

Teapots in the Tempest: Ceramics and Military Order at 18th-Century Fort
Stanwix

Elizabeth Anne Scholz

Charlotte, North Carolina

Bachelor of Arts, Hamilton College, 2013

A Thesis presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the College of William and Mary in Candidacy for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Anthropology

The College of William and Mary
August, 2016


By Elizabeth A. Scholz 2016



APPROVAL PAGE

This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of


Master of Arts


Elizabeth Anne Scholz

Approved by the Committee, April 2016


Committee Chair
Associate Professor Neil Norman, Anthropology
The College of William and Mary


Associate Professor Frederick H. Smith, Anthropology
The College of William and Mary


Amy Roache-Fedchenko, Ph.D.
National Park Service Fort Stanwix National Monument

ABSTRACT

Historically, there has been significant interest in examining sites of conflict. Recent studies in historic conflict archaeology have contributed to scholars' understanding of military sites, specific battles, and sites of sieges and encampments. Archaeological excavations at 18th-century Fort Stanwix in Rome, New York have uncovered a rich assemblage that has facilitated the reconstruction of the fort; however, it is a careful analysis of the artifacts recovered during this process that can help scholars explore the daily lives of the inhabitants at the fort. Integrating archaeological, historical, and documentary evidence, this paper analyzes the spatial and typological distribution of ceramics at Fort Stanwix. It examines the way the officers and rank-and-file soldiers negotiated power relations as well as the ways that material culture is imbricated in the maintenance of military order at this isolated fort. Assuming officers and soldiers maintained strict discipline based on military hierarchy, scholars may expect to find structures with particular material types and forms of ceramics that signaled status; however, this study confounds the standard assumptions. Instead, an analysis of the ceramics suggests that even though the officers maintained order and a strict daily routine, distinctions between rank-and-file soldiers and their officers were not always clearly maintained, as soldiers also had economic agency and power. Ultimately, this study provides a much-needed examination of the ways in which armies maintained discipline in isolated forts and encampments during the 18th century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Dedication	iv
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vi
Introduction	1
Historical Perspective	6
Conflict Archaeologies	6
Fortification Studies	9
Fort Stanwix History	12
Theoretical Perspective	18
Theories of Power	18
Power and Capitalism	19
Power and Ceramics	20
Military Power Structures	23
Methods	28
Results and Analysis	36
Discussion	49
Structures	49
Status	53
Interpretation	64
Conclusion	66

Appendices	68
Appendix A: Description of Key Areas in Forts	68
Appendix B: Raw Data	72
References Cited	76

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Neil Norman for his mentoring, positive feedback, and answering my never-ending questions during this research process. I also want to thank Dr. Frederick Smith and Dr. Jenny Kahn for helping me negotiate theoretical concepts, difficult data, and the writing process. This project would also not have been possible without the help of Dr. Amy Roache-Fedchenko and the support of the archaeologists and scholars at the National Park Service at Fort Stanwix National Monument. I also wish to thank the Cohort of 2014 as well as Ally Campo, Mallory Moran, and members of the Anthropology department who have provided me with friendship, endless support, positivity, and guidance throughout this process.

This master's thesis is dedicated to my entire family who has never ceased to support my love of archaeology and history.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sherds Found in Structures by Material Types	37
Table 2. MNV by Structure	39
Table 3. Sherd by Material as Percentage of Structure Total	41
Table 4. Form Type as a Percentage of Structure Total	42
Table 5. Percentages of Form Types and Material Types	44
Table 6. Distribution of Material Types in Features within Structures	48
Table 7. Distribution of Form Types in Features within Structures	48
Table 8. Raw Data of Vessel Forms by Structures	72
Table 9. Description of Types and Varieties of Pottery	73
Table 10. Raw Data of the Location of Pottery Types	74
Table 11. Raw Data of the Location of Vessel Types	75

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Map of Fort Stanwix within New York State	2
Figure 2. Map of Fort Stanwix and Areas of Excavation	17
Figure 3. Excavation Units at Fort Stanwix in the 1970s	28
Figure 4. Hartgen Archaeological Associates Excavation Map	30
Figure 5. 2012 Test Excavation Units at Fort Stanwix	31
Figure 6. 2013 Excavation Areas at Fort Stanwix	32
Figure 7. Sherd Counts by Structure	50
Figure 8. Bar Graph of Material Types by Structure	55
Figure 9. Map of Material Types by Structure	56
Figure 10. Bar Graph of Form Types by Structure	61
Figure 11. Map of Form Types by Structure	62
Figure 12. Map of Fort Stanwix with Key Areas Highlighted	68
Figure 13. Excavation Map for East and West Barracks	69
Figure 14. Excavation Map for Southwest Bombproof	70
Figure 15. Excavation Map of North Casemate	70

Introduction

Wars are won through the slog and glory of battle, but it is by studying the time between the battles that historians and anthropologists can begin to explore the social relationships connecting soldiers with their officers. Historically, the times between battles were spent at forts and encampments, and by treating these sites as artifacts, as Charles Fisher (1995) suggests, and analyzing their material culture, scholars are able to “study the social and economic composition of a military force, and in so doing gain some insight into individual motivations and ideology” (Lee 2001:279). Today, historic conflict archaeologists (for example, Feister 1984; Fisher 1983; Fisher 1987; Huey 2010; Manning-Sterling 2010) have largely embraced this theoretical framework in their analyses of North American sites. This study follows a similar framework in its examination of Fort Stanwix, an 18th-century fort in Rome, New York. The secluded nature of Fort Stanwix and the difficult conditions at the fort prompted fights between soldiers and officers as well as desertions (Hanson and Hsu 1975:156). These were not daily occurrences, but officers constantly needed to establish and reinforce their control. Using material culture as a potential indicator of social, military, and economic rank, this paper analyzes the spatial and typological distribution of ceramics at the fort in order to explore the way military hierarchy was maintained and negotiated at Fort Stanwix.

Although Fort Stanwix was just one of several frontier forts established in New York during the 18th century, it played a central role in both the British and American defense (Figure 1). The British built Fort Stanwix in 1758, an era when the British were fiercely competing to establish trading dominance over the French, to protect access to a portage path known as the *De-O-Wain-Sta*, or the Oneida Carry (Hanson and Hsu

1975:6-7). This path was the second shortest route from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic and was therefore strategically important for trade as well as for the defense of colonial settlements to the north (Hanson and Hsu 1975:6-7). Accordingly, the British constructed a series of forts along the path during the French and Indian War (1754-1763). These forts were not successful and thus, the British constructed Fort Stanwix. Fortifying this position helped the British maintain the fur and beaver pelt trade with Native American groups, particularly the Onondagas and other Iroquoian groups (Hanson and Hsu 1975:6-7). Control of the lucrative fur trade in central New York minimized the French's access to the rich resources in the area, which facilitated the establishment of British dominance in the region (Chartrand 2014:1-5).




Figure 1. The location of Fort Stanwix within New York State and in relation to several other 18th-century frontier forts. The Oneida Carry is highlighted in green (Figure from Hanson and Hsu 1975:6).

Despite Fort Stanwix's strategic location, the French did not directly attack it during the French and Indian War and the British abandoned the fort in 1765. Fort

Stanwix fell into ruin until American colonists, as part of their strategy for the American Revolution, rebuilt the fort in 1776 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:9).¹ The first major military conflict at the fort was between the British and the American colonists; it began on August 3, 1777 and developed into a 21-day siege. Despite a lack of supplies and reinforcements the Continentals, under strong leadership, held Fort Stanwix and earned the reputation as the “the fort that never surrendered” (Zenzen 2008:13). After the siege ended on August 23, 1777, the soldiers stationed there did not see additional major military action. On May 13, 1781, under suspicious circumstances, the fort caught fire and the American troops were forced to abandon the fort (Hanson and Hsu 1975:13; Willet 1831:50-64).

Aside from the 21-day siege and brief skirmishes, British and Continental soldiers’ lives at the fort were largely characterized by long periods of military inaction, isolation, and training. Orderly books note that soldiers began their day at dawn and filled it with inspections of the soldiers and constant drilling (Hanson and Hsu 1975:156-159). Although these exercises served to reinforce order, an analysis of the material culture can help reveal additional negotiations of power at the fort.

This thesis incorporates archaeological, historical, and anthropological lines of evidence in order to explore how the British and Revolutionary troops used the fort and what this reveals about the social and power relations between higher-ranking commissioned officers, the enlisted officers, and rank-and file soldiers. Excavations at

¹ During the Continental occupation, the fort was known as Fort Schuyler. Since it is relatively accepted that the two forts followed the same general structure and layout and for the sake of clarity, the fort will generally be referred to as Fort Stanwix for the rest of this paper (Luzader et al 1976:2).

Fort Stanwix began in 1965, and since then archaeologists have uncovered over 500,000 artifacts including bricks, munitions, weapons, buttons, jewelry, glass, and ceramics (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1-5, 48). Dellino-Musgrave posits, “people engage with the world through materiality [—] they justify themselves as ‘being-in-the-world’, creating and projecting their social identities through the use and manipulation of goods” (Dellino-Musgrave 2006:49). Accordingly, material culture, particularly ceramics, have the potential to illustrate the relative prestige of individuals and play a role in power negotiations. Drawing on Breen (2012), Bourdieu (1984), Dellino-Musgrave (2006), Leath (1999), and Yentsch (1990), this paper uses ceramics as an indicator of status in order to examine the maintenance of “military order” and relationships between rank-and-file soldiers and officers at Fort Stanwix. Ultimately, a spatial and typological analysis of the material and form types confounds the standard assumption that officers and soldiers clearly demarcated status and rank. Instead, this study finds that even though the officers maintained order and a strict daily routine, distinctions between rank-and-file soldiers and their officers were not always clearly maintained as soldiers also wielded economic agency and power.

The paper will begin by providing some historical perspective by briefly discussing conflict archaeology and how excavations at Fort Stanwix and studies of military life, status, and class fit within the broader field. Then, it will explore anthropological theories on fortifications, material culture, status, and military life. This will provide an introduction to key theoretical concepts concerning power, status, and material goods that ultimately inform an understanding of the material culture at Fort Stanwix. The next section will discuss the research methods and design undertaken

during the original excavation at Fort Stanwix and the specific methods employed. The thesis will then provide a brief discussion of the findings from an analysis of the material and form types. Subsequently, this paper will synthesize this information to present findings regarding the distribution of ceramics within eighteen different structures at the fort and suggest potential status distinctions in these areas. The conclusion will consider the findings at Fort Stanwix and suggest possible avenues for future investigations at Fort Stanwix and in the field of historic conflict archaeology.

Historical Perspective

Conflict Archaeologies

Even a cursory examination of the archaeological record reveals that conflict, violence, and warfare have existed and affected people for millennia; however, the ways in which people waged war, protected themselves from attack, and experienced warfare were by no means universal. The conceptual issues that define warfare are best summed up by Ferguson (1990) when he suggests that war is:

‘organized, purposeful group action, directed against another group... involving the actual or potential application of lethal force’(Ferguson 1984:5). War is not merely action however. It is a condition of and between societies, with innumerable correlatives in virtually every dimension of culture [Ferguson 1990:26].

Warfare, as Ferguson suggests, is largely strategic and organized, but touches all strata of society and its effects can be seen on and beyond the battlefield.

The study of conflict archaeology at historical sites developed from peoples’ general fascination, curiosity, and reverence for battlefields or military sites.² The events of the 1970s and 1980s, such as the Cold War and Vietnam War, further popularized the study of conflict (Carman 2013:1; Scott et al. 2009:1). Since then, the field has developed in North America and Europe in particular, but it is still fighting to establish a strong body of literature and a more global, less Anglo-centric perspective. Historic conflict archaeologists are also now beginning to explore larger anthropological questions of status, ethnicity, and gender and this paper seeks to contribute to that literature. This

² For a discussion of prehistoric conflict studies please see Arkush and Allen 2006; Bamforth 2006; Connell and Silverstein 2006; Dye 2006; Gabriel and Metz 1992; Hill and Wileman 2002; Howard 2003; Kusimba 2006; Milner 1999; Redmond and Spencer 2006; Solmeto 2006; Thorpe 2003; and Underhill 2006.

paper also contributes to contemporary studies, as current trends in historic conflict archaeology have focused on reconstructing battles, preserving sites, and investigating sites associated with conflict, such as Fort Stanwix.

In the field of historic conflict archaeology, significant focus has been given to studying actual battlefield sites in order to understand the specific actions that transpired there and make them accessible to the public. Exploring particular battlefield events requires a thorough understanding of military technology, such as ammunition and ordnance (Scott and Haag 2009; Sivilich 2009), and military tactics, as seen in the study of Big Hole, Montana and Sand Creek, Colorado (Scott 2001) and with the examination of the Battle of Brawner Farm (Potter 2001). These archaeological findings can problematize historical interpretations of battles and help preserve the site. The most famous example of battle recreation was done with Custer's Last Stand (Fox 1988; Scott et al. 1989), but this approach has also been taken at Palo Alto (Haecker 2001) and the Saratoga Battlefield (Kelso and Hsu 2013). These archaeological studies, some of which are examples of public archaeology, allow scholars to develop a more accurate understanding of events and capture the public's interest.

A second area of concentration in battlefield studies has a more political focus as scholars suggest that sites are linked to a country or community's memory and identity. In their examination of conflict, Leech (2002), Schofield (2002), and Lees (2001) suggest that battlefields are sites that frequently have intense emotional connections, which are tied to national identity. Another aspect of battlefield sites connected with the preservation of memory is the recovery of remains. Throughout history, millions have died on battlefields and as Silverstein et al. (2009) note, many of them have not been

recovered; therefore, countless archaeologists have sought to locate, identify, or otherwise honor the dead (Hoshower-Leppo 2002; Jarvis 2002). As such, battlefields are often poignant sites that are entrenched in memory and meaning and thus one aspect of conflict archaeology is, and will always be, to preserve and enhance the memory of and knowledge about the site.

The other primary goal of conflict archaeology is to investigate other sites associated with conflict. Scott and McFeaters (2011) note that recently the scope of conflict archaeology has grown beyond just studying battlefields to analyzing “sites other than battlefields that played important roles in military events, including military support facilities, camps, bases, arsenals, logistical support processes, and even prisoner of war, internment, and concentration camps” (Scott and McFeaters 2011:104). Despite this turn, studying encampments, other sites tangentially associated with battlefields, and forts, like Fort Stanwix, has received less attention, but should not be overlooked as it can provide archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians with new information about how people lived during wartimes.

Although archaeological analyses of battles can help problematize historicized understandings of conflict and preserve the sites, serious focus should also be given to a careful and critical analysis of fortification sites. Excavations and work at Fort Stanwix, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s, have contributed to the current National Park Service reconstruction of the fort that stands in Rome, New York. Additionally, the recovery of approximately 500,000 artifacts has helped scholars interpret the fort’s history (Hanson and Hsu 1972a, 1972b, 1972c, 1975; Luzader et al. 1976; Scholz 2013), but more can be done to analyze other anthropological questions. This paper contributes

to scholars' understanding of the fort by particularly examining military status and the way officers and soldiers negotiated power at the fort during the 18th century.

Fortification Studies

Although the construction and purpose of forts have varied throughout the prehistoric and historic periods, they all illustrate a concerted effort to establish some line of defense from attackers (Milner 1999; Hill and Wileman 2002; Solmeto 2006; Kusimba 2006). Accordingly, forts were often strategically placed to safeguard areas of economic, political, or military importance (Milner 1999; Hill and Wileman 2002). While the location of the fort needed to be defensible, the fort also had to provide the occupier with a significant advantage over the invader: the ability to survey. Sébastien Le Prestre de Vauban, a seventeenth-century French engineer, in his seminal work, *The New Method of Fortification* (1693), discussed the geometric shapes and designs of fortifications that facilitate optimal surveillance of the surrounding landscape (Vauban 1693:21). Similarly, Hirst (1997) and Pepper and Adams (1986) suggest that artificers (tradesmen) manipulated the fort's structure and immediate surroundings to maximize the inhabitants' ability to observe and protect against threats.

Forts located on the frontier, like Fort Stanwix, played a particularly vital role in the defense of the vulnerable colonies and strategic trade pathways, like the Oneida Carry. In 1757, George Washington noted, "Our Frontiers are of such immense extent that if the enemy were to make a formidable attack on one side ... they might overrun (a) great part of the country" (Waddell 1995:177). Accordingly, the British and colonists constructed a series of forts throughout modern day Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York (Stille 1986). Fort Stanwix was one of these

forts, but some of the most well-known frontier forts include Fort Ligonier, Fort Rice, and Fort Necessity in Pennsylvania, and Fort William Henry and Fort Ticonderoga in New York.³ Many of these sites are, as Starbuck (2011) suggests, places of “‘action’ that ... [have] helped to define America” and while this statement is true, it is the periods of military inactivity that can help archaeologists gain a more comprehensive understanding of life during wartime (Starbuck 2014:5). Overwhelmingly, these forts were seen as places to trade with Native Americans, and to shelter local citizens and soldiers. It is through the study of the material culture left behind that archaeologists can begin to understand military life at forts and encampments on the frontier (Waddell 1995:178-180).⁴

Archaeologists studying fortifications during the 1960s and 1970s often sought to use archaeology to facilitate the reconstruction of the physical structures that once stood on the site. To date, a variety of forts, including Fort Stanwix, have been rebuilt across the country. Some of the most notable reconstructions include Fort Necessity and Fort Ligonier in Pennsylvania and Fort Ticonderoga, Fort William Henry, Fort Niagara, and Fort Montgomery in New York (Gifford 1955; Grimm 1970; Manning-Sterling 2004; Starbuck 2011). Although the excavation process and subsequent reconstruction did allow an initial exploration of these sites, reconstructions were often inaccurate, disturbed the remaining archaeological evidence, and did not necessarily contribute to scholars’

³ In the literature, some authors refer to these forts as frontier forts, but the term frontier fort is also frequently used to refer to forts built in western portions of North America in the 1800s.

⁴ Although military life may broadly be defined as including the civilian men, women, and children; the wives of the officers; and the carpenters, blacksmiths, and bakers who made life at the fort possible, this study focuses on the soldiers and the officers who resided at Fort Stanwix.

understanding of the lives of soldiers (Starbuck 1999:10-13). Still, at many of these sites, reconstruction did allow for the recovery of artifacts and created an environment where visitors could interact with history.

Recently, another more popular method for learning about non-battlefield military sites has emerged and involves analyzing the material culture at forts, encampments, cantonments, and sometimes prisons in order to explore military ideology and the soldiers' wartime experiences. Some archaeologists analyze the construction and design of sites in order to examine how the leaders maintained order, how daily life might have been structured, and how the sites compared to one another (Balicki 2000; Feister 1984; Feisler et al. 2006; Fisher 1983; Geir et al. 2006; Reeves and Geier 2006; Manning-Sterling 2010; Orr 2006). Scholars also use material culture to determine potential status, class, and gender differentials present at these sites (Feister 1984; Seidel 1990; Simmons 1999). As a component of this field of study, archaeologists have also studied the type and distribution of ceramics (Griswold and Largy 2010; Huey 2010; Miller 2000; Miller et al. 1970; Seidel 1990; Sussman 2000; Walthall 1991), faunal remains (Pippin 2010), glass (Starbuck 2011), and building materials (Feister 1984). There are countless ways to analyze artifacts from these sites and when this analysis is combined with information from historical documents, it can illustrate how people lived in these temporary situations.

Archaeologists need to study military sites within a larger historical and anthropological framework to facilitate a better understanding of the effects of war on the

lives of soldiers and civilians.⁵ In order to do this, archaeologists should continue to broaden their studies of conflict areas beyond the field of battle, explore the ways warfare affected the lives of civilians and the organization of society, and offer a critical examination of forts and encampments.

Fort Stanwix's History

Fort Stanwix sits at one of the highest points between Wood Creek and the Mohawk River and provided the British and Continental armies with a means of defense along the portage path known as the *De-O-Wain-Sta*, or the Oneida Carry. This path was the second shortest portage path between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean and was, therefore, the primary supply route for frontier forts and settlements during the 18th century (Hanson and Hsu 1975:6). The completed fort was rectangular with four bastions, five casemates, and at least nineteen buildings that housed the officers, a kitchen, and a group of rangers (Luzader et al. 1976:31; Hanson and Hsu 1975:9).⁶ The bastioned fort was strategically constructed to allow the occupants to survey, defend, and control the surrounding regions, which gave the soldiers and officers stationed there a significant military advantage in the defense of this otherwise isolated portion of land in central New York.

During the French and Indian War, the British erected several forts in the area. First, they constructed Fort Bull, Fort Williams, and a post at Oswego to restrict access to

⁵ For example, archaeologists at Fort Michilimackinac in Michigan discovered that despite the fort's isolation, soldiers and officers stationed there often had access to the latest ceramic types and forms. This suggests that despite frontier forts apparent isolation, their location on trading routes often kept the soldiers and officers in touch with the latest fashions (Miller and Stone 1970:94).

⁶ For definitions of the various places around the fort, please refer to Appendix A.

the Oneida Caarry; however, Fort Bull fell in 1756. Despite the establishment of several other forts (Fort Wood Creek, Fort Newport, and Fort Cravens) in 1757, General Daniel Webb abandoned the area until the construction of Fort Stanwix (Hanson and Hsu 1975:7; Luzader et al. 1976:25). With nearly 2,750 men, including civilians, constructing the fort, 400 soldiers from Fraser's Highlanders were able to occupy Fort Stanwix by the winter of 1758 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:9; Luzader et al. 1976:28). Strategically occupying the high ground overlooking the Mohawk River, the fort was not attacked, but remained an active site for trade and military training. With the rise of Pontiac's Rebellion in 1763, the British refortified the structure and replaced the officers' quarters with barracks (Dixon 2005). Following the end of the French and Indian War, the fort fell into a state of disrepair, and the British abandoned the site in 1767 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:9).

In 1776, Major General Philip John Schuyler of the Continental army recognized the strategic importance of the area and began to reoccupy and reconstruct the fort. In a letter to a Colonel, General Schuyler noted that:

As I never was at Fort Stanwix, I cannot positively recommend any particular place for erecting a Fortification, but from the best Information [*sic*] I have been able to procure, I am led to believe the spot on which the old Fort stood, the most Eligible, of this you must be the Judge [Luzader, et al. 1976:9].

Historical and archaeological evidence thus suggests that the Continentals' construction of Fort Schuyler occupied the site of the British Fort Stanwix and followed the previous fort's general pattern. Soldiers from the New Jersey company started the rebuilding process, which was continued by the Connecticut regiment, under Colonel Samuel Elmore in October 1775 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:155). Later, members of the 3rd New York Regiment under Colonel Peter Gansevoort and Lieutenant Colonel Marinus Willett

replaced Colonel Elmore's soldiers. The 9th Massachusetts Regiment joined these soldiers at Fort Stanwix just before the siege (Hanson and Hsu 1975:11). This influx of soldiers meant that at the time of the Siege of 1777, the fort was home to nearly 700 soldiers, well over its capacity of 400 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:11). Schoolcraft (1846) and Scott (1927) suggest that soldiers stationed at the fort were in constant fear of running out of ammunition, powder, and food (Schoolcraft 1846:10; Scott 1927:222).

Considering the number of soldiers and the state of the fort, Fort Stanwix was relatively unprepared for the Siege of 1777. However, the Continentals were able to procure enough supplies to survive, and since the British bombardment was unable to destroy the fort, neither side gained an advantage until the Native Americans abandoned the British on August 22nd. This led General St. Leger, the British commanding officer, to retreat, leaving behind cannons, mortars, and other supplies (Schoolcraft 1846:26). Although this fort and the Siege of 1777 are often overlooked, some scholars suggest "the failure of the British to take Fort Stanwix was a significant factor leading to the surrender of the main force under Burgoyne at Saratoga on October 17, 1777" (CLI 1999:Part2a, 1). Accordingly, it is important to understand how officers and soldiers worked together to secure this victory. Following the Siege of 1777, soldiers stationed at the fort saw little action and after a suspicious fire in 1781, the fort was abandoned. After the war, the fort was used to sign several treaties, but it largely fell into disrepair as the city of Rome, New York developed over its foundations.

Although the first attempt to locate Fort Stanwix began in 1896, the first serious attempt to locate and excavate the fort's foundations began in 1965. As part of Rome, New York's Urban Renewal Project, Colonel J. Duncan Campbell led the first

excavations in 1965 to find and assess the state of the fort's foundations (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1). Like many other archaeological projects on fortifications and encampments during the 1960s and 1970s (recall Starbuck 2011; Grimm 1970; Manning-Sterling 2004; Gifford 1955), a primary goal of the excavations was to identify the original structures in order to aid in reconstruction and to use the artifacts and other archaeological findings to supplement the historical record (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1). As Hanson and Hsu note, since:

Fort Stanwix played a key role in the American Revolution, serving as a plug to one of the two main invasion routes between Canada and the American Colonies, ... it was determined that the fort should be a focal point of interest during the bicentennial observance of the American Revolution [Hanson and Hsu 1975:1].

Accordingly, reconstruction of Fort Stanwix began in 1974, and it was opened to the public in 1976, although additional renovations, construction, and maintenance continue today (CLI 1999:Part 1, 5).

During the 1970-1974 excavations, Hanson and Hsu uncovered approximately 33 percent of the fort's footprint and approximately 500,000 artifacts during archaeological excavations (Figure 2) (Hanson and Hsu 1975:48). Scholars used these findings to aid in the reconstruction of the fort, but they were also interested in classifying the artifacts and studying life at the fort (Hanson and Hsu 1975:48-49). More recent excavations took place in 1997, 2002-2003, 2011, 2012, and 2014 and have further contributed to archaeologists' understanding of the site. Although questions of status, gender, material culture, and military life are alluded to in texts discussing the findings at Fort Stanwix (Hanson Hsu 1975; Scott 1927; Hsu 1972; Torres 1974; Roache-Fedchenko 2014, CLI 1999), these questions have never been fully explored. This study of Fort Stanwix offers

a foray into the examination of the maintenance of military structure and power relationships during the late 18th century.




Figure 2. A map of Fort Stanwix with the areas of the 1970-1974 excavation shaded in grey (Figure from Hanson and Hsu 1975:19).

Theoretical Perspective

Although an understanding of the historical perspective provides important contextual information, to fully address this paper's primary research question it is necessary to craft a theoretical framework examining military hierarchies and how ceramics frame status and play an active role in social and economic negotiations. This framework must weave theories of power and status with a discussion of 18th-century military communities. Accordingly, this discussion of power is embedded within western cultural ideas of power, which suggest that power can be derived from a variety of sources and is unlimited but must be legitimized (Hearn 2012:15). As such, this paper incorporates Bourdieu's notion of social distinction (1984) to discuss negotiations of power and social structure and particularly focuses on Yentsch (1990), Breen (2012), and Leath's (1999) discussion of ceramics' role in power and status negotiations in the 18th century. Additionally, it contextualizes the study of ceramics and the role ceramics played in the social worlds of 18th-century military life where officers needed to portray refinement and education to separate themselves from the rank-and-file soldiers.

Theories of Power

In order to begin to explore the hierarchies of the 18th century, particularly the military structure, it is necessary to discuss relationships of power as well as power itself. Historically, the military has been a highly regimented and structured entity that relies on the strong leadership of a few to direct hundreds or thousands of soldiers. This concept aligns with Hobbes' discussion of the emergence of hierarchies. Hobbes posits "The only way to establish a common power that can defend [men] from the invasion of foreigners and the injuries of one another... is to confer all their power and strength on one man, or

assembly of men” (1651:79). These selected men, or single man, are imbued with power in the form of authority. It is this authority, as Hearn suggests, that give these men “the power to make commands and have them obeyed” (Hearn 2012:23). Although this suggests that those who give the orders are placed in a dominant position over those who receive the orders, it is necessary to examine the way these relationships were established and supported since these are not natural states, but conditions that were socially negotiated.

Power and Capitalism

This paper primarily draws on Bourdieu’s theories of power and its connection to social status. His discussion of power is imbedded within a western ethos and is linked to distinction, structure, and capitalism. Accordingly, he posits that those who have the capacity to accumulate more resources and capital have greater social power. In his analysis of Bourdieu, Shwartz suggests that for Bourdieu (1989:373-85), there are:

two major competing principles of social hierarchy — what Bourdieu calls a ‘charismatic structure’ — [that] shape the struggle for power in modern industrial societies: the distribution of economic capital (wealth, income, and property), which Bourdieu calls the ‘dominating principle of hierarchy,’ and the distributor of cultural capital (knowledge, culture, and educational credentials), which Bourdieu calls the ‘second principle of hierarchy [Shwartz 1997:137].

Although these principles are often linked, this paper explores the “dominating principle of hierarchy” and examines economic capital (Shwartz, 1997:83).⁷ In *Distinction*, Bourdieu notes that elites frequently purchased expensive, new, decorative pieces in order to demonstrate their wealth and prestige in contrast to the lower classes’ reliance on

⁷ Cultural capital can also play a role in negotiating and reinforcing military structure, but will not be discussed extensively in this paper.

well-used, practical materials (Bourdieu 1984:191). Accordingly, the goods used by different economic classes take on different meanings that relate directly to the social context in which they are deployed. By examining ceramics as both an indicator of wealth and a symbol for social distinction, it is possible to analyze relationships between groups (Shwartz 1997:83; Dellino-Musgrave 2015).

Power and Ceramics

Using the ceramics as both an indicator of economic status and social distinction allows an examination of relationships and distributions of power. In her exploration of ceramics and navy ships, Dellino-Musgrave echoes Bourdieu when she posits that:

objects carry meanings which are often attached to people according to the shape, texture, colour, decoration, use and discard of the object. Moreover, these attached meanings are variable and differ according to spatial, temporal/historical, and social contexts [2015:61].

It is therefore necessary to examine how ceramics, particularly different material types and forms, may provide evidence of underlying social conditions in the 18th century.

The rise of the industrial revolution in the 18th century radically altered the accessibility and meaning of certain material types of ceramics. Mass production of creamware, earthenware, and stoneware as well as press-molded decorations allowed these ceramic types to become relatively common and accessible in most areas in Europe and in the American colonies. Similarly, while Chinese porcelain had become more accessible to the middle class during the 18th century, the use of it still held significant meaning, particularly in the distant British colonies in North America (Dellino-Musgrave 2015:117-120). Leath's analysis of ceramics in Charleston, South Carolina suggests that elite colonists invested in porcelain "to ornament their interiors, massing it atop furniture,

doorways, and chimney pieces in a decorative display designed to impress both friends and visitors” (Leath 1999:51). This display of wealth not only linked the elite colonists back to the gentry in England, but also referenced their high cost and exhibited a level of style and opulence that distinguished them from lower-status families (Leath 1999: 50-52). Yentsch’s exploration of 18th-century ceramics also demonstrates that ceramics were frequently used to separate and classify a household’s status (1990:42). She posits that the elite favored expensive, fragile porcelain ceramics, while the lower status households relied upon hardier earthenwares and delftware (Yentsch 1990:42-43). As these studies suggest, despite mass production and greater accessibility, the use of particular material types still held specific meanings for different groups of people in the colonies.

Although the material type was important, the forms of ceramic also held specific meaning. In part, this emerges from the idea that “...food serves both to solidify group membership and to set groups apart,” and ceramics, often an integral vessel for the consumption or display of food, could help to reinforce status. (Mintz and Du Bois 2002:107) On British navy ships during the 18th century, Dellino-Musgrave suggests that tea and dinner sets, commonly found in the officer’s quarters, were indicative of standards of social behavior and the presences of tea sets and emphasized ties to Britain in spite of the isolation and distance (Dellino-Musgraves 2015:118). Yentsch argues that during the 18th century the elites began to focus on more individual place settings and fragile ceramic dishes, like teacups, while lower-status families relied on communal ceramics like large dishes and “pie pans” (Yentsch 1990:26). Similarly, Ligon (1999) notes that a complete tea set included individual cups as well as sugar bowls, teaspoons, tea container, milk container, and teapot. She continues by noting that:

perhaps one can conclude that although the tea itself was being consumed by a wide range of people, an entire population could never afford the items required to serve tea socially. Therefore, material items work as a sensible barrier to keeping the social hierarchy intact [Ligon 1990:10].

Accordingly, it was the presence of a complete tea set, including sugar bowls that often served to distinguish between groups.

Analyzing punch bowls, Breen (2012) identified a similar pattern. Obtaining large punch bowls and the accompanying equipment required a significant investment of economic capital that could be exhibited during social gatherings, which could help to increase a family's social capital and status (Breen 2012:811; Smith 2005). As such, Breen (2012) notes that "colonial punch drinking assumed an important role in the realm of gentility, sociability, and group membership" (Breen 2012:81). Studying historical and archaeological evidence of teapots, punch bowls, and pie pans strongly indicates that the forms of ceramics played an integral role in crafting relationships and supporting people's power and prestige.

Despite these general trends of particular material type and forms and their role in supporting power and prestige, it is necessary to examine particular circumstances to understand how individual actors negotiated these relationships. When relating power to status, it is particularly useful to use Bourdieu's discussion of *habitus*. Bourdieu defines *habitus* as:

a structuring structure, which organizes practices and the perception of practices, [which is] also a structured structure: the principle of division into logical classes which organizes the perception of the social world is itself the product of internalization of the division into social classes [Bourdieu 1984:170; Bourdieu 1994:76].

Accordingly, personal styles may vary, but most action can typically be related or attributed to an existing structure, relationship, or class (Sewell 2012; Shwartz 1997:105). With the underlying material record as a guide, this paper's analysis suggests that although 18th-century civilians often used ceramics to demarcate status, both the officers and soldiers at Fort Stanwix used ceramics as a way to reinforce the military hierarchy and negotiate power.

Military Power Structures

In both the French and Indian War and the American Revolution, members of the armies and militias operated under a strict military hierarchy. Typically, generals (the highest order of commissioned officers) controlled and interacted — directly and indirectly — with the greatest number of men, while the privates (the lowest order of enlisted men) were directed by and followed the orders of the more powerful and higher ranking officers.⁸ However, those in places of power had to find ways to maintain and reinforce their position.

In the 18th century, there was a strong correlation between social standing and rank.⁹ In the British army, commissioned officers were typically from families that had significant access to economic capital (Otterbein 2009:31; Brumwell 2002:2). In fact, Brumwell suggests that a significant portion of the commissioned British officers purchased their own commissions in the army (Brumwell 2002:4). In contrast, Mayer notes that many commissioned Continental officers were not from the highest-status

⁸ Recall Hobbes (1651) and Hearn's (2012) discussion of power relating to social capital: the more followers a person had, the greater the power.

⁹ Feats of bravery on the battlefield or charisma could also help individuals, from lower socio-economic status achieve a higher status within the military ranks.

families, as many of those families remained loyal to the British (Mayer 1996:53). Accordingly, Brumwell notes that British soldiers generally respected the power structure, and authority of the commissioned officers, and were able to be trained to act as a military unit (Brumwell 2002:72). In comparison, Neimeyer notes that Continental soldiers “during the later years of the war made colonial elites (including Continental army officers) increasingly afraid of the revolutionary tendencies of an armed lower class army” (Neimeyer 1996:xv). Although the difference in the mindset of the British and Continentals is reflective of larger social issues, the attitude of those in power, particularly the pessimistic Continental attitude (Neimeyer 1996), does illustrate the divide between higher- and lower-status families and the necessity of maintaining clear relationships of power between the dominant and subordinate groups.

This divide may be seen in the goods used by the different soldiers, since, as Bourdieu, Breen, Yentsh, Leath, and Dellino-Musgrave suggest, material culture is often indicative of economic status and the larger 18th-century paradigm. In both armies during both wars, soldiers and commissioned officers alike were responsible for bringing or purchasing supplies to supplement their military-issued gear (Mayer 1996:43). Commissioned officers from the British and Continental armies often had financial resources to help maintain their position. Holding special teas and dinners, wearing special uniforms, and carrying special weapons further reinforced this socioeconomic distinction (Otterbein 2009:31; Mayer 1996:54; Brumwell 2002:91). In examining the enlisted soldiers, Neimeyer notes that most Continental soldiers were described as “seeping from jails, gin mills, and poorhouses, oafs from the farms beguiled into ‘taking the King’s shilling,’ adventurers, and unfortunates who might find a home in a regiment”

(Neimeyer 1996:13). Looking specifically at demographics of the New Jersey army, Neimeyer writes that “90 percent of the privates and non-commissioned officers came from the poorest two-thirds of the [tax] ratable population (61 percent from the poorest third, 29 percent from the middle third). Nearly one half of the brigade owned no taxable property at all” (Niemeyer 1996:19). As such, many of these men did not have significant access to cultural or social capital and would have relied on more utilitarian wares, yet they still had economic agency to choose their ceramics and other material goods.

Despite this agency, the elite commissioned officers’ access to fine goods, particularly when compared to the rank-and-file soldiers’ access, theoretically illustrated and reinforced a clear divide between the commissioned officers and the enlisted men. Although this division may seem rather simplistic, the access to and use of particular goods was imbedded and negotiated within a system of rules and accepted practices (*habitus*) that helped to inform and reinforce peoples’ social status, identity, and access to power. Theoretically, the maintenance of this clear divide was particularly necessary when armies settled at long-term encampments or fortifications. This paper explores the way the soldiers at Fort Stanwix may or may not have maintained these distinctions through the material culture of ceramics.

The discussion of power and status, particularly as it is applied to the military, is a dynamic and complex theoretical topic, but by deconstructing aspects of these ideas, it is possible to understand some of the rationale behind, and implementation of, military hierarchy and how soldiers and officers maintained and understood that status within the system of dispositions (*habitus*). In the past, powerful commissioned officers have received a significant amount of historical and archaeological focus, but Niemeyer

suggests that “there is a real need to recover the [Continental soldier’s] history — his hopes and fears, his origins, motivations, and actions” (1996:7). This paper seeks to begin examining the relationship between the elite officers and the common soldier: relationships that were mediated through material things.

Building upon previous works that examined structures of power, status, and military archaeologies, it is possible to contextualize the archaeological findings, particularly the ceramics, at Fort Stanwix in a way that can illuminate how the ways in which British and Continental armies maintained military hierarchies within isolated frontier fortifications. If these armies maintained a strict division in relationships — between those with authority versus those without and those in dominant versus subordinate roles — there should be a clear division of material types and forms of ceramics at Fort Stanwix. This would be expected, as it would suggest that not only was there a clear distinction in access to ceramics, but also that those with access to similar quality goods worked and lived in the same areas.

In contrast, a lack of distinction may suggest that strict boundaries of power were not necessarily maintained at Fort Stanwix or that ceramics and economic capital may not have been the “dominating principle of hierarchy” (Shwartz 1997:137). Instead, the soldiers and officers at Fort Stanwix may have used literacy, education, and/or other forms of material culture to distinguish their status. Furthermore, ceramics may not have been one of the primary economic indicators of status, or the conditions at the fort may not have been conducive to maintaining distinct boundaries that can be identified in the archaeological record. Considering this, the findings, which do not show a clear distinction of material types and forms across the fort, suggest that the material culture of

enlisted soldiers and commissioned officers does not reflect the way that other 18th-century civilians used ceramics to negotiate power.

Methods

Fort Stanwix has a long and varied history of excavation and research, and this paper contributes to this literature. Considering the relationship between power, ceramics, and the military, a discussion of the distribution of material types and forms allows for an examination of the negotiations and representations of power at 18th-century Fort Stanwix. Relying on the ceramics from the 1970-1974 excavations, this thesis uses a spatial and typological analysis of the ceramics to discuss the expected and observed distribution of ceramic material types and forms by structure. This approach allows for a discussion of the relationship between the officers and rank-and-file soldiers.




Figure 3. This diagram depicts the units opened during the 1970-1974 excavations at Fort Stanwix (National Park Service Fort Stanwix 2015).

Archaeological work at the site began in 1965 when Colonel J. Duncan Campbell led the first preliminary test excavations in order to locate the foundations of the fort (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1).¹⁰ Hanson and Hsu began the first large-scale excavation of the fort in 1970 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1). During their excavations, Hanson and Hsu did not rely upon a grid system, but instead established five reference areas and marked their units and sub-units and units according to the structures and features on the site and used the known stratigraphy to preserve vertical control (Figures 3) (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1-2). By 1974, when they completed the excavation, archaeologists had uncovered nearly 33 percent of the fort and estimated that “15 percent ... had been disturbed in the 19th and 20th centuries” (Hanson and Hsu 1975:1).

Although the work undertaken by Hanson and Hsu (1975) serves as the foundation for this paper, it is important to briefly discuss the other excavations at the fort. Griswold undertook additional excavations in 1997 as part of the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 compliance for planting trees at the site; however, additional information about this excavation was not available at the time of this study. In 2003, and in compliance with federal regulations, Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Inc. undertook Phase II and Phase III investigations of the land adjacent to Fort Stanwix in preparation for the construction of the Willett Visitor Center at the Fort Stanwix National Monument (Figure 4) (Stull and Klinge 2005:51).

¹⁰ Recall, this was an era when one of the primary goals of historic conflict archaeology at fortifications was to contribute to reconstructions (Starbuck 2011; Grimm 1970; Manning-Sterling 2004; Gifford 1955).




Figure 4. This map depicts the location of the units and trenches excavated by Hartgen Archaeological Associates, INC. These units were not opened within Fort Stanwix, but were adjacent to the reconstruction (Figure from Stull and Klinge 2005).

More recently, the National Park Service has overseen additional excavations although a majority of these excavations were conducted in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. During the 2011 field season, the Division of Cultural Resources at Fort Stanwix National Monument opened nearly 28 shovel test pits in order to further investigate the stratigraphy and deposition of artifacts (Roache-Fedchenko 2011). In 2012, Roache-Fedchenko excavated a two-meter by three-meter trench outside the fort and several test units within the fort in preparation for placing a post indicator valve and piping for the fire suppression system (Figure 5) (Roache-Fedchenko 2012:8). During the 2013-2014 field season, archaeologists under Roache-Fedchenko opened nine test units along the walkway and parade ground in preparation for additional fire suppression measures. Roache-Fedchenko notes that they excavated

“using a combination of stratigraphic and arbitrary (5cm) levels in order to provide vertical control and documentation of the site” (Roache-Fedchenko 2014:1) (Figure 6). As this brief survey of these excavation projects illustrate, work at Fort Stanwix continues today and this paper will contribute to a greater understanding of the fort and the people who lived and worked there.




Figure 5. This map depicts the location of some of the test units excavated during the 2012 project. The depicted units are not to scale (Figure from Roache-Fedchenko 2012:10).

All of the ceramics analyzed in this paper are specifically drawn from the Fort Stanwix catalogue (Appendix B). Since the first excavations of the site in 1965, archaeologists have recovered 19,121 ceramics (accounting for 38.24 percent of the entire assemblage). These ceramics have been examined and categorized by Roache-Fedchenko, Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Griswold, Hanson and Hsu, Campbell,

and countless archaeologists and volunteers for the Division of Cultural Resources at Fort Stanwix National Monument. Due to the variety of excavation methods, and the location and research interests of the newer projects, this project focuses on the ceramics identified and recorded in *Casemates and Cannonballs* by Hanson and Hsu (1975).




Figure 6. This map depicts the trench area excavated during the 2013 project in relation to the areas excavated in the 1970s (Figure from Roache-Fedchenko 2014).

During the original analysis, the ceramics were assigned a catalogue number and described in the catalogue by context, vessel type, material, and count. When noting the context, no point proveniences for the artifacts were provided, but the unit number, stratigraphic layer, and feature number described the location of the artifacts when applicable. Descriptions of vessel types not only categorized the sherds as belonging to the body, rim, or base, but also included the type of vessel the sherd might have belonged to like a bowl, teacup or teapot, punch bowl, drinking vessel, or flatware. Similarly, the ceramic material was classified into broad categories including redware, stoneware, yellowware, earthenware, creamware, whiteware, ironstone, porcelain, pearlware, and

delft. Any additional descriptions of the ceramics, specific patterning, colors, or size were also recorded as part of the description. Furthermore, since the use and manufacture of ceramics are well documented historically, many of the entries in the catalogue include an approximate location and date of manufacture. Entries in the main Fort Stanwix catalogue include total raw sherds counts and descriptions include a note if an artifact could be cross-mended. *Casemates and Cannonballs* provides additional information regarding the counts. In Hanson and Hsu's (1975) discussion of ceramic artifacts, counts of ceramic material types, like porcelain, stoneware, and earthenware sherds were given as raw counts and the number and distribution of forms were given as a minimum number of vessels (MNV) (Hanson and Hsu 1975:116-117). The National Park Service at Fort Stanwix National Monument kindly provided the catalogue and excavation notes and maps that serve as the foundation of this study.

The information provided by Fort Stanwix National Monument was used to answer the primary research question regarding the relationship and the maintenance of military hierarchy at Fort Stanwix. This study begins with an analysis of the spatial distribution of ceramics across the fort. As previously discussed (Figure 2), Hanson and Hsu's excavation of the interior of the fort involved irregularly shaped units, as such, it is necessary to discuss the way this paper studies the distribution of artifact at the fort.

Although determining the spatial distribution of ceramics per cubic meter of soil would have been ideal, it could not be calculated with the existing information. Instead, this paper analyzes the ceramics according to the structure in which they were found (Appendix B). This approach is similar to Bridge's (2015) examination of analyzing the distribution of ceramics in regions and sub-regions on Salvadoran Sugar Haciendas. At

Fort Stanwix, Hanson and Hsu determined which ceramics belonged to the military occupation of the fort and the structures that these artifacts were likely associated. This information serves as the basis of this study. Although the forms of many of these structures are known, a careful analysis of the ceramics in the structure can help scholars understand how the fort was actually used and if different structures were used in different ways during periods of overcrowding. Some scholars suggest the higher frequencies of ceramics could be indicative of a kitchen, commissary, or storage area (Fisher 1986; Miller and Stone 1970; Sussman 2000). This quantitative analysis complements historical documents discussing the fort's layout and enriches scholars' current understanding of the structure of the site and the activity areas of the officers and the soldiers.

After identifying areas with significant concentrations of ceramics, this study analyzes the typological distribution — of both the material and form type — of ceramics in each of the structures. Bourdieu (1984) suggests that members of different groups often used economic capital, or material goods like ceramics, to demarcate relationships and status. Other scholars suggest that different material type of ceramics can be indicative of social status or prestige; therefore, differences in distribution of particular types of material and forms of ceramics at the fort could be reflective of the military hierarchy at the fort (Fisher 1987, Griswold and Largy 2010; Stull and Klinge 2005; Wurst 2006; Yentsh 1990). Since it was not possible to calculate the ceramics per cubic meter, this paper analyzes the material type and form counts (raw sherd count and MNV) per structure. Additionally, the ratios of the ceramics were calculated and compared by

material types and forms within each structure in order to allow a cross comparison across the site. The results of these ratios were analyzed and presented visually in graphs.

Since the ultimate aim of this study is to examine ceramics, power relationships and the military hierarchy, the paper concludes by discussing the role ceramics may have played in supporting and reinforcing the power relationships between the officers and soldiers at Fort Stanwix. Although many isolated frontier forts played an important role in the early history of the United States, this study offers a unique examination into the life of those living at Fort Stanwix. Accordingly, the analysis contributes to the existing body of research aimed at understanding military life during the 18th century.

Results and Analysis

While ceramics are only one type of artifact uncovered at Fort Stanwix, an analysis this type of material culture can help to understand how the soldiers and officers used Fort Stanwix. Over 33 percent of the fort has been excavated and this has yielded approximately 500,000 artifacts. Ceramics (including flatware, bowls, teawares, etc.) account for 19,121 or 38.24 percent of the assemblage. Of these ceramics, 9,691 fragments have been found in contexts associated with the military occupation of the fort or have a temporal range that includes occupation of the fort. This includes 731 sherds of pearlware (1779-1820), but since the fort was only occupied until 1781 and 19th and 20th century intrusions have significantly disturbed the stratigraphy, and this study does not include pearlware within the analysis. This leaves approximately 8,950 sherds associated with the two military occupations of the fort and Hanson and Hsu attribute 5,443 identifiable sherds to the various military structures and the 221 (2.47 percent) sherds that have been found in 18th century features.¹¹

An examination of a suite of structures (all of the bombproofs, casemates, and barracks together) to determine if one area may have been more actively utilized or occupied revealed that the casemates had the greatest frequency (n=2045) of ceramics

¹¹ Discrepancies in the counts and identification of sherds must be addressed. The catalogue created for this study selected 8,950 sherds to be associated with the military occupations and calculated that 6,664 sherds had not been identified or analyzed, which left 2,286 sherds for the focus of this study. In comparison, the tables provided by Hanson and Hsu, suggested the total number of sherds in their study to be 5,443. In order to mitigate this discrepancy, this paper relied upon the data provided by Hanson and Hsu since they were the original excavators and were able to have a clearer understanding of context. It uses the 221 sherds from features as a comparison.

and the bombproofs (n=128) had the least (Table 1).¹² When analyzing the sherds count by structure, the North Casemate had the highest quantity (n=855) while the Southwest Bombproof had the lowest quantity of sherds (n=15). The sherds located outside the fort — Ditch, Ravelin, and East Scarp (n=1078) — also make up a significant portion (19.80 percent) of the entire assemblage.

	Creamware	Delft	Earthenware	Porcelain	Stoneware	Totals
N Casemate	216	179	67	141	252	855
W Casemate	8	30	0	3	20	61
SW Casemate	107	139	40	131	302	719
SE Casemate	12	61	11	33	17	134
E Casemate	66	47	46	35	82	276
East Barracks	42	86	36	125	114	403
West Barracks	144	126	42	81	176	569
Guardhouse	186	99	56	49	169	559
Headquarters	3	8	6	9	23	49
Parade Ground	30	15	2	8	36	91
NE Bombproof	10	18	3	5	20	56
NW Bombproof	25	15	3	7	7	57
SW Bombproof	3	6	0	1	5	15
Bakehouse	6	14	6	3	9	38
Ditch	64	116	39	24	104	347
Ravelin	12	116	23	15	73	239
East Scarp	67	205	24	73	123	492
Sally Port	71	152	31	84	145	483
Totals	1072	1432	435	827	1677	5443

Table 1. Sherds found in Structures by Material Type

¹² For specific definitions and descriptions of locations, please see Appendix A.

In addition to studying the sherd counts, Hanson and Hsu also calculated the MNV and an analysis of the MNV illustrates a similar pattern as the sherd count (Table 2). The casemates had the greatest number of ceramic vessels (n=270) with the greatest number being found in the North Casemate (n=129). In contrast, the bombproofs had the smallest MNV (n=33) with the greatest number of vessels being found in the Northwest Bombproof (n=25). Aside from the casemates, particularly the North Casemate, consistently having greatest ceramic evidence, and the bombproofs, particularly the southwest, having the least, this analysis does not reveal any other major patterns of activity use among the other fort structures.

Material Types

In order to study the potential differences in status at Fort Stanwix, this investigation also analyses the distribution of material types and forms at various structures around the fort. The counts and MNV used in this analysis draw heavily upon the figures provided by Hanson and Hsu (1975) (Table 1).

Stoneware was the most prominent sherd type (n=1677) and the highest quantities were found in the Southwest Casemate (n=302) and the lowest were found in the Southwest Bombproof (n=5) and the Northwest Bombproof (n=7). Delft or tin-enamelled ware was the second most prevalent sherd found at the site (n=1432) and the highest quantity was found in the East Scarp (n=205) and the Southwest Bombproof had the lowest count (n=6). Of a total of 1,072 creamware sherds, the greatest quantity was found in the North Casemate (n=216), but the Guardhouse (n=186) and the West Barracks (n=144) also had significant quantities of creamware. The lowest number of creamware sherds was found at the Headquarters and in the Southwest Bombproof (n=3).

Location	Plate	Saucers	Cups/Handled Cups	Teapot	Sugar Bowls	Pitchers	Tankards	Bowls	Punch Bowls	Pans	Platters	Jars	Jugs	Totals
N Casemate	18	31	30	5	0	0	0	8	30	1	4	2	0	129
W Casemate	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	9
SW Casemate	12	15	19	4	0	0	2	2	17	0	5	1	0	75
SE Casemate	3	8	7	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	27
E Casemate	5	6	6	2	0	0	2	2	6	0	3	0	0	30
East Barracks	6	11	5	3	1	0	0	1	11	0	5	1	0	45
West Barracks	7	17	16	5	1	0	0	5	10	0	7	3	1	72
Guardhouse	5	10	6	1	1	0	0	2	10	0	4	1	0	41
Headquarters	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	10
Parade Ground	2	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	15
NE Bombproof	2	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	18
NW Bombproof	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	9
SW Bombproof	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
Bakehouse	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9
Ditch	5	15	10	5	1	1	3	11	0	9	2	0	0	62
Ravelin	4	6	3	1	0	0	1	7	0	1	0	0	1	24
East Scarp	10	9	8	3	2	0	0	3	12	1	0	2	1	51
Sally Port	9	10	9	1	0	1	2	2	12	0	2	0	0	46
Totals	98	159	133	36	7	2	2	31	145	3	47	12	2	678

Table 2. MNV by Structure

Earthenware (n=435) was commonly found in the North Casemate (n=67) and the Guardhouse (n=56), but they were not found in the West Casemate or Southwest Bombproof. Porcelain (n=827) was found nearly twice as frequently as earthenware (n=435) and the highest quantities were found in the North Casemate (n=141) followed by the Southwest Casemate (n=131). The lowest counts of porcelain were found in the Bakehouse (n=3) and the Southwest Bombproof (n=1). This form of analysis provides a rough understanding of the distribution of ceramics and the material composition the ceramics across the fort.

A broad study of the raw counts can help to identify general patterns and an analysis of areas with the highest concentrations of particular types also provides useful information since all the structures of the fort were not excavated to the same extent. The percentage of each structure's assemblage was calculated based on Hanson and Hsu's count of a particular material type divided by the total count for the structure (Table 3). Accordingly, calculating the ratios allows for a more equitable comparison of the distribution of types and forms across various structures at Fort Stanwix.

Although the highest counts for a number of the material types were found in the North Casemate, analyses of the ratios reveal different trends. The highest concentration of creamware in a structure was found in the Northwest Bombproof (43.85 percent). The West Casemate had the highest concentration of delft (49.18 percent) while the Headquarters had the highest concentration of stoneware (46.93 percent). In studying earthenware, the highest concentration was found in the East Casemate (16.66 percent) while the highest concentration of porcelain (31.01 percent) was found in the East Barracks. As this demonstrates, an examination of the percentage of ceramics may

	Cream-ware	Delft	Earthen-ware	Porcelain	Stone-ware	Totals
N Casemate	25.26	20.94	7.84	16.49	29.47	100.00
W Casemate	13.11	49.18	0.00	4.92	32.79	100.00
SW Casemate	14.88	19.33	5.56	18.22	42.00	100.00
SE Casemate	8.96	45.52	8.21	24.63	12.69	100.00
E Casemate	23.91	17.03	16.67	12.68	29.71	100.00
East Barracks	10.42	21.34	8.93	31.02	28.29	100.00
West Barracks	25.31	22.14	7.38	14.24	30.93	100.00
Guardhouse	33.27	17.71	10.02	8.77	30.23	100.00
Headquarters	6.12	16.33	12.24	18.37	46.94	100.00
Parade Ground	32.97	16.48	2.20	8.79	39.56	100.00
NE Bombproof	17.86	32.14	5.36	8.93	35.71	100.00
NW Bombproof	43.86	26.32	5.26	12.28	12.28	100.00
SW Bombproof	20.00	40.00	0.00	6.67	33.33	100.00
Bakehouse	15.79	36.84	15.79	7.89	23.68	100.00
Ditch	18.44	33.43	11.24	6.92	29.97	100.00
Ravelin	5.02	48.54	9.62	6.28	30.54	100.00
East Scarp	13.62	41.67	4.88	14.84	25.00	100.00
Sally Port	14.70	31.47	6.42	17.39	30.02	100.00
Totals	19.70	26.31	7.99	15.19	30.81	100.00

Table 3. Table of Sherd by Material as a Percent of Structure Total

mitigate the effects of the different areas of excavation in the analysis of ceramics type by structure and allow new patterns of use to emerge.

Form Types

The examination of the form of the ceramics also provides useful information in the analysis of the distribution of status across different fort structures. The types of the ceramics were divided into plates, saucers, cups and handled cups, teapots, sugar bowls, pitchers, tankards, bowls, punch bowls, pans, platters, jars, and jugs and measured as a MNV (Table 2). Pitchers (n=2) and jars (n=2) were the least common forms and many

structures did not contain evidence of these forms. In contrast, saucers (n=159) were the most frequently found type of ceramic artifact and the greatest MNV was found in the North Casemate (n=129) and the Southwest Bombproof had the lowest MNV (n=6). The North Casemate also had the highest MNV of saucers (n=31) plates (n=18), cups and handled cups (n=30), tankards (n=8), and bowls (n=30). The North Casemate, West Barracks, and Ditch also had the highest MNV of teapots (n=5). Considering the distribution of forms across the fort structures provides information that can be used in the interpretation of military organization at Fort Stanwix.

Although the raw MNV is important, it is also necessary to consider the total amount excavated particularly because of the irregular excavation units. As such, a rough concentration of form type by structure was calculated by determining the ratio of a form type of ceramic in a structure to the total ceramics found in that structure (Table 4).

Location	Plate	Saucers	Cups	Teapot	Sugar Bowls	Pitchers	Tankards	Bowls	Punch Bowls	Pans	Platters	Jars	Jugs	Total
N Casemate	13.95	24.03	23.26	3.88	0.00	0.00	6.20	23.26	0.78	3.10	1.55	0.00	0.00	100
W Casemate	11.11	22.22	33.33	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
SW Casemate	16.00	20.00	25.33	5.33	0.00	0.00	2.67	22.67	0.00	6.67	1.33	0.00	0.00	100
SE Casemate	11.11	29.63	25.93	3.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.81	3.70	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
E Casemate	16.67	20.00	20.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	6.67	20.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
East Barracks	15.56	37.78	35.56	11.11	2.22	0.00	11.11	22.22	0.00	15.56	6.67	2.22	0.00	160
West Barracks	9.72	23.61	22.22	6.94	1.39	0.00	6.94	13.89	0.00	9.72	4.17	1.39	0.00	100
Guardhouse	12.20	24.39	14.63	2.44	2.44	0.00	4.88	24.39	0.00	9.76	2.44	0.00	2.44	100
Headquarters	30.00	20.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Parade Ground	13.33	20.00	20.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	26.67	0.00	13.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
NE Bombproof	11.11	38.89	22.22	5.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
NW Bombproof	22.22	22.22	11.11	22.22	0.00	0.00	11.11	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
SW Bombproof	16.67	33.33	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Bakehouse	33.33	33.33	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Ditch	8.06	24.19	16.13	8.06	1.61	1.61	4.84	17.74	0.00	14.52	3.23	0.00	0.00	100
Ravelin	16.67	25.00	12.50	4.17	0.00	0.00	4.17	29.17	0.00	4.17	0.00	0.00	4.17	100
East Scarp	19.61	17.65	15.69	5.88	3.92	0.00	5.88	23.53	1.96	0.00	3.92	1.96	0.00	100
Sally Port	19.57	21.74	19.57	2.17	0.00	2.17	4.35	26.09	0.00	4.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	100

Table 4. Table of Form Type as a Percentage of Structure Total

Interestingly, the highest concentration of plates and saucers (33.33 percent) were found in the Bakehouse. The greatest cluster of cups and handled cups were found in the

West Casemate (33.33 percent). The Ditch, which may have contained the remnants of swept trash, held the highest concentration of teapot fragments (8.06 percent) and the greatest concentrations outside of the Ditch were found in the East Casemate and the East Barracks (6.66 percent). Although few examples of sugar bowls or pitchers were found, the greatest concentrations were found in on the Parade Ground (6.66 percent) and the Sally Port (2.17 percent) respectively. The highest concentrations of tankards (6.94 percent) and platters (4.16 percent) were found in the West Barracks. The highest concentration of bowls (29.16 percent) was found outside the Ravelin, and the next highest concentration (26.66 percent) was found in the Parade Ground. Evidence of punch bowls was rather limited, but the highest concentration (3.70 percent) was found in the Southeast Casemate. Pans were commonly found in the Ditch (14.51 percent) and in the East Barracks and Southeast Casemates (11.11 percent); platters were found in the highest concentration in the East Barracks (6.67 percent). Jars and jugs were also rarely found on the site but jars were found in highest concentrations in the East Scarp (1.96 percent) and jugs were frequently found in the Ravelin (4.16 percent). This information provides another avenue from which to take in account the size of the assemblage and constructively analyze the MNV of certain form types.

Material and Form Types

A survey of types of materials used to make the different forms provides information that can contribute to scholars' understanding of Fort Stanwix (Table 5). Of the plates uncovered at the fort, 59.18 percent of them were stoneware. Similarly, stoneware vessels made up over 50 percent of the cups and saucers found and of the six sugar bowls uncovered at the fort, 83.33 percent were also identified as stoneware. The

Type	Creamware	Delft	Earthenware	Porcelain	Stoneware	Total
Plates	17.35	12.24	0.00	11.22	59.18	100.00
Saucers	8.18	1.89	5.66	31.45	52.83	100.00
Cups	13.71	1.61	0.81	30.65	53.23	100.00
Teapots	57.14	0.00	31.43	8.57	2.86	100.00
Sugar Bowls	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	83.33	100.00
Pitchers	67.74	0.00	3.23	0.00	29.03	100.00
Tankards	9.66	34.48	15.86	17.93	22.07	100.00
Handled Cups	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Bowls	9.66	34.48	15.86	17.93	22.07	100.00
Punch Bowls	0.00	66.67	0.00	0.00	33.33	100.00
Pans	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Platters	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Drug Jars	0.00	89.47	5.26	0.00	5.26	100.00
Jars	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	50.00	100.00
Jugs	0.00	0.00	66.67	0.00	33.33	100.00

Table 5. Percentages of Form Types and Material Types

teapots uncovered were largely earthenware with 65.71 percent being earthenware and 34.28 of that being Whieldon ware and of the three jugs found, 66.66 percent were identified as earthenware. The tankards found at the fort were largely made from creamware (54.83 percent). The bowls (34.48 percent), punch bowls (66.66 percent), and drug jars (89.47 percent) were largely examples of delft or tin-enameled pottery (Hanson and Hsu 1975). This information provides a bit more detail in the analysis as frequently it is both the form type and the material together that suggest the status of the owner; therefore, an analysis of both of these characteristics (the material and form types) might provide deeper insight into the use of the fort.

These different levels of analysis were undertaken in order to examine status of the users, but a few assumptions and important notes should be discussed before a comprehensive analysis of these results. To begin, all the data used in this study were

identified and categorized by archaeologists and scholars associated with Fort Stanwix and no new identification or analysis of the artifacts were undertaken during this study. Accordingly, the results of this paper are dependent upon the excavation methods and work done by other archaeologist and scholars for over forty years. Considering this, it is necessary to reflect on how previous scholars have categorized the artifacts.

The information provided by Hanson and Hsu (1975) and the collection management database at Fort Stanwix are slightly different particularly in their categorization of material types. This could be clearly observed in the treatment of earthenware sherds. In the tables provided by Hanson and Hsu (Hanson and Hsu 1975), the material types are listed by the larger categories of stoneware, earthenware, porcelain and then they are divided into types and varieties that more specifically identify the artifact (Appendix B). The catalogue characterizes the ceramics by porcelain, stoneware, and earthenware, but further divide earthenware into creamware, pearlware, wheildon ware, delft, redware, and rockingham ware. The additional identification, what would be found in in Hanson and Hsu's table as types and varieties, are discussed in the description portion of the catalogue. Although this is not a large discrepancy, it is necessary to select a way in which to catalogue the artifacts so they are not double counted or counted in the wrong group. Since creamware and delft/tin-glazed can be further subdivided, this paper has chosen to analyze them as separate categories from earthenware. Rockingham ware and redware, two common forms of earthenware, have been included with the earthenware counts. Wheildon ware has been incorporated into the creamware counts. This classification system sought to limit computing errors particularly in duplicating counts while drawing on both the catalogue and the data in Hanson and Hsu (1975).

Although this study was able to work with both data sets, there were still some limitations on the data that could be analyzed. Hanson and Hsu's *Casemates and Cannonballs* (1975) does not provide specific information regarding the location of the specific ceramic artifacts, such as whether two porcelain bowls were found in the East Barracks. This complicates the analysis of the ceramics as it is difficult, if not impossible, to associate particular artifacts with specific structures. Also, despite having the total sherd counts and MNV, it is difficult to establish a clear understanding of the distribution per structure as low counts or MNV can inflate the concentrations of specific material or form types. The excavation methods, as discussed previously, also complicate this analysis. Despite these limitations, the methods used by this paper were chosen in order to facilitate the analysis of the ceramics by structure.

As mentioned previously, the fort was occupied by the British (1756-1765) and the Continentals (1776-1781) and during the Continental occupation, the regiments at the fort changed several times. Multiple occupations of the fort and post-depositional processes at the fort may obscure the occupation and activity areas of the officers and soldiers at the fort. Since the original excavators were unable to distinguish between the two eras of occupation, it makes it difficult to know if the ceramics used in this analysis were a product of the Continental occupations or both periods. Accordingly, this paper is predicated on the idea that the Continental soldiers rebuilt Fort Stanwix using the existing foundations and similar layout, and that the British and Continental soldiers used

ceramics to reinforce their power and status in the same ways.¹³ Historical documents (Luzader et al. 1976) suggest this may be the case. Still, other factors, including occupation and deposition, preservation, and excavation methods complicate learning about those who lived at the fort. During the fort's occupation, significant traffic, including civilians, soldiers, traders, and artificers (tradesmen) could have also introduced a variety of ceramics to different structures, which would make it difficult to tell whether the officers or the enlisted soldiers used an area. Subsequently, after the military occupation of the fort, the city of Rome, NY developed across its ruins and the site experienced significant post-depositional disturbance. An analysis of the undisturbed features located in several of the structures revealed a similar distribution of ceramic materials and form types (Table 6 and 7). Although this does not mean that significant post-depositional processes were not at work at this site, it suggests that the placement of the ceramics, in the undisturbed portions of the fort, may be reliable. Despite these potential shortcomings, as the results, analysis, and discussion suggest, an examination of the ceramics at Fort Stanwix provide a better understanding of the role ceramics played in reinforcing and indicating military status.

¹³ As previously discussed, the location of the officer's quarters and the barracks changed over time and the identification of ceramics by structure, particularly the barracks, reflects the American occupation of the fort.

Feature	Cream-ware	Delft	Earthen-ware	Porcelain	Stone-ware	Totals
West Barracks	6	1	2	4	7	20
East Barracks	1	1	3	3	7	16
NE Bombproof	0	0	0	0	0	0
NW Bombproof	0	0	0	0	0	0
SW Bombproof	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Casemate	20	3	5	9	8	45
SW Casemate	1	3	1	0	2	7
SE Casemate	0	1	0	0	0	2
Headquarters	50	2	2	0	3	57

Table 6. The Distribution of Material Types in Features within a Structure

Feature	Tea Wares	Lid	Bottle	Bowl	Plate	Cup	Cupsidor	Mug	Chamber Pot	Unspecified	Total
West Barracks	8	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	6	21
East Barracks	1	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	16
NE Bombproof	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NW Bombproof	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SW Bombproof	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Casemate	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	55	57
SW Casemate	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	6	9
SE Casemate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Necessary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Headquarters	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	51	53

Table 7. The Distribution of Form Types in Features within a Structure

Discussion

A careful examination of the material and form types at Fort Stanwix facilitates a critical analysis of the way 18th-century soldiers and officers negotiated power and maintained military hierarchy. While many archaeological studies of conflict focus on reconstructing and analyzing particular battles, historians are more focused on the lives of the soldiers and the officers. Drawing from these two fields of study, this paper primarily focuses on the daily lives of soldiers and officers when they were at war but not fighting battles. As such, this thesis uses an analysis of the ceramics to develop a greater understanding of how soldiers and officers might have interacted at the isolated Fort Stanwix. The data help highlight particular activity areas at the fort, but confounds the common idea that soldiers and officers maintained distinct quarters and clearly demarcated status. Instead, it suggests that officers and the rank and file soldiers may have occupied the same spaces and had access to similar ceramics. This indicates that although soldiers were responsible for obeying their officers, officers had to obey and craft a relationship with their soldiers.

Structures

Although most forts, including Fort Stanwix, typically follow a set plan and have similar activities areas, it is necessary to examine the archaeological evidence at Fort Stanwix to confirm the activity areas and potential areas of interaction between the soldiers and the officers. The structures used and occupied by the soldiers and officers could have had particular significance. As McConnell suggests, in the 18th century, the British particularly “found themselves occupying quarters designed to reinforce a social system that lent order and meaning to military — as well as civilian-life” (McConnell

2004:43). It is therefore important to use the results to determine areas that suggest significant occupation or activity areas that may merit further analysis to determine who might have used these areas (Figure 7). An analysis of activity areas suggests that archaeologists can expect to find different distributions of ceramics, or other material goods, in particular structures (Dellino-Musgrave; 2006; Feister 1984; Feister 2006; Fisher 1987; Fisher 1995; Fox 1988). For example, a kitchen may have large pots, utensils, or larger concentrations of platters, plates, or bowls versus a magazine, which may have large concentrations of ammunition, powder, fuses, and ordnances. As such, this paper examines the quantity of ceramics to suggest activity areas and identify the structures on which to concentrate.




Figure 7. Sherd Counts by Structure

Although the use of Fort Stanwix's structures has been relatively well documented, an analysis of the distribution of ceramics can help to problematize and reinforce previous understandings of the fort, as well as suggest areas for additional study

(Figure 7). Historically, the barracks have been defined as residential structures and the high quantities of ceramics seem to support this idea (A Military Dictionary 1708:15). The variety of form types found in this area lends credence to the idea that this was an area where many activities or storage of ceramics may have occurred. The North and Southwest Casemates contained the highest number of ceramics. Casemates, as Hanson and Hsu note, “served a dual purpose, for they were built comfortably enough to house the garrison and stout enough to withstand artillery bombardment” (Hanson and Hsu 1972a:1). In total, the casemates were intended to house between 200 and 400 men depending on the season (Hanson and Hsu 1972a:3). The difference in ceramic quantities between the casemates may be indicative of different levels of occupancy; however, it is more likely that these differences occur because the West and Southeast Casemates have not been excavated to the same extent as the North and Southwest. The high counts of ceramics in the Guardhouse may also suggest that it was used heavily throughout the fort’s use and Luzader et al. (1976) suggests that this was used to house members of the guard and to house prisoners (1976:69). The high quantities of ceramics located in these areas suggest that these were highly occupied areas may have been used for domestic activities. The Ditch, Ravelin, Sally Port, and Scarp were also areas of high quantities of ceramics, but historically, these are relatively marginal areas located just outside of the fort’s walls and it is more likely that these represent discard areas for broken ceramics and other materials.

In contrast, the Headquarters, Parade Grounds, Bakehouse, and Bombproofs contained relatively low quantities of ceramics. The relatively low quantities of ceramics found at the Headquarters and Parade Ground could suggest that the area was occupied

but not heavily occupied on a continuous basis or that this highly visible area was cleaned of debris on a regular basis. The Continental soldiers used the area identified as the Bakehouse (Figure 2) from 1776 to 1781 while the British previously used the area as a Powder Magazine from 1758-1767. Although these uses might explain the low counts of ceramics, the low counts can also be explained by the fact that Campbell's 1965 work excavated this area and removed the artifacts. Campbell's findings are not used in this study (Hanson and Hsu 1972c:7-10). Of all the structures, the bombproofs consistently had the lowest quantities of ceramics, which may indicate that the soldiers and officers did not frequently occupy the area. This fits with historical accounts as Willett notes that people used the Southwest Bombproof to store goods as it "[was] the most airy, and agreeable" (Hanson and Hsu 1972b:1). Although this may account for the lower quantities, it is also possible that the bombproof had been cleaned out prior to the fort's abandonment in 1781 or that the area has not been excavated as extensively as the other areas. Overall, the low ceramic counts in these areas may suggest that they were not routinely occupied or commonly used by soldiers or officers for domestic activities.

Although some of the differences in sherd counts may be due to post-depositional factors and excavation methods, considering the distribution of ceramics throughout the fort provides key information for understanding the way Fort Stanwix was used during wartime. Ultimately, an analysis of the ceramics supports the historical documentation of the fort. As such, this information suggests that this study should focus on areas like the Casemates, Guardhouse, Headquarters, and Barracks while other areas like the Ditch, Ravelin, East Scarp, and Sally Port may suggest where officers or soldiers deposited their refuse and swept trash. Still, the remaining areas should not be neglected entirely as they

may help to understand post-depositional factors or who frequently used the structure. Although a spatial analysis of the distribution of ceramics does not offer conclusive evidence of activity areas, this analysis does suggest that post-depositional and excavation factors played a significant role at Fort Stanwix and that casemates and barracks were likely areas of significant domestic activity that can be analyzed further to examine military hierarchy at the fort.

Status

In order to examine potential status differences, it is necessary to analyze the distribution of both the material and the form types of ceramics in different structures.

Feister (1984) posits that:

status enforcing rituals, as South (1977:42-43) has suggested, are especially important in a situation where flexible role differentiation threatens the power structure, where status mobility is divisive, and where rigid status-enforcing rituals act toward maintaining control in the power center [Feister, 1984:104].

As such, it is expected that the elite commissioned officers and enlisted soldiers would have occupied different structures in the forts. At Crown Point (Feister 1984) archaeologists identified differences in construction techniques of structures and theorize that the materials used reflect and reinforce status. The difference in construction materials is absent from Fort Stanwix. Instead, this study uses the material and form types of ceramics as an indicator of status and the interactions between the soldiers and the officers (Fisher 1983).

Theoretically, high concentrations of luxury materials or form types indicate that the officers used a particular area while more common materials or communal form types indicate that the enlisted soldiers used this area. Archaeologists might expect to find this

difference since McConnell notes that the British army allowed officers to bring trunks filled with personal gear, while the soldiers had to limit their belongings to what they could carry including spoons, plates, and kettles (McConnell 2004:73-74). As such, the elite commissioned officers may have been able to bring more luxury materials and the lower status enlisted soldier may have brought more durable material types and utilitarian and multipurpose form of ceramics. Accordingly, examining the distribution of these artifacts across the site suggests the activity areas of the officers and the enlisted soldiers reveals the relationship between those of dominant and subordinate rank.

With a few exceptions, there appears to be a relatively even distribution of the material types of ceramics across the fort (Figure 8 and 9). All the structures, except for the West Casemate and Southwest Bombproof, have sherds from all of the known types of ceramics with the quantities of sherds varying slightly by structure.¹⁴ A close examination of the distribution does reveal slightly higher concentrations of porcelain in the East Barracks and Southeast Casemate. As Yentesh (1990) suggests, colonial elites often used porcelain as an indicator of wealth and even though porcelain had become more accessible to members of the middle class by the late 18th century, the presence of porcelain suggests that those using it had enough wealth to bring this fragile ceramic into the wilderness and replace it if it broke (Dellino-Musgraves 2006). Furthermore, Dellino-Musgraves posits “in a capitalistic society, material things create a complex interaction between people and the various materials they use to justify themselves and their social identities” (Dellino-Musgraves 2006:64). As members of the dominate, upper socio-economic class, commissioned officers may have been used to materially indicating

¹⁴ This shows only the most common types of ceramics.

access to discretionary income that could be used to buy fragile items that might break in the field. Accordingly, higher concentrations suggest that officers or higher status individuals may have used this area. Furthermore, the quantities found in the Ditch and Ravelin may lend credence to the idea that porcelain was highly regarded as the low quantities suggest that individuals may have been more reticent to use this ceramic except in important situations, like a dinner service for visiting officers, or abandon this valuable ceramic.




Figure 8. This map shows the material types that were found at each location as a standard bar graph.




Figure 9. This map shows the material types that were found at each location. It contains pie graphs that are superimposed over a map of the excavation units used in the 1970s. The different sizes to the pie graphs illustrate the number of artifacts found associated with each structure.

Apart from these concentrations of porcelain, there does not seem to be a significant difference in the material types of ceramics the soldiers and officers brought with them and left behind at Fort Stanwix. The relatively even distribution of ceramics may be due to a couple of factors. First, with the emergence of industrial manufacturing processes, it may have been easier for men of different social status to purchase a variety of ceramics. McConnell notes that at Fort Pitt, “common soldiers, if not buying as much, were clearly buying the same sorts of materials as their officers and local civilians...” and these goods may have also been obtained through trade or reclamation (McConnell 2004:77, 80). Archaeologists at the 18th century Fort Michilimackinac also note that despite the fort’s incredibly isolated location, soldiers’ and officers’ material culture and ceramics reflected what might be found in highly connected areas of the colonies (Miller and Stone 1970:94). Accordingly, trade with the Native Americans and the relatively constant influx of regiments may have allowed Fort Stanwix, despite its isolated frontier location, to remain connected to the latest material culture and ceramic material types.

Second, during the siege of 1777, the fort held approximately 300 more soldiers and officers than it was designed to host (Hanson and Hsu 1975:2-6). Luzader et al. (1976) posit that apart from the Headquarters, enlisted soldiers and commissioned officers may have shared the same quarters although the officers had greater access to less crowded rooms (Luzader et al. 1976:102-104). Considering this evidence, the ceramic material type does not provide incontrovertible evidence of clear status differentiation at Fort Stanwix and the maintenance of distinct social identities; however, the higher concentrations of a fragile and expensive porcelain in the East Barracks and

Southeastern Casemate provides strong evidence that the highest-ranking officers occupied these structures.

The distribution of ceramic form types provides stronger evidence of status differentiation at the fort and primary and secondary documents provide key evidence about how ceramics were distributed across social categories.¹⁵ Similar to how particular material types, like porcelain, were indicative of status, certain form types can indicate status and suggest how the officers and soldiers negotiated power. Reviewing historical documents, McConnell notes that during the French and Indian War, “wives like Isabella Graham entertained with tea sets and obtained the latest fashions and dry goods from Britain [while] common soldiers lived communally in barrack rooms furnished by the government” (McConnell 2004:74). Similarly, during the siege of 1777, Willett notes that British envoys were received at the fort “by Colonel Gansevoort in his dining-room. The windows of the room were shut, and the candles lighted; a table was also spread, covered with crackers, cheese, and wine” (Willett 1969:55-56). Although the parley with Gansevoort does not speak specifically of the types of ceramics used, this interaction and the experiences of Isabella Graham speaks to a larger characteristic of military life and the importance of tablewares in the everyday social interactions of soldiers and officers at Fort Stanwix. Although all the form types were analyzed, this study focuses on punch bowls and teapots as indicators of status and the power negotiations at the fort.

Examining punch bowls from Punta Salinas, a saltpan on La Tortuga Island, Antczak (2015) discusses the importance and use of both large punch bowls and smaller more personal punch bowls called “sneakers.” Antczak notes that “consumption of

¹⁵ This shows only the most common types of ceramics.

alcohol was primarily based on relaxation and sociability for the captains” (Antczak 2015:180) and posits that these ceramics were used to help negotiate social relationships between the captains and the crew (Antczak 2015:160). Also examining alcohol and the role of punch bowls, Smith (2005) suggests that consuming punch was a highly ceremonial activity that typically reinforced and distinguished wealth and status (Antczak 2015:123). However, alcohol, and potentially consumption of punch also served an important role for lower status individuals. Antczak (2015) notes that punch typically contained five ingredients rum or other spirits, spices, water, sugar, and citrus fruit like lemons or oranges. This also metaphorically represented the social mixing that may occur during the consumption of this drink (Antczak 2015:175).¹⁶ As such, punch bowls found at Fort Stanwix provide integral evidence of status and power negotiations at the fort.

Even though the soldiers stationed at Fort Stanwix may have had access to the latest material types, their location on this frontier restricted access to taverns; therefore, the presence of punch bowls provides vital evidence for understanding power negotiations. An analysis of the punch bowl fragments found at the fort suggests that the fragments once belonged to the smaller sneakers (Hanson and Hsu 1975:123; Collections Catalogue). Not only were these vessels small and portable, but they were also more individual and could have served as multi-purpose vessels. Logically, bringing this type of vessel into the field makes sense since soldiers and officers alike were limited in the amount of goods they could carry with them. The smaller size, and lack of accompanying accoutrements, suggests the punch bowls may have not have been used by the elite used in

¹⁶ Smith (2005) also discusses alcohol as a social lubricant in Caribbean society life, such as in Barbados.

large-scale entertaining and for ceremonial purposes as Breen (2012) and Smith (2005) discusses. Instead, punch bowls at Fort Stanwix may be more indicative of a daily consumption of alcohol. Soldiers, and even officers, may have found it difficult to obtain all the necessary ingredients for punch, but the consumption of rum was a regular occurrence at the fort. In 1778, soldiers at the fort were given a maximum of a half pint of rum per day (Luzader et al. 1976:79). The consumption of alcohol, including rum or punch, provided, as Antczak notes, a “source of strength for ordinary men” and served as “a key safety valve that assured that the crews would comply with the captains and do their job as expected” (2015:180, 183). Although it helped maintain order, Antczak (2015) notes that the alcohol acted as a social lubricant and helped facilitate interactions between those from different statuses (Antczak 2015:180). Accordingly, punch bowls at Fort Stanwix do not necessarily indicate elite status, but suggest that soldiers and officers may have been interacting with each other in the North, Southeast, and Southwest casemates.

Like the consumption of rum and other spirits, the tea had grown incredibly popular and was widespread throughout the British Empire in the 18th century. For those living in the colonies, it served as a link to England (Dellino-Musgrave 2006:117). As the century progressed, the consumption of hot beverages including drinking tea, coffee, and chocolate, grew increasingly popular (McConnell 2004:76). An analysis of the consumption of these beverages in forts and encampments, like Crown Point Barracks, illustrates that these beverages had become such a favorite that the common enlisted soldier invested in at least a teapot to facilitate the consumption of these beverages (Farry 2005:30). Still, many lower status individuals, including the enlisted soldier, often could




Figure 10. This standard bar graph illustrates the different form types found at each of the structures.



Figure 11. Figure 11 displays pie graphs that are superimposed over a map of the excavation units used in the 1970s. The different sizes to the pie graphs illustrate the number of artifacts found associated with each structure.

not afford a full tea set. In her analysis of the tea ceremony, Ligon (1999) suggests that a complete set included teaspoons, cups and saucers, a milk container, a canister, tongs, slop bowl, sugar container and teapot (1999:4). Accordingly, an analysis of the wide distribution of teapots at Fort Stanwix confirms that consumption of coffee, tea, or chocolate was popular among all those living at the fort, so it is the presence of sugar bowls, associated with partaking in the full tea ceremony that suggests elite occupation (Figure 10 and 11). The Parade Grounds and the Guardhouse had the highest concentration of sugar bowls. Following Breen (2012), Smith (2005), Antczak (2015), Dellino-Musgrave (2006), and Ligon (1999) this suggests that these were areas where officers congregated to entertain or observe soldiers. Partaking of the rituals associated with tea, coffee, or chocolate drinking, particularly using sugar bowls, helped the elite officers indicate their status and reinforce their power over the enlisted soldiers at Fort Stanwix.

Considering both the material and form types facilitates a greater understanding of the interactions between officers and enlisted soldiers. In the East Barracks, the high concentration of porcelain and sugar bowls presents the most compelling evidence for use by elite officers. The presence of some concentrations of porcelain and sugar bowls in the West Barracks also suggests that that these structures housed elite officers. Considering this evidence, the highest-ranking officers occupied the centrally located Barracks, and used the highly visible Headquarters, Guardhouse, and Parade Grounds to demonstrate their power. The relatively even distribution of ceramics throughout the other structures at the fort, and the presence of the sneaker punch bowls, indicates that lower status officers and soldiers quartered in the Casemates. A journal entry provided by Lieutenant

Elmer lends credence to this option as he notes, “Cold, stormy day, and I obliged to live in a cold wet marquee, which leaks considerable [sic] Whilst the Captain, with the Field officers and other great men, have good rooms in barracks” (Elmer 1847: 30).¹⁷ Finally, the areas outside the fort —the Ditch, Ravelin, Sally Port, and Scarp — contain a mixture of materials and form types, which not only illustrates the broad range of ceramics used at the fort, but also that soldiers and officers alike were likely responsible for maintaining an orderly site.

Interpretation

Although the ceramic evidence suggests that the highest-ranking officers occupied separated quarters while the lower-ranking officers and enlisted soldiers shared quarters, it also alludes to both the officers’ and soldiers’ ability to negotiate power. Life at the fort, despite the overcrowding and lack of distinct boundaries, was still directed by a highly regimented routine. Lieutenant Elmer notes that the soldiers at the fort strictly adhered to a daily schedule and soldiers were expected to maintain their uniforms and weapons. He also writes that on Monday, September 2, 1776:

At 9 o’clock, A.M. a Court Martial was called to try several persons who yesterday misbehaved towards a guard... The Court, after being duly sworn, proceeded to the trial of Jno. Barrett, of Capt. Bloomfield’s company, charged as principle in raising a sedition, insulting and striking a Corporal and his guard in the execution of their duty...[Elmer 1848:190].

As this brief entry demonstrates, even in these remote and isolated frontier forts and despite sharing quarters, the officers managed to maintain a dominant position of power

¹⁷ Originally cited in Hanson and Hsu 1975, the original source cannot be found. It is particularly notable since the 19th of September 1776 fell on a Thursday and not the Sunday it is originally dated to in Hanson and Hsu 1975.

over the enlisted soldiers. Accordingly, participating in highly visible tea ceremonies, with the expensive accoutrements, helped the highest-officers preserve order and decorum at the fort.

Although ceramics, like sugar bowls, indicate the power of the elite, ceramics can also illustrate the power of the soldiers. The majority of soldiers may have been “seeping from jails, gin mills, and poorhouses,” but they should not be overlooked for two essential reasons (Niemeyer 1996:13). First, the widespread distribution of ceramic material and form types speaks to the soldiers’ economic agency. In the 18th century, people had greater access to products, but as Yentsch (1990), Leath (1999), Breen (2012), Dellino-Musgrave (2015), and Smith (2005) posit, certain types were indicative of status. Accordingly, the wide distribution of types speaks to even the lowest status individual’s ability to choose, purchase, manipulate, and use their own ceramics.

Second, the presence of the punch bowls in the casemates shared between the officers and soldiers indicates that the officers had to find a way to interact with and gain the support of their soldiers. As Antczak (2015) and Smith (2005) suggest, alcohol as a social lubricant helps facilitate interactions between groups and social mobility. Although officers could maintain decorum through punishment methods discussed by Lieutenant Elmer, the presence of punch bowls indicates the officers’ need to work with and appease the rank-and-file soldiers in a way that encouraged them to acknowledge the officers’ authority in such a way that they could live, fight, and die together.

Conclusion

Despite overcrowding and a few desertions, officers at Fort Stanwix managed to maintain relative order at the fort. Although McConnell (2004) contends that literacy, clothing, and food helped define status, ceramics account for over a third (roughly 38.24 percent) of the 18th-century assemblage at Fort Stanwix. Accordingly, this thesis explores and critically examines the role ceramics played in the maintenance of military hierarchy and negotiations of power between the soldiers and officers. This analysis suggests that military life at Fort Stanwix was not a rigid top-down hierarchy as scholars typically conceive. Instead, military hierarchy at Fort Stanwix was informed by both top-down and bottom-up negotiations of power as both officers and soldiers used ceramics to craft their own identities and ensure their place within the military hierarchy.

During the 18th century, officers and soldiers living at isolated frontier forts were often the last line of defense against attackers and those living at Fort Stanwix were no exception. Despite the important role these officers and rank-and-file soldiers played, they have largely been overlooked.¹⁸ Although some historical texts do describe life at these forts, an analysis of the material culture can help scholars learn more about the way military hierarchies operated at these isolated frontier sites.¹⁹ Soldiers and officers alike were not mere pawns in the military structure, but used ceramics to negotiate and reinforce their power (Sewell 2005:33). Accordingly, scholars analyzing conflict should

¹⁸ Women, civilians, and artificers (tradesmen) often lived at these forts and they too have been overlooked in the literature. For example, Luzader et al. (1976) notes that a woman was wounded and gave birth to a daughter at the fort during the Siege of 1777; however, no information is available. Future studies at Fort Stanwix should use material culture to explore the lives of the non-military personnel living at the fort.

¹⁹ This study focused on ceramics, but additional analyses of buttons, clothing, glass, or weapons could also help to contribute to or contradict these findings.

undertake a critical analysis of the archaeological record, as it will help problematize traditional understandings of military hierarchies, power negotiations, and life at 18th-century fortifications.

Appendix A: Descriptions of Key Areas in forts




Figure 12. Map of Fort Stanwix with key areas examined in this paper circled (Figure from Hanson and Hsu 1975:19).

Barracks: Barracks were generally located in a central area and were meant to house either soldiers or officers. These quarters were typically found at more permanent encampment or fort sites. At Fort Stanwix there were two Barracks, the East and West Barracks (A Military Dictionary 1708:15-16; Hanson and Hsu 1975:21-25).




Figure 13. A map of the East and West Barracks at Fort Stanwix showing areas of excavations and disturbance (Figure from Hanson and Hsu 1975:22). Note: the horizontal grey shading corresponds to the vertical black bars in the center of the smaller fort map.

Bastion: Smith defines a bastion as “part of the inner enclosure of a fortification, making an angle towards the field, and consists of two faces, two flanks, and an opening towards the center of the place, called the gorge...” (Smith 1779:108). Essentially, it is a portion of the fort that projects out from a corner in order to help increase sightlines and the defense of the fort. There were four bastions at Fort Stanwix (Hanson and Hsu 1975:16-17).

Bakehouse: As the name implies, these structures were used to provide the soldiers and officers with bread and other necessary rations. At Fort Stanwix, bakers may have needed to produce as much as 200 loaves of bread a day and so these structures often had large fireplaces and ovens to meet this need (Hanson and Hsu 1975:17-18).

Bombproof: These areas were typically located under the bastions and are constructed to provide a secure location that can withstand bombardment. Accordingly, these places are often used to store ammunition, powder, rations, or even house a hospital. Fort Stanwix had four bombproofs located under each of the bastions (Hanson and Hsu 1975:27).




Figure 14. A map of the Southwest Bombproof at Fort Stanwix showing areas of excavations and disturbance (Figure from Hanson and Hsu 1975:31).

Casemate: These areas were typically located under or built into the ramparts of forts. Like bombproofs, they were meant to provide shelter and often they had gun loops to also provide a concealed area from which to attack besiegers (Smith 1779:109). At Fort Stanwix, archaeologists have identified five casemates that were likely made form timber (Hanson and Hsu 1975:33-38).




Figure 15. A map of the North Casemate at Fort Stanwix showing areas of excavations and disturbance (Figure from Hanson and Hsu 1975:33).

Ditch: This area was a trench that was dug around the fort in order to ensure additional protection from attackers. The ditch could be filled with water or kept dry and could be wide and shallow or narrow and deep (Smith 1779:110). At Fort Stanwix, historical and archaeological evidence suggests that the soldiers did not construct a ditch along the east side of the fort (Hanson and Hsu 1975:39).

Guardhouse: These structures were often used for multiple purposes, including housing prisoners and providing shelter for officers and soldiers who were on guard duty (Hanson and Hsu 1975:46).

Parade Ground: This area was a central feature of most forts and encampments. This highly visible area was often where “troops assemble[d] before they [went] on duty” (Smith 1779:301). At Fort Stanwix, the parade ground was 90 feet by 85 feet and also included a whipping post and was surrounded by the barracks (Hanson and Hsu 1975:42).

Headquarters: This structure was often used to house senior officials and could have included additional rooms for entertaining and managing the fort. Evidence at Fort Stanwix suggests the Headquarters were first built between 1763-1764 (Hanson and Hsu 1975:46).

Ravelin: Technically defined, this structure is “a work placed before the curtain to cover it, and prevent the flanks from being discovered sideways; it consists of two faces meeting in an outward angle” (Smith 1779:113). Essentially, curtains connect the bastions and the Ravelin is a triangle shaped structure or small structure that is build in front of the structure to protect the entrance of the fort.

Sally Port: This structure is best defined as “under-ground passages, which lead form the inner works to the outward ones...” (Smith 1779:312). At Fort Stanwix, archaeologists have found evidence of a sally port in the east curtain wall (Hanson and Hsu 1975:44).

Scarp: This feature has been defined as “the interior talus or slope of the ditch next [to] the place, at the foot of the rampart” (Smith 1779:228). Essentially, it is the slope at the base of the rampart that often feeds into a ditch. The opposite side, or the exterior slope, is referred to as the counter-scarp. At Fort Stanwix the scarp was constructed at roughly a 40 to 45 degree angle.

Appendix B: Raw Data Tables

Location	Plates	Saucers	Cups	Teapots	Sugar Bowls	Pitchers	Tankards	Handled Cups	Bowls	Punch Bowls	Pans	Platters	Drug Jars	Jars	Jugs	Total
Casemates																
North	18	31	30	5			8		30	1	4	2	5			134
West	1	2	3	1					2				1			10
Southwest	12	15	18	4			2	1	17		5	1	1			76
Southeast	3	8	6	1				1	4	1	3		1			28
East	5	6	5	2			2	1	6		3	1	1		1	33
Barracks												3		1		4
East	6	11	5	3	1		1		11		5	1	3		1	48
West	7	17	15	5	1		5	1	10		7					68
Guardhouse	5	10	6	1	1		2		10		4					39
Headquarters	3	2	1	1			1		2							10
Parade Ground	2	3	3		1				4		2					15
Bombproof																
Northwest	2	7	3	1			1	1	4							19
Northwest	2	2	1	2					1							8
Southwest	1	2							2							6
Bakehouse	3	3	1								2					9
Ditch	5	15	9	5	1	1	3	1	11		9	2	2			64
Ravelin	4	6	3	1			1	1	7		1				1	24
East Scarp	10	9	7	3	2	1	3	1	12	1		2	3	1		55
Sally Port	9	10	8	1			2	1	12		2		2			47
Total	98	159	124	36	7	2	31	9	145	3	47	12	19	2	3	697

Table 8. The complete table drawn from Hanson and Hsu (1975) that describes the vessel type by location (118). All numbers correspond to MNV.

Porcelain	
<i>Type 1. Hard paste ceramics that were likely from China, but it could also be from Japan.</i>	
Variety a	Unadorned
Variety b	Adorned with a blue paint under glaze
Variety c	Adorned with a red paint over glaze
Variety d	Adorned with either a single color or combination of gold, green, white, black, or red over glaze
Stoneware	
<i>Type 1. White salt glazed ceramics</i>	
Variety a	Some relief molding present, but largely undecorated. Rim types included: undecorated rims, as well as Diaper, Queen, Barley, Gadrooned, Barley and Wavy lines, King of Prussia, or Feather-edge patterns.
Variety b	Decorated in the "scratch blue" style- the incised lines were painted with cobalt blue
Variety c	Interior adorned with red paint
Variety d	Over glazed, polychrome adornment that is often in a floral designs including the colors green, yellow, blue, red, and black.
Variety e	"Copper-tinted lead glaze" (Hanson and Hsu 1975:121)
<i>Type 2. Thicker, grey salt glazed ceramics</i>	
Variety a	Likely Westerwald types as these ceramics are adorned with cobalt blue stamped designs.
Variety b	Either lightly decorated with cobalt blue paint or undecorated
<i>Type 3. Unglazed red stoneware</i>	
Earthenware	
<i>Type 1. Pink or buff body with tin-glaze</i>	
Variety a	Unadorned
Variety b	Motifs of water and boats, houses on islands, and floral designs are painted in blue
Variety c	Black over glaze paint with white writing
Variety d	Polychrome adornment with flower motifs in green, yellow, blue, black, and red
Variety e	Adorned "with powdered purple (aubergine) pigment" (Hanson and Hsu 1975:125)
<i>Type 2. Buff or cream body with a lead-glaze</i>	
Variety a	Often identified as Queensware or creamware, it is unadorned except for relief molding
Variety b	Adorned with red paint that was applied as an over-glaze
Variety c	Adorned with brown paint that was applied as an over-glaze
Variety d	Adorned with a floral motif that has been applied as an over-glaze in polychrome paint
Variety e	Ceramics with a mottled polychrome glaze frequently identified as Whieldon ware, tortoise shell, or clouded ware
Variety f	Adorned with a lead-glaze that was tinted green
Variety g	Adorned with a lead-glaze that was tinted orange
Variety h	Adorned with a brown lead-glaze
Variety i	Adorned with a black transfer printed over-glaze.
<i>Type 3. Redware with a clear lead-glaze</i>	
<i>Type 4. Jackfield type ceramics</i>	
<i>Type 5. Coarse buff body with a lead-glaze</i>	
Variety a	Trailed white slips applied over a red slip background
Variety b	Trailed white slips over a combed red slip
Variety c	Dotted and trailed red slip over a white slip background
Variety d	Brown, red, and white slips that have been swirled or marbled
<i>Type 6. Coarse redwares with a lead-glaze</i>	
Variety a	Unadorned
Variety b	Adorned with a white slip design
Variety c	Adorned with a trailed white slip pattern
Variety d	Adorned with a marbled design that combines a white slip with iron and copper oxides, which results in brown and green colors
Variety f	Adorned with white slip and a copper-lead glaze
Variety g	Adorned with a trailed white slip and a copper-lead glaze
<i>Type 7. Coarse redware with a black lead-glaze (more coarse than Jackfield type)</i>	

Table 9. Drawn from Hanson and Hsu (1975) this table briefly describes the types and varieties of ceramics identified at Fort Stanwix; corresponds to Tables 11 and 12 (115-128).

	Casemates				Barracks				Guard-house quarters	Parade Ground	Bombproof				Bake-house	Ditch	Ravelin	East Scarp	Sally Port
	North	West	South west	South East	East	East	West	Porcelain			North east	North west	South west						
Porcelain																			
Type 1																			
Variety a	31		19	11	7	41	19	18	1			1	1	1	2	3	15	13	
b	106	3	97	17	27	78	50	24	6			6	4	6	1	2	19	12	52
c	3			2				3	1										60
d	1		15	3	1	4	9	6	2			2			3		6	11	
Type 2						1													
Stoneware																			
Type 1																			
Variety a	185	12	237	9	61	84	89	133	17	27	12	6	5	8	76	50	85	117	
b	53	8	41	7	20	15	30	28	6	8	5	1		1	19	21	36	24	
c	3					1	1				1								
d	10		24	1	1	2	4	7			2				3	1		3	
e															1				
Type 2																			
Variety a	1							1		1						1	1		
b						12	52							4			1	1	
Type 3														1			1		
Earthenware																			
Type 1																			
Variety a	82	11	72	29	25	35	56	56	7	6	12	6	2	6	63	56	98	76	
b	83	15	55	26	19	44	68	34	1	8	5	9	4	7	42	45	81	71	
c																	13		
d					3		5								6		4		
e	13	2	9	2	3	7	2	7			1			1	8	15	13	5	
f	1	2	3	4			2			1					3				
Type 2																			
Variety a	194	5	104	11	64	40	140	181	3	30	6	21	3	5	36	11	59	60	
b	1						1								2		2	5	
c	3					1										1			
d					3		5									6			
e	22	3	3	1	2	2	4	5		4	4			1	28	1	8	11	
f	7			2				1	1					2			2	1	
g																		1	
h							4												
i															1				
Type 3																			
Type 4	5		2		10	3	3								2				
Type 5	15			1	4	5	1		1		2	1		6	1	2	2		
Type 6																			
Variety a	2		7				4	24							1		1		
b						1		1										1	
c	1		6	1	1	1	2				1				5	9	8		
d														2	7	2			
Type 7																			
Variety a	4		21	4	7	2	14	19	4	1		1			1		1	7	
b	8			1				1		1					4		1		
c	4					1						1							
d					6														
e	5			2	12	12	5								8	3	5	5	
f						6	1											1	
g	9						4										3		
Type 7	3		4		3	1	2	10						2	2				

Table 10. The complete table drawn from Hanson and Hsu 1975 that describes the location of pottery types throughout the fort (Hanson and Hsu 1975:114-115). All numbers correspond to raw sherd counts.

	Plates	Saucers	Cups	Teapots	Sugar Bowls	Pitchers	Tankards	Handled Cups	Bowls	Punch Bowls	Pans	Platters	Drug Jars	Jars	Jugs
Porcelain															
Type 1															
Variety a		2	1						3						
b	8	36	33	3					18						
c		3	1												
d	3	8	3						5						
Type 2		1													
Stoneware															
Type 1															
Variety a	58	38	31		4		7		22	1				1	
b		35	28		1		1		7						
c		2													
d		9	7						3						
e				1											
Type 2															
Variety a							1							1	1
b															
Type 3					1	1									
Earthenware															
Type 1															
Variety a	1								5					9	
b	10	3	2						34	1				7	
c									1						
d	1	1							6	1				1	
e									4						
Type 2															
Variety a	16	12	16	8		1	17		11						
b		2	1						3						
c		1													
d		1							1						
e	1	1	1	12			4		3						
f		1		1											
g															
h															
i						1									
Type 3									3						
Type 4		3	10	1					1						
Type 5															
Variety a													7		
b													1		
c								8	5						
d												1			
Type 6															
Variety a									3		23	2			
b									1		2				
c									1		6	1			
d							1								
e									1					1	1
f									1		13				
g											2				
Type 7								1	3		1			1	1

Table 11. The complete table drawn from Hanson and Hsu 1975 that describes the location of the vessel types throughout the fort (115-116). All numbers correspond to raw sherd counts.

References Cited

- A military dictionary: Explaining all difficult terms in martial discipline, fortifications, and gunnery. The Third edition, improv'd. To which is likewise added, a sea-dictionary of all the terms of navigation. Both of them very useful (to all persons that read the publik news, or serve in the army, navy, or militia) for the understanding the account of sieges, battles, and other warlike and marine expeditions, which daily occur in this time of action. By officers who serv'd several years at sea and land.* 1708. Eighteenth Century Collections Online, Gale: London.
- Antczak, Konrad A.
2015 "Tavern" by the Saltpan: New England seafarers and the Politics of Punch on La Tortuga island, Venezuela, 1682-1781. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 19:159-187.
- Arkush Elizabeth N.
2006 Collapse, Conflict, Conquest: The Transformation of Warfare in the Late Prehistoric Andean Highlands. *In* The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 286-335. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.
- Arkush, Elizabeth N. and Mark W. Allen
2006 Introduction: Archaeology and the Study of War. *In* The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp.1-22. Gainesville: University of Press
- Babits, Lawrence E.
2001 "Book Archaeology" of the Cowpens battlefield. *In* Fields of Conflict: Progress and Prospect in Battlefield Archaeology: Proceedings of a conference held in the Department of Archaeology University of Glasgow, April 2000. P.W. Freeman and A Pollard, eds. Pp 117- 126. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Balicki, Joseph
2000 Defending the Capital: The Civil War Garrison at Fort C.F. Smith. *In* Archaeological Perspectives on the American Civil War, Clarence R. Geier and Stephen R. Potter, eds. Pp. 125-147. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Bamforth, Douglass B.
2006 Climate, Chronology, and the Course of War in the Middle Missouri Region of the North American Great Plains. *In* The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 66-100. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.

- Bentham, Jeremy
1791 Panopticon or the Inspection House, Volume 2. Dublin.
- Bowman, Glenn 2001
1987 The violence of identity. *In Anthropology of Violence and Conflict*. Bettina E. Schmidt and Ingo W. Schröder, eds. Pp. 25-46. London: Routledge.
- Bridges, Lauren A.
2015 (In publishing). On the Precipice: The Ceramic Signature of Identity and Agency at a Nineteenth Century Salvadoran Sugar Hacienda. *Historical Archaeology*.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1986 The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for Sociology of Education*. Greenwood: New York. Pp:241-258.

1984 *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Richard Nice, trans. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

1993 *Sociology in Question*. Trans Richard Nice. London: Sage Publications.
- Breen, Eleanor
2012 One More Bowl and Then?: A Material Culture Analysis of Punch Bowls. *Journal of Middle Atlantic Archaeology* (28):81-94.
- Brumwell, Stephen.
1996 *The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carman, John
2013 *Archaeology of Conflict*. London: Bloomsburg.
- Chartrand, Rene.
2014 *Montcalm's Crushing Blow: French and Indian Raids along New York's Oswego River 1756*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.
- Cleland, Charles and James Fitting
1978 *The Crisis of Identity: theory in Historic Sites Archaeology*. (Document taken from Class syllabus and rest of citation not provided).
- Connell, Samuel V. and Jay E. Silverstein
2006 From Laos to Mesoamerica: Battlegrounds between Superpowers. *In The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest*. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 394-436. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.

- Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI)
1999 Fort Stanwix National Monument.
- Dellino-Musgrave, Virginia
2006 Maritime Archaeology and Social Relations: British Action in the Southern Hemisphere. New York: Springer.
- Dixon, David
2005 Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Dollar, Clyde D.
1978 Some thoughts on Theory and Method in Historical Archaeology. *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 1976* 2: 3-31.
- Doyle, Peter, Lawrence Babits, and Jamie Pringle
2009 "For You the War is Over:" Finding the Great Escape Tunnel at Stalag Luft III *In Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War*. Douglas Scott, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker, eds. Pp. 398-416. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.
- Dye, David H.
2006 The Transformation of Mississippian Warfare: Four Case Studies from the Mid-South. *In The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest*. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 101-147. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.
- Elmer, Lieutenant Ebenezer.
1847. Journal Kept During an Excavation to Canada in 1776. *Proceedings, New Jersey Historical Society* II (4).
- Farry, Andrew
2005 Regulars and 'Irregulars': British and Provincial Variability among Eighteenth-Century Military Frontiers *Historical Archaeology* 39:16-32.
- Feister, Lois M.
1984 Building Materials Indicative of Status Differentiation at the Crown Point Barracks *Historical Archaeology* 18:103-107.
- Fesler, Garret R., Matthew R. Laird, and Hank D. Lutton
2006 'Beautiful Confusion:' The Archaeology of Civil War Camp Life in an Urban Context. *In Huts and History: The Historical Archaeology of Military Encampment During the American Civil War*, Matthew Reeves, David Gerald Orr, and Clarence R. Geier, eds. Pp. 216-243. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

- Ferguson, Brian
1990 Explaining War. *In* The Anthropology of War, Jonathan Haas, ed. Pp: 24-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, Charles L.
1983 Archaeology at New Windsor Cantonment: Construction and Social Reproduction at a Revolutionary War Encampment *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 12: 15-23.

1987 The Ceramics Collection from the Continental Army Cantonment at New Windsor *Historical Archaeology* 21: 48-57.

1995 The Archaeology of Provincial Officer's Huts Crown Point State Historic Site. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 24: 65-86.
- Friedkin, Noah E.
1986 A Formal Theory of Social Power. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* (12): 103-126.
- Fox, Jr. Richard Allen.
1988 Archaeology, History, and Custer's Last Battle: The Little Big Horn Reexamined. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Foucault, Michel
1977 "Panopticism" *In* Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Alan Sheridan, trans. Pp. 195-228. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel
1982 Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry* (8): 777-795.
- Gabriel, Richard and Karen Metz
1992 A Short History of War: The Evolution of Warfare and Weapons. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College.
- Geier, Clarence R., Matthew B. Reeves, and David G. Orr (editors)
2006 *Huts and History: The Historical Archaeology of Military Encampment During the American Civil War*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Gifford, Stanley M.
1955 Fort Wm. Henry- A History. Lake George, NY: Fort William Henry.

- Grimm, J.L.
1970 Archaeological Investigation of Fort Ligonier 1960-1965. Carnegie Museum: New York.
- Griswold, William A. and Tonya B. Largy
2010 A Tale of Two Middens. *In* Soldiers, Cities, and Landscapes: Papers in Honor of Charles L. Fisher. Penelope Ballard Drooker and John P. Hart eds. New York State Museum Bulletin 513. Pp. 57-67.
- Haecker, Charles M.
2000 The official explanation versus the archaeological record of a US-Mexican War Battle. *In* Fields of Conflict: Progress and Prospect in Battlefield Archaeology: Proceedings of a conference held in the Department of Archaeology University of Glasgow, April 2000. P.W. Freeman and A Pollard, eds. Pp. 135-142. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Harrington, J.C.
1955 Archaeology as an Auxiliary Science to American History. *American Anthropologist* (57): 1121-1130.
- Hanson, Lee and Dick Ping Hsu
1972a The North Casemate at Fort Stanwix. *Fort Stanwix Report No. 11*. U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service Fort Stanwix Archaeological Project: Rome, NY.
- 1972b The Southwest Bombproof at Fort Stanwix. *Fort Stanwix Report No. 10*. U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service. Fort Stanwix Archaeological Projects: Rome, NY.
- 1972c The Bakehouse at Fort Stanwix. *Fort Stanwix Report No. 10*. U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service. Fort Stanwix Archaeological Projects: Rome, NY.
- 1975 *Casemates and Cannonballs: Archaeological Investigations at Fort Stanwix, Rome, New York*. Publications in Archaeology, 14, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service: Washington.
- Hearn, Jonathan
2012 Theorizing Power. Palgrave Macmillan: London.
- Hill, Paul and Julie Wileman
2002 Landscapes of War: The Archaeology of Aggression and Defense. Charleston, SC: Tempus Publishing.

- Hirst, Paul
1997 The Defence of Places: Fortifications as Architecture (part 2). *A.A. Files* (34): 6-17.
- Hobbes, Thomas
1651 *Leviathan Part 2- Commonwealth*. New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909-14.

1994 (1668) *Leviathan*. Edwin Curley, ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Hoshower-Leppo, Lisa
2002 Missing in action: searching for America's war dead. *In Matériel Culture: The Archaeology of twentieth-century conflict*. John Schofield, William Gray Johnson and Colleen M. Beck, eds. Pp.80-90. London: Routledge.
- Huey, Paul R.
2010 Overview and Interpretation of the Fort Gage Excavations at Lake George, 1975. *In Soldiers, Cities, and Landscapes: Papers in Honor of Charles L. Fisher*. Ed. Penelope Ballard Drooker and John P. Hart. Pp: 47- 56. The New York State Education Department: New York.
- Howard, David
2003 *Bronze Age Military Equipment*. South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Books Limited.
- Hume, Ivor Noël
1964 Archaeology: Handmaiden to History. *The North Carolina Historical Review* (41): 214-225.
- Hume, Ivor Noël
1969 *Historical Archaeology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Ibn Khaldun
1987 *An Arab Philosophy of history: Selections from the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldun of Tunis (1332-1406)*. C. Issawi, trans. Princeton, New Jersey: The Darwin Press, Inc.
- Jarvis, Helen
2002 Mapping Cambodia's 'killing fields.' *In Matériel Culture: The Archaeology of twentieth-century conflict*. John Schofield, William Gray Johnson and Colleen M. Beck, eds. Pp. 91-103. London: Routledge.

- Kelso, Gerald K. and Dick Ping Hsu
2013 Battlefield Palynology: Reinterpretation of British Earthworks, Saratoga National Historical Park, Stillwater, New York. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* (24): 87-96.
- Kusimba, Chapurukha
2006 Slavery and Warfare in African Chiefdoms. *In* The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp.214-252. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.
- Leath, Robert A.
1999 "After the Chinese Taste": Chinese Export Porcelain and Chinoiserie Design in Eighteenth-Century Charleston. *Historical Archaeology* (33):48-61.
- Lee, Wayne E.
2001 Early Ways of War: A New Reconnaissance, 1600-1815. *The Historical Journal* 44:269-289.
- Leech, Roger
2002 the battlefield of the Dukla Pass: an archaeological perspective on the end of the Cold War in Europe. *In* Matériel Culture: The Archaeology of twentieth-century conflict. John Schofield, William Gray Johnson and Colleen M. Beck, eds. Pp. 41-48. London: Routledge.
- Leone, Mark P., Parker B. Potter Jr, and Paul A Shackel.
1987 Toward a Critical Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* (28): 283-302.
- Little, Barbara J.
1994 People with History: An Update on Historical Archaeology in the United States (1): 5-40.
- Ligon, Samantha M.
1999 The Fashionable Set: The Feasibility of Social Tea Drinking in 1774. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of American Studies. College of William and Mary: Williamsburg, VA.
- Luzader, John F., Louis Torres, Orville W. Carroll
1976 History, Historic Furnishing, and Historic Structure Reports. Office of Park Historic Preservation National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior: Washington.

- Manning-Sterling, Elise
2010 Ticonderoga: French Fort Construction on the Eighteenth-Century Frontier. In *Soldiers, Cities, and Landscapes: Papers in Honor of Charles L. Fisher*. Ed. Penelope Ballard Drooker and John P. Hart. The New York State Education Department: New York. Pp: 31-46.
- Mayer, Holly A.
1996 *Belonging to the Army: Camp Followers and Community during the American Revolution*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- McBride, W. Stephen, Susan C. Andrews, and Sean P Coughlin
2000 *In Archaeological Perspectives on the American Civil War*. Clarence R. Geier and Stephen R. Potter, eds. Pp. 99-124. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- McCauley, Clark
1990 Conference Overview. In *The Anthropology of War*, Jonathan Haas, ed. Pp. 1-25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McConnell, Michael. N.
2004 *Army and Empire: British Soldiers on the American Frontier, 1758-1775*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Mead, Margaret
1990 Warfare is Only an Invention—Not a Biological Necessity. In *The Dolphin Reader*, Douglas Hunt, ed. Pp: 415-421. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Milner, George R.
1999 Warfare in Prehistoric and Early Eastern North America. *Journal of Archaeological Research* (7): 105-151.
- Miller II, J. Jefferson and Lyle M. Stone.
1970 *Eighteenth-Century Ceramics from Fort Michilimackinac: A Study in Historical Archaeology*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Mintz, Sindey and Christine M. Du Bois
2002 The Anthropology of Food and Eating *Annual Review of Anthropology* (32):99-119.
- Nelson, Dean E.
2006 ““Right Nice Little house[s]:” Winter Camp Architecture of the American Civil War. In *Huts and History: The Historical Archaeology of Military Encampment During the American Civil War*, Matthew Reeves, David Gerald Orr, and Clarence R. Geier, eds. Pp. 177- 193. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

- Neimeyer, Charles Patrick
1996 *America Goes to War: A Social History of the Continental Army*. New York: New York University Press.
- Orr, David G.
2006 Cabin in Command: The City Point Headquarters of Ulysses S. Grant. *In Huts and History: The Historical Archaeology of Military Encampment During the American Civil War*, Matthew Reeves, David Gerald Orr, and Clarence R. Geier, eds. Pp. 244- 262. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Orr, David G., Clarence R. Geier, and Matthew B. Reeves
2006 Encampment Architecture and Material Culture. *In Huts and History: The Historical Archaeology of Military Encampment During the American Civil War*, Matthew Reeves, David Gerald Orr, and Clarence R. Geier, eds. Pp. 173-176. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Otterbein, Keith F.
2009 *The Anthropology of War*. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Pepper, Simon and Nicholas Adams
1986 *Firearms and Fortifications: Military Architecture and Siege Warfare in Sixteenth-Century Siena*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Prentice, Guy and Marie C. Prentice
2000 Far from the Battlefield: Archaeology at Andersonville Prison. *In Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War*. Douglas Scott, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker, eds. Pp: 166-187. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.
- Pippin, Douglas J.
2010 Distressed for the want of provisions: Supplying the British Soldier on Carleton Island (1778-1784). *In Soldiers, Cities, and Landscapes: Papers in Honor of Charles L. Fisher*. Ed. Penelope Ballard Drooker and John P. Hart. The New York State Education Department: New York. Pp: 67-8
- Potter, Stephen R., Robert C. Sonderman, Marian C. Creveling and Susannah L. Dean
2000 "No Maneuvering and Very Little Tactics:" Archaeology and the Battle of Brawner Farm. *In Archaeological Perspectives on the American Civil War*. Clarence R. Geier and Stephen R. Potter, eds. Pp. 2-28. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Randle, Lisa
2011 Applying the Panopticon Model to Historic Plantation Landscapes through Viewshed Analysis. *Geographies of Slavery* (33): 105-127.

- Redmond, Elsa M. and Charles S. Spencer
 2006 From Raiding to Conquest: Warfare Strategies and Early State Development in Oaxaca, Mexico. *In* The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 336-393. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.
- Reeves, Matthew and Clarence R. Geier
 2006 Under the Forest Floor: Excavations at a Confederate Winter Encampment, Orange Virginia. Pp. 194-215.
- Roache-Fedchenko, Amy
 2014 Mitigation Report for 2013 Monitoring and excavations Related to the Fire Suppression and Parade Ground Replacement Projects (PEPC Project#29475), Fort Stanwix National Monument, Rome, NY. On File at Fort Stanwix National Monument.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques
 1973 The Social Contract and Discourses. London: J.M. Dent and Sons.
- Scott, J.A.
 1927 Fort Stanwix (Fort Schuyler) and Oriskany: the romantic story of the repulse of ST. Leger's British invasion of 1777 told for the first time in chronological order and in detail- mainly from contemporary reports, letters, and diaries. Rome Sentential: Rome, NY.
- Scott, Douglas
 2001 Battlefield archaeology: patterns of combat in the American Indian War. *In* Fields of Conflict: Progress and Prospect in Battlefield Archaeology: Proceedings of a conference held in the Department of Archaeology University of Glasgow, April 2000. P.W. Freeman and A Pollard, eds. Pp. 177-200. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Scott, Douglas and Andrew P. McFeaters
 2010 the Archaeology of Historic Battlefields: A History and Theoretical Development in Conflict Archaeology. *Journal of Archaeological Research* (19):103-132.
- Scott, Douglas, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker,
 2009 Introduction. Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War. *In* Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War. Douglas Scott, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker, eds. Pp. 1-4. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.

- Scott, Douglas and Lucien Haag
2009 "Listen to the Minié Balls": Identifying Firearms in Battlefield Archaeology. *In* Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War. Douglas Scott, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker, eds. Pp. 102-120. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.
- Scott, Douglass, Richard Fox, Jr., Melissa Connor, and Dick Harmon
1989 Archaeological Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Schofield, John
2002 Monuments and the memories of war: motivations for preserving military sites in England. *In* Matériel Culture: The Archaeology of twentieth-century conflict. John Schofield, William Gray Johnson and Colleen M. Beck, eds. Pp. 143-158. London: Routledge.
- Scholz, Elizabeth
2013 On the Origins of Ordnance: An Analysis of Cannonballs at Fort Stanwix. Unpublished B.A. thesis. On file with National Park Service at Fort Stanwix.
- Schoolcraft, H. R.,
1846. *Historical Consideration son the siege and defence of Fort Stanwix, in 1776: read before the New York Historical Society, June 19th*. Press of the Historical Society, New York.
- Scott, J.A.,
1927 *Fort Stanwix (Fort Schuyler) and Oriskany; the romantic story of the repulse of St. Leger's British invasion of 1777 told for the first time in chronological order and in detail- mainly from contemporary reports, letters, and diaries*. Rome Sentential, Rome.
- Seidel, John L.
1990 "China Glaze" Wares on Sites from the American Revolutions: Pearlware before Wedgwood?" *Historical Archaeology* 24: 82-95.
- Schuyler, Robert L.
1970 Historical and Historic Sites Archaeology as Anthropology: Basic Definitions and Relationships. *Historical Archaeology* (4): 83-89.
- Schmidt, Bettina E. and Ingo W. Schröer
2001 Introduction: violent imaginaries and violent practices. *In* Anthropology of Violence and Conflict. Bettina E. Schmidt and Ingo W. Schröder, eds. Pp. 1-24. London: Routledge.

Shackel, Paul

2001 Public Memory and the Search for Power in American Historical Archaeology (103): 644-670.

Silverstein, Jay, John Byrd, and Lyle Otineru

2009 Hill 209: The Last Stand of Operation Manchu, Korea. *In Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War*. Douglas Scott, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker, eds. Pp. 417-428. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.

Simmons, Anna.

1999 War: Back to the Future. *Annual Review of Anthropology* (28): 73-108.

Sivilich, Daniel

2009 What the Musket Ball Can Tell: Monmouth Battlefield Sat Park, New Jersey. *In Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War*. Douglas Scott, Lawrence Babits, and Charles Haecker, eds. Pp. 84-101. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.

Smith, George

1779 An universal military dictionary, or a copious explanation of the technical terms &c. Used in the equipment, machinery, movements, and military operations of an army. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. London: Gale.

Starbuck, David

1999 The Great Warpath: British Military Sites from Albany to Crown Point. London: University Press of New England.

2011 The Archaeology of Forts and Battlefields. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Sterling, Bruce B.

2010 The Flat Site- An Eighteenth Century Skirmish Line? In *Soldiers, Cities, and Landscapes: Papers in Honor of Charles L. Fisher*. Ed. Penelope Ballard Drooker and John P. Hart. The New York State Education Department: New York. Pp 19-30.

Stull, Scott D. and David Klinge

2005 Phase II & III Investigation Archaeological Data Retrieval Report, Volume 1: History, Field Results, & Interpretation of Willett Center Archaeological Investigation. Rome: Hartgen Archaeological Associates, INC.

Stillé, Charles J.

1896 The Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 20: 257-264.

- Smith, Frederick H.
2005 *Caribbean Rum: A Social and Economic History*. University Press of Florida: Gainesville, FL.
- Smith, Samuel D.
2000 Military Sites Archaeology in Tennessee. *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (59): 140-157.
- Solmeto, Julie
2006 The Dimensions of War: Conflict and Culture Change in Central Arizona. In *The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest*. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 23-65. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.
- Sussman, Lynne
1978 British Military Tableware, 1760-1830. *Historical Archaeology* (12): 93-104.
- Thorpe, I.J.N
2003 Anthropology, Archaeology, and the Origin of Warfare. *World Archaeology* (35): 145-165.
- Torres, Louis
1974 Historic Furnishing Study Fort Stanwix National Monument, New York. United States Department of the Interior: Denver, CO.
- Underhill, Anne P.
2006 Warfare and the Development of States in China. In *The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest*. Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds. Pp. 253-285. Gainesville: University of Press Florida.
- de Vauban, Sebastien Le Prestre
1693 *The New Method of Fortification as Practiced by Monsieur de Vauban, Engineer General of France with an explication of all terms appertaining to that art*. London: Middle-Temple-Gate.
- Voss, Barbara L. and Rebecca Allen
2010 Guide to Ceramic MNV Calculation Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis. Technical Briefs in Historical Archaeology 5. Pp:1-9.
- Waddell, Louis M.
1995 Defending the Long Perimeter: Forts on the Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia Frontier, 1755-1765. *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* (62): 171-195.

- Walthall, John A.
1991 An analysis of Late Eighteenth Century Ceramics from Arkansas Post at Ecores Rouges. *Southeastern Archaeology* 10: 98-113.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells
2006 "What Social Class Is in America. In Social Class and Stratification: Classic statements and theoretical debates, 2nd ed. Rhonda Levine Ed. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Pp:67-93.
- Weber, Max
2006 "Class, Status, Party" In Social Class and Stratification: Classic statements and theoretical debates, 2nd ed. Rhonda Levine Ed. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Pp:49-63.
- Willet, W. M.,
1831 *The Military Actions of Colonel Marinus Willet, taken chiefly from his own manuscript*. G&C&H: Carvill, New York.
1969 A Narrative of the Military Actions of colonel Marinus Willet, reprinted by Arno Press: New York.
- Wurst, LouAnn
2006 A Class All Its Own. Historical Archaeology, Martin Hall and Stephen Silliman, eds. Pp: 190-206. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yentsch, Anne
1990 Minimum Vessel Lists as Evidence of Change in Folk and Courtly Traditions of Food Use. *Historical Archaeology* 24(3):24-53
- Zenzen, J.M.,
2008 *Fort Stanwix National Monument: Reconstructing the Past and Partnering for the Future*. State University of New York: New York.

Fall 2016

The Teapots in the Tempest: Ceramics and Military Order at 18th Century Fort Stanwix

Elizabeth Scholz

College of William and Mary, [eascholz@email.wm.edu](mailto: eascholz@email.wm.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scholz, Elizabeth, "The Teapots in the Tempest: Ceramics and Military Order at 18th Century Fort Stanwix" (2016). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1477068174.

<http://doi.org/10.21220/S2X59K>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.