

EDWARD HOUSE & DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)
Old House Road
Spring Island
Beaufort County
South Carolina

HABS No. SC-868

HABS
SC-868

PHOTOGRAPHS

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C St. NW
Washington, DC 20240

ADDENDUM TO:
EDWARD HOUSE & DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)
Old House Road
Spring Island
Beaufort County
South Carolina

HABS No. SC-868

HABS
SC-868

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C St. NW
Washington, DC 20240

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

Addendum to EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

Location: Old House Road, Spring Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina.

The house and its dependencies occupy a site overlooking the Chechessee River on the northeast shore of Spring Island in Beaufort County, formerly St. Luke's Parish, South Carolina. The structures are approached via an oak avenue, and land around the architectural complex is now occupied by a golf course that was installed by the Spring Island Company around 1990.

Present Owner: The Spring Island Trust.

Present Use: Ruin.

Significance: The Edwards House and its dependencies constitute one of the best preserved groups of late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century tabby plantation buildings in Beaufort County. Of tripartite form, the main house reflects an architectural response to both the particular demands of tabby construction and local climatic conditions. Two small tabby-built dependencies, here called the North and South Flankers, are unique structures for Beaufort County. A larger tabby outbuilding northwest of the main house was apparently erected as a tenement for domestic slaves or servants. As such it is an unusual survival, with only one other similar structure being known. Additionally, vestiges remain of an extensive landscape layout installed during the early nineteenth century which originally incorporated both formal and picturesque elements.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History

1. Date of erection: The exact date is not known. Archaeological and historical information indicates two main construction phases at the site. The first (Phase I) is attributed to the 1770s and saw the erection of the original house. During the second (Phase II) period ca. 1800-15 the main house was extended and enlarged by the addition of two wings. The North and South Flankers, the slave quarters, and principal landscape elements probably constituted part of the second construction phase.

2. Architect: Not known.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 2)

3. Original and subsequent owners: The original (Phase I) dwelling was probably built for John Edwards, a local planter and merchant who gained control of Spring Island through his marriage to Mary Cochran Barksdale in 1773. Phase II construction appears to have been executed for the couple's son, George Edwards (1776-1859), who besides pursuing a successful mercantile career based in Charleston, South Carolina, made Spring Island into one of the most productive plantations of St. Luke's Parish. During the latter's period of ownership, the house was the island's principal residence and focus for plantation life. Following the death of George Edwards, the property passed to George Barksdale Edwards who died intestate in 1860. Still unsettled, the estate was confiscated by Federal authorities after their occupation of the Beaufort District in 1861 and subsequently sold for unpaid taxes. While a Certificate of Redemption was granted to Emma J. Edwards in 1866, it is unlikely that the main house was ever re-occupied. Subsequently, Spring Island passed by sale through a succession of owners, ultimately being purchased from the heirs of Elisha J. Walker by the Spring Island Company for subdivision and residential development in ca. 1984.

4. Builder, contractor, suppliers: Not known.

5. Original plans and construction: The original house was probably a two-story or two and one-half story tabby structure with external end chimneys. A timber-framed porch supported on tabby piers extended along each of its long sides. Living spaces were raised over an elevated basement but nothing survives of any construction above the first floor level.

6. Alteration and additions: The original main house was extended by the erection of two symmetrical, flanking wings during the early nineteenth century. Each wing incorporated a single living space elevated over an undivided, raised basement. Living spaces in the new and old parts of the house were linked by tabby screen walls and a square, U-shaped porch erected on the enlarged building's east (river) side.

7. Destruction: The house and its dependencies were abandoned following the Battle of Port Royal in November of 1861 when almost all of the entire white population fled the Beaufort District. The complex was looted by Union soldiers in February of 1862 and probably fell into ruin soon thereafter. There is no direct evidence that the main house or any outbuilding were re-occupied after the Civil War although slave houses (no longer extant) located to the north are said to have been inhabited during the early twentieth century.

B. Historical Context

Spring Island: Synopsis of Development, 1706- 1800

Spring Island was first granted to the prominent Indian trader Captain John Cochran¹ on 1 September 1706 but evidence for the island's occupation by the grantee on anything other than a temporary basis during visits to local, Native American communities is equivocal.² It is established that following Cochran's death at the hands of the Yemassee during, or soon after, 1715, Spring Island then known as Cochran's Island passed successively to his son, James Cochran, who died intestate some time between 1719 and 1724, and grandson, James Cochran the Younger. The latter is definitely known to have instituted improvements on the island, building a kitchen chimney and plastering an otherwise unidentified structure just before his death in 1739 or 1740. Subsequently, the property passed by inheritance to his kinswoman, Mary Ash.

Trinkley (1990: 29) observes: "Mary Ash married George Barksdale, but died prior to 1757, leaving possession, but not ownership[,] to Barksdale." Rather, Spring Island went to the couple's daughter, Mary Cochran Barksdale "who married John Edwards a Beaufort merchant in 1773 and had a son, George Edwards." Mary Edwards died in 1791 on Spring Island, leaving three small children.³ Her will mentions a brother, George Barksdale "of Spring Island" who was then perhaps managing the property. Mary's executors were instructed to sell any or all of the estate, if necessary, for the benefit of her children but this may or may not have happened, relevant records of the period being ambiguous.⁴ It does seem that Spring Island was divided into three portions before 1800, George Edwards receiving the middle one and his two sisters, Elizabeth Edwards and Mary Holbrook, sharing the rest.

¹ Like other South Carolina Native American traders of the period, Cochran earned himself an unsavory reputation. He was prosecuted for enslaving free Native Americans after several prior offenses in August of 1714. See *Journal of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade, 1710-15*.

² In 1872 Spring Island was described as containing about 3000 acres of high land. The same description states that "it is abundantly supplied with springs of good water" these permanent water sources giving the property its current name.

³ *Charleston City Gazette* (15 August 1791) cited in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 21:81.

⁴ Charleston, SC, Will Book B 1786-93, p. 598.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 4)

This division is documented by cartographic resources. A map dated 1782⁵ shows one settlement on the island located near its northwestern extremity.⁶ Another map dated 1812 attests that the same site was still occupied during the early nineteenth century; however, two previously unrecorded settlements now appear, the first located near the middle of the island on its east side, the second located some distance south.⁷ Additionally, a single structure is illustrated occupying a position near the island's north tip, this structure overlooking an open (probably deep water) stretch of the Chechessee River.

George Edwards (1776-1859)

George Edwards is credited with developing Spring Island into a flourishing plantation which by 1850 was producing more bales of cotton than any other holding in St. Luke's Parish. Earlier, the island's husbandry had been dominated by cattle ranching and indigo production, both activities being mentioned in late eighteenth-century sources. When exactly the transition to cultivation of cotton as the major cash crop occurred is difficult to say. However, the U.S. Census of 1800 for St. Luke's Parish does attest that a substantial work force was then available to George Edwards, listing forty slaves under his name and an additional sixty slaves belonging to the estate of George Barksdale which he (Edwards) apparently controlled. Aside from slaves, the household was small. George Edwards was then living on Spring Island with a single male companion. This situation no doubt changed after 1801 when Edwards married his cousin, Elizabeth Barksdale, who brought valuable real property as her marriage portion including Ferry Plantation on the North Santee, a house on Tradd Street in Charleston, and twenty more slaves.⁸

According to the U.S. Census of 1810, the couple had taken up residence at least temporarily in St. Luke's Parish, the Spring Island household then comprising two adults (presumably George and Elizabeth Edwards) and what were probably their two children, one male, the other female. Since 1800, the island's slave population had seen significant growth, reaching 170 individuals in 1810. Slave numbers continued increasing for the next two decades, reaching a total of 336 persons by 1830, a figure which made Edwards one of the Beaufort

⁵ Reproduced in Trinkley (1990:31), fig. 3.

⁶ This was perhaps the house occupied by George Barksdale, Senior, before 1780 which is said to have burned during the American Revolution. If destroyed, it must have been either rebuilt or replaced before 1791 when his son, George, was living on the island. Alternatively, George Barksdale, Junior, could have relocated, the Phase I house described below apparently being of late eighteenth-century date.

⁷ U.S. National Archives. reproduced in Trinkley (1990: 33), fig. 5.

⁸ Elizabeth was the daughter of Thomas Barksdale and Mary Barksdale, a daughter of Arnoldus Vanderhost. Thomas Barksdale represented Christ Church Parish in the State Legislature. Elizabeth Edwards died on 23 April 1832.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 5)

District's largest slave owners. In 1816, Edwards bought himself a handsome brick house at what is now 14 Legare Street in Charleston and resided principally there until his death on 11 April 1859. How much time the family spent on Spring Island cannot be said although it does seem that the main residence was kept in good order and remained furnished. The plantation itself apparently witnessed a decline after 1830, its slave population dropping to 250 individuals by 1840. Even so, the work force remained exceptionally large for the Beaufort District and was well-managed, producing 150 bales of cotton in 1850 along with large quantities of foodstuffs including 2,400 bushels of corn, 2,800 pounds of rice, 1000 bushels of peas and beans, 100 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 200 pounds of butter. Surprisingly, two hundred cattle were still ranging the island, other domesticated animals listed by the agricultural schedule of 1850 included twelve horses, sixteen assess and mules, seventy-three milch cows, forty working oxen, seventy sheep, and one hundred swine.

After the death of George Edwards in 1859, cotton production fell, the 1860 U.S. Census recording a total of ninety-nine bales of cotton which was 33 percent less than the total for 1850. Rice was no longer planted and the number of cattle had fallen, going from two hundred head in 1850 to fifty head in 1860.⁹ Indeed, it is clear the period 1859-61 was a difficult, uncertain and finally devastating one for the plantation. George Barksdale Edwards, who inherited Spring Island from his father, died in June of 1860 having apparently tried to sell a portion of the slave holdings. Litigation over his estate followed but was soon rendered moot, the old order being swept away in November of 1861 when Union troops began their occupation of the Beaufort District.

Along with most other local plantations, Spring Island was confiscated in 1862 for non-payment of taxes, totaling \$380.43 including penalties; the U.S. Direct Tax Commission reported that the property which still belonged to the estate of George B. Edwards then incorporated 2450 acres valued at \$9,800. Sold at auction, the island was bought by the Federal Government for \$10,500.

Trinkley (1990: 38) observes:

in 1866 Emma J. Edwards, as guardian, applied for the redemption of Spring Island, and a certificate of redemption was issued... This event, and its rarity was mentioned in a January 28, 1866 letter from John Kirk to his daughter Emily "the fact is the Negroes will surely hold the islands, except Spring and Callawassie...

⁹ If Jacob W. Oestervicker (Spring Island's overseer) is believed, this was a temporary setback, since he reported that 203 cattle were lost when the plantation was abandoned during the Civil War. However, it is possible, though by no means certain, that figures given by Oestervicker were inflated with a view to obtaining compensation. According to the U.S. Census of 1860 the Estate of George Edwards then included 251 slaves. Unfortunately the number of houses occupied by this population is not given.

After 1888, Spring Island saw numerous changes in ownership, remaining an agricultural holding until purchased for development and sub-division as a gated residential community from the heirs of Elisha Walker in ca.1984.

Architectural and Landscape Improvement

Agricultural development on Spring Island during the early nineteenth century was accompanied by programs of architectural and landscape improvement. Although George Edwards eventually bought out the interests of his two sisters, he remained attached to that portion of the island he inherited from his mother. Here Edwards extended an existing house built overlooking the Chechessee River, added outbuildings, and created an extensive landscape setting which combined both formal and picturesque elements. This enlarged residence was to serve Edwards during intermittent visits to the island, which probably decreased in frequency after 1830.

The earliest extant structure in this location is ruined. Incomplete tabby walls represent the lower story of a rectangular house which had two exterior end chimneys of which only the massive bases now survive.¹⁰ Fabricated as wall construction proceeded, these bases were cast solid in tabby up to the level of the main living floor which was raised about 6'-0" above grade. Fragments of tabby piers show that wide porches once extended along the building's two principal (east and west) facades, timber steps doubtless giving access to interior spaces via the porches. But the walls enclosing these living spaces are now lost, a loss which leaves the dwelling's original form uncertain. However, additions made by George Edwards suggest that the upper walls, like the lower ones, were made of tabby, the house probably comprising two and one-half stories, with main living spaces raised over an elevated basement. Unlike most local plantation houses, the (Phase I) house faced east and west, the easterly exposure giving fine, open views over marshes to the Chechessee River and islands beyond.

The date of this structure is uncertain. In dimension, construction, and typology it closely resembles the first tabby dwelling built at the B. B. Sams House site on Dataw Island, a building attributable to the 1770s or 1780s. If as early as the mid-1780s, then the Phase I dwelling may have replaced an early or mid eighteenth-century house occupied by George Barksdale I (a staunch Loyalist) which is said to have been burned during the American Revolution. Alternatively, it could have been built as the nucleus of an entirely new settlement by John Edwards, Senior, presumably before the death of his wife Mary in 1791. Either way, the dwelling proved too small, and perhaps too humble, for George Edwards who set about enlarging it by the addition of two symmetrically organized, tabby-built wings probably some time between his

¹⁰ Presumably this orientation was chosen to take advantage of the expansive river views to the east and the prevailing breezes.

marriage in 1801 and 1816 when he took up semi-permanent residence in Charleston, South Carolina.

Each two-story wing enclosed one large living area at the upper level raised over an elevated basement. Circulation between new spaces and the old plantation house was effected by introducing a square U-shaped porch wrapped along the enlarged building's river front. Besides linking living spaces at the upper level, this device performed an aesthetic function, unifying the tripartite massing produced by the major additions. On its land side, the old house probably remained unaltered or nearly so, an oak allee (almost certainly introduced by Edwards) projecting the dwelling's central, east to west axis into surrounding landscapes.

The building program adopted by Edwards was ingenious since additions in the form of wings allowed new construction to be treated as two structurally independent units, simplifying formwork fabrication and allowing exterior tabby walls to be cast without any vertical breaks. New space distributed over two smaller units rather than one large one also brought advantages. Floor and roof spans were minimized and the size of timber framing members reduced. Dead loads were also kept down, allowing use of relatively slender exterior tabby skins to enclose new living and storage spaces.

Perhaps as importantly in its owner's eyes, the scheme echoed new fashions which began permeating plantation architecture of the Low Country during the last decade of the eighteenth century. One relevant group of houses attributed to this period is characterized by loose, fragmented or sometimes linear plans which seem vaguely Palladian in inspiration although it is difficult to find any house or villa illustrated by Palladio's *Quattro Libri* which offers more than distant parallels. Instead the group occupies a territory standing between "polite" and vernacular architecture, adapting "bookish" architectural models to local climatic and social needs.

Describing two such structures from the Santee Delta, Stoney observes:

In the 1790s El Dorado and Harrietta, with their elaborated wings, mark attempts to give with some architectural distinction more and better spaces for windows and the cross ventilation so necessary for comfort in the Low Country.

Apparently built overlooking the South Santee River in a single phase by Rebecca Bruton Motte, *Eldorado* (now ruined) incorporated three principal blocks arranged to produce an open court on one side. Lindner and Thacker (n.d.: 755) observe: "The design of the house was such that each room had windows on three sides providing a view of both the river and the avenue. Two wings were perpendicular to the main body of the house which rested on an arched brick foundation."

George Edwards almost certainly knew this house since his wife's plantation, then called the *Ferry* now *Crow Hill*, was located only a mile or so away on the North Santee. This

proximity suggests *Eldorado* may have served as an exemplar when Edwards came to enlarge the old dwelling on Spring Island. If so, he made changes to the model. Rebecca Motte's scheme was slightly refashioned through a process which typifies folk building especially in peripheral geographic locations, the designer disassembling then reassembling various plan components to produce an original and yet not altogether unfamiliar building form.¹¹ Edwards also chose to follow local building precedent, opting for tabby construction common about Beaufort District, rather than the timber framing carried on brick arches used at *Eldorado* and elsewhere in the Santee region.

On Spring Island, all exterior tabby surfaces of the enlarged Edwards' house were stuccoed (and old surfaces perhaps re-stuccoed), the stucco everywhere being scored to simulate high quality stone construction, which although admired was beyond the means of even the wealthiest of local planters. Seen from a distance, the illusion created by scoring must have been convincing, especially after the stucco finishes had been burnished and newly tinted with lime washes. The fragmented massing contributed to another illusion, making the house seem large and expansive even though actual living spaces were few in number and relatively modest in area for an elite house of the period.

Gardens and avenues further enhanced the design, creating a park-like setting about the dwelling modulated by a series of small outbuildings. On the river side, Edwards erected two small freestanding flankers in tabby, this creating an architectural composition centered on the main house extending about 244'-0" north to south along the Chechessee shore.

Both flankers contained one undivided space raised about 3' or 4' above grade. The north flanker was perhaps a storehouse where high quality foodstuffs such as hams, rice and preserves were kept for the owner's use. The southern one perhaps functioned as the plantation owners' office or alternatively a rather luxurious privy (see below).¹² Each building was carefully finished on the exterior with stucco. The south building had large glazed windows at its upper level and was plastered internally, ghost impressions suggesting shelving or closets lined the walls.

A lavishly planted garden extended around the house. In February of 1862, this layout caught the attention of John Frederick Holahan, a marauding Union soldier, who described the scene in his diary as follows:

¹¹ For discussion, see Thomas Hubka, "Just Folks Designing: Vernacular Designers and the Generation of Form," in Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, eds., *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*. (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1986), pp. 426-32.

¹² In *Historic Resources of the Lowcountry* (1979) these two dependencies are described as a kitchen and smokehouse, however, field investigations have produced no architectural or archaeological evidence to support such identification.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 9)

the immediate grounds were enclosed by a fence of Osage orange, trimmed as rectangular as a stone wall... Flowers grew everywhere in profusion and everything about us was calculated to delight the eye and overpower the senses with beauty and fragrance.¹³

Holahan also saw three "magnificent avenues" on the main dwelling's land side "leading away at least half a mile." The long and memorable oak allee by which the house is currently (2003) approached is one of these. Trees belonging to the other two avenues still live although they are now difficult to distinguish among old live oaks clustered at the surviving allee's west end.

Slightly east of this point, the existing approach crosses a creek which flows roughly north to south. Impounded ca. 1968, the water course showed evidence of earlier artificial terracing before it was again altered to form a small lake during the early 1990s. Terraces visible in 1989 suggested that the creek once constituted an improved and picturesque element in a larger landscape design instituted before the Civil War. This impression is heightened by U.S. Coastal and Geodesic Survey charts based on surveys completed during the 1850s, the 1872 edition showing what is clearly a slave settlement located northwest of the main house laid out not in conventional parallel rows but rather in a less formal, curved configuration.¹⁴

Picturesque landscapes inviting the observer into active participation with an orchestrated sequence of seemingly unpremeditated views which balance architectural and artificially "improved" natural features, are amongst the most transient of entities, disappearing quickly once abandoned. While few traces are extant, literary evidence indicates several local planters created such idealized settings for themselves, William Smith's plantation on the Combahee River in Colleton County, South Carolina, where according to Abeil Abbott "pleasure grounds" ornamented with "select trees, elegant and rare trees & bulbous flowers" were "visited un every part thro serpentine walks"[sic] being characteristic of the genre.¹⁵ At Smith's plantation, the slave settlement appeared not as a regimented collection of insubstantial cabins or hovels as was so often the case throughout the Low Country during the early nineteenth century but rather "as a group of handsome cottages" similar in intent no doubt (though different in form) to those cottages built for agricultural workers by British landlords influenced by Nathaniel Kent's *Hints to Gentlemen of Landed Property* (London, 1775, 1776) or other "improving" publications.

¹³ John Frederick Holahan, *Diary*, Bluffton Historical Preservation Society, Bluffton, South Carolina. The osage orange was frequently used for plantation hedges, its density and thorns making it almost impenetrable to both men and animals.

¹⁴ Reproduced, Trinkley (1990:39), fig. 6. This site was obliterated by construction of a golf course in the early 1990s after minimal archaeological testing.

¹⁵ Abeil Abbott, *Journey to Savannah*, Ms.1832. Essex Institute Library, Essex, Connecticut.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 10)

Although the near total loss of where were most probably consciously designed, picturesque features now make it impossible to say categorically that the landscape surrounding the house was similar, a structure erected near the main building just north of the existing oak avenue does demonstrate how certain members of the island's slave population enjoyed better than average living conditions. Incorporating two full stories, this tabby building contained four, single-roomed apartments arranged in pairs right and left of a central hall at the first and second floor levels. Each living space was heated and given three large, probably double-hung, glazed windows. The latter were almost unheard of luxuries in the context of contemporary slave settlements making the Spring Island building with its carefully constructed tabby walls, light, airy rooms and sense of permanence more reminiscent of urban slave structures than rural ones. Proximity to the main house, high quality construction, and visual prominence all suggest that the tenement, or Service Building as it has been designated, accommodated privileged, most likely domestic, slaves who perhaps traveled with George Edwards and his family between town and plantation residences.¹⁶

Whether the far larger, resident slave population also enjoyed better than average living conditions is impossible to know. Archaeological surveys confirm that one settlement was located north or northwest of the main house but have yielded no definite architectural information. An absence of shell scatters only suggests that slave houses here were timber-framed rather than tabby-built.

Nearer the main house, evidence is incomplete for outbuildings associated with day-to-day life as enjoyed by the owner and his family. Thus, nothing is known of any boat shed, stable or carriage house. Nor has information yet surfaced about the main kitchen which like an extant although ruined example at the Sams House, Dataw Island, was almost certainly a free standing structure located somewhere apart from but still very near the owner's living quarters. Holahan's eyewitness description suggests that hedges played an important role in organizing space around the main house, but whether these defined some kind of yard enclosure resembling the yard at the Sams House, Dataw Island or at Rosehill-on-the-Combahee (a tripartite house not unlike the Edwards House, known only from a painting in the Charleston Museum) cannot be said.¹⁷

¹⁶ Joyner (1984: 84) notes that typically housing for domestic slaves was located "between the street of the field hands and the Big House" and how such housing "was often superior to that furnished other slaves" two conditions which fit what is known of the Service Building on Spring Island. Joyner also remarks that "the Alston house servants were said to have felt themselves 'vastly superior to the ordinary run of Negroes, the aristocracy of the race.'" See Charles Joyner, *Down by the Riverside, a South Carolina Slave Community* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984).

¹⁷ Analogy with the painting of Rose Hill on the Combahee suggests that any yard enclosure at the Edwards House would have been located on the east, river side of the building, the north and south pavilions perhaps playing some organizing role in its layout. West, the Edwards House would have been approached via oak allees, these being focused on the old plantation house which must have retained some pivotal role in the reception of guests visiting the island.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)
HABS No. SC-868
(page 11)

One other incompletely understood issue deserves mention. According to the inventory taken soon after George Edwards's death, the Spring Island residence was then sparsely furnished. This could mean that in his declining years Edwards made infrequent visits to the island, leaving its management to a relative or trusted overseer. Or, perhaps furnishings (especially expensive or valuable personal items such as plate, china; glass and small pieces of furniture) traveled with him. Alternatively, it might be that such objects had been removed immediately after his death. Whatever the case, appearances had changed by February of 1862, when Union soldiers broke into the house. John Frederick Holahan records:

the building was large, roomy and imposing externally, and had been furnished with elegance and taste by the opulent proprietor of the Island. But vandals had smashed the grand piano, cut and mutilated the costly paintings and furniture and carried off the best carpets and other articles capable of removal...I appropriated some books from the extensive library and a "love of a writing stand" I know they would only be destroyed if left behind.

Jacob W. Oestervicker, who was then Spring Island's overseer, valued the furnishings abandoned after the Battle of Port Royal in November of 1861 at \$2,000. The island's slave population represented a far greater accumulation of wealth, 263 slaves being valued at \$144,000. Cotton was another valuable item. Fleeing in panic as rumors of Union landings circulated about the Beaufort District, the overseer or whoever else was then managing the plantation left behind eighty bales of long staple cotton worth \$8,000, twenty-five wagons and carts, two carriages, four large cypress boats, quantities of plantation goods, foodstuffs and numerous animals including, or so Oestervicker said, 202 head of cattle.

The cattle were almost certainly hunted and slaughtered for food soon thereafter, groups of Union soldiers roaming the sea islands in search of food both for themselves and the half-starved groups of plantation slaves who, abandoned by their owners, flocked into Beaufort Town looking for sustenance and shelter. After having been thoroughly looted, there is clear evidence that the house and its dependencies were stripped of their more portable materials, for brick, timber and metals were especially sought after, and then burned. Subsequently, the main house fell into ruin, and was never rebuilt or re-occupied. Similarly, its dependencies such as the kitchen were destroyed or fell into disuse.¹⁸

¹⁸ An informant who lived on Spring Island states that "old houses" (presumably slave dwellings) located north of the main Edwards House continued to be occupied between 1910 and 1941. When destruction of the main house occurred is uncertain. The extent of robbing suggests a date during the Civil War, however, an advertisement in the *Charleston Daily Courier* of 9 January 1872 (when the property was offered for sale) mentions "a large dwelling house and ample outbuildings" which may mean the main residence was still habitable or capable of restoration.

Removal of materials continued into the twentieth century, oral testimony¹⁹ and field surveys indicating that disassociated tabby was cut up, carried away, and re-used as sill supports for tenant houses before or during 1914.²⁰ Later, probably during the 1960s, fallen tabby was used to face a causeway carrying the main approach avenue over the creek which skirts the settlement site on its east side.²¹ Around the same time, the then owner, Elisha Walker, replanted oaks missing from the avenue and installed a large bronze statue of St. Francis at the avenue's west end. Realizing that the tabby ruins had become critically endangered, Walker's heirs began a limited program of conservation and stabilization in 1985, with Colin Brooker acting as their preservation consultant. Further stabilization was carried out for the Spring Island Company in 1992.

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General statement

1. Architectural Character: The main house is of tripartite form, constructed principally in tabby over the course of two major construction phases. Associated outbuildings include a pair of small, tabby-built flankers to the east and a larger, tabby-built slave tenement building to the west.
2. Condition, main house: The main house is substantially ruined. All timber framing including the floor, porch and roof elements are lost; exterior finishes have largely disappeared and most interior features are missing. The original (Phase I) house has suffered particularly severe damage, disappearing entirely above the first floor level. Surviving elements of the lower floor include heavily eroded fragments of two end walls, bases of two end chimneys, and three of four porch piers.

While much still stands, the South Wing is severely impaired and must be considered endangered. North and south facades have disassociated in part, sections of both walls falling outwards. Preserved to its full, original two-story height, the east facade has moved nine inches out of vertical. Cracks above openings and splits along pour lines indicate this wall is close to collapse; the guy wires introduced during the early 1970s, moreover, are of dubious structural value. By contrast, the North Wing retains at least superficial integrity, all exterior facades standing to their full height despite a loss of

¹⁹ Gordon Mobley, Spring Island Plantation manager, personal communication, 1985.

²⁰ Brooker (1990:154-55), figs. 28, 29.

²¹ This has erroneously been called a tabby bridge however there is no evidence that a bridge, tabby or otherwise, ever stood here.

original timber-framing members and stucco finishes. Prior to 1985, the south facade was badly cracked and missing fabric about its central door openings. Such disabilities have since been mitigated by conservation and restoration. Other conservation measures include the capping of exterior tabby walls, insertion of new timber frames into original openings, insertion of replacement floor joists into original sockets (North and South wings) and the filling of cracks with lime mortar. Tabby walls linking wings to the original (Phase I) house are also differentially preserved, the northern example being marginally more intact than the southern one.

Main House, Phase I

A. Description of Exterior

1. Overall Dimensions: The original (Phase I) house is now substantially ruined. Today only fragments of exterior tabby walls survive. These define a rectangular structure with external end chimneys, measuring approximately 19'-9" north-to-south x 37'-0" east-to-west excluding the chimneys.

2. Foundations: Tabby, dimensions not ascertained.

3. Walls: Except where broadened into chimney bases, all exterior walls at the lower level were cast solid in tabby to a width of 14" to 15". Pour lines and other impressions show the formwork, which, as usual, was re-used at successively higher building levels, measured 24" in height, its opposing faces tied by timber "pins" measuring 3½" x 2½" in section. If wall thickness diminished at the upper level is not known. Neither can the original exterior wall height be accurately determined.

Where abutted by Phase II additions, the original building retains traces of an early exterior stucco finish. Stucco, containing an oyster shell lime was applied in two coats over the tabby substrate, the base coat measuring about ½"- 5/8" in thickness. Whiter and thinner, the top coat was perhaps polished or burnished after having first been scored to simulate stonework. Where preserved on the chimney base and porch piers, scoring is shallow, creating the effect of stonework laid up in regular 12" high courses, with blocks measuring 19" in length.

4. Structural system, framing: Load bearing, exterior tabby walls, probably two stories high. No evidence survives for floor or roof framing.

5. Porches: Incompletely preserved L-shaped tabby corner piers show that porches fronted the Phase I building's two principal facades. The west porch was approximately 11'-3" wide while its counterpart to the east measured approximately 8'-9" in width. The original

east porch underwent alteration and extension laterally during the Phase II building campaign but, if supporting piers were refashioned or rebuilt at the same time has not been determined. Nothing remains to indicate the material, character or form of the columns or posts belonging to either Phase I or Phase II porches.

6. Chimneys: While upper portions are lost, the bases of the two end chimneys remain more or less intact. Measuring about 6'-4" x 4'-0" including the thickness of the exterior wall, both were cast solidly in tabby to a height of about 5'-8" above present grade.

7. Openings

a. Doorways and doors: No doorway or door survives. However, axial organization of the Phase II additions strongly suggest that the Phase I structure was entered via doorways centered on both the north and south facades, this arrangement probably being retained when the original house was extended.

b. Windows: A small window opening measuring about 2'-5" wide x 3-1½" high flanks each chimney base right and left. Ghost impressions indicate that these openings originally housed timber window frames (now lost). Nothing survives to attest how fenestration patterns were ordered on the building's east and west facades.

B. Description of Interior

1. Floor plans: No evidence is visible for any tabby cross partition at the building's lower level, but the possibility that this relatively large, rectangular space was subdivided by framed or board partitions cannot be excluded. No evidence survives to suggest that the lower floor was linked to the upper portions of the original house by way of an interior staircase or steps. Rather, structural remains insofar as they exist, point toward the lower floor being an elevated basement used for storage of household items as commonly the case on the South Carolina Sea Islands. If so, this area would have been entered directly from the exterior. Upper level planning arrangements are not preserved, although it seems likely given the form of the Phase II additions and weight of the local planning tradition that the living spaces were organized in a central or through-hall plan configuration on one principle level, the roof space perhaps containing additional accommodation reached by an internal staircase.

2. Flooring: At the lower level, excavation in 1990 exposed portions of a tabby floor cast 6" deep directly over subsoil. This floor showed little sign of wear and no repairs indicating that traffic here was light and intermittent. Nothing is preserved of the upper floor(s).

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 15)

3. Wall finishes: At the lower level, interior faces of tabby enclosing walls were plastered, the plaster which contained a few small broken brick inclusions, being applied to a thickness of 5/8" - 7/8".

Main House, Phase II

A. Description of Exterior

1. Form and overall dimensions: Enlargement of the Phase I house involved the erection of a two-story tabby wing right and left of the original building in an axial and symmetric arrangement. The west side of each wing continued the line of the old building's east facade, new construction being distanced, at minimum, approximately 15' away from the original construction. The wings themselves each measured approximately 22'-5" north-to-south x approximately 25'-4" east-to-west and incorporated one principal living space raised over an elevated basement, external tabby walls rising approximately 20' -4" above present grade.

Circulation between the original building and its Phase II wings was made externally via a two-tiered porch which looked out toward the Chechessee River. This extended along the south side of the North Wing, north side of the South Wing, and east side of the old house in a square, U-shaped configuration. From the approach allee to the west, porch construction was concealed by tabby screen walls extending between the new and old buildings, these walls rising something close to two full stories in height. It is likely that an axially positioned stair gave access to the porches from the east and west but traces of such conjectured features are now lost above ground.

2. Foundations. Tabby dimensions and depth not ascertained.

3. Walls: Construction of North and South Wings is almost identical. All exterior walls at the lower (first floor) level were cast solid in tabby to a width of 15" except where interrupted by openings. Pour lines show the formwork employed measured 24" in height, this formwork being re-used at successively higher building levels. At the second floor, exterior wall thickness was reduced internally to 12", the formwork height remaining constant. Pour lines attest that the exterior wall construction required a total of eight separate pours or "rounds" above grade.

Tabby screen walls extending between the Phase I house and its two wings were essentially similar in construction except that no reduction in width occurred at the second floor level, each 12" wide wall rising in excess of 17'-0" above present grade. Pour lines match those of the wings. Through-joints show that tabby screen fabrication was an in-fill operation; no attempt was made to bond these essentially freestanding

features into either the new or old tabby construction. Rather, stability was dependent on the bracing action of the porch framing.

4. Structural System: Load bearing exterior tabby walls, two stories high. No evidence survives for any framed partitions. All roof members are lost but evidence – sockets and ghost impressions – does survive for floor framing at the second level (see below).

5. Porches: Except along the east side of the Phase I house, the porch supports are missing. However, archaeological sounding has revealed that pier fragments still exist below ground. These attest that porches running along the south face of the North Wing and north face of the South Wing measured approximately 9'-0" in width. Along the east front of the Phase I building, the porch was somewhat wider, measuring about 11'-0" in width, this additional width perhaps being related to a staircase or set of steps (now lost) giving access from the building's river (east) side.

At the second level, sockets left in exterior tabby wall faces indicate porch construction, such as the joists and floorboards, was supported on timber beams, measuring about 6" x 8" in section, the beams being cast in place as exterior construction proceeded. Larger, diagonal members measuring about 10" x 9" in section helped carry the porch at its northwest and southwest corners. A row of sockets still visible along the North Wing's south facade located about 16' above ground indicate an enclosing roof. What exact form this porch roof took is not known. Neither can anything now be determined about the character of the second-floor porch columns or posts, although tabby piers are known at the first-floor level.

6. Chimneys: Chimney construction has almost completely disappeared above ground. The only traces of the chimney work are a faint ghost impression centered on the interior face of the North Wing's north facade and fragments of fired brick foundations excavated during 1970. The ghost impression suggests that the chimney here, and no doubt, a similar chimney in the South Wing, was built as an independent unit after the tabby exterior walls had been cast. This would have reduced the potential for differential settlement, use of fired brick for chimney stacks protecting tabby surfaces which tend to crack, spall, and split when subjected to fire or intense heat for prolonged periods. Chimney dimensions are uncertain, but the interrupted sequences of joist sockets indicate that the chimney breast was about 6'-0" wide at the second floor.

7. Openings

a. Doorways and doors: The North and South Wings opened on one side into the U-shaped porch described above via a tall central opening (about 15'-0" high), divided horizontally by timbers to give two doorways, one at each floor level.

These doorways were about 3'-4" wide at the first floor and 3'-6" wide at the upper level. Exceptionally large for tabby construction, the doorway openings created serious structural problems following the loss of timber wall plates, floor joists, and porch framing which served to brace and strut surrounding tabby skins. At the South Wing, near total collapse of its north facade was the eventual outcome. At the North Wing, the south facade retained coherence but had become seriously impaired, cracking and disassociating about its central opening prior to stabilization and restoration in 1985. Regarding the doors proper, nothing is known of their design. Nor has anything survived of any decorative surround, fanlight or framing.

b. Windows: All four facades of both North and South Wings feature paired window openings at first and second floors, windows of the North Wing's south facade and the South Wing's north facade flanking a central doorway. Lower window openings measure 3'-9" wide x 4'-1" high. Upper openings measure 3'-5" to 3'-6" wide x 6'-8" high. Each originally housed a timber frame, but these are now lost. Sockets and ghost impressions show that the upper windows were spanned by timber lintels measuring 2³/₄" or 3" deep x 3¹/₂" wide. Lower openings were constructed without lintels, the tabby above being supported by the window frames. While double hung windows may be assumed at least at the second floor, no physical evidence survives to confirm this conjecture.

B. Description of Interior

1. Floor Plans: No evidence exists to suggest that either the North or South Wing was subdivided by any kind of partition. Rather, each wing apparently contained a single space at both the upper and lower levels. These spaces were entered via a central doorway on one side and linked to other parts of the building by external porches. Each wing probably had a second-floor fireplace located opposite its entranceway. If lower spaces were heated is not clear.

2. Stairways: There is no evidence to show that either wing enclosed any stairway, upper and lower spaces apparently being kept physically and functionally discrete.

3. Floors: Reduction of exterior tabby wall thickness at the second floor created internal ledges in both North and South Wings. These were used to support timber wall plates (the size of original section uncertain) running north to south. The wall plates are now lost except for carbonized fragments of closely grained heart pine, one plate, found in the North Wing, internal south facade, preserving evidence for a carefully scarfed and pegged joint along its length.

Wall plates originally supported timber floor joists spanning north to south. Sockets show joists to have measured something over 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " deep (probably 10" or 12") x 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ " wide, these being positioned 1'-8" apart on center and cast in place as wall construction proceeded.²² The sequence of sockets is interrupted about the mid-point of each wing where joists were trimmed around a chimney stack (see above).

4. Wall Finishes: Surviving patches show that the walls of the upper spaces were plastered, and that the plaster was applied directly to internal, tabby wall surfaces in at least two coats. Impressions of timber fixing pieces suggest that the upper spaces may have been wainscoted.

North and South Flankers

A. General Statement

1. Architectural Character: Located overlooking the Chechessee River, the North and South Flankers are a pair of small, one and one-half story ruined tabby outbuildings built to flank the enlarged Edwards House in symmetrical fashion on its east side. The two buildings match one another with respect to construction and size but facade treatment differs, reflecting two distinct functions. The North Flanker originally contained a single, unlighted space raised approximately 4'-8" above present grade over an elevated basement, the upper space reached by a doorway centered on its south facade via timber or masonry steps (now lost).

The South Flanker was similar in size but differed in its organization, incorporating one principle space lighted by three large windows entered north by way of a staircase or steps (now lost) raised over a full basement which, in turn, was entered from the exterior via some kind of excavated area. All timber framing has gone, however, the almost square ground plans suggest a roof of pyramidal form enclosed each structure.

Beyond playing an obvious aesthetic role in the Edwards House landscape, functional questions are unresolved. Lack of windows at the upper level suggest the North Flanker was a storage building. The South Flanker with its well-illuminated upper space, plastered interior walls, and possible shelving suggests an office used by the owner or his overseer. However, the full basement is an usual and unexpected feature, suggesting an alternative interpretation. One possibility is that the South Flanker was an

²² New pressure treated joists, cut from pine grown on Spring Island, were introduced into the old sockets as a conservation measure in 1985. Unfortunately, replacement joists were made somewhat less deep in section than the originals.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 19)

unusually well appointed privy, serviced and cleaned from the lower, basement level. If so, it must have been intended for the owner and his family.

2. Condition of fabric: Tabby walls of both structures are well preserved and stand to their full original height. The North Flanker has lost its original stucco facing, exterior tabby having suffered considerable erosion in consequence. Exterior surfaces of the South Flanker are better preserved, all faces of the building having been re-stuccoed at an undetermined time. Stabilization in 1990, introduced new timber frames into the original wall openings, the design of new frames reproducing lost originals as reconstructed from ghost impressions and fragments preserved in situ. Previously (ca. 1980) exterior surfaces of the North Flanker were somewhat clumsily patched, however, exterior tabby wall surfaces generally remain in soft and friable condition.

B. Description of Exterior

1. Overall Dimensions: North and South Flankers each measure approximately 15'-2" x 15'-1" overall.

2. Foundations: Exterior tabby walls of the South Flanker descend to a depth of approximately 4'-0" below present grade, enclosing an undivided basement space (originally about 8'-0" high) which is now part filled with silt. There is no evidence for any foundation strip nor an increase in thickness of tabby exterior walls below ground. Construction of the North Flanker is similar, however, the exterior walls are less deeply founded (exact depth not determined but probably about 2'-0" below present grade).

3. Walls: Exterior walls are of tabby cast to a common width of 13" using formwork measuring 24" in height. Walls rise approximately 14'-4" above present grade. Original exterior finishes are lost, the South Flanker having been entirely re-stuccoed during an otherwise undocumented repair episode. Replacement stucco is finished smooth and shows no sign of ever having been scored in imitation of stonework.

4. Structural System, framing: All framing details are lost except for sockets and ghost impressions left by the upper level floor construction. In the South Flanker these indicate that the second floor was supported on timber joists running north to south, positioned about 22" on center, and measuring about 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4" in section. Joists were supported on timber plates, measuring about 3" x 5" in section, bedded directly into the outside walls and cast in place as tabby construction proceeded.

5. Porch and access steps: No evidence survives to indicate exactly how the north and south upper spaces were reached from the exterior. While access by a single flight of

masonry or timber steps seems likely, such an arrangement can be neither confirmed nor denied without additional archaeological excavation

6. Chimneys: No evidence for any chimney or heating flue is now visible in either the North or South Flanker.

7. Openings

a. Doorways and doors: The North Flanker was entered by a single doorway centered on its south facade. Now heavily eroded this doorway matched a similar doorway accessing the South Pavilion in size and detail. Centered on the South Flanker's north facade the latter doorway measures 3'-9" wide x 7'-1" high, sockets here and surviving fragments at the North Flanker showing that each of these openings was originally spanned by timber lintels.

The South Flanker's basement space was entered via an external doorway centered on its lower west facade, the opening measuring 7'-7" high x approximately 3'-9" wide. Nothing is known of the door design or any associated trim details.

b. Windows: Except for the doorway described above, exterior walls of the North Flanker are blank at the upper level. At the lower level, a single window opening is centered on the east facade. The South Flanker was far better illuminated, east, west and south facades each featuring a relatively large window opening measuring 3'-0" wide x 5'-2" high at the upper level. Lower walls were pierced by two smaller window openings each measuring 3'-0" wide x 2'-6" high), centered on the south and east facades.

C. Description of Interior

Almost all interior details are lost except for patches of plaster which still adhere to the inside faces of the South Flanker. These patches preserve ghost impressions suggesting that some kind of shelving was once installed inside the building at its principal (upper) level.

Slave Quarters

A. General Statement

1. Architectural character: The Slave Quarters is a ruined, two-story, rectangular tabby structure located slightly northwest of the main Edwards House, built parallel to the latter's approach alley. Internal framing elements are missing, however, fenestration

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 21)

patterns and joist sequences as evidenced by sockets indicate division into four separate living units, each consisting of a single, heated room, arranged in pairs flanking a central hall on two levels.²³

The two lower, first floor apartments were reached directly from the exterior while the upper second floor living spaces were accessed via an interior staircase (now lost) located within the central hall

This building represents a rare, or perhaps rarely preserved, type of plantation structure most likely designed to accommodate small groups of privileged house slaves or other domestic servants in near proximity to the owner's residence. The only analogous structure known from Beaufort County is another ruined tabby dependency (one of a pair) built to flank the main Heyward House at Whitehall Plantation located on Euhaw Creek, a tributary of the Broad River, near Ridgeland.

The date of the Spring Island structure is not directly attested, but close similarities in construction and detail suggest it to be contemporary with the Phase II additions made to the main house by George Edwards ca. 1801-15.

2. Condition of fabric: Like other standing structures constituting the Edwards House complex, the slave quarters building has lost all of its original timber framing elements, including floor and roofing members. Except for the south facade, exterior tabby walls stand to their full original height but are missing original finishes. The south facade is incompletely preserved, portions at the second-floor level having disassociated and fallen to the ground. While top surfaces are somewhat friable, and vertical surfaces slightly eroded, the tabby remains in relatively sound condition. A stabilization program included the introduction of new pressure-treated timber frames into all original wall openings (new frames being designed to replicate the lost originals), restoration of the second floor joists, and surface patching. Archaeological testing was conducted inside the building by Chicora Research Foundation (Dr. Michael Trinkley, Director) in 1990.

B. Description of Exterior

1. Overall dimensions: The building is rectangular measuring 36'-3" x 20'-2" overall, with its long axis aligned N10E.

2. Foundations: Not investigated.

²³ Individual spaces measured approximately 262.5 square feet which was slightly smaller than the tabby-walled slave houses at Haig Point, Daufuskie Island, South Carolina which also probably accommodated house slaves. See HABS No. SC-867.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 22)

3. Walls: Two-story high exterior walls (rising approximately 19'-0" above present grade) are made of tabby cast, using timber formwork measuring 24" in height, to a width of 14" at the first floor level. At the second floor, formwork width was adjusted internally, reducing the wall thickness to 12", this dimension being maintained during all subsequent pours. Interior and exterior finishes are mostly lost, small patches surviving below ground indicating external wall surfaces were stuccoed and internal faces plastered, stucco and plaster being applied directly to the tabby

4. Structural system: Exterior walls are made of load bearing tabby. Internally, ghost impressions and joist sequences attest that timber partitions originally enclosed the central stair hall but these partitions are now lost. Fragments remain of two wall plates originally measuring 2¼" x 4½" in section. Plates ran east to west and were supported on ledges resulting from a reduction of wall thickness at the upper level. Sockets and other ghost impressions show floor joists spanned between the wall plates north to south. Positioned between 14" and 22" on center, joists probably measured 10" or 12" x 3½" or 4" in section.

5. Porches: While it is possible that exterior doorways to the south were protected from sun and rain by some kind of porch or stoop no evidence survives above ground which might confirm this possibility.

6. Chimneys: Excavation and faint tabby impressions attest to a pair of chimneys built against the inside face of the north facade in tabby brick, each presumably designed to serve one upper and one lower apartment. Following the building's desertion during the Civil War and subsequent dereliction, the chimneys were robbed down to their lowest foundation course. The fragments preserved below ground indicate that each measured 3'-10" north-to-south x 5'-6" east-to-west in plan.

7. Openings

a. Doorways and doors: The building has three exterior doorways disposed in a symmetrical arrangement along the length of its south facade, one portioned centrally (measuring 7'-5" high x 3'-9" wide), the others located toward the east and west ends. Lateral doorways (measuring 7"-5" high x 3'-10" wide) each flank a single window opening, the widows being placed right and left of the central entrance. No trim or any decorative details survive.

b. Windows: End elevations (east and west) each feature a pair of window openings at the first and second floor. Upper openings are 3'-0" wide x 5' -5" high, the lower openings measuring 3' -0" wide x 5"-2½" high. Judging by examples still extant, window openings on the south facade were similar in size

and detail. The north facade is blank except for a single opening at the upper level centered on the building's stair hall. Everywhere, timber window frames originally supported the tabby above without any intermediate lintel. All of the windows were furnished with shutters on the exterior; these were held back when open by metal ties of a swivelling, "butterfly" type. Timber inserts into which surviving ties are fixed indicate that shutters were envisaged from the beginning of building operations. It is also near certain that all of the windows were originally glazed, the combination of glazed (probably double-hung) windows and shutters being highly unusual for a rural, slave or servant dwelling.

8. Roof: All roof framing has disappeared. There is no evidence to suggest that end walls were carried up as gables, which most likely means that the roof was of hipped form.

C. Description of Interior

1. Floor plans: The first floor was apparently organized in a single pile, central stair-hall configuration, with an apartment containing one undivided space positioned east and west of the hall. Living spaces were each entered south from the exterior via a separate doorway. On the opposite (north) wall, the poorly preserved chimney foundations described above suggest a fireplace. The character and architectural treatment of the living spaces cannot be determined although surface impressions and timber inserts show that trim elements included baseboards and chair rails. Very little is known about the central hall, except that it was relatively narrow and defined by two 10" x 5" timber beams aligned north to south at the second floor level, sockets for these beams marking the position of lost timber partitions. While it seems obvious that the hall contained a staircase giving access to second floor spaces, nothing definite is known about this feature.

The second floor plan was similar except that habitable spaces were entered off the central stair hall. Almost nothing is known of a presumed landing giving access to the two second floor apartments, except that it was illuminated by the north facing window opening already mentioned.

2. Flooring: Excavation indicates that the first floor consisted of tongued and grooved boards carried by timber battens set into a bed of oyster shell lime mortar. This bedding was cast as a thin layer directly over subsoil. Flooring at the upper level has entirely disappeared but tongued and grooved boards running east to west are likely supported on timber joists spanning north to south.

Site

A. Landscape Development

The most prominent landscape feature visible today is the allee of live oaks by which the Edwards House is approached from interior areas of Spring Island. Aligned approximately east to west, the present avenue is the only easily recognizable element of an earlier layout which in 1862 consisted of three avenues "leading away at least half a mile." If any of the existing oaks were planted before the Civil War is debatable, however, early twentieth century U.S. Coastal Survey charts based upon field surveys made during the 1850s show that the present avenue follows the mid nineteenth-century alignment. According to oral testimony, several diseased, dead or missing trees were replaced by Elisha J. Walker after he bought Spring Island in 1964. Additionally, besides erecting a monument to St. Francis at the present avenue's western extremity, Walker installed or possibly added to the mass plantings of flowering bulbs beneath the oaks, the bulbs including snowdrops, daffodils and *Gladiolas byzantinus*.

B. Outbuildings

A relatively large, timber-framed structure raised on tabby piers perhaps 8" or 9" inches above present grade is known from excavation to have occupied a position on the shoreline northeast of the main Edwards House. This building measured about 32'-6" north-to-south x 19'-0" east-to-west. Tabby corner piers cast to a width of 14" were L-shaped in plan, the best preserved example at the building's northwest angle measuring 3'-8" x 4'-1" in length. Quantities of glass encountered during excavation suggest glazed windows. No evidence was discovered for a chimney or hearth. It is difficult to say if this absence has any real interpretive or functional significance since chimneys have been found heavily or even completely robbed elsewhere on the site.

In February of 1862, John Frederick Holahan mentioned how he came across a "cotton house" which seems to have been located somewhere not far distant from the main house. However, there is no way of knowing if the framed building described and Holahan's building are one and the same.²⁴

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural Drawings

²⁴John Frederick Holahan, Diary, February 1862 (Bluffton Historic Society, Bluffton, South Carolina). Holahan remarks "buried near the cotton house we found a lot of articles useless to us, except for...a few dollars in silver coin" a comment which indicates the thoroughness of Union looting on Spring Island.

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 25)

No original or early architectural drawings are known. Measured drawings were made of the main Edwards House and its dependencies by Colin Brooker in 1985 and 1990. These were subsequently published in part by Chicora Foundation (see Trinkley, 1990). The measured drawings are held on file by Brooker Architectural Design Consultants, in Beaufort.

B. Interviews

Oral information concerning the Edwards House site was collected by Colin Brooker from L. Hayes, joint owner, and Gordon Mobley, Spring Island Plantation Manager, in 1980.

C. Bibliography

Brooker, Colin. "Tabby Structures on Spring Island," and "Vernacular Architecture on Spring Island," in Michael Trinkley, ed., *The Second Phase of Archaeological Survey on Spring Island, Beaufort County SC*. Columbia, SC: Chicora Research Series 20, 1990.

[Cole, Cynthia, ed.] *Historic Resources of the Low Country*. Yemassee, SC: Low Council of Governments, 1979.

Harvey, Bruce G., Colin Brooker, David B. Schneider, and Sarah Fick. *Beaufort County Above-Ground Historic Resources Survey of Beaufort County, South Carolina*. Beaufort, SC: Brockington Associates; Inc., Brooker Architectural Design Consultants, Historic Beaufort Foundation, and Preservation Consultants Inc., 1990.

Holahan, John Frederick. Diary, February 1862. (Original manuscript, Bluffton Historic Society, Bluffton, South Carolina).

Trinkley, Michael. "Prehistoric and Historic Overview," in Michael Trinkley, ed., *The Second Phase of Archaeological Survey on Spring Island, Beaufort County SC*. Columbia, SC: Chicora Research Series 20, 1990.

PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

This project was sponsored by the Historic Beaufort Foundation and by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) division of the National Park Service, Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief, HABS. This report is one component of a larger survey of extant examples of tabby architecture within Beaufort County, South Carolina. The documentation was undertaken by HABS under the direction of Paul D. Dolinsky with assistance from Virginia B. Price, HABS Historian, who worked with Jefferson G. Mansell, (formerly of) the Historic Beaufort Foundation, Ian D. Hill, Beaufort County Planning Department, and Colin Brooker, Brooker Architectural Design Consultants, to identify subjects of study and locate them in the field in 2002 and 2003. Colin

EDWARD HOUSE AND DEPENDENCIES (RUINS)

HABS No. SC-868

(page 26)

Brooker, whose research underpinned the project, wrote the historical report. Evan Thompson, now with the Historic Beaufort Foundation, assisted Brooker in the production of the reports. Jack E. Boucher, HABS Photographer, took the large format photographs.
