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U.S. Senator David Levy Yulee’s Margarita sugar plantation flourished from 1851 to 1864 in Homosassa, Citrus County, Florida. The plantation was abandoned in 1864 and memory of its precise location slowly faded, as the physical evidence of its existence deteriorated. Today, the only plantation structure known to be still standing is the sugar mill, preserved as part of the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park (CI124B). The remainder of the plantation, including its boundaries, remains unknown. Perhaps at least partly owing to this absence, the mill’s interpretive signage provides an unfortunate univocal historical interpretation of the site and lacking in both acknowledgement and understanding of the experiences of the enslaved laborers who lived at Margarita.

This thesis research uses archaeological reconnaissance survey and historical research in an attempt to locate the slave quarters in order to shed light on the power structures that existed between planter and enslaved laborer at Margarita. Shovel tests on state, county, and private land surrounding the mill identified two new archaeological sites, including possible remnants of an additional plantation structure, and ruled out for several locations as the site of the former slave quarters. Historical research uncovered additional information about the names of the enslaved laborers and provided more insight into their experiences on the plantation. This work culminates with suggestions for updated State Park interpretive signage, and suggestions for future work.
CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

Research Design

Since David Levy Yulee’s plantation home was burned by Union troops in 1864, the remains of his Margarita plantation in Homosassa, Citrus County, Florida have slowly faded both in memory and in physical appearance. Today, the only remaining physical evidence of its existence is its sugar mill (Figure 1.1), now a part of the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park (herein abbreviated as “State Park”). Although offering minimal interpretive signage, the State Park provides a univocal historical interpretation of the site, omitting the lives and experiences of enslaved laborers who once lived at Margarita from the plantation’s narrative.

Archaeological evidence for the slave quarters, and other plantation structures, can help shed light on the lives and experiences of enslaved laborers help to broaden the narrative on Margarita. In this thesis I use knowledge of the plantation landscape at Margarita to shed light on the presence and experiences of the enslaved laborers that lived and worked there as well as the power structures that both affected and were affected by their presence. While no concrete archaeological evidence for the slave quarters was uncovered during this research, a potential location for the slave quarters was identified and historical research provided new information about the enslaved laborers that lived at Margarita.
Organization of Thesis

In Chapter 2, I provide a brief background on David Levy Yulee and his Margarita Plantation. I also discuss the sugar mill’s ownership history, evolution of its interpretive signage, Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1. Location of the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park (CI124B). Base Map: United States Geological Survey [USGS], 7.5 Minute Map, Homosassa Quadrangle, 1954. This and subsequent maps by the author, except where noted.
and previous archaeological work on Yulee’s former land holdings. Chapter 3 gives a brief historical overview of plantation archaeology as well as other theoretical frameworks utilized in this project, as well as the larger significance this research poses.

In Chapter 4, I detail the methods used in selecting area for archaeological investigation in addition to explaining archaeological techniques utilized during shovel testing. Chapter 5 presents the findings of the project in two parts. First, I discuss the information uncovered during historical research, followed by the results of archaeological testing on state, private, and county property. Finally, Chapter 6 presents a summary of the project findings. It also discusses recommendations for park signage updates based on my findings, and offers suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

David Levy Yulee

Much has been written about David Levy Yulee’s participation in both the government and the railroad business (Adler 1973; Alderman 1946; Dunn 1995; Fichter 1991; Kavanaugh 1995; Stein 1973), but little about his time managing Margarita plantation in Homosassa, Florida. What little is written about his plantation activities is focused on Yulee himself, and does not expand upon the enslaved laborers that were a crucial part of the plantation’s success. Therefore, this review focuses on some of the lesser-studied aspects of his life including his early and family life, and later on his activities at Margarita Plantation.

David Levy was born on June 12, 1810 on St. Thomas, Virgin Islands to Moses Elias Levy and Hannah (Abendanone) Levy (Adler 1973:3-4; Alderman 1946:2; Dunn 1995:2; Matrana 2009:131; Nimnicht 1971:3). Of Sephardic Jewish descent, his grandfather, Jacob Attal, had held a distinguished court position in Morocco (Adler 1974) and was only given the name Yulee upon his death in 1790. Attal’s wife then referred back to her maiden name of Levy, which is how Moses Levy acquired that name. David Levy officially changed his name to “Yulee” in 1846 to – either to honor his grandfather (Adler 1973:39-40; Matrana 2009:132) or distance himself from “Levy,” which carried with it the problematic connotations of his family’s Jewish faith (Monaco 2005:164).
In 1819 Yulee was sent by his father to Virginia, where he attended school at Norfolk Academy (Alderman 1946:2; Dunn 1995:3; Fichter 1991:91; Matrana 2009:131; Nimnicht 1971). His father eventually established roots in the United States and began to set up plantations in Florida. Yulee ended up living on his father’s Micanopy plantation where he learned about plantation management (Adler 1973:9; Alderman 1946:2-3; Dunn 1995:3; Matrana 2009:131; Rerick 1902:213).

Unfortunately for Levy, Yulee was more interested in learning about the legal realm than about plantation dealings. This, along with his decision to distance himself from the Jewish faith and his views on slavery, pushed Levy to sever all ties with Yulee (Adler 1946:9-10; Monaco 2005:3,155). Yulee eventually went on to law school and began a political career – a position for which he is best known. In 1836, Yulee was elected to the Territorial Council of Florida (Adler 1973; Alderman 1946:3; Dunn 1995:4). Following this appointment he became a Florida delegate to the U.S. Congress in 1841 (Dunn 1995:4; Fichter 1991:91) and from 1845-1851 he became a Senator for the state of Florida (Dunn 1995:4; Fichter 1991:91). Following this term, Yulee went to Florida where he saw to his three plantations and also began dabbling in railroad activities.

In April 1846 Yulee was married in Wickland, Kentucky (Adler 1973:39). His wife, Nannie C. Wickliffe, was daughter of the Honorable Chase A. Wickliffe, a former governor of Kentucky (Monaco 2005:163-164). Through church records from Washington, D.C. it’s known that David and Nannie had four children; Florida, Margaret, David, and Nancy (Potton 1972). Initially, his wife and children lived at a “medium-sized, plain frame house,” on his Fernandina plantation in the north of Florida (Reid 1866). Yulee had inherited a significant amount of land in Eastern Florida following his father’s death, and it was there that he established both his
Fernandina and Cottonwood plantations. He then returned to the Senate from 1855-1861, splitting his time between residences in Washington, D.C. and Florida (Adler 1973). He even attempted to promote the sugar cane industry and his plantations during some of his trips north, going so far as to bring stalks of sugar cane with him to the Senate (Alderman 1946).

Due to his political affiliations and associated polarizing viewpoints about several hot topics of the time, Yulee was arrested in the late 1860s, charged with treason, and imprisoned in Fort Pulaski (Reid 1866; Yulee 1909:12). Eventually he was released following the recommendation of the famed General Ulysses S. Grant (Matrana 2009). Upon his release, Yulee returned to Fernandina and focused on restoring the Florida railroad system (Alderman 1946; Matrana 2009; Yulee 1909:13). After returning to Washington, D.C. with his wife in 1881, Yulee died on October 12, 1886 at the age of 77 and was buried at Oak Hill Cemetery (Matrana 2009; Potton 1972).

**Sugar Plantations in Florida**

The sugar industry in Florida was influenced by the sugar industry in both the lower southern states (Georgia and South Carolina) and the Caribbean (Wayne 20045:42). According to Wayne (2014:3) sugar production in Florida can be grouped in two distinct eras. The first spanned from the late 18th century until around 1835 and was mainly concentrated in what is today Volusia County, on the eastern coast of the state (Wayne 2014:3). At least 22 plantations have been documented at this time (Wayne 2014:3). Unfortunately, attacks during the Seminole Wars in early 1836 destroyed most of these plantations, and the industry on this coast never recovered (Griffin 2003:172; Wayne 2014:3).
Later, between 1842 and 1861, additional plantations were developed both in central Florida and “along the lower Florida Gulf Coast” (Wayne 2014:3). Yulee’s Margarita plantation falls within this second phase of plantations, having been erected in central Florida sometime in the late 1840s.

As in the case with Margarita, which I describe in detail in the next section of this chapter, the sugar works are the only standing remains at many of these plantations. Little is known about the planter homes and slave cabins that would have existed on these plantations (Wayne 2014:11). What is known about them results from a combination of archaeology and historical records. A common theme for these plantations was for the planter’s residence to be located away from the fields and near water access, and for the slave quarters to be located further inland (Griffin 2003:173). While every plantation varied in layout, slave quarters on Florida plantations seem to have been in three general arrangements: in a semicircle, in two rows with a path in between, or in one continuous row (Griffin 2003:174).

According to census records, there were 15,501 enslaved laborers in Florida in 1830 (U.S Census Bureau 2006). By 1845, around the time when Yulee was beginning to establish Margarita, that number had increased to 33,950 (Williams 1949:106). This number continued to increase over the years – reaching 61,750 enslaved laborers in 1860 (Hergesheimer 1861; U.S. Census Bureau 2006), or 43.9% of the state’s total population. In the same year, the population of Hernando County (where Margarita was located) was 1,200 (Florida Center for Instructional Technology 2005). Hergesheimer (1861) lists the enslaved population in Hernando county to be 16.6 percent of the population, which means there would have been around 200 enslaved laborers in Hernando in 1860.
The majority of what is known about Florida sugar plantations is based on substantive research that has been done on the eastern plantations (Griffin 2003; Wayne 2014). Even less has been explored about the experiences of the enslaved laborers who lived there, due in part to limited historical accounts. Rivers (2000:127) counts only 35 “testimonies” about the nature of enslaved life in the state. Therefore, information on the treatment of enslaved laborers, and how labor was organized is quite limited.

Florida’s slave code, like many of the slave codes in other southern states, aimed to restrict enslaved laborers’ movements both on and off the plantation, as well as limit their communication with one another (Thompson 1993:325). In the early 1800s there were laws prohibiting slaveholders from teaching their enslaved laborers to read or write, laws requiring enslaved laborers to get permission to leave plantation property, and laws preventing them from meeting in groups of more than seven “without a white chaperon [sic] in attendance” (Thompson 1993:325). In terms of physical treatment, it was legal to brand, mutilate, or even kill an enslaved laborer depending on what crime they committed (Thompson 1993:326). By the time of statehood in 1845 a revised code went into effect (Thompson 1993:326). While many of the original laws remained, new laws were included to protect enslaved laborers from “arbitrary or excessive punishment” (Thompson 1993:326). Regardless of these laws, most of the conditions in which enslaved laborers lived were decided by the planters who owned them. As enslaved laborers were “the single largest investment of slaveholders in Florida” (Rivers 2000:127) it was to the slaveholders’ best interest to at least provide the basic necessities needed for their enslaved laborers to be able to work on the plantation.

Enslaved laborers fished, hunted wild game, and would often have their own gardens to supplement the food they received from the planters (Rivers 2000:129-131). While access to
food doesn’t seem to have been an issue based on accounts of both planters and enslaved laborers, housing was a different situation. In the early 1800s, the standard for quarters was a wooden, one-room domicile that often leaked and let in a variety of pests and bad weather (Rivers 2000:134).

By the mid-1800s, an improvement period occurred in plantation housing and many of the quarters were replaced by updated and better built structures (Rivers 2000:134). However, this improvement wasn’t due to the kindness of planters. Their motivations were self-serving, as improved housing would reduce sickness “associated with poor housing and hygiene” (Rivers 2000:134) resulting in a reduction in labor loss. As Wayne (2004:44) writes “without the slave labor force, the economics of sugar production were not viable in Florida.”

While the above has been an attempt to characterize the basic experience of enslaved laborers on Florida sugar plantations, it is not necessarily an accurate portrayal of what those at Margarita would have experienced. As only one brief testimony by an enslaved laborer at Margarita is known (Zander 2011), it is difficult to confirm or reject the idea that those at Margarita had the same experiences mentioned above.

**Margarita Plantation**

Sources are not too clear on when Yulee arrived in Homosassa. Hillyard mentions that it was sometime “shortly after the Seminole War ended,” which would place Yulee in Homosassa around 1842 (1887:218). An exploration into the State of Florida Land Records shows that Yulee purchased a small piece of land in the area in April of 1843, and continued to acquire more and more land up until July of 1863 (State of Florida Land Records 1843; 1844; 1845a; 1845b; 1846a; 1846b; 1846c; 1846d; 1851; 1854; 1858a; 1858b; 1863). The exact date that the
planted her operations is unknown, but many sources seem to agree that the plantation was “productive” by 1851 (Nimnicht 1971:3).

Yulee named his plantation “Margarita,” which translates to “daisy” in Spanish, supposedly as a loving tribute to his beautiful wife Nannie. It is important to mention here that “margarita” was mistranslated in multiple sources as meaning “pearl,” and multiple records attribute the name selection as a reference to Nannie’s unofficial title as “the pearl of Homosassa” (Nimnicht 1971:2).

Yulee built his plantation home, which has been described as “commodious,” “luxurious,” and “romantic,” on Tiger Tail (formerly Lithloe) Island, on the Homosassa River (Alderman 1946:96; Clay-Copton and Sterling 1905:54; Hillyard 1887:218; Norton 1890:121). The home was furnished with lavish items purchased by Nannie Yulee at the estate auction of the Stockton Mansion (the home of a prominent socialite) in Washington, D.C. (Matrana 2009:132; Tampa Tribune-Times [TTT] 1955). The rest of the plantation was most likely located on the mainland several miles away, due to its size, and the best estimate comes from a description by Yulee’s son that notes it was “three miles distant” from the plantation home (Yulee 1909:6).

The actual size of the plantation is described in varied terms in historical records. Many sources cite 5,000 or 5,100 acres (Hillyard 1887:218; Matrana 2009; Nimnicht 1971) but some specify he only grew crops on one hundred of those acres (Citrus County Chronicle [CCC], 2 November 1950). An analysis of historic land records (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management [USDI, BLM] 2017) and the personal writings of David Yulee reveal more detailed information on Yulee’s land holdings in Homosassa. Between 1840 and 1865 under the names of David Yulee, Nannie Yulee (his wife), and both William Cooley and John Parsons (his business partners, to whom he entrusted his affairs when out of state), a total of 26 distinct parcel sales.
were identified. 15 of these belonged to David Yulee, seven belonged to William Cooley, two to John Parsons, and two were registered in the name of both Nannie Yulee and John Parsons. A list of these holdings can be found below in Table 2.1.

Figure 2.1. Parcels owned by David Yulee or associates between 1840 and 1865. Base Map: Citrus County Property Appraiser.
Table 2.1: Historic Land Records pertaining to David. L. Yulee (USDI, BLM 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Certificate #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>E/SE</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>SW/SW</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NW/NW</td>
<td>4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SW/SW</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. L. Yulee</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cooley</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N/W</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cooley</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>E/NW</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cooley</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NE/NW</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cooley</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NW/NW</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cooley</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SW/NW</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cooley</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. Yulee &amp; John Parsons</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SW &amp; W of SE/NE of SE</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. Yulee &amp; John Parsons</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NW/SE</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Parsons</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19S</td>
<td>17E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/SE</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A designation of UK indicates information is unknown*
Visualized against a map of modern day Homosassa, Yulee’s holdings can be seen in Figure 2.1 above. Whatever its true size, the plantation was quite productive and successful; one estimate claims an acre of his land could produce 2,750 pounds of sugar (Hillyard 1887:218). In 1851, with the help of millwright Joseph Hale and 69 enslaved laborers (Matrana 2009:132), Yulee erected “the finest sugar mill in the state,” with supplies from the Stillman, Allen & Co, Novelty Iron Works, New York (Griffin 1952:2; Hillyard 1887:218; Nimnicht 1971:2). This allowed the plantation to begin producing many different sugar products, which were then supplied to local merchants and Confederate troops (Nimnicht 1971).

In terms of layout, several different building types have been described as existing within the plantation landscape. Those include storehouses, shops, a sugar-house, a church, and slave quarters (Hillyard 1887:218; Norton 1890). Descriptions that provide a fuller picture of the plantation are few and far between. In an unpublished manuscript from Yulee’s daughter Mary, slave quarters are described as being arranged in neat rows, white-washed, and as having small picket-fence enclosed gardens (Citrus County Archives [CCA], Citrus County Historical Notes [CCHN], unpublished manuscript of Mary Yulee, Yulee Family Binders, Inverness, Florida). She adds that at a small church existed and that separate services were held there for both Yulee’s family and the families of the enslaved (CCA, CCHN, unpublished manuscript of Mary Yulee, Yulee Family Binders, Inverness, Florida). She also mentions the existence of a superintendent’s house, overseer residence, a blacksmith’s workshop, a worn-out pathway through the brush on which the enslaved laborers would bring laundry to the river and fish, as well as a clearing in which herdsmen watched over a variety of stock animals (CCA, CCHN, unpublished manuscript of Mary Yulee, Yulee Family Binders, Inverness, Florida).
The number of enslaved laborers that lived and worked at Margarita as well as where they came from are contested (Adler 1973:104). An 1850 slave schedule from Benton County listed Yulee as owning 14 enslaved laborers (United States of America, Bureau of the Census, 1850). However, this number seems small based on the size of the plantation, and it is likely he had many more enslaved laborers on the plantation. Other sources aren’t clear on the number, citing larger numbers associated with significant construction events, while the day-to-day operations of the plantation required a smaller number of enslaved laborers. For example, Adler notes that the initial construction of the plantation and plantation home required the labor of “more than 100 slaves” (1973:104). However, when speaking of the sugar production of the plantation, he notes that labor force consisted of “80 slaves” (Adler 1973:104). Yulee’s son wrote that some of the enslaved came to the plantation as part of Nannie Yulee’s dowry (Yulee 1909:5). This may be true, but at least some of the enslaved laborers came from Georgia and Jacksonville, Florida as shown in census records for one of the families that were enslaved at the plantation (State of Florida, 1885; United States of America, Bureau of the Census, 1850, 1860).

While there are few sources that detail the number of enslaved laborers that Yulee kept, there are even fewer sources that detail his demeanor as a slave owner. As Homosassa was in its infancy during the time when Margarita was in operation, few lived in the area besides those on the plantation and Yulee and his family were often alone with the enslaved. His son wrote that that only “an overseer, a German gardner [sic], and a Scotch accountant, were the only other whites within twenty miles,” (1909:5). He also wrote that Yulee was sympathetic towards his slaves and would never split up a family if he was buying or selling enslaved laborers (Yulee 1909:5). While this is possible, it is more likely that Yulee’s son painted an idealized portrait of his father, and this account should be taken with a grain of salt.
In contrast to these anecdotes of Yulee as a trusting and caring slave owner, an interview with one of Yulee’s former slaves, and historical records of Yulee’s siding with pro-slavery political platforms paint another picture. In 1939 interview, Dollie Nattiel, a former enslaved laborer who spent her childhood years at Margarita before moving to Yulee’s Cottonwood plantation, revealed that Yulee was “strict” with both his slaves and the overseer at Margarita (Zander 2011). She also remembers Yulee required that the enslaved “keep themselves clean and looking well and also their quarters looking nice” (Zander 2011).

However, Yulee’s stance on slavery during his time in politics probably best informs his demeanor as a slave owner himself. During his tenure as representative to Florida, he repeatedly pushed the idea that newly acquired territories should allow slavery (Alder 1974:53; Alderman 1946:34-35). And, as Yulee’s time in the political sphere lengthened, his convictions about slavery only grew stronger. Yulee believed that slave owners should be protected regardless of the territory they lived in, and that if the United States acquired territory where slavery was outlawed, that rule should be nullified (Alderman 1946:40-41).

The core of Yulee’s belief on slavery had to do with the notion that enslaved laborers were the “property” of their owners, and thus the abolition of slavery was essentially an attempt by the government of taking away a citizen’s property (Alderman 1946:45). Given that Yulee considered enslaved laborers to be property, I find it highly unlikely that he treated them with the trust and respect credited to him by his son (Yulee 1909).

Destruction of the Yulee’s Plantation Residence, and Plantation Demise

A federal blockade demolished Yulee’s residence by fire on May 28, 1864 (Nimnicht 1971:3) and a nearby warehouse was said to have burned on what was known as Chafie Landing
Fortunately, the thick tree line shielded the sugar mill and slave quarters from the view of the blockade, and they were spared destruction (Hillyard 1887:218). The enslaved laborers were said to have fled in fear, leaving everything behind, although a few are reported to have gone back briefly to the demolished home the following day to retrieve valuable items (Yulee 1909:6). Sources are unclear about what happened to the enslaved laborers that were a part of Margarita, although Yulee’s son writes that they were purchased by a nearby cotton plantation owner in Archer, Florida (Yulee 1909:7). While no evidence has been found proving this theory, it is also possible they simply relocated to his Cottonwood plantation, which was still in operation at the time.

Following the destruction of Yulee’s plantation home on Tiger Tail Island and the abandonment of the remainder of Margarita by the enslaved laborers, what plantation structures existed succumbed to the elements and began to fall apart. The associated sugar-house is said to have been burned in 1869 by the “carelessness of cattlemen,” although this is not mentioned elsewhere in the record (Norton 1890).

As of 1887, when Hillyard wrote *The New South*, some of the slave quarters still stood “with huge stone chimneys and open fireplaces, beneath outspreading live oaks and palmetto and date palms” (218). Additional mention of their survival is provided in 1890 where, they are noted as “in good preservation,” and “always on object of curiosity” to visitors (Norton 1890). There also remained an “ivy mantled chimney” further on, the only standing evidence of the church that once existed there (Hillyard 1887:218-219; Norton 1890).
Sugar Mill Ownership & Interpretive Signage

Following Yulee’s death in 1886, his children sold his Homosassa land (History of Homosassa, FDEP, Bureau of Natural and Cultural Resources [BNCR], Division of Recreation and Parks [DRP], Archives, Yulee: History Pre-park History, David Yulee and Early Settlement, Tallahassee, Florida). Eventually, the mill came under private ownership by a Mr. Claude Root who eventually sold it to the Citrus County Federation of Women’s Clubs in 1923 (CCC, 2 November 1950; Denson et al 1997:11). The Federation conducted some restorative work on the site and erected a plaque on October 26, 1950 commemorating Yulee (CCC, 2 November 1950).

Shortly thereafter, in 1952, John W. Griffin produced a report on the sugar mill site and submitted it to the Florida Board of Parks and Historical Memorials, suggesting that the site qualified as a State monument under Criterion B (National Park Service 2017) due to its association with Yulee, who is considered a prominent figure in Florida’s history. While there is no mention of the site’s association with enslaved laborers, this is not unusual for the time, as the value of preserving the heritage or enslaved laborers would not be realized for many more years. Following the community’s agreement that the site should be made a monument, the Citrus County Federation of Women’s Clubs transferred ownership of the sugar mill site to the state of Florida in 1953 so that it could become a “public park” (Denson et al 1997).

Sometime between the creation of the State Park in 1955 and September of 1966, where an interpretive sign can be seen in a photo for a local newspaper column, the first set of interpretive signage was installed (Orlando Sentinel, 18 September 1966). Lacking illustration, each sign contained one or two sentences of basic information on major mill components (FDEP, BNCR, DRP, Archives, Yulee: Copy of Interpretive Signs, Tallahassee, Florida).
In 1970, a petition began to realign the road at the site. State Road 490’s extremely close proximity (less than 5 feet) from the sugar mill caused concern for building integrity, and it was suggested that the road be re-built several hundred yards away to give the building a wider berth (Bradley 1970). Unfortunately, the petition never gained much traction and the road remained in its original location, where it still sits today. Despite this setback, the site was nominated and subsequently admitted to the National Register of Historic Places NHRP in 1971, being subsequently renamed the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park.

Updated signage was installed in 1979, with more detailed illustrations accompanying the larger signs, and in 1984, plans were developed to update and improve the State Park site. Suggestions included establishing an interpretive center, adding an additional recreation pavilion, moving the parking lot, and including a self-guided nature trail (State of Florida, Department of Natural Resources [DNR] 1984). Numerous drawings and discussions of the proposed expansion and improvement are documented, but due to funding issues the plans fell through.

A decade later, in 1989, the State assessed the signs and determined that they needed replacement because they looked worn out (Memo 17 August 1989, FDEP, BNCR, DEP, Archives, Renovation of Park Signs, Tallahassee, Florida). On the physical assessment, when asked if the exhibit interpretation needed updating, the assessor indicated that “no, the interpretive contents of the signs” was “alright” (Memo 17 August 1989, FDEP, BNCR, DEP, Archives, Renovation of Park Signs, Tallahassee, Florida). Because this update did not require editing the interpretive text, reprints of the 1979 signs were issued, and more secure casing was provided for each.

Since there have been no further updates, the signage displayed at the park today contains the original text and illustrations from 1979, and they are displayed in the new cases from the
1990 renovation. As designed in 1979, there are seven large signs with text and illustrations, and eight small signs with text only. Prior to the renovation in 1990, two of the smaller signs were missing (Memo 17 August 1989, FDEP, BNCR, DEP, Archives, Renovation of Park Signs, Tallahassee, Florida). Today, three of the smaller signs are missing and one of the larger signs, entitled “Cutting and Gathering Cane” is also missing. Photos and descriptions of the current interpretive signage can be found in Appendix A.

**Plantation-Related Archaeological Work**

Archaeological investigations of the area that encompassed the plantation are few. Two archaeological evaluations of Tiger Tail Island have been done – one in 1975 by Ray Williams of the University of South Florida (USF) Anthropology Department, and one in 1993 by Gary Ellis (then of Ellis Archaeology, now of the Gulf Archaeology Research Institute [GARI]). Both were of prehistoric shell middens, and did not explore remnants of the plantation house (Williams 1975; Ellis 1993). A general survey of historic structures in Citrus County was carried out in 1987 by Laurie Murray. The survey mostly identified structures from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and did not identify anything from the timeframe during which the plantation was active (Murray 1987). Ellis also conducted an additional excavation in 1995 of Homosassa Station, a few hundred yards to the west of the sugar mill site, which uncovered evidence of a nineteenth- or twentieth-century logging site (Ellis 1995).

The most extensive archaeological investigation of the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins was conducted by GARI in 1997. Excavation was limited to remains of the sugar mill and there “was not sufficient funds or time to investigate properly the extent of the plantation and its related features” (Denson et al 1997:23). However, as part of this survey, local community members
were interviewed and questioned about their knowledge of the site, and a massive list of historic documents was compiled; this information could prove useful to anyone who wishes to research the site and plantation in the future.

Additionally, in 2006, restorative work was done on the mill and the structure was stabilized (Matrana 2009). A 2008 Cultural Assessment Survey of the State Park lists a future goal as “Improve the interpretation of cultural resources at the park, especially through the modernization of interpretive displays to reflect current knowledge of the site” (State of Florida, DEP 2008). Apart from these developments, no new work or excavations have commenced at the State Park.
CHAPTER 3:
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Plantation Archaeology

It is important to note that a plethora of archaeological work exists on the lives of enslaved laborers, plantation layout, and power structures unique to Caribbean plantations. Because I am focusing on the Southeast U.S., I have purposely omitted these studies in an attempt to focus on trends in the U.S.

Plantation archaeology came about in the late 1960s to mid-1970s with landmark excavations by Charles Fairbanks, Robert Ascher, and John Solomon Otto. In his manuscript *Uncommon Ground*, archaeologist Leland Ferguson, who himself has conducted a wide variety of plantation archaeology, suggested that the sub-discipline came about as a direct response to the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s (Ferguson 1992:xxxv). Fairbanks’s work at Kingsley Plantation (Florida), Ascher’s work at Rayfield Plantation (Georgia) and Otto’s work at Cannon’s Point (Georgia) were some of the first attempts by archaeologists to look specifically at how enslaved laborers in the Old South lived (Otto 1979; Fairbanks 1974; Ferguson 1992).

Historically, what little was known about the lives of enslaved laborers came from descriptions written by (white) planters and only reflected small portions of the larger story (Ascher and Fairbanks 1971; Otto 1979; Otto and Burns 1983). When the stories of enslaved laborers were collected, like those collected through the Works Progress Administration (WPA),
their recollections were often “marred by lapses of memory, colored by postbellum experiences, or misinterpreted by white interviewers” (Otto 1979:16).

Realizing that written accounts about the lives of enslaved laborers were often inaccurate, early investigations utilized archaeology as a tool to uncover information that could not necessarily be gained from these historical accounts. Ascher and Fairbanks’s (1971:12) work at Cannon’s Point looked at the artifacts found in the kitchens of enslaved laborers to shed more light on the day to day activities of enslaved laborers. Handler and Lange (1979:48-50) looked at the grave goods buried with enslaved laborers and found evidence of a trade and barter system as well as evidence that they were crafting items in the West African tradition. Thus, examining aspects such as building structures, refuse piles (middens), and other material remains allows archaeologists to directly compare enslaved laborer, overseer, and planter lifestyles. Through these excavations, new details of the lives of the enslaved began to emerge; work schedules, supplemental dietary strategies, health, trade, and much more (Ascher and Fairbanks 1971; Fairbanks 1974, 1984; Otto 1979; Otto and Burns 1983). Most importantly, the lives and voices of enslaved laborers are at last being brought to light, after so many years of being under- and miss-represented in written accounts.

Following the pioneering work of Ascher and Fairbanks, Otto, and Handler and Lange, an increasing number of archaeological investigations were conducted to uncover the many different aspects of the lives of the enslaved. Some archaeologists became interested in the material distinctions between planter, overseer, and enslaved laborer. Otto and Burns (1983:188) looked at the differences of black enslaved laborers and white overseers, Fairbanks (1984:4-5) looked at the material distinctions between classes at Cannons Point and helped shed light on
plantation management patterns through the different ways in which planters were able to provide food and shelter for their enslaved laborers.

Singleton added a great breadth of knowledge to this new pursuit, focusing on the household and settlement archaeology of the enslaved (1985; 1990). In what is perhaps her most influential work, *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*, she offers a plethora of case studies illustrating the way different pieces of archaeological evidence can inform about crucial aspects of the lives of enslaved laborers (1985).

In the late 1980s archaeologists began moving away from “the enslaved” as a cohesive group with shared characteristics who were easily identified through ceramic deposits. Instead, archaeologists began to realize the multiple social dynamics present within the enslaved population and began considering deeper, more complex questions. Studies began to focus on evidence of slave resistance, slave material traditions such as colonoware (Babson 1987; Ferguson 1992), African cultural traditions, maroon communities, the list goes on. Finally, the subdiscipline’s focus had shifted away from the white male-dominated narrative in favor of focusing on the diverse lives and experiences of those who lived on the plantations as enslaved laborers.

Some archaeologists, however, were highly critical of sole reliance on material culture in understanding the lives of the enslaved. Potter (1991:98) pointed to the heavy reliance on functionalism and the use of plantation material culture (especially ceramic) to represent people when trying to understand relationships between different social groups on the plantation. Potter argued that plantation archaeologists needed to step back from their sole focus on these materials because “slavery is a more significant social fact here than the possession of pearlware or porcelain” (Potter 1991:98).
Potter and other archaeologists began to suggest alternative and complementary methods of research that would augment the archaeological record and allow for a more balanced and well-rounded view of enslaved life. They began vocalizing the need to use historical and ethnohistorical data as well as information from oral traditions and folklore to complement the archaeological record (Potter 1991; Samford 1996; Singleton 1991). From these records, a more holistic view of enslaved experiences began to form.

Singleton (1991:142) joined in this critique, suggesting the need to look beyond the material record by mentioning that “…aspects of slave life [were] largely influenced…by external forces, especially social controls inherent within slave society.” She advocated for using a wide variety of evidence – zooarchaeological, material, ethnographical, architectural – to form a better picture of the lives and social relations of the enslaved (Singleton 1991). Joseph (1993:57) published a similar critique of plantation archaeology, specifically calling out the need to look at “the social… relations [that] occurred symbolically…as evidenced by settlement systems, architecture, and material remains.” Scholars argued for a more nuanced investigation of the plantation landscape – especially the way the main house, slave quarters, and other structures were situated in relation to one another - as a projection of the social ideologies and social dominance of the planter, in order to better understand the live of enslaved laborers (Joseph 1993:59; Vlach 1993:8).

In 2004, Wilkie (2004:111) discussed what she saw as themes for the next decade in African American archaeology. In her overview, she included a call for “incorporating landscape studies more extensively into the way we construct interpretations of past social relations.” However, she warned archaeologists studying the spatial arrangement of the plantation landscape
to acknowledge that enslaved individuals’ perception of space was gained not only as “reactions to imposed geographies,” but also through their own creative acts (Wilkie 2004:111).

*Landscape Archaeology*

Many scholars have touted the importance landscape and space play in understanding symbolic, ideological, and practical aspects of past lives (Heath and Bennett 2000; Joseph 1991; Vlach 1993; Wilkie 2004). Specifically, they argue that “space serves to define class, religious beliefs, personal and group identity, and the relationships among different communities and individuals” (Heath and Bennett 2000:45). In agreement with this sentiment, many archaeologists began using a landscape framework to understand some of the social relations present on plantations that were not necessarily clear through the material record alone (Anschuetz et al 2001:162).

There are many definitions of ‘landscape’ depending on the discipline or the professional writing about it (Anschuetz et al 2001; Branton 2011; Spencer-Wood and Baugher 2010). This research explores the ‘cultural landscape’ of Margarita Plantation. I prefer to adhere to Suzanna Spencer-Wood and Sherene Baugher’s holistic definition of cultural landscape, which incorporates both visible and invisible aspects of landscape. The authors write that cultural landscapes are those which are “permanently altered by human activity…[and] range on a continuum of increasing scale from gardens, house yards, and farms to villages, planned utopian communities, towns, cities, and regions…[and] can also include built environments that involve construction on and/or beneath the visible surface of the land, such as structures, roads, bridges, tunnels, dams, water lines, and sewer systems” (2010:464).
It is, however, important to expand the above definition to include places and structures both in and around the plantation as part of its cultural landscape. For this, I agree with Laurie Wilkie when she writes “while houses may serve as the most visible evidence of the enslaved people’s living spaces…house yards, work areas, the planter’s residence and kitchen, and the spaces between the areas were all part of the continuous landscape across which African Americans moved” (Wilkie 2004:111). She stresses an often-overlooked aspect of plantation social life, the ‘spaces between,’ which speak volumes about enslaved people’s lives and social ideologies. Singleton concurs with Wilkie’s sentiments, writing “buildings, yards, streets, fields, and alleyways are all elements that make up the built landscape of slavery” (2014:93).

Adding my own views to the above three definitions, I would argue that the cultural landscape of a plantation should also include spaces and places outside the physical bounds of the plantation, such as churches, markets, walking paths, etc., that would have been of great importance to both the enslaved and the planter class. Especially in the case of Margarita, this would include walking paths to the river, grazing pastures for livestock, and a nearby church where weekly services were held; all of which are mentioned in the historic record as being landscapes in which the enslaved interacted (CCA, Inverness, Florida, Undated Personal Writings of James Edwards, Yulee Family Binders:Volume II).

Going a bit further, I also see plantations as examples of a “powered cultural landscape,” defined by Spencer-Wood and Baugher (2010:464) as a space where “power relations…are expressed through human alterations to land.” Battle-Baptiste (2011:106) relates this power in landscape more directly to the plantation setting, writing “the plantation landscape became a physical space where resistance and autonomy were practiced daily” and that “the lives of captive people can be seen directly in their relationship to their homespaces and the larger
planted landscape.” This notion drives my research, in that it challenges me to look at the land alterations and spatial layout of the plantation to understand the underlying power structures that were in play, and how those both affected and were affected by the enslaved. There has been a tendency to use landscape to understand one side of the power relations at play; that is, how the enslaved reacted to the white, planter ideology asserted through the spatial layout of the plantation (Wilkie 2004:110; Vlach 1993:8). However, it is extremely important to also consider how the enslaved exerted their own power and social ideologies through the landscape. It was not a one-way street; social ideologies played back and forth, and we need to explore all aspects of them in order to combat one-sided views of history and to understand the way that the enslaved reinterpreted these plantation spaces (Bates 2016:80; Singleton 2014:111; Wilkie 2004:112).

Scholars have pointed to the spatial layout of plantations as indicators of the power that coursed through these cultural landscapes. Burroughs (2013:114-116) notes that planters “likened the living spaces of laborers to those parts of the human body that are necessary to the functioning of the organism but kept hidden from the view of outsiders.” Thus, at most plantations, slave dwellings were located behind the great house or were shielded by foliage so that they could be out of sight (and out of mind). Additionally, building facades were intentionally created in different styles, as a way to distinguish between the occupants of each dwelling, and hidden passage ways were created to shield domestic slaves from the view of the planter and his family (Singleton 2014:100).

While plantation layouts certainly changed over time, during the nineteenth century many plantations in the United States had similar layouts: the great house or overseer house was centrally located near service buildings, and square or rectangular patterned slave quarters were
There have been several different styles of plantation layout and associated power ideologies researched and presented, one of which is the “panoptic” plantation (Singleton 2014). As Singleton (2014:102) writes, “the goal of the panopticon is to force the occupant to internalize and exercise the disciplinary regime of the institution on his or her own through constant threat of being watched.” Because Yulee’s plantation home was situated on Tiger Tail Island which was “three miles distant” (Yulee 1909:6) from the plantation, and because he was often away in Washington, D.C. for political business, he would have need some system in place to ensure the plantation’s enslaved laborers were watched. There is evidence from several sources that the enslaved quarters were closer to the sugar mill than the great house (CCA, Inverness, Florida, Undated Personal Writings of James Edwards, Yulee Family Binders:Volume II; Denson 1997; Hillyard 1887). There is mention of a superintendent named James Edwards (Denson et al 1997) who kept an eye on the enslaved laborers, and more than one mention of an overseer is made in the literature on Margarita (CCA, Inverness, Florida, Undated Personal Writings of James Edwards, Yulee Family Binders:Volume II; Hillyard 1887). Therefore, it is certainly possible that Yulee utilized the panopticon model at Margarita.

While some plantation archaeologists feel that plantation layouts were variable depending on crop type, location, and size (Samford 1996), others, like Joseph (1993), feel there is enough evidence to make generalizations about what we can expect to find, based on previous research. According to Joseph, slave settlements in the Low Country on plantations with “more than 60 to 70 slaves” usually consisted of more than ten houses and are most often found near the fields where the enslaved laborers would have worked (Joseph 1993:68). Additionally, he notes that settlements were “organized as ‘streets’” (Joseph 1993:68) which made supervision easy. It is my goal to combine the understanding of spatial arrangement at Margarita with the material
record to paint a clearer picture of the true power structure and planter-enslaved relationship that was occurring at the site.

I focus on the material record to complement the spatial arrangements that I find, both in historical documents, and those found archaeologically; specifically, those in relation to enslaved dwellings. Historically, slave quarters were “old one-room log cabins…[which] had just the bare ground for a floor” (Vlach 1995:118). Over time, planters realized that by improving the housing conditions for their enslaved laborers, they may be able to coerce them into forgoing rebellion and resistance (Vlach 1995). Additionally, it was thought that happier, healthier slaves would lead to their increased value, should the planter decide to sell them (Vlach 1995:126). Vlach (1995:120) notes a trend in southern plantations during the first sixty years of the nineteenth century (the time when Margarita was active) where plantation owners attempted to improve living conditions for the enslaved by adding glass windows, chimneys, and plank walls. Finding evidence of slave quarters can determine whether this “improved” dwelling type is present, and can shed light on how Yulee did or did not attempt to “coerce” his enslaved laborers through these improvements, as his fellow southern planters did.

From the few surviving accounts of slave dwellings at Margarita, it would initially seem that they would fall into the “improved” category. One account notes “huge stone chimneys, and open fireplaces, beneath outspreading live oaks and palmetto and date palms” (Hillyard 1887:219-220). Another account describes that a cabin that was “whitewashed regularly, as was the neat picket fence that enclosed it” and that cabins had “wide brick chimneys for cooking and heat,” (CCA, Inverness, Florida, Undated Personal Writings of James Edwards, Yulee Family Binders:Volume II). However, as mentioned previously, only so much faith should be put in the written records of (white) planters, and I am skeptical that this description was accurate. It has
been noted that studying dwellings of the enslaved is of great importance as it can illustrate “black agency including creative adaptations of language, religion and music, as well as numerous forms of resistance and rebellion” (Small 2013:417). Additionally, understanding facets of slave quarters within the larger context of a plantation’s landscape allows archaeologists to look at differences in “class, race and gender aspects of southern history,” as well as understand the inequalities and access (or restrictions) to resources experienced by the enslaved (Small 2013:417).

**Research Significance**

It is also important to further explain the purpose of my archaeological inquiry. From a tourism standpoint, since the sugar mill still stands today and draws in an estimated 35,000 visitors annually, some could argue that additional information regarding the plantation is not necessary to draw additional visitors, as it is quite “popular” already (Denson et al. 1997). However, as previously mentioned, current interpretive signage at the site fails to include any narrative regarding the role of enslaved laborers in both the creation and success of the plantation. I would argue that this is not a singular incident of lapsed judgement or an oversight by park staff; it is part of a larger problem in which tourism actively silences “problematic” voices of the past (Jackson 2011).

As noted by Paul Shackel (2001:656), “people experience and remember to forget collectively…[this] collective memory becomes public when a group has the resources and power to promote a particular past.” While slavery is something that is certainly well-documented and written about, communities that were once associated with slave-holding practices and plantations often wish to erase this piece of this history from memory. One way to
do this – either consciously or unconsciously – is to leave mention of slavery out of public interpretations of the past. Thus, interpretive signs at Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park do not mention the many enslaved laborers that helped erect the site and made it a resounding success.

Masking group history is well documented throughout the world, with many regional case studies having been written in detail (Shackel 2001:656). Specifically, within North America, much has been written about the way heritage tourism sites have approached the subject of slavery (Alderman and Campbell 2008; Small 2013). Heritage tourism and heritage sites aim to provide the public with a sense of national pride, but as Shackel (2003:2) notes, “becoming part of the national story has often been a struggle to overcome racist views of the past, and national park sites are often where this battle takes place.” Unsavory aspects of our national memory have often been left out or obscured and do not “present a version of history that is dirty or controversial” (Corkern 2004:10).

As part of his research on plantation tourism in the American south, Stephen Small (2013) visited and researched several hundred plantation sites across ten southern states to get a sense of how the topics of slavery and slave quarters are presented to the public at these sites. He concluded that there are several distinct strategies employed by these sites to deal with the topic of slavery and associated slave quarters. Two strategies in particular stood out to me as being evident at the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park. The first, Small calls “marginalization” (2013:413). In cases where this strategy is present, both interpretive material and tour language trivialize and deflect slavery by using “mechanisms, phrasing and images that minimize and distort” (Small 2013:413). I would argue that this strategy is being employed at the
Yulee site, based on interpretive signs that distort the presence of slavery by presenting the enslaved as “field workers,” making it seem as though they were paid for their labor.

A second strategy identified by Small (2013:414) is “symbolic annihilation.” Where this strategy is present, “slavery and the enslaved are either completely absent or…mention of them is negligible” (Small 2013:414). I would argue that this is also one of the strategies employed at the Yulee site, as almost all of the interpretive signs show black individuals working to process sugar, but do not mention slavery or the plantation, and refer to them only once (as “field workers,” mentioned above). As is made clear by these two examples from Small’s extensive research, these are strategies that are employed throughout the southern United States to purposely deflect from slavery, and the Yulee site’s employment of these strategies is clearly not an accidental or singular incident; it is part of much wider issue.

The Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park is a facet of the local Homosassa community; in ignoring the enslaved at this monument, the local community is continuing a “precedent for ignoring African Americans on the American landscape” (Shackel 2003:2). Because the site pulls in so many visitors annually, and because research by the Travel Industry Association of America has shown that heritage sites are the third major source of historical information for the American public (Corkern 2004:12-13), the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park offers a legitimate opportunity to inform and educate the public. Therefore, I would argue that a more inclusive and representative version of history needs to be presented.

Over the past few decades, archaeologists have begun to realize the importance of publicizing their findings on the lives and experiences of the enslaved (Fairbanks 1984:12). Many historical archaeologists would agree that there is a “larger and more imperative duty” (Fairbanks 1984:12) to share the research they are doing, especially in a fascinating and easily
understandable format that will be of interest to the public (Wilkie 2004:111). Many of the ethical guidelines promoted by various archaeological professional organizations such as the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA), Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA), and Society for American Archaeology (SAA) include terminology addressing the need to present research to the public in a responsible manner (ACRA 2016; RPA 2016; SAA 1996).

Many scholars have written on the importance of ensuring silenced voices are brought to light via the archaeological record. Wilkie (2000:117) wrote that it would be “devastating” for larger political forces to obscure the “multitude of voices waiting to speak to us from the past and present.” Leone (2011:166-167) notes that some of the goals of historical archaeologists are to “give voice to the voiceless,” and provide the “correction of injustice.” Battle-Baptiste (2011:35) goes even further, suggesting that perhaps these voiced are not “silenced” – we just haven’t been listening to them.

More specifically for plantation sites, Derek Alderman and Rachel Campbell (2008:340) stress how “artifacts can be employed strategically...[to] resist the marginalization of the enslaved.” Antoinette Jackson (2011:451) wrote that archaeologists should be active participants in both “creating and interpreting representations of postbellum plantations as public heritage sites that shape national memory.” I agree with all of these sentiments; archaeologists have a duty to correct problematic interpretations of history and help to foster a more holistic narrative of the past by ensuring public understanding of pertinent findings.

It is my intention to share the findings of my research with the DEP in hopes that they can incorporate this expanded information on Margarita and its enslaved laborers in updated interpretive signage. I will also to provide my research findings to the Florida Public
Archaeology Network (FPAN) in hopes they will incorporate it into discussions with the public about Yulee and the State Park.

In attempting to locate the boundaries and structures that once made up David Levy Yulee’s Margarita plantation, I hope to shed light on the presence and experiences of the enslaved laborers that lived and worked there as well as the power structures that both affected and were affected by their presence. I will use multiple methods of inquiry including historical source documents, oral traditions, and ethnohistorical materials in an effort to obtain a more holistic interpretation of Margarita’s history.

In conforming to more recent trends within the theoretical framework of plantation archaeology, I strive to shift the focus away from the planter versus slave dichotomy and instead shed light on the multiple veins of social relations and power structures that were inevitably present throughout. As Battle-Baptiste (2011:71) discusses, archaeologists need to especially focus on landscape in the cultural sense, in that “space is directly connected to culture and people” and it can inform on narratives that have been left out of written records. To do this, I use the lens of landscape archaeology to look beyond the material record and pay attention to the spatial arrangement of the plantation landscape in hopes of understanding the underlying social structures it would have both promoted and prevented.

As evident by the large amount of literature on suppression of alternative or “unsavory” versions of the past, it is quite clear that distortion and omission of slavery in current interpretive signage at the State Park is both intentional and part of a larger problematic tradition of unbalanced representations of history at sites promoting American heritage. By publicly disseminating my findings to both the Homosassa community and organizations in charge of managing the State Park, I hope to inspire a change in interpretive signage at the site as well as
future research on the plantation. In bringing to light the story and experiences of the enslaved at Margarita, I hope to add to the growing body of literature that contributes positively towards more holistic representations of the American past.
CHAPTER 4:
METHODS

Project Area Selection & Access

For this project, I identified all of the Homosassa landholdings of Yulee and his associates and plotted them over a map of modern Homosassa; the sheer size of their holdings far exceeded my expectations. Due to limitations in both time and funding for this project, I decided to select a small area near the sugar mill on which to focus my survey. In part due to the ease of obtaining permission to conduct a survey on State Park lands, I focused initially on the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park and the areas immediately surrounding it. In accordance with Chapter 267 of the Florida Statutes, I went through the process of acquiring a permit to conduct a survey on Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park (herein abbreviated as “State Park”). Research permit #1516.056 was issued, with Diane Wallman, Ph.D. as the primary investigator, to conduct archaeological survey and excavations at the State Park took place during May and June of 2016 with help from students in the University of South Florida Summer 2016 Archaeological Field Methods course.

Tiger Tail Island was also sought out as a secondary location for shovel testing, due to numerous sources stating it was the home of Yulee’s plantation residence (Alderman 1946; Clay-Copton and Sterling 1905; Hillyard 1887; Norton 1890). In March of 2016, myself and Thomas J. Pluckhahn were granted a tour of the island by the current caretaker. Unfortunately, we were
given to assume that the current homeowner would not allow shovel testing on the property, and it was therefore ruled out as a possible location for testing.

The area surrounding the park is made up of both residential and commercial properties. Initially, neighborhood canvassing was planned to make contact with land owners and obtain permission to do property walkthroughs and shovel testing. Permission to access only one property – 10466 West Yulee Drive – was gained through this method due to the multitude of abandoned properties and absent homeowners, as well as the inaccessibility of certain properties. In lieu of further canvassing, I drafted a letter explaining the project and seeking permission to access private land and sent it to landowners on streets immediately adjacent to the State Park. Land owner information was obtained from the Citrus County Property Appraiser, and a total of 45 land owners on six streets in the vicinity of the mill were targeted for outreach. The letter was sent out on October 1, 2016.

Figure 4.1. Areas of focus for private landowner outreach.
Of the 45 owners who I reached out to by letter, nine responded granting permission to access their property. Follow ups were conducted via phone and email to the nine respondents, which led to six preliminary property walkthroughs. Visual inspection and conversations with land owners at four of these walkthroughs – 10505, 10555, 10572, and 10610 W. New York Street – revealed that the properties had been filled in significantly, and would not likely be suitable for shovel testing. The two remaining properties – 5301 S. Coral Bells Ave. and 10350 W. Anchorage Street – were determined to be good candidates for archaeological investigation. Shovel testing for the property on West Yulee Drive was completed in June of 2016, and the properties at South Coral Bells Avenue and West Anchorage Street were shovel tested in November and December of 2016, all with volunteers from the USF Anthropology Department.

In the process of completing private property walkthroughs, it was discovered that the county right-of-way (ROW) might prove a useful area to test. Located between the private land boundaries and the roadway, this land is subject to county management and is therefore easier to gain access to. I obtained a ROW Utilization Application from the Citrus County Board of Commissioners to obtain permission to dig along the roadway in these areas, and shovel testing was carried out in March of 2017. It was decided that if any of ROW shovel tests tested positive for cultural materials, more determined efforts would be made to contact the land owners of any adjacent private property to gain permission for additional testing.

**Survey Techniques**

Field methods followed state guidelines (Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources [FDS, DHR] 2002). For each area surveyed, circular shovel test pits (STPs) of 50 cm in diameter were potted out on a grid of either 15 or 25-meter intervals using a compass
and tape. Each STP was marked with flagging tape, located on a UTM grid using a GPS, and assigned a number. STPs were dug in natural levels to a maximum depth of 100 cm, although many were terminated around or before the 50 cm mark due to natural limestone deposits or high water table. Paperwork was completed on each STP noting location, level descriptions, and any artifact descriptions. All excavated material was fill sifted through 0.25-inch (.64-cm) hardwire mesh, artifacts were retrieved and bagged when present, and the remaining material was backfilled into the shovel test.

**Artifact Identification and Curation**

Artifacts were identified using reference books (Arnall 1996; DAACS 2015; Ferraro 1964; Jones et al. 1989; Lindsey 2016, 2017a, 2017b). Artifacts associated with the State Park were sent to the Florida Bureau of Archaeological Research in Tallahassee for curation and storage, per state guidelines (FDS, DHR, 2017). Artifacts associated with private property are curated at the University of South Florida’s Southeastern Archaeological Lab, with permission from the landowner.

**Contingency Plan for Inadvertent Discoveries**

While no human remains were uncovered during this survey, a contingency plan was created for the inadvertent discovery of human remains. In this circumstance, excavation in the area would cease, the remains would be stabilized and secured, and the district medical examiner and/or State Archaeologist would be notified immediately (The Florida Legislature, 2013).
Historical Research

To complement archaeological investigation, a number of locations were checked for any important historical resources that make mention of Margarita. These include, but aren’t limited to: Special Collections at the University of South Florida; Special & Area Studies Collections at the University of Florida George A. Smathers Libraries, archives of the Citrus County Historical Society, archives at the Florida Bureau of Natural & Cultural resources, special collections at the Tampa Public Library, and Ancestry.com.
The goal of this investigation was to learn more about the plantation’s boundaries and structures, especially the enslaved laborers’ quarters, in order to see how they reflect the power structures and relationships on the plantation, and to help give voice to the enslaved laborers who have thus far been excluded from the general narrative on Margarita. First, I will give a summary of findings obtained through historical research, followed by a summary of archaeological findings.

**Historical Findings**

*Lands and Structures Owned by Yulee*

One of the most significant gaps in the historical records is the time at which Yulee began to work on constructing Margarita and its associated buildings. Only one source pinpoints that time period, stating that construction on Yulee’s plantation home began in April 1848 (CCA, Inverness, Florida, Undated Manuscript, Yulee Family Binders, Volume II). Multiple sources state that Yulee’s plantation home was located on Tiger Tail Island (CI131) – formerly called Iathloe island – which sits on the Homosassa River about three miles southwest of the sugar mill (Hillyard 1887). Two shell mounds are documented on the island, but no official record of the plantation home being there exists. One first-hand account of an individual who visited Yulee at
his plantation home notes that the building was “situated on a shell mound sloping to the river,” and that near the water there was a “stone wall a quarter mile in length,” (Hallock 1876).

I was able to tour Tiger Tail in March of 2016 with the current caretaker, and observed the stone wall as well as the shell mound written about in the source mentioned above. There are multiple stone walls on the island that may be remnants of or recycled rocks from the walls mentioned in historical documents. Today, a modern home sits atop the mound where Yulee’s home would have existed.

Figure 5.1. Drawing of the remainder of Yulee’s plantation home, as viewed in 1887 (Hillyard 1887).
Figure 5.2. Tiger Tail Island and the remains of Yulee’s plantation home, photo ca. 1910-1920 (Anders 2009).

Figure 5.3. Modern home, and rock wall remnants on Tiger Tail Island, as seen from 25 m offshore, ca. 2016. Photo courtesy of Dr. Thomas J. Pluckhahn.
Unfortunately, as noted above, the current owner will not grant permission for 
archeological investigation in the area, so I was unable to confirm that Yulee’s home was 
located here via archeological investigation. However, during my tour I observed historic 
artifacts lying on the surface in multiple areas around the mound and home. Based on this 
observation, and based on the multiple historical documents that mention the plantation home’s 
existence on the island (Alderman 1946; Clay-Copton and Sterling 1905; Hillyard 1887; Norton 
1890), I am comfortable concluding that this is likely where it existed. Historical evidence was 
summarized and submitted as an update to the Florida Master Site File (FMSF) for CI131. This 
update can be viewed in Appendix B.

While much has been written about the location of the plantation home and mill, there 
has been little written about where the sugar cane fields were. A singular source detailing a 
firsthand visit to the plantation comments that “several hundred acres” of the fields were located 
right by the water’s edge on the Homosassa River (Hallock 1876). This would place a portion of 
the fields a mile or two to the southwest of the sugar mill. The same source also notes that the 
sugar house was located on the water, which would make sense if some of the fields were also 
there (Hallock 1876), however it is said to have burned down in 1869 (Norton 1892).

In terms of other buildings that would have existed on the plantation, multiple sources 
mention a chapel, superintendent’s house, blacksmith house, and carpenter’s house (Alderman 
1946; CCA Manuscript, Yulee V:II). To determine where some of these buildings would have 
existed, it is necessary to know how much land Yulee held, and where. In May of 1852, Yulee 
owned a total of 324 acres (CCA Manuscript, Yulee V:II). In 1863, the last full year he would 
spend in Homosassa, he is listed as owning a total of 5278 acres (Florida State Library, 
Tallahassee, Florida [FSL] 1851-1864: Tax Rolls Hernando County [HC] 547). Based on land
sale records and plat maps, I was able to create a map illustrating the holdings that Yulee had between 1845 and 1864 (see Figure 2.1 in Chapter 2).

*Names and Lives of Enslaved Laborers at Margarita*

Perhaps one of the major reasons that information on the enslaved is not discussed at the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park is because, to my knowledge, there has never been a published summary of what little is written about them. General information surrounding those enslaved at Margarita, their daily lives, and even some information about specific family names does exist, but across multiple organizations and media types. As Jackson (2008:137) suggests, putting together information from a variety of disciplines and sources “invites critical analysis using a variety of data sources.” Individually, these sources paint a scattered picture, but put together they begin to tell a story and shed some light on the lives of those enslaved individuals who made Margarita run.

Historical written accounts of the plantation conflict on the number of enslaved laborers that existed at Margarita. Looking at both the historical documents and tax records, it is clear that as Yulee’s plantation grew, so did the number of enslaved laborers. In 1846, Yulee purchased 10 male and 12 female enslaved laborers in St. Augustine for a price of $6,380, and then in 1849 he purchased an enslaved laborer named Henry, who was “a trained house servant,” (CCA Manuscript, Yulee V:II). In 1851, tax records list Yulee as owning 32 enslaved laborers (FSL 1851-1864:HC 85). Curiously, a slave schedule from November of that same year lists him as only having 14 enslaved laborers (United States of America, Bureau of the Census, 1850). While these numbers clearly do not line up, it’s possible that he acquired more enslaved laborers between the time the slave schedule was written in November, and the time that his tax would
have been assessed in early 1851. The next record is from February of 1854, at which time Yulee acquired five more enslaved laborers, and then in October of 1855 he purchased three more enslaved laborers from a Joseph Finigan for a sum of $2,600 (CCA Manuscript, Yulee V:II). By 1863, Yulee is listed as owning 83 enslaved laborers, worth $37,000 (FSL 1851-1864:HC 547).

While numbers of enslaved laborers are not too difficult to come by, names are certainly not easy to find. However, it is so important to name as many of these individuals as possible, in an effort to re-humanize them and prevent them from remaining just a number in a log book. In an undated slave manifest for a ship bound from Savannah to Jacksonville, three individuals aboard the vessel – Cleo, aged 18; Edward, aged 13; and another male, aged 21 - are listed as belonging to David Levy Yulee (Citrus County Historical Society, Inverness, Florida [CCA], Undated Slave Manifest, Yulee Family Binders, Volume IV). He is also said to have purchased an enslaved laborer name Clarissa and her four children sometime after 1855 (CCA Manuscript, Yulee V:II).

In 1939, an interview was conducted with Dollie Nattiel, who was enslaved at both Margarita and Cottonwood plantations. The interview was discovered by an Archer journalist in a museum, and he published the account in 2011. In the interview, Dollie stated that she was born in 1855 and was enslaved at “the sugar Plantation of David Yulee,” (Zander 2011). She also states that at age 9, which would have been in 1864, she and her family were moved to Yulee’s other plantation, Cottonwood. This is important because it verifies multiple written accounts of what happened to the enslaved at Margarita following the burning of Yulee’s nearby mansion in 1864, which suggest that those enslaved at Margarita ended up at or near Cottonwood.

While the remainder of the interview discusses what life was like at Cottonwood, it is possible that the plantation shared some similarities with Margarita, since they were active
concurrently and since they were relatively close geographically. Dollie states that the slave quarters “consisted of two long lines of shanties” and that Yulee wanted his slaves to “keep themselves clean and looking well, and also their quarters looking nice” (Zander 2011). This assertion may reflect Yulee’s participation in to the trend of the time, which was for planters to have the appearance of being good to their enslaved laborers (Rivers 2000:135).

One of the large hurdles in conducting ancestry research during this time period is that documents were handwritten, and in many cases it is difficult to be certain of spelling. As a result, a singular name can have several spellings. While the interview mentioned above spells Dollie’s last name as Nattiel, several variations can be found in the census records, including Nateel, Natile, and Natheal (State of Florida, 1885; United States of America, Bureau of the Census, 1880, 1900, 1910) among others. This makes finding relatives and making family connections very difficult. However, despite variations in names, I was able to trace the Nattiel family through several decades via the US Census. Below, in Figure 5.4 is a family tree with what information is available.

Additionally, it was also practice for some enslaved laborers to take on the last name of their masters. This is the case at Margarita. The Citrus County Historical Society has confirmed that two enslaved laborers – named William and Henry Yulee – both lived at Margarita. Henry is perhaps the individual mentioned as the “trained house servant” who Yulee purchased in 1849 (CCA Manuscript, Yulee V:II). Both individuals are listed on the Hernando County Tax Rolls in 1866 as being over 21 and living in the area, but not owning any property or having any taxable possessions (Florida State Library, Tallahassee, Florida [FSL] 1866-1869: Tax Rolls Hernando County [HC] 639).
Figure 5.4. Natheal Family Tree with family members and years of birth (State of Florida, 1885; United States of America, Bureau of the Census, 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880, 1900, 1910).

Knowing these family names is incredibly important to the memory and history of Margarita. Descendants of both the Nattiels and Yulees still live in Citrus County today. Dolly Nattiel’s great-great-grandchildren have been confirmed to live in both Archer and Gainesville (Zander 2011) and one of them has learned of this project, identified himself, and has been contributing to our knowledge of his family.

Another important point is that the name “Nattiel” (although with several variations in spelling) occurs several times throughout documents pertaining to Yulee. A death notice for a Peter Nateel was published in a local newspaper in 1905. The notice speaks of his incredible old age (The Ocala Banner 1905). Census records confirm a Peter Nateel was in the Homosassa area and born around 1810. Initially, it was believed the age of Mr. Nateel may be incorrect, as 115 is an unusually old age. However, the Nattiel descendent was able to confirm that many of his great aunts and uncles lived into their early 100s, giving credence to the fact that perhaps Mr. Nateel did live to 115.

Despite gaps in the information, and changing last names, what is important here is that many descendants of the enslaved laborers who lived and worked at Margarita are still located in
Citrus County today. Thus, it is important to continue to identify and reach out to them to gauge their interest in being involved with uncovering information about Margarita, as well as learn valuable information from them about family history. These descendants are a large stakeholder group, and should absolutely be considered when attempting to craft more appropriate signage and interpretive material for the Yulee Sugar Mill Historic Ruins State Park, which I will discuss further in the following chapter.

Archaeological Reconnaissance

All the areas explored are located in Section 32 of Township 19 South, Range 17 East (USGS, 7.5 Minute Map, Homosassa). The area geology consists of limestone, as well as Hallendale-rock substratum topped with Citronelle Fine Sand (United States Department of Agriculture [USDA], Natural Resources Conservation Service [NCRSS], Soils, Citrus County, 2016).

State Property

The State Park consists of four acres located on both sides of State Road 490 (SR 490). The western portion of the park contains the ruins of the plantation’s sugar mill, a pedestrian walkway, and interpretive signs. The eastern portion consists of a cleared area containing a picnic shelter and bathroom facilities, bordered by thick forest. The area surrounding the sugar mill was the focus of previous testing by Denson et al (2007), however the size, location, and results of testing were not well documented. As a result, I focus on the eastern portion of the park, which I systematically tested at 25 m intervals running parallel to the SR 490 and oriented to 50 degrees.
Originally, 43 circular STPs were plotted. However, inspection of the area just prior to the start of fieldwork showed the majority of forested State Park area to be prone to severe flooding, reducing the possibility of archaeological remains in these areas. Following this discovery shovel tests that fell within the forested area were removed from the grid, except for those that fell just beyond the tree line. If any of the shovel tests at the edge of the tree line yielded archaeological material, additional shovel tests would be plotted further back in the forested area. This plan can be viewed below in Figure 5.5. An additional shovel test (STP 6) was plotted in the western portion of the park, adjacent to the mill ruins.

Figure 5.5: Site Plan, CI124B.

In total, 16 shovel tests were excavated. Due to the natural limestone in the area, the maximum depth achieved during shovel testing on this property was 35 cm. Shovel tests along
the southern side of the forested area (STPs 13, 14, 15, and 16) were all terminated at less than 10 cm due to water. Testing next to the mill ruins (STP 6) resulted in the recovery of several small artifacts, which are listed below in Table 5.1. Artifacts were recovered between 7 and 15 cm below surface. This finding is consistent with materials recovered during previous excavation around the mill (Denson et al 1997).
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Figure 5.6: Undergraduate field school attendee Shannon McGuffey hitting limestone at the bottom of STP 8 at CI124B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS.LOT</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Artifact Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS1.01</td>
<td>STP6</td>
<td>BOAU</td>
<td>Faunal material</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS1.02</td>
<td>STP6</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal fragments, Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Artifacts recovered from STP 6 at CI124B.
Figure 5.7. Faunal specimen recovered from STP 6 at CI124B.

Figure 5.8. Metal fragments recovered from STP 6 at CI124B.

While CI124B was certainly associated with the plantation, by evidence of the standing mill, there is no archaeological evidence to support that it was the site of the slave quarters. However, historical and archaeological evidence uncovered during this project was summarized and submitted as an update to the FMSF for CI124B. This update can be viewed in Appendix D.
Private Property

A few of the properties subjected to surface survey were very close to the mill and would have been good areas to shovel test, but had been filled in with multiple feet of fill over the last few decades to prevent flooding. As shovel testing beyond 100 cm in depth would have been required to get past the fill, it was determined to not survey these properties. Despite the inability to dig at several of these locations, walk throughs and observations still provided some useful knowledge for this project.

10466 West Yulee Drive. This property directly abuts the north border of the eastern section of the State Park and consists of both a private commercial structure and a restored historic structure on 0.77 acres of land. Most of the land was cleared with minimal vegetation, but the southeastern portion of the property was overwhelmed by heavy scrub and thick canopy. The property was systematically tested along a 25-m grid oriented to 200 degrees. Fifteen shovel tests were planned, but only 11 were excavated. STP 26 was in an area that had a surface level limestone outcrop, and STPs 27, 31, and 31 were in a flooded, wooded area. As seen below in Figure 5.9, 2 STPs were plotted off-grid. STP 21 was plotted off-grid east five meters to avoid a septic tank, and STP 17 was plotted off-grid west 5 meters, and north 5 meters, to be parallel with the edge of the State Park grid, which is located directly to the south of this property. All the shovel tests were terminated at varying depths (10 to 38 cm) due to impassible limestone outcrops, and no archaeological material was recovered on the property.
5301 South Coral Bells Avenue (CI1535). This property consists of a modern residential structure on 0.38 acres of land. Half of the total land was open and well-maintained, and half consisted of thick scrub and dense tree cover. Four shovel tests were plotted at 15 m intervals on a grid oriented due north, and a fifth (STP 39) was added later after STP 38 yielded a high number of artifacts.
STPs 36, 37, 38, and 39 yielded a total of 83 artifacts, while STP 40 did not yield any. An additional 13 artifacts were obtained by the landowner in the form of an unprovenienced collection (UPC), collected during October and November of 2016 during gardening activities on the property. A summary table of artifact classes, covering material found in both shovel testing and the unprovenienced collection, can be found below in Table 5.2. Additionally, a list of notable historical artifacts, include a glass hygiene bottle from the early twentieth century (Figure 5.12) and a wire cut nail (Figure 5.13), found can be seen in Table 5.3. A full, detailed list of artifacts from CI1535 can be found in Appendix D.
Table 5.2. Summary of artifacts recovered CI1535.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Artifact Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CERN (9%)</td>
<td>Ceramic, modern</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, ironstone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAS (50%)</td>
<td>Glass, brown</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, clear</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, milk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, amethyst</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>META (20%)</td>
<td>Metal, modern</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal, historic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHR (20%)</td>
<td>Plug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAS (6%)</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEL (14%)</td>
<td>Shell, oyster</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Notable historic artifacts recovered from CI1535.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS.LOT</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Artifact Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS3.02</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, lock, Slaymaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.08</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Glass, milk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.12</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Nail, wire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.01</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Glass hygiene bottle, amethyst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.02</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Ceramic, ironstone, rim sherd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.03</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Ceramic, stoneware, colored alkaline glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.11. Graduate volunteer Jean Lammie breaking ground on STP 36 at CI1535.

Figure 5.12. Glass hygiene bottle recovered from CI1535 as part of UPC.
Figure 5.13. Wire nail recovered from CI1535.

Based on the presence of historical artifacts across multiple shovel tests, and the unprovenienced collection provide by the landowner, this property qualifies as an archaeological site, even if it does not fit the period of interest for this study. The site was designated Coral Bells 1, and was assigned site number CI1535 by the FMSF. A copy of the site form can be viewed in Appendix E.

10350 W. Anchorage Street. This property consists of a modern residential structure and attached carport on 0.23 acres of land. The entirety of the property was cleared, well maintained, and easily accessible. Due to the orientation of the house within the parcel boundaries, shovel tests were placed at uneven intervals to maximize coverage. A total of four shovel tests were plotted and excavated, however no archaeological material was recovered.
W. Anchorage 1 (CI1536). Located only two blocks from the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park, CI1536 sits in undeveloped hardwood forest on a piece of private property. The site was first brought to my attention when conversing with a local homeowner while shovel testing her property. She mentioned that an old stone structure was visible at the edge of this property from the road, and that it looked to be very old. Following this conversation, the homeowner accompanied me and a colleague to the area discussed and the structure could be seen, as described, from the road. Additionally, multiple ceramic fragments (likely stoneware and whiteware) were visible on the surface directly adjacent to the sidewalk at the front of this property.
Unfortunately, the full extent of the site is unknown, as contact was attempted but not able to be made with the landowner, and permission was not granted to access the property. However, access was gained to the property immediately to the West of CI1536, which provided a closer look at the structure, as it sits only several feet back from the property line between the two parcels.

CI1536 consisted of mostly uncleared, thick forested land. The feature of interest sits on a small rise and is about five feet in both length and width, composed of shaped limestone rocks of varying sizes. Based on this size and shape, I suggest this feature is a hearth, or a chimney base. The probable hearth or chimney base is presumably associated with a structure; although no other structural features such as piers were noted, we were unable to look closely and there is a good deal of brush surrounding the feature. Based on the fact that the materials and condition of the feature are very similar to those at the nearly sugar mill, as well as the presence of whiteware and stoneware sherds found nearby, I suggest that this site dates to the mid to late 1800s, and is probably related to Margarita.

Some accounts from the late 19th and early 20th centuries note that chimney remains of slave quarters, and of the plantation’s church could still be seen in the area near the mill (Hillyard 1887:218-219; Norton 1890). It is possible that the structural remains at CI1536 could be the remnants of either of these structures. The probable house site sits within an area of higher elevation, in the shape of an arc, as seen in the topographic map below. Based on the presence of the historical structure, and the discovery of historical surface finds, this property qualifies as an archaeological site. The site was designated W. Anchorage 1, and was assigned site number CI1536 by the FMSF. The Site Form can be found in Appendix F.
Figure 5.15. Facing southeast, a portion of the hearth structure at CI1536, taken from an adjacent property.

Figure 5.16. Map showing 5-foot topographic rise near CI1536. Base Map: USGS, 7.5 Minute Map, Homosassa Quadrangle, 1954.
County Property (ROW)

The ROW was systematically tested at 25 m intervals along both the north and south sides of West New York Street and West Anchorage Street. All the land in this area was open and well-maintained. As illustrated below in Figures 5.17 and 5.18, several shovel tests were plotted but not excavated, and there are several gaps in the grid. Following the creation of the grid, STPs 51, 77, and 78 were determined to be in locations directly in front of properties previously walked through and omitted for shovel testing, and were therefore not completed. STP 70 was only a few meters north of STP 32 at 10350 W. Anchorage Street, so it was omitted. Where gaps exist in the grid, shovel tests were not plotted due to the presence of a driveway or pavement. In total, 34 shovel tests were excavated.

All the shovel tests were terminated at varying depths (10 to 90 cm) due to impassible limestone outcrops, except for STP 50 which was terminated at 23 cm at due to the discovering of an unmarked utility line and STP 63 which was terminated at 5 cm due to an impassible root mat. Several of the STPs (STPs 41, 45, 50, 56, 59, 66, 69, 72, 73) contained modern refuse, including fragments of glass and plastic, but were otherwise devoid of archaeological material. As ROW property, it is possible that the areas tested could have been disturbed during utility line placement or road construction. However, even if this were the case one would expect to find undisturbed evidence of previous occupation at lower depths, and no historic archaeological material was found, even at depths of 80 and 90 cm. Therefore, there is no archaeological evidence to support that the ROW on either W. New York Street or W. Anchorage Street was the site of the slave quarters.

In summary, no definitive archaeological evidence of the slave quarters was uncovered. However, one area (CI1536) was identified as being potentially associated with Margarita, but
further archaeological investigation will be needed in order to either confirm or deny this association. Additionally, another area (CI1535) was identified as a new archaeological site, but was most likely not associated with the plantation.

Figure 5.17. Site Plan, W. New York Street ROW.

Figure 5.18. Site Plan, W. Anchorage Street ROW.
CHAPTER 6:
PROJECT SUMMARY & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Project Summary

The goal of this project was to find evidence of plantation structures, especially the slave quarters, to bring to light the experiences of the enslaved laborers at Margarita, who have largely been excluded from the narrative of the plantation. Archaeological investigations completed as part of this project ruled out the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park as well as several nearby private properties as possible locations for the slave quarters at Margarita. The one exception is site CI1536, which may contain structural remains of a former plantation building, possibly a slave quarter. As previously mentioned, a few sources (CCA, CCHN, unpublished manuscript of Mary Yulee, Yulee Family Binders, Inverness, Florida; Zander 2011) suggest that the slave quarters at Margarita were in rows, or line, and assuming this structure follows that pattern, additional structural remains might be located to both the northeast and southwest of these remains. Landowner permission will be required to conduct future archaeological investigation into this theory. In addition, historical research uncovered more details about Yulee’s land holdings in Homosassa, details about structures that existed on the plantation, and, most importantly, information on the lives of enslaved laborers at Margarita.

While I was not able to find solid evidence of the location of the slave quarters, I am committed to using what information was uncovered during this project to help readjust the
narrative on Margarita and ensure that a more holistic version is presented. As Matrana (2009:xiii) writes, we must look to “lost” plantations because they “ultimately reflect upon us and how we as a society deal with our own intricate, complicated past.” If what Matrana says is true, then Margarita – in the form of the sugar mill and its interpretive signage – reflects that society does not want to acknowledge or deal with the fact that its community was associated with enslaved labor.

Many plantations have successfully used original or reconstructed slave quarters as well as on-site museums and memorials to honor enslaved laborers and educate the public about their stories. Monticello offers the “Hemings Family Tour,” an interactive tour that combines information gathered from archaeology, historical research, and oral histories to detail the lives of the Hemings family, a family of enslaved who worked at Monticello for several generations (Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc.) At Mt. Vernon, a memorial has been erected on the site of an unmarked burial ground for enslaved laborers, and an annual commemoration is held there each year (Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association 2017). Perhaps the best example of properly honoring the memory and lives of enslaved plantation laborers is Whitney Plantation, which opened in 2014. The entire site is dedicated to being a place of “memory and consciousness” and is meant to honor the experiences of both the enslaved laborers who lived on the plantation, as well as enslaved laborers across the South (Whitney Plantation 2015).

The challenge in the case of Margarita is how to acknowledge its enslaved laborers when so much of the both the tangible and intangible evidence of the plantation is lacking; there are no standing slave quarters, there is only one firsthand account by an enslaved laborer (Zander 2011) and there are not enough artifacts to create a museum. But just these things are lacking, and the
enslaved laborers remain mainly lost even to archaeology, doesn’t mean they have to be lost in the narrative on Margarita.

My first suggestion for the State Park would be to update the current signage to include information about the involvement of enslaved laborers in the many steps of sugar processing and plantation management. Currently, the signage (Attachment A) discusses the many processes of sugar production without the aspect of human involvement, and only refers to the enslaved laborers once, calling them “field workers.” This incorrectly implies that the individuals working the plantation were paid for their labor, and that they were there willingly. Secondly, the State Park brochure and website should be updated to include more accurate information on the number of enslaved laborers at Margarita, and the extent to which they were responsible for the building of the plantation, its operation, and the wealth it generated for the plantation owner.

Figure 6.1. Current text on State Park welcome page.
Welcome to the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park

This site was once part of Margarita, a 5,000 acre sugar plantation owned by David Levy Yulee. Yulee was a member of the territorial Legislative Council, and served in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate after Florida statehood. The park contains the remnants of the plantation’s sugar mill, which operated from 1851 to 1864.

The plantation encompassed almost all of the area that is a part of modern day Homosassa, and it supplied sugar products for southern troops during the war. However, the plantation would not have been built or operational without the over 80 enslaved laborers that lived and worked there. Descendants of the enslaved still live in the area today. To preserve the memory and experiences of the people who were enslaved at Yulee Plantation, a memorial garden was installed in the spring of 2018.

The park is located in the small town of Homosassa, which is located about 3 miles west of the city of Homosassa Springs. Take U.S. Hwy 19 (northbound or southbound) to the town of Homosassa Springs, then turn west onto C.R. 490 West (Yulee Drive). Proceed for approximately 2.5 miles to the park. There are brown and white highway signs that will lead you to the park. The Ruins of the Mill are situated within five feet of the road and can be easily seen. The site offers a picnic pavilion, restroom, tables and grills.

Figure 6.2. Proposed text on State Park welcome page.

Third, I suggest a plaque and memorial garden be installed at the State Park. There is ample space available on the site, and it would be a wonderful opportunity to acknowledge and provide information on the enslaved laborers, as well as offer a space for reflection. A prototype for the garden is shown in Appendix G.

Suggestions for Future Work

While I was unable to find the answers to many of the questions I posed at the start of this project, I feel that my research has laid a solid foundation upon which a future researcher might be able to continue searching for the slave quarters and uncovering more information about the plantation’s landscape. Therefore, the following are some suggestions and recommendations I have for future work.
Further Shovel Testing

The area tested during my fieldwork was only a small percentage of the land that Yulee once owned, and that potentially was part of Margarita. Additional private, commercial, and county land – identified in the area of high plantation probability that I mentioned previously – will need to be conducted in order to systematically confirm or rule out the presence of slave quarter remains. Additionally, it would be ideal to shovel test at both CI131 and CI1536, but the current landowners will need to agree before a survey can be conducted at either property.

Geophysical Survey

One of the main issues with gaining landowner permission to dig on private property is that landowners are wary of having their properties disturbed. As evident by my own shovel testing results, in many cases holes are dug and nothing is found. Use of various methods of non-invasive geophysical survey, such as ground penetrating radar (GPR), gradiometer, resistivity testing, and even metal detecting could be helpful in securing landowner permission. These survey methods allow for subsurface structures or anomalies to be detected, and could help confirm that an area is truly of interest prior to sticking a shovel in the ground. However, no method is without its issues; much of the land in the area of interest is developed, and that may make it difficult to interpret results because of interference from things like underground utility lines. Regardless of these issues, I believe this method should still be explored.
Investigation of the Yulee Papers

One source with a great potential for yielding information pertinent to this project is the David Yulee Papers. The David Yulee Papers are a collection of thousands of pages of Yulee’s personal and business correspondence spanning his entire lifetime. Donated by his daughter, they are currently housed in the Special and Area Studies Collections at the University of Florida Smathers Libraries in Gainesville, Florida and are available for viewing via microfilm. A small selection of these papers is also available to view through the library’s website.

As was common in Yulee’s time, the papers are written in cursive. A small percentage were later transcribed via typewriter, but the majority are the original writings and as such are very time consuming to interpret, with some sections being completely illegible. Due to time constraints, I chose to read through a portion of Yulee’s personal correspondence during the time of the plantation’s existence (1851-1864).

It is quite possible that additional information about Margarita and the enslaved laborers that lived there exists within the Yulee papers. However, it will take a great deal of both time and patience to transcribe the papers and determine if there is any information useful for this project.

Genealogical Research

Knowing of only one family name linked to the enslaved laborers at Margarita, genealogical research for this project was limited. Going forward, it is possible that additional family names will be identified through historical records, allowing for further genealogical research and identification of additional living descendants.
Public Promotion & Involvement

While I did nothing to promote my project outside of contacting a small number of local landowners via mail to request permission to dig on their properties, I found that individuals who learned of the project were quite interested in it. Especially when digging in more visible locations, such as along the county right-of-way north of the sugar mill, or on the State Park property, locals would drive or walk by and ask both myself and my dig volunteers what we were doing. In many instances, they would acknowledge they knew who Yulee was, and offer their own theories as to where the plantation was located.

In one instance, while digging in the county right-of-way, a homeowner came outside and offered to allow me to look around their property and conduct shovel tests if the area looked promising. As it turned out, this homeowner was one of the individuals I contacted via mail, and then email, but was previously unable to plan a visit with due to scheduling issues. Because the homeowner was familiar with my project, and had a visual reminder that work was underway, she was willing to become involved.

Matthew Litteral, a fellow graduate student in the University of South Florida Anthropology Department, is currently working on a similar project for his Master’s thesis. His research focuses on locating the slave quarters and attempting to understand the lives of the enslaved laborers who lived at the Gamble Plantation in Ellenton, Florida. In the summer of 2017, the USF Department of Anthropology held a six-week archaeological field school at Gamble Plantation. The area excavated was located on a piece of the Gamble property close to the plantation house, where the public is allowed to tour.

Excavating in such a visible location attracted both park visitors and local community members, leading to both promotion of the project and potential research leads. I had the
opportunity to visit Matthew’s project area several times. On one occasion when I was present, a local man stopped by, showed some artifacts he had found in his yard, and offered to allow Matthew to dig on his property. Matthew confirmed it was not an unusual incident and that multiple community members had stopped by to offer up information or permission to dig on their properties (Matthew Litteral, personal communication 2017). Additionally, the project offered weekly “Public Days” where any interested individuals – children included – could be a part of the project and aid in both excavation and washing of artifacts.

As evident by this ongoing project, it appears one of the best ways to promote such a project is to be as visible as possible to the community in which you want to be involved. While investigation at the Yulee Sugar Mill Historic Ruins State Park has been completed, and survey on private properties – often in backyards – is not incredibly visible to the public, I believe that further work in county right-of-ways would be an ideal way to attract more interested individuals.

Another method for educating the public and promoting understanding of the plantation’s history is to update its nomination criteria for the NHRP. In addition to its association to Yulee, the site is significant due to its association with and history of enslaved individuals. Additionally, if further testing reveals that CI1536 does in fact contain slave quarter remnants, I would suggest that the State pursue purchasing the land, and incorporating it into the existing State Park property and narrative.

Additionally, having the support of large organizations such as the Florida Public Archaeology Network (FPAN) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Recreation and Parks (DRP) would aid in spreading the word about the project and attracting additional interested parties.
Collaboration with the FPAN

The Florida Public Archaeology Network (FPAN) is a state-wide program “dedicated to the protection of cultural resources…involving the public in the study of their past,” (FPAN 2017). Its regional centers conduct both public and professional trainings, host workshops, tours, and even camps for children. FPAN helps to make archaeology both accessible and interesting to the public. In addition to being a well-known organization, FPAN has access to many state and local resources, allowing for even further visibility.

Citrus County is served by FPAN’s Central Office. Should further archaeological survey be conducted in the future, involving FPAN would be beneficial. Using their email lists, website, and its access to local resources, FPAN would be able to spread the word about upcoming excavations, and help drum up community interest.

Another possibility is to hold an artifact identification event in the Homosassa community. The idea would be to encourage locals to bring items they have found on their properties that may be related to the plantation to be identified. Having an event like this would increase community awareness of the project, and also identify new areas to survey based on the location of potentially related artifacts.

Part of FPAN’s Goals and Objectives is “visible public outreach programs,” and “dissemination of archaeological information to the public” (FPAN 2017). A community artifact identification event certainly fits this description, and partnering with FPAN for this type of event would be beneficial due to their training, resources, and experience holding public events like this.
Collaboration with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Recreation and Parks

The DRP is in charge of State Park oversight and management in Florida. With a network of 174 parks covering the entire state, the Florida State Parks system attracts thousands of visitors per year (Florida State Parks 2017). The DRP keeps the interested public informed of events, park updates, and special announcements via its website, email list, and The Florida State Parks Newsletter (Florida State Parks 2017). Should further survey be completed, having the support of the DRP would be instrumental in being able to promote the project to a wide audience. Additionally, the DRP manages the interpretive signage at the State Parks. Involving them in this project and sharing significant findings with them would provide an opportunity for an update to both the State Park website and interpretive signage at the State Park.

Descendant Involvement

Another extremely important group that needs to be involved with further research on this project is the descendant community. Over the last two decades, there has been an increasing effort on the part of archaeologists to create collaborative projects for plantation excavations that include the descendant community (Baker 1997; McDavid 2002; Montaperto 2012). These projects promote inclusion, better communication between archaeologists and descendants, and result in more meaningful interpretations of history.

As previously mentioned, at least one living descendent has been identified and contacted, and he has shown interest in this project. Once further genealogical research is completed, and additional living descendants are identified, it will be important to collaborate with them and get their input on any interpretive materials that may be created for the State Park.
Conclusion

As previously stated, it has always been my hope that some future graduate student(s) would continue this project. In October of 2016, I presented a portion of my research in poster form at the 73rd annual meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference in Athens, Georgia. During this meeting, I met a doctoral candidate from the University of Florida’s Anthropology Department who expressed interest in this project and in continuing it for his doctoral dissertation. In an effort to provide as solid a starting point as possible, I have shared my sources, genealogical research, community contacts, and potential leads with this individual in hopes that he will be able to build upon the foundation I have laid and continue the search for slave quarter remnants.

While I may not have achieved my goal of locating evidence of the slave quarters at Margarita or gaining additional information as to the power structures that existed there, my findings – both archaeological and historical – allowed information from previously scattered sources to be woven together, forming a more cohesive picture of the plantation, and of the enslaved laborers who lived there. I sincerely hope that my suggestions for the State Park are thoroughly considered, and I look forward to hearing about future research done at this site.
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Zander, M.
Title: DAVID LEVY YULEE

Text: David Levy Yulee (1810-1886), who built Florida’s first cross-state railroad, was the State’s first U.S. Senator. He came to Florida as an immigrant and rose to become an outstanding businessman and statesmen. He served in Florida’s territorial council, as a territorial delegate to congress, and helped write the State’s first constitution. His sugar mill began operations in 1849. During the Civil War, he supplied the Confederates with sugar, syrup, and molasses. Federal raiders burned the Yulee home May 29, 1864, but the mill and plantation escaped destruction.”
The fertile, moist soil and mild climate of Florida’s coastal areas was ideal for growing sugar cane and many plantations went into operation during the early 1800s. Due to the enormous amount of water associated with the making of sugar, the cane could not be economically shipped to a central mill for processing. Thus, each plantation had its own equipment for removing the juice from the cane and cooking it into sugar.

The sugar produced here, unlike the white, fine-grained sugar that we use today, was moist, course, and light brown in color.
The cylinder of the steam engine is located at the near end of the iron frame to the right. Steam entering the cylinder through valves forced the piston inside to move back and forth.

The piston was connected to the arm at the far end of the frame by a driving rod and slide (now missing). Their movement made the arm rotate, turning the flywheel shaft, the flywheel, and the small gear at the left which turned the large gear mounted just beyond. The large gear shaft connected by a square sleeve to the top roller shaft turned the top roller. The small top roller gear turned the small gear on each of the bottom rollers. A small water pump, located on the far side of the frame just beyond the cylinder, operated off the driving rod and slide and pumped water from the wells into the boiler.
The steam powered machinery which removed the juice from the cane was located here.

The fresh-cut cane was mashed between large, rotating iron cylinders and the juice was collected in vats. The crushed cane, called “bagasse,” was piled and used, along with wood, as fuel to fire the furnaces. The juice was piped from here to the cooking kettles.
The juice flowed from the settling vats into the “grande,” the largest of five kettles built into the furnace below. The “grande” was also the coolest, being farthest from the “batterie” kettle under which the furnace was fired. The chimney draft pulled the heat from this fire through the furnace to heat the other kettles. The heated juice was hand dipped from the larger to the smaller kettle and ended as syrup in the “batterie,” the smallest and hottest. Here it reached the “strike” (sugar) stage. It was then ladled into a trough and poured into large wooden vats where sugar crystals began to form as it cooled. After hardening it was spade into slices, carried into small tubs to the “purgery” (curing room) and packed in hogsheads (wooden barrels).
A larger “purgery” or curing room was probably located just beyond this sign. The hogsheads (barrels) were kept in this warm curing room for 20-30 days until all the molasses had dripped from the sugar into a cistern in a recess under the room. The molasses was sold for making rum. The partly emptied hogsheads were then refilled with sugar and stored until ready for shipment. A large storage and loading room would have been part of the mill. Its location is unknown.
Note: This interpretive sign was either removed or stolen sometime between December 2015 and April 2017. As a personal photograph was not able to be obtained, this image is taken from Flowers 2011.

Title: “CANE HARVESTING”

Text: Sugar cane was planted in January and February and was ready for harvesting by the middle of October. Field workers cut the cane and loaded on wagons to be brought here to make sugar.
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Township  19S  Range  16E  Section  36  3/4 section: NW 3/4 SE 3/4 ENE

NAME OF PUBLIC TRACT (e.g., park)

TYPE OF SITE (select all that apply)

FUNCTION

STRUCTURES OR FEATURES

STREET ADDRESS / ROUTE

CULTURE PERIODS (select all that apply)

NON-ABORIGINAL

ST. johns (prehistoric)

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

DHR USE ONLY

Official Evaluation

ShPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: yes no insufficient info

Owner Object

NR Criteria for Evaluation: A B C D

Date

Rationale

Recommendations for Owner or ShPO Action

DHR USE ONLY

NR List Date

Owner Decision

Date

Read:

300 National Register Bulletin 16, p. 2.
### ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

**SITE DETECTION**  (select all that apply)
- No field check
- Exposure, ground
- Screened shovel
- Literature search
- Pothole tests
- Screened shovel-1/4" depth
- Informant report
- Suger tests
- Screened shovel-1/16" depth
- Remote sensing
- Unscreened shovel
- Screened shovel-1/16" depth
- Other methods: number, size, depth, pattern of units

**SITE BOUNDARY**
- Sounds unknown
- Remote sensing
- Unscreened shovel
- Exposure, ground
- Screened shovel
- None by recorder
- Pothole tests
- Screened shovel-1/16" depth
- Informant report
- Suger tests
- Excavations
- Estimated or guess

**SITE DESCRIPTION**

**Extent** Size (m²): 8,094
Depth / Stratigraphy of cultural deposit: Unknown

**Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one):**
- Single component
- Multiple component
- Uncertain

Midden similar to those found on nearby islands that are Wooden Island and Safety Harbor. Second occupation during 1840s - 1864 when David Levy Yulee established his plantation home on the island. Integrity - Overall disturbance: None seen

**Disturbances / threats / protective measures:** Home burned down in 1844. Modern home sits atop the spot where the home would have been located. Possibility that additional remains exist on the island. Threat from future home construction.

**Surface collection:** Area collected 0 m²
Collection units: 0

**ARTIFACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Artifacts</th>
<th>Collection #</th>
<th>Surface #</th>
<th>Subsurface #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselective (all artifacts)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective (some artifacts)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed selectivity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPATIAL CONTROL**

- Uncollected
- General (not by subarea)
- Unknown
- Variable spatial control
- Other (describe in comments below)

**Artifact Comments:** Nothing collected, some glass and metal artifacts seen on surface near previous site of Yulee residence.

**DIAGNOSTICS** (type or mode and frequency: e.g., Suwanee pottery, heat-treated chart)

1: N=4  N=7
2: N=5  N=8
3: N=6  N=9

**ENVIRONMENT**

- Nearest fresh water: Type River Homosassa River
- Distance from site (m): 0
- Natural community: Topography: Elevation Min 0 m Max 0 m
- Local vegetation: Mangrove Swamp Forests and Coastal Marshes
- Present land use: Private Land/Residence
- SCS soil series: Salt Water Marsh
- Soil association:

**DOCUMENTATION**

- Accessible Documentation: Not filed with the Site File
- Document type: All materials at one location

1) Document description: Master’s Thesis
   - Maintaining organization: University of South Florida, Dept of Archeology
   - File or accession #: Unknown

2) Document type: Maintaining organization

**RECODER & INFORMANT INFORMATION**

- Informant Information Name: Katherine Maria Padula
  - Address/Phone/E-mail: University of South Florida
  - Address/Phone/E-mail: 5396 W. Riverview Drive, Tampa, FL 33637/817-814-8752/Kam.padula@gmail.com
APPENDIX C

SITE FORM UPDATE, CI124B

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE
Version 4.0  1/07

Site Name(s) Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Pa
Project Name Re-Placing the Landscape at Yulee's Margarita PI
Survey # (DHR only)
Ownership private-profit private-nonprofit private-individual private-specificity city county state federal aboriginal american foreign unknown

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name HOMOSASSA USGS Date 2012 Plat or Other Map
City/Town within 3 miles HOMOSASSA In City Limits? Yes No unknown County CITRUS
Township 19S Range 178 Section 32 1/4 section: NW SE NE NE irregular-name:
Township 19S Range 178 Section 32 1/4 section: NW SE NE NE
Landgrant Tax Parcel #
UTM Coordinates: Zone 118 Easting Northing
Other Coordinates: X: Y:
Address / Vicinity / Route to: State Road 440, Homosassa, FL 34446

Name of Public Tract (e.g., park) State Park

TYPE OF SITE (select all that apply)

SETTING

ANIMAL (terrestrial) Wetland (aquatic) River/Stream/Creek (marine)

STRUCTURES OR FEATURES

Log boat Agrofarm building Burial mound Agrofarm building

FUNCTION

Aboriginal Non-Aboriginal

1. 2.

CULTURE PERIODS (select all that apply)

ABORIGINAL

European (prehistoric)

1. 2.

NON-ABORIGINAL

1. 2.

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places? Yes No Insufficient information
Potentially eligible as a component to a National Register district? Yes No Insufficient information
Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed) Site on National Register since 1971.

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action

DHR USE ONLY

OFFICIAL EVALUATION

DHR USE ONLY

NR List Date SHPO - Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: Yes No Insufficient info Date
KEEPER - Determined eligible: Yes No Date
Owner Objection NR Criteria for Evaluation: A B C D (see National Register Bulletin 15, p. 2)
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM**

**FIELD METHODS** (select all that apply)

- [x] no field check
- [ ] exposed ground
- [ ] screened shovel
- [x] bounds unknown
- [ ] remote sensing
- [ ] unscreened shovel
- [x] literature search
- [ ] posthole tests
- [ ] screened shovel-1/4
- [x] none by recorder
- [ ] exposed ground
- [ ] screened shovel
- [ ] literature search
- [ ] posthole tests
- [ ] block excavations
- [x] informants report
- [ ] auger tests
- [ ] informants report
- [ ] auger tests
- [ ] estimate or guess
- Other methods; number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan) 16 shovel tests, 1/2 m diameter, to rock/water table, 35' grid, 1/4' screen

**SITE DESCRIPTION**

- **Extent** Size (m²): 59
- **Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit:** 1850-1864 sugar mill operation

**Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one):**
- [ ] single component
- [ ] multiple component
- [ ] uncertain

**Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically.** Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:

**Integrity - Overall disturbance:**
- [ ] none seen
- [ ] minor
- [ ] substantial
- [ ] major
- [ ] redeposited
- [ ] destroyed-document!
- [ ] unknown

- **Disturbances / threats / protective measures:** road construction and road use

**Surface collection:** area collected: 10 m²

**ARTIFACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Artifacts #</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Count Estimate</th>
<th>Surface #</th>
<th>Subsurface #</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COLLECTION SELECTIVITY**

- [ ] unknown
- [ ] unselective (all artifacts)
- [ ] selective (some artifacts)
- [ ] mixed selectivity

**SPATIAL CONTROL**

- [ ] uncollected
- [ ] general (not by subarea)
- [ ] controlled by subarea
- [ ] variable spatial control
- [ ] other (describe in comments below) artifact Comments

**DIAGNOSTICS** (type or mode, and frequency; e.g., Suwanee ppp, heat-treated chair, Deptford Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENT**

- Nearest fresh water: Type: River
- Name: Homestead River
- Distance from site (m): 610
- Natural community: coastal rock barrier
- Topography: Delta
- Elevation: Min: 1 m Max: 2 m
- Local vegetation: Swamp Hardwoods
- Present land use: State Park
- SCS soil series: Hallendale Rock Outcrop
- Soil association: Okeechobee-Lauderhill-Terra Cui

**DOCUMENTATION**

**RECORDE & INFORMANT INFORMATION**

**Informant Information:** Name: Diane Wallman, Ph.D.
- Address / Phone / Email: University of South Florida

**Recorder Information:** Name: Diane Wallman, Ph.D.
- Affiliation: University of South Florida
- Address / Phone / Email: 4202 E Fowler Ave SOC107, Tampa, FL 33620 / 813-974-2138 / dianewallman@usf.edu

**PHOTOCOPY OF 7.5 USGS QUAD MAP WITH SITE BOUNDARIES MARKED and SITE PLAN**

Plan at 1:3,600 or larger. Show boundaries, scale, north arrow, test/collection units, landmarks and date.
## APPENDIX D

### LIST OF ARTIFACTS, CI1535

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS.LOT</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Artifact Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS2.01</td>
<td>STP36</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Brown glass, undiagnostic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2.02</td>
<td>STP36</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Clear glass, diagnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS2.03</td>
<td>STP36</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.01</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Glass, mirror</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.02</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, lock, Slaymaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.03</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, sheet metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.04</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, screw, modern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.05</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, spark plug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.06</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.07</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>SHEL</td>
<td>Shell, fragments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.08</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>PLAS</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS3.09</td>
<td>STP38</td>
<td>OTHR</td>
<td>Plug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.01</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Brown glass, bottle sherds, 1999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>146.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.02</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Clear glass, collar/screw top</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.03</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Clear glass, bottle sherds</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>209.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.04</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Clear glass, unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.05</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Clear glass, bowl rim shard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.06</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Clear glass, bottle, burned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.07</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Lightbulb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.08</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Milk glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.09</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Ceramic, body sherds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.10</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Ceramic, body sherds, Sears Roebuck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.11</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Screw, oxidized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.12</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Nail, wire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.13</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, unidentified, modern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.14</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Hubcap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.15</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, unidentified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS4.16</td>
<td>STP39</td>
<td>SHEL</td>
<td>Shell, oyster</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>170.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.01</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>GLAS</td>
<td>Glass hygiene bottle, amethyst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.02</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Ceramic, ironstone, rim sherd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.03</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Ceramic, stoneware, colored alkaline glazed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.04</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>Pottery, unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.05</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, spring, oxidized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.06</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, wire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.07</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>Metal, clasp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.08</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>PLAS</td>
<td>Plastic, button</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC.09</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>PLAS</td>
<td>Plastic, rim sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E  
SITE FORM, CI1535

ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE
Version 4.0 1/07

Site Name(s)  Corral Del Rio 1  
Project Name  Re-Planting the Plantation Landscape at Yulee's...  
Ownership  Private-Profiler  

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name  Homosassa  
City/Town (within 3 miles)  Homosassa  
Township  19S  
Range  17E  
Section  22  
Other Coordinates X:  Y:  
UTM Zone:  11S  
Eastings:  4,127,412  

Other Features or Functions (Choose from the list or type a response.)
1.  2.  

CULTURE PERIODS  (select all that apply)

ABORIGINAL  
Archaeic (non-specific)  
Archaic, Early  
Archaic, Late  
Bella Culture  
Cades Cove  
Chocophambisco  
Dep Inf  
Indian (pre-Columbian)  

NON-ABORIGINAL  
First Spanish (non-specific)  
British 1763 to 1815  
Second Spanish 1782 to 1821  
American Territorial 1821-45  
American Civil War 1862-65  
American 20th Century  
American (non-specific)  

OTHER FEATURES OR FUNCTIONS  (select all that apply)

FUNCTION  
Domestic  
Pre-contact  
Structural  

OPINION OF RESOURCE SIGNIFICANCE  (select all that apply)

Potentially eligible individually for National Register of Historic Places?  
Yes  No  Insufficient Information  

Potential eligible as contributor to a National Register district?  
Yes  No  Insufficient Information  

Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed)

Recommendations for Owner or SHPO Action  N/A  

DHR USE ONLY  

NR List Date  S-HPO – Appears to meet criteria for NR listing:
  Yes  No  Insufficient Info  Date:
  Initial:
  Owner Objection  NR Criteria for Evaluation:
  A  B  C  D  (see National Register Bulletin 16, p. 2)
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

SITE DETECTION
- no field check
- exposed ground
- screened shovel
- screened shovel 14"
- screened shovel 10"
- material test
- auger tests
- screened shovel 15"
- informer report
- auger report
- auger tests
- estimate of guess
- Other methods: number, size, depth, pattern of units; screen size (attach site plan): 4 circular shovel tests of 50cm diameter
- conducted at 15m intervals, and a 5th in the middle of one of the intervals. 5th to max depth of 50cm due to limestone deposits. Additional unprovenienced collection provided by homeowner.

SITE BOUNDARY
- bounds unknown
- remote sensing
- exposed ground
- screened shovel
- screened shovel 14"
- screened shovel 10"
- literature search
- material test
- auger tests
- block excavations
- estimate of guess
- Other methods:

SITE DESCRIPTION

Extent: Size (m²): Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit: 1,539 2-50cm

Temporal Interpretation: Components (check one): single component multiple component uncertain
Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:
Modern homestead refuse spanning early 20th C to modern day.

Integrity: Overall disturbance: none seen minor substantial major redeposited destroyed document? unknown
Disturbances / threats / protective measures: Homeowner frequently gardens, uncovering artifacts and potentially disturbing stratigraphy of artifacts.
Surface collection: area collected: m² # collection units: # excavation: # noncontiguous blocks

ARTIFACTS

Total Artifacts: 96 @count: Estimate: 

COLLECTION SELECTIVITY
- unknown
- unselective (all artifacts)
- selective (some artifacts)
- mixed selectivity

SPATIAL CONTROL
- uncollected
- general (not by subarea)
- unknown
- controlled (by subarea)
- variable spatial control
- other (describe in comments below)

Artifact Comments:

DIAGNOSTICS (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee pot, heat-treated chert, Desford Cheek-stamped, ironstone/whiteeware)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metallic &quot;Eyeemaker&quot; bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nonaboriginal ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENIRONMENT

Nearest fresh water: Type River Name: Homosassa River Distance from site (m): 
Natural community: COASTAL WETLANDS Topography: Other Elevation: Min m Max m
Local vegetation: Swamp hardwoods
Present land use: Private Residence
SCS soil series: Hollendale Bock Outcrop Soil association: Okeechobee-Lauderdale-Terra Col

DOCUMENTATION

Accessible Documentation: Not filed with the Site File - including field notes, analysis notes, photos, plans and other important documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
<th>Maintaining Organization</th>
<th>File or Accession No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Master's Thesis</td>
<td>University of South Florida, Dept of Anthropology</td>
<td>File or Accession No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECORD & INFORMANT INFORMATION

Informant Information: Name: 
Address/Phone/E-mail: 

Recorder Information: Name: Katherine Maria Padula 
Affiliation: University of South Florida
Address/Phone/E-mail: 6506 W Riverchase Drive, Tampa, FL 33617 / 617-849-5752 / kate.padula@gmail.com
APPENDIX F
SITE FORM, CI1536

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
FLORIDA MASTER SITE FILE
Version 4.0 1/07

Consult Guide to Archaeological Site Form for detailed instructions

Site Name(s): W. Anchorage
Multiple Listing (DHR only)

Project Name: Re-planting the Plantation landscape at Yulee's...

Ownership: Private Profit

Survey # (DHR only)

LOCATION & MAPPING

USGS 7.5 Map Name: HOMOSEDA
USGS Date: 2012

City/Town Area: Homoseda

Township: 19S
Range: 17R
Section: 32

Land Grant: Tax Parcel # 1763-1620-10

Other Coordinates X: 16 Y: 27

Address / Vicinity / Route to: Close to 10 Mile W Anchorage Street, Homoseda, Florida 34448

Name of Public Tract (e.g. park)

TYPE OF SITE (select all that apply)

- Log local
- Log frame building
- Basic mound
- Armamentary
- Buried garden
- Subsistence features
- Surface scatter
- Wall

FUNCTION

- Composite
- Informative site
- Subsidiary site
- Settlement (prehistoric)
- Homestead (historic)
- Farmstead
- Village (prehistoric)
- Town (historic)
- Quarry

CULTURE PERIODS (select all that apply)

- ABORIGINAL
- MISSISSIPPIAN
- CALIFORNIA
- MIDDLE ATLANTIC
- EASTERN SEABoard
- GREAT LAKES
- SOUTHERN PERIOD
- EASTERN SEABOARD
- CALIFORNIA

- NON-ABORIGINAL
- Post Spanish 1513-85
- Post Spanish 1586-95
- Post Spanish 1596-1623
- Post Spanish 1623-1658
- Post Spanish 1606-1783
- Second Spain 1783-1821
- American Civil War 1861-95
- American 19th Century
- American 20th Century
- African-American

CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE (select all that apply)

- Yes
- No
- Insufficient Information

Explanation of Evaluation (required if evaluated; use separate sheet if needed)

Recommendaions for Owner or SHPO Action: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHR USE ONLY</th>
<th>OFFICIAL EVALUATION</th>
<th>DHR USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR List Date</td>
<td>NHPD - Appears to meet criteria for NR listing: yes no Insufficient Information: Date:</td>
<td>Keeper: Determined eligible: yes no Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Objective</td>
<td>NR Criteria for Evaluation:</td>
<td>6b National Register Bulletin 15, p. 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM

**SITE #** CI01536

**FIELD METHODS** (select all that apply)

- [ ] no field check
- [ ] exposed ground
- [ ] screened shovels
- [ ] bounds unknown
- [ ] remote sensing
- [ ] unscreened shovel
- [ ] literature search
- [ ] auger tests
- [ ] screened shovels 1/2
- [ ] holes by recorder
- [ ] exposed ground
- [ ] screened shovel
- [ ] screened shovels 1/2
- [ ] literature search
- [ ] test hole tests
- [ ] block excavations
- [ ] informant report
- [ ] auger tests
- [ ] estimates or guess
- Other methods: number, size, depth, pattern of units, screen size (attach site plan)

**SITE DESCRIPTION**

Extent Size (m^2) 2,428
Depth/stratigraphy of cultural deposit Unknown

Temporal Interpretation - Components (check one): [ ] single component [ ] multiple component [ ] uncertain

Describe each occupation in plan (refer to attached large scale map) and stratigraphically. Discuss temporal and functional interpretations:
Possible homestead/slave quarter/building related to Yulee's Margarita Plantation. If so, would range from 1840s to 1861.

Integrity - Overall disturbance [ ] none seen [ ] minor [ ] substantial [ ] major [ ] redeposited [ ] destroyed-document [ ] unknown

Disturbances/threats/protective measures: Landowner has cleared some land near the structural remains. Further land clearing could destroy the remains/additional remains that may exist further back in the property.

Surface collection: area collected 0 m^2 # collection units Excavation: noncontiguous blocks

**ARTIFACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Selectivity</th>
<th>Surface #</th>
<th>Subsurface #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] unknown (all artifacts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] selective (some artifacts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] mixed selectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPATIAL CONTROL**

- [ ] Uncollected (not by subarea)
- [ ] Controlled (by subarea)
- [ ] Variable spatial control
- [ ] Other (describe in comments below)

**DIAGNOSTICS** (type or mode, and frequency: e.g., Suwanee pottery, heat-treated chert, Cliffside Check-stamped, ironstone/whiteWare)

1. **[ ] bowl**
   - N= 2
   - N= 7
   - N= 3
   - N= 6

2. **[ ] tumbler**
   - N= 5
   - N= 8
   - N= 9
   - N= 9

**ENVIRONMENT**

Nearest fresh water: **[ ] River** Name: Homosassa River Distance from site (m): N=

Natural community **[ ] Swamp Hardwoods**

Local vegetation **[ ] Swamp Hardwoods**

Present land use **[ ] Private Residence**

SCS soil series **[ ] Hallendale Rock Outcrop** Soil association **[ ] Okeland-Loamhill-Terra C"al**

**DOCUMENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible Documentation Not Filed with the Site File:</th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All materials at one location</td>
<td>Document type: All materials at one location</td>
<td>Document type: All materials at one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University of South Florida, Dept. of Antiquities</td>
<td>File or accession #:</td>
<td>File or accession #:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECODER & INFORMANT INFORMATION**

Informant Name: [ ]

Address: [ ]

Informant Information: [ ]

Address: [ ]

**Recorder Information:**

Name: Katherine Maria Padula
Affiliation: University of South Florida
Address: 6306 W Riverchase Drive, Tampa, FL 33637 / 617-840-6752 / kato.padula@gmail.com
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APPENDIX G:

PROTOTYPE FOR THE NATHEAL MEMORIAL GARDEN
“Natheal Memorial Garden”

The Natheals were just a few of over 80 enslaved laborers who lived and worked at the plantation. This garden is dedicated to their memory and to the memory of all of those enslaved at Margarita.
APPENDIX H

FAIR USE WORKSHEET FOR FIGURE 5.2.

University of South Florida

INSTRUCTIONS

Check all boxes that apply, and keep a copy of this form for your records. If you have questions, please contact the USF General Counsel or your USF Tampa Library Copyright Librarian.

Name: Katherine M. Padula Date: 11/9/2017

Class or Project: Re-Placing the Plantation Landscape at Yulee’s Margarita Plantation

Title of Copyrighted Work: Photo entitled “Tiger Tail Island and the remains of Yulee’s home” (Anders 2009)

PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✐ Educational</td>
<td>☐ Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use)</td>
<td>☐ Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Research or Scholarship</td>
<td>☐ Bad-faith behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Criticism, Parody, News Reporting or Comment</td>
<td>☐ Denying credit to original author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Transformative Use (your new work relies on and adds new expression, meaning, or message to the original work)</td>
<td>☐ Non-transformative or exact copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Restricted Access (to students or other appropriate group)</td>
<td>☐ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Nonprofit</td>
<td>☐ Profit-generating use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the purpose and character of your use ✓ supports fair use or ☐ does not support fair use.

NATURE OF THE COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Published work</td>
<td>☐ Creative or fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Factual or nonfiction</td>
<td>☐ Consumable (workbooks, tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Important to favored educational objectives</td>
<td>☐ Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the nature of the copyrighted material ✓ supports fair use or ☐ does not support fair use.

AMOUNT AND SUBSTANTIALLY OF MATERIAL USED IN RELATION TO WHOLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Small amount (using only the amount necessary to accomplish the purpose)</td>
<td>☐ Large portion or whole work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Amount is important to favored socially beneficial objective (i.e. educational objectives)</td>
<td>☐ Portion used is qualitatively substantial (i.e. it is the ‘heart of the work’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lower quality from original (ex. Lower resolution or bitrate photos, video, and audio)</td>
<td>☐ Similar or exact quality of original work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LeEtta Schmidt, jmschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu
Reviewed by USF General Counsel 08/11/2015
Overall, the amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole □ supports fair use or □ does not support fair use.

**EFFECT ON THE MARKET FOR ORIGINAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ No significant effect on the market or potential market for the original</td>
<td>□ Replaces sale of copyrighted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No similar product marketed by the copyright holder</td>
<td>□ Significantly impairs market or potential market for the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ You own a lawfully acquired copy of the material</td>
<td>□ Numerous copies or repeated, long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The copyright holder is unidentified</td>
<td>□ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lack of licensing mechanism for the material</td>
<td>□ Affordable and reasonably available permissions or licensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the effect on the market for the original □ supports fair use or □ does not support fair use.

**CONCLUSION**

The combined purpose and character of the use, nature of the copyrighted material, amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole and the effect on the market for the original □ likely supports fair use or □ likely does not support fair use.

**Note:** Should your use of copyrighted material not support fair use, you may still be able to locate and request permissions from the copyright holder. For help on this, please feel free to contact your **Copyright Librarian**.

This worksheet has been adapted from:

**Cornell University’s Checklist for Conducting A Fair use Analysis Before Using Copyrighted Materials:**
[https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf](https://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf)


**Smith, Kevin; Macklin, Lisa A.; Gilliland, Anne.** A Framework for Analyzing Any Copyright Problem. Retrieved from: [https://d396qouza4ov.cloudfront.net/cfel/Reading%20Docs/A%20Framework%20for%20Analyzing%20Any%20Copyright%20Problem.pdf](https://d396qouza4ov.cloudfront.net/cfel/Reading%20Docs/A%20Framework%20for%20Analyzing%20Any%20Copyright%20Problem.pdf)

LaEtta Schmidt, lmschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu
Reviewed by USF General Counsel 08/11/2015
APPENDIX I

FAIR USE WORKSHEET FOR “CUTTING CANE” INTERPRETATIVE PANEL

University of South Florida

INSTRUCTIONS

Check all boxes that apply, and keep a copy of this form for your records. If you have questions, please contact the USF General Counsel or your USF Tampa Library Copyright Librarian.

Name: Katherine M. Padula Date: 11/9/2017

Class or Project: Re-Placing the Plantation Landscape at Yuiee’s Margarita Plantation

Title of Copyrighted Work: Photo, "Cutting Cane" (Flowers 2011)

PURPOSE AND CHARACTER OF THE USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad-faith behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denying credit to original author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-transformative or exact copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profit-generating use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the purpose and character of your use supports fair use or does not support fair use.

NATURE OF THE COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative or fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumable (workbooks, tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the nature of the copyrighted material supports fair use or does not support fair use.

AMOUNT AND SUBSTANTIALLY OF MATERIAL USED IN RELATION TO WHOLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large portion or whole work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portion used is qualitatively substantial (i.e. it is the ‘heart of the work’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar or exact quality of original work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LeEtta Schmidt, lmschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu
Reviewed by USF General Counsel 08/11/2015
Overall, the amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole supports fair use or does not support fair use.

**EFFECT ON THE MARKET FOR ORIGINAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Supports Fair Use</th>
<th>Likely Does Not Support Fair Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ No significant effect on the market or potential market for the original</td>
<td>□ Replaces sale of copyrighted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No similar product marketed by the copyright holder</td>
<td>□ Significantly impairs market or potential market for the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ You own a lawfully acquired copy of the material</td>
<td>□ Numerous copies or repeated, long-term use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The copyright holder is unidentifiable</td>
<td>□ Made accessible on Web or to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lack of licensing mechanism for the material</td>
<td>□ Affordable and reasonably available permissions or licensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the effect on the market for the original supports fair use or does not support fair use.

**CONCLUSION**

The combined purpose and character of the use, nature of the copyrighted material, amount and substantiality of material used in relation to the whole and the effect on the market for the original supports fair use or likely does not support fair use.

*Note: Should your use of copyrighted material not support fair use, you may still be able to locate and request permissions from the copyright holder. For help on this, please feel free to contact your Copyright Librarian.*

This worksheet has been adapted from:

Cornell University’s Checklist for Conducting A Fair use Analysis Before Using Copyrighted Materials:

http://copyright.cornell.edu/policies/docs/Fair_Use_Checklist.pdf


Smith, Kevin; Macklin, Lisa A.; Gilliland, Anne. A Framework for Analyzing any Copyright Problem. Retrieved from:

https://s3.amazonaws.com/docs.cloudfront.net/STM/Reading%20Docs/4%20Framework%20for%20Analyzing%20Copyright%20Problem.pdf

LeEtta Schmidt, mschmidt@usf.edu and Drew Smith dsmith@usf.edu

Reviewed by USF General Counsel 08/11/2015