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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Our interest in Parris Island cemeteries had a modest beginning. Through our work on the Spanish colonial Santa Elena site on the southern end of Parris Island, we knew that there was an African American cemetery located just north of Spanish Fort San Felipe (Woodrow Garvin, personal communication, 1979; South 1983:77-80). In 1996 we discovered an earlier French fort, Charlesfort (1562-1563), that lay beneath San Felipe (DePratter, South, and Legg 1996). In subsequent years as we gradually exposed portions of the Charlesfort moat/ditch, we realized that remains of that fort may extend into the nearby cemetery, and it became important for us to know the extent of that cemetery which at present contains only one marked grave.

At roughly the same time (2000) that we became interested in determining the extent of the cemetery located at the Charlesfort/Santa Elena site (38BU51/162), Brigadier General James R. Battaglini, Parris Island Commanding General at the time, expressed an interest in knowing the extent of the known cemeteries so they could be marked and avoided in any future expansion of facilities on Parris Island. A 1997 survey by Panamerican Consultants, Inc. (Hendryx et al. 1997) identified four extant cemeteries on Parris Island including the one at the Charlesfort/Santa Elena site (Figure 1). At the request of Dr. Steve Wise, Director of the Parris Island Museum, we expanded the scope of our cemetery interest to include all four of these cemeteries.

In July, 2000, when we began preparing a proposal for funding to delineate the cemeteries, we made a timely discovery. Previous researchers with Panamerican Consultants, Inc., had determined that Cemetery #1 (now 38BU1895B) had been obliterated by modern development (Hayward et al. 1997:69-70, 126-129). Our examination of the same sources used by Panamerican researchers demonstrated that their location for Cemetery #1 (which we have identified as the Fuller Cemetery) was off by about 900 feet, and that the actual site was fairly well preserved in a grove of mature oak trees that did not contain any visible gravestones or other markers (Figure 1). At the time we identified this cemetery, a contract had already been awarded for construction on the site, so there was an immediate need to confirm our identification of the cemetery and to determine its extent.

The Marine Corps provided funding for a project at the Fuller Cemetery (38BU1895B), and that fieldwork was conducted in September, 2000 (Chapter 3). The Marine Corps soon provided funding to delineate the other three known cemeteries and to search for additional cemeteries. Fieldwork on the remaining three cemeteries was conducted in 2001. This report describes our cemetery delineation and search efforts.
Figure 1. Known Cemeteries on Parris Island.
Initial Research

An initial search of maps and available published resources indicated that there was little known concerning the extent or period of use for any of the four known cemeteries on Parris Island (Hayward and Steinbeck 1997; Woodrow Garvin, Steve Wise, personal communication). Dr. Steve Wise, Director of the Parris Island Museum, provided us with a copy of an anonymous Marine Corps memorandum relating to cemeteries on Parris Island. That memo (USMC 1968) states that in 1968 there were three known cemeteries on the island. Citing information provided by former resident Robert Bee, who was born on the island, the memo (USMC 1968) provides the following brief history of island cemeteries:

…these people [former African American residents] originally buried their dead in the Nivers Beach area (behind the existing Golf Clubhouse) until the Marines erected a camp at that site [the Maneuver Grounds] during World War I. At that time they were told that they could no longer use that cemetery, and were given two additional cemetery sites - one at Elliott’s Beach and the other in the area northeast of the Depot’s rifle ranges. Mr. Bee’s grandfather, Charles Stephens, is buried in this latter-mentioned area.

The 1968 memorandum continues with a statement concerning the long-term responsibility of the Marine Corps in regard to these cemeteries:

...While the Depot has no legal requirement to maintain the cemetery areas or grant visitation privileges, it is anticipated that we will continue to do so in order to foster goodwill among the descendents of those buried there.

The 1968 Marine Corps memorandum contains several errors. The cemetery said to be “in the Nivers Beach area (behind the existing Golf Clubhouse)” is without doubt the Means cemetery on the Santa Elena site (38BU51/162) (Figure 1). Nivers Beach is on the opposite side of the island from Santa Elena, but both are near the southern tip of the island. We have found no reference to any cemetery on the south end other than the Means cemetery. It is likely that the author of the memo simply misunderstood Mr. Bee’s description of the cemetery’s location, or over-generalized. The Means Cemetery is, in any case, “behind the existing Golf Clubhouse” (Chapter 6).

The locations of the other two cemeteries mentioned, one at Elliott’s Beach (38BU1618) and the other northeast of the rifle range (identified by us as the “Edings” Cemetery–38BU39/1619), are both well known to island personnel (Chapters 4 and 5) (Figure 1). Whether or not these were original plantation cemeteries or were established in 1918 at the instigation of the Marines is one of the questions addressed in this report.

In addition to the three cemeteries listed in the 1968 memo, there is the Fuller Cemetery (38BU1895B) located at the north end of the island near the building that houses the base recycling facility. As discussed above, the existence of this cemetery had been lost to memory until archaeologists began looking for it (albeit unsuccessfully) in 1997 (Hayward and Steinback 1997:69, 70, 126-129). This cemetery shows up on numerous maps up to 1933 (Chapter 3).
According to Mr. Bee in the 1968 memorandum cited above, “…there are many more graves in the four cemeteries than are presently marked. Other simple markers, made of concrete or wood, deteriorated through the years and were tossed aside by grounds crews during their grass cutting and policing operations” (USMC 1968). The reference in this account to the types of markers that may have been removed is in part corroborated by a 1958 description of an African American cemetery on neighboring Hilton Head Island (Cohen 1958:94-95):

Hilton Head has a number of small cemeteries. Because there is no stone on the island, graves are usually marked with crude headstones fashioned from cement or with wooden stakes. Frequently the name of the deceased is incised in the wet cement and the depressions filled in with black paint. Sometimes the name and date of death are merely painted on the marker. Occasionally more elaborate efforts are made. The headstone may be painted silver or a pictorial dinner plate set in the cement above the name of the departed. Only in rare cases, such as when the military authorities provide a marker for a deceased veteran, are there any but homemade tombstones.

Cohen (1958:95) then goes on to describe such items as “eating utensils, medicine bottles, wash basins, crockery and the like” placed on the surfaces of graves. These surface “grave goods” are discussed elsewhere in this report (Chapters 2-6).

The cemeteries on Parris Island must have originally looked much like the one Cohen described in 1958. The eight remaining grave markers in the Parris Island cemeteries are “store-bought” tombstones with engraved names, dates, and epitaphs. Some or all of the U.S. military veteran’s markers on Parris Island were relocated to the Beaufort National Cemetery in 1918 (Chapter 8).

Because Parris Island has a complex plantation history and was then occupied by several hundred Freedmen and their descendants in the decades following the Civil War, we suspected that there might be additional, presently unknown cemeteries on the island. Part of our cemetery work involved a documentary search followed by a field effort to locate such cemeteries (Chapter 7) in addition to delineating the four known cemeteries (Figure 2).

**Work History**

Funding for this project began in September 2000 and continued through December 2002. Fieldwork took place in three field seasons. Work on site 38BU1895B (Cemetery #1 - Fuller Cemetery) took place on August 22, 26, 27 and September 5-14, 2000, and also June 18, 2001. Excavations at site 38BU39/1619 (Cemetery #4 – Edings Cemetery) and 38BU1618 (Cemetery #3 – Elliott or Whale Creek Cemetery), as well as the search for additional cemeteries, took place from May 21 to June 29, 2001. The continued search for additional cemeteries and excavations at 38BU162V (Cemetery #2 – Means Cemetery) occurred between
Figure 2. Cemetery Search Locations on Parris Island.
August 13 and October 5, 2001. Collection processing was completed in the weeks immediately following each field season. Archival research was conducted in local repositories and in Washington, D.C. intermittently over the course of the project.

**General Methods**

Although topsoil trenching was used to delineate cemetery margins throughout the three seasons of the Parris Island cemetery project, refinement and variation developed as we proceeded. Lab methods remained consistent throughout the project. This discussion covers the general field and lab methods common to the entire project, while site-specific details are found in the methods section for each cemetery (Chapters 3-6).

**Field Methods**

*Mapping.* All sites and search locations were transit mapped. Reference points were established and marked with rebar. Reference points are indicated on individual maps in this report.

*Test trenching.* An unsuccessful effort to detect graves with ground penetrating radar was confined to 38BU1895B (Chapter 3). Given the entirely ambiguous results of the ground penetrating radar survey, we needed an alternative method of identifying graves. Neither block excavation nor general stripping with heavy equipment was a reasonable option given project time constraints and our need to minimize disturbance to the cemeteries, and in any case total exposure of large areas was unnecessary for the simple goal of establishing the limits of each cemetery. Shovel testing was not a practical option, as grave stains and other features would have been impossible to identify with any confidence in such small exposures. Shallow trenching was the solution. We recognized that this trenching would have to be extensive in order to provide an array of positive and negative results sufficiently dense to define the limits of the cemetery. As the budget and schedule precluded the hand excavation of thousands of feet of test trenches, we opted for backhoe trenching. The exception was the hand excavation of trenches adjacent to Fort San Felipe in the Means Cemetery (Chapter 6).

At each site, placement of the first trenches was intended to simply confirm the presence of unmarked graves. That accomplished, subsequent trenches were placed subjectively, each in turn building on the information already gathered to establish a pattern of positive and negative results. Except for those excavated at 38BU162 (Means Cemetery), the trenches were not oriented on any grid nor aligned with one another. Trenches were laid out with tapes and pin flags in increments of 10 ft (3 m), although shorter or slightly longer sections were occasionally excavated. With the exception of 38BU162 (Chapter 6), each continuous trench was assigned a sequential provenience number regardless of length, with each 10 ft segment receiving a letter designation. Thus “Trench 5B” denotes the second 10 ft segment in the fifth trench excavated.

Backhoe trenches were 1.5 ft (0.5 m) wide, a dimension dictated by the width of the backhoe bucket. The teeth of the bucket were covered with a rectangular steel plate that allowed for a smooth, straight cut. As much as possible, roots were cut by hand as soon as they were detected to avoid damage to the trench walls and floor. Trench depth varied with the thickness
of the topsoil or fill horizons encountered. In the absence of fill, features could usually be identified at a depth of 0.8 to 1.5 ft (0.2 to 0.5 m) below the surface after hand cleaning of the trench floor with flat shovels and trowels. No vertical distinctions were recognized in the removal of the topsoil with the exception of the trenching at 38BU162 (Chapter 6). In some cases, backhoe or hand-dug extensions were excavated beyond the original trench walls in order to clarify possible grave features. All graves and other features in each 10 ft segment were recorded on an excavation data form with a measured drawing on the reverse. Each trench was mapped with transit shots at either end of the centerline. The total length of test trenching during the entire cemetery project was 3,515 ft (1,072 m).

Artifact Recovery. When initial fieldwork began at 38BU1895B, it was not known if the site was deeply disturbed on the one hand, or perhaps held dense deposits of grave goods or significant, intact prehistoric components on the other. We began by screening 50% of the soil from Trench 1A, which proved to be both disturbed and heavily laden with concrete rubble and other twentieth century debris. The 50% sample was tentatively adopted as a standard sufficient to characterize the various cultural components present. In all 38BU1895B excavations, 50% of trench fill was screened except in those cases where the trench encountered deep fill or disturbed surfaces, and in those cases trench fill was not screened at all.

Beginning with the excavations at 38BU39/1619, all trench fill was screened, and this 100% screening was adopted as the standard for the remainder of the project. Soil from each 10 ft trench was excavated by backhoe (except in the case of 38BU162) and the soil was piled adjacent to the trench; this soil was then hand-shoveled into a gasoline-powered screen with ¼ in (0.6 cm) wire mesh. Screened artifacts were bagged and saved with the exception of such materials as concrete, gravel, cinders, coal, and shell; these latter types of material were sampled to record presence, but they were not quantified. Shell was sampled by species.

Photography. Photographic documentation included formal photos of grave features and in situ grave goods, all extant grave markers, various prehistoric and historic non-grave features, and work shots illustrating field methods and the appearance of various parts of each site. Three cameras were used, including 35mm cameras for color prints and color slides and a digital still camera.

Backfilling and Landscaping. Throughout the project we sought to minimize open excavations and messiness generally in keeping with the sensitive nature of the sites. All trenches were backfilled, compacted, and carefully landscaped as soon as recording was complete. At each site, the surface was restored as nearly as possible to its original appearance.

Lab Methods

The artifacts were taken to the SCIAA lab in Columbia for processing. Material was washed, dried, and rebagged in archival zip-lock bags by provenience and class. A generous selection of artifacts, including the entire Native American sherd and lithic collection, was permanently marked with provenience. Dr. Chester DePratter conducted the analysis of the Native American materials, while James Legg handled the historic collections. Fragmented vessels were mended and cross-mended. Two prehistoric vessels were extensively reconstructed.
and drawn for illustration in this report. After analysis, representative artifacts from each cultural component were selected for illustration in this report and photographed with a digital camera.

**Analysis.** The Native American pottery was identified on the basis of a pre-existing typology in use in the region for more than 60 years (Caldwell and Waring 1939a, 1939b; DePratter 1976, 1979, 1991; Waring 1968a, 1968b, 1968c; Waring and Holder 1968). Using this typology, many of the larger sherds were identified to the type level, whereas smaller sherds could only be identified to the level of kinds of temper or grog added to the paste. Stone tools and flakes were identified by raw material and by type where possible (Coe 1964; Charles 1981; Whatley 2002).

The historic collections included familiar types and materials ranging in age from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. As the catalog reveals, these familiar materials were characterized using conventional type/material/color nomenclature. Marine Corps military artifacts were identified with their actual nomenclature whenever possible. All of the cemeteries and most of the cemetery search locations exhibited several unrelated cultural components. This meant that a catalog presentation with artifacts grouped by functional class or by material (e.g. “glass things” or “iron things”), would be less than ideal. The solution was that originally adopted by the Santa Elena project for the 38BU162U testing project report (DePratter, Legg and South 2001: Appendix IV). That catalog as well as the present effort (Appendix IV) groups artifacts into their most probable cultural components. The component groups established vary from site to site within the overall Parris Island cemetery project. In the case of 38BU1895B, for example, there were five groups including Native American, 18th/19th Century Plantation, Cemetery, 20th Century USMC and Non-diagnostic. Clearly these are not all mutually exclusive categories, and the system requires some degree of arbitrary and/or subjective assignment. Cut nails from 38BU1895B, for example, are assigned to 18th/19th Century Plantation as a “best fit,” while manganese glass container fragments are assigned to the Cemetery group as probable grave goods, rather than to 20th Century USMC. This distinction was made because there was very little kitchen-related material in the WWI-era USMC material, while manganese glass containers are common grave goods. However imperfect, the present catalog can provide a reasonable impression of the components present in a provenience.

**Metal Artifact Conservation.** A selection of 87 metal artifacts from the cemetery project were cleaned and conserved; many of these are illustrated in the artifact plates, Figures 55, 57, 72, 110, 114, and 121. The selection included all 26 of the reasonably preserved iron and copper alloy artifacts from the Santa Elena component, and 25 iron and copper alloy objects from the post-sixteenth century components at 38BU162 and the other cemeteries and cemetery search loci. The conservation procedure involved electrolytic reduction, repeated boiling in distilled water, heated drying, and sealing with microcrystalline wax.

**Historical Research**

To place the Parris Island Cemeteries in their historical context, extensive documentary research was undertaken to expand on what was already known (see Butler et al. 1995, Hendryx et al. 1997, Alvarez 1998 for previous efforts). This research included work in the National
Archives, the Library of Congress, the Department of the Navy Real Estate Office, Charleston, S.C., the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, the Caroliniana Library at USC, the Thomas Cooper Library at USC, the South Carolina State Library, the Parris Island Museum, the Parris Island Public Works Office, the Parris Island Legal Affairs Office, Beaufort County governmental offices, the Beaufort County Library, Beaufort National Cemetery, private collections, and a wide array of online resources. About nine months of research was conducted in Washington, D.C. by a contract researcher. The result was a wealth of historical documentation that has substantially enhanced our understanding of Parris Island history.

Conclusions

What began as a simple project aimed at finding the margins of a single African American cemetery at the Santa Elena site was transformed through expansion to a much broader project aimed at a better understanding of Parris Island’s complex history. Although this research has centered on the cemeteries and those buried in them, it has been necessary to reconstruct the plantation history that brought those African Americans to the island as slaves, to document the breakup of those plantations after the Civil War, and then to track the Freedmen who bought land and resided on the island until their removal in the early part of the twentieth century when the land was purchased by the Marine Corps for use as a training facility. Because the Marine Corps use of the island has had direct impacts on the known cemeteries, it has been necessary to reconstruct Marine Corps activities in the vicinity of the known cemeteries. This is indeed a complex story, and the results of our efforts are presented in the pages that follow.
Chapter 2

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

This chapter provides a general historical context for the cemeteries on Parris Island. The emphasis here is on settlement and land use on the island proper since the sixteenth century, followed by a discussion of plantation and postbellum African American cemeteries in the larger region. For the broader historical background, the reader is referred to Rowland et al. (1996); we have not attempted to write a history of either South Carolina or Beaufort County. Detailed histories of the properties associated with the four known cemeteries are found in the chapters devoted to those sites. The distribution of the cemeteries resulted in some property history coverage of all of Parris Island, including the Habersham Plantation/Page Field area, which is not presently associated with a known cemetery.

Part I: Parris Island History

The history of Parris Island from the sixteenth century to the present has been covered by a number of previous researchers (Lyon 1984; Darden 1985; DePratter and South 1995; Rowland 1990; Paar 1999; Butler et al. 1995; Hayward and Steinback 1997; Alvarez 1998). None of these works, however, provides a detailed, comprehensive history of the island. Even when considered together, they offer uneven coverage with much emphasis on the French and Spanish in the sixteenth century, and the Marine Corps in the twentieth century. The seventeenth century is virtually untouched, and coverage is weak for the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth century occupations that relate to the four cemeteries considered here. Although the critical Civil War era on Parris Island has received little attention in previous works, we have found that in many respects it is abundantly documented, and much of what we have learned is included here as new material.

The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

The Parris Island-related sagas of Jean Ribault’s Charlesfort (1562-1563) and the Spanish town of Santa Elena (1566-1587) are well documented in both primary documents (Connor 1925, 1930; Lyon 1992) and in secondary literature (Quinn 1977; DePratter et al. 1996; Lyon 1984; Rowland 1990; Paar 1999). Beginning in the late fifteenth century, the entire east coast of North America was part of Spain’s claim to territory in the New World. In the first half of the sixteenth century, efforts were made to explore and colonize this vast region, an area the Spanish called La Florida, but these early efforts did not lead to permanent settlement.

In the spring of 1562, two vessels commanded by French captain Jean Ribault, sailed into Port Royal Sound (Figure 3). Ribault’s mission was to explore the coastline, not to establish a colony, but he was so impressed by Port Royal Sound that he decided to build a small fort, Charlesfort, on the southern tip of Parris Island to defend the harbor while he returned to France for reinforcements. The small garrison left in Charlesfort ultimately abandoned their post and
made their way back to France before Ribault was able to return to assist them. In 1564, a larger French colony was established near present-day Jacksonville, Florida. In response to these French intrusions, Spanish King Philip II sent a large military force commanded by Pedro Menéndez de Avilés to Florida to reestablish Spanish control. Menéndez routed the French colonists and established settlements at St. Augustine and Santa Elena (on Parris Island) to deny the French further access to the region. Santa Elena served as the capital of Spanish Florida from 1566 to 1576; its peak population was approximately 300 settlers with a military garrison consisting of from 50 to 75 soldiers. After a brief abandonment caused by an Indian attack, the settlement was reoccupied in 1577, and for the next decade it served as a military outpost on the northern frontier of Florida; St. Augustine served as the capital during this latter period (Lyon 1976, 1984; Paar 1999).

In 1587, Santa Elena was abandoned, and its residents were withdrawn to St. Augustine. The town was never resettled, and in subsequent decades the most northerly permanent Spanish settlement was a mission and small military outpost at Guale on St. Catherines Island on the Georgia coast. Extensive archaeological excavations have been conducted at the sites of both Charlesfort and Santa Elena (South 1979, 1980, 1983; South and DePratter 1996; DePratter and South 1995; DePratter, South, and Legg 1996).

Figure 3. Jacques Le Moyne’s 1564 map of Port Royal Sound; Parris Island is in center of image (Lorant 1965:47).
There was at least one Native American town on Parris Island in the seventeenth century, the “Saint Ellens” visited by William Hilton in 1663, and by Robert Sandford in 1666 (Salley 1911). Both accounts suggest that the town was a Spanish “visita,” a place occasionally served by a visiting priest. The town was apparently at or near the Spanish Santa Elena site. No other pre-eighteenth century occupations of the island, European or Native American, have been documented historically.

The Plantation Era

The “Plantation Era,” including the eighteenth century and the antebellum nineteenth century, saw the establishment of the cemeteries considered in this report. When considering Parris Island plantations, it is important to recognize that the various associations of owners and properties documented in Chapters 3 through 6 do not necessarily indicate complete, fully appointed plantation complexes including main houses that were primary planter residences. Beaufort area planters often had more than one plantation, only one of which might include an owner residence, and many plantation owners maintained their primary residences in Beaufort. Thus, while there were between five and seven plantation operations on Parris Island at various times in the antebellum period, there were always fewer planters than this in residence. While there was certainly a distinct slave community for each plantation, it is not known how the subdivisions of properties and slave communities over time may have affected the use of old cemeteries and the establishment of new ones. It may be that burials continued in a single traditional cemetery after a property and its slave community were divided.

The future Parris Island was granted in 1698 to Robert Daniel who owned it until 1701, when he sold it to Edward Archer; apparently neither Daniel nor Archer settled or made improvements on the island (Webber 1925:137-138). Alexander Parris (1661-1736) bought the entire island from Archer in 1715. Subdivision into multiple plantations began in 1722, when Parris granted the northern 40% or so of the island to his daughter Jane and his son-in-law John Delabare (Webber 1925:138; Edgar and Bailey 1977:190-191). Both Alexander Parris and John Delabare appear to have operated plantations of some sort on Parris Island, although when these began and what they produced is not recorded, nor is it known if either planter built a personal residence on the island (see Chapters 3 and 6).

The English settlement and development of Port Royal Sound began in earnest in the first years of the eighteenth century, and the town of Beaufort was founded in 1711 (Rowland et al. 1996:80-92). The area surrounding Port Royal Sound was then severely disrupted and depopulated during the Yemassee War (1715). In the 1720s Parris Island was part of a thinly settled frontier area that was still alert to attack by both Native Americans and the Spanish. In 1721, there were only 30 White and 42 Black inhabitants in St. Helena Parish, which included Parris Island and the other islands on the north side of Port Royal Sound (Rowland et al. 1996:101).

Whenever it was that slaves first took up residence on the island, cemeteries would have been established soon thereafter, and the cemeteries at 38BU162 (Means) and 38BU1895B
(Fuller) may both date to this earliest period. The Gascoigne map (Figure 4) depicts two houses on Parris Island, corresponding to the two earliest plantations (see Chapters 3 and 6). The southernmost of these houses is at or near the Santa Elena site. While the map was published in 1776, the information it contains may be much earlier, as the magnetic declination date for the map is given as 1729. In any case, the structures are probably the first two substantial houses on the island, and may have been overseer’s houses or the secondary residences of owners.

The work of the early settlers and slaves on Parris Island probably included forest clearing, the cultivation of food crops, and the maintenance of cattle herds. Cattle ranching was an important industry in parts of South Carolina for much of the eighteenth century. The Port Royal area in particular lacked the extensive freshwater swamps required for rice culture, leaving early landowners without a cash crop sufficiently lucrative to justify the clearing and cultivation of large tracts (Rowland et al. 1996). It is likely that most of Parris Island remained forested until the 1750s, when the emergence of indigo as a cash crop made commercial planting profitable. After the indigo boom began, the landscape and the population of the island must have changed rapidly. By the time Sea Island cotton replaced indigo in the 1790s, Parris Island had been further divided into five plantations, with two more to follow shortly thereafter (see Chapters 3 and 6). The Mills Atlas map of Beaufort District, published in 1825, shows the seven plantations (Barnwell, Cartright, Edings, Elliott, Grayson, Habersham, and Means) operating at that time (Figure 5). Means plantation was at the Santa Elena site. By 1832 these seven plantations had been reduced to five (Edings, Elliott, Grayson, Habersham, and Means) (Rowland et al. 1996:356). This maximum of seven plantations on Parris Island may have resulted in seven or more slave cemeteries, only four of which are presently known.

Most of the well-drained land on the island was cleared and cultivated by the early nineteenth century, with a corresponding increase in the resident population of slaves. The total slave population on Parris Island is not known for any period, as in any given census there are listings for Parris Island slave holders who held plantation slaves and house slaves elsewhere in
St. Helena Parish. Fortunately, certain 1850 census totals particular to Parris Island allow for an extrapolated estimate of 450 to 500 slaves resident on the island in that year (U.S. Census Bureau 1850b).

The resident White population, in contrast, was very small in the antebellum period. Frances Gage, while superintendent of Parris Island in 1863, reported (New York Daily Tribune, 10 March 1863:2):

Paris Island, which has had the reputation of being a lonely, unhealthy point, surrounded by marsh, and reached only at high tide, and through long winding

**Figure 5.** Detail of the Mills’ Atlas Map of Beaufort District, showing Parris Island (1825).
lagoons, was owned by several proprietors. They seldom (if the negroes tell us truly) spent much time on the island, but left it to the care of overseers and black drivers.

Notes of the U.S. Coast Survey record that only two planters resided on Parris Island in the late 1850s; they resided at the Means and Elliott (Whale Creek) plantations. The island is described in those notes as “devoted to the culture of Sea-Island Cotton” (Bache and Boutelle 1861:24-25). While there is no record of a planters’ church or chapel on Parris Island, it is possible that there were small cemeteries for planters and their families on some plantations that are now unknown and lost. Generally speaking, however, the planters of St. Helena Parish attended church in Beaufort, and most are buried there.

**The Civil War and Postbellum Eras**

Beaufort and the Sea Islands were undisturbed by the enemy for the first seven months of the Civil War. Then, on November 7, 1861, a Federal Navy force under the command of Commodore Samuel F. Du Pont attacked Confederate Forts Walker and Beaufort at the entrance to Port Royal Sound. This effort was intended to establish a Union coastal enclave, to strengthen the blockade of Confederate ports along the South Atlantic coast, to provide a base from which to mount future attacks, and to isolate Savannah and disrupt communications between that port city and Charleston. The attack was an overwhelming success, and the Confederate forces retreated inland, abandoning Port Royal Sound and Beaufort (Ammen 1956:671-691). This new Union enclave became the headquarters for a command called the Department of the South, which would cover Union military activities on the coasts of South Carolina, Georgia, and part of Florida.

Plantation owners and other White residents of the Port Royal Sound region fled, taking with them personal belongings and some slaves. For the most part, however, they left behind the bulk of their possessions, including thousands of slaves and large amounts of cotton from the record crop then in the process of being harvested (Rose 1964:3, 17). This bumper cotton crop attracted the interest of Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase, and he dispatched Lt. Colonel William Reynolds to oversee the seizure of the harvested cotton and that still in the fields (Rose 1964:19). Shortly thereafter, he sent Edward L. Pierce, well known for his work with freed slaves or “contrabands” at Fortress Monroe in Virginia, to look into the situation among the thousands of freed slaves who had been abandoned by their owners or who had escaped and taken refuge within the Union lines (Rose 1964:20-21; Pierce 1861). Pierce was also to formulate a plan to use contraband labor to plant and harvest the 1862 cotton crop to help pay for mounting war costs, including feeding the numerous contrabands (perhaps as many as 16,000) at Port Royal (Rose 1964:21; Berlin et al. 1990: note 192, 78-9).

At the same time that Pierce arrived to deal with the contraband problem, another agent, the Reverend Mr. Mansfield French representing the American Missionary Association, arrived to assess the needs of the former slaves. Pierce and French formulated plans for the support and education of the contrabands, and each pursued those plans independent of the other, although both reported to Secretary Chase. Pierce recruited missionaries and support for them through
friends in Boston, and French sought the same through contacts in New York (Rose 1964:30-1). As a result of these efforts, a ship loaded with 41 men and 12 women - “Gideonites” they were labeled - destined to be teachers, plantation superintendents, and missionaries among the contrabands sailed from New York for Beaufort on March 3, 1862 (Rose 1964:44). The Port Royal Experiment had begun.

The Gideonites worked and taught on the islands surrounding Port Royal under Treasury control for the next several months. In April 1862, control over Port Royal was transferred from the Treasury Department to the War Department. Although Pierce was considered for a possible appointment as military governor, in the end Capt. Rufus Saxton, later brevet Brigadier General, was appointed to that position (Rose 1964:152-3).

In a final report to Salmon P. Chase, Edward Pierce supplied detailed information on conditions on the sea islands. In that report Parris Island’s population, all former slaves, was given as 274 on five plantations, all under the control of a superintendent, John Zachos. Pierce lists the specific duties of the superintendents (Berlin et al. 1990:194):

The duty of each [superintendent] has been to visit all the plantations under him as often as practicable, some of which are one, two, three and even four miles from his quarters, transport to them implements from the store-houses, protect the cattle and property upon them, converse with the laborers, explaining to them their own condition, the purposes of the Government towards them, what was expected of them in the way of labor and what remuneration they are likely to receive, procure and distribute among them clothing & food whether issued in army rations or contributed by the benevolent associations, collecting the materials of a census, making reports of the condition and wants of the plantations and any peculiar difficulties to the Special Agent, drawing pay rolls for labor on cotton and paying the amounts, going when convenient to the praise meetings and reading the Scriptures, instructing on Sundays & other days those desirous to learn to read as much as time permitted, attending to cases of discipline, protecting the Negroes from injuries and in all possible ways endeavoring to elevate them and prepare them to become worthy and self-supporting citizens.

In his report, Pierce also provided detailed information concerning conditions on the islands at the time that the superintendents arrived in late March, 1862. Tools were in short supply, and an effort was made to procure necessary tools for each plantation. The island residents had prepared no ground for the planting of cotton, but they had planted subsistence crops including corn and potatoes. The superintendents worked to convince the contrabands that the planting of cotton was necessary to support the purchase of food and clothing (Berlin et al. 1990:195-6).

Superintendents reported to Pierce the specific acreage of crops planted on the lands under their supervision. The Parris Island superintendent (John Zachos, though he is not named in Pierce’s report) reported that island crops included 164 acres of corn, 30 ¼ acres of potatoes, 221 acres of cotton, and 6 acres of miscellaneous vegetables, all apparently grown as “cash”
crops. An additional 157 acres of provisions (unspecified but probably corn, sweet potatoes, and miscellaneous vegetables) were planted “by laborers on their own account.” Sixty acres of slip potatoes and miscellaneous vegetables remained to be planted at the time the report was submitted. Total Parris Island acreage being farmed in June 1862 was 632 1/4 acres (Berlin et al. 1990:199). These figures were comparable to plantings listed for other islands.

Among the first group of 53 “Gideonites” was John C. Zachos. In an 1862 letter to Secretary Chase, Pierce (NARA RG 366, “Port Royal Correspondence,” March 2, 1862) described Zachos as a 42-year-old clergyman who had taught at Antioch College in Ohio. Of Greek ancestry, Zachos was an experienced teacher who was paid $50 per month to serve as superintendent and teacher on Parris Island. Also serving on Parris Island with Zachos was a Treasury Department cotton agent, Conrad C. Ellery (NARA RG 366, “Port Royal Correspondence,” May 26, 1862). Zachos was assigned to serve as superintendent on Parris Island, a position he held until November or December 1862.

Among our best early sources relating to wartime Parris Island is a report written by Zachos (1863) at the end of 1862. He reported that there were 330 persons living on the island, including 130 children, 150 “available to work the fields” (half of those were women), 12 old people, 4 or 5 invalids, six carpenters, and an unspecified number of house servants. During the previous growing season, they had harvested “220 acres of cotton, 300 acres of corn, 46 of sweet potatoes, 20 of rice and garden products, for a total of 590 acres under cultivation.” Total income as a result of this effort came to only $3.00 per person, with which, as Zachos (1863:1) notes, they were supposed to clothe and support themselves for a year.

The west bank of the Broad River remained in Confederate hands for most of the War, which meant that Parris Island was on the frontier of the Union military enclave. The Federal picket front thus included Parris Island, and at least small numbers of troops must have been posted on the Island throughout the War to watch the Broad River for enemy activity and to prevent unauthorized foraging by friendly troops. The picket forces would have been detachments from regiments (perhaps a company or two at any given time) which resulted in poor historical visibility in the military records; a regiment may be recorded as camped on St. Helena Island or Port Royal Island, with no mention of minor detachments assigned elsewhere. Archaeological evidence suggests that Federal troops were present at the Means Plantation, and there is documentary evidence for elements of the 97th Pennsylvania, the 33rd U.S. Colored Infantry, and the 128th U.S. Colored Infantry on Parris Island at various times during and shortly after the War.

The regimental history of the 97th Pennsylvania (Price 1875:148-149; see also Hewett 1998:248-9) provides a record of what may have been a typical Parris Island tour of duty:

On February 17 [1863], Companies A and I were ordered to Paris Island, opposite St. Helena Island, to guard the residents, mostly contrabands, from annoyance by parties of soldiers crossing over and robbing them of their produce. The companies were stationed in a large cotton house at one of the plantations, having orders to allow no soldiers or civilians to land upon the island without a pass from
Brigadier Gen. R. Saxton. Those companies remained on duty at Paris Island, Capt. F.M. Guss in command, until March 31, when they returned to the regiment at Hilton Head.

The Freedmen of the island were then, and for a long time, in the charge of Mrs. F.D. Gage and her son, George D. Gage. The former has since expressed their very great satisfaction, on account of the uniform kindness and courtesy of Capt. Guss and his officers and the companies under his command while on duty at that place, stating that no cause of complaint occurred from any source while the island remained in their charge.

Before the occupation of Paris Island by Capt. Guss’ command, the complaints of trespassing and injury to the property of the contrabands were both numerous and varied....

The pension file of Abraham Delegall, a Parris Island native who served in the 33rd U.S. Colored Infantry, notes that he was detached “on Picket on Paris Isle S.C.” in October, 1863 (NARA RG 94, Pension of Abraham Delegall, Co. I, 33rd U.S.C.I.). From October, 1865, to at least January, 1866, two companies of the 128th U.S. Colored Infantry were on duty on Parris Island and had access to a school operated there by non-commissioned officers of the regiment. J. J. Wright, a teacher at the time, made weekly visits to the school (AMA letters #H5784, H5895, H6014).

There was also a small Navy installation on Parris Island during the Civil War. It appears to have been a temporary coaling station, and was probably located at a wharf on the site of the Port Royal Navy base established in 1883, but very little documentation for the station has been found (Steve Wise, personal communication 2000). In November 1864, the steamer Mary Boardman, carrying the 55th Massachusetts Regiment to participate in the Broad River Campaign, stopped at Parris Island. Lt. Col. Charles Fox of the 55th recalled in a letter, “We have been ordered to Parry Island, just above Port Royal, for coal, and are now at the wharf. The regiment has landed and their arms are stacked in a field, while the men have a chance to wash and breath the fresh air” (Fox Papers, Nov. 28, 1864).

The first effort to raise African American troops from among the Port Royal Freedmen began in April, 1862, when Gen. David Hunter, then commanding the Department of the South, ordered recruiting for an African American regiment, to be called the 1st South Carolina Volunteers. When the number of voluntary enlistments proved inadequate, Hunter resorted to forcible impressment from among the Freedmen on the plantations. This tactic was disruptive to the efforts to gain the trust of the Freedmen and to restore agricultural production and was roundly criticized. The regiment was, in any case, not authorized by the War Department, and in August 1862 it was almost entirely disbanded (Higginson 1870:272-274; Rose 1964:144-148, 187-189). While we have no particular records of Parris Island natives serving in Hunter’s regiment, there almost certainly were some, and the discontent and distrust resulting from the impressment affair must have been felt as strongly on Parris Island as anywhere.
The recruitment effort was revived in October 1862 when General Saxton received authority to raise as many as 5000 troops from among the Freedmen, initially by voluntary enlistment alone. This resulted in the reforming of the 1st South Carolina in November, 1862, and the creation of the 2nd South Carolina in February 1863 (Higginson 1870:276-280). These units were later renamed the 33rd and 34th U.S. Colored Infantry, respectively, after the recruitment of African Americans became a national effort. Ultimately, six regiments and an artillery battery were raised primarily from among the Freedmen in the Department of the South (Dyer 1979) including the following:

- 21st U.S. Colored Infantry
- 33rd U.S. Colored Infantry
- 34th U.S. Colored Infantry
- 103rd U.S. Colored Infantry
- 104th U.S. Colored Infantry
- 128th U.S. Colored Infantry
- Battery G, 2nd U.S. Colored Artillery

Thus far we have identified more than 30 former Parris Island slaves who served in three of these units, including the 21st, the 33rd, and the 34th U.S.C.I. (NARA RG 94, AGO, Pensions for Military Service) (See Chapter 8).

On January 1, 1863, President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation became effective. The Proclamation freed all slaves outside the territory then controlled by Union forces and those within Union controlled territory except for those in Virginia and Louisiana. This Proclamation gave all former slaves in South Carolina their freedom, and a great celebration, hosted by Military Governor Saxton, was held on Port Royal Island in honor of this great occasion (Rose 1964:195-6).

John Zachos was replaced as Parris Island Superintendent by Frances Dana Gage who, like Zachos, was from Ohio. Frances Gage was a well-known abolitionist and temperance advocate who left her husband in Ohio and traveled to Beaufort to assist the former slaves (Holtzman 1931). She arrived in Beaufort in October 1862, in the expectation that she would be made a teacher among the contrabands (National Anti-Slavery Standard, 11 October 1862:3). For the first few months in South Carolina, Frances Gage does not appear to have held any official position. She did however publish a series of letters in those months concerning the death of General Mitchell, troop movements, and other news in the New York Daily Tribune, the Independent, and the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

In January 1863, Frances Gage was appointed Superintendent of the six Parris Island plantations, and she remained in that position until late October, 1863. As of June, 1863, she was one of four general superintendents overseeing island populations: Henry G. Judd oversaw Port Royal and Barnwell Islands, Reuben Tomlinson was assigned St. Helena, Ladies’, and Coosaw Islands, Thomas Howard was on Hilton Head Island, and Frances Gage oversaw Parris Island with its five plantations and 500 residents. Teachers were also placed on the islands to work with the superintendents. Of a total of 55 teachers in the Port Royal area at this time, one,
Frances Gage’s daughter Mary, was assigned to Parris Island. These superintendents and teachers reported directly to the Military Governor, General Rufus Saxton (Berlin et al. 1990:236-237, 241).

In a letter published in March 1863, Frances Gage described conditions on Parris Island (New York Daily Tribune, 10 March 1863:2):

Last year there were about 330, all told, upon the island [probably a figure derived from John Zachos report--see above]. The crop was put in late, and the caterpillar almost destroyed it. The people were confused, easily alarmed; and being rationed by the Government, and tenderly cared for by Dr. J. C. Zachos, and other superintendents that were with him, they went through the year without fully paying expenses or their keeping. This was the case in many places.

In order to make the island residents self-supporting, superintendents and managers submitted a plan to General Saxton that would allow residents to work for the government in exchange for support; those who did not accept the plan would be forced to pay rent for their houses and land. Frances Gage said that nearly every laborer on Parris Island accepted the new work plan. Each man and woman was allotted 1.5 acres for corn and 0.5 acres for sweet potatoes to be grown for personal use. Old people, invalids, and orphans were to be supported by the produce from additional acreage farmed communally by island residents. All land was to be plowed using government plows and oxen, and in return residents were to provide support and upkeep of the animals and equipment (Ohio State Journal, 3 February 1863:1; New York Daily Tribune, 10 March 1863:2).

Each able-bodied man and woman was required to farm cotton land (typically 1.5 acres per person) for which the workers were paid at the rate 25 cents a day for work during the season and then two cents a pound for harvesting the crop. The government no longer supplied rations, and workers were required to purchase their own hoes. According to Mrs. Gage, in addition to doing their farm labor, men on the island earned extra income by boating, fishing, gathering oysters, and doing odd jobs. Women washed clothes for soldiers and officers of the fleet, baked pastries, sold chicken and eggs and oyster soup. As a result, island residents were able to “turn a penny in many ways.” Available food supplies consisted of stored corn and banks of sweet potatoes, as well as an ample supply of hogs, ducks, turkeys, chickens, and guinea fowl. Mrs. Gage was confident that under this new work plan, residents of Parris Island and nearby islands would soon be self-supporting (Ohio State Journal, 3 February 1863:1; New York Daily Tribune, 10 March 1863:2).

Frances Gage remained on Parris Island until late October 1863, when she departed for New York. In her view, the island’s residents were approaching self-sufficiency. In a letter published in October 1863 (National Anti-Slavery Standard, 31 October 1863:3), she reported as follows:

The people of Paris Island have outgrown, in most cases, the need of charity except in school. They have good crops of corn and of sweet potatoes, and a trade
of three or four thousand dollars since last January, has put many a good garment
and comfortable appendages into the house and home, that will last till money is
earned for more.

The necessity of keeping a store [supported by donations and operated by Frances
Gage] upon the island is now in a great measure obviated, as the people have to
take their fish, sweet potatoes, pumpkins, chickens, turkeys, and eggs over to
Hilton Head [due to a recent influx of troops], and as several now have boats,
their purchases can be made there, and the drift of trade will find its way to those
marts where there is the largest supply of merchandise kept…The negroes are
learning to hold their own with the sutlers, and demand prices for eggs and
chickens as oppressive to pockets as do their antagonists.

Frances Gage, as did John Zachos before her, appears to have made great strides in
helping the former slaves on Parris Island adapt to their new freedom. Believing her assistance
was no longer needed there, she left in October 1863 to go north
to travel on the lecture circuit to
tell people of the great needs that still existed among others newly freed persons. She felt that
there she could make a greater contribution to the cause than she could by remaining on Parris
Island (National Anti-Slavery Standard, 31 October 1863:3).

The U.S. Treasury Department took advantage of the voluntary exile of landowners to
seize most of the property in the Port Royal area for non-payment of taxes. In February and
March 1863, the seized property was auctioned off by the U.S. Direct Tax Commissioners.
While some plantations were sold to private individuals, others totaling 60,000 acres were
retained by the United States through the device of uncontested auctions whereby the federal
government bought the tracts from itself. Initially, all of Parris Island was retained by the United
States (Basler 1953:453-459; Rose 1964:272-275).

In September 1863, President Lincoln sent the tax commissioners new orders for the
disposition of the 60,000 acres remaining in Federal hands. The instructions stipulated four
categories of disposition and specified which properties were assigned to each. They included:

1. Land to be sold outright, in tracts no larger than 320 acres.

2. Land to be retained by the United States “for war, naval, revenue and police
purposes.”

3. Land to be retained by the United States, in tracts of 160 acres or less, for the support
(through rent) of schools for the “education of colored youths, and... poor white
persons.”

4. Land to be sold in lots of no more than 20 acres to “the heads of families of the
African race” for not less than $1.25 per acre.
No Parris Island property was included in the first of these categories--land selected for unrestricted sale. An unspecified portion of the Means plantation was designated for retention by the U.S. in the second category, but that reservation, if it was created, does not appear in later records. School farms of 160 acres each were retained from the Fuller plantation and the Means plantation, respectively, on either end of Parris Island. The old Edings, Elliott and Habersham plantations (called “Elliott Place 1, 2 and 3” by the tax commissioners), together with the remainder of the Means and Fuller plantations, were designated for sale “…for the charitable purpose of providing homes for such heads of families and their families respectively, so as to give them an interest in the soil, and to form an industrial settlement of worthy persons of said race” (Basler 1953:457).

Between April 17, 1865, and November 27, 1869, Head of Family Certificates were issued to a total of 208 Black men and women who sought to reside on Parris Island and nearby islands including Horse, Goat, and Sheep Islands (see Appendix II for a list of certificates and Figure 6 for a map of lots distributed). These certificates ultimately led to purchase of 2972.4 acres on Parris Island and the nearby small islands at a cost of $1.50 per acre (NARA RG 58, Internal Revenue Service, Direct Tax Commission, Entry 108).

School farms were established throughout the Port Royal region as a result of Lincoln’s order to the tax commissioners. Two school farms were established on Parris Island as directed. School Farm No. 31, 160 acres in extent, was located on the Fuller Plantation property at the north end of the island, and School Farm # 32, also 160 acres, was on the Means tract at the southern end of the island (Figure 6; Chapters 3 and 6). The school farm tracts were to be leased for terms of five years or less, and the proceeds were to be applied to the “education of colored youths, and of such poor White persons, being minors, as may by themselves, parents, guardians, or next friends, apply for the benefit thereof.” The tax commissioners were further authorized to establish such schools and “to direct” the tuition as they saw fit (Basler 1953:455-6).

On Parris Island this plan met with only moderate success. In January, 1864, Henry G. Judd was the first to lease the two Parris Island school farms. Rent for each of the two farms was $300, payable in quarterly installments. The lease came with a series of conditions. Judd was to farm only one-half (80 acres) of each farm, leaving the remainder fallow. With proceeds from farming, Judd was instructed to operate a “free day school” from January 1st to May 15th and from October 15th to December 25th. The number of students and the tuition charged was to be under the control of the tax commissioners. Judd was to provide students with “the necessary books and stationery.” If he faithfully fulfilled the conditions for operating the school (or in his case schools, one per farm), then he would receive, as compensation for operating the schools, the amount that he paid for each lease (NARA RG 217, Department of the Treasury, Entry 888, Vol. 1).

We know additional details about the operation of the school farm from records of the American Missionary Association (AMA), which provided teachers for some of the Freedman schools. In February, 1864, the year in which Judd leased the two Parris Island school farms, Rev. W. T. Richardson, AMA Superintendent in Beaufort, wrote to Simeon S. Jocelyn, AMA
Figure 6. Sections and Lots on Parris Island purchased by Freedmen, April 1865 to November 1869 (see Appendix II for list of purchasers).
Secretary, stating the need for teachers on Parris Island. He suggested that the AMA not send “ladies” who were not willing to live “rather isolated,” since the island was difficult to get to, though he did add that the house where the teachers were to reside was “pleasantly situated” (AMA, letter H2851, February 16, 1864).

By March 26, 1864, Rev. Richardson was able to send two teachers, Miss Theresa Barcalow and Miss Mary Armstrong to Parris Island (AMA, letter H5303, February 20, 1864). By May, Martha Forsaith had been sent to replace Miss Barcalow who had been relocated to Jacksonville (AMA, letter H5335, May 21, 1864). Mary Scott, a Black teacher, and her husband Edward, a minister, were also on the island by this time (AMA, letter H5335, May 21, 1864). During the period between March and July, 1864, first one and then two schools were operated on the Fuller Place (i.e., School Farm # 31). Monthly reports submitted by the teachers to the AMA indicate that these two schools had approximately 45 and 20 students, respectively, including both children and adults (AMA, letter H5398, August 10, 1864).

Correspondence by the Parris Island teachers provides tantalizing details of life on the island during 1864. Martha Forsaith reported in a letter to Mr. Michael E. Strieby, AMA Secretary, that there was little on Parris Island to make residence there pleasant and that there were many sacrifices to be made when living on such a small isolated island (AMA, letter H5546, March 14, 1865). The Scotts had a difficult time finding good housing and ended up living in “a leaky old building.” They also wrote that they had a difficult time with the island’s agent, Mr. Hammond, but they provide no details of their relationship with Mr. Smith who they say rented the school (indicating that Mr. Judd must have given up his lease some time prior to September, 1864) (AMA, letter H5417, Sept. 30, 1864). In a June, 1864, monthly report on the Fuller Plantation School, Martha Forsaith reported that she had 22 pupils that month, including 18 males and 4 females, all between the ages of 6 and 16 and all able to read and spell (AMA, letter H5373, July 5, 1864).

The last record we have of an AMA school for island residents comes in April, 1865, when Martha Forsaith submitted a bill for her services (part at $10/mo and then increased to $15/mo for her final six months) (AMA, letter H5577, April 22, 1865). Presumably she and the other teachers left at the end of the term, because there are no further AMA records relating to these Parris Island schools. On March 3, 1865, the Freedmen’s Bureau Act became law, and education fell to the newly established Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands in combination with other aid groups including Freedmen’s Aid Societies in New England, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, and elsewhere (Rose 1964:337).

The school farm properties continued to be leased after 1865, but the lease agreements no longer carried the requirements of operating schools (NARA RG 217, Entry 888, Vol. 1). The 1865 four-year lease of the Fuller Place (School Farm #31) by Henry M. Kingman did not include the “use of the best mansion house” (it may have been reserved for the school or to house teachers or for some other purpose); only half of the 160 acres could be farmed, and none of the persons residing on the land could be removed except by “military or police exigencies” unless so ordered by the tax commissioners, though “laborers” who resided on the tract were required to work for the lessee at a negotiated rate of pay. Subsequent leases were issued in 1867, 1870,
1871, and 1872. In each of the later leases, there is a provision stating that “the lease is made subject to the sale of the property…the purchaser to take possession at his option” (NARA RG 217, Entry 888, Vol. 1). This provision was inserted because at the time, many properties were being redeemed by their original owners, as was indeed the case for School Farm #32 (Means Tract) which was redeemed in 1866 (NARA RG 123, Box 1029, Files 17341, 17348), and School Farm #31 (Fuller Tract), which was redeemed at some point after 1872 (NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523).

With the end of the Civil War era, records pertaining to activities on Parris Island become sparse. Census records ultimately will allow tracking of individuals and families descended from those who purchased their lands in the late 1860s. Land records will allow tracking of sales and the breakup of the landholdings acquired through the Head of Family Certificates, though many land transactions, deeds, wills, and other related documents were never officially filed in the county courthouse given the isolation of Parris Island and the difficulty in traveling to Beaufort.

The resident population of Parris Island gradually increased from the 330 figure provided by John Zachos (1863:1) in 1863. Part of this increase might have been the result of an effort by military officials to disperse the large number of refugee slaves then settled around Beaufort. Frances Gage (National Anti-Slavery Standard, 14 March 1863:3) reports on a proposed resettlement of three or four hundred “of the ‘vagrant’ population of Beaufort and vicinity” to Parris Island; how many of those actually relocated there is not known. An 1881 estimate places the island’s Black population at about 800, and at that time there were only two White families resident on the island (Doyle ms, March 13, 1881). Doyle observed that the island’s residents were raising “principally cotton here and also sweet and common potatoes, figs, oranges &c.,” a list of crops not markedly different from those raised on the island’s former large plantations (Doyle ms, March 13, 1881).

With the gradual increase in population on the island in the decades following the war, the original ten and twenty acre tracts were subdivided as their owners died and their heirs received portions of those tracts. Unfortunately, many of these divisions were never filed with Beaufort County, so the boundaries and owners of these progressively smaller and smaller tracts became less certain through time.

The most dramatic event in the Island’s late-nineteenth century history was the 1893 hurricane (Harris 1894a, 1894b; Marscher and Marscher 2001). That hurricane, which struck on the night of August 27, 1893, had a devastating impact on the area around Port Royal Sound. Contemporary estimates place the number killed by the storm at 2,000 (Marscher and Marscher 2001:vii). Estimates concerning the number of dead on Parris Island range from 25 (Savannah Morning News, 2 September 1893:2) to “nearly half the people on Parris Island” (which would have been about 350 to 400 deaths—clearly too high an estimate) (Mather 1894:29). One report puts the number of houses destroyed on Parris Island at 12 (Charleston News and Courier, 3 September 1893:1). Bodies of two Parris Island residents, Mary Parker and her daughter, were found 15 miles inland at Salt Creek where repairs were being made to the Port Royal and Augusta Railway, and they were buried there in a hastily dug grave (The Atlanta Constitution, 2
September 1893:1). It is likely that other island residents were also swept from the island by the storm.

_The Growing Federal Presence_

In the years after the Civil War, as the new owner/residents of Parris Island settled into their isolated, rural community, the government presence that would ultimately destroy that community began to grow. The poorly documented U.S. Navy station located on Parris Island during the Civil War was apparently abandoned, but a floating station was maintained in Port Royal Sound. By 1875 the coaling vessel USS *Pawnee* was the only ship permanently on station, but Port Royal Sound was the designated assembly point for the North Atlantic Squadron, and there was growing interest in establishing a substantial naval facility in the area (Darden 1985:415, 416; Alvarez 1998:16-18). In 1883, the Navy purchased 41 acres on the northeast corner of Parris Island for what would be called the Port Royal Naval Station. By 1888 the new base was functioning as a coaling station and storehouse, and by 1891 work was underway on a large timber dry dock, which was completed in 1895 (Darden 1985:416, 417). An additional 20 acres was purchased and added to the reservation in 1899 (U.S. Navy 1975).

Meanwhile, the U.S. Lighthouse Board received funding in 1878 to construct a set of navigation range lights on Parris Island. The system was built in 1881, and included a front light in the marsh off the southern tip of the Island, a rear light (38BU1620) located well inland about 2100 yards (1920 m) northeast of the front light, and a keeper’s house (38BU1622) located roughly between the lights, just south of 38BU16, on former Means plantation property (Hendryx et al. 1997:132-37; Grover et al. 1999:77-97). The Parris Island lights appear to have gone out of service in 1912, although there is evidence that they were re-established for a time, circa 1917-1921 (Grover et al. 1999:91-97; Marscher ca 1980).

In 1879, the State of South Carolina selected Parris Island as the site of a maritime “quarantine anchorage and boarding station” for Port Royal Sound. The state purchased 15 acres on the north bank of Ballast Creek, on the Broad River, on former Cartwright plantation property (Chapter 3). The station was to include “buildings suitable for a medical officer and staff and for the comfort of the sick.” The facility was acquired by the United States in 1908, and it later became the site of the quarantine barracks for incoming Marine Corps recruits (Hayward and Steinback 1997:48, 49).

In 1901, Charleston was chosen over Parris Island as the site for a massive new Navy facility which would incorporate the existing dry dock services of Parris Island. Between 1904 and 1908, the Parris Island station was essentially closed, with only a small Marine Corps detachment guarding public property. In 1908, the Port Royal Naval Station was transferred to the Marine Corps for use as a training facility for prospective officers as well as modest numbers of enlisted recruits. In 1910 the Navy established a disciplinary barracks, or prison, at the station, which led the Marine Corps to abandon training there. Control of the station remained with the Navy until October, 1915, when the entire reservation was “turned over to the Marine Corps... for its exclusive use as a recruit depot known as Marine Barracks, Port Royal” (Darden 1985:418-420).
Until World War I, the government presence on Parris Island was relatively minor, with all but the 61-acre Navy tract, the 15-acre quarantine station, and the minor range light properties still in private hands (U. S. Navy 1975). Most of Parris Island remained a rural, agricultural, African-American community. The DeRoode map of 1916 (Figure 7) depicts the island as it was in the pre-World War I era, with numerous civilian home sites. A transformation began in 1915, when Parris Island became the primary Marine Corps recruit training facility for the eastern United States (Alvarez 1983, 1997:40-41; Darden 1985:420). Within three years the entire island was owned by the United States (U. S. Navy 1975).

In April, 1917, the United States entered World War I. A massive expansion of the Marine Corps began immediately, and ultimately 46,202 recruits were trained at Parris Island during the 19 months of American involvement in the war (Darden 1985:421). This increased training load required major additions to the facilities on Parris Island. Two building contracts let in 1917 and 1918 involved the construction of more than 500 buildings (Darden 1985:420). In 1919 the Commandant of the Marine Corps described the completed, war-time improvements as including “additional barracks accommodations for about 4,100 men, messing facilities for 5,600 men, latrines and bathing facilities for 8,000 men, and quarters for 56 officers...” (U.S. Navy, 1919:2648).

On the north end of Parris Island, the additions included three large, linear complexes of wooden barracks and associated facilities designated the East Wing, the West Wing, and the West Wing Extension. The East and West Wings stretched along the north shore of Parris Island from the original Navy reservation to where the present causeway comes on to the island, while the West Wing Extension (38BU1895A) ran from the latter point southwest, encompassing the Fuller plantation cemetery now designated 38BU1895B (Chapter 3). On the western shore of the island, a new rifle range complex was begun which continues in use today, impacting much of the western half of the old Edings Plantation (Chapter 4). On the south end of Parris Island, the Maneuver Grounds tent camp, which had its modest beginnings in 1915-1916, was quickly expanded to serve 5000 recruits; the Means cemetery at 38BU162 was nearly obliterated in the process (Chapter 6). Only the former Elliott and Habersham plantations remained essentially undisturbed by the World War I expansion (Chapters 5, 6).

Apparently, the civilian-owned areas required by the Marine Corps for World War I expansion were initially seized on an emergency basis, and dispossessed residents were allowed to relocate elsewhere on the island. While some residents were dispossessed, approximately three quarters of Parris Island was not actively used by the Marine Corps during World War I. Nevertheless, all civilian property on the island was seized and eventually purchased by the United States by a presidential condemnation proclamation of August 7, 1918 (U. S. Navy 1975, 1918:1612-1613, and 1920:128, 302-307). In 1923 the Commandant of the Marine Corps (U. S. Navy 1924:966) reported:
Figure 7. DeRoode Map of Parris Island, 1916.
The title of the whole island is now vested in the United States, although all payments have not been made. To date the claimants have received payment for land amounting to $251,963.26, with something less than $25,000 due... The inability to settle for the balance is due to a number of causes, primarily to inability to locate the former owners and lack of knowledge of identity of owners.

Residents of the extensive areas not immediately required for Marine Corps use were allowed to remain on their former properties. In 1927, residence was restricted to base employees and their families, and thus 56 families were granted permits to remain on Parris Island. Even those residence permits were revoked in 1937 and 1938, and the last civilians left the island in 1938, ending a 200-year tradition of occupation by African Americans, enslaved and free (Alvarez 1998:110-111). Burials may have continued as late as 1938 in the two cemeteries (Elliott-38BU1618 and Edings-38BU39/1619) known to have been approved by the Marine Corps for continued use after World War I (USMC 1968). The actual status of the other two known cemeteries (Fuller-38BU1895B and Means-38BU162) is not clear, but they may have remained officially closed after World War I (Chapters 3, 6).

Since the Navy and Marine Corps takeover of Parris Island, a number of major, landscape-altering projects have been conducted that may have hidden or destroyed cemeteries that are now, therefore, unknown. Given that at least two, and perhaps all four, known cemeteries on the island were substantially effaced at some point, it is not unreasonable to suppose that others, falling in locations where their preservation would have presented a barrier to needed military improvements, were destroyed or covered over. The general development and expansion of “Mainside,” beginning with the Naval Station in 1883 and continuing to this day, would certainly have been a threat to any cemeteries in that area. These might have included cemeteries associated with the Grayson or Cartwright plantations (Figure 5), since both must have had substantial slave communities, but neither plantation is represented by a cemetery known today (Chapter 3). It is also possible that the quarantine station included a cemetery, which would be somewhere in the vicinity of the old Parris Island officers’ club (now Marsh Landing).

The construction of Page Field in the late 1930s completely transformed most of the former Habersham plantation (Chapters 5, 6), which also has no known slave cemetery. Not only was the airfield site itself extensively filled and leveled, but in addition, huge borrow pits were excavated for fill, and in the process, large tracts of high ground were converted to marsh. Fortunately, much of the plantation complex site along Means Creek, east of Page Field, appears to have avoided total destruction (Hendryx et al. 1997:194-205). It may yet be possible to locate a Habersham plantation cemetery.

Since 1918, the growing rifle range complex has heavily impacted most of what was Edings plantation, although the known cemetery on that tract, 38BU39/1619, is likely the original slave cemetery (Chapter 4). Similarly, the site of a plantation complex (38BU1401) on the Elliott “Whale Creek” plantation has been almost completely destroyed by fill borrowing, but the known, extant cemetery, 38BU1618, was probably the accompanying cemetery (Chapter 5). The
Means plantation appears to have had two (possibly three) slave communities during its long history. If the property had more than one slave cemetery, or an owner family cemetery, they are probably lost under the present golf course, which was built in 1947, and re-designed in 1999-2000 (Chapter 6).

Part II: African American Cemeteries

Port Royal, S.C., Jan. 28, 1862

In company with Mr. Lee and the Government cotton agent, I went to visit a place called Parry Island, about six or seven miles distant. We went by boat, and were rowed by six contrabands...we joined in a funeral, at which Mr. Lee read a chapter and spoke to them very solemnly. It was one of the most solemn scenes I have ever witnessed. The grave-yard was in a beautiful grove of live-oak, with hanging moss from every branch, and as the words sounded through it, ‘O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory? etc., the earnest and sad look of the black and strange faces of the crowd told that even death was somewhat of a stranger in their little world. (Wilson 1862:2)

Other than this brief passage describing an unidentified cemetery, we have found no description of any cemetery on Parris Island, nor any information regarding the burial practices of the island’s African American communities, before or after emancipation. The only other historical references appear to be the few mentions of various cemeteries cited in Chapter 8, the Robert Bee memorandum (USMC 1968), and simple depictions on several twentieth century Marine Corps maps. Impressions of how the Parris Island cemeteries were placed and how they appeared when in use, and of the mortuary practices of Island residents, can be had only by recourse to information from African American communities elsewhere among the Sea Islands and beyond.

Antebellum African American Cemeteries

Colonial and antebellum descriptions of African American funerals and related activities are common enough to permit in-depth discussions (e.g. Genovese 1974:194-202; Roediger 1981:163-174; Morgan 1998:640-644; Jamieson 1995:39-58), although the various accounts drawn upon are more notable for their diversity than for their contribution to any reasonably unified tradition. Unfortunately, the early sources provide remarkably little information about the geography or appearance of cemeteries, or about grave placement, grave goods (if any), or grave markers, precisely the details that might be useful to this study. We have found only five antebellum or Civil War-era informants who describe African American cemeteries on the South Carolina and Georgia coast. They include Frederick Law Olmstead (1904:32-35), Harriet Ware (Pearson 1906:65), Edward Pierce (1863:302, 303), Frances Hodgson (Torian 1943:352), and Fanny Kemble (1961:307, 308).

Journalist and author Frederick Law Olmstead witnessed an African American funeral in Charleston in 1854, and recorded that “The burying-ground was a rough “vacant lot” in the midst
of the town. The only monuments were a few wooden posts, and one small marble tablet.” Traveling south, Olmstead visited a cemetery outside of Savannah, “a square field, in the midst of an open pine wood, partially enclosed with a dilapidated wooden paling” that “proved to be a graveyard for the negroes of the town.” Olmstead (1904:32-3) described the cemetery as follows:

...I walked in, and found much, in the monuments, to interest me. Some of these were mere billets of wood, others were of brick and marble, and some were pieces of plank, cut in the ordinary form of tombstones. Many family plots were enclosed with railings, and a few flowers or evergreen shrubs had sometimes been planted on the graves; but these were generally broken down and withered, and the ground was overgrown with weeds and briars. I spent some time in examining the inscriptions, the greater number of which were evidently painted by self-taught negroes, and were curiously illustrative both of their condition and character.

Olmstead observed that the formal, stone markers included several “erected by whites to the memory of favorite servants,” and at least two were placed by African American churches in honor of former pastors (Olmstead 1904:34-35).

Olmstead’s urban examples are less useful as Parris Island analogies than the other four descriptions. Coffin Point plantation cemetery on St. Helena Island was described by Gideonite Harriet Ware (Pearson 1906:65) in 1862:

This burying place was an unfenced quarter of an acre of perfectly wild, tangled woodland in the middle of a cotton field, halfway between here [the Coffin Point mansion] and the quarters. Nothing ever marks the graves, but the place is entirely devoted to them...

U.S. Treasury agent Edward Pierce (above) took an interest in the African American cemeteries he observed in the Beaufort area. After a trip across Port Royal Island to visit Barnwell Island on Whale Branch River, Pierce (1863:302-303) wrote an article that included this discussion:

The Negro graveyards occasionally attracted me from the road. They are usually in an open field, under a clump of some dozen or twenty trees, perhaps live-oaks, and not fenced. There may be fifty or a hundred graves, marked only by sticks eighteen inches or two feet high and about as large as the wrist. Mr. Olmstead saw some stones in a Negro graveyard in Savannah, erected by the slaves, and bearing rather illiterate inscriptions; but I never succeeded in finding any but wooden memorials, not even at Beaufort. Only in one case could I find an inscription, and that was in a burial-place on Ladies Island. There was a board at the head of the grave, shaped something like an ordinary gravestone, about three feet high and six inches wide. The inscription was as follows:
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On the foot-board were these words:
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The rude artist was Kit, the son of the old man…I inquired of Kit concerning several of the graves; and I found, by his intelligent answers, that their tenants were disposed in families and were known. These lowly burial-places, for which art has done nothing, are not without fascination, and in some hours of life they take a faster hold on the sentiments than more imposing cemeteries, adorned with shafts of marble and granite, and rich in illustrious dead.

Frances Hodgson (Torian 1943:352), in a ca. 1907 memoir of her father’s antebellum plantation near Savannah, recalled:

Negro graves were always decorated with the last article used by the departed, and broken pitchers and broken bits of colored glass were considered even more appropriate than the white shells from the beach nearby. Sometimes they carved rude wooden figures like images of idols, and sometimes a patchwork quilt was laid upon the grave.

The relative humanity of a planter toward his slaves might have been an important factor in the appearance of cemeteries. Writing from the Georgia coast in 1839, Fanny Kemble (1961:307-308) provided a telling (if frustratingly undetailed) description of a slave cemetery on her husband’s plantation:

We skirted the plantation burial ground, and a dismal place it looked; the cattle trampling over it in every direction, except where Mr. King had had an enclosure put up round the graves of two white men who had worked on the estate. They were strangers...but by virtue of their white skins their resting place was protected from the hoofs of the cattle, while the parents and children, wives, husbands, brothers and sisters of the poor slaves, sleeping beside them, might see the graves of those they loved trampled upon and browsed over, desecrated and defiled, from morning to night...

There may be other descriptions of antebellum/Civil War era cemeteries, but these were the only ones discovered by the time this report was being prepared.
Cemetery Placement: Settlements and Shorelines

On Parris Island the initial designation of a plot of land for a plantation cemetery would have been up to the landowner, assuming he chose to exercise his authority. His choice may have been aesthetically motivated, or concerned with consigning the cemetery to literally “marginal land,” with relatively low agricultural value. The selection would have been less than critical in the eighteenth century before the cotton boom resulted in the clearing and cultivation of most of the Island, and it is possible that the slave community had some choice in the placement. It appears that all four of the known Parris Island cemeteries were chosen before the general clearing of the Island, as none shows any sign of cultivation.

The proximity of slave cemeteries to slave settlements varies widely, and may have had little spiritual significance. In her study of Berkeley County plantation cemeteries, Connor (1989:39, 56, 68) hypothesized “extreme proximity of slave housing to slave cemetery” as a reflection of “Creolized aspects of West African ideology in slave mortuary behavior,” but she ultimately found no pattern of such proximity. It is possible, of course, that the whims of the planter may have held sway over “West African ideology.” On Parris Island, the Means cemetery (38BU162) is adjacent to a large slave settlement, while the other three are hundreds of yards from the nearest settlement (see Chapters 3-6).

Sea island African American cemeteries are often characterized as typically located adjacent to water, although the same writers observe that some are not (e.g. Cohen 1958:95; Wright and Hughes 1996:41, 55). Cohen (1958:95) reports that on Hilton Head Island, the chief reason for choosing sites adjacent to water is that “…if a Negro drowns, he must be buried so that the water, at least from the high spring tides, will wash over his grave.” A more typical explanation, also from Hilton Head, is that “…African Americans once believed their spirits would more easily make the trip across the water to return to Africa if they were buried near the water” (Wright and Hughes 1996:64). Similarly, on Daufuskie Island, “…native Sea Islanders… believe that the water is their gate to the spiritual world and that the water serves as a channel for the spirits of the dead to return to their native Africa” (Wright and Hughes 1996:49). Here again it is presupposed that African Americans had some choice in the matter of cemetery location, which may or may not have been the case prior to emancipation. Coffin Point plantation on St. Helena Island had an extensive shoreline, yet as we have seen, the slave cemetery was located “in the middle of a cotton field” (Pearson 1906:65). Edward Pierce characterized Port Royal slave cemeteries as “usually in an open field, under a clump of…trees, perhaps live-oaks” (Pierce 1863:302). All four known Parris Island cemeteries are almost certainly antebellum, and all four were established on properties that included very extensive shorelines, but only two of the four, 38BU162 and 38BU1618, are located on the water. A planter’s choice of “marginal land,” or at least land not currently in use, may have been as significant in the choice of cemetery location as any other factor.

Our review of sources relating to the placement of plantation cemeteries yielded ambiguous results. Little light was shed on the meaning of the four known cemetery locations chosen on Parris Island, and little information was found that might help us to predict the locations of additional, lost cemeteries.
The importance in traditional African American communities of burial in “home ground” may have been a significant factor in the establishment and use of cemeteries on Parris Island. In the postbellum era, at least, burial in one’s community cemetery was of overriding importance, as the spirit of an individual buried elsewhere would be unable to rest (Combes 1972:56; Georgia Writers’ Project (GWP) 1940:62, 63, 77, 95, 113, 147, 174; Wright and Hughes 1996:59). We can only assume that such a strongly held belief existed prior to emancipation as well, and indeed the “home ground” emphasis appears to have solid West African antecedents (GWP 1940:195, 196; Jamieson 1995:48). Burial immediately adjacent to family members was apparently not nearly so critical as burial in the “home” cemetery (Parsons 1923:215), although Edward Pierce (1863:303) was informed that burials in a Ladies Island slave cemetery were “disposed in families and were known.”

If we grant that this strong and widespread emphasis on “home ground” burial probably prevailed on antebellum Parris Island, it may have affected the proliferation of cemeteries. In the century after 1722, the original two plantations comprising Parris Island were subdivided into seven plantations. If slave communities were substantially subdivided as well, and assuming friendly relations between planters, it is possible that burials continued in the old “home grounds,” and that the five additional plantations did not require five new cemeteries. Similarly, when the old Grayson, Barnwell, and Cartwright properties were later combined (Chapter 3), burials may have continued in more than one cemetery on the new Fuller plantation. “Home ground” considerations may have dictated the continued use of the old slave cemeteries after emancipation, at least among Parris Island natives (Woodrow Garvin, personal communication). While it is possible that new cemeteries were established by postbellum praise houses, churches or burial associations on the island, we have found no evidence for them thus far.

A widespread belief related to “home ground” was that “strangers” who were so unfortunate as to die in one’s community, away from home, must be buried apart from community members, in a separate lot (GWP 1940:77, 113, 147, 174). In the 1930s, a former Georgia Sea Island slave recalled, “Yuh gib people wut ain belong tuh yuh anudduh piece uh groun tuh be bury in” (GWP 1940:147). This practice probably became more important after emancipation, when a more fluid population might have resulted in significant numbers of “strangers” or recent arrivals. It is possible, then, that some or all of the four known cemeteries have small, discrete lots off to one side, devoted to individuals not considered community members. These lots, or even scattered, individual “strangers,” may lie outside of the boundaries we have established for the cemeteries proper.

Grave Markers

Antebellum African American plantation cemeteries in the Low Country apparently had few durable markers, to judge from contemporary descriptions (above) and the near-absence of extant specimens. While Harriet Ware reported that “nothing ever marks the graves” in the Coffin Point cemetery, at least some graves in other slave cemeteries were marked with wooden sticks, posts, headboards, or effigies, or occasionally sandstone slabs (Pierce 1863:302; Torian
...we discovered that Siras’ skill in woodcarving was manifested in many unusual markers. These were wooden images set on graves that were close together. One resembled a large bird; another represented a snake writhing upon a stand; and the third was a figure of a man, round and pole-like of body, with a head that resembled a ball and rudely sculptured features.

More recently, home made cement markers have become common. Even into the late twentieth century, however, many graves lacked durable markers, and if visible at all were marked only by mounds, sinks, or surface grave goods (Combes 1972:54, 56, 58, 59). In describing the African American cemeteries on Hilton Head Island in the 1950s, Cohen (1958:94, 95) reported that “...graves are usually marked with crude headstones fashioned from cement or with wooden stakes...Only in rare cases, such as when the military authorities provide a marker for a deceased veteran, are there any but homemade tombstones” (see Chapter 8).

In 1919, folklorist Elsie Clews Parsons (1923:214-215) described an African American cemetery on St. Helena Island, across the Beaufort River from Parris Island:

...one of those ragged patches of live-oak and palmetto and briar tangle which throughout the Islands are a sign of graves within - graves scattered without symmetry, and often without head-stones or head-boards, or sticks, but invariably dug east and west, the head to the west.

Generally speaking, it is a fairly safe assumption that an older African American cemetery in the Low Country contains several times the number of burials indicated by headstones, even when there has been no deliberate removal of markers as was the case on Parris Island.

Grave Goods

Surface grave goods remain a common (if rapidly diminishing) feature in traditional African American cemeteries on the Sea Islands and inland over much of the Southeast. Other than the Frances Hodgson memoir (above), the earliest descriptions of the practice date to 1881 and 1891, and both concern the same large African American cemetery in Columbia, South Carolina. After a visit to Columbia in 1881, Ernest Ingersoll (1892:68-69) wrote an article describing the “Negro cemetery” there:
I saw at Columbia, S.C. a practice in vogue among the blacks which exists nowhere else so far as I can learn... [emphasis added]. When a negro dies, some article or utensil, or more than one, is thrown upon his grave; moreover it is broken... Nearly every grave has bordering or thrown upon it a few bleached sea-shells of a dozen different kinds, such as are found along the south Atlantic coast. Mingled with these is a most curious collection of broken crockery and glassware. On the large graves are laid broken pitchers, soap-dishes, lamp chimneys, tureens, coffee-cups, sirup [sic] jugs, all sorts of ornamental vases, cigar boxes, gun-locks, tomato cans, teapots, flower pots, bits of stucco, plaster images, pieces of carved stone-work from one of the public buildings destroyed during the war, glass lamps and tumblers in great number, and forty other kitchen articles. Chief of all these, however, are large water pitchers; very few graves lack them. The children’s graves were really pathetic. There you could see doll’s heads, little china wash-bowls and pitchers, toy images of animals, china vases, and pewter dishes, indeed everything of that sort that would interest a child...The negroes themselves hardly know how to account for this custom. They say it is an ‘old fashion.’

Clearly the practice of placing personal items on graves had been thriving for some time in Columbia prior to 1881.

The Columbia cemetery was visited by H. Carrington Bolton (1891:214) in about 1891, and his description is similar:

...the numerous graves are decorated with a variety of objects, sometimes arranged with careful symmetry, but more often placed around the margins without regard to order. These objects include oyster-shells, white pebbles, fragments of crockery of every description, glass bottles, and nondescript bric-a-brac of a cheap sort - all more or less broken and useless. The large number of medicine bottles on some graves has suggested that the bottles once held the medicines that killed the patients.

Since Bolton made his observations, the practice has been described in dozens of published accounts, with a fair degree of agreement regarding the range of materials used and their meanings (e.g., Parsons 1923:214; Puckett 1926:103-107; Combes 1972:52-61; Vlach 1978:139-147, 1991:42-48; Roediger 1981:174-176; Creel 1988:316-319; Jamieson 1995:48-51). The remarkable record of traditional African American life on the Georgia coast gathered by folklorists with the Georgia Writers’ Project of the WPA in the 1930s includes much cemetery-related material (GWP 1940). The GWP interviews among African American natives of the Sea Islands and adjacent mainland communities include nine characterizations of the surface grave goods tradition, widely scattered geographically, but very similar (GWP 1940:58, 59, 87, 95, 117, 127, 130, 131, 136, 147). A few examples suffice to represent the tradition as understood in the 1930s:
Dis wuz a common ting wen I wuz young. Dey use tuh put duh tings a pusson las use on duh grabe. Dis wuz suppose tuh satisfy duh spirit an keep it from followin yuh back tuh duh house. (GWP 1940:58-59).

Yuh put dishes an bottles an all duh pretty pieces wut dey lak on duh grabe. Yuh alluz break deze tings fo yuh put um down. Yuh break duh dishes so dat duh chain will be broke. Yuh see, duh one pusson is dead an ef yuh dohn break duh tings, den duh udduhs in duh fambly will die too. (GWP 1940:130-131).

Yuh puts all duh tings wut dey use las, lak duh dishes an duh medicine bottle. Duh spirits need deze same as duh man. Den duh spirit res an dohn wanduh bout. (GWP 1940:136).

Dem dishes and bottles wut put on duh grabe is fuh duh spirit an it ain fuh nobody tuh tech um. Das fuh duh sperrit tuh feel at home. (GWP 1940:147).

Lest these Columbia and Georgia Sea Island examples seem rather distant from our study area, the surface grave goods tradition is also documented (and still visible) on the islands immediately surrounding Parris Island, including Hilton Head and St. Helena (e.g. Cohen 1958).

Easily the most interesting and widely-touted aspect of the surface grave goods tradition is its strong association with West African precursors. It was apparently Bolton (1891) who first recognized the “African connection” in print. He reported that “Inquiry of residents as to the origin and significance of this custom elicited no satisfactory explanation...” Shortly thereafter, however, Bolton saw a Century Magazine article, “Fetishism in the Congo,” which included an illustration of a grave in the Congo “that would do very well for the picture of one in the Potter’s Field, Columbia, S.C.” The Century article reported, “The natives mark the final resting-places of their friends by ornamenting their graves with crockery, empty bottles, old cooking pots, etc., all of which articles are rendered useless by being cracked or perforated with holes” (Glave 1891:827). Bolton (1891:214) concluded that:

The negroes of South Carolina are simply following the customs of their savage ancestors, and are unwittingly perpetuating the fetishism so deeply impressed. . . in decorating the graves of the departed they afford an illustration of the long survival of customs the meaning of which has been quite forgotten by those practicing them.

There is little question that an array of West African mortuary beliefs and practices contributed to the surface grave goods tradition seen in many African American communities, and an extensive body of literature documents specific African examples that match or approximate elements of the African American tradition (e.g. Puckett 1926:103; GWP 1940:231, 232, 242; Vlach 1978:142-144; Thompson 1984:132-142; Nichols 1989:44-50). Strangely, however, the archaeological and historical evidence marshaled to date does not support the continuity of the practice from West Africa to postbellum North America. There is in fact very
little evidence that the placing of surface grave goods was a common practice until some years after emancipation.

The only evidence we have located for an antebellum tradition of surface grave goods includes the Frances Hodgson memoir cited above, and a single archaeological example, also from Georgia. Writing ca. 1907, Hodgson recalled that on her father’s plantation near Savannah, “Negro graves were always decorated with the last article used by the departed, and broken pitchers and broken bits of colored glass were considered even more appropriate than the white shells from the beach nearby” (Torian 1943:352). While it thus appears that the practice was flourishing on her father’s plantation in the 1850s, it is also possible that her antebellum recollections were mixed 60 years later with postbellum observations of cemeteries. Significantly, none of the other four antebellum cemetery descriptions cited above mentions grave goods, and Harriet Ware actually states that “nothing ever marks the graves” (Pearson 1906:65). A detailed (if brief) 1894 discussion of “Mortuary Customs and Beliefs of South Carolina Negros” (Waring 1894:318, 319) makes no mention of grave goods.

The sole archaeological example of antebellum surface grave goods is from the excavation of Cunningham Mound D, on St. Catherines Island, Georgia (Thomas et al. 1977:406, 407). The prehistoric mound was intruded by two early 19th century African American burials, one of which had three sherds from a blue edged pearlware plate (a variety dating ca. 1800-1818) near the ground surface and roughly over the individual’s head. The position of the plate suggests that it may have served as a grave marker, and was not an item of “grave goods” in the sense discussed here. No other material was found on either grave.

The strongest evidence favoring a substantially postbellum date for the surface grave goods practice is in what we do not find archaeologically. If indeed grave goods were commonly placed on eighteenth century and antebellum African American graves, then the topsoil zone overlying cemeteries then in use should be abundantly strewn with material such as cups, plates and bowls in colonoware, lead-glazed earthenwares, Westerwald, creamware, and pearlware, dark olive green wine bottles, and pontil-marked aqua medicine bottles. Artifacts like the blue-edged plate from the Cunningham Mound (above) should be the rule rather the exception. It might be argued that the material available to slaves was generally more limited than that available to Freedmen, or that the grave goods applied by slaves may have consisted largely of non-durable items (e.g. wooden bowls, baskets, gourds, textiles). Both arguments are countered by reference to the dense middens of durable vessel fragments that typically characterize slave settlement sites (including 38BU162), which suggest that utilitarian ceramic vessels and bottles would have been available for a function as important as a deeply-held spiritual imperative.

On Parris Island, as Chapters 3 through 6 will demonstrate, we found only one ambiguous example of an antebellum surface grave goods object (see “Grave Goods,” Chapter 6). In a number of instances we found buried, early twentieth century objects in situ or nearly so, with relatively fresh-looking graves, but older-looking grave features were consistently without material. The question of shell on early graves is unclear. Although shells were (and are) commonly employed as surface grave goods or decorations (e.g. Thompson 1984:135-138), we found no examples in situ or in groups such that they appeared to be grave goods. Whelk, clam,
ark and other species that commonly appear as grave goods were found in the four Parris Island cemeteries - some examples are probably disturbed grave goods, and some may even be antebellum grave goods - but they are impossible to separate from the prehistoric and historic dietary refuse present at all four sites. In sum, our extensive trenching encountered very minimal evidence for surface grave goods pre-dating the late-nineteenth century. In light of this finding, we informally polled eight archaeologists with extensive South Carolina experience, and found that none could recall a single example of antebellum surface grave goods anywhere, with the exception of the Cunningham Mound example (Stan South, Carl Steen, Chris Judge, Natalie Adams, Ramona Grunden, David Jones, Chris Espenshade, John Cable, personal communications 2000-2002).

We believe that surface grave goods represent more a revival of neglected ancestral traditions than a West African practice that arrived with slaves and was actively maintained into the postbellum era. Far from merely debunking an “African survival,” this notion raises a host of very interesting historical and anthropological questions. If our contention is correct, then when, where and why did the revival originate, and how was it spread throughout the southeast? Does Ingersoll’s 1881 description suggest an origin in the Columbia area? Perhaps much of what we think we know about spirituality among slaves, which is based primarily on postbellum and twentieth century sources, is not valid for the colonial and antebellum periods.

Summary and Conclusions

The postbellum history of Parris Island is surprisingly well-documented given its relative isolation from major events of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Freedmen who purchased the island after the Civil War lived off of what they could produce on the land or obtain from the surrounding marsh and rivers. Land holdings became progressively smaller tracts through time as ten and twenty acre parcels were gradually divided up among children and grandchildren of the original purchasers and, as a result, young people were forced to relocate off of the island to make a living.

The construction of the lighthouse and naval station on the island provided additional employment opportunities for island residents, but they were the initial steps of government encroachment that would eventually result in seizure of the entire island in 1918. Over the next twenty years, the African American residents of the island were forced to move off of the island and were dispersed in surrounding communities. Today only a few of those original inhabitants are still alive, and most are too old and infirm to recall their early years on the island. The documentary record is now our only source of information concerning the postbellum occupation of the island. We have made an initial effort to reconstruct that history from available sources. In our minds we have been moderately successful, but there is still much more research to be done.
Chapter 3

38BU1895B: THE FULLER PLANTATION CEMETERY

The cemetery discussed in this chapter was forgotten and “lost” until 1997, when researchers with PanAmerican Research, Inc. found map evidence for a cemetery they called “Cemetery #1,” now 38BU1895B. They determined that the cemetery had been obliterated by modern development (Hayward and Steinback 1997:69-70, 126-129). Our examination of the same sources used by PanAmerican demonstrated that their location for the cemetery was off by about 900 feet, and that the actual site was fairly well preserved.

Hayward and Steinback’s (1997:126) projected location for Cemetery #1 was extrapolated from the cemetery location depicted on a 1921 map of the temporary, World War I “West Wing Extension” of the recruit depot. They assumed that the World War I complex was in the same location as a similar complex built during World War II; the World War II complex is securely located on several maps (through several decades of demolition and rebuilding) in the area southwest of the intersection of present Malecon Drive and Wake Boulevard, and bordering on both roads (see Figures 10, 11, 14, 15). Panamerican’s assumption placed the current site of the cemetery “under a drill field and Building 410,” in the present Third Battalion complex located well to the southeast of the actual location of Cemetery #1 (Hayward and Steinback 1997:69).

In fact, the World War I and World War II temporary complexes were in different locations. The World War I West Wing Extension was located on the western margin of the island, while the World War II West Wing Extension was located nearby, but farther to the east. The actual location of the World War I “West Wing Extension” is depicted on several maps, which clearly show an extensive undeveloped area between the World War I complex and present Wake Boulevard - the area heavily developed during World War II. The original World War I roads can still be traced, and our scaling of historic maps to modern maps located Cemetery #1 adjacent to present Buildings 856, 866, and 867 (Figures 8, 16). This location fits well with a cemetery depicted on the DeRoode map of 1916 (Figure 9). While the site is not labeled by DeRoode as a cemetery, it is drawn like the known cemetery on the Santa Elena site as a rectangle within a small woods.

Because of the cemetery’s proximity to the recycling center (see Figure 16, Building 867) where modifications were being planned, work on 38BU1895B was begun shortly after its identification. On August 22, 2000, Chester DePratter and Stanley South shot transit data for the 38BU1895B map; the resulting base map was drawn by Stanley South. On August 26 and 27, a ground penetrating radar survey of a portion of the cemetery was conducted (below). Fieldwork on 38BU1895B was carried out between September 5 and September 14, 2000, and again on June 18, 2001.
Figure 8. 38BU1895B. View to the southwest across cemetery; recycling building (Bldg. 867) in background.

History

Introduction

None of the previous historical works cover the 38BU1895 vicinity in any detail (Butler et al. 1995; Hayward and Steinback 1997; Alvarez 1998). The cemetery (38BU1895B) has not even been previously recorded in its correct location, and the World War I West Wing Extension (38BU1895A) has received no attention of any sort. In the present study, the cemetery is correctly located and is identified with a particular plantation, but otherwise it remains nearly undocumented. The West Wing Extension remains sparsely documented from text sources, but its chronology and appearance are characterized from an extensive collection of maps and construction plans and a detailed, panoramic photograph.

The Plantation Era

No pre-eighteenth century occupation of the 38BU1895 vicinity has been documented historically; the first European settlement of the property appears to have occurred after 1722.
As discussed elsewhere (Chapters 2, 6), neither of the first two owners of the future Parris Island (Robert Daniell and Edward Archer), appears to have settled on the island or subdivided it (Webber 1925:137, 138). Alexander Parris (1661-1736) bought the entire island in 1715, but any planting or other improvements he may have made were probably confined to the southern portion of the island, given that he granted the northern 40% or so of the island to his daughter, Jane and his son-in-law, John Delabare, in 1722 (Webber 1925:138; Edgar and Bailey 1977:190, 191).

Edgar and Bailey (1977:191) state that John Delabare established a plantation on his Parris Island property which was worked by some 40 slaves. His house would be the northern-most of the only two depicted on the 1776/1791 Gascoigne map (Figure 4), which may be a later edition of an earlier survey, given the 1729 date for the magnetic declination on the map. Delabare’s house appears to have been located near the site later called “Fullers Landing,” east-northeast of 38BU1895B, where a branch of Archer’s Creek touches high ground on the north shore of Parris Island. The “Graston’s” (Grayson’s) label on the map is presumably correct for the 1776 date of publication (see below). As the 1375-acre John Delabare property included the area of 38BU1895B, the initial use of the cemetery may well date as early as Delabare’s ownership from 1722 until his death in 1739. In 1738 John Delabare advertised for sale “one half of an island near Port Royal, 1500 acres, already settled also 35 or 40 negro slaves” (Webber 1925:143). Assuming this offer referred to Parris Island, (with the acreage somewhat inflated), there was apparently no sale. On his death in 1739, John Delabare left his Parris Island property to his minor sons, John Kennered and George, each of whom received 682.5 acres (Webber 1925:143, 144). We know from subsequent plantation history (below, and Chapter 4) that John Kennered Delabare’s tract lay to the southwest and included the present rifle range complex, as well as Horse Island to the north. George Delabare’s tract would have included what is now “Mainside,” the site of 38BU1895B, and, it appears, his father’s house and plantation complex.

Thomas Wigg bought George Delabare’s 682.5 acre plantation in 1758. In January, 1759, Wigg bought an additional 88 acres from John Kennered Delabare, the tract “bounding N.W. on formerly George Delabare, now Thos. Wigg, on Parris’ or Archer’s Island” (Webber 1925:143). Thomas Wigg died later that year, apparently leaving the eastern half of his new 770.5-acre property to his son John Wigg, and the western portion (presumably including the Delabare complex and 38BU1895B) to his daughter Sarah Grayson, wife of John Grayson (Butler et al. 1995:24-27; Edgar and Bailey 1977:711; Bass 1933:I-VII). This assumption is based on the fact that the original structure on the north end of Parris Island is labeled “Grayson” (or some variation) on several later eighteenth century maps (Butler et al. 1995:29, 32, 33, 37). A second “Grayson” house eventually appears on maps (e.g. Figure 5), located well to the east of the old Delabare/Grayson house, on what would have been John Wigg property in 1759. We can only assume that at some point after 1759 the John Wigg property passed to the Graysons; the Wigg and Grayson families were complexly interrelated (see Bass 1933:1-V; Barnwell 1969).

The plantations (or plantation) on the north end of Parris Island are very poorly documented for some 60 years after 1759, due to the destruction of many Beaufort District land records. We do know that Sarah Grayson died in about 1804, and whatever the Grayson plantation then consisted of she left to three different heirs, including her grandson, William J. Grayson (1788-1862). William Grayson recalled (Calhoun 1990:73-75):
my dear old grandmother died at the age of seventy-four. She left me a few negroes and a third of her plantation on Parris Island. ...The plantation was a good one as a whole; it was converted into three and was of little value to anybody. ...This perpetual subdivision of estates is detrimental to the masters, the slaves, to the land and therefore to the State. A dozen sons look forward to the partition of the parental property with exaggerated notions of their future fortunes...The effect... is as bad for the slaves as for their masters. It breaks up their homes and scatters them among strangers. The land suffers also. It is made liable, by being broken into small tracts, to injudicious clearings that strip it of timber, to the multiplication of fences and houses, to imperfect cultivation.

William J. Grayson did not record how his grandmother’s property was divided, nor the identity of the other two heirs. The Mills’ Atlas map of Beaufort District (Figure 5), which was surveyed 16 years later, in 1820, shows a house to the east labeled “Grayson” and the old house to the west labeled “Barnwell.” At that time, the “Barnwell” plantation was the property of Elizabeth Barnwell (1797-1872), inherited from her father Senator Robert Barnwell (1761-1814) (NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523; Barnwell 1969:46). How Robert Barnwell came to possess former Sarah Grayson property is not clear, but it probably had to do with his marriage to Elizabeth Hayne Wigg (1775-1823), or one of several other connections between the Barnwells, the Wiggs, and the Graysons (Barnwell 1969:46). 38BU1895B was on the Barnwell property in 1820. The “Grayson” plantation depicted to the east was still owned by William J. Grayson; an 1824 St. Helena Parish tax return shows that Grayson held 390 acres and 80 slaves (Butler et al. 1995:41). The origin of the “Cartwright” place depicted on the Mills’ Atlas map is not known, but presumably it had to do with one of the three heirs of Sarah Grayson, possibly with the Cartwright surname.

In 1829, Elizabeth Barnwell married Dr. Thomas Fuller (1788-1862), who thereby began the consolidation of the northern third of Parris Island under his ownership (Barnwell 1969:129; NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523). Fuller has been described “as one of the wealthiest sea island cotton planters in the world,” whose “agreeable manners and great intelligence made him a favorite everywhere” (Barnwell 1969:127). In 1838, Fuller bought from the estate of Ann Cartwright a plantation of 192 acres located on Ballast Creek and the Beaufort River. The 1838 deed description of this tract describes it as “bounded west and so. west by lands formerly belonging to William J. Grayson & now to the said Dr. Thomas Fuller,” which makes little sense geographically, but suggests an early sale to Thomas Fuller of the southern portion of the Grayson property that is otherwise unknown (NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523). Grayson had sold “a plantation near Beaufort” in 1834 (Bass 1933:ccxxxv), but no other details are available. The Grayson Plantation proper was supposedly not sold until later; Thomas Fuller’s heirs recalled that he bought the Grayson Plantation from William J. Grayson in 1846, and purchased Horse and Sheep Islands, north of Parris Island, from William Edings in 1853 (NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523).
In 1850, Thomas Fuller owned 1000 acres and 145 slaves on Parris Island, and 1200 acres and 108 slaves on St. Helena Island (Rowland et al. 1996:372). In 1860 his holdings in St. Helena Parish totaled 2400 acres, and those properties were valued at $35,000, the sixth most valuable operation in the Parish (US Census Bureau 1860c). Whatever additional ambitions Dr. Fuller may have had for his growing empire were thwarted by the Civil War. He abandoned his properties to the invading Federals in November, 1861, and the plantations were ultimately seized for non-payment of taxes. When the 1200-acre “Fuller Place” was sold at auction for $200 to the United States in 1863, it was by far the largest of the five plantations on Parris Island (NARA RG 217, Inventory #14, Entry 888, Vol. II, 35/36). Thomas Fuller died in 1862, followed by his wife Elizabeth in 1872. In the 1890s, their heirs brought a compensation claim against the United States for the long-lost property (NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523). The evidence and supporting documents in that case provide numerous details (some previously cited, above) concerning the Fuller holdings:

- there was a sale [in 1863] by the Direct Tax Commissioners of a tract of land called the Fuller place, containing 1200 acres and which was sold for non-payment of taxes in the amount of $96.

- the tract sold [as the Fuller place] consisted of five separate plantations: “Cartwright,” “Grayson,” “Parris,” “Horse Island” and “Sheep Island.”

- Dr. Thomas Fuller owned plantations on Parris Island, St. Helena Parish, as follows: one called Grayson’s bought from William Grayson, and the other from Mrs. Cartwright, which went by the name of Cartwright... the number of acres in Graysons, was about 500... [Cartwright’s was] of 192 acres

- [Thomas Fuller] owned other property near Parris Island called Horse Island and Sheep Island... the deed from William Eddings to Thomas Fuller, conveying Horse Island, containing 200 acres, more or less... and also another island called Sheep Island, containing 20 acres, more or less

- Elizabeth B. Fuller... owned land on Parris Island, and derived it from her father... there was about 485 acres in the tract, and [it was] called Parris Tract.

The testimony further clarified that the three contiguous plantations, named Parris, Grayson and Cartwright, were arrayed from west to east, and totaled about 1,177 acres. Of that total, only about 20 acres was wooded in 1860, including “about 8 to 10 acres” on the Parris property, which would have included 38BU1895B. The remainder was described as under cultivation in 1860. These documents also provide the first and only evidence that the western property was actually named “Parris Plantation.”

As detailed in Chapter 2, between 1865 and 1869 most of Parris Island was sold by the United States to ex-slaves for $1.50 per acre. The majority of the Fuller property was subdivided and the lots sold to several dozen African American “heads of household” who bought one or
two 10-acre lots, or fractional lots thereof totaling no more than 20 acres (Figure 6 and Appendix II). The major exception was School Farm #31, or the “Fuller School Farm,” a 160-acre strip on the north shore of the island, including the Fuller house on the west, the Grayson house to the east, and 38BU1895B (the cemetery is on 10-acre Lot 9 of St. Helena Township Section 6) (Chapter 2).

The United States first rented out School Farms #31 and #32 (the “Means School Farm”) in January, 1864, to Henry G. Judd, the former U.S. superintendent of Parris Island, for a term of one year (NARA RG 217, Revised Inventory #14, Entry 888, Vol. I:24). Judd’s “indenture” document specifies that for his rent of $300 per farm, he was allowed to cultivate up to 50% of the arable land on the tract “at the appropriate season.” Judd was responsible for supplying the schools with books and stationary, and his rent was subject to be refunded if the schools were suitably provided for during the year. The indenture concludes,

And it is also understood and agreed that none of the persons now residing in the cabins on the said school farm, shall be removed therefrom except upon the orders of the said [U.S. Tax] Commissioners, and that the rate of wages paid to laborers on the said school farm, shall be not less than that heretofore paid by the government for cultivation of the plantations in the Parish of St. Helena.

Henry M. Kingman rented School Farm #31 in 1865, for a term of four years at $530 per year (NARA RG 217, Revised Inventory #14, Entry 888, Vol. I:6). Kingman’s indenture excluded “the best mansion house thereon,” which may have been reserved for teachers or Federal employees. Kingman’s tenure apparently lasted only two years, as the school farm was rented to others in 1867, 1870, 1871 and 1872 (no records for 1868 and 1869 were found) (NARA RG 217, Revised Inventory #14, Entry 888, Vol. I:110, 129, 194, 215, 275). Henry Judd’s initial indenture of 1864 is the only one with a connection to a functioning school – all of the later agreements appear to be simple leases of U.S. property, with certain restrictions. Beginning in 1870, the indentures suggest that the property was subject to sale to third parties at any time.

At some point after March, 1872, the 160 acres of School Farm #31 (and the cemetery) were redeemed and reclaimed from the United States by the Fuller heirs (NARA RG 123, Box 1041, File 17523). The remainder of the former Fuller land was already dispersed among numerous private purchasers, and was not eligible for redemption. No information was found regarding the use or occupation of the property after it was redeemed by Fuller heirs, but it was almost certainly under cultivation. The old house near Fuller’s Landing had burned by 1868 (NARA RG 58, Acc. 531), and there is no evidence to suggest that it was replaced. Apparently the Grayson house, on the east end of the school farm tract, still stood in 1868, and it may have been occupied by family members or tenants after the property was redeemed (NARA RG 58, Acc. 531).

The Reverend John H. Elliott (1832-1906) and his second wife Rosa (1843-1926) are known to have possessed the school farm tract for some period between 1872 and 1906. Elliott was a son of the Reverend Stephen Elliott (Chapter 5), and was a Fuller heir by virtue of his first marriage to Thomas Fuller’s daughter, Mary (Barnwell 1969:130, 152, 153). It appears that
Elliott sold the property before his death in 1906, and by 1917 it was in the hands of Beaufort businessmen George Waterhouse and C. E. Hamrick. When the property was seized by the Marine Corps (below), Waterhouse and Hamrick were engaged in a commercial truck farming operation on the property, and their compensation included payment for crops unrealized in 1917 (NARA RG 125, Entry 135, Box 21).

The 1916 DeRoode map of Parris Island (Figure 9) depicts no houses or other structures at what is still labeled “Fuller’s Landing,” nor anywhere else on the former school farm tract. The cemetery, 38BU1895B, is depicted as a rectangle within a small woods, but it is not labeled. (The only other cemetery shown on the 1916 map is the “Means” cemetery at Santa Elena - it too is an unlabeled rectangle within a small woods).

Figure 9. Detail of the DeRoode Map of Parris Island in 1916, showing 38BU1895B (arrow, left center).

The long and complex history of the plantation that included 38BU1895B is not well documented, and its generations of enslaved African American occupants are essentially undocumented. It is fairly clear, however, that the cemetery was associated with a plantation that may have begun as early as 1722, and that operated until 1861, with a building complex and landing located about 600 yards east-northeast of the cemetery (at about the location of the present water reservoir tanks on the north side of Malecon Drive) (Figure 1). One or more additional slave cemeteries may have existed on the 1200 acres that comprised Thomas Fuller’s plantation in 1861. The former Cartwright and William J. Grayson tracts, as well as Horse Island, are good candidates for other “lost” African American cemeteries.
The Marine Corps Era

The old Fuller School Farm (#31) tract was heavily developed during World War I. Included in the emergency expansion of 1917-1918 were three large, linear complexes of wooden barracks and associated facilities designated the East Wing, the West Wing, and the West Wing Extension. The East and West Wings stretched along the north shore of Parris Island from the original Navy reservation to where the present causeway comes on to the Island, while the West Wing Extension (38BU1895A) ran from the latter point southwest, encompassing the cemetery (38BU1895B) (Figures 10, 11).

The history of these temporary World War I cantonments is presently known best from period maps. The earliest of the maps, probably a construction plan, dates to June 29, 1917, less than three months after the U.S. entry into the War (Pendleton and Bryant 1917). It depicts the East and West Wings, but projects no construction in the area of the cemetery and the future West Wing Extension. The cemetery, 38BU1895B, is shown in a location consistent with that on the DeRoode map of 1916 (Figure 9), and for the first time it is mapped with the distinctive teardrop shape depicted on all later maps; this shape was essentially confirmed by our archaeological testing (below). A January 30, 1918 map (National Board of Fire Underwriters 1918), shows the “New Camp” consisting of the East and West Wings, but with no sign of a West Wing Extension or the cemetery. An early version of the West Wing Extension finally appears on a pair of plan maps dated May 4 and May 6, 1918 (USMC Quartermaster Department 1918a; USMC 1918b). These depict a “Proposed Extension to West Wing” consisting of two widely separated complexes, one northeast of the cemetery and one well southwest of the cemetery, suggesting an initial effort to avoid it entirely. There is no evidence, however, that this version of the cantonment was ever begun. The May 4, 1918 map shows “Present Bayonet Grounds & Pistol Butts” immediately southwest of the cemetery, indicating that that area was already in use for Marine Corps training before the West Wing Extension was built.

The original plan for the West Wing Extension was soon discarded in favor of the version that was actually built, which first appears on a June 11, 1918 plan of “Extension to Marine Barracks” (U.S. Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks 1918), and on the Smith map, “Existing Improvements and Additions Contracted For,” of August 3, 1918 (U.S. Navy, Charleston Navy Yard 1918; Riddle 1919) (Figure 10). The new plans called for a single, larger complex that would engulf the cemetery, but still avoid direct impact; a set of four latrine buildings around the site was spaced more widely than the other two sets in the complex in order to avoid infringing on the cemetery (Figure 11). It is not known exactly when the West Wing Extension was built. The 1920 Fort Fremont Quadrangle topographic map (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] 1920/1939), which was field-revised in July, 1918, shows the East and West Wings but no sign of the West Wing Extension. The next available map (Riddle 1919), which depicts “Conditions as Existing June 30, 1919,” shows the West Wing Extension as completed (Figure 11). The complex was probably built in the late summer and fall of 1918, and may not have housed any recruits who actually served overseas prior to the Armistice on November 11, 1918.
Although the size of the Marine Corps was reduced after World War I, the West Wing Extension apparently saw use in the postwar period, if only briefly. A fairly detailed picture of the complex is provided by the June, 1919 Riddle map (Figure 11), a panoramic photograph of June, 1920 (Figure 12) (USMC Post Studio 1919), and a 1921 map (Hayward and Steinback 1997:126). These depict an array of wood structures including 36 two-story barracks, 12 mess halls, 12 latrines, a hospital, and various other specialized facilities. Detailed blueprints for many of these buildings are preserved (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Roll 584, Frames 26-59). Evidence for use of the complex is found in the differences between the 1919 and 1921 plans; a YMCA building on the 1919 map had been removed by 1921, while two new structures were added. It seems unlikely that alterations and additions would have been made to an unused complex that was entirely surplus to requirements. Both maps depict the cemetery with its familiar outline, and the photograph (Figure 12) shows an isolated clump of mature hardwoods at the cemetery location. The pistol range indicted in 1918 (USMC Quartermaster Department 1918a) is no longer in evidence by 1919, although the “Bayonet Field” is shown in detail, and includes an extensive system of Western Front-style trenches (Figure 11). The West Wing Extension may have been used in the early 1920s by units undergoing bayonet training, and recruits firing on the rifle range are documented as using the “West Wing,” perhaps in fact the West Wing Extension, as it was closer to the rifle range (Alvarez 1998:95, 96, 98). Ball rifle
Figure 11. Detail of the Riddle Map of the training camp complex on Parris Island in 1919, showing the West Wing Extension and the cemetery, 38BU1895B (arrow).
Figure 12. Detail of a panoramic photograph of the training camp complex on Parris Island in 1919, showing the West Wing Extension. The clump of trees rising above the rooftops at left marks the location of the cemetery, 38BU1895B. 
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cartridges and clips recovered during the cemetery testing support this speculation, as only recruits in the rifle range phase of training would have had live ammunition.

The large barracks complexes built on Parris Island during World War I were intended to be emergency, temporary facilities, and indeed most of the structures stood for less than 10 years. In June, 1923 a map of the northern portion of the island was prepared showing which buildings were to be removed and which were to be retained for the time being. Throughout the area built up during the War, including the West Wing Extension, structures slated for destruction heavily outnumbered those to be spared (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Roll 584, Frame 110). A 1927 report from the Commandant of the Marine Corps stated, “The West Wing training area has been abandoned, most of the barracks, buildings and the mess hall[s] razed and the material salvaged” (U. S. Navy 1928:1203). This demolition presumably included the West Wing Extension; in any case, a 1929 map (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Roll 581, Frame 257) shows only six of the original 36 barracks in the West Wing Extension still standing. This map depicts the cemetery as it was shown during World War I. A 1933 map (Figure 13) reveals that by that

Figure 13. Detail of the 1933 U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey map of Parris Island, compiled from aerial photographs, showing the vicinity of 38BU1895B (arrow).
date the buildings of the West Wing Extension were entirely gone. The cemetery is not labeled in 1933, but it appears as a discrete wooded area matching the shape depicted on various earlier maps. This suggests that the cemetery was not substantially disturbed by the construction, use, or demolition of the West Wing Extension.

While the cemetery, 38BU1895B, appears to have been intact in 1933, the civilian African American community it served (or once served) had been relocated off of Parris Island. The last residents were removed from the island in 1938, but burials in the cemetery may have ceased much earlier, perhaps in 1917 or 1918, when the Marines began using the area. Although 38BU1895B was not directly impacted by World War I construction as was the “Means” cemetery (see Chapter 6), it may have been considered within active Marine Corps territory and no longer appropriate for civilian burials.

The sites of the World War I East and West Wings were built over once again during World War II, and have remained developed since. The old West Wing Extension area, however, was substantially undeveloped until after World War II. Several maps show that the only construction on the site in the period 1941-1946 was Building 852, a radio facility, which was located well northeast of the cemetery, at about the location of the current Public Works office building (e.g. the Rutter Map, 1943) (Figure 14) (Carlson 1941; USACE 1999b:G18, Watkins 1946). All of the World War II-era maps show that the 1918 loop road defining the old West Wing Extension was intact, while none of the maps indicate the cemetery. At some time between June, 1946, and June, 1953, a complex of eight structures was built on the southwestern end of the West Wing Extension site, some of which impacted the southern and eastern edges of the cemetery, 38BU1895B (USACE 1999b:G18; Smith 1953). The buildings depicted on a 1953 map (Smith) include the warehouses presently standing (Buildings 855, 856, 865, 866 and 867), as well as a group of three somewhat smaller structures located in the southwest angle of the 1918 loop road, in the now heavily wooded area southwest of the cemetery. By 1966 the three smaller buildings had been removed, and an additional warehouse (Building 869) had been added between Buildings 865 and 866 (Figure 15).

There are currently no surface indications of the cemetery, 38BU1895B. At some point, the site was landscaped, and all surface evidence including grave markers, grave sinks, and grave goods was eliminated. Archaeological evidence (below) suggests that shallow grading of the topsoil was employed to achieve the fairly smooth, featureless surface now seen at 38BU1895B, but it is not clear when the work was done. World War I is, of course, the first possibility. We know from military headstone records and cemetery records that the remains of at least four Civil War veterans were removed from “Fuller Cemetery” on Parris Island to the Beaufort National Cemetery in 1918 (NARA RG 92, MF #1845; Beaufort National Cemetery) (Chapter 9). These men now lie adjacent to fellow veterans removed from the Means cemetery in 1918, when that cemetery was built over during construction of the Maneuver Grounds hospital (Chapter 6). This suggests that the “Fuller” cemetery, almost certainly 38BU1895B, was similarly erased at the same time, a theory supported by the absence of the cemetery from the USMC “Depot Cemeteries” memorandum (USMC 1968) (see Chapter 1).
Figure 14. Detail of the 1943 Rutter map of Parris Island, showing the vicinity of 38BU1895B (arrow).
Figure 15. Detail of a 1966-1972 Bureau of Yards and Docks map of Parris Island showing the vicinity of 38BU1895B (arrow).
As discussed above, the hardwood grove apparently defining the cemetery was mapped and very deliberately avoided during the construction of the West Wing Extension. It is possible that at least some of the markers and obvious grave goods were removed in 1918. The demolition of the West Wing Extension, circa 1927, is another possibility for the landscaping, but again, the cemetery woods appears intact on the 1933 map (Figure 13). Perhaps the most likely time for the landscaping of the cemetery is after World War II, when the warehouse complex was built. Woodrow Garvin (personal communication 2001) remembers stone markers being present at this cemetery in the late 1940s, but they were removed soon after. Two of the buildings and the access road accompanying them actually impacted graves, suggesting that knowledge of the nature and extent of the site had faded. An earlier removal of grave markers and grave goods would have left the cemetery nearly invisible even before the site was graded and partially built over. By the 1990s, knowledge of the very existence of the cemetery was lost, at least among the many long-serving Parris Island personnel consulted by historians and archaeologists in the last several years.

Archaeological Methods

Site Designations

The focus of the field work conducted in September, 2000 was the confirmation and delineation of the corrected location of the cemetery designated “Cemetery #1” by PanAmerican Consultants, Inc. (Hayward and Steinback 1997:69-70, 126-129). The “Cemetery #1” designation was used during the field work, and South Carolina site numbers were assigned afterward. In this case, a site (the cemetery) was situated entirely within the area of a larger site (the World War I West Wing Extension). Mr. Keith Derting, who assigns South Carolina site numbers, determined that while the two components were unrelated, they should share a site number because of their geographic overlap. Thus the World War I site was designated 38BU1895A, while “Cemetery #1” became 38BU1895B. These distinctions are indicated on the Site Inventory Record on file in the State Archaeological Site Files at SCIAA.

Field Methods

Chapter 1 covers the general field and lab methods employed during the Parris Island cemetery project. Site-specific methodological details for 38BU1895B are discussed below.

Mapping. South and DePratter created a base map for the site (Figure 16). Because there are no known USGS survey markers located near the site, five reference points were established in the area surrounding the cemetery; each of these points consisted of a section of rebar. Reference Points 1, 3, 4, and 5 are shown on Figure 16; Reference Point 2 is located in the paved lot to the north of 38BU1895B. Transit data were shot from these points, and the base map was drawn using these transit shots. Grid north runs on the line connecting Reference Points 1 and 5 with point 5 being at the north end of this line. Grid north is 45 degrees east of magnetic north.
Figure 16. 38BU1895B. Site map.
During excavations, transit shots were taken and the individual trenches were plotted onto the base map. Once excavations were completed and the margins of the cemetery were determined, Marshall Owens, Parris Island base archaeologist, took GPS readings and plotted the cemetery outline on the island base map.

**Ground Penetrating Radar.** Prior to excavations on the site, a portion of the cemetery was investigated using ground penetrating radar and conductivity (Figures 17, 18). This work was by a team consisting of Dr. Ervan Garrison and Ms. Nina Şerman, University of Georgia, and Dr. Kent Schneider, National Forest Service.

The radar unit employed in this survey was a Geophysical Survey Systems Inc. (GSSI) model SIR-2 equipped with a 400 MHz antenna set to 60nS. Raw GPR data was coupled with GPR-Time Slice software to produce amplitude time slice plan views in an effort to map cemetery boundaries and individual graves within the cemetery. Another instrument, a GEM 300 multi-frequency soil conductivity meter, was used in an effort to confirm GPR data and more firmly establish cemetery boundaries.
Figure 18. 38BU1895B. Site map showing the area of the Ground Penetrating Radar and conductivity surveys.
Both the ground penetrating radar and conductivity surveys were conducted in the 150 ft$^2$ (13.9 m$^2$) survey block indicated on Figure 18. Unfortunately, neither radar nor conductivity defined individual graves or cemetery boundaries. The unsatisfactory results may have been caused by high water table or unknown soil characteristics.

Backhoe Trenching. The search area for the cemetery, 38BU1895B, was suggested entirely by historic map evidence; there were no surface indications that a cemetery existed on the site. Thus, placement of the first few trenches was intended to simply confirm the presence of graves. Trenches were excavated to the base of the topsoil/disturbed soil zone; at that point, grave outlines were clearly visible and excavations were terminated to avoid grave disturbance. Trenches were laid out with tapes and pin flags in increments of 10 ft (3 m). Each continuous trench was assigned a simple, sequential provenience number regardless of length, with each 10-foot segment receiving a letter designation. Thus “Trench 5B” denotes the second 10 ft segment in the fifth trench excavated. Trenches were 1.5 ft (.46 m) wide, the dimension dictated by the width of the backhoe bucket. Trench depth varied with the thickness of the topsoil or fill horizons encountered. In the absence of fill, features could be identified at a depth of 1.0 to 1.8 feet (0.3 to 0.5 m) after hand cleaning with flat shovels and trowels (Figure 20). No vertical distinctions were recognized in the removal of the topsoil (see “Stratigraphy”). In some cases, (Trenches 1, 2, 3, 5, 18, 22 and 24) extensions were excavated beyond the original trench walls in order to clarify possible grave features. All graves and other features were drawn using a survey tape pulled from a nail at one end of the trench as a centerline. Each 10-foot segment was recorded on an excavation data form, with the measured drawing on the reverse. Each

Figure 19. 39BU1895B. Backhoe and power screens at Trench 11; view to the southwest.
trench was mapped with transit shots at either end of the centerline. Trenches 1 through 28 were excavated in September, 2000, while Trenches 29 through 33 were dug in June, 2001, during the second season of the cemetery project. The total length of test trenching at 38BU1895B was 1,036.5 ft (315.9 m).

Artifact Recovery

Field work at 38BU1895B began with the details of artifact recovery unsettled. It was not known if the site was covered with fill or had been deeply disturbed on the one hand, or perhaps held dense deposits of grave goods, or significant, intact prehistoric components on the other. We began by screening 50% of the soil from Trench 1A, which proved to be both disturbed and heavily laden with concrete rubble and other twentieth century debris. The 50% sample was tentatively adopted as a standard sufficient to characterize the various cultural components present. There were no instances which called for increasing the sample, but a number of trenches which encountered deep fill or stripped surfaces were not screened at all. Trenches 29 and 30 were excavated later, after a 100% sample was made standard for cemetery project trenching, and all of the fill from those trenches was screened. The artifact catalog (Appendix IV) includes the sample percentage from each provenience. Screening was accomplished with gasoline-powered screens with heavy ¼-inch wire mesh. The project area was densely strewn with twentieth century architectural debris and other bulk materials including gravel, cinders, coal, and shell of uncertain origin. These materials were sampled to record...
presence but were not quantified. Shell was sampled by species, but otherwise it was not retained or quantified.

**Photography**

Photographic documentation included formal photos of several grave features and work shots illustrating field methods and the appearance of various parts of the site. Three cameras were used, including 35mm cameras shooting color prints and color slides, and a digital camera. The depot archaeologist also photographed the project.

**Lab Methods**

The general lab methods for the cemetery project are discussed in Chapter 1. Details specific to 38BU1895B are detailed below.

Like the other sites investigated later in the project, 38BU1895B exhibited several essentially unrelated cultural components. The component groups established for the catalogs vary from site to site within the overall Parris Island cemetery project. In the case of 38BU1895B, the component groups include Native American, 18th/19th Century Plantation, Cemetery, 20th Century USMC and Non-diagnostic. Clearly these are not all mutually exclusive categories, and the system requires some degree of arbitrary and/or subjective assignment. Cut nails, for example, are assigned to 18th/19th Century Plantation as a “best fit,” while manganese glass container fragments are assigned to the Cemetery group as probable grave goods, rather than to 20th Century USMC. This is because there was very little kitchen-related material in the WWI era USMC material, while manganese glass containers are common grave goods. The current catalog provides a reasonable impression of the components present in a provenience.

Materials which were clearly grave goods were reburied in the cemetery in December, 2000. Some of the original digital artifact photos for this chapter were later lost to a computer virus, leaving us with only the poor quality image used for Figure 31.

**Results**

The 33 backhoe trenches excavated in and around 38BU1895B allowed identification of cemetery boundaries. The cemetery was confirmed where it was shown on historic maps (Figures 7, 11, and 13), and the outline as we determined it was quite close to the teardrop shape shown on those same maps. The cemetery area was found to have a variety of prehistoric and historic archaeological components, but only the twentieth century Marine Corps usage can be described as intensive.

**Stratigraphy**

Generally, 38BU1895B exhibited about 0.8 to 1.2 ft (0.2 to 0.4 m) of dark, gray-brown loamy sand, fading to pale yellow sand subsoil. While the topsoil was often disturbed for much of its depth, there were no indications of a plow zone; the transition from topsoil to subsoil was natural, and no plow scars or agricultural ditches were detected. This would be in keeping with
an early cemetery established in a wooded area not previously cleared and cultivated. The cemetery area presented a fairly level appearance, with no sign of grave sinks or grave mounds (much less grave markers), and it had clearly been landscaped. In profile, much of the topsoil had a distinctly disturbed appearance, as if subjected to grading, but not so deep as to mix topsoil and subsoil. In most areas a humus/sod zone was visible that post-dated the general disturbance. In some locations (exposed in Trenches 3, 5, and 14) heavy equipment tire tracks penetrated into the subsoil, leaving features that may date to the landscaping (these tracks were not visible on the surface). The appearance of the topsoil was not inconsistent with the disturbance dating to the period of warehouse construction, between 1946 and 1953 (USACE 1999b:G18; Smith 1953).

Some areas were far more disturbed. Trenches 8, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29 and 30 were missing much or all of the topsoil component and exhibited mixed, disturbed soils topped with modern gravel and asphalt (Figure 16). Trenches 12 and 13 were deeply filled with re-deposited sand and clay subsoils. Trench 12 excavations stopped at about 2.5 ft (0.8 m) in depth, while Trench 13 encountered poorly drained, white sand subsoil at about 2 ft (0.6 m). These trenches may have been in a low area that was scraped and filled to facilitate construction in either 1918 or 1946-1953. Trenches 31, 32, and 33 revealed fill mixed with concrete rubble and other destruction debris. Trench 31 featured about a foot of topsoil mixed with concrete chunks, overlying at least 2.5 ft of re-deposited yellow-tan subsoil; the bottom of the fill was not reached. Trench 32 encountered such heavy concrete rubble that excavations were stopped at about a foot. Trench 33 featured heavy rubble and fill to at least 2.9 ft (0.8 m). Rubble and fill in Trenches 31, 32, and 33 may be from the World War I hospital shown on maps at this location.

The Cemetery Component

Grave Distribution and Density. The methods employed in the cemetery project were not conducive to the collection of detailed grave distribution information. As discussed in Chapter 1, the goal was to establish approximate and generous boundaries for the unmarked cemeteries, and extensive testing within the cemeteries was limited. In a real sense, negative test trenches, not grave stains, comprised the sought-after information.

A total of 56 grave features were identified in the test trenches, distributed over a known area 240 ft (73.15 m) north-south by 160 ft east-west (48.77 m). A rough extrapolation of total numbers was made by reproducing the appearance of the grave densities in positive trenches over the area of the cemetery and an estimate of 450 to 500 graves was derived. Figures 21-25, which include all soil disturbances, show localized crowding in some parts of the cemetery, while other areas appear less heavily used. Seemingly unnecessary clumping may actually represent family or community groups. Crowded areas exhibit many instances of later graves intruding upon earlier graves, and re-deposited bone fragments were occasionally observed. The intrusions are generally marginal, however, at least within the limited “windows” of the sample. This suggests that some semblance of rows and spacing was maintained over the many years of the cemetery’s use, and that blatant reuse of earlier grave locations was proscribed. Probable early graves were found scattered throughout the cemetery with the exception of a concentration in the southwestern corner (Trenches 22 and 26), while those of later appearance are confined to
Figure 21. 38BU1895B. Trenches 1-3.
Figure 22. 38BU1895B. Trenches 5, 6, 9, & 13.
Figure 23. 38BU1895B. Trenches 15-18.
Figure 24. 38BU1895B. Trenches 19, 22, 25, & 26.
Figure 25. 38BU1895B. Trenches 27, 29 & 30.
the southern third of the cemetery. Again, the cemetery boundary generated by our trenching does not necessarily encompass all burials. There may be scattered “outliers” in any direction that are too thinly distributed to have been encountered by our limited trenching.

**Grave Morphology.** Only two of the 56 grave outlines identified were completely exposed, but several others were sufficiently cleared to provide some idea of their size and shape. A very general chronology was suggested, derived from observations of grave shapes, edge preservation, and fill soil. While this would be an overgeneralization based on the small 38BU1895B sample alone, the chronology was supported by observations in the other three Parris Island cemeteries (Chapters 4, 5, and 6). Several graves exhibiting very diffuse feature edges also contained mottled fill containing gray and brown topsoil elements mixed with pale gray and tan subsoils. Where dimensions could be discerned, these graves were relatively narrow, and were not particularly symmetrical. The grave shown in Figure 26 is enlarged at the east end, while the grave illustrated in Figure 27 is quite irregular. We suggest that these are older graves of individuals buried in shrouds or narrow coffins. At the opposite extreme are

![Figure 26. 38BU1895B. Grave feature in Trenches 2C and 3A; view to the south.](image-url)
large, formally dug, rectangular graves with crisp feature edges, and often relatively clean subsoil fill. Individuals in these graves may have been buried deeper in large, rectangular coffins or caskets. Many graves actually fall somewhere in between these models, or were not revealed sufficiently to characterize. The graves of small children are not considered in this comparison; the several observed exhibit dark, topsoil fill, suggesting that the remains may be quite shallow.

A grave in Trench 5G had a mortared brick marker base or foundation at its west end (Figure 28). The grave feature in this case had the well-preserved edges and dark but brightly mottled fill indicative of a relatively late grave. The length of the grave was undetermined, but its width suggested a child’s burial, or perhaps an adult in a shroud. The bricks used in the foundation appeared hand made, probably of eighteenth or nineteenth century manufacture, and were re-used. The topsoil in the immediate vicinity of the grave included several bricks and brick fragments representing at least one additional course that had been broken away when the site was graded. This was the only evidence for grave markers of any sort discovered at 38BU1895B, with the possible exception of the porcelain dog figurine from Trench 5D/5E (Figure 33).
Figure 28. 38BU1895B. Grave feature with brick marker base in Trench 5G; view to the south.

Figure 29. 38BU1895B. Grave features in Trench 6; view to the north.
Grave Goods. Only two of the 56 graves exposed by trenching in 38BU1895B had grave goods in situ, although an additional collection of probable grave goods was derived from general, disturbed context in the topsoil without direct association with burials. The relative scarcity of grave goods at 38BU1895B suggests either that the graves there were sparsely decorated, or that landscaping, perhaps during post-World War II construction, removed most of the surface material. The relative abundance of grave goods in the other Parris Island cemeteries argues for the latter explanation.

A grave in Trench 6B exhibited a deposit of grave goods including two manganese glass food bottles, two clear glass medicine bottles, five manganese glass medicine bottles, and two manganese glass tumblers; these artifacts date to ca. 1900 (Figures 30 and 31). The deposit continued into the east wall of the Trench 6B, but the remainder was not excavated and the full extent of the deposit is unknown. Most of the 11 vessels were essentially complete and several were undamaged, and there was at least a suggestion in their arrangement that they were originally oriented upside down. The deposit was buried or pressed into the clean, yellow, redeposited sub-soil of the grave fill and was not discovered until the grave feature was being cleaned; the objects were sufficiently deep that they were probably not visible on the surface of the new grave. Two of the medicine bottles retained portions of their contents, including a white powder or precipitate in one case, and small, purple, spherical pills in the other example. Samples of both substances were removed and curated, but neither has been analyzed.

The only other instance of in situ material was a broken, plain whiteware bowl found on a grave in Trench 15C (Figure 32). This vessel continued into the trench wall and was not completely exposed, but the bowl appeared to be broken in place, and was inverted. As noted above, additional grave goods and probable grave goods were recovered from general, topsoil context. These items included fragments of several pressed glass objects including a lamp base, fragments of medicine bottles, and a molded porcelain dog figurine (Figures 33 and 34). The dog retained traces of mortar on its base, suggesting that it may have adorned a grave marker and was not in the same “grave goods” category as the other material discussed here.

Figure 30. 38BU1895B. Grave feature with grave goods deposit in situ, Trenches 6A/6B; view to the south.
Figure 31. 38BU1895B. Grave goods from the deposit in Trenches 6A/6B.

Figure 32. 38BU1895B. Portion of a whiteware bowl from a grave feature in Trench 15C.
Figure 33. 38BU1895B. Porcelain dog figurine from Trenches 5D/5E.

Figure 34. 38BU1895B. Manganese pressed glass lamp base from Trenches 3E/3F.
Other Components

In excavations to determine the margins of the cemetery, artifacts representing other occupational components were recovered. These artifacts represented several prehistoric occupations, a sparse plantation component, the World War I component derived from the construction and use of the West Wing Extension, and a scatter of post World War I material.

Native American. The 38BU1895B site area contained only a sparse scatter of Native American artifacts. Although the components present span a period of at least 4,000 years, there does not seem to have been any time when the area was intensively occupied (Table 1). See Appendix I for a discussion of prehistoric material recovered from this and other cemeteries.

The earliest confirmed occupation of the 38BU1895B vicinity dates to the Stallings Period (c. 2200 to 1100 B.C.). Stallings Plain sherds were present in two trenches; Trench 2 contained a single sherd and Trench 25 contained 17 sherds. The concentration of sherds in Trench 25 may be associated with a structure, as a faint feature stain resembling a portion of a wall trench was recorded (Figure 24). Nearly all of the Stallings sherds from this trench show signs of having been used as hones. These hones were probably used to shape and polish the bone pins which are commonly found in Stallings shell midden sites.

The Refuge/Deptford Periods (1100 B.C. to A.D. 500) were represented by a total of only nine identifiable sherds found in Trenches 5, 17, and 29. Five of these sherds were Refuge Plain and four were Deptford Check Stamped. The majority of these sherds were found in Trench 29 at the south end of the site, so there may have been a structure or an unidentified activity area located there. Extensive Marine Corps disturbance associated with the hospital that once occupied that part of the site would have destroyed such a structure if one had been present. A Woodland projectile point, provisional type “F” (Charles 1981) found in Trench 17, may also be associated with the Refuge/Deptford occupation of the site (see Appendix I).

The most extensive and intensive utilization of the 38BU1895B area occurred during the St. Catherines Period (A.D. 1000 to 1200). St. Catherines sherds were found in nine trenches (Trenches 1, 2, 4, 6, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 28) scattered across the area tested, suggesting that the site may have been the location of intermittent occupation over the 100-year span of the St. Catherines Period. A light shell midden with St. Catherines sherds and three possible post holes in association was found in Trench 19 (Figure 24), suggesting a house location.

The Irene Period (A.D. 1325 to 1700) was represented by only three sherds that were found in Trenches 1 and 29. The small number of Irene sherds present suggests that this part of the island was not used intensively during this period.
Table 1. Native American Pottery Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>A.D. 1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Harbor</td>
<td>A.D. 1580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>A.D. 1425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah II</td>
<td>A.D. 1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah I</td>
<td>A.D. 1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines</td>
<td>St. Catherines</td>
<td>A.D. 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>A.D. 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthour</td>
<td>A.D. 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford</td>
<td>Deptford II</td>
<td>A.D. 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford I</td>
<td></td>
<td>400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Refuge III</td>
<td>900 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge II</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1100 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallings</td>
<td>Stallings II</td>
<td>1700 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallings I</td>
<td></td>
<td>2200 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the pottery and projectile point discussed above, there were several other Native American items found during our excavations. Two small triangular projectile points, one made of chert (Trench 3) and one of mudstone (Trench 22), and a third point fragment made of quartz (Trench 30), are probably associated with either the St. Catherines or Irene Period occupations, although they may have been lost by hunters at some other date (See Appendix I). A portion of a ground stone tool (Trench 21) made of argillite could have been made and used during any of the site’s multiple occupations. Likewise, a crystal quartz flake (Trench 29) and a quartz chunk (Trench 4) could have been dropped on the site at any time in the past several thousand years.

Plantation/Postbellum Eras. As discussed above, the plantation complex most directly associated with 38BU1895B was located about 600 yards east-northeast of the cemetery. This substantial distance is reflected in the dearth of material recovered from the cemetery that can be assigned to an eighteenth/nineteenth century plantation occupation. The collection from that period is limited to a yellow slipware sherd, four pearlware sherds, four dark olive green bottle fragments, two smoking pipe fragments, a faceted, blue glass bead, six cut nail fragments and a horse shoe fragment. This suggests that there was indeed no domestic occupation near the cemetery during the plantation period, and also supports the observation (Chapter 2) that the Sea Island practice of leaving vessels and other goods on graves was a late-nineteenth century development or revival. The few small, widely scattered fragments of earlier objects recovered in the cemetery clearly do not reflect the placement of intact or nearly intact vessels or bottles on graves.

The old Fuller School Farm property on which the cemetery was located was not subdivided before its seizure by the U.S. in 1918, and no evidence of tenant occupation has been found. It appears unlikely that anyone lived immediately adjacent to the cemetery in the postbellum period, and in any case the material evidence for such a presence would be impossible to sort from the plantation and cemetery (i.e., grave goods) collections.

Marine Corps. The World War I era West Wing Extension (38BU1895A) was heavily represented in the test trench collection (Figure 35; Appendix IV). As the cemetery was deliberately avoided during construction, most of our test trenches fell in areas that were not actually built over in 1918. Exceptions were Trenches 29-33, which were on or near the West Wing Extension hospital site, and Trench 1, in which we encountered a large posthole that is probably related to the latrine/bath house located northeast of the cemetery. Raking and probing revealed an array of concrete rubble and iron pipes just north of Trench 1 (Figure 16). Architectural material was abundant across the site, however, reflecting both the construction and the salvage demolition of the complex between 1918 and ca. 1927. This material included wire nails, gravel, concrete rubble, electrical and plumbing hardware and tarpaper fragments. A number of porcelain “knob and tube” electrical wiring insulators were recovered, artifacts identical to those found in abundance on the WWI era “Maneuver Grounds” site at Santa Elena (Figures 35A, B; see chapter 7) (Bock 1989:27, 28; DePratter and South 1995:67).

Diagnostic WWI era military material was noticeably less common at 38BU1895A than at the Maneuver Grounds, probably a reflection of the relatively light use of the West Wing Extension. Only a single USMC button, an example of the enlisted men’s overcoat size, was
recovered (Figure 35K) (Albert 1976:111). Equipment hardware included a brass web strap end (Figure 35J) and a web snap of the type using the USMC button die for the face. Both are artifacts of the “Infantry Equipment, Model of 1910,” as used by the Marine Corps during World War I (U.S. War Department 1917).

A total of 31 ordnance artifacts were found generally scattered over the area tested, including cartridges and cartridge cases bearing dates and a variety of manufacturer’s codes (Vivas 1993:10, 86, 90, 91). Three unfired .45 caliber ACP cartridges were found, all dated 1918 (Figure 35H). These are not surprising finds given the close proximity of a pistol range even before the construction of the West Wing Extension. Two fired and one unfired .30’06 blank cartridge cases were found, dated 1908 and 1909 (Figure 35F). These are blanks for the Model 1903 Springfield Rifle used by the Marine Corps, and are probably artifacts of the trench and bayonet training area (apparently a simulated assault course) located just south of the West Wing Extension (Figure 11). An assortment of components from ball (live) .30’06 ammunition was recovered, including one unfired cartridge, five fired cartridge cases, 14 fired and unfired bullets, and three unfired cartridge cases with the bullets deliberately removed. Eight of the .30’06 cases were dated 1918, one was dated 1917 (Figure 35E-G). These are fairly strong evidence for the occupation of the West Wing Extension by units undergoing the rifle range phase of basic training. Ball rifle ammunition was distributed and fired only at the rifle range, and only during the range phase of the training cycle. Ball rifle ammunition components are virtually absent from the Maneuver Grounds, site of a training phase which preceded the rifle range. Three brass, five-round stripper clips were recovered which were appropriate for either ball or blank .30’06 cartridges (Figure 35I). Other ordnance artifacts include a hand grenade pin (Figure 35D), and a “Three-In-One Oil” bottle (Figure 35L). “Three-In-One Oil” was used as gun oil during World War I (Strand 1972), and the bottles are common finds at the Maneuver Grounds.

The close proximity of 38BU1895B to the Parris Island Recycling Center (Building 867) and various Public Works facilities and yards has left a remarkably diverse array of mid to late twentieth century trash on the site. This material includes electrical components, plumbing fittings, mechanical parts, metal scrap, plastic fragments, broken Coke bottles and brown beer bottles, and other items which will not be discussed here, but which are listed in the artifact catalog (Appendix IV).

Conclusions

Research by the authors led to the discovery that there was an unmarked cemetery located near the recycling center on the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island. Given the size, location, and condition of this cemetery, it is believed to contain graves of African Americans who occupied the island from the early 18th to the early 20th century. A total of 56 graves were exposed in excavated trenches. Spacing and distribution of graves encountered during excavations suggest that 38BU1895B contains approximately 400 to 500 burials.

No grave markers were observed on the surface of the site prior to excavation. If any were present in the past, they may have been removed during the World War I construction of
Figure 35. 38BU1895. World War I era USMC artifacts.  

the West Wing Extension barracks complex that surrounded the cemetery, or after World War II when the extant buildings on the site were constructed. Sea Island African American cemeteries dating to the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries typically have large numbers of items including ceramics, bottles, metal pots, and other utilitarian objects on the surfaces. Only two of the 56 graves encountered during excavations exhibited associated artifacts. The general scarcity of such items in 38BU1895B indicates that either this practice was not followed by local residents, or that landscaping, perhaps during modern construction on the site, led to removal of both grave goods and any headstones or other grave markers. Virtually no European artifacts dating prior to the 1870s were found during excavations.

During excavations, evidence of other, non-cemetery uses of the area was recovered. A variety of prehistoric artifacts, including ceramic sherds and three projectile points, were found scattered across the site area. These artifacts indicate site use between 4000 and 500 years ago. USMC artifacts including buttons, web equipment hardware, cartridges and construction debris all date to the World War I use of the area. Remains of a latrine/bath house building dating to that same era were found near the north end of the cemetery.

In summary, 38BU1895B appears to be an African American cemetery that probably began as a slave cemetery in the eighteenth century, and certainly saw major use in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The cemetery, as delineated, covers approximately 0.8 acres. It is possible that some graves are located beyond the outline indicated on Figure 16, because this cemetery was likely an unfenced grove of trees at the time of its use, and burials could have been made outside the cluster.
Chapter 4

38BU39/1619: EDINGS CEMETERY

This cemetery is one of the four known cemeteries on the island. It appears on Marine Corps era maps, it is mentioned in the 1968 cemetery memo cited earlier (Chapter I), and it has been included in previous archaeological reports concerning Parris Island. Despite all of this information, the cemetery and its history remain poorly known (Figure 36 and 37). What we knew about this site when we began work there was limited to information published by Hendryx and his colleagues (1997:139-41) and the USMC “Depot Cemeteries” memorandum (USMC 1968). Hendryx et al. (1997:140) identify the cemetery as “well-marked;” they note that it contained six marked graves dating to 1919 to 1927. Overall dimensions were reported as 75m by 40m (246 ft by 131 ft) based on the dimensions of an oval drawn to include the six marked graves. At no point in their discussion do Hendryx et al. suggest that there may be additional graves in this cemetery. They conclude their discussion by stating that “the site does not warrant further testing, [and] the area should be avoided at all costs” (Hendryx et al. 1997:140).

The 1968 memo (USMC) cites Robert Bee, long-time island resident, as stating that when the Marines developed the Maneuver Grounds on the south end of the island as a World War I training facility, island residents were told to stop using the cemetery near Nivers Beach (believed to mean 38BU162—see Chapter 6). Instead they were to use two other cemeteries, one at Elliotts Beach (believed to be 38BU1618—see Chapter 5) and the other northeast of the rifle range; this latter placement fits with the location of 38BU39/1619. The fact that five of the six marked graves in the Edings cemetery post-date 1918 suggests there was some use of this cemetery as requested by the Marines.

Figure 36. 38BU39/1619. View to the northwest, from a point southeast of the cemetery.
Figure 37. 38BU39/1619. Site map.
Based on work by Hendryx et al. (1997), this cemetery was assigned site number 38BU1619. A nearby prehistoric/historic site previously had been identified as 38BU39. As originally described, site 38BU39 was located approximately 0.2 mi. northeast of the cemetery. Subsequent archaeological testing by Brockington and Associates (Butler et al. 1995:107-116), Panamerican Consultants (Hendryx et al. 1997:142-151), and Hardlines Design Company (Brandon and Sewell 2002) expanded the boundaries of 38BU39 to the point where it overlaps the cemetery, 38BU1619, on its south end and from there it extends roughly three-quarters of a mile north along Wake Boulevard. The overlap of these two sites, 38BU39 and 38BU1619, is the reason for the compound site number used in this report.

This cemetery is located on a small knoll located approximately 120 ft (37 m) west of Wake Boulevard near the eastern margin of the rifle range (Figure 36). The knoll, an unusual landform for the area, is about one acre in extent and rises approximately three feet above the surrounding landscape. Six graves, grouped into three clusters, are present on top of this knoll (Figures 37 and 38).

**Figures 38.** 38BU39/1619. Gravestones.
The largest cluster of graves, located on the southwestern end of the knoll, contains three graves (Figure 37). These graves were numbered 4 to 6 by Hendryx and his colleagues (Hendryx et al. 1997:140), and those numbers are retained here. Inscriptions on these stones are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave 4 (Figure 38D)</th>
<th>Grave 5 (Figure 38E)</th>
<th>Grave 6 (Figure 38F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6430</td>
<td>[Masonic symbol; eye with chain links]</td>
<td>[Angel] CHAS STEPHENS 1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[unreadable]</td>
<td>CARPENTER MITCHELL 1847</td>
<td>AUG. 21, 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APR. 27, 1922</td>
<td>Asleep in Jesus blessed thought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two other graves were located adjacent to one another on the south central periphery of the cemetery. Inscriptions on these two graves are as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave 1 (Figure 38A)</th>
<th>Grave 2 (Figure 38B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CYLER LYDIA CYLER APR. 10, 1879 OCT. 7, 1927</td>
<td>PATIENCE BARNWELL 1868-1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of such is the kingdom of heaven</td>
<td>ERECTED BY SISTER NANCY SINGLETON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final marked grave in this cemetery is located in the edge of the woods along its southeastern margin. The inscription on this gravestone is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave 3 (Figure 38C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A SOLDIER ROBERT SANDERS OCT. 12, 1902 OCT. 17, 1919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past there were certainly other grave markers present. The 1968 memo (USMC 1968) reports that less durable markers were simply tossed aside as they deteriorated. In addition, an undated photo shows a cross standing near the cluster containing graves 1 and 2 (Alvarez 2002). A wooden cross currently housed in the Parris Island Museum may be the same marker visible in this photograph. (Steve Wise, Parris Island Museum, personal communication, Feb. 6, 2003).
History

Plantation and Postbellum Eras

The plantation associated with the cemetery at 38BU39/1619 is the least well documented of the four major properties covered in this study. Ultimately called the Edings (or Eddings) plantation, the plantation had its origins in the division of the John Delabare property in 1739. As detailed in Chapters 3 and 6, Alexander Parris granted the northern portion (about 40%) of Parris Island to his son-in-law John Delabare in 1722. Delabare began a plantation on the property, but his plantation complex was almost certainly located well north of the future Edings plantation, on what became Fuller property in the nineteenth century. On his death in 1739, John Delabare’s property was left to be divided between his sons John Kennered (or Kennerd) Delabare and George Delabare; each son was to receive 682.5 acres, and presumably a share of their father’s 40 slaves as well. Both sons were minors in 1739, and the actual division did not take place until 1758, when George Delabare chose to sell his share of the plantation to Thomas Wigg Delabare. Wigg purchased the north end of Parris Island, including 38BU1895B, while John Kennered Delabare retained the tract to the southwest, including the present rifle range complex and 38BU39/1619 (Webber 1925:143).

J. K. Delabare’s acreage also included Horse Island and Sheep Island, but he sold these in 1758 to Drury Dunn, of Virginia, who owned several tracts of land in and around Granville County (Rowland et al. 1996; South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH), Granville County Land Records, 21 May 1763). By 1773 these two islands were owned by John Barnwell (Chapter 6), who sold them to a Jacob Deveaux, of Savannah, for 1300 pounds (Rowland et al. 1996:177, 178). At some point the islands became Edings property, as they were purchased from William Edings by Thomas Fuller in 1853 (Chapter 3).

The plantation tract including 38BU39/1619 presumably was developed some time after 1758, during the tenure of John Kennered Delabare, although we have found no information regarding its creation or operation. In 1759, Delabare sold 88 acres of his property to Thomas Wigg, with the tract described confusingly as “bounding N.W. on formerly George Delabare, now Thomas Wigg” (Webber 1925:143). Northeast would work better than northwest here, but in any case, the tract appears to be the northernmost 88 acres of J. K. Delabare’s 682.5 acre share. The new, 1759 northern boundary separating the Delabare and Wigg properties may be the “Old Line” shown on the 1869 tax map, running northwest to southeast, a few hundred feet northeast of 38BU39/1619 (Figure 39). In 1768 Delabare sold an additional 160 acres to William Elliott (Chapter 5), described as bounding “S.E. on William Elliot, S.W. on Broad River, N.W. on John Kennard Delabare” (Webber 1925:143). This presumably left Delabare with about 434.5 acres, minus whatever acreage was counted for Horse Island and Sheep Island (above).

John Kennered Delabare died prior to 1787 (SCDAH, Estate Dispositions, Feb. 6. 1787) and his widow Ann married Isaac Rippon in 1791 (Webber 1925:145). While we have no further information regarding the Rippon ownership, it was of sufficient duration to result in the creek defining the northwest edge of the property being named Rippon Creek (since corrupted to “Ribbon” Creek).
Figure 39. Compilation of 1869 Direct Tax Commissioners Section Maps showing Edings plantation and the site of 38BU39/1619 (arrow) based on surveys in 1864-66.
In his autobiography, William J. Grayson (1788-1863) recalled the Rippon plantation from his childhood (Calhoun 1990:42, 43):

[My grandmother] had a neighbor Mrs. Ann Rippon of her own age whose plantation lay on the opposite side of the island, on the Broad River shore, about three miles off…I was a frequent and willing guest at Mrs. Rippon’s. Never was a hostess more devoted to the comfort and enjoyment of her friends or better pleased at having a house full…The finest hams of her own curing, the fattest turkeys of her own raising, the choicest fish and oysters and puddings and pies and dainties without number were marshalled on her dinner table in suitable order…Her plantation abounded in all good things. Her garden was excellent, producing every fruit and vegetable. Oranges were plentiful, figs without number, peaches and pomegranates in profusion. At that time and before people lived on their plantations and all useful and pleasant things flourished accordingly. Now plantations are cotton fields rearing a crop for foreign markets and little more.”

At some point there was an additional subdivision of the Delabare property, perhaps at the time of John Kennered Delabare’s death. In 1793 one Sarah Dill gave to her son Thomas Taylor “one third of a tract of land on ‘Parris’s’ Island, formerly the property of John Kennard Dela Bere” (Webber 1925:143). Unfortunately, we have no idea how or when Sarah Dill acquired the land, nor where it was located, nor the acreage involved. Neither Sarah Dill nor Thomas Taylor reappear in the records we have located.

The old John Kennered Delabare property falls into undocumented oblivion after 1793, and only reemerges in the 1820’s, as the Edings plantation. The Mills’ Atlas map published in 1825 (Figure 5) shows an “Edings” house on Rippon Creek in the northwest portion of the tract, in a location that matches the “Eddings” house shown on the 1869 Direct Tax map (Figure 39). A large domestic site at that location (38BU1402) was tested by Brockington and Associates in 1994. The site yielded a mean ceramic date of 1794.9, and a minimum date range of 1750-1845 (Butler et al. 1995:139-143), which certainly spans the Delabare, Rippon, and Edings occupations.

While it is not known how and when the Parris Island property passed into Edings ownership, it is fairly clear how ownership unfolded after 1833. Butler et al. (1995:41) cite a partial 1824 St. Helena tax roll listing a Joseph Eddings with 1682 acres and 197 slaves. We have found no indication how much of his property was on Parris Island, but an 1857 Elliott plantation boundary description does mention the land to the north “formerly of Joseph Edings now of William Edings” (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File #17570). The memoir of Rev. George Moore, recalling his preaching circuit in ca. 1832, mentions William Eddings as one of five owners of Parris Island, and the only Edings among them (Jones 1960:165). In 1833, Benjamin L. Edings entered into a trusteeship covering his Parris Island property, which was described as an undivided interest of 450 acres in a 650-acre tract, “bounding northerly on the Creek which separates it from Horse Island, South and South-westerly on Broad River; Easterly on lands of Stephen Elliott, and the estate of Haversham...” (NARA RG 123 Box 1052, File #17598).
function of the trust is not known. The trustees were William Seabrook, Joseph D. Edings, and William Edings. Apparently William Edings owned the other 200 acre (or more) share, and planted the entire combined tract. In the 1850 census schedules, William Edings, age 40, is listed with 107 slaves, including “104 on Parris Island,” which would have been a reasonable labor force for 650-odd acres (US Census Bureau 1850b). As discussed above, the Delabare property should have been somewhat less than 435.5 acres after the various eighteenth century sales, but we have no information to suggest how the Edings family ended up with 650 (or more) acres by 1833. An acquisition of Elliott acreage is the best possibility (Chapter 5).

In February, 1859, “Benjamin Edings, wife et al.,” broke the trust governing his 450-acre share of the Edings property in order to sell the land “for a change of investment.” The tract was sold to the Rev. Stephen Elliott and his son Stephen Elliott, Jr. (Chapter 5), for $17,000. The Elliots secured the property with a cash down payment and assumed mortgages totaling $12,825. The property was lost to confiscation in 1863, and both Elliots died in 1866, with the result that the mortgage was never paid. When the Elliott heirs filed for compensation for their various lost properties in the 1890’s, the effort was initially challenged by the Edings heirs, who brought the unpaid mortgage to the attention of both the court and the Elliots. It appears from subsequent documents in the compensation case that an out-of-court settlement was reached between the two families (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File #17598).

The remaining 200 or more acres that remained Edings property “constituted the western portion of Parris Island, bounded by a creek on the north, and south and west by Broad river,” in other words a tract including the Broad River and Rippon Creek shorelines, the old home site at 38BU1402, and probably a slave settlement depicted on Figure 39. The cemetery, 38BU39/1619, was probably located on the Elliott purchase. William Edings was dead by 1860, and his Parris Island property was left to his widow and his son David Scott Edings, who later claimed that his total acreage was 247, not 200. In 1860, Stephen Elliott Jr. paid the taxes on “200 acres in the name of the estate of William Edings,” apparently “as a matter of accommodation” of some sort (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File #17598).

In November, 1861, the Edings plantation, along with the remainder of Parris Island, was abandoned to occupying Federal forces (Chapter 2). In March, 1863, the former Edings plantation was sold to the United States in a tax sale. For some reason, the various Elliott properties on Parris Island, together with the remnant Edings tract, were sold as three separate plantations designated “Elliott Place Nos. 1, 2 and 3.” Elliott Place No. 1 included the 450 acres of Edings land bought by the Elliots from Benjamin Edings in 1859, and the remainder (variously 200, 245 or 247 acres) still in the estate of William Edings. The tax commissioners described Elliott Place No. 1 as containing 695 acres more or less, bounded “Northerly by the Fuller Place, Southerly by the Elliott Place No. 2 [Whale Creek plantation], Easterly by the Fuller Place, Westerly by Broad River and the Elliott Place No. 2” (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File #17598). Figure 40 is a compilation of three 1869 Direct Tax maps, which were based on surveys made 1864-66, and it provides a fair picture of Edings plantation as it was shortly before its demise.
Figure 40. Detail of a variation of the 1869 Direct Tax section map showing lot owners in the Edings plantation vicinity. Cemetery location is in or near red circle.
In addition to the Edings residence on Rippon Creek (38BU1402), it shows a cluster of “Eddings Buildings” to the south, which appears to include at least nine slave houses. The plantation cemetery is not indicated on the original, but it would fall in the southeast corner of the large wooded tract as indicated on Figure 40. The otherwise overwhelmingly open character of the property is apparent. An Elliott heir recalled that “on the entire Edings tract [the 650-plus acres], there was very little woodland; all of the property having been cultivated for a great many years, and the land exceedingly valuable for planting purposes” (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File #17598).

Like the remainder of Parris Island, excepting the two school farms, the former Edings plantation was sold off to Freedmen in 10-acre tracts (Chapter 2). Figure 40 is a slight variation of the 1869 map in Figure 39, with the names of initial purchasers and their “Head of Family” Certificate numbers marked in the 10-acre lots (see Figure 6 and Appendix II). The Freedman community that developed on the former Edings plantation in the years after the Civil War remained undisturbed until the Hurricane of 1893.

The DeRoode Map of 1916 (Figure 41) shows the Freedmen community shortly before its destruction for the new Marine Corps rifle range complex. Some 41 houses appear on the map, as well as a church, the site of which would be under the north end of the former Argonne Trailer Park. The old plantation house on “Ribbon” Creek (38BU1402) appears to be gone, while most of the original plantation roads shown on the 1869 Direct Tax Map (Figure 39) can still be traced. Most of the large woods depicted in 1869 had been felled by 1916, but the cemetery site proper remained conspicuously wooded.

The Marine Corps Era

As discussed in Chapter 2, the wartime expansion of the Marine Corps recruit training effort after April, 1917, resulted in an array of new facilities outside of the old Navy reservation and led, ultimately, to the permanent seizure of the entire island by the United States in August, 1918. In 1918, the former Edings plantation became the site of the new Parris Island rifle range which functions to this day in a much altered and expanded form.

It is not clear exactly when in 1918 the new range was built. A January 30, 1918, map of Parris Island shows no extant or planned Marine Corps facility on the site, while the old rifle range on Ballast Creek is labeled simply “Rifle Range” (National Board of Fire Underwriters [NBFU] 1918). A May 6, 1918, map of “Sites for Extension to Present Marine Corps Reservation” labels the Ballast Creek range as “Existing Rifle Range,” and shows a cluster of buildings marked “Proposed Rifle Range” on the old Edings plantation (USMC 1918b). By August 3, 1918, the range “proposed” in May is labeled “New Rifle Range” (U. S. Navy, Charleston Navy Yard 1918). The new range originally included a 1000-yard rifle range, a 600-yard rifle range, and a pistol range, occupying an area well west-southwest of 38BU39/1619, in the vicinity of the present Khe Sanh (Range A), Hue City (Range B), and Pusan ranges. The orientation of the original ranges was the same as the present versions, pointing northwest toward the Edings house site, 38BU1402, with the broad marsh of Ribbon Creek as a safety zone. The original 1918 complex of support buildings was located at the west corner of the
Figure 41. Detail of the DeRoode map of Parris Island in 1916, showing the location of 38BU39/1619 (arrow).

The developments of 1918 had a profound impact on the African American residents in the vicinity, but their cemetery was probably undisturbed, and indeed its use was encouraged. According to the Robert Bee memorandum (USMC 1968), when the cemetery at 38BU162 (and perhaps that at 38BU1895B?) was closed by the Marine Corps in 1918, residents “were given two additional cemetery sites – one at Elliott’s Beach and the other in the area northeast of the Depot’s rifle ranges.” While this wording suggests that the cemetery at 38BU39/1619 may have been created in 1918, we are reasonably certain that it was in fact a long-established plantation cemetery, maintained by the Freedmen after emancipation (see archaeological discussions, below).

The new rifle range continued in use through the 1920’s, apparently without expansion. In 1931, the original plantation road that followed an indirect route from the old West Wing to the rifle range was bypassed. The new road was a nearly straight extension of present Wake Boulevard, running directly to the range complex. The blueprint for the new road, dated December 17, 1930, includes the earliest labeled depiction of the “Negro Cemetery [sic]” at 38BU39/1619. Figure 51 is an adaptation of a portion of the 1930 blueprint, with the original
labels (U. S. Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks 1930). The 1933 USCGS map of Parris Island (Figure 43) shows the new road, the cemetery woods, and the rifle range complex in essentially its original configuration. World War II brought a major expansion of the range complex. Two 600-yard Ranges, “C’ and “D” (now Chosin and Starlight Ranges), were added, as well as a hand grenade range that nearly encroached on the cemetery (Figure 44). A permanent 500-yard rifle range (Inchon, or Range E) replaced the grenade range and temporary rifle ranges southwest of the cemetery in 1970 (USACE 1999b:7-2, 7-3).

At some point after 1933, the cemetery was cleared of its woods and partially graded, and the areas to the south and west were deeply stripped and landscaped (see archaeological discussion, below). Informant Woodrow Garvin (personal communication, 2001) reported that a warehouse stood on the cemetery knoll in the 1950s and 1960s. The construction or demolition of this structure may have been the occasion for the landscaping. There does not, however, appear to have been any deliberate effort to efface the cemetery. In contrast to 38BU1895B, which was entirely obliterated, 38BU39/1619 was actually tended by the Marine Corps to some degree. Graves with formal, stone markers were delineated with white wooden fences (recently removed), and the area has been regularly mowed and policed.

Archaeological Methods

Mapping

In order to construct a detailed map of the site prior to excavation, three reference points (Figure 37) were established. Two of these points, #1 and #2, were placed along the summit of the knoll; the alignment of these two points defined grid north which was 39 degrees east of magnetic north. The third reference point was positioned to allow mapping of areas to the north and west of the knoll in the event the cemetery extended farther along the tree line in that direction. Once these reference points were in place, transit shots were taken on major landscape features and the marked graves. This information was used to draw the final site base map (Figure 37).

During excavations, transit shots were taken and the individual trenches were plotted onto the base map. Once excavations were completed and the margins of the cemetery were
determined and flagged, Marshall Owens, Parris Island base archaeologist, took GPS readings and plotted the cemetery outline on the island base map.

**Backhoe Trenching**

In the case of 38BU39/1619, the presence of a cemetery on the knoll was confirmed and partially defined by the six marked graves. A backhoe trenching strategy was employed to determine the extent of the cemetery on the knoll and adjacent lower-lying areas (Figure 45). Trenches were placed subjectively, each in turn building on the information already gathered to establish a pattern of positive and negative results (Figure 37). A total of 27 trenches were excavated in the search for the boundaries of this cemetery.
Figure 44. Detail of the Watkins map of Parris Island in 1946, showing the vicinity of 38BU39/1619 (arrow); north to left.
Figure 45. Backhoe trenching southwest of 38BU39/1619, in an area almost entirely stripped of topsoil. View to the southwest.

Trenches were laid out with tapes and pin flags in increments of 10 ft (3 m). Each trench was assigned a sequential provenience number regardless of length, with each 10 ft segment receiving a letter designation. Thus “Trench 5B” denotes the second 10 ft segment in the fifth trench excavated. Trenches were 1.5 ft (0.5 m) wide, the dimension dictated by the width of the backhoe bucket. The teeth of the bucket were covered with a rectangular steel plate that allowed for a smooth, straight cut. Roots were cut by hand to avoid damage to the trench walls and floor. Trench depth varied with the thickness of the topsoil (see Stratigraphy, below).

Features could be identified at a depth of 0.5 to 1.5 ft (0.15 to 0.45 m), after hand cleaning with flat shovels and trowels (Figures 46 and 47). No vertical distinctions were recognized in the removal of the topsoil. In some cases (Trenches 17-19, 22, 26, 27), extensions were excavated beyond the original trench walls in order to clarify possible grave features. All graves and other features were drawn using a survey tape pulled from a nail at one end of the trench as a centerline. Each 10 ft segment was recorded on an excavation data form, with the measured drawing on the reverse. Each trench was mapped with transit shots at either end of the centerline. The 27 trenches were excavated between May 22 and May 31, 2001. The total length of test trenching at 38BU39/1619 was 990 ft (302 m).
Figure 46. Screening and troweling Trench 26 in the woods northeast of 38BU39/1619; view to the northeast.

Figure 47. 38BU39/1619. Screening dry soil at Trench 22; view to the northwest.
Figure 48. 38BU39/1619. Trenches 1, 3, 8, 17, & 18.
Figure 49. 38BU39/1619. Trenches 19, 22, 23, 26, & 27.
Artifact Recovery

38BU39/1619 was not expected to exhibit the disturbance, filling, and rubble/trash deposition encountered at 38BU1895B. We planned, therefore, to screen all trench segments, and perhaps increase the standard sample size above the 50% standard used at 38BU1895B. All fill from the trenches was screened, with the exception of Trenches 3E-G, which were 50% screened. Screening was accomplished with gasoline-powered screens with heavy ¼-inch wire mesh. Portions of the project area included varying densities of shell; the shell was sampled by species, but otherwise not collected or quantified. Intact shell midden was cleaned but not excavated.

Photography

Photographic documentation included formal photos of several prehistoric and historic subsurface features, the six extant grave markers on the site, and work shots illustrating field methods and the appearance of various parts of the site. Three cameras were used, including 35mm cameras shooting color prints and color slides and a digital still camera.

Lab Methods

In the case of 38BU39/1619, the analysis groups included Native American, Spanish(?), 18th/19th Century Plantation, Cemetery, 20th Century USMC and Non-diagnostic. Once again, these are not all mutually exclusive categories, and the system requires some degree of arbitrary and/or subjective assignment. For example, manganese glass container fragments are assigned to the Cemetery group as probable grave goods, rather than to 20th Century USMC, as there was very little or no early twentieth century USMC refuse in the vicinity. Postbellum domestic material is probably present in small amounts, but it would be impossible to sort from grave goods of the same period, and is therefore not a catalog category. The complete catalog for 38BU39/1619 is found in Appendix IV.

Results

Excavations at 38BU39/1619 avoided areas adjacent to the marked graves. Our intent was to discover whether this was a larger cemetery than the six marked graves indicated. With these constraints in mind, we excavated a total of 27 trenches, each 20 to 70 ft (6.1 to 21.3 m) long, around the periphery of the site. This work resulted in identification of the cemetery boundary and showed that the cemetery was large and had been used over a long period of time.

Stratigraphy

Three distinct variations in stratigraphy were observed in the 38BU39/1619 vicinity. The currently wooded area east and downslope of the cemetery (Trenches 11-16, 25 and 26) is an old field, with a dark gray, loamy sand “plow” zone as much as 1.2 ft (0.4 m) in depth. No plow scars were observed, but we saw several examples of the flat-bottomed cultivation ditches that are more commonly seen on Parris Island, and which are very familiar from the excavations at
the Santa Elena site, 38BU51/162. In Trench 26A/B we encountered a much larger historic ditch, running north-south, which is probably an historic field boundary ditch (Figure 37).

Within the cemetery proper we found no evidence of agriculture. The grey-brown loamy sand topsoil generally faded to tan subsoil within 0.5 to 0.8 ft (0.1 to 0.2 m) below surface. In Trenches 17C, 19B/C and 22A, intact prehistoric shell midden was encountered at about 0.5 ft (15 cm) below surface. Significant disturbance of the topsoil was suggested by a variety of evidence, however. Most obviously, the woods that characterized the site as late as 1933 (Figure 43) have been almost completely removed. Also absent are any surface indications of the cemetery beyond the six marked graves; at some point grave sinks, grave mounds, grave markers and surface grave goods were eliminated, probably by shallow grading. A local informant, Woodrow Garvin (personal communication, July, 2001) reports that there was a warehouse on top of this cemetery in the 1950s and 1960s; it may be that the evidence of grading we observed in our excavations dates to the construction of this warehouse.

Trenches 3F, 18D/E and 24C/D/E revealed large, irregular, and fairly recent features backfilled with topsoils and subsoils churned together; these are thought to be tree or stump removal disturbances (Figures 48 and 49). Trench 22D revealed a large tire rut, perhaps from the heavy equipment used in clearing the site (Figure 49).

The third major stratigraphic variation at 38BU39/1619 was seen in the level areas to the south and west of the cemetery knoll, in Trenches 4-10 and 20-23 (Figure 37). Except where they actually addressed the slope of the knoll, these trenches uniformly revealed deep stripping. In these trenches, a modern sod and topsoil zone rested unconformably on a surface of clean, yellow or tan subsoil. While we found a well-preserved prehistoric feature in this context (Trench 8C), it is important to note that much of the cultural material originally present in the stripped area was removed with much of the original topsoil, and the objects remaining have certainly been pushed around to some extent (Figure 48).

The Cemetery

Grave Distribution and Density. Trenching revealed that the cemetery measured about 250 x 150 ft (76.2 x 45.7 m), as shown on Figure 37. The six marked graves at 38BU39/1619 (above), together with the obvious elevated landform that characterized the site, helped us to define the boundaries with a minimum of trenching within the cemetery itself. This, however, left us with relatively little information regarding grave density, distribution, and morphology. Nine positive trench sections (in six different trenches) encountered a total of 15 grave features (Figures 48, 49). What little we could see of the graves suggested a very irregular distribution, with extensive empty areas contrasting with small clusters of overlapping graves (e.g. Trenches 17A, 18C/D). Of the 15 grave features recorded, all but three were within 2.5 ft (0.8 m) of other graves, and nine actually intruded or were intruded on by other graves. The intrusions were doubtless responsible for the several coffin tacks recovered from our trenches. A necessarily rough extrapolation from our limited information yielded an estimate of 300 to 400 graves in 38BU39/1619 under the assumption that the more elevated portions of the knoll (on the south end) that we did not test contained the same density of graves as the lower areas to the north that we did test.
Grave Morphology. No grave features were completely revealed, but given the dimensions we did observe (Figures 48 & 49), two graves are clearly those of small children (Trenches 19A, 23B). The remaining graves are of adult dimensions. While entire shapes were not observed, considerable variation is seen in the exposed east and west ends, which range from heavily rounded or irregular to carefully squared. As well as could be determined, all graves were oriented roughly east-west. Grave fill varied from dark, gray-brown topsoil to yellow, tan, and white subsoils mixed with topsoil. Some graves features showed very diffuse edges and vague mottling of the fill, while others had crisp edges and brightly mottled fill. These differences in clarity of grave edges are indicative of differences in the ages of the grave features; some of the graves in this cemetery were clearly much older that some others.

Grave Goods. As discussed above, the surface of 38BU39/1619 was apparently graded at some time after 1933. Given that disturbance and the small sample of grave features exposed, the original extent of surface grave goods in the cemetery is not clear. In only one location were grave goods found in direct association with burial features; four grave goods items were found on or immediately adjacent to the three overlapping graves in Trench 17A/17A Extension (Figure 48). They included much of a redware teapot (Figures 50, 51), a manganese glass U.S. Navy Medical Department bottle (Figure 52B), a brown glass pharmaceutical bottle (Figure 52C), and a clear glass pharmaceutical bottle from the “Chas. G. Luther” pharmacy in Beaufort (Figure 52D). The “Luther” bottle was broken in place, but apparently had contained a cluster of five wire finishing nails found among the bottle fragments. In addition to these reasonably certain associations, Trenches 1 and 18 yielded probable grave goods that were not found at grave features, although both trenches contained graves in other 10 ft sections. Trench 1A produced most of a manganese, pressed glass lamp base (Figure 52E), while Trench 18A produced a broken, clear glass, screw-top “Rexall Store” pharmaceutical bottle (Figure 52A) and much of a white porcelain tea cup with overglaze, decal decoration and a “GERMANY” import mark. Other grave goods were represented by scattered, smaller fragments of manganese, brown, olive green, cobalt blue, white, clear, and “carnival” glass containers, and porcelain and Bristol Glazed sherds.

Generally, the grave goods array at 38BU39/1619 can be described as moderate in quantity and heavily disturbed, with even the few in situ items damaged. Chronologically the material is entirely late nineteenth and early twentieth century in origin.

Other Components

Native American. Trench excavations led to the recovery of a wide array of prehistoric pottery spanning a period of more than three thousand years. Examples of some of these materials are illustrated in Appendix I, and sherd counts by provenience are contained in Appendix IV. Two projectile points found in test trenches are also described in Appendix I.

In addition to artifacts, we encountered several features believed to be Native American in origin. The largest of these features is a buried shell midden located in the northern portion of the cemetery (see Figure 37). This shell midden, likely an in-place refuse deposit, was first identified through the presence of very small fragments of crushed shell on the surface. Probing
Figure 50. 38BU39/1619. Redware teapot *in situ* at the west ends of two overlapping grave features in Trench 17A.

Figure 51. 38BU39/1619. Partially reconstructed redware teapot from Trench 17A.
revealed that the buried midden was a roughly circular deposit 25 ft (7.6 m) in diameter; an additional thin scatter of shell extended out several feet from this concentration in all directions. Our Trench 22 intersected the shell scatter on the western edge of this midden. The shell layer, only 0.1 to 0.2 ft (3.1 to 6.1 cm) thick, was exposed in place in the floor of all of Trench 22A (Figure 49). The age and cultural affiliation of this shell midden was not determined.

In Trench 26, we found a prehistoric shell midden that had been bisected by a plantation period field boundary ditch (Figure 49 and 56). The intact portion of the shell midden was approximately 0.3 ft (9 cm) thick; shells present included oyster, whelk, ribbed mussel, and periwinkle. This midden contained abundant St. Catherines Cord Marked sherds (See Appendix I).

In Trench 17 on the western edge of the knoll we encountered another prehistoric shell midden (Figure 48 and 53). The shell array in the midden, located in the northwest end of Trench 17, was composed of the usual species including oyster, ribbed mussel, whelk, and periwinkle. Thickness of this midden layer was not determined; the midden was left intact. A large St. Catherines Cord Marked sherd was recovered from this midden during cleaning for a photograph, so it is likely that it dates to the St. Catherines Period as did the midden in Trench 26.

A prehistoric period feature was found in Trench 8C (Figures 48 and 54). This feature was a refuse-filled pit approximately three feet long; the exposed portion was slightly more than 1.5 ft (0.5 m) wide. Parts of the feature were filled with a dense deposit composed of oyster, quahog clam, and ribbed mussel shells, but in its southwest end there was a deposit of ash and charcoal. Sherds recovered from this feature indicate that it was deposited during the St. Catherines Period, like the other shell midden deposits at this site.

Spanish. Two possible sixteenth century Spanish artifacts were recovered from 38BU39/1619. Trench 7A produced a very small, thin, unglazed redware sherd that would be counted as Spanish “Fine Thin Redware” if recovered at Santa Elena. Trench 23D produced a fragment of a large, crudely wrought, “T” headed nail that is much like those found in large numbers at Santa Elena (Figure 55A). While neither object is dramatically diagnostic of the sixteenth century, it is not unreasonable to suppose that either or both are artifacts of European or Native American activity during the Spanish occupation of Parris Island.

Plantation/Postbellum. Adams (2001:45-51) identified a thin but intriguing eighteenth century component just above the northeast limit of 38BU39/1619 in the vicinity of our subsequent Trenches 3, 24, 26 and 27. From two 1 x 1 m test units and several shovel tests, she recovered a delft sherd, a Staffordshire slipware sherd, 11 dark olive green glass fragments, and two pipe bowl fragments. Apprised of this finding, we expected to recover a substantial collection of eighteenth century material in the area, given that our trenching would involve a much larger volume of screened soil. Our excavations encountered the same component, but our collection was curiously small. From Trenches 3 and 23-27, we recovered only eight artifacts that might be considered eighteenth century, including five dark olive green bottle fragments, a delft sherd (Figure 55B), a plain pearlware sherd, and a pipe bowl fragment (Figure 55F).
Figure 53. 38BU39/1619. Woodland shell midden in Trench 17C.

Figure 54. 38BU39/1619. Woodland shell pit feature in Trench 8C.
addition we found three hand-painted blue-on-white creamware sherds in Trenches 18C and 18D (Figure 55C), two pipe stems in Trenches 14B and 19B (Figure 55G), nine other fragments of dark olive green bottle glass, and a very light scatter of hand-made brick fragments across the area. This collection represents an ephemeral occupation indeed, but one that is still very interesting, as it is well removed from the known plantation components on the property and clearly pre-dates the several Freedman occupations in the vicinity.

The DeRoode map (Figure 41) shows several domestic sites in the vicinity of 38BU39/1619 in 1916. In addition, Adams (2001:45-51) found a late-nineteenth century locus within 38BU39, about 100 m north of the cemetery boundary. None of these sites, however, are close enough to account for a light scatter of early twentieth century material found east and northeast of the cemetery by both Adams and this project. As in the cases of the other cemeteries, this component may simply represent fragmented grave goods, but it is certainly possible that an additional Freedman’s home site is present somewhere east of 38BU39/1619.

Another ephemeral occupation is suggested by several probable Civil War artifacts. These include a musket percussion cap from Trench 27C (Figure 55H), a revolver percussion cap from Trench 19D (Figure 55I), and a brass grommet from a U.S. rubber blanket or shelter tent from Trench 8D (Figure 55J). There may have been a camp or picket post in the vicinity, or the artifacts may represent post-war civilian use of the items.

While no features were identified in the trenching that might be associated with antebellum or postbellum domestic occupations, features related to historic agriculture were seen. As discussed above, the area east of the cemetery, covered by Trenches 11-16, 25 and 26, revealed several agricultural ditches (not plow scars) of the sort common on the Santa Elena site, 38BU51/162 (Chapter 6). No such ditches were seen in the cemetery proper. In Trench 26 we encountered a much larger historic ditch, running north-south, which cut through a dense patch of prehistoric shell midden (Figure 49 and 56). Agricultural ditches were observed both east and west of the ditch, and most of the shell was finely broken and eroded by intensive agriculture. Immediately west of the ditch feature, however, a strip of shell midden several feet wide was intact where it had been sealed under the historic ditch spoil, which obviously had been deposited along the west edge of the ditch. The Trench 26 ditch is readily interpreted as a field boundary ditch, which was dug before commencement of cultivation on the site. The ditch cut through the shell midden which by that time had been there for several centuries.

Two other historic features were found in Trench 27, the final and northern-most trench of the project (Figures 37 and 49). These included a ditch feature in Trench 27D/27D Extension, and an old road trace in Trench 27A/27B. The ditch included narrow, perpendicular appendages, was very steep-walled, and ended in a flat bottom at about 1.9 ft (0.6 m) below surface. The feature had the general appearance of a utility ditch, but contained no line or pipe, and the ditch fill looked as if it might pre-date any USMC utilities. A wall trench was considered, but no evidence of posts or sills was apparent, nor did it contain daub or wrought nails that might be expected on the site of an early structure. The ditch remains unexplained. The road feature was simply a very compact surface under the current humus that aligned with a faintly visible historic road bed that ran northeast into the woods and southwest for perhaps 40 ft (12.2 m) toward the cemetery.

Marine Corps. The Marine Corps ranges are heavily represented in the 38BU39/1619 collection (Figure 57), and the artifacts most directly related to the ranges are ammunition components. While the ranges had their first incarnation in 1918, there was apparently little or no range activity in the immediate vicinity of 38BU39/1619 during the World War I period, and the single ammunition item dating to that period is a broken .30’06 cartridge case dated August, 1914. The next earliest dated item is a broken, .30’06 drill cartridge dated 1934. These cartridges, together with a collection of ten iron, five-round stripper clips (Figure 57K), were for the M1903 Springfield Rifle. The M1 Garand Rifle, adopted by the Marines early in World War II, is represented by a fragment of an iron, eight-round clip and a .30’06 cartridge case dated 1952 (Figure 57E). The M14 Rifle, adopted in 1957, is represented by a single, unfired 7.62mm (.30 caliber) cartridge dated 1960 (Figure 57F). In addition, several fired and unfired .30 caliber bullets were recovered that might have originated with any of the three weapons discussed above (Figure 57H, I). The M16 Rifle, which was adopted by the Marine Corps in 1967, is represented by six fired and unfired 5.56mm (.223 cal.) cartridges, a stripper clip, and a single fired bullet (Figure 57G, J, L). Most of the 5.56mm cartridges were completely mangled by mowing, but two with legible headstamps were dated 1973 and 1983. The .45 cal. M1911 Automatic Pistol
(or a submachine gun) is represented by a bullet fragment. The buckle and strap end from a World War II-era canvas web rifle sling were also recovered (Figure 57M, N).

The hand grenade range, which formerly existed on the present site of the nearby Inchon Range, was also represented in the 38BU39/1619 collection. Two classes of practice grenades are represented by artifacts, including simple, inert, cast iron “dummy grenades” used for throwing practice, and grenades with functional time fuses and a small, pyrotechnic main (bouchon) charge housed in a reusable body. Two fragments of broken “dummy” grenades were recovered, including examples of the Mk.1 and the Mk.1A1 practice grenades (Figure 57B, C). Fused practice grenades (probably the M21) are represented by a grenade pin and eight exploded brass bouchons (Figure 57A, D). The distribution of practice grenade artifacts in Trenches 4, 8-10, 17 and 20 suggests that the practice facility was somewhere south-west of the cemetery. The recent EOD assessment of Parris Island (USACE 1999a:2.23-2.25) suggests that live, high explosive grenades were also thrown on the range, but probably well northwest of 38BU39/1619. No fragments from high explosive grenades were found in our testing.

A diverse array of other Marine Corps-era artifacts, both military and civilian, was recovered from 38BU39/1619 (Appendix IV). Military items included USMC mess hall ware sherds, an M1923 mess kit spoon, fatigue buttons, web equipment hardware, insignia attachment devices, shooters plastic ear plugs, and a rifle cleaning brush. Other material included coal, cinders, gravel, marl, brick, wire nails and other hardware, electrical components, twentieth century coins, pen and pencil fragments, and soda bottle, beer bottle and food jar fragments. This is a typical assemblage of architectural debris, lost items and minor trash found in areas used by the Marine Corps over many decades.
Conclusions

Archaeological excavations at site 38BU39/1619 demonstrated that the cemetery was far more extensive than was indicated by the six marked graves. Maximum length of the cemetery is about 250 ft (76.2 m) northeast/southwest, and maximum width is 150 ft (45.7 m) northwest/southeast. This distribution coincides with observed margins of the knoll occupied by the cemetery; no evidence of any graves located off of this knoll was found in any of our trenches.

The six extant grave markers indicate that burials were placed in this cemetery during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Our excavations indicate that there are approximately 300 to 400 other individuals buried here. Based on the observed fill mottling and diffuse edges, some of these unmarked graves certainly date to the nineteenth century, and some of them may date to the eighteenth century. Informant testimony and a photograph indicate that there were other graves markers in this cemetery in the past; the fate of those other markers is currently not known. Surface grave goods recovered during trenching were late nineteenth/early twentieth century in origin.

An array of other artifacts not associated with the cemetery was recovered during our excavations. Prehistoric pottery indicative of a long occupation span was recovered, but most of the materials (as well as the shell midden deposits and a single feature) all date to the St. Catherines Period. Two probable Spanish artifacts, a nail and a ceramic sherd, were found during our excavations, indicating that that either the sixteenth century Spanish occupants of the island or some of the contemporary local Indians may have visited the knoll two centuries or more before the cemetery was begun. An ephemeral eighteenth/nineteenth century occupation was indicated by a scatter of artifacts on the north end of the knoll.

A diverse array of Marine Corps artifacts was found across the knoll, as would be expected with the presence of the rifle range nearby. We found no evidence of the Marine Corps warehouse reported to have been constructed on top of the cemetery, but we excavated relatively few trenches top of the knoll where the warehouse would have been located.

This cemetery, covering approximately 0.9 acres, contains the remains of Freedmen and, almost certainly, slaves. It was in use during the nineteenth century, and it may well have had its beginnings as early as the founding of the John Kennered Delabare plantation in the eighteenth century.
Chapter 5

38BU1618: THE ELLIOTT PLANTATION CEMETERY AT WHALE CREEK

This cemetery, located on the western side of the island near Whale Creek, is the least known of the four Parris Island cemeteries covered in this report (Figure 1). So far as we have been able to determine, it does not appear as an identified cemetery on any map of the island. On a 1933 map it does appear as a wooded tract, but on other maps even the clump of trees does not appear.

We have been able to find two documentary references that we believe apply to this cemetery. The first is in the 1968 memo that we have referenced previously (USMC 1968). In that memo, a cemetery described as “near Elliott’s Beach” was proposed as an alternative for use once the Maneuver Grounds had disrupted access to the cemetery “in the Nivers Beach area (behind the existing Golf Clubhouse).” We argued earlier that this Nivers Beach area cemetery was actually the Means cemetery on the opposite side of the island where the Maneuver Grounds was constructed in 1918. We believe that the cemetery at “Elliott’s Beach” is the Elliott Cemetery (38BU1618) at Whale Creek.

Figure 58. Dense undergrowth at 38BU1618.
The cemetery at Whale Creek is located along the marsh edge about 600 ft (182.9 m) northeast of the General’s Landing boat ramp (Figures 58 and 59). This location is approximately 1,500 ft (457.2 m) southeast of the nearest portion of Elliott’s Beach and about one-half mile (804.6 m) southeast of the plantation house formerly located on the bluff overlooking the beach. Although there may well have been another cemetery associated with the Elliott Plantation, we have found neither documentary nor map evidence to indicate that is the case.

The second documentary reference is to an 1872 interment in the “Elliott’s Graveyard.” According to Civil War pension records, Celia Stevens, widow of Primus Stevens of the 34th Regiment, U. S. Colored Infantry, died on Spring Island on June 14, 1872. She was buried in the “Elliott’s Graveyard” on Parris Island the following day (NARA RG 94, Pensions, Primus Stevens file). Available records do not indicate the type of grave marker, if any, that was erected at the grave of Celia Stevens.

When the field crew from Panamerican consultants (Hendryx et al. 1997:137-139) worked on this site in 1995, they were directed to the site by base personnel (Steve Wise, personal communication 2001). Based on visual observation, the Panamerican field crew estimated the extent of the site at 30 m by 25 m. Within those limits, the field crew observed two marked graves and nine depressions that they believed to be graves. In addition, they noted the presence of an undisclosed number of “fox holes” which they attributed to military activities. The grave-shaped depressions, according to Hendryx et al. (1997:139), were “oriented in a relatively north-south orientation.” Our detailed mapping of the site suggests that the graves were actually oriented east/west as would be expected.

Hendryx et al. (1997:137) provide information that indicates that at least one, and possibly two, grave markers were removed from the site between 1995 and 2001. At the time of the 1995 survey, one grave was observed to have “a headstone and a footstone, and was outlined in brick” (this would be the grave numbered 46 on our Figure 59). The Panamerican crew made an effort to decipher an inscription (presumably on the headstone), but that effort failed. Another unmarked sandstone “fragment” was associated with a “grave-shaped depression” in a spot approximately 20 m (66 ft) north of the first grave (Hendryx et al. 1997:137). There are several grave-shaped depressions (see Figure 59) located north of that first grave; any one of these may be the marked depression noted by the Panamerican crew.

Of the three gravestones observed by the Panamerican crew, only the footstone from the grave surrounded by bricks remains (our #46); this stone does not contain any evidence of an inscription. The absence of the other two stones from the site suggests that they were intentionally removed by unknown persons.

There is also additional evidence that suggests that removal of gravestones from this cemetery has been an on-going problem. While we were working on the site, a man walked over from the nearby parking lot to see what we were doing. Once he learned that we were working on the cemetery, he provided information on a gravestone that he had observed there thirty years ago. The informant, Mr. Marty Darlity, described himself as a forester. In 1970 or 1971, he was
Figure 59. 38BU1618. Site map.
involved in activities in the vicinity of General’s Landing that included clearing the tract of land where the picnic area southeast of the cemetery is located. While working on this clearing, he observed a gravestone on the southern end of the nearby cemetery, though he did not know at the time that there was a cemetery there. He recalls that the gravestone contained an inscription that dated to exactly 100 years earlier; this would place the date of the stone he observed at either 1870 or 1871.

Based on the description provided by Mr. Darity while he was on site, the gravestone that he observed was in the vicinity of our “probable grave depression” #19 (Figure 59). There are currently no gravestones visible in that part of the cemetery. In order to be sure that the stone had not simply fallen over and become buried by debris in the past thirty years, we systematically probed the entire southern portion of the site and along the adjacent marsh edge. This probing did not encounter any buried gravestones, so we must conclude that the marker observed by Mr. Darity is now gone.

Given the information we had when we began work on this cemetery (Hendryx et al. 1997), we expected it to be rather small. If Celia Stevens were truly buried in this cemetery, then it originated at least as early as the 1870s. The near absence of gravestones was typical of other Parris Island cemeteries, so we did not anticipate finding any others.

**History**

*The Plantation/Postbellum Eras*

The cemetery designated 38BU1618 was located on Whale Creek Plantation, or the “Elliott Place.” Until the 1760s, the tract was a part of the Parris/Barnwell property that included the southern half of Parris Island. That earlier period is covered in Chapter 6.

There is some uncertainty as to the date and the manner in which the property on Whale Creek was split from Nathaniel Barnwell’s Plantation. The 1700 acres on Parris Island owned by Nathaniel Barnwell were subdivided by 1768, but the details are unclear. Butler et al. (1995:30) report that Nathaniel Barnwell left 1200 acres to his eldest son John, and 500 acres to his daughter, Mary, and son-in-law, William Elliott (1730-1778). Mary died in childbirth in 1774, however, and William Elliott was already remarried before Nathaniel Barnwell’s death in February 1775 (Edgar and Bailey 1977:56, 57, 230, 231). It appears that the Elliots took possession of the 500 acres at some earlier date, perhaps as a wedding gift in 1760. An additional tract purchased by William Elliott from John Kennered Delabare in 1768 was bounded “S.E. on William Elliott,” indicating the property acquired earlier from Nathaniel Barnwell (Edgar and Bailey 1977:230; Webber 1925:143).

The 500 acres comprising the new Elliott’s, or Whale Creek, Plantation (NARA RG 123, U.S. Court of Claims, No. 17436), was cut from the northwest portion of Nathaniel Barnwell’s 1700 acres. This property probably included the areas now known as Elliott’s Beach, Elliott’s Wood, and General’s Landing, and the cemetery, 38BU1618. With the 160 acres purchased from John Kennered Delabare in 1768, William Elliott’s Parris Island plantation would have totaled some 660 acres. This is nearly twice the size of the 19th century Whale Creek plantation,
and must have included considerable acreage that was later part of the Edings plantation to the north. As detailed in Chapter 4, the John Kennered Delabare property (later Edings) was much smaller by 1768 than it was in the nineteenth century, and the discrepancies for both plantations can be reasonably explained by a currently undocumented sale or other transfer of Whale Creek property to its northern neighbor at some time prior to 1833 (Chapter 4).

William Elliott was a South Carolina native who initially planted in Georgia and then settled in Beaufort by 1759. He held a variety of local offices and was elected to the Royal Assembly in 1772, but he declined to serve. Although Elliott’s principal plantation was that on Parris Island, he lived in Beaufort (Edgar and Bailey 1977:230; Barnwell 1969:30). It is not known if Elliott built a secondary residence on Parris Island.

William Elliott’s son William (1761-1808) was called William Elliott II, although he was actually the third William in as many generations. Barnwell (1969:39) records:

William Elliott II, even more than his father, laid the foundations for the Elliott fortune in the Sea Islands. He owned 650 acres on Parris Island inherited from his father and mother, and in 1801 bought Little Newberry Plantation in Prince William’s Parish... In addition to these and the plantation on Hilton Head where he experimented with Sea Island cotton, He had several others in South Carolina and Georgia. His estate in 1810 shows some 160 slaves.

William Elliott II was also politically active, serving as a delegate to the U.S. Constitutional Convention and in the South Carolina legislature (Barnwell 1969:39).

On the Mills’ Atlas map of 1825 (Figure 5), an Elliott house appears on the west bank of Whale Creek, northeast of 38BU1618. That house site, unfortunately, falls in a large area that was used as a borrow pit. On a narrow berm of original ground left around the flooded barrow pit on its eastern margin, Butler et al. (1995:109, 133-138) found ample evidence for an eighteenth/ nineteenth century plantation complex. The remnant site, 38BU1401, yielded a ceramic sample (N=78) with a mean date of 1817, and a minimum date range of 1750-1845. This was very probably the original, eighteenth century Elliott complex, including the house later depicted by Mills. The cemetery, 38BU1618, may have originally served a slave settlement located at 38BU1401.

William Elliott II died in 1808, and the Parris Island plantation passed to his son Stephen (1804-1866) in 1811. Stephen was only about seven years old at the time, and it is not known how the Parris Island property was managed in the years before Stephen’s graduation from Harvard in 1827 (Barnwell 1969:151). This Stephen Elliott was ultimately known as the Reverend Stephen Elliott, not to be confused with Stephen Elliott (1771-1830), brother of William Elliott II, nor with Bishop Stephen Elliott (1806-1866), who was the son of Stephen Elliott (1771-1830), and thus the Rev. Stephen Elliott’s cousin. Stephen Elliott, Jr. (1830-1866), later General Stephen Elliott, was the Rev. Stephen Elliott’s son, and also a Parris Island planter (below). Adding to the confusion, three of these Stephen Elliotts, the Reverend, Bishop, and General, all died in 1866. Perhaps for this reason, historian C. Vann Woodward (1981), in his

By 1824, the Elliott plantation was already much reduced from William Elliott II’s 650 (or 660) acres. The St. Helena tax roll for that year shows the absentee Stephen Elliott with 311 acres and 28 slaves (Butler et al. 1995:41). A Mary Elliott, presumably Stephen’s spinster sister Mary (1793-1850), is shown with 376 acres and 63 slaves. Mary’s property was probably Battery Point plantation on Port Royal Island, rather than the remainder of the old William Elliott property on Parris Island (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File 17598). We have no other clues regarding how a large portion of Elliott property ended up in Edings hands by 1833 (Chapter 4).

After his return to Beaufort from Harvard in 1827, Stephen Elliott began planting on Parris Island and in Prince William’s Parish. He soon became more interested in the ministry, however, and he was ordained an Episcopal priest in 1836. Barnwell (1969:151) records:

His first cure was as rector of Sheldon Church which he had renovated in 1837. After ten years there he resigned to devote himself largely to a ministry to the Negroes of the district...Out of his own funds he built a chapel which could seat 600 persons. It was consecrated Christ Church-on-the-Combahee on April 16, 1846. He served this church for fifteen years. It was destroyed in February 1865 by Sherman’s army who needed the logs to build a bridge across the river. He lived part of the time in Pocataligo and part of the time on Parris Island where he kept up his planting, and also owned a home next to Dr. Thomas Fuller on the Bay in Beaufort.

In 1830, Stephen Elliott married Ann Hutson Habersham (1813-1843), daughter of John Habersham and Anne Middleton Barnwell, who owned Habersham plantation on Parris Island. Stephen Elliott, Jr. (later General Stephen Elliott) was born the same year. He attended Harvard and South Carolina College and graduated in 1850, and thereafter “He was a very successful planter and sportsman in Beaufort.” He married in 1854 and became Captain of the Beaufort Artillery in 1858 (Barnwell 1969: 151-152).

Ann Hutson Habersham Elliott died in 1843, leaving her one-half interest in Habersham plantation to her husband Stephen and their six children. The other half of the Habersham property was owned by Anne’s sister, Maria, until 1849, when it was purchased by the Rev. Stephen Elliott. It appears that Stephen Elliott, Jr., eventually collected whatever shares his siblings held in his mother’s Habersham plantation legacy. In 1857, he traded that interest to his father in exchange for Whale Creek plantation (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File 17598). The legal instrument accomplishing the trade included descriptions of both plantations (NARA RG 123, Box 1050, File 17570):

All that certain plantation or tract of land commonly known as the Whale Creek Plantation situate lying and being on Paris Island...measuring and containing three hundred and four acres more or less. Butting and Bounding to the South East and East on Whale Creek, to the North East on lands belonging to the said Stephen Elliott the elder, to the North on lands belonging to William Edings, to the North
West on Savannah Creek and to the South West on Broad River...all that certain piece, parcel or tract of land situate, lying and being on Paris Island...measuring and containing four hundred acres more or less, Butting and Bounding to the South West on lands formerly of Robert Means, now of Thomas Means, to the Northward on lands formerly of Joseph Edings now of William Edings, to the South East on Port Royal River and to the North West on lands formerly of William Elliott and now of Stephen Elliott the elder…

These descriptions fit well with our understanding of Parris Island properties, with the exception of the northern boundary of the Habersham land, described as bordering on Edings property rather than on Ballast Creek or Fuller property. This suggests that Edings acreage extended well into the middle of Parris Island, including land on the south bank of Ballast Creek, and this might explain the discrepancy between the 400 acres of the Habersham place in 1857 and the considerably larger 1800 version (see Chapter 6).

In 1859, the Elliots purchased much of Edings plantation. As detailed in Chapter 4, the property was planted by William Edings, but 450 acres of the 650 (or more) acres were owned by Benjamin Edings, who sold the property for $17,000 “for a change of investment.” The deal was closed with a cash down payment, leaving mortgage bonds totaling $12,825. The purchase was shared equally by the Rev. Stephen Elliott and Stephen Elliott, Jr., and while they each subsequently paid taxes on 225 acres, it is not clear if they literally divided the tract between them (NARA RG 123, Box 1050, File 17570; Box 1052, File 17598). If they did divide the tract, certainly Stephen Elliott, Jr. would have taken the southerly half contiguous with his Whale Creek plantation, while the Rev. Elliott would have chosen that bordering his Habersham plantation. The 1860 census provides no Elliott information specific to Parris Island, as both the Rev. Elliott and his son owned properties elsewhere in St Helena Parish. The Rev. Elliott owned 1900 improved and 900 unimproved acres, and 190 slaves, while Stephen Elliott, Jr. owned 500 acres improved, 125 acres unimproved, and 49 slaves (US Census, 1860 Slave and Agricultural Schedules, St. Helena Parish, SC). Stephen Elliott, Jr.‘s principal operation was clearly Whale Creek plantation; of his 625 acres in St. Helena Parish, 533 (or 529) acres were on Parris Island. He also owned Daws Island, across the Broad River in St. Luke’s Parish after 1850 (NARA RG 123, Box 1050, File 17570; NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File 17598).

Notes of the U.S. Coast Survey made shortly before the Civil War cite Stephen Elliott, Jr. as one of only two proprietors actually living on Parris Island. His house is described as being on the Broad River shore, at the first landing on the island heading north (Bache and Boutelle 1861: 24, 25). This clearly is not the Elliott house depicted on the Mills’ Atlas map, which was located inland, on Whale Creek, and is probably the plantation house at 38BU1401. The “later” house is that depicted on Figure 60, which also shows two rows of “cabins” which are certainly slave quarters, and “Elliott’s Wood” as it stood ca. 1864 (NARA RG 58, IRS Direct Tax Commission). Unfortunately, the next map section to the east of Figure 60 is lost, so we have no idea whether the other Elliott house still stood at that time. A complex of archaeological sites on and just east of Elliott’s Beach (38BU115/248, 38BU1398, 38BU1400) includes the “later” house site somewhere in a broad scatter of eighteenth and nineteenth century material (SC Site Files; Butler et al. 1995:109, 120-122, 129-133). The eighteenth century component is problematic, given the sequence of occupations suggested above.
Captain Stephen Elliott, Jr., participated in the bombardment of Fort Sumter in April, 1861, ushering in the conflict that ended the plantation era on Parris Island. In July, a U.S. Navy assessment of Port Royal Sound included the information that “Stephen Elliott, jr., of Parry Island...has been employed in fortifying Port Royal, every foot of which he is familiar with...” (DuPont et al. 1863:321). Elliott commanded the two companies of artillery at Fort Beauregard at the mouth of Port Royal Sound during the successful Federal attack in November (Chapter 2). Captain Elliott and his father, who was serving as a chaplain and assisted the evacuation of Fort Beauregard, were apparently the only Parris Island planters who actually engaged in the defense of Port Royal. After the Confederate withdrawal, the Rev. Elliott found refuge in Camden, while his son saw distinguished service for the remainder of the war. The son rose to the rank of Brigadier General, and he was wounded at least five times (Barnwell 1969:189-195, 203, 204).

Meanwhile, the Elliott plantations were confiscated and sold to the United States, together with the rest of Parris Island (Chapter 2). For reasons unknown, the tax commissioners who arranged the sale of Parris Island properties in 1863 did not recognize the remaining Edings plantation (Chapter 4), and listed three (not two) Elliott plantations, designated Elliott Place Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

Figure 60. 1869 Direct Tax Commissioners Section Map showing the western portion of Whale Creek plantation and the site of 38BU1618 (arrow); drawn from surveys in 1864-65.
These three Elliott plantations were the old Edings, Whale Creek, and Habersham plantations, respectively. The formal descriptions include (NARA RG 123, Box 1050, File 17570):

The Elliott Place No. 1, bounded Northerly by the Fuller Place, Southerly by the Elliott Place No. 2, Easterly by the Fuller Place, Westerly by Broad River and Elliott Place No. 2, containing six hundred and ninety-five acres, more or less.

Elliott Place No. 2, bounded Northerly by The Elliott Place No. 1, Southerly by the Elliott Place No. 3, and the Meares [Means] Place, Easterly by the Fuller Place and the Elliott Place No. 3, Westerly by the Broad River, containing three hundred and four acres, more or less.

We did not locate the boundary description for Elliott Place No. 3 (Habersham plantation), but the property was sold as 400 acres, which matches the 1857 description (above) (NARA RG 123, Box 1050, File 17570).

Beginning in 1865, the former Elliott properties were sold off in 10-acre tracts, nearly all of them to former slaves (Chapter 2, Appendix II). Almost immediately after the collapse of the Confederacy in 1865, General Stephen Elliott returned home for a visit. He later described his experience at one of the Elliott plantations, probably Whale Creek or Habersham (Woodward 1981:827):

Our negroes are living in great comfort. They were delighted to see me and treated me with overflowing affection. They waited on me as before, gave me beautiful breakfasts, splendid dinners, &c &c. But they firmly and respectfully informed me: ‘We own this land now. Put it out of your head that it will ever be yours again.’

General Elliott died from the effects of his wounds on February 21, 1866, and his father followed less than a month later, on March 13 (Barnwell 1969:152, 204). The mortgage on their Benjamin Edings purchase was never paid, a fact that the Elliott heirs were apparently unaware of when they filed for Federal compensation in the 1890s. A challenge from the Edings heirs ensued, which resulted in the contested acreage being dropped from the Elliott claim (NARA RG 123, Box 1052, File 17598).

The DeRoode map shows the Freedman community on the former Whale Creek property as it appeared in 1916 (Figure 61). Thirteen houses appear on the map, including one just west of Elliot’s Woods that may be the old Whale Creek plantation house. The cemetery, 38BU1618, is not shown, and no woods are indicated at its location. A later, more detailed map (Figure 62), shows a narrow strip of woods that may have been too slight to appear on the DeRoode map, which was not a detailed survey (U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey 1933).
The historic properties associated with the other three cemeteries covered in this report were all heavily impacted by Marine Corps activity during World War I. In contrast, the old Elliott’s or Whale Creek Plantation vicinity was apparently not used for military purposes until some two decades later.

Although they relinquished ownership of their lands in 1918, the African American residents in the area may have remained substantially undisturbed until 1927, when employment by the Depot became a condition for residence on Parris Island. Residents meeting that requirement might have lived on the property until 1938, when the last civilian residents were forced to leave (Chapter 2). Figure 62 shows the Whale Creek area in 1933; only three houses are depicted, but any houses with tree cover are not shown on the 1933 map, which was prepared from aerial photos (USCGS 1933). The cemetery is visible as a small strip of woods in an area that is otherwise quite clear.

Apparently a Marine Corps need for field artillery ranges on Parris Island was at least partially responsible for the removal of the last civilian residents. Alvarez (1998: 111) recorded:
the black living areas were needed for a impact area where the Marines could practice howitzer artillery fire. Initially the families were vacated from their endangered homes and taken to the parade ground during the day, and fed each noon. But this arrangement was cumbersome and dangerous, and it was soon realized that a permanent move for the safety of the blacks was necessary.

Figure 63 is adapted from a figure in the recent explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) assessment of Parris Island (USACE 1999a:Plate 2), and depicts the two field artillery ranges in use during the late 1930s. As amply confirmed by artifact finds, 38BU1618 is within the impact area of the “West Main Range,” although the primary target area was to the northeast. Visiting USMC artillery units fired on the Parris Island ranges in 1937, 1938 and 1939, expending several thousand rounds of 75mm ammunition (USACE 1999a:2.4, 2.71-2.76, Plate 2; 1999b:C79-C88). We have found no evidence for use of the artillery ranges after 1939.

A 1940 map shows a series of planned explosive ordnance magazines dispersed across the old Whale Creek tract, but there is no evidence that these were ever built (USACE 1999b:4-37). The area appears to have seen very little construction or other major disturbance during World War II or the Cold War, with the exception of the large barrow pit that destroyed most of 38BU1401. The entire peninsula between Whale Creek and Savannah Creek is now reforested and is popularly called “Elliott’s Woods,” although the current forested area is many times larger.
Figure 63. Adaptation of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers map showing the artillery ranges on Parris Island in 1937 (USACE 1999b: Plate 2).
than the Elliott’s Woods of the nineteenth century. The area was used for recruit bivouacs and field training exercises until recently, and half-filled foxholes and other excavations are still abundant. Elliott’s Woods also includes recreational facilities at Elliott’s Beach and at General’s Landing, just below the southern boundary of 38BU1618.

Archaeological Methods

Mapping

Unlike the other cemeteries on the island, 38BU1618 was densely forested, with a shrubby groundcover (Figure 58). In order to facilitate mapping, a transit shot baseline was placed along the shallow ditch that ran roughly northeast/southwest along the western margin of the site limits as determined by the Panamerican Consultants crew (Hendryx et al. 1997:138). Seven reference points (A-G) were placed along this baseline, and one additional reference point (H) was located to the south of this baseline to allow mapping in the picnic area in the event that the cemetery was found to extend in that direction. The baseline, which was oriented at 40 degrees east of magnetic north, was used to provide the orientation for grid north in case excavations other than trenching were conducted on the site.

Once the baseline was in place, transit shots were taken for use in constructing a detailed site map. This detailed map (Figure 59) includes the two ditches that surround the cemetery, the shoreline, the nearby road, and the picnic area. All surface disturbances were carefully identified and mapped.

Surface disturbances were of two types. First, there were many depressions (n = 24) that were rectangular in plan and appeared to be graves in which the earth had settled through time. These “probable graves” were mapped by taking transit shots at both ends. The area around each of these features was probed in an effort to find fallen gravestones, grave goods, or other grave associated information. One grave was marked by a foot stone. Also scattered across the site were “surface depressions” that were generally round and less than a foot deep; these features were identified by Hendryx et al. (1997:139) as foxholes used in military training, though these features appear to be too shallow for that use. These features (n = 25) were also mapped and selectively probed. The single marked grave on the site was mapped (Figure 59, #46), as was a cluster of rocks and asphalt on the northeastern shoreline.

Backhoe Trenching

At 38BU1618, only the extent of the cemetery was in question, because the marked grave and numerous grave sinks made it clear that a substantial cemetery was present. Trenching was designed to determine how far north and south the graves were distributed, and whether graves were present as far west as the ditch, or beyond the ditch. As before, trenches were placed subjectively, each in turn building on the information already gathered to establish a pattern of positive and negative results (Figure 59). A total of 16 trenches were excavated in the search for the boundaries of this cemetery.
Trenches were laid out with tapes and pin flags in increments of 10 ft (3 m). Each trench was assigned a sequential provenience number regardless of length, with each 10 ft segment receiving a letter designation, as was the case with other cemeteries.

Unfortunately, unusually heavy roots at 38BU1618 made neat excavation and hand cleaning more difficult than at other locations. Trench depth varied with the thickness of the topsoil and the relative difficulty presented by roots (see Stratigraphy, below). Features could be identified at a depth of 1.0 to 1.5 ft (0.3 to 0.5 m) after hand cleaning with flat shovels and trowels. No vertical distinctions were recognized in the removal of the topsoil. In two cases (Trenches 3 and 8) extensions were excavated beyond the original trench walls in order to clarify outlines of possible grave features. All graves and other features were recorded on trench forms and transit mapped. Once excavations were completed and the margins of the cemetery were determined and marked with survey flags, Marshall Owens, then Parris Island base archaeologist, took GPS readings and plotted the cemetery outline on the island base map. The 16 trenches at 38BU1618 were excavated between June 4 and June 15, 2001. The total length of test trenching at 38BU1618 was 429 ft (130.8 m).

Artifact Recovery

By the time 38BU1618 was tested, 100% artifact recovery from trench fill was the standard for the project, and it was adhered to (see Chapters 3, 4). All of the fill from the trenches was screened using gasoline-powered screens equipped with heavy ¼-inch wire mesh. Portions of the project area included minor amounts of shell; the shell was sampled by species, but otherwise not collected or quantified.

Photography

Photographic documentation included formal photos of the marked grave and one grave feature, and work shots illustrating field methods and the appearance of various parts of the site. Three cameras were used, including 35mm cameras shooting color prints and color slides, and a digital still camera.

Lab Methods

In the case of 38BU1618, the analysis groups included Native American, 18th/19th Century Plantation, Cemetery, 20th Century USMC and Non-diagnostic (Appendix IV). Assignment of material was less ambiguous than in some other cases, as there was apparently no postbellum domestic site in the immediate vicinity, and no early twentieth century Marine Corps refuse. This made the “Cemetery” group straightforward, and the other groups were also clearly defined.
Figure 64. 38BU1618. Backhoe and screening, Trench 11; view to the north.

Figure 65. 38BU1618. Shoveling and screening, Trench 2; view to the southeast.
Figure 66. 38BU1618. Trenches 3, 5, 6, & 7.
Figure 67. 38BU1618. Trenches 8, 9 & 12.
Results

Trenching at 38BU1618 revealed two distinct stratigraphies, which did not entirely correspond to cemetery and non-cemetery areas. Outside of the western ditch that defined the cemetery, five of six trenches (10, 11, 13-15) encountered a typical gray sand plow zone (or ditch zone) as much as one foot (0.3 m) in depth, overlying yellow or pale gray subsoil. The exception was Trench 1, which featured about six inches (15 cm) of uncultivated, gray sand topsoil, fading naturally to yellow subsoil. The area within the cemetery boundary ditch appeared to be uncultivated, with a natural, forest floor topsoil horizon fading to subsoil. While the topsoil was typically only 0.4 to 0.8 ft (0.1 to 0.2 m) in thickness, it was often necessary to excavate trenches to as deep as 1.8 ft (0.6 m) in order to eliminate an unusually dense root content that prevented proper cleaning and examination of the trench floors.

The Cemetery Component

Grave Density and Distribution. In the case of 38BU1618, the boundaries of the cemetery were strongly suggested by surface appearance alone. A broad, shallow ditch separated an overgrown area of mixed pines and hardwoods from what was clearly an old field grown up in pines in the last several decades (Figure 61). The former area included a marked grave and 24 probable grave sinks aligned east-west, while the old field exhibited only a few non-linear depressions that were probably Marine Corps features. Our field work demonstrated that graves probably do not extend beyond the ditch into the field, and that the area between the ditch and the marsh is indeed a fairly dense cemetery with many more graves than those indicated by markers and sinks.

The grave sample from 38BU1618 included one marked grave, 24 probable grave sinks, and 11 grave feature stains, in addition to 24 non-linear depressions. Three trenches crossed linear depressions that had been mapped as probable grave sinks. Of these, depressions in Trenches 3 and 5 were indeed graves, while that in Trench 8B was actually a tree disturbance. Conversely, Trenches 4, 7 and 12 crossed non-linear depressions; Trench 4 revealed no subsurface feature, while the depressions in Trenches 7 and 12 were found to be graves.

Our field work indicated that the maximum extent of the cemetery was about 300 ft (91.5 m) north-south, and about 100 ft (30.5 m) at its maximum width (Figure 63). A necessarily rough extrapolation from known grave occurrences suggests that about 200 graves are present at 38BU1618.

Grave Morphology. Only 11 graves were actually observed as subsurface soil features, none in their entirety (Figures 66, 67, 70). As well as could be determined, all that were exposed were of adult dimensions. Shapes included rectangular (e.g. Trench 3A/B) and end-pinched (e.g. Trench 8A). As in the other cemeteries, a wide range in age was suggested by variations in the clarity of the feature edges and fill mottling.

We were unable to relocate the possible grave with associated “unmarked sandstone fragment” noted by Hendryx et al. (1997:137). Apparently, this stone was removed at some time between 1995 and 2001. As discussed above, another marked grave (Figure 59, #46) was
described by Hendryx et al. (1997:137) as having a footstone as well as an illegible headstone. We found no standing headstone on this grave, but removal of the overlying humus revealed a broken, but reassembled, headstone lying flat and bordered by bricks (Figures 68, 69). This was not a crypt cover or a marker designed to lie flat, but rather an ordinary vertical marker placed on the surface of the grave. Unlike the missing marker, this stone was readily legible, reading “SACRED/ To the Memory of/ MRS ELIZA SCOTT/ Wife of/ RICHARD W. SCOTT/ Who died May 2nd 1877/ [etc.]” (Figures 68 and 69). Given that this is apparently not the marker that originally stood at the head of this grave, it is not clear that it actually identifies the occupant.

The grave in Trench 7A (Figure 66) was apparently oriented almost due north-south, not merely misaligned but obviously perpendicular to the other graves. This may indicate a special circumstance, such as drowning (Cohen 1958:96), or it may simply represent a poorly dug grave. The individual buried in the grave in Trench 5 may have been removed (Figures 59 and 66). A remarkably heavy occurrence of roots resulted in Trench 5 being excavated by hand to a depth of 1.8 ft (0.5 m) below surface, where the grave stain was finally clear enough to draw. The fill removed in this process yielded 100 small fragments of typical early twentieth century grave goods (glass and ceramics) objects as well as five cut nail fragments that may have been coffin nails. Either the grave was originally dug through a deposit of grave goods on the surface, or removal of the burial and subsequent backfilling scattered the fragments through the fill.

**Grave Goods.** 38BU1618 showed no signs of the grading or stripping that was apparent on the other three cemeteries, and the surface grave goods there were probably the least disturbed among the Parris Island cemeteries examined. Nevertheless, most of the vessels represented were badly broken and scattered. Even reasonably intact vessels were not found in situ on grave features, although several were found in obvious association with particular graves, and some may have been in place until disturbed by trenching.

The grave feature exposed in Trenches 3A, 3B and 3A/B Extension, which had very fresh-looking fill, had the heaviest concentration of grave goods in reasonable association (Figure 70). These included a selenium pressed glass dessert cup (Figure 71E), a brown glass pharmaceutical bottle (Figure 71A), and most of two, clear glass pharmaceutical bottles (Figure 71B), as well as 43 fragments of several additional bottles and vessels. The humus overlying a grave feature in Trench 6A yielded most of a

![Figure 68. 38BU1618. Grave #46 after cleaning.](image-url)
Figure 69. 38BU1618. Close up of broken marker on grave #46.

Figure 70. 38BU1618. Grave feature revealed in Trench 3A/B Extension.
manganese pressed-glass stemware goblet (Figure 71F), and a few fragments of other vessels. Half of a stamp-decorated, semi-porcelain plate (Figure 71H) and a few manganese glass vessel fragments were found in association with the apparently misaligned grave in Trench 7A. Trench 8A produced 16 fragments of a manganese, pressed glass lamp base in probable association with the grave feature exposed in Trench 8A/8A Extension. Trench 9C yielded a U.S. Navy pharmaceutical bottle (Figure 71C), a porcelain child’s cup (Figure 71H), an Argentine copper coin of 1888, and a large collection of bottle and vessel fragments (N=46) from at least seven other glass objects. These probably originated with the grave feature in Trenches 9C/9B, and perhaps with the one in Trenches 9B/9A as well. Trench 9B produced another 15 glass fragments.

In addition to the materials recovered during clearing and trenching, a small cluster of grave goods was discovered by probing just west of the head of Depression #26 (Figure 59). These materials lay just under the humus and were excavated by trowel; they included a screw-top food bottle (Figure 71D), a partial stemware goblet (Figure 81G), and a jar fragment, all in manganese glass. Many other grave goods items, chiefly bottles and pressed glass vessels, were represented by fragments scattered over most of the cemetery.

The surface grave goods at 38BU1618 were late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century in age. No objects that were clearly antebellum were recovered, with the exception of the few small sherds and other objects discussed below, which are probably not related to the cemetery. The three graves in Trench 12, at the north end of the cemetery, appeared to be very old. Significantly, no grave goods of any age were recovered from Trench 12 with the exception of a single, small fragment of manganese glass.

Other Components

Native American. The location occupied by cemetery 38BU1618 has a long history of prehistoric occupation spanning about two and one half centuries. The earliest occupation indicated by our excavations belongs to the late Refuge/Deptford Periods dating as far back as 900 B.C. (see Table 1 and Appendix I). That Refuge/Deptford occupation is followed by a sparse Walthour occupation (ca. A.D. 500 to 600). After A.D. 600, the site was apparently abandoned for a few hundred years until about AD. 1000. Following that reoccupation, the site was then occupied intermittently by Native American until sometime in the seventeenth century. These later occupations are represented on the site by St. Catherines, Savannah, Irene, and Altamaha pottery (see Appendix I).

Plantation/Postbellum. Other than material related to the cemetery, very little evidence of civilian occupation was recovered from 38BU1618. Material assigned to the Eighteenth/Nineteenth Century class included three pearlware sherds, six olive green and dark olive green bottle fragments, a pipe bowl fragment, three cut nail fragments, three iron barrel band fragments, a length of wrought iron chain, two brick fragments, and a wrought iron “pole crab” from a wagon tongue. As in the case of 38BU1895B, the “plantation” finds were too sparse to indicate substantial domestic activity in the immediate vicinity, and any “postbellum” domestic artifacts were indistinguishable from broken grave goods of the same period.
Marine Corps. Twentieth century Marine Corps material fell into two groups including artifacts of the ca. 1937-1939 artillery range and artifacts of tactical field exercises from the 1950s through the 1980s (Figure 72).

The artillery range collection totaled 72 artifacts, all fragments or components of exploded artillery shells (Figure 72A-G). Marine Corps records show that the thousands of rounds fired in the late 1930s included at least four varieties of projectiles: the shrapnel shell and the high explosive shell for the M1897 75mm Gun, and the shrapnel and high explosive shells for the 75mm M1 Pack Howitzer (USACE 1999b:C79-C88; U.S. Army Ordnance Department 1919). All of the artifacts from 38BU1618 can be readily assigned to either shrapnel or high explosive shells, but it is virtually impossible to determine from small fragments which 75mm shell variants (for the M1897 or the M1) are represented.

Shrapnel shells contained only a small explosive charge in the base, with the remainder of the body filled with 0.5 in (1.3 cm) lead alloy shrapnel balls. The shells were designed to be detonated in flight by a time fuse, discharging the shrapnel balls forward while the shell body fell to the ground intact. Fifty-six shrapnel balls were found at 38BU1618, as well as two components from a brass M1907 Scovill Combination Fuse (as used with shrapnel shells) and a portion of a brass flash tube, which connected the fuse on the nose of the shell with the explosive charge in the base (Figure 72A-D). High explosive shells consisted of steel bodies completely filled with cast high explosive, and normally were fitted with a percussion fuse to explode on impact; the blast shredded the steel shell into small, jagged fragments. 38BU1618 yielded 11 such steel shell fragments and one fragment of copper rotating band (the band that engaged the rifling in the bore of the gun), all probably from 75mm shells (Figure 72E-G). In addition, one fragment from a 37mm high explosive shell was found. While the 37mm gun does not appear in the 1930s range records examined, it was in regular use at that time, and 37mm firing on the Parris Island ranges is suggested as a possibility in the 1999 EOD study (USACE 1999a:2.71).

Tactical field exercises for recruits have long included simulated combat using blank rifle ammunition. Thirty-five fired and unfired blank cartridges were recovered from 38BU1618, representing three different weapons, and three discrete periods of activity (Figure 72H-J). Earliest are fifteen .30'06 cartridges dated 1952 and 1954, as well as an eight-round clip, for use with the M1 Garand rifle. The M14 rifle (or an M60 machine gun) is represented by fifteen 7.62mm cartridges dated 1962 and 1964. Finally, the M16 rifle is represented by five 5.56 mm (.223 caliber) cartridges dated 1987 and 1988. Other training artifacts include fragments of a face camouflage paint stick and small amounts of trash from field rations. The “Elliott’s Woods” area generally is marked by numerous depressions and holes, usually backfilled to some degree, which were foxholes and other excavations dug during field exercises. As noted above, some of the non-linear depressions mapped at 38BU1618 (Figure 59) are probably such Marine Corps features rather than grave sinks.

Conclusions

Excavations at site 38BU1618 revealed that the site is larger than anticipated. Previous researchers estimated that it covered approximately 8000 sq ft (743 m²), whereas we believe it covers approximately 12,000 sq ft (1,114.8 m²), or 0.28 acres. A total of 16 backhoe trenches with a total length of 429 ft (130.8 m) were used to determine site limits. These excavations exposed the outlines of 11 graves; no graves were excavated.

Maximum length of the cemetery is estimated at 310 ft (94.5 m) northeast/southwest and maximum width at 80 ft (24.4 m) northwest/southeast. The cemetery occupies a piece of high ground bounded along its entire eastern margin by marsh. The western edge of the cemetery is
bounded by a shallow ditch that we believe is a plantation era field boundary ditch. The ditch along the southern boundary of the cemetery may also be a field boundary ditch that also served to provide drainage from nearby fields. Variations in the clarity of grave edges and in the mottling of fill indicate that burials were placed into this cemetery over a considerable span of time. It is possible that some graves date to the eighteenth century.

Surface grave goods at this site all dated to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite the fact that we saw no evidence of grading or stripping, most vessels and containers were highly fragmented. This fragmentation may have occurred during pine planting and logging operations, use of the site for military training, or through vandalism.

This cemetery, the smallest of the four known Parris Island cemeteries, was definitely in use by the 1870s and it may contain graves as much as 100 years older. We estimate that this cemetery contains approximately 200 graves. Some were clearly Freedmen who occupied the surrounding land in the decades following the Civil War. The northeast end of the cemetery, where grave outlines are the least distinct, may contain the graves of slaves.
Chapter 6

38BU162V, W: THE MEANS PLANTATION CEMETERY

The cemetery located at the south end of Parris Island has had a long history of use beginning in the eighteenth century (Figure 73). It was used throughout the plantation period, and it continued in use after emancipation and perhaps up to the mid-twentieth century. The 1968 Marine Corps memo (USMC 1968) notes that the Marine Corps prohibited further use of this cemetery when the Maneuver Grounds training facilities were erected on the site in 1918 (see Chapter 1). When the Maneuver Grounds were abandoned a few years later, it is possible that burial in this cemetery was resumed by the remaining residents of the island (Woodrow Garvin, personal communication 2001).

At present, this cemetery retains only a single headstone (marking the grave of William Binyard, d. 1909), located immediately north of Fort San Felipe (Figures 74, 75). In addition, there is a small rectangular brick surface, laid with cement, that is very likely the base for an additional grave marker, similar to the example seen at 38BU1895 (Figure 28). Previous testing in the cemetery area by Stanley South (1983:77-80) indicated that there were many additional graves located here. Long-time island employee, Woodrow Garvin, informed Stanley South that the cemetery was large and continued in use well into the twentieth century (personal communication, 1979 to 1995). South’s work, however, was focused on the Spanish occupation of the site, and he therefore did not attempt to determine the extent of the cemetery which he identified as “a Black graveyard…possibly dating from the early nineteenth century” (South 1983:77).

Our work at the site was designed to address several questions. First and foremost was the identification of the cemetery boundary. Second, we wanted to determine whether shoreline erosion was actively eroding graves into the nearby marsh. Third, we were curious why there was only a single marked grave remaining in this cemetery that was reported to contain many graves. Through the combination of archaeology and documents, we were able to answer all of these questions.

History

In contrast to the other three cemeteries addressed by this project, the vicinity of the “Means” cemetery at 38BU162 has already received a great deal of historical attention. While most of the previous work focuses on the sixteenth century French and Spanish settlements on the Charlesfort/Santa Elena site, there has also been substantial attention paid the eighteenth and nineteenth century plantation occupation (Butler et al. 1995; DePratter and South 1995; Hayward and Steinback 1997; DePratter et al. 2001; Shumpert 2001), and the twentieth century Marine Corps activities (DePratter and South 1995; Omanson 1997; Alvarez 1998; DePratter et al. 2001; Legg 2005). None of these efforts, however, provides a comprehensive, coherent narrative of the history of the property over the last three centuries.
Figure 73. 38BU51/162. Current map of the Santa Elena site.
Figure 74. 38BU162. View to the north from the south end of the cemetery. The grave of William Binyard is in the foreground.

Figure 75. 38BU162. Grave of William Binyard (d.1909).
We recounted earlier the story of the competition between Spain and France for control of what is today the southeastern coast of the United States (Chapter 2). As we now know, important aspects of this competition occurred on Parris Island at site 38BU51/162. It was here that Captain Ribault built Charlesfort in 1562; it was abandoned the next year. The Spanish arrived in 1566 to build Santa Elena and its forts on the same site; Santa Elena was subsequently abandoned in 1587 (Lyon 1976, 1984; DePratter et al. 1996).

Although this picture of the early colonial history of the south end of Parris Island is now relatively clear, this has not always been the case. In the seventeenth century, William Hilton visited Parris Island and saw a fort that he identified as Charlesfort (Salley 1911:41). That fort, with its open moat, remained visible through the nineteenth century, and local residents consistently identified it as Charlesfort (Rivers 1856:25; Simms 1860:17; Doyle 1881:13). With the acquisition of the island by the Marine Corps and the outbreak of World War I, the southern tip of the island was soon converted to the Maneuver Grounds for use in training. As part of that construction, the visible fort moat, thought by some to be Charlesfort, was filled (Osterhout 1923:105). This filling caused a tremendous uproar among local residents, and even the Secretary of the Navy got involved (Cole 1926:15). In order to discover the true identity of the fort and to aid planning for its future, Major George Osterhout was assigned to excavate inside the fort (Cole 1926; Osterhout 1923, 1936). Major Osterhout trenched extensively within the fort and concluded it was indeed Charlesfort (Cole 1924, 1926; Osterhout 1923, 1936). The filled moat was re-excavated, and in 1926 a monument proclaiming the fort to be Charlesfort was erected in the center of the fort.

Osterhout’s excavations and conclusions were not totally accepted by historians. Mary Ross (1923:269, 1925:353; Connor 1927:8) believed that the fort identified by Osterhout as Charlesfort was actually Fort San Marcos, the last Spanish fort in the town of Santa Elena. Examination of Major Osterhout’s collections by Albert Manucy (1957), a National Park Service historian from St. Augustine, demonstrated that those artifacts were clearly Spanish and not French, confirming the identification as a Spanish fort, most likely San Marcos.

In 1979, Stanley South began excavating at Santa Elena. In his first season, he discovered the remains of a second Spanish fort, San Felipe, occupied from 1566 to 1570 (South 1979; DePratter and South 1995). Since then additional sampling has shown that the town covers approximately 15 acres (South 1983; South and Hunt 1986; DePratter and South 1995:49) (see Figure 73). Extensive excavations have been conducted in the town at the location of what may be the Governor’s two town lots (South, 1982; South and DePratter 1996) as well as within Fort San Felipe (South 1983, 1984, 1985) and Fort San Marcos (South 1980). In 1996, the remains of Charlesfort were found buried beneath Fort San Felipe (DePratter et al. 1996). There was probably a substantial cemetery associated with the church at Santa Elena, but its location is unknown.
The Seventeenth Century

As was noted earlier, seventeenth century explorers William Hilton (1664) and Robert Sandford (1666) visited Parris Island during their respective forays along the South Carolina coast. William Hilton visited the island while exploring the southeast U.S. coast in search of a place where a group of Barbadian “Adventurers” could establish a colony (Salley 1911:33). In visiting an Indian village called St. Ellens (clearly at Spanish Santa Elena) on Parris Island, Hilton saw a large house that he described as follows (Salley 1911:41):

…built in the form of a Dove-house, round, two hundred foot at least, completely covered with Palmeta-leaves, the wal-plate being twelve foot high, or thereabouts, and within lodging Rooms and forms; two pillars at the entrance of a high seat above all the rest…

Nearby was another structure “like a Sentinel-house, floored ten foot high with planks, fastnd with Spikes and Nayls, standing upon substantial Posts, with several other small houses round about.” This building may have been built by Spaniards (perhaps as a watch tower of gun platform), because surrounding it were “many planks, to the quantity of three thousand foot or thereabouts, with other timber squared, and a Cross before the great house” (Salley 1911:41).

Hilton also observed the ruins of a fort “compassing more than half an acre of land within the Trenches, which we supposed to be Charlesfort” (Salley 1911:41). These dimensions fit the remains of Fort San Marcos (occupied 1582 or 1583 until 1587), the last Spanish fort at Santa Elena, which are still visible (DePratter and South 1995; South and DePratter 1996). Hilton was incorrect in his identification (DePratter et al. 1996).

Only a few years later, Robert Sandford visited the Indian town located on the southern tip of the island, and in his account he reported that the town was large and surrounded by many fields of corn (Salley 1911:100-101). Within the town was a large building that Sandford noted was “in every respect like that of Eddistowe.” In describing the building he visited at the Edisto town, he said it was “their general house of State,” large, circular in form, with a fire kept burning perpetually in its center (Salley 1911:91). The cassique or chief sat on an elevated bench opposite the entrance and other benches along the walls contained the “whole rabble of men, women and children” who resided in the town. Sandford also observed a chunky yard at the Edisto town where men competed at throwing “six foot staves” at a “marble bowle” or stone disk that was rolled along the smoothed playing surface. He further reported that the Indian town on Parris Island also had a chunky yard “before the great round house” (Salley 1911:100). Nearby was a cross that Sandford presumed was erected by the Spanish who still maintained missions on the Georgia coast to the south. The surrounding fields of corn grew on loose, rich soil. Sandford saw numerous peach and fig trees, perhaps survivors from the abandonment of the island by the Spanish colonists 79 years earlier.

Both Hilton and Sandford were clearly describing an Indian town occupying the former Santa Elena town site. Based on the results of our shovel testing in the boundary survey (DePratter and South 1995:47, 51), the most likely location of the council house and surrounding town is in the northern part of the site northwest of Fort San Felipe and the cemetery. Most of
the Indians who occupied Santa Elena and surrounding Port Royal Sound area had departed by 1683, when John Crafford (1683) reports that there were fewer than 160 Indians around Port Royal Sound.

The Plantation Era

The plantation that included 38BU51/162 was probably the first to be established on Parris Island, and some burials in the African American cemetery there may date as early as the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Unfortunately, while the chain of title for the property is reasonably clear, we have found no information to indicate when a functioning plantation with a slave community (and a cemetery) was established on the site.

Webber (1925:137) assembled the details of the earliest property history of what was originally called Port Royal Island and ultimately Parris Island:

On August 12, 1698, the Lords Proprietors of South Carolina conferred upon Major Robert Daniell the title of Landgrave, which carried with it land grants to the extent of 48,000 acres; part of the lands selected by Major Daniell included ‘all yt tract of land commonly called Port Royall Island’ containing three thousand and twenty acres, situated at the mouth of Port Royall River. The Warrant was dated 9th March, 1698/9.

By a deed, dated April 17, 1701, Landgrave Daniell of Berkeley County, conveyed to Edward Archer, of Barbadoes, planter, consideration one hundred pounds current money of the province, all of the 3020 acres included in the warrant of 9th March, 1698/9.

Butler et al. (1995:25) assert that Edward Archer’s interest was apparently speculative, and that he “did not reside [on] or establish a plantation on the island,” but they provide no documentation for this. The island was generally called “Archer’s Island” through the first half of the eighteenth century. Archer sold the entire island to Alexander Parris (1661-1736) in 1715. Parris later described the property thus (Webber 1925:138):

One Tract of Land, containing Three Thousand and Twenty Acres, called Port Royal Island...being one large Island and eight smaller, granted unto Robert Daniell, Esqr....butting and bounding to Southwest, on Port Royal River, to Northwest on a creek running out of the said river, to the Northeast on a Creek, running out of the Port Royal River, which said Tract of Land was conveyed unto the said Alexander Parris by a deed of sale signed by Edward Archer dated the 1st day of July, 1715.

Alexander Parris, ultimately the namesake of Parris Island, was a significant public figure in early South Carolina. A seventeenth century immigrant from Barbados, Parris served four terms in the Commons House of Assembly between 1703 and 1715, and he held numerous other local and provincial offices and posts in Charlestown and Berkeley County. As Public Treasurer from 1712 to 1735, Parris openly used public funds to satisfy his personal debts. By 1731 he
owed the colony 40,000 pounds, but apparently he was so well respected that he remained in
good graces with the Commons House with the understanding that he would gradually repay the
debt (Edgar and Bailey 1977:505-507). On his death in 1736, Parris’ obituary made no
suggestion that he had ever behaved less than honorably (Webber 1925:139):

On Wednesday last died Alexander Parris; Esq...at the age of Seventy–four,
wanting a few days, one of the oldest Settlers in this Province, in which he had
been Forty-five Years...He had the Honour to be in all publick Offices in this
Government, Civil and Military, both of Honour and Profit, in all of which he
never had regard to his private Interest.

Alexander Parris is cited as “one of the original settlers in the town of Beaufort in 1717,”
and at his death he owned nine town lots in Beaufort (Edgar and Bailey 1977:505). It appears,
however, that his principal town house was in Charleston, and his plantation residence was at
his Islington Plantation on Shem Creek in Christ Church Parish (Butler et al. 1995:25). Butler et
al. (1995:25) make the undocumented statement that Alexander Parris conducted agricultural
activity on Parris Island, which is not unlikely, but we have located no evidence to indicate when
that “agricultural activity” began. An inventory of Alexander Parris’ estate in 1739 included
“the personal property at Archer’s Island,” which suggests that Parris had a residence of some
sort there (Webber 1925:142). The 1776/1791 Gascoigne Map (Figure 4) may depict a house
dating as early as the Parris occupation; the magnetic date of that map is 1729, which may
indicate that at least some of the information shown dates to much earlier than 1776.

Parris Island was first subdivided in 1722, when Alexander Parris gave 1375 acres (the
northern 40% or so of the island) to his daughter Jane and her husband John Delabare (Edgar and
Bailey 1977:190-191). John Delabare began a plantation at some point during his tenure (1722-
1739) (Chapter 3). The remaining 1700 acres of the island was still owned by Alexander Parris
when he died in 1736. In his will, Parris left the property to his son John, but John died shortly
after his father. John Parris’s son, John Alexander Parris, was heir to his grandfather’s Parris
Island property, but he died a minor in 1739, leaving a cousin (also named John Alexander
Parris) as heir (Webber 1925:142, 144). In any case, Alexander Parris’s estate was so
encumbered by his debt to the colony that none of his heirs would ever have clear title to the land
on Parris Island. On March 25, 1738, the General Assembly passed an act “...for the better
securing the Fund of 27,171 pounds 4 shillings, five and a quarter pence due to the public from
the estate of Alexander Parris” with Charles Pinckney and Gabriel Manigault as trustees and
commissioners (Webber 1925:141). The case was apparently complex, and it was not until
September 19, 1751, that the trustees could “...release to Col. Nathaniel Barnwell of Beaufort,
one moiety or half of an island called Archer’s Island,” presumably by sale (Webber 1925:141).

Nathaniel Barnwell (1705-1775) was the son of John Barnwell (1680?-1724), one of the
most dynamic figures in early South Carolina political and military history and an important
early settler and advocate of the Port Royal Sound area (Edgar and Bailey 1977:52-54). Nathaniel
was also an important political and military figure, but less so than his father. He
inherited various properties including “Doctors,” his father’s principal plantation near Beaufort,
and added holdings including his 1751 acquisition on Parris Island. With the family home at
“Doctors” and another house in Beaufort, Barnwell probably spent little or no time in residence
on Parris Island, if indeed there was a suitable structure standing on the property. The substantial deposits of period artifacts found at 38BU162 may well have originated entirely with slave and overseer occupations (Edgar and Bailey 1977:56, 57; DePratter and South 1995:55). At one time Nathaniel Barnwell’s several properties “were tilled by a force of 91 slaves” (Edgar and Bailey 1977:56), but there is no way to know how many of them were on Parris Island.

The 1700 acres on Parris Island owned by Nathaniel Barnwell apparently were subdivided by 1768, although the details are confused. Butler (1995:30) reports that Nathaniel Barnwell left 1200 acres to his eldest son John, and 500 acres to his daughter and son-in-law, Mary and William Elliott. Mary died in 1774, however, and William Elliott was already remarried before Nathaniel Barnwell’s death in February 1775 (Edgar and Bailey 1977:56, 57, 230, 231). It appears that the Elliots took possession of the 500 acres at some earlier time, perhaps as a wedding gift in 1760. A tract purchased by William Elliott from John Kennered Delabare in 1768 was bounded “S.E. on William Elliott,” indicating the property acquired earlier from Nathaniel Barnwell (Edgar and Bailey 1977:230; Webber 1925:143). The 500 acres comprising the new Elliott’s, or Whale Creek Plantation, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 5, was cut from the northwest portion of Nathaniel Barnwell’s 1700 acres. This property included the areas now known as Elliott’s Beach, Elliott’s Wood, and General’s Landing, and the cemetery, 38BU1618. The remaining 1200 acres left to John Barnwell in 1775 included the present golf course and the Page Field area and extending as far north as Pilot or Ballast Creek.

John Barnwell (1748-1800) was yet another in the line of significant public figures that began with his grandfather. He saw distinguished service as a militia officer during the Revolution, and he held numerous elected and appointed offices and posts. In 1808, the General Assembly named Barnwell District in honor of John Barnwell (Edgar and Bailey 1977:54-56). Like his ancestors, John Barnwell maintained his primary plantation residence on Port Royal Island, and it is not known if he had a residence on Parris Island. The Gascoigne Map (Figure 4) indicates that by 1776, and possibly much earlier, there was a house of some sort that corresponds in location with the eighteenth and nineteenth domestic site just south of the 38BU162 cemetery (Figure 73). In the 1786 plat and appraisal of John Barnwell’s Parris Island property, “…1511 [1/4] acres of the Large Island and Ten Little Islands 163 [1/4] acres,” was appraised at £2520. The appraisal makes no mention of a house or other improvements, and the accompanying plat shows a fort (Fort San Marcos) and a live oak at 38BU162, but no house (SCDAH 1786). In 1790 Barnwell owned 83 slaves, some of whom certainly lived on Parris Island, and who are probably buried at 38BU162 (Barnwell 1969:38). John Barnwell and his brothers were among the first planters to adopt sea island cotton agriculture after 1790, and the Parris Island property may have been one of the earliest tracts planted in that revolutionary crop (Rowland et al. 1996:280).

John Barnwell left his Parris Island property to his son, John Gibbes Barnwell (1778-1828), and his daughter, Anne Middleton Barnwell (1783-1840) (Barnwell 1969:74, 75, 79). The tract conveyed to John Gibbes Barnwell was the southernmost 710 acres, including 38BU162 (Beaufort County (SC) Register of Deeds, Quitclaim of Robert Gibbes Barnwell, 1811). John Gibbes Barnwell had several other plantations, and his principal residence was not on Parris Island. It is not known whether he maintained a Parris Island residence (Barnwell 1969:74,75). Anne Middleton Barnwell received the northern half or so of her father’s property,
the tract that would become Habersham plantation after her marriage to James Habersham, Jr., in 1812 (Barnwell 1969:79). That property became the site of Page Field in the 1930s.

In 1809, John Gibbes Barnwell sold his Parris Island tract to Robert Means, the husband of his sister, Mary Hutson Barnwell Means, for $16,000. The property was described thus (Beaufort Co. 1811):

...Seven hundred and ten Acres more or less – Bounded on the South by the Confluence of Broad and Beaufort Rivers, on the West by Broad River, Whale Creek and Land belonging to the Estate of William Elliott deceased, on the North by Land belonging to Miss Ann Barnwell and on the East by Beaufort River...

Robert Means (1774-1832) was a recent arrival among Port Royal planters. A native of Boston, he first settled in Charleston, South Carolina, where he ultimately became a successful merchant. By about 1804, Means was ready to move toward his second career as a gentleman planter. He may have been inspired by a former Charleston employer and fellow New Englander, Ebenezer Coffin, who began his Coffin Point Plantation on St. Helena Island in 1800 (Rowland et al. 1996:281, 282; Shumpert 2001:34). Means purchased seven slaves from Coffin in June, 1804, and in 1805 he moved to Beaufort and built a substantial home there. On June 20, 1805, Robert Means married Mary Hutson Barnwell (1781-1851), another daughter of John Barnwell (Barnwell 1969:78; Shumpert 2001:34, 35). We have found no evidence for any plantation property that Mary may have brought into the marriage, so it may be that Means’ 1809 purchase on Parris Island was his initial plantation acquisition. He eventually owned additional property in St. Helena Parish, but the Parris Island plantation was his principal plantation (Barnwell 1969:78). If indeed there was no suitable planter’s residence extant on the south end of Parris Island in 1809, Robert Means must have built one. The Mills’ Atlas map of Beaufort District (Figure 5), surveyed in 1820, shows the Means house at 38BU162. The location is compatible with both the house on the Gascoigne Map (Figure 4) and with the domestic site known through archaeology to be located south of the cemetery (DePratter and South 1995).

Robert Means prospered in his new endeavor. In 1810 he owned 66 slaves, and by 1820, 82 slaves. His 1824 St. Helena Parish tax return shows 2,240 acres and 180 slaves, indicating a substantial acquisition elsewhere in the parish after 1820 (Barnwell 1969:78; Shumpert 2001:35). At his death in December 1832, Robert Means left his Parris Island property to be divided among his three sons, Thomas, William, and Edward. Testimony in a postbellum compensation case recorded that Thomas and Edward bought out William’s share in about 1839, and Thomas bought out Edward in 1852, re-uniting his father’s “750 acres of high land” under his ownership (NARA RG123, Box 1029, Files 17341 and 17348). Butler et al. (1995:43) state that Robert Means’ property was “evidently divided between his son Thomas and son-in-laws [sic] Dr. Henry Fuller, and Thomas Fuller.” This assertion, later cited in DePratter and South (1995:53, 103), is undocumented and demonstrably incorrect, and appears to be based in part on confusion between Dr. Thomas Fuller (1788-1862), the Parris Island planter, and his son Thomas Fuller (1813-1845), who was indeed a son-in-law of Robert Means (Barnwell 1969:78,128).

A second house, located on the western shore of Parris Island at present-day Nivers Beach, was built on the Means’ plantation in the antebellum period. Archaeological testing on
the site, 38BU1399, suggested an initial occupation in the first or second quarter of the nineteenth century (Butler et al. 1995:123-129; DePratter and South 1995:94-106; Hendryx et al. 1997:152-155). The house does not appear on the Mills’ Atlas map published in 1825 (Figure 5) but it is mentioned in an 1861 description of Port Royal Sound by the U.S. Coast Survey, which reported that on “Parry Island” there were “…four proprietors, of whom two reside on the Island, viz. Dr. J. H. Means and Stephen Elliott, Jr. – Their houses are on the Broad River shore, and the first landing at low water upon the island is at Mr. Elliott’s which is the second house” (Bache and Boutelle 1861:24, 25). The report is almost certainly mistaken in citing “Dr. J. H. Means” as the “proprietor” in residence at the lower house on Broad River. It appears that Dr. Thomas Means (1812-1876) has been confused with his son, Dr. John Hugh Means, who lived in Fairfield District and who does not appear in the 1860 St. Helena Parish census (Shumpert 2001:39, 40). There is no question that Dr. Thomas Means was the sole and final “proprietor” of Means Plantation (including both house locations) after he bought out his brother Edward in 1852.

Several explanations are possible for the second house. Robert Means may have built a new house to replace an aging or destroyed structure at 38BU162. Alternately, after Robert Means’ death in 1832, Thomas Means may have built a new house for himself or for his mother, Mary Hutson Means (1781-1851), or for other family members. In the 1850 census, Thomas’ brothers, William Means (age 30) and Edward Means (age 28), are enumerated with their mother in Beaufort. Both William and Edward had plantations elsewhere in Beaufort District, but the family may have had a secondary home on the Parris Island property (U.S. Census 1850; Barnwell 1969:79). In any case, we found no documentary evidence for the older, eastern house later than the Mills’ Atlas map, and at the time of the Civil War the newer house (at Nivers Beach, 38BU1399) was considered the Means place (Clara Barton Diary, 5 May 1863; NY Daily Tribune 5 June 1863:3).

The 1860 census (Table 2) reveals that “planter & physician” Thomas Means continued to thrive in the last decade before the Civil War. He valued his real estate (including his property in Beaufort) at $50,000 and his personal property at $52,000. His only plantation in St. Helena Parish, located on Parris Island, was a remarkably successful operation. The “Cash value of Farm” for that property was $40,000, placing Means Plantation in the top four of the 132 plantations recorded in the parish. Oddly, Means recorded only 500 acres of improved land, and 100 acres unimproved, considerably less than the 700+ acres of improved land consistently recorded elsewhere, before and after 1860; perhaps the missing acreage was leased out. Means owned 72 slaves housed in 18 “slave houses” on Parris Island. His operations were quite diversified (Table 2), yet only two other planters among the 132 listed produced more sea island cotton in 1859, and both of them claimed far more improved acreage (U.S. Census 1860a). St. Helena Parish tax records for 1860 show Thomas Means with 754 acres valued for taxation at $4 per acre, and 500 acres at 20 cents, the latter being marsh lands (NARA RG 123, Box 1029, Files 17341 and 17348).
Table 2. Thomas Means’ Plantation in the 1860 Census, Slave and Agricultural Schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of Farming Implements and Machinery</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asses and Mules</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Cows</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Oxen</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Live Stock</td>
<td>$3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Corn, bushels of</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginned Cotton, bales of 400 lbs. each [long staple cotton]</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool, lbs. of</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas and Beans, bushels of</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes, bushels of</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter, lbs. of</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, tons of [including corn fodder]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Animals Slaughtered</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Civil War and Postbellum Eras

Like the other Parris Island planters, Thomas Means abandoned his plantation to the invading Federals in November 1861. On March 12, 1863, the property was “sold” to the United States by the U.S. Direct Tax Commissioners for $140. The plantation was described as follows (NARA RG 123, Box 1029, Files 17341 and 17348):

‘The Means Place,’ bounded Northerly by the Elliott Place No. 2 and the Elliott Place No. 3, Southerly by Broad River, Easterly by Port Royal River, Westerly by Broad River, containing 754 acres...valued for taxation at $3,016.00...

In January 1863, Frances Gage was appointed the U.S. Superintendent of Parris Island, replacing John Zachos (Chapter 2). It is not known where Zachos resided, but Mrs. Gage made her home and headquarters at the Means Place (Clara Barton Diary, 5 May 1863). A visitor in May, 1863 recorded (New York Tribune, 5 June 1863:3):

The mansion (it would be called a large old farm house at the North), which she [Frances Gage] occupies commands a magnificent view of Port Royal Harbor, and in the distance the ocean, the shipping at Hilton Head, the large fleet of war vessels...

As detailed in Chapter 2, between 1865 and 1869 most of Parris Island was sold by the United States to ex-slaves for $1.50 per acre. The bulk of the property was subdivided and the lots sold to African American “heads of household” who each bought one or two 10-acre lots, or
fractional lots thereof totaling no more than 20 acres (Figure 6; Appendix II). The major exceptions were the two 160-acre school farms retained by the U.S. as rental properties, the proceeds of which were to support schools for the freedman community. School Farm #32, or the “Means School Farm,” was a rectangular tract running east-west across the Means Plantation and the Charlesfort/Santa Elena site, 38BU51/162 (Figure 6).

The United States first rented out School Farms #31 and #32 in January, 1864, to Henry G. Judd, the former U.S. superintendent of Parris Island, for a term of one year (see Chapters 2 and 3) (NARA RG 217, Revised Inventory #14, Entry 888, Vol. I:24). Judd’s 1864 “indenture” is the only one found for School Farm #32, so it is not known if the property continued to rent as a school farm in 1865 or 1866. In any case, by late 1866 the school farm was defunct and the property was surplus. Unlike the remainder of Means Plantation, the school farm was eligible for redemption by the previous owners. On December 8, 1866, Thomas Hanckel, trustee for Thomas Means’ wife Ann, purchased 160 acres of former Means property for $1850, including at least 110 acres of the old school farm (NARA RG 123, Box 1029, Files 17341 and 17348; USMC 1918-1919). On June 19, 1876, the Means tract was sold by Ann Means to James Snyder for $1500 (Beaufort Co (SC) Register of Deeds, Deed of James Snyder, June 19, 1876).

No information has been found regarding the 1866-1876 Means tenure. If a planter’s house still stood at 38BU162, it left no obvious archaeological expression of a postbellum occupation. The house site at 38BU1399 (Nivers Beach) does show archaeological evidence of the documented postbellum occupation. The old slave settlement within 38BU162, as well as another settlement identified at the present golf club house (seasons 38BU51C, D and F), appear to have been abandoned after the Civil War, but use of the associated cemetery continued (South 1982; DePratter and South 1995).

In 1881, an engineer named John Michael Doyle was sent to Parris Island to erect a new rear navigation light on Parris Island to align with the range light on the southern tip of the island (Chapter 2). The new light was located about half a mile north-northwest of 38BU51/162 (it is visible in the background of Figure 78). Doyle (1881:4, 13) kept a detailed diary of his stay on Parris Island, which includes an interesting demographic observation and an early description of what was probably Fort San Marcos:

The population is about 800 souls and, strange to say, there are but two white families here who are residents. Mr. Snyder and Mr. Rivers [actually William H. Niver] are from N. York state and are married to sisters.

Mr. [Snyder], Mr. D. and myself went to see an old fort on the former’s place which history says was built three hundred and fifty years ago by the French...It is a circular shaped embankment with a ditch inside and out and is in a remarkable state of preservation. There are fragments of pottery and arrowheads found around it frequently...

James Snyder and the Niver brothers, Christian and William H., were northern men who settled on Parris Island after the Civil War and began buying up whatever properties became available. The Means tract purchased by James Snyder in 1876 included the old Means house
on the Broad River shore at present Niver’s Beach (38BU1399) and that is presumably where he resided in 1881 (USMC 1918-19). William H. Niver later purchased the property from Snyder, and he was apparently living in that same house in 1904 (Niver 1904). In about 1896, W.H. Niver built another house (“Twin Oaks”) near the north edge of the old Means Plantation, just west of the interior navigation light; the new house may have been intended for William H. Niver’s son William Wadsworth Niver. Both houses were still standing in 1918 (NARA RG125 Box 18; USMC 1918-19). In 1904, William H. Niver (1904:16) claimed that he and his brother had worked all along toward the goal of creating a major, deep water port at the south end of Parris Island:

In the year 1865, Mr. Christian Wadsworth Niver, now deceased, came from his home in Columbia Co., New York, to this place [Parris Island]. The next year his brother, Mr. W. H. Niver, followed him; the two young men…foresaw the inevitable future of this glorious harbor in the deep water frontage of Paris Island. Their belief grew to a purpose…During the Civil War the lands in this vicinity had been confiscated by the Government, and in 1866 [sic] were cut up in ten acre lots and sold to heads of colored families, prohibiting them from alienating or selling them for six years. They still hold some of this land. After the six years were ended it was still found that land could not be purchased there \textit{ad libitum}. A negro will not readily part with his home. The more anxious one is to buy the less he wants to sell, and until his mind is made up to do so, money is no inducement...

But the boys remained true to their purpose, and through all the years that followed...they worked quietly and waited patiently to secure these Paris Island lands that lay along the water front...In 1902 the last coveted piece of water frontage…was secured, and Mr. Niver now stands ready to offer such inducements as he believes cannot fail to make this island the terminal for the great railroad systems...

The Niver dream, of course, was never realized, but by the end of the civilian era in 1918, the Niver family had re-assembled much of the property that formerly comprised Means plantation, including 38BU51/162 and the cemetery.

\textit{The Marine Corps Era}

The small Navy base established on Parris Island in 1883 was confined to the northeast corner of the island (Chapter 2). The vicinity of 38BU51/162 remained rural and agricultural, with the lighthouse complex near the southern tip of the island representing the only Federal presence. A radical transformation began shortly after the Marine Corps designated Parris Island as their primary, eastern U.S. basic training facility in 1915.

The reservation available to the Marines for training in 1915 was limited to a substantially developed area including the original Navy base and the former Quarantine Station property to the south. The Marines required a large, isolated, undeveloped tract where field training of recruit units could be undertaken. The acquisitive Niver family was able to offer suitable tracts for this “Maneuver Grounds,” which included a camping area at 38BU51/162, and
a field training area on the southernmost dry ground on the island, south of the present 2nd Fairway of the Legends Golf Course (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 621:610-3-66). Before 1918 the property was only leased by the Marine Corps, with the provision that the Nivers were allowed to operate a private “post exchange” store for Marines at the Maneuver Grounds campsite. This exchange, the “Lucky Bag,” was located just west of the remains of Fort San Marcos (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 621:610-3-66; USMC Quartermaster Dept. 1918b).

In January 1916, the *Beaufort Gazette* published an article describing one of the first “deployments” of recruit training companies to the Maneuver Grounds (Hundertmark 1916:1):

...a number of the older companies under training went out for a practice march to the new manoeuver grounds on Paris Island. These grounds are located about 3 miles distant from the depot.

They carry with them rations to last them for the entire length of the march, also their ordinary equipment, rifle, belt, and bayonet, haversack, canteen, shelter tent, and entrenching tool. Upon reaching their destination, the first thing to be done is to pitch shelter tents...These tents are used only in the field, where other accommodations are not to be had. After that the various companies are assigned to different tasks, in accordance with the length of time for which they have undergone instruction at the depot. Some men will form skirmish lines and practice advance upon an imaginary enemy under fire...Others will start to dig trenches, commencing with a prone trench, and then eventually enlarging it to into a kneeling trench, and from that into a standing trench...

It appears that initially the Maneuver Grounds was used for brief exercises of a few days’ duration, in contrast to its later, wartime status as the site of one of the three primary phases of basic training. The campsite was apparently only a bivouac area for shelter tents; it is not known if any durable structures were erected in 1916. The DeRoode map of April 5, 1916 (Figure 76) shows no Marine Corps structures or other improvements, with the possible exception of the main plantation road from the north, which was apparently straightened and simplified at some time after a survey in 1912 (USACE 1920/1939). DeRoode depicts the cemetery as a rectangle within a woods in the same manner he used for the cemetery at 38BU1895 (Chapter 3).

The entry of the United States into the World War, on April 6, 1917, resulted in a complete transformation of the Maneuver Grounds, and, eventually, the near obliteration of the Means plantation cemetery at 38BU162. Two major phases of construction in 1917 and 1918 replaced the simple bivouac area of 1916 with a vast complex of temporary wooden buildings supporting a formal tent camp for thousands of recruits (Figures 77, 78, 79). During the war, recruit companies each spent several weeks at the Maneuver Grounds, normally as their first or second phase of three training phases. The other phases were the “training camp,” a period of intensive drill and education at the mainside complex, and the rifle range phase, which was always last.
In July and October, 1917, the Marine Corps *Recruiter’s Bulletin* published descriptions of the recruit experience in the Maneuver Grounds phase of his training:

After several weeks of drilling [at the training camp], he and his company comrades don their packs and are guided to a secondary camp known as the “manoeuvring grounds.” More work awaits him here, as this camp is also being enlarged. Those having knowledge of carpentry are put to work constructing field mess kitchens, etc. Each trade is put to advantage. Work and drill days are alternated until each company has completed a specified amount of labor. (Honing 1917:9)

Five hundred tents are pitched here, on a broad plateau, aligned with military precision, and laid out to form company streets. This is the only tented encampment on the island – the others are built on the cantonment plan. Recruits who passed through during the summer took particular pains to improve the camp... Shells...are spread round about and over the grounds. They glisten in the
sunlight and add to the immaculate appearance of the camp... At this camp the recruit is furnished with a rifle and additional equipment. There are hours devoted to the handling of the rifle and its various movements... At this camp the recruit learns, through practice marches into the surrounding country, how to pitch & strike shelter tents, roll & unroll equipment, build fires, cook...(quoted in Omanson 1997:18)

The recollections of several recruits who trained at the Maneuver Grounds in 1917 present an interesting contrast to the Recruiter’s Bulletin narratives:

On June 7th we arrived at the maneuvering grounds. We slept on cots without mattresses or pillows. The drilling was very strenuous and the days were baking hot...[A] form of punishment was to carry buckets of seashells from the beach which was about a mile from camp. The shells were used to pave the company streets. We ate our chow on the ground and the hot wind blew sand into our food. (Omanson 1997:20)

Ninety in the shade & no shade. More drill. Up at 5 AM, drill till 6.30, breakfast at 7.30, drill until 12. Dinner. From 1 PM to 3 PM out on beach with our water buckets picking up oyster shells to carry them a mile, making road...3 PM to 4 PM wash clothes. Supper at 6 PM and drill until 8 PM Fall out. Next day the same, & so on...We had four weeks of this drilling. (Rendinell 1917:23)

On the flat sands of the maneuver grounds, we pitched pup tents and an attempt was started to turn us into Leathernecks...Half our daylight hours were spent on weapons training and endless marching. The other half was spent in building oyster shell roads. Nights were spent battling sand fleas. It was really rugged! (Finney 1977:19,20)

A January 30, 1918, map of Parris Island shows the “Manouvr Grounds” camp consisting of a north-south row of eleven messhalls, and the “Old Tent Camp,” confined to the area between the mess halls and Means Creek to the east (National Board of Fire Underwriters 1918). The mess halls are those shown on the Tittoni Map in 1920 (Figure 77) and a 1918 photograph (Figure 78) taken from the roof of one of the messhalls, looking north (Culp 1918). The same mess halls were encountered archaeologically in 2000 at the northeastern corner of the present golf course driving range (DePratter et al. 2001:38, 39).

A June 11, 1918, map of the Maneuver Grounds camp complex shows existing facilities as well as an ambitious array of planned additions (US Navy, Yards and Docks 1918). The buildings on this map include the row of messhalls and a few other unidentified structures, as well as the “Lucky Bag.” The map depicts the latrine facility, described by 1917 veterans, which consisted of a plank walkway to an open platform on Mean’s Creek (Omanson 1997:25). At this stage of development, the Maneuver Grounds had probably had little impact on the cemetery at 38BU162; the June, 1918 map shows no standing structures or tent camps in the immediate vicinity.
Figure 77. Detail of the Tittoni map of Parris Island in 1920, showing the “Sea Going and Maneuver Grounds” and hospital atop Means Cemetery (arrow).
The planned additions shown on the June, 1918, map included more than 50 buildings, among them mess halls, latrines, officer’s quarters, storehouses, a guardhouse, a library and recreation center, and a hospital. The complex was to be served by electricity and buried water and sewer systems (US Navy, Y&D 1918; NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 622:610-33-46, 610-33-83). Most of the planned buildings, as well as some additional structures, were built in the summer and fall of 1918 (Figure 77). One of the few major changes from the original June, 1918, plan was the relocation of the new hospital complex, which was to have been located just south of Fort San Marcos. Perhaps because that site was rather low and poorly drained, the hospital was actually built squarely on top of the African American cemetery at 38BU162. A revised plan showing the hospital where it was actually built is dated October 7, 1918 (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 621:610-31-25).

In contrast to the plans and maps of the 1918 West Wing Extension (Chapter 3), none of the Maneuver Grounds plans depicts or mentions a cemetery, although it was shown on the 1916 DeRooode map and it must have been obvious to any surveyor. When the planned hospital was relocated, or perhaps earlier, the African American community was denied further use of the cemetery. The important (if geographically confused) Depot Cemeteries memorandum (USMC 1968) records:

According to a longtime employee of the Depot, Robert Bee...who was born on Parris Island, these people originally buried their dead in the Nivers Beach area (behind the existing Golf Clubhouse) until the Marines erected a camp at that site during World War I. At that time they were told that they could no longer use that cemetery...

Federal cemetery and military headstone records reveal that the remains of at least two veterans were removed from the “Means Place” cemetery on Parris Island in 1918 prior to hospital construction. These two men were reburied in Beaufort National Cemetery. They included Robert Robinson, formerly of the 34th USCTs, and William H. Snow, a seaman on the U.S.S. Pawnee, which was stationed in Port Royal Sound after the Civil War (NARA RG 92, MF #1845; Beaufort National Cemetery) (see Chapter 8). Snow was a white man married to an African American resident of Parris Island, and he had the rare distinction of being buried in an African American cemetery in 1892 (Doyle Diary, March 19, 1881; NARA RG 92, MF #1845).

The Niver property at the Maneuver Grounds, along with the remainder of Parris Island, was seized and purchased by the United States under the proclamation of August 7, 1918 (Chapter 2). The Maneuver Grounds, meanwhile, was still expanding and probably operating at capacity or beyond to fill the demand for new Marines to serve in the Great War. A Marine Corps officer recalled the facility at its peak of operation (Coyle 1925:189-190):
Figure 78. A 1917 or 1918 photograph of a portion of the Maneuver Grounds camp complex; view to the south-southeast. The cemetery at 38BU162 is out of the frame to the left. The Parris Island lighthouse is visible in the left background (Culp 1918).

Figure 79. A 1917 or 1918 photograph of recruits training at the Maneuver Grounds (Culp 1918).
At the entrance to the Maneuver Grounds, the officer commanding of the battalion received his billeting schedule, his assignment to mess hall, and drill schedule for the following day, and the evening gave them the opportunity to get settled in tents...Two days later an inspection of tents in the battalion streets would fail to disclose any lack of uniformity and precision...At seven-thirty in the morning, breakfast and camp police being over, they began the facings, marching, and school of the soldier. Physical exercise, swimming, and personal combat, scrubbing clothes, and kitchen police. For three weeks we had them at this camp, and as I watched one day 5000 pass in review at sunset parade, it was difficult to believe that none of them had served over four weeks, and many of them only two...In these three weeks they acquired most remarkable precision in close order drill...They learned assurance with their bayonet. They learned to scale a nine-foot wall and climb a thirty-foot rope. Ninety-five percent learned to swim, and all learned to keep themselves clean.

In France the 4th Marine Brigade, which was the only Marine unit to see action, was engaged for about six months. They established a reputation for aggressiveness and tenacity unequalled in the American Expeditionary Force. From a brigade strength of 8,469, the Marines suffered 11,968 casualties including 2,292 killed in action (Venzon 1995:741). A substantial portion of those men, easily more than half, trained at the Maneuver Grounds between 1916 and 1918.

The Great War ended rather unexpectedly on November 11, 1918, with much of the military potential of the Marine Corps (and the United States in general) unrealized. The newly expanded and improved Maneuver Grounds was suddenly surplus to the requirements of the small, peacetime Marine Corps, and training of the much smaller numbers of recruits was consolidated on the north half of Parris Island. Exactly when basic training ceased at the Maneuver Grounds is unclear. A version of the June 30, 1919, annual report map of the area is overlaid with information regarding which buildings were to be “salvaged,” or demolished (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 622:610-33-137). Presumably if the salvage plans post-dated the June 30, 1920, annual report map, then the latter map would have been used as the base map, although actual demolition did not begin until several years later. In any case, descriptions of the training phases at Parris Island published in 1920 include no reference to the Maneuver Grounds (Proctor 1920:11; Thompson 1920:9, 26).

A small “Sea Going Depot” was located on Means Creek at the Maneuver Grounds by 1919, but possibly as early as 1917 (Osterhout 1923:105). The facility, unrelated to the basic training cycle, provided instruction in shipboard “sea service” for selected Marines. An architectural plan for an “Instruction Building for Sea Going Detachment” is dated April 12, 1919 (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 620). An article published in March, 1920, describes “How the men of the Sea-Going Depot at Parris Island are coached in the ways of seafaring men before going to serve on battleships,” and suggests that the depot “has come into existence” recently (Potts 1920:14-16). The Sea Going Depot on Parris Island was short lived. A March, 1921, article mentioned that “The Sea Going [sic] expect to move to Norfolk, Virginia, some time this coming week” (Thompson 1921:11).
Annual report maps show that the demolition of the Maneuver Grounds complex began in earnest in 1923 or 1924, with the removal of the eleven 1917 messhalls and a few other buildings. By 1926, many 1918 buildings were gone, but the hospital overlying the cemetery still stood. The 1927 annual report map shows only a fire station, a coal bin, and the wharf remaining; the hospital had been demolished (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF Reel 620:610-3-60, 610-3-65, 610-3-72). A 1933 aerial survey map (Figure 80) reveals no structures at all in the vicinity, and it appears that the area was becoming overgrown by that date. The cemetery site appears as a discrete wooded area, as it did in 1916 (Figure 76), suggesting that in 1918 an effort was made to maintain a shady, wooded setting around the hospital (U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey 1933).

In 1938, the last of the civilian African Americans residing on Parris Island were evicted, freeing the entire reservation for military use (Chapter 2). Although Parris Island remained primarily a recruit training depot, facilities for the use of Marine air and artillery units were also established in the 1930s, including Page Field, practice bombing targets, and ranges for live artillery fire. As detailed in Chapter 5, visiting USMC artillery units fired on the Parris Island ranges in (at least) 1937, 1938 and 1939, expending several thousand rounds of 75mm ammunition including both shrapnel and high explosive shells (USACE 1999a:2.4, 2.71-2-76, Plate 2; 1999b:C79-C88). While the designated impact areas for the fire were north and east of the present golf course (Figure 63), scattered artifacts of the shelling have been found throughout the 38BU162 vicinity and in the cemetery (DePratter and South 1995:66-69, 103-106; DePratter et al. 2001:26, 27).

The primary target for practice aerial bombing was initially located on the east side of Page Field to the north of the present golf course. Aircraft based at Page Field and at other bases in the region dropped non-explosive, miniature practice bombs on targets consisting of concentric circles outlined in lime (USACE 1999a:2.52-2.54, Plate 4). In 1942 the Page Field target was eliminated and a new target was established, centered about 350 feet northwest of the cemetery, near the old eighth hole on the golf course (which was of course not constructed until after World War II). An additional target was established in the tidal flat south of the present clubhouse (USACE 1999a:2.58-2.60, 2.80-2.82, Plate 4). While these two documented bomb targets may account for the abundance of practice bombs and bomb fragments scattered across the golf course (DePratter and South 1995:65-68), it is possible that other targets existed in the vicinity between 1937 and 1946 (USACE 1999a:2.58).

The Parris Island golf course was completed by 1948 (USACE 1999a:2.58). The 8th Fairway of the new course ran immediately to the west of the cemetery, but aside from cutting back the northwest corner of the cemetery woods, construction of the fairway appears to have had little impact on the site. Construction of the 8th Hole mound was more damaging; topsoil was robbed from an area just north of the cemetery to build up the mound (see Stratigraphy, below) (Woodrow Garvin, personal communication). It may have been when the golf course was built that the Binyard grave (Figures 74 and 75) was fenced with concrete posts and chain.
In 1999, the golf course was closed for a thorough makeover. The original 7th, 8th and 9th Holes were removed from the vicinity of 38BU51/162, and replacements were constructed west of Belleau Wood Road. The driving range was retained at its former location on the western margin of the Santa Elena site. In 2001, the Charlesfort/Santa Elena site was designated a National Historic Landmark.

Figure 80. Detail of the 1933 U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey map, compiled from aerial photographs, showing the vicinity of the cemetery at 38BU162 (arrow).
Archaeological Methods

Santa Elena Site Numbers

The African American cemetery addressed in this chapter has no South Carolina site number that is exclusive to it – it is a part of the site 38BU162, which includes most of 16th century Santa Elena, as well as several other significant components. Other site numbers are associated with Santa Elena, including 38BU51 and 38BU1103. Fort San Marcos and the southern portion of Santa Elena, east to the golf club house, are designated 38BU51. We have used the combined number “38BU51/162” when referring to the entire Santa Elena site. 38BU1103 is a site number assigned to Santa Elena by the Low Country Council of Governments. It is redundant, and has never been used by the Santa Elena project.

Santa Elena Season Suffixes

Letter suffixes are sometimes added to site numbers to designate distinct areas or components within the site. An example is the Fuller Cemetery site, 38BU1895B (Chapter 3), where the larger site of the World War I West Wing Extension is 38BU1895A, and the African American cemetery within it is 38BU1895B. Letter suffixes are not used in the same way at sites 38BU162 and 38BU51. Shortly after the Santa Elena project began in 1979, Stanley South began applying letter suffixes to the site numbers to distinguish discrete field seasons or unrelated research efforts within a season. Thus, “38BU162F” does not designate a portion of 38BU162, but rather a field season in 1982. Of course the suffixes do effectively describe a particular portion of the site (that addressed during the season), and when supplemental work is conducted within the area of a previous season, the old suffix is sometimes employed for convenience.

38BU162V and 38BU162W

The cemetery area at 38BU162 was investigated in several earlier seasons (South 1982, 1983; South and DePratter 1995). Seasons of work include 38BU162E (1982 and 2000 block excavation of the northwest bastion of Fort San Felipe), 38BU162F (1982 sampling north of San Felipe with 3 x 3’ test units), and 38BU162Q (1994 shovel testing of the entire Santa Elena site) (Figures 81 and 82). The 2001 project was the first to deliberately address the cemetery rather than the Spanish component and involved entirely different goals and methods. As it was not “supplemental” to any previous season, it thus required at least one new season suffix. In our excavations we used two suffixes, “V” to designate the extensive backhoe and manual trenching in search of the western, northern and eastern limits of the cemetery, and “W” to designate the more formal, hand excavations on grid undertaken to delineate the southern boundary of the cemetery and the northern extent of the probable Charlesfort ditch/moat (DePratter et al. 1996).

Field Methods

Chapter 1 covers the general field and lab methods employed during the Parris Island cemetery project. Site-specific methodological details for 38BU162V and W, which varied considerably from the methods applied to the other three cemeteries, are discussed below.
Figure 81. Map showing previous archaeological projects in the area of the cemetery at 38BU162.
Figure 82. 38BU162E. Grave feature discovered during the 1982 38BU162E excavations; view to the west.

Mapping. All mapping for this project was tied to the Santa Elena site grid established by Stanley South in 1979 when he began his excavations on the site. This grid was modified in 1994 during the boundary survey shovel testing so that the 0/0 point was located in the marsh off-site, allowing all points within the town to fall within a single compass quadrant.

A base map for the Means Cemetery and vicinity was created from transit shot data for use during this project (Figure 83). Mapping included visible surface features, trees, and the shoreline. All trenches were laid out and excavated on the site grid. Elevations were based on the Marine Corps elevation point located at the west side of the Charlesfort monument inside fort San Marcos.

Proveniencing. In contrast to the way provenience numbers were assigned in previous cemetery trenching, at 38BU162V and W each 10 ft (3 m) segment was assigned a new trench number rather than a letter suffix. This allowed us to use letters to designate “A” and “B” soil zones within a trench; on the previous sites, no stratigraphic distinctions were made in proveniencing. Where the “A” and “B” zones typically seen at Santa Elena were not always discerned, the topsoil was usually divided into upper (“A”) and lower (“B”) halves to provide some measure of vertical segregation (see “stratigraphy,” below).
Figure 83. 38BU162V and W. Site map.
38BU162V Backhoe and Manual Trenching. The test trenches designated 38BU162V included two types of excavations, both of which differed significantly from those excavated at the three previous cemeteries and the cemetery search loci (see Chapter 7). We originally assumed that like Fort San Felipe, the Means Cemetery was probably eroding into Means Creek along its eastern margin. The bluff is eroding away at a significant rate (about 150 ft [45.7 m] since the sixteenth century) and unless the cemetery was deliberately set well back from the shoreline, graves were certainly eroding into the creek. Confirmation was not a simple matter of examining the eroding face of the bluff, as it is almost completely obscured by slumping soil, a humus/root mat, collapsing trees, and other vegetation. Backhoe excavation of trenches along the bluff edge was not practical for reasons of safety and access, and because we wanted to disturb the bluff as little as possible lest we accelerate erosion. Hand excavation was called for, and 10 trenches (38BU162V-2 through 11) were formally excavated with shovel and trowel along the break of the bluff edge (Figures 83, 84). Unlike the other trenches in 38BU162V and W, the bluff trenches were not aligned on the Santa Elena grid, but rather were angled variously to run along the bluff. Length of bluff trenches varied from 9.0 to 25 ft (2.7 to 7.6 m), depending on the open space available, and width was either 1.5 or 2.0 ft (.5 to .6 m).

The remaining trenches of 38BU162V (12 through 97) were located inland from the bluff. While these were dug primarily with the backhoe, they were located and aligned on the Santa Elena grid such that each 10 ft trench is actually a 10 x 1.5 ft (3.0 x .5 m) portion of one 10 x 10 ft (3 x 3 m) Santa Elena excavation square (Figures 83, 85, and 87-93). This strategy was designed to mitigate the impact of the cemetery testing on the Santa Elena component by insuring that the data recovered would be compatible with any future Santa Elena excavations. In six cases (Trenches V30/31, 39/40, 61, 68/69, 87, and 95), extensions to normal 1.5 ft-wide trenches were excavated to better examine features. In one location (Trenches V24-26), we excavated a substantial extension block in order to map a sample of graves in the cemetery interior, and in another case (Trenches V43/44) we excavated a large extension block to examine a portion of a sixteenth century wall-trench feature. The provenience of each extension was derived from the adjacent trench, with the addition of the suffix “Ext.” before the stratigraphic letter suffix (e.g., “38BU162V-62 Ext. A” refers to the “A” zone in an extension of Trench V62). All features encountered in “V” trenches and extensions were mapped, but no features of any kind were excavated. All trenches were excavated to a depth that exposed either undisturbed subsoil or grave outlines. Graves were mapped, but none was excavated.

38BU162W Hand Excavation. In the area immediately north of Fort San Felipe, the goal of the test trenching differed from that in the remainder of the cemetery project. We already had a southern limit for the cemetery based on the three graves exposed in previous seasons (below), and the fact that no graves were found in the total excavation of the interior of Fort San Felipe (South 1984, 1985). However, the earlier fortification underlying Fort San Felipe, French Charlesfort, was known from the earlier work to project north, into the cemetery. The testing effort designated 38BU162W was designed to trace the French fortification and its relationship with the cemetery.
Figure 84. 38BU162V. Hand excavation and screening of shoreline Trench V6; view to the southeast.

Figure 85. 38BU162V. Cleaning Trenches V41-44; view to the north, with the old 8th Fairway on the left, and the old 8th Hole in the center distance.
Trenching in the 38BU162W area called for formal, hand excavation. Each trench was laid out and strung as a 10 x 1.5 ft (3 x .5 m) or 5 x 1.5 ft (1.5 x .5 m) excavation unit and then excavated with shovel and trowel (Figures 86). Again, each trench formed part of a particular 10 x 10 ft square on the Santa Elena grid. Provenience numbers W2 through 15, 20, and 22 through 26 designated the 20 excavated trenches. Trenches W2 and W13 required extensions. W16 was not a trench but was the re-excavation of a 10 x 10 ft unit originally excavated in the 38BU162E season in 1982 (South 1983). Four features were at least partly excavated in the course of the 38BU162W testing, and these received the provenience numbers W17, 18, 19 and 21. The remainder of the features encountered were mapped but not excavated.

Artifact Recovery, 38BU162V, W. One hundred percent of the soil excavated from all trenches was dry screened through 1/4-inch mesh and then water-screened through 1/16-inch mesh. Shell, which was abundant, was sampled by species. Certain bulk twentieth century material, such as concrete and gravel, was also sampled.

Photography. Photographic documentation included formal photos of the Binyard grave and several grave features, as well as a number of Native American, Spanish, and WWI Marine Corps features. Work shots illustrating various field methods and the appearance of different parts of the site were also taken. Three cameras were used including 35mm cameras shooting color prints and color slides, and a digital still camera. The depot archaeologist also photographed the project.

Figure 86. 38BU162W. Hand excavation and screening, Trench W2; view to the northeast with the Binyard grave visible at left.
Lab Methods

Like the other areas investigated during this project, the analysis and catalog for 38BU162 V and W (Appendix IV) groups artifacts into their probable cultural components. The component groups in this case include Native American, 16th Century Spanish/French, 18th/19th Century Plantation, Cemetery, 20th Century USMC and Non-diagnostic. As before, there were ambiguities in classing certain artifacts that required subjective, “best guess” assignments. The major difficulty was in distinguishing certain 18th/19th Century Plantation material and 20th Century USMC material from possible surface grave goods belonging in the Cemetery category (see the discussions of those components, below). Spanish ceramics were analyzed using the established Santa Elena code system such that the data is compatible with other Santa Elena seasons.

In addition to the “V” and “W” materials, we processed and analyzed the 38BU162F materials from the 1982 3 x 3 ft testing effort that was substantially within the cemetery (South 1983:77-81). The artifact figures in this report were drawn from all three collections, as well as from 38BU162E (South 1982). Santa Elena material accounted for most of the metal artifacts conserved in the course of the cemetery project (62 of 87 objects). All reasonably preserved Spanish metal artifacts were stabilized in the field by storage in a base water solution and were later conserved.

Results

The 38BU162V and W field season was the first to deliberately address the cemetery component. Three earlier Santa Elena research efforts, however, involved excavation in the cemetery. Grave information from those projects is included in this discussion of findings.


The 38BU162E season involved the block excavation of the northwest bastion of Fort San Felipe (South 1982). Extensions to the north of the original block were excavated in 2000. Three grave features (E69, E89, and E123) were revealed in the “E” block, including two in 1982 and the third in 2000 (Figures 81, 82). The graves were confined to the northern quarter of the block, demonstrating that burials did not extend south into the site of Fort San Felipe. The excavations in 2000 confirmed that the 1562 Charlesfort ditch (Feature E49) continued northeast from Fort San Felipe into the southeast corner of the cemetery (Figure 83).

38BU162F (1982)

The 38BU162F project involved the excavation of twenty-eight 3 x 3 ft test units, which provided a one percent sample of a bounded area north of Fort San Felipe (South 1982:77-80) (Figure 81). While the testing was intended to assess the density of Spanish material north of the fort, it effectively sampled perhaps 60 percent of the cemetery area. South (1982:77) reported:

In doing this [sample] a number of squares were found to contain burial features from a Black graveyard. The three-foot squares at the south half of the research
frame revealed a number of features that are thought to be 12 burials in the grave yard possibly dating from the early nineteenth century during the period when the “Means” plantation was seen in the Mills Atlas of 1825. Since a one-percent sample revealed 12 burials it is thought that many more remain to be seen in the area.

38BU162Q (1994)

The 1994 Santa Elena Boundary Survey (38BU162Q) involved the shovel testing of the entire Santa Elena vicinity at an interval of 30 ft, with the goal of establishing the boundaries of the sixteenth century town and the densities of Spanish material and various other components (DePratt and South 1995). In the vicinity of the Means cemetery, nine shovel tests (719, 720, 753, 754, 850, 882, 976, 977, and 1007) had disturbed fill that went deep (Figure 81). In the boundary survey report we did not speculate about the disturbances encountered in these shovel tests, but in retrospect, their distribution and fill suggest that these nine tests may have intruded on graves. Their distribution correlates well with the grave distribution previously noted by South (see Figure 81). Our more recent work indicates that all nine of the possible graves identified through shovel testing fall within the boundaries of the Means cemetery (Figure 83).

Stratigraphy

The stratigraphy in the 38BU162 cemetery vicinity varied greatly, mostly due to the heavy disturbance of some areas during the twentieth century. In relatively undisturbed areas, we saw a thin humus/sod zone overlying about 0.8 to 1.2 ft (0.2 to 0.4 m) of dark, gray-brown loamy sand, fading to pale yellow sand subsoil. In many cases we could not discern the darker “A” and lighter “B” soil zones we normally recognize at Santa Elena. There were few indications of a plow zone (or ditch zone) over most of the area tested. Within the cemetery the transition from topsoil to subsoil appeared natural, with no plow scars or agricultural ditches, except in the extreme southwest corner. There, Trenches V95 and V97 exhibited agricultural ditches. Trench V62, outside of the cemetery to the northwest, also included agricultural ditches. This is in keeping with an early cemetery established in a wooded area not previously cleared and cultivated, and it is a trait shared with the other three Parris Island cemeteries tested during this project (Chapters 3, 4 and 5).

The cemetery exhibited no sign of grave sinks or grave mounds, only the Binyard grave marker (Figure 74) and the brick marker base remained. Clearly, the area had been landscaped at least once, and the history suggests it may have been impacted as many as three times: 1918, ca. 1927, and ca. 1947. During excavations the topsoil often appeared disturbed for part of its depth, and within the Maneuver Grounds hospital site (Figure 77), concrete chunks, gravel, wire nails, tarpaper and other architectural debris was seen churned into the topsoil as if by heavy equipment. Masses of concrete rubble, sewer pipe, and other debris along the marsh edge suggest that the remains of the demolished hospital were bulldozed over the bluff. An area just north of the cemetery (Trenches V66-69, 71-76, 88-91) was almost completely scalped of topsoil, typically revealing clean, yellow subsoil under a thin mat of recent humus (Figure 83). The missing topsoil was pushed or hauled to the north during the construction of the golf course to form the mound for the original 8th hole (Woodrow Garvin, personal communication 2001).
The Cemetery Component

The 116 trenches excavated during this project, together with the grave information from previous projects, allowed us to establish the boundaries of the cemetery at 38BU162 (Figures 98-106). The southern limit of burials is the clearest, thanks to the near total excavation of Fort San Felipe and the area immediately north of it in the 1982 and 2000 38BU162E seasons (above). The fort included no burials at all, and the three burials north of the moat are probably the southernmost in the cemetery (unless, for some reason, the southeastern corner of the cemetery protrudes southeast, toward the unexcavated portion of the San Felipe moat).

Contrary to our expectations, none of the 10 bluff-edge trenches (38BU162V2 through V11) encountered graves, indicating that the cemetery was not yet eroding into Means Creek (Figure 94). The explanation for why the cemetery begins some 20 feet (60.1 m) inland from the present bluff probably lies in the location of an original plantation road that ran north/south along the shore. This road has been traced in excavations south of Fort San Felipe, where it sometimes interrupts sets of agricultural ditches (e.g. South and DePratter 1996:14), and the entire network of plantation agricultural ditches appears to be very square with the road. The Marine Corps retained the road in laying out the Maneuver Grounds (which is thus square with both the road and the agricultural ditches), and paved it with crushed shell. North of Fort San Felipe, the road is visible as a vague trace, devoid of older trees. It appears that this road was the designated eastern boundary of the cemetery, and that graves, including that of William Binyard (Figures 73 and 74), begin immediately west of it.

To the north and west, the cemetery limits were defined in the established fashion by an array of positive and negative trenches, as well as by the brick grave marker base exposed in the southwest corner. There were two unexpected developments, however. First, the grave marker base is isolated by numerous trenches containing no graves at all, including V12 through V16, V45 through V47, and V92 through V97. In the absence of the brick feature, we would have located the southwest corner of the cemetery some 60 feet (18.3 m) further east. It is interesting that the only agricultural ditches found within our cemetery limits occur east of the marker base, suggesting that the grave lies outside of the historic cemetery woods in a field (see Plantation/Postbellum, below). The other peculiarity emerged in the excavation of Trench V87, actually a small block, which was placed in an unsuccessful effort to relocate a 1983 3 x 3 ft square (38BU162F-26), which appeared to include a grave. A tight cluster of four graves was discovered in V87 in an area that was surrounded by an extensive grid of negative trenches. This suggested a discrete plot of burials in an area that otherwise had few or no graves – a family plot or strangers’ plot are possible explanations (Chapter 2).

Based on our trenching, we estimate that the cemetery covers about one acre (4047 m²). As in the earlier phases of the cemetery project, we saw little utility in extensive testing in the known interior of the cemetery at 38BU162; limits, not graves, were the goal. Trench V87 (Figure 93) and the extension block excavated along Trenches V24-26 (Figure 88) provided our only substantial window into grave density and the appearance of the cemetery interior. A necessarily rough extrapolation of grave occurrences in all positive trenches provided an estimate of 450 to 500 total graves in the cemetery at 38BU162.
Figure 87. 38BU162V. Trenches 9-21.
Figure 88. 38BU162V. Trenches 22-26, 32-36.
Figure 89. 38BU162V. Trenches 27-31, 37-40, 84-86.
Figure 90. 38BU162V. Trenches 41-44, 48-52.
Figure 91. 38BU162V. Trenches 53-62.
Figure 92. 38BU162V. Trenches 63-81.
Figure 93. 38BU162V. Trenches 82-87, 92-97.
Figure 94. 38BU162W. Trenches 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 20.
Figure 95. 38BU162W. Trenches 8, 12-16, 22-26.
Grave Morphology. The sample from the 38BU162 cemetery totaled 42 graves, including the William Binyard grave, the grave marker base, three graves exposed in 38BU162E excavations, and 37 graves recorded in the 38BU162V and W season (Figure 83). In addition, about 12 probable graves were seen in 3 x 3 ft test units during the 38BU162F season, and nine possible graves were suggested in shovel tests during the 38BU162Q season. Of this sample, seven grave features were completely exposed, and 13 more were sufficiently visible to allow a fair understanding of shape and size (Figures 87-90, 93, and 94).

Five graves, located in Trenches V17, 24, 26, 30 and 87, ranged in length between 2.1 ft (0.4 m) and 4.2 ft (1.3 m), and were obviously the graves of infants or small children. Several other graves were about 5.0 ft (1.5 m) in length, and might have held older children or small adults. The remainder were either clearly adult graves, or were insufficiently exposed to judge with certainty. The largest and smallest graves recorded were both in Trench V26/26 Ext.; the largest was 8.5 ft (2.6 m) in length and 3.4 ft (1.0 m) wide, while the smallest was 2.1 ft (0.4 m) in length, with indeterminate width (Figure 88). Some graves were quite narrow, suggesting shroud burials, while others were easily wide enough to accept a rectangular coffin; most, however, might hold either shroud or coffin interments. As in the other cemeteries, grave shapes varied considerably and included “pinched” examples (e.g. Trench V30/31) but many more had parallel sides. Essentially rectangular shapes predominated, although the corners or ends were often very rounded, tending toward more of a lozenge-shape (Figure 96). Several very irregular graves were also recorded. All graves were oriented roughly east-west, although it is possible that the unidentified ditch feature recorded in Trench W20 is, in fact, a grave oriented north-south. However, the ditch is located such that it could be part of the Charlesfort ditch/moat (W17) (Figure 95).

Testing in the three previous Parris Island cemeteries suggested a wide range in ages among the grave features and the graves in the cemetery at 38BU162 also followed this pattern. Some grave features appeared quite fresh with sharply-defined edges and bright mottling in the fill, while others had very diffuse edges and softened mottles. It was noted that the earlier-appearing graves tended to be more narrow and less regular in shape, while later-appearing graves were usually fairly regular rectangles (although the largest grave, in V26/26 Ext., was both rectangular and very old in appearance). Distinctly younger-looking graves included those to the south in the 38BU162E block, and several of the 38BU162W graves, as well as the westernmost graves recorded in Trenches V38/39. The oldest-looking graves were those in the V24-26 block, V30/31, and V87 in the northern interior and extremity of the cemetery. This suggests, albeit from very limited evidence, that the southern end and the western corner of the cemetery were not heavily used until much later than the remainder (see also “Grave Goods,” below).
Figure 96. 38BU162V. Grave feature revealed in Trench V22. Iron water pipes from the 1918 Maneuver Grounds hospital complex protrude from the trench wall at left.

Grave Goods. Evidence of surface grave goods was common in some areas of the cemetery, although the objects were generally disturbed (rarely in situ on grave features) and badly fragmented; only a few relatively intact objects were recovered. This condition is readily attributed to Maneuver Grounds hospital construction and demolition, and perhaps the “policing” of the area by Marines even before the hospital was built.

Feature E69, one of the two graves identified in 1982 during the 38BU162E season, was adorned with a manganese pressed glass tumbler (Figures 82, 97) (South 1983:50). The tumbler, which contained a deposit of white powder that has not been identified, was apparently inverted, and broken in place.
Figure 97. Pressed manganese glass tumbler recovered in 1982 from the surface of the grave feature 38BU162E-69. The tumbler contained an unidentified white powder.

The other two graves exposed in the “E” block in 1982 and 2000 showed no signs of surface grave goods (Figure 83). In the 38BU162W area, only one grave in Trench W4 (Figure 94) had a grave goods object in association; this was a portion of a badly broken, undecorated porcelain saucer. Trench V22 (Figure 88) yielded a white glass lid, possibly from a sugar bowl, in loose association with a grave feature, while Trench V35 (Figure 88) produced a whiteware paste or ointment pot (Figure 98D), and fragments of a white glass lamp globe, possibly associated with graves in that trench or Trench V36 (Figure 93). The V87 block produced several fragments of a redware flowerpot, and portions of a plain, white ironstone vessel. Other “V” trenches produced collections of small fragments of various typical grave goods objects including medicine bottles, pressed glass objects, and whiteware and porcelain tableware. The most extensive collection was that from Trenches V38/39 and Extensions (Figure 89), although the only reasonably intact items were the “grave furniture” objects discussed below. The three graves recorded in this area were relatively late in appearance.

With one interesting exception, the date range of the grave goods from 38BU162 was consistent with that of the other three Parris Island cemeteries; those goods date overwhelmingly to the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. The V24-26 block, while it revealed 11 older-looking graves, yielded only one possible grave goods item, a cylindrical, plain creamware mug, represented by 15 small sherds that mended poorly (Figure 111G illustrates a rim section). This eighteenth century vessel may well be an example of the elusive antebellum surface grave goods discussed in Chapter 2, or it may simply be refuse from the nearby slave settlement. The disturbed context and poor associations of the vessel leave it as a reasonable, but ambiguous, candidate for an early grave goods object. In addition to numerous fragments of late-nineteenth to early twentieth century objects, Trench V17 yielded 38 fragments from two badly fragmented, dark olive green bottles. While these bottles were certainly antebellum, their closer proximity to the slave settlement midden (which begins about 60 ft [18.3 m] to the south) makes their identification as grave goods even less certain than the creamware mug example noted above.
Other Cemetery Artifacts. Also recovered from the cemetery at 38BU162 were four objects that are not “surface grave goods” in the sense used elsewhere in this report, as they are items manufactured for use on graves; these items might be better characterized as “grave furniture.” The most remarkable of these is the porcelain object shown in Figure 99, which was found on a grave feature in Trench W3 (Figure 94). This grim artifact, ornamented with a skull and crossbones, appears to be the base for a temporary grave marker card holder of the sort still used by funeral homes. Trench V39/39 Ext. (Figure 89) produced all three of the other “grave furniture” objects, including a porcelain angel figurine and two miniature porcelain vases (Figure 98A-C).

Throughout the Parris Island Cemetery Project, cut nails and non-Spanish, wrought nails have been assigned to the 18th/19th Century Plantation component, except in the obvious postbellum case of CSL “C” (Chapter 7). In the course of the 38BU162 analysis, it was noted that a majority of the cut nails and fragments from the 38BU162 cemetery area retained remnants or rust impressions of wood, suggesting the gradual decomposition of the wood with the nails in place. These may be coffin nails, which ended up in the topsoil when earlier graves were impacted by later graves.
Other Components

Native American. Previous excavations at the Santa Elena site have resulted in the recovery of tens of thousands of Native American sherds, as well as stone tools and lithic debitage. These items span most of the range of prehistory and extend up to the time when Parris Island ceased to be occupied by Native Americans at some time in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century (Table 1).

Our best distribution information relating to prehistoric components comes from the boundary survey project (DePratter and South 1985). That project involved excavation of 1,383 shovel tests in a 35-acre tract that included the Santa Elena site as well as the 7th, 8th, and 9th holes of the Marine Corps golf course. Results of this shovel testing included a series of maps plotting the distribution of various Native American occupations, as well as later plantation period, postbellum, and Marine Corps activities on the site.

Based on the boundary survey results, we anticipated that we would find concentrations of Stallings and Irene/Altamaha materials in the cemetery project area and lesser amounts of Refuge, Deptford, Wilmington, St. Catherines, and Savannah material (DePratter and South 1995:35-47). This supposition was confirmed by our excavations. Examples of all types recovered are illustrated and discussed in Appendix I.

Our excavations for the cemetery project found a number of areas of intact Native American shell midden, and there may have been additional shell concentrations before World War I hospital construction and golf course landscaping impacted the area. Most of the western part of the cemetery would have been cleared and scraped for hospital construction, so some shell piles may have been destroyed at that time. Thirty years later when the golf course was under construction, topsoil, midden deposits, and at least half of a foot of subsoil (0.2 m) were scraped off in parts of the cemetery area for use as fill in constructing the eighth green and 9th Tee on the golf course. The presence of dense shell midden (up to 1.0 to 2.0 ft [0.3 to 0.6 m] thick) in our Trench V8 and running north from there along the shoreline is suggestive of the amount of midden shell that may have been disturbed by golf course construction (Figure 83).

At the southeastern corner of the cemetery adjacent to the Fort San Felipe bastion, there was a discrete midden deposit approximately 20 ft (6.1 m) across and 0.5 to 0.75 ft thick (0.15 to 0.23 m). This midden dated to the Irene/Altamaha period, and may have been associated with the Spanish occupation or the period immediately following the departure of the Spaniards. Another midden dating to roughly the same time period was located in the vicinity of our Trenches V82 to V85 (Figure 83); this midden was visible on the surface so we avoided it as much as possible. The adjacent trench contained a large number of Spanish artifacts, so it may be that this shell deposit relates to that occupation. There are undoubtedly other midden deposits within the limits of the cemetery, but they were not impacted by our limited trenching around its periphery.

Our trenching did encounter several shell-filled features that were likely prehistoric in origin. Among these are a feature in Trench V25 intruded by a grave (Figure 88), a possible tree fall hole filled with midden shell in Trenches V30 and 31 (Figure 89), an Irene period pit
(Feature W19) in Trenches W8, W14, and W16 (Figure 95 and 100), and a pit (Feature W21) located in our Trenches W9 and W20 (Figure 94).

Feature W21 (Figure 94), a shell-filled pit 3.75 ft in diameter, was partially excavated in an effort to determine if it was a segment of the Charlesfort moat that had been backfilled with midden shell. Upon removal of the uppermost one foot of shell (including oyster, whelk, clam, razor clam, ribbed mussel, and periwinkle, as well as crab claws, turtle and fish bones, and Irene sherds), the feature was identified as a basin-shaped trash pit rather than a moat segment. As excavations neared the bottom of this feature, human bone was found protruding from apparent subsoil matrix on the east margin of the shell. The bone consisted of the proximal ends of a radius and an ulna as well as two phalanges. It appeared that an earlier burial had been intruded by the Irene trash pit. At this point excavations were halted, and after consultation with Dr. Steve Wise and Parris Island Archaeologist, Marshall Owens, all material and soil removed from Feature W21 was replaced, and the feature and trench were backfilled. The consulting Native American Tribes were immediately contacted, and they were supplied with copies of the complete excavation record of Trenches W9 and W20 and Feature W21.

In excavating the trenches and exposing grave pit outlines, numerous other features were exposed but were not excavated. Some of these could be readily identified as Spanish features, plantation period agricultural ditches, or Marine Corps utility ditches, though others were not so readily identifiable. At least some of these unidentified non-shell features may have been prehistoric pits, but there is no way to know without additional excavations.

Two features were clearly identifiable as prehistoric in origin. These were both “pot busts” consisting of fragments of individual pots that had been broken during use. The first of these, Feature W18 in Trench W13 (Figures 95) contained a fragmented Refuge Plain vessel (Figure 101). The feature consisted of a deposit of sherds lying flat on a former ground surface. This vessel, measuring approximately 1.17 ft (0.4 m) in diameter and 1.0 ft (0.3 m) in height, was missing only a few small fragments once it was reconstructed.
Figure 101. 38BU162W. Refuge Plain vessel (Feature 18) found in Trench W13 and W13 Extensions.  
A. Sherds in situ.  B. Portion of rim.  C. Vessel reconstruction.
Figure 102. Deptford Simple Stamped vessel found in Trench V24 and V24 Extensions, 38BU162V.
A. Rim detail. B. Basal detail, showing tetrapods. C. Vessel reconstruction.
The second reconstructable vessel (Figure 102) was found in Trench V24 (Figure 88). A portion of this vessel was also found in a compact deposit where it had been broken on a former ground surface. Unfortunately, this deposit had been intruded by a plantation period grave pit. Many of the sherds in the original deposit had been displaced, and some were scattered in earth that had apparently been thrown out when the grave pit was being excavated. Additional sherds from this vessel were undoubtedly redeposited in the grave pit when it was refilled. As a result of this intrusion, we were able to recover only about 35 per cent of this pot.

This second vessel is of the type Deptford Simple Stamped (Figure 102). The simple stamping is applied horizontally except near the base of the pot where it is applied in a crosswise fashion. The conical base of the vessel has four small, modeled tetrapods. The vessel has a total height of approximately 0.98 ft (0.3 m) and a maximum diameter of 1.11 ft (0.4 m). The rim was stamped with the same paddle that was used on the body producing regularly spaced impressions (Figure 102A).

The two recovered prehistoric vessels (Trenches W13 and V24) provide important information on the rate of soil build up at this site. These two vessels were found broken on former land surfaces that were approximately 1.2 ft (0.4 m) below the present ground surface. This deposition over the two pot busts has occurred in approximately 2000 to 2500 years. Part of this deposition may be due to natural processes, but some is undoubtedly the result of human activity on the site.

A small amount of flaked stone was recovered from the cemetery trenching. In addition to flakes and other debitage, several projectile points were recovered, including both Woodland and Mississippian types (see Appendix I).

Incised Pipe. Among the many interesting artifacts recovered from 162 V/W excavations was a fragment of a Native American pipe. This pipe fragment (Figure 103A, B, and C) was found in Trench V44 Extension B. Although this pipe was found in general excavations and not within a pit feature, it clearly is related to the Mississippian period Irene occupation of the site (Table I). This identification is based on the fact that nearly identical pipes have been found on the central Georgia coast. Clarence B. Moore (1897), a Philadelphia physician, excavated numerous mounds on the Georgia coast in the summer of 1897. Among Moore’s finds were three pipes that closely resemble the one we found in our excavations (see Figure 103D, E, and F).

The pipe shown in Figure 103D was found by Moore (1897:18) in Lawton’s Field, Mound B, located near Darien, Georgia, on the central Georgia coast. This mound contained evidence of multiple uses over a long period of time, but among the materials found in the mound were Irene vessels, columella shell beads, and shell drinking cups of the sort that date to the Irene period on the Georgia coast. A second pipe, illustrated in Figure 103E, was found by Moore (1897:62) in the mound at Bourbon on Sapelo Island approximately 12 miles to the northeast of Darien. The mound at Bourbon contained complicated stamped burial urns that clearly date to the Irene period. The third pipe (Figure 103 F) was found by Moore (1897:68) in a mound at DeMoussay’s Field, also on Sapelo Island; in the same mound were complicated
Figure 103. 38BU162V. Anthropomorphic pipe fragment from Trench 44 Extension B, with parallels from Mississippian sites in coastal Georgia. A.-C. Left side, frontal, and right side views of pipe fragment. D. Pipe from Lawton’s Field, Mound B (Moore 18967:18). E. Pipe from Mound at Bourbon (Moore 1897:62). F. Pipe from Mound at Dumoussay’s Field (Moore 1918:68).
stamped urns, shell drinking cups, and a shell gorget engraved with a rattlesnake motif that is typical of the Irene period.

Although the three Moore pipes and the one we found at Santa Elena differ in minor ways, they are clearly made in the same style. Similarities include circular to oval eyes surrounded by concentric lines, prominent, jagged teeth, and large noses. Distinctive hair treatments and elongated ears found on the three Moore examples are not present (or preserved) on the fragment from Santa Elena.

We do not know if the pipe fragment from Santa Elena was part of a pipe made and used at the site or whether it was traded to the Port Royal Sound area or brought there by a visitor from the south, where this pipe style appears to have been common. The close relationship between the Indians who resided around Port Royal Sound and the Guale of the central Georgia coast is clear from available documents. When the French occupants of Charlesfort ran short of food in 1562/1563, they traveled by boat to the Guale coast to supplement their diminished supply of corn (Quinn 1979:II, 303). The Guale also were regular visitors to Santa Elena, and Guale forces played a prominent role in forcing the abandonment of the settlement in 1576 (Paar 1999:129-159, 184-188).

Shell-working. A large amount of shell was encountered in screened trench fill from cemetery delineation. For the most part, this shell was difficult to assign to a particular occupation, since Native Americans, Spaniards, Frenchmen, slaves, and freedmen all discarded the remains of their meals on the site. Furthermore, the Marines hauled large quantities of shell to the site for use in decorative landscaping, sidewalks, roads, and parking lots during their World War I use of the site as part of their Maneuver Grounds complex.

Mixed with the large quantities of non-diagnostic midden and redeposited landscaping shell was one class of shell material that was readily identifiable and attributable to the Native American use of the site. This diagnostic material was the residue from the manufacture of shell beads in the area later occupied by the Means cemetery.

It is apparent from the material recovered that columella beads (Figure 104A-C, H-V) were being made from the shells of knobbed whelks (Busycon sp.). The collection of columella bead-making residue was not extensive, but it is representative of all stages in the manufacturing process. A comparable assemblage has been reported from Ossabaw Island on coastal Georgia (Pearson and Cook 2008). While we also found shell disk beads during our excavations, we did not find any evidence that they were being manufactured on site.

The knobbed whelk shells used to make beads by coastal populations consist of two major parts. The columella, the thick core of the shell, is the shaft around which the thin outer whorls of the shell wall twist. Typically, on the southeast U. S. coast, this columella was used to manufacture large, heavy beads, and the whorls were used for the manufacture of smaller disk beads. The first step in the bead-making process involved removal of the outer whorls of the shell. This process, which was done through hammering or pounding resulted in irregular fragmentation of the whorls. A sample of such whorl fragments is illustrated in Figure 104(D-G).
Since we have no evidence of disc bead manufacture at this site, it is likely that the whorl sections were simply discarded as a byproduct of columella bead manufacturing.

Once the outer whorls were removed, the bead-maker would have been left with columella and shell apex sections like those illustrated in Figure 104 (A-C). The next step in the process was removal of the sharply tapering distal end of the columella. This was sometimes done by incising a groove around the columella and then snapping off the tip (Figure 104A). In other cases, it seems that the tip may have been snapped off by brute force, since we have a series of such snapped off tips with the resulting “lip” along one side of the fractured piece (Figure 104H-J). In some cases these distal ends were worked and polished, although these fragments typically were not shaped into beads (Figure 104L-N).

After the fragile tip had been removed, the remaining portion of the columella was suitable for use in bead manufacture. Segments of the columella would have been separated through the grooving process described above (Figure 104A) or by snapping off a segment (see Figure 104K, a broken medial segment with no evidence of grooving or cutting on either end). Once a suitable columella segment had been produced through breaking or cutting, then the final shaping process was initiated. Based on the small sample from our excavations, it seems that the columella beads being manufactured here were approximately 0.75 in (1.9 cm) in length. All rough edges were ground away until the desired shape was achieved; Figure 104O-T illustrates stages in this process. Stringing holes were drilled once the final shape was achieved. These holes were apparently drilled from either end and met in the middle. Figure 104U has a hole from one end that reaches to the middle of the bead, and Figure 104V has been drilled completely through from both ends. The fact that only one finished bead was found during our excavations indicates that the final products were carefully curated when finished.

In addition to the scrap resulting from columella bead manufacturing, the collection also contains a variety of other kinds of worked whelk shell. Two whorl fragments (Figure 104W and X) show evidence of grinding along one or more edges. Presumably these pieces were being ground into shape for use as pendants (Figure 104GG) or small decorative items. One such piece (of unknown function) contains several drilled perforations of various diameters and ground edges (Figure 104HH). Two other small worked fragments consist of knobs from the shoulder of the shell which have been ground on all edges (Figure 104Y and Z). It is possible that these were blanks for beads of some sort, but we did not find any drilled examples.

The final group of worked shell items we recovered includes small beads made from whorl fragments of whelk shells. Most common among this group are the small disk beads (Figure 104AA-DD). These beads would typically have been worn in long strings and are often found in Mississippian and protohistoric period burials. Three of the four disk beads (Figure 104AA-CC) recovered during this project were found in two contiguous trenches (W14 and W15) in the southeast corner of the cemetery. The single example of a tubular bead was also found in Trench W15 (Figure 104FF). These beads were loose in the topsoil and were not associated with any known feature. Two other beads, one a disk bead (Figure 104DD) and the other a fragment of an eroded spherical bead (Figure 104EE) were found in Trenches V80 A/B and V83 A/B, respectively.
The quantity of fragmented whelk shell and the presence of columella beads in various stages of manufacture provide clear evidence that this type of bead was being made on-site. The unfinished columella beads and worked shell fragments were found in two clusters (Figure 83). The first cluster was in the area that included Trenches V22-26 and V32-36, and the other included V77, V80-83, and V87. Within each of these areas were found both whorl and columella fragments as well as unfinished columella beads. This distribution suggests that there may have been two households or workshops where columella beads were being made. A third cluster, in Trenches V61 and V62, contained fractured shell fragments as well as the only two columella beads that had been drilled. One example had been drilled through part of its length, and the other had a hole drilled completely through it. The fact that the only two drilled examples came from the same area may indicate that there was a third household or workshop where the final stages of the bead-making process were completed. Additional work in this part of the site should reveal additional evidence relating to this interesting process.

Charlesfort. Previous excavations have shown that French Charlesfort (1562-1563) is located on the southern margin of the Means cemetery (DePratter et al. 1996). Excavations in 2000 in the area between the Binyard grave and the Fort San Felipe moat indicated that the Charlesfort moat extends into the southeast corner of the cemetery. Hand-excavated trenches were dug in this area in order to determine the extent to which the remains of Charlesfort had been impacted by the cemetery. These excavations, all hand-dug, are identified as 38BU162W trenches as was noted above (Figure 83).

Although a full discussion of the results of this work will await completion of our final report on Charlesfort, a summary of the most recent work will be provided here. In the 2000 field season we traced the Charlesfort moat or ditch across the Spanish Fort San Felipe moat and into the area just south of the Binyard grave. The portion of the moat exposed in that fieldwork is labeled E49 on Figure 83, and the moat is clearly traceable on the other side of the San Felipe moat. In our cemetery project trenching, we reopened a 10 x 10 ft unit previously excavated by South (1982) (his square 162E-36 and our 162W-16), because we expected to find the Charlesfort moat/ditch continuing north across this unit (Figure 95). We were surprised to find that the moat ended in this re-excavated unit (this moat terminus is identified as 162W-Feature 17). A series of postholes that are likely associated with a bastion or entranceway was present in W16 and W14 (Figure 95); this new evidence relating to Charlesfort will be investigated in a future project.

Excavations in the vicinity of the Charlesfort moat terminus and the possible bastion or entrance did not produce any French sherds or other French artifacts, but this is not surprising given the low density of French materials at the site generally. A single French sherd, identifiable as Normandy stoneware (Figure 108F), was found in Trench V94A, well outside the confines of Charlesfort (Figure 83 and 93).

Santa Elena. When we began work on the Means Cemetery, we already had a fair amount of information about the distribution of artifacts in the area as was noted above. This knowledge was derived from South’s (1983) work (his 38BU162F block) just to the north of Fort San Felipe and from the 1984 boundary survey (DePratter and South 1995).
In his testing north of San Felipe, South (1983:77-79) found numerous graves associated with the Means cemetery. He also recovered Spanish artifacts over much of the area he tested (Figure 81), but those Spanish materials were present at a much lower frequency than they had been present in the town deposits located farther to the south. South (1983:79) concluded that the relative dearth of Spanish artifacts north of the fort meant that “the main occupation of Santa Elena occurred south of Fort San Felipe and not toward the north.” A partial explanation for the distribution South observed can be found in the fact that the sampling frame he tested is directly adjacent to the fort, on its northern defensive perimeter, a factor that would have made it unsuitable for habitation during the years the fort was in use (probably 1566 to 1570). After the fort’s abandonment, the area would have been available for use from then until the town’s abandonment in 1587.

The distribution of Spanish ceramics found in the 1994 boundary survey in the vicinity of the Means cemetery can be seen in Figure 105 (DePratter and South 1995). A discontinuous distribution is apparent. This area shows ample evidence of Spanish utilization, but clearly refuse was not deposited in a continuous sheet midden. Instead, there are concentrations of artifacts that may be indicative of structure-related debris, refuse heaps, or concentrations of artifact rich features. We did not use this plot to place our cemetery project trenches, but, by chance, those excavations intersected many of the artifact concentrations identified through boundary survey shovel testing. The Spanish concentrations on Figure 105 have been assigned letters for ease in identification in the discussion that follows. Spanish artifacts are illustrated in Figures 106 to 110.

Trenching in the vicinity of concentration “A” assisted in delineation of the western margin of the cemetery (Figure 105). The V92-V95 trench fell across the southernmost arm of the “A” concentration (Figure 83 and 93). Large numbers of Spanish sherds were found in this trench with the density increasing to the north. The northernmost unit in this trench, V95, was expanded to further expose several features (Figure 93). The expansion of this V95 trench resulted in the discovery of three (and possibly four) Spanish features that we believe to be postholes; one of these presumed postholes is filled with unfired daub. This trench was positioned to avoid a shell deposit visible on the surface directly north of the V95 trench segment. It is likely that this shell is part of the Spanish refuse deposit indicated as the dense “A” concentration of Spanish pottery in the boundary survey plot. It would appear that there is a Spanish structure, perhaps a kitchen or storage building, adjacent to this refuse pile.

Spanish artifact concentration “B” (Figure 105) from the boundary survey also correlates with a concentration of Spanish artifacts and features exposed in cemetery project trenching. The diamond-shaped portion of the concentration is centered on our cemetery Trench V50 where we uncovered a large, Spanish daub-processing pit (Figures 83 and 90). The adjacent trench segment, V51, contains a 6.5 ft diameter Spanish feature that we believe is a well, because it exhibits the typical plan composed of an outer ring of fill with a darker inner core representing the actual well shaft. About 25 ft (7.6 m) west of this presumed well, our cemetery trenching
Figure 105. Map of the cemetery area showing the distribution of 16th century Spanish ceramics as determined by the 38BU162Q shovel testing project (DePratter and South 1995). Density levels are based on sherd counts in individual shovel tests.
revealed the corner of a wall-trench Spanish structure and an associated daub pit (Figures 83, 90, and 106). It is possible that this structure and the nearby well were located on a single lot, but verification of this will require additional excavations.

Artifact concentration “C” is just outside the area that included our cemetery trenching, but the nearest trenches (V57 to V60 and V61 to V62), did contain elevated Spanish artifact counts when compared to other cemetery trench segments. The highest concentration was in Trenches V61 and V62 (Figures 83 and 105). Spanish artifacts from the trenches in the “C” concentration include a barrel band fragment (Figure 110L) and gilt cast brass ball button (Figure 110X). It is likely that this “C” concentration is the location of a Spanish structure or refuse deposit.

Our cemetery delineation Trench V18 to V21 ran through a particularly high concentration of Spanish artifacts (Figure 83 and 87). As it turns out, this trench was located within boundary survey concentration “E” just to the north of the highest density shaded area (Figure 105). Our cemetery trenching revealed only a single Spanish feature, located in Trench V19 (Figure 87), but large numbers of Spanish artifacts of all types were found in our excavations. Items recovered include a sherd of high-grade “Imperial” Chinese porcelain (Figure 108D), Spanish glass vessel fragments, a silver one real coin (Figure 110R), and ball buttons (Figure 110Y). It is possible that this concentration represents a refuse deposit or structure associated with an individual of high status.

Boundary survey artifact concentration “F” is centered over our cemetery Trenches V24 and V25 (Figures 83 and 88). These trenches contained moderate amounts of Spanish pottery but no Spanish features.

Cemetery testing Trenches V82 and V83 intersected the boundary survey concentration “G” (Figures 83 and 93). Trench V83 contained three Spanish features containing numerous Spanish artifacts including large numbers of ceramic sherds, tacks, nails, and spikes (Figure 110E, F), an auger bit (Figure 110K), and numerous other items. Much of the material was burned. The size and shape of these three features suggests that they may be daub processing pits reused for refuse disposal, but final identifications must await further excavations.
The other concentrations, “D,” “H,” “I,” “J,” “K,” and “L” (Figure 105) either were not touched by cemetery project trenching or did not produce either Spanish features or significant quantities of Spanish artifacts. With the exception of concentration “J,” this group of concentrations contained only slightly elevated Spanish ceramic counts when compared to the area surrounding them. It is unlikely that they are the locations of structures or clusters of features, and they clearly represent slightly elevated counts in the normal “background” distribution of Spanish artifacts across the Santa Elena site area.

Two moderate concentrations of Spanish artifacts revealed during cemetery testing were not predicted by the boundary survey results. Trenches V12 to V14 and V15 to V16 (Figure 83 and 87), located just south of the boundary survey concentration “E,” contained a moderate density of Spanish ceramics, chiefly olive jar sherds, and a few other artifacts including a Nueva Cadiz bead (Figure 110W). This concentration of artifacts may be related to the structure or refuse deposition activities that created either concentration “A” or concentration “E.”

There was also a modest concentration of Spanish material in the area covered by the “W” test trenches (Figure 83), but it was apparently insufficiently dense to show up in the 1994 shovel testing. The “W” concentration includes a number of lead shot and two crossbow goats-foot parts (Figure 110I) and may be a refuse and/or activity scatter from Ft. San Felipe or the earlier Charlesfort.

In the final analysis, the cemetery trenching confirmed the results of the boundary survey in the area north of Fort San Felipe. The same artifact concentrations were identified in both projects. The cemetery trenching provided additional information on feature density and the range of artifact types present in each concentration identified by shovel testing in the boundary survey. The cemetery trench pinpointed the locations of numerous Spanish features, including a wall trench structure, a possible well, and numerous daub processing and refuse pits. This information will be useful in planning future excavations in this part of the Santa Elena site.

While the Spanish component in the cemetery vicinity was much less dense than that to the south of Fort San Felipe, the assemblage was nearly as diverse. Most of the overall Santa Elena assemblage described by South, et al. (1988) was present in the cemetery area, and several items were recovered that have not previously been identified at Santa Elena. Figures 107-110 illustrate a selection of both representative and exceptional sixteenth century artifacts.

The Spanish ceramics were dominated, predictably, by Olive Jar, Columbia Plain majolica, and Lead Glazed redware sherds, but most of the other types known from Santa Elena were represented, including rare types such as Feldspar Inlaid redware (South et al. 1988:266) (Figure 107M) and Caparra Blue majolica (South et al. 1988:234, 235, 237) (Figure 107H). Other wares recovered that were introduced (but not manufactured) by the Spanish included Chinese porcelain (South et al. 1988:283-289) (Figure 108D), Ligurian Blue on Blue majolica.
Figure 107. 38BU162V, W. Sixteenth century Spanish ceramics  
A. Columbia Plain majolica (V58B).  
B. Yayal Blue on White majolica (V83A/B).  
C. Yayal Blue on White pseudo-calligraphic majolica (V48B).  
D. Santa Elena Mottled Blue on White majolica handle fragment (V37A).  
E. Santo Domingo Blue on White majolica (W23A).  
G. Honey-Colored Glazed fine paste earthenware (V52B).  
H. Caparra Blue majolica (V39 Ext. 2A/B).  
J. Orange Micaceous earthenware handle (V56C).  
K. Green Glazed fine paste earthenware (V83A/B).  
L. Green and Yellow Glazed fine paste earthenware (V94B).  
M. Feldspar Inlaid earthenware (V4 Ext.).
Figure 108. 38BU162V, W. Other Sixteenth century ceramics. **A.** Mexico City San Luis Blue-on-White majolica (V62A/B). **B.** Mexican (?) green-on-white majolica (W24B). **C.** Mexican Red Painted (V8A). **D.** Chinese (Ming) blue-on-white porcelain (V19/20). **E.** Ligurian blue-on-blue majolica (V86A). **F.** Normandy stoneware (V94A). **G.** Hessian crucible (V4). **H.** Rhenish brown salt-glazed stoneware (V56A).

Figure 109. 38BU162W. Portion of a Spanish lead-glazed redware *puchero* (cooking pot) recovered from Trench W14.
Three new ceramic types not previously known from Santa Elena were recovered, including Hessian crucible ware (Bill Kelso, personal communication, 2002) (Figure 108G), San Luis Blue on White majolica from Mexico City (Kathleen Deagan, Carl Halbirt, personal communication, 2002) (Figure 108A), and an unidentified green on white majolica (Figure 108B). Small fragments of glass tableware were also recovered.

A representative collection of Spanish architectural hardware including tacks, nails and spikes totaling 51 conservable examples was recovered (Figure 110A-F), but their incidence was certainly lower, even in apparent house locations, than in the excavated areas south of Fort San Felipe. The earlier 38BU162F 3 x 3 ft testing recovered only two possible Spanish nail fragments. This suggests building methods using a minimum of nails and may represent lower status occupations.

Arms artifacts from the cemetery testing included a typical range of fired and unfired lead shot (Figure 110M-P), shot sprue (Figure 110T), and two iron parts from a crossbow goats-foot lever device (Figure 110 I, J). The goats-foot parts include one of the pair of claws that pull the crossbow string, and the swivel end of the handle; both artifacts closely match goats-foot parts illustrated by Payne-Gallway (1903:84-89; South et al. 1988:103).

A few personal and clothing artifacts were found, including familiar ball buttons (Figure 110 X, Y), Nueva Cadiz beads (Figure 110W), and two coins. Sixteenth century coins are very rare at Santa Elena, with only three examples previously recovered from all contexts. One coin was a copper Ferdinand and Isabella four marevedis piece (Figure 110Q), while the other was a silver Phillip II one real piece from the Mexico City mint (Figure 110R). The one real piece was struck on the same dies as another example recovered in the 38BU162L season, far to the south. Both examples show little wear, and they were certainly introduced to Santa Elena in the same batch. In addition to actual coins, an example of platas corrientes was found in the cemetery testing (Figure 110 S); these are raw chunks or puddles of silver marked with a portion of a tax stamp, which circulated as coins in the Spanish colonies. Seven other examples have been found at Santa Elena (South et al. 1988:166-167).

A small array of miscellaneous items was recovered from the 38BU162V, W testing, including an iron wedge (Figure 110H), an auger bit (Figure 110K), barrel band fragments (Figure 110L), possible net weights (Figure 110U, V), brass scrap, and a few unidentified metal objects (e.g. Figure 110G).

The area north of Fort San Felipe certainly has a lower density of artifacts than other parts of Santa Elena, but status indicators are mixed. Findings that suggest lower status occupations in the Means cemetery area include the small, discrete nature of the artifact concentrations, the relative scarcity of nails, the near absence of porcelain and fine redwares, and the total absence of metal wire lace (bordado) and lace aglets (South et al. 1988:135-142). Confounding this pattern, however, are the finds of coins and ball buttons, glass tableware fragments, and a very diverse assemblage of ceramic types, all indicative of higher status occupation.

*Plantation/Postbellum.* As discussed in the historical background for this chapter, the Means house depicted on the Mills’ Atlas map of 1825, and one of at least two slave settlements on the plantation are in the vicinity of Spanish Fort San Felipe. The previous Santa Elena projects conducted between Fort San Felipe and the golf course driving range (Figure 75) have encountered abundant evidence for this plantation component, including large collections of early-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century domestic and architectural material (South 1979:23-26; South 1980:51; South and Hunt 1986:12,13,48; DePratter and South 1995; Shumpert 2001:7, 10, 47, 48). The shovel testing project conducted in 1994 (38BU162Q) revealed the approximate shape of the plantation midden, including the strong suggestion of a linear slave settlement running east from the driving range to the west side of Fort San Felipe (DePratter and South 1995:50, 52-59). Excavations on the southwest bastion of the fort in 1979 and 1997 (38BU162 and 38BU162S) uncovered brick footings, shell mortar, and a domestic midden that may mark the location of the plantation house depicted by Mills (South 1979:23-26; DePratter and South 1997; Shumpert 2001:7, 10, 47, 48). Mean ceramic dates of 1798, 1801 and 1802 (Shumpert 2001:48, 49, 51) and 1844 (South 1979:24) have been derived from large samples from various parts of this plantation complex.

As anticipated, our cemetery test trenching recovered additional evidence for the plantation component (Figure 111). We had imagined that there might be some confusion between plantation midden artifacts and surface grave goods dating to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, there was comparatively little antebellum material within the cemetery, and there are no entirely unambiguous grave goods items in the collection that date as early as the plantation era (see “Grave Goods,” above). The 38BU162 V and W trenches within the cemetery generally yielded a very thin scatter of eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century material, chiefly isolated small sherds and dark olive green bottle fragments. This finding is supported by the collection from South’s 1982 (38BU162F) testing within the cemetery, which recovered few plantation artifacts. The exceptions are trenches V92 to V97 (Figures 83, 93), the trenches closest to the slave settlement midden indicated by the 38BU162Q shovel testing (DePratter and South 1995: 60); not surprisingly, these trenches produced large collections of plantation material, including most of the items illustrated in Figure 111. As noted above, Trenches V92 through V97 include agricultural ditches but no graves, and are “within the cemetery” only by virtue of falling east of the isolated brick grave marker base.
Figure 111. 38BU162F, V, W. Eighteenth and nineteenth century artifacts.  
Agricultural ditches were the only features we identified in test trenching that can be attributed to the plantation era (excepting, of course, the graves of many slaves). Trenches V62/62Ext., V95 and V97 (Figure 83, 91 and 93) exposed the familiar cultivation ditches that occur over most of the Santa Elena site (e.g., South and DePratter 1996:14; DePratter et al. 2001:7, 10, 17). Trench V43 Ext., outside of the cemetery, was marked with two plow scars; these were relatively fresh-looking and may be attributable to golf course construction rather than historic agriculture (Figure 83 and 90). An isolated, plow scar-like feature was found in Trench V86, near the middle of the cemetery (Figure 93); this feature is probably not an agricultural plow scar, as the interior of the cemetery does not exhibit a plow zone or any other evidence of cultivation.

There is little evidence from the Santa Elena area (38BU162) for any substantial domestic occupation after the Civil War. Collections normally include mid-nineteenth century material and World War I material, with no noticeable assemblage dating in between. This is reasonably explained by the fact that 38BU162 was part of the 160-acre Means School Farm tract, which, unlike most of Parris Island, was not sold in 10-acre lots to freedmen. Instead, most of the land remained in the hands of white families including the Means, the Snyders, and the Nivers, and it was probably farmed commercially or rented out. Late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century domestic material does occur within the cemetery, but there it is classified as surface grave goods.

**Marine Corps.** U.S. Marine Corps basic training on the Maneuver Grounds in the period 1916-1920 left abundant evidence in the cemetery at 38BU162. Nearly every trench contained artifacts or features from that era, and the near absence of grave markers in the cemetery is the result of World War I Marine Corps activity. By far the most substantial archaeological remnants of this occupation includes architectural materials and features from the Maneuver Grounds hospital, which was built ca. October 1918 (Figure 77 and 112) (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF, Reel 621:610-31-25).

Trenches V15/16, V18, V20, V23, V24-26, V32, V34, V81, V82, and V95 (Figures 83, 87, 88, 92 and 93) all encountered poured concrete post footings (Figure 113), and several additional examples were located by probing and mapped. The resulting pattern of footings was compared to the footings in the 1918 construction plans for the Maneuver Grounds hospital (NARA RG 71, Y&D MF, Reel 584:47-50), and it was found that the two sets matched, and in only one possible configuration. This allowed us to overlay the hospital plan on the cemetery site with precision (Figure 112). This placement allowed us to identify the concrete ruins first mapped by Stanley South during the 38BU162F season (South 1983:78) as the foundation for a set of entrance stairs and a wheelchair ramp, although the ramp is somewhat offset from the version in the construction plans (Figures 81 and 112). Ceramic or iron pipes were found *in situ* in ditch features in Trenches V14, V17, V18/19 and V94 (Figures 83, 87, and 93), and additional, probable pipe ditches were found in Trenches V16, V21 and V67/68 (Figures 87 and 92). These are the remains of water and sewer lines that served the hospital.
Figure 112. 38BU162V, W. Location of the USMC Maneuver Grounds hospital built in 1918.
The Maneuver Grounds hospital was demolished in 1926-27 (NARA RG71, Y&D MF, Reel 620:610-3-65, 610-3-72). A report of the post-war demolition of the West Wing Extension (Chapter 3) mentions that the materials were “salvaged” (Navy Department 1928:1203). Evidence for the salvaging of lumber from the hospital was seen in the block V24-V26 (Figure 88), which encountered part of a mass of pulled wire nails that number in the thousands. Several other trenches in the same vicinity produced lesser quantities of used nails. Other materials, including concrete rubble and iron and ceramic pipe, were pushed over the bluff and are still visible along the marsh edge. Smaller architectural artifacts such as tarpaper fragments, window glass fragments, iron sash weights, electrical fixtures, and “knob and tube” wiring insulators (Bock 1989:27, 28) were found scattered across the hospital site (Figure 114A, B).

Military and personal artifacts were less common in the cemetery area than in areas previously excavated to the south and west. This is probably a reflection of the avoidance of the area (an active cemetery) until October 1918, followed by only moderate use of the new hospital thanks to the unexpected close of the Great War in November. The small assemblage we did recover includes tent hardware, USMC uniform buttons in pocket, coat and overcoat sizes, brass 4-hole trouser buttons, coins, a watch fob, and a gilt collar button (Figure 114C-M).

Test trenching yielded evidence of the field artillery firing on the “East Shrapnel Range,” ca. 1937-39, including several small fragments of high explosive shells, and lead alloy balls from shrapnel shells. This is the same sort of material as that found at 38BU1618 on the “West Main
Three iron AN-MK 23 aerial practice bombs (Figure 115) were recovered from trenches, outliers from the bombing target located near the 8th Hole of the original golf course in the period 1942-45 (U.S. Navy, Bureau of Ordnance 1947). Numerous practice bombs and parts have been recovered in previous Santa Elena projects (DePratter and South 1995:65, 66, 68; DePratter et al. 2001:27, 29, 30). Also recovered were two aluminum fragments of aircraft wreckage (Figure 115), artifacts of mishaps on the bombing range. At least two planes are known to have crashed in the vicinity, and small fragments of wreckage are occasionally found (DePratter and South 1995:68; DePratter et al. 2001:30, 41, 42).

Finally, the cemetery testing encountered a minor array of items related to the original golf course on the site (1947-1999), chiefly golf balls. This material has been recovered by every Santa Elena field season (e.g. DePratter and South 1995:68,70), but is now, presumably, a non-renewing cultural resource with the original 8th Fairway relocated off of the site.

Figure 115. 38BU162V. Practice bombs and aircraft wreckage.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The 38BU162V and W trenching, combined with evidence from earlier projects, established boundaries for the African American cemetery on the Santa Elena site. Historical research suggests that the cemetery began as the slave cemetery for the Parris/Barnwell/Means plantation on the site, and it may have had its origins as early as the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Burial there continued after emancipation, with freedmen and their descendants using the cemetery until at least 1918, when the site was officially closed by the Marine Corps.

A total of 116 test trenches were excavated employing three variations in excavation methods. The total length of trenching, not including perpendicular extensions, was 1149 ft (350.2 m). In addition to graves and possible graves recorded in previous seasons, the V and W trenching identified 37 new grave features. The positive and negative grave evidence from all sources combined to demonstrate that the cemetery measured a maximum of 300 ft north-south by 170 ft east-west (91.4 m by 51.8 m). Limited grave density information was extrapolated to provide a rough estimated total of 450 to 500 graves. The cemetery boundary as determined by our trenching and as is indicated on maps in this report is only an approximate boundary. There could well be isolated graves or family clusters that fall outside this boundary.

Surface grave goods were fairly abundant but were badly fragmented and scattered. Once again, the materials employed as grave goods dated almost entirely to the late-nineteenth/early twentieth century period, with rare and ambiguous examples of earlier material.

Extensive evidence for other, non-cemetery cultural components was encountered. These included a broad range of Native American components, the sixteenth century Charlesfort and Santa Elena occupations, the eighteenth and nineteenth century plantation occupation, and twentieth century Marine Corps activities.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century plantation material was not abundant within the cemetery proper. Test trenches near the southwest corner of the cemetery, however, showed evidence of the large domestic midden located west of Fort San Felipe and delineated by the 38BU162Q testing. This midden is thought to be the site of a linear slave settlement from the antebellum period. No postbellum domestic occupation of the cemetery area was indicated.

The most substantial impact to the 38BU162 cemetery site came in 1918, when the Marine Corps built a hospital to serve the Maneuver Grounds training camp squarely on top of the cemetery. Test trenches revealed abundant evidence for the construction and demolition of the hospital, which probably erased nearly all surface indications of the cemetery. Coincident with hospital construction, graves of several military veterans were removed to the Beaufort National Cemetery.

One of the goals of the cemetery trenching was to determine whether the cemetery was being actively eroded by Means Creek. Our trenching indicates that the cemetery was set back from the present shoreline, and that erosion has not yet impacted the main part of the cemetery. This does not mean that there are not isolated graves outside the boundaries of the cemetery as determined by our trenching that could be impacted by erosion. Because Means Creek is
actively eroding the shoreline adjacent to this cemetery, the shoreline should be monitored for eroding graves, particularly following storms, spring tides, or whenever one of the large trees located there is felled by undercutting. If eroding graves are detected through monitoring, they should be excavated by qualified archaeological professionals and reburied in the cemetery. Reburial should also be done by professional archaeologists to mitigate damage to the cultural deposits in the cemetery.
When we began work on Parris Island cemeteries, we suspected that there must be more than the four known African American cemeteries on the island. This suspicion was based on the known plantation history of the island and the fact that areas such as the large, intensively developed Mainside part of the base and Page Field, constructed in 1938-1939, were large enough to conceal unknown cemeteries.

Our search began with an examination of available maps and construction plans. This search involved inspection of historical maps of the Port Royal Sound region, as well as maps and base construction plans specific to Parris Island. Repositories with maps that were examined include the Parris Island Museum (including 12 reels of Bureau of Yards and Docks microfilm), the Parris Island Public Works Department, the Navy Real Estate Office in Charleston, the Beaufort County Tax Assessor’s Office, and the Department of the Treasury and Direct Tax Commission records in the National Archives. This search involved the inspection of several hundred maps and plans.

We also examined written records for clues that might lead us to additional cemeteries. This part of the search included study of extant records relating to the antebellum period, 1860s survey records of the Direct Tax Commission, Civil War pension records of former island residents, newspaper records relating to the 1893 hurricane, and assorted files related to the Marine Corps purchase of the island in 1918.

This extensive map and records search did not result in the identification of any additional cemeteries, although documentation for the four known cemeteries was improved. This does not mean, however, that no additional cemeteries exist on the island. It is possible that there were cemeteries associated with specific plantations that were used for a period of time and then abandoned. There could also have been cemeteries, particularly in the Mainside area and beneath Page Field, that simply were not recorded on any map, and which are now obliterated. This prospect is suggested by the fact that only three of the known cemeteries show up on maps or plans; the Elliott Plantation cemetery at Whale Creek (38BU1618) does not appear on any known map or plan.

We also know from historical documents that there are other graves on the island that were not placed in cemeteries. When the August 28, 1893, hurricane struck the coasts of Georgia and South Carolina, as many as 2,000 people were killed. At least 24 Parris Island residents were among the dead (Savannah Morning News, 3 September 1893; New York Times, 3 September 1893). Admiral Beardslee, commander of the Port Royal Naval Station at the time, reported that he “gave Christian burials” to nine bodies recovered immediately after the storm, but an additional 12 bodies found later were, for sanitary reasons, buried “at once where we found them” (Barton 1903:207). Another account by Charlotte Edwards, an island
resident, suggests a much higher death toll. She states that 19 men died in a single boat, and “nearly half the people on Parris Island perished that awful night, among whom were nearly all my relatives” (Mather 1894:28-29). If true, this would mean the death toll on Parris Island was in the hundreds. Regardless of which account is more nearly correct, some of these burials may have been made in known cemeteries, but certainly some were placed in isolated graves scattered across the island. In addition, the storm surge itself may have buried some individuals on Parris Island who were never discovered (see Cemetery Search Locations D, E and F, below).

In the examination of maps, the DeRoode map (1916) was found to contain the most information concerning cemeteries. DeRoode shows two cemeteries, 38BU1895B (Figure 9) and the cemetery at Santa Elena, 38BU162 (Figure 76), indicated by rectangular enclosures within wooded tracts, although neither is labeled as a cemetery. The rifle range cemetery, 38BU39/1619, is also shown as a wooded tract by DeRoode (Figure 61), but it does not have the cemetery “rectangle” within it. The fourth cemetery, 38BU1618, does not appear at all on the DeRoode map.

Since three of the known cemeteries show up on the DeRoode map as being wooded tracts at a time when perhaps 95% of the island was cleared, we focused our search for additional cemeteries on other discrete wooded tracts that appear on the DeRoode map and on a 1933 map compiled from aerial photographs (USCGS 1933). Many of the tracts shown as wooded on the historic maps were no longer accessible due to the subsequent expansion of Mainside and the construction of the rifle range, Page Field, and the golf course. We visited those locations that were accessible, and selected several for testing. We also selected several locations where very old oaks stand today in relative isolation. The locations actually tested were designated Cemetery Search Locations (CSLs) “A” through “H.” These are discussed below not in strict alphabetical order but rather grouped into two geographical clusters, including CSLs “A,” “B,” “C,” “G,” and “H,” and CSLs “D,” “E,” and “F.”

During this phase of the work we also visited several locations suggested as the sites of cemeteries by local informants, but none of these showed any indication of having been used for that purpose (i.e. large hardwood trees, grave sinks or mounds, grave goods, grave markers, etc.). In addition, the locations suggested were too general to be readily confirmed or denied by trenching. The informants for this phase of the work were not former residents, but rather island employees who had seen or heard something (i.e. presence of bones, irregular topography, etc.) to make them think there might be a cemetery in the areas they identified. In this regard, it is significant that the many long-term employees who visited during the testing of 38BU1895B disclaimed any knowledge of the existence of that large cemetery. This kind of informant-based search might have been successful twenty years ago, before the African Americans who formerly resided on the island passed away, but at the present time we know of no local resident who could provide additional information relating to the location of additional cemeteries.
Cemetery Search Location “A”
(38BU39)

CSL “A” (Figures 2, 116 and 117) consisted of the area around an especially large live oak tree on a slight knoll just west of Wake Boulevard, between Wake Village and the rifle range. The area surrounding this large tree was forested, but the large oak stood out from its surroundings due to its size. This search area falls within the limits of a very large multi-component site, 38BU39, which is primarily characterized by a thin, prehistoric scatter with intermittent shell middens (Brandon and Sewell 2002:81-84; Butler et al. 1995:107-116; Hendryx et al. 1997:142-52).

Two backhoe trenches were excavated in this search area (Figure 117). Each trench was 20 ft long, oriented so as to avoid trees and dense vegetation. One hundred percent of fill was screened. Trench 1 was excavated to the south of the large oak; the “A” segment of this trench was at the north end. The trench penetrated a prehistoric period midden with a moderate amount of shell. In Trench A1, an extension was excavated to investigate a large feature in the “A” segment; this feature was found to be a tree stain. Trench 2 was located to the north of the large oak; the “A” segment of this trench was located at the south end of the trench. Like Trench 1, this trench contained a prehistoric period shell midden composed of moderate amounts of shell. This trench also contained a large tree stain, but no grave features were present.

These two trenches contained a variety of prehistoric Native American sherds, but only a sparse assemblage of later historic period materials. The prehistoric sherds (n=69 in Trench 1 and its extension; n=92 in Trench 2) included three Stallings Plain sherds and a wide variety of Late Woodland and Mississippian sherds spanning the period from c. A.D. 600 to 1450 (See Appendix I). The shell midden in these trenches contained a variety of species including oyster, clam, periwinkle, whelk, and mud snail. No prehistoric features were encountered in either of these trenches.

Nineteenth century material found in these two search trenches included one whiteware sherd, an aqua glass medicine bottle fragment, cut nails, and small brick fragments (Appendix IV). This collection is too small to allow interpretation of activities that may have taken place in the vicinity during this period. The twentieth century assemblage included coal, gravel, cinders, a wire fragment, a variety of glass fragments, assorted fragments of iron, and a hex nut (Appendix IV). The dispersed nature of the materials is suggestive of a large debris field associated with long-term Marine Corps use of this area for a diverse array of training activities and perhaps refuse disposal.

No grave outlines or other evidence of a cemetery was found at CSL “A.” It is likely that the large oak at this location was simply a tree that was left standing when most of the other trees on the island were removed to facilitate intensive agriculture. This location was eliminated as the site of an historic cemetery.
Figure 116. 38BU39. Site map of Cemetery Search Location "A."

Figure 117. 38BU39. Cemetery Search Location "A;" view to the west.
Cemetery Search Location “B”
(38BU39)

CSL “B” (Figures 2, 118 and 119) was located in the Wake Village PT (Physical Training) Field; the area was selected on the basis of two large, isolated live oaks found there. This search area was the first of four areas tested in the PT field along the eastern margin of Fuller’s Wood, a large, forested depression that apparently was never completely cleared because its poor drainage made it unsuitable for agriculture (Figure 118). The 1933 USCgreens map shows the same clusters of trees that are present today, so we thought that perhaps one or more of these groups of old, large trees might be indicative of the presence of a cemetery.

At CSL B, we excavated two backhoe trenches, each thirty feet long (Figure 118). Each of these trenches exhibited a plowzone about one ft thick, indicating that this area had been used for agriculture at some time in the past. Beneath the plowzone was a clean yellow/tan subsoil. Trench 1 was excavated with the “A” segment at its east end. Nograve pit outlines or any other features were present in this trench. There was a low-density scatter of shell throughout the plowzone, but there was no intact midden. Trench 2, excavated at a right angle to Trench 1, also contained a scatter of shell. Beneath the plowzone were three large tree stains; intruding into these tree stains were small pockets of shell. These concentrations of shell may be indicative of the density of shell in this area prior to intensive plowing, or they may have been small pit features excavated into the subsoil by former site inhabitants. We did not excavate these features.

We recovered a total of 164 prehistoric Indian sherds from the two trenches in CSL “B.” Nearly one-third of the prehistoric pottery from this site consisted of Stallings Plain sherds, many of them used as hones (Table I; Appendix I). The proportion of Stallings in the collection would probably have been higher had we excavated into the subsoil, as Stallings sherds are often found in the leached “subsoil” sands on Parris Island. There is a single identifiable Deptford sherd in Trench 1. A total of three late prehistoric period Irene sherds were also found. The remainder of the collection consists mainly of St. Catherines and Savannah Period sherds, meaning that after the Stallings occupation ended around 1100 B.C., the site saw little use until it was reoccupied between A.D. 1000 and 1325; after 1325, this part of site 38BU39 again was abandoned or saw only limited activity during the Irene Period.

Historic period artifacts found at CSL “B” included a large collection of twentieth century Marine Corps material and a lesser amount of eighteenth to twentieth century civilian material. The eighteenth/nineteenth century assemblage included five colonoware sherds, two whiteware sherds, 12 manganese glass fragments, two horse shoe fragments, and a few brick fragments. The Marine Corps assemblage consists of approximately 70 items, not counting sheet iron fragments, lumps of coal, cinders, pieces of concrete, asbestos tile, and gravel. The only dated item in the assemblage is a well-worn 1912 nickel. The presence of messhall ceramic sherds and glass container fragments suggests that this area may have been used as a mess area or refuse dump at some time in the first half of the twentieth century, although maps of Marine Corps activities on Parris Island do not show any Marine Corps structures in the vicinity.
Figure 118. 38BU39. Site map of Cemetery Search Locations “B,” “C,” “G,” and “H.”
Figure 119. 38BU39. The physical training field located west of Fuller’s Woods and east of Wake Village housing area. View is to the south from CSL “H,” with Fuller’s Woods at left, CSL “G” center left, and Wake Village at right. CSLs “B” and “C” are beyond CSL “G.”

Subsequent work on this part of the 38BU39 site by Hardlines Design Company (Brandon and Sewell 2002:81-82) involved shovel testing and the excavation of two 1x1 m test units. Based on the material that they recovered, they identified our CSL “B” as a “Freedman Site #1,” a domestic site dating to the early twentieth century, approximately 50 m (164 ft) in diameter. While we have not actually examined the Hardlines collection, it appears that it may be very similar to ours and contains little material that is necessarily of a civilian, domestic nature. In addition, the DeRoode map (Figure 7) depicts no civilian residence on the site in 1916. We suspect that the site may consist primarily of Marine Corps refuse, although some sort of earlier, historic period activity is certainly indicated. While the nature of the historic components in unclear, CSL “B” was eliminated as a potential historic cemetery site.
Cemetery Search Location “C”
(38BU39)

CSL “C” was also located in the Wake Village PT Field (Figures 2, 118, 120 and 121). We include this site as part of 38BU39 on the basis of a recent survey by Hardlines Design Company (Brandon and Sewell 2002: Fig. 3). Hardlines designated our CSL “C” as “Freedman Site #2.” While no grave features were discovered at CSL “C,” other components of some significance were recorded. Like CSL “B,” it was selected for testing based on the presence of two large, isolated oak trees that appear on the 1933 USCGS map. A single backhoe trench 40 ft (12.2 m) long was excavated to the south of the two oaks; the “A” 10 ft segment was on the south end. This trench encountered a dense, plow disturbed shell midden that was distributed throughout the approximately one ft thick plowzone. At the interface between the plowzone and subsoil, there were undisturbed pockets of shell representing intact remnants of undisturbed shell midden.

The single trench at CSL “C” produced large collections of both prehistoric and historic artifacts. The prehistoric material included 248 sherds large enough for analysis. As was the case with other areas tested in the Wake Village PT Field, the earliest occupation dates to the Stallings period; the 13 Stallings sherds recovered represent approximately five percent of the prehistoric materials from this CSL (Appendices I and IV). Nineteen Deptford sherds dating to c. 400 B.C. to A.D. 500 were found dispersed among the collection from the four trench segments (Table 1).

Figure 120. 38BU39. Screening and troweling Trench 1, CSL “C;” view to the southeast.
Two-thirds (168 of 248 sherds) of the prehistoric collection was composed of the three St. Catherines types represented, including cord marked, fabric impressed, and plain (Table 1; Appendix I). This abundance of St. Catherines sherds suggested an intensive utilization of resources from the Fuller’s Woods swamp ecosystem during the St. Catherines Period (A.D. 1000-1200). Following the St. Catherines Period, there appears to have been only limited use of the same resources during the succeeding Savannah (represented by nine sherds) and Irene Periods (four sherds). The remaining 34 sherds were too small to allow assignment to a specific type. Three chert, triangular projectile points were also recovered from CSL "C" (see Appendix I).

CSL “C” also yielded a large collection of historic material (440 counted artifacts) dating to the second half of the nineteenth century (Figure 121). The ceramics collection (88 sherds) was dominated by inexpensive plain and hand-decorated whiteware and utilitarian stoneware (Appendix IV). The decorated wares included dipt (annular), blue edged, hand-painted, and cork-stamped varieties. A dipt pearlware bowl was also represented. Glass bottle and container fragments numbered 92, and while 47 of the fragments were of clear or manganese glass, the remainder included many fragments of “earlier” colors and forms, including dark olive green (“black”) ale bottles and aqua medicinal bottles. No screw-top or crown-top bottles were identified, nor any that were obviously machine-made. One hundred eighty-three nails and nail fragments were recovered, including two wrought examples and 181 cut examples; no wire nails were found. Other material included iron cooking vessel fragments, clay smoking pipe fragments, a brass thimble, a ceramic marble, Prosser buttons, a white glass bead, case lock fragments, an iron fork, window glass, and small brick fragments (Figure 121). The site was remarkably uncontaminated by later USMC activities, which were represented by four .30'06 blank cartridges (dated 1942-1944), a fired .30 caliber bullet, a bottle cap, and a scatter of cinders and gravel.

The CSL “C” assemblage indicates a low status domestic site with material dating primarily from the 1850s to the 1890s. The range of occupation can be reasonably narrowed by allowing for curation of older ceramics, and by considering the historic settlement patterns on Parris Island. The antebellum slave settlement for Fuller Plantation, of which CSL “C” was a part, was apparently located far to the north, near Fuller’s Landing (Chapter 3). An isolated house originating in the antebellum period is a possibility, but is much less likely than a house built (or moved to the site) by ex-slaves after emancipation. Based on the artifact assemblage, the occupation does not appear to have extended into the twentieth century, and it is not unreasonable to suggest the great Hurricane of 1893 as an end date. On the other hand, the DeRoode map (Figure 7) does show a house at or a little west of CSL “C” in 1916. This may have been a long-abandoned structure, or perhaps a very recent one that left little archaeological evidence before being abandoned ca. 1918.

The subsequent testing by Hardlines Design Company (Brandon and Sewell 2002: 82,83) yielded a collection of 740 artifacts, and an occupation range of “mid to late nineteenth century.” Hardlines found a Civil War period Connecticut state seal button at CSL “C,” which they suggest probably dates “to the 1864 occupation of the Beaufort area by the 29th Regiment, Connecticut
Infantry (Colored)” and further, that “This artifact is the only positively African-American indicator recovered from this site” (2002:82). Two such buttons have been recovered at Santa Elena, and all three examples are more likely to have originated with one of the several white Connecticut units stationed on adjacent islands earlier in the war (Albert 1976:123, 124; Legg and Smith 1989:100).

The historic “Freedman” domestic component at CSL “C” is an important archaeological resource. The site is dense and apparently well preserved, and represents an occupation type of great significance in the history of Parris Island. Unlike most such sites, which are typically overwhelmed by continuing twentieth century occupation, the CSL “C” occupation appears to be confined to the first three decades after emancipation. Our study of historic maps (e.g. DeRoode 1916, Tittoni 1920) suggests that most of the African American house sites that were standing structures in the early twentieth century have already been destroyed or badly degraded by development, fill borrowing, and landscaping. Well preserved sites like those at CSL “C” and CSL “G” are actually rare and significant resources on Parris Island.

Cemetery Search Location “G”
(38BU39)

CSL “G” was another of the search areas in the large Wake Village PT field (Figures 2, 118, 122 and 123). Two 30 ft (9.1 m) long trenches were excavated adjacent to two large live oak trees on the northwestern fringe of Fuller’s Wood. The plowzone in this area was c. 0.8 ft thick and contained a moderate amount of shell scattered throughout. As the search location was on the edge of the high ground where it began to fall away into Fuller’s Wood, two deep tests were excavated to check for buried prehistoric components. One 10 ft section in each trench was excavated into the subsoil to a depth of approximately 3.2 ft (0.9 m) below the present surface; although all of the fill was screened, no artifacts at all were recovered. CSL “G” is also considered a part of 38BU39 on the basis of testing later conducted by Hardlines Design Company. Hardlines designated the historic component “Freedman Site #3” (Brandon and Sewell 2002: Figure 3). No grave features were identified at CSL “G.”

Prehistoric occupations were represented by 105 sherds (Table 1; Appendix I). Eight of these sherds date to a Stallings Period occupation of the second millennium B.C. Seven Refuge and Deptford Period sherds date to the following 1500 years. Two Oemler Check Stamped sherds were the only ones of this type found in the Wake Village PT Field testing. Two possible Wando Simple Stamped sherds, distinguished by the use of finely crushed limestone or phosphate for temper, were present in one of our trenches. By far the most abundant types recovered from CSL “G” were St. Catherines Cord Marked and Plain (n=69). Later Savannah (n=2) and Irene (n=2) Period sherds were rare.

CSL “G” was the also the site of a low status, domestic occupation, a “Freedman” site somewhat later than that at CSL “C” (Figure 123). The collection of 567 counted artifacts included 64 ceramic sherds (Appendix IV). Of that total, 43 were undecorated whiteware, ironstone, or porcelain sherds. Two decal-decorated whiteware sherds were recovered, but there were none with hand decoration or transfer printing. Seventeen sherds of various types of utilitarian stoneware were also found. The glass bottle and container fragments numbered 289, a collection dominated by 207 fragments of clear, manganese and brown glass. Fragments of several machine-made, crown cap beer and soda bottles were recovered, as well as one manganese glass, monogrammed South Carolina Dispensary flask dating 1894-1907 (Huggins 1971). The base of a Beaufort “Chero-Cola” bottle was also recovered. These bottles are found

Figure 122. 38BU39. Cemetery Search Location “G.” Flat-shoveling and screening Trench 1, CSL “G;” view to the northeast.
in World War I era context at Santa Elena, and while the operating dates for the Beaufort bottling concession are not known, “Chero-Cola” generally was made from ca. 1912 to 1925 (Jetter 1987: 39,40) (Figure 123I). In contrast to CSL “C,” this site yielded 46 wire nails and fragments in addition to 114 cut nails and fragments. Other artifacts included iron cooking vessel fragments, Prosser buttons (Figure 123K), a Goodyear hard rubber button (Figure 123M), an eyeglass lens fragment, clay pipe fragments, brass lamp parts, window glass fragments, and brick fragments. CSL “G” had only small amounts of later USMC period material, including recent soda bottle fragments, a ceramic water or sewer pipe fragment, and a scatter of gravel and cinders.

An occupation range of c. 1880-1920 is suggested for the historic component at CSL “G.” The CSL “G” house is apparently depicted on the DeRoode map of 1916 (Figure 7). The beginning date is roughly estimated largely by the absence of the mid-century ceramics that were common at CSL “C,” which almost certainly was settled in the 1860s. Machine-made, crown cap bottles and wire nails, both absent at CSL “C,” push the date for “G” somewhat later. The assemblage is not inconsistent with an occupation ending at the time of the U.S. seizure of Parris Island, in 1918-1920 (Chapter 2). Subsequent testing by Brandon and Sewell (2002:83) produced a collection of 567 historic artifacts, and they suggested that “any associated structure(s) was constructed in the mid-to late nineteenth century, and occupied possibly up into the early twentieth century.”

Like CSL “C,” this Freedman site is dense and apparently well preserved. It probably represents the second generation of the post-emancipation African American tenure on Parris Island, as well as the community that was in place at the time of the Marine Corps takeover. As discussed above, few of these sites appear to be preserved on Parris Island, and those that remain in fairly good condition are significant archaeological resources.

**Cemetery Search Location “H” 38BU39**

As was the case with the other CSLs in the PT field, CSL “H” was chosen due to the presence of two large oak trees on the northwestern margin of Fuller’s Wood. Only a single 30 ft (9.1 m) trench was excavated. Excavations indicated that this part of the field had been subjected to earthmoving, probably to create a level surface. The original topsoil/plowzone had been partially removed and a layer of orange sandy clay was used to replace it; the remaining plowzone contained a sparse amount of shell.

Prehistoric artifacts recovered from this trench totaled 50 sherds including only one or two each of Stallings, Refuge, Chatham County, Wilmington, and Irene types (Table 1; Appendix I). The bulk of the collection, as was the case in our other excavations in this field, consisted of St. Catherines Plain (n=7) and St. Catherines Cord Marked (n=32). These counts clearly indicate that this part of 38BU39 was intensively occupied during the St. Catherines Period but saw only intermittent use during all other prehistoric periods. A single Woodland projectile point (see Appendix I) was recovered from this search location.
Figure 123. 38BU39, Cemetery Search Location “G.” Late Nineteenth-Early Twentieth century artifacts, CSL “G.”  
Historic period artifacts were also sparse in this area. Nineteenth/twentieth century artifacts included three container glass fragments, two cut nails, a clay pipe bowl fragment, and a brass 4-hole button (Appendix IV). These artifacts may be associated with an African American household located somewhere in the vicinity. Marine Corps activity in this area is indicated by the presence of a limited collection of artifacts including bits of plastic, a cigarette filter, a silver necklace chain, a piece of sheet iron, and a steel fitting in addition to gravel and cinders. It is likely that we would have recovered more historic period artifacts in this search area if the topsoil had not been largely removed at some time in the past.

**Cemetery Search Locations “D,” “E,” and “F”**

Three CSLs, “D,” “E,” and “F,” (Figures 3, 124-128) were selected for testing based on the fact that they appeared as isolated clumps of trees on the 1916 DeRoode map. Because nearly the entire island had been cleared of forests for agricultural purposes by the nineteenth century, these wooded tracts were identified as potential cemeteries. None of the three tracts is still wooded today, but all were easy to locate because the road system has remained unchanged. Backhoe trenches were excavated into all three tracts. CSL “D” was located on the southwest corner of the large tract of land currently occupied by the Weapons Battalion/Rifle Range complex (Figure 2). The former Savannah Creek, now connected by a dredged cut to Ballast Creek, is located just to the east of CSL “D.” Officers’ Quarters, buildings 706, 707, and 708

![Figure 124. Cemetery Search Location “D” Site map.](image)
Figure 125. Cemetery Search Location “E” Site Map.

Figure 126. Cemetery Search Location “E.” View to the east.
were located adjacent to the area tested. Four backhoe trenches (each 10 ft long) and a 4 ft deep shovel test (Test Hole #3) were excavated at CSL “D” (Figure 124).

CSL “E” was located approximately 1500 ft (457 m) northeast of CSL “D.” The former wooded tract was located in the corner of a PT field just to the east of building 800 (Figure 125). Three test trenches (each 10 ft/3 m long) and a deep (ca. 3.0 ft/0.9 m) shovel test hole were excavated at this location (Figure 126). CSL “F” was located to the east of CSL “D” in an open field to the northeast of building 807, an officer’s residence (Figure 127). The former Savannah Creek channel was located to the southeast of the field. Six backhoe trenches, each 10 ft long, were excavated in this field.

The backhoe trenches and deep shovel tests in all three of these search areas revealed thick overburdens of waterlaid sand and clay. At CSLs “D” and “F,” the deposit was as deep as four feet. In places the deposit consisted solely of interbedded sand lenses, while in other places the sand lenses were interspersed with lenses and rolled lumps of marsh mud (Figure 128). At CSL “E,” observed stratigraphy was more complex, consisting of interbedded sands overlaid by about a foot of marsh clay. Based on our testing and that later conducted by Brandon and Sewell (2002: Figure 4), it is apparent that the deposit covers more than 45 acres. The inland edge of the deposit is delineated by a noticeable drop of 2 to 3 ft (0.6 to 0.9 m) to the level of the surrounding land surface.
We have considered two entirely different explanations for this deposit. First, the structure of the deposit, including the rolled clay inclusions, is consistent with that found in washover fans associated with massive storm surges (Deery and Howard 1977:261). This suggests that the deposit dates entirely, or in large part, to the great hurricane of August 28, 1893 (see pages 25, 26, 209 and 210 in this report). If this explanation is correct, several house sites and quite possibly a few missing residents are buried under the deposit.

Our alternate explanation is less dramatic. Between 1933 and 1946, a broad channel was dredged through the marsh and high ground to the southeast of the rifle range complex (see Figures 43 and 44). This ambitious engineering project connected Ballast Creek (and thereby the Beaufort River) to the Broad River. It is possible that the large volumes of dredge spoil pumped from the channel were discharged in low areas to the north, expanding the land available for development. The officers’ quarters northwest of CSL “D,” which were in place by 1946, were built on top of the deposit. The discharge of the spoil as a slurry may have imparted much the same structural characteristics seen in storm washover deposits.
Summary

In our search for additional cemeteries we excavated a total of 300 ft (91.4 m) of backhoe trenches over eight different Cemetery Search Locations (CSLs). We discovered no evidence for additional cemeteries. In CSLs “A,” “B,” “C,” “G” and “H” we identified a variety of prehistoric components, and at least two African American house sites dating between Emancipation and World War I; all of these components were elements of site 38BU39. In an area southeast of the rifles ranges (CSLs “D,” “E” and “F”) we identified a large area that was buried under thick, waterlaid sand and clay deposits of uncertain origin. The search for additional cemeteries was a limited effort, and our failure to locate additional cemeteries should not suggest that none exist.
Chapter 8

BEAUFORT NATIONAL CEMETERY

As we began our work on Parris Island cemeteries, we were surprised at the scarcity of headstones or other forms of grave marking. Some of this scarcity we could explain by the use of perishable materials or homemade markers that could have been removed by the Marines during “policing up” activities as they deteriorated through time (see Chapter 1). Also absent, however, were markers supplied by the government for veterans of service in the Civil War. This absence was more difficult to explain, because we knew that there were veterans who lived on the island in the decades after the war, and if they had indeed been buried with government-provided gravestones, they would not have been of the perishable sort that may have marked many other graves on the island. A description of these government-supplied markers is provided on the application form for such markers (NARA RG 92, Entry 592, Applications for headstones, Abraham Delegall, December 1910):

Upon application to the Quartermaster General, U.S. Army, headstones will be furnished for unmarked graves of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during any war or insurrection (including the Revolution), whether regular or volunteer, and whether they died in the service or since their muster out or discharge therefrom [sic]. Headstones will be furnished also for unmarked graves of Army Nurses who had regular or volunteer commissions as such.

These headstones are of best American white marble, 39 inches long, 12 inches wide, and 4 inches thick, the top slightly rounded and the portion of the stone which will be above ground when set is sand-rubbed; each headstone is inscribed with the name, rank (if above private), company, and State regiment, or other organization, to which the deceased belonged, cut in relief within a sunken shield. No deviation can be made from these specifications, which are prescribed by the Secretary of War, and the law does not provide any expenditure for fences or for any other purpose except for the headstone as above described; neither is it lawful to make any money allowance in place of furnishing a headstone.

Headstones will be shipped, freight prepaid by the Government, only to the nearest railroad station or steamboat landing; they will not be delivered to street addresses or to the cemetery.

Relocated Burials

Our search of records in the Parris Island Legal and Public Works offices, the Parris Island Museum, and the Navy real estate office in Charleston failed to disclose any reference to the fate of the veterans’ grave markers (assuming, of course, that there were such markers there originally). As our National Archives research in Civil War pension files proceeded, the list of
Parris Island veterans grew to approximately 35. Surely the families of some of those veterans had requested and received markers from the government. So, where were the graves of the veterans?

Our search led ultimately to the Beaufort National Cemetery, in Beaufort, South Carolina. Once we had developed a list of island veterans, it was a simple matter of consulting the online list of those buried in that cemetery (US Veteran’s Administration 2007). This search resulted in the identification of at least 11 former Parris Island residents buried in the National Cemetery. Four were in isolated graves scattered through the cemetery (Sections 30, 32, 52, and 63), and the other seven were grouped together in Section 32 (Table 3, Figure 129).

The four men buried in isolated graves include Cyrus Canfield, William Williams, Gilbert Fulton, and William Green (Table 3). These four men were likely buried in the National Cemetery at the time of their deaths. All information relating to these four individuals is from military pension files in the National Archives.

- Cyrus (or Silas) Canfield (buried in Section 30, grave #3086, or 30-3086) was a private in Co. H, 21st U.S. Colored Infantry; he died of smallpox on Hilton Head Island on March 23, 1866, while still in the service (Figure 130A).
- William Williams (grave 52-8865) was a private in Co. A, 34th U.S.C.I.; he died on March 29, 1915 (Figure 130B).
- Gilbert Fulton (grave 32-8818), a private in Co. I, 33rd U.S.C.I., died January 23, 1910 (Figure 130C).
- William Green (grave 63-8771), a private in Co. E, 34th U.S.C.I., died July 5 1903 (Figure 130D).

The remaining seven graves in the National Cemetery are clustered together in Section 32 where they are buried in graves with consecutive numbers (Figure 129, Table 3):

- W.H. Snow (grave 32-8890), a white man married to Flora Snow, a black island resident, served in the U.S. Navy and died on October 13, 1892 (Figure 130E).
- Cupid Hayward (grave 32-8891), a private in Co. C, 33rd U.S.C.I., died November 11, 1892 (Figure 130F).
- William Fields (grave 32-8892) was a corporal in Co. D, 34th U.S.C.I.; he died on May 27, 1913 (Figure 130G). Cemetery records indicate that William Fields wife Emily (who died October 6, 1921), is buried in the same grave with him.
- Friday Kirk (grave 32-8893), a private in Co. B, 21st U.S.C.I., died on February 5, 1896 (Figure 130H).
- Robert Robinson (grave 32-8894) was a corporal in Co. C, 34th U.S.C.I.; he died January 14, 1902 (Figure 130 I).
- Abraham Delegall (grave 32-8895) who was a private in Co. I, 33rd U.S.C.I. died on December 22, 1910 (Figure 130J).
- Lawrence Green (grave 32-8896), a Navy veteran, died in July 1903, in the Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia (Figure 130K).

The death dates for these last seven individuals span a period of 21 years, so it is unlikely that they were buried side by side in the National Cemetery due to chance, and individuals from particular localities were not systematically segregated within the cemetery (personal communication, Marvin Oaks, Beaufort National Cemetery, April 25, 2002). The online information (http://www.interment.net) relating to these seven graves provides an important clue to how they came to be buried together. The entry for Robert Robinson reads, in part, “9/24/18 Removed from Parris Island.” Pension files indicate that Robinson died on January 14, 1902, and records on file with the Quartermaster Department state that the Lee Marble Works, Lee, Massachusetts, supplied a headstone for his grave in Means Plantation cemetery, Parris Island (NARA RG 92, Entry 628, Headstone records, 1861-1903). This means that Robinson was originally buried on Parris Island and was then moved to the National Cemetery. The date of this relocation, “9/24/18,” is significant, because it coincides with planned construction at the Maneuver Grounds including the hospital that was placed directly on top of the Means cemetery (see Chapter 6, Figure 70). Construction of other Maneuver Grounds buildings began in summer, 1918, but the hospital does not appear to have been constructed on the Means Cemetery until October 1918. Robert Robinson’s grave was clearly moved from the Means Cemetery (38BU162V) in September, 1918, in preparation for the planned construction of the Maneuver Grounds hospital.

The National Cemetery online index entry and other evidence allows a similar conclusion in regard to the grave of Friday Kirk. Kirk died on February 5, 1896. Quartermaster Department records (NARA RG 92, Entry 628, Headstone records, 1861-1903) indicate that a gravestone was provided for Kirk’s grave by the Vermont Marble Company. The gravestone was placed in the Fuller Plantation Cemetery (38BU1895B) on Parris Island. The National Cemetery index entry for Kirk includes the statement “Removed from Parris Island” but no date is given for that removal.

National Archives records provide information on the five other graves from the cluster of seven believed to have been relocated in 1918. William Snow, a Navy veteran, was buried in the Means Cemetery on Parris Island in October 1892; his stone was provided by the Vermont Marble Company, Proctor, Vermont (NARA RG 92, Entry 628, Headstone records, 1861-1903). Cupid Heyward died in November 1892, and he was buried in the Fuller Cemetery; his headstone was provided by the Gross Brothers Company, Lee, Massachusetts (NARA RG 92, Entry 628, Headstone records, 1861-1903). Abraham Delegall died in December 1910, and he was buried in the Fuller Plantation cemetery, Parris Island (NARA RG 92, Entry 592, Applications for Headstones). William Fields died on May 27, 1913, and he was also buried in the Fuller cemetery (NARA RG 92, Entry 592, Applications for Headstones). Lawrence Green, who served in the U.S. Navy between 1892 and 1903, died in July, 1903, in the Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia; his body was transported to Parris Island where he was buried in an unspecified cemetery (NARA RG 92, Entry 592, Applications for Headstones).
Table 3. Grave locations for Parris Island veterans in Beaufort National Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Plot #</th>
<th>Date of death</th>
<th>HOF #</th>
<th>Original Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfield, Cyrus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>March 23, 1866</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, William</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8865</td>
<td>April 29, 1915</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton, Gilbert</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8818</td>
<td>Jan. 23, 1910</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, William</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8771</td>
<td>July 5, 1903</td>
<td>1310, 1858</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow, W.H.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8890</td>
<td>Oct. 13, 1892</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyward, Cupid</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8891*</td>
<td>Nov. 11, 1892</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields, William</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8892*</td>
<td>May 27, 1913</td>
<td>1271, 1721</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Friday</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8893*</td>
<td>Feb. 5, 1896</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Robert</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8894*</td>
<td>Jan. 14, 1902</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegall, Abraham</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8895</td>
<td>Dec. 22, 1910</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Lawrence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8896</td>
<td>July ??, 1903</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These four graves are side by side; the remaining three graves in this number sequence are scattered nearby.

Because Friday Kirk and Robert Robinson were buried side by side in the National Cemetery, we are sure that they must have been removed from Parris Island at the same time, but these two individuals were not removed from the same cemetery. Kirk was originally buried in the Fuller Plantation cemetery, while Robinson was buried in the Means cemetery at the opposite end of the island. At the same time that the hospital was being planned for the Means Cemetery site, the West Wing Extension was being constructed around the Fuller Plantation Cemetery on the north end of the island. This construction resulted in removal of graves from each of these two cemeteries.

Based on the foregoing, it appears that in September 1918, there was a general removal of veterans’ graves from Parris Island in preparation for a series of construction projects associated with the training of recruits following U.S. entry into World War I. Given that Robinson and Kirk are buried in the National Cemetery in a cluster of graves with sequential numbers, we suspect that the other graves in this cluster were removed from Parris Island at the same time. Available records indicate that those included in the 1918 removal came from at least the two cemeteries impacted by 1918 construction (Table 3). In addition to Robert Robinson, discussed above, W. H. Snow was also removed from the Means Cemetery. Cupid Hayward, William Fields, and Abraham Delegall, along with Friday Kirk (see above) were all removed from the Fuller cemetery. At the present time, we do not know where Lawrence Green was originally buried on Parris Island.

The actual gravestones in the National Cemetery provide another bit of information concerning activities at the time of the 1918 grave relocation. Of the seven gravestones believed to belong to the relocation group, four (those of W.H. Snow, Cupid Hayward, Friday Kirk, and
Robert Robinson) have the National Cemetery plot numbers engraved on them (Figure 130E, F, H, and I). This means that these stones could only have been created at the time of the relocation. We know that both Kirk and Robinson were originally provided with gravestones for the graves on Parris Island (see above), so these new numbered gravestones must be replacements. Perhaps the originals had been damaged prior to the relocation and needed replacement, perhaps the originals were damaged in transit to the National Cemetery, or perhaps the original stones were lost or stolen at some time prior to the relocation. Whatever the reason, new stones were clearly created for these four individuals as part of the 1918 relocation.

Not all graves involved in the 1918 relocation received new headstones. The gravestones of William Fields, Abraham Delegall, and Lawrence Green do not contain plot numbers, and we suspect, though we cannot prove, that these are original gravestones relocated with the burials in 1918 (Figures 130 G, J, and K). Two of these “original” gravestones (those of soldiers Fields
Figure 130. Gravestones of Parris Island residents in Beaufort National Cemetery.
and Delegall) differ from the four “replacement” stones. The two “originals” contain both the rank and unit of the deceased soldiers (as specified in the headstone requirements quoted above), but the “replacement” stones do not contain either regiment or company information. The gravestone of Lawrence Green indicates only that he served in the Navy as a seaman.

Conclusions

As a result of our research, we have found that there are graves of at least 11 former Parris Island residents in the Beaufort National Cemetery. Four of those graves are for individuals who were originally buried in that cemetery, and the remaining 7 were moved there from Parris Island. We suspect that there were more veterans buried on Parris Island than the 7 that we know of, but we have so far found no documentary evidence of the existence of such burials. Our suspicions are based in part on the absence of information on graves relocated from the Edings and Elliott cemeteries; surely there were veterans buried in each of these cemeteries, but there are no extant veterans markers in either one. And, if we are correct in our speculation that there may have been other cemeteries beneath Page Field and at Mainside, were there no veterans in either of them? These are questions that can perhaps be resolved by additional research in the National Archives.
Chapter 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The Parris Island cemetery project was successful in establishing boundaries for the four known African American cemeteries on the island. When we began, all four cemeteries were poorly understood. The cemetery later designated 38BU1895B was known only from historic maps, and was entirely unmarked. The “Rifle Range Cemetery” (or Edings cemetery in this report, 38BU39/1619) included six marked graves, but its boundaries were not known. The “Elliott’s Beach Cemetery” (or Whale Creek Cemetery in this report, 38BU1618) retained only one marked grave, although its original surface was reasonably preserved and showed numerous grave sinks. A fourth cemetery (the Means cemetery in this report, 38BU162) at the Santa Elena site retained only one marked grave, but previous archaeological projects had incidentally provided some idea of its extent.

After an attempt to confirm the cemetery at 38BU1895 with ground penetrating radar proved unsuccessful, shallow backhoe and shovel trenching was adopted as the principal field method for the remainder of the project. At each known cemetery, a series of trenches was dug to establish a pattern of positive locations (those showing grave features), and negative locations. These results combined to indicate a perimeter that effectively bounded each cemetery. In each case, grave distributions were irregular, and only a small percentage of the graves in a cemetery was exposed and mapped. It is possible, therefore, that isolated, outlying graves exist beyond the confirmed boundaries. For this reason, we suggested an additional buffer zone of 50 ft (15.2 m) beyond the limit of mapped graves; this buffer should allow for protection of all or nearly all outlying graves.

All four cemeteries were more extensive than we anticipated, if not in area then certainly in population. Extrapolation from the limited sample of mapped graves at each cemetery provided rough estimates of total graves. These estimates were 200 graves at 38BU1618, 300 to 400 graves at 38BU39/1619, and 450 to 500 graves each for 38BU1895B and 38BU162, for a total of 1400 to 1600 individuals. Although only approximations, these numbers indicate intensive use of the cemeteries over many generations.

The four known cemeteries almost certainly began in the eighteenth century as the burial grounds for the slave communities of four Parris Island plantations. Intensive historical research allowed us to prepare fairly detailed histories of the plantations, but virtually no information was found regarding the cemeteries themselves. All four cemeteries continued in use after emancipation; 38BU162 and (probably) 38BU1895B were closed by the Marine Corps in 1918, while 38BU39/1619 and 38BU1618 apparently remained open until the last of the civilian population was removed from Parris Island in 1937-38.
Since 1918, the four cemeteries have been subjected to a variety of impacts. The great majority of grave markers have been removed; only eight marked graves remain on Parris Island. Few, if any, antebellum graves would have had anything other than wooden markers, but many postbellum and twentieth century graves were probably marked with headstones which are no longer present. Three of the four cemeteries have been landscaped at one time or another, eliminating all evidence of grave sinks such as those still evident at 38BU1618. In the case of 38BU1895B, where no markers remain, this completely erased the cemetery from view, and knowledge of its presence was lost. While it was substantially avoided during the 1918 construction of the West Wing Extension complex, portions of 38BU1895B were infringed upon by warehouses and a paved road constructed after World War II. The Maneuver Grounds hospital was built squarely on top of the cemetery at 38BU162 in 1918, and the concrete footings and utility ditches from those structures were found in abundance in the course of our trenching. There was apparently a temporary structure in the middle of 38BU39/1619 at one time as well.

Research revealed that the remains of several military veterans were removed from 38BU162 and 38BU1895B when those cemeteries were closed in 1918. The veterans were reburied in the Beaufort National Cemetery, in some cases marked by the same U.S. military headstones that originally marked their graves on Parris Island. Other individual graves may have been moved from Parris Island between 1918 and 1938, but we found no archaeological or historical indications of any general cemetery removals.

Surface grave goods were in evidence in all four cemeteries, but the objects were generally badly fragmented and scattered. While surface grave goods are widely considered a West African survival, there was very little evidence in the Parris Island cemeteries for material pre-dating the late nineteenth century. Together with historical and archaeological evidence from the larger region, this finding suggests that the practice was not common until after emancipation, and it might be considered a revival rather than a widespread survival.

In addition to delineating the four cemeteries currently known on Parris Island, we made a limited effort to discover additional, lost cemeteries. This involved trenching in several locations (designated Cemetery Search Locations, or CSLs) where discrete stands of mature hardwoods were present, or where historic map evidence indicated such stands existed in the early twentieth century. We also inspected (but did not trench) two areas where cemeteries were vaguely rumored to have existed; in neither case was the information specific enough to make trenching a practical means of investigation. The CSL efforts were unsuccessful in locating additional cemeteries, but that component of the cemetery project was necessarily limited and was by no means comprehensive.

The Parris Island cemetery project resulted in the discovery (or further documentation) of several substantial prehistoric and historic components unrelated to the primary goal. Native American occupations were encountered at all four cemeteries, and at CSLs “A”, “B”, “C”, “G” and “H.” These Native American occupations spanned several thousand years of prehistory and extended up to the time when Native Americans finally abandoned the island in the eighteenth century.
Cemetery test trenching provided significant new information concerning the northern third of the Santa Elena site, including the locations of several discrete feature and artifact concentrations that probably represent individual households. These findings correlated remarkably well with the Spanish artifact densities indicated by the 38BU162Q shovel-testing project. The large Spanish artifact sample derived from trenching included several types not previously recovered at Santa Elena. A number of Spanish features including a wall trench structure, a possible well, several trash pits, and several large postholes were recorded.

All four cemeteries yielded some artifacts dating to the plantation period, but at 38BU1895B and 38BU1618 the evidence was very slight. At 38BU39/1619 we found a small collection of eighteenth/early nineteenth century material from an apparent domestic site located just north of the cemetery. At 38BU162, plantation material was not abundant in the cemetery itself, but was increasingly dense to the southwest, where several test trenches encountered the edges of a very large domestic midden that was originally delineated by the 38BU162Q project; that concentration is thought to represent the major eighteenth/nineteenth century slave settlement on the site. None of the CSLs produced substantial evidence of antebellum occupation.

None of the four cemeteries appeared to have a postbellum occupation in their immediate vicinity, although the evidence for any such component would have been difficult to recognize among the general scatter of late-nineteenth/early-twentieth century material used as surface grave goods. At CSL “C” we encountered a freedman’s domestic site dating ca. 1865-1895, while CSL “G” revealed another house site dating ca. 1880-1920. Both sites are dense and apparently well preserved, and are important surviving examples representing the rural African American community that characterized most of Parris Island between the Civil War and World War I.

The vicinities of the cemeteries at 38BU162 and 38BU1895B were both heavily developed by the Marine Corps during World War I, and test trenching at both sites encountered architectural features and artifacts from the period. 38BU1618 and 38BU162 fell within field artillery ranges that were in use between 1937 and 1939, and both sites yielded shell fragments. A nearby aerial bombing target used during World War II left practice bombs scattered among the graves at 38BU162, and 38BU39/1619 produced artifacts from adjacent rifle and hand grenade ranges. 38BU1618 was littered with blank rifle cartridges from field exercises in the area between the 1950s and 1980s.

**Recommendations**

Now that the four known Parris Island cemeteries have been defined, they should be physically delineated, identified, and maintained. At this writing, most of 38BU1895B has been enclosed with an unobtrusive, low, black, chain link fence that bars vehicle traffic but does not present an intimidating visual barrier to interested visitors. This same fencing would be appropriate for 38BU39/1619 and 38BU1618. At 38BU1895B, the south end of the cemetery remains outside of the new fence, as a paved road and a storage yard that are still in use overlie the southernmost graves. When these intrusions can be removed, the fencing should be extended to enclose all of the cemetery. At 38BU162, fencing would be a less desirable solution. There,
the fencing would run along the north moat of Fort San Felipe, and would block off the northern third of the Santa Elena site. We believe an open perimeter of pylons or posts would be a better choice for delineating the cemetery there. Any placement of posts or pylons should involve consideration of the underlying, sensitive archaeological deposits. A descriptive historical marker should be erected at each cemetery; proposed text for each of the markers is presented in Appendix III.

The cemeteries should be free of intrusions such as picnic facilities, recreational equipment, and stored materials, and should be regularly mowed and policed of litter. In short, the sites should be treated with the same considerations due a current, well-marked cemetery, with activities limited to visitation and upkeep.

We believe that a general exception should be made for archaeological research at 38BU162. As demonstrated by this project and previous Santa Elena field seasons, excavation can be accomplished without impacting grave features below the topsoil level, and careful restoration leaves no sign of disturbance. Prohibiting research within the cemetery would effectively eliminate significant portions of the Santa Elena and Charlesfort site as accessible archaeological resources.

Shoreline erosion is a serious threat to both 38BU1618 and 38BU162. While gradual erosion occurs on each tide, a greater risk is that from a catastrophic storm, which could easily expose and destroy graves in those cemeteries. Stabilization of the shoreline at both locations is recommended. In the meantime, shoreline monitoring should be undertaken after major storms to allow retrieval of any exposed human remains.

An additional effort to discover lost cemeteries should be undertaken. Several historically documented plantations, including Habersham’s, Grayson’s and Cartwright’s, have no known cemetery. Horse Island may have had its own cemetery, as might the South Carolina quarantine station on Ballast Creek. The search for these cemeteries would require additional documentary research and additional archaeological testing when and if evidence is found for the location of one or more of these cemeteries.
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NATIVE AMERICAN LITHICS AND POTTERY
Appendix 1

NATIVE AMERICAN LITHICS AND POTTERY

Although the research described in this volume was not directed toward recovery of Native American artifacts, stone tools and pottery were recovered at each site tested. Parris Island was the home to Native Americans for more than ten thousand years, and artifacts they left behind are found across the island from one end to another.

This appendix is not intended to provide a full discussion of the many Native American sites and occupations encountered, but it is intended, instead, to provide basic chronological information relating to the stone tools and pottery that were recovered. Reference has been made to these materials in the text, and representative specimens are illustrated here.

A basic cultural chronology for the past 15,000 years is provided in Table 1. The dates given are approximate time ranges for recognized cultural periods (adapted from Sassaman et al. 1990). Once again, our goal is not to provide a complete cultural history, but rather to provide a framework to make the contents of this volume more intelligible to the non-archaeologist.

Table 1. Cultural Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period / Phase(s)</th>
<th>Time Range (uncorrected c14 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Appalachian Mississippian Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Mississippian (Irene and Altamaha)</td>
<td>AD 1325 - contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Mississippian (Savannah)</td>
<td>AD 1200 - 1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodland Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late (Wilmington, St. Catherines)</td>
<td>AD 500 – 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (Deptford)</td>
<td>400 BC – AD 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early (Thom’s Creek/Refuge)</td>
<td>1100 – 400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaic Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late (Savannah River, Stallings)</td>
<td>3,050-1,100 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (Stanly, Morrow Mountain, Guilford, MALA)</td>
<td>6,000-3,050 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early (Taylor, Palmer/Kirk, Bifurcate)</td>
<td>8,000 – 6,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paleoindian Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late (Dalton/Hardaway)</td>
<td>8,500-7,900 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (Simpson, Suwannee)</td>
<td>9,000-8,500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early (Pre-Clovis, Clovis)</td>
<td>13,000+ – 9,000 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native American Lithics

The extensive test trenching undertaken in the course of the Cemetary Project recovered a modest and clearly unrepresentative sample of the prehistoric lithic components present on Parris Island - only three types are represented among 13 diagnostic tools (Figure 1). Eleven of the tools were of Allendale or Coastal Plain chert, while two were knapped from mudstone. Very small numbers of flakes and chunks were also recovered, mostly of chert, as well as a single quartz hammerstone (Figure 1N).

The earliest diagnostic lithic artifacts recovered by the Cemetery Project were two chert, Savannah River stemmed knives or projectile points, which date to the Late Archaic and Early Woodland (Coe 1964:42-45). Generally speaking, Savannah River points are the second most common type recovered on Parris Island, after Woodland triangular points (below). On Stallings Island the points occur both below, and in association with, Stallings Island pottery (Oliver et al 1986:190; Sassaman 2006), and the same association appears to occur (but is not demonstrated) at Santa Elena, where Stallings pottery is abundant. One Cemetery Project example, from 38BU39/1619, is heavily re-sharpened, to the point that it may have been discarded as useless (Figure 1A). Several similarly exhausted examples have been found at Santa Elena – they are typical of hafted knives from the lower South Carolina coast and other areas where good raw material was a rare commodity. The second example, from 38BU162W, shows considerably less re-sharpening (Figure 1B).

The chronological placement of the next group of Cemetery Project points is uncertain, but they are thought to be Early Woodland projectile points. Charles (1981) defined the type and designated it the “Type F,” or “Fairfax” Point in his discussion of un-named South Carolina point types. These points superficially resemble Early Archaic corner-notched types (e.g. Kirk), but they are rather crudely made on large flakes rather than bifacially (and skillfully) reduced from preforms, as Early Archaic points were. Type F points typically show little or no patination, which also argues for their relatively recent placement. The three examples from the Cemetery Project (Figure 1C, D, and E) are all of chert, and they were recovered from 38BU162W, CSL “H” of 38BU39, and 38BU1895B respectively, from one end of Parris Island to the other. Several additional examples have been recovered in earlier seasons at Santa Elena, and others are known from the Elliot’s Beach site, 38BU115/248 (below).

The third and final group of diagnostic lithics recovered by the Cemetery Project is comprised of small triangular projectile points dating to the Woodland and Mississippian (Figure 1F-M). Eight examples were found, six of chert and two of mudstone, well distributed across Parris Island. A number of different type names have been applied to such points in the Southeast, some apparently redundant, others based on variations in size, shape and occurrence. Where large assemblages of triangular points are available from given contexts, it might be useful and legitimate to subdivide them into apparent types; in the case of a small scatter of examples like those from the Cemetery Project, the generic label “small triangular projectile points” is probably the appropriate level of analysis, and one commonly applied (e.g. Sassaman et al 1990:164-168). Small triangular points are the most common sort found at Santa Elena, and at least a few examples are from contexts that suggest that they were launched at Spaniards.
As suggested above, the lithic assemblage from the Cemetery Project is not representative. Like the extensive excavations at Santa Elena, the cemetery trenching was designed to go no deeper than necessary for the definition of historic features – that is, to the top of clean yellow or tan sand, which for our purposes has been considered “sterile” subsoil. The soil zones above that sand contain all of the various historic occupations, as well as the Mississippian, and at least some portion of the Woodland. Earlier material is more deeply buried, except where disturbed by later features. Thus, the lithic collections from both the Cemetery Project testing and the Santa Elena excavations are biased toward later material. This depth bias is probably compounded by the fact that sea level rise has inundated much of a substantially larger “Parris Island” landform as it was thousands of years ago. Any Early Archaic site (for example) adjacent to a major stream or river would have long since been lost. The extensive excavations at Santa Elena have produced only a very few points pre-dating the Late Archaic, including two Early Archaic Palmer points and several Middle Archaic Morrow Mountain and Guilford Points (Coe 1964: 37-44,67-70).

There is one locality on Parris Island that has produced material from nearly the entire prehistoric sequence, in quantity. The eroding bluff along the Broad River at Elliot’s Beach (38BU115/248) yielded more than 100 points to a single surface collector, including a probable Paleoindian Suwannee point base, Early Archaic Palmer, Kirk and Taylor points, Middle Archaic Morrow Mountain points, and the full range of later types, as well as a wide variety of pottery (SC Site Survey Record for 38BU115/248; Goodyear, et al 1989:36-38; Michie 1966; Coe 1964: 67-71). Like the Cemetery Project and Santa Elena collections, nearly all of the points from Elliot’s Beach were chert. Interestingly, Elliot’s Beach is located directly across the Broad River from Daws Island, which is famous for its remarkable density of prehistoric material, most notably Archaic lithics.

Native American Ceramics

During the course of this project, several thousand sherds of Native American pottery were recovered. These were analyzed and classified into recognized pottery types as defined by Chester DePratter (1976, 1979, 1991, 2009). The majority of coastal Native American pottery fits within one of the defined types, and illustrations of representative pottery sherds are contained in Figures 2-4. Table 2 illustrates the sequence of those types and contains references to individual illustrated sherds.

Some sherds cannot be readily placed into a described type, and in this catalog they are individually described (i.e. Sand tempered plain or clay tempered incised). These described types are not, for the most part, illustrated.

Some sherds that are recognizable types do not fit with the currently existing chronological framework. Thus sherds identified as “Chatham County Cord Marked” cannot be placed in one of the phases shown in Table 2 (see Fig. 3 A-D). The same is true of the Oemler series listed in this catalog and illustrated in Figure 2 R and S. While fairly common on some sites, Oemler pottery has never been found in good stratigraphic context, so its’ chronological placement is uncertain. With more research, the date range during which Chatham County Cord Marked and the Oemler series were manufactured will be determined.
TABLE 2

Native American Pottery and Sequence for the Parris Island Cemetery Project
# Table 2. Native American Pottery and Sequence for the Parris Island Cemetery Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Ceramic Types</th>
<th>Dates (uncorrected C(^14) years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>Altamaha Cross Simple Stamped (Fig. 4P)</td>
<td>A.D. 1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altamaha Line Block (Fig. 4Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altamaha Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altamaha Red Filmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Incised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Burnished Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Irene Incised (Fig. 4H-J)</td>
<td>A.D. 1580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Burnished Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Harbor</td>
<td>Irene Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>A.D. 1425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Burnished Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>Irene Complicated Stamped (Fig. 4E-G, N, O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Burnished Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Check Stamped (Fig. 4K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah II</td>
<td>Savannah Complicated Stamped</td>
<td>A.D. 1325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah Check Stamped (Fig. 4A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah Cord Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah I</td>
<td>Savannah Burnished Plain</td>
<td>A.D. 1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines</td>
<td>St. Catherines Fabric Impressed (Fig. 3M, N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Catherines Net Marked</td>
<td>A.D. 1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Catherines Cord Marked (Fig. 3I-L)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Catherines Burnished Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Catherines Plain</td>
<td>A.D. 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>Wilmington Cord Marked</td>
<td>A.D. 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington Brushed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington Fabric Marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthour</td>
<td>Walthour Cord Marked (Fig. 3E-H)</td>
<td>A.D. 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walthour Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walthour Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walthour Checked Stamped (Fig. 3O-P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walthour Simple Stamped (Fig. 3Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford II</td>
<td>Deptford Fabric Impressed (Fig. 2P)</td>
<td>A.D. 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deptford Complicated Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deptford Cord Marked (Fig. 2K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deptford Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge Simple Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford I</td>
<td>Deptford Linear Check Stamped</td>
<td>A.D. 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deptford Check Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge Simple Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge III</td>
<td>Deptford Linear Check Stamped (Fig. 2L)</td>
<td>400 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deptford Check Stamped (Fig. 2M-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge Simple Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuge Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge II</td>
<td>Refugee Dentate Stamped (Fig. 2J)</td>
<td>900 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Simple Stamped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge I</td>
<td>Refugee Simple Stamped (Fig. 2H, I)</td>
<td>1000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Punctated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Incised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallings II</td>
<td>Stallings Incised &amp; Punctated (Fig. 2C)</td>
<td>1100 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stallings Incised (Fig. 2G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stallings Punctated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stallings Plain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallings I</td>
<td>Stallings Plain</td>
<td>1700 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2200 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2 contains several sherds that are of special interest. On Stallings period sherds, we sometimes find grooves that were formed during the manufacture of bone tools, most likely bone pins that can be up to eight inches in length (Fig. 2, A, B, D). Figure 2 K is a Deptford Complicated Stamped sherd that has been used as an abrader, like sand paper, in working bone, wood, or shell. Figure 2 T is a sherd worked on all edges to make a tool or ornament.

Figure 3 R illustrates a sherd of Wando Simple Stamped which is identifiable based on the use of crushed limestone or marl for temper. It is not included on the chronological chart because of the uncertainty of its temporal placement in the Port Royal Sound area. Also in Figure 3 S and T, respectively, are sherds of “Clay tempered incised” and “Sand and grit tempered fabric impressed” as examples of undefined types.

Pottery sherds illustrated in Figure 6 R and S are fragments of what DePratter has called “child’s pots.” These small pots are poorly made and sloppily decorated, and they are likely made to serve as playthings for children. During the Irene and Altamaha periods, sherds are often used as hones for sharpening bone awls; a sherd hone is illustrated in Figure 4 T. Figure 4 U is an Irene sherd used as an abrader to work bone, wood, or shell. Sherds shown in Figure 4 V to X have been reworked into disks. The function of these disks is currently unknown, though they are often referred to as gambling tokens.
Figures 2 - 4

Native American Pottery
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Appendix II

Head of Family Certificates
Figure 1. Composite map showing Township Lots on Parris Island
**Figure 2. Map A.** Lots in Township 1 South, Range 2 West, Sections 35 and 36, purchased by Heads of Families
Figure 3. **Map B.** Lots in Township 2 South, Range 2 West, Sections 1, 2, 11 and 12, purchased by Heads of Families
Figure 4. **Map C.** Lots in Township 2 South, Range 2 West, Section 13, purchased by Heads of Families
Figure 5. **Map D.** Lots in Township 2 South, Range 1 West, Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, purchased by Heads of Families
Figure 6. **Map E.**Lots in Township 2 South, Range 1 West, Sections 17, 18, 19 & 20, purchased by Heads of Families
**Appendix II**

**HEAD OF FAMILY CERTIFICATES**  
(by Certificate Number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFC No</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Capt. Blake</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>36-37-38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>Capt. Blake</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>Brister</td>
<td>Geddis</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>McCloud</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Comet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Flagg</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>Hagar</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Gillison</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Gilliard</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1287</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Burtis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Cupid</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Lowndes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Jacob Fuller</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Grimke</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>Pompey</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Pompey</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Pheobus</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>63-64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Jones, Jr</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Grimke</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Edings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>12-13-14-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Bram</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>18-19-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Doublin</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Gerin</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Generett</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Burnside</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>Comins</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Chisolm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Henrietta</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Cilla</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Ansel</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Gerin</td>
<td>10-11-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Bickham</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Mingo</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>14-15-16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Devaux</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Devaux</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Geo. Singleton</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Bob D.</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Pettigru</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Pettigru</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Quash</td>
<td>Fickling</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>33-34-35-36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Stoney</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Cudjoe</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Simon Means</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Ede</td>
<td>Generett</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Elic</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Slowman</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>5-6-7-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>McKnight</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Aiken</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Flagg</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Deas</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Jimmie</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Quash</td>
<td>Fickling</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Savanna</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Straffon</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Hagar</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Cesar Elliott</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>51-52-61-62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>4-5-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Forrester</td>
<td>13-14-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Pluto</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Renty</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Parris</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Phibus</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Jacob Fuller</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Robinson, Jr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>Manigault</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Eagen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Fripp</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Nellie</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>48-49-50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Singleton [Reynolds]</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Maryann</td>
<td>Cableton</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Eagen</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>McKnight</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Cupid</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Rhina</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Ansel</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Ansel</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Comet</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Generett</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Nathaniel B.</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Nathaniel B.</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>12-47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>5-6-11-12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Myers, Jr.</td>
<td>24-42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Goden</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Priley</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Gillison</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>54-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>Lymus</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>33-34-35</td>
<td>45-46-47-48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Gilliard</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>3-4-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2172</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>22-23-24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>George P.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262</td>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HEAD OF FAMILY CERTIFICATES**  
(by Last Name)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFC No.</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Aiken</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Cupid</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Ansel</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Ansel</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Bickham</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Ben Edmond</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1287</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Rhina</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>33-34-35-36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>3-4-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>George P.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Pheobus</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Straffon</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Phebus</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>Lynmus</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Burnside</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Burtis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Maryann</td>
<td>Cableton</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No.</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Chisolm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Comet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Comet</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>Comins</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Elic</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Parris</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Deas</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Devaux</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Devaux</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Eagen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Eagen</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Edings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>Pompey</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Pompey</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Quash</td>
<td>Fickling</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Quash</td>
<td>Fickling</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262</td>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Flagg</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Flagg</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Forrester</td>
<td>13-14-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Fripp</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Mingo</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>14-15-16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>Brister</td>
<td>Geddis</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Generett</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Ede</td>
<td>Generett</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Generett</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Gerin</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No.</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Gerin</td>
<td>10-11-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Gibbs</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Gilliard</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Gilliard</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Gillison</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Gillison</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Goden</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Ansel</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Henrietta</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Geo. Singleton</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Grimke</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Grimke</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Cupid</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Doublin</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Heyward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Jimmie</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>5-6-7-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>63-64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No.</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Jones, Jr</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Lowndes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>Manigault</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>McCloud</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>McKnight</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>McKnight</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Bram</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>18-19-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Nathaniel B.</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Nathaniel B.</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>12-47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>5-6-11-12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Myers, Jr.</td>
<td>24-42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>54-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Savanna</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Pettigru</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Pettigru</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Renty</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Priley</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No.</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>Hagar</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Hagar</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Cilla</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Bob D.</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Robinson, Jr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Jacob Fuller</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Jacob Fuller</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Singleton [Reynolds]</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Slowman</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Stoney</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Cudjoe</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC No.</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>4-5-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Capt. Blake</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>36-37-38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>Capt. Blake</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>12-13-14-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Nellie</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>48-49-50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>33-34-35 45-46-47-48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Cesar Elliott</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>51-52-61-62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2172</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>22-23-24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[38BU1895B]

FULLER PLANTATION CEMETERY
ca. 1722 – ca. 1918

On this site are the graves of several hundred African American residents of Parris Island, including plantation slaves and their free descendants.

The plantation later named the Fuller Plantation was established in the 1720’s, and was one of the first two plantations on Parris Island. The plantation operated until 1861, when U.S. military forces captured Port Royal Sound. After the Civil War most of Parris Island was purchased by the former slaves, who operated small farms and continued to use the old plantation cemeteries.

In 1918 the U.S. purchased all of the private property remaining on Parris Island to expand the USMC Recruit Depot, and this cemetery may have been closed at that time. The last civilian residents left Parris Island in 1938.

Three other historic African American cemeteries are known on Parris Island, including the Means Plantation Cemetery at the Santa Elena site, the Whale Creek Plantation Cemetery near Elliott’s Beach, and the Edings Plantation Cemetery at the Rifle Range.

[38BU39/1619]

EDINGS PLANTATION CEMETERY
ca. 1758 – 1938

On this site are the graves of several hundred African American residents of Parris Island, including plantation slaves and their free descendants.

The plantation later named the Edings Plantation was probably established in about 1758. The plantation operated until 1861, when U.S. military forces captured Port Royal Sound. After the Civil War most of Parris Island was purchased by the former slaves, who operated small farms and continued to use the old plantation cemeteries.

In 1918 the U.S. purchased all of the private property remaining on Parris Island to expand the USMC Recruit Depot. This cemetery was used until the last civilian residents left Parris Island in 1938.

Three other historic African American cemeteries are known on Parris Island, including the Means Plantation Cemetery at the Santa Elena site, the Fuller Plantation Cemetery near Public Works, and the Whale Creek Plantation Cemetery near Elliott’s Beach.
WHALE CREEK PLANTATION CEMETERY
ca. 1760 – 1938

On this site are the graves of several hundred African American residents of Parris Island, including plantation slaves and their free descendants.

The plantation later named the Whale Creek Plantation was apparently established in the 1760’s. The plantation operated until 1861, when U.S. military forces captured Port Royal Sound. After the Civil War most of Parris Island was purchased by the former slaves, who operated small farms and continued to use the old plantation cemeteries.

In 1918 the U.S. purchased all of the private property remaining on Parris Island to expand the USMC Recruit Depot. This cemetery was used until the last civilian residents left Parris Island in 1938.

Three other historic African American cemeteries are known on Parris Island, including the Means Plantation Cemetery at the Santa Elena site, the Fuller Plantation Cemetery near Public Works, and the Edings Plantation Cemetery at the Rifle Range.

MEANS PLANTATION CEMETERY
ca. 1715 – 1918

On this site are the graves of several hundred African American residents of Parris Island, including plantation slaves and their free descendants.

The plantation later named the Means Plantation was established by Alexander Parris as early as 1715, and it was first plantation on Parris Island. The plantation operated until 1861, when U.S. military forces captured Port Royal Sound. After the Civil War most of Parris Island was purchased by the former slaves, who operated small farms and continued to use the old plantation cemeteries.

In 1918 the U.S. purchased all of the private property remaining on Parris Island to expand the USMC Recruit Depot, and this cemetery was officially closed at that time. The last civilian residents left Parris Island in 1938.

Three other historic African American cemeteries are known on Parris Island, including the Fuller Plantation Cemetery near Public Works, the Whale Creek Plantation Cemetery near Elliott’s Beach, and the Edings Plantation Cemetery at the Rifle Range.
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