

Ouachita Baptist University

## Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita

---

Honors Theses

Carl Goodson Honors Program

---

1985

### Historical Archaeology Possibilities for Arkansas

Julia Gray

*Ouachita Baptist University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors\\_theses](https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses)



Part of the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), and the [Other History Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Gray, Julia, "Historical Archaeology Possibilities for Arkansas" (1985). *Honors Theses*. 203.  
[https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors\\_theses/203](https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses/203)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Carl Goodson Honors Program at Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. For more information, please contact [mortensona@obu.edu](mailto:mortensona@obu.edu).

T1985  
G779h

SPEC COL  
T1985  
G779h

Historical Archaeology  
Possibilities for Arkansas

Despite early... Archaeology in North America, the... until the mid-1960s. Since that time there has been continual debate as to what historical archaeology actually is, what it does or what it should do. To understand this debate, it is first necessary to examine some early orientations of the discipline.

In the 1930s archaeologists were concerned with studying the oldest possible sites. Some archaeologists had begun to dig in historic sites, but archaeological really started gaining popular organization of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. The National Park Service then began a regular program of archaeologically investigating its sites to improve the interpretation of historical national monuments (Fairbanks 1983:17). In a like manner, Dr. T.L.

submitted by  
Julia Gray  
spring, 1985

Hodges and his wife Charlotte in 1943 attempted to explain how archaeology... early phases of Arkansas history. the importance of the area in east... the mouth of the Arkansas River in Desha... they cited the territory known as Ark... parent colony, a stepping place between... or a place for transfer to interior Arkansas or further west. The Hodgeses then recommended the site for a state park (Hodges 1943:163). Archaeological study was needed because of the meager and scattered

Independent Study  
Carl Goodson Honors Program  
Ouachita Baptist University

Approved by  
Director



Despite early examples of historical archaeology in North America, the field did not gain formal status until the mid-1960s. Since that time there has been continual debate as to what historical archaeology actually is, what it does or what it should do. To understand this debate, it is first necessary to examine some early orientations of the discipline.

In the 1930s archaeologists were concerned with studying the oldest possible sites. Some archaeologists had begun to dig in historic sites, but historical archaeology really started gaining popularity with the organization of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. The National Park Service then began a regular program of archaeologically investigating its sites to improve the interpretation of historical national monuments (Fairbanks 1983:17). In a like manner, Dr. T.L. Hodges and his wife Charlotte in 1943 attempted to explain how archaeology could clarify some of the early phases of Arkansas history. Their article established the importance of the area in eastern Arkansas, near the mouth of the Arkansas River in Desha and Arkansas counties. They cited the territory known as Arkansas Post as Arkansas' parent colony, a stopping place between St. Louis and New Orleans, or a place for transfer to interior Arkansas or further West. The Hodgeses then recommended the site for a state park (Hodges 1943:163). Archaeological study was needed because of the meager and scattered



distribution of source material and displacement of early documents and records. The Hodges' referred to the archaeologist as "a historian with mud on his boots" (Hodges 1943:142).

In the 1950s archaeology mainly concerned itself with describing recovered materials and constructing chronologies of artifact types. Archaeologists still must first establish a time framework for sites and artifacts. They also often remain concerned with verifying vague documents about historic routes, town or building locations. Also in the 1950s, and today, archaeologists seek to provide information, such as architectural details, necessary for historic building restoration (Fairbanks 1983:17).

The use of the term "historical archaeology" implies a separate discipline, and a definition is in order. Leslie Stewart-Abernathy, state historical archaeologist for Arkansas, has defined historical archaeology as "the study of human behavior through the examination of the things people make and use, with additional enlightenment provided by written and oral records" (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:292). The primary subject matter of the discipline in North America is the development of cultural patterns in the New World since the sixteenth century, the relation of those patterns to the Old World, and their effect on Native Americans (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:293). Historical archaeology, because of its high degree of chronological control, "permits a correspondingly more specific description of culture change than one usually encounters in prehistory" (Deetz 1977:17).



A "typical" historical archaeological site does not differ greatly from a prehistoric site--the methodology of investigating with excavation grids, trenches and test plots is similar in both circumstances. Historical artifacts are usually much more diverse in raw material and places of origin, and more is known of their history and technology than many prehistoric artifacts. Also, because historic sites study generally concerns the activity of people immediately ancestral rather than those separated from the archaeologist by great time and distance, many historic sites are quite visible even before any earth is removed; at the visible extreme are whole buildings. In contrast, nineteenth century domestic sites in wooded areas today are as "invisible" as their prehistoric counterparts. This is especially true in Arkansas where high soil acidity prevents artifact preservation.

In addition to historic artifacts, usually found broken in the ground, and historic structures, documentary records can help to discover the daily life of past peoples. Many of these documents were assembled to record property holdings, insure proper tax payments, acquire data through censuses, and record the activities of secular and sacred private and public institutions. Stewart-Abernathy (1984) includes as another "intact residue of past lifeways" the collections of objects and relics by those interested in the intact objects of the past, giving sentimental and commercial interest to them. Resulting from this interest in antiques, hundreds of books and magazine articles have been written by and for collectors. These works can be valuable to the historical archaeologist,



especially when it includes research in the primary documents kept by manufacturers (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:293).

Also valuable to research in historical archaeology are the field and methods of ethnoarchaeology. By utilizing the methods of ethnoarchaeology, the historical archaeologist seeks to minimize the distortion resulting from the study of only the residues of past populations and cultures. When the archaeologist conducts research on a living population, he/she gathers data in three ways: observing and participating in activities generating archaeological data; questioning informants on their actions and reasons for dealing with their material culture in a certain way; and recording data on aspects of how material culture relates to behavior, as in the location of trash deposits and action taken when structures are destroyed (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:294). In the historic investigations of the Conway project in Arkansas (Santeford and Martin 1980:194-5), oral tradition provided information about the character of log houses no longer present. Some of the persons interviewed had lived in or visited the log structures and were able to relate information on house orientation, window and door patterns, room arrangements, and location and relationship of outbuildings.

The availability to historical archaeologists of documents, oral data, and archaeological data has promoted the study of behavioral processes involved in human perception and the means of manipulating or coping with the environment (Deagan 1982). An assumption of archaeology is that an object's physical appearance, its particular use, and its abandonment



are the result of shared ideas about these attributes held by the group who utilized the object. The shared ideas, or culture, are expressed through behavior which includes modification of the physical world, and thus artifacts. "The concept of culture is the primary contribution of the discipline of anthropology to world knowledge" (Stewart-Abernathy 1984: 295). Historical archaeology in the United States is firmly placed within the discipline of anthropology, and historical archaeologists are trained as specialists in the study of culture of the past. Other archaeologists with primary training in history of American studies, who call their results "social history," and claim no connection with anthropology, are also studying past cultural expressions (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:295).

One of the most important aspects of historical archaeology is its ability to test principles of archaeological interpretation under controlled conditions. Only in recent years have studies concentrating on testing and verifying relationships between patterning in the material and behavioral sphere become explicit. Inclusion of contemporary societies in the focus of historical archaeology is related to a fairly recent conceptual self-image--that of historical archaeology as the "science of material culture." This describes archaeology essentially as the study of relationships between human beings and material things (Deagan 1982:164).

All of the data sources used by the historical archaeologist are complimentary and together give a more detailed and complete picture than any one could alone. Despite a possible



rich and diverse available historical record, this record does not often tell of "simple people doing simple things" (Deetz 1977:6). During the first decade of historical archaeological research in America, the discipline could confidently be placed in the history category. The basic point of view of the historical-oriented researchers was that the best questions and most reliable answers in historical archaeological research were those designed to "fill in the gaps" in history. This need included providing architectural details, materials culture, and details of non-elite life not available in documents. Historical archaeology is now able to do more than merely describe materials and sites excavated, provide missing data in the contemporary documents of the period, and investigate elite or military sites (Fairbanks 1983:17).

Through this concern with the "simple people," historical archaeology can add to our understanding of the American (and likewise Arkansan) experience in a unique way. Countless objects have been discarded and abandoned by Americans for three and one-half centuries. "It is the notion of culture that makes the objects worthy of study to the archaeologist, and the usefulness of an artifact to reveal information about its parent culture does not necessarily depend on the object being intact" (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:295). It is necessary, however, that objects actually be available for study. Neither contemporary documents, illustrations, or oral history is adequate by itself. These sources may not provide information about what an object is, how old it is, or, in the case of catalogs, what was actually



bought and by whom (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:295-6).

The fact that information from the digging of archaeological sites is enhanced by above ground information and collections, public or private, has already been stated. However, factors which favor survival must be taken into account: "Surviving artifacts cannot be taken as necessarily representative objects of their period" (Deetz 1977:6-7). An unusually small dress in a museum may have survived because it was too small for anyone else, and therefore too small to hand down. A surviving piece of crockery may have been a piece which was rarely, if ever, used as a functional object, being therefore less susceptible to breakage.

Historical archaeology oriented toward history is most visible today in projects of historic reconstruction and restoration. Fontana (v. 31) stated that when the aim of archaeological work is preservation or restoration, it is archaeological technique as opposed to methodology, which is essential. He goes on to say that in wholly non-aboriginal sites and frontier sites a historian trained in architectural technique may do a better job of restoration. The rapid expansion of cultural resource management during the 1970s has encouraged historical supplementation goals in archaeology. Thus, historical archaeology can still be a "handmaiden to history." Another important development resulting from the expansion of cultural resource management is the importance of making explicit the research



goals of a project. In historical reconstruction, the data recovered by the historical archaeologists is very often crucially important to the completion of the project that provided the contract. Many projects throughout the country "contractually restrict the historical archaeologist to supplemental data gathering and historical archaeology to a service industry" (Deagan 1982:159). Nevertheless, as archaeologist can employ broader research questions to these sites when given a chance to dig at them.

The 1977 and 1979 studies of Old Davidsonville are Arkansas examples of contract archaeology (Dollar 1977; Stewart-Abernathy 1979). Because Old Davidsonville is on the National Register of Historic Places, plans for future park development had to be preceded by an assessment of the subsurface archaeological record. The 1979 study afforded an opportunity to reach four constituencies with which archaeology often works: parks, the past, the public and the present. The project was supposed to provide an opportunity to demonstrate that the site was "an important location, deserving of careful protection because of the potential for interpreting its possible unique historical archaeological record to the people of today" (Stewart-Abernathy 1979:3,5).

Archaeology has probably reached more nonarchaeologists through programs of public interpretation than through any other means. Also, certain historical information cannot be retrieved in any other way than through archaeology.



This information can often prove illuminating to historical interpretation. Again, in examining the "simple people," slave habitation sites are very largely unrepresented in the available literature. In 1968, no one had yet excavated a slave house. "If historical archaeology could bring to light important information about the literate segments of our past, how much more would it contribute to those aspects that had no written past?" (Fairbanks 1983:22). There are documentary indications that firearms were prohibited and food was cooked communally at slave sites; both have been refuted archaeologically (Deagan 1982:160). There is considerable evidence, through faunal analysis of food remains, that slaves on the southern coastal plantations supplemented their rations with wild foods. The evidence of the presence of firearms at slave cabins provides a logical way slaves could have obtained these wild foods (Fairbanks 1983:23,24).

Since the early 1960s, there has been an ongoing debate between "culture history" (particularizing) archaeologists and "culture process" (generalizing) archaeologists (Flannery 1973:50-53). With the study of the operation of cultural processes and new environmental legislation for cultural resource management, there is an increasing emphasis on regions rather than on individual sites (House 1977:241). An emphasis on regions is also developing as a response to the fact that the same massive land modification projects affecting prehistoric sites are affecting historical sites as well. On a regional level, the archaeological study of a past society requires



reliable data on the totality of archaeological sites formed by that society. Confining historical research to sites and phenomena documented in the historical record is an unwarranted limitation of the scope and potential scientific contributions of historical archaeology (Stewart-Abernathy 1979:3).

When using documentary data, the processes by which the information becomes recorded and preserved must be considered. An Arkansas example of a misleading town platt is illustrated in Dollar's study of Old Davidsonville (Dollar 1977). Likewise, the processes by which the archaeological record is formed must be considered. Schiffer (1982) contends that the study of the past depends on establishing connections between observations of present phenomena and past events and processes. This connection problem involves the consideration of "formation processes" specific to each domain. The primary evidence of the archaeologist, the archaeological record, is not itself a past socio-culture system, but in part represents materials transformed from the system by numerous processes (Schiffer 1982: 13-15).

Stewart-Abernathy concludes that Old Davidsonville is a spectacular site because it is a town site unaffected by the extensive and continual rebuilding of urban areas. It was occupied intensively for less than two decades, allowing firm use dates for artifacts found at the site. The site comes down to the present as the archaeological record of a prosperous town during the pioneer or frontier period (Stewart-Abernathy 1979). However, data from this single site, or even a few



sites in the region, cannot provide a basis for typifying the cultural behavior of a past society during a given time (House 1977:243).

Stanley South has also noted a change in historical archaeology away from particularistic strategies of qualitatively derived pattern toward deep pattern recognition based on quantitative analysis. "In order to recognize deeper culture pattern, the archaeologist must quantitatively explore the empirical data base using the methods of archaeological science" (South 1977 Research Strategies:2). The goal is to explain human behavior through cultural systems study. From delineated patterns behavioral laws are formulated, then explained through theory.

Historical archaeology today encompasses several different orientations besides that of "handmaiden to history," "reconstruction of past lifeways," or "culture process." Among the newer emphases, unique to historical archaeology, is the investigation of the relationship between patterned human behavior and patterned archaeological remains, and the testing of traditional archaeological principles accounting for those relationships. Written statements, because they reflect perception in the past, make the "cognitive orientation" in historical archaeology possible and could also offer a potential for the explanation of pattern (Deagan 1982:158,170).

In the two decades since its recognition, historical archaeology has progressed theoretically from descriptive and chronological concerns to culture history studies, to problems of



culture process, cognition, and archaeological principles. It is interesting to examine what types of historical archaeology have been done in Arkansas. Also, questions may be asked as to the current framework of approach in Arkansas, and the future potential of historical archaeology in the state.

Relatively little historical archaeology has been done in Arkansas. The few projects completed were usually guided by questions of location and chronology of specific sites. Walker's study of Arkansas Post (1971) was such a project. The study provided definite boundaries for the building of the Arkansas Post Branch of the Bank of Arkansas and concluded that the bank building was indeed used as a hospital, shelled by Union artillery and destroyed by fire in a battle January 11, 1863 (Walker 1971: 22-23). Martin's 1977 study of Jacob Bright's Trading House and William Montgomery's Tavern was designed to affirm or refute Walker's placement of the trading house and tavern. The author admitted the difficulty of integrating the evidence gleaned from deed records and other documentary sources with the physical remains in the earth, due to the poor cartographic studies of the area available (Martin 1977:86).

Walker's study also provided conclusive evidence for shaky historical facts, providing architectural details, materials culture, and details of non-elite life. The Hodgeses proposed use of archaeology for the historic period was mainly to fill in the sketchy details of the early phase of Arkansas history, at Arkansas Post (Hodges 1943). The Hodgeses also sought to bolster the state through the discovery of old cemeteries



bearing famous names (Hodges 1943:162-63). The Hodges' study included a proposal for a state park at Arkansas Post, and subsequent studies have involved various state parks. It is largely through the growth of cultural resource management and contract archaeology that some sites in Arkansas have been examined. Contract archaeology has necessitated the need for research designs in historic and prehistoric archaeology.

The study of house lots of two surviving pre-Civil War houses in Old Washington, the Sanders and Block-Catts houses, demonstrated the use of the urban farmstead model as a framework for developing research designs. The increased pace of restoration at Old Washington and a new concern with out buildings, fencing, and other landscape elements made archaeology crucial. The two efforts at Old Washington supported a specific reconstruction goal: "To acquire evidence of the size, layout and appearance of the detached kitchens on the Sanders and Block-Catts house lots" (Stewart-Abernathy 1983:11)

Archaeology was especially necessary because the kitchen buildings were both gone from the landscape. The results concluded that by the mid 1800s there were two separate models of lot layout ("setback," Block-Catts; and "corner," Sanders), and two separate models of kitchen location (separate, at some distance from main house, Sanders; and separated only by a porch or breezeway, Block-Catts), but only one set of rules as to what a kitchen was supposed to look like. Through the use of photographic and oral history evidence it was determined that both kitchens were almost identical in plan and construction:



one story frame, gabled roof, rectangular plan, subdivided cross-wise into two rooms, double fireplace with massive brick chimney column in the partition of the rooms (Stewart-Abernathy 1983:14).

The current framework of approach in Arkansas is that of activity periods devised by Leslie Stewart-Abernathy (see Appendix). This "effort to construct activity periods and introduce general problems is also an effort to point out research needs by organizing the past into manageable units" (Stewart-Abernathy 1982: 42). This organization, it is hoped, will aid in determining the significance of sites and in assigning research priorities. Stewart-Abernathy contends that an immediate effort should not be made to identify the oldest site, since it is very nearly impossible to deliberately locate sites of the Indirect Contact (1500-1660), Direct Contact (1660-1720), and Spanish Periods (1500-1700); they are not accessible through the documentary record. Effort could be better directed "toward confirming the semi-known sites of hundreds of farmsteads, mills, and villages from the Pioneer Period (1780-1850), or for recording the fragile body of oral history concerning sites occupied in (or into) the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:42).

When stating Arkansas' statewide research problems for historical archaeology, Stewart-Abernathy suggests the frontier as a place of contrasts. In terms of the past in Arkansas, these contrasts are apparent in three ways: contrasts between different cultures, between different patterns of behavior in



the organized compared to the organizing area, and contrasts between material culture assemblages within the same culture at and away from the same frontier. This last contrast is, of course, the most visible archaeologically (Stewart-Abernathy 1982).

An interesting example provided by contrasts is in the Pioneer Period (1780-1850). The pioneer life was similar to frontier life--struggle, crudity, hardship, and sometimes bare survival. However, archaeological examination of Davidsonville, a townsite of the Pioneer Period, revealed a material culture of sophisticated, urban planning. Artifacts found included glass only 1-2 millimeters thick and a ceramic assemblage largely (90percent) made in industrial Britain. These artifacts indicated that the residents of this remote and early town were part of an ongoing international trade network. In fact, these imported ceramics are common at sites all over Arkansas dating to the early nineteenth century (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:33-35; 1979).

Another study of the early nineteenth century focusing on ceramic and glasswares was that of the Block cellar in Old Washington (Stewart-Abernathy 1985;10). These artifacts permit investigation of trade and consumer choice practiced by the prominent merchant family of Abraham Block. This family was one of the first to bring manufactured goods to southwest Arkansas. The assemblage at the site "has not been supplanted in significance since it was first sampled in the summer of 1982. As a deposit with the potential for increasing our understanding



of life in the earliest years of statehood in Arkansas (1836), it has no peer in the state" (Stewart-Abernathy 1985:11).

The faunal collection at the site is also useful in the examination of ethnicity, because the family was publicly Jewish. Since the site provides an opportunity to study ethnic variation and the archaeological record of merchant, it is important even in the sphere of the Old Southwest (Stewart-Abernathy 1985:11).

One processual area to which historical archaeology has made significant contributions is that of understanding acculturation. Studies have concentrated on acculturation through trading relations, religious conversion, and racial intermarriages. Conclusions have shown that the sex of the people providing the links between the two cultures is a critical factor. In Native American groups, changes resulting from the interaction of Europeans has been shown to be more clearly linked to change in economic patterns than religious conversion or intermarriage (Deagan 1982:162-63). The same could be true of early nineteenth century Americans in pioneer times. Also, there is the possibility in Arkansas to study the social or material transformations accompanying contact between Indians and whites.

In contrasting the Ozark and Delta cultures, the focus of out of state attention on the Ozarks has served incorrectly to dramatize a single region, the Ozarks, as more distinctive of Arkansas than that of other regions. The work only defines an area in which a great deal of folklore has been done. "Work in the Delta by the Center for Southern Folklore in Memphis, has



shown that quilt making, tale telling, crafts, and independence of spirit are abilities or qualities held by people, not a landform" (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:36). To this problem one may add problems in patterning in settlement, agriculture, material culture, technology, and other areas.

The 1984 study of the Moser site has increased the understanding of the lifeways of Ozark farm families of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries. According to Stewart-Abernathy, "...in spite of years of study of the post-Indian occupation of the Ozark Plateaus, we do not have detailed and easily accessible data on any more than a small percentage of the thousands of farmsteads that existed in the late 1800s and early 1900s" (Stewart-Abernathy 1984:296). In fact, the Moser farmstead is the first to be thoroughly examined archaeologically. Another characteristic of the Ozarks, high quantities of log structures, may reflect factors other than the dominance of a particular vernacular building material. There are indeed log structures in all 75 counties in Arkansas, along with people still making quilts, still playing fiddles, and still watching out for signs of the Devil (Stewart-Abernathy 1982).

As elsewhere, in Arkansas the processes that form the archaeological record must be taken into account. There may be relatively more log structures in the Ozarks today or in the past due to such factors as continual occupation or repair, resistance to urban spread, or resistance of the area to increases in farm acreage. For these same reasons, Old Davidsonville is a good early nineteenth century urban site (it is relatively



undisturbed) to study, and plantations outside the lowlands may be more useful to archaeologists. Similarly, for the Resort Period (1840-1930), a site like Pinnacle Springs, which grew up around a medicinal spring on Cadron Creek in northern Faulkner County and was abandoned before World War I, is more useful for the period than Hot Springs. The sites are also important because they provide perhaps more sites available for regional studies. Stewart-Abernathy argues that a major emphasis should be given to those research areas that will result in generating data about the maximum number of sites that may have components from other activity periods (Stewart-Abernathy 1982).

Another problem almost entirely ignored in Arkansas research in the historic period is the visibility of minorities in the archaeological record. The sites include Black slave cabins and tenant steads, the German occupation of the Ozark/Ouachita interface along the Arkansas River and the previously little inhabited Grand Prairie. Also included in the sites is the location of the nineteenth century French, who, like the Creoles of Louisiana, remained after the Louisiana Purchase (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:36-37).

In addition to specific research problems discussed above, archaeologists in Arkansas face both natural and economic constraints. The two major natural constraints on historical archaeological research in Arkansas are stream channel movements (irreversible permanent change) and forest regrowth.



Both involve relatively short term dynamics in the landscape but one involves irreversible permanent change, and the other is only a temporary change. Such change in the physiography of an area was extremely pertinent when attempting to understand the history of the various past phases of Arkansas. From the 1500s to the late 1800s one of the most important locations for settlement was directly along the river courses. Rivers cutting into the bank have destroyed several townsites and destroyed the scattered evidence left by travelers. The focus on agribusiness in the alluvial plains of the Mississippi, Arkansas, and Red Rivers, and the abandonment of row cropping on a family scale elsewhere have allowed as much as three-quarters of the state's land surface to revert to pine and hardwood forest. This overgrowth has caused significant difficulties with site visibility--in many cases, the only time the ground surface is visible is during a construction project, where the historic debris is often ignored (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:39).

The three major sources of economic constraints are changes in farming, expansion of urbanization and domestic residences, and impacts specific to activity periods, such as commercial use of the environment. The intensive cultivation, landleveling, and massive forest clearing in the east and southwestern portions of Arkansas have caused great damage to historic as well as to prehistoric sites, with particular significance for selected activity periods. Changes in plantation agriculture obscured former slave quarters and are now removing tenant families and farmsteads from the land. Other places have been stripped of



natural resources to support expansion, urban leisure activity, provide water supplies or sewage lagoons. Reversion to forest of many areas intensively occupied during the Maximum Occupation Period (1840-1930) has meant damage to farmstead sites when the tree cover is harvested for timber. Also, the record of rivercraft represented by sunken vessels is being destroyed by the dredging of river bottoms--these rivercraft exist nowhere else (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:40). To date, only one flatboat, discovered in dredging the Arkansas River, is available for Arkansas archaeologists to study. The vessel was built between 1840 and 1900, and is apparently a flatboat or barge. Because any dredging in the Arkansas River must first receive an Army Corps of Engineers permit, and a subsequent letter from Hester Davis, State Archaeologist, requesting notification of evidence of prehistoric or historic life encountered, the boat timbers were salvaged (Stewart-Abernathy Oct. 1984:13-14).

Ignorance among specialists in history and historic preservation, collectors concentrating on historic Euramerican objects, and collectors concentrating on Native American objects are major social constraints on historical archaeological research. Since historical archaeology is a new field, the special skills in artifact identification have not yet circulated through the ranks of local historians and their organizations, architectural historicans, state preservation groups, or professional archaeologists. Often people do not appreciate the archaeological correlate to their studies of local history, historic structures, or sites with historic components. Treasure hunters and others



can do great damage to the complex relationships of soil and artifacts that provide the critical context that archaeologists carefully record and interpret. In Arkansas, "the greatest damage to sites is evidently those of the Civil War and Maximum Occupation activity periods" (Stewart-Abernathy 1982:41).

Fortunately, collectors are not interested in surface collecting broken historic material except for such items as marbles and ceramic doll parts. Also, the commercial pothunter or collector who loots graves of the prehistoric period in search of spectacular Mississippian pottery destroys the sites containing European trade goods. Possibly most of the Native American sites created between 1500 and 1750 have already been severely disturbed. These sites could have been extremely productive if they contained easily dated European artifacts, and because many of the sites are mentioned in the literature of early European travelers in the area. Although they should not be the first sites sought, ". . . activity periods under Contact and European headings, because they represent probably the smallest number of sites initially created, should always receive first priority if opportunities occur" (Stewart-Abernathy 1982;41-43).

As hopefully demonstrated, the possibilities for historical archaeology in Arkansas are remarkable. Because of its integration of data (documents, oral, archaeological artifacts), this discipline can tell the "unwritten" of history, or provide information about historic periods for which there exist no documents. It can reveal the history of historic peoples with no written record, and help eliminate untested assumptions about



certain peoples, cultures, or regions. Historical archaeology, unique within archaeology, can also attempt to study cognition. It can address regional questions of trade routes, transformation of the wilderness and the expansion of urban centers, and the effect this process has on farmsteads. The discipline provides an opportunity to test archaeological principles in a controlled situation. It can also, perhaps more importantly, uncover the everyday, simple lives of past Arkansans. Historical archaeology has the possibility to provide the state with a most incredibly rich history and at the same time, study the underlying cultural processes which shaped the world of the historic inhabitants of Arkansas and continue to shape the world today.

Flannery, Kent V. "Archaeology with a Capital A." *The Arbor*, Michigan: Univ. of Michigan. *Research and Theory in Current Archaeology*, Charles L. Redman, ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Fontana, Bernard H. "On the Meaning of Historical Archaeology." *American Antiquity*, vol. 31 (1966): 21-22.

Hodges, T. L. and Charlotte. "Possibilities for the Archaeologist and Historian in Eastern Arkansas?" *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 17:41-16. Fayetteville, Arkansas: The Arkansas Historical Association, 1943.

House, John H. "Survey Data and Regional Models in Historical Archaeology," ch. 9, *Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology*, Stanley South. New York: Praeger Press, 1977.

Hume, Ivor Noel. *Martin's Hundred*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.

Martin, Patrick B. *An Inquiry into the Locations and Characteristics of Jacob Bright's Trading House and William Montross's Tavern*. Fayetteville, Univ. of Arkansas; Arkansas Archaeological Survey Research Series No. 11, 1977.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Deagan, Kathleen. "Avenues of Inquiry in Historical Archeology," ch. 4, Advances in Archeological Method and Theory, vol. 5., Michael B. Schiffer. Tuscon, Arizona: Univ. of Arizona, 1982.
- Deetz, James. In Small Things Forgotten. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press, 1977.
- Dollar, Clyde D. An Archeological Assessment of Historic Davidsonville, Arkansas. Dept. of History, Univ. of Arkansas. Arkansas Archeological Survey Research Report No. 17, 1977.
- Fairbanks, Charles H. "Historical Archaeological Implications of Recent Investigations," from Geoscience and Man, vol. XXIII, "Historical Archaeology of the Eastern United States: Papers From the R.J. Russell Symposium," edited by Robert W. Neuman. Baton Rouge, April 29, 1983.
- Flannery, Kent V. "Archeology With A Capital 'S'," Ann Arbor, Michigan: Univ. of Michigan. Research and Theory in Current Archeology. Charles L. Redman, ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Fontana, Bernard L. "On the Meaning of Historic Sites Archeology," American Antiquity, vol. 31 (1): 61-65.
- Hodges, T.L. and Charlotte. "Possibilities for the Archeologist and Historian in Eastern Arkansas," Arkansas Historical Quarterly II:141-163. Fayetteville, Arkansas: The Arkansas Historical Association, 1943.
- House, John H. "Survey Data and Regional Models in Historical Archeology," ch. 9, Research Strategies in Historical Archeology, Stanley South. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Hume, Ivor Noel. Martin's Hundred. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.
- Martin, Patrick E. An Inquiry into the Locations and Characteristics of Jacob Bright's Trading House and William Montgomery's Tavern. Fayetteville, Univ. of Arkansas: Arkansas Archeological Survey Research Series No. 11, 1977.



- Santeford, Lawrence Gene and Martin, William A. The Conway Water Supply: Results of Archeological Survey and Testing and a Historical Survey of a Proposed Reservoir Area in Conway County, Arkansas. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Arkansas Archeological Survey project no. 340, 1980.
- Schiffer, Michael B. Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory, vol. 5. New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- South, Stanley. Method and Theory in Historical Archeology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Research Strategies in Historical Archeology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C. "The Block House Cellar" Field Notes, newsletter of the Arkansas Archeological Society, Hester A. Davis, ed., no. 203. March/April 1985.
- "Flatboat Found in Arkansas River", Field Notes, no. 200, Sept./Oct. 1984
- "Historical Archeology" A State Plan for the conservation of archeological resources in Arkansas, 1982. Hester Davis, ed.
- "Independent But Not Isolated: The Archeology of a Late Nineteenth Century Ozark Farmstead." contributions by Beverly Watkins and John H. House. Fayetteville, Arkansas: The Contract Program of the Arkansas Archeological Survey, no. 534, 1984.
- The Seat of Justice: 1815-1830. An Archeological Reconnaissance of Davidsonville. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Arkansas Archeological Survey Research Report no. 21, 1979.
- "Urban Farmsteads in Washington, Arkansas: the dynamics of spatial and chronological patterning on 2 house lots from the mid 1800s to the present. Denver, Colorado: a paper presented at the national meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Jan., 1983.
- Walker, John W. Excavation of the Arkansas Post Branch of the Bank of the State of Arkansas. Southeast Archeological Center, Division of Archeology, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. National Park Service. U.S. Dept. of Interior. 1971.



APPENDIX

Activity Periods. Leslie Stewart-Abernathy, taken from A State Plan.

Contact Period 1500-1840

Indirect Contact 1500-1660  
Direct Contact 1660-1720  
Coexistence Contact 1720-1770  
Resettlement Contact 1770-1840

European 1500-1825

Spanish 1500-1700 (1825?)  
French 1700-1825 (1850?)

Anglo-American 1780-2000

Pioneer 1780-1850  
Maximum Occupation 1840-1930  
Civil War 1860-1875  
Plantation 1800-2000  
Tenant Farm 1870-1950  
Riverine 1780-1880 (1930?)  
Railroad 1855-1950  
Extractive Industry 1880-2000  
Resort 1840-1930 (2000?)  
Automobile 1920-2000  
Urbanization 1890-2000  
Localized Industry 1780-1930  
Military 1880-2000