SOURCE CRITICISM AND THE INTERPRETATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN SITES

Brian W. Thomas

Researchers interested in colonial and antebellum sites in the U.S. Southeast have a number of sources to draw upon to acquire an "insider" perspective of African-American life during this period. This paper examines three of these sources (narratives written by former slaves, interviews of former slaves recorded this century, and ethnographic research) and explores some of the difficulties in constructing analogies based on African ethnographic material, specifically, an uncritical use of the term "traditional" and an often unwarranted assumption of cultural homogeneity among African peoples. I stress the importance of source criticism and suggest that we can overcome some of the deficiencies of our sources by drawing on multiple lines of evidence in interpreting these sites.

Over the past several decades, scholars increasingly have sought ways to overcome European and European-American bias in studies of African-American slavery (e.g., Blassingame 1975, 1976; Brown and Cooper 1990; Ferguson 1992; Gutman 1976; Howson 1990; Joyner 1986; McKee 1992; Stuckey 1987; Yentsch 1992). There are several sources that we can use to present an "insider" view of slave life, such as historical documents, material culture, and African ethnographic material. Historical documents include autobiographical narratives and interviews of former slaves (e.g., Bruce 1969; Cade 1935; Rawick 1972-79; Schweninger 1984; Stroyer 1968). Archaeological studies of slave sites provide a look at the material remains of African-American slave homes (e.g., Kelso 1984; McKee 1987; Michie 1990; Orser 1988; Otto 1984; Wheaton and Garrow 1985), and African ethnographic research can be used to construct analogues for interpreting material culture (e.g., Brown and Cooper 1990; Ferguson 1991, 1992; Handler and Lange 1978; Yentsch 1994). These sources are valuable tools in constructing knowledge, but only after we recognize their limitations and critically evaluate their appropriateness case by case (Vansina 1989:343-347; Wood 1990).

Sources of information require evaluation, a concept familiar to most archaeologists. We recognize that biases are inherent in our data—for example, we take into account issues of sampling and site forma-

tion processes in our interpretations of archaeological data (Redman 1987; Schiffer 1983, 1987). But source criticism must also be applied to the documents and ethnographic material we use. Furthermore, we must tightly specify what we regard as relevant in our use of analogic reasoning, and not uncritically "map on" a complement of traits when some similarities are found (Stahl 1993; Wylie 1985, 1988).

This paper examines issues of source criticism as they apply to historical documents and ethnographic material used to interpret African-American life during the colonial and antebellum periods. I look first at narratives written by African Americans during the nineteenth century, and then examine some of the issues involved with using interviews of former slaves recorded early this century. Finally, I explore how African ethnographic material is used and examine potential problems. These problems include the uncritical use of the term "traditional," which is often defined in the twentieth century and projected back into time, and a frequently unwarranted assumption of cultural homogeneity in Africa.

Narratives

There exists a common misconception that African-American slaves left no written records. Although this record is limited, a number of former slaves wrote autobiographies describing the conditions of slavery in the South, both during and immediately following the antebellum period. Bailey (1980:384) estimates that there are 120 such documents which he could "verify as genuine autobiographies and not novels, biographies, or any other nonautobiographical form."

The most important aspect of antebellum slave narratives is that they were written by individuals who had experienced enslavement. Because they were written before, or soon after emancipation, they are one of the few contemporaneous sources produced by African descendants. Although the time scale covered by the autobiographical narratives is limited—only about 15 percent were written prior to 1800—they nonetheless offer a valuable view of slavery at a proximate slice in time (Bailey 1980:384; also see Starling 1981).

Prior to the 1960s, historians generally ignored narratives as source material. U. B. Phillips (1918, 1929), in his major treatments of slavery, dismissed autobiographies as of dubious value, and suggested that
of insights that would allow us to understand the material conditions found in specific contexts. Many lack the details of day-to-day conditions that would be most helpful in our attempt to understand the material remains of slavery. They also tend to emphasize evidence which puts the author in the best light, a problem shared by all autobiographical material (Bailey 1980:402).

**Interviews**

A second source of documentary information is testimony collected from former slaves. The bulk of this material consists of interviews conducted between 1936–1938 under the auspices of the Federal Writers Project, or FWP (Rawick 1972–79). Other material was collected by private institutions, including work done by Fisk University in 1929, published in 1945 (Fisk University 1945), and Southern University (as yet unpublished, although a summary was published by Cade [1935]).

The FWP collection consists of over 2,000 interviews of ex-slaves still living in the South, but the context within which they were collected presents some problems. First, they were collected long after emancipation; and, second, interviews were conducted under awkward conditions. Most slaves were emancipated in 1865; those still living in 1937 were 72 years removed from slavery, and many experienced it only as children. Sixty-seven percent of those interviewed were 15 years old or younger when emancipated (Yetman 1967:534–535), and may have relied on memories of stories they heard rather than their own personal experiences. More disconcerting are the conditions under which these sources were collected. FWP interviewers were predominantly white, and considering the racial climate of the South during the Depression years, elderly blacks may not have been forthright about conditions and treatment during slavery.

Despite these problems, the testimony of former slaves promises to be a useful means to complement the study of slavery in the U.S. Testimony on certain aspects of slave life was probably little affected by problems relating to interviewers (caste etiquette, poor interview techniques, editing, etc.). For example, interviews contain valuable information on mundane, day-to-day activities that did not reflect on white-black interaction. Also, information obtained from interviews by whites can be compared with that collected by African-American interviewers from Fisk University and blacks working for the FWP.

These testimonies, as well as slave narratives, are important sources that can help to bring the slaves’ perspective, or view of the “other” to the study of African-American slavery (e.g., Blassingame 1972, 1976, 1977; Genovese 1976; Stuckey 1987). Like any
source material, both must be exposed to external and internal criticism (Wood 1990), and are best used when combined with sources that represent other views of slavery such as planters' and travelers' accounts (e.g., Mavor 1990; Olmstead 1856; Redpath 1968; Sterling 1969). By drawing on a variety of sources, including material culture, a fuller understanding of the past will result.

Ethnographic Analogy

The role that analogy plays in constructing knowledge about the past is the subject of an extensive literature of the past several decades (Ascher 1961; Binford 1967; Charlton 1981; Gould 1980:29–47; Gould and Watson 1982; Heider 1967; Hodder 1982:11–41; Stahl 1993; Stiles 1977; Thompson 1991; Wylie 1985, 1988). While archaeologists interested in prehistory have focused a great deal of attention on the use and appropriateness of analogy, historical archaeologists have made little explicit use of ethnographic analogy. One reason is the availability of historical documents, which often present an "ethnographic present" of the site or region being studied. Deetz (1977:156–7) points out, however, that analogy enters into many of our interpretations of archaeological sites of the historic period, although implicitly. He cites one example of faulty analogy in describing how museum interpreters imposed nineteenth-century concepts of privacy on seventeenth-century house museums by labeling rooms as "born ing rooms," although such a room never existed. This unwarranted assumption of uniformitarian principles of cultural continuity is one of the major errors in applying analogic reasoning to the interpretation of historic sites. Although this assumption has been critiqued (Deetz 1977:157; Skowroney 1992; Trigger 1985), there remains a tendency for historical archaeologists to assume cultural uniformity through time because of the short time frame in their studies.

The interest in the African heritage of African Americans stemmed from the social movements of the 1960s. The search to identify "Africanisms," or cultural similarities between African-American and African material culture, led to increasing use of ethnographic analogy. A search for African "holdovers" in slave sites was seen as a way of illuminating the history and cultural heritage of a group that had been marginalized in U.S. history and society. Identifying cultural retentions also provided evidence for archaeologists interested in the material conditions of slavery, African-American ethnicity, the process of acculturation or creolization, and resistance to dominance—all important goals of African-American archaeology (Orser 1990; Singleton 1988, 1990). Studies of material culture (especially ceramics), architecture, and mortuary practices sought to highlight the significant cultural differences between African and African-American culture on one hand and the dominant European-American culture on the other during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Such works (e.g., Ferguson 1978, 1980, 1991, 1992; Handler and Lange 1978; Jones 1985; Vlach 1976; Wheaton and Garrow 1985) provided new insights on African cultural connections for groups of the African diaspora.

Among the best known investigations into African characteristics found in African-American material culture is Leland Ferguson's study of Colono Ware pottery from plantation sites, primarily in South Carolina (Ferguson 1978, 1980, 1991, 1992; see also Anthony 1978, 1986; Vernon 1988). Ferguson uses analogy to posit African "retentions" in slave material culture. The term Colono Ware refers to an unglazed, low-fired earthenware found on colonial-period sites in the Southeast. While initially believed to have been made exclusively by Native Americans (Noël Hume 1962), Ferguson argues that Colono Ware was also produced by African-American slaves (Ferguson 1977, 1980). As evidence, he noted the presence of Colono Ware on numerous Euro- and African-American sites of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and its paucity on Native American sites (1980: 17). Initially, Ferguson relied on "casual observation of the similarity of modern Ghanaian and Nigerian pottery to the Colono-Indian ware of South Carolina" in concluding that Colono Ware represented an African cultural retention (Ferguson 1980:15). More recently (Ferguson 1991) he has used specific ethnographic material from West Africa to demonstrate the similarities between Colono Ware and African ceramic styles.

An interest in African patterns of material culture among groups of the diaspora is also present in the work of Thomas Wheaton and Patrick Garrow (Wheaton et al. 1983; Wheaton and Garrow 1985). These scholars have examined the archaeological remains from three distinct slave quarters on the Yaugah and Curriboo plantations in Berkeley County, South Carolina, where the occupation ranged from the 1740s to the 1820s. They concluded, based on architectural and archaeological evidence, that the slave communities on these plantations underwent a process of acculturation from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries, adopting Euro-American building techniques and material culture to a greater extent as contact with Euro-Americans increased over this period (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:257).

Changes in architecture through time form an important line of evidence in Wheaton and Garrow's work. They note that the earliest construction episodes (wall-trench construction) show similarities to architectural forms common in West Africa, while later forms (post-constructed frame structures) follow Euro-American models of architecture (Wheaton and
Their use of ethnographic material is limited to a
general observation of twentieth-century West Afri-
can building techniques (Greene 1983).

Steven L. Jones has examined the influences of Af-
rican architecture on American vernacular archi-
tecture (Jones 1985; see also Vlach 1976). Jones based his
conclusions on ethnographic work that he conducted
in West and Central Africa during 1969 and 1970. He
noted "the persistent presence of traditional Central
and West African elements in terms of plan, spatial
distribution, materials, and forms in New World ar-
chitectural patterns from the seventeenth to the nine-
teenth centuries," which he believed indicated an
African origin (Jones 1985:195). However, his de-

The Appropriateness of Source Material

The work reported by Brown and Cooper (1990)
was conducted at the Levi Jordan Plantation, which
is located in Brazoria County, Texas, approximately
60 miles south of Houston and 15 miles inland from
the Gulf of Mexico. The slave and tenant quarters
were constructed in 1848 and occupied until 1891,
when the tenants were forced to abandon them
(Brown and Cooper 1990:9). The plantation is be-
lieved to have housed as many as 150 slaves in the
1860s in long barracks-like structures, each of which
was subdivided into four individual cabins.

The site is remarkably well preserved. After aban-
donment, the quarters were padlocked and allowed
to deteriorate naturally. The area around the site was
never plowed, and the bricks that made up the ex-
terior walls run approximately one foot beneath the
surface, acting to seal the archaeological deposits from
outside intrusions (Brown and Cooper 1990:10–11).
The excellent preservation allowed them to define
and compare the actual floor areas of individual cab-
ins. Without this resolution, questions of occupa-
tional specialization, political and economic status, and
religious practices could not have been addressed.

Brown and Cooper used artifacts recovered in nine
of the individual slave cabins to identify specific so-
cial and economic roles performed by former occu-
pants. These included seamstress, carpenter, hunter,
metsmith, political leader, healer/magician, and Af-
rican craftsman (Brown and Cooper 1990:15). The au-
thors based much of their interpretation—particu-
larly their identification of the healer/magician—on
ethnographic material that described African social
and religious practices. They compared artifacts with
accounts of "traditional" African religious practices
presented in ethnographic sources. These artifacts in-
clude:

cast-iron kettle bases, several pieces of utilized chalk, frag-
ments of a small scale, bird skulls, an animal's paw, medicine
bottles, bullet casings put together to form a sealed tube,
ocean shells, small doll parts, a high frequency of nails and
spikes, several tablespoons, metal knives—both real and
'fake,' a chert projectile point, and two chert scrapers [Brown
and Cooper 1990:16–17].

Brown and Cooper's work is innovative in several
ways. Their call for a contextual, rather than func-
tional, approach to interpreting artifacts enables a
richer understanding of African-American society.
Their approach is particularly promising because it
offers a framework within which material culture,
historical data, and ethnohistorical accounts can be
synthesized. There are, however, two difficulties in how they select source material for constructing analogies, both of which center on what is questionably considered “traditional” in African cultural practices. The first is an assumption of regional homogeneity in West African social and religious practices, and the second is an assumption that the “traditional” elements noted in the ethnographic material collected in the twentieth century accurately reflects social and religious practices of the nineteenth century and earlier.

At several points in their discussion, Brown and Cooper refer to traits that are characteristic of “traditional” West African practices, lumping all of West Africa into a single corporate identity. This gloss, of course, ignores the heterogeneity in West African cultures. Likewise, it ignores the diversity of groups that were victims of the trans-Atlantic slave trade, for it assumes that they reflect this homogeneity. In an article on the bicentenary of Sierra Leone, Fyfe (1987) describes the wide range of peoples that were liberated and settled in Sierra Leone by the British navy after the British abolished the slave trade. These “receptive” members were drawn from homelands scattered over the African continent—Temne, Mende and Vai among those from near by, Bambara and Wolof from the north, Yoruba (the largest group), Igbo, Hausa and others from the modern Nigeria, many from modern Zaire and Angola, and some even from East Africa.” (Fyfe 1987:412). Fyfe gives us some idea of the great geographic and ethnic diversity of enslaved Africans. Accordingly, we should be careful not to presume that “West African” refers to a uniformity of culture and cultural practices; nor should we presume that the slaves who arrived in the United States represent “West African” culture.

The same diversity exists with respect to religion as well. In discussing his study of African religious practices, Iddowu (1973:105–106) points out the great diversity in religious practice:

Some time ago, I began to write a book on God in West African Belief. Before long I began to run into difficulty and had to admit that it would be unwise for any one scholar to attempt such a formidable task. Therefore, I limited my scope to God in Nigerian Belief. But even here, I was faced with the predicament of at least 250 distinct languages and variations of cults and traditions in bewildering numbers. This is to say that any study of African traditional religion that is to be thorough and academically effective and profitable should be regional or one that covers only a limited area. The more limited the area the more effective and honest the study will be.

The ethnic origin of the slave community at the Jordan Plantation is unknown. The authors point out that there were a number of African-born slaves in Brazoria County (133 according to the 1870 population census), suggesting that perhaps some of the 150 slaves from the Jordan Plantation may have been of African birth (Brown and Cooper 1990:12). Yet no information is available about the geographical origins of these Africans. (This fact is, of course, not surprising; considering that the United States abolished the importation of slaves in 1808, it is unlikely that detailed records of illegally imported slaves were kept.) Despite the lack of information about the origin of the African slaves at the Jordan Plantation, Brown and Cooper select very specific ethnographic studies to create behavioral analogies with which they interpret their data, but do so without discussing the reasons for their selection.

The majority of the ethnographic material used by Brown and Cooper describes the religious beliefs of the BaKongo in Central Africa (Janzen and MacGaffey 1974; MacGaffey 1977). Along with the BaKongo material, the authors employ a study by Bascom (1952) that shows similarities between religious practices of the Yoruba of Ife, Nigeria (observed in 1937–38), and Afro-Cuban religious cults. Implicit in the choice of these unrelated studies is an assumption that religious practices of dispersed peoples of Africa are interchangeable and can be applied on an ad hoc basis to the archaeological record. Such an application makes it likely that any pattern found in the archaeological record could be correlated to some combination of ethnographic information on African religious practices.

A second problem is an uncritical acceptance that ethnographic material represents “traditional” practices. The majority of the ethnographic work used in their study was collected late this century, although some of the BaKongo material comes from work done in the first two decades of the twentieth century. It may be inappropriate to assume that the observations of twenty-first-century recorders represents practices as they existed in the mid-nineteenth century. Accepting this body of work uncritically for the construction of analogies applicable to mid-nineteenth century African-American sites may be problematic. African societies experienced many changes in the nineteenth century. There were several factors that account for much of this change: the suppression of the slave trade; the activities of Christian missionaries; and the imposition of colonial rule (or contact and conflict with colonial powers). McCaskie (1983: 36), for example, documents the significant changes that took place among the Asante during the nineteenth century:

What, I think, is of paramount importance is that it was in this period [the mid-nineteenth century] that Asante became massively exposed to novel options, to different (and even contradictory) ways of looking at the world... In cognitive terms... the 'generation' of 1880 was further removed from that of 1830 than that 'generation' had been from any of its predecessors throughout Asante history.
Ottenberg and Ottenberg (1960:83) also note the changes in religious belief during the twentieth century. They observe that “Witch-finding cults, modifications of traditional witchcraft beliefs, are sweeping areas of West, central, and East Africa, and are now found even in groups which had little or no belief in witches in pre-contact times.” These beliefs, when observed by ethnographers, are often presumed to reflect pre-contract traditions, which they very well may not.

The extent to which cultural practices among groups in Africa may have been affected by internal and external pressures during the nineteenth century and earlier is not always acknowledged. In the introduction to An Anthology of Kongo Religion (from which Brown and Cooper draw heavily), Janzen and MacGaffey (1974:3–4) indicate their belief in the continuity of traditional cultural practices among the Bakongo:

The persistence of traditional thought is not remarkable and calls for no explanation unless one first assumes that African beliefs must necessarily disintegrate in a world dominated by bureaucratic and capitalist institutions. We consider that this assumption can never be made a priori.

Somewhat paradoxically, these authors lament only several pages later “how greatly the traditional forms of indigenous religion have been impoverished in recent decades” (1974:7). This perspective reflects a certain naïveté by assuming that change could not have taken place prior to the ethnographic work in the early twentieth century.

There is a further issue regarding the early Bakongo ethnographic material found in Janzen and MacGaffey (1974). Ethnographic work on the Bakongo was conducted in the early 1900s at the impetus of Christian missionaries, most notably by a Swedish missionary named K.E. Laman. Laman employed a group of Bakongo who were educated at mission schools in the area for this work (Janzen and MacGaffey 1974). These Bakongo recorders were the leading converts and the principle indigenous agents of the Protestant missions in the Lower Congo (MacGaffey 1986:263). MacGaffey (1986) notes that these individuals also formed the core of later indigenous resistance to the colonial order in the Belgian Congo. He proposes that their participation in the ethnographic work came out of a sense of their own national interests, stating that “They were engaged in defining their culture and its values in contradiction to those of others, African as well as European, and creating for the future a record of a vanishing past” (MacGaffey 1986:274). One must therefore weigh the extent to which the political and social agenda of these recorders entered into their characterizations of the practices they observed and documented (Vansina 1989:343–347).

Conclusion

How, then, can we improve upon the valuable works discussed above? Because we cannot always eliminate the limitations or biases in source material, I suggest some ways to limit their impact on our interpretations: 1) evaluate source material through source criticism; 2) use multiple lines of evidence to support insights provided by source material; and 3) use ethnographic analogues comparatively, rather than using a few similarities as the basis for mapping on a constellation of social traits.

It is important to understand the possible biases of documentary sources—just as we consider the potential limitations of archaeological data. Source criticism provides a method to evaluate the authenticity of documents and the credibility of information they contain; it also provides a vehicle to understand the context within which they were created.

Having considered the potential limitations of specific sources, we can use multiple lines of evidence to assess our interpretations. Relevant ethnographic analogies, for example, can be supplemented by data from narratives and interviews of former slaves, as well as by the historical anthropological literature on African societies (e.g., McCaskie 1983). Other sources to explore include archaeological studies of African sites contemporary with the slave trade (e.g., DeCorse n.d.; Stahl 1994). These sources would strengthen studies focused on similarities in African and African-American material culture (e.g., Ferguson 1991; Jones 1985) because they present contemporaneous material culture for comparison. Brown and Cooper’s (1990) study, for example, might also incorporate interview data and autobiographical narratives to look for descriptions of healers or conjurers to assist interpreting material culture in a contextual manner (e.g., Bruce 1969:52–59; Pennington 1968:91–92).

Finally, when using analogies, we need to refrain from mapping on a wide range of social traits when we see some material similarities (Stahl 1993). For example, although there may have been a healer/magician or “conjuror” on the Jordan Plantation site, the role that this individual played in this community may have had no analogue in West Africa. Analogy clearly has a role in the archaeological interpretation of the past, and this is as true of the historic period as it is of prehistory; however, in order to use ethnographic analogy effectively in studies of U.S. slave communities, more careful consideration must be given to the appropriateness of the ethnographic material employed. Analyses such as Brown and Cooper’s will benefit significantly by a discussion of the considerations of relevance used to construct their analogic inferences (Wylie 1985, 1988) rather than an assumption of cultural constancy. In determining considerations of relevance, researchers need to ques-
tion the accuracy of twentieth-century ethnographic accounts that are used to construct analogies. Researchers also must understand the character and direction of historical change taking place in these societies. Historical archaeologists are faced with the same problems in the application of analogies which exist for their colleagues studying prehistory (Wylie 1985). Although we cannot always recognize the impact of these biases in our research, it is important to engage them explicitly.

Sources exist that can give historical archaeologists an "insider" view of ante- and postbellum African-American communities. Slave narratives and interviews of former slaves contain valuable information about religious practices and social relations within slave communities that can illuminate the archaeological study of these communities. African ethnography can provide a source for analogic insight. Furthermore, archaeologists working on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sites in Africa can provide valuable comparative material for studying contemporary African-American sites (Stahl 1994, n.d.). Used together critically, this material offers us multiple lines of evidence and can help us construct an "insider" context within which material culture can be understood.

Notes

Acknowledgments. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Ann Stahl, Larry McKee, Larissa Thomas, and Charlie Cobb for their thoughtful comments on previous drafts of this article.

1 Slaves who remained in territories still at war with the Union were officially emancipated January 1, 1863, by Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation; by December 1865 the Thirteenth Amendment had been ratified by the States, freeing the remainder.
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