

that practiced at Drax Hall, although with more commensal taxa, including a native hutia, and a large number of freshwater turtles. It remains to be decided whether to interpret the remains of several horses as those of commensal animals or food animals.

CONCLUSIONS

Comparison of faunal remains from these historic sites suggests that distinctly different subsistence strategies were practiced in each region (Table 12). The contrasts in subsistence strategies suggested by these numerical summaries undoubtedly reflect human efforts to conform to the laws of thermodynamics, ecology, and anthropology. They suggest a number of interesting aspects of human behavior to explore. However, it should be noted that the degree of comparability which has resulted in this final comparison is deceptive. In the first place, the comparison has required glossing over individual variations among the collections and within collections. Many of the ideosyncratic characteristics of these samples might be just as interesting as the larger picture produced by inter-site comparison. In order to make these comparisons, I have not critically evaluated each sample in terms of taphonomic, excavation, and analytical biases. However, it should be understood that substantially better samples are needed before the results offered here can be considered anything more than suggestive.

Secondly, methodological impediments to inter-site comparisons are abundant. The comparisons made here have been possible only because of dogmatic insistence on my part that comparable methods be applied to all of these samples. In some cases the comparison has been made in spite of archaeological evidence of human behavior which would be more suitably studied using different methods. If, however, modifications had been made in analytical methods, then comparability would have been reduced. For example, there is some discussion about the wisdom of making comparisons based on minimum numbers of individuals rather than butchering units. In spite of the fact that there are a number of variables which tend to make estimates of minimum numbers of individuals non-comparable among sites, these are minor compared to the difficulties that exists in the area of butchering units since there are no standard protocols for defining, reporting, or summarizing butchering data.

In order to determine the validity of the differences and similarities which seem to exist in these samples, several areas need to be given more attention. We need vertebrate faunal assemblages which have been collected using the most discriminating recovery methods and which have been carefully identified using a good comparative skeletal collection. The archaeological samples need to be larger in size and from a diverse number of contexts. Good documentary support as well as collaboration from other data classes is needed for each sample. Samples should come from a variety of temporal, social,

and ecological settings. During analysis it will be necessary to remember that taphonomic and archaeological variables influence the sample. More research is needed into the impact of meat processing on preserved meats and efforts should be made to acquire documentary evidence on the costs of sixteenth through early nineteenth century cuts of meat on the Atlantic seaboard. Discussions of the elements found in collections should be more extensive and we need to develop a better way to present the data. We need to better define the criteria which distinguish between deposits of different ethnic, social, and temporal associations. If attention is paid to these factors it should be possible in the next several years to discuss subsistence in this region in terms of change through time, socio-economic status, ethnicity, and urban/rural contrasts.

Acknowledgements. I wish to thank Anne Yentsch and Historic Annapolis, Inc., for the opportunity to examine the faunal remains from the Calvert House. I also appreciate the assistance and patience of Jennifer Freer, Timothy Young, Barbara Ruff, Lori Taylor, and Emmett Walsh. Funding for the research was provided by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (Grant #RO 21482-87) to Historic Annapolis, Inc. An short version of this paper was presented at the 21st Annual Meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, January, 1988, Reno, Nevada, under the title "Comparison of Zooarchaeological Evidence from Annapolis and Charleston.

REFERENCES CITED

American Poultry Association

1874 American Standard of Excellence.

Armstrong, Douglas V.

1985 An Afro-Jamaican Slave Settlement: Archaeological Investigation at Drax Hall. In The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life, edited by T. A. Singleton, pp. 291-308. Academic Press, New York.

Bent, Arthur Cleveland

1963 Life Histories of North American Gallinaceous Birds.
Dover Publications, New York.

Casteel, Richard W.

1978 Faunal Assemblages and the "Wiegemethode" or Weight Method. Journal of Field Archaeology 5:72-77.

Cumbaa, Steven

1981 Archaeological Evidence of the 16th-18th C. Atlantic Cod Fishery. Paper presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, New Orleans.

Dreisch, Angela von den

1976 A Guide to the Measurements of Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites. Peabody Museum Bulletin No. 1

Faulkner, Alaric

1985 Archaeology of the Cod Fishery: Damariscove Island. Historical Archaeology 19(2):57-86.

Gilbert, B. Miles

1980 Mammalian Osteology. Modern Printing Co., Laramie.

Gould, S.J.

1966 Allometry and Size in Ontogeny and Phylogeny.

Biological Review of the Cambridge Philosophical Society
41:587-640.

1971 Geometric Similarity in Allometric Growth: A

Contribution to the Problem of Scaling in the Evolution of
Size. The American Naturalist 105(942):113-137.

Grayson, Donald K.

1973 On the Methodology of Faunal Analysis. American
Antiquity 38(4):432-439.

1979 On the Quantification of Vertebrate Archaeofauna. In
Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory, vol. 2,
edited by M. B. Schiffer, pp. 199-237. Academic Press,
New York.

Gust, Sherri M.

1983 Problems and Prospects in Nineteenth Century
California Zooarchaeology. In Forgotten Places and
Things: Archaeological Perspectives on American History,
edited by A. E. Ward, 341-348. Center for Anthropological
Studies Contributions in Anthropological Studies No. 3,
Albuquerque.

Miller, Henry M.

1985 Colonization and Subsistence Change on the 17th
Century Chesapeake Frontier. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan
State University. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

Reitz, Elizabeth J.

1986a Urban/Rural Contrasts in Vertebrate Fauna from the Southern Atlantic Coastal Plain. Historical Archaeology 16(2):47-58.

1986b Urban Site Formation Processes and the Faunal Record. Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Nashville, TN

1986c Vertebrate Fauna from Drax Hall Great House, Jamaica. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens.

Reitz, Elizabeth J., and Dan Cordier

1983 Use of Allometry in Zooarchaeological Analysis. In Animals in Archaeology: 2. Shell Middens, Fishes and Birds, edited by C. Grigson and J. Clutton-Brock, pp. 237-252. BAR International Series 183, London.

Reitz, Elizabeth J., I. R. Quitmyer, H. S. Hale, S. J. Scudder, and E. S. Wing

1987 Application of Allometry to Zooarchaeology. American Antiquity 52(2):304-317.

Rick, Ann M.

1975 Bird Medullary Bone: A Seasonal Dating Technique for Faunal Analysis. Canadian Archaeological Association Bulletin 7:183-190.

Ruff, Barbara

1986a Analysis of the Vertebrate Fauna from the Aiken-Rhett House, Charleston, South Carolina. In Outside of Town: Preliminary Investigation of the Aiken-Rhett House. by M. Zierden, J. Calhoun, and D. Hacker, pp. 88-115. The Charleston Museum Archaeological Contributions 11, Charleston.

1986b Zooarchaeological Analysis of the Vertebrate Fauna from the Gibbes House, Charleston, South Carolina. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Schmid, Elizabeth

1972 Atlas of Animal Bones for Prehistorians, Archaeologists, and Quarternary Geologists. Elsevier Publishing, Amsterdam.

Silver, I. A.

1963 The Ageing of Domestic Animals. In Science in Archaeology, D. Brothwell and E. Higgs, eds., pp. 250-268. Praeger, New York.

Simpson, George G., A. Roe, and R.C. Lewontin

1960 Quantitative Zoology. Harcourt, Brace, and Co., New York.

Thomas, D. H.

1971 On Distinguishing Natural from Cultural Bone in Archaeological Sites. American Antiquity 36:366-371.

Watson, J. P. N.

- 1978 The Interpretation of Ephyseal Fusion Data. In
Research Problems in Zooarchaeology. edited by D.R.
Brothwell, J.D. Thomas, and J. Clutton-Brock, pp. 97-102.
University of London Institute of Archaeology Occasional
Publication No. 3.

White, T. E.

- 1953 A Method of Calculating the Dietary Percentages of
Various Food Animals Utilized by Aboriginal Peoples.
American Antiquity 19(2):396-398.

Wing, Elizabeth S., and Antoinette B. Brown

- 1979 Paleonutrition: Method and Theory in Prehistoric
Foodways. Academic Press, New York

Table 1. Urban Compared to Rural Faunal Categories^a.

	Urban		Rural	
	MNI	%	MNI	%
Domestic Mammals	167	28.9	172	17.2
Domestic Birds	114	19.7	41	4.1
Wild Mammals	47	8.1	192	19.2
Wild Birds	44	7.6	30	3.0
Turtles/Alligators	31	5.4	137	13.7
Fishes	114	19.7	383	38.4
Commensal Taxa	<u>61</u>	10.6	<u>43</u>	4.3
TOTAL	578		998	

^a(Reitz 1986a)

Table 2. Slave Compared to Planter Faunal Categories^a.

	Slave		Planter		Gibbes	
	MNI	%	MNI	%	MNI	%
Domestic Mammals	89	20.5	71	15.0	8	29.6
Domestic Birds	13	3.0	26	5.5	4	14.8
Wild Mammals	107	24.7	61	12.9	1	3.7
Wild Birds	9	2.1	16	3.4	5	18.5
Turtles/Alligators	45	10.4	84	17.8	2	7.4
Fishes	159	36.6	191	40.4	5	18.5
Commensal Taxa	<u>12</u>	2.8	<u>24</u>	5.1	<u>2</u>	7.4
TOTAL	434		473		27	

^aSlave and Planter data from Reitz 1986a; Gibbes from Ruff 1986b.

Table 3. Allometric Values Used in This Study.^a

Faunal Category	N	log a	b	r ²
<u>Biomass, kg, from Bone Weight, kg</u>				
Mammal	97	1.12	0.90	0.94
Bird	307	1.04	0.91	0.97
Alligator	3	0.91	0.89	0.89
Turtle	26	0.51	0.67	0.55
Snake	26	1.17	1.01	0.97
Osteichthyes	393	0.90	0.81	0.80
Siluriformes	36	1.15	0.95	0.87
Perciformes	274	0.93	0.83	0.76
Serranidae	18	1.51	1.08	0.85
Carangidae	17	1.23	0.88	0.86
Sparidae	22	0.96	0.92	0.98
Sciaenidae	99	0.81	0.74	0.73

^aThe allometric formula is $Y=aX^b$, where Y is biomass, X is bone weight, a and b are scaled constants, N is the number of observations used in the regression, and r^2 is the proportion of total variance explained by the regression model (Reitz and Cordier 1983; Reitz et al. 1987).

Table 4. Calvert House: Species List.

	Cnt	MNI		Wt, gm	Biomass	
		#	%		kg	%
UID Mammal	5201			2389.73	30.9348	11.7
UID Lg Mammal	1535			5860.48	66.7051	25.2
UID Sm Mammal	89			13.64	0.2763	0.1
<u>Didelphis virginiana</u>	15	1	0.6	8.87	0.1876	0.07
Opossum						
<u>Sylvilagus</u> spp.	44	4	2.3	23.08	0.4460	0.2
Wild rabbit						
UID Rodent	30			1.43	0.0363	0.01
<u>Sciurus</u> cf. <u>carolinensis</u>	17	2	1.2	9.37	0.1970	0.07
Grey squirrel						
<u>Rattus</u> spp.	367	32	18.6	80.08	1.3697	0.5
Rat						
<u>Rattus norvegicus</u>	23			12.34	0.2525	0.1
Norway rat						
<u>Rattus rattus</u>	27			12.26	0.2510	0.9
Roof rat						
<u>Canis familiaris</u>	6	1	0.6	12.10	0.2480	0.09
Dog						
<u>Procyon lotor</u>	2	1	0.6	0.95	0.0251	0.01
Raccoon						

Table 4. Calvert House: Species List.

	Cnt	MNI		Wt, gm	Biomass	
		#	%		kg	%
<u>Felis domesticus</u>	1	1	0.6	1.0	0.0263	0.01
Cat						
<u>Equus caballus</u>	1	1	0.6	190.1	2.9586	1.1
Horse						
<u>Artiodactyl</u>	88			350.24	5.1278	1.9
<u>Sus scrofa</u>	143	6	3.5	812.37	11.4147	4.3
Pig						
<u>Odocoileus virginianus</u>	1	1	0.6	6.23	0.1365	0.05
Deer						
<u>Bos taurus</u>	261	10	5.8	9541.22	105.9969	40.0
Cow						
Caprine	60	4	2.3	271.39	4.3601	1.6
Goat/sheep						
<u>Capra hircus</u>	2			17.6	0.3475	0.1
Goat						
<u>Ovis aries</u>	11			57.59	1.0243	0.4
Sheep						
UID Bird	1103			657.39	7.6083	2.9
UID Juvenile Bird	52			28.52	0.4307	0.2

Table 4. Calvert House: Species List.

	Cnt	MNI		Wt, gm	Biomass	
		#	%		kg	%
cf. Anatidae	2			19.32	0.3022	0.1
possible duck						
Anatidae	99			104.16	1.3999	0.5
Ducks						
<u>Anas</u> spp.	53	6	3.5	56.48	0.8058	0.3
Duck						
<u>Anas platyrhynchos</u>	2			5.46	0.0957	0.04
Mallard						
<u>Aythya</u> spp.	65	7	4.1	63.91	0.8976	0.3
Scaup						
<u>Branta canadensis</u>	90	8	4.7	337.91	4.1279	1.6
Canada goose						
Phasianidae	121			190.62	2.4263	0.9
Pheasant family						
<u>Colinus virginianus</u>	5	1	0.6	0.79	0.0165	0.01
Bobwhite						
<u>Gallus gallus</u>	110	15	8.7	148.44	1.9939	0.8
Chicken						
<u>Meleagris gallopavo</u>	168	15	8.7	768.21	8.7560	3.3
Turkey						

Table 4. Calvert House: Species List.

	Cnt	MNI		Wt, gm	Biomass	
		#	%		kg	%
cf. <u>Phasianus colchicus</u>	15	4	2.3	26.83	0.4074	0.2
possible Ring-necked pheasant						
cf. <u>Pavo real</u>	1	1	0.6	0.15	0.0036	tr
possible peafowl						
<u>Capella gallinago</u>	1	1	0.6	0.24	0.0056	tr
Common snipe						
<u>Turdus migratorius</u>	2	1	0.6	0.24	0.0056	tr
Robin						
<u>Chelydra serpentina</u>	2	1	0.6	7.77	0.1095	0.04
Snapping turtle						
Viperidae	1	1	0.6	0.41	0.0574	0.02
Poisonous snake						
UID Fish	741			69.94	1.0498	0.4
<u>Lepisosteus</u> spp.	1334	2	1.2	132.65	1.4455	0.5
Gar						
<u>Esox</u> spp.	25	8	4.7	2.29	0.0581	0.02
Pickeral						
<u>Opsanus</u> spp.	1	1	0.6	0.06	0.0033	tr
Toadfish						

Table 4. Calvert House: Species List.

	Cnt	MNI		Wt, gm	Biomass	
		#	%		kg	%
Siluriformes	9			0.95	0.0197	0.01
Catfishes						
<u>Ictalurus</u> spp.	12	3	1.7	4.35	0.0832	0.03
Bullhead catfish						
<u>Arius felis</u>	11	2	1.2	2.95	0.0558	0.02
Hardhead catfish						
<u>Bagre marinus</u>	2	2	1.2	0.91	0.0182	0.01
Gafftopsail catfish						
Percichthyidae	6	4	2.3	0.40	0.0129	tr
Temperate basses						
<u>Morone</u> spp.	87	16	9.3	18.03	0.3364	0.1
Temperate bass						
Centrarchidae	11	1	0.6	0.93	0.0164	0.01
Sunfishes						
<u>Perca flavescens</u>	9	3	1.7	0.90	0.0252	0.01
Yellow perch						
<u>Caranx</u> spp.	1	1	0.6	0.08	0.0042	tr
Jack						
<u>Lutjanus</u> spp.	11	2	1.2	1.14	0.0307	0.01
Snapper						

Table 4. Calvert House: Species List.

	Cnt	MNI		Wt, gm	Biomass	
		#	%		kg	%
Sparidae	3	1	0.6	0.92	0.0147	0.01
Porgies						
<u>Cynoscion</u> spp.	5	1	0.6	0.5	0.0233	0.01
Sea trout						
<u>Pogonias cromis</u>	2	1	0.6	13.86	0.2722	0.1
Black drum						
UID Bone	-----	---		195.64	-----	
TOTAL	12086	173		22535.42	265.2416	

Table 5. Calvert House: Summary.

	MNI		Biomass	
	#	%	kg	%
Domestic Mammal	20	11.6	121.7717	82.9
Domestic Bird	16	9.3	1.9975	1.4
Wild Mammal	9	5.2	0.9922	0.7
Wild Bird	43	24.9	15.0224	10.2
Turtle	1	0.6	0.1095	0.07
Fish	48	27.8	2.4001	1.6
Commensal Taxa	<u>36</u>	20.8	<u>4.66</u>	3.2
TOTALS	173		146.9534	

Table 6. Calvert House: Element Distribution.

	Artiodactyl	Pig	Deer	Cow	Caprine	Goat	Sheep
Head	2	25		60	4		1
Teeth	2	39		26	6		
Vertebrae	16	11		45	4		
Forequarters	13	13		47	14	1	3
Forefeet	1	6		2	4		3
Hindquarters	13	15	1	34	12	1	
Hindfeet	4	14		12	2		3
Feet	4	17		15	11		1
Ribs	31	3		19			
Sternum	2			1			
Hyoids	--	---	-	---	3	-	--
TOTALS	88	143	1	261	60	2	11

Table 7. Calvert House: Bone Modifications.

	Rodent	Cut	Burned	Calcined	Hacked	Dog	Sliced	Sawed
	Gnawed					Gnawed		
UID Mammal	65	21	127	93	7	2		1
UID Lg Mammal	3	59	39	25	41		5	
Rabbit	1							
Rat	2	3				1		
Dog				1				
Artiodactyl	6	7	3		4	3		2
Pig	3	5	1		3	1	2	1
Cow	3	23			33	1	13	4
Caprine	2	8		1	7		2	
Goat		1				1		
Sheep		1			1			
UID Bird	155	29	15	4		13		
Duck family	8	13				4		
Duck		9						
Scaup	5	4	1			1		
Canada goose	17	18	1	1		2		
Pheasant family	20	8				5		
Bobwhite		1						

Table 7. Calvert House: Bone Modifications.

	Rodent	Cut	Burned	Calcined	Hacked	Dog	Sliced	Sawed
	Gnawed					Gnawed		
Chicken	10	6				5		
Turkey	30	20				5		
cf. Peafowl		1						
cf. Pheasant	1	2						
UID Bone	1		16					
TOTALS	332	239	203	125	96	44	22	8

Table 8. Calvert House: Number of Bones from Each Age Group.

PIG	
Less than 2 years of age	10
At least 2 years of age	8
Less than 3 years of age	18
Three years of age or older	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	37
COW	
Less than 1.5 years of age	5
At least 1.5 years of age	18
Less than 3 years of age	10
3.5 years of age or older	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	37

Table 9. Comparison of the Percentage of Individuals from the Calvert House, Aiken-Rhett, and Urban Southern Coastal Plain Sites^a.

	Calvert	Aiken-Rhett	USCP
Domestic Mammals	11.6	43.1	28.9
Domestic Birds	9.3	12.3	19.7
Wild Mammals	5.2	7.7	8.1
Wild Birds	24.9	6.2	7.6
Turtles/Alligators	0.6	9.2	5.4
Fish	27.8	18.5	19.7
Commensal Taxa	20.8	3.1	10.6

^aCalvert data from this report; Aiken-Rhett data from Ruff 1986a; Urban Southern Coastal Plain from Reitz 1986b.

Table 10. Comparison of the Percentage of Individuals from
Planter, Slave/Transitional Contexts, Drax Hall, Jamaica^a.

	Planter	Slave/Trans	Total
Domestic Mammals	44.4	63.8	58.5
Domestic Birds	5.6	8.5	7.7
Wild Mammals			
Wild Birds	11.1	2.1	4.6
Sea turtles	11.1		3.1
Fish	27.8	17.0	20.0
Commensal Taxa		8.5	6.2

^a(Reitz 1986c)

Table 11. Comparison of the Percentage of Individuals from
Drax Hall with Rural Southern Coastal Plain Sites^a.

	Drax Hall	RSCP
Domestic Mammals	58.5	17.2
Domestic Birds	7.7	4.1
Wild Mammals		19.2
Wild Birds	4.6	3.0
Turtles/Alligators	3.1	13.7
Fish	20.0	38.4
Commensal Taxa	6.2	4.3

^aDrax Hall from Reitz 1986c; Rural Southern Coastal Plain from
Reitz 1986a.

Table 12. Comparison of the Percentage of Individuals from the Calvert House, Southern Coastal Plain, and Drax Hall^a.

	Calvert	SCP	Drax Hall
Domestic Mammals	11.6	21.5	58.9
Domestic Birds	9.3	9.8	8.2
Wild Mammals	5.2	15.2	
Wild Birds	24.9	4.7	4.1
Turtles/Alligators	0.6	10.7	2.7
Fish	27.8	31.5	20.6
Commensal Taxa	20.8	6.6	5.5

^aCalvert House data from this report; Southern Coastal Plain from Reitz 1986a; Drax Hall data from Reitz 1986c.