In both of these accounts the references to firearms strongly suggest self-igniting ignition types, most likely the snaphaunce, as the percentages of arms inventoried in the Muster indicate (Appendix A). The muster for Wariscoyack lists only "1 pistol, and 5 Peeces" (Jester 1964: 47). I suggest that these 6 arms were all flint ignition forms and not matchlocks. The sentence *"...juft at that Inftant, finding his Mafter's Gun loaded, fhot at Random" (Smith1986: 296)* likely can only refer to a self-igniting arm.

There is little doubt that from 1607 onwards firearms were an integral part of colonial life as would be any other functional tool. It is reasonable to speculate that the colonists would select the most current and efficient firearm types for their personal and collective use. It is hinted the relation of the 1622 "Gift" that there was some displeasure with receiving "arms not fit for modern military service", (Gill 1974: 4) clearly Virginia colonists were aware of the need for efficient arms, especially after the massacre of 1622 and it is likely that any opportunity to obtain the most modern guns available would be taken advantage of.

Demographics may play a role in the arming of Virginia colonists as well. It is possible that on early seventeenth-century plantation sites located away from the more established core communities, an archaeological investigation would be likely to encounter flint ignition firearm parts in deposits dating from even the earliest levels, one could also expect to find parts associated with the deliberate discarding of obsolete firearm elements. Forms such as the wheel-lock, snaphaunce and early forms of the English lock (flintlock) are included in this category as they reach their time of obsolesance. At the core communities or heavily populated sites such as Martins Hundred or Jamestown one would expect matchlocks to be more commonly encountered in both

period documents and in the archaeological deposits. The use of matchlocks necessitates a source of fire to ignite the match, which ignites the priming powder, which in turn ignites the main charge thereby firing the piece. Conceptually, therefore it is much like using a piece of small ordinance, such as a "murderer". Maintaining a system allowing for effective operation of the matchlock takes planning, and especially, a foresighted need to use the weapon. It would be difficult and impractical to consistently maintain the necessary fire source in proximity to the users of the weapon for the matchlock to be of any real value, the exception of course is during those situations when it is obvious that the gun would be needed imminently.

Self-igniting flint firearms would be a logical choice to address the problem of firearm readiness. While the matchlock was not completely disregarded in all cases nor used exclusively in fortified settlements, there are some indications that a greater proportion of flint ignition type arms may be expected in the more vulnerable settlements during the first quarter of the seventeenth-century.

To understand the relationship of firearms types to the function they served it is important to understand the technology for each of the types represented in the muster. Typologically, three ignition methods are represented in the Muster and archaeologically in pre-1630's context, these are the matchlock, wheel-lock and snaphaunce. Technologically, the matchlock is the least complex and the wheel-lock the most complex, with the snaphaunce falling somewhere in between.

Chronologically, the matchlock is the earliest of the three forms represented, dating back to the fifteenth-century with little change through the seventeenth-century when its manufacture in Europe virtually ceased. The wheel-lock development occurred

in the sixteenth-century particularly in its most recognizable state, in the Germanic Provinces of central Europe, the wheel-lock appears to be well established in that region of Europe by the second quarter of the sixteenth-century. Dating the development of the snaphaunce is somewhat more difficult given the shortage of dated specimens. The earliest dated English snaphaunce (Fig. 4)is 1584 (Godwin et al 2003a: 87) it has a lock mechanism almost identical to a complete lock found at 44JC39 (Fig. 3). Based upon this dated specimen it is safe to assume that the snaphaunce in England was developed by the forth quarter of the sixteenth-century. Recent study suggests that the snaphaunce (Fig. 14) remained a principal flint arm in England into the early years of the second quarter of the seventeenth-century (Godwin 2003a, Spencer 1997, Straube 1990), in fact, Sir Thomas Southwell is shown in a painting from c. 1630 holding a snaphaunce musket (Blackmore 1971:227). The declining use of the snaphaunce likely coincided with the development and general acceptance of the English-lock in the 1630's to the point that by mid-century it was relegated to obsolescence. It is interesting to note however, the term snaphaunce was used throughout the seventeenth-century possibly even being applied to descriptions of the English-lock (Parnell 1995).

The matchlock arm in use during the first quarter of the seventeenth-century in Virginia would be most likely a common military musket. Throughout its period of use, it was its economy of manufacture (ease in production and cost) compared to other contemporary ignition types, such as the snaphaunce and the wheel-lock that insured its popularity in military circles. The simplicity of the mechanism (repair factor) and the lower cost would make them attractive to organizations and individuals acquiring supplies for an economically motivated venture such as the establishment of the Virginia

Colony, from 1622 to as late as 1676 obsolete matchlocks were sent to the colony (Parnell 1995). However, the economic benefits of the matchlock would not compensate for its major flaw as a weapon, particularly in a frontier situation. The matchlock was a cumbersome and difficult firearm to maintain in a ready to use form. The constantly burning match tended to burn out or burn away from the serpentine, and inclement weather had the effect of rendering the arm ineffective at best. Therefore, as an offensive weapon or as a gun to be relied upon for instant service, the matchlock would likely not prove useful. In a defensive situation, such as in a fortified settlement the matchlock could be used much as light artillery would have been, such as directed firing from protected vantage points where support elements such as fire to ignite match cord would be present and easily accessible.

The snaphaunce is a self-igniting flint mechanism (Fig. 6). Its origins are somewhat obscure but developmental variations are known from Italy, Scandinavia, Spain, Netherlands and England. The earliest documentation for the snaphaunce comes from the Swedish royal workshop in Arboga in 1556 discussing the fitting of snaplocks to harqebuses (Lenk 1939). Another specimen has a German attribution and is dated 1572 in the Germanisches Museum Nurenburg (no.W.411).

Traditionally amongst arms students it has been assumed that the English form of snaphaunce was developed in Holland and introduced to England (Colton 1992). However, English specimens, one in particular, which is dated 1584, (Blackmore 1971; Godwin 1997; Godwin et al 2003a; Spencer 1997) predate any known dated Dutch examples. The snaphaunce appears to have been well enough established in England at the turn of the seventeenth-century for James I to provide snaphaunce lock long-guns as

gifts to King Phillip III of Spain in 1604 (Godwin 2003a: 51). This act may very well indicate the popularity of the snaphaunce in England and provide further evidence that indeed this ignition form was mainstream and evocative of an "English" gift. One specimen in the Bedford collection is similarly noted as having an 'English Lock" and is dated 1622 with a French provenance (Gussler & Lavin 1977: 15). Godwin recently has prepared a Chronology Comparison Chart of English vs. European dated firearms between 1570 and 1680 (Godwin et al 2003a: 87) that suggests that, especially in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century, the English at least, produced the majority of dated snaphaunces, and it was not until the 1630s that the first dated flintlocks are known. The English dated specimens and including Cruso's "Miliarie Instructions for the Cavall'rie" in 1632 are exclusively snaphaunce arms (Godwin et al 2003a; Straube 1990). In 1609 Richard Pots, in his contribution to "The Proceeding of the English Colonies in Virginia" relays the following in reference to John Smiths accomplishments:

> Leaving us (10-4-1609) thus, with 3 ships, 7 boates, commodities ready to trade, the harvest newly gathered, 10 weekes provision in the store, 490 and odde persons, 24 peeces of ordinances, 300 muskets snaphaunces and firelocks, shot powder and match sufficient. (Tyler 1907:304)

This quote is interesting in that it differentiates between muskets, snaphaunces and fire-locks. Tyler in 1907 interprets muskets snaphaunces as a singular term and further states in a footnote that a firelock was fired by means of a match. An inventory prepared in 1547 for the armory of Henry VIII lists a number of pistols known as "dags" or "tackes" armed with "fire lockes" meaning wheel-locks, Cruso notes a similar distinction in 1632 (Straube 1990). At the time Tyler was writing much of what is known about early firearms was not available to him so it is understandable that misinterpretation of some

terms occurred. A modern interpretation would be that; snaphaunces refer to the ignition type we currently view as having a separate battery and pan cover, that fire locks refers to wheel-locks and the term Muskets refers to the matchlock. Evidence for this interpretation is suggested as late as 1625. In the Virginia Company Muster of 1624-25, the term Musket is applied only to Match-cocks as noted in the inventory of Ralph Hamers at Hog Island and others (Appendix A). Conversely, the qualifier for snaphaunces, if included, is always "peece" in the Muster. As to wheel-locks in the Muster, the term 'petronell' is probably describing the form (Fig. 4) as opposed to the earlier description of "fire-locke"

CHAPTER II

HISTORIC OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

The English settlement of the James River and the motivation for the investors of the Virginia Company of London, were solely economic. As early as 1585, Sir Walter Raleigh detailed "Marchantable Commodities" (Harriot 1590: 12) that would support an economic venture. There was the impression that the natural resources in the colony of Virginia would provide the basis for very positive economic investment opportunities both to secure the stability of the Colony and also to establish a cash product base. The first ten years of colonization was a particularly difficult time for the colony, however, by the end of the 1610s the Virginia Company of London investors witnessed the realization and expansion of the economic base of Virginia into many and diverse realms (see Haile 1998: 25 for full range of suggested income producing commodities and products).

In order to take economic advantage of the colony a practical approach to settlement was required. By act of the thirteen member Council for Virginia in 1618 each of the four Corporations were granted 3000 acres each, Elizabeth City, James City, Charles City and Henrico. Within the four Corporations were 28 settlements; by 1619 the Corporations were further divided into plantations. These settlements provide the core for the attempts to promote agricultural development in Virginia. Prior to the dissolution of the Virginia Company in 1624 these settlements were the political and economic link to England. The original settlements (Fig. 1) established between 1607 and 1620 provided

the organizational units by which the investors were able to maintain continuity of control over the colonists and their activities, for those colonists whom the Virginia Company funded to come to Virginia were to provide 50 percent of the land profits to the Company the other 50 percent to the government (Jester 1964: xxi).

The leaders of the communities were closely related to the Virginia Company of London and likely had little intention of remaining in the colony after their personal fortunes had been realized. But by the middle of the 1610s the situation had begun to change, land divisions and expansion of plantations throughout the region, not just along the James River and the Great Charter of 1618 set the stage for private property ownership in Virginia (Haile 1998: 37-38). Therefore the colonists were becoming vested economically in the land, an opportunity not easily attained in England. Jester notes rather succinctly that when "Captain Harvey left Virginia in February or March 1625, he carried with him reports from the plantations and replies to sundry questions which give a fairly approximate idea as to the condition of the colony. Among the questions were: *how many several plantations there be public and privat? What people, men, women and children be in each plantation? What houses? What cattle? etc? what corn? What fortifications? What arms? What boats?* The answers to these questions constitute the Muster, which, although dated January-February 1624-25, probably was a final compilation and check on information gathered during the seven or eight months period following the dissolution of the Virginia Company…the Muster is a document pertinent both to the Company's administration in Virginia and to the termination of the authority of this private corporation originally composed largely of London Merchants, who, in

1606, had been granted a Royal charter to establish a colony in the new world" (Jester 1964: 4)

The English dominance of the region was in a very real sense defined by the mandate of the 1606 charter. The focus of virtually all activities, economic, political, and military in Virginia during the first quarter of the seventeenth-century was the plantation unit contained within the four "corporations" of Henrico, James City, Charles City and Elizabeth City (Barka 1993: 315) and on a daily basis, the 28 core settlements. The primary contemporary database in the historical record is the Muster of 1624-25, which relates almost exclusively to the occupation at these settlements, as such it was decided that a valid interpretive hypothesis of the value of particular elements of material culture could rely on the data presented in the Muster.

The social, political, military, economic systems are so intertwined with the records of the Virginia Company that it became apparent threat these data would provide a wealth of interpretive possibilities. With respect to firearms, the records provided insights to how specific types of were valuable in a variety of contexts. The Muster is the most comprehensive documentary source used in this study. As the entire population of the colony was hypothetically inventoried in 1624-25, there appears to be an excellent opportunity to arrive at conclusions on the firearms available and in current use in Virginia at the end of the first quarter of the seventeenth-century. Further, this temporal marker is important as it really does underscore the new developments happening in Virginia and the evolving relationship Virginia has with England. In the mid-1620s Virginia had been an established colony for twenty years and it's survival tested at least three times since 1607, including the disastrous events of March 1622 when Native

Americans killed approximately one quarter of the European population of Virginia. The security of the colony was far from complete, however, it was obvious that there was no turning back from the English occupation and dominance of Virginia.

The firearm terminology used in the muster and how these period terms reflect ignition technology is the central theme of this thesis. The context in which the terms were used is the Muster, but also other early sources are referred to assist in sorting out the confusing array of descriptions used by the muster recorders. Barka notes that:

> As Hecht and others have pointed out, the Muster is often difficult to deal with because similar information is often listed differently, and some of the information is undoubtedly biased. Whether or not all settlements were described accurately as to the presence or absence of certain features will never be known, except possibly through detailed archaeological research (Barka 1993: 313).

Never the less, the Muster is extremely useful in providing a firsthand period insight to the terminology of small arms present in the Virginia Colony in 1624-25. Further, the Muster provides a text description of arms by which interpretations of other contemporary sources may be formulated. The tangible proof of this hypothesis must, however, be obtained from the archaeological record, and at this point in time archaeological data is scant indeed. The archaeological analysis is made even more difficult by the slim probability of identifying specific households or locations noted in the Muster and having the opportunity to investigate the associated middens. However, recent archaeological investigations have identified the probable site of Kiskiac, a Native American village complex of sites along the south bank of the York River. Kiskiac was visited by John Smith in 1609 and is likely the site of the failed Jesuit Mission from the 1580's (Blanton et al 2002), it is hoped that this site will yield data that can be related to

period records. Several other archaeological sites, which contain components related to the Virginia Company period, have been tested in past years, but the work is far from comprehensive.

CHAPTER III

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The archaeological history of sites dating to the period between 1600 and 1625 is highlighted by the investigators desire to find that elusive contact period site, sites which display evidence of the early interactions between the English explorers and the Native American population. The attempts to locate the original site of the Jamestown fort dating to 1607-09 have been undertaken since the early years of the twentieth-century. The National Park Service, who since 1934 has owned most of Jamestown Island, has had an ongoing archaeological presence since then. The 1950s witnessed a series of large-scale excavations on the Island that resulted in the identification of many buildings and structures all dating to the seventeenth-century, a time when Jamestown was the Capitol of the Virginia colony. It is ironic that the site of the latest discoveries are in an area noted by Cotter (Cotter and Hudson 1957:2) as having the "earliest known armor's forge in North America". While no deposits dating to the earliest decade of the seventeenth-century were identified by the Park Service archaeologists, is seems clear that the current investigations being conducted in partnership with the APVA, National Park Service and The College of William and Mary, and The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation are obtaining data which identified a significant portion of the original fortification and associated archaeological features.

FIREARMS AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD

The archaeological investigations at Jamestown Island sites, both current and in the past have revealed firearms parts. Other sites dating at least to the end of the first quarter of the seventeenth-century have yielded small but significant arms materials as well. Archaeological investigations have revealed firearms materials in deposits dating to the first half of the seventeenth-century, plantations likely associated with the archaeological deposits containing gun parts are: Martin's Hundred; West and Sherley hundred 44CC178 (Causeys Care); 44PG65 Pierseys (Flowerdew) Hundred (Barka 1975; Deetz 1993); 44PG3; Basses Choyse 44IW13 (Bedell 1990); 44PG300 and 302 Jordan's Journey (McLearan and Mouer 1993), 44JC41 Governor's Land the Maine (Outlaw 1990) and 44JC39 Kingsmill Tenement (Kelso 1984).

The artifact inventory for readily identifiable firearm related artifacts is short for each of these sites, however, site 44CC178 has several interesting elements associated with the deposits that may indicate forging activities at this site in the late 1620s- early 1630's. Jordan's Point 44PG300 & 302 likewise shares many of the same attributes as Causey's Care, below is a list of identified firearm parts, a comprehensive listing of all iron artifacts from 44CC178, are contained in Appendix B, courtesy of The Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

44CC178 (Causey's Care [West and Sherley Hundred], Walter Aston Site)

Snaphaunce locks:	4; 44CC178/37/20-9 (retains pan cover & shield, sear and external buffer)
(Figs. 5,11-13)	44CC178/6B-1 (completely stripped)
	44CC178/37/2C #459 (retains pan cover & shield, Battery spring and external buffer)
	44CC178/16/26 (almost complete mechanism, cock has flint in jaws)

Wheel-lock (Fig.5)	1; 44CC178/37B-1
Pistol barrel (Snaphaunce)	1; 44CC178/6-1 #769 (this barrel is complete, includes the breech-plug. The tube is approximately 10.5 inches long, octagonal, tapered and flared at the muzzle. Similar with a 1601-dated example in Levens Hall, Westmoreland, England) (Godwin 2003:51 fig.7)
Barrel sections	3; 44CC178/39/2L-6 44CC178/42/C-1 44CC178/37/D-5 (muzzle section exhibiting a flared bulbous crown and retaining a bead and post sight)
Snaphaunce cocks	4; 44CC178/37/2D-3 (musket size) 44CC178/37/D-4 (musket size) 44CC178/37/2D-2 (musket size) 44CC178/39/3D-1 (pistol size)
Snaphaunce Battery	4; 44CC178/2/3E#2076-00 (pistol size) 44CC178/37/2B-2 (musket size) 44CC178/39/1A-1 (musket size) 44CC178/42B-2 (musket size)
Snaphaunce pan	1; 44CC178/6/12A
Triggerguard	3; 44CC178/14/4B 44CC178/17/6-1 44CC178/16/D-2
Lock/Barrel bolt	1; 44CC178/12/3/2A-1
Snaphaunce Main spring	1; 44CC178/16D-1
Cock Jaw Screw	1; 44CC178/37/2C-6 #755
Trigger (Blank, unfinished)	1; 44CC178/39/2L #2083C-00

44PG300 and 302 Jordan's Journey

Matchlock	1; 44PG300,EU614-42 (Fig. 2) Lock is complete
Snaphaunce Lock	1; 44PG302/EU1192, F-320-27 (still retains pan cover)
Snaphaunce lock plate	1; 44PG300/53B-398, 99, 400
Snaphaunce	1; 44PG300/1B390 (heavily eroded but appears to be related to the lockGodwin illustrates in fig. 25) (Godwin 2003:57)
Snaphaunce cock	2; 44PG302/EU2117, F430, S2-145 44PG300, 52E-94, F-2 #386
Snaphaunce battery spring	2; 44PG300, 52E-102, #376 44PG302/EU1016, F-409

Barrel sections	4; 44PG 300, 901C-3 #398 44PG302/EU2105-54 44PG302/EU2095, F-435-121 44PG302/889/F-320-93
Trigger guard	2; 44PG302/EU2039-89, F435 44PG302/EU2071, F-435-136
Bullet Mould	2; 44PG/EU2117/F-430-74 44PG/EU2058, F-499-477

Further, several other recorded sites with early seventeenth century deposits have yielded firearms parts dating to the early seventeenth -century:

44JC41 Governor's Land the Maine

Triggerguard	1
Snaphaunce sear fragment	1
Gun flint	1
Snaphaunce cock jaw screw	1

44JC39 Kingsmill Tenement

Complete snaphaunce lock	1: (Fig. 3)

44PG65 Piersesys Hundred (Flowerdew)

Snaphaunce Lock	1
Matchlocks	2+/-
Wheel-lock spanners	2

44IW13 Basses Choyse

Wheel-lock (fragment)	1
Snaphaunce pan	1
Snaphaunce Lock fragment	1
Snaphaunce battery spring	1
Pan (wheel-lock?)	1

While Site 44CC178 (Causey's Care) has been destroyed by gravel mining operations, a significant effort was made by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources to salvage large portions of this important archaeological deposit prior to mining. This site was located above Eppes Creek a tributary of the James River, in Charles City County, Virginia; it was situated approximately 50 meters away from the Creek at an elevation of +25 feet above mean sea level. The artifacts uncovered at the site

place a date range of between the 1610s and the 1660s. The artifact assemblage in several key pit features, 16 and 37 as well as 39 and the general site feature designation 15; supports the earlier date range. While the exact function of these features has not been established due to the nature of the salvage recovery, artifacts such as Dutch trade tokens dating to the 1580s were identified as well as sixteenth century French green glazed earthenware establish the earlier date of these specific deposits. Significantly the features contained a wide variety of tools and debris associated with metalwork.

Firearm parts dating to the first quarter of the seventeenth-century were found in situ in feature fill. The features containing the majority of gun related parts were characterized by a distinct dark soil noticeably different from the surrounding soil substrate. The fill of Features 16 and 37 was distinctive in that they had lenses of cinder and ash that contained artifacts which related to not only gunmaking, but a wide range of iron objects were observed, including large numbers of keys, scissors, fireplace tools, salvaged saw blades, fragments of files and in one very interesting discovery, a rough forged blank for a gun trigger (VDHR No. 2083C-00) (refer to Appendix B for a comprehensive inventory of all ferrous artifacts). There is a distinct distribution of the firearm parts, the two principle features that contained the majority of the gun parts were distinct from other artifact bearing features, this trend may suggest functionally discrete areas within the site of Causey's Care. The unusual quantity of firearms related parts in the feature fill pointed to the possibility that there was more going on at this site than purely discarding of obsolete gun parts. The presence of cinder and ash in the feature matrix amplified this hypothesis. The collection contains at least parts of five gunlocks in various stages of disassembly. The gunlock elements exhibit deliberate disassembly, not

the vestiges of corrosion or degradation of the iron. The collection of gunlocks includes a wheel-lock, and four snaphaunce locks. Along with the partially disassembled gunlocks were snaphaunce cocks, snaphaunce batteries, springs and gun barrel sections. One of the barrel sections was the breach end and this section had the breech-plug removed. One very interesting barrel is from a pistol; it is tapered and flared, octagonal and still retains the breech-plug. This barrel bears a similarity to one found on a snaphaunce pistol dated 1601 (Godwin 2003a: 51 fig.7), also found were a pistol size cock and battery from a snaphaunce. In the artifact assemblage from the site were iron sheet fragments, many roughly cut with a size consistent for the production of gunlock "V" springs, interestingly there is no evidence of Matchlock parts in the artifact assemblage in the excavated portions of 44CC178.

These last points are important indications of at least one of the possible functions of 44CC178, that being firearms repair or modification, case in point is the barrel with the breech-plug removed. Removal of the breech plug is a task undertaken almost certainly by a competent armorer or gunmaker, this is not a task associated with common maintenance of any firearm. Alaric Faulkner identified early seventeenth-century gunsmith tools at Fort Pentagoet on Penobscot Bay, Maine, as did Horning and Wehner at Structure 24 at Jamestown Virginia (Faulkner and Faulkner 1987; Horning and Wehner 2001). Structure 24 is associated with the activities of John Jackson, the earliest recorded gunsmith in Virginia (Gill 1974). Removal of the breech plug from a gun barrel requires a specialized wrench that surrounds the tang (rear projection) of the plug and allows for the unscrewing of the plug from the barrel. This particular tool would be expected only in an armory. While no specific tool was identified which could be interpreted as a breech-

plug wrench at 44CC178, numerous other items which would be consistent with a gunsmiths tool assemblage were identified at Causey's Care, including hammer heads, files, tongs, shears and drift punches. It seems likely therefore that 44CC178 was an area where specialized manufacturing activities were taking place, gunsmithing included. While there are no records that name a gunsmith in residence in this part of West and Shirley Hundred, the archaeological evidence is compelling as an inference as to the repair and possible production of flint arms in the first half of the seventeenth-century, possibly as early as the 1620s or early 1630s.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Historic Resources, has prepared a comprehensive overview of all the known information gathered as of 1996 of Virginia Company period sites, both English and Native American to assess the potential for archaeological integrity and possible long-term preservation (Turner and Opperman 1996). This assessment contains detailed summaries of each of over 150 Powhatan and English settlements. What are important about the data presented in this assessment are not only the summary documentation, but also the assessment of potential survival of archaeological deposits that may relate to Virginia Company period sites represented in the Muster.

An interesting example of a multifaceted location described in the historic record in detail and possibly retaining depositional integrity that could be tested archaeologically, is Treasurer's Plantation. In the 1610s Treasurer's consisted of about 650 acres "on all sides square 1 mile"(Nugent 1974: 1,4). By the time of the Muster of 1624-25 this was one of the best-equipped Plantations in Virginia. It consisted of three distinct settlements, which may indicate differing specific uses of the Bainham, Sandy,

and Grindon tracts. Each settlement is noted to contain a fort, two having ordnance a variety of houses, including a "House framed for silk worms" (Jester1964: 40) and a population of 32 men, four women, and four children. The Muster notes also that there were the following categories of firearms; Peece, 30; Peece Fixt, 10 and 3 pistols (Fig. 15 for illustrations of types); (Appendix A). The area on which the various components of the Plantation are located is currently under cultivation and has been historically for many years. There is an excellent probability that major components of this Plantation are intact, although no sites are known at present. Intensive archaeological survey of the portions closest to the James River would likely provide evidence of this early occupation. Therefore this area may in fact be a good choice for archaeological testing, not only for identification of ca. 1625 archaeological deposits, but also to assess the categories of items listed in the Muster, specifically regarding firearms to assess whether there is evidence for the snaphaunce = Peece thesis.

In 1620 Samuel Jordan received a patent for four hundred and fifty acres, three hundred and eighty eight of which constitute the distinctive landform presently known as Jordan's Point located on the south bank of the James River in Prince George County. The land patented by Jordan, which bears his name, was occupied at the time of the 1622 uprising. John Smith noted that "Master Samuel Jordan gathered together but a few of the straglers about him at Beggars-bush, where he fortified and lived in despite of the enemy", the importance of this notation is that it points to the a complex relating to the occupied during the Company period that is located within the original patent and was noted as a landmark through the seventeenth century (Nugent 1974: 68).

The census of 1623 lists the inhabitants as twenty-four men, twelve women, and six children (Hotten 1962: 171). By the time the Muster of 1624-25 was taken the population was thirty-five men, twelve women, and nine children. The population was divided into fifteen individual households occupying twenty-two buildings (Turner and Opperman 1996; 8-32/33). Jordan's point landform contains a well-known and long identified archaeological complex of sites. It wasn't until recently however that attempts at systematically investigating the landform known as Jordan's Point were implemented by the professional archaeological community. The lack of a comprehensive archaeological survey limits the interpretation of the area defined as Jordan's Point which represents a portion of the 388 acre tract of land originally controlled by Samuel Jordan. While there are several recorded sites located on the point two in particular have components that may indeed date to the Company period (44PG300, 44PG302). The recent construction and development of this area of Jordan's Point has undoubtedly compromised the potential for a detailed analysis of the site complex, but what is compelling is the arms noted in the Muster; Snaphance Peece 3, Peece 15, Peece fixt 22 and 1 petronel.

The areas east and west of the Hampton River are densely populated, therefore the likelihood of identifying Virginia Company period sites or even deposits is remote (Turner and Opperman 1996: 6-5/6 and 6-11/15), therefore Elizabeth Cittie and its components as described in the Muster are probably heavily impacted. However, if sites associated with Elizabeth Cittie that date to the first quarter of the seventeenth-century, were to be identified it would be interesting to conduct an analysis of firearm material from an archaeological context and compare those data with the Muster. The Muster