The study undertaken in this chapter will demonstrate the pattern of refuse disposal carried out at Brunswick Town, N.C., in the eighteenth century. This pattern reflects a British-American refuse disposal practice, and can well be compared with such demonstrated patterns on sites representing other cultural traditions. The importance is emphasized of distribution studies such as this for use in interpretation of the relationship between site structure, content, context, and function.

For more than a decade the pattern of refuse discard at the ruins of the town of Brunswick, N.C., has been used as a guide for predicting the location of refuse deposits reflecting eighteenth-century behavior on British-American sites. Excavations at Brunswick Town were carried out from 1958 to 1968, and revealed that the occupants of these structures from ca. 1725 to ca. 1776 discarded their refuse adjacent to their homes, primarily at the back door, but also adjacent to the front doorway. Nearby depressions were also used, as well as the public street. So firmly established was this pattern of refuse disposal that entrance areas to structures could be identified by the increased quantity of midden at the doorways, even if no architectural data had been present. This practice of discarding secondary refuse adjacent to the dwellings is the basis for what we call the Brunswick Pattern.

Two types of secondary refuse are defined elsewhere in this book on the basis of the ratio of bone to the total artifact count. A low bone-artifact ratio is seen in refuse deposits adjacent to occupied structures, whereas a high bone-artifact ratio is seen in those secondary midden deposits peripheral to occupied structures, allowing us to recognize adjacent secondary refuse and peripheral secondary refuse. The adjacent
secondary refuse is the basis for the Brunswick pattern, peripheral secondary refuse not being found in large quantities at Brunswick Town.

The adjacent secondary refuse thrown into the yard cannot be assumed to remain forever untouched. On the contrary, even though it would accumulate in concentration is some areas through time, dispersal factors would work toward periodically scattering the refuse. Immediate dispersal would begin with humans placing the accumulating refuse in landscaping efforts, chickens scratching in search of food, dogs scavenging for bones, pigs rooting for edible fragments, and raccoons going through the garbage. Despite these and other dispersal factors sufficient concentration of refuse accumulated at the entrances to the Brunswick Town structures to prompt recognition of the Brunswick Pattern of adjacent secondary refuse disposal.

It is this Brunswick Pattern that has served to allow prediction of the location of refuse areas on many other sites beyond the limits of the town of Brunswick. At the Poca House, in Annapolis, Md., predictions were made on the basis of the Brunswick Pattern and excavation proved these to be correct. At the 1610 fortifications at Charles Towne in South Carolina, the concentration of midden in one angle of the defensive ditch allowed an interpretation of the position of the original gateway across the ditch to be made, and the positioning of the roadway into the fort. This interpretation has not been independently verified but is based on the Brunswick Pattern (South 1967, 1971).

At Fort Moultrie, S.C., the exploratory excavations revealed the moat to the original fort, with a heavy concentration of both American and British midden limited to one concentrated area. This discovery allowed for the suggestion that the gateway to the original fort must have been in this area. When the map of the fort was positioned on the site using the architectural data provided by the angle in the moat, it was found that the original gateway was indeed opposite the midden concentration associated with the moat, again conforming to the Brunswick Pattern (South 1974). The Brunswick Pattern can be expressed as a lawlike generalization:

On British-American sites of the eighteenth century a concentrated refuse deposit will be found at the points of entrance and exit in dwellings, shops, and military fortifications.

The demonstration of this pattern is seen in the distribution of several artifact classes from three Brunswick ruins, The Hepburn-Reonalds House (S7), Nath Moore's Front (S10), and the Public House-Tailor Shop (S25). The artifact classes chosen for this comparison are ceramics through creamware, ceramics-pearlware plus (pearlware and later types), wine bottle fragments, tobacco pipe fragments, nails, bone fragments,
and tailoring objects, which includes scissors, hooks and eyes, baling
seals, thimbles, buttons, buckles, pins, and beads.

The adjacent secondary refuse disposal pattern can be seen in Figure
5. The S7 and S10 ruins are representative of domestic dwellings having a
shop in a downstairs room, with the Public House-Tailor Shop (S25)
containing six rooms. Our goal here is to examine not only the specific
areas where refuse was thrown from the doors of the structures, but to
contrast these areas with the other areas around the ruins.

METHOD AND CONTEXT

Nath Moore's Front (S10) was excavated in 1958, The Hepburn-Reon-
Under the assumption that variability in artifact frequencies in various
parts of an historic ruin will reflect behavioral activity, the Brunswick
Town ruins were excavated using a grid system of 5- and 10-foot squares.
A one-quarter inch screen was used, with periodic testing of each
square and level by a window screen mesh for recovering seed beads
and pins, etc. Whenever testing indicated these were present, total
screening through window screen was carried out, using water to assist
in the screening process.

For the purpose of this study, artifact totals for all levels in the area
around the ruins were combined by square, with separation inside the
ruins based on the floor level, and the postdestruction levels. In the
Public House-Tailor Shop no floor level was found, but the layer
beneath the floor joists was used instead, revealing a large quantity of
sewing objects.

_in situ_ objects lying on the floor in the S7 and S10 ruins were sought by
carefully isolating this layer of ash lying on the burned floor boards from
the layers of rubble above. However, virtually no artifacts were found to
indicate that there were furnishings in the structures at the time they
were destroyed by fire. This finding is in agreement with the historical
documents indicating that Brunswick had been virtually abandoned prior
to its being burned by the British in 1776, an early casualty of the Revolu-
tion (South 1956; 1959; 1960). The absence of _in situ_ refuse in these
burned structures resulted in the artifact analysis being composed almost
entirely of adjacent secondary refuse.

The Public House-Tailor Shop (S25) ruin revealed no burned floor, but
burned floor joists were found beneath the rubble layer. The sand
around these joists revealed objects that had fallen through the floor-
boards, or onto the floor after the floorboards had become rotten. This
primary _de facto_ refuse resulting from accidental loss at the area of use
will be used in a comparison of such refuse with the adjacent secondary

refuse surrounding the structure. (For a discussion of primary, sec-
dary, and _de facto_ refuse, see Chap. 8, and Schiffer 1972: 161.)

THE HEPBURN-REYNOLDS HOUSE (S7)

The Hepburn-Reynolds House (S7) ruin is seen in Figure 6, with the
brick patio on the private side to the north, a burned wooden floor in
the west room, a cobblestone floor in the east room (interpreted as a
public shop room), and stone footings for second floor porch supports.

By plotting the ceramics through creamware (no pearlware or later
types were recovered) at the S7 ruin, using a symbol representing from 1
through 25 fragments, the distribution of ceramics around the ruin can
be seen (Figure 7). A concentration of ceramics can be seen around the
northwest corner of the house, at the end of the brick patio. A second
concentration can be seen in the sunken, public entranceway on the
street, at the south side of the structure. As we will see, this pattern
prevails throughout Brunswick Town, and is referred to as the Brunswick
Refuse Disposal Pattern.

---

Figure 6. Foundation plan for the Hepburn-Reynolds House—field drawing (Unit S7, Lot 71).
The distribution of wine bottle and tobacco pipe fragments (Figure 9) reveals a surprising uniformity at this ruin, not reflecting the adjacent refuse concentration at the rear and front entrances seen for ceramics. A significant variable seen here is the fact that a high concentration of wine bottle fragments were recovered in the rubble above the burned layer of the house. This phenomenon reflects the disposal of wine bottles inside the house after it was in ruins, probably by people walking past the ruin in the street adjacent to the structure. This did not continue for long, however, since no objects later than creamware were recovered from the ruin.

The uniform distribution of tailoring objects in the S7 ruin is seen in Figure 10. This is in marked contrast to the high frequency found in the Tailor Shop Ruin (S25). Bone is also illustrated in Figure 10, and the low occurrence in the midden deposit areas suggests that careful control of peripheral refuse was in effect at this house, such refuse obviously being discarded elsewhere. The highest concentration of bone is seen in the

Figure 7. Foundation plan for the Hepburn-Reads House—Ceramics (Unit S7, Lot 71). Ceramics through Creamware: Solid symbol = total from yard and burned ash layer to floor; open symbol = above burned layer; symbol = 1-25 frequency.

The nail distribution (Figure 8) follows the concentration seen for ceramics in the refuse deposit at the northwest corner of the structure, but reveals no increase in the sunken entrance way on the south side of the house. A high concentration is also seen for the east room compared with the west room. An important point to note in any of these distributions is the contrast between the area to the front of the house, the rear, inside, and in the adjacent refuse deposit. At this ruin there appear to have been a number of nails discarded in the adjacent refuse suggesting discard of old nails, boards, etc., probably from repairs inside. Such activity may result in a higher ratio of architecture-related artifacts in relation to kitchen-related artifacts in such cases. As was seen to be the case with the bone ratio, sampling of historic sites such as this will reveal differing ratios of artifacts depending on the area in relation to the structure, so that prediction should be able to be made from artifact ratios as to whether the artifacts are from the front, rear, inside or in adjacent refuse, even in the absence of architectural data.

Figure 8. Foundation plan for the Hepburn-Reads House—Nails (Unit S7, Lot 71). Symbol = 1-25 frequency.
Figure 9. Foundation plan for the Hepburn-Reynolds House—Wine Bottle and Tobacco Pipe fragments (Unit S7, Lot 71). Solid symbol = total from yard and burned ash layer to floor; open symbol = above burned ash layer; symbol = 1-25 frequency; O = Wine bottle; Δ = Tobacco Pipe.

Figure 10. Foundation plan for the Hepburn-Reynolds House—Furniture object distribution (Unit S7, Lot 71). O = Buckle; ● = Beads; △ = Scissors; ○ = Buttons; □-□ = Bone; symbol = one object.
east room, where fragments were found in the yellow sand layer which was lying over the cobblestone floor at the time the house burned.

NATH MOORE’S FRONT (S10)

The field drawing of the features at the S10 ruin is seen in Figure 11, showing the rear, private entrance to the house, and the public street entranceway on the south. The typical Brunswick Town porch footings are shown for two sides of the house, with the public street passing close to the structure on the south and the east of this corner lot.

The ceramic distribution (Figure 12) for all types prior to pearlware reveals a concentration toward the east of the rear doorway, with very little to the left. This might be interpreted as caused by a person flinging refuse toward the right or, more likely, suggests that an architectural obstruction to the left prevented disposal of refuse in that direction. The refuse distribution has provided a suggestion relating to architectural data, an important factor when reconstruction of such structures is planned. Another major concentration of adjacent refuse is seen at the south, public entrance, also thrown toward the right-facing away from the house. Again a similar architectural obstruction may have been located beside the sunken entranceway, which prevented discarding of refuse toward the west.

The distribution of refuse in this area between the porch footings and the sunken foundation wall indicates that there was no wooden floor covering this area at ground floor level, another important implication for interpreting the architectural details of the structure.

Notice the high concentration of ceramics above the burned ash layer of the house, in the rubble, postdating the burning of the building. This results from the use of the interior of this ruin as a refuse disposal area by occupants of the town after the Revolution. This is revealed dramatically in the distribution of the pearlware plus (post-pearlware) ceramics seen in Figure 13.

A third concentration of ceramics to creamware is seen in the trench extending toward the east in the area of the public street. This concentration reveals refuse was being thrown into the street as well as around the house. A high drop off at the edge of the marsh is located another 50 feet or so toward the east, and it is over this embankment where quantities of peripheral refuse was likely discarded by the occupants of Nath Moore’s Front.

The distribution of pearlware plus other associated, later types (post-1770s) emphasizes the concentration of refuse discarded inside this ruin (Figure 13), as well as scattered throughout the yard. The absence of

Figure 11. Nath Moore’s Front—archaeological field drawing (Structural Unit S 10, Brunswick Town, Lot 29).

Archaeological features: (1) charcoal floor boards; (2) fallen brick chimney in west room; (3) fallen brick chimney in east room; (4) layer of clean sand above floor in east room; (5) fallen brick chimney section intact; (6) hole dug before house burned; (7) brick hearth platform built above rubble of burned house; (8) mortared brick doorway seal fallen intact; (9) pile of brick bits thrown from inside ruins; (10) pit dug during building of the house; (11) deeper midden in area of "Bay Street"; (12) Pit dug after house burned; before chimney fell; (13) shallow depression present before house burned; (14) pit dug after house burned; (15) pit dug after house burned, before feature 7 was built; (16) pit dug after house burned.


Interpretive notes: (1) the house was built before 1728; (2) the south entrance was walled with bricks; (3) Outside footing added to west room; (4) Wooden floor in east room replaced by brick; (5) walls plastered over wooden lathing strips; (6) weatherboarded construction above first floor; (7) ballast stone foundation from below surface to several feet above ground; (8) porch or second floor overhang supported by columns on the east and south side; (9) posts on north side may have supported a porch and roof; (10) the windows were shuttered; (11) the bay was abandoned in 1774; (12) a hole was dug in the floor of the east room; (13) burned by the British in 1776; (14) holes dug in the ruins in both rooms; (15) brick platform built above ash of the ruins for use as a hearth to warm Confederate soldiers; (16) all whole bricks were salvaged for use in other houses; (17) the ruins were used as a garbage dump until 1830; (18) ruins were wrecked during the shelling of Fort Anderson in 1865; (19) ruins were discovered in 1958; (20) excavation was completed in 1959.
Figure 12. Nath Moore's Front—Ceramics through Creamware distribution Structural Unit S 10, Brunswick Town, Lot 29. Solid symbol = total from sand and burned ash layer to floor; open symbol = above burned ash layer; symbol = 1-25 frequency.
Figure 14. Nath Moore's Front—Tailoring objects distribution (Structural Unit S 10, Brunswick Town, Lot 29). Solid symbol = total from yard and burned ash layer to floor; open symbol = above burned ash layer; symbol = ore object; ☐ = Thimble, ❀ = Scissors; ● = Pin. ❆ = Hook & Eye; ⊙ = Bale Seal; △ = Bead; ◀ = Buckle; ◇ = Button.

Figure 15. Nath Moore's Front—Bottle and Bone fragments distribution (Structural Unit S 10, Brunswick Town, Lot 29). Solid symbol = total from yard and burned ash layer to floor; open symbol = above burned ash layer; symbol = 1-25 frequency; ○ = Bottle; □ = Bone.
THE PUBLIC HOUSE-TAILOR SHOP (S25)

The Public House-Tailor Shop (S25) was found to be a six-room structure in a row house plan (Figure 17), built against the wall of the lot. Burned floor joists just below the floor level and the sockets in the foundation wall for these clearly indicated the floor level of this building. However, in the destruction of the building and the salvaging of materials, the actual floor level was destroyed.

Excavation of the easternmost room revealed a construction ditch cutting through a midden deposit located in the depression at the southeast corner caused by the slope of the hill at this point. This discovery indicated that midden had been deposited in this area prior to the construction of this easternmost room. Since a central chimney was located between the two easternmost rooms, it appeared that these two rooms may have been constructed after the four others. A check of the foundation wall at the juncture of these two rooms with the westernmost four rooms revealed a seam in the stonework, verifying this observation. For this reason the bottom layers inside Room 6 contained refuse originally thrown from rooms 1 through 4.

This fact is clearly seen in the distribution of ceramics shown in Figure 18, where a higher concentration of ceramics is obvious in the southeast corner of the ruin resulting from the midden discarded there prior to construction of the eastern two rooms. The ceramic distribution reveals a heavy deposit over the lot wall at the east end of the building, as well as along the end of the structure. This midden deposit was over 3 feet deep to the south of the lot wall in squares 16 through 18. Since this refuse deposit was beyond the private lot—over the lot wall—a higher bone ratio is seen here, giving this deposit more of a peripheral refuse character than an adjacent one, even though the midden is adjacent to the rear of the ruin.

A second concentration of refuse lying outside the lot wall at the rear of the fourth room, plus the fact that a stone landing of cobblestones was located here, suggests a doorway into the building at this point. Not considering the landing, but using the Brunswick Pattern, the prediction of an entryway here would be warranted. The contrast between the ceramics found inside the lot at the front of the structure and the refuse disposal area behind the building is remarkable.

An important point regarding the few fragments of annular and blue-painted pearlware shown in this ruin is the fact that they were found in a context clearly suggesting their presence prior to the time the structure burned in 1776. This finding is in keeping with evidence now appearing from military sites indicating the presence of this type of pearlware at this time period (South 1974: 4,163–166).
Figure 17. Plan of the Public House and Tailor Shop—field drawing (Excavation Unit S 25, Lot 27, Brunswick Town, N.C., 1732-1776).

Figure 18. Plan of the Public House and Tailor Shop—Ceramics (S 25, Brunswick Town, N.C., ca. 1732-1776). Ceramics through Creamware and Pearlware Plus; ● ● ● (total from yard and below burned floor joints; OEE (above joints); symbol = 1-25 frequency.
The distribution of pins and beads can be studied in Figure 19, which illustrates a contrast between the western five rooms and the eastern Room 6. These objects found below the floor joists apparently fell between floorboards when the floor was intact, or were dropped after the floor rotted and a sand floor was in use, though no evidence of the latter could be seen in the form of a specific surface layer. Some larger tailoring objects, such as scissors and buckles, stretch the limits of imagination to suggest they also fell through cracks in the floor, unless of course the rotten floorboards were involved. This is entirely a possibility, however, since sand surrounded the burned floor joists on each side, a situation conducive to producing rot.

The dramatic contrast between the pins and beads in rooms 1–5 with the virtual absence in Room 6 resulted in the field interpretation that Room 6 must have been used for merchandising the objects sewn together in the five other rooms. This interpretation still would appear to be as good as any to account for the lack of pins and beads in this room. A floor without wide cracks in Room 6 would also account for this phenomenon.

The possibility arose, therefore, that perhaps the sand around the floor joists was hauled in from elsewhere after the floorboards rotted in the rooms, in order to provide a level sand floor on which to work. When the structure burned, therefore, the remaining parts of the joists would have become burned as well. If such an alternative was indeed the case for these rooms, then the absence of pins, etc. in the sixth room might be caused by sand having been brought from a different area to this room, whereas sand from a tailoring shop area may have been brought into the remaining five rooms.

With this somewhat fanciful alternative in mind, therefore, questions regarding the ratios of various artifact types found in these rooms can now be asked. If the ratio between pins and beads, for instance, resulted from tailoring activity elsewhere than in the rooms of this structure, there is no conceivable reason for that ratio to remain the same for pins in relation to beads found in the refuse deposit behind the ruin. In other words, if the ratio of beads to pins remained the same inside the ruin as compared with that in the refuse deposit, they may well have originated from the same behavioral activity inside the structure and not elsewhere.

Chi-square comparison of beads to pins inside and outside the ruin revealed a .50 level of significance, suggesting that there is little difference between the ratios inside the structure compared with the refuse deposit. This result suggests that the tailoring objects inside the structure are to be considered as primary de facto artifacts (usable artifacts lost in their place of use, not intentionally discarded).

The question then arises as to whether there is a different pin and bead loss within the five remaining rooms that might reflect different
were carried out in all five rooms, but some factor involving pins results in a clustering of rooms 1, 3, and 4, and rooms 2 and 5. Perhaps activity in rooms 2 and 5 related primarily to the basic tailoring activity of cutting, which would not involve the use of pins. The activity in rooms 1, 3, and 4, may have involved sewing, the second half of the tailoring process, a process in which a number of pins are involved.

These suggestions are supported when we compare the ratio of pins to tailoring objects plus buckles in rooms 1, 3, and 4. Again a low χ² value reveals no significant difference in these ratios of pins to tailoring objects and buckles. The same is true for rooms 2 and 5.

The uniformity of tailoring objects for all six rooms is illustrated in Figure 20, with a far higher ratio of such objects in the refuse deposit than was the case with pins and beads. Comparison of this Figure 20 with Figure 19 clearly reveals why the S25 ruin was interpreted as a tailor shop activity area when contrasted with tailoring objects seen in Figure 10 at the domestic S7 ruin.

The dramatic contrast seen for the distribution of pins inside the S25 ruin compared with those found in the refuse deposit to the south of the lot wall is reversed with the wine bottle distribution (Figure 21). The wine bottle fragments inside the ruin virtually match the frequency for the front yard, with a heavy concentration in the refuse deposits. This fact suggests that when wine bottles were broken inside the building they were cleared up and thrown into the refuse pile, with only the smaller fragments remaining inside, lost in the sand layer of the floor, or swept through holes in the floor. The fact that somewhat large pieces were sometimes involved inside the building suggests that the wooden floor was allowed to rot, after which a sand floor was used. The wine bottle distribution seen in Figure 21 certainly typifies the Brunswick Pattern in the contrast between the refuse dump area, the entrance, and the front yard.

Tobacco pipe fragments reveal a similar pattern to that seen for wine bottles, with a major concentration centering on the midden deposit areas (Figure 22). Nails, a major architectural class of artifacts, are relatively uniformly distributed throughout the immediate area of the ruin, with fewer in the front yard and a heavy concentration in the refuse deposits (Figure 23). Again, as we have seen for other artifact classes, sample squares taken at the rear of the structure, inside the structure, and in the front yard will reveal contrasting frequencies that have potential predictive value for determining information about an historic site through sampling prior to undertaking total excavation.

The bone frequency distribution seen in Figure 24 clearly reflects the Brunswick Pattern phenomenon, with a somewhat heavier concentration...
Figure 22. Plan of the Public House and Tailor Shop—Tobacco Pipe fragments (S 25, Brunswick Town, N.C., ca. 1732-1776). ● = 1-25 frequency.

Figure 23. Plan of the Public House and Tailor Shop—Nail distribution (S 25, Brunswick Town, N.C., ca. 1732-1776). Symbol = 1-25 frequency.
in rooms 1 and 4. When the bone from these two rooms is compared with the total of all tailoring objects including pins, no significant difference in the ratios for the two rooms is seen in the X² comparison. This suggests a similar behavioral activity regardless of these two rooms in the Pin Cluster A rooms. However, beyond suggesting that those working in the tailor shop may have met in these rooms to have lunch, the significance of this information is not clear.

In this chapter we have examined some of the artifact classes from three Brunswick Town ruins with the view of abstracting some comparative information from frequency variability, while demonstrating the Brunswick Refuse Disposal Pattern. This study has concentrated on the entire artifact frequencies from all proveniences rather than conducting an analysis of various levels and features. Such an approach can be used to abstract general quantitative data from historic site excavations such as these. Once such a general control over historic site data is accomplished, we can begin to examine more specific questions regarding behavioral meaning in the regularity and variability demonstrated in the archaeological record.

Suggestions for the use of the Brunswick Pattern have been made in this study, among which is the prospect of reliable prediction from sampling on historic sites. I have long resisted sampling as opposed to total excavation, but if we first totally excavate a number of historic site ruins toward conducting analyses, such as these demonstrated here from excavations conducted in the 1950s, we can begin to sample with some degree of expectation that our projections may be relatively accurate. Such predictive control of the data cannot come, however, without the quantification analysis approach urged in this book. This prediction is addressed to the empirical data base and relates to the relationship between pattern revealed through sampling and that revealed through total excavation of a ruin. In either case, deductive explanation does not enter the scene until we ask why the pattern we witness as it is and invent explanations to account for it. These hypotheses must then be tested with new data.

The Brunswick Pattern is mainly applicable, it is thought, to sites of British-American, or British colonial, origin. There is some evidence to indicate that German-American settlements such as at Bethabara, N.C., the Moravian settlement begun in 1753, that the Brunswick Pattern of refuse disposal does not apply (South 1972). Richard Carrillo (1975), in comparing a German-American with a British-American ruin has found marked contrasts in quantity and distribution of associated artifacts. This suggests that the Brunswick Pattern will not apply to German-American sites, the Germans being inordinately neat compared with the British-Americans. This proposition needs further testing.
Leland Ferguson (1975a, b) has demonstrated that a number of artifact types relating to domestic and personal functions are distributed in a different area from military ordnance artifacts, at the site of Fort Watson, S.C. Fort Watson was occupied for four months in 1780-1781, and was built on top of an Indian mound. It fell to Americans under General Francis Marion after a tower was constructed allowing sharpshooters to fire over the stockade wall into the fort. Ferguson’s detailed analysis of the association and distribution of all artifact types inside the fort allowed four major interpretations to be made.

1. Activity areas relating to military and personal behavior were discovered.
2. There was a clear demonstration of the use of the tea ceremony on the mound.
3. There was a statistically significant correlation between creamware and pearlware ceramic types, including annular pearlware, clearly demonstrating the occurrence of this type at the 1781 time period.
4. The distribution of flattened lead balls shot by the Americans using rifles (weight and rifling being used to classify these as opposed to the British balls), was along only two sides of the fort interior, making it possible to locate the tower from which the sharpshooters were firing. This information was not previously known from historical documentation.

The distribution of the flattened lead balls shot by the Americans is shown in Figure 25, taken from Ferguson’s report (1975a).

This simple and lucid explanation of artifact distribution demonstrates well the value of articulating field methods with questions appropriate to the archaeological context. Against a background of decades of excavating fort sites with little more than catalogs of relics to show for the effort, Ferguson’s quantification and distribution analysis appears as an

---

Figure 25. Mound Summit of Fort Watson JBCRI—distribution of flattened lead balls. Distribution of rifle balls indicates tower was located north of the stockade. Δ = 1 Ball.

Interpretive sketch of Fort Watson, S.C., during the Revolution.

The study of artifact distribution illustrated here is only one of the many approaches to pattern recognition that can be undertaken on historic sites by archaeologists concerned with asking questions of their data that can be answered only through such a framework. It is hoped that pattern recognition through such methods of quantification will be used by those excavating historic sites.
extremely sophisticated study. To fulfill the responsibility to the data each archeologist has, such studies must become routine.
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