Chapter 8
Marronage and the Dialectics of Spatial Sovereignty in Colonial Jamaica

Kristen R. Fellows and James A. Delle

One of the most vexing problems facing slave-owning planters in the colonial era was the question of how to control their vast enslaved populations. Social and physical control of the enslaved was crucial for the planters, who defined their net worth both by the value attached to the enslaved as capital assets and the value of the products of labor they co-opted from the enslaved. In many places, such as in the case of Jamaica, which we explore here, the ability of planters to make capital investments to improve existing estates, purchase and develop new estates, acquire manufactured and luxury goods on credit from merchant houses, and to acquire and exploit enslaved labor gangs was dependent on their ability to demonstrate their financial solidity; no asset was valued as highly as what was rather crassly defined in Jamaica as a "gang of prime negroes." Steps were taken at many levels to ensure the stability of these assets, from the imperial center through colonial laws like the amelioration acts which sought to lengthen the lifespan of the enslaved, to local legislation like the deficiency acts that aimed to balance the black/white population ratios in remote corners of the island, to local acts of vicious repression, generally on the part of overseers, whose goal was to coerce and terrify people into obedience.

Such measures were necessary because Jamaica was a predominantly black landscape nominally controlled by a white minority. The overall population of the island was primarily black, with the affluent, minority white population concentrated in the urban centers of Kingston and Spanish Town. By the end of the eighteenth century, many, if not most, of the plantation proprietors lived only sporadically on their estates, leaving their management to itinerant overseers and attorneys. Within the

J. A. Delle (✉)
College of Arts and Sciences,
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania,
225 Dauphine Hall, Shippensburg, PA 17257, USA
e-mail: james.delle@gmail.com

K. R. Fellows
Department of Sociology and Anthropology, North Dakota State University, Minard 428,
Fargo, ND 58108, USA
e-mail: kristen.fellows@ndsu.edu

P. P. A. Funari, C. E. Orser Jr. (eds.), *Current Perspectives on the Archaeology of African Slavery in Latin America,* SpringerBriefs in Archaeology,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-1264-3_8

larger plantations, much of the landscape was under the direct control of the enslaved; estate maps from this time clearly indicate that hundreds of acres on average estates were defined as "negro grounds" or "ruinate," the former characterized by small provision farms worked by the enslaved population, the latter areas defined as wasteland by the planters with no particular economic value to their estate. The landscapes of Jamaica were simultaneously multivalent; movement by the white planters and their employees was largely restricted to roads and the areas surrounding the immediate residential and industrial core of the plantation, particularly on remote coffee plantations located in the highland periphery of the plantation world.

How this landscape was negotiated is the focus of this chapter. We explore three dialectical phenomena that emerged from the conflict to control the plantation landscapes of Jamaica. Marronage, or more properly, *grand marronage*, was a process by which some members of the enslaved community managed to separate themselves from the plantation world. In Jamaica, this process of marronage resulted in armed struggle between those who would be free and those who would enslave, culminating in a series of treaties that guaranteed social and spatial sovereignty to Jamaica's Maroons, provided they agreed to collaborate with the colonial powers to limit future self-emancipation by enslaved Jamaicans; some archaeology has been done on the homesites of several Maroon groups and we review that literature here. The second phenomenon, sometimes referred to as *petit marronage*, was a strategy through which enslaved members of a plantation community would absent themselves for a limited time, often returning on their own volition to the plantation from which they absconded. Finally, we explore the nature of the multivalent landscape of the plantation as materially expressed in the existence of field houses: impermanent structures dotting the plantation landscape, often far from the central slave villages and the gaze of the white overseers and black drivers who managed the work lives of enslaved workers.

The Maroons of Jamaica

Most of the archaeological work done on African diaspora sites has focused on the plantation complex in the US South and the Anglophone Caribbean, though there is a small set of studies concerned with Maroon settlements. Maroons, or runaway slaves, were able to form communities, some of which consisted of thousands of people, isolated from the dominant European culture throughout the American colonies. Interestingly, the majority of research on Maroon sites has taken place in Latin America and the Caribbean (Singleton 2010; Weik 2004). Weik (1997, 2004) offers a thorough overview of the work done in the former Spanish colonies, Agorsah (2007) presents a more general summary of the archaeological work done on Maroon sites, and Sayers (2012) provides a rather recent review of the limited number of studies performed in the USA. Archaeological studies have included sites in Brazil (Funari 2003, 2007; Orser 1994; Orser and Funari 2001), the Dominican Republic (Weik 2004), Suriname (Goucher and Agorsah 2011; Hoogbergen 1990), Jamaica (Agorsah 1993, 1994, 1999, 2007; Groucher and Agorsah 2011), and the US South (Deagan and Landers 1999; Sayers 2006; Sayers et al. 2007; Weik 2007) among others.

The relative dearth of studies centered on sites associated with Maroons may be explained, at least in part, by the nature in which such sites were selected and used by the runaway slaves. As others have acknowledged, the settlements established by the Maroons were often situated in remote, liminal spaces that were hard to reach, hard to find by outsiders, and easily defended (Agorsah 2007; Goucher and Agorsah 2011; Orser and Funari 2001; Price 1996). These protective measures kept colonial forces at bay, and, unfortunately, seem to have at least contributed to keeping modern archaeologists at bay as well. Based on work done in Suriname and Jamaica, Agorsah (2006, p. 196) suggests that "Maroon sites could be ranked on a scale from more permanent strongholds to temporary hideouts or less permanent rest stops." He goes on to point out that it would be, "senseless to categorize Maroon lifestyles into 'sedentary' and 'non-sedentary,' because Maroons were essentially always on the move, living guerilla style between sites with some sites more permanent than others for logistic reasons" (Agorsah 2006, p. 196; citing Guevara (1969)). Unlike permanent colonial towns and agricultural estates, not all Maroon settlements were continuously occupied for long periods of time, which presents difficulties for archaeologists in terms of site identification. As many of the sites associated with the Maroons were used intermittently, local, ephemeral building materials[1] would have been used leaving little to no structural evidence for modern archaeologists (Orser and Funari 2001). In addition to short occupations, low population densities also put researchers at a disadvantage. Even if sites are successfully located, the lack of material traces left behind is an issue for the study of Maroon communities (e.g., Accompong Town, see Agorsah 1993). Tellingly, many of the Maroon sites studied to date are focused on settlements which lasted decades and even centuries (e.g., Nanny Town and Palmares). Whether or not this is due to the oftentimes short-lived nature of these settlements, the limited accessibility of such sites, the limited historical knowledge which would allow for the location of such sites, or the overemphasis on the plantation complex within the archaeology of the African diaspora is hard to say. Regardless, the relative lack of research performed on Maroon sites illustrates that logistics play a role in the success of such archaeological endeavors. As Goucher and Agorsah (2011, p. 149) state, "Maroon archaeology of these remote and nearly inaccessible sites has itself been a struggle to find even the most meager clues to the elusive Maroon past."

Some archaeologists have discussed Maroons and marronage in terms of resistance. As Charles Orser (1994, p. 69) has pointed out, "In the often-overwhelming abundance of research on slavery, there is something refreshingly bold about examining men and women who threw off the shackles of slavery and demanded freedom on their own terms" (see also Orser and Funari 2001). Perhaps in response to early notions of the complete cultural stripping of Africans during the Middle Passage, resistance has spurred on the search of African continuities within these communities of runaway African slaves. Ethnographic and ethnohistoric research has shown the

[1] Of course, the Maroons were also dealing with limited resources and logistical difficulties as regards building with more permanent materials (i.e., stone and brick).

continued identification with particular West African cultural groups as Maroons and their descendants refer to themselves as, for example, "Kromanti," "Dokosi," and "Asante" (Agorsah 1993, p. 177; see also Kopytoff 1976; Price 1996). And though limited, there has been some evidence of "African-influenced material culture" at Latin American sites (Weik 2004, p. 35; citing Arrom and García Arévalo 1986, p. 64; Guimarães 1990; Orser 1996). As will become apparent later, Agorsah's (1999) ethnoarchaeological work comparing sites in Ghana and Jamaica has also shown evidence of the continuation of African practices of familial-based spatial patterning in Old Accompong Town.

More recently, there have been calls to move beyond the resistance/African continuities focus in favor of a broader, more inclusive African diasporic approach. Stemming from a Marxist framework, Sayers (2012) advocates for a shift to a diasporic perspective. He believes that this would broaden the scope of what could be included in studies of marronage and would bring the scholarship of resistance activities, such as the Underground Railroad, into greater dialogue with studies on Maroon communities. Weik (2004) argues that a diasporic approach would allow scholars to move beyond the clean slate versus continuity models of New World slavery. He advises that this would enable a shift in focus to processes of ethnogenesis among the Maroon communities, with a special emphasis being placed on the interactions between the African and black Maroons and their Amerindian counterparts. The various Amerindian groups were the first to be enslaved by the Spanish settlers, and their flight from the mines and plantations led them to form the first Maroon communities (Agorsah 1994, 2007; Kopytoff 1976; Weik 2004). While Weik has advocated for a more in-depth look into processes of ethnogenesis and particularly interactions between indigenous groups and the African Maroons, some of that work has already begun. Barbara Kopytoff's ethnohistorical work has shown that the original bands of Jamaican Maroons consisted of individuals coming from diverse African backgrounds, which created tensions and the need to develop an overarching Maroon culture and ethnicity. She also discusses the processes behind the integration of the Arawak Maroons who had fled the Spanish prior to 1655, with African slaves fleeing the British post 1655. This amalgamation of peoples would serve as the basis for the Windward Maroons based out of the Blue Mountains (Kopytoff 1976; see also Kopytoff 1978, 1979, 1987). Weik (2007), himself, has explored ethnogenesis among the Black Seminoles of Florida at the site of Pilaklikaha. Agorsah, who has focused on resistance and has routinely referred to the Maroons as the "pioneer freedom fighters of the Americas" (see, for example, Agorsah 2007), has also long called for an examination of the interactions between African and African American Maroons and their Amerindian counterparts, even if he has not specifically called for the application of an ethnogenetic approach (Agrosah 1994, 2007; Goucher and Agorsah 2011). As we will come to see, archaeological research in Jamaica has shown that researchers cannot ignore the role of Amerindians at and around Maroon sites.

The history of marronage on Jamaica is striking and has been shown to be significant for the development of the colonial society on the island. Two major bands of Maroons, using guerilla warfare tactics, managed to disrupt the British colonial rule

to such a degree that treaties were signed with each group in 1739. The Windward Maroons were located in the Blue Mountains region in the east of the island, and the Leeward Maroons were situated in what is known as the Cockpit Country in the west. There has been a great deal written about the Maroons of Jamaica (see, for examples, Bilby 2005; Campbell 1990; Kopytoff 1976, 1978, 1979, 1987; Sheridan 1985). One noteworthy volume edited by Agorsah (1994) includes anthropological as well as historical contributions and includes authors from the extant Maroon communities. And still, the vast majority of the archaeological research performed at Maroon sites has come from Agorsah and the Maroon Heritage Research Project (MHRP) at the University of the West Indies.[2] Sites thus far identified and/or explored include Nanny Town, Old Accompong Town, Seaman's Valley, Gun Barrel, Marshall's Hall, Brownsfield, and Reeder's Pen (Agorsah 1994, 2007; Goucher and Agorsah 2011, this book chapter provides a nice overview of the work done at some of these sites). Nanny town, the primary settlement for the Windward Maroons, and Old Accompong, the main seat of power for the Leeward Maroons led by Colonel Kojo, are the two most significant sites studied on Jamaica to date (Agorsah 1994, 2007).

The excavations at Nanny Town produced a substantial artifact assemblage coming from three distinct periods of time: the pre-Maroon indigenous occupation, the Maroon era (1655–1734), and a brief occupation by British troops (Agorsah 1993, 1994, 2007). For the Maroon occupation, the assemblage indicates that materials were coming from both local and European sources; interestingly, there was a higher-than-expected percentage of locally made ceramics (Agorsah 1994). Unfortunately, the only structural evidence coming from Nanny Town was the remnants of a British military fort dating to after 1734, though at least one structure may have been built atop a Maroon-era floor feature (Agorsah 1993, 1994, 2007). The material assemblage offers evidence for the existence of Arawak Maroons dating to the Spanish occupation of the island. Given the high percentage of locally made earthenwares, they also speak to the possibility of a material record resulting from interactions between the Amerindians and African Maroons. Of course, more work needs to be done on comparative sites before scholars can gain a better understanding of what is being represented by the artifacts (Agorsah 1993, 1994; Goucher and Agorsah 2011). Nanny Town is an example of a Maroon settlement which was occupied for a relatively long period of time (1655–1734). Furthermore, it shows evidence of the various social networks in which the Maroons were engaged (Agorsah 2007). Nanny Town also illustrates the potential for Maroon sites to be misidentified as sites of indigenous occupation, which would stem from the locally produced ceramics and the fact that any structures have left little to no visible traces (Agorsah 1993, 1994, 2007). This site is not the first to demonstrate this particular pitfall of the archaeology of Maroon communities (e.g., Palmares, see Orser and Funari 2001).

[2] Agorsah (1994) cites two previous attempts at the archaeological study of Nanny Town, though they do not appear to be entirely successful (Bonner 1974; Teulon 1967). The MHRP and Agorsah began excavations in 1990, and the project has also supported archaeological work on the Maroons in Surinam (Agorsah 2007; Goucher and Agorsah 2011).

The settlement of Accompong is still in existence, but the modern town has shifted southwest of the original occupation (Agorsah 1993, 1994, 2007). Obviously, it is one of the Maroon settlements which has been occupied for centuries. Despite excavations in multiple areas of Old Accompong, little has been recovered from this site (Agorsah 1993, 1994, 2007; Goucher and Agorsah 2011). There was only one clear cultural level identified in the excavations at Accompong and the material culture found dated mostly to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; however, it is interesting to note that three cowrie shells, originating from West Africa, were recovered (Agorsah 1994; Groucher and Agorsah 2011). Although the excavations at Accompong have not yielded as much information as one might hope, Agorsah's (1999) comparative work in Africa and ethnoarchaeological techniques have offered some insights into the spatial patterning of the town. Using the clan-based settlement patterns in the northern Volta basin in Ghana as a point of comparison, Agorsah has found similar living arrangements in Accompong. In Accompong, it seems that different quarters within the town were arranged, in large part, based on familial relationships. "These town quarters appear to represent the congregation of related families clustering as units of the town" (Agorsah 1999, p. 48). He does not argue that this spatial model was knowingly and consciously reproduced by the African Maroons, but he finds support for his argument of continuity in slave villages which have been studied by Armstrong (1985, 1990) at Drax Hall and Seville and Higman (1974) at Montpelier. Both scholars found spatial organization within the slave villages which reflected the importance of family units and arrangements involving shared yard spaces and compound-like setups (Agorsah 1999). Similar spatial patterns have also been seen in the slave village at Marshall's Pen, a coffee estate (Delle 2011). And so, while the study of the material culture at Accompong was not as fruitful as hoped, Agorsah has been able to explore African continuities within the town using an ethnoarchaeological approach.

Goucher and Agorsah (2011, p. 152) describe the current state of the study of the Maroons thusly: "Although the excavations in Jamaica helped reconstruct some aspects of Maroon cultural behavior and confirmed partnership of enslaved Africans and Amerindians in freedom fighting, questions concerning sociospatial relationships and formative and transformative processes of Maroon settlements and culture remained unanswered." It seems obvious that more work needs to be done on Maroon sites throughout the Americas in order to gain a more complete understanding of the Maroons, their communities, and the processes of ethnogenesis occurring in the New World during the colonial era.

Temporary Freedoms: The Concept of Petit Marronage

The primary focus of Maroon archaeology has taken place at major settlement sites with long periods of occupation by Maroon communities. Running away with the end goal of joining/establishing a separate community is commonly referred to as *grand marronage* (Price 1996). What has yet to be studied archaeologically, and for good

and obvious reasons, are less permanent forms of marronage. Richard Price (1996, p. 3) referred to this as *petit marronage* and defined it as, "repetitive or periodic truancy with temporary goals such as visiting a relative or lover on a neighboring plantation." Such temporary freedoms would leave a light trace in the archaeological record, but should not be overlooked.

In Jamaica, such acts of repetitive, temporary absence may have been more common on coffee plantations in the remote interior, where what Delle (1998, 2000) has defined as the intermediate spaces between the white-controlled plantation works and elite housing and black-controlled provision grounds and forests were in greater abundance. The example of Radnor, a coffee plantation in the Blue Mountains of Jamaica, located just a few days' walk from the Windward Maroon settlements, serves to illustrate this phenomenon.

Radnor was among the largest of Jamaica's pre-emancipation coffee plantations; in March of 1822, the estate was taxed on 226 slaves and 987 acres of land, both of which made it an exceptionally large coffee plantation by Jamaican standards. A fragmentary daybook, documenting the daily activities for the estate in the early 1820s, records, among other things, absences from work on the part of the enslaved. These absences are alternatively defined by the bookkeepers who kept the journal as people absconding, being absent, or running away. The accounts record the names of those workers who left the plantation, the dates they left, and the dates they returned. In some cases, the plantation book records short remarks about the circumstances of their return (Radnor Plantation Book).

The Radnor Plantation Book covers the period from January 1822 through February of 1826, save the period January 4–July 5, 1823, the pages for which are missing from the book. During these 42 months, 25 different people—about 11 % of the total population or 16 % of the adult population of Radnor—absconded from the plantation a total of 33 times; 8 escaped twice, 17 once. The dates of escape and return for all but eight of these incidents were recorded. Of the 25 people who managed to escape, 11 were women and 14 were men. Of these, all but one, Phoebe, eventually returned to the plantation. Of the incidents with recorded dates of escape and return, the average time away from the plantation was 18 days. Besides Phoebe, only Trim (79 days), Flora (21 days), Little Quomin (55 days), Murray (36 days), and Matthew (43 days) were gone for a longer period than the mean. The journal records several additional instances that cannot be quantified, as the date the people returned and/or the number of days they were absent from the plantation does not appear in the journal. It also distinguishes between those who the plantation officially designated as runaways, individuals whose names would be stricken from the plantation list and thus were not taxable (Radnor Plantation Book).

A similar plantation book exists for New Forest, a contemporary coffee plantation located in the parish of Manchester, several days' walk from the Leeward Maroon site of Accompong.

Although in terms of land New Forest was significantly larger than Radnor, the population in 1828 was less, only 150, of which eight were defined as children. The plantation managers kept track of absences in 1828 and 1829. In total, 17 different people—five women and 12 men—or 11 % of the plantation population, absconded

a total of 21 times, with four people escaping twice. Three episodes lasted for more than 100 days, and the time away was not recorded for six. The average time absent for the additional 11 events was 43 days, considerably longer than at Radnor. With the exception of two men, all of the runaways returned, apparently of their own volition, to the estate. Dublin, one of the recidivists, was a notable exception. In August of 1829, he had been incarcerated in the Manchester Parish Workhouse, a penal building used primarily to hold and punish runaways who had been apprehended within the parish boundaries. Of particular significance was his earlier return, in October of 1828, when he had been brought back to New Forest by a group of Maroons who collected a reward for his return (New Forest Plantation Book).

This latter incident is revelatory of the difficulty some would-be runaways had in joining the existing Maroon communities. Throughout the nineteenth century, at least on some occasions such as this, the Maroons stayed true to the promises they made to the colonial government of Jamaica, that they would return any escaped slaves that might seek refuge in their communities. Absent the possibility of joining existing Maroon communities, many escapees likely chose the path of petit marronage, escaping for a limited amount of time. If the entries in the New Forest plantation book can be believed, those escapees who voluntarily returned to the estate were not punished for their time away, but were, as the entries suggest, "forgiven" upon their return. It would seem to be the opposite case for those who were apprehended while they were away from the estate. Dublin was punished upon both of his returns, although the nature of that punishment is not recorded in the book. George Palmer was similarly punished upon his return to New Forest. A third escapee, Robert, died the day after his return, although it is unclear whether he was punished so severely as to cause death, or whether he returned to the estate knowing that he was quite ill and likely to die. The former seems a more plausible explanation.

Freedom in Full Site: Field Houses and Spatial Sovereignty

Both grand and petit marronage are manifestations of a similar phenomenon, made possible by the multivalent nature of Jamaica's plantation landscape. The nature of the plantation system in Jamaica was such that many plantations, including New Forest and Radnor, contained thousands of acres of lands, most of which was not developed for use by the plantation management. A cursory glance at the cartographic record of Jamaica indicates that the majority of plantations for which we have such records were spatially divided; well over half of the land claimed as private property by the estates was, in fact, undeveloped woodland or ruinate, or was held for the use of the enslaved population as what was commonly called "Negro Grounds" or "Provision Grounds." The landscape of Jamaica, particularly in the interior, was thus characterized by hundreds of thousands of acres of land that was not in the direct control of the plantation elite. It was to these spaces that the Maroons first removed to establish their sovereignty, and to which, once their communities were closed to any incoming escapees, the petit Maroons fled to find their temporary refuges.

Fig. 8.1 A field house occupied in the early 1990s near St. Ann's Bay, Jamaica. (Photograph by James A. Delle)

Such intermediate spaces existed not only between plantations but within them. In Jamaica, possibly built on West African antecedents, there is a spatial tradition of occupying temporary field houses. Such small, temporary shelters are often located near pieces of land cultivated by farmers, who may or may not have clear title to the land they are working. During the nineteenth century, prior to emancipation, it was common practice for those enslaved on plantations to be allocated land within the estate boundaries upon which they would grow foodstuffs, which would then either be consumed by the worker and his or her family, sold back to the estate for the use of the white plantation staff, or else exchanged in local markets. In the latter two cases, any surplus value generated through the sale of provisions would be kept by the enslaved worker who had grown and sold the produce, and not the plantation that claimed ownership of both the land and the laborers (Delle 1998, 2009, 2014; Hauser 2008).

Figure 8.1 depicts a field house that was occupied in the late 1980s and early 1990s by a day laborer who was squatting on land owned by the Jamaica government. The small 10-ft-by-10-ft structure was constructed by sinking pimento-wood posts into the ground, and using these as a frame to support corrugated zinc walls. The resident of this house grew provisions in the yard surrounding the house, pirated electricity from a nearby water department pump house, and used that same pump house as a source of freshwater, apparently with permission from the local water department supervisor. This structure was occupied for a short time, and then abandoned, virtually disappearing from the visible landscape and retreating into the archaeological record by 1999 (Fig. 8.2).

Field houses such as these may occasionally serve as a primary residence. However, many Jamaican farmers maintain smaller houses in their fields that serve as a secondary residence or expedient shelter. Figure 8.3 depicts such a small field house occupied by a farmer who has been granted permission by his employer to grow crops on a plot of land at the periphery of her property. The house is barely large enough to hold a single mattress, but it provides shelter from sudden storms, and a place for the farmer to rest and guard his crops should he be concerned about theft or vandalism. As can be seen from the figure, he also collects rainwater in a barrel which he uses both to water seedlings and for his personal use.

Fig. 8.2 The location of the field house depicted in Fig. 8.1, in 1999, several years after its abandonment. (Photograph by James A. Delle)

Fig. 8.3 A field house occupied in the early 2010s near Mandeville, Jamaica. (Photograph by James A. Delle)

The archaeological record of a former coffee plantation known as Marshall's Pen suggests that the use of such field houses predates emancipation in Jamaica. A plat of the estate drawn in the early 1820s to depict landmarks and boundaries for a lawsuit between the owner of Marshall's Pen and his neighbor, clearly indicates that a number of small structures, alternately referred to on the maps as "huts" or "negro houses,"

Fig. 8.4 The ruins of a slavery-period field house under excavation, located within 100 m of the house depicted in Fig. 8.3. (Photograph by James A. Delle)

were scattered around the estate, including in areas defined as provision grounds. Archaeological field testing conducted in 2012 resulted in the location of five of these field houses. One of these (Fig. 8.4) produced an archaeological signature very similar to contemporary houses located in the slave village attached to the plantation. This suggests that this field house was likely a full-time residence, much like the first field house described above. Two additional field houses (Figs. 8.5 and 8.6) produced only a very light scatter of artifacts, suggesting that these two structures were likely expedient houses occupied sporadically to provide shelter from sudden storms, much like the second, small field house described above. Artifacts recovered from a fourth field house (Fig. 8.7) date primarily to the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, suggesting that this structure was either constructed later or was heavily reoccupied at the turn of the nineteenth century. A final field house remains to be tested in future field seasons.

Testing of locations of field houses at Marshall's Pen indicates that the settlement of the plantation was far more complex than a dichotomous division of space into white/black, overseer/slave, owner/worker. Although the majority of the population likely lived in one of two villages known to exist on the site, the number of field houses so far identified indicates that enslaved workers lived throughout the plantation. Although we know of no other similar maps indicating the locations of field houses for other plantations in Jamaica, it seems unlikely that Marshall's Pen was unique in this settlement pattern. The landscape of Jamaica would likely have featured hundreds if not thousands of these small, expedient, temporary houses. Workers on

Fig. 8.5 The ruins of two slavery-period field houses located on Marshall's Pen, a coffee plantation near Mandeville, Jamaica. (Photograph by James A. Delle)

Fig. 8.6 A nineteenth-century field house at Marshalls' Pen, prior to excavation. This is the same house seen in the background in Fig. 8.5. (Photograph by James A. Delle)

Fig. 8.7 The ruins of a field house at Marshalls' Pen, during excavation. Recovered material culture suggests this structure was occupied, or reoccupied, during the first half of the twentieth century

a given estate would have had the opportunity, whether sanctioned or not, to find some measure of privacy in these kinds of houses, located far from the bustle of the cramped plantation village, and the watchful gaze of the plantation overseer. More significantly, perhaps because some of these field houses are clearly associated with provision grounds, it seems more than likely that provision gardens located in the margins of estates and carved out of the forests between the industrial and residential cores of plantations would have featured houses like this; houses to which men and women could flee, either to escape conditions in which they found themselves enslaved or else to create temporary sovereignty over their own movement, through their ability to extract a living from the land of Jamaica in places in the landscape unknown to the white planters and their estate staffs.

Conclusion

The process of marronage in Jamaica should be considered part of a continuum through which members of the African diaspora expressed sovereignty over the movement of their bodies through the island's landscape. The planters were always concerned with controlling if not limiting that movement. As Delle argued elsewhere (Delle 1998), many of the punishments inflicted on enslaved populations were focused on curtailing movement, including the use of stocks and pillories, jail cells,

ankle shackles, neck collars, and other devices designed to simultaneously humiliate a person while also controlling their ability to move. Grand marronage was dialectically opposed to these efforts; by completely removing themselves from the worlds the planters made, Maroons were able to exert maximum control over their own movements, provided they did not challenge the authority of the slaveholders. Jamaican Maroons held this sovereignty so dear that they were willing to collaborate with those they opposed by, for example, returning escaped slaves who had hoped to join the Maroon communities.

Joining the sovereign communities of Maroons became an exceptionally difficult challenge after the turn of the nineteenth century. As we saw in the example of New Forest, Maroons were willing to return escapees back to the planters, and were rewarded for their efforts. The process of petit marronage, by which people fled their captivity for a few days, weeks, or months at a time, was for many a much more reasonable option. This too was part of the continuum of spatial sovereignty, as the petit Maroons would fade into the wilderness, perhaps engaging in social or material activities beyond the control of those who claimed them as property.

A related phenomenon, the landscape of Jamaica appears to have been dotted by field houses, places of refuge neither part of the established plantation world nor that of the Grand Maroons. Such houses existed within the boundaries of estates, and it seems more than reasonable to conclude that such temporary houses existed in the undeveloped wilderness between and beyond the plantation communities of Jamaica.

Each of these phenomena clearly indicates that the landscape of Jamaica was multivalent and complex, and only in understanding the spaces in between can we fully understand the sociospatial dynamics of plantation Jamaica.

References

Agorsah, E. K. (1993). Archaeology and resistance history in the Caribbean. *The African Archaeological Review, 11,* 175–195 (Papers in Honor of Merrick Posnansky).

Agorsah, E. K. (1994). Archaeology of Maroon settlements in Jamaica. In E. K. Agorsah (Ed.), *Maroon Heritage: Archaeological, ethnographic, and historical perspective* (pp. 163–187). Kingston: Canoe.

Agorsah, E. K. (1999). Ethnoarchaeological consideration of social relationship and settlement patterning among Africans in the Caribbean diaspora. In J. B. Haviser (Ed.), *African Sites Archaeology in the Caribbean* (pp. 38–64). Princeton: Markus Wiener.

Agorsah, E. K. (2006). Freedom, geography, and Maroon military strategies. In E. K. Agorsah & G. T. Childs (Eds.), *Africa and the African diaspora: Cultural adaptation and resistance* (pp. 175–203). Bloomington: Author House.

Agorsah, E. K. (2007). Scars of brutality: Archaeology of the Maroons in the Caribbean. In A. Ogundiran & T. Falola (Eds.), *Archaeology of Atlantic Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 332–354). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Armstrong, D. V. (1985). An AfroJamaican slave settlement: Archaeological investigations at Drax Hall. In T. Singleton (Ed.), *The archaeology of slavery and plantation life* (pp. 261–287). New York: Academic Press.

Armstrong, D. V. (1990). *The old village and the great house: An archaeological and historical examination of Drax Hall Plantation, St. Ann's Bay, Jamaica*. Blacks in the New World. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Arrom, J. J., & García Arévalo, M. A. (1986). *Cimarron*. Santo Domingo: Fundacion García Arrévalo.

Bilby, K. M. (2005). *True-born Maroons*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Bonner, T. (1974). The Blue Mountain expedition. *Jamaica Journal, 8*(2&3), 46–50.

Campbell, M. C. (1990). *Maroons of Jamaica: 1655–1796*. Trenton: Africa World Press.

Deagan, K. A., & Landers, J. (1999). Fort Mosé: Earliest free African-American town in the United States. In T. Singleton (Ed.), *I, Too, Am America: Archaeological studies of African-American life* (pp. 261–282). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Delle, J. A. (1998). *An archaeology of social space: Analyzing coffee plantations in Jamaica's Blue Mountains*. New York: Plenum.

Delle J. A. (2000). Gender, power and space: Negotiating social relations under slavery on coffee plantations in Jamaica, 1790–1834. In J. A. Delle, S. A. Mrozowski, & R. Paynter (Eds.), *Lines that divide: Historical archaeologies of race, class, and gender* (pp. 168–201). Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Delle, J. A. (2009). The governor and the enslaved: Archaeology and modernity at Marshall's Pen, Jamaica. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology, 12*(4), 488–512.

Delle J. A. (2011). The habitus of Jamaican plantation landscapes. In J. A. Delle, M. Hauser, & D. V. Armstrong (Eds.), *Out of many, one people: The historical archaeology of Colonial Jamaica* (pp. 122–143). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Delle, J. A. (2014). *The colonial Caribbean: Landscapes of power in the plantation system*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Funari, P. P. A. (2003). Conflict and interpretation of Palmares, a Brazilian runaway polity. *Historical Archaeology, 37*(3), 81–92.

Funari, P. P. A. (2007). The archaeological study of the African diaspora in Brazil. In A. Ogundiran & T. Falola (Eds.), *Archaeology of Atlantic Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 355–371). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Goucher, C., & Agorsah, K. (2011). Excavating the roots of resistance: The significance of Maroons in Jamaican Archaeology. In J. A. Delle, M. W. Hauser, & D. V. Armstrong (Eds.), *Out of many, one people: The historical archaeology of Colonial Jamaica* (pp. 144–162). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Guevara, C. (1969). *Guerilla warfare*. Translated from Spanish by J.P. Murray, with prefatory note by I.F. Stone. New York: Vintage Books.

Guimarães, C. M. (1990). O Quilombo do Ambrósio: lenda, documentos e arqueologia. *Estudos Ibero-Americans, 16,* 161–174.

Hauser, M. W. (2008). *An archaeology of black markets: Local ceramics and economies in eighteenth-century Jamaica*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Higman, B.W. (1974). A report on excavations at Montpelier and Roehampton. *Jamaica Journal, 8*(2), 40–45.

Hoogbergen, W. (1990). The history of the Suriname Maroons, resistance and rebellion in Suriname: Old and new. In V. H. Sutlive, M. D. Zamora, V. Kerns, & T. Hamada (Eds.), *Studies in third world societies* (pp. 65–102). Williamsburg: Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary.

Kopytoff, B. K. (1976). The development of Jamaican Maroon ethnicity. *Caribbean Quarterly, 22*(2/3):33–50.

Kopytoff, B. K. (1978). The early political development of Jamaican Maroon societies. *The William and Mary Quarterly, 35*(2), 287–307.

Kopytoff, B. K. (1979). Colonial treaty as sacred charter of the Jamaican Maroons. *Ethnohistory, 26*(1), 45–64.

Kopytoff, B. K. (1987). Religiou change among the Jamaican Maroons: The ascendance of the Christian God within a traditional cosmology. *Journal of Social History, 20*(3), 463–484.

Orser, C. E., Jr. (1994). Toward a global historical archaeology: An example from Brazil. *Historical Archaeology, 28*(1), 5–22.
Orser, C. E., Jr. (1996). *A historical archaeology of the modern world*. New York: Plenum.
Orser, C. E., Jr., & Funari, P. P. A. (2001). Archaeology and slave resistance and rebellion. *World Archaeology, 33*(1), 61–72.
Price, R. (1996 [1973]). Introduction: Maroons and their communities. In R. Price (Ed.), *Maroon societies: Rebel slave communities in the Americas* (3rd ed., pp. 1–31). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Sayers, D. O. (2006). Diasporan exiles in the Great Dismal Swamp, 1630–1860. *Transforming Anthropology, 14*(1), 10–20.
Sayers, D. O. (2012). *Marronage* perspective for historical archaeology in the United States. *Historical Archaeology, 46*(4), 135–161.
Sayers, D. O., Burke, P. B, & Henry, A. M. (2007). The political economy of exile in the great dismal swamp. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology, 11*(1), 60–97.
Sheridan, R. B. (1985). The Maroons of Jamaica, 1730–1830: Livelihood, demography and health. *Slavery and Abolition, 6*(3), 152–172.
Singleton, T. A. (2010). African diaspora in archaeology. In T. Olaniyan & J. H. Sweet (Eds.), *The African diaspora and the disciplines* (pp. 119–141). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Teulon, A. E. (1967). *Report on the expedition to Nanny Town (July 1967). Mimeo pamphlet*. Kingston: Institute of Jamaica.
Weik, T. (1997). The archaeology of Maroon societies in the Americas: Resistance, cultural continuity, and transformation in the African diaspora. *Historical Archaeology, 31*(2), 81–92.
Weik, T. (2004). Archaeology of the African diaspora in Latin America. *Historical Archaeology, 38*(1), 32–49.
Weik, T. (2007). Allies, adversaries, and kin in the African Seminole Communities of Florida: Archaeology at Pilaklikaha. In A. Ogundiran & T. Falola (Eds.), *Archaeology of Atlantic Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 311–331). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Manuscript Sources

Radnor Plantation Book. Manuscript in the Collection of the National Library of Jamaica.
New Forest Plantation Book. Manuscript in the Collection of the National Library of Jamaica.