

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

historic name Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation (Boundary Increase/Amendment)

other names/site number _____

2. Location

street & number north side of US 64, 0.4 mile west of junction w/SR 1564 not for publication

city or town Pittsboro vicinity

state North Carolina code NC county Chatham code 037 zip code 27312

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant nationally statewide locally. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

William S. Rain, Jr.
Signature of certifying official/Title

8-9-93
Date

State of Federal agency and bureau _____

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title Date

State or Federal agency and bureau _____

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that the property is:

- entered in the National Register.
 - See continuation sheet.
- determined eligible for the National Register
 - See continuation sheet.
- determined not eligible for the National Register.
- removed from the National Register.
- other, (explain:)

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Classification

Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply)

- private
- public-local
- public-State
- public-Federal

Category of Property
(Check only one box)

- building(s)
- district
- site
- structure
- object

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

Contributing	Noncontributing	
<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	buildings
<u>2</u>		sites
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	structures
		objects
<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	Total

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)

Domestic: dwelling, secondary structure
Agriculture: agricultural outbuilding
storage

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)

Domestic: dwelling, secondary structure
Agriculture: storage

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions)

Georgian/Federal

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions)

foundation brick
walls weatherboard

roof asphalt
other log
stone

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

Attached

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations

(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B removed from its original location.
- C a birthplace or grave.
- D a cemetery.
- E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- F a commemorative property.
- G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance

(Enter categories from instructions)

architecture
agriculture
archaeology: historic/non-aboriginal

Period of Significance

1810 - 1942

Significant Dates

1810 1899
1842 1914
1881 1921

Significant Person

(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

N/A

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder

Broome, MeLeus

Narrative Statement of Significance

(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # _____
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____

Primary location of additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

Name of repository:

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Name of Property

Chatham, North Carolina
County and State

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property approximately 106 acres

UTM References

(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

1

1	7
---	---

6	5	8	5	7	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

3	9	5	5	9	2	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Zone Easting Northing

3

1	7
---	---

6	5	9	0	6	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

3	9	5	5	0	4	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Zone Easting Northing

2

1	7
---	---

6	5	9	2	6	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

3	9	5	6	0	2	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

4

1	7
---	---

6	5	8	5	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

3	9	5	5	1	8	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

See continuation sheet

Verbal Boundary Description

(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Attached

Boundary Justification

(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.) Attached

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Kitty Houston, Lee Novick; architectural historian, archaeologist

organization North Carolina Department of Transportation date April 29, 1993

street & number 1 S. Wilmington St. telephone (919)733-9770

city or town Raleigh, state NC zip code 27611-5201

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps

A **USGS map** (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

A **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs

Representative **black and white photographs** of the property.

Additional items

(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name Ken and Judith Lessler

street & number Rt. 3 telephone (919)542-4607

city or town Pittsboro state NC zip code 27312

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

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

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 7 Page 1Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC**Section 7. Narrative Description**

The extant core of the Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation is centered around the south-facing plantation house, which is situated at the end of a long, sheltered lane fronting on US 64. East of the lane, there is a large wooded area which extends to the small creek that forms the eastern boundary of the district. West of the lane there is an open meadow and SR 1514, which forms part of the western boundary of the district. North of the plantation house there is a modern pond and additional wooded area.

Outbuildings are located to the west and north of the house and represent a range of building types and periods. A one and one-half story, three-bay, frame nineteenth century kitchen with a large stone chimney is located to the rear, or north, of the house. East of the kitchen is a pig boiling pit; further east is a nineteenth century frame privy. A small hip-roofed frame smokehouse is located immediately west of the kitchen; a late nineteenth century privy is situated nearby. A hip-roofed replacement shelter covers the hand-dug well immediately west of the house. Further west of the house, in a north-south, linear arrangement, are a c. 1940 square-notch, canted-log mule barn; a late nineteenth/early twentieth century V-notch, round log crib with a gable-front roof; and two modern barns. An abandoned dirt roadbed leads north from the kitchen to the Allston road, an unpaved road connecting SR 1514 to the Frank Allston House (Frank Allston's great-grandfather was a slave of Adaline Alston, second owner of the plantation). Several hundred feet north of the kitchen, the roadbed forks to the east. There is one stone chimney, the remnant of a log house, located on this fork. North on the main part of the roadbed, about 500' south of the Allston road, are two additional stone chimneys, also remnants of a log house. A third log house ruin is located in a wooded area southeast of the plantation house.

Structures Inventory: Inventory covers all resources except the main house, which is adequately addressed in the original, 1974 nomination.

1. Kitchen. Early to mid-19th century. Contributing. Three-bay, one-and-one-half story frame building with fieldstone end chimney. Original room configuration is unknown. When the present owner bought the property, there were two rooms in the older, front portion of the house; now there is one large room. Substantial additions have been made to the rear of the house over the years.
2. Pig boiling pit. 19th century. Contributing. Oral tradition has it that laundry was washed in an iron pot over an open fire. Later, the large iron pot was secured with stone and covered with a modern open shed (which has no sides).
3. Four-seat privy. Mid-19th century. Contributing. Frame building, with side-gable roof, weatherboard sheathing, and batten door.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 2

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

4. Smokehouse. Mid-19th century. Contributing. Square, frame, hip-roofed building with weatherboard siding. Measures 12'4" X 12'4"; has batten door.
5. Two-seat privy. Late 19th century. Contributing. Frame building with shed roof; weatherboard sheathing, batten door with square lock and porcelain knob.
6. Crib. Appears to be early 20th century. Contributing. V-notch, round log building with gable-front roof, later frame shed addition. Older portion measures 16'6" wide by 20'4" deep; frame addition is same width as original portion and measures 12' deep.
7. Small barn. C. 1940. Contributing. Mule barn; canted logs with square-notching and gable-front roof with cantilevered overhang. The building was built by Frank Allston, a tenant during that period. Allston's great-grandfather was a slave of Adaline Alston's, second owner of the property. The interior space has been rearranged in modern times; there were one or two stalls originally, but now there is one large, open area.
8. Well shelter. Contributing. Hip-roofed replacement shelter over historic hand-dug well.
9. Dog pen. Modern. Non-contributing.
10. Chicken pen. Modern. Non-contributing.
11. Brick well house. Modern. Non-contributing.
12. Barn. Modern. Non-contributing.
13. Tractor shed. Modern. Non-contributing.
14. Horse barn. Modern. Non-contributing.
15. Historic Agricultural Landscape. Contributing Site.
 - 15A. Log Cabin ruin.
 - 15B. Log Cabin ruin.
 - 15C. Log Cabin ruin.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 3

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

- 15D. Farm roads. A series of roads crosses the plantation. The oldest runs between the main house and Cabin C. Prior to the construction of US 64, this route probably served traffic from Pittsboro to the west. Many of the plantation products were transported to market via this road.
- 15E. Fields and woodlands. Three agricultural fields remain in use in the district: two fields are located west of the front drive; a third is located south of the pond and east of SR 1514. The three fields total approximately 10 acres. Recent-growth woodlands, consisting of mixed hardwoods and pines, surround the house and outbuildings and are estimated to total approximately 75 to 85 acres of the district.
16. Main house. Contributing. Alston-DeGraffenried House, c. 1810. The house is described and documented in the September 25, 1974 National Register nomination of the same name.

7. Archaeological Description (NR Bulletin 16A:32)

Environmental Setting of Archaeological Components

Today, the environmental setting for all three archaeological cabin remains (Cabins 15A, B, and C [31Ch657] on the Boundary and Site Map), road system (15D on the Boundary and Site Map), and fields (15E) at 31Ch719**, the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation, are typical of the North Carolina piedmont physiographic province. The ruins of the cabins are overgrown with grasses, forbs, and vines. Trees, including oak and dogwood, are adjacent to all cabins. Other trees including pines and hickory, are in the forested areas. More water tolerant species are adjacent to the drainages. Clumps of daffodils are also near all three cabin ruins but do not occur elsewhere on the property. The fields are currently used for hay.

Periods of Use

The property was inherited in 1780 by Joseph Jones Alston and occupied continuously thorough the Civil War and Reconstruction Periods, though the early 20th century by Alston descendants. It was bought By the Lesslers, the current owners, in 1972.

Identity of Persons

As will be described in more detail below (Section 8 Significance) Joseph Jones ("Chatham Jack") Alston inherited this property upon his father's death (SHC 172). The property was occupied by his son, John Jones Alston (d. 1841), and his family. His daughter, Delia Alston DeGraffenried lived at the plantation with her husband, John Baker DeGraffenried. Their daughter Martha DeGraffenried married Thomas L. Peay (d. 1916) and they divided their time between the farm and a home in Durham. The family farm was divided between the Peay daughters. The Lesslers bought the property in 1972 and have lived in the main house since that time.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 7 Page 4Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC**Physical Characteristics of Archaeological Components**

The previous National Register nomination did not address archaeological resources. Archaeological components of the plantation are described below. Although no early artifacts were recovered during the 1993 fieldwork, the cabins (15 A, B, and C) likely date from the antebellum period. In addition, cabin C was used by tenants into the 20th century.

In an archaeological survey report for proposed highway widening of US 64, Thomas Hargrove recorded cabin C as site 31Ch657 (1990), please see discussion below under heading "Previous Investigations". Based on this reconnaissance survey, he described it as a 20th century tenant house. However, additional field work, in combination with archival research among primary sources (P.C. 1575) indicates this structure is earlier and a contributing element of the plantation.

Additional fieldwork was conducted by Lee Novick (1993) on March 2, 3, and 23, and April 23, 1993, and consisted of mapping archaeological features and coring soils on the property. The archaeological work centered on reported slave cabins and previously recorded archaeological site 31Ch657. The following descriptions of archaeological components of 31Ch719** are based on this work (Novick 1993).

Archaeological Component 15 A: Cabin A

Located approximately 400 meters north of the main house is Cabin A, the archaeological remains of a double pen structure (Figure 4.2; Photo 4). It has a foundation of field stone footers and rotted logs, probably cedar. The log on the south side runs the length of the structure indicating the structure was built as a double pen rather than a single cabin with an addition. The remaining logs are weathered and rotted in many places. Some logs consist of unweathered knots resembling spikes extending from the weathered center suggestive of cedar. Evidence of hand hewn trimming is visible along some log sides. An interior log, separating the rooms, was cut and trimmed as if to make a door sill between the rooms (Figure 4.2 lines across central log). The southwest corner is the only place with notched logs still in place (Photo 5). Notching is the V technique.

The eastern room is approximately 18 feet wide and 27 feet long. The chimney on the east end is slightly off center and has collapsed into the center of the structure. The west room is approximately 18 feet long by 18 feet wide and is within the size range for slave cabins described by historians (e.g. Fox-Genovese 1988:149; Genovese 1972:524; and Taylor 1926:81-82).

Both ends of the cabin have remnants of dry laid field stone chimneys made of locally outcropping metavolcanic material from the Carolina Slate Belt. These chimneys are similar to a field stone chimney in Transylvania County reported by Glassie (1968:346-7) and most likely occur throughout the region. They are almost rectangular in form with no narrowing towards the top of the chimney. The top of both chimneys collapsed into the structure. Some stones and brick are along the exterior east wall. At the mantel level is a set of metal strips. The exterior of the chimney is in good shape but has collapsed into the interior of the structure and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 5

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

forms a mounded pile extends seven feet into the room. The western chimney is in similar condition. It had no metal strip at the lintel. The exterior is in good shape but the top has collapsed and forms a pile of rock extending approximately seven feet into the center of the room. Bricks are located north of the chimney.

A series of 13 cores was excavated adjacent to the cabin. Not all soil horizons were found in each core. The top soil horizon is a dark organic soil with decomposing leaves that is very dark brown (10YR2.5/2). In most cases this overlies a mottled transition zone of varying depth that is dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4). In other cases the transition zone is brown (10YR5/3). The subsoil is a brownish yellow (10YR6/6) clay.

Archaeological Component 15B: Cabin B

Cabin B is located approximately 400 meters northeast of the main house along a dirt roadway. The west section of the cabin consists of stone footers and foundation stones along the north wall (Figure 4.3; Photo 6). The room measures 19 feet by 16 feet and is within the size range for slave cabins described by historians (e.g. Fox-Genovese 1988:149; Genovese 1972:524; Taylor 1926:81-82). A dry laid field stone chimney, similar to those at Cabin A, is at the west end of this room. The chimney has collapsed inward. A notched log corner remains at the northeastern corner of the structure. These are not V-notched as at Cabin A but are simply notched in a round fashion. A number of moss covered bricks lie inside the cabin. Two timbers on the north side of the building appear to be part of the door frame and exhibit highly weathered probable nail holes.

The eastern part of the structure is 22 feet long and 16 feet wide. It consists of large field stones which appear to be footers for an addition. This was probably a raised room with wooden flooring. Nothing but the stones remain on the surface.

A series of cores was excavated around the exterior of Cabin B. Not all cores include all soil horizons. Many have a dark organic, very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) horizon which overlies a clay rich brown (10YR5/3) horizon. Some cores exhibited a mottled transition soil overlying the subsoil. This is a clay rich, yellowish brown (10YR5/4) horizon. The subsoil is a reddish yellow (7.5YR6/8) clay. Core depths ranged to 40 centimeters.

Archaeological Component 15C: Cabin C

Based on the similarity of the log structural elements of 31CH657 or Cabin C with Cabins A and B, in combination with the historical documents (P.C. 1575), the site was reassessed. Now this site is included as a contributing structure within the expanded boundary for the plantation (31Ch719**).

Cabin C foundation ruins (Figure 4.4; Photo 7) consist of several rooms. When the Lesslers bought the property this structure was still standing. The Lesslers dismantled it. The likely remains of the oldest room, furthest east, measure approximately 20 feet (north side) by 18 feet (east side). The logs in this room are similar to those in Cabins A and B and are probably cedar. Stone footers and a stone

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 7 Page 6Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

wall along the south side are visible. The stones are local metavolcanic material, the same material used in all chimney construction including the kitchen, and quartz cobbles. This room was wired for electricity. A metal roofing piece lies adjacent to the southeast corner.

Southwest of this room is a series of concrete blocks and field stones which probably represent piers for a porch. It extends approximately seven feet south of the house wall and most likely ran the length of the room. Immediately west of the main room of the house are stone foundations along the south and west wall with the chimney on the east end. Some field stone and logs are along the north wall. The third room is immediately to the north of this room. The northwest corner has several bricks along the foundation and fragments of wooden flooring. Square logs lie across the room and along the north wall. Square nails were observed in logs in this section of the structure. Linoleum fragments are in the interior. Metal roofing is more common here compared to other places in the structure. A dump, consisting of bottles, enameled metalware, and cans lies approximately 43.3 feet eastnortheast (75 degrees east of north) of the northeast corner of the cabin.

A series of 10 cores was excavated around the exterior of Cabin C (Figure 4.4). Core E was taken in the east room of the house. Core J was taken in the room west of the chimney. Not all cores include all soil horizons. Many have a dark brown organic, (7.5YR3/2) horizon which over lies a clay rich brown (7.5YR4/4) horizon. Some cores exhibited a mottled transition soil overlying the subsoil. This is a clay rich, brown (7.5YR5/4) horizon. The subsoil is a reddish yellow (7.5YR6/6) clay. Core depths ranged to 40 centimeters.

Archaeological Component 15D: The road system

In addition to the cabins, a series of roads cross the plantation. One runs between the main house and cabin C (Photo 8) north of U.S. 64. A plantation road is illustrated in the Chatham County Estate Records for Joseph John Alston and thus predates 1841. Adjacent to sunken parts of this road the Lesslers collected bottles (described below "Description of Artifacts") which date as early as the Civil War. Prior to construction of U.S. 64 in 1922 (NCDOT Archives), this route served traffic from Pittsboro west as illustrated on Ramsey's 1870 Chatham County map. The widow Alston's house can be seen immediately to the north of the road. Many of the plantation products were transported to markets in Fayetteville and through Raleigh, along this road.

Other roads run north-south from the main house, past Cabin A and east-west past Cabin B. In places the roads are at ground level, in others they are three to four feet below the surface of surrounding terrain. Road bed width varies from six feet to 12 feet depending upon location. Vegetation varies upon location and season. In the winter the roads are more readily visible. In the spring and summer the road beds are covered with forbs, grasses, and poison ivy. In places arching oaks and hickories border the roads. Pines are also adjacent to the roads. Water tolerant species are located at the lowest elevations of the roads where drainages now cross the roads.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 7 Page 7Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC**Description of Archaeological Artifacts**

No artifact collections were made during the 1993 field work. The artifact analysis is based on collections borrowed from the Lesslers, the current property owners (Novick 1993). A ceramic collection of 26 sherds is dominated by ironstone whiteware. The sherds, based on different foot rings and body elements, illustrate at least 16 different items. An embossed ironstone whiteware rimsherd is also present. The only sherd with a maker's mark is a large plate base with a black transfer printed unicorn. It is most similar to the mark of the A.J. Wilkinson Company of Burleson, England and dates to the 19th century or the John Moses and Sons pottery of Trenton, New Jersey and dates from 1830 to 1890 (Thorn 1947).

The oldest transfer printed pieces are both underglazed blue. One is a floral designed body sherd probably from a bowl. The other is a large serving plate marley with an architectural design. Other transfer printed sherds are overglazed plate marleys. The oldest sherd, which is an earthenware and may be pearlware, is a floral hand painted design with blue petals and green leaves. The rounded shape of the sherd suggests a bowl or cup form. Two yellow glazed earthenware sherds most likely represent mixing bowls. The last sherds are gray saltglazed stoneware. The entire collection of ceramics represents domestic activities of the 19th and 20th centuries.

The bottle collection made by the Lesslers consists of complete bottles collected mainly adjacent to the old wagon road between the plantation and Cabin C (31Ch657) to the southeast (Novick 1993). Bottles were analyzed following Switzer (1947). Most bottles represent the last quarter of the 19th century and early 20th century (e.g. Wilson 1981). These include is a 12 sided, aqua Atwood's bitters bottle that dates to 1876 (Wilson 1988:133), a Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey, brown bottle from 1887 to 1899 (Wilson 1981:132); an aqua, Fellows' Compound Syrup of Hypophosphites rectangular bottle dating to 1880 (Wilson 1981:137), and a small, deep, cobalt blue used for poison, with a skull and cross bones on one face with the overlapping embossed letters DPS below and small squares along all lateral edges with the word POISON in capital letters down both sides. The poison bottle likely dates after 1872.

Likely Appearance of the Site During Periods of Use

When first inherited in 1780, parts of the land were already cultivated. Based on the shallow top soil in the soil cores at Cabins 15A, B, and C, it is likely that much of the property was cultivated at one time. The original vegetation was most likely similar to many of the hardwoods and pines at the site today. These species are similar to the communities described for the region by Oosting (1942). Today parts of the property are used for horse grazing. The Lesslers also mow the area adjacent to the pond they constructed on the property northwest of the main house.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 / 8 Page 8 Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Current and Past Impacts

Since the property has remained in the family from 1780 until approximately 1972, and primary records (P.C. 1571) indicate it functioned as a plantation and farm, impacts of agricultural erosion probably occurred throughout the period. With the exception of fields mowed for hay, the property has not been farmed on a large scale since the depression. Part of the property was changed when the Lesslers constructed the pond. Certain low places on the property flood during wet seasons of the year.

Previous Archaeological Work

During an archaeological survey for a portion of US 64, Cabin C was previously recorded as site 31Ch657 (Hargrove 1990:36). He described the site: This historic site appears to be a 20th century tenant house on the grounds of the Alston-DeGraffenried National Register property. The site is clearly marked by the remains of a stone chimney, stone foundations, and sheet metal roofing. The collection of artifacts from the site includes modern wire nails, white ironstone, clear glass fragments, Mason jar fragments, "milk" glass Mason jar lids, and plastic. One brick was embossed with the words PLAINVILLE BRICK CO./PLAINVILLE, GA. The apparent lack of "amethyst" glass suggests a post-World War I date. The 1933 soil map of Chatham County shows a structure in this vicinity, and the Soil Conservation Service's 1938 serial photograph clearly shows a farmhouse in a field, surrounded by trees or shrubbery and small outbuildings.

This work was preliminary and included enough effort to complete the official North Carolina Archaeological Site form. No subsurface testing or mapping were conducted as part of that project (Hargrove 1990).

Section 8. Statement of Significance

A highway project, North Carolina Department of Transportation project R-2219, triggered a federally mandated environmental review process in the project area. During that review process, National Register boundaries for Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation were re-examined and found to be outdated and somewhat arbitrary. The environmental review process also prompted an examination of the project area by a cultural geographer, who discovered important resources outside the original Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation boundaries. These findings prompted a revision of the National Register boundaries. This amendment addresses additional criteria, additional areas of significance, and an expanded period of significance, all of which require a thorough inventory of the outbuildings and landscape and archaeological features included in the original boundaries but neglected in the original nomination. (Consequently, the data on this registration form addresses the entire National Register area, not just the expansion area.)

The Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation is eligible for the National Register under Criteria A, C, and D and is significant for architecture, agriculture, and historic archaeology. Criterion C and significance in architecture were adequately covered in the original nomination. This amendment addresses the property's eligibility under

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 9Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Criteria A and D and its agricultural and historic archaeological significance. The Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation is significant in agriculture because it reflects the historic economic and social changes and resulting agricultural patterns and practices that occurred progressively in Chatham County throughout the years from 1810 to 1942: large landholding and slaveholding; growth of the plantation economy; its end with the Civil War; its replacement by sharecropping and tenancy; and finally, the gradual erosion and decline of agriculture in the twentieth century. The Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation is significant in archaeology because it can yield data about how the site was utilized and how the site changed through time.

Historical Background and Agricultural Context

John Jones Alston was born in 1792. His father, Joseph John Alston, known as "Chatham Jack", was a large landowner in Chatham County. In 1800 Chatham Jack owned 123 slaves; by 1810, he had 168 slaves, making him one of the largest slaveholders in the county. In 1800 the total population of Chatham County was 11,645, of which 2,708 were slaves. The town of Pittsboro's population was 135, 77 of whom were slaves. Principal crops in the county in 1800 were corn and wheat; lesser crops were cotton and tobacco; large numbers of swine and smaller numbers of cattle and sheep were raised (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:9).

Like other members of the planter class, Chatham Jack helped his children get established. Local tradition states that Chatham Jack built the house on Harland's Creek (now Holland's) and settled his son John Jones Alston in it. The traditional date given to the house now known as the Alston-DeGraffenried House is 1810. The younger Alston was a student at the University of North Carolina in 1808-1809, and was at the University as late as 1812. The 1810 census lists John Jones Alston as having 15 slaves. It is possible that a modest house, the core of the present plantation house, was built about 1810 and expanded about 1822, the year that John Jones Alston married Adaline Williams. (September 25, 1974 National Register nomination).

According to the 1820 census, 27 percent of Chatham County's total population of 3,407 was employed in agriculture; approximately one-third of the population was black (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:9). John Jones Alston had a total of 34 slaves. Eighteen of those slaves were employed in agriculture, two in commerce, and 12 were fourteen years old or younger.

The years between 1820 and 1830 were prosperous ones for Chatham County and for John Alston. North Carolina's population had grown just over two percent during the decade; Chatham County's overall population had grown about 22 percent; its slave population had grown 33 percent (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:10). In the 1830 census, Alston's slaveholdings had increased considerably. He was reported as having a total of 81 slaves, although there is some discrepancy with the slave schedule enumeration, which lists 74 slaves. The Alston-DeGraffenried family papers contain numerous receipts and documents which show that the Alstons were large producers of both cotton and tobacco during the 1830s. The first reference that can be tied definitely to John Jones Alston is a contract dated January 1, 1836, between "Jno J.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 10Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Alston" and "Wm. Yearns". Mr. Yearns was to work one year as an overseer "to attend to the various interests of the Plantation, to cultivate the land with industry and skill in husbandry he is to rise early in the morning so that the stock is fed [horses, cows, hogs, sheep] and that the hands under his direction are at their work by sunrise or before and remain with them through the day..." If Mr. Yearns did not fulfill his obligations, he was "liable to be turned off the plantation". He was to be paid \$200 and "800 weight of pork" (P.C. 1575.1, Folder 12). The 1840 census tallies listed John J. Alston owning 117 slaves. Of the slaves enumerated, 60 were employed in agriculture and two were employed in manufacturing and trade (1840 Population Census:641). At the same time, his father, Joseph John Sr., owned 104 slaves (Population Census 1840:291).

The Alstons, both father and son, raised and sold large amounts of cotton and tobacco in the 1830s. Cotton was hauled to Raleigh for sale, while tobacco was marketed in Petersburg, Virginia. A letter dated 1840 from Petersburg, concerned tobacco and problems of spoilage and high freight costs.

Sale of Ten Hnds Tobacco for Mr J J Alston "Some of yours was prized [?] in dry order, but most of it was funk'd and the whole of it more or less damaged by wet on the outside too, some of it very badly so. We hope the price will be satisfactory to you. Freight [?] are much objected to particularly when freights are as high as they are now" (P.C. 1575.1, Folder 3, 1840-1848).

Joseph John Alston, "Chatham Jack", wrote his will in 1839 and died sometime in 1840. In his will, he disposed of his large holdings of land, giving parcels to each of his sons and dividing his slaves among his daughters. To John Jones Alston he left a "tract of 300 acres lying on Harland Creek including the house in which he lives...." provided John did not claim lands that had been willed to him that Chatham Jack had previously disposed of; if John claimed the latter, his 300 acre parcel would be divided equally among his brothers. John Jones Alston died within a year of his father. On November 14, 1842, Adaline Williams Alston was made administratrix of her husband's estate, that he had left to her "to do with as she pleases" (September 25, 1974 National Register nomination).

According to the 1850 census, Adaline Alston, then 45, owned real estate valued at \$7500. Eight of her children, including son John J., 23, with "none" as entry for his occupation, were living at home. Mrs. Alston's overseer, James Webster, his wife and eight children, lived on the plantation. In 1850, Chatham County was one of the most agriculturally productive counties in a state that was overwhelmingly rural and agricultural. Out of 79 counties in the state at the time, it ranked first in the value of its implements and farm machinery, and in bushels of wheat produced; second in number of horses and value of livestock; third in butter production; fourth in number of sheep; seventh in number of swine and Indian corn production, eighth in cash value of farms; and ninth in tons of hay produced. Cotton and tobacco production were comparatively low; no rice cultivation was reported.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 11Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

At the time of the 1850 census, Adaline Alston was one of the more prosperous planters in the county. She owned 300 acres of improved land and 1,100 acres of unimproved land. The cash value of her farm was listed at \$10,000 and the cash value of farming implements and machinery was listed at \$175. Livestock was valued at \$1,395 and included five horses, six asses/mules, 18 milch cows, four oxen, 22 other cattle, and 115 swine. Mrs. Alston's main crops included 218 bushels of wheat, 2,500 bushels of Indian corn, 270 bushels of oats, 13 tons of hay, and substantial amounts of peas and beans, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, and butter. No rice, tobacco, or ginned cotton was listed. Her home manufactures were valued at \$225; and the value of her slaughtered animals was listed at \$250 (1850 Census, Part II, Schedule 4:799). Mrs. Alston apparently raised livestock to be sold on the hoof, rather than slaughtered. The large amounts of hay and Indian corn were to feed the livestock and perhaps the surplus was sold.

There were approximately 700 farmers listed in the 1850 Lower Regiment census enumeration area and Adaline was among the top 27 farmers and planters in terms of amount of improved land and among the top seven in cash value of farm. Of the approximately 700 farmers in the 1850 Lower Regiment census area, 425 farmers owned a total of 3,308 slaves, making the average number eight per owner. Although her plantation's slaveholdings had decreased by almost 50 percent since the 1840 census, with 58 slaves, Adaline Alston was a large slave holder for the area. Eighteen of Adaline's 58 slaves were over 18 years old, the rest were 14 or younger (1850 Census, Part II, Schedule 2:614).

Adaline Alston employed an overseer to run the plantation. A contract dated January 1, 1858 stipulated that Mrs. Alston would pay the overseer \$150 for the year, furnish him the house "he now occupies" and the attached garden and ground for growing potatoes, corn, and a cotton patch. She would also provide him with 300 pounds of pork, three barrels of corn, two barrels of flour, 50 pounds of coffee, and 50 pounds of sugar. The contract required that the overseer "take charge of the said Adaline Alston's farm and such hands as she may place under his care, management, and directions for the purpose of farming..." Also, the overseer promised to give "his constant and careful oversight and attention to" Mrs. Alston's interests "to the best of his skill and ability in an industrious and economical way and to give his attention to the care and feeding of the stock connected with said farm" (P.C. 1575.1, Folder 12).

Adaline Alston apparently sold farm products locally. An undated note among family papers read:

Mrs. A Alston
Will you please send me two bushels of wheat
Eliza C Hamlet
(P.C. 1575.1, Folder 15)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 8 Page 12

Agricultural productivity peaked in Chatham County between 1850 and 1860. "Crops including corn, cotton, and the new bright-leaf tobacco increased in quantity and price; land values doubled; and Chatham's wheat crop more than doubled" (Osburn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:20). Improved access to markets was partially responsible for the prosperity. Two plank roads, referred to as "farmer's railroads", were built in the county between 1852 and 1861, and provided better access to local and distant markets (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:22). Adaline Alston apparently used the roads; among the Alston-DeGraffenried papers, there is a receipt for using the H and P Plank Road Co. in 1857.

By 1860, there were 1740 farms in Chatham County. Two had over 1000 acres and 15 had between 500 and 1000 acres. Adaline Alston was one of the 15 planters with 500-1000 acres. Out of 86 counties in the state, Chatham ranked first in wheat production; second in wool production; third in swine production; fourth in value of farm machinery and implements, fourth in number of sheep, horses, mules and asses; fifth in value of livestock and number of milch cows; sixth in value of livestock slaughtered and butter produced; seventh in production of cheese and Irish potatoes; tenth in number of other cattle; and twelfth in production of Indian corn. Tobacco and cotton production were relatively low compared to the rest of the state; the county ranked twentieth in tobacco production (1860 Census).

According to the 1860 agricultural census, Adaline Alston had 300 acres of improved land, 700 acres of unimproved land, and the cash value of her farm had decreased by \$6,000 to \$4,000. The value of her livestock increased from \$1,395 to \$2,000 and the value of her slaughtered animals was \$248. Her livestock included one horse, nine asses or mules, 10 milch cows, 30 other cattle, nine sheep, and 70 swine. She raised a number of crops in large quantity: 500 bushels of wheat, 1,700 bushels of Indian corn, 300 bushels of oats, 3,000 pounds of tobacco, nine tons of hay, and no rice or cotton. Food products included sizeable amounts of peas and beans, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, and butter. The value of homemade manufactures was listed at \$900, indicating that the plantation produced items for sale. Adaline Alston was tied with another planter as the fifth largest tobacco producer in the county (1860 Census, Schedule 4:235). Tobacco was not, however, a dominant crop in Chatham County at that time.

In 1860, the slave population of Chatham County was 6,246, making it seventeenth among the counties in slave holding. There were 769 slaveholders, and only nine of those owned 50 or more slaves. Adaline Alston, with 67 slaves was one of those nine (1860 Census, Slave Schedule:177).

The Civil War had an immediate impact Adaline Alston's plantation. An entry in one of her account books reads: "All of the negroes who had not quit work before the 24th of Oct 1865 quit on that day except [Henry Betsy & Bethiah]" (P.C. 1575.3, Account Book, Vol. 1, 1832-1850, 1865-1868).

After the Civil War, there was a reordering of the southern agricultural economy. Landed proprietors from the old order lacked capital and labor; experienced Negro farm laborers lacked capital and land. The mutual dependency of the two classes resulted in the rapid evolution to the share-cropper system. Large

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetAlston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NCSection number 8 Page 13

plantations broke up rapidly: there were 75,203 farms averaging 316 acres each in North Carolina in 1860; by 1900, there were 225,000 farms averaging 101 acres each (Lefler and Newsome 1979:522).

Adaline Alston took part in the agricultural and economic transition. Soon after the Civil War, she entered into contracts with black sharecroppers. The same account book that commented on the slaves quitting lists names and provisions (bacon, molasses, butter) provided to Negro tenants (P.C. 1575.3, Account Book, Vol. 1, 1832-1850, 1865-1868). Other account books list numerous tenants with surnames Alston and DeGraffenreid (P.C. 1575.3 Account Books, Vol. III, 1865-1874, and Vol. IV, 1870-1876). A contract dated February 18, 1868 between Mrs. Alston and Madison Alston, Freedman, stipulated that she furnish the land and provide Madison Alston with a house for which he was to pay her "when the crop is gathered". She was to provide him with five barrels of corn. Madison was to haul and cut wood and keep up the fences as well. Mrs. Alston was to receive one-third of all the crops, except for the garden produce.

"By 1870 the production of tobacco and other crops in Chatham County had dropped drastically but the amount of cotton, wine, and butter products increased. Of the county's 2,810 farms operating in that year all but 248 were 100 acres or smaller. This proved to be the beginning of a decline that was to continue steadily throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century...There was a dramatic rise in the number of small farms and particularly in the system of sharecropping and tenancy. Farmers, tenants, and sharecroppers alike were hit by the shortage of money and received low prices for their produce, especially cotton. High taxes and decreasing land values also plagued land owners...Farming became an increasingly unremunitive occupation although many residents remained tied to the land by habit, tradition, or preference" (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:23).

Because of the size of her holdings, Adaline Alston was not immediately affected to the degree that other farmers were, but the profitability of her farming operations continued to decline. Throughout the state, prices for farm products were declining as farm expenses grew progressively higher. Towns, railroads, corporations, industry, and banks all flourished while agriculture languished and declined. 1870 census data illustrates how Adaline Alston's farming operations were affected. Although her land holdings remained unchanged (300 acres of improved land, 600 acres of woodland, and 200 acres of other unimproved land) and although she continued to own one of the largest farm operations in the county, the value of her real estate had declined from \$4,000 to \$3,000 between 1860 and 1870 (1870 Census, Schedule 1, Pittsboro Post Office:272). Also, the number and value of her livestock had declined greatly since 1860: the value of her livestock had dropped from \$2000 to \$250; 129 head of cattle were reduced to 13. Her crop production also declined drastically between 1860 and 1870: production of wheat, Indian corn, and oats were approximately one-tenth what they had been; hay production was one-third what it had been. Three thousand pounds of tobacco had been produced on the plantation in 1860; none was grown in 1870. Cotton was still not being grown (1860 Census, Schedule 3:585). Mrs. Alston continued sharecropping operations. Among the Alston-DeGraffenried papers, there is an 1876 contract between Mrs. Alston and Shack Alston

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation

Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 8 Page 14

which is typical of sharecropping arrangements of the period. In exchange for the use of Mrs. Alston's land and a small house, Shack Alston was to grow small grain, corn and cotton. He was to give Mrs. Alston one-third of all the grain he raised; one-fourth of all the cotton if he manured the field; or one-third if he did not (P.C. 1575.1, Folder 14, Contract, Tenant Farmer, 1876).

Between 1870 and 1880, North Carolina's cotton production increased 169 percent. Chatham County's cotton production increased 268 percent for the same period, but the county's 1880 cotton production was still relatively low (5,858 bales) and the county ranked 26th out of 94 counties in production. While North Carolina's tobacco production increased between 1870 and 1880, it had not reached 1860 levels; Chatham County's tobacco production actually decreased slightly for the same period. Adaline Alston was one of the large farmers who stopped growing tobacco. The overall adoption of a cash crop system led to an increasing number of tenant-operated farms. In 1880, one-third of Chatham County's 3,554 farms were tenant operated (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:33).

In 1881, after Adaline Alston's death, the 1,184 acres that she had owned were divided into eight parcels and distributed among her children and family. The 202-acre parcel on which the Alston-DeGraffenried House still stands was left to her daughter, Delia Alston DeGraffenried. Another 175-acre parcel, not contiguous to the house parcel, was given to John DeGraffenried, Delia's husband DeGraffenried had been a successful planter and a study of the 1870 census reveals that his farming operations appeared to have initially survived the war better than Mrs. Alston's. However, he declared bankruptcy shortly after 1870 (P.C. 1575.7, Folder 5).

The county survey publication summarizes changes in local agriculture during the 1890s. In 1890, 1,625, or 43 percent, of the 3,744 farming families in Chatham County were tenant farmers. By 1896, improved farming implements and machinery had come into use and commercial fertilizers were used to enrich the soil. Diversified farming remained the rule and in 1900 corn and wheat were the largest crops in Chatham County. Tobacco continued to be grown in the eastern and some southern portions of the county and cotton was produced at about a bale per acre" (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:35). The agricultural census for 1890 is not available, but it is assumed that John DeGraffenried, like other owners in the county at that time, rented his farmland to tenants and sharecroppers.

After John DeGraffenried's death in 1899, his wife, Delia, moved to Durham to live with their daughter Martha (Patty) Peay and Patty's husband Thomas L. Peay. The Peays continued to run the farm as a sharecropping operation. A number of tenant records exist from this period. During the period 1902-1904, there were 36 to 37 tenants listed in family records; in the spring of 1903, guano and phosphate were given to thirteen tenants for fertilizing cotton and corn (P.C. 1575.3, Account Books, Vol. 5, 1902- 1904). In 1908, T. L. Peay sold 50 bales of cotton for \$2546 (P.C. 1575.2, Folder 14, Misc. Receipts and Accounts, 1908-1921).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 15Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

After Delia DeGraffenried's death in 1914, Mrs. Peay inherited the farm and sharecropping operations continued. A 1916 receipt from Chatham Oil and Fertilizer Co., Pittsboro, to Charlie Alston specified that one-third of the \$71.61 paid for 372 pounds of cotton was to go to Mrs. Peay (P.C. 1575.2, Folder 14, Misc. Receipts and Accounts, 1908-1921). Mrs. Peay appears to have sold cotton locally, in Pittsboro. In April of 1917, Mrs. Peay made a trade with J.M. Odell Manufacturing Co., Pittsboro, for 70 bales of her cotton. The cotton was credited at 20 cents per pound (P.C. 1575.7, Folder 8). In 1919 Mrs. Peay was also growing Miracle or stone wheat, apparently types or brands. In 1921 she was for flour and meat for two tenants, Lonnie and Tommie DeGraffenried (P.C. 1575.7, Folder 9).

By 1920, Chatham County had 3,741 farms and 70 percent of those farms were owned by whites. The average farm size was 97 acres, of which 30 acres were improved. In 1920 1,339 farms were tenant operated and tenants were evenly divided between whites and blacks (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:38).

Pattie D. Peay died in 1921, leaving the Alston-DeGraffenried House and 400 acres to her four daughters, who used the house as a country retreat. The property continued to be farmed by sharecroppers. An account book from 1921-1922 recorded that tenants paid one third of crops they produced to the owners. There are many separate entries for chores and supplies, including pasture fences, tools, guano, cotton, cedar posts. Day labor was paid with meals, meat, and flour (P.C. 1575.3, Account Books, Vol VI, 1921-1922). Another account book dated 1922-1923 listed 19 names, presumably tenants and day laborers. There were entries for clothes, food, and drygoods, and notations made for advances on workers' taxes (P.C. 1575.3, Vol VII, 1922-1923).

Between 1920 and 1930, the number of farms in the county had decreased by 15 percent, but the average farm size remained 97 acres. "Thirty-six percent of these farms were classified as cotton farms, 20 percent as self-sufficient, and 16 percent as general farms. Thirty-five percent of total farm acreage was devoted to cultivating cotton" (Osborn, Seldin-Sturgill 1991:40).

The Alston-DeGraffenried property continued to be farmed by sharecroppers as late as 1940 when the square notch log mule barn was built by Frank Allston, a sharecropper and descendent of one of Adaline Alston's slaves. At least a portion of the property continued to be farmed by a black family into the 1960s.

Archaeological Statement of Significance

The archaeological significance of any plantation, using Criterion D, is related to its agricultural history, as outlined above for the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation. The specific archaeological contexts in which the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation is assessed with respect to Criterion D include agriculture, but other topics as well, including site structure, socioeconomic differences at the intraplantation and interplantation levels (including diet and Africanisms), the relationship of the plantation to transportation networks, the shift from plantations to tenancy, and 20th century tenancy, which are discussed below.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 16 Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Since few Piedmont plantations have been the subject of archaeological investigation (e.g. Orser 1988, 1991; Orser et al. 1987; Trinkley and Adams 1992; Trinkley, Adams, and Hacker 1992) in the southeastern United States, the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation with a variety of standing structures and archaeological ruins, in combination with the primary documents (P.C. 1575) provides a unique opportunity for archaeological interpretations of Piedmont plantation and farm life covering the period 1780 through 1940. At the broadest level, the plantation is eligible under Criterion D for this reason alone.

Piedmont Plantation Site Structure

The most elementary question is what is the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation structure (see boundary map) and how does it compare to other southeastern plantations? Existing archaeological work on Piedmont plantations (e.g. Orser 1988, 1991; Orser et al. 1987; Trinkley and Adams 1992; Trinkley, Adams, and Hacker 1992), coastal plantations (e.g. Fairbanks 1974; Fegruson 1991; Lewis 1978; Lewis and Hardesty 1979; Moore 1981; Singleton 1985), historical research (e.g. Gray 1933; Sitterson 1939; Taylor 1926), and primary historical documentation (discussed above; P.C. 1575; SHC 172, 2909) allows the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation to be placed in context. The family papers (P.C. 1575) were searched for illustrations or descriptions of the plantation structure but none were discovered. Southern agrarian society included poor whites, frontier farmers, small commercial farmers or yeomen, planters, white laborers, overseers, slaves, and free Negroes (Gray 1933:481-527). Many farms in the south were worked by the farm owner and his family, who owned no slaves. Large farmer or small planters held only a few slaves. Large plantations employed overseers who managed hundreds of African Americans as slaves. Nineteenth century plantation managers suggested that plantations of 900 to 1,000 acres worked by between 60 and 100 slaves was the optimal agricultural unit (Prunty 1955). The Alston-DeGraffenried plantation, compared to other Piedmont plantations, falls in the last category, a large plantation which represents the apex of southern agricultural society. Thus the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation has the potential to yield a wealth of archaeological information on a large scale plantation with an overseer and slaves. Although smaller than many coastal plantations (e.g. Scott 1961; Sitterson 1939), the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation was large for the central Piedmont.

The southern plantation was often a self-contained unit. The concept of self contained plantation units continued in North Carolina's Piedmont through the Civil War (e.g. Taylor 1926) and into the postwar years as a tenant system (e.g. Prunty 1955). Many Piedmont multicrop plantations grew corn, tobacco, cotton, and a variety of garden produce for plantation consumption. Taylor (1926:81) describes the typical North Carolina plantation structure which includes the main house and stables, porkhouse, storehouse, dairy, granary, and tobacco barns in the tobacco zone were practically indispensable. Other buildings, such as a ginhouse, icehouse, loomhouse, carpenter's shop and mill were convenient and perhaps necessary on the larger plantations, but on the smaller estates they were frequently absent.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetAlston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NCSection number 8 Page 17

At the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation there was a main house (Photo 10), kitchen (Photo 1), smokehouse, barns, and slave cabins. Based on the receipts, it is possible that specialty shops and the remains of other structures, such as a laundry, await discovery in the archaeological record. The structure, or plantation layout, of a such a multicrop plantation was different from the coastal rice plantations (e.g. Moore 1981; Scott 1961).

The earliest census recording slaves, the second census conducted in 1800, lists Joseph John Alston (p. 206) with 123 slaves. Some slaves may have been craftsmen (e.g. DuBois 1978). Evidence for possible slave craft specialization is found in the plantation receipts (P.C. 1575). For example, a 1792 account at Ebenezer Stott and Company including silk, buttons, negro cottons, corduroy, linen, muslin, felt and ladies hats, a shoe hammer, shoe knives, pegging awls, awl blades, and shoe nippers, suggests that shoes were probably manufactured and/or repaired on the plantation by male slaves. Similarly, a 1799 receipt from the Robert and Donalson Company included more Negro cottons, cotton shirting, breeches (sic) cloth, chintz, buttons, and twill along with stocks, and upper and saddle leather, small knives, and a gun lock. A contract with the tanyard indicates slaughtered livestock hides were processed for Alston and provided an ample source of leather. Further evidence of slave craftsmanship may be the 1830 purchase of German steel, files, gunpowder, and shot may indicate gun manufacture and/or repairs.

Evidence of specialized crafts for female slaves is also found in the family papers (P.C. 1575). Loom houses were on some plantations (Taylor 1926:86). The Alston and DeGraffenried receipts (P.C. 1575) for fabrics, including linen, negro cottons, flannel, silk, calico, and muslin, edging, ribbons, and needles, are indicative of sewing and clothes manufacture. Olmstead (1959:92) reported that owners provided slaves with clothing "of a coarse woolen or woolen and cotton stuff (mostly made, especially for this purpose, in Providence, R.I.)." Women were provided with cotton dresses and jumpers as well as shoes. Sometimes slaves made socks and clothing on the plantations. However, in some cases the plantation mistress was responsible for slave clothing Fox-Genovese (1988:128). With several Alston daughters and relatives nearby, the Alston women probably worked together on clothing for their families and slaves. The purchase of silks and other fine fabrics suggests the mistress's clothes were made on the plantation. The 1869 Frank Leslie's Lady's Magazines (P.C. 1575.5) indicate the DeGraffenried women were purchasing dress patterns on a regular basis. Slave women probably assisted with domestic tasks, such as sewing, cooking, cleaning, and manufacturing, since the census records indicate many female slaves did not work in agriculture. John DeGraffenried's immediate post Civil War account books have tenant payments and credits for such activities (P.C. 1575.3). Alston receipts in 1830 for cotton and wool cards suggest some cotton and wool may have been spun and woven into cloth on the plantation. A reference to weaving is an account entry dated January 1866, a credit to Lenor Rogers for weaving, which paid more than four times washing pay (P.C. 1575.3 Book I). There may have been separate structures for these specialized craft activities, such as a cobbler's shop,

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 18Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

gun smith shop, or loom house, which may be identifiable in the archaeological record. The absence of archaeological documentation of such craft specialization at Piedmont plantations enhances the archaeological potential of the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation.

The structure of slave cabins, living quarters, varied. Some are referred to as "the quarter" and consisted of houses along a street or series of streets (Rawick 1976:344). These were located in relation to the front of the main house. Along the coast, this was more noticeable since plantations were approached by water and by land. Frequently the front of the main house faced the river and slave cabins were behind the house, on the road side of the main house. In the Piedmont, many plantations were in the uplands and not adjacent to drainages, thus as the main house was approached cabins were likely to be behind the house. Construction materials of slave cabins is also related to physiography. While coastal cabins are frequently made of tabby, Piedmont cabins are described as log or wood (e.g. Taylor 1926). The Alston-DeGraffenried plantation cabins (15A, 15B, and 15C), described above (Section 7), were constructed of logs with chimneys of local fieldstone. The Alston-DeGraffenried plantation cabins fit well within historical descriptions of slave cabins. Besides streets, some domestic slaves cabins were adjacent to the main house and kitchen (e.g. Genovese 1972; Fox-Genovese 1988; Taylor 1926). Other cabins may have been scattered across the plantation. Some were located adjacent to fields to reduce travel time for fieldhands (e.g. Scott 1961:57).

Based on the available information, the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation illustrates the dispersed slave cabin pattern. Additional archaeological work will provide more information about the slave cabin component within the overall plantation site structure.

Socioeconomic differences

Another research question posed by archaeologists is how does the socioeconomic status of the residents of the plantation compare on the interplantation and intraplantation level (e.g. Moore 1981; Otto 1977)? Subsumed in this topic are other questions regarding dietary differences between groups and ethnicity, such as retention of Africanisms among slaves (e.g. Ferguson 1992). For example, status of the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation can be compared to other Piedmont plantations as well as plantations in other geographic areas. The baseline for such studies is the income and social standing of the Alston and DeGraffenried families who lived on the plantation in comparison to other North Carolinians and in a broader perspective, Southerners in general. In addition to these statistics, details about particular purchases (P.C. 1575) provide information about the status of the families. Both the Alstons and DeGraffenrieds employed overseers who managed their slaves, often referred to as "workers, negros (sic), boys, girls" (P.C. 1575) and farm activities. Thus the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation has the potential to yield information on status differences between owner, overseer, and slaves based on archaeological correlates represented by differences in dietary remains, ceramics, and other artifact groups (South 1977) associated with various domestic structures on the plantation (Moore 1981; Otto 1977).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetSection number 8 Page 19Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Archaeological remains at slave cabins will reflect the slave living conditions which were directly related to the plantation owner's status and attitudes. Some slaves were maltreated and others treated well. For example, some slaves received good cuts of meat and food beyond what was generally provided as slave rations (e.g. Rawick 1976). Some slaves supplemented their rations with wild foods. Although slaves were not allowed to carry arms nor read, some masters allowed their slaves to hunt and others taught slaves to read and figure. Domestic slaves often lived near the main house or laundry. Specialized craftsmen may also have lived away from the field hands (e.g. Scott 1961:57). Slave housing reflected the physiographic region of the plantation as well as the socioeconomic status of the plantation owner. A variety of historians argue that since the capital investment in slaves was so high, it is difficult to comprehend that owners did not take care of their slaves (e.g. Genovese 1972). For example, the number of slaves living in a cabin, a plantation hospital, all provide information about the status and condition of the plantation. Census records, indicate the Alstons and DeGraffenrieds had the average number of cabins for the numbers of slaves that they owned (five to six persons per cabin, see Genovese 1972:524). Legal evidence cites slaves who stole food and clothing, which has been interpreted as a lack of such goods among some slaves (Watson 1983). Since relationships of owners with slaves and slave tasks varied greatly, it follows that archaeological remains at slave cabins will mirror this diversity.

Receipts provide evidence of a plantation owner's status and means. From the earliest time period of Alston occupation, numerous receipts for the late 1700s include a variety of special foods such as coffee, chocolate, brown sugar, salt, pepper, and tea. Alston had the cash income to buy various manufactured luxury goods. By 1810 Joseph Alston owned 168 slaves. Only eight other counties in North Carolina, mostly coastal counties, listed more slaves than Chatham County. Alston ranked high among slave owners, particularly those in the Piedmont, and ranked at the top of agricultural society.

Although Alston owned many slaves and much land, court records and claims against his estate indicate he was not without financial problems. The Chatham County Trial Docket (SHC 2909, Vol 3) record the State Bank of North Carolina sued John J. Alston and Joseph and John J. Alston for defaulting on loans. The seasonal nature of plantation income resulted in payment schedule problems. At the time of his death in 1841, Alston left his wife with at least \$1560 in outstanding debt notes (P.C. 1575). In addition to crop sales, cash income for the Alstons and DeGraffenrieds came from hiring out their slaves (P.C. 1575). This was a risky proposition as relatives acted as middle men in transactions with strangers who misrepresented themselves (e.g. 19th century deadbeats). Regaining slaves and collecting debts was difficult (P.C. 1575). In a letter dated January 11, 1855, John McKay assures Mrs. Alston that concerns about the health of slaves she rented to him were unwarranted. Cash provided luxury purchases, however, neither family would rank among the plutocratic, conspicuous consumer, planters described by Gray (1933).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetAlston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NCSection number 8 Page 20

Evidence of plantation education, another high status indicator, includes a geography book, an atlas, paper, and a slate. Elizabeth Jones Alston in a letter of 1844 to her sister, Adeline Alston, scolds that her spelling and mental clarity would improve if she wrote more often.

Purchase of food staples such as rice and molasses, as well as luxury items including coffee, salt, pepper, raisins, sugar, allspice, nutmeg, alum, and almonds continued to be purchased in the 1830s. Sale prices of slaves in Salisbury during 1835 ranged from \$203 for a seven year old boy to \$850 for a 20 year old male (Taylor 1926:73), while female slaves generally sold for two thirds the price of their male counter parts. The value of Alston's slaves in the 1830s, based on these prices, was considerable. In fact, by 1836 John Jones Alston's plantation business was so successful that he contracted with William Yearns to oversee husbandry and the "hands under his direction" in return for \$200.00, 800 weight of pork, two barrels of corn, two bushels of wheat, and two milk cows.

In 1850 America overseers were a small class, only 18,859 (Gray 1933:501). Land holdings in North Carolina were small in comparison to other states (e.g. Virginia, Alabama, Georgia) and overseers were less common. Scarborough (1966:10) compares the numbers of overseers in the southern states for the 1850 and 1860 census and discovered North Carolina ranked last (below Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia) with 989 and 1,782 overseers respectively. Many overseers recruited from the lower classes were not educated and skeptical of innovations and improvements. They were held in such low esteem that few educated men ever entered their ranks (e.g. Scott 1961:80). This typical view contrasts with a letter of 1844 in which Elizabeth Alston Jones writes to her sister Adaline Alston "Mr. Jones has gone to the plantation this evening we have another overseer they say he is a very clever man," although he replaced a less worthy overseer. Alston's employment of an overseer in 1836 underscores his high socioeconomic status.

In 1850 Mrs. Alston owned 58 slaves (U.S. Census Schedule 2:310). Slaveholders in North Carolina numbered 28,303 in 1850. Most (N=9,668, 34.16 percent) owned only two slaves (Taylor 1926:46). The widow Alston, with 58 slaves, ranked with 485 other slave holders who owned between 50 and 100 slaves. She ranked in the 99th percentile of large slave holders, only .42 percent of slave holders (N=92) in North Carolina held more slaves. The placement of the widow Alston in regional and state perspective illustrates that it was possible for a single woman to run and maintain a large plantation, retaining her family position at the apex of agricultural society. Few, if any, similar female owned plantations have been investigated archaeologically.

In 1858 Mrs. Alston contracted with George W. Dismukes as an overseer for a period of one year. In North Carolina only 989 overseers were employed in 1850 (Scarboro 1966:10) and the number nearly doubled in the following ten years. This emphasizes Mrs. Alston's position at the top of the state's financial scale. Mr. Dismukes was to manage and care for the farm, animals, and hands, the term slave

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 8 Page 21

is not used. Mrs. Alston's 1860 regional standing among Piedmont farmers can only be made by comparison with Chatham County figures and Piedmont data (Sitterson 1939). Only two farms are listed with over 1,000 acres in the 1860 Chatham County census, while 15 were between 500 and 1,000 acres. This places Mrs. Alston in the top percentile for total farm acreage among 1,740 farms in the county. In the Piedmont, she ranks in the top two percentiles. The number of slaves rather than acreage can be examined. In 1860 North Carolina slaveholders numbered 34,878 (Taylor 1926:46). The highest percent (27.61 percent, N=9,631) owned only two slaves. Mrs. Alston with 67 slaves ranked in the 99th percentile. On either scale, landholding or slaves, nearly 20 years after her husband's death, Mrs. Alston remained a woman of means.

Based on historic documentation and context, at all occupation periods the Alston plantation was a large plantation often employing an overseer. Both land and slave holdings were high. The Alstons were able to purchase luxury goods with profits from crop sales and cash obtained from slaves rented for hire. Specialized craftsmen and women were likely located in slave cabins away from the field hands. The archaeological comparison of materials recovered from the main house, overseer's house, specialized activities, and slave quarters would be one of the first such contributions to North Carolina Piedmont plantation archaeology.

The Plantation and Transportation Networks

Correspondence and receipts (P.C. 1575) for crops raised and sold on the plantation by the Alstons, DeGraffenrieds, and Peays provide documentation for the various types of transportation used on the plantation and to get plantation crops to market. In the 1830s cotton was hauled to, stored, and sold in Fayetteville. Based on 1833 advertisements in the Fayetteville paper, the cost of hauling to the city varied from fifty to seventy-five cents per hundred pounds. Alston and later his widow paid to have cotton and tobacco hauled to Fayetteville. Other receipts indicate tobacco and cotton were shipped north, through Raleigh, on the railroad to Petersburg, Virginia (P.C. 1575). This meant that all crops going by rail from Raleigh first had to be hauled from the plantation, through Pittsboro, and then over 30 miles of Piedmont roads into the railroad station in the center of Raleigh. If the materials were hauled by the family, road tolls still needed to be paid. Receipts for such tolls are in the family papers (P.C. 1575). Such tolls were also paid by carriages without cargo. As Lefler and Newsome (1973:315) observe the Mountain and Piedmont regions were constrained by inadequate transportation to major markets. These transportation costs reduced profits made by planters. Transportation costs were, in part, responsible for why Chatham County, along with other Piedmont counties relied on corn as a major crop, rather than tobacco and cotton (Taylor 1926:35). In fact, corn substituted for cash in many economic transactions. Alston, however, was able to diversify his agricultural products and use cash for some business transactions (P.C. 1575). DeGraffenried also sold cotton and tobacco in the major markets, including New York.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetAlston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NCSection number 8 Page 22

Intraplantation road networks were used to transport slaves from their dwellings to the fields and transport crops from the fields to processing and storage centers on the plantation. The same roads were used to haul crops off the plantation to markets. After the Civil War, the DeGraffenried account books (P.C. 1575) are filled with entries for hauling fodder, crops, and other supplies. Wagons were purchased for hauling. In 1868 the widow Alston's wagon is described as "rundown" (P.C. 1575). The upkeep of plantation transportation routes was perhaps more important after the Civil War as former slaves, who had never had the freedom of mobility before, were dispersed on tenant farms with their own livestock and transportation modes (Prunty 1955:479). The plantation road networks were used by tenants to bring their rent crops to a central storage location on the farm as well as personal use for visiting or going to town.

The east-west trending road (Photo 8) between the main house and Cabin C is adjacent to U.S. 64. Fragments of similar road remains have been recorded by archaeologists in other parts of Chatham County (e.g. Cantley and Kern 1983:91). Alston's estate records illustrate a road on the property prior to his death in 1841. The widow's home is illustrated north of the road, west of Pittsboro, on Ramsey's 1870 Chatham County map. The embracement of Progressivism in the south brought with it the good roads movements (Brown 1931; Preston 1991). The 1920 and 1930 Highway Commission maps illustrate a major highway at this location west of Pittsboro. U.S. 64, with a tar and soil surface, was only 18 feet wide in 1922. The highway was paved with asphalt in 1928 and widened to 20 feet. Both roads, the old dirt road and old U.S. 64 can be seen on a 1938 U.S. Soil Conservation Service photograph. The plantation road network continued to function as an integrated unit until parts were replaced with the concrete paved construction of sections of U.S. 64 on new location in 1941 and 1942. These sections of U.S. 64 are 22 feet wide.

The archaeological remains of plantation and highway roads on the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation, in combination with archival evidence of transportation use (P.C. 1575) by the Alston, DeGraffenried, and Peay families until 1940 and highway improvements provides important information on the historical importance of transportation networks and Piedmont plantations.

The Shift to Tenancy

After the Civil War, many yeoman farms and small farms owned by poor whites remained almost unchanged in Chatham County. Plantations remained intact as large parcels of land maintaining their individual identity in the absence of slavery, which had been instrumental to their foundation and success. Landowners developed systems of tenancy for former slaves or poor whites who wanted to work in the area. Although tenant farm archaeology in the southeastern US has come into its own in the past 10 to 15 years (e.g. Anderson and Joseph 1988; Anderson and Muse 1981, 1982, 1983; Orser 1988, 1991; Orser, Nekola, and Roark 1987; Taylor and Smith 1978; Trinkley 1983; Trinkley and Adams 1992), geographers (e.g. Prunty 1955), sociologists and economists (e.g. Dickey and Branson 1922) have studied tenant farms for decades.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places
Continuation SheetAlston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NCSection number 8 Page 23

The archaeological significance of tenant sites is an important avenue of research since tenants are conspicuous by their absence in journals published by 18th and 19th century travelers (e.g. Olmstead 1959; Scott 1961).

After the Civil War, both Mrs. Alston and John Baker DeGraffenried maintained one year contracts with black tenants, many of whom were former slaves who did not leave the plantation (P.C. 1575). In 1868 Mrs. Alston entered into a contract with Madison Alston, freedman, in which she furnished the land, the house, and five barrels of corn while he in turn paid her, at harvest, one-third of his corn. In addition, he was to cut and haul wood as well as keep up the fences and behave (P.C. 1575). Mr. DeGraffenried had contracts with Wesley Gunter and Sam Harrup, freedmen. Mr. DeGraffenried provided his tenants with one peck of corn and five pounds of bacon each week.

Mr. DeGraffenried continued tenant contracts in his account books in the 1870s (P.C. 1575.3). In some cases men requested food, material goods, land for their own crops, construction on the houses or barns, washing, and/or cash in exchange for farming. While the minimum cash wage for men was \$8.00 per month, one of the few entries for a woman was for \$5.00 per month. DeGraffenried debited his tenants for supplies and credited their accounts during the summer harvest season. Tenants paid him in wheat, oats, and cotton. In some instances tenants earned credits for special tasks such as fencing. A female tenant was debited for a "missing or broken plate" (P.C. 1575).

Most archaeological work on the shift from plantation to tenant farms has been conducted in South Carolina and Georgia (e.g. Anderson and Muse 1981, 1982, 1983; Orser 1988, 1991; Orser, Nekola, and Roark 1987). Thus the opportunity to examine this shift based on the archival records (P.C. 1575) in combination with archaeological data at the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation is a unique opportunity in the North Carolina Piedmont. Future archaeological work on the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation offers the potential to provide a real contribution to the question of the shift from plantation to tenancy.

20th Century Tenancy

After the break up of plantations and the shift to tenancy, 20th century tenant farms can be examined for archaeological evidence of tenant farm lifeways. Rather than merely being former slaves who worked the plantation land as tenants, 20th century tenant farmers were black and white farmers and laborers who worked for black and white farm owners under a variety of systems (Raper and Reid 1941).

The DeGraffenried and Peay tenants appear to have been share tenants and share croppers who paid a percentage of their crop as rent, were provided with housing, but were debited on the account books for seeds, supplies, and livestock (P.C. 1575.3). Books for the years 1865-1876 where tenant family names include Alston, DeGraffenried, Peays, Right, and Carter, indicate former slaves stayed to work in Chatham County rather than contributing to the southeastern labor shortage as former slaves moved west in search of a new life (Prunty 1955).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 8 Page 24

Later account books from 1899-1915 belonged to Thomas L. Peay, the husband of Chatham Jack's great grand daughter. Unlike the earlier account books, these have individual page entries for each tenant. By this time the tenants bought fewer items, most entries relate to agriculture exclusively. A contract provides that Thomas L. Peay rented to J. O. Cambell the farm, was to build a barn, and refloor the house, in return Cambell payed Peay one-third all the cotton, corn, wheat, oats, and all other crops raised on the land during the year 1904.

During the summer of 1922 Mr. Dickey (Branson and Dickey 1922) spent three months interviewing white and black farm owners and tenants in Chatham County with average incomes of 23 cents per day. Their homes are described as "board and timber construction, a few are log houses" over 30 years old without running water, few outhouses, and few electrified. This work provides a baseline for archaeological expectations of 20th century tenants in Chatham County.

One of the few detailed historical and archaeological study of Piedmont tenants was sponsored by the US Army Corps of Engineers as part of the compliance work done for the Richard B. Russell Reservoir project (Orser 1988, 1991; Orser, Nekola, and Roark 1987). Since no similar studies have been undertaken in the North Carolina Piedmont, the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation records in combination with additional archaeological research could contribute substantially to this research domain. Since Chatham County farmers outnumber slave holders by more than two to one, there were fewer large planters to promote a tenant system. Archaeological evidence of tenancy is Cabin C on the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation, which was wired for electricity and used into the 20th century. Thus the large Alston-DeGraffenried plantation, which maintained a large tenant share cropper system into the 1920s is unique for the Piedmont.

Summary

The archaeological significance for the Alston-DeGraffenried plantation, using Criterion D, includes agriculture, site structure, socioeconomic differences at the intraplantation and interplantation levels (including diet and Africanisms), the relationship of the plantation to transportation networks, the shift from plantations to tenancy, and 20th century tenancy. The ceramic and bottle collection from the plantation also cover the post Civil War period and the tenant period. Additional archaeological work at the plantation has the opportunity to reveal evidence of the entire period of occupation, beginning with the late 18th century. Overall the archaeological components of the site, the cabins (Structures 15A, B, and C), the road network (15D), and as yet uninvestigated areas around the main house, provide a diachronic picture of an elite Piedmont plantation which spans nearly 180 years, a rich resource taken in combination with the Alston-DeGraffenried family papers (P.C. 1575).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 9 Page 25 Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section 9: Bibliography

- Alston and DeGraffenried Family Papers 1575.
Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Department of Archives and
History, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Alston, J.J.
1780 Last Will and Testament of Joseph John Alston. Halifax County.
Southern Historical Collection No. 172.
- Anderson, D.G. and J.W. Joseph
1988 Prehistory and History Along the Upper Savannah River: Technical
Synthesis of Cultural Resource Investigations, Richard B. Russell
Multiple Resource Area. Interagency Archaeological Services, National
Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Anderson, D.G. and J.L. Muse
1983 The Archaeology of Tenancy (2): A Reply to Trinkley. Southeastern
Archaeology 2:65-68.
1982 The Archaeology of Tenancy in the Southeast: A View from the South
Carolina Lowcountry. South Carolina Antiquities 14:71-82.
1981 An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Clarendon County Industrial
Park. Commonwealth Associates, Inc., Report, no. 2398. Jackson,
Michigan.
- Brown, C.K.
1931 The State Highway System of North Carolina, Its Evolution and Present
Status. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Cantley, C.E. and J.R.Kern, assemblers
1984 A Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Recreational Development
Areas and Wildlife Subimpoundments at B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake.
Report prepared by Commonwealth Associates for the U.S. Army Corps of
Engineers, Wilmington. York.
- Chatham County Records, Chatham County Courthouse, Pittsboro, North Carolina
(Subgroups: Deeds, Wills, Estates)
- Chatham County Trial Docket
1826-9 Southern Historical Collection No. 2909.
- Dickey, J.A. and B.C. Branson
1922 How Farm Tenants Live. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Fairbanks, C.H.
1974 The Kingsely Slave Cabins in Duval County, Florida, 1968. The
Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 1972 7:62-93.
- Ferguson, L.
1992 Uncommon Ground. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington, D.C.
- Fox-Genovese, E.
1988 Within the Plantation Household. University of North Carolina Press,
Chapel Hill.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 9 Page 26

- Garrow, P.H., G.G. Weaver, C.R. Cobb, Editors
1989 Nineteenth- to Twentieth-Century Agriculture in Southern Illinois: Pope County Farmstead Thematic Study, Shawnee National Forest. Garrow & Associates, Atlanta.
- Genovese, E.
1972 Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made. Pantheon, New York.
- Glassie, H.
1968 The Types of the Southern Mountain Cabin. In The Study of American Folklore. Edited by J.H. Brunvand. Pp. 338-370. W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York.
- Graffenried, T. P. de
1956 The DeGraffenried Family Scrapbook. Charlottesville, Virginia.
- Gray, L.C.
1933 History of Agriculture in the Southern United States in 1860. Volume I. Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D.C.
- Groves, J.A.
1901 The Alstons and Allstons of North and South Carolina. Franklin Printing and Publishing Company. Atlanta.
- Lawson, J.
1967 A New Voyage to Carolina. Leffler, H.T., editor University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Leffler, H.T. and A.R. Newsome
1979 The History of A Southern State, North Carolina. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Lewis, K.E. and D.L. Hardesty
1979 Middleton Place: Initial Archaeological Investigations at an Ashley River Rice Plantation. Research Manuscript Series No. 148. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Lewis, L.G.
1978 Drayton Hall: Preliminary Archaeological Investigation at a Low Country Plantation. National Trust for Historic Preservation, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- Merrrens, H.R.
1964 Colonial North Carolina in the Eighteenth Century, a Study in Historical Geography. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Moore, S.A.M.
1981 The Antebellum Barrier Island Plantation: A Search for an Archaeological Pattern. PhD Dissertation, Anthropology Department, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Novick, L.
1993 Historical and Archaeological Documentation of the Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation, Chatham County, North Carolina. North Carolina Department of Transportation.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 9 Page 27

- Olmstead, F.L.
1959 The Slave States. Capricorn, New York.
- Oosting, H.J.
1942 An Ecological Analysis of Plant Communities of Piedmont North Carolina. The American Midlands Naturalist 28(1):1-126. Orser, C.E., Jr.
1991 The Continued Pattern of Dominance: Landlord and Tenant on the Postbellum Cotton Plantation. In The Archaeology of Inequality, edited by R.H. McGuire and R. Paynter. Pp. 40-54. Basil Blackwood, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
1988 The Material Basis of the Postbellum Tenant Plantation. University of Georgia Press, Athens.
- Orser, C.E., Jr.; A.M. Nekola, and J.L. Roark
1987 Exploring the Rustic Life: Multidisciplinary Research at Millwood Plantation, A Large Piedmont Plantation in Abbeville County, South Carolina, and Elbert County, Georgia. National Park Service, Atlanta.
- Osborn, Rachel and Ruth Seldin-Sturgill.
1991 The Architectural Heritage of Chatham County, North Carolina. N.p.: North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Raleigh.
- Otto, J.S.
1977 Artifacts and Status Difference--A Comparison of Ceramics from Planter, Overseer, and Slave Sites on an Antebellum Plantation. In Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology, edited by S. South. Pp. 91-118. Academic Press, New York.
- Preston, H.L.
1991 Dirt Roads to Dixie, Accessibility and Modernization in the South, 1885-1935. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
- Prunty, M.
1955 The Renaissance of the Southern Plantation. The Geographical Review 45(4):457-491.
- Ramsey, N.A.
1870 Map of Chatham County, North Carolina. Snyder, Black and Sturn, New York. North Carolina Division of Archives and History.
- Raper, A.F. and I.De A. Reid
1941 Sharecroppers All. UNC Press, Chapel Hill.
- Rawick, G.P.
1976 The American Slave: a Composite Autobiography, Vol 15 North Carolina Narratives Part 2. Greenwood Publishing Company, Westport Connecticut.
- Scarborough, W.K.
1966 The Overseer. University of Georgia Press, Athens.
- Scott, J.A., Editor
1961 Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 9 Page 28

-
- Singleton, T.A., editor
1985 The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life. Academic Press, New York.
- Sitterson, J.C.
1939 Economic Sectionalism in Ante-Bellum North Carolina. North Carolina Historical Review. XVI(2):134-146.
- South, S.
1977 Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology. Academic Press, New York.
- South, S., editor
- Stewart, R. and G. Cosentino
1976 Bottles A Guide for the Beginning Collector. Golden Press, New York.
- Switzer, R.R.
1974 The Bertrand Bottles. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Taylor, R.L. and M.F. Smith
1978 The Report of the Intensive Survey of the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina. University of South Carolina, Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Research Manuscript Series 142.
- Taylor, R.H.
1926 Slaveholding in North Carolina: An Economic View. James Sprunt Historical Publications Vol 18 Nos.1 and 2. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Thorn, C.J.
1947 Handbook of Old Pottery & Porcelain Marks. Tudor Publishing Company, New York.
- Thorp, D.B.
1989 The Moravian Community in Colonial North Carolina. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tennessee.
- Touart, P.B.
1987 Building the Backcountry. The Davidson County Historical Association.
- Trinkley, M.
1983 Let Us Now Praise Famous Men-If Only We Can Find Them. Southeastern Archaeology 2:30-36.
1983 Reply. Southeastern Archaeology 2:68-69.
- Trinkley, M., and N. Adams
1992 Archaeological, Historical and Architectural Survey of the Gibson Plantation Tract, Florence County, South Carolina. Chicora Foundation Research Series 33.
- Trinkley, M., N. Adams, and D. Hacker
1992 Plantation Life in the Piedmont: A Preliminary Examination of Rosemont Plantation, Laurens County, South Carolina. Chicora Foundation Research Series 29.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number 9 Page 29

United States Bureau of the Census.

- 1800 Second Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Slave Schedules.
- 1810 Third Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Slave Schedules.
- 1820 Fourth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Slave Schedules.
- 1830 Fifth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Slave Schedules.
- 1840 Sixth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Slave Schedules; Compendium.
- 1850 Seventh Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population, Slave, and Agriculture Schedules; Compendium.
- 1860 Eighth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population, Slave, and Agriculture Schedules.
- 1870 Ninth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Agriculture Schedules; Compendium.
- 1880 Tenth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population and Agriculture Schedules; Compendium.
- 1890 Eleventh Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population Schedule.
- 1900 Twelfth Census of the United States. Chatham County, North Carolina, Population Schedule.

Watson, A.D.

- 1983 North Carolina Slave Courts, 1715-1785. North Carolina Historical Review, 60:24-36.

Wilson, R.L.

- 1981 Bottles on the Western Frontier. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 10 Page 30

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section 10: Geographical Data

Verbal Boundary Description

The revised boundary is shown on the accompanying map at a scale of 1" = 200'. It encompasses approximately 106 acres. The USGS map shows the entire property.

Boundary Justification

The boundary of the Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation is being amended to include all of the acreage historically and currently associated with the main house which retains identifiable resources or characteristics from the property's period of significance. These resources include the house, outbuildings, archaeological remains, meadows, wooded areas, and fields. The boundaries follow legal lot lines on the west and north. Beyond the west and north boundaries, new houses have been built on land that was subdivided from the plantation. The amended eastern boundary follows the creek because it is a prominent topographical feature and because no historic resources retaining integrity have been identified farther east.

Since US 64 replaced old US 64 in 1945, the northern edge of existing pavement of old US 64 is being used as the revised southern boundary. This area is within the 500' wide corridor that was surveyed for archaeological significance for the federal-level environmental study in 1990. No significant archaeological potential was found in the corridor.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number PHOTOS Page 31

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation
Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Photographs

The following applies to all of the photographs:

Photo 1
Photographer-Kitty Houston
April, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation,
Structure 1, kitchen; camera facing north

1. Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation Boundary Increase/Amendment
2. Chatham County, NC

Photo 2
Photographer-Kitty Houston
April, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation, Raleigh, NC
Structure 7, small mule barn; camera facing west

Photo 3
Photographer-Kitty Houston
June, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Structure 12, modern barn; camera facing west

Photo 4
Photographer-Lee Novick
March, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Historic Agricultural Site 15A- Cabin A chimneys' ruins; camera facing west

Photo 5
Photographer-Lee Novick
March, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Historic Agricultural Site 15A- Cabin A's ruins; camera facing east

Photo 6
Photographer-Lee Novick
March, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Historic Agricultural Site 15B- Cabin B's ruins; camera facing northeast

Photo 7
Photographer-Lee Novick
March, 1993
Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Historic Agricultural Site 15C- Cabin C's ruins; camera facing northwest

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Alston-DeGraffenried Plantation

Boundary Increase/Amendment, Chatham County, NC

Section number PHOTOS Page 32

Photo 8

Photographer-Lee Novick

March, 1993

Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation Historic Agricultural Site
15D-roadbed; camera facing northeast Raleigh, NC

Photo 9

Photographer-Kitty Houston

June, 1993

Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Historic Agricultural Site 15E- field; camera facing west

Photo 10

Photographer-Lee Novick

March, 1993

Negative at North Carolina Department of Transportation , Raleigh, NC
Main house; camera facing north

