

**Defining Activity Areas at
Pensacola's First Lighthouse**

by

Connie M. Huddleston

Paper presented at the
56th Annual Southeastern Archaeological Conference

Pensacola, Florida

(Page 1) In *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* (South 1977), Stanley South presented archaeologists with his theories of quantitative analysis and pattern recognition. Since its publication in 1977, this book (South 1977) has become a mainstay for historic archaeologists, especially those of us in the southeastern United States.

(Page 2) South applied this theory of quantitative analysis and pattern recognition to a number of sites and identified these three patterns:

the Brunswick Pattern - British Colonial pattern

the Carolina Pattern - British-American Colonial pattern based on urban sites

the Frontier Pattern - British-American Colonial pattern based on rural sites

(Page 3) Other archaeologists added additional patterns such as the Revised Carolina Pattern, the Public Interaction Pattern (Garrow 1982), the Carolina Slave Pattern (Garrow 1981), and the Revised Frontier Pattern (Wheaton et al. 1983). Pat Garrow (Garrow 1981) moved colonoware from the Activities Group to the Kitchen Group based on archaeological evidence of its use. In *Historical Archaeology*, Joseph (1989:55-56) noted the responses of a number of researchers to South's original artifact patterns and the processes involved with the utilization of these patterns. He recognized the need for "scholarly consideration of the utility of South's artifact patterning concept" and suggested that we "evaluate the research potential of artifact patterning, and outline a more critical framework for its application."

(Page 4) A number of us, myself included, have applied and compared South's original patterns based on colonial sites to any number of sites from a wide range of occupational dates without discussing refuse patterns, excavation strategies, and collection techniques. Often, we present the data only as percentages without discussion of artifact types, quantities, and use. Frequently, we present the percentages and fail to compare them to other sites in order to identify patterns.

With all of this previous research in mind, I attempted to apply South's method of quantitative analysis and pattern recognition to a very different type of site, 8ES64, the first Pensacola lighthouse keeper's residence. As you have heard during the last few papers, artifacts and historical research have identified occupations from the Spanish colonial period up to World War I. Additionally, the presence of military forces at the site during the Seminole Wars, mid-nineteenth century military harbor fortification, the Civil War, and World War I have disrupted the archaeological record presented by the lighthouse keeper's residence. Another problem identified during quantitative analysis of the artifact collection from 8ES64 was the presence of a large number of chimney glass fragments from the nearby lighthouse. Placed in the Activities Group, this large number of one artifact type severely skewed the group percentage.

(Page 5) In order to deal with these intricacies of the site, in our report (Jordan et al. 1999), we added an additional artifact group to our pattern analysis. This Military Group includes all artifacts that can be easily identified as related to any military presence at the site before and during the Civil War. Post Civil War military artifacts are not included. Our identification of the military artifacts is based on the descriptions and illustrations of a number of collectors such as Harris (1987) and Crouch (1995). While we understood that this additional group would limit the usefulness of the pattern for comparison with other sites, it was felt that its addition would enhance intra-site comparison.

(Page 6) In order to overcome this limitation, our artifact pattern analysis tables present a quantitative list of the items included; therefore, it is possible for others to reorganize and use these data for their own comparisons.

(Page 7) It should be noted that our artifact assemblage is based on feature excavations and very limited collections made during scraping by block. No unit excavations were conducted. This excavation method, as stipulated in our scope of work, was designed to identify, excavate, and evaluate the largest possible number of significant features from the site with the time and money available for the study.

(Page 8) Before examining the quantitative analysis for pattern recognition, an additional aspect of intra-site artifact distribution must be presented. This approach states that architectural and furniture related artifacts are usually very closely associated with structures during their use, while kitchen, clothing, personal, tobacco, arms, and activities group artifacts are more likely to be mobile in their areas of use. Artifact groups except architecture are often discarded during occupation of a site, i.e., their placement at a site is the result of intentional refuse disposal or accidental loss. Both of these are human behaviors. In opposition, architectural artifacts are more often included in site deposition by the natural forces of decay and dereliction after a structure has been abandoned. There are of course exceptions to each which we as archaeologists may or may not be able to identify in the archaeological record. This distribution of artifacts should reflect patterns of use or disposal at a site that can define areas of activity.

(Page 9) The laboratory staff prepared modified South Inventory Patterns for each excavation block. Comparison of these percentages initially presented us with several indications of site use.

(Page 10) For example, Blocks 2 and 8 show high percentages of Kitchen Group artifacts. These high percentages seem to indicate proximity to cooking and/or consumption areas. However, historical research and archaeological evidence place the lighthouse keeper's residence in Block 7, an area with a relatively low Kitchen Group percentage. Block 2 is more than 40 meters from the east side of the house. If this area was used for kitchen/house refuse, a great deal of effort was taken in its disposal. However, post molds recorded in this block may also indicate an additional domestic structure in this area. Or these postmolds may support Butler's previously presented theory of an unidentified U.S. military occupation in this area during the 1830s or 1840s. This pattern of refuse disposal may indicate a detached kitchen in one or both of these blocks or a cultural preference for waste disposal away from the main residence.

(Page 11) Furthermore, the high Architecture Group percentages in Blocks 4 and 7 indicate the presence of structures in the immediate area, as architectural items are rarely displaced during occupation of a site and usually are not widely distributed even after destruction of the structure. The high percentage in Block 7 can be explained by the presence of the lighthouse keeper's

residence. Again, post molds in Block 4 along with the high number of architectural related artifacts indicate the presence of some type of structure in this area. Based on the low percentage of Kitchen Group artifacts in Block 4, a possible structure there was probably not a kitchen or used domestically. **(Page 12)** By examining the list of Activities Group artifacts, we may conclude that this structure is some type of storage facility. The presence of a large number of glass chimney fragments may indicate storage of additional lighthouse chimneys, and the large number of barrel band fragments may indicate storage of lamp oil.

(Page 13) Three artifact groups appear relatively evenly across the site. The Clothing Group averages 1.2 percent with a variation of only 0.5 percent from the average. The Tobacco Group and Furniture Groups follow this pattern. This lack of variation prohibits the identification of activities based on these three artifact groups by block; however, it does help establish a pattern of artifact distribution for these three groups. As sites of this period are studied in the future, this pattern should be compared to other residential patterns.

(Page 14) Analysis of the Block 7 percentages as compared to the other excavation blocks shows higher percentages of Personal and Arms Group artifacts. The site average for Personal Group artifacts is 0.4 percent. **(Page 15)** However, three of the six Personal Group artifacts recovered from Block 7 post date the nineteenth century occupation at the site. **(Page 16)** If these three artifacts are removed from the Block 7 Modified South Inventory Pattern, then the Personal Group percentage falls to 0.5 percent, approximately average for the site.

(Page 17) This same situation occurs with the Arms Group; of the 17 artifacts, 16 most likely post date the nineteenth century occupation of the site. These 16 artifacts are modern ammunition and like the three Personal Group artifacts are most likely associated with twentieth century military use of the site. Please remember our Military Group includes only those items associated with a military presence before or during the Civil War, not after. **(Page 18)** Removal of these artifacts from the Block 7 Modified South Inventory Pattern reduces the number of Arms Group artifacts to

one and the percentage to 0.2. Using this modified percentage, the Arms Group for Block 7 is compatible with the remainder of the site.

(Page 18) Comparison of the Military Group percentages shows a Block 4 percentage of 1.7 compared to an average of 0.9 for the remainder of the site. However, a comparison of the number of military-related artifacts recovered from the excavation blocks shows that the distribution is more even than the percentages portray. **(Page 19)** Actually, Blocks 2, 4, and 8 contain relatively similar numbers of Military Group artifacts.

(Page 20) These four examples of analysis of the Modified Artifact Patterns serve to demonstrate the necessity for closely examining the artifacts presented within each group. Conclusions drawn simply from the percentages may be misleading. South proposed this type of close analysis in his interpretation of the Public House-Tailor Shop (1977:102-104). At that site, the inclusion of 1,228 small shot found in association with the thousands of tailoring objects suggested that the shot had a function other than in the context of arms. This conclusion along with the lack of other arms related artifacts such as gun flints and gun parts indicated that these artifacts were misplaced within the Arms Group. Based on this idea, South removed the shot from the Arms Group and placed it in the Clothing Group. This type of analysis is often lacking or not discussed in current archaeological reports; however, it may directly impact our interpretations of site use and activity areas. Furthermore, it demonstrates the necessity for presenting South Artifact patterns that give at least a general list of the artifacts within each group.

(Page 21) At 8ES64, just as comparison of the artifact patterns from the excavation blocks provided insight into spatial and functional relationships, artifact patterns based on selected features were compared in order to understand the depositional processes within the site. We hoped that comparison of artifact group percentages from one feature to another would indicate specific activity areas, locations of buildings, and/or refuse deposition patterns. While our report analysis compared data from ten features, this table presents data from only the four features with the highest artifact counts. Block numbers are presented in parenthesis after the feature number.

(Page 22) Comparisons of these percentages show the highest percentages of kitchen related artifacts in Features 613 (Block 2) and 715 (Block 8). These two features also contain the highest Kitchen Group artifact counts. This could indicate either that these two features were closer to the cooking/serving areas of the site or that they were used for kitchen refuse disposal. However, archival and archaeological data indicate that while Feature 715 is located only 10 to 15 meters from the eastern edge of the residence, Feature 613 was separated from the house by approximately 43 meters. This distance seems somewhat excessive for everyday refuse disposal for a household during the nineteenth century. Although, since Feature 613 contained a great deal of faunal debris, this pit may have been placed a longer distance from the house because of the objectionable odor. On the other hand, this feature may represent refuse from a secondary food preparation area or be associated with a different temporal occupation. However, the mean ceramic date for this feature does not support a different temporal episode.

(Page 23) Feature 653 displays a very high Activities Group percentage. Analysis of these data shows that 644 glass lighthouse chimneys fragments are listed in this group. If this count is removed and placed in Lighthouse related group then the Activities Group percentage falls to 2.1. Feature 653 is in Block 5, approximately 40 meters from the supposed lighthouse location. Based on the presence of large numbers of this one artifact type that could be conclusively attributed to the presence of the lighthouse, data indicate that a Lighthouse Group would have enhanced the artifact patterning process and allowed for additional interpretations of the site data.

(Page 24) Finally, we designed the addition of a Military Group to the artifact patterning process for 8ES64 to pinpoint areas or features within the site impacted by the Civil War military encampment. However, further analysis of these artifacts, specifically the buttons, revealed military use or occupation of the site during at least two distinct time periods. The first occupation or presence appears to have been between the 1820s and the 1840s by the U.S. Navy and U.S. Army. The second occurred during the Civil War by Federal troops. **(Page 25)** Analysis of five dateable U.S. Navy buttons recovered from Feature 613 (Block 2) dates deposition of this feature from c.1802 to c.1830. The presence of this many Navy buttons implies Navy occupation or use of the site during

this period. Our research identified three military episodes during this time frame. The first two are occupations by General Andrew Jackson during in November of 1814 and again in the Spring of 1818. Additionally, Coleman and Coleman indicate some of General Jackson's troops camped near Fort San Carlos de Barrancas again in 1822. Any of these occupations or the continuous occupation of Pensacola by the U.S. Navy after this time may have contributed to the deposition of these Navy buttons. Only one Civil War era U.S. Army button was recovered from Block 2; this occurred during surface scraping.

Other than Block 2, only Block 8 contains a number of dateable military buttons. Six of the twenty are from the early period, c.1802 to c. 1840. These include three U.S. Navy buttons and three U.S. Army buttons. There is also one Navy button that dates from 1830 to 1852, a somewhat later period, yet still before the Civil War. Thirteen of the buttons date from the Civil War period. All of these are either U.S. Army or New York Militia staff buttons. Ninety-five percent of these military buttons are from Feature 715. This deposition and other artifact data indicate that Feature 715 fill includes a temporal mix of artifacts from all occupations of the site.

The addition of the Military Group to the artifact patterning process did provide additional information on areas of the site with high concentrations of military related artifacts. Additional research of these artifacts also presented us with data supporting more than one military occupation of the site. In hindsight, our attempt to locate the areas of Civil War encampment based on the addition of this artifact group failed; however, had we then broken this group into sub-groups based on temporal indicators the data may have been more useful.

In conclusion, the site of the first Pensacola lighthouse keeper's residence presented us with numerous obstacles during excavation, analysis, and interpretation. Based on South's original artifact patterning theory, we added one artifact group - the Military Group - in an attempt to define areas of specific activities. However, our analysis indicates that this additional group could not stand alone. We needed to look at a number of variables together, such as temporal indicators and artifact counts in order to interpret activity areas within the site.

(Page 26) Furthermore, we found it necessary to modify our patterns, percentages, and counts based on the temporal indicators. While this type of analysis is time consuming, it more accurately follows the theories put forth by South in 1977. Since that time, 20 years of historical archaeology has presented us with a wealth of raw data. Yet, we have often failed to evolve. We continue to present raw data with little regard for synthesis and interpretation of the data and explanations of the cultural processes reflected by the data. If historical archaeology is to continue, we must capture the minds of our public. We must include the development of explanatory exhibits. Moreover, we must begin to present and interpret our data in a form that will allow other archaeologists to compare sites and develop regional and temporal patterns and syntheses.

References Cited

Crouch, Howard R.

1995 *Civil War Artifacts: A Guide for the Historian*. SCS Publications, Fairfax, Virginia.

Garrow, Patrick H., editor

1981 Investigations of Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations. Paper presented Before the Annual Meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, New Orleans.

1982 *Archaeological Investigations on the Washington, D.C. Civic Center Site*. Soil Systems, Inc.

Harris, Charles S.

1987 *Civil War Relics of the Western Campaigns: 1861-1865*. Rapidan Press, Mechanicsville, Virginia.

Jordan, William R. and Connie Huddleston

1999 *The First Pensacola Lighthouse: Archaeology of a Keeper's Residence*. Report submitted to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District by Brockington and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.

Joseph, J. W.

1989 Pattern and Process in the Plantation Archaeology of the Lowcountry of Georgia and South Carolina. *Historical Archaeology* 23(1):55-68.

South, Stanley

1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.

Wheaton, Thomas R., Amy Friedlander, and Patrick H. Garrow

1983 *Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations: Studies in Afro-American Archaeology*.
Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District, and National
Park Service, Southeast Regional Office, Atlanta.