

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form**

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instruction in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

New Submission Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

Historic and Archaeological Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950

C. Form Prepared by

Andrew W. Chandler, Architectural Historian; Valerie Marcil, Archaeologist; J. Tracy Power, Historian; and Stephen W. Skelton, Preservation Programs Supervisor
South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
8301 Parklane Road
Columbia, S.C. 29223
(803) 896-6178

Katherine Saunders, Preservation Planning Coordinator, and Jonathan H. Poston, Director of Preservation
Historic Charleston Foundation
40 East Bay Street
Charleston, S.C. 29401
(843) 724-8486

Carl Steen and Ellen Shlasko, Archaeologists
Diachronic Research Foundation
P.O. Box 50394
Columbia, S.C. 29250
(803) 929-0294

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. The submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature and title of certifying official

Date

Mary W. Edmonds, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, S.C. Dept. of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.
State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

	Page Numbers
E. Statement of Historic Contexts (If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order).	3-22
F. Associated Property Types (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	23-41
G. Geographical Data	42
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	42-43
I. Major Bibliographical References (List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	44-49

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 3

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Statement of Historic Context

The permanent European settlement of colonial South Carolina and its subsequent economic, political, and social development was tied so closely to the rivers of the lowcountry that the historic, archaeological, landscape, and other cultural resources located on or associated with those rivers are among the most significant places in the state, region, and nation. From the time the Carolina colony was founded at Charles Town in 1670—near the confluence of the Ashley and Cooper Rivers—the Cooper River was not only a major transportation route but was also one of the foundations on which the Carolina plantation society grew and flourished. After the abolition of slavery and the decline of the plantation system the society tied to the Cooper and other lowcountry rivers lost a great deal of its former influence, status, and wealth but continued to have a significant, if diminished, impact on the state and region through the end of the twentieth century.

Surviving resources located on or associated with the Cooper River in Berkeley County document the continuing occupation and use of the area from the late seventeenth century through the mid-twentieth century and are related to several broad themes of American history. Such themes include the creation, growth, development, and decline of the Southern plantation society and its association with significant persons and events in state, regional, and national history; the range and diversity of its historic architecture and designed landscapes; and the changing face of the lowcountry over a period of almost three hundred years, including the ways in which it was shaped by the demands imposed on it by agriculture, industry, conservation, and tourism.

The Early Colonial Period: European Settlement

The European settlement of Carolina began in 1670 near present-day Charleston. Established by eight Lords Proprietors who received their charter from King Charles II, the region was envisioned as a province “based upon a local hereditary nobility and the permanent ownership of land”.¹ This plan, set forth in the Fundamental Constitutions, was to be accomplished through the creation of signories (reserved for Lords Proprietors only) and baronies (to be occupied by landgraves, cassiques, and barons). Three baronies—Fairlawn, Cypress, and Wadboo, each consisting of twelve thousand acres—were established in the Cooper River region. Although this baronial system never fully developed, the relatively small number of large plantation tracts still located on and near the river reflects their origins in these baronies.²

¹ Henry A.M. Smith, *The Historical Writings of Henry A.M. Smith: Articles from The South Carolina Historical (and Genealogical) Magazine, Volume 1: The Baronies of South Carolina* (Spartanburg: The Reprint Company for the South Carolina Historical Society, 1988).

² Ibid.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 4

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The first settlers were largely English, some coming through Barbados or other English possessions in the Caribbean but many directly from Great Britain. These Anglicans took up the earliest grants, particularly south of the Tee of the Cooper on its tributaries of Goose Creek, from 1672 to 1680. After that date French Huguenots first came to South Carolina and in the succeeding decade established themselves in the area, particularly at French Quarter Creek. Their settlement, encouraged by pamphlets distributed in Protestant areas of France, was often called Poitevin after the chief organizer of the colonists there, Antoine Poitevin.³ The Huguenots were soon followed by groups from Holland, Scotland, England, northern Ireland, and Germany, many of them encouraged to settle in the Carolina colony by the promise of religious toleration as outlined in the Fundamental Constitutions.⁴

Life on the Cooper River was difficult for all settlers throughout the colonial period, as indeed in all of the Carolina colony. The population did not experience great natural increase until after 1770, as the mortality rate was extremely high in both town and city. Although St. John's Berkeley Parish fared somewhat better than Christ Church Parish (nearer to Charleston), the vast majority of individuals did not reach the age of twenty and of those who did one-third did not reach forty. The first Carolinians considered the country to be safer for health reasons than the city of Charleston.⁵

The Early Colonial Period: Landgrants

Even though the Lords Proprietors' concept for a hereditary feudal aristocracy did not seem to encourage the growth of a Caribbean-style plantation culture, the topography and initial settlers soon combined to cast the Cooper River region in this mold. Samuel Stoney, in his landmark study *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country*, observed, "The great plantation age of the Low Country began with the conception of the idea for Carolina in the mind of a Barbadian planter, as a land for planters and plantations."⁶

³ Jon Butler, *The Huguenots in America: A Refugee People in New World History*, Harvard Historical Monographs, Vol. 72 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 93.

⁴ Richard S. Dunn, "The English Sugar Islands and the Founding of South Carolina," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 72:2 (April 1971), 81-93; David D. Wallace, *South Carolina: A Short History, 1520-1948* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951); Maxwell C. Orvin, *Historic Berkeley County, South Carolina, 1671-1900* (Charleston: Comprint, 1973), p. 15.

⁵ Peter Coclanis, *The Shadow of A Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country, 1670-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 42-43. See also H. Roy Merrens and George D. Terry, "Dying in Paradise: Malaria, Mortality, and the Perceptual Environment in Colonial South Carolina," *Journal of Southern History* L:4 (November 1984), 533-549.

⁶ Samuel Gaillard Stoney, *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country* (Charleston: Carolina Art Association, 1938), pp. 2-3.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 5

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Fairlawn Barony, located on the upper reaches of the West Branch of the river, was originally surveyed for Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Proprietor for whom the Ashley and Cooper Rivers were named. Fairlawn was actually granted to another Proprietary family in 1678, making this more properly known as a signiory. Although Sir John Colleton died before the issuance of the signiory, his son, Landgrave Peter Colleton, was granted large tracts of land on or near the river.⁷

The second and third sons of Sir John Colleton were also issued baronies. Landgrave Thomas Colleton was granted Cypress Barony in 1683 near the headwaters of the East Branch of the Cooper. The properties which now occupy this section include Limerick, Kensington and Hyde Park Plantations. Wadboo Barony, located to the east of Fairlawn Barony on the West Branch, was granted to Landgrave James Colleton in 1683 and now includes the area occupied by Biggin Church. James Colleton later added to his holdings through the inheritance of the 2,000-acre Mepshew tract and the 3,000-acre Mepkin tract. The Colletons, through younger brother James—who briefly served as governor—were the only descendants of an original Lord Proprietor to settle in South Carolina.⁸

Another early figure, Sir Nathaniel Johnson, is buried at Silk Hope Plantation. Johnson, governor of Carolina 1702-1709, received a Proprietary grant of 1,940 acres in 1696 and added to his holdings through several warrants for land, eventually amassing over 5,000 acres, including Silk Hope Plantation.⁹ During Johnson's administration, the "High Church" party of the Anglican Church began to consolidate its power, undermining the rule of the proprietors and diminishing the cooperative nature of earlier religious cooperation. He became responsible also for the construction of Anglican churches, particularly the building originally at Pompion Hill.¹⁰

Adjoining Silk Hope property, a tract of 2,000 acres was rendered to John Ashby, "of the family of Quenby in the County of Leicester". Ashby, a London merchant, and his son, also named John, eventually amassed over 5,000 acres along the southern portion of the East Branch of the Cooper River on which now sits Quinby Plantation.¹¹ By 1816, Quinby passed to the Ball family, perhaps the most prominent family associated with the great Cooper River plantations.

⁷ Smith, Volume I, pp. 19-20.

⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

⁹ Wallace, pp. 66-74.

¹⁰ Frederick Dalcho, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in South Carolina, from the First Settlement of the Province, to the War of the Revolution; With Notices of the Present State of the Church in Each Parish* ... (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1820).

¹¹ Smith, Volume I, p. 151.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 6

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The intermarried clans of Balls and Harlestons owed their presence on the river to the good fortune of the first mate of the *Carolina*, John Coming, who acquired Comingtee Plantation and other Cooper River holdings, in addition to much of the present Charleston peninsula. Through his widow Affra, his estates were devised to his wife's Harleston nephew and the son of his own half-brother, Elias Ball.¹²

In addition to these large land grants and immigrant headrights, warrants for land were acquired by settlers in the first forty years of the province through application to the Governor and Council. With the changes in the system by the proprietors, in 1682, a lengthy indenture was required with annual payment of a quitrent. A warrant for land was recorded by the Secretary of the Province and issued to the applicant. Later, the Surveyor General produced a certified plat of the land requested.¹³ This system became more and more complex between 1672 and 1711, often resulting in ownership disputes and land fraud. By the 1730s, in part due to the rapid increase in population, registration of all land titles was required. The Land Act of 1731, providing for systematic registration and secure land titles, had "a profound impact on the colony's economic growth." Nearly one million acres were registered in the province between 1731 and 1738.¹⁴

Benjamin Simons, a French Huguenot immigrant, acquired his first warrant for land in 1697 for 100 acres "in Barkley County."¹⁵ His plantation house at Middleburg, completed shortly thereafter, is the oldest surviving plantation house in South Carolina. Simons added to this tract in 1704 and was one of the many French Huguenots to eventually settle in the area on the south of the East Branch near the area known as Orange Quarter or French Quarter. His descendants also added to the initial tract until it measured 2,592 acres by 1796.¹⁶

The Church Act and the Parish System

The Cooper River planters played a major role in defining the political, religious, and social system of colonial South Carolina. With the increasing dominance of the "Goose Creek Men" or Anglican party in the Commons House of Assembly, the colonial government moved farther away from the intent of the Fundamental Constitutions. The Vestry Act of 1704, excluding all but Anglicans from the

¹² Edward Ball, *Slaves in the Family* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroud, 1998).

¹³ A.S. Salley, Jr. comp., *Warrants For Lands in South Carolina, 1672-1711* (Columbia: The State Company, 1911-15; reprint ed., Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), p. ix.

¹⁴ Coclanis, pp. 102-103; J. Russell Cross, *Historic Ramblin's Through Berkeley* (Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company, 1985), p. 25.

¹⁵ Salley, p. 576.

¹⁶ See plat of Joseph Purcell for Benjamin Simons, Esq., 1786, Berkeley County Plats, copy at South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 7

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Assembly, was followed in 1706 by the Church Act, dividing the province into parishes and establishing the Anglican Church as the state church.¹⁷ Though a certain amount of religious tolerance had been guaranteed by the earlier Fundamental Constitutions and the dissenting groups continued to worship freely, they grudgingly paid taxes to support the established religion. This act ensured the dominance of the plantation system by creating political as well as religious units with both church vestries and Assembly elections controlled by the large planters in each parish.¹⁸

Two of the three extant rural Anglican churches stood within the bounds of present-day Berkeley County in 1706: St. James Goose Creek and Pompion Hill. The area was divided into six parishes by the Church Act in that year. Portions of three of these (St. John's, Berkeley; St. James, Goose Creek; and St. Thomas, incorporating the then-separate Huguenot parish of St. Denis) are part of the Cooper River region. Within each parish an official parish church was built and additional chapels of ease were designated for the convenience of those residents living in areas distant from the main parish church.

Pompion Hill Chapel, overlooking a high bluff on the East Branch of the Cooper River, was the first Anglican church in the province to be built outside of Charleston. The early wooden church built ca. 1703 became "ruinous" and it was replaced by the current brick Georgian chapel in 1763 with outstanding architectural details including a pulpit carved by William Axson.¹⁹

Pompion Hill Chapel was designated the chapel of ease for St. Thomas Parish in 1747, replacing the chapel of St. Denis on French Quarter Creek. The Huguenot church of St. Denis had been established as early as 1695 on French Quarter Creek. It was recognized as a parish of French-speaking adherents in the Church Act of 1706, and one historian has observed that St. Denis was the "first and only linguistically defined Anglican parish ever created in America."²⁰ Unlike other Huguenots, who were expected to become Anglicans in practice, the Orange Quarter congregations revolted against Anglican-style worship in 1712.²¹ The parish of St. Thomas merged with St. Denis and by 1784 was officially known as the Parish of St. Thomas and St. Den[n]is. A monument was erected on the site of this church by the Huguenot Society of South Carolina in 1922. The principal

¹⁷ Dalcho, p. 58; Wallace, pp. 71-73.

¹⁸ Stoney, pp. 20-21; M. Eugene Sirmans, *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1966).

¹⁹ Dalcho, p. 291; Carl R. Lounsbury, "Pompion Hill Chapel," in Carter L. Hudgins, Carl R. Lounsbury, Louis P. Nelson, and Jonathan H. Poston, eds. *The Vernacular Architecture of Charleston and the Lowcountry, 1670-1990: A Field Guide* (Charleston: 1994 Annual Conference, Vernacular Architectural Forum), pp. 309-10.

²⁰ Butler, p. 115.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 118-119.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 8

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

parish church of St. Thomas, built in 1708, was part of a special act of the assembly recognizing the unusual dual English-French nature of the parish. It was destroyed by fire in 1815 and was replaced by the current smaller building, with early Greek Revival details and proportions, in 1819.²²

Biggin Church, at the head of the West Branch of the river, was the parish church of St. John's, Berkeley. Sir John Colleton donated three acres for construction of the parish church at Biggin Creek in ca. 1711. This church burned in 1755, was rebuilt but burned again during the American Revolution and partially burned during the Civil War. It was finally reduced to its current ruined state by a late-nineteenth century forest fire.

The chapel of ease for St. John's was Strawberry Chapel. This, the oldest surviving church building in the region, was constructed ca. 1725 and is remarkable for its surviving exterior fabric, including its windows, doors, and jerkinhead roof. Strawberry Chapel often functioned as the parish church after the eighteenth-century fires at Biggin Church and eventually replaced it as such in 1825.²³

Strawberry Chapel was constructed within the planned town of Childsbury. This town, laid out in 1707 on the 12,000 acres granted to James Childs, was located at the Tee of the Cooper River. With its important ferry, its chapel of ease and other buildings, Childsbury achieved prominence for a time in the eighteenth century. Its subsequent decline was due to the growth and development of the plantation society in the area during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.²⁴

The Early Colonial Period: Trade and Commodities

The traditional, and still evident, uses of land along the Cooper River reflect the economic aspirations of the first South Carolinians for economic prosperity. Carolina settlers spent most of the early years herding cattle and hogs for export of beef and pork to Barbados and other islands, as well as producing peas and grains. In the meantime, a methodical search was employed in the areas around Charles Town for a single commodity that would bring wealth and prosperity such as tobacco was bringing to Virginia and sugar was bringing to Barbados. The name of Silk Hope Plantation reflects the early idea of growing mulberry trees (not the native ones) and producing silk from caterpillars.²⁵

²² Lounsbury, "St. Thomas and St. Den[n]is Church," in Hudgins, et al., eds., p. 304.

²³ Dalcho, pp. 271-274; Lounsbury, "Strawberry Chapel," in Hudgins, et al, eds., p. 312.

²⁴ Henry A.M. Smith, *The Historical Writings of Henry A.M. Smith, Volume 2: Cities and Towns of Early South Carolina* (Spartanburg: The Reprint Company for the South Carolina Historical Society, 1988).

²⁵ John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1981). The imported silk-producing caterpillars did not like the native mulberry trees and South Carolina only exported less than a thousand pounds of raw silk in the 1740s and 1750s. See also Joyce Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-*

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 9

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

These ventures failed, and the colony's most significant early exports were livestock and deerskins. This trade, dependent on Indians in the backcountry, eventually declined once naval stores—particularly lumber, tar, pitch, and turpentine—became a profitable option. South Carolina naval stores, although not of the highest quality, assisted the British shipbuilding industry in breaking its dependence on Baltic area naval stores between 1705 and 1720. One historian has argued that this product transformed the Lowcountry economy and made the later widespread acquisition of slaves and the rice culture that grew from it possible.²⁶

A significant brickmaking industry also arose along the Cooper River and was fully established by the 1740s, with many brickmakers of Huguenot descent. Remains of the industry such as those at Parnassus and the Brickyard near the Grove still survive in the region. Brickmaking often occurred in the winter and spring and could be a complimentary means of income to agriculture. The demand for brick in nearby Charleston, the presence of rich clay deposits along the lower section of the Cooper River and along the Back River, and the presence of slave labor, all combined to ensure a profitable brick industry. Much of the great architecture of the city of Charleston includes brick made in this region, from eighteenth century dwellings to St. Michael's Episcopal Church.

Associated industries such as tilemaking at Redbank Plantation and potteries such as that of John Bartlam at Cainhoy were also a significant part of the Cooper River economy.²⁷

The Rice Culture, Plantations, and Slavery

The development of the rice culture defined the area around the Cooper River from the second quarter of the eighteenth century through most of the nineteenth century. First grown in inland swamps, the seed was probably brought in from Madagascar in the late seventeenth century. Only 10,000 pounds of rice were exported in 1698. Within two years, however, the colony exported 394,000 pounds; by 1709, more than a million pounds; and by 1775, more than 80 million pounds.

1815 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1993), pp. 158-162.

²⁶ Clarence L. Ver Steeg, *Origins of A Southern Mosaic: Studies of Early Carolina and Georgia*, Mercer University Lamar Memorial Lectures, No. 17 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975), pp. 124-129.

²⁷ Lucy Wayne, "Burning Brick: A Study of A Lowcountry Industry," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1992, pp. 46-48; John B. Irving, *A Day on Cooper River* (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1842; 2nd ed., Columbia: Press of the R.L. Bryan Company, 1932), pp. 22-23; Stanley A. South and Carl Steen, "The Search for John Bartlam at Cain Hoy: America's First Creamware Potter," Research Manuscript Series No. 219, Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1993.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 10

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

England's decision to allow Carolina rice to be directly exported to Southern Europe rather than through Great Britain played a significant role in this economic expansion.²⁸

By the 1730s, rice planters discovered the potential for using the flow from tidal rivers to flood and drain their rice crops and saw it as potentially preferable to the excessive weeding and possible overflooding associated with inland fields. Within twenty years the tidal rice culture was surpassing the inland rice culture in the lowcountry, though the capital and labor output required to convert plantations to the tidal system was such that the shift was a gradual one.²⁹

The rapid growth of slavery corresponded with this trend. Shortly after 1700, South Carolina already had a black majority population. By 1740, in the rice-growing districts around Charleston, as much as 90 percent of the population consisted of African slaves, many of them from rice-growing areas of Africa and familiar with its cultivation.³⁰ By 1778, Elias Ball's field slaves at Comingtee were equally divided between native-born and African slaves, the latter coming from Angola or Gambia.³¹ The retention of African ways on the plantations were aided by the linkage of settlements along the Cooper River and the growth of the task system as the preferred means of division of labor, meaning that once slaves completed their assigned task for a particular day, their time was essentially their own. This system permitted slaves to cultivate their own small crops and raise limited numbers of livestock as well. By the 1750s, the task system was fully widespread throughout the Cooper River region, with a typical task set at a quarter of an acre.³² As early as 1728, the Ball family paid slaves for fowls and hogs on their Cooper River holdings. Slaves also dominated the riverborne traffic of the Eastern branch operating ferries and various vessels.³³

²⁸ Henry C. Dethloff, *A History of the American Rice Industry, 1685-1985* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1988), pp. 8-11.

²⁹ Chaplin, pp. 227-234.

³⁰ McCusker and Menard, pp. 182-182; Peter Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: Knopf, 1974). See also Leland G. Ferguson, *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America, 1650-1800* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992), and William B. Lees, "Limerick, Old and in the Way: Archaeological Investigations at Limerick Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina," Occasional Papers of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, the University of South Carolina, No. 5, Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980.

³¹ Philip D. Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1998), p. 453.

³² Philip D. Morgan, "The Task System and the World of Lowcountry Blacks, 1700 to 1880," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 39:4 (October 1982), 563-575; Johann Bolzius observed in 1751, "If the Negroes are skillful and industrious, they plant something for themselves after the days work."

³³ Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, p. 239.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 11

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The archaeological remains of slave houses, slave streets, and other elements of slave settlements at Middleburg, Limerick and other Cooper River plantations document and illustrate that significant cultural landscape, and the remnants of agricultural fields and of paths and trails leading from the settlements to the fields and back are also important resources as well.

Clay-walled or rammed-earth houses with planking or thatched roofs such as those seen in a view of Mulberry by Thomas Coram in the 1790s and located through archaeological investigations at various sites in the region were reminiscent of African building practices, as were occasional site arrangements of houses in a horseshoe or circle.³⁴ Archaeological investigations at Cooper River plantations have yielded valuable information about the architecture of slave settlements, about the everyday lives and material culture of slaves on these plantations, and many examples of the slave-made pottery called Colonoware.³⁵

The handful of elites who controlled the Cooper River plantations constructed substantial houses and enjoyed the pleasures of wealth. These planters were extensively connected and intermarried by the mid-eighteenth century and produced some of the most powerful leaders of the colony. Families such as the Harlestons, Balls, Hegers, and Simonses mixed with the descendants of the first of these families—the Colletons, Broughtons, and Johnsons. The initial wave of great houses were built at Goose Creek and on the Cooper with Fairlawn, Exeter, and Mulberry chief among them. By the 1740s, however, the Ashley River seems to have been the preferred venue for such showplace estates, and simpler houses generally prevailed on the Cooper River. Nonetheless, many planters who kept townhouses in Charleston stayed on their Cooper River plantations during the winter months. Landscaped portions of surviving plantations still illustrate planters' interest in gardening and in such pastimes as horseracing. Racetracks were cleared at Childsbury and Strawberry Plantation and planters often focused on the breeding of blooded horses.³⁶ The copy book kept at the Bluff by the young scions of the Harleston family attests to the education of the master's children on Cooper River plantations by private tutors.³⁷

³⁴ Ferguson, pp. 63-82, and Lees, "Limerick."

³⁵ Ferguson, pp. 82-92.

³⁶ Ball, p. 177.

³⁷ Michael Zuckerman, "Penmanship Exercises for Saucy Sons: Some Thoughts on the Colonial Southern Family," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 84:3 (July 1983), 169-179.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 12

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Only a small number of yeoman farmers and poor whites lived among the planters of the Cooper River region, and their numbers decreased throughout the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1749, however, white planters were uneasy over a supposed plot of sixteen poorer whites and one hundred slaves to stage an insurrection, perhaps the only such biracial plan ever discovered in the colonial or antebellum South.³⁸

Indigo

The cultivation of indigo and production of dye from it added greatly to the economic development of the Cooper River region before the American Revolution. The first successful processing of indigo in the province took place in the 1740s. Indigo quickly gained significance as a cash crop because it commanded a bounty paid for it by the English government (as a result of the Seven Years War and the interruption of French colonial sources for indigo needed in the British cloth industry), because it was relatively easy to grow and cultivate it on high ground, and because some planters sought to wean themselves from what one of them called their "Bewitchment to Rice."³⁹ Just before the American Revolution the Southern colonies exported about a million pounds of indigo. The success of indigo, however, was doomed by the Revolution and the loss of the British bounty once the war began. British troops in the Carolina lowcountry, furthermore, made significant attempts to destroy both the crop and the plantations on which it was grown and processed. In the upper Cooper River region, for example, the British burned 20,000 pounds of prepared indigo on Peter Sinkler's plantation. The industry never fully recovered after the Revolution, though some indigo was planted as late as the first few years of the nineteenth century. Some ruins and other remains of indigo processing vats are still extant in the upper Cooper River region.⁴⁰

Plantations growing rice and indigo as cash crops also sometimes grew other cash crops such as cotton. Most of them also grew the typical subsistence crops of the colonial and antebellum periods, such as corn, wheat, and peas and beans, and raised livestock such as horses, milk cows, chickens, and sheep, producing milk, butter, eggs, and other farm products.

³⁸ Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, p. 303.

³⁹ Orvin, p. 60.

⁴⁰ McCuskar and Menard, pp. 186-187. See also G. Terry Sharrer, "Indigo in Carolina, 1671-1796," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 72:2 (April 1971), 94-103.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 13

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The American Revolution

The Cooper River region was the scene of many skirmishes during the American Revolution, most of them from 1780 to 1782 as British and Loyalist forces tried first to capture and then to control the strategic port city of Charleston. In April 1780, British forces under Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton attacked the local militia near Biggin Church. Later, having gained control over much of the area along and near the Cooper and Wando Rivers, as well as the area west of the Ashley River, the British laid siege to Charleston, which surrendered along with its Continental and militia garrison on 12 May 1780. With British control over Charleston, volunteers under the command of Gen. Francis Marion became the only effective American force in the area for several months. Marion, a native of the Cooper River region, is best known as the commander of a brigade most often separated into small components which operated against British and Loyalist outposts and forces in guerrilla raids and then retreated back into the relative safety of the swamps and forests of the lowcountry.

Marion's and other partisan forces continued to conduct raids harassing the British and disrupting their supply lines. On 15 July 1781, Col. Wade Hampton surprised a British landing detachment of one hundred men at Strawberry Ferry near Lewisfield Plantation, burning two boats and capturing seventy-eight men.⁴¹ On 16-17 July, Gen. Thomas Sumter, supported by Lt. Col. Henry Lee's Legion and Marion's brigade, challenged the British position at Quinby Plantation by assaulting Lt. Col. John Coates's force near Biggin Church. In the ensuing action, which resulted in relatively heavy losses for the Americans and British, the church was burned and the British finally withdrew to their established position at Quinby. According to local tradition, many of the dead were buried along the entrance road to Quinby Plantation.⁴²

Under increasing pressure to protect their supply lines, the British erected a fort near the headwaters of the Cooper River within the boundaries of the old Fairlawn Barony. The redoubt of this square fortification survives intact with its earthen walls and moat. Marion considered this fortification, with its full garrison of men, to be too strong to attempt an assault on it, and decided instead to attack the nearby Fairlawn Plantation house. On 17 November 1782, in what was one of Marion's last engagements of the war, the house was captured and burned.⁴³ Increasingly, the British realized that the cumulative effect of losses such as these and others throughout the lowcountry and into the

⁴¹ Orvin, p. 101; "Lewisfield Plantation," National Register of Historic Places Files, 1973, South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.

⁴² H. Henry Lumpkin, *From Savannah to Yorktown: The American Revolution in the South* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1981), p. 211.

⁴³ Orvin, pp. 109-110; Lumpkin, p. 78.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 14

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

South Carolina backcountry were serious enough to warrant a gradual abandonment of this area. They finally evacuated Charleston that December.

Transportation

During the Revolution the Americans, British, and Loyalists used the Cooper River as a strategic transportation route. Indeed, from the earliest days of settlement in the area, the river functioned as the major mode of transportation for both goods and people.⁴⁴ In order to make full use of the river, landing sites were established at most of the plantations located along the water. Goods such as rice and indigo were loaded at these sites onto flat boats or schooners and taken to market in Charleston. Other landing sites served plantations which were landlocked or located in the northern section of Berkeley County.

In addition to transportation along the Cooper River and its tributaries, roads and ferries were established in the early settlement period. Ferries and public roads were at first unregulated, but the General Assembly soon took over their jurisdiction. In 1705, the assembly passed legislation establishing a ferry at Strawberry and a road running south from Wadboo to "the place where the ferry shall lie at." Strawberry Ferry, located at the Tee in the Cooper River, was subsidized by the residents of both branches and operated between Strawberry Plantation (later Childsbury) and what is now the Bluff Plantation. This ferry was of great strategic importance during the Revolution and also provided a much-used departure point for rice transports.⁴⁵ Another public road connected the ferry landing at the Bluff with the main road to Charleston, known as the Broad Path which ran along the West side of the river. A portion of this connecting road survives in the landscape there.

Another public road led through the north and eastern portion of the region by the end of the eighteenth century. The road to Calais began north of Biggin Church and continued south along the east side of the West Branch of the Cooper River, turning east above the Tee to Bonneau Ferry. Crossing the East Branch at Bonneau Ferry, the road continued south along the east side of the river, past the Church of St. Thomas to its terminus at the Calais Ferry on Daniel Island's Clouter Creek. The Calais Ferry shuttled goods and travelers to the landing at "Dover" near Charles Town. This ferry and its road were constructed ca. 1783 and operated by John Clement. Several sections of this road are still extant and in use.

⁴⁴ Orvin, pp. 65-66.

⁴⁵ Cross, pp. 150, 153, Orvin, p. 66.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 15

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The Recovery of the Rice Culture, Mills, and Canals

After the Revolution, rice production in the Cooper River region recovered and then surpassed its previous totals with the widespread adoption of the tidal rice culture system in the last decade of the eighteenth century and the first two decades of the nineteenth century, a system which held sway in much of lowcountry South Carolina until the Civil War. That system, based on the acquisition and development of acreage by planters and on the exhaustive labor of African slaves who cleared the land, laid out and maintained the fields, and planted, tended, and harvested the crop, brought about a dramatic and lasting transformation of the landscape in the region.⁴⁶ In 1860 St. John's, Berkeley led the Cooper River region, boasting eleven rice plantations with more than 100 slaves on each; there were four such plantations in St. Thomas's and St. Denis's Parish. This is particularly significant as even in South Carolina only 1,471 planters (out of a total white population of 274,563) owned fifty or more slaves in 1860.⁴⁷

The eighteenth and nineteenth century planters of the Cooper River region included several of the most prominent and significant South Carolinians of their day. Henry Laurens, former President of the Continental Congress and commissioner from the Treaty of Paris, returned home from imprisonment in the Tower of London and retired at Mepkin Plantation, building a new house and transforming the landscape into that of a country seat. Here he was the first prominent American to be cremated and his ashes were buried at Mepkin along with other family members.⁴⁸ Edward Rutledge, signer of the Declaration of Independence, beautified Richmond Plantation, inherited by his wife; 1803 watercolor views by Charles Fraser confirm that it was "one of the truly rich plantations of the Low Country."⁴⁹ Continuing the tradition of earlier planter-botanists was Dr. Sanford Barker of South Mulberry. Scientists such as Dr. Edmund Ravenel, artists such as John Blake White, and writers such as Dr. John Beaufain Irving also lived and worked on the Cooper River. In the late

⁴⁶ See Joyce Chaplin, "Tidal Rice Cultivation and the Problem of Slavery in South Carolina and Georgia, 1760-1815," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 49:1 (January 1992), 29-62; Ball, p. 260.

⁴⁷ William Dusinberre, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 460-61; Rosser H. Taylor, *Ante-bellum South Carolina, A Social and Cultural History*, James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), p. 8.

⁴⁸ Irving, p. 84; George C. Rogers, Jr., "Changes in Taste in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of Early Southern Decorative Arts* VIII (May 1982), 1-24; Charles Fraser, *A Charleston Sketchbook, 1796-1806; Forty Watercolor Drawings of the City and the Surrounding Country, Including Plantations and Parish Churches*, ed. Alice Ravenel Huger Smith (Rutland, Vt.: Published for the Carolina Art Association by the C.E. Tuttle Company, 1959).

⁴⁹ Fraser, Plates 32-34.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 16

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

eighteenth century, many of the Cooper River plantations were looked upon as showplaces, especially Mepkin, and all had formal gardens soon boasting parterres and plantings of new imports such as camellias. The Cooper River plantations became one of the leading examples of the romantic plantation ideal. They were first identified as a cohesive area when Irving wrote a series of sketches about them, serialized in six parts in the *Charleston Courier* in 1842 and published in book form as *A Day on Cooper River*, describing handsome houses, able planters, cultured wives, daughters and sons, content bondsmen, and such pursuits as entertaining, dining, literature and music, and hunting and fishing.⁵⁰ Agricultural societies such as Black Oak and Strawberry in St. John's, Berkeley promoted agricultural improvements and scientific farming.⁵¹

The slave population in the region, often left virtually unsupervised by absentee masters or even the occasional overseer, and usually under the supervision of slave drivers, took advantage of the refinements of the task system brought about by tidal cultivation and enjoyed an almost complete cultural separation from whites, both slaveholders and non-slaveholders alike.⁵² With the relative isolation of many slaves in their village complexes, Gullah language, religion, foodways, musical traditions, social events, and other customs made a tremendous impact on the Cooper River region.

As rice production increased in other areas of lowcountry South Carolina and Georgia, plantations on the Cooper River remained almost unchanged from the eighteenth century, except that in some cases owners removed some of their slaves to plantations established elsewhere as they expanded their holdings and the percentage of their land under cultivation. Silk Hope, for example, boasted more than 200 slaves in 1790, when Gabriel Manigault owned it. Later sold to the Heyward family, it returned to the Manigault family, along with 165 slaves, on Charles Manigault's marriage to Henrietta Heyward. At least twenty-two prime hands were transferred to Manigault's newer and more profitable Gowrie Plantation beginning in the 1820s. The Manigaults rarely used Silk Hope, preferring a country seat at Marshlands.⁵³

Englishman Jonathan Lucas erected his first water-driven rice mill on the Santee River in 1787; by 1817 he built the first steam-powered rice mill in Charleston. Lucas was also responsible for the construction of mills on the Cooper River such as those at Comingtee and Middleburg. His son and successor, Jonathan, Jr., married Lydia Simons and became master of the latter plantation in addition to extensive holdings in South Carolina and abroad.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Irving, *passim*.

⁵¹ Walter B. Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), p. 278.

⁵² Edgar, pp. 313-314.

⁵³ Dusinberre, pp. 4-7.

⁵⁴ Irving, p. 155; Wallace, p. 362.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 17

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

One of the earliest navigation canals in America was built in 1792 for planters along the Back River, eager to improve the transportation of their tidal culture rice crops.⁵⁵ The Santee Canal, constructed between 1793 and 1800 by Col. John Christian Senf at a cost of \$600,000, was intended to provide an important link between the Santee and Cooper Rivers. This link was seen as providing vital commercial access from much of the state's interior to Charleston Harbor and it was part of the progressive economic vision of Charleston's federalist leaders of the late eighteenth century.⁵⁶ The canal route, initially twenty-two miles long, was used primarily for the transportation of cotton. During the earliest years of its operation, 1,720 boats arrived in Charleston via the canal, bringing 80,000 bales of cotton to market. Although considered to be a feat of engineering in its day, the Santee Canal, with its ten masonry and stone locks, was beset with design problems. These problems were most noticeable in the drought years of 1817-1819 when the canal did not have enough water to operate. While the shareholders of the canal corporation received good dividends during the 1820s and 1830s, the canal was largely inoperable again by 1850 and increased competition by new public roads and railroad routes spelled financial ruin. The Santee Canal was officially closed by an act of the General Assembly in 1850.

The Civil War and Reconstruction

Little direct military action occurred within the Cooper River region during the Civil War, although its residents certainly felt the effect of the blockade of Charleston Harbor as early as 1862. Most planters and their families left the area and refugeed to farms in the upstate and in North Carolina. Soon after the Union occupation of Charleston in February 1865, Federal troops conducted raids or expeditions in the Cooper River region, burning or vandalizing several houses and churches, such as the plantations at Buck Hall, Limerick, Kensington, Middleburg, and Pawley's, and Biggin Church.⁵⁷

The postwar years were a period of social, economic and political transformation for Berkeley County and, indeed, for the entire state of South Carolina. According to South Carolina historian Walter Edgar, "by 1867 forty-five of fifty-one plantations on the Cooper River were idle."⁵⁸ The area was

⁵⁵ Carl Steen, "Preliminary Report for Archaeological Investigation for Pine Grove Plantation" (Columbia: Diachronic Research Foundation, 1992), p. 12.

⁵⁶ George C. Rogers, Jr., *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969; reprint ed., Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), pp. 108, 139.

⁵⁷ Irving, pp. 178-179, 156, 108; Ball, pp. 345-47. At Limerick, United States Colored Troops looted the barns, were frustrated by not finding the household silver and smashed the china, but did little damage to the buildings or other possessions of the family.

⁵⁸ Edgar, p. 379.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 18

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

generally peaceful, with blacks and whites actually sharing a measure of political power for most of the Reconstruction era.⁵⁹ In October 1876, however, a race riot occurred at the church of St. Thomas and St. Denis when a political meeting and debate between Republican and Democratic candidates became violent as African-American Republicans fired on a crowd of white Democrats and whites returned the fire; at least six people were killed and many more were wounded in what has been called “the Cainhoy Massacre.”⁶⁰

The economic system of the Cooper River region was in transition as well in the years following the Civil War. The antebellum economic system based on the slave-intensive production of rice and other commodities was replaced by a tenancy or sharecropping method. Many former slaves acquired small plots and became excellent farmers.

Postwar Decline of the Rice Culture

Although to some degree rice production on the Cooper River—as in the rest of the South Carolina lowcountry—had a short-lived and small-scale revival after the Civil War, between 1880 and 1900 it suffered a steady and permanent decline before disappearing from the landscape almost altogether by about 1920. This was due in part because it was impossible for planters to hire a large enough labor force to grow rice on a scale that would justify the effort and expense, and in part because changes in the method of rice production, shifting from a tidal system to an upland system featuring irrigation, made it easier and more profitable to grow rice in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. Although Berkeley County still produced six million pounds of rice in 1900, production declined sharply during the ensuing two decades.⁶¹ The last crop grown at Mulberry Plantation, for example, was in 1916.

After timber companies such as A.C. Tuxberry and the Atlantic Coast Lumber Company bought much of the former plantation land, yet another transformation occurred in the landscape during the Great Depression. When these financially troubled companies asked the federal government to buy them out, it established the 250,000-acre Francis Marion National Forest in 1936. The forest has long supported or encouraged timber production, watershed protection, wildlife conservation, and recreation.⁶² Two Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camps were located within the bounds of

⁵⁹ Ibid., 412.

⁶⁰ Sarah Fick, John Laurens, Robert P. Stockton, and David B. Schneider, *Historic Resources of Berkeley County, South Carolina* (Charleston: Preservation Consultants, 1990).

⁶¹ Fick, et al, p. 11; Dethloff, pp. 58-59.

⁶² Charles F. Kovacic and John J. Winberry, *South Carolina: The Making of a Landscape* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989); Fick, et al, p. 12.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 19

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

the forest. These served as bases for the lowcountry component of an effort that planted more than 56 million trees in South Carolina, built firebreaks, fought forest fires, and created the basis of the South Carolina State Park system.⁶³

The Second "Yankee Invasion"

Beginning in the late nineteenth century and continuing into the 1930s, many Cooper River plantations were acquired by wealthy Northerners as winter homes and hunting retreats. To account for this trend, historian George C. Rogers, Jr., has cited the persistent and persuasive myths of the Old South as a powerful incentive for Northern purchasers who wished to attain or replicate their vision of the status and grandeur associated with colonial and antebellum plantations. In many instances these new owners had the financial means to obtain large tracts of land and to restore or renovate surviving historic buildings. Other owners replaced historic buildings with buildings designed and intended to evoke the feeling of a "Southern plantation" as they believed it had been or should have been. Those replacements were often of a scale and architectural style larger and more elaborate than the original plantation houses, many of them much more modest than the plantation myth led their owners—or their guests—to believe.

The influx of money into the Cooper River region during this period of economic and agricultural failure ensured the survival of these plantations. Because many of the newly acquired plantations were to be used as hunting preserves, former rice fields were also retained to provide habitats for ducks, fish and other wildlife. Maps of the lowcountry beginning in the 1920s show that many plantations were owned by individuals prominent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as "captains of industry" such as members of the Carnegie, DuPont, Field, Pratt, Pulitzer, and Vanderbilt families.⁶⁴

Among the plantations which were acquired by wealthy Northerners and restored were Dean Hall, acquired by Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Kittredge of New York at the end of the nineteenth century; Mulberry Plantation, purchased by Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Chapman of New Jersey in 1914; Gippy Plantation, bought by Nicholas Roosevelt of Philadelphia in 1928; and Lewisfield Plantation, purchased in 1937 by Robert R.M. Carpenter, vice president of E.I. du Pont. Medway Plantation, purchased in 1930 by Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Legendre of New York, is perhaps the best known of the restored Cooper River plantations. While preserving much of the historic fabric of these plantations, many of these owners also left their mark upon the landscape in the form of new buildings and

⁶³ Fick, et al, p. 12.

⁶⁴ Preservation Consultants, "Berkeley County Historical and Architectural Inventory: Survey Report," Charleston: Preservation Consultants, 1989, p. 17.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 20

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

professionally designed formal gardens. They enjoyed a camaraderie and their interconnected circle brought a vastly different social setting to the Cooper River.⁶⁵

In some instances, whole new domestic complexes were constructed in the early twentieth century on former plantation tracts. These include the main house at Bossis Plantation, built ca. 1910 by St. Clair White; an entire complex of Tudor Revival buildings at Richmond Plantation constructed in 1927 under the ownership of George Ellis, a cofounder of E.F. Hutton; a Colonial Revival House at Pimlico, no longer extant, built by Mrs. and Mrs. George Dana Boardman Bonbright; and the house at Rice Hope Plantation, built in 1929 by former United States senator Joseph Frelinghuysen of New Jersey. These dwellings were generally built as replacements for historic buildings that had been lost by fire or age and were generally designed to evoke a sense of advanced age and grandeur. One notable exception to this was the complex of buildings at Mepkin Plantation designed by Edward Durrell Stone in 1938 for publisher Henry Luce and his wife, writer Claire Booth Luce. Important landscape architects such as Loutrel Briggs and Ides Vandegracht transformed and augmented existing, or created new, gardens at Mulberry, Medway, and Mepkin into gardening showplaces.

Some families retained their plantation holdings. The descendants of Benjamin Simons remained at Middleburg until the 1970s, as did the Stoney descendants of the Ball family of Kensington. The Stoneys were prominent among the locals who also kept the history of the Cooper River alive with literary and artistic works, and they were the center of a circle of native and transplanted writers and artists. While the Stoneys still owned Medway and neighboring Parnassus, John Bennett used the Medway house as the setting for his novel, *The Treasure of Peyre Gaillard* (1906). Hervey Allen published several poems about the area, including one about Medway, in his *Earth Moods and Other Poems* (1925). Samuel G. Stoney's mother Louisa Cheves Stoney produced various artistic works and edited a reprint edition of John B. Irving's *Day on Cooper River*, adding commentary and a historical narrative on the Cooper River plantations since Irving's time, in 1932. Augustine T. Smythe Stoney turned out important maps and drawings of numerous plantations including a valuable and often-reprinted map of the Cooper River Plantations as they were in 1842. His work aided his kinsman Samuel G. Stoney in the production of *Plantations of the Carolina Lowcountry* (1938), the culmination of a survey that utilized the drawing talents of noted local architects Albert Simons and Samuel Lapham and the photography of Judah Ben Lubshuz and Frances Benjamin Johnson.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Gertrude Sanford Legendre, *The Time of My Life* (Charleston: Wyrick, 1987), pp. 75-77.

⁶⁶ Stoney; Curtis Worthington, *Literary Charleston: A Lowcountry Reader* (Charleston: Wyrick and Company, 1996).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 21

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The Changing Landscape

An agricultural depression crippled South Carolina throughout the 1920s, with a significant drop in cotton prices, the end of profitable rice production, and problems associated with the timber industry. Rural Berkeley County was particularly hard-hit by the agricultural downturn. One entrepreneur, Thomas C. Williams, had an idea to reestablish the Santee and Cooper Canal and through the drop in elevation between the former and the latter, build a modern hydroelectric plant. With the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the coming of the New Deal, this project became more important. The organization of the South Carolina Public Service Authority and its extensive mission to develop inland navigation, reclaim swamps and reforest watersheds, impelled South Carolina politicians to lobby and gain approval from Roosevelt's administration for the Santee Cooper Project. Construction began four years later on the largest New Deal effort undertaken in South Carolina and what was then the largest land-clearing project in the world, clearing most of the 193,000 acres of land acquired for the project. The Moderne-style Jefferies Hydroelectric Plant, on what became Lake Moultrie, was in operation by 1942. It not only assisted in powering war industry facilities in Charleston but brought electric power for the first time to many citizens of a state in which only 2% of the farms had electricity in the mid-1930s.⁶⁷ The electric power and the flooding of so many former plantations had a distinct impact on the area, as did the change in water level in the former rice fields and along the banks, yet another alteration to the landscape of the Cooper River region.

The nearby navy base and shipyard expanded with some Works Progress Administration (WPA) and Public Works Administration (PWA) projects in the 1930s and the entry of the United States into World War II in 1941 brought a major expansion of all military-related facilities in the Cooper River and Charleston areas. Employment at the Charleston Navy Yard increased from 6,000 in 1941 to 28,000 in 1943 and another 72,000 workers found employment with private defense firms in the Charleston area. This did not include the numerous servicemen stationed at the Base or other facilities. The need for housing greatly increased and impelled much new construction particularly in nearby North Charleston. After the war, however, with the expansion of the Naval Weapons station and its designation as a Polaris missile facility, Berkeley County and the Cooper River region experienced its first wave of suburbanization.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Walter Edgar, pp. 502-04; See also Edgar, *History of Santee Cooper, 1934-1984* (Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company for the South Carolina Public Service Authority, 1984); Fick, et al, p. 12.

⁶⁸ Edgar, pp. 513-14; Fick, et al, p. 12. See also R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Inc., "Inventory, Evaluation and Nomination of Military Installations: Naval Base Charleston," Frederick, Md.: R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, 1994, Volume 1, pp. 37-39.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 22

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

This change continued in the late 1950s with the development of the Cooper River Industrial Park (Bushy Park). The acquisition of Dean Hall Plantation in 1957 by DuPont (and the subsequent moving of the principal plantation buildings elsewhere), as well as the construction of plants such as Mobay Chemical, Harriman and Reimer, and Bayer followed this event. Newer industries on the Cooper River include Amoco, Nucor, and Mikasa. These new industries, although generally supportive of the preservation of natural and cultural resources, have worked yet another change on the landscape through increased suburban sprawl and the growth of Moncks Corner.

**Properties Already Listed in the National Register and Contributing to the
Resources of the Cooper River Multiple Property Submission**

	Date Listed
Mulberry Plantation (NHL)	15 October 1966; NHL 9 October 1960
St. James Church, Goose Creek (NHL)	15 April 1970
Pompion Hill Chapel (NHL)	15 April 1970
Middleburg Plantation (NHL)	15 April 1970
Medway	16 July 1970
Strawberry Chapel and Childsbury Town Site	26 April 1972
Calais Milestones	14 March 1973
Lewisfield Plantation	9 May 1973
White Church	22 September 1977
Biggin Church Ruins	13 December 1977
Taveau Church	14 February 1978
Richmond Plantation	24 November 1980
Santee Canal	5 May 1982
Quinby Plantation House/Halidon Hill Plantation	10 October 1985

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 23

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type: Residences and Other Domestic Resources

II. Description

Many historic residences in this region are on current or former plantations. The typical Cooper River plantation, whether an eighteenth or nineteenth century plantation devoted primarily to the production of rice or indigo and secondarily to the production of subsistence crops and raising livestock, or a twentieth century plantation devoted primarily to recreation, conservation and the management of game, waterfowl or marine life, includes a wide array of historic resources. Plantation buildings were—and in some respects, still are—important components of a self-contained and self-sufficient economic and social unit.

Plantation houses, slave houses, domestic outbuildings, and similar properties are tangible reflections of the wealth and status of colonial, antebellum, and post-Civil War Cooper River planters and of those twentieth century plantation owners who acquired, consolidated, and maintained historic plantations and landscapes. These buildings often share a commonality of size, materials, design, spatial arrangement, and physical placement, and reflect architectural styles and building traditions typical of plantations in the South Carolina lowcountry between ca. 1670 and ca. 1950.

Plantation houses in this region are typically one-, one-and-one-half-, or two-story frame buildings with exterior clapboard covering, and less frequently one-and-one-half- or two-story brick buildings. Significant exterior features often include one- or two-story porches and gabled dormers on the principal and secondary elevations. Generally sited on high ground, these plantation houses are often oriented with their principal elevation toward the Cooper River or one of its many tributaries in the area. Significant interior features often include staircases and stairhalls, plaster and wood moldings, and mantels.

Domestic outbuildings associated with plantation houses, such as kitchens, garages, and well houses, are most often frame buildings but occasionally brick buildings constructed to serve a utilitarian purpose. As such, they are vernacular and generally have little or no architectural detailing or ornament.

Slave houses, freedmen's houses, and tenant houses in this region are typically one-story frame buildings with exterior clapboard covering, and sometimes—though rarely—one-story brick buildings. Vernacular, their exterior and interior features are usually quite simple with little or no architectural detailing or ornament. They are most often one- or two-room buildings with exterior end or interior

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 24

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

double chimneys. The occasional one-story porch dates from the post-Civil War era, most likely the early twentieth century. Windows are sometimes simple glassless openings covered by shutters and sometimes multi-light double-hung sash.

More recent historic residences, such as caretaker's houses, are typically one-story frame or brick buildings with typical exterior and interior features and finishes of the period of construction, and their floor plans include multiple rooms not present in slave, freedmen's, or tenant houses.

III. Significance

These resources are among the most readily recognizable properties associated with the plantations that define so much of the character of the Cooper River region. They reveal much, too, about the way of life of the people who lived and worked on these plantations for more than three hundred years. Buildings may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criteria A, B, and C, within the areas of significance for Architecture or Social History.

IV. Registration Requirements

Residences and other domestic resources may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction, retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain all or most of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction, retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. In all cases, additions and alterations are acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

I. Name of Property Type: Properties Associated with Agriculture

II. Description

Agriculture in the Cooper River region was largely defined by rice culture, at first in inland ricefields fed and drained by reserves and later primarily in tidal rice fields fed and drained by the Cooper River and its tributaries and creeks. Rice cultivation was achieved by a complicated system of canals,

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 25

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

dikes, and trunks. After the land was cleared, it was divided into large fields and subdivided into smaller tracts enclosed by dikes or banks. These dikes were built to a height of five to ten feet and were approximately four to six feet wide. They were surrounded by canals, dug fifteen to twenty feet inside the banks, with dirt from the canal used to increase the height of the banks. Dividing land into fields enclosed by banks permitted each individual field to be flooded independently of the others during the flooding season.

Trunks, or small flood gates, were installed at intervals in the banks. A trunk was made of two facing doors which worked automatically with the ebb and flow of the water pressure from the river or reserves, flooding or draining the fields as necessary. Rice was planted in early April and harvested at the end of August or beginning of September.

Processing and storing a year's rice crop was almost as complicated a procedure as planting, growing, and harvesting it. Rice mills, at first water-powered, were common on the larger plantations by the end of the eighteenth century and were steam-powered by the first few decades of the nineteenth century; they pounded or threshed rice from the stalks in preparation for shipping as rough rice or for further processing such as husking and cleaning. Rice barns were also a necessity on the larger plantations. Many extant resources associated with rice culture, such as ricefields and the canals, dikes, trunks within them; rice mills and their machinery; and rice barns, illustrate the establishment, growth, development, and decline of rice as the most profitable and most significant crop grown in the Cooper River region from the colonial era through the end of the Civil War.

The cultivation and production of indigo was also an important part of agriculture in the region in the late colonial era, until the disruption of the American Revolution and the resulting loss of the British colony doomed it as a viable cash crop. Extant resources such as agricultural fields and the vats in which the crop was processed illustrate the establishment, growth, development, and decline of indigo as a secondary crop in the Cooper River region.

Other extant resources associated with the production of subsistence crops or with raising and housing livestock further illustrate the secondary workings of many plantations in the colonial and antebellum eras of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the primary workings of many plantations after the Civil War and well into the twentieth century.

Buildings and structures associated with agriculture and agricultural industry illustrate and document the establishment, growth, development, and maintenance of agricultural practices on plantations in the Cooper River region. They often share a commonality of size, materials, design, spatial arrangement, and physical placement, and are typical of similar resources on plantations in the South Carolina lowcountry between ca. 1670 and ca. 1950.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 26

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Agricultural buildings such as barns, stables, cribs, coops, and smokehouses are typically one-story or occasionally one-story-with-loft frame buildings, utilitarian in both form and function. Structures specific to ricefields such as dikes, banks and canals are built up or dug out of the landscape itself; trunks, or wooden flood gates, may also be present. Structures specific to the production of indigo such as indigo vats are typically simple brick structures.

III. Significance

These resources are significant as key elements of the plantations that help define so much of the character of the Cooper River region. Properties associated with agriculture and agricultural industry reveal much about the workings of these plantations from the colonial era to the mid-twentieth century. They may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criteria A and C, within the areas of significance for Agriculture, Engineering, or Industry.

IV. Registration Requirements

Buildings and structures may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction, retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain all or most of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction, retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. In all cases, additions and alterations are acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

Agricultural fields that qualify for listing must be intact examples of their type. Although alterations have undoubtedly occurred over time as a result of continuous maintenance and reuse, and it is impossible to determine the age of fields or their components with any certainty, it is still possible to evaluate their integrity and significance within the context of both their individual setting and the Cooper River region as a whole. They may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction and retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction and retain overall integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 27

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance. In all cases, alterations are expected and acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

**I. Name of Property Type: Properties Associated With
Landscape Architecture or Conservation**

II. Description

Properties associated with landscape architecture are tangible reflections of the desire of colonial, antebellum, and post-Civil War planters and twentieth century plantation owners to illustrate their wealth and status. These sites and structures often share a commonality of spatial arrangement and physical placement, and reflect styles typical of designed landscapes and their components on plantations in the South Carolina lowcountry between ca. 1670 and ca. 1950.

Among the most notable and historic of these features are oak avenues, ranging widely in age from the colonial and early national periods to the modern era, serving as the formal entrance to the plantation and occasionally approached through wooden gates supported by brick posts. Designed gardens are also significant, often including plantings of trees, bushes, shrubs, and flowers in geometrical or other arrangements, ornamental ponds and fountains, sculpture, and such structures as walls, fences, gates, bridges, gazebos, pergolas, greenhouses, or garden houses.

Properties associated with conservation or the management of game, waterfowl or marine life are also significant as reflections of the changing emphases of the twentieth century owners who consolidated and preserved large landholdings and prevented residential or industrial development on them.

III. Significance

These resources are significant as key elements of the plantations—both early and more recent—that help define the character of the Cooper River region. Properties associated with landscape architecture and conservation reveal much about these plantations and about historic and modern perceptions of their importance. They may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criteria A and C, within the areas of significance for Landscape Architecture, Conservation, or Social History.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 28

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

IV. Registration Requirements

Buildings and structures may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction, retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain all or most of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction, retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. In all cases, additions and alterations are acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

Designed landscape features and features associated with conservation that qualify for listing must be intact examples of their type. Although alterations have undoubtedly occurred over time as a result of continuous maintenance and reuse, and it is often impossible to determine the age of landscape features or their components with any certainty, it is still possible to evaluate their integrity and significance within the context of both their individual setting and the Cooper River region as a whole. They may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction and retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction and retain overall integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance. In all cases, alterations are expected and acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

I. Name of Property Type: Properties Associated With Transportation

II. Description

Roads, canals, railroad tracks and trestles, ferries, and other resources associated with transportation illustrate the establishment, growth, development, and maintenance of land and waterborne transportation in the Cooper River region from its earliest days. They often share a commonality of size, materials, design, spatial arrangement, and physical placement, and are typical of similar resources throughout the South Carolina lowcountry between ca. 1670 and ca. 1950.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 29

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

III. Significance

These resources are significant as some of the most important, if often overlooked, historic properties associated with the Cooper River and its environs, and reveal much about the transportation network of the South Carolina lowcountry. Structures may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criteria A and C, within the area of significance for Transportation.

IV. Registration Requirements

Although alterations have undoubtedly occurred over time as a result of continuous maintenance and reuse, and it is often impossible to determine the age of structures or their components with any certainty, it is still possible to evaluate their integrity and significance within the context of both their individual setting and the Cooper River region as a whole. They may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction and retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction and retain overall integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance. In all cases, alterations are expected and acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

I. Name of Property Type: Properties Associated with Religion

II. Description

Properties in this region associated with religion illustrate the significance of the church as an institution in the area for most of its history. Though churches and associated buildings in the region date from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries, those most closely related to the Cooper River and its environs are parish churches and chapels of ease dating from the colonial and antebellum periods, or from ca. 1700 to ca. 1860.

The Anglican church, with its role as the established church ensured with the passage of the Vestry Act of 1704 and the Church Act of 1706, played a central role not only in the religious life of early South Carolina but also in the establishment, growth, and development of the lowcountry plantation system. That system was one in which church vestries and elections to the General Assembly were controlled by the large planters of each parish. The prominent part that parishes, parish churches,

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 30

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

and chapels of ease played in almost every aspect of political and social life from the colonial era through the American Revolution and up to the Civil War is another of the defining features of the Cooper River region.

Parish churches and chapels of ease are tangible reflections of the fabric of colonial, antebellum, and post-Civil War society in the region, and they often share a commonality of size, materials, design, spatial arrangement, and physical placement, and reflect architectural styles and traditions typical of such resources in the South Carolina lowcountry between ca. 1670 and ca. 1860.

Parish churches and chapels of ease in this region are typically small one-story brick or stuccoed brick buildings, and less frequently one-story frame buildings with brick pier foundation and exterior clapboard covering. Significant exterior features often include arched window openings with multi-light, double-hung sash and operable shutters, entrances on at least two but possibly three elevations, bold cornice lines, and jerkinhead roofs clad in slate. Less often are full pedimented gable roofs clad in wood or metal. The buildings are typically three-to-five bays in length and three bays in width. Generally sited on high ground or bluffs overlooking the Cooper River or one of its many tributaries in the area, their settings are typically quite remote from any other buildings or building types and often include associated cemeteries. Significant interior features of parish churches and chapels of ease often include stone or brick-paved floors, carved wooden pews, wood altar rail with unturned balusters, and wooden lectern-like pulpits. Other features may include wood floors, paneled wainscoting, box pews, and octagonally-shaped, pedestaled pulpits with octagonal, belcast caps.

III. Significance

These resources are significant as key elements of the parish system that defined so much of the character of the Cooper River region. Properties associated with parish churches and chapels of ease reveal much about life in the region from the colonial era to the twentieth century. They may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criteria A and C, within the area of significance for Religion or Architecture, and under Criteria Consideration A.

IV. Registration Requirements

Buildings and structures may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction, retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain all or most of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction, retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials,

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 31

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

and exterior finishes. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance, are on their original site or a compatible one, and retain at least 50% of their original plan, materials, and exterior finishes. In all cases, additions and alterations are acceptable if they do not overwhelm or significantly detract from the historic appearance of the resource and are clearly distinguishable as such.

I. Name of Property Type: Cemeteries

II. Description

Cemeteries are present throughout the Cooper River region, whether they are adjacent to and associated with parish churches, chapels of ease, or other churches, or whether they are located on or near plantations and include the plots or individual graves of planters and their families, slaves, freedmen, and other inhabitants of the area from the colonial era to the mid-twentieth century. They often share a commonality of size, design, spatial arrangement, and physical placement, and their component parts reflect gravestone art and other burial traditions typical of such resources in the South Carolina lowcountry between ca. 1670 and ca. 1950.

Typical grave markers range from the most simple fieldstones marking a burial to the most elaborate designed and carved monuments. Markers with inscriptions are most often made of marble or granite, though sometimes they are made of slate, sandstone, concrete, bronze, cast-iron, or aluminum. They include headstones (and, less often, footstones), ledgers and plaques, box-tombs, tomb-tables, obelisks, pedestal-tombs, vaults, tombs or mausoleums, often combining design features or decorative elements from several types. Their symbolic and decorative details and inscriptions often reflect and illustrate the religious, cultural, and ethnic beliefs, values, and traditions of the persons buried in these cemeteries and the communities.

Typical design elements in cemeteries in this region include brick, stone, tabby, or concrete walls or cast-iron fences delineating cemetery or plot boundaries; paved and unpaved walkways and other paths, and benches. Typical landscaping features include trees such as cedars, magnolias, oaks, and dogwoods; shrubs such as holly and boxwoods; and other plantings. Decorative or commemorative objects, including artificial flower arrangements or grave goods such as pitchers, vases, bowls, clocks, or other personal items belonging to the deceased, are also occasionally present.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 32

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

III. Significance

These resources are significant as reflections of the wealth and status of families and individuals of lowcountry South Carolina, and for their association with those families and individuals, from the most prominent to the least remembered. They may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criteria A, B, and C, within the area of significance for Social History and Art, and under Criteria Considerations A and C.

NOTE: Cemeteries may also qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion D for Archaeology (Historic); see Property Subtype "Archaeological Sites in Cemeteries" below under Property Type "Archaeological Resources."

IV. Registration Requirements

Cemeteries that qualify for listing must retain their integrity of plan, setting, and a majority of marked and unmarked burials, including grave markers and other decorative or commemorative objects, dating from the period between ca. 1670 and ca. 1950; though burials and gravestones may date from the period since 1950, they must not detract from the overall historic appearance of the cemetery.

Although alterations have always occurred over time to some degree, cemeteries may be considered individually eligible if they demonstrate individual distinction and retain a high degree of integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of an individual listing if they have some measure of individual distinction and retain overall integrity from their period of significance. They may be considered eligible as resources contributing to the character of a historic district if they lack individual distinction but still retain overall integrity from their period of significance.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 33

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

I. Name of Property Type: Archaeological Resources

II. Description

Extensive archaeological resources, many of them already identified and evaluated and many of them already excavated and interpreted, survive from the period of significance. These resources play a vital role in helping interpret the history and significance of the Cooper River region. Archaeological investigations may help answer old questions and raise new ones about a wide range of topics.

**Property Subtype I: Archaeological Sites Associated with Residences
and Other Domestic Resources**

Archaeological resources associated with domestic sites during the period of significance will include, but are not limited to, the remains or sites of plantation houses, slave, freedmen's, tenant, and caretaker's houses, associated domestic outbuildings, and settlements, complexes, or similar collections of such resources, dating from the late-seventeenth through the mid-twentieth centuries.

Potential Research Questions

These resources have the potential to yield valuable information about colonization, creolization and assimilation, and cultural change and persistence among white, black, and mixed-race inhabitants of the plantation society. Potential topics of interest include domestic architecture and furniture, food, clothing, tools and work, recreation, the family unit, religion, and society, for example, as well as more general and abstract aspects of plantation culture. Others include those associated with social, economic, and cultural trends among individuals, family units, and communities. Other research questions may help explain broad or specific patterns of the spatial relationships between and among buildings and agricultural fields or designed landscapes on these types of complexes.

Property Subtype II: Archaeological Sites Associated with Agriculture

Archaeological resources associated with agriculture in the region will include, but are not limited to, the remains or sites of fields, canals, dikes, trunks, and other structures, as well as mills, barns, cribs, stables, and other agricultural outbuildings.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 34

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Potential Research Questions

These resources have the potential to yield valuable information about agricultural practices and processes on plantations from the late-seventeenth through the mid-twentieth centuries. Potential topics of interest associated with plantation agriculture on rice, indigo, cotton, and subsistence plantations in the region include the changing technologies associated with land-clearing and boundary-defining activities, with the cultivation, processing, storage, transportation, and marketing of crops, and with the management of livestock.

Property Subtype III: Archaeological Sites Associated with Industry

Archaeological resources associated with industry in the region will include, but are not limited to, the remains or sites of tar kilns, lumber yards, brick yards, and phosphate mines, and secondary structures such as walls, fences, roads, and paths associated with those industries.

Potential Research Questions

These resources have the potential to yield valuable information about industrial practices and processes from the late-seventeenth through the early-twentieth centuries. Potential topics of interest include the changing technologies associated with land-clearing and boundary-defining activities, and with the processing, storage, transportation, and marketing of naval stores such as tar, pitch, and lumber; of bricks; and of phosphate and other fertilizers.

**Property Subtype IV: Archaeological Sites Associated with
Landscape Architecture or Conservation**

Archaeological resources associated with designed landscape features or conservation practices in the region will include, but are not limited to, the remains or sites of gardens and other historic plantings, and sites or structures associated with the consolidation of large tracts or virtually undeveloped acreage including wetlands, forests, fields, roads, paths, trails, ditches, walls, and fences.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 35

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Potential Research Questions

These resources have the potential to yield valuable information about landscape architecture and conservation practices from the early-eighteenth through the mid-twentieth centuries. Potential topics of interest include the changing technologies associated with land-clearing and boundary-defining activities, with the design, layout, and maintenance of gardens and other historic plantings, and with the consolidation and maintenance of large tracts.

Property Subtype VII: Archaeological Sites Associated with Transportation

Archaeological resources associated with transportation in the region will include not only the remains or sites of roads, canals, railroads, but most significantly, the remains or sites of historic resources directly associated with the Cooper River itself, including but not limited to docks, landings, ferries, and the wrecks or other remains of ships, boats, barges, and other vessels.

Potential Research Questions

These resources have the potential to yield valuable information about transportation networks and methods from the late-seventeenth through the mid-twentieth centuries. Potential topics of interest include the changing technologies associated with roads, canals, railroads, docks, landings, ferries, and ships, boats, barges, and other vessels on the Cooper River, as well as the transportation of inhabitants and goods into, out of, and through the Cooper River region.

Property Subtype V: Archaeological Sites Associated with Religion

Archaeological resources associated with religion in the region will include, but are not limited to, the remains or sites of churches and church-affiliated institutions, including parish churches, chapels of ease, church schools, and praise houses.

Potential Research Questions

These resources have the potential to yield valuable information about the architecture of churches and church-affiliated institutions, about religious practices, and about the social and economic communities that created and supported these institutions from the late-seventeenth century through the mid-twentieth century.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 36

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Property Subtype VI: Archaeological Sites in Cemeteries

Cemeteries, whether associated with churches, plantation families, or slaves, freedmen, or other inhabitants of the area, are present throughout the region and have the potential to yield additional valuable information through archaeological investigation and interpretation.

Potential Research Questions

Potential topics of interest include those associated not only with the demographics and anthropology of the white, black, and mixed-race population of the region, but also with social, economic, and cultural trends among individuals, family units, and communities. Excavation of cemeteries or cemetery plots and the study of human remains, grave goods, and other extant materials may help archaeologists identify and evaluate burial practices or to formulate osteological studies regarding the age, sex, race, birth and death rates, growth rates, nutrition, diseases, and occupations of individuals buried in them and to make conclusions about the population of the region during the period of significance.

III. Significance

Archaeological sites fill the gaps in the Cooper River region – both as a physical entity and in terms of the body of knowledge or documentary base on which its history depends. The retention of large tracts of land with limited development creates a high likelihood for site integrity.

Huge tracts of land in this area have seen human settlement, agricultural use, and commerce, yet little remains on many of those tracts to tell the story except through archaeological remains – artifacts, features, and land modification. The documentary record comes almost entirely from the perspective of the controlling elite. Archaeology is almost all we have to learn the story of both the black majority and white yeomen that lived and worked in this area from the colonial, antebellum, and postbellum years well into the twentieth century.

Preliminary archaeological investigations, more extensive surveys and reports, and papers and monographs, most of them based on extensive research and fieldwork, have already demonstrated the Cooper River region's ability to yield valuable information through archaeological identification, testing, evaluation, excavation, and interpretation. The undisputed potential for similar work with additional archaeological components is just as significant.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 37

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Some archaeological sites are expected to retain enough integrity, density, clarity, and uniqueness to be individually eligible for listing; they will be able to answer important research questions on their own. Boundaries will be definable by artifact deposits and features.

Other archaeological sites which do not have the integrity, density, clarity, and uniqueness to be individually eligible may still, as components of a group of sites and structures, be able to provide valuable information to increase our understanding of plantation complexes, agricultural resources, hunting retreats, or timbering operations, for example. Landscape features and original plats where little land alteration has taken place are likely to define such complexes or districts.

IV. Registration Requirements

Archaeological sites documenting these resources may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion D, within the area of significance for Archaeology (Historic).

In order to be eligible for listing under Criterion D—whether as individual listings or as components of complexes, historic districts, or cultural landscapes—archaeological sites must be associated with the Cooper River and its environs during the period of significance (ca. 1670-ca. 1950). They must not only retain their integrity of setting and materials but must also demonstrate that they have the potential to yield significant information about their historic functions by addressing research questions already developed or likely to be developed through research and fieldwork.

They should meet a combination of the following significance criteria for historic archaeological sites derived primarily from Michael Glassow's typology in *American Antiquity* (1977):⁶⁹

Integrity: The current site of preservation of a site should be sufficient for the recovery of data from interpretable contexts and proveniences.

Density: Density refers to the quantity of archaeological artifacts and features within the site. A high density of such materials would be expected to yield a sufficient statistically valid sample. A low density of materials indicates the site would be limited in the quality of scientific information it might yield.

⁶⁹ Michael S. Glassow, "Issues in Evaluating the Significance of Archaeological Resources," *American Antiquity* 42 (1977): 413-20.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 38

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Clarity: Clarity pertains to the lack of mixing of components within a multicomponent site and the potential of the archaeologist to correctly interpret data derived from its content.

Uniqueness: Uniqueness is the special quality of a particular site type and its potential to yield significant data in relation to other sites of a similar type. A unique site might be one which is the last remaining example of its kind in a particular environment.

V. Other

Bibliography of Notable Archaeological Studies in the Cooper River Region

Adams, Natalie P., and Richard M. Affleck. "Archaeology at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina." Paper presented at the 15th Annual Conference on South Carolina Archeology, Archeological Society of South Carolina, Columbia, 1989.

Affleck, Richard M. "Power and Space: Settlement Pattern Change at Middleburg Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina." M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1990.

Babson, David. "The Tanner Road Settlement: The Archaeology of Racism on Limerick Plantation." M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1987.

Beard, David. "'Good Wharves and Other Conveniences': An Archaeological Study of Riverine Adaptation in the South Carolina Lowcountry." In Linda Stine, et al, eds., *Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Carr, John P. "The Cooper River-Amoco Project." Paper Presented at the 4th Annual Conference on South Carolina Archeology, Archeological Society of South Carolina, Columbia, 1978.

Connor, Cynthia. "'Sleep On and Take Your Rest': Black Mortuary Behavior on the East Branch of the Cooper River, South Carolina." M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1989.

Ferguson, Leland G. *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America, 1650-1800*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 39

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Ferguson, Leland G., and David W. Babson. "Survey of Plantation Sites along the East Branch of the Cooper River: A Model for Predicting Archaeological Site Locations." Columbia: Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1986.

_____. "Afro-American Community on the East Branch of Cooper River, South Carolina." Paper Presented at the Joint Meeting of the 44th Southeastern Archaeological Conference and 1987 Eastern States Archeological Federation, Charleston, 1987.

Garrow, Patrick H. "Archeological Investigations of Two Slave Quarter Sites in Berkeley County, South Carolina." Paper Presented at the 37th Southeastern Archaeological Conference, New Orleans, 1980.

Harmon, Michael, and Rodney Snedeker. "The Archaeological Record of Tar and Pitch Production in Coastal Carolina." In Linda Stine, et al, eds., *Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Hart, Linda P. "Industrial Archeology in the Rural South: Excavation of a Tar Kiln." U.S. Forest Service, 1981.

Lees, William B. "Limerick, Old and in the Way: Archaeological Investigations at Limerick Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina." Research Manuscript Series No. 157. Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980.

Lewis, Kenneth E. "Plantation Layout and Function in the South Carolina Lowcountry." In Theresa A. Singleton, ed., *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*. Orlando: Academic Press, 1985.

Marcil, Valerie G. "Continuity and Change: Colono Ware as a Coping Tool for African Americans." M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1993.

Newell, Mark. "The Santee Canal Sanctuary. Part II: Preliminary Archaeological Investigation of a Portion of the Old Santee Canal and Biggin Creek, Berkeley County, South Carolina." Underwater Antiquities Management Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1989.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 40

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

-
- _____. "Preliminary Report on Excavations in the Old Santee Canal." Paper Presented at the 15th Annual Conference on South Carolina Archeology, Archeological Society of South Carolina, Columbia, 1989.
- Poplin, Eric C. "Archaeological Survey of Three Mine Sites, French Quarter Creek Development Tract, Berkeley County, South Carolina." Mount Pleasant: Brockington and Associates, 1990.
- Rucker, Marc D. "Introducing Cooper River: A Management Overview." U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, South Atlantic Division, Atlanta, 1980.
- Shlasko, Ellen. "Carolina Gold: Economic and Social Change on a South Carolina Rice Plantation." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Yale University, 1997.
- Simmons, Joe J., III. "The Santee Canal: Recent Investigations of a Portion of the Oldest True Canal in the United States." Paper Presented at the 14th Annual Conference on South Carolina Archeology, Archeological Society of South Carolina, Columbia, 1988.
- _____, and Mark Newell. "The Santee Canal Sanctuary. Part I: Preliminary Archaeological Surveys of a Portion of the Old Santee Canal, the Biggin Creek Vessel and the Mouth of Biggin Creek, Berkeley County, South Carolina." Underwater Antiquities Management Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1989.
- South, Stanley A., and Michael Hartley. "Deep Water and High Ground: Seventeenth Century Low Country Settlement." Research Manuscript Series No. 166. Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980.
- South, Stanley A., and Carl Steen. "The Search for John Bartlam at Cain Hoy: America's First Creamware Potter." Research Manuscript Series No. 219. Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1993.
- Steen, Carl. "A Preliminary Report on the 1992 Excavations at Pine Grove Plantation." Columbia: Diachronic Research Foundation, 1992.
- _____. "The 1993 Restoration Excavations at Somerset Place Plantation." Columbia: Diachronic Research Foundation, 1993.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 41

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

_____, and Ellen Shlasko. "Archaeological Resources of the Proposed Cooper River National Register District." Columbia: Diachronic Research Foundation, 1998.

Wheaton, Thomas R., Jr., and Patrick H. Garrow. "Acculturation and the Archaeological Record in the Carolina Lowcountry." In Theresa A. Singleton, ed., *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*. Studies in Historical Archaeology. Orlando: Academic Press, 1985.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number G, H Page 42

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Geographical Data

The Cooper River and its environs within the county limits of Berkeley County, South Carolina

Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

A comprehensive county-wide survey of historic places in Berkeley County was conducted by Preservation Consultants, Inc., of Charleston in the summer and early fall of 1989. Historians and architectural historians working with the South Carolina Statewide Survey and National Register of Historic Places programs of the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) conducted National Register eligibility evaluations for complexes and individual resources as a result of that survey, including evaluations conducted before Hurricane Hugo struck the state on 21-22 September 1989 and damage assessments and further evaluations afterward.

In early 1996 the South Carolina SHPO received letters from three Berkeley County organizations—the Lord Berkeley Conservation Trust, the Berkeley Soil and Water Conservation District, and the East Branch [of the Cooper River] Property Owners Association—asking it to evaluate the Cooper River region for possible eligibility as a National Register historic district.

The SHPO staff organized several meetings with representatives of these and other organizations—most notably the Historic Charleston Foundation (HCF)—along with interested citizens of Berkeley County to discuss the “Cooper River Focus Area” occurred throughout the year and a potential historic district of approximately 100,000 acres was identified. The Historic Charleston Foundation volunteered to conduct the research and field work necessary to prepare a National Register nomination for a Cooper River Historic District, and in May 1997 the SHPO awarded HCF a survey and planning grant to prepare a draft nomination. HCF hired the Diachronic Research Foundation, an archaeological consulting firm in Columbia, to prepare the archaeological component of the nomination. Marilyn Harper of the National Register staff of the National Park Service reviewed a preliminary request from the SHPO for determination of eligibility and offered the Park Service’s opinion that the district was potentially eligible for listing in the Register.

The Historic Charleston Foundation staff and SHPO staff consulted frequently during 1997 and the first half of 1998, holding several public meetings to discuss the proposed district, reviewing previous survey and National Register information on properties within the area, conducting site visits and other field work, and conducting research on individual historic and archaeological resources as well as on the Cooper River region as a whole. This field work and research produced a historical narrative of the region, detailed district and inset maps, black and white photographs, and slides documenting the history and extant resources of the Cooper River region from ca. 1670 to ca. 1950.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number H Page 43

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

The SHPO received a first draft nomination for the Cooper River Historic District from HCF in June 1998, a revised nomination that summer, and a completed nomination that October. At the same time, during the second half of 1998, industries and other corporations in the Cooper River region and elected officials such as the Berkeley County Chamber of Commerce and Berkeley County Supervisor James H. Rozier, Jr. expressed significant concerns about the proposed historic district.

These concerns, most notably those over the possible effects that National Register status might have on permitting and other regulatory processes and on the property rights of corporations and private citizens owning land within the proposed boundaries, led Rozier to formally oppose the district nomination in a letter to the SHPO dated 30 November 1998. As a result of this opposition and considerable local controversy and confusion concerning the historic district, its boundaries, contributing and noncontributing resources, and the potential effects of National Register listing, the SHPO postponed taking the nomination to the South Carolina State Board of Review—originally planned for November 1999—and announced that it would thoroughly review and evaluate the proposed historic district and its boundaries and hold a series of several additional public meetings inviting comments on the nomination. In the meanwhile, in early 2000, Marilyn Harper of the National Park Service staff made a site visit to the Cooper River region and reviewed the boundaries of the historic district with the SHPO staff, confirming her previous opinion that the district was eligible for listing in the National Register. The SHPO staff then revised and refined the district boundaries to exclude several large modern subdivisions and other housing developments, industrial complexes, and other noncontributing resources in areas which retained relatively few significant historic, archaeological, or cultural resources, while retaining the largest and most intact concentration of those resources in the proposed district. This process, which reduced the size of the district from more than 100,000 acres to 59,000 acres, continued throughout 2000 and 2001.

Throughout 2001 the SHPO staff held additional public meetings to provide information on the district and the National Register program and to invite public comment on it. In the winter of 2001-02 the SHPO staff made substantive revisions to the district nomination, with its final boundaries centered primarily on the East Branch of the Cooper River and a total size of 30,020 acres. The SHPO also developed a historic context for the Historic Resources of the Cooper River as part of a multiple property submission intended to document the rich historic, archaeological, and other cultural resources of the region and to facilitate future nominations for such resources to the National Register of Historic Places.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 44

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Major Bibliographical References

- Baldwin, William P., Agnes L. Baldwin, and N. Jane Iseley. *Plantations of the Low Country: South Carolina 1697-1865*. Greensboro, N.C.: Legacy Publications, 1985.
- Ball, Edward. *Slaves in the Family*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroud, 1998.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Myths and Realities: Societies of the Colonial South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952.
- Briggs, Loutrel W. *Charleston Gardens*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1951.
- Bull, Elias B. *Historic Preservation Inventory, Berkeley County*. Charleston: Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Council of Governments, 1979.
- Butler, Jon. *The Huguenots in America: A Refugee People in New World History*. Harvard Historical Monographs, Vol. 72. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Chaplin, Joyce. *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1993.
- _____. "Tidal Rice Cultivation and the Problem of Slavery in South Carolina and Georgia, 1760-1815." *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 49:1 (January 1992).
- Coclanis, Peter. *The Shadow of A Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country, 1670-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Cooper River Focus Area. *Cooper River Focus Area Habitat Protection Project: Conserving the Natural Resources and Historic Character of the Cooper, Ashley, Wando, and Stono River Systems*. Bonneau, S.C.: Cooper River Focus Area, 1993.
- Cross, J. Russell. *Historic Ramblin's Through Berkeley*. Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company, 1985.
- Dalcho, Frederick. *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in South Carolina, from the First Settlement of the Province, to the War of the Revolution; With Notices of the Present State of the Church in Each Parish ...* Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1820.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 45

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Deas, Anne Simons. *Points of Colonial Interest Around Summerville*. Summerville, S.C.: S.P. Driggers Print, 1905.

_____. *Recollections of the Ball Family of South Carolina and the Comingtee Plantation*. Summerville, S.C., 1909; reprint ed., Charleston: South Carolina Historical Society, 1978.

Dethloff, Henry C. *A History of the American Rice Industry, 1685-1985*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1988.

Doar, David. *Rice and Rice Planting in the South Carolina Low Country*. Charleston: The Charleston Museum, 1936.

Doyle, Don H. *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860-1910*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Dunn, Richard S. "The English Sugar Islands and the Founding of South Carolina." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 72:2 (April 1971).

Dusinberre, William. *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Dwight, Henry Ravenel. *Some Historic Spots in Berkeley: Being Some Notes on Places of General Historic Interest*. Monck's Corner, S.C.: Monck's Corner Drug Co., 1921; reprint ed., Pinopolis, S.C.: The Womans' Auxiliary of Trinity Church, 1944.

Easterby, J.H., ed. *Wadboo Barony: Its Fate as Told in Colleton Family Papers, 1773-1793*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952.

Edgar, Walter B. *History of Santee Cooper, 1934-1984*. Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company for the South Carolina Public Service Authority, 1984.

Edgar, Walter B. *South Carolina: A History*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998.

Ferguson, Leland G. *Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America, 1650-1800*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 46

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Ferguson, Leland G., and David Babson. "Survey of Plantation Sites along the East Branch of the Cooper River: A Model for Predicting Archaeological Site Locations." Columbia: Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1986.

Fick, Sarah, John Laurens, Robert P. Stockton, and David B. Schneider. *Historic Resources of Berkeley County, South Carolina* (Charleston: Preservation Consultants, 1990).

Fraser, Charles. *A Charleston Sketchbook, 1796-1806; Forty Watercolor Drawings of the City and the Surrounding Country, Including Plantations and Parish Churches*, ed. Alice Ravenel Huger Smith. Rutland, Vt.: Published for the Carolina Art Association by the C.E. Tuttle Company, 1959.

Fraser, Walter J. *Charleston! Charleston! The History of a Southern City*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Inc., "Inventory, Evaluation and Nomination of Military Installations: Naval Base Charleston," Frederick, Md.: R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, 1994.

Gray, Lewis Cecil. *History of Agriculture in the Southern States to 1860*. 2 volumes. Washington: Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1932. Reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958.

Heyward, Duncan Clinch. *Seed from Madagascar*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937.

Hudgins, Carter L., Carl R. Lounsbury, Louis P. Nelson, and Jonathan H. Poston, eds. *The Vernacular Architecture of Charleston and the Lowcountry, 1670-1990: A Field Guide*. Charleston: 1994 Annual Conference, Vernacular Architectural Forum.

Irving, John B. *A Day on Cooper River*. Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1842; 2nd edition, ed. by Louisa Cheves Stoney. Columbia: Press of the R.L. Bryan Company, 1932.

Kovacik, Charles F. "Landscapes of the East Cooper River Region." Unpublished paper, presented at "Historic Landscapes of Mount Pleasant," a conference sponsored by the Mount Pleasant Historical Commission, Mt. Pleasant, S.C., February 1993, copy on file at the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 47

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Kovacik, Charles F., and John J. Winberry. *South Carolina: The Making of a Landscape*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

Lees, William B. "Limerick, Old and in the Way: Archaeological Investigations at Limerick Plantation, Berkeley County, South Carolina," Occasional Papers of the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, the University of South Carolina, No. 5. Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980.

Legendre, Gertrude Sanford. *The Time of My Life*. Charleston: Wyrick, 1987.

Lewis, Kenneth E. "Plantation Layout and Function in the South Carolina Lowcountry." In Theresa Singleton, ed., *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*. Orlando: Academic Press, 1985.

Lumpkin, H. Henry. *From Savannah to Yorktown: The American Revolution in the South*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1981.

McCusker, John J., and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1981.

Merrens, H. Roy, and George D. Terry. "Dying in Paradise: Malaria, Mortality, and the Perceptual Environment in Colonial South Carolina." *Journal of Southern History* L:4 (November 1984).

Morgan, Philip D. *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1998.

_____. "The Task System and the World of Lowcountry Blacks, 1700 to 1880." *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 39:4 (October 1982).

Orvin, Maxwell C. *Historic Berkeley County, South Carolina, 1671-1900*. Charleston: Comprint, 1973.

Preservation Consultants, Inc.. "Berkeley County Historical and Architectural Inventory: Survey Report." Charleston: Preservation Consultants, Inc., 1989.

Rogers, George C., Jr. "Changes in Taste in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of Early Southern Decorative Arts* VIII (May 1982).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 48

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

-
- _____. *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969; reprint ed., Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980.
- Salley, A.S., Jr. comp., *Warrants For Lands in South Carolina, 1672-1711*. Columbia: The State Company, 1911-15; reprint ed., Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973.
- Sharrer, G. Terry. "Indigo in Carolina, 1671-1796," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 72:2 (April 1971).
- Sirmans, M. Eugene. *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1966.
- Smith, Henry A.M. *The Historical Writings of Henry A.M. Smith: Articles from the South Carolina Historical (and Genealogical) Magazine. Volume I: The Baronies of South Carolina. Volume II: Cities and Towns of Early South Carolina. Volume III: Rivers and Regions of Early South Carolina*. Spartanburg: The Reprint Company for the South Carolina Historical Society, 1988.
- South, Stanley A., and Michael Hartley. "Deep Water and High Ground: Seventeenth Century Low Country Settlement." Research Manuscript Series No. 166. Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1980.
- South, Stanley A., and Carl Steen. "The Search for John Bartlam at Cain Hoy: America's First Creamware Potter." Research Manuscript Series No. 219. Columbia: Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, 1993.
- Steen, Carl. "Preliminary Report for Archaeological Investigation for Pine Grove Plantation." Columbia: Diachronic Research Foundation, 1992.
- Steen, Carl, and Ellen Shlasko. "Archaeological Resources of the Proposed Cooper River National Register District." Columbia: Diachronic Research Foundation, 1998.
- Stoney, Samuel Gaillard. *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country*. Charleston: Carolina Art Association, 1938.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 49

Historic Resources of the Cooper River, ca. 1670-ca. 1950
Name of Multiple Property Listing
Berkeley County, South Carolina
County and State

Taylor, Rosser H. *Ante-bellum South Carolina, A Social and Cultural History*. James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. 25, No. 2. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.

Terry, George D. "Champaign Country': A Social History of an Eighteenth Century Lowcountry Parish in Colonial South Carolina, St. John's Berkeley County." Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1981.

Thomas, Theodore Gaillard. *A Contribution to the History of the Huguenots of South Carolina, Consisting of Pamphlets by Samuel Dubose and Frederick A. Porcher. Republished for Private Circulation by T. Gaillard Thomas*. New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1887; reprint ed., Columbia: R.L. Bryan Company, 1972.

Ver Steeg, Clarence L. *Origins of A Southern Mosaic: Studies of Early Carolina and Georgia*. Mercer University Lamar Memorial Lectures, No. 17. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975.

Wallace, David D. *South Carolina: A Short History, 1520-1948*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951.

Wayne, Lucy. "Burning Brick: A Study of A Lowcountry Industry." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1992.

Wood, Peter. *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion*. New York: Knopf, 1974.

Worthington, Curtis. *Literary Charleston: A Lowcountry Reader*. Charleston: Wyrick and Company, 1996.

Zuckerman, Michael. "Penmanship Exercises for Saucy Sons: Some Thoughts on the Colonial Southern Family," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 84:3 (July 1983).