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Abstract

In summer of 2012 archaeological excavations were conducted at the Iberville Housing Projects in New Orleans, Louisiana. The excavations were conducted in order to gather archaeological data pertaining to the site’s history as part of New Orleans’ notorious vice district, Storyville. During excavation a cache of 765 turquoise glass seed beads was uncovered along the east wall of Test Unit #1. The cache, found at a depth of around 83 cm below the ground surface, suggests, in conjunction with other artifacts found at this level, that the beads were deposited at the site between 1810 and 1830. This cache of seed beads is unique at the site both in its context and in the quantity of beads that were found. The presence of the bead cache suggests that there may have been an active trading economy at the site, as beads similar to those found at the Iberville site are important elements in informal economies of the eighteenth century. This paper discusses the possibility that an alternative or informal reciprocal, non-cash based economy was in operation on the periphery of New Orleans in the early nineteenth century.
Keywords: Historical Archaeology; Nineteenth Century New Orleans; Beads; Informal Economies; New Orleans Archaeology
Introduction

The Iberville Housing Projects, located near the French Quarter in New Orleans, Louisiana, were originally constructed in 1939. The current boundaries of the Housing complex almost precisely coincide with those of Storyville, New Orleans’ experiment with a semi-legal vice district in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. In 2009, the Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO), who is responsible for the Iberville Complex, announced a proposal to demolish most of the current structures in the complex in order to redevelop the area into mixed income housing. In compliance with the federal National Historic Preservation Act, archaeological excavations were conducted in order to gather historically relevant data that would otherwise be lost in the redevelopment. This provided the University of New Orleans’ Department of Anthropology the opportunity to conduct an archaeological field school within a single courtyard in the Iberville Housing Projects. This courtyard is located on City Square 130, the block historically bounded by N. Franklin St., Iberville St., Conti St., and Tréme St. Between June and July of 2012, nine students, headed by Dr. Ryan Gray and Andrea White, participated in the archaeological field school with the goal of recovering archaeological data pertaining to the block’s development throughout the late-eighteenth to early-twentieth centuries.

Excavations for the field school consisted of four 2 x2 meter excavation units spanning two historic lots located within the courtyard. Two units (Test Unit 1 and 2) were placed on 315-317 Tréme/ Liberty, and the other two units (Test Units 3 and 4) were placed on 318-320 Franklin/ Crozat. (See Figure 1) During excavations, Test Unit 1 produced a cache of 766 turquoise glass seed beads found at a depth of 83 cm below the ground surface. The depth in conjunction with other artifacts found at this level suggests that the beads were deposited at the
site between 1800 and 1830. The cache of seed beads is unique at the site both in its context and in the quantity of beads that were found.

While the primary research focus of the excavation was the recovery of deposits associated with the Storyville era (1897-1917), the deposit in which the beads were found predates Storyville by almost a century. Beads like those found at the Iberville site are well documented as being a common form of currency used in trade during the eighteenth century (Gijanto 2011: 638; Degan 1987: 156; Smith 2002; Kidd & Kidd 1983; Stine et al. 1996). Beads of this sort were often manufactured in Europe and shipped to merchants operating in the Americas in order to trade with the indigenous populations (Smith 2002; Sprague 1985: 206-207; Deagan 1987:158). The size of the beads suggest that they were intended to be used as decoration and adornment for clothing, and the color, turquoise, may suggest that they were of some spiritual significance to people of African descent (Stine et al. 1996; Sprague 1985). Glass beads, along with other items such as deer skins, alcohol, food stuffs, tools, and other amenities, were important elements in what historian Daniel Usner termed a “frontier exchange economy”(Usner1985:187-185). A frontier exchange economy is a locally developed economy in which inhabitants of a region conduct small scale, face-to-face trade that is independent of the larger, national economy. In Colonial America, these kinds of exchanges created vast trading networks that connected diverse groups of people, including Native Americans, African slaves, free people of color, and white European settlers, and helped to create a culture that was unique to the region. Usner argues for a strong local system of exchange that flourished in the early part of the eighteenth century but slowly declined and almost disappeared by the close of the century when there was a shift to a more formal cash and slave-based plantation economy.
This paper discusses the possibility that an alternative or informal reciprocal, non-cash based economy similar to the frontier exchange economy documented by Daniel Usner was in operation on the periphery of New Orleans in the early nineteenth century. The presence of the bead cache suggests that there may have been an active trading economy at the site, as beads similar to those found at the Iberville site are important elements in informal economies of the eighteenth century. The beads themselves are potentially indicative of people’s social status, ethnic identities, and spiritual affiliation. The history of the Iberville site will be discussed in order to understand the individuals who occupied the site historically, as well as the social conditions under which an informal system of exchange could have operated. While participants in a non-cash-based informal economy most likely participated in the more formal economy, the reciprocal and informal economy also served as a networking tool that created social bonds that spanned race and social class in a time when race-based slavery structured social relations in New Orleans. This paper is an effort to use archeological data to explore some of the social and economic relationships between people who lived in the marginal areas of New Orleans. Such people may have been linked through a common system of exchange that reached across social boundaries, and yet this system remains absent from most historical records.

Site History

The area that the Iberville Housing Projects now occupies, formally bounded by St. Louis St. to the north, Basin St. to the east, Iberville St. to the south, and North Claiborne Ave. to the west, was once designated as the City Commons. When plans for New Orleans were established between 1718 and 1719 by the French, the colonial administration established a Military Commons that surrounded the landward sides of the city limits. This land was set aside for the eventual fortification of the city, but this did not materialize until 1759 when construction on the
fortifications began. The area beyond the Military Commons, which was about 461 feet wide (or two arpents and twelve toises in French measurements), was designated as the City Commons. The City Commons was situated between the boundaries of Governor Bienville’s riverfront plantation to the south (modern day Common-Tulane St.), the Charles de Morand habitation to the north, the Military Commons to the east, which is modern day Rampart Street, and west towards Bayou Saint John. (See Figures 2-4) The area was considered a useless swamp that was not sought after for purchase and hence was designated for public grazing and a source of free firewood (Toledano et al. 1980: 57). The area remained mostly vacant until 1743, and it was rumored that in the early colonial period Ouma Indians held corn festivals in the area beyond the Military Commons, possibly near the area that later become Congo Square (Godzinski et al. 2013:16).

By 1750 the city had expanded to modern-day Rampart St., while the lakeward area remained the City Commons. This area could not be legally developed, but still there were a number of minor intrusions into the public commons (Toledano et al. 1980:57; Godzinski et al. 2013:16). In 1759 construction began on the fortification of the city for fear of a British attack, and the town was enclosed by earthen work fortifications along with a stockade. By 1760 fortifications were completed and consisted of a moat and palisade with platforms and curtains. In 1805 the landward forts and earthen work fortification were removed under the direction of Governor Claiborne. The area that was formerly occupied by the earthen works, bounded by modern-day Canal St., North Rampart St., South Peters, and Iberville, was intended to be sold. In 1810, the city commissioned Jacques Tanesse to prepare a plan to subdivide the area, and throughout the nineteenth century portions continued to be sold and developed as both commercial and domestic properties (Godzinski et al. 2013:14).
In 1812 the city of New Orleans had Jacques Tanesse draw up plans to subdivide the portion of the city commons that was not previously subdivided in 1810. This portion was situated on the lakeside of Rampart St., and consisted of City Squares 123, 124, and 127-130. Lots located on these squares were considered to be in a desirable location between Canal St. and the Carondelet Canal. The lots probably sold quickly but details about the original development along Basin St. are scarce. Due to the redevelopment of the area in the twentieth century, only a few of the nineteenth century structures remain. By 1852 it is likely that the squares facing Basin St. were well developed with both commercial and domestic properties (Godzinski et al. 2013:43). The particulars of the original buildings along Basin St. are unknown, but from the 1887 Sanborn Company maps of New Orleans some structural data from these squares can be inferred. It suggests that creole cottages predominated but villa and center hall cottages, town houses, and commercial buildings including store houses and corner stores were dispersed throughout the neighborhood (Toledano et al. 1980, Godzinski et al. 2013:43).

By 1887 female boarding houses (brothels) appeared on the 100 block of North Basin St., and the area on the lakeside of Rampart St., between Common St. and the Carondelet Canal, was flooded with immigrants and the urban poor. According to the 1896 edition of the Sanborn maps, other buildings on the 100 block of North Rampart St. had become female boarding houses, “Negro dance halls,” and other various tenderloin establishments. By 1897 Storyville was established by city officials in order to contain prostitution, and over the next two decades North Basin St., between Canal and Conti, hosted some of Storyville’s most popular brothels and personalities including Tom Anderson, Josie Arlington, and Lulu White (Picayune: 1997). Most of the squares within Storyville were almost solely dedicated to prostitution, and most prostitutes conducted business in “cribs”, small constructions hastily built to meet demands. By the
Storyville era the area that was formerly the City Commons was no longer a backwater swamp but rather a bustling neighborhood with a vibrant economy in the center of the city.

Storyville was closed in 1917 by the city administration at the demand of the U.S. Navy, but by then the area had begun to decline. Some of the properties located within the boundaries of Storyville were taken up by commercial ventures, but the structures that remained raised public concern over slum conditions on the remaining properties. This contributed to the acquisition and eventual razing of properties by HANO in 1938. By 1939, few buildings associated with Storyville remained and construction began on the Iberville Housing Projects (Godzinski et al. 2013:45). In 2011 HANO and the City of New Orleans were granted a considerable amount of money by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Choice Neighborhood Initiative. They plan to revitalize the neighborhood by integrating the site physically and socially to create a diverse, mixed-income community (HANO: 2013). Construction on the site began in the fall of 2013.

The antebellum socio-economic development of the area that was subdivided in 1812 is unclear due to the ambiguity of the available census information, and it is often difficult to place specific names to specific address. This problem arises from the fact that information that antebellum censuses sought to obtain relied on individuals having a fixed residence as well as a fixed identity (Gray 2011: 61). The census records from this time period often only list the name of the head of household (usually a male), his ethnicity, his occupation, and the number of people living within the household grouped by age and sex. Yet these criteria did not always apply for people living on the periphery of the city, in such places as the former City Commons. These people often comprised the city’s working class and they frequently moved, changed jobs, and household structures. (Gray 2011: 61). In 1850, efforts were made to conduct a more
systematic and precise census survey, yet some of the problems of the old process still remained, and the U.S. Census for New Orleans didn’t list households by street address until 1880.

The developmental history of the City Commons shares many characteristics with the better known adjacent neighborhood of Tréme. The Tréme, known as Faubourg Tréme, is historically an ethnically mixed neighborhood that is bound by North Rampart St., North Broad St., Canal St., and St. Bernard Ave. It was once the Morand grant habitation that bordered the area of the City Commons. In 1798, it was subdivided and sold by its namesake Charles Tréme and many free people of color were allowed to purchase property within it. Other social groups also inhabited the neighborhood, such as poor whites, Europeans immigrants, and Natives Americans. One square with in the Tréme, City Square 115, was not sold and remained open for public use. By 1806 this space was officially known as Circus Place, today called Congo Square, and it was used as a congregation place for slaves on Sundays (Godzinski et al. 2013:43). (See Figure 5) Such a public space provided an atmosphere that allowed small face-to-face trade to occur on a regular basis between peoples of different ethnic and racial backgrounds.

A law that dates to 1806 stated that slaves must be free to enjoy Sundays or they would be compensated for a day of work, usually with the sum of fifty cents. The basis of slaves’ participation in informal and alternative economies as both consumers and producers is rooted in the free time this law granted them. This law also allowed for public spaces such as Congo Square to become designated areas for urban slaves to meet on Sundays. In 1817 the city of New Orleans passed an ordinance that restricted the assemblies of slaves, only permitting it in the instances of worship, funerals, games, and dances. It stated that assemblies of slaves for the purpose of merriment should only take place on Sundays in open public spaces that were appointed by the Mayor, and that they could only last until sunset. Due to the development of
both the Tréme and the City Commons by the late 1830s, the activity in Congo Square was heavily restricted, even though no law explicitly forbade it. In 1854, a petition was presented to the First Municipal Council requesting that the privilege of dancing on Sundays be returned to the urban slaves. The council agreed, stating that “from May 1 to August 21 each year, slaves, with the written consent from their owners, could gather in Congo Square on Sundays from 4 to 6 P.M. The dancing must not be offensive to public decency and eight police men must be present” (Toledano et al. 1980: 65). In 1851, Congo Square was renamed the Place d’ Armes and designated as the drilling place of the militia on Sundays (Toledano et al. 1980:65). The importance of the traditional Sunday assemblies of slaves is demonstrated by their active pursuit of this right to assemble in Congo Square during the early nineteenth century. This in part may be the result of their drive to participate in independent market activities commonly conducted at Sunday market assemblies.

Another feature located within the City Commons that would connect participants of informal economies and encourage trade was the Carondelet Canal. (See Figures 7-8) Completed in 1794 under Spanish administration via slave labor, the canal was used both as a waterway and as a drainage system. As a waterway it connected to Bayou St. John, which was one of the main routes connecting New Orleans to the north and east. The Carondelet Canal proved important in local commerce as it connected New Orleans, via Bayou St. John and Lake Pontchartrain, to many other important waterways such as Bayou Lacombe, Pearl River, Tchefuncte River, Tangipahoa River, and the Gulf Coast. Flat bottom boats brought lumber, tar, pitch, turpentine, brick, charcoal, fish, and oysters to New Orleans from various locations (Toledano et al. 1980: 60-61). A first hand travel account from the 1820’s records the activity that could be commonly observed on the Carondelet Canal,
“We frequently see in the Basin from 70 to 80 sail, of some 550 to 600 barrels from the West Indies, Pensacola, Mobile, Covington and Mandeville…. By this Canal is brought cotton, oysters, tobacco, lumber, wood, limes, brick, tar, pitch, sand, oysters, marketing, and a great variety of other articles. A great number of Indians come by this route to New Orleans with their furs and peltries.” (Crété 1978: 44)

As a means of commerce the Carondelet Canal was of obvious importance to the formal economy, but at the same time and for the same reasons it was an important facility of the informal economy. First, it was a space in which slaves and the free workforce would come into contact with one another, which would create social relationships that in time would facilitate face-to-face trade. Second, as it was a waterway, it would have been utilized by itinerant river peddlers and Native Americans, both of whom will be discussed later, as a route to connect their trading networks to New Orleans. Such a high traffic and commercial area would have attracted participants of the informal economy and provided an atmosphere in which small scale face-to-face trade could occur frequently.

The site that the Iberville Housing Projects now occupies has a long and complex history starting with the establishment of the City Commons in 1719 and spanning all the way up to the present. The period that is of interest to this paper is between 1800 and 1830 when the beads were most likely deposited at the site. There is little record of occupation for the site before it was subdivided and sold in 1812 by the city. From the amount of artifacts recovered that date to the early nineteenth century, it suggests that the site was occupied and actively used before and after the subdivision. This is further supported by the history of such spaces as the Carondelet Canal and Congo Square, which were highly active commercial and public centers located within or in close proximity to the City Commons in the early nineteenth century. Since the historical
record is scant regarding the socioeconomic development of the City Commons, the history of the socioeconomic development of the adjacent neighborhood, the Tréme, an ethnically mixed neighborhood composed of working class residences provides a template in which to view the development of the City Commons during this period.

Archaeological Excavation of Test Unit 1

As stated earlier, the excavations conducted by the University of New Orleans Anthropology Department field school were confined to a single courtyard with in the Iberville Housing Complex located on City Square 130. City Square 130 was included in the second phase (1812) of Jacques Tanesse’s subdivision plan for the city of New Orleans. The excavations included the placement of four 2 x2 meter excavation units located within the courtyard. The units were placed on two double municipal lots which backed up to each other. Two units (Test Unit 1 and 2) were placed on 315-317 Tréme/ Liberty and the other two units (Test Units 3 and 4) were placed on 318-320 Franklin/ Crozat according to the post-1894 street enumeration system. For convenience, the units were oriented towards the historic city street grid and a grid north was established so that North Liberty constituted the northern boundary of the block. Excavation methods consisted of hand excavations using shovel and trowel. The units were excavated according to the natural strata, and if necessary the stratum was subdivided into levels ranging between 5 and 10 cm depending on the amount of material. Soils were screened using a .25 inch mesh, and soil samples were collected from relevant historical strata. All four excavation units were brought down to the sterile subsoil in order to confirm the absence of deeply buried deposits.
Test Unit 1, which produced the cache of seed beads, was placed on the property line of historic lots 65 and 69 Tréme/ Liberty (1887 Sanborn map), later lots 315/317 and 319 (1895 Sanborn map). It was hoped that Test Unit 1 would shed light on the earlier development of the lot, which is absent in the historical record. Most of the unit was located on the 319 lot, and its developmental history as well as that of lot 315/317 will be discussed briefly. The early development of the square is murky but from the available documents, the Robison New Orleans Atlas, and Sanborn maps, the structural development can be pieced together. According to the Robinson Atlas published in 1883, there was a medium sized brick building set back from the street located on lot 65. Based on the building’s location, being set back from the street, along with its architectural style, it suggests that it may have been one of the first structures on the square constructed sometime between 1830 and 1850. By 1909, the lot had been redesigned 315/317, and the Sanborn map shows that two frame buildings were placed in the front of the lot both of which are designated female boarding houses. By 1914, all three structures were replaced by the two-story building as seen in an aerial photograph. The 1887 Sanborn map shows a large wood frame building on lot 69 that extended all the way to the street front. The 1895 map shows that the building on lot 69, by this time lot 319, was expanded towards the back of the lot. The 1909 Sanborn map shows that the building was expanded even more; so much so that it occupied nearly the whole lot and could be considered a new construction. Also shown in the 1909 Sanborn map, the two structures placed at the front of lots 315/317 and the structure placed on the 319 lot were designated female boarding houses. (See figures 9-12) The remains of these structures were documented within the excavation context of Test Unit 1.

Test Unit 1 was placed directly north of a shovel test pit previously conducted by Earth Search, Inc. which produced an aboriginal pottery sherd from a deeply buried context. It was
initially hoped that the unit would expose a prehistoric deposit (Godzinski et al. 2013:219). Originally, Test Unit 1 was intended to be a 2 x 2 meter unit; however, early on a utility trench was discovered running north to south in Stratum IV (22.5 to 24.5 cmbd). Due to the disruptive nature of the trench, the unit was extended one meter to the east in order to obtain a better stratigraphic context. Fifteen distinct cultural strata were identified along with a number of features. These features included the remains of a brick chain wall (Feature 4) found at a depth of 50 cmbd, a partially destroyed brick footing (Feature 14) found at a depth of 32 cmbd, and a brick-lined post hole (Feature 16) found at a depth of 63 cmbd. Although the remains of the brick chain wall date to the early part of the twentieth century and are likely associated with the outermost wall of the large structure on lot 319, seen in the 1895 Robison Atlas, most of the strata originate from an earlier era. These strata, occurring between 60 and 100 cmbd, extend back to the early nineteenth century, produced a number of creamware and pearlware sherds, in addition to large quantities of animal bone, bottle glass, and various metal objects. Test Unit 1 was excavated to the sterile subsoil and terminated at a depth of 120 cmbd. (See Figure 13)

The most unique find to be recovered from Test Unit 1 was the cache of 766 turquoise glass seed beads. The beads were found in situ articulated in a cluster as if they were once strung together. They were uncovered along the east profile wall at a depth of 93 cmbd and originated in Stratum XIV. The beads were designated their own lot number and collected along with the clumps of dirt that entombed them. A soil sample was then taken from the area immediately surrounding the bead deposit in hopes of recovering more beads, through flotation, that were not gathered in the initial collection. The bead cache was found lying on top of a piece of animal bone, and within the immediate vicinity other artifacts were recovered including creamware and pearlware ceramic sherds, two bottle bases, and ferrous metal objects. (See Figures 14-16)
artifact assemblage, in addition to the beads themselves, may provide clues as to how the entire assemblage became buried and will be discussed in greater detail later.

Analysis of the ceramic sherds collected from Stratum XIV and the strata at the same depth and directly above and below suggests that the beads were deposited around 1804/05 but no earlier than 1795 (See Appendix A for more detail). This date was obtained by mean ceramic dating techniques. Included in the calculation were ceramic sherds from Stratum XII, Stratum XIII, and Stratum XIV. This technique for dating ceramics was developed by Stanley South of the South Carolina Archaeology and Anthropology Institute, and his method relies on the fact that the manufacturing periods for over one hundred European pottery types are known. Calculating a mean ceramic date is done by counting all the sherds or obtaining a minimum vessel count from the sherds and determining a mean manufacturing date for each pottery type. The mean dates are then assigned a weighted average based on the relative quantity of each type of pottery represented at the site. From the weighted averages a mean date is taken, and that date should represent a midpoint in the period in which the site was occupied (Deetz 1996:25-27). As this is a relative dating technique, there are certain factors that might account for errors in dating. One such factor is that people in a lower socio-economic standing may hold on to pottery longer or receive the pottery as hand-me-downs, which would result in an earlier deposit date not necessarily reflected by the mean ceramic date (Deetz 1996:25-27). To eliminate this possible error in the mean ceramic date formula a *terminus post quem* can be established for each context. The *terminus post quem* simply means the “date after which”, and in the context of mean ceramic dates, it is the earliest manufacturing date of the latest piece of pottery. For example, in the context of the bead deposit the most recent pottery sherd was almost always Blue-Transfer print Pearlware, which was manufactured between 1795 and 1830. In this case the *terminus post*
quem would be 1795 hence the deposit cannot be older than that date. While the mean ceramic date for the bead deposit is 1804/05, it is possible that it is associated with a later date which would coincide with the earliest development of the lot, presumably around 1830. This is also based on the fact that the people who inhabited the area of the former City Commons are presumably of low or middle class economic status and would have held on to pottery longer and/or received pottery by second hand means.

The complex nature of the stratigraphy at the depth at which the beads were found suggests that during the time of deposit there was active development in the area that caused the artifacts to become buried in distinct strata relatively quickly. This is further supported by the ceramic analysis in which the mean ceramic dates acquired from each individual stratum only range from 1802 to 1809 by both sherd count and minimum vessel count, and by the strata themselves, which have a mean thickness of only 12 cm. (See Appendix B for more detail.)

**Bead Analysis**

739 turquoise glass seed beads were initially recovered in the field, and another 27 beads were recovered via flotation from the soil sample collected on site for a total of 766. A cache of this quantity is unusual as archaeologists typically only find a few beads scattered throughout the strata. For analysis, the beads were meticulously counted and recounted to insure an accurate number. A sample group was then collected at random which consisted of 148 beads, or 20% of the 739 beads initially collected on site, in order to obtain an average diameter and width of the beads. From the sample group the average diameter was 2.648 mm with an average width of 2.04 mm. Initially it was thought that the beads varied in color and consisted of different hues of blue and turquoise, but after cleaning and soaking it became clear that all the beads were the same
monochrome turquoise color. Under magnification the beads seem to be semi-translucent with a semi-glossy surface. (See Figures 17-18)

From the analysis it can be reasonably concluded that the turquoise beads are in fact seed beads (Conn 1972: 7-8; Sprague 1985: 206). The usual classification for seed beads is between 0-2 mm (Sprague 1985: 206). The term “seed bead” can be misleading due to the fact that the beads are made out of glass and not seeds. Other names that have been used to identify beads of this size include micro bead, sand bead, bead-work bead, or short bead (Sprague 1985; Francis 1981; Kidd and Kidd 1970). Beads of this sort were made through a manufacturing method known as drawing and winding, but also known as tubular drawn, cane, hollow cane, tube, or cut (Deagan 1987: 159; Sprague 1985: 206; Harris and Harris 1967: 135; Kid and Kid 1970:50). The process by which seed beads were manufactured involved taking the desired amount of molten colored glass and placing it in the center of a rod of the desired thickness. The glass is then blown into a hollow form, and two people pull the glass in opposite directions, drawing the glass out into a pipe or tube of the desired thickness. At this point the glass maker may decide to add other colors to the beads or not. After the tube has cooled the beads are cut from the entire length and removed from the rod. The beads are then gathered and placed in a tumbler to polish and round out the cut edges. The finished beads are then packaged and shipped out to merchants and traders (Sprague 1985: 206-207; Deagan 1987:158).

This method of manufacturing leads to varying diameters even if the beads are cut for the same tube, as observed in the beads collected for the Iberville site, and the process of cutting the beads produces jagged edges which was also observed in the Iberville beads. Beads of this sort were often used for embroidery, bodily adornment, amulets, and other personal artifacts due to their versatility and small size (Sprague 1985: 206; Stine et al. 1996). During the colonial and
antebellum period drawn glass beads and glass beads in general were manufactured in Europe, namely Venice, Amsterdam, and Milan, and shipped to merchants operating in the colonies through middlemen and trading companies (Sprague 1985: 207). It is impossible to trace the manufacturing of seed beads back to a specific manufacturer, but if a firm date of a bead deposit is obtainable it may be possible to trace the beads to a specific European city (Sprague 1985:205).

The cache of seed beads that was found at the Iberville site may be representative of an informal economy that was in operation on the fringes of New Orleans during the early nineteenth century. Beads such as those found in the cache are well documented as being a form of currency used in trade throughout the colonial world (Usner 1987, Stine et al. 1996, Gijanto 2011, Sprague 1985, Smith 2002). Informal economies are also well documented within the historical record, and most of the research that has been conducted pertaining to informal economies has concentrated on the slave economies of the American colonial south (Usner 1987, 1985; Gijanto 2011; Berlin & Morgan 1991; Morgan 1983; Stine et al. 1996; Thompson 2012). Current research has been concerned with rural plantation regions such as Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and the Caribbean in general (Stine et al. 1996; Berlin & Morgan 1991; Beckles 1991; Campbell 1991; Schlotterbeck 1991). Such research has tended to focus on informal economies within plantations zones rather than urban settings like New Orleans. This is not surprising seeing as certain problems arise when trying to examine an informal economic system within an urban setting, such as who is participating in the economy, to what extent did the participants had access to the formal economy, and how far removed was face-to-face trade from the formal economy. In an urban setting, the population almost always had access to consumer goods that could be purchased through credible establishments, regardless of socio-
economic status, as opposed to a rural plantation setting where access to consumer goods was more restricted. Easy access to consumer goods makes informal trade networks less visible to the public and subsequently to the historical record. In addition, easy access to consumer goods could potentially make an informal economy unnecessary within an urban setting like New Orleans, yet an informal economy was almost certainly in existence and necessary on the periphery of the city during the early nineteenth century. By looking at the social construction of New Orleans during this time period and at the laws laid out by the colonial and antebellum administrations, it is easy to see why an informal economy was not only necessary but also beneficial to the people of New Orleans who occupied a lower socio-economic status.

Colonial and Antebellum Social Relations in New Orleans

During the early nineteenth century race-based slavery structured social relations in New Orleans. The social structure of the city had remained relatively unchanged throughout the colonial period due to the colony’s government, which remained partially independent because it was considered less important compared to other colonies at the time. The only major amendments to be made with concern to the social hierarchy of New Orleans from its founding until 1803 (when the Americans purchased the city) were made by the Spanish in 1777. These amendments stemmed from policies put in place by the new government which were designed to expand Louisiana’s economy, increase planter’s opportunities, and improve upon the French Black Code of 1724 (Ingersoll 1991:178; Allain 1980:127). The Black Code of 1777 perpetuated most of the French policies that had existed previously since the founding of New Orleans towards slaves and free blacks but made other provisions based on local customs and suggestions from planters and city officials (Ingersoll 1991:180). In the simplest of models, by the antebellum period, the social hierarchy of New Orleans can be divided into three groups. At the
summit were the whites who consisted of Americans, Creoles, and the inhabitants of European
descent or origin. The next class was the free people of color who were viewed as “half citizens”
but enjoyed some degree of freedom and mobility. At the bottom were the slaves, people of
African descent who had few if any civil rights and were regarded as property (Crété 1978: 68).
At first glance the social divisions within New Orleans society seem to be clearly defined and
based on racial ideology yet upon further examination the lines of social division become less
distinct and the social standing of particular groups becomes more uncertain. In fact the only
clearly defined social group within the three tier social division of this period, in terms of the
overall social structure of New Orleans society, is the slave class.

Slaves constituted the hardcore working class of the colonial and antebellum South. As
such their labor was the basis of the southern states’ economy, which depended on their
backbreaking labor. Slaves were imported from Africa, the Caribbean, and other southern states
for their labor and were sold at public auction to wealthy members of society. In general slaves
were regarded as property, and they could be bought and sold at the whim of their master (Crété
1978: 84). Slaves were employed for a variety of tasks ranging from artisans, to domestic
workers, to basic day laborers (Crété 1978; Ingersoll 1991; Berlin &Gutman 2001; Berlin &
Morgan 1991). Urban slaves much like their rural counterparts, tended to work in the low skilled
sector of the economy, as domestic servants and day laborers. But unlike their rural counterparts,
they could potentially work in the most advanced sector of the economy as factory hands (Berlin
&Gutman 2001: 1185). Although confined to a life of servitude, their individual conditions and
relative autonomy depended almost wholly on the nature of their work and the character of their
master. The price of slaves, which was high during this period, guaranteed to some extent that
slaves were relatively well treated in terms of food and health but still within the boundaries of
slavery (Crété 1978: 85). Laws established by colonial and antebellum administrations, which will be discussed later, did to some extent grant slaves some rights within the slave labor system, but most laws were aimed at controlling or limiting slave freedoms.

The two uppermost classes, the whites and the free people of color, are more ambiguous in their lines of social division, and outside of racial hierarchies, no clearly defined boundaries existed. For example, free people of color occupied the intermediary position between the white elite and the enslaved blacks and yet in some cases eclipsed whites in terms of wealth and social status. According to Crété,

“If one were to rank the citizens of New Orleans according to wealth and cultural attainments, it would soon become clear that many blacks not only occupied the same position as whites but even surpassed them on the social scale.” (Crété 1978: 68)

The elite whites on the other hand were never a homogenous and coherent group, and even within their social category further divisions existed based on wealth and national origins.

Under Spanish administration, slaves in the New Orleans colony were given the opportunity to earn money that could potentially be used to purchase their freedom and the freedom of their relatives. In the early days of Colonial New Orleans there was a high demand for plantation labor and slaves could hire themselves out, with their master’s permission, to do extra work and receive cash payments. Besides plantation work, slaves were also hired out for other tasks, which enabled them to earn money and which will be discussed in much greater detail later. Nonetheless Spanish colonial policy aided the growth of the free black population in New Orleans, if only incidentally (Ingersoll 1991: 176). In 1803, when Louisiana was purchased by the American government, it was feared that the free black population would grow too
numerous and powerful and disrupt the social structure of the city. To combat this growing fear the government abolished slave’s ability to self-purchase, although there remained other means by which slaves could be emancipated. In addition restrictions were placed on their freedoms and mobility which effectively barred them from certain facets of white society (Ingersoll 1991: 174; Crété 1978: 68). Despite the restrictions placed on free people of color they still engaged in commerce, made joint business ventures with whites, owned slaves, and employed white workers (Crété 1978: 68). The extent of the free blacks industriousness and wealth depended almost entirely on the individual’s motivation and entrepreneurship. Despite the possible economic opportunities available to free blacks most remained poor and resided in white households as servants or roomed with other families of low economic status (Ingersoll 1991: 189; Berlin &Gutman 2001: 1196). Some free blacks become prominent artisans, but generally they were confined to trades that were denoted by whites as distasteful and dirty work, such as butchering and barbering (Berlin &Gutman 2001; 1188). Other occupations that were available to free people of color included work on ships such as sailors or deckhands, carpenter, tailoring, seamstress, servants, cooks, and musicians. In some extremely rare cases some free blacks were able to become planters in their own right and were able to both own slaves and employ white laborers. This placed them in a profession that was held to be of the highest rank in the social hierarchy (Crété 1978: 68).

Within the free black social tier a further division of social hierarchy existed where rank was determined based on skin color rather than personal wealth. In a time when race was determined by skin color, the lightness or darkness of an individual’s skin was associated with how much African blood flowed through his veins. Regarding this matter historian Liliane Crété states,
“The full blooded black was looked down upon by the griffe, who had one quarter white blood. He in turn was snubbed by the mulatto who was regarded with [condescension] by the quadroon (those who were three-quarters white or those who had only an eighth or a sixth of black blood in their ancestry).” (Crété 1978: 76)

In addition free blacks of mixed racial origins, in varying degrees, typically enjoyed a higher skill level than those who were considered wholly black (Berlin & Gutman 2001: 1188). Despite the restrictions placed on emancipation by the American government the free black population increased in New Orleans which provoked whites to discriminate against them whenever possible. Free blacks could be kidnapped by slave owners, re-enslaved and sold to another colony or reduced back to slavery for unpaid debts or felonies. (Ingersoll 1991:189) In order to cope with a hostile society dominated by whites who actively tried to limit their freedom, free people of color allied with other free blacks to form close knit communities bound together by strong ties of friendship and kinship (Ingersoll 1991: 189-190). According to Ingersoll,

“Blacks helped one and other purchase freedom, protect one another from whites in criminal situations, favored merchants of their own color as consumers, held public dances together on weekends, and conducted big funerals attended by blacks of every status.” (Ingersoll 1991:190)

The formation of a tight knit communities among free peoples of color based on the shared experiences of limitations and hardships is important in the production and maintenance of informal economies within an urban setting. Free people of color within Louisiana enjoyed rights such as free movement, freedom to assemble, and the right to bear firearms, yet they were
constantly reminded of their precarious position within a society that barely tolerated them (Crété 1978: 77; Ingersoll 1991:194-95). Regardless of their tremulous position within the social hierarchy of New Orleans, free blacks had no desire to disrupt the social order and strove to demonstrate loyalty and devotion to their country and make the best of their situation by enjoying the privileges granted to them as free persons.

At the top of New Orleans social hierarchy were the whites who consisted of Americans, Creoles, whites of European decent, and European immigrants. This social group remains the most ambiguous and the most mobile within the three tier social system. Like the free people of color, there existed numerous subdivisions based on occupation, nationality, and wealth. Their social status ranged from the elite and affluent upper rungs of society down to the poorest day laborers. The most important factor that determined their social position was their skin color; they were white and free which placed them above those of African or mixed descent, and hence they were granted more rights and privileges. Whites worked in every sector of the economy including plantation work among slaves, but the varying degrees of social positions are too numerous to list in this paper. What concerns this discussion is the planters, the wealthiest members of society, and those who constituted the lowest socio-economic position. The planters, those who owned the plantation, were the pinnacle of the social hierarchy. They came from diverse European backgrounds and exerted political and social control over the region and to a large degree they structured the overall social relations within the city. On the other end of the spectrum were the poor whites that also came from mixed European descent. Free blacks, southern born whites, northern born whites, and foreign born whites formed the free working class of New Orleans. The immigrants consisted of nationalities such as Irish, French, English, Germans, Spaniards, Italians, and various peoples of Eastern European nationalities (Crété
1978: 74). The urban workforce, including slaves, free peoples of color and low status whites practiced different trades, worked at different skill levels, and labored in different sectors of the economy. These positions and trades within the workforce were based on various combinations of color, status, and nativity (Berlin and Gutman 2001: 1182). Urban workers often constituted the lowest portion of the social hierarchy, yet they remained the largest occupational group in the South. Usually members of the free work force were in some way skilled tradesmen in order to compete with the unskilled slave population, but some free man also worked at unskilled menial jobs. Most of the unskilled free workers within the urban south were composed of Irish immigrants who in some Southern cities constituted between 40 and 60 present of the unskilled labor force (Berlin and Gutman 2001: 1187). With the exception of the Irish, the majority of immigrant workers had artisanal trades and dominated a disproportional share of the skilled labor force and was especially important in urban service trades. Southern born whites, because of their nativity, had a distinctive place within the artisanal working class and dominated trades such as building, printmaking, and piloting. (Berlin and Gutman 2001:1188).

At this time there was no residential segregation and workers of all professions and colors lived in close proximity. Since they were of lower socio-economic status they would have been pushed to poorer residential areas on the fringes of the city, in such places like the former City Commons. Residential mixing created continuity among the low and middle class free work force despite racial and nationalistic divisions. Neighbors often practiced the same trade and some families could be found sharing a house with another family of a different race or nationality. Although upper class whites in the antebellum South aimed to create social stratification within in the society, “shared values and behavior evolved slowly, unevenly, and imperfectly among Southern urban workers.” (Berlin & Morgan 2001: 1197) Doubtless conflicts
arose between the various groups of the urban working class, but the shared realities of the working class life may have provoked sympathy towards the slaves and other urban workers and their shared experiences may have bonded them (Berlin & Morgan 2001: 1194- 1196). The free workers, clustered together on the fringes of the city, may not have attended the same church or possessed the same trade but they may have participated in convenient trade with others of the low status working class to supplement their income, to purchase contraband items, or to improve their standard of living.

**Slave Laws in Colonial and Antebellum New Orleans**

The social stratification that was present in New Orleans during the early-nineteenth century inevitably placed people of low socio-economic status and mixed racial ancestry in close proximity to one another on the fringes of the city, and their disenfranchisement from the upper class elite society spawned the need for an informal economy. In addition, a number of laws were enacted, most aimed at limiting and controlling blacks both free and enslaved, that helped to facilitate the creation of an informal economy in urban New Orleans. In the earliest days of colonial settlement, under the successive rule of the French and Spanish these laws inevitably created the need for an informal economy which, in turn, undermined these restrictions. Although the laws may have changed over time, they most likely created a tradition of trade among the urban poor that once put in place could not be suppressed.

The French established the colonial outpost of New Orleans in 1718. The administration implemented the Black Code of 1724, a revision of Louis XIV’s code of 1685, which was the only royal code regulating slavery in the Americas (Ingersoll 1991: 176; Gayarré 1965: 531). The principle intent of the Black Code of 1724 was to ensure subjugation of all blacks and to separate
the races in order to limit the number of mixed raced people and free blacks. This code placed a number of economic restrictions on slaves. First and foremost Article 50 condemned slave owners who allowed their slaves to buy their freedom because it encouraged theft and brigandage by slaves seeking to obtain money. Article 22 forbade slaves any property rights, which discouraged slaves from saving money in order to purchase their freedom. Most important in this code in relation to the creation of informal economies is Article 15 which forbade all blacks from selling commodities except when “wearing their known marks or badges” (Ibid 1966: 538-539; Ingersoll 1991: 177). These articles set forth by the French colonial administration restricted economic enterprise among slaves as well as free blacks by attempting to limit the need for money and preventing opportunities for blacks to buy and sell commodities. No doubt that slaves and free blacks felt compelled to navigate around these laws through backhanded means in order to secure valued commodities that were otherwise legally denied to them. While the Black Code of 1724 was meant to restrict blacks, in many ways it also provided them with protections such as requiring masters to provide food, clothing, and religious instruction (Allian 1980: 127-137). In 1751, a unified code of police regulations was adapted to supplement the Black Code of 1724. Again this was aimed at regulating the entire black population of New Orleans, not just the enslaved. In addition to reiterating the prohibition of slave assemblies in New Orleans and the laws against harboring runaway slaves, it prohibited the sale of alcohol to all blacks (Ibid 1966: 364-365). By forbidding the sale of alcohol to blacks, the colonial administration all but ensured that blacks, who continually faced the harsh realities of racial subjugation, would find alternative means by which to obtain contraband items.

In 1762, the Spanish took control of New Orleans and implemented their own Black Code in 1777. This code perpetuated most of the laws put in place by the French Black Code of
1724 but with a few minor adjustments at the suggestion of city officials and prominent planters. The new code added seventy three amendments including seventeen aimed explicitly at free blacks (Ingersoll 1991: 180). Under Spanish rule slaves were allowed to purchase their freedom; although the law was not officially published it was strictly enforced as early as 1769 (Ingersoll 1991: 180). The prospect of earning one’s freedom resulted in slaves becoming more industrious and may have urged them to participate in underground trade as a means to accumulate cash whenever possible. In 1803, Louisiana was purchased by the American government and with the new administration came a new Black Code that was implemented in 1806 (Ingersoll 1991: 196). The new laws abruptly stopped slaves’ ability to self-purchase, which effectively limited the growth of the free black population (Ingersoll 1991: 196). Under this new code the general population was forbidden to “buy, sell, or receive of, to or from a slave, any commodity what so ever.” (Schlotterbeck 1991: 171) In 1834, a law was passed that operated under the new credit system, effectively preventing slaves from buying contraband from reputable merchants (Campbell 1991:148). The credit system was implemented to limit the amount of cash a slave could accumulate and was used to restrict not only where slaves could purchase items but also what type of items a slave could potentially buy (Campbell 1991: 131-155). The restriction on contraband and the limited amount of cash available to slaves effectively led them to find illegal means by which to obtain these forbidden items. The laws implemented by the colonial and antebellum administration that limited the economic freedoms of slaves and all blacks no doubt led to the creation and, through racial division, the maintenance of an informal economy on the fringes of the city. The temptation to rebel rather than comply with the restriction placed on them facilitated the need for an informal economy that reached across racial boundaries and included all people, white and black, who found themselves disenfranchised from upper class elite society.
Blacks, in order to obtain items they were legally denied, would turn to their neighbors or co-workers, those of the privileged race, to aid them in their struggles.

**Informal Economies in New Orleans**

The central argument of this paper is that an informal economy was in operation on the fringes of New Orleans, in places such as the City Commons, during the early part of the nineteenth century. As stated in the section above, most of the recent scholarship on informal economies has tended to focus on informal slave economies within a rural plantation setting. Again, a problem arises when examining the presence of informal economies within an urban setting due to the fact that the evidence is more elusive. This is because such trade was often hidden in large part from the public eye and was often conducted under illegal premises, violating the legal code of New Orleans also demonstrated in the section above. So far the social construction of New Orleans and the legal code have been examined in order to argue that conditions in New Orleans fostered and facilitated the rise and in some ways the necessity of an informal economy. This section, on the other hand, will examine the basis of slave economies according to recent scholarship in order to demonstrate the finer mechanics of informal economies and how they could have operated within the context of early nineteenth century urban New Orleans. Such an examination will make more apparent the involvement of whites of lower socio-economic class and the continuity an informal economy could create within poorer communities despite the racial barriers that existed at that time.

Informal economies developed in order to supplement goods that could be obtained and replace the ones that could not for one reason or another through the legal and formal economy. Exchanges within informal and alternative economies are often conducted on the basis of face-
to-face trade between individuals or groups and consist of objects, legal or illegal, that are
distributed in unregulated ways (Usner 1987:167; Thompson 2012: 56; Smith 1989: 294). It is
important to note that while informal and alternative economies do exist outside the boundaries
of a formal and legal economy, they also overlap and are intertwined with the market activities
of the formal economy. Another point that has to be emphasized is that informal and alternative
economic exchanges occur under and despite unequal social and racial conditions that were
strictly enforced by colonial and antebellum elites (Usner 1987: 168). In urban New Orleans, as
in many other southern cities, unequal racial and social relations created the need for informal
and alternative economies because some commodities and contraband items could not be
obtained through the formal economy. Slaves, Native Americans, free people of color and poor
whites, both native and foreign born, participated in alternative economic activities not only to
secure contraband goods but also as a means to undermine economic and social restrictions that
were strictly enforced by the powerful elite. The independent economic activity of slaves and the
black population in general allowed them some control over their lives both as producers and

Economies or trade networks that exist outside of legally sanctioned formal economies
have gone by many names. Such names include “frontier exchange economy,” informal
economies, alternative economies, internal slave economies, and independent economies (Usner
et al. 1996). All are used to describe economic activities that exist in some fashion, outside of a
national economy. For this paper the preferred terms are alternative and informal economies
because both express the relative independence of the economy from a national economy yet at
the same time allow for some overlap with the national economy. In contrast the term or
“frontier exchange economy” specifically denotes economies that existed on the frontiers of colonial America and not within an urban context. Both alternative and informal economies are preferred precisely because they are ambiguous and describe the trade economy on the fringes of New Orleans.

**Mechanics of Slave Economies**

This section will explore the finer mechanics of slave economies in the American Colonial and Antebellum South. For the purposes of this paper such an examination will prove useful because it is a basis for the development of informal economies in the context of a society where race-based slavery structured social relations and economic activities. Slave economies can also be viewed as creating a legacy in which the traditions of informal and alternative economic activities conducted by slaves could be carried over and continued by free people of color. By participating in independent economic activities slaves challenged the restrictions placed on them by the bondage of servitude and exerted some control over their lives by actively choosing to be both producers and consumers (Stine et al. 1996:58; Thompson 2012: 54; Berlin & Morgan 1990 2, 15; Schlotterbeck 1991: 171).

Like all economies, informal economies are rooted in the production of goods. Slaves worked for their masters, and in return their master was obligated to feed, clothe, and shelter their slaves. Yet on many occasions the masters did not meet their obligations, most notably when it came to food and clothing. This neglect forced the slaves to support themselves and their families through various means. In regards to the slaves’ industrious spirit Berlin and Morgan state,
“[In] a manner that characterizes so much of the slave experience slaves turned the master’s additional demands to their own advantage transforming attempts to rivet tighter bonds of servitude into small grants of independence […] whereby they controlled a portion of their own lives.” (Berlin & Morgan 1991: 2)

In order to produce additional supplements, masters often allowed slaves to keep garden plots and in some cases additional provision grounds. This provided slaves with an opportunity to supplement and vary their diet but it could also be used as a source of profit by selling or trading their surplus. Masters saw slave’s self-subsistence privileges as a means to lower expenses and raise profits while slaves viewed it as an opportunity to exert some control over their lives and as a means to elevate their standard of living. Thus it was often the slaves rather than the master who initiated independent economic activities (Berlin & Morgan 1991: 4). Surpluses from garden plots and provision grounds could be liquefied in a number of ways. It could be traded with other slaves, sold to the planter and peddlers, or sold in markets. There were many incentives for slave owners to allow slaves some freedom in independent economic production in addition to the obvious cost reduction. Informal slave economies and independent economic activities can best be understood as a constant struggle between master and slave. On the one hand masters thought that if a slave was industrious for himself he would also be industrious for his master (Campbell 1991: 152). Slave owners believed that by granting their slaves some semblance of independence through independent economic activity the responsibility that it placed on the slaves would produce more compliant workers who would be less likely to run away. On the other hand, slave owners were deeply suspicious of the slave’s independent economic activity and they feared “that the slave’s preoccupation with their own enterprise and their dealings with free blacks and non-slaveholding whites could dissipate their
energy and undermine their dependence - mental and physiological- on the owning class” (Berlin & Morgan 1991: 20). Overall slave owners would only allow and recognize slave’s rights to independent economic activity as long as those rights affirmed their own domination. As slaves continued to push for more economic freedom so too did the masters continue to place restrictions on the benefits slaves could possibly receive from their economic ventures.

There were a number of ways in which slaves could participate in informal economies as producers. As stated before, slaves could sell their surplus from garden plots at market, to other slaves, to their masters, to shopkeepers, or to peddlers. The slave’s informal economy was often centered around the family and dependent on the family for the production of goods. The basis of the slave’s ability to participate in independent economic production is rooted in their right to have Sundays to themselves and in some cases even Saturday afternoon. Slaves participated in farming cash crops such as sugar, cotton, corn, and tobacco (Campbell 1991: 144-146; McDonald 1991: 188). Slaves also fished, collected nuts, hunted small game, collected firewood, and in Louisiana they collected Spanish moss (Schlotterbeck 1991: 173; McDonald 1991: 186-188; Berlin & Morgan 1991: 11). Eventually slaves created household industries where they manufactured goods such as bead-mats, bark ropes, baskets, brooms, wicker chairs, earthen jars, shoes, horse collars, canoes, barrels, carts, furniture, and various metal objects and tools. (Berlin & Morgan 1991:11) In addition slaves had the ability to hire themselves out, with the permission of their master, as a way to earn extra money. This was beneficial to both the slave and the master as they would both receive money as compensation for the slave’s efforts (Berlin & Morgan 14; Crété 1978: 98). Another common source of goods for slaves was theft (Berlin & Morgan 1991: 11; Campbell 1991:140; McDonald 1991: 196). Slaves would steal a variety of items from their master that could be sold or traded. This source of revenue would often be
restricted to the underground portion of the economy and not sold or traded openly. Slaves would steal household items, crops, and farm animals and the stolen goods were often traded to itinerant peddlers who were usually immigrants (McDonald 1991: 195-197; Berlin & Morgan 1991: 12; Campbell 1991:140; Schlotterbeck 1991:175; Stine et al. 1996: 58).

The independent economic acts conducted by slaves effectively created a vast trading network that connected the many plantations in the South and reached into urban areas. The vastness of this trade network is due to the involvement of other social groups, most notably poor whites and Native Americans. In many ways poor non-slaving holding whites perpetuated the slave’s informal economy by eventually becoming integrated and full participants. When poor whites could not obtain a living honestly they would get the slaves in the neighborhood to steal corn, grain, poultry, and other items from their masters (Campbell 1991: 138). In the case of Louisiana sugar plantations slaves would often steal from their masters and bring the stolen goods to the river. There they would meet river peddlers, usually German immigrants, and trade the stole goods for contraband items such as alcohol (McDonald 1991: 195-196). The peddler would then continue down the river, trading with all the river front plantations, and make his way back to the city where he would continue to trade and sell with the urban poor and urban slaves. Through this trade network slaves and poor, disenfranchised whites created social relationships through shared hardships of the colonial and antebellum social structure.

Native Americans also helped to facilitate the creation of informal and alternative economies in the American Colonial and Antebellum South. The rise of cotton production in the southern states during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries led to a sharp decline in Indian commerce. The led to a great number of tribes to accumulate debt and as payment were required to relinquish their lands. As a result some groups migrated west, “but most remained
and tried to diversify trade with the United States, becoming itinerant laborers and vendors, or intensified their own horticultural production.” (Usner 1987: 298) In the face of changing social and economic relationships between Native Americans and white settlers, Native American communities creating trading that included both slaves and settlers. Much like slaves and poor whites, Native Americans utilized trading networks to supplement their incomes, navigate around discriminatory laws, and elevate their standard of living. Native Americans were frequently seen in New Orleans markets selling and trading their commodities (Crété 1978:68). Current scholarship on informal economies has tended to understate the role that Native Americans had in the creation and maintenance of informal and alternative economies during the nineteenth century. (Berlin & Morgan 1991; Campbell 1991; McDonald 1991; Schlotterbeck 1991). Yet they were most certainty important participants in informal and alternative economies during this period.

Slave owners, fearful of the continuity of the lowest classes, tried to curb slave’s independent economic activities by placing restrictions on their ability to produce, sell their goods, or even travel off the plantation (Campbell 1991:140; Berlin & Morgan 1991: 12). They even placed restrictions on Sunday markets, which was the main trading post of the informal economy of the slaves. In Sunday markets like Congo Square in New Orleans, slaves would dress up in their finest clothes and meet with friends, neighbors, and relatives to both sell their wares and spend their earnings as well drink, dance, and gamble (McDonald 1991: 194). Not all slaves were able to conduct business in Sunday markets simply because they were not in close proximity to a town. These slaves could often travel to nearby plantations to trade, or they relied on trading networks established largely by immigrant peddlers and Native Americans.
The independent economic activity of slaves produced an informal economy that reached from the rural plantation zones into urban centers. Although the economy operated within the constraints of chattel bondage, the opportunity to conduct independent economic activity allowed slaves to exert some control over their lives. As independent agents they decided what to produce, how to market their goods, and how to dispose of the income they made. With the help of poor whites and Native Americans, their trading networks encompassed large areas and included a wide variety of participants. These trading networks reached into urban areas where slaves, Native Americans, and whites could participate and help one another achieve a better standard of living. The tradition of independent economic activities no doubt carried over to the slaves’ lives as free people of color once emancipated. The informal economy created a bond that reached across social boundaries in a race-based society and connected people of varying racial backgrounds through a common system of exchange.

The tradition of participating in informal economies among rural plantation slaves no doubt became integrated into urban life as slaves were passed from owner to owner and moved from one location to another or connected with slaves and traders within urban centers. In an urban context such as New Orleans, urban slaves would not have access to garden plots and provision grounds to same extent as their rural counterparts. As such the basis of the urban slave economy would be rooted in labor and home industries. But much like their rural counterparts urban slaves would have utilized a vast trading network that would encompass various social groups. Unique to an urban context is the close proximity of people of lower socio-economic status to one another. People of varying racial backgrounds and of low socio-economic status were pushed to the fringes of the city, such as the former City Commons during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, where social relations were less structured and based more on
shared experience rather than racial descent. In these marginal areas people could conduct face-to-face trade largely out of the public eye. Places like the Carondelet Canal and Congo Square attracted people to the area of the City Commons for both work and social events. Such areas allowed people to connect with one another, create social relationships, and conduct trade. Much like the Sunday markets in rural towns, the Carondelet Canal and Congo Square in New Orleans, functioned as places where slaves, free people of color, and poor whites, native and foreign born, could meet and conduct business.

**Beads within the Informal Economy**

The types of goods sold and traded within the informal and alternative economies can be placed into three categories. The first category consists of improved sustenance items, the second consists of high-status objects, and the third is composed of luxury consumables (Joseph 1987:5). The first category is items that are deemed necessary for survival, the second is objects that reflect the individual’s status and wealth, while the third category consists of illegal contraband items such as alcohol or finer quality food stuffs. The cache of glass turquoise seed beads fall into the second category and represent a luxury item used for personal purposes and as a reflection of status. Glass beads such as those found at the Iberville site are consistent with European glass trade beads that are present at trading and commercial centers in colonial regions of the Atlantic world from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth century (Gijanto 2011: 638; Degan 1987: 156; Smith 2002; Kidd & Kidd 1983; Stine et al. 1996). Within the black community of New Orleans the beads themselves might hold some spiritual meaning, and furthermore they may have been an expression of status (Stine et al. 1996; Gijanto 2011: 640). The archaeological context in which the beads were found in conjunction with other items found in the immediate vicinity might suggest that they were contained within a subfloor pit of a
structure that was present at the site during the early half of the nineteenth century (Samford 2007).

By examining the mechanics of informal economies and their relation to both the enslaved and the free work force, slaves can then be seen as both producers and consumers. As consumers it is reasonable to conclude that they had some influence on the types of goods made available to them for purchase. The variety of items purchased by slaves outside of general groceries included tobacco, alcohol, cloth, clothing, bowls, pots, utensils, jewelry, watches, and other personal goods (Berlin & Morgan 1991: 13; McDonald; 1991:135-136; Schlotterbeck 1991: 177). Finer quality goods such as high quality clothing, beads, elaborate buttons, eyeglasses, decorative ceramics, and mirrors, to name but a few, were purchased in order to demonstrate the success of the individual or family through material goods (Stine et al. 1996:58). Such items were multifunctional and communicated more than just status. They may represent the autonomy slaves had when it came to purchasing decisions as well as representative of certain beliefs and practices found within African-American culture. When considering how objects convey meaning, both materially and sensorial, it must be recognized that such object are encoded with social and cultural values and shared principles. When these objects are used, displayed, or exchanged they maintain, enhance, or create social relationships (Gijanto 2011: 646, Lesure 1999: 25). Value that is ascribed to material objects is based on shared understandings and social motivations that are highly contextualized, and when, where and how an item is displayed is important in conveying social meanings (Gijanto 2011: 646; Stine et al. 1996:54). These aspects of social and symbolic significance represented through personal artifacts such as the cache of seed beads are not usually recognized by archaeologists (Stine et al. 1996: 58-59).
Beads are often encountered at historical sites, and historical archaeologists have noted that glass beads similar to those found at the Iberville site are typical finds at African-American sites (Stine et al. 1996: 49). In addition to being common commodities in trade, beads are considered to be personal artifacts and some archaeologists suggest that such artifacts reflect cultural practices from West Africa (Stine et al. 1996:49; Gijanto 2011; Armstrong 1990). The color blue might also be symbolically meaningful for slaves of African descent in the eighteenth and nineteenth century (Adams 1987: 14). It is important to note within the academic community the cultural meaning associated with blue beads is controversial, and some suggest that blue beads have “little historical validity among African-Americans in the past.” (Stine et al. 1996: 49; Wheaton 1993: 83) Despite the fact that no systematic and comprehensive study of beads from African American sites has been conducted, Stine et al. collected a data set based on the distribution of beads from 51 temporal components and 21 African-American plantation sites in order to conduct a spatial analysis of bead distribution. They concluded that the archaeological data demonstrated that blue beads are uniformly represented and almost always present at African-American sites. Their study showed that blue was not always the most prevalent color at each individual site, but in a national sample it was the most prevalent color overall (1996:50). Stine et al. also concluded that while beads were deposited in various locations on the plantation site, blue beads were predominantly lost or discarded in or around African-American residents (1996:52). In regards to the spatial distribution of blue beads Stine et al. asserts that “if the distribution of blue beads was only a result of availability and not cultural preference, blue beads should have been found equally in all areas of the plantation.” (1996:53)

The conclusions drawn by Stine et al. in relation to the spatial distribution of blue beads on plantation sites may be consistent with conditions found at the Iberville site. A brick lined
post hole (Feature 16) was found within Test Unit 1 at a depth of 53 cm below the ground surface. (Shown in figures 19-20) The post hole represents a wood frame structure that occupied lot 319, previously lot 69. Since only one post hole was uncovered the exact parameters of the original structure are unknown, but its close proximity to the cache of beads may be significant. Thus two possible conclusions can be drawn; the first is that the beads could have been deposited outside the structure; the second is that the beads could have been deposited in a subfloor pit underneath the structure. Subfloor pits are flat-bottom pits cut into the soil under the floor of a house and commonly used as a storage space. Usually they are rectangular and are commonly found under dwellings associated with enslaved African-Americans during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century (Samford 2007: 5). While subfloor pits are not exclusively African-American in origin and have been associated with Native Americans and white colonists, in the context of the American South they are most commonly associated with peoples of African descent (Samford 2007: 6). Artifacts found in subfloor pits consist of items that could be characterized as refuse, or they could be serviceable items such as bottles, tools, and pottery. Another possibility is that some subfloor pits functioned as shrines, a practice found in some West African cultures, and the items placed within them are of spiritual significance (Samford 2007: 9-10). If in fact the beads were found within a collapsed subfloor pit this may prove that the cache of beads was an item of spiritual significance, and in addition it might provide clues as to the identity of the individual who deposited them. However, the soil composition associated with the bead cache does not explicitly point to the presence of a subfloor pit. While the possibility of a subfloor pit cannot be ruled out, especially given the close proximity to the ceramic sherds and bottle bases found within the same stratigraphic context as the beads and the beads themselves, the context does not definitely suggest a subfloor pit was present.
The symbolic and cultural significance of the bead cache within the context of an informal economy demands further examination with regards to antecedents of African-American culture in the late colonial and antebellum American South. An estimated 10 million African slaves were imported to the Americas between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, and most of them originated from various tribes and cultural groups from West Africa. According to archaeologist James Deetz, “The unwilling passenger aboard the thousands of slave ships that made the same crossing brought with them, against enormous odds, traditions from their West African homelands which would endure in a new and hostile environment.” (Deetz 1996:58). Since the American slave population originated from numerous distinct cultural groups that were dispersed upon arrival in the New World, specific cultural patterns found among the enslaved cannot be definitively ascribed to specific cultural groups in West Africa. Because of the difficulties in tracing cultural patterns African-American culture within the Americas should be viewed as a blending of African inspired cultural forms and practices:

“It is not unreasonable to anticipate that broadly based practices and beliefs associated with beads and personal ornamentation, in addition to other aspects of the material domain, both survived the middle passage and were eventually transformed into new cultural traits by enslaved African Americans in the South.” (Stine et al.1996: 53).

Beads have been important in West and Central African material culture long before the arrival of Europeans and globalized trade. Within African and African-American culture beads are multifunctional and convey a variety of cultural and spiritual symbolic meanings. They were, and still are today; used in jewelry; as a form of personal adornment; decorate clothing both ceremonial and casual; and convey social markers such as wealth, age, marital status, and political, cultural, and religious affiliation (Stine et al. 1996:53; Gijanto 2011:646).
Within African culture, beads utilized as social markers are usually a display of wealth or status and are considered luxury items (Gijanto 2011). As such they express a higher social status as well as the access to resources that support that status. Individuals that are capable of obtaining such luxury items assert to the public that they are free of economic constraints. This too can be said of African-Americans in the late colonial and antebellum South choosing to spend their hard won resources on luxury items such as beads. In addition to conveying social status, beads often hold spiritual significance in African culture and were viewed as possessing spiritual potency. In West Africa beads are commonly used to make amulets, charms, and other fetishes and are thought to contain spiritual power. Such items are worn for the protection of the wearer or placed in the house to protect the structure, its contents, and its residents (Stine et al. 1996: 54). The cache of seed beads found in situ, clustered together as if they were once strung together, may suggest that it was an item of religious significance such as an amulet or charm. The color turquoise, a variant of blue, also supports this assumption because the color blue was usually associated with protective properties and was believed to ward off illness and misfortune in West African cultures (Stine et al. 1996: 63).

**Conclusion**

This paper is an effort to use archaeological data obtained from the Iberville Housing Projects located in New Orleans Louisiana, in order to discuss the possibility that an informal and alternative economy was in operation on the fringes of New Orleans during the early nineteenth century. The cache of 766 turquoise glass seed beads recovered from Test Unit 1 suggests that there may have been an active trading economy present at the site. Beads such as those recovered from the site are well documented as being a common form of currency used in trade throughout the Atlantic World during the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries. The close
proximity of the site to known commercial and public spaces such as the Carondelet Canal and Congo Square, places where informal trade could happen frequently and on a regular basis, further supports that the beads were a commodity used in local trade. By examining social relations in New Orleans and the legal code of the city, it is clear that conditions in New Orleans fostered and facilitated the rise and in some ways the necessity of an informal economy.

The socioeconomic and developmental history of the former City Commons, the current location of the Iberville Housing Projects, suggests that the area was inhabited by people who would have actively participated in informal and economic activities. These people were the urban poor and working class who consisted of both native and foreign born whites, slaves, and free people of color. Located in a marginal area of the city, the residents would have been of low socioeconomic status, and the shared realities of working class life would have created continuity among the urban poor despite racial and nationalistic social barriers. The continuity found among the disenfranchised would have actively encouraged the emergence and maintenance of an informal economy in order to supplement incomes, improve living standards, and obtain contraband items. In addition laws that were put in place by New Orleans’ colonial and antebellum administrations also aided the creation of an informal economy. These laws, aimed at limiting the freedoms and economic activities of both enslaved and free blacks, encouraged informal and alternative economic activities in order to undermine such restrictions. The temptation to rebel rather than comply with the restrictions placed on them facilitated the need for an informal economy that reached across racial boundaries and included all people, white and black, who found themselves in a lower socioeconomic position.

The mechanics of informal slave economies have been explored in order to demonstrate the inner workings of informal economies according to resent scholarship. Informal economies
like all economies are rooted in the production of commodities that can be bought, sold, or traded. By participating in independent economic activities, slaves challenged the restrictions placed on them by the bondage of servitude and excreted some control over their lives by actively choosing to be both producers and consumers. Slave economies also created a legacy in which the traditions of informal and alternative economic activities conducted by slaves could be carried over and continued by free people of color in an urban context such as New Orleans. Slaves utilized a vast trading network established largely by poor whites that encompassed large areas and included a wide variety of participants. This trading network reached into urban areas where slaves as well as whites could participate and help one another achieve a better standard of living. Hence the informal economy created a bond that reached across social boundaries in a race-based society and connected people of varying racial backgrounds through a common system of exchange.

The cache of 766 glass turquoise seed beads may also be representative of characteristics of the individuals who used them such, as identity, social status, and spiritual affiliation. As a luxury item within an informal economy they may express the wealth and status of the individual who owned them. In addition the beads could have held some spiritual significance to people of African descent. The close proximity of the cache to the brick lined post hole might suggest that they were once part of a subfloor pit. The color might hold some spiritual significance, and the cache may have once been an amulet or charm used for protection, both of which are reminiscent of West African cultural traditions that were transported to the New World via the slave trade and reassembled by enslaved African-Americans. Because beads were important elements in informal trade economies in both the Americas and Africa, their presence at the site, on the fringes of New Orleans, where people of low socio economic status were in close contact,
suggests that an alternative and informal economy was active at the site during the early nineteenth century.
Figure 1. This figure shows the positions of the four 2x2 meter UNO excavation units placed on City Square 130.
Figure 2. This figure shows the original boundaries of the New Orleans City Commons. Map by: Peter Trapolin and Rob Domin. Reproduced from Toledano et al. 1980:56.
Figure 3. This figure is an early map of the layout of New Orleans, shows the swampy area of the city commons. Plan de la Nouvelle Orleans, Ville Capitolie de la Province de la Louisianne by Dumont de Montigny c. 1732. Courtesy of the Library of Congress, Washington D.C., reproduced from Toledano et al. 1980: 57.
**Figure 4.** This map shows the area occupied by the Iberville Housing Projects, highlighted in red, constructed in 1939.

**Figure 5.** Late 19th century artist's conception of African dances several generations earlier in Congo Square, New Orleans. Engraving by E. W. Kemble.
**Figure 6.** This map shows the Carondelet Canal and Congo Square. New Orleans Notarial Archives.
Figure 7. 1834 Map with showing New Orleans, the City Commons and the Trémé. Also shown is the Carondelet Canal and Congo Square. Map by Charles L. Zimple. (Courtesy of New Orleans Historic Collection)
Figure 8. 1887 Sanborn Company Map showing City Square 130.

Figure 9. 1895 Sanborn map showing City Square 130.
Figure 10. 1909 Sanborn map showing City Square 130.

Figure 11. 1914 aerial photograph showing the two story structure placed on the 317 lot (circled in red).
Figure 12. South profile wall of Test Unit 1, City Square 130 (16OR1800) courtesy of Earth Search Inc.
Figure 13. Cache of glass turquoise seed beads found in situ on site at a depth of 83 cm below the ground surface.

Figure 14. Cache of glass turquoise seed beads found in situ on site at a depth of 83 cm below the ground surface.
Figure 15. Larger view of the cache of glass turquoise seed beads found in situ on site at a depth of 83 cm below the ground surface. Cache circled in red.

Figure 16. 766 Glass turquoise seed beads after being cleaned in the lab.
Figure 17. Close up of 766 glass turquoise seed beads after being cleaned in the lab.

Figure 18. Close up of the brick lined post hole (Feature 16) found at a depth of 63 cm bd.
Figure 19. Shows the brick lined post hole (Feature 16) found at a depth of 63 cmbd.
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Appendix A

This appendix shows the ceramic sherd counts and minimum vessel counts of the strats and levels directly above, below, and at the same depth as Lot 79 (bead collection) for the purpose of obtaining a relative date for the deposit using mean ceramic dating technique. The dates used in for calculations come from Jill Yakubik with some minor corrections from Dr. Ryan Gray, all of which are listed below. Stonewares, redwares, tin-glazed wares were not used in calculations of the mean ceramic dates due to their extended manufacturing. Two different mean ceramic dates were calculated, one utilizing the sherd count and the other utilizing the minimum vessel count, in an attempt to obtain a more accurate date of the seed bead deposit. The mean ceramic dates for each lot are listed below the corresponding table along with the terminus post quim. All the mean ceramic dates were averaged to obtain a date of 1805 according to the sherd count and 1804 according to the minimum vessel count.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain: Chinese; Canton</td>
<td>1800-1830</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faience: White Glazed</td>
<td>1700-1800</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Undecorated</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Blue-transfer print</td>
<td>1795-1830</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Brown-transfer print</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Blue-Sell Edge</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Green-Shell Edge</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Poly-chrome</td>
<td>1780-1830</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Annular</td>
<td>1790-1820</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Applique</td>
<td>1800-1820</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware: Monochrome yellow</td>
<td>1800-1820</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware: Undecorated</td>
<td>1762-1820</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware: Annular- Mocha</td>
<td>1790-1820</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware: French</td>
<td></td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-field Type Ware: Black glazed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Abbreviations:
- FL = Flat ware
- HO= Hollow ware
- Blue-trans. P= Blue Transfer Print
- Poly-chrome- Poly-chrome Hand-painted

Fig. 1- Lot 70- Strat XII: level 3 95cmbd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Glaze/ Decoration</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Minimum Vessel Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>Chinese; Canton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware Type</td>
<td>Glaze/ Decoration</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>Minimum Vessel Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-trans. P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Brown-trans. P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Green-shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Poly-chrome</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Applique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Annular- Mocha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Blue-trans. P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Grey salt glazed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-field Type Ware</td>
<td>Black glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date (Sherd Count) = 1802
Mean Ceramic Date (Vessel Count) = 1803
Terminus Post Quim: Whiteware Blue Transfer Print: 1830
**Fig. 3- Lot 72- Strat XIV: level 1 93-100 cmbd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Glaze/ Decoration</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Minimum Vessel Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 FL 2 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-trans P.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4 FL 2 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Green- shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Poly-chrome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 FL 1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>Red Corse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-glazed</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date (Sherd Count) = 1805  
Mean Ceramic Date (Vessel Count) = 1801  
Terminus Post Quim: Pearlware Blue-Transfer Print: 1795

**Fig. 4- Lot 76- Strat XII/ XI (Clean Up)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Glaze/ Decoration</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Minimum Vessel Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-trans P.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 FL 1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Green- shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date (Sherd Count) = 1807  
Mean Ceramic Date (Vessel Count) = 1802  
Terminus Post Quim: Pearlware Blue-Transfer Print: 1795
### Fig. 5- Lot 79- Strat XIV: level 1 93-100 cmbd (Bead Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Glaze/ Decoration</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Rim</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Minimum Vessel Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-trans P.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-shell Edge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Monochrome yellow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date (Sherd Count) = 1805  
Mean Ceramic Date (Vessel Count) = 1805  
Terminus Post Quim: Pearlware Blue-Transfer Print: 1795

### Fig. 6- Lot 83- Strat XIV: level 1- 93-100 cmbd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Glaze/ Decoration</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Minimum Vessel Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-trans. P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 FL 5 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Poly-chrome</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Albany slip-brw/blk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date (Sherd Count) = 1809  
Mean Ceramic Date (Vessel Count) = 1809  
Terminus Post Quim: Pearlware Blue-Transfer Print: 1795

### Fig. 7- Lot 84- Strat XII: level 3 (Clean Up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ware Type</th>
<th>Glaze/ Decoration</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Minimum Vessel Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-trans. P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Blue-shell Edge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ceramic Date (Sherd Count) = 1803  
Mean Ceramic Date (Vessel Count) = 1803  
Terminus Post Quim: Pearlware Blue-Transfer Print: 1795.
Appendix B

This appendix shows a detailed description of the 15 historical strata observed in Test Unit 1. Due to the complex nature of the stratigraphy and the amount of disturbances encountered during excavations, the data is presented starting from the deepest deposits toward the surface. This chart shows the level of the stratum, the lot number associated with the artifacts collected, the top and bottom depths of each level, the munsell soil color, the soil texture, artifacts commonly found in the stratum, disturbances, descriptions, the number of bags collected, the number of the floatation sample collected (if applicable), photo numbers associated with the stratum and level and the date of excavations. This chart is based on the field notes and forms composed on site (16OR180) by Austen Dooley, Jonelle Schmidt, and Jermaine Taylor.
### Iberville Square 130 16OR180 Test Unit 1 Stratums for the bottom of the main unit up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>level</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Top Level Depth</th>
<th>Bottom Level Depth</th>
<th>Munsell Color</th>
<th>Soil Texture</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Disturbance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Bag</th>
<th>Float Sample</th>
<th>Photo Date</th>
<th>Date Excavated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98-102.5 cmbd</td>
<td>105-118 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/1</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>8lb. of brick, 1 bead faceted, some bone, glass, metal fragments. The majority of artifacts come from the first few centimeters.</td>
<td>Large root running across the unit and some small root activity.</td>
<td>Iron oxide inclusions. After the first few centimeters of the strat the soil became solid clay with no sandy loam.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Canon 7/12/12 5-8</td>
<td>Ryan 7/12/12 5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91-94 cmbd</td>
<td>94-101 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr3/2</td>
<td>Sandy loam</td>
<td>Some brick and slate. Seed bead cache found on east wall.</td>
<td>Some minor root disturbance. Water damage from heavy rain.</td>
<td>Turquoise seed beads, several photos taken on 7/10/12 and 7/11/12. Cinder and brick.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canon 7/9/12 1-2</td>
<td>Ryan 7/9/12 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90-94 cmbd</td>
<td>98-102.5 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/3</td>
<td>Sandy clay</td>
<td>18lb. of brick, 9lb. of shell, some coal and river rocks. Sm quahog clam shell. A few ceramic shards, some glass, and a copper coin.</td>
<td>Two roots one in the middle running east to west and in the east corner running east to west.</td>
<td>Coal flecking, brick.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canon 7/9/12 1-2</td>
<td>Ryan 7/9/12 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88-93 cmbd</td>
<td>90-94 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/1</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>Minor brick 34lb. and shell rubble. Some pottery and bone fragments.</td>
<td>Minor root disturbance. Unit was flooded.</td>
<td>Charcoal and brick flecking consistent with stratum XII, but more clay than prior levels.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canon 7/6/12 4-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85-91 cmbd</td>
<td>88-98 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr3/2</td>
<td>Sandy silt with occasional loamy patch</td>
<td>Lg ballast stone</td>
<td>Minor root activity</td>
<td>Lg. concentration of pottery and ceramics, porcelain and faience, metal objects and bone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canon 7/6/12 1-3</td>
<td>Ryan 7/6/12 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Lot #</td>
<td>Top Level Depth</td>
<td>Bottom Level Depth</td>
<td>Munsell Color</td>
<td>Soil Texture</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Disturbances</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td># of bags</td>
<td>Float Sample</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Date Excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75-84 cmbd</td>
<td>82-91 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr3/2</td>
<td>Sandy silt with occasional loamy patch</td>
<td>Lg. quantity of ceramics, including a few shards of faience, lg. quantity of metal objects and a great deal of glass.</td>
<td>Minor root activity</td>
<td>Mottled with black and orange flecks, coal and brick present but not prevalent.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canon 7/5/12 1-4 Ryan 7/5/12 1-4</td>
<td>7/5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88-99 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/2</td>
<td>Silty loam</td>
<td>Mostly ceramic and metal artifacts with one glass piece.</td>
<td>None obvious.</td>
<td>Mottled with charcoal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canon 7/6/12 4-7</td>
<td>7/6/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72-78 cmbd</td>
<td>75-84 cmbd * lower in the center trench 88-89 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/1</td>
<td>Silty loam</td>
<td>Limestone rock, river stone (5 or 6), some brick</td>
<td>Root in SE corner</td>
<td>We removed a few centimeters from level 2 and found two different distinct strats, 1 on the W and the other on the E of the unit b/w the two, strat X lvl. 2 continued down and formed a trench b/w the strats at the bottom of lvl.2 The strats on either side met in the middle.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canon 7/3/12 7-8 Ryan 7/3/12 7-8</td>
<td>7/3/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62-72 cmbd</td>
<td>72-78 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/1</td>
<td>Sandy clay with pocket of silt</td>
<td>Lots of brick (28lb.) and metal, some ceramic and bone.</td>
<td>Some fine roots, no other apparent disturbance.</td>
<td>Some green and black motting in gray sandy clay. Charcoal, coal, and cinder present but not in great quantity.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canon 7/2/12 5-8 Ryan 7/2/12 5-8</td>
<td>7/2/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>Lot #</td>
<td>Top Depth</td>
<td>Bottom Depth</td>
<td>Munsell Color</td>
<td>Soil Texture</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Disturbances</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td># of Bag</td>
<td>Float Sample</td>
<td>Photo Date</td>
<td>Date Excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78-84 cmbd</td>
<td>79-84 cmbd</td>
<td>5yr 6/2</td>
<td>Sandy loam</td>
<td>Ceramic, metal, and some bone</td>
<td>None obvious with the exception of 1 root on map and water disturbance due to rain</td>
<td>Some of strat XII mottled into strat XII. Strat XII sits atop a clay layer composed of brick rubble and other loose artifacts. Very limited strat and light on artifacts.</td>
<td>Some of strat XII mottled into strat XII. Strat XII sits atop a clay layer composed of brick rubble and other loose artifacts. Very limited strat and light on artifacts.</td>
<td>Canon 7/5/12</td>
<td>1-2 Ryan 7/5/12</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63-73 cmbd</td>
<td>62-75 cmbd</td>
<td>2.5yr 4/3</td>
<td>Very silty clay</td>
<td>Some bone and brick, metal, glass, and terra cotta pot pieces</td>
<td>None obvious.</td>
<td>Thin and relatively empty layer. *found a wood feature going into strat X- calling it feature 6. Feature 4 is present.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canon 6/29/12 1-4 Ryan 6/29/12 1-4</td>
<td>7/2/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54-63 cmbd</td>
<td>63-66.5 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr2/1</td>
<td>Sandy clay</td>
<td>Some brick and lots of bone. Articulated skeleton of a small mammal (dog/rat) in SE corner. Slate and shell.</td>
<td>None obvious</td>
<td>Large quantity coal, charcoal, and slag.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canon 6/29/12 1-4 Ryan 6/29/12 1-4</td>
<td>6/29/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43-55 cmbd</td>
<td>54-63 cmbd</td>
<td>7.5yr 2.5/2</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>115 lb. of brick and construction material. Slate, bone, tile, shell, metal, buttons, and porcelain.</td>
<td>None obvious</td>
<td>Some clay and lots of sandy mortar. Feature 4 present</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>Canon 6/28/12 57-60 Ryan 6/28/12 57-60</td>
<td>6/28/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum</td>
<td>Leve 1</td>
<td>Lot #</td>
<td>Top Level Depth</td>
<td>Bottom Level Depth</td>
<td>Munsell Color</td>
<td>Soil Texture</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Disturbances</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td># of Bags</td>
<td>Float Sample</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Date Excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35-41 cmbd</td>
<td>43-55 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr 2/2</td>
<td>Silt with sandy mortar</td>
<td>Brick (430lb.) and construction rubble, slate, tile.</td>
<td>Some root activity</td>
<td>Lrg. Quantity of sandy mortar, some clay and charcoal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canon 6/27/12 55-56 Ryan 6/27/12 55-56</td>
<td>6/27/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29-35 cmbd</td>
<td>35-41 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr 4/2</td>
<td>Sandy mortar</td>
<td>177lb. of brick. Ceramic, metal, glass, and plastic</td>
<td>None obvious</td>
<td>Soil change about 37 cmbd., more loose sandy soil with a lot of mortar. Hit a distinct demolition layer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canon 6/27/12 43-44 Ryan 6/27/12 43-44</td>
<td>6/27/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.5-24.5 cmbd</td>
<td>29-29.5 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr 3/4</td>
<td>Loamy sand</td>
<td>Ceramic, glass, plastic, shell, slag</td>
<td>See below *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6/22/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38 cmbd</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10yr 3/4</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>Cleanup of feature four. Slope into feature four.</td>
<td>Disturbed by trench dug for feature 15.</td>
<td>Highly disturbed soil matrix, had an effect on feature 4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/28/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stratum IV Lot 22 – We cut through the east side of strat IV and found modern material mixed with older material. Since Strat III was obviously disturbed we decided to dig a “window” on the north east corner of the unit to see how far the disturbance went. We dug to 124 cmbd and found a lot of ceramics. We decided to permanently suspend Strats III and IV and extend the units 1 meter to the east to avoid the disturbance found in Strat III. The parameters of the unit we re-drew at this time to make a 2x2 unit beginning from the west side of the window wall. This extension is what most of the unit artifacts came from. Associated with lot 10 which is its counterpart on the original 2x2 unit.
Iberville Square 130 16OR180 Test Unit 1 Stratums for the original unit from the top down

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>level</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Top Level Depth</th>
<th>Bottom Level Depth</th>
<th>Munsell Color</th>
<th>Soil Texture</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Disturbances</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of bags</th>
<th>Float Sample</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Date Excavated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-11 cmbd</td>
<td>16.5-18 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr2/1</td>
<td>Clay loam</td>
<td>Modern artifacts, glass, Mardi Gras beads, cream ware, pearl ware, jack, socket wrench, band aid.</td>
<td>Grass roots.</td>
<td>Top soil is loamy mixed with clay loam chunks.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canon 6/18/12 Top 1,2 Bottom 7,8 Ryan 6/18/12 Top 1,2 Bottom 7,8</td>
<td>6/18/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5-18 cmbd</td>
<td>21-24 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/2</td>
<td>Silty sandy loam</td>
<td>Modern Plastic debris grouped in south-east corner of the unit. Building material in the north-west corner of the unit. Metal, bone, slag, glass, beads, ceramics (blue and green shell edge.)</td>
<td>Concentration of building material and brick in the north-west corner and into the middle of the north edge of the unit. Concentration of modern plastic debris in south-east corner of unit.</td>
<td>North-east corner had hard packed clay similar to the south-west corner, west side more of a silty texture.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canon 6/20/12 7-8 Ryan 6/20/12 7-8</td>
<td>6/18/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21-25 cmbd</td>
<td>29-35 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr3/4</td>
<td>Silty clay</td>
<td>Modern plastic, brick, faience ceramic, 116 lb. of brick</td>
<td>Building material and brick throughout, modern plastics, faience ceramic found proving a heavy disturbance of the area.</td>
<td>Heavy clay concentration, hard packed.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canon 6/20/12 15-16 Ryan 6/20/12 15-16</td>
<td>6/20/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Iberville Square 130 16OR180 Test Unit 1 Stratums of the “Center Bulk” under feature 4 Bottom Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>level</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Top Level Depth</th>
<th>Bottom Level Depth</th>
<th>Munsell Color</th>
<th>Soil Texture</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Disturbances</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of bags</th>
<th>Float Sample</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Date Excavated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>96-99 cmbd</td>
<td>99-102 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/3</td>
<td>Sandy clay</td>
<td>Some brick and shell (oyster) in small quantity. Metal, glass, and ceramic. Light artifact layer.</td>
<td>Excavation disturbance from getting in and out of the unit and heavy rain fall.</td>
<td>More sandy clay in a very thin layer on top giving way to darker greyish loamy clay at strat interface.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon 7/20/12 1,2 Ryan 7/20/12 1,2</td>
<td>7/23/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>96-100 cmbd</td>
<td>99-102 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/2</td>
<td>Clay Loamy clay</td>
<td>Bone, brick, metal glass, ceramic, brick and oyster shell.</td>
<td>Small root activity</td>
<td>Dark Brown loamy clay soil on top of layer with dark greyish brown clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon 7/20/12 1,2 Ryan 7/20/12 1,2</td>
<td>7/23/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N-117</td>
<td>90-91 cmbd</td>
<td>96-100 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr4/1</td>
<td>Loamy clay</td>
<td>Lot 117 consists of heavy shell concentration and minor brick</td>
<td>Excavation disturbance from getting in and out of the unit and heavy rain fall.</td>
<td>Shell concentration (lot 117) appears to be 1 layer but could be a feature. There are two very different layers on the north and south side of the unit. This could be the result of a porch the South side being under the porch and the north being the beginning of a yard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon 7/19/12 19-20 Ryan 7/19/12 19-20 Canon 7/19/12 1-8 Ryan 7/19/12 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85-86 cmbd</td>
<td>90-91 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr3/2</td>
<td>Sandy silt Loamy clay</td>
<td>16lb. of brick, lg. amount of shell quahog.</td>
<td>A slight remnant of strat III still present at this depth but we have pedestalled it because of feature 15 no further excavation is done.</td>
<td>Pockets if loamy clay on the north side as well as charcoal flecking. On the south side there is a lg. amount of brick that covers the south side of the unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon 7/18/12 15-18</td>
<td>7/18/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Lot #</td>
<td>Top Level Depth</td>
<td>Bottom Level Depth</td>
<td>Munsell Color</td>
<td>Soil Texture</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Disturbances</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td># of bags</td>
<td>Float Sample</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Date Excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65-66 cmbd</td>
<td>77-79 cmbd</td>
<td>7.5yr2.5 /2</td>
<td>Very silty loam</td>
<td>15lb. of brick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-gritty soil matrix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>64-65 cmbd</td>
<td>64-66 cmbd</td>
<td>2.5yr4/3</td>
<td>Very silty loam</td>
<td>Bone Brick Metal and glass. 12lb. of brick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gritty soil matrix. Relatively empty layer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>59-63 cmbd</td>
<td>63-65.5 cmbd</td>
<td>10yr3/1</td>
<td>loam</td>
<td>157lb. of brick and 23lb. of mortar rubble.</td>
<td>Trench cuts along the edge of center bulk, likely where plastic came from.</td>
<td>Mottled with mortar and brick flecking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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