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Introduction

To gain a better understanding of archaeological evidence contemporary to that of shipwreck site 31CR314, believed to be the sunken remains of the pirate Blackbeard’s flagship, *Queen Anne’s Revenge* (QAR), this literature search focuses on North Carolina archaeological sites dating specifically to the Carolina proprietary period (1663-1729). Regardless of the ship’s identity recovered artifacts place the date of loss after 1714 *terminus post quem* and prior to 1730 based on the collective mean date of manufacture (1707) for twenty-five datable objects or classes of artifacts (Wilde-Ramsing 2007). The most likely candidate, *Queen Anne’s Revenge*, was lost on the outer bar of the inlet in June 1718, consequently scattering the crew of several hundred pirates and conscripted tradesmen throughout the Carolina countryside. Throughout the proprietary period but especially during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the North Carolina colony was beset with divisive rebellions, wars with the native inhabitants, widespread disease, a weak economy and government, and the very real presence of those practicing piracy.

To locate existing archaeological reports, published and unpublished, related to sites dating to the proprietary period, the archaeological files from three state facilities were thoroughly inventoried. These were the archives of the Office of State Archaeology in Raleigh, the William M. Reaves Room of the Underwater Archaeology Branch at Fort Fisher, and the research library at East Carolina University’s Department of Anthropology in Greenville. Research report bibliographies were examined for references to additional site reports and list of proprietary period archaeological sites was compiled. This list was then circulated to a host of practicing historians and archaeologists for their comments and additional sites and references. Those approached were Richard Lawrence, NC Underwater Archaeology Branch, Dr. Lawrence Babits, ECU Maritime Studies Program, Thomas Beaman, NC Archaeological Society, Dr. Lindley S. Butler, Rockingham Community College, Dr. Linda Carnes-McNaughton, Fort Bragg CRP, Dr. Patricia Samford, Bath Historic Site, John Mintz, Office of State Archaeology, and Loretta Lautzenheiser, Coastal Carolina Research, Inc, and Dr. Charles R, Ewen, ECU Department of Anthropology. While this survey is certainly not exhaustive, it pulls into one document the majority of archaeological contributions investigating European colonial sites dating to the proprietary period in North Carolina.

Historical Background

During the reign of Charles II, proprietary grants were bestowed to individuals to satisfy financial obligations while expanding Britain’s empire with minimal cost. Much like a large land development today, the Lord’s Proprietors were given the sovereign right to develop and govern huge land holdings. In 1663 the Carolina proprietary grant, which included present day North and South Carolina, was deeded to eight noblemen and knights, who were political supporters of the

At the time of the proprietary grant, Carolina was divided into three counties: Albemarle included the northern half of present day North Carolina; Clarendon encompassed the lower half of the state; and Craven centered on the Ashley and Cooper Rivers of South Carolina. The earliest attempt to settle proprietary Carolina was undertaken by settlers from Barbados between 1664-1667. These initial attempts failed, however, only to be successfully accomplished a few years later at present day Charleston, South Carolina (1670). These events, which left the Clarendon section unpopulated until very late in the proprietary period, created a great distance between settlements in Albemarle and Craven Counties and eventually led to the division of North and South Carolina. The separation of the colonies became official in 1712 with the appointment of Edward Hyde as North Carolina governor (Butler 2007).

Political unrest during the Culpepper Rebellion (1677-80) persuaded Albemarle settlers to migrate south from their homes to establish a new district in 1696 named Bath County. Encompassing the area south of the Albemarle Sound to the Neuse River, development was further enhanced by waves of immigrants from France, Germany and Switzerland during the first decade of the eighteenth century. (Watson 2005:5-6).

To the south, along the Cape Fear River, substantial settlement was prohibited after the failure of the Charles Town settlement until the founding of Brunswick Town in 1725. The settlement was laid out on a 360-acre tract of land purchased by South Carolinian Maurice Moore and was largely settled by colonists migrating from that area. (Lee 1965)

**Archaeological Background**

Archaeological investigations North Carolina proprietary sites [Figure 1] have followed a chronological development paralleling most areas of the United States. Civil work programs of the late 1930’s first recorded the occasional proprietary sites, such as the Hobson-Stone site associated with Hope Plantation (Phelps 1980:63). More rigorous investigations took place in the 1950 and 1960’s mostly by state archaeologists as historic archaeology became mainstream, with efforts primarily aimed at locating early settlements and providing information upon which to reconstruct the long since deteriorated structures. Harrington’s efforts beginning in the late 1940’s at Fort Raleigh in search of the Lost Colony represent the earliest archaeological endeavors. An intense period of archaeological investigations at historic sites in North Carolina continued for several decades, led in large part by Stanley South (Carnes-McNaughton 2005). South conducted numerous excavations throughout the state during the late 1950’s and 1960’s as an employee of the North
Carolina Division of Archives and History, most notably he excavated twenty-three of sixty known structures at Brunswick Town, which provided the theoretical basis for his processual treatise, *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* (1977). Other state archaeologists, including Gary Wheeler Stone, Stuart Schwartz, Steve Gluckman, Thomas Funk, John Clauser, and Linda Carnes-McNaughton, continued investigations through the end of the twentieth-century at proprietary sites throughout coastal North Carolina. Most of these were driven by public interests, either state or local, for the purpose of looking at historical reconstruction and interpretation. Occasionally, landowner request or preservation groups spurred fieldwork, such as the investigations at the Newbold-White house (Bandy 2000: 34-43) and Charles Town (Debnam 1969). This work represents the linking of archaeology with the historic preservation movement that first appeared at such places as Williamsburg several decades earlier. Investigations at another standing structure potentially dating to the proprietary period, the Sutton-Newby House, were funded through a National Park Service’s survey and planning grant (Lautzenheiser 1992).
In the 1970’s, cultural resource management surveys (CRM) provided the location, identification and on occasion excavation of historic sites predating 1730. Reports generated by these federally mandated studies range from initial Phase I site survey reports (Mathis and Clauser 1984) to comprehensive Phase II reports at a site near Bath (Thomas et al 1987) to the expansive and noteworthy report of major data recovery at Eden House on Albemarle Sound (Lautzenheiser 1998).

University studies have also made significant contributions, particularly in more recent times, as anthropology departments have included historic archaeology within their studies. Occasionally field schools have been conducted in areas that hold or have the potential to hold remains from the proprietary period, such as at Charles Town on the Cape Fear (Loftfield 1998) and at Bath (Lawrence et al 1984; Charles R. Ewen, personal communication 2005). Academic research has not only continued the investigation of proprietary sites by state archaeologists, but has begun encompassing individual sites within a broader prospective to enhance our understanding of regional trends. In those cases, South’s Carolina Pattern has most often been used for comparative purposes (Bandy 2000; Gray 1989).

Regional History and Archaeological Sites

Albemarle Region

Even before the establishment of the Carolina proprietary grant in 1663, Virginians and Marylanders were already moving into the Albemarle region from the Chesapeake. Discontent with existing conditions or holding desires to explore new lands, these early settlers were hunters and trappers, traders and farmers. At that time the northern coastal region appears to have been inhabited by indigenous tribes within the Algonkian cultural group. Throughout the late seventeenth century the area was developed slowly but steadily by Europeans to the point it was not the frontier but a settled community with hundreds of small farms and several large plantations. Edenton, which began officially as the seat of government in the upper Albemarle region, was officially recognized in 1712. (Cheeseman 1980:15-18)

Town sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Edenton 1722 Council Chamber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>North side of Albermarle Sound, Edenton Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type:</td>
<td>Town government building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When:</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why:</td>
<td>Restoration research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference:</td>
<td>Carnes-McNaughton and Beaman 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation:</td>
<td>Extensive excavations have been undertaken in and around the courthouse. A three-week archaeological project, as a continuation of state excavations in the early 1990’s, confirmed a variety of eighteenth century buildings and nineteenth/twentieth century buildings, as well as nineteenth century activities centered at the 1767 courthouse and previous council chamber (1722).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: In the lower levels investigators encountered artifacts (1720 – 1750), structural evidence and a possible refuse pit that predated the courthouse.

### Homesteads/Plantations

**Site:** Reid Site [31PK8]  
**Location:** East side of Little River  
**Site Type:** Rural Farmstead or Plantation  
**When:** 1985  
**Why:** Artifacts discovered in plowed field by owner and OSA called to investigate.  
**Reference:** Clauser 1985; Gray 1989; Gray 1997  
**Investigation:** Initial site visit by state archaeologists identified intact features below plow zone. A week-long excavation followed in which a ballast stone foundation and brick floor was documented and a collection of artifacts recovered.  
**Results:** The site represents the central domestic building of an eighteenth century farmstead (1720 – 1750) that was destroyed by fire during the last quarter of the century and not reoccupied. Comparison with Nath Moore’s Front in Brunswick Town was undertaken by Gray based on South’s Carolina Pattern.

**Site:** Spruill House [31TY9]  
**Location:** South of the Albemarle Sound  
**Site Type:** Farmstead  
**When:** 1984  
**Why:** OSA conducted a surface and subsurface survey prior to residential development  
**Reference:** Mathis and Clauser 1984  
**Investigation:** After location of eighteenth century artifacts (1720 – 1750) and non-native trees, thirteen shovel units were placed at the Spruill site; the basement or other structural evidence was not located  
**Results:** Architectural, kitchen and personal use artifacts indicated a domestic dating from the first half of the eighteenth century. The site is relatively intact and deemed archaeologically and historically significant.

**Site:** Sutton-Newby House [31PQ113]  
**Location:** Sutton Creek off of the Perquimans River  
**Site Type:** Farmstead House  
**When:** 1992  
**Why:** Excavations by contract firm via an NPS survey and planning grant sought to answer age and restoration questions regarding the standing Sutton-Newby House. Investigators confirmed that the medieval building style survived into the eighteenth century.  
**Reference:** Lautzenheiser 1992; Lautzenheiser, et al 1994  
**Investigation:** Surface collection of artifacts (>1720’s) from adjacent fields and excavation of test units placed adjacent and under the house  
**Results:** Excavations provided evidence of a second chimney, lack of cellar, etc. and supported the early eighteenth period of the site. Associated archaeological deposits are likely to yield important information.

**Site:** Joseph Scott Plantation  
**Location:** Adjacent the Newbold-White House, Perquimans River  
**Site Type:** Farmstead  
**When:** 1970-present
Why: Much of the archaeological investigations centered around the Newbold-White house in an attempt to confirm its age, which was suspected to be seventeenth century, as well as examining evidence from later eighteenth and nineteenth century occupation.


Investigation: After dendrochronology in 1994 placed construction of Newbold-White house to 1730’s (Heikkenen 1994), focus was on “arbor” area where late seventeenth and early eighteenth century artifacts found. First thought to be associated with Newbold-White, but it now appears that the house was built later than the structure at the arbor area, which is the suspected site of Joseph Scott.

Results: Extensive test excavations carried out (66 5x5 units), possible evidence of post in ground structures representing a dwelling, large volume of artifacts.

Site: Eden House [31BR52]  
Location: South of Albemarle Sound at the mouth of the Chowan River and across from Edenton  
Site Type: Frontier Settlement to Plantation Site  
When: 1996  
Why: Data recovery prior to highway construction  

Investigation: A 21,700 square-foot area was excavated and mapped. Of a total 588 features, 272 were excavated and 95 partially excavated representing structures and associated activity areas.

Results: The site included at least three earthfast structures, one having a cellar, and a possible stockade. Occupation appeared to be relatively affluent with buildings (1660’s to 1750) exhibiting leaded glass and hearth tiles. A rich collection of food remains provides insights into English settlement during the proprietary period.

_Bath (Pamlico) Region_

Visited as early as the 1580’s during the original English settlements at Roanoke Island, major development spread south to the Pamlico region as a result of upheavals during the Culpeper Rebellion (1677-80). Native American populations at that time were attributed to the Secotans of the Algonquin cultural group. As European traders and settlers moved into the area, diseases decimated the original native peoples and further encouraged immigration not only of non-natives but also the mobile Tuscarora Indians of the Iroquoian culture group. Development of the region was further promoted and enhanced with the coming of French Huguenots settling along the Trent River and Swiss and German immigrants at the town of New Bern in 1710. The town of Bath and surrounding areas were placed under great stress during the Tuscarora Wars between 1711 to 1715, which ended with defeat and the migration of hostile Indian populations out of the area. (Broadwater et al 1979)

_Town Sites_

Site: Bath - Waterfront Warehouse and Courthouse  
Location: Bath Creek off the Pamlico  
Site Type: Town  
When: 1978-1979; 2002-present
Why: Examine waterfront structure prior to bulkheading; underwater investigation of Bath harbor; locate and document early residences such as the John Lawson house.

References: Broadwater, et al 1979; Lawrence 1984; Baicy 2003; Baicy and Ewen 2003

Investigation: Magnetic survey and anomaly investigation in the harbor, shovel tests and excavation units employed at various sites including the Palmer-Marsh house, Town Point and the suspected location of the eighteenth-century courthouse.

Results: Exploratory excavations, both on land and in the water, have not confirmed proprietary period structures or intact deposits.

Homesteads/Plantations

Site: Beasley Point Site [31BF115]
Location: West side of Bath Creek near confluence with the Pamlico Sound
Site Type: Plantation
When: Identified as early as 1950’s by South; initial archaeological recording 1979 field school; Phase I/II in 1987 by MAAR, contract archaeologists

Why: Archaeological field school with UAB/ECU staff and students; contract CRM done in anticipation of shoreline bulkhead.

References: Lawrence et al 1984; Thomas et al 1987

Investigation: Surface collection, plus numerous test units and large area soil stripping

Results: Forty-seven subsurface units identified including a partially eroding brick foundation and a ballast stone wharf structure. This site appears may be more closely associated with Edward Salter (1730) rather than the 1714-1718 Eden’s stay, which is reportedly a short distance away from the shoreline.

Clarendon (Cape Fear) Region

At a defensive position at the mouth of Town Creek on the west side of the Cape Fear River, several miles from its mouth, a development venture was playing out in this region. In 1664 colonists arrived from Barbados seeking a new beginning as population pressures intensified on the Caribbean’s fastest growing and wealthiest island due to its profitable sugar industry. Unable to sustain the effort, Charles Town was abandoned in 1667 and the Lords Proprietors prohibited development until the beginning of the second quarter of the eighteenth century. While it is likely that small trading and farmsteads existed illegally along the Cape Fear, it was not until 1725 that development began in earnest with the founding of Brunswick Town and adjacent plantations. At that time the small numbers of local Indians related to larger tribes of the Siouan culture group to the south and west, were effectively defeated and removed from the area. (Lee 1965)

Town Sites

Site: Charles Town
Location: At the confluence of Town Creek and the Cape Fear River
Site Type: Contact settlement
When: 1960s, 1987-1992
Why: Initial explorations by state archaeologist at the request of the landowner; University archaeologists extended work later.

References: Debnam 1969; South 1963; Loftfield 1989 and 1999
Investigation: During field school 15,500 square feet of the site was excavated and features recorded.

Results: Archaeological evidence records a defensive earthwork consisting of a series of ditches and associated post-in-ground structures forming an enclosed compound. Ceramics within the artifact assemblage indicate a very high status for the occupants.

Site: Brunswick Town - Nath Moore’s Front
Location: Lower Cape Fear on the west side of the river
Site Type: Town house
When: 1960s
Why: Examination by Stanley South and Lawrence Lee, NC Department of Archives and History
Reference: South 1958; Gray 1997

Investigation: Excavation of the stone foundation with two brick chimneys, evidence of a porch and numerous features and midden deposits.

Results: The foundation represents a domestic house site apparently burned around 1750 and used as a dump site until the abandonment of the town in the late 1770’s.

Commentary: Extensive excavations have taken place at Brunswick Town, as well as at nearby the governor’s mansion of Russellborough and eighteenth century remains at the site of the earlier Charles Town (South 1963; Stone 1970). With the beginnings of development not taking place until 1725 at the very end of the proprietary period, most archaeological evidence most likely falls afterward. Archaeological excavations of the foundation on “Nath Moore’s Front” is known to have been part of the initial building phase are included here as a typical investigation at Brunswick Town.

Summary

It is apparent that settlement and culture of North Carolina during its fledgling beginnings in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the Proprietary Period, is relatively unstudied through archaeology in North Carolina. Despite an active period of archaeological activity during the late 1950’s and 1960’s, at present only a fraction of sites have been located, few excavated, and unfortunately of those examined from this period few have been adequately reported. Within North Carolina’s earliest towns, the surrounding countryside, and beneath state waters surely a rich archaeological record must still remains today. Both academic and state archaeologists have recognized this gap in research and are now revisiting previous collections and unpublished work, particularly at Brunswick Town (Carnes-McNaughton 1997). Efforts to conduct large scale archaeological testing throughout the entire town of Bath by East Carolina University (Baicy 2003), similar to the harbor surveys at Bath, Edenton and New Bern conducted in conjunction with the NC Underwater Archaeology in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, are now underway. As the database of archaeological information builds, expanded knowledge and understanding will be gained on how the environmental, economic, social and political pressures of the period affected early European,
African American, and Native American populations in North Carolina. Furthermore, there is great potential to study cultural adaptation within and between the relatively isolated regions of North Carolina as their period of development, settlement patterns and economic pursuits made them potentially distinct.

With regard specifically to existing archaeological data contemporary and relevant to the loss of *Queen Anne's Revenge*, several sites have yielded substantial artifact collections that can provide the basis for comparative studies. Eden House [31BR52] in the Albemarle Region and the Eden-Salter Residence [31BF115] on Bath Creek, are associated with the colonial governor who dealt directly with the vessel’s captain, Edward Teach, aka Blackbeard. Although the later investigation may post date Eden’s stay, both of these sites are the result of CRM generated studies and are well reported. Two other Proprietary Period sites have been investigated within the Albemarle region and hold promise for comparative purpose. They are the seventeenth century Joseph Scott Plantation located in the arbor area of Newbold-White House and evidence collected from the Reid Site dating to the early eighteenth century. The extensive collections from Brunswick Town and Russellborough, although mostly post-dating the loss of QAR, can also provide an inventory of artifacts that may be relevant. For instance, specimens of blue-green case bottles, flacons, associated with French settlement sites and well represented on the shipwreck site are found in the collection from the mid-eighteenth-century mansion at Russellborough.

In a final note, this literature review has not included several significant Native American sites dating to the proprietary period as evidenced by European trade goods. Among them are Occaneechi (Dickens et al 1984, 1985, 1987), Saura Town (31SK1 and 3SK1) (Lewis 1951) and the Bell Farm Site (31MK85) (Wilson 1983), and the Amity site examined during the search for Pomeiooc village (Gardner 1990). Archaeological evidence from these sites and other contact sites should be included in any study of the proprietary period since they provide greater cultural depth to the study of European expansion and the subsequent interaction and adaptation between immigrant and native populations.
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