

HABS  
VA  
100 - YORK.V,  
2-

Kiskiack (Naval Mine Depot)  
Yorkville Vicinity  
York County  
Virginia

HABS No. VA-183

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

Historic American Buildings Survey

ADDENDUM TO  
KISKIACK, NAVAL MINE DEPOT  
(Chiskiack)  
(Kiskiskiack)  
(Henry Lee House)  
State Rt. 238 vicinity  
Yorktown vicinity  
York County  
Virginia

HABS No. VA-183

HABS  
VA  
100-YORK.V  
2-

WRITTEN HISTORICAL & DESCRIPTIVE DATA  
REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS  
PHOTOGRAPHS

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY  
National Park Service  
U.S. Department of Interior  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20249

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

HABS No. VA-183

HABS  
VA  
100-YORK V  
2-

KISKIACK, NAVAL MINE DEPOT  
(Chiskiack)  
(Kiskiskiack)  
(Henry Lee House)

Location: State Route 238 vicinity, Yorktown, York County, Virginia. Kiskiack is within the boundaries of the Naval Weapons Station, a naval base belonging to the United States of America.

Present Occupant

& Owner: Naval Weapons Station, Department of the Navy, United States Government.

Present Use: Kiskiack is unoccupied. The house also is inaccessible because of its location inside the Naval Weapons Station.

Significance: "Kiskiack" or the "Henry Lee House" exists as an eighteenth-century artifact characterized by extravagant brickwork popular in the mid 1720s. Kiskiack's most salient features are its T-shaped chimney stacks; implied by the detailing of these brick chimneys is a high level of craftsmanship, and so cost, needed to construct them. The expense incurred by building in brick made such dwellings unusual in colonial Virginia, leaving it as a place characterized by wood, that is to say, forests and wood-frame houses. Thus, the quality of materials (brick) and the manipulation of the brickwork, as well as the allusion to labor required for the project, quietly stated the owner's wealth and inferred his position in society.<sup>1</sup>

Traditionally referred to as the ancestral home of the Lee family of Virginia, Kiskiack has been identified with Henry Lee who immigrated to York County, Virginia, by 1640.<sup>2</sup> Although the county records do not substantiate this association, the dwelling's preservation is an effect of the belief that the

---

<sup>1</sup>Dell Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia," Ph.D. Diss, Brown University, 1980; Personal Communication, Camille Wells, 1997; Personal Communication, Edward A. Chappell, Fall 1997.

<sup>2</sup>Until January 1752, England and her colonies observed the New Year on the 25<sup>th</sup> of March, following the Julian or "old style" calendar. The "new style" calendar, adjusted by Pope Gregory XIII in 1572, began its new year on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January. The Gregorian calendar was accepted by the rest of Europe much earlier; yet England used both calendars for reasons justified by trade. The English recorded the days between 1 January and 25 March by identifying the years, for instance, they wrote 1 January 1640-41 to satisfy both calendar years rather than just noting the Gregorian 1 January 1641 as the day that followed 31 December 1640. See The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, vol. 1, 1619-1660, edited by William Waller Hening (New York, NY: R & W & G Bartow for the editor, 1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 393-395.

There were two Henry Lees that emigrated to Virginia from England, one transported by James Berry who received his fifty acre head right in Accomac County in 1636-37 and another brought over by Joseph Harmon who received his head right in James City County in 1638; the Lee family is unsure from which Henry Lee they descended. See George Cabell Greer, Early Virginia Immigrants, 1623-1666 (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1960), p. 201; and Catherine H.C. Seaman, The Lees of Seventeenth-Century York County, Virginia: A Case Study of Family, Kinship, and Land Tenure (Sweet Briar, VA: Sweet Briar College Printing Press, 1985), passim. Moreover, claims of a relationship between either of the Henry Lees and Richard Lee has not withstood the test of genealogical research. For information about the Richard Lee family's property, see Frasier D. Neiman "Domestic Architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: The Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in Common Places Readings in American Vernacular Architecture, edited by Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, p. 292-314 (Athens, GA and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1986).

property descended from Henry Lee, the emigrant, to its last private owner, William Warren Harrison Lee. A fire destroyed the interior of the house in 1915; all that remains -- and that largely due to the efforts of the Henry Lee descendants -- is a shell of early Tidewater architecture. Even so, Kiskiack is a rare survivor from the colonial period.

## PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

### A. Physical History:

1. Date of construction: 1720s. During the 1720s bricklayers built Kiskiack for a member of the Hansford family. The brick house with its dormer windows punched into the steep gable roof probably came after Charles Hansford purchased the property in 1727.<sup>3</sup>

Archaeological investigations of the site turned up no artifacts from the seventeenth century, nor were any datable ceramics discovered for that period.<sup>4</sup> The verifiable glass post-dated 1820. Yet the thirty-nine artifacts scattered around Kiskiack suggest an eighteenth-century date; the parameters for the objects found in the vicinity of the building are 1720 and 1820, indicating that Kiskiack was occupied during that time. The presence and arrangement of colonial period outbuildings also speak to Kiskiack's early eighteenth-century origin. The archaeological survey, unfortunately, was not comprehensive enough to definitively date the house.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Unfortunately, no advertisements for a bricklayer's services or for brick needed to erect the dwelling can be traced; extant copies of the Virginia Gazette begin in 1736. Advertisements placed by members of the Hansford family are mostly from the mid-eighteenth century. For instance, Charles Hansford posted a notice about a lost horse in April and November 1771; Samuel Hill wanted to sell a Negro and wanted to attract interested parties to the Halfway House for the event in 1773. A runaway apprentice was last seen at Charles Hansford's, and his master asked for his return in 1777. Notice of the marriage of Elizabeth Hansford to the Reverend John Camm was published in July 1769. Charles Hansford advertised the Halfway House "to be lett" in 1755 and 1759. See Virginia Gazette (Purdie & Dixon) 18 April 1771, p. 3 and 21 November 1771, p. 2; Virginia Gazette (Purdie & Dixon) 6 May 1773, p. 2; Virginia Gazette (Dixon & Hunter) 19 December 1777, p. 3; Virginia Gazette (Purdie & Dixon) 13 July 1769; Virginia Gazette (Hunter) 17 October 1755, p. 3 and 30 November 1759, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Four seventeenth-century artifacts turned up in the woods west of the house, between it and Lee Road. This suggests that a predecessor existed in those woods. See Charles K. Thomas and David F. Muraca, "The Archaeological Testing at Kiskiack," Archaeological Investigation and Report, for the Henry Lee House Fund Inc., May 3, 1986, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia.

<sup>5</sup>Test units dug into the builder's trench at the southeast corner revealed an oyster-shell layer. The layer was present only in that spot and beneath the eave in the southwest corner, which infers it was laid down in an effort to stop erosion. This was done around 1890. Back in the southeast corner, beneath the oyster shell, was a repair trench. In that trench several phases of work on the foundations exist, but the archaeologists were unable to sort the layers chronologically within the small area of the test unit. The repairs to the foundations destroyed the initial trench dug by the builder, making a construction date impossible to read. Ceramics found in the site (pearlware) infer that the last repair was done after 1779. The archaeologists proposed that this activity alludes to the presence of an earlier building on the site of the existing house. See Thomas and Muraca, p. 25, 32.

The archaeologists' theory that another structure was present where Kiskiack sits today collaborates the tradition that there was a fire there in the late eighteenth century (about 1780) that necessitated a rebuilding campaign. See Kristina E. Maddocks, "The Lee House Near Yorktown," Paper, The College of William and Mary, 1969, site file, Virginia Department

Architectural evidence from Kiskiack places its construction date before 1750. Its brickwork, laid in Flemish bond with regular patterns of glazed headers, was popular in the first half of the eighteenth century. As the century progressed, more of the gentry houses were built in Flemish bond of bricks carefully selected or rubbed for consistency in color. This allowed for a more subtle statement of wealth, that is, access to costly building materials, than that announced by arrangements of glazed headers seen at Kiskiack. Randomly placed glazed headers also spoke to a planter's resources, yet with the exception of Rosewell, they were not used in the most expensive houses.<sup>6</sup>

Because of Kiskiack's location on a military base, access to it is severely limited. Several examples of brickwork reminiscent of that made for Kiskiack, however, can be seen in Yorktown, Virginia. On Yorktown's Main Street, houses of similar proportions and architectural detail to Kiskiack were constructed around the same time.(Figure 1) Other examples of early Virginia houses also are nearby and traditions, much like those about Kiskiack, surround their histories. These are Pinewoods, in James City County, the Lynnhaven House and the Adam Thoroughgood House, both in Princess Anne County. Dendrochronology dated the construction of the Lynnhaven House to 1724. Along with the Lynnhaven House, dendrochronology provided a date for the alternations (1720s), such as the addition of dormer windows, in the Adam Thoroughgood House. Circumstantial evidence from these dwellings infers an eighteenth-century construction date for Kiskiack as well.

Although no longer extant, the house constructed for Charles Cox in Yorktown, Virginia, was made of brick laid in Flemish bond. Cox's dwelling, like Kiskiack, had two dormer windows installed in its gable roof, two (exterior) end chimneys, and fenestration in its gable ends. Windows, that were each nine-over-nine double hung sash, flanked the chimneys on the first floor while six-over-six double hung sash lit the upper floor. Cox sold the structure to Thomas Nelson in 1729. The house later was converted into a store and had three doors cut into its front facade. By 1900 it had fallen into disrepair. (Figure 2)

Next to the Cox house site is the Pate house called the Blow house or Diggs house by some. The formal characteristics of the Pate House share much with Kiskiack. The Pate House also is made of brick laid in Flemish bond with glazed headers that provide a kind of structural decoration. It is one and half stories, over a cellar. Inside there were six rooms originally. Three dormers punctuate its gable roof, which is covered by cedar shingles. Unlike Kiskiack, the additions to the Pate House survive. There is a wing extending from the rear of the house; it too is made of brick.<sup>7</sup> (Figure 3)

---

of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, or Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, p. 3-4. Maddocks' source was an un-published article by Paul Smith who worked on the Naval Weapons Station; Smith also said that the Navy moved the grave markers between 1925 and 1950.

<sup>6</sup>Personal Communication, Camille Wells, November 1997.

<sup>7</sup>Traditionally the date for the erection of the Pate House is about 1701, but questions about the accuracy of such an early date should be answered by the completion of the current study of the house. Personal Communication, Jane Sundberg, July 1998.

Across the street from the Cox and Pate houses is the Nelson House, built around 1730.<sup>8</sup> The Nelson House is of greater scale than Kiskiack, however, it has walls of Flemish bond and has a roof covered by cedar shingles. The Nelson House is a two and half story structure with a full basement and an attic. It has a gable roof with pedimented gable ends. Accenting the brickwork are stone quoins, window sills, keystones, and doorways. Medallions ornament the cornice, that also has fleur-de-lis at the corners. Inside, the Nelson House is two rooms deep. In plan, it has two rooms to either side of the central passage from which the stair rises. The second floor plan mimics that of the first, and so, the Nelson House commonly is cited as an example of Georgian-style architecture. Although its scale is grander than that seen at Kiskiack and the Pate House, the Nelson House attests to the skill of brick-masons and master builders working in York County around the time Kiskiack was built.<sup>9</sup>

As at Kiskiack a fire took all but the brick sections of Pinewoods, also known as the Warburton House, making a definitive date elusive. The Warburton family owns Pinewoods today and tradition maintains that the house was built by someone in that family. The earliest record of Warburton land holdings in the area is that of Thomas Warburton who patented 200 acres in James City County in February 1664. Also suggested is a seventeenth-century construction date, similar to the story told about Kiskiack's origin.

Pinewoods is a one and half story dwelling made of brick laid in Flemish bond above a beveled watertable; the headers are glazed. Below the watertable, the bricks are assembled in an English bond pattern. Other decorative features, that display the craftsmanship and the cost expended for the brickwork, are the segmental arches above each opening. The arches consist of alternating glazed and rubbed bricks. The interior end chimneys also exemplify this quality; they are T-shaped stacks ornamented with glazed headers at the principle corners and a hound's tooth course at the base of each cap. The chimneys step back from the end walls to create a beveled ridge line.

A pre-fire photograph, before 1917, shows three dormers above the three first floor openings, which suggests the plan followed a central passage layout. Because of the detail and expense represented by the segmental arches, Pinewoods probably was a central plan house initially. Changes to the plan, however, are implied by the bricked in windows in the gable ends -- just as Kiskiack's were on the south side. Numerous additions were added to the house; all but the chimney stacks have been painted grey and porches obscure the facade arrangement. (Figure 4)<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>The trees used to make parts of the Nelson house were felled in 1729, and so the dendrochronology report indicates a 1729-30 construction date for the house. Personal Communication, National Historical Colonial Park, Yorktown, Virginia, February 1998.

<sup>9</sup>Personal Communication, Jane Sundberg, July 1998.

<sup>10</sup>Nomination form, "Pinewoods," National Register for Historic Places, National Park Service, 1971. Early photographs, including one before the 1917 fire, are on file in the Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Tradition held that the Lynnhaven House survived the seventeenth century, dating from about 1680. Physical evidence supported this supposition for it has a steep gable roof, massive exterior end chimneys, and exposed chimney joists. The Lynnhaven House also followed the hall and chamber plan. During restoration a leaded glass quarrel was discovered, which suggested that the windows were casement rather than the double hung sash popular in the eighteenth century. Archaeological evidence from around the house placed its construction to around 1725, a turned piece of lead for one of the casement windows dated to 1730, and tree ring analysis pinpointed the house's erection to the year 1724. Despite aesthetics reminiscent of seventeenth-century architectural choices, the Lynnhaven House joins Kiskiack as an eighteenth-century structure.<sup>11</sup>(Figure 5)

Like Kiskiack, the Adam Thoroughgood House in Princess Anne County, Virginia, is a brick structure capped by a steep gabled roof, heated by two end chimneys, and lit through small gable windows. It is of similar proportions to Kiskiack, measuring about 45 by 22 feet, and shares the embellishment of glazed headers along the eaves line. Important differences between the buildings are the presence of leaded glass casement windows in, and the obvious alterations to, the Thoroughgood house. Three of its walls are of English bond, the fourth in Flemish bond, which infers that it was built in stages.<sup>12</sup> Also, on the south wall is an exterior end chimney, about 11'0" wide at the base, but its northern counterpart is an interior end chimney. Inside, a kitchen was in the south room and a hall on the north side. Later a 10'0" wide passage was added, changing the two room plan to a central passage layout fashionable in the eighteenth century. With the addition of a passage, the room use probably shifted from hall-kitchen to hall-chamber. At this time, dormer windows were installed in the second floor and paneling put in place to cover the interior walls. Dendrochronology dated the modifications to the 1720s, however, the tree ring dating process could not be used for the older sections of the house. This is because the earlier parts of the house are made of pine; data to compare the tree rings from those wood (pine) members does not extend back far enough in time. The datable changes were made from white oak. The accepted date for the initial portions of the Thoroughgood house is about 1680. <sup>13</sup>(Figure 6)

---

<sup>11</sup>Nancy Elizabeth Packer, White Gloves and Red Bricks APVA 1889-1989 (Richmond, VA: Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, 1989), p. 46-47; see also, Property files, Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, Richmond, Virginia.

<sup>12</sup>Later, houses and furniture were constructed with more elaborate fronts, putting their best faces forward so to speak, and less expensive materials and craftsmanship made up the sides and rear of those objects. Flemish bond was used in the front facade, while American five course or seven course bond was laid for the sides and back - the walls not seen by all passing by. Likewise, the legs of chests, desks, chairs, and so on, were more elaborately turned and rested on fancier feet than the back legs, or ones obscured from view. Also, secondary woods were carved for backs, insides of drawers, and corner blocks of feet on furniture, such as a chest of drawers. At a glance, only the status-bearing mahogany was seen or veneered panels, but inside and behind were made of less auspicious hardwoods.

<sup>13</sup>Personal Communication, Patrick Brennen, 1998; James Dillon, Nomination form, "Adam Thoroughgood House," National Register for Historic Places, National Park Service, 1975; see also, the drawing in Thomas Tileston Waterman and John A. Barrows, Domestic Colonial Architecture in Tidewater Virginia (New York, NY: Charles Scribners Sons, 1932), p. 7.

2. Architect, builder, contractor, suppliers: Although the architect, builder, contractor, and suppliers for the erection of Kiskiack remain unknown, this anonymity is not unusual for private building projects in the colonial period. Often the builder, contractor, and supplier were one and the same: the patron for whom the house was built. "Architect" as a particular professional occupation did not exist in the colonial period as we understand the term in the twentieth century. Consider, for instance, that Benjamin Henry Latrobe is reputed to be one of the first American architects -- even if he was not born in the United States -- and he did not appear on the scene until the end of the eighteenth century.<sup>14</sup> Of the trades outlined in the 1662 act for re-building Jamestown, moreover, architects were not included. The 1662 law required each county to build a house in Jamestown and so the act authorized the counties to impress bricklayers, laborers, carpenters, sawyers, and other tradesmen to get the job done. No mention of an architect or designer was made.<sup>15</sup>

Most likely, the "architect" of Kiskiack was a local craftsman who was guided by his experience and by that of his patron. Hugh Jones, writing in 1724, observed that colonial Virginians taught their slaves (or had them instructed) to be craftsmen, such as sawyers, coopers, bricklayers, smiths, carpenters, and so forth. Slaves owners benefitted from skilled labor and also leased those artisans to their neighbors for specific projects for a fee. Jones commented that "Virginia planters readily learn to become good 'mechaniks' in building, wherein most are capable of directing their servants and slaves." Thus, the craftsmen who made Kiskiack probably worked for the Hansford family, or for their neighbors, and built the kind of house that the Hansfords decided upon according to their knowledge of fashion and to their financial capabilities.<sup>16</sup>

Architectural treatises and pattern books guided the colonial builder and patron. The first American handbook published was Asher Benjamin's Country Builder's Assistant in 1797 -- too late to assist those constructing Kiskiack. Nonetheless, books from England were available to those who

---

<sup>14</sup>Some say Peter Harrison is America's first professional architect, however, his primary occupation was as a merchant and sea captain. Other architects of the mid-century were the gentleman-architects, who like Harrison relied on pattern books for designs, and the craftsmen such as William Buckland, who was trained as a carpenter and cabinet-maker initially. The architect and engineer -- as an occupation in and of itself -- did not arrive until the late of the eighteenth century. Thus, Charles Bulfinch of Boston could be described as America's first architect. See William H. Pierson, Jr., "Gibbs and Palladio in the Colonial World," chap. in The Colonial and Neoclassical Styles, vol. 1 in American Buildings and their Architects series (New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 111-156, 240-284.

<sup>15</sup>See The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, vol. 2, 1660-82, edited by William Waller Hening (New York, NY: R & W & G Bartow for the editor, 1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 172-175.

In 1701-02, Francis Louis Michel observed that "the best trades are carpenters, joiners, coopers, shipbuilders, masons, smiths, locksmiths, tailors, and glassblowers. Skilled workers were much esteemed and well paid" in Virginia. "Report of the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," translated and edited by Wm. J. Hinke, Ph.D., Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 24, no. 2 (July 1916) : 287.

<sup>16</sup>Hugh Jones, The Present State of Virginia, edited by Richard L. Morton (London: printed for J. Clarke, 1724; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Virginia Historical Society, 1956), p. 76; Pierson, p. 12-16; Personal Communication, Camille Wells, 1997; and Alan Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves the Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800 (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986), p. 396-408.

could afford them. An English translation of Palladio's Quattro Libre, as well as Colen Campbell's Vitruvius Britannicus, appeared in 1714. Those treatises were followed by James Gibbs' A Book of Architecture in 1728.<sup>17</sup> Pattern books, such as Benjamin's, assumed their audience had a knowledge of carpentry and basic design technology. Benjamin described himself as both an architect and a builder, blurring the twentieth-century distinction between who designed and who erected a structure. His book, then, was "a carpenter's bible" and resembled the rules recorded by the Philadelphia Carpenters Company in 1786 more so than a portfolio of original design projects. The pattern books were just that: examples or models of fashionable forms for a craftsman to imitate. Not until the nineteenth century were the plates annotated with advice from the authors on how to build a particular way specifically.<sup>18</sup>

Teaching the art of architecture, before the diffusion of locally produced pattern books, in a largely illiterate world was done through the apprentice system. Children were bound to master craftsmen to learn a trade, a custom that sustained the industry and provided boys with a skill that they could then use to support themselves. Charles Hansford, for instance, was bound to Peter Gibson a gunsmith to learn the trade. Gibson left his trade for that of an ordinary keeper and so Hansford petitioned the court for release from his apprenticeship. Gibson forfeited the labor of his apprentice because he did not fulfill his obligation to him.<sup>19</sup> Another apprentice, Lewis Hansford, was bound to Samuel Gordon, a merchant in 1740.<sup>20</sup>

In colonial Virginia, the raw materials used for building were the trees namely white oak, black walnut, sweet gum, ash, poplar, birch, and yellow pine. Bricks and glass were made in Virginia, beginning in Jamestown, but hardware, such as nails, came from abroad. Foundries in Virginia started after Alexander Spotswood's tour as Governor.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the supplies needed for building Kiskiack

---

<sup>17</sup>Pierson, p. 113-115. See also, Dell Upton, Architecture in the United States Oxford History of Art (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

<sup>18</sup>Dell Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860," Winterthur Portfolio 19 (Summer/Autumn 1984) : 109-115.

<sup>19</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, 1702-1706, p. 387.

In the eighteenth century, apprenticeship was a way of raising children. It was both an education and moral development, a mode of social control for potentially disruptive adolescents, and provided role models. As did the plantation patriarch, the master had a moral obligation or commitment to his apprentices. They were the master's children and responsibility. See W.J. Rorabaugh, The Craft Apprentice from Franklin to the Machine Age in America (New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

Thomas Hansford also was bound to Peter Gibson in 1704. See York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, 1702-1706, p. 232.

<sup>20</sup>"York County Records: Some Wills and other Records," Tyler's Quarterly 2, no. 3 (January 1921) : 205.

<sup>21</sup>Spotswood is responsible for the construction of the Governor's Palace, completed around 1721. After he was relieved of his post in Williamsburg, Spotswood stayed in Virginia and led explorations to the western part of the colony.

Actually the first iron forge was at Henrico around 1620 but it was wiped out in the 1622 uprising. See also, Marcus B. Whiffen, The Eighteenth-Century Houses of Williamsburg (Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Inc., 1960), p. 1-43, passim.

were obtained from local sources. Perhaps a merchant's account books noted the Hansfords' transactions, but no records have surfaced at this writing.

3. Chain of Title:

Date	Kind	Grantor	Grantee	Where Rec'd. When Rec'd. <sup>22</sup>
08-7-1918	Release	William Warren Harrison and Margaret B. Lee	United States Government	Bk 39A, p.90-91 <sup>23</sup> 04-18-1924
03-19-1886	Will	William W. Lee Richmond County, NY	Henry H[arwood] Lee William Warren Harrison Lee	Bk 17, p. 403 07-18-1919
11-24-1866 <sup>24</sup>	Deed	John H. and Sarah M. Lee James City County	William W. Lee York County	Bk 17, p. 171 8-17-1868
10-23-1866 <sup>25</sup>	Deed	Robert H. Armistead, Commissioner	John H. Lee	Bk 17, p. 425 1-22-1871
10-10-1859	Deed of Trust	James B. Croswell	Robert H. Armistead Commissioner	Bk 16, p. 371-372 04-16-1860
10-10-1859	Deed	John H. and Sarah M. Lee York County	James B. Croswell Gloucester County	Bk 16, p. 370-371 04-16-1860

---

<sup>22</sup>York County Records begin in 1633 and are grouped together as "Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc.," by date; in time, "Deeds and Bonds" are separated from the other court records as were the "Wills and Inventories" later until finally there were simply "Deed" books. For this chart, the abbreviations are as follows: Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc. become "DOW"; Deeds and Bonds become "D&B"; "Wills and Inventories" become "W&I"; "Judgements and Orders" become "J&O"; Orders become "O"; and the Deed Books are noted as "Bk."

<sup>23</sup>In the Deed of Release, the parcel of land confiscated by the United States Government is identified by an "Official Atlas" drawn in 1919 and presently held by the Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. The key to the property line survey (otherwise known as the "Official Atlas") is in the field notes. William Warren Harrison Lee and Margaret B., his wife, held property parcel number eighty-seven, located in the Nelson District of York County, Virginia, called "Kiskiack Farm." The farm was 265.33 acres in all. The 265.33 acres of parcel eighty-seven consisted of the tract inherited from William Warren Lee, the uncle of the last individual owner; a tract purchased from Joseph S. Deneufville and Carrie B., his wife; and a tract assigned by Henry Wilkinson. The government determined \$17,500.00 to be "just compensation" for parcel eighty-seven. See York County Records, Deed Book 39A, p. 90-91, 3 February 1921; Deed Book 31, p. 24, 16 January 1911; and Deed Book 37, p. 236, 22 July 1920.

<sup>24</sup>There is an error in the transcription of the deed book, the first date reference is 1867 and others are 1866. The 1866 date most likely is correct as the interview with Sarah M. Lee is dated 14 March 1867 by James City County Justice of the Peace Wm B. Wynne; the deed was recorded in York County Clerk's Office on 17 August 1868 by Samuel Van Bosterod, Clerk.

<sup>25</sup>The first date reference, that I discovered, is from the November 1866 transaction, and is to a previous deed made on the 22 October 1866. Yet the first date reference in this document is for 23 October 1866, but the certification of the deed in the presence of a Justice of the Peace refers to the original date as 22 October.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 9)

05-15-1854	Deed of Release	Bolivar Shield, Jr. Trustee	John H. Lee	D&B, 15, p. 423 05-15-1854
08-19-1850	Deed of Trust	John H. Lee	Bolivar Shield, Jr. Trustee	D&B, 15, p. 120- 121 08-19-1850
01-01-1850	Deed	James Wilson and Uphama, his wife York County	John H. Lee	D&B, 15, p. 119- 120 08-19-1850
04-16-1846	Deed	Robert Mc Candlish Trustee for B&E Hansford	James Wilson	D&B, 14, p. 212- 213 04-28-1846
02-05-1841	Deed of Trust	Benjamin Hansford & Elizabeth S., his wife	Robert Mc Candlish Trustee	D&B, 13, p. 94-96
04-10-1834	Deed of Trust	Benjamin Hansford, Jr. Warwick County	Robert Mc Candlish Trustee	D&B, 11, p. 461 04-21-1834
08-09-1815	Deed	Benjamin Hansford, Senr James City	Benjamin Hansford, Jr. York County	D&B, 8, p. 321- 322 09-18-1815
03-21-1787	Deed	Elizabeth Hansford, Ret &Exx to Charles Hansford York County	Richard & Benjamin Hansford, her sons	D&B, 6, p. 343 04-16-1787
04-13-1778	Codicil	Charles Hansford [Jr.]	Richard & his heirs if Benjamin marries Mary Hyde	W&I, 22, p. 412 12-21-1778
06-03-1777	Will	Charles Hansford [Jr.]	Elizabeth Hansford, as long as she remains a widow then to Richard & Benjamin, his sons	W&I, 22, p. 411- 412 12-21-1778
08-04-1758	Will	Charles Hansford, Senr York County	Charles Hansford, Jr. York County	W&I, 21, p. 60- 62 06-15-1761
11-01-1757	Deed	Charles Hansford, Senr York County	Charles Hansford, Jr. York County	D&B, 6, p. 100- 103 11-21-1757
07-25-1727	Deed	William Hansford Spotsylvania County	Charles Hansford [Sr.] York County	D&B, 3, p. 471- 475 08-21-1727
1710	Order To divide the land	William, Charles, & John Hansford	William & Charles Hansford	DOW, 13, p. 272 02-11-1710

07-24-1702	Will	[Capt.] Charles Hansford	William Hansford Charles Hansford John Hansford	DOW, 12, p.10 08-1702
09-19-1700	Deed of Release	William Hansford & his heirs Gloster County	Charles Hansford <sup>26</sup> & his heirs York County	D&B, 1, p. 257- 258 09-24-1700
04-26-1698	Order To divide the estate	John Hansford	Charles Hansford & heirs of Thomas Hansford	DOW, 11, p. 92 08-24-1698
02-08-1679	Will	Elizabeth Hansford, Widow of Thomas Hansford	Thomas Hansford & Mary Hansford	DOW, 6, p. 39 1679
1665-1672	Order To divide the estate	John Hansford, decd.	Charles & Thomas Hansford	DOW, 4, p. 112
05-09-1654	Will	John Hansford York County	Charles & Thomas Hansford His sons	DOW, 3, p. 121 08-24-1661
05-18&19-1658	Survey To settle dispute between Hurd and Hansford	Mr. Weston's daughter	John Hansford	DOW, 3, p. 27, 30 05-19-1658
n.d.	Purchase	Mr. Weston's daughter	John Hansford	n.d.
12-13-1658	Land Patent	Crown	John Hansford	Patent Bk 4, p. 244 Bounded on south by that of Thoms Weston; adjacent to land of Capt Harwood, decd., now Capt Hurd's
12-22-1651	Land Patent	Crown	Richard Hansford	Patent Bk 2, p. 340 In Chickyack, bounded on south by that of Thomas Weston, for transport of John & Elizabeth Hansford
02-09-1637	Land Patent	Crown	Thomas Weston, Mariner Charles River County	Patent Bk 1, p. 517
07-02-1635	Land Patent	Crown	Samuell Weaver, rec'd. in name of Thomas Weston	Patent Bk 1, p. 198

For transcriptions of these real estate transactions in York County, please see the Supplemental Materials section.

Original and Subsequent Owners, Occupants, Uses

For most of its life, the structure called "Kiskiack" served the purpose for which it was built: it was a dwelling. Under the present owner's tenure Kiskiack has been empty. Initially the United States

---

<sup>26</sup>By 1700, Charles Hansford was known as "Captain" and this Captain Charles Hansford was William Hansford's uncle. William Hansford was the son of William Hansford, the brother to John, Thomas, and Charles, the three other male heirs of John Hansford's estate provided for in his will of 1654 (recorded 1661). The Deed of Release (1700) describes the family relationship between the parties involved in the land transfer (uncle, son of). See York County Records, Deeds & Bonds, Book 1, p. 257-258.

Navy planned to keep its residential use by restoring and adding onto the house. Yet, since 1919, no one officially has lived in it. The descendants of Henry Lee are permitted to visit Kiskiack and on occasion hold family picnics there.<sup>27</sup>

Under the auspices of a Presidential Proclamation made in 1918 and spurred by the experience of the Great War of 1914-18, the United States government confiscated property along the York River in Virginia for defensive purposes.(Figure 7) Included in the appropriated land was the parcel containing the house, "Kiskiack." The boundaries of the Kiskiack land, a tract swollen to 265.33 acres by the last private owner William Warren Harrison Lee's purchases in 1911 and another verified in 1920, were a road to Felgates Creek and the Mill Pond, as well as the property lines of the E. Wolf estate, Florence S. McCandlish, G.W. Ridpley, Armistead Taylor, Thomas Lackey, C.H. and J.A. Shield, Margaret Ashlock, John Taliaferro estate, Mary Taliaferro estate, and Ivordeen Bryan.<sup>28</sup>

William Warren Harrison Lee inherited the Kiskiack house tract from his uncle, William Warren Lee, in 1900. William Warren Lee bought the property for \$950.00 from John H. and Sarah M. Lee who lived in Williamsburg, Virginia; Lee's purchase included 144 acres bounded north by the land of Felix Bennett, east by Felgates Creek, south by the land of the late Willis Wooten, and west by the land of James Kirby.<sup>29</sup> In his will Lee bequeathed the land to his half brother, Henry Harwood, with the provision if Henry pre-deceased him, title to the Kiskiack tract would fall to Henry Harwood Lee's son, William Warren Harrison Lee. William Warren Lee described the parcel of land as the "farm in Nelson township where Henry H. Lee now resides containing about 200 acres."<sup>30</sup>

Deed records in York County, Virginia, document the purchase of the Kiskiack tract in 1866 by William W. Lee from John H. and Sarah M. Lee of James City County, Virginia. The Lees bought 140 acres for \$548.00 from James Wilson and his wife. The transaction occurred in 1850, at which time the Lees mortgaged the property as security for a debt of \$448.00. The debt was paid in full by 1854 because the trustee released the deed. In the 1854 title, the property was described as the "brick house tract late the property of Benjamin Hansford."<sup>31</sup> In 1859 the Lees sold it to James B. Crosswell

---

<sup>27</sup>Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>28</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Book 31, p. 24; York County Records, Deeds, Book 37, p. 236; York County Records, Deed Book, 39A, p. 90-91; William Warren Harrison Lee to the United States Navy, Correspondence, 1921, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; and "Official Atlas of the Naval Mine Depot," Map, 1919, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>29</sup>According to the genealogical chart of the Henry Lee descendants, probably made by one of William Warren Harrison Lee's children, a John Henry Lee was born in 1819 and married a woman named Sarah. This John Henry Lee was one of three sons of Whitaker Lee, who was a son of Robert H. Lee, great-uncle to William W. Lee. William W. Lee's grandfather was Francis Lee, and Francis' brothers included Robert H., William Whitaker, Haynes, and Higginson Wade. The later was the father of Elizabeth Wynne, who married William Lee, and had William W. Lee. When widowed, Elizabeth Wynne Lee married another cousin, John R. Lee, and bore him a son, Henry Harwood.

<sup>30</sup>York County Records, Deed Book 17, p. 403.

<sup>31</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 15, 1849-1854, p. 423.

for \$1450.00, but retained the title in a deed of trust held by Commissioner Robert H. Armistead. The Lees and Crosswell went to Chancery Court in 1866 and Armistead returned the property to John H. and Sarah M. Lee. Crosswell must have defaulted on the loan payments, specified in the deed, because of the depressed economy caused by the Civil War.<sup>32</sup>

During their tenure on the Kiskiack parcel, the Lee family members were essentially absentee owners. Near the house, and presumably on the Lee family property, Vines Foster and his children lived. Their dwelling is noted as "Vines House" on the ca. 1900 site plan of the property. (Figure 8) It is possible these tenants are the people standing by the north end of the house in the photograph of Lyon Gardiner Tyler, who posed on the front porch of Kiskiack. Tradition holds that the image of Tyler, taken by Huestis Cook, dates to the 1880s; moreover, a family photograph taken in about 1901, described Vines Foster "as a former slave on the plantation and his twenty-one children." It seems, then, that the Lees moved to Richmond but left a black family behind as tenants on the York County property. Perhaps this is why no Henry Harwood Lee or William W. Lee appears in the census records for 1870, but counted as living in Nelson Township were Vines Foster and his wife, Sicily, and their two children. Foster was twenty-seven years old; his occupation was as a farmer.<sup>33</sup>

By 1880, Henry Harwood Lee returned to York County. Lee was fifty-eight years old; his wife, Vestilla, forty-nine. Living with them were several of the children, specifically Dan aged twenty-two, Elizabeth aged nineteen, Vestilla aged fourteen, and William, a black servant, aged ten. Henry Harwood Lee farmed, his wife kept house, and their son, Dan also was a farmer. Only the youngest child at home, Vestilla, attended school within that year.<sup>34</sup>

#### Colonial Owners & Occupants

According to a land survey, taken on the 18th and 19th of May 1658, Mr. John Hansford owned 650 acres on the west side of West's Creek.<sup>35</sup> Hansford's property began at the Creek and ran into the woods by marked trees. The trees divided the lands of Hansford and that of Mr. Jones, formerly belonging to Serjeant Waynes northwest and by west 322 poles and a half south and by east 322 ½ poles southeast and by east 322 poles and ½ north and by west 182 poles to the head of the

---

<sup>32</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 15, 1849-1854, p. 119-121; York County Records, Deeds, Book 16, 1854-1866, p. 370-372; York County Records, Deeds, Book 17, p. 425; and York County Records, Deeds, Book 17, p. 171.

<sup>33</sup>The picture of Lyon Gardiner Tyler on the front porch of Kiskiack belongs to the Cook Collection of the Valentine Museum in Richmond, Virginia; it was published in Lawrence A. Kocher and Howard Dearstyne, Shadows in Silver a Record of Virginia 1850-1900 in Contemporary Photographs taken by George and Huestis Cook with additions from the Cook Collection (New York, NY: Charles Scribners Sons, 1954). The photograph and site plan of the property were copied by Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia, from a Lee family album. Duplicates for this report were made by the author from the negatives held by the Park Service.

<sup>34</sup>Population Schedules, Census Records, micro. 1682, 1880, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

<sup>35</sup>In the seventeenth century, Felgates Creek was known as West's Creek.

creek and down the creek northerly 140 poles and a half to the place first specified. In the land survey, the boundaries of the Hansford's property were specified in the a patent (1635) granted to Samuel Weaver for the use of Mr. Weston. Hansford bought it from Weston's daughter.<sup>36</sup>

John Hansford bequeathed a parcel of land in the Chiskiack area of York County to his younger sons, Charles and Thomas. That property consisted of 500 odd acres, more or less, lying at the head of Felgates Creek and was the same tract which Hansford purchased from Mr. Weston's daughter. It was to be equally divided.<sup>37</sup> John Hansford wrote his will in 1654; in that document, Hansford also left Thomas the seventy acres where his dwelling house stood, with the provision that his wife Elizabeth had life rights to it. Thomas would receive title only after his mother died. John Hansford's will, however, did not specify that the property would pass to Charles and Thomas and their heirs forever. Without the legalese providing for his sons's inheritance in perpetuity, the brothers went to court when Thomas came of age between 1665-72.<sup>38</sup>

Again in 1698, the docket of York County courts included Charles and Thomas Hansford's portions of their father's estate. When Thomas Hansford died, his will gave two of his children, Thomas and Mary, to his brother Charles who served as their guardian. In the 1698 settlement the land is divided between Charles and Thomas, with Thomas' portion parceled between his son Thomas and daughter Mary, who in turn had married William Hewitt. Two years later, William Hansford, son of William and grandson of John Hansford, relinquished any claims he had to the 500 odd acres of land lying at the head of Felgates Creek that his grandfather had bought from Mr. Weston's daughter. Charles Hansford received the parts north of York Road and Thomas Hansford's children received parcels south of the road and some land spilling over into Warwick County. Charles Hansford bequeathed his part of land to his three sons, John, Charles, and William in 1702.<sup>39</sup> Charles

---

<sup>36</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, 1657-1662, p. 27, 30; Patent Book, No. 1, part 1, p. 198, part 2, p. 517; No. 2, p. 340; and No.4, p. 244; and Nell Marion Nugent, Cavaliers and Pioneers Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants, 1623-1800 (Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press, 1934), p. 24, 80, 220, 383. John Hansford patented the land on 13 December 1658; John Hansford's patent included 850 acres, 650 of which came from Thomas Weston's patent in Charles River County 9 February 1637 and Samuel Weaver's patent on behalf of Weston on 2 July 1635; the remaining 200 acres came from an adjacent tract awarded to Richard Hansford for the transport of John and Elizabeth Hansford. Richard Hansford's patent is dated 22 December 1651.

<sup>37</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, 1657-1662, p. 121.

<sup>38</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 112.

<sup>39</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 1, 1694-1701, p. 257-258; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, 1702-1706, p. 10; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 11, 1698-1702, p. 92; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 39. The 1704 quit rent list included property for William Hewitt and Thomas Hansford in both Warwick and York Counties. See also the 1704 "tract map" drawn and owned by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. A reference-only copy is available in the field notes.

Thomas Hansford's portion of his father Thomas's inheritance consisted of 75 acres, or the remainder of the parcel given to William Hewitt in right of his wife, Mary, and a plantation also of 75 acres in York County. The plantation, known by a name Ch... , appears on the 1704 tract map. The 1704 quit rent list included 150 acres in York County and another 150 acres in Warwick County for William Hewitt. Thomas Hansford was assessed for 75 acres in York County and 75 acres in Warwick County. Hansford actually was assessed twice in Warwick County for the 75 acres as it noted he never before had

Hansford's son John received one parcel while Charles and William got the difference. Presumably Charles and William were under age as the 1704 tract map illustrates John's portion and that of an Elizabeth Hansford. The boys' father, Charles Hansford, married Elizabeth Follriott so the 100 acres ascribed to Elizabeth Hansford on the 1704 map probably refers to their mother, who would have had dower rights to the land.<sup>40</sup> Also out of Charles and William's percentage were smaller plots given by will for a limited time to the deceased Charles Hansford's sons-in-law, Samuel Hill and Henry Duke. In 1710, the three boys went to court to divide the land, however, the courts described only the boundaries of John's part and left Charles and William Hansford's dividend as understood to be the residual acreage.<sup>41</sup>

In 1727, William Hansford moved to Spotsylvania County and sold 100 acres to Charles Hansford. The deed described the parcel as the plantation lying in York County and in Yorkhampton parish on the head of Felgates Creek; William received land from his father, Charles, by will. The perimeter of the land granted to Charles Hansford by William Hansford ran from a marked hickory on the lower side of the swamp, then shifted west along the hill of swamp to the land of John Hansford, where it turned south along the property line until reaching a marked poplar. From that tree, the boundary line headed west until it got to York Road, which it then followed until coming to the land of William Stead. At the point, the line stretched eastward along Stead's line to a branch, then going west of the branch to the main creek and thence to the place it began. The deed included appurtenances, which referred to something in relation to something else on the property such as an orchard to a house or a right of way to the land. There is no mention of a brick house specifically.<sup>42</sup>

In 1757, Charles Hansford sold property to his son, Charles Hansford, Jr., a planter. For five shillings Charles Hansford, Jr., received the land lying at the head of Felgates Creek. The tract included 100 acres purchased from William Hansford of Spotsylvania County in 1727 and another 100 acres bought from Stephen and Elizabeth Fuller of New Kent County in 1737. The 200 acres were in

---

paid. Hansford mortgaged land in 1710 and by the 1713 rent roll was living in Warwick County only. Hansford's will written in 1719 leaves his property in Warwick and York counties to his son Thomas, with instructions to sell the Warwick acreage to settle debts of the estate. Thomas Hansford's will was probated in 1720.

<sup>40</sup>A widow's dower rights customarily were one-third of her husband's real property and a child's portion of his personal property. Generally dower rights included use of the land and dwelling that a woman had shared with the deceased. Sometimes husbands specified that their wives could remain in the house for the rest of their natural lives, or sometimes they revoked any rights of occupancy if their widows remarried. Some men also stipulated in their wills that their wives could keep their chambers nicely furnished; this clause protected the women from their son(s) who inherited the property outright. Marylynn Salmon, Women and the Law of Property in Early America (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986), p. 147, 149-153; Lois Green Carr, "Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake," in Women in the Age of the American Revolution, edited by Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, p. 155-158 (third printing, Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia for the United States Capitol Historical Society, 1992).

<sup>41</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, 1702-1706, p. 10; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 13, 1706-1710, p. 272; as well as the 1704 Tract Map, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

<sup>42</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 3, 1713-1729, p. 471-475.

York and Warwick Counties.<sup>43</sup> In his 1758 will, Charles Hansford bequeathed the same land to his son.<sup>44</sup>

Charles Hansford in turn willed the land in York and Warwick Counties to his sons, Richard and Benjamin, with the provision his wife -- their mother -- have lifetime rights to it. In a codicil to his will, Charles disinherited Benjamin if he continued his relationship with his cousin, Mary Hyde.<sup>45</sup> Charles' widow Elizabeth, however, gave the lands to her sons "for their natural love and affection" effectively bypassing her husband's threat of disinheritance. The property included 220 acres in York County at the time of Elizabeth Hansford's deed.<sup>46</sup> Benjamin Hansford sold his portion to his son, Benjamin, for \$1200.00 dollars in 1815.<sup>47</sup> By 1834, the younger Benjamin Hansford accumulated debts, mortgaged his land in Warwick county, and sold his interest in the Halfway House. By 1841, Hansford encumbered his York county property -- about 200 acres -- which he later sold to James Wilson for \$900.00. At the time of the sale (1846), a survey recorded the York County parcel as only 140 acres.<sup>48</sup>

4. Original plans and construction: In 1686, Durand de Dauphine, a Frenchman who toured Virginia, commented on colonial building practices. Durand said that

Whatever their estates, for what reason I do not know, they build their houses consisting only of two ground floor rooms, with some closets and one or two prophet's chambers above. According to his means, each planter provides as many of such houses as he needs. They build also a separate kitchen, a house for the Christian slaves, another for Negro slaves, and several tobacco barns, so that in arriving at the plantation of a person of importance you think you are entering a considerable village. They provide no stables at all for they never house their cattle. More than that, few of their house doors are ever locked for robbery is here unknown.<sup>49</sup>

The interior space of Kiskiack followed the two room, hall and chamber plan prevalent in early Virginia houses as mentioned by Durand. This kind of spatial organization also was found in New

---

<sup>43</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 6, 1755-1763, p. 100-103.

<sup>44</sup>York County Records, Wills and Inventories, Book 21, 1760-1771, p. 60-62.

<sup>45</sup>York County Records, Wills and Inventories, Book 22, 1771-1783, p. 411-412.

<sup>46</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 6, 1777-1791, p. 343.

<sup>47</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 8, 1809-1820, p. 321-322.

<sup>48</sup>York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 11, 1828-1834, p. 461-463; York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 13, 1840-1843, p. 94-96; York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 14, 1843-1849, p. 212-213.

<sup>49</sup>[Durand de Dauphine], A Frenchman in Virginia Being the Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee in 1686, translated by a Virginian (Richmond, VA: privately printed, 1923), p. 111-113.

England dwellings, except the ground floor room designations were a hall and parlor. In Virginia, the hall was a multi-purpose room where work, eating, and visiting occurred. Often the door to the outside world opened into this space, making it unavoidably a public room. A family's consumer goods were kept in this room displaying its status and wealth to all who entered. The other room, called the chamber, was a more private place and was where the family slept, however, sleeping was not the only activity going on there. The chamber usually did not have a door opening to the outside, so access was more indirect, but it too was a place family and non-family members gathered.<sup>50</sup> Kiskiack consisted of just the hall and chamber initially.

After Charles Hansford purchased the property in 1727 the house entirely of brick was built, possibly in one campaign. More likely Hansford bricked-in the front and back wood-frame walls, added a partition in the larger ground floor room (the hall) to create a passage, and had the dormer windows installed to light the second floor and make it a more comfortable place. The fenestration of the front and back walls suggest space inside Kiskiack was arranged (or adapted) according to a central passage plan. The windows are placed roughly equidistant from the door, and the doorways cut into the front and back facades are placed in the center of those walls and in correspondence to one another. The passage doors facilitated cross ventilation of the house as well as afforded the family a screening device, limiting who gained permission to enter the ground floor rooms. The stair to the upper floor was in the passage. William Hugh Grove, who traveled up the York River in 1732, described the central passage plan that Kiskiack had. Grove surmised that

The Manner of Building is much alike. They have a broad Stayrcase with a passage thro the house in the middle which is the Summer hall and Draws the air, and 2 rooms on Each hand. Some indeed have only one room on a Side and the Windows opposite each other. <sup>51</sup>

Heat for the dwelling came from the two fireboxes on the first floor. The T-shaped chimney stacks, accommodating three flues each, helped draw the smoke upward and out of the rooms. Whether the upstairs ever was heated is uncertain, although it is possible that the chimneys were open when the dormer windows were there making the space more comfortable for the family. With light

---

<sup>50</sup>Dell Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia," generally; Henry Chandlee Forman, Architecture in the Old South, p. 42. See also, Dell Upton, "The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture," in Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture (Annapolis, MD: Maryland Historical Trust, 1982), p. 44-46; Henry Glassie, Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: a Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1975); and Carl R. Lounsbury, editor, An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape (New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 69-71, 173-174.

<sup>51</sup>Mark R. Wenger, "The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space," in Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture II, edited by Camille Wells, p. 137-141 (Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1986); Henry Chandlee Forman, "The Typical Country House in Virginia," chap. in Architecture of the Old South, p. 44-47; "Virginia in 1732 the Travel Journal of William Hugh Grove," edited by Gregory A. Stiverson and Patrick H. Butler, III, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 85, no. 1 (January 1977) : 28; Whiffen, p. 46-51; and Robert Beverley, The History and Present State of Virginia, edited with an introduction by Louis B. Wright (London: printed for R. Parker, 1705; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1947), p. 289-290.

and heat, the upstairs of Kiskiack probably was used by family members as bedchambers, leaving the ground floor for hall and dining rooms. Because of the location of the modern kitchen addition, the north room would have been the hall and then used as a dining room. The southern room was the chamber initially and later became the hall or "parlor" space. In the twentieth century, the family reverted the south room back into a bedroom; they also closed the fireboxes.<sup>52</sup>

It is possible that a wood-frame dwelling preceded Kiskiack on the present house site.<sup>53</sup> The Matthew Jones House in Warwick County, Virginia, for instance, began as a wood-frame building around 1725. The gable ends were constructed of brick shortly thereafter. Its exterior end chimneys are indicative of early brickwork for the planes, texture, and patterns vary. In 1729-30, the structure completely was rebuilt of brick. The brick building followed the proportions of the previous frame house; it too had the hall and chamber, two room plan. Tradition holds that Matthew Jones built his brick house in 1727.<sup>54</sup> Changes to the appearance of the house, without dramatically altering its two room living space, are represented by the additions to the Matthew Jones House. These alterations happened within several years of the initial construction. It is possible that a similar progression occurred on the Kiskiack site, culminating in the dwelling seen today.(Figure 9)

Another scenario, suggested by its brickwork, is that Kiskiack was built in two phases, initially with brick end walls and chimneys only. The front and rear walls of the house, then, were wood. Evidence for this hypothesis is that the courses do not line up in relation to one another at the corners of the building and there is a difference in the size of bricks used. Any changes would have been early as the bricks in the front and back appear to be of a type similar to those in the gable ends.<sup>55</sup>

Representative of Kiskiack, as a structure constructed in two distinct building campaigns, is Want Water or the Lyles House in Prince George's County, Maryland. Want Water was a wood and brick dwelling that had brick gable ends. Of similar proportions to Kiskiack, Want Water is about 46 by 22 feet and is one and a half stories high. Inside, it was heated by two exterior end chimneys and followed the hall and chamber plan so prevalent in the Chesapeake. The end walls were of brick laid in Flemish bond; some of the headers were glazed and placed randomly throughout the walls. Also

---

<sup>52</sup>Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; Newbill and Beale, Inc., "Alternatives and Recommendations for Kiskiack," Report prepared for the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Norfolk, Virginia, August 1988, p. 71.

<sup>53</sup>Thomas and Muraca, *passim*.

<sup>54</sup>William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, "A Preservation Plan for the Matthew Jones House, Fort Eustis, Virginia," Technical Report Series, no. 3 (Williamsburg, VA: The College of William and Mary, 1991); "The Matthew Jones House: A Case Study of Historic Preservation," produced by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, (Norfolk, VA: 1994), 42 minutes, Videocassette; and Camille Wells, Review of "A Preservation Plan for the Matthew Jones House, Fort Eustis, Virginia," and of "The Matthew Jones House: A Case Study of Historic Preservation," in Vernacular Architecture Newsletter 70 (Winter 1996): 15-24.

<sup>55</sup>Personal Communication, Edward A. Chappell, Fall 1997. See also, "Alternatives and Recommendations," generally.

present was a beveled watertable. Want Water differs from the Kiskiack seen today because it had a gambrel roof and was four bays across, rather than the three found at Kiskiack. There were also three dormers, front and back, installed in Want Water. The most visible distinction between the two houses is that Want Water's east and west walls were wood frame throughout its life.<sup>56</sup> (Figure 10)

5. Alterations and additions: Archaeological testing uncovered a possible lean-to addition off Kiskiack's south facade. The existence of a structure on this side offers an explanation for the filling-in of the windows that flanked the chimney on this level. Unfortunately an relative date for the postholes, that is, all that remains of the addition, was not determined.<sup>57</sup> The absence of a watertable at the southwest corner supports this theory; perhaps it was damaged or removed when an addition was built.<sup>58</sup>

In the north facade, the northeast window on the ground floor was converted into a door. This doorway led into the wood-frame wing connected to the side of the house. This addition is shown in early photographs of the house, in archaeological test sites, and on the ca. 1900 topographical map. The latter described it as a "kitchen."<sup>59</sup> Architectural evidence supports the map-maker's description of the space as a kitchen because of the hole punched through the exterior wall of the chimney stack. This probably was made to accommodate a flue for a stove. The Navy demolished this wing in 1957.

The dormer windows represent another addition to the house. Likely, they were put in during the eighteenth century in an effort to make the house a more comfortable place to live. Tradition, however, holds that they are a nineteenth-century feature replaced in the post-fire restorations of the house.<sup>60</sup> Questions about the presence of dormer windows in the 1800s are raised by Dr. Francis Lee, son of the last private owner of the house, who stated there were no dormers in the house when he was

---

<sup>56</sup>"Lyles House (Want Water)," HABS/HAER Collection, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Want Water dates to about 1706.

<sup>57</sup>Thomas and Muraca, p. 36.

<sup>58</sup>Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>59</sup>In 1935, a HABS team drew Kiskiack. The HABS documentation followed that prepared by Addison F. Worthington, published in Twelve Old Houses West of the Chesapeake Bay (Boston, MA: Rogers and Manson Company, 1918), but the HABS delineaters annotated their drawings. HABS noted a door to the modern kitchen was in place of one window, its counterpart was blocked and the two opposite [on the south wall] were "bricked up openings." See "Kiskiack," HABS/HAER Collection, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., sheet 1 of 4.

Also, a descendent of William Warren Harrison Lee said that the first floor room on the south side of the hallway was a bedroom, the north side one a sitting room with a wood-burning stove in the fireplace, and a kitchen through the door in the northeast side of the north wall. See "Alternatives and Recommendations," p. 71; and Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>60</sup>Nomination Form, "Kiskiack," National Register of Historic Places, 1969, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.; See also, Nathaniel Lloyd, Building Craftsmanship (Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1929), p. 25-34, regarding dormer windows.

a child, that is, before the 1915 fire.<sup>61</sup> Yet the Cook photograph, with its accepted date of the 1880s, captured Lyon Gardiner Tyler on the porch of the house with dormers. Regardless of their age, routine inspections cited the dormers as a source of roof leaks and so they were taken out in the interest of preventative maintenance in the mid to late 1980s.

Another confusing detail is the alterations made after the 1915 fire which took the interior of the house and left a brick shell. One account, by a naval officer, said that Kiskiack was "rebuilt with the old walls on the original foundation, the original type of architecture being carried through in detail." Interpretations of this account implied the "old pink bricks" were used to rebuild the house on its foundations.<sup>62</sup> Some repairs were made, as evidenced in the archaeological test unit in the southeast corner and the mismatched, molded bricks marking the watertable.

After the government took over the property in 1918-19, the roof was repaired, a back porch added, and a bathroom installed in the second floor.(Figure 11) These changes were done in 1927 in preparation for occupancy, however, the house remained vacant because of its location in the restricted zone. In 1937, the Navy replaced the wood porch with a brick vestibule, lit by four windows, and rebuilt the wood-frame wing on the north side.(Figure 12) These renovations were short-lived. In 1953, the Navy proposed demolishing the wing along with the rear porch and bathroom.<sup>63</sup>

In 1965, the Navy did some basic maintenance work on Kiskiack that altered its appearance slightly. Addressing the parts of the roof needing repair, the Navy put cedar shingles in places requiring cover but did so without matching them to what was there. The four gable windows were closed in hopes to eliminate water penetration. Also at this time the Navy cleaned and tuckered mortar joints in approximately 400 square feet of the masonry walls as well as chipping out the deteriorated brick faces and dummied in red mortar to match. When complete, two coats of clear silicone masonry sealer were applied on the outside as a water repellent.<sup>64</sup>

During the mid 1980s Kiskiack again received attention from naval officials. Because of recommendations solicited by the Navy from Colonial Williamsburg, the modern additions to Kiskiack were demolished although this had been discussed within the Navy as early as 1953. The Colonial

---

<sup>61</sup>Maddocks, p. 4.

<sup>62</sup>Commander A.H. Miles, "Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia, " Paper, 1926, site file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, p. 16.

<sup>63</sup>Elbert Cox, Lieutenant, USNR, Memorandum for file regarding Lee House Conference, 4 January 1945, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; Cox's memo was followed up in 1965, Ben B. Pickett, Commanding Officer, to Mr. C.H. Humelsine, Colonial Williamsburg, Letter, 6 January 1965, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

At some point before the Navy took over the property, there was a screen porch off the back of the house. See "Alternatives and Recommendations," p. 71.

<sup>64</sup>R.H. Smethells, Public Works Officer to Commanding Officer, Memorandum regarding Preservation of Lee House, 29 March 1965, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

Williamsburg consultants advised the Navy to get rid of the twentieth-century accretions, such as the front and back porches and second floor bathroom, it was responsible for creating. At this time, wood steps were made to replace the porch and to give convenient access to the front door. The Colonial Williamsburg officials also emphasized that the Navy protect Kiskiack's chimneys. It was suggested that the Navy have copper covers made for each T-shaped chimney and its three flues. When installed, the covers would keep water out of the chimneys and so too the house. Conscious of costs, however, the Navy stabilized the structure by fixing the roof leaks but postponed closing the chimney flues. The Navy reversed an earlier preservation attempt when they uncovered the windows and doors by removing the boards.<sup>65</sup> The lights were replaced as needed. The woodwork was painted. The Navy got rounded bricks from the National Park Service to reset and repair Kiskiack's chimney caps.<sup>66</sup>

B. York County Time-line:<sup>67</sup>

by BC 600	Indians have semi-permanent villages, produce crops and pottery in Tidewater
1400s	Indians speaking dialects of the Algonquian language establish permanent villages and farming areas between the James and Potomac Rivers of Tidewater
1560s	Intermittent contact between Spanish explorers and the Indians
1570s	Spanish Jesuit Mission established and destroyed near Chiskiack; Spanish retaliate from their outpost in Florida
1606	Virginia Company established, seeking piety and profit from the New World
1607	Jamestown settled, sustained by Indians and immigration; Captain John Smith explores the Pamunkey River whereon he identified the Chiskiack Indian village
1611	Plantations, or hundreds, established in Virginia
1611	Sir Thomas Dale, deputy Governor, recommended having a fortified place at Chiskiack <sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup>Kiskiack with its boarded-up windows is shown in Emmie Ferguson Farrar's Old Virginia Houses Along the James (New York, NY: Hastings House, 1955), p. 205.

<sup>66</sup>"Safety Hazard, Repairs to be Made to Stabilize Building," Prop. No C-14, Inspection Report, 1985, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, p. 2.

<sup>67</sup>The Hornbook of Virginia History, edited by Emily J. Salmon and Edward D.C. Campbell, Jr., 4<sup>th</sup> edition (Richmond, VA: The Library of Virginia, 1994), p. 3-14; The Statutes at Large being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature in 1619, edited by William Waller Hening, 13 vol., (Richmond, VA., New York, NY., and Philadelphia, PA., 1819-1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1969); Ivor Noel Hume, The Virginia Adventure Roanoke to Jamestown an Archaeological and Historical Odyssey (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1994, esp. p. 377-394; Edward M. Riley, "Suburban Development of Yorktown, Virginia, during the Colonial Period," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 60, no. 4 (October 1952) : 522-536; and "York County History" organized by the York County Historical Committee in the York County Reference Book, Williamsburg Regional Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.

This is not a typical section in a HABS history report; generally, the "historical context" follows the "physical history" portion of the documentation. The time-line was inserted as a ready reference.

<sup>68</sup>Sir Thomas Dale to Earl of Salisbury, 1611. Letter quoted in "History of York County in the Seventeenth Century," Tyler's Quarterly 1, no. 4 (April 1920): 232.

- 1614 Pocahontas converted to Christianity, married John Rolfe, who began the tobacco industry (also in 1614)
- 1618 Head right system inaugurated by the Virginia Company to populate the colony
- 1619 First meeting of the General Assembly, Jamestown
- 1619-23 Approximately 4,000 settlers or more died from disease, starvation, and the Indian uprising of 1622 led by Opechancanough in which 300 plus settlers were killed
- after 1622 Palisade across peninsula proposed by Governor Sir Francis Wyatt and his Council because of sustained hostilities between the English and the Indians
- 1624 Virginia became a Royal Colony
- ca. 1626 Samuel Mathews of Denbigh and William Claiborne of Kicoughtan offered to build the palisade
- 1629 Chiskiack Indians chased from the south shores of the Pamunkey River
- 1630 Act passed to secure tract of land called the "Forest"; 50 acres offered to each person who would settle near the Charles River and the land of the Pamunkey Indian king; 25 acres offered to each person who settled there in the second year. Patents granted to Captain John West and Captain John Utie, with the latter settling near Felgates Creek and King's Creek
- 1632 Captain Martian represented Kiskyacke in the Assembly
- 1633 Palisades ran from Archer's Hope Creek to Queen's Creek, with a settlement at the mid point called, "Middle Plantation"; York village established on Wormley's Creek and declared a port
- 1634 Eight shires or counties established: Accomac, Charles City, Charles River, Elizabeth River, Henrico, James City, Warrosquyoake (Isle of Wight), and Warwick River
- 1635 Colonists revolted against Governor Sir John Harvey; Samuel Weaver patented land for Thomas Weston in Chiskiack
- 1637 Thomas Weston patented a parcel of land in Chiskiack
- 1640 Chiskiack parish set up by the General Assembly in Charles River County; first Chiskiack Church built
- by 1642 First York parish church built in York Village
- 1643 The name of Charles River County changed to York; Chiskiack parish renamed Hampton
- 1644 Second Indian uprising, led by Opechancanough, in which 500 settlers were killed in one day
- 1646 Treaty with the Indians, ending the chiefdom of Powhatan; Chiskiack or Hampton parish extended from Yorktown Creek to Queen's Creek, the most western of the three parishes
- 1651 Gloucester County, north of the York River, separated from York County, and so defined its northward boundary; Richard Hansford patented land in Chiskiack
- 1654 New Kent County cut off from York County, thereby, limiting the westward expansion of York County; John Hansford wrote his will in which he bequeathed 500 acres in Chiskiack near the head of Felgates Creek to his younger sons, Charles and Thomas
- 1658 John Hansford re-patented his tract in Chiskiack
- 1667 Second York parish church built of brick on the foundations of its wood-frame predecessor

- 1676 Bacon's Rebellion escalated from a quarrel between Thomas Matthew and the Susquehannock Doeg Indians, in which Nathaniel Bacon sought a commission to march against the Indians. Bacon attacked the Oceaneechi and Pamunkey villages without a commission, an act of rebellion against the colonial government that threw Virginia into anarchy. Bacon's foe was the established authority, Governor Sir William Berkeley and his supporters, the Green Spring faction.
- 1677 Bacon's Rebellion ended with the return of Governor Berkeley to power. The Indians were contained on reservation lands by this time, and the 1646 treaty requiring tributes from each group participating in the 1644 uprising was extended to all Indians.
- 1678-79 Thomas Hansford's house leased as courthouse
- 1680 Courthouse moved from Thomas Hansford's dwelling to the French Ordinary
- 1691 Yorktown established by an act of ports of the General Assembly<sup>69</sup>
- 1697 Third church for York Parish built (predecessor of Grace Church) in Yorktown
- 1698 Courthouse moved from French Ordinary to Yorktown
- ca. 1700 Second Chiskiack parish church built of brick and situated on a ridge between King's and Felgates Creeks on the west side of the road connecting Williamsburg to Yorktown
- 1703 Samuel Hill granted a license to run the French Ordinary
- 1706-07 Hampton (Chiskiack) parish combined with York parish; Yorkhampton parish covered Back Creek to Yorktown Creek and Yorktown Creek to Queen's Creek<sup>70</sup>
- 1710-39 Yorktown designated as a slave port; and continued as port for the export of tobacco.
- 1720s Kiskiack built by a member of the Hansford family
- 1733-37 Governor Gooch included a pottery in his yearly reports to the Crown on manufactures in Virginia; this referred to William Rogers (d. 1739) a potter in Yorktown
- 1750s Charles Hansford advertised in the Virginia Gazette trying to lease the Halfway House<sup>71</sup>
- 1757 First suburb of Yorktown annexed to town (Gwyn Read development)
- 1781 Halfway House was a landmark in the American and French armies' march to Yorktown
- 1814 Fire destroyed the waterfront and "lower town" area of Yorktown

---

<sup>69</sup>The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, vol. 3, 1684-1710, edited by William Waller Hening (Philadelphia, PA: Thomas Desilver for the editor, 1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 58-69.

<sup>70</sup>Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, vol. 3, 1 May 1705 - 23 October 1721, edited by H.R. McIlwaine (Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1928), p. 140; see also, The Hornbook for Virginia History, p. 179; Charles Francis Cocke, Parish Lines Diocese of Southern Virginia (Richmond, 1960); and David Hackett Fischer, Albion's Seed Four British Folkways in America (New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 235. Fischer cited a 1725 record wherein Yorkhampton parish consisted of 800 families, who attended two churches, for an average of eighty communicants or about two-thirds attendance.

<sup>71</sup>Charles Hansford inherited the Halfway House from William Hansford. York County Records, Judgements and Orders, Book 2, p. 297; around 1760, Charles Hansford petitioned to settle William Hansford's estate. See York County Records, Judgements and Orders, Book 3, p. 132. During this time, Charles Hansford obtained ordinary licences from the court. See, for example, Judgement and Orders, Book 3, p. 111.

- 1825-33 Second Chiskiack church, called "Cheescake," used by a Baptist group  
1833 Episcopalians locked out the Baptists, who then built their own church near Lebanon; Cheescake fell into disuse, and the ruins of the Cheescake church are within the confines of the Naval Weapons Station today  
1838 Benjamin Hansford sold his interest (one-fifth) in the Halfway House<sup>72</sup>  
1862 General McClellan's Peninsula campaign  
1881 Centennial celebration of the Battle of Yorktown  
1915 Kiskiack burned  
1918-20 Creation of the Naval Weapons Station in Yorktown, Virginia

### C. Historical Context

#### Virginia Algonquians

Before the Lee family claimed the house called "Kiskiack" and the Hansford family owned property referred to as "Kiskiack," a group of Virginia Algonquians occupied the land between King's and Queen's Creeks in York County. These people predated the European explorers, such as Captain John Smith, who mapped the Chesapeake Bay and its environs.<sup>73</sup> The Indians' primary settlement along the York River, or Pamunkey as it was known then, is designated "Indian Fields" today. (Figure 12) John Smith labeled the site, "Kiskiack" on his map of Virginia published in 1624.(Figure 13)

The Algonquian group who lived on the land also owned it, though not in the traditional sense of possession as conveyed by the British common law. Land *ownership* as in patent, grant, title, and deed of the British legal system came in conjunction with permanent dwelling sites and fences, and with forts and palisades. The Algonquians' migratory way of life, as well as the dispersed buildings they left behind, gave the British impression of land that was predominantly unsettled and marred only by impermanent villages. The colonists took advantage of the cultural differences between Anglos and Algonquians; rather than honoring Virginia Algonquian land use, the British seized the opportunity afforded by their superior weaponry. As English guns and diseases killed the Virginia natives more land was opened for settlement. Less Indians were alive or in the area to protest so the British settlers established outposts and homesteads. The Algonquians struck back in a 1622 uprising, however, the colonists just harassed them all the more. For example, the British planned to attack the Indians at vulnerable times of the year, such as during the Indian harvest or hunting seasons. An act passed the General Assembly in October 1629 authorizing three marches against the Algonquian groups. The marches were slated for November, March, and July. To cover the most territory, the colony was divided into fourths. One target consisted of "Elizabeth Cittie, Warwick, Nuttmegg Quarter,

---

<sup>72</sup>A separate study should be done on the French Ordinary, known in the eighteenth century as the Halfway House. When, for instance, did the name change? When and for how long did the Hansford family own it? Did they continue to operate it or was Charles Hansford successful in leasing it to someone else to run in the 1750s?

<sup>73</sup>Rhys Isaac, The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790 (New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988); John Smith, Generall Historie of Virginia, ... &c., (London, 1624; reprint, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms Inc., 1966).

Accawmacke, the plantation at Kiskyacke and the places adjoining." The British went up to the Indians at the Pamunkey, once before the frost at Christmas and again during the summer months, as instructed by the law.<sup>74</sup> The same year, 1629, the General Assembly decided

After debate of many matters, it was thought a business of great benefit and good consequence to send and maintain a company of men to plant corne at Kiskyake, the charges of building to be borne equally by all that should bee the Adventurers, and to bee there seated by the 15<sup>th</sup> of November next. Where upon voluntarily the Governour offered to find three men.<sup>75</sup>

The policy of harassment worked against the Chiskiack Indians. By 1630, parcels adjacent to the Charles River and to that of the Chiskiack Indian group were opened for patents and grants to the English. Among the first settlers in the Chiskiack territory were Captain John West, John Utie, and Nicholas Martiau. The later represented the Chiskiack area in the General Assembly in 1632. As a precautionary measure, the colony pursued Sir Thomas Dale's recommendation for a palisade across the Peninsula. Dale suggested the palisade twenty years earlier, but in 1633 the fortification finally was built.<sup>76</sup>

Like the Algonquians, the colonists settled near the major waterways. They followed the Indians' example because the rivers and tributaries leading into the Chesapeake Bay were a source for food and communication. In Virginia there are four major rivers feeding into the bay. They are the Potomac, Rappahannock, York, and James Rivers. Between these waterways lie three peninsulas or necks, the Northern Neck, Middle Peninsula, and the Peninsula respectively. South of the James River is known as the "Southside." The Virginia Algonquian groups included on John Smith's map are Occohannock & Accomac ("across the water") on the Eastern Shore; Chesapeake ("big salt bay"), Nansemond, Warraskoyack, & Quiyoughcohannock on the Southside; Weyanock in Charles City County & Prince George's County; Appamattuck, Powhatan, and Arrohateck near Richmond and Henrico County; Chickahominy, Paspahagh, Kkecoughtan, Chiskiack, Youghtanund, Pamunkey, & Mattapanient on the Peninsula; Werowocomoco, Piankatank, Opiscopank, Nandtaughtacund, Cuttatawomen on Middle Peninsula; and the Pissaseck, Rappahannock, Moraughtacund, Cuttatawomen, Wiccocomico, Sekakawon, Onawmanient, and Patawomeck on the Northern Neck. The dominant group of Indians living on the waterway gave its name to the river or area, and that is what Smith recorded. Thus, Pamunkey and Mattaponi are both names of rivers and particular Indian

---

<sup>74</sup>The Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 140-41.

<sup>75</sup>The Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 139-140.

<sup>76</sup>Ronald E. Grim, "The Absence of Towns in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," Ph.D. diss, The University of Maryland, 1977, p. 70; Parke Rouse, "Kiskiack Once Was a Busy Settlement," Daily Press 9 September 1990; among others.

groups. Chiskiack is both a town near the Pamunkey River and a group of Algonquian speaking Indians.<sup>77</sup>

A similar repetition occurred with "Powhatan." That word denotes an Indian chief, his hometown, his empire, and an Algonquian dialect. Traditionally, the Virginia Algonquians living in the coastal plain have been called "Powhatan Indians," a collective term lumping all of the groups together on the assumption of a cultural and linguistic alliance to the chief-dom created by Powhatan the individual Indian chief. Not all Algonquians allied themselves with Powhatan, or if pledged to him, acquiesced on all occasions. The Chickahominy Indians joined forces with Powhatan in the face of a common enemy only, that of the white man. Other groups on the Potomac obeyed some times and not on others.<sup>78</sup> In 1612 Ottahotin was the werowance, or commander, of the Algonquian group affiliated with Powhatan that lived by the York River. He ruled over the Chiskiack Indians; because of its location on the Peninsula, Ottahotin's tribe was near the Jamestown settlement.<sup>79</sup> Close proximity to Jamestown made the Chiskiack Indians, and their land, early targets of colonial ambition.<sup>80</sup> By March 1629-30, the Chiskiack Indians had been moved from the Peninsula. Territory that had been theirs was opened for settlement rights by the British.<sup>81</sup> The displaced Chiskiack Indians occupied the south bank of the Piankatank River by summer 1642. They stayed there until 1677. The Chiskiack Indians also lived on the northeast shore of York River for awhile. The Chiskiack Indian population dwindled along with that of the other Virginia Algonquians, essentially extinct by 1700.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Helen C. Roundtree, The Powhatan Indians of Virginia Their Traditional Culture The Civilization of the American Indian Series (Norman, OK and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989; second printing, 1990), p. 3-31; C.G. Holland, "The Kiskiack/Chiskiack Path," Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia 39, #3 (September 1984): 150-155; and Smith, Generall Historie of Virginia. . . &c., p. 21-24.

<sup>78</sup>Roundtree, passim, but especially, p. 3-31, 58-78.

<sup>79</sup>Facts about Williamsburg and Vicinity (Richmond, VA: Whittet and Shepperson for the Business Men's Association of the City of Williamsburg, 1900), p. 49; "History of York County in the Seventeenth Century," p. 231; See also, "Cheescake," Tyler's Quarterly 13, no. 3 (January 1932) : 199; and Smith, Generall Historie of Virginia. . . &c., p. 23. In the "Cheescake" article, Tyler stated that the Chiskiack tribe was one of the thirty-four tribes of which Powhatan was head war chief or Werowance. As did John Smith, Tyler put the Chiskiack tribe on the south side of the York River, with their chief town about two miles above Yorktown at a place called "Indianfields" today. Tyler repeated Smith's accounting of the Chiskiack population, citing they had forty or fifty fighting men.

<sup>80</sup>Garland Evans Hopkins, "Preface," York County Source Book, York County Historical Series #4 (Winchester, VA: privately issued, 1942): 5-6. Hopkins said that the "new settlers faced grave problems, not the least of which were the Chiskiack Indians, who roamed the county, and the mosquitoes. They were able to conquer the Indians...."

<sup>81</sup>On John Smith's map, the Indians lived between the King and Queen Creeks on the York River. Archaeological evidence, such as the Chickahominy pottery and Stony Creek pottery found near Indian Field Creek and Felgates Creek, suggests that the area occupied was much broader. See Holland, p. 150 and Smith, Generall Historie of Virginia. . . &c.

<sup>82</sup>"Cheescake," p. 199; Holland, p. 163, 173; Holland summarized his study of the Kiskiack/Chiskiack path by evaluating the Indian group's influence, however, he used English signposts of significance. Holland said the Indian tribe's "historical hey-day" came while they lived on the Piankatank River (1642-77) for that is when their name was given to landscape features, and thoroughfares; when it appeared in land deeds as a point of reference; and when the Indians themselves were the subject of legislation. In 1677, the Indians fled from their "protected" lands in fear of Nathaniel Bacon and his men.

### Spelling a Virginia Algonquian Name

Historical consensus states that a group of Virginia Algonquians lived in the vicinity of the Kiskiack house, now located within the boundaries of the Naval Weapons Station in Yorktown. No agreement, however, has been reached on the spelling of the Indian name that came to be associated with a people and a geographical area, be it an Indian settlement, Anglican parish, or a dwelling. Twentieth-century spellings include "Kisckiack" which refers to the Indian village in Facts about Williamsburg; "Kis Kis Kiak" a term identifying the house in Shadows in Silver; "Kis Kis Kiack" a slight variation referring to the house in Twelve Old Houses West of the Chesapeake Bay; "Cheescake" meaning the house and "Chiskiack" the region in Tyler's Quarterly; and "Chischiacke" and "Kiskiack" both labels for the house in Old Virginia Houses along the James.<sup>83</sup> The last private owner probably preferred the "Kis Kis Kiak" spelling as that is what he chose for the memorial marker on the property for William Warren Lee.<sup>84</sup> Newspaper articles generally adhered to the spelling adopted by HABS in 1935, "Kiskiack" after the map drawn by Captain John Smith and published in 1624 for his general history of the colony.<sup>85</sup>

Seventeenth-century source material merely adds to the array of spellings for Kiskiack. Captain John Smith used "Kiskiack" interchangeably with a "ch" format, "Chiskiack." Smith lived in Virginia in 1607-09. During his sojourn in the colony, he concentrated on military and exploratory missions. Smith's "Map of Virginia" appeared in 1612, and was reissued in the 1624 publication, A Generall Historie of Virginia...&c.<sup>86</sup> Likewise, William Strachey who was in Virginia from 1610 to 1611 relied on interviews with two Indians and excerpts from Smith's work for his manuscript. Gabriel Archer also used both the "k" and "ch" spellings and the incipient variations of each type such as "Chesciak" in his work; Archer lived in Virginia in 1607-08 and again in 1609. The most promising source for the preservation of the Algonquian language was Henry Spelman, who was sold by John Smith to Powhatan. To benefit the colony, Smith wanted Spelman to learn the Algonquian language among other things while he lived with the Indians from 1609 to 1611. Despite these communication efforts, the Algonquian language never was written down in such a way for later day peoples to study.

---

See Holland, p. 173.

<sup>83</sup>Facts about Williamsburg and Vicinity, p. 49; Worthington, p. 13-15; and Farrar, p. 204.

<sup>84</sup>Site visits, 1997-98, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>85</sup>This is my observation; at this time, I have not discovered any document standardizing the spelling of "Kiskiack." Another version of the spelling is cited in Ivor Noel Hume, The Virginia Adventure Roanoke to Jamestown an Archaeological and Historical Odyssey; this reference is "Cheskacke," and Noel Hume got it from a letter from colonist Robert Bennett to Edward Bennett included in Kingsbury's Records of the Virginia Company of London, vol. 4, p. 220-221. See Noel Hume, p. 384.

<sup>86</sup>Smith, Generall Historie of Virginia, ... &c., p. 23, 41. Smith counted forty to fifty bowmen in the Chiskiack tribe in 1606.

English names, moreover, supplanted many of the Algonquian ones. The Pamunkey River was renamed the Charles River and then the York; Chiskiack parish was anglicanized to Hampton.<sup>87</sup>

In Cavaliers and Pioneers, the land patents also reveal a plethora of spellings for the area lying between King's and Queen's Creeks on the York River. The colonists followed the "ch" spelling primarily. On 8 October 1630, fifty acres on Queen's Creek were granted. The patent also included a descriptive note specifying that the lands were on the "southern side of the Pamunkie River, now called the Charles River, in an area known by the Indian name of Chiskake."<sup>88</sup> By the mid-1630s, variations of "Chiskiak(e)" prevailed over the "Kiskiack" spellings; by 1703, the Indian name dropped out of use altogether. In 1703, the term was used descriptively as the "old Indian Cheescake path" but attempts to spell it phonetically had stopped.<sup>89</sup>

The Laws of Virginia fares no better than the land patent records at maintaining consistency for spelling Chiskiack. By February 1631-32, Captain Nicholas Martiau represented the "Kiskyacke" borough and the Isle of Kent.<sup>90</sup> In September 1632, the assembly passed an act granting settlement rights in the district between Archer's Hope Creek and Queen's Creek. The rights established for this district followed those given to the planters of "Kiskyake," that is, fifty acres of land for every person seated there in one year and twenty-five the next year.<sup>91</sup> Several years later, Chiskiack (Kiskyake) was made a parish. The name lasted about three years for in March 1642-43 another act changed "Chescake" to Hampton parish.<sup>92</sup> In a succession of acts the name referred to both a place and a group of Virginia Algonquians. By 1647, an act regarding the safety of Indians couriers included the house of "Captain William Taylor att Chiscake"; others in the 1660s clearly meant a particular group of Indians, be they "the small inconsiderable nation of "Chiskoiack" Indians living quietly on the land they are now seated upon" who were obedient to English laws; the "Chesquiack" whose lands were entrenched upon by Mrs. Mary Ludlow in 1661-62; the "Chiskoyackes" in Gloster who had approximately fifteen bowmen and so were taxed at three wolf heads a year beginning in 1669; or the

---

<sup>87</sup>Roundtree, p. 3-31; Holland, p. 150, 173-175; Smith, Generall Historie of Virginia, ... &c., p. 40-41.

<sup>88</sup>Cavaliers and Pioneers, vol. 1, 1623-1666, p. 117.

<sup>89</sup>Holland p. 174; Cavaliers and Pioneers, vol. 1, 1623-1666, p. 14-15, 18, 25, 29-30, 82; Cavaliers and Pioneers, vol. 3, 1695-1732, p. 73. Although the "ch" spelling was preferred after 1635, inconsistencies still were prevalent. On May 1635, a patent for twenty-five acres referred to Chiskiack as "Chiskiake," "Chiskiack," and "Chisekiake." This one transaction also used a "k" reference, that is, "Kisekeiake." See Cavaliers and Pioneers, vol. 1, 1623-1666, p. 82. In the second volume, Chiskiack appeared three times, twice in Gloucester County as "Chescake" and "Cheesecake"; and once in York County as "Kiskeyack." See Cavaliers and Pioneers, vol. 2, 1666-1695 (Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1977), p. 21, 316, 396.

<sup>90</sup>Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 154, 203.

<sup>91</sup>Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 199.

<sup>92</sup>Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 228, 250-51.

"Cheescake" in Gloster who had liberties and rules established by law for trading with the English by 1677.<sup>93</sup>

Although the Indians living in Virginia spoke the Algonquian language, differences in dialects contributed to the white man's confusion. Writing about the failed Jesuit mission (1570) in Chiskiack territory, Bartolome Martinez said many "tongues were spoken on the waterways." On the other hand, John Smith stated that the groups all spoke the language of Powhatan the Indian chief. In either scenario the sounds were foreign to Europeans, who could only guess at spelling and pronunciation. The language disappeared by 1800.<sup>94</sup> The extinction of a language transmitted orally, that is to say, sporadically or not at all in written form, means "Chiskiack" can be spelt any number of ways today. In this report, "Kiskiack" refers to the house in order to maintain a level of consistency in the documentation. This examination, however, will invoke "Chiskiack" to name the parish, region, and Indian group as that is the term closest to the various spellings chosen by the colonists.<sup>95</sup>

#### York County after the Algonquians

Competing with the Chiskiack Indians for territory in York County were immigrants initially from the British Isles. Yeomen farmers, laborers, textile tradesmen, and various craftsmen left England for the colonies during the seventeenth century. They crossed the Atlantic Ocean in hopes of finding work, land, and opportunities unavailable at home. Generally, men and women emigrated between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four. Because of their youth, it is likely that the immigrants were low ranking participants in their trade guild or had not yet mastered the skills necessary to support themselves. Upon landing, those without means to pay for the journey or to buy property were hired as indentured servants by colonists who proceeded them. The immigrants without financial resources contracted their labor for a specific time period; when their tour of duty was complete, the freedmen bought land and worked for themselves. The Chesapeake welcomed its new arrivals as indentured servants because tobacco cultivation was labor-intensive.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup>Statutes at Large, vol. 2, 1660-1682, p. 39, 153-54, 275, 410-12.

<sup>94</sup>Roundtree, p. 15-16; Holland, p. 173-175.

<sup>95</sup>My arbitrary designation of the spelling of Kiskiack and Chiskiack is necessary because of the loss of the Algonquian language. It is not because of my lack of interest, like that that plagued an earlier synopsis of the house: "... we hesitate to advance a definite interpretation of 'Kiskiack.' *Having no knowledge of, or even interest in, Indian terminal generics, for ourselves we are content to accept the generally adopted meaning 'broad or flat land' and if, if Kiskiack does not mean that, then the Indians should have given it a name that did for above Yorktown the land is certainly broad and flat.*" The author continued, noting that the name "Kiskiack" applied to the territory inhabited by the Chiskiack Indians rather than to just one site in particular. See Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. (Emphasis mine)

<sup>96</sup>James Horn, "Servant Emigration to the Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century," in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century Essays on Anglo-American Society, edited by Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, p. 51-95 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1979); Russell R. Menard, "British Migration to the Chesapeake Colonies in the Seventeenth Century," in Colonial Chesapeake Society, edited by Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, p. 99-132 (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1988); and James Horn, "Adapting to a New World," in Colonial

The Chesapeake colonies depended on an influx of people each year to sustain themselves. The population did not reproduce itself through a natural course of events, and so, needed new bodies each year to survive. People were necessary imports because the sex ratio was imbalanced: more men came to Virginia and Maryland than women. As servants, males were more desirable because their potential output was greater than that offered by a woman. The low number of women in the Chesapeake, who were eligible as marriage partners, made population increases difficult; also indentured servants did not (and could not) marry until after earning their freedom. Forced to postpone marriage until after servitude meant that any offspring faced the possibility of losing at least one parent before reaching adulthood. Short life cycles generated a need for kinship networks to protect children whose parents had died.<sup>97</sup>

Along with the paucity of females living in the colony, many immigrants to the Chesapeake died. Early settlers in the Peninsula between the James and York rivers suffered from salt-poisoning and outbreaks of disease, neither of which were mitigated by a period of "seasoning" or adjusting to a new climate. The high death rate, however, was not a deterrent. In spite of its reputation as a demographic disaster today, the changes of survival in the Chesapeake were no worse than those faced in England especially in the cities.<sup>98</sup> Colonists began to live longer when they moved away from Jamestown and from other places near where salt and fresh waters met. The transitional zones of salt to freshwater proved deadly to the newcomers and to "seasoned" residents. Although healthier than Jamestown, water in the salty, low estuary areas also killed many colonists. York County was one of those danger spots and as an estuary not entirely safe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>99</sup>

Supplemented by immigration, enough settlers lived in present day York County in 1634 for it to be declared an independent entity from James City. About 510 people resided in York County at that time. Although the population tally in 1699 reached 1099 in York County, the increase after 1660 came solely from the importation of slaves. Mortality rates and out-migration of non-householders from the county counteracted the increasing white birth rate. By the 1680s, however, the white

---

Chesapeake Society, edited by Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, p. 133-175 (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1988).

<sup>97</sup>Lorena S. Walsh, "'Till Death Us Do Part': Marriage and Family in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century Essays on Anglo-American Society, edited by Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, p. 126-152 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1979); Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, "Family, Friends, Neighbors," chap. in A Place in Time Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984) p. 94-127, and regarding orphans, p. 113-120.

<sup>98</sup>Horn, "Servant Emigration to the Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century," p. 73; Personal Communication, Camille Wells, Fall 1997.

<sup>99</sup>Carville V. Earle, "Environment, Disease, and Mortality in Early Virginia," in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century Essays on Anglo-American Society, edited by Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, p. 96-125 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1979); and Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, "'Now-Wives and Sons-in-Law': Parental Death in a Seventeenth-Century Virginia County," in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century Essays on Anglo-American Society, edited by Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, p. 153-182 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1979).

population was predominantly county born. These children lived to maturity in greater numbers. Along with extended life cycles of the native born, after 1660 the likelihood of an indentured servant rising from servitude to a comfortable living arrangement on the land declined. By 1680, the probability of doing so was virtually nil. The effect, by 1704, in York County was a high percentage of non-landholders.<sup>100</sup>

Of those fortunate enough to own land, the value of the parcels varied, affording some greater economic capabilities than those offered on the lesser tracts. The earliest patents claimed territory on the York River and its tributaries up to Chiskiack. Water access was essential but not every waterway was navigable. By 1705, the disparity between plantation location and size was marked. York County was characterized by parcels of 300 acres or less and by tracts over 900 acres. Large landowners, such as Joseph Ring, John Utie, and John West who sold his property to Edward Diggs, lived on large plantations named Ringfield, Utiemaria, and Bellfield respectively near Kings and Felgates Creeks in Chiskiack. Christopher Wormley's tract at York plantation and that of Nicholas Martiau were the early town centers in York parish. The latter's parcel became Yorktown in 1691. These men were some of the county's initial settlers, however, small farms were more common than their massive land holdings.<sup>101</sup>

Land ownership did not parlay into a comfortable domestic environment.<sup>102</sup> For instance, some of the immigrants came to the Chesapeake only with the clothes on their backs and a gun; others brought provisions gathered specifically for the journey.<sup>103</sup> For his sojourn in the New World Francis Louis Michel purchased consumer goods before his departure. Michel knew that if he acted as a merchant in the colonies he could sell all the items he stock-piled and could double or triple his investment. Michel realized the colonists lacked finished products, despite the availability of raw materials, and so they ordered many things from England. With the Chesapeake's economic situation in mind, Michel took "mattresses, linen, whiskey, ready-made clothes, hats, stockings, shoes, rifles, all kinds of household goods and implements, knives, scissors, show buckles, hair powder, especially amber, all kinds of perfumes and laces; in short everything a man needs, except food."<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup>Kevin P. Kelly, "A Demographic Description of Seventeenth-Century York County, Virginia," Paper for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, October 1983, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; Menard, "British Migration to the Chesapeake Colonies in the Seventeenth Century," p. 111.

<sup>101</sup>Grim, p. 56, 75-80; "History of York County in the Seventeenth Century," p. 233-236; Clyde F. Trudell, Colonial Yorktown being a brief History of the Place: Together with Something of its Houses and Publick Buildings (Richmond, VA: the Dietz Press, 1938), p. 21-48, passim; and John L. Thomas, "Martiau," Tyler's Quarterly 1, no. 1 (July 1919) : 52-57.

<sup>102</sup>Horn, "Adapting to a New World," p. 160. Horn argued that the low standard of living was a product of short life spans, low prices of tobacco, and the dependence on English factors for consumer goods. See p. 160-163.

<sup>103</sup>James Deetz, Flowerdeew Hundred: the Archaeology of a Virginia Plantation, 1619-1684 (Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1993), p. 15-56, especially the muster given on p. 20-23.

<sup>104</sup>"Report of the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," translated and edited by Wm. J. Hinke, Ph.D., Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 24, no. 1 (January 1916) : 1-5.

Another traveler to Virginia commented on the dearth of consumer goods made in the colony, attributing the lack of enterprise to their obsession with tobacco production. Durand de Dauphine, writing in 1686, said of the cash crop and the planters' decisions to allocate their resources:

There is little money in circulation, except among the people of quality. They do business with their tobacco as if it was money. With tobacco they buy lands, hire and buy cattle; and as they can secure all they want with this commodity they become so lazy that they even import from England their linen and their hats, their women's clothes and their shoes, their iron, their nails, nay even their wooden furniture, although they have the best and a superfluity of wood which could be made into tables and chairs and boxes and wardrobes and generally all kinds of furniture for house or kitchen.<sup>105</sup>

Seventeenth-century planters, then, devoted their energies to tobacco production. They did so at the expense of other crops and economic ventures.<sup>106</sup> Although the tobacco market peaked early in the seventeenth century, the weed remained Virginia's cash crop. Some planters made money in spite of falling prices, that were pushed lower and lower because supply exceeded demand. The success of several planters sustained the expectation of the others, each striving to earn enough from the crop to clothe his family and improve his standard of living. Some even hoped to return to England with profits in hand. By the end of the century, all plantations felt the economic effects of the flooded market; however, each household responded to the stagnated tobacco market according to the resources at its disposal.<sup>107</sup>

The land continued as the Chesapeake's most lucrative resource throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth century. Almost anything put into the soil in Virginia flourished. In particular, foodstuffs such as corn, wheat, barley, and oats prospered, as did fruit trees. Yet tobacco continued to be the principal crop planted in the eighteenth century. It also remained the medium of exchange in the colonies. With tobacco, planters participated in trade networks, using it as specie in place of gold and silver. Traditional money rarely was seen in the colonies so most planters bartered for goods in terms of tobacco pounds per cask when merchants passed by their land. Some merchants

---

<sup>105</sup>Durand, p. 99-100.

<sup>106</sup>Warren M. Billings, "Sir William Berkeley and the Diversification of the Virginia Economy," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 104, no. 4 (Autumn 1996): 433-454.

<sup>107</sup>Allan Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves the Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800 (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986), p. 31-33, 78-85. For more information about the declining wealth of the economy, but not necessarily the standard of living, in the Chesapeake see Lois Green Carr, Russell R. Menard, and Lorena S. Walsh, Robert Cole's World Agriculture and Society in Early Maryland (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1991), p. 151-157, wherein the authors tell what happened to Robert Cole's children. They had difficulty achieving the status or estate that their father had done.

kept storehouses filled with goods, and colonists came to them to buy wares with their tobacco notes for the upcoming season.<sup>108</sup>

Settlement patterns in York County, and elsewhere in Tidewater Virginia, were impacted by the colony's agricultural livelihood. Durand reported that there was no town or village in all of Virginia, except for Jamestown, which was necessary only for gathering of the government. Michel asserted that the lack of towns was a result of the colonists' economic choices. He said, "the inhabitants do not live close together because of tobacco cultivation; ... not settled in villages because they constantly need new ground for tobacco."<sup>109</sup> Shortly after Michel visited Virginia, an assessment of the colony revealed that York County encompassed 60,767 acres and 1208 taxable workers.<sup>110</sup>

Along with the governmental body of the county courts, the dispersed householders lived under the auspices of the Anglican parish. The colony sustained the Anglican religion with public moneys, making it the "established" church of Virginia. The General Assembly could -- and did -- determine the parish boundaries, similar to its designation of county lines, because the church was a state supported entity. The local units of the church and state connected the thinly distributed farmsteads to one another on court days and during ecclesiastical rituals. County residents gathered at court and in church; each was a place that fostered social interaction in the absence of towns save Jamestown.<sup>111</sup> In effect, the courthouse and church were community centers sprinkled throughout the county proper.

---

<sup>108</sup>"Report of the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," p. 29-31; Robert Beverley, The History and Present State of Virginia, edited with an introduction by Louis B. Wright, (London: printed for R. Parker, 1705; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1947), p. 314-319; [Edward Kimber], "Observations in Several Voyages and Travels in America," The London Magazine (July 1745); reprint, Collections of the Georgia Historical Society, vol. 4 (Savannah, GA: J.H. Estill, printer, Morning News Steam Printing House, 1878), p. 35.

<sup>109</sup>Durand, p. 85-86, 90; "Report of the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," p. 31; and Kimber, p. 35. See also, Kevin P. Kelly, "'In dispers'd Country Plantations': Settlement Patterns in Seventeenth-Century Surry County, Virginia," in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century Essays on Anglo-American Society, edited by Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, p. 183-205 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1979). Although Kelly's subject is Surry County, Virginia, his argument that settlement followed social and economic development, locally and colony-wide, applies to York County. Planters in both counties concentrated on tobacco production.

<sup>110</sup>Beverley, p. 253.

<sup>111</sup>Kelly, p. 191; Durand, p. 90; Ronald E. Grim, "The Absence of Towns in Seventeenth-Century Virginia the Emergence of Service Centers in York County," Ph.D. diss, The University of Maryland, 1977, on Virginia's lack of urban centers. For information about the development of courthouses, see John O. Peters, Virginia's Historic Courthouses (Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia, 1995); Carl Lounsbury, "The Structure of Justice: the Courthouses of Colonial Virginia," in Perspectives of Vernacular Architecture III, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, p. 214-226 (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1989); and for a discussion of court day ritual, see A.G. Roeber, "Authority, Law, and Custom: the Rituals of Court Day in Tidewater Virginia, 1720 to 1750," in Material Life in America 1600-1860, edited by Robert Blair St. George, p. 419-439 (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 1988). On church making and going, see Dell Upton, Holy Things and Profane Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia (Architectural History Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1986; reprint, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1997).

In the part of the Peninsula that became York County, there were three parishes: York, Hampton (Chiskiack), and New Poquoson.<sup>112</sup> Often the parish was a precursor to the establishment of neighborhood networks in the relatively isolated sections of Virginia. Not only did the parish provide a place and reason for planters to congregate, it was required by law to keep vital statistics on the families within the parish. This made the rites of passage (birth, marriage, death) more than a family affair and ensured that the community knew what transpired. The parishioners paid taxes to support the parish activities and to build its churches. In the eighteenth century, church-going was a confirmation of faith as well as a ritual wherein a planter's place in the social hierarchy was acknowledged, where social interaction occurred, and secular business conducted.<sup>113</sup>

Overseeing the parish was the vestry; that body allocated the taxes and made decisions regarding church business. The last included construction projects, attendance at services, as well as seating within the church. Significantly, the vestry also was charged with legislating the morality of the parish. It reprimanded parishioners absent from church, those who broke the Sabbath, committed adultery, and bore children out of wedlock. Identifying the father was a concern of the vestry because it fell to the parish to assist the child if no one was named responsible. Often the vestry members held government posts, such as Justices of the Peace and Surveyors; they also sat on juries. Shared civil and religious responsibilities gave the community an identity rooted in the solidarity of the social and political authority.<sup>114</sup>

Parishioners arrived at church and court on horseback. By the eighteenth century, most planters owned at least one horse, unless they were very poor. Horses were ridden at a full gallop, a pace that easily covered the thirty miles or so it took some planters to get to church. Traveling by horseback was a sign of prestige throughout the 1700s. An observer of Virginians noted that they would chase a horse eight miles just so that they could ride it five miles to a community center. This suggests the importance of appearance to Chesapeake planters. What one looked like when traveling, arriving at church or at court set the gentry apart from middling sort and poorer folks. Equestrians, literally and symbolically, occupied a higher place in the social order than those on foot.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup>The Hornbook of Virginia History, p. 181-182, 187; George Carrington Mason, Colonial Churches of Tidewater Virginia (Richmond, VA: Whittet and Shepperson, 1945), p. 217-219; The Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 228, 251. Also, Beverley included the 1703 census in his book; in that, York had three parishes. York and Newpocoson were supplied with a minister while Hampton parish was vacant. See Beverley, p. 253.

<sup>113</sup>Kulikoff, p. 232-240. See also, Upton, Holy Things and Profane, generally.

<sup>114</sup>Upton, Holy Things and Profane, generally; Caroline Julia Richter, "A Community and its Neighborhoods: Charles Parish, York County, Virginia, 1630-1740," Ph.D. diss, The College of William and Mary, 1992, p. 4-5.

<sup>115</sup>"Report on the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," p. 21-22; Rhys Isaac, The Transformation of Virginia 1700-1740 (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, ), p. 52-57; Upton, Holy and Things and Profane, p. 3-4; Roeber, p. 419-439, passim; Kimber, p. 49; Kulikoff, p. 213; and Personal Communication, Camille Wells, Fall 1997.

Also, the gentry used horse racing as a forum to compete with one another. They placed high bets on the outcome. At stake was an individual's honor more so than his money. The horse races reinforced class lines for only the gentry or elite planters participated. Yeomen watched these symbolic occasions. See Kulikoff, p. 220, 228; and Isaac, p. 88-114, passim.

The buildings the colonists rushed toward on their horses were made from wood, including the churches, and generally those were without towers and bells. In 1701, Michel saw only three brick churches in Virginia, one each in Jamestown and Williamsburg, as well as one in Gloucester. Each county had a "house of assembly" and Justices of Peace by that time.<sup>116</sup> Before the establishment of Yorktown, churches, chapels of ease, and courthouses existed in various locations or neighborhoods. At York Plantation, first patented in 1631, a church was in place by the 1650s; the parish church moved to Yorktown in 1696 drawing activity away from the Wormley Creek site. A second governmental nexus was at Chiskiack, at the mouths of King's and Felgates Creeks. A third locus of public activity arose at the headwaters of the Warwick River near a mill. Joining the courthouse and church in these community centers were merchant-planters, linking the locality to the larger, trans-Atlantic network, between 1630 and 1649.<sup>117</sup>

### Chiskiack

As a government "service center" Chiskiack grew throughout the seventeenth century. Between 1650 and 1689, a road passed through Hampton (Chiskiack) parish.<sup>118</sup> As it crossed the headwaters of Felgates Creek, the Chiskiack community came into view. By then the courthouse had shifted from the dwelling of county commissioners to the French (Halfway House) Ordinary. An actual courthouse building was erected around 1680 by the ordinary keeper in exchange for permission to operate the inn in perpetuity. The courthouse, completed by William Whitaker, was joined by a jail. Also working in the vicinity were a blacksmith, ordinary keeper, shoemakers, a lawyer, and trade officials acting as planter agents and merchants. Only after the parish church moved inland, in the eighteenth century, did the service area decline.<sup>119</sup>

In 1639-40, the General Assembly established Chiskiack as a parish; its members then were directed to build a church with "all convenient speed." The act of creation, however, merely recognized the presence of a community already in place. By 1700, the Chiskiack settlement was thriving. Representative of that growth was the new church built between King's and Felgates Creeks. It stood just west of the road joining Williamsburg and Yorktown. The church, serving Hampton parish, shared a minister with York parish. This reciprocal arrangement was made official in 1706 when the two parishes merged into the larger entity Yorkhampton.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup>"Report on the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," p. 21-24.

<sup>117</sup>Grim, p. 240-241, 305-307.

<sup>118</sup>"Service center" is Grim's phraseology.

<sup>119</sup>Grim, p. 232, 248-256, 309-318.

<sup>120</sup>Mason, "York County Churches," chap. in Colonial Churches of Tidewater Virginia, p. 217-243, and for Chiskiack parish specifically, see p. 227-229; Miles, p. 20; Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, vol. 3, p. 140.

The Episcopalians stopped using the church, and during the early nineteenth century, a Baptist sect moved into it. Around 1825, the Episcopalians reclaimed their building, forcing the Baptists out. The Baptist built a church, near Lebanon.

Near the Chiskiack church was the French Ordinary, a facility that offered eatables and lodging to travelers. By the mid-eighteenth century, the French Ordinary was known as the Halfway House because of its roughly equidistant location between Williamsburg and Yorktown.<sup>121</sup> Ordinaries like the Halfway House appeared at crossroads in the county communities. Sometimes a planter living near a perceived community center petitioned the court for a license because his hospitality repeatedly was imposed upon. Initially established to serve passers-by, ordinaries also offered a respite to local planters against drudgery of agriculture and congested living quarters. There, the men ate, drank, gambled, and talked. During the eighteenth century, planters patronized the ordinaries on a regular basis. Schoolmasters working a circuit stopped in several times a year as they moved from plantation to plantation; local planters came in two times a month, when their labor could be spared from the plantation fields, and others went as many as three times.<sup>122</sup> Because of their location on roadways and their function as a gathering place, ordinaries such as the Halfway House became landmarks in the Chesapeake landscape.

In lieu of ordinaries, travelers asked for food and lodging at private houses. This custom made Virginia's reputation for hospitality. When looking for a place to stay, however, travelers knocked on doors in dwellings with two brick chimneys whenever possible. If the planter lived in such a building than he could provide a bed and lodging.<sup>123</sup> The implied discrepancy, between houses with brick stacks

---

The Baptist pile was known as "Cheescake" church, and survived until the Civil War. It measured 60'0" by 30'0" overall; each brick typically was 8 3/4" by 4 3/4" by 2 3/4." African-Americans worshiped there and buried their dead in the churchyard. Tradition holds that the abandoned church site was vandalized in the Civil War. Its bricks were taken and reused in the chimney stacks of the quarters for union officers billeted in Williamsburg. Miles, p. 20.

Please refer to the maps of York County in the field notes, listed in the Supplemental Information section, for locations of the church and ordinary in Hampton parish.

<sup>121</sup>Miles, p. 17-19; Alan Simpson, "Williamsburg to Yorktown: Tracing the Last Miles of the American Revolution Following in the Footsteps of Washington and Rochambeau on the Roads to Independence," *Colonial Williamsburg* 11, no. 4 (Summer 1989) : 26-35. See p. 28-29, for the map that traces the routes to Yorktown. During the Revolutionary War, the American and French armies marched to the Halfway House, at which point they diverged to position themselves around Lord Cornwallis and the British army he commanded. The French headquarters were in a brick house, about three miles down the road toward Yorktown from the ordinary.

The Halfway House was a brick structure that stood one and half stories tall including an attic. A lean-to was tacked onto the back. Inside, the Halfway House had two ground floor rooms, in keeping with the traditional use as a hall and chamber, as well as a central passage. The hall was heated by a brick hearth. Upstairs, the attic was partitioned into two rooms and was lit by windows in the gables.

Prior to 1934, the Halfway House became known as the "Russell House" after Sarah Russell, and then William Russell who occupied the house between 1854 and 1912. At that time, Wise Thomas bought the property. Eventually, the Halfway House was replaced by the Tabernacle Church. See Works Progress Administration, Historical Index, micro 509, #32, 12 May 1937.

<sup>122</sup>Kulikoff, p. 222-223.

<sup>123</sup>"Virginia in 1732," p. 30; "Report on the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," p. 114-115, 140.

By 1783, visitors to Virginia were not so fortunate. Johann David Schopf found Virginia's hospitality woefully overestimated. Americans on the Eastern Shore of Maryland were more gracious than the folks he encountered in Virginia, particularly in the Peninsula, where no one opened their dwelling to him. Supposedly fears of smallpox dampened the

and those without, suggests an inequality in dwellings and resources of Virginia planters readily perceived by passers-by. Structures to be avoided, if possible, were small, generally heated by one exterior chimney and consisted of one or two rooms. A stranger would have to eat, sleep, and dress in the same social space as the household members. Sometimes the room offered to the guest also was the place for food preparation, sewing, and recreational activities.<sup>124</sup> This crowded domestic environment prompted Michel to characterize Virginia in 1701 as "a land for people, who desire with small means to reach a comfortable living and do not care for society and luxury."<sup>125</sup> Yet congested social space did not prevent Virginians from opening their doors to strangers, that is to say, being hospitable within the means on hand.

As colonists came to York County, and the density around the service centers grew, neighborhoods emerged. Within those areas, such as Chiskiack near the head of Felgates Creek where the descendants of John Hansford lived, gathered planters of similar social, economic, and religious affiliations. Neighbors married one another, appraised property, stood as witnesses to legal documents or security for debts, and acted as god-parents and guardians to orphaned children. Neighborhoods and families increasingly became linked. This was facilitated when children reached maturity and claimed their legacies in land. For instance, John Hansford's initial tract of 500 acres was divided in half by his sons, and then their portions sub-divided to seat their children.<sup>126</sup> Neighbors and kin also fought over land and roadways. William Hewitt, for example, took his dispute with his brother-in-law, Thomas Hansford, to county court; Hewitt argued that Hansford maliciously blocked his plantation path and public road as well as obstructed Hewitt's access to the main road.<sup>127</sup>

### Yorktown

By the end of the century, enough activity occurred along the York River to attract attention from the government. In April 1691, the General Assembly designated twelve places for towns to be built. Each port town consisted of wharves and dwelling houses, per the assembly's edict. The assembly declared port cities in the twelve selected sites so that import and export activities could be secured, duties and customs paid, and generally to reduce fraud in the marketplace. By indicating

---

Americans' willingness to be hospitable. Schopf observed that travelers gained entry only if they were known to the hosts in some way. Schopf also commented that the Virginians blamed everything on Cornwallis: he either stole all their beds or pulled the house down, and so, prevented them from extending courtesies to strangers. See Travels in the Confederation [1783-1784] New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, translated and edited by Alfred J. Morrison (Philadelphia, PA: 1911; reprint, New York, NY: Bergman Publishers, 1968), p. 86-95.

<sup>124</sup>Horn, "Adapting to a New World," p. 152-154.

<sup>125</sup>"Report on the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," p. 125.

<sup>126</sup>See "Tract Map," 1704, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

<sup>127</sup>Kulikoff, "Neighborhood Communities on the Tobacco Coast," section in Tobacco and Slaves, p. 207-260; York County Records, Orders and Wills, etc., Book 14, 1709-1716, p. 20, 216-217.

where vessels docked, officials monitored shipments of tobacco in particular and of consumer goods. If the merchants disobeyed the act, that is, loaded or unloaded elsewhere, than their ships and cargo were forfeited. For the upper part of York County, the port town was established at present day West Point, near the place where the York River ends and splits into the Pamunkey and Mattaponi. For lower York, the town was located on the land of Benjamin Read, between Smith's Creek and the ferry dock on the river. The act also stipulated that these points of entry were to be fifty acres, and within that parcel, warehouses were to be erected. Along with the port towns, several places for the exchange of goods -- but not initial entry and clearance -- were specified to serve Henrico, Isle of Wight, Warwick, Surry, and Westmoreland counties.<sup>128</sup> By putting the port for lower York county on Read's land, and not building onto the settlement at York plantation by Wormley's Creek, the existence of the latter was put in jeopardy. Community focus shifted to the port of entry, away from York plantation, as the city grew.<sup>129</sup>

As specified by law, the city of Yorktown consisted of fifty acres, that were then subdivided into eighty-five lots.(Figure 14) It was built on land, originally patented by Governor John Harvey and owned by Nicholas Martiau in the 1630s, sold to the county by Benjamin Read.<sup>130</sup> One of the lots was purchased by Charles Hansford in 1691. Hansford bought a half acre parcel from Thomas Ballard and Joseph Ring.<sup>131</sup> In 1732, traveler William Hugh Grove described Yorktown as

York. This City (as tis Called) is indeed a delicat Village. [It] Stands Elivated [sic] on a Sandy hill...that Overlooks a fine river ... and has Likewise the prospect of a noble Bay. A Stranger [would] Conclude there were at Least 100 houses whereas there are really not 30- for Their Kitchins, Warehouses, etc. are here and generally Elsewhere Separate from their Dwelling houses and make them appear different habitations. ... The roads are Extreamply good thro the whole Country which is levell without Hills or Stones.<sup>132</sup>

From York, Wednesday 28 June, I went by ship up the river, which has pleasant Seats on the Bank which shew Like little villages, for having Kitchins, dayry houses, Barns, Stables, Store houses, and some of them 2 or 3 Negro Quarters all Separate from Each

---

<sup>128</sup>The Statutes at Large, vol. 3, 1684-1710, p. 53-69.

<sup>129</sup>York plantation was known as "Temple Farm" in the nineteenth century, so named for the ruins of a church seen there.

<sup>130</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 9, 1691-1694, p. 70-71.

<sup>131</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 1, 1633-1694, p. 379.

<sup>132</sup>"Virginia in 1732," p. 21-22.

other but near the mansion houses make a shew of 7 or 8 distinct Tenements, tho all belong to one family.<sup>133</sup>

In the first half of the eighteenth century, Yorktown thrived. The surrounding land produced a high grade of tobacco for sale. The city was a port of entry for slaves and a point of departure for approved, inspected hogsheads of tobacco. By 1757, the adjacent territory was subdivided into lots and annexed to the city. Living in the newest section of town -- its suburb -- were craftsmen trained as carpenters, wheelwrights, butchers, barbers, tailors, and bricklayers. Also nearby was a windmill. On the waterfront, a "lower town" developed in the five acres left as common grounds in 1691 and a ferry docked there.

The population growth slowed during the later half of the century. Planters exhausted the soil with their efforts in tobacco production. In 1780 Virginia's seat of government moved westward to Richmond, taking many people with it. The siege of Yorktown destroyed the suburban district in 1781, as well as many houses in the original section of town. A fire wiped out the lower town in 1814.<sup>134</sup>

#### Traditions Associated with Kiskiack

Memories of the past as we would like for it to have happened, and a nostalgia for the improved-with-time version of the past serve a need. In the face of a changing world, these memories and myths substitute for negative or discredited portions of a tradition surrounding a group's roots. In the South, the cavalier myth glossed over its point of origin as a land of one horse farmers planting one crop: tobacco.<sup>135</sup> The turbulent tobacco market, based on credit from the next year's crop, beset poverty on many southerners, an experience in contrast with the national myth of America as the land

---

<sup>133</sup>“Virginia in 1732,” p. 26.

<sup>134</sup>Edward M. Riley, “Suburban Development of Yorktown, Virginia, during the Colonial Period,” Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 60, no. 4 (October 1952) : 522-536, passim; The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, edited by William Waller Hening, vol. 7, [date], (Richmond, VA: Franklin Press, W.W. Gray printer, for the editor, 1820; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University of Virginia Press for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 139.

<sup>135</sup>Actually the Virginia Company chartered the English colony at Jamestown with the vision of getting converts to the Christian faith and reaping monetary rewards, that is, silver and gold. The men who went to Virginia hoped to get rich quick and return to the old world. By 1686, a Frenchman who traveled in Virginia observed that “the gentlemen called Cavaliers are greatly esteemed and respected and are very courteous and honorable. They hold most of the offices in the country.” The term “cavalier,” however, alluded to a man's political sympathies; many of the royal supporters fled England and went to Virginia during the Commonwealth period. These persons with royal ties made up a small percentage of the population; most were indentured servants (seventy-five percent); some immigrants were younger sons with money and connections to forge new mercantile alliances. See [Durand de Dauphine], A Frenchman Traveling in Virginia Being the Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee in 1686, translated by a Virginian (Richmond, VA: privately printed, 1923); and David Hackett Fischer, “The South of England to Virginia” Distressed Cavaliers and Indentured Servants, 1642-1675,” chap. in Albion's Seed Four British Folkways in America (New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 207-418. For a true cavalier's perspective, see Henry Norwood's essay in Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origins, Settlement and Progress of the Colonies in North America, edited by Peter Force, 4 vol. (1836-1846; reprint, New York, NY: 1947).

of opportunity and wealth.<sup>136</sup> By 1830, the depressed economic condition prompted many southerners to look back to the “good days” of the eighteenth century. That nostalgic generation made up a past for a land that prided itself on not having one -- replacing the land of new beginnings, virgin lands, and opportunities with a “feudal fantasy” world of cavaliers. In 1824, George Tucker described the eighteenth-century gentry as “remarkable for their urbanity, frankness, and ease; great lovers of Madeira wine, of horses, and dogs, free at jest.”<sup>137</sup> The nostalgia was a reaction to social fluctuations, beyond their power to control, and to the realization that Virginia was no longer the nation’s epicenter.<sup>138</sup> Virginia’s monopoly on the Presidency ended; industry and opportunity shifted the nation’s focus northward and westward.

It was the reality of the antebellum era that sparked a yearning for the “cavalier” days; a similar mood prevailed after the Civil War when the plantation legend of the antebellum south masked the trying times of an era, that in its day looked back to the cavaliers. Few white southerners wanted to remember the effects of slavery, preferring to recall a benevolent and paternalistic system. Whether they wanted to remember or not, the legacy of guilt from slavery fueled myths of southern righteousness, just as the experience of defeat in the Civil War created regional defensiveness. In response, southerners dusted off the legacy of the founding fathers emphasizing the men (Virginians) who defined the country, led it to independence, and crafted the Enlightenment experiment with democracy. Through heroic myths of the nation’s creation, southerners (Virginians) promoted the virtues of their past and so their regional identity.<sup>139</sup>

Distinguishing between the past, its myths and traditions, is difficult. To begin, the historian must sort through these to find the identity of the subject. The embellished tales of the past are as important as the empirical evidence for it is often the tales of an “imagined” community that save it or the lore around a house site that warrants keeping it intact. The latter is true of Kiskiack. It was the Henry Lee House Fund, Inc., that urged the Navy to stabilize the house. Descendants of an immigrant to Charles River County, Virginia, joined forces, raised awareness and probably money, to preserve what they believed to be the dwelling their ancestor Henry Lee built upon arrival.<sup>140</sup> In tandem with a

---

<sup>136</sup>C. Vann Woodward, “Introduction,” chap. in The Burden of Southern History (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, [1968]).

<sup>137</sup>Robert P. Sutton, “Nostalgia, Pessimism, & Malaise: the Doomed Aristocrat in late Jeffersonian Virginia,” Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 76, no. 1 (January 1968): 44. Sutton cites, George Tucker, Valley of the Shenandoah: or Memoirs of the Graysons (New York, NY: 1824), II, p. 31-32.

<sup>138</sup>Sutton, p. 41-55, passim; Fraser D. Neiman, “Domestic Architecture at the Clifts Plantation: The Social Context of Early Virginia Building,” in Common Places Readings in American Vernacular Architecture, edited by Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, p. 293 (Athens, GA and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1986).

<sup>139</sup>Kammen, p. 89-90, 101-131; James M. Lindgren, Preserving the Old Dominion Historic Preservation and Virginia Traditionalism (Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia, 1993), p. 241-248.

<sup>140</sup>“Henry Lee House,” Nomination Form, National Register for Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.; and Catherine H.C. Seaman, The Lees of Seventeenth-Century York County, Virginia: a Case Study of Family, Kinship,

1630s construction date, early Henry Lee family genealogists linked their ancestor to Richard Lee, suggesting they were brothers or cousins, yet no research was done to substantiate the claim. The Henry Lee family outlined its traditional past, embellishing its genealogical chart with the crest of the Lee family in England. Their use of the crest, however, was not authorized by the College of Heralds in London. A representative of the Richard Lee descendants, who are entitled to use the crest and shield, explained due to the prevalence of "Lee" as a surname in England the coincidence of immigration in the 1630s to Virginia was not enough to establish a connection between the families.<sup>141</sup> Kiskiack survives today because of the tradition of its seventeenth-century creation and Henry Lee, and because of the lore surrounding the Richard Lee family of Virginia that produced two signers of the Declaration of Independence and General Robert E. Lee.

Myths and traditions are not synonymous with history. Historical myths exist in the present, influencing contemporary perceptions of the past. They are stories told about reality lived. They evolve, are questioned, and sometimes, abandoned, within a framework of cultural values and assumptions. Mythical stories do not have to have a truism as a foundation; they can and do exist along side of facts that contradict them. A myth, however, is not a misnomer. Symbols and myths mingle and merge with historical data to convey, collectively, the many desires and experiences of the past. Such a representation can not be an exact replica of the physical and social environment of the past; it usually is more appealing than the past as lived.<sup>142</sup> Moreover, authenticity is relative, for myth makers opt for the better story rather than the actual past or for an example of, rather than the specific site of, where a legend lived and died. In the United States, myths glorify men who actually lived, using the public details of their lives to make them into "impossible abstractions of idealized virtues."

---

and Land Tenure (Sweet Briar, VA: Sweet Briar College Printing Press, 1985). See also, the newspapers articles about the family: "Ancient Residence Burned Historic Lee Home in York County Wiped Out by Early Morning Fire," Richmond Times-Dispatch, 26 February 1915, p. 9A; Cindy Elmore, "Lees House History Is Untouched," Daily Press, 11 March 1985; Cindy Elmore, "Museum Gives Up on Moving County's Oldest House," Daily Press, 9 August 1985, section C, p. 4; Preston Grady, "APVA Opposes Dismantling Kiskiack," Daily Press, 14 March 1964, p. 3, 12:1; Tina Jeffrey, "Old Lee House Is Hidden But Not Forgotten," Daily Press, 15 June 1975, section B, p. 3; Kurt Jensen, "300 Years Later, House May Be Saved," Virginia Gazette, 13 February 1985, p. 1A, 5A; "Lee Family Reunion," Daily Press, 22 June 1975; "Lee Home to Remain," Virginia Gazette, 10 August 1985; "Plans Are Being Made to Restore Lee House, One of Oldest Still Standing," Danville Register, 15 June 1975; "Restoration Sought for Old Lee House," Roanoke Times, 15 June 1975.

<sup>141</sup>Eleanor Lee Templeton, to Captain [Randall W.] Young, 17 June 1975. Letter, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. Eleanor Lee Templeton, to Captain [Randall W.] Young, 27 June 1975. Letter, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. Templeton stated that the Lees of Virginia organization maintained records of 43 UN-RELATED Lee families of Virginia. It was unclear from her letter, however, if the Henry Lees of York County were among them.

<sup>142</sup>My interpretation of a myth comes from Peter Novick, That Noble Dream the 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988, reprint, 1993), p. 470-563; and from Henry Nash Smith, Virgin Land the American West as Symbol and Myth (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950, reissued 1970), preface.

Examples of men transformed into American legends are the founding fathers, Abraham Lincoln, and Robert E. Lee.<sup>143</sup>

Historical traditions depend on the transmission from generation to generation of beliefs, customs, and legends or myths. The act of transferral between a succession of persons can be done orally or through practice. Traditions, then, grow out of a consensus reached through time and sustained within the community. Traditions held by that community underpin its sense of identity. How that community views itself, represented in the traditions it upholds, is tied to the ways it remembers its creation, its history. As pieces of the past rather than a complete account, memories can be, and often are, contested. The present to past relationship incipient in a memory -- a present generation remembers something about its past, conveys it to another generation, and so has invented or continued a tradition -- allows challenges to, and allows for changes in, a community's identity.<sup>144</sup>

Forging and sustaining an identity out of the traditions carried on within a community is complicated by the selectiveness or subjectivity of memories; this is especially valid in the United States where the private sector -- with its individual agenda -- initially was the custodian of tradition. Moreover, in the early twentieth century, American traditions merged with making money, creating a "heritage tourism" industry.<sup>145</sup> On two separate occasions, preservationists lobbied to move the Kiskiack house from its original site to make it accessible to the public, that is to say, to tourist dollars. The first came from Paul Hudson, a once and future board member of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, in 1962. Hudson suggested that the Navy relocate the house to the Colonial Parkway so that it could be exhibited to the thousands of tourists who visit(ed) the historic triangle area each year. Hudson emphasized the dwelling's significance as one of Virginia's seventeenth-century structures, and as "the birthplace of the Lees of Virginia."<sup>146</sup> The other request was made by the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation in the 1980s; the foundation's interest renewed awareness of the house ultimately led to its rehabilitation.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup>Michael Kammen, Mystic Chords of Memory the Transformation of Tradition in American Culture (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1991; paperback edition, Vintage Books, 1993), p. 1-30, passim.

<sup>144</sup>Kammen, p. 4-13, 25-31, 52.

<sup>145</sup>Kammen, p. 13.

<sup>146</sup>Paul Hudson to Captain Frank L. Pinney, Jr., CO, 6 November 1962. Letter, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. Hudson only repeated the tradition of Kiskiack as the birthplace of the Lees; Fraser D. Neiman had not discovered Clifts Plantation yet. The Clifts was the seventeenth-century dwelling on the tract of land purchased by Thomas Lee in 1718; Lee built Stratford Hall on this property and demolished Clifts around 1730. The genealogical research published in Tyler's Quarterly and the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography did not refute the claim of kinship between the Henry Lees of York County and the Lees of Westmoreland County.

<sup>147</sup>Library, Yorktown Victory Center, Yorktown, Virginia; see also, Cindy Elmore, "Lees House History Is Untouched," Daily Press, 11 March 1985; Cindy Elmore, "Museum Gives Up on Moving County's Oldest House," Daily Press, 9 August 1985, section C, p. 4; Kurt Jensen, "300 Years Later, House May Be Saved," Virginia Gazette, 13 February 1985, p. 1A, 5A; and "Lee Home to Remain," Virginia Gazette, 10 August 1985.

The selection of traditions to sustain a community and its identity occurs from a presentist perspective. A society reconstructs its past with the needs of contemporary culture in mind; its collective memory could be consciously short-sighted, its identity invented or elaborated, rather than inherited.<sup>148</sup> In the post Civil War south, the soldiers returned to their farms. Working the soil acted as a continuum; its familiarity linked pre and post Civil War experiences. As southerners slipped back into an agricultural routine, their military duty became legendary as memories. Reinforcing the legends bred on the battlefields, the significance of the memories, and of ancestors who were the subjects of myths, grew increasingly important after 1870. It was then that the celebrations, the statues and dedication ceremonies, and the genealogical associations such as the Colonial Dames, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Society of the Cincinnati, and Sons of the Colonial Wars, all thrived. Each contributed to the making of the cult of the "Lost Cause." During this era, the Civil War was re-fought as both the North and South evaluated each other. This time, the regions battled for self-respect and cultural autonomy. In the south, traditions of past wealth and of a romantic social history flourished.<sup>149</sup>

The tradition of a southern past, an interpretation of a way of life lost in the Civil War, separated the South from the rest of the United States in way geography did not and could not do. The South was at once differentiated from the rest of the nation and perceived as homogenous entity. To an outsider, this regional distinctiveness, and remarkable monotony within, was an effect of the social habits of white people, specifically their thoughts, feelings, and prejudice that colored their relationships to one another. In reality, however, the agricultural condition of the region determined the seemingly homogenous form of the post Civil War South. Ownership of the land, still the region's primary resource, had not changed in the war. The old adage "40 Acres and a Mule" remained an unfulfilled promise; although, after the Reconstruction era, many landholders did go to the cities to earn a living. Removed from the land, memories of a pre-Civil War life became the crux of an identity independent from that of the New South and its Yankee characteristics. The traditions of a romantic social history sustained an identity apart from that of the North, and indeed from the South itself. The distinguishing characteristic, its identity, was the legend of the "Old South."<sup>150</sup>

The tradition of the "Old South" was that of a land polished and poised, and characterized by chivalric ideals of honor. This mythical place of antebellum plantation legend was inhabited by the cavaliers, who were soft-spoken gentlemen that performed gallant deeds, courted lovely ladies, and dueled for honor against a background of rose gardens, moonlight, and magnolias. In reality, the eighteenth-century 'cavaliers' were planters with sufficient funds, or the appearance thereof, to escape

---

<sup>148</sup>Kammen, p. 3-5, 52.

<sup>149</sup>Kammen, p. 89-90; see also, W.J. Cash, The Mind of the South, with a new introduction by Bertram Wyatt-Brown (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1941; Vintage Books edition, 1991).

<sup>150</sup>Kammen, p. 89-90; and Cash, passim.

the tobacco season and dabble in other economic ventures, politics, and patronage.<sup>151</sup> Colonial gentlemen were property owners, who more often than not lived in wood houses and farmed to make a living. Gentlemen worked. The early plantations were clearings in the woods. Inventories of these farm dwellings reveal silver, carriages, clocks, and other consumer goods whose use evokes a sense of gentility today, irrespective of their New World setting.

Virginians claimed George Washington and many of the nation's preeminent statesmen for her traditional social history. Virginia also appropriated of New England's mythical beginnings; evidence was discovered that placed the first thanksgiving at Berkeley Plantation, Virginia, 1619, thus seizing the legend from the Plymouth pilgrims.<sup>152</sup> Taking a piece of New England's creation myth was done as a challenge to that region's dominance in United States' history. Many were taught that the United States began in Massachusetts, rising the ire of Virginians. This dispute was symptomatic of the second civil war, wherein the regions fought for cultural recognition, each constructing an identity that vied for a premier place in the nation's history.<sup>153</sup>

In his book, Preserving the Old Dominion, James M. Lindgren cited the efforts of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) as the source of the invented tradition of historic preservation, and so, the genesis for the memories and identity of Virginia.<sup>154</sup> The tradition invented by the APVA's activities, which concentrated in eastern Virginia's Tidewater and Piedmont regions, reflected the sentiment of those areas. This new Virginia tradition embraced the beliefs championed by the men who lived on or owned the sites preserved. These values were localism, states' rights, and the traditional racial and social order, as well as the personal commitments to duty and Protestant morality. Also held in high esteem were qualities of individualism, rural culture, and family.<sup>155</sup> Linked to the founding fathers and to Robert E. Lee, Virginia traditionalism was about maintaining a code of honor, structured class relations, loyalty to the Commonwealth.<sup>156</sup> The sites saved, and those reconstructed as Colonial Williamsburg, connected the values held by eastern Virginians in ages past to those adopted by late nineteenth - and twentieth- century preservationists. In sum, the APVA's preservation activities gave traditionalism its symbols.<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup>T.H. Breen, Tobacco Culture: the Mentality of Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of the Revolution (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), passim.

<sup>152</sup>Kammen, p. 89-90, 130-131, 375-406. Lyon Gardiner Tyler, one of the Presidents of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, found the document in the New York Public Library. Tyler also championed the Confederate cause, so undoubtedly he was pleased to snatch the Thanksgiving tradition for Virginia and away from Massachusetts.

<sup>153</sup>Archives, Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, Richmond, Virginia.

<sup>154</sup>Lindgren, p. 248.

<sup>155</sup>Lindgren, p. 240.

<sup>156</sup>Lindgren, p. 245.

<sup>157</sup>Lindgren, p. 240-248.

Traditionalism APVA style operated as a hegemonic force in the state. Houses once occupied by Virginia's gentlemen and the likes of Lee became shrines. The effect of the APVA, in the context of a cultural war, allowed the traditional sources of authority to recover momentum and power lost during the Civil War, Reconstruction, and Re-adjuster periods of the nineteenth century. Money funded the resurgence of familiar power brokers; it also was the prerequisite to preservation action. Just as the early Virginians needed and maintained a measure of wealth, the early preservationists used their economic standing -- which as in the eighteenth century included social and political means -- to protect what they could (or wanted?). By choosing to preserve sites in Tidewater and the Piedmont, the APVA and other traditionalists re-instituted the identity and ways of old elite who exercised control over the land. They restored the traditional order by saving the places where Virginia's great white men lived, fought, and died. Through the APVA's efforts, Virginia's architecture attested to the permanence of her past; it symbolically held memories of family, work and leisure. Through her buildings, Virginia asserted her primacy in the nation's history. The APVA's shrine at Jamestown clearly demonstrated Virginia's place as the first permanent settlement in British colonial America. The ruins of the Jamestown church tower were a powerful, symbolic rebuttal to the belief that New England's Massachusetts was the birthplace of the United States. Moreover, the shrines -- signifying only the grand pieces of Virginia's past -- made money. The invented identity was a partial recollection, but a powerful one.<sup>158</sup>

The symbols of this traditionalism, the mansions of Virginia chronicled by Thomas Tileston Waterman and others, represented an existence made extinct, vanquished and lost in the midst of progress and time. The houses left behind by our forebears signify a gentility of bygone days. They also stand for our own historical legitimacy. The old houses satisfy a presentist longing for roots, preferably good ones. Just as genealogists claim connections to well known individuals from the many ordinary, but no less respectable, candidates, preservationists place legendary figures at their sites as visitors or owners.<sup>159</sup> Deliberate choices made by genealogists and preservationists put their family or house into the larger context of the region's invented traditions and its self consciously shaped identity. Moreover, unless the ancestors left diaries, neither they nor their dwellings can keep future generations on the straight and narrow historical path. For example, on the Henry Lee family genealogical chart, the text beneath the drawing of Kiskiack reads as follows:

The Lee House...also known as "Kiskiack" after the Indian tribe in the area...is located about two miles off the York River towards the center of the Naval Weapons Station, the only one of the plantation houses on the station that is still standing. *The bricks for the house came from England as ballast on the ships. The house originally had a west*

---

<sup>158</sup>Lindgren, p. 241-248. Moreover, in Peter Novick's *That Noble Dream the 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988; reprint, 1993) the point is made that no one tells the truth all the time because other values intervene. There is a relationship between social purpose, social institutions, and the establishment of knowledge. Novick invoked Michel Foucault's linkage of knowledge and power, a connection that produced and sustained truth. See Novick, p. 470, 522-544.

<sup>159</sup>Neiman, "Domestic Architecture at the Clifts Plantation: The Social Context of Early Virginia Building," p. 292-293.

wing, but that as since burned, and the kitchen was originally on the east side. *The house was constructed to withstand the frequent Indian raids, i.e., thick walls and narrow slits for windows.*<sup>160</sup> (Emphasis mine)

and in a letter signed by William Warren Harrison Lee,

The Old Home having been built in the sixteenth century by Henry Lee, it has the honor of having sheltered the fore-fathers of the two signers of The Declaration of Independence. Richard Henry Lee - Francis H. Lee, which to all true Americans is quite an honor.<sup>161</sup>

and data concerning Building C-14, "Old Lee House," which was reported as an historical structure, and so, included in the identification and registration process for Historic Buildings, Structures and Monuments in the Naval Shore Establishment,

The main section was constructed in 1647 by the brothers Sir Francis Lee and Henry Lee on a site known as the Kiskiskiack Plantation, named after the Kiskiskiack Indians who had a village in the vicinity and were Spanish speaking Indians who befriended the colonists in the winter of 1608 at Jamestown. A famous descendent of Sir Francis, who moved to Westmoreland County in 1649 or 1650, was General Robert E. Lee. From Henry, who remained at the Lee House, descended White Horse Harry Lee of Revolutionary War fame.<sup>162</sup>

Within the context of Virginia traditionalism, the errors incorporated in the genealogical chart made by the off-spring of William Warren Harrison Lee, who wistfully called Kiskiack the "Old Home," are understandable. Lee's children sought a connection between Henry Lee of York County and Richard Lee whose descendants built Stratford Hall, the birthplace of Robert E. Lee, and their house. The Richard Lee descendants, especially General Robert E. Lee, embodied the ideals of honor, dignity, Protestant morality, and loyalty to the Old Dominion as did many of the elite Virginia families, but the Confederate General personified these values more so than other nineteenth-century heroes.<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup>"The Lee Family Tree of Kiskiskiack of York County," Chart, n.d., Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>161</sup>William Warren Harrison Lee, the Jefferson, Richmond, Virginia, to Commanding Officer, Navy Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia, Letter, 27 March 1919, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>162</sup>Commandant, Fifth Naval District to Commanding Officer, U.S. Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, Report, 30 April 1963, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. This reference was written in response to Comfive Notice 5750, Code N37, of 12 April 1963, regarding Historic Buildings, Structures and Monuments in the Naval Shore Establishment; identification and registration. The Navy's primary source of information was the William Warren Harrison Lee family.

<sup>163</sup>W.J. Cash, *The Mind of the South*, with a new introduction by Bertram Wyatt-Brown (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1941; Vintage Books edition, 1991).

Besides the similar circumstances of immigration of Richard and Henry Lee, the lore of General Lee's family made such a relationship desirable. Their father's account of their family's past also cemented these associations in the minds of the Lee children and grandchildren as fact rather than legend.

Stories that muddy the picture, although not in an unappealing way, seem to come from the last private owner of the house, William Warren Harrison Lee. His memories of "fateful days during the War Between the States" appeared in a ca. 1930 newspaper article because "now in the serenity of his eighty years, [he] surveys the past with an accurate appraisal." Lee said he was born in the house, and was about ten years old when the war ended.<sup>164</sup> Lee was born in 1856-57, however, his uncle William W. Lee did not buy the property until 1866.<sup>165</sup> If Lee remembered correctly, then it was John H. and Sarah M. Lee who let their kinsmen live at Kiskiack.<sup>166</sup> If so, then Lee's father, Henry Harwood Lee, must have moved his family to Richmond when James B. Crosswell owned the property (1859-66).<sup>167</sup> Henry Harwood Lee's decision to relocate his family was one many of their neighbors made. During McClellan's Yorktown campaign, Edge wrote that the Peninsula was deserted. He encountered only one farmer, who he characterized as too lazy to work or build fences, and implied the man lacked the motivation, energy or intelligence to flee from the northern troops.<sup>168</sup>

Who actually lived in the house remains a mystery because county records tell only who owned it, not who occupied it. William Warren Lee evidently thought his half brother Henry Harwood Lee lived there in 1886 because he bequeathed the property as the "land on which he [Henry Harwood] now

---

<sup>164</sup>R.B. Munford, Jr., "Memories of Fateful Days During War Between the States related by Wm. Lee," Newspaper clipping, ca. 1930, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>165</sup>See Chain of title, compiled from the York County records.

<sup>166</sup>The John H. and Sarah M. Lee in the York County records could be the same people listed in the William and Mary Quarterly genealogy as John Henry Mortimer Lee (b. 1819) who married a Sarah Miles Burnham of Warwick County, Virginia, and lived in Williamsburg. John Henry Mortimer Lee was the son of Whitaker Lee, who was also of Warwick County, and his mother was Ann Kirby. Whitaker and Ann Lee married in 1806. See "The Lee Family of York County Virginia," William and Mary Quarterly, 24, no. 1 (July 1915): 52.

<sup>167</sup>Earlier accounts about Kiskiack asserted its "uninterrupted lineage" descending from Henry Lee to William Warren Harrison Lee. By emphasizing the Lee's family's tenure on the property, these histories linked ownership to occupancy, neither of which can be verified in the County records. See "The Lee Family of York County, Virginia," William and Mary Quarterly, 24, no. 1 (July 1915): 46-54 and 24, no. 3 (January 1916): 215-216; as well as Maddocks, p. 2.

Lyon Gardiner Tyler wrote "Cheesecake" when Lee's wife died. In the article, Tyler suggested William Lee, who died in 1728, built the house. Tyler's account contradicted Lee's version in which Lee called the structure "the oldest Lee house in America" and the home of Henry Lee, brother of Richard Lee. Tyler shifted away from claims of kinship between Richard and Henry Lee, however, he included the traditional chain of title, wherein the house descended from father to son continually, that is, from Henry Lee to William Warren Harrison Lee. The 1931 article also rescinded a 1922 excerpt wherein Tyler attributed the house to Henry Lee's son. See "Cheesecake," p. 199-200, and "Chiskiack," Tyler's Quarterly 3, no. 4 (April 1922): 302.

<sup>168</sup>Frederick Milnes Edge, Major General McClellan and the Campaign on the Yorktown Peninsula, (London: Trubner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row, 1865), p. 58-86.

resides.”<sup>169</sup> Census records indicate that Henry Harwood Lee moved back to York County by 1880.<sup>170</sup> William Warren Harrison Lee confirmed his absentee ownership of the property in a 1919 letter. Lee wrote that he had “passed three score and some years... [and that he had] for fifty years been looking forward to the day when he could return to the Old Home and rest there the remaining years of [his] life.” Lee continued, stating the house had not been occupied permanently since his children Sargeant W.H.H. Lee and Francis H. Lee volunteered for the war.<sup>171</sup> The content of this letter suggests Lee left York County around age ten, and did not return as a permanent resident. Moreover, the newspaper article reporting the 1915 fire said that Lee was “in residence” implying he did not live there all of the time. The 1919 letter post dates the fire, which gutted the interior, and Lee’s correspondence with Lyon Gardiner Tyler regarding an assignation at the house in which he apologized to Tyler for being tardy with the excuse he was making some repairs to house. Lee complained about the difficulty of the job because materials were so far away.<sup>172</sup> If he lived there, its relative remoteness would have been part of a daily routine and not a source of complaint.

At the time of the fire, Lee lived on Stuart Avenue; earlier (1910s) correspondence came from the Jefferson Hotel, both in Richmond, Virginia.<sup>173</sup> Lee said his first association with the city was when the Yankees came up the York River; his family fled to the safety of Richmond.<sup>174</sup> This corresponds with the ca. 1930 newspaper article’s statement that Lee had been in the city for years and the Henrico County clerk’s testimony that the Lees were known well to the county at the time of the deed transfer to the government. Also in 1921, Lee requested, and was granted permission, to be

---

<sup>169</sup>York County Records, Will Book 17, 1919, p. 403.

<sup>170</sup>Henry H. Lee moved back to York County between the 1870 and 1880 lists of residents in Nelson Township taken for the census records. His sons, William Warren Harrison Lee and Richard Lee were not included in Lee’s household.

<sup>171</sup>William Warren Harrison Lee, the Jefferson Hotel, Richmond, Virginia, to CO, Navy Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia, Letter, 27 March 1919, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>172</sup>William Warren Harrison Lee to Lyon Gardiner Tyler, Letter, 5 August 1915, Tyler Family Papers, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia; “Ancient Residence Burned Historic Lee Home in York County Wiped Out by Early Morning Fire,” Richmond Times-Dispatch, 26 February 1915, p. 9A.

<sup>173</sup>During the 1910s, Lee wrote to Lyon G. Tyler, of the College of William and Mary, on stationery from the Jefferson Hotel. People lived at the hotel around that time, but no one from the Jefferson Hotel could or would confirm Lee’s residence or role at the hotel. Tyler Family Papers, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

<sup>174</sup>Lee’s memoirs of the war specifically are listening to the guns of the Yankees around Seven Pines. Lee also said that on 3 April, he watched the burning of a powder magazine and a Negro Poorhouse in Richmond. He, and some other boys, salvaged what they could for themselves, but Yankee soldiers came for the items the next day. When the Yankees opened a white Poorhouse, he went there to eat beefsteak. Previously, under the Confederacy, a flour horsecake cost a dollar. See Munford, *passim*; see also Frederick Milnes Edge, Major General McClellan and the Campaign on the Yorktown Peninsula, (London: Trubner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row, 1865), p. 58-86, and the chain of title documents in the field notes, specifically York County Records, Deed Book 39A, p. 90. The deed was signed in 1921 and recorded 18 April 1924.

buried in the "family" cemetery.<sup>175</sup> His obituary, however, listed his interment at Richmond's Riverview Cemetery.<sup>176</sup>

William Warren Harrison Lee encouraged the myths surrounding the creation of the house; his stories were copied onto the Henry Lee family's genealogical chart, an action signifying the family's acceptance of the traditions surrounding its roots. Referring to traditions included in the genealogical chart specifically, the bricks used to build the house were made in Virginia, rather than coming across the Atlantic as "ballast" in ships. This misconception could be from the term, "English" bond that describes the pattern or arrangement of the individual bricks in the wall. In addition, windows were smaller in early eighteenth-century houses because crystal glass was expensive; the possibility of Indian attacks was slim by that time. The colonists chased the Chiskiack Indians from the area of Charles River County before the Governor opened it for settlement in the 1634; they squelched the Indian uprisings of 1622 and 1644 and by the 1670s the Indian numbers were reduced. The Chiskiack Indians, in fact, were not even listed as an independent tribe in the treaty of 1677. The remaining Indian groups were contained in areas north of the York River or in western lands, and so, not a determining factor in eighteenth-century aesthetic choices. Lee's son, who may have stayed in the house during the 1910s with his brother, Francis H. Lee of Richmond, dated the house to an act signed by Governor Berkeley that ordered the colonists to build in brick.<sup>177</sup>

Today, Kiskiack is linked in popular imagination to the Lees who signed the declaration of the independence and to General Robert E. Lee. Stories floating around the Naval Weapons Station are about General Lee's daughter, or more specifically, her ghost that appears around gate 13.<sup>178</sup> By tying Kiskiack to a popular legend and to the tradition of the Lees of Virginia, the Henry Lee descendants made the house accessible in a symbolic manner. This is significant because of the site's location in a militarily restricted zone.

\*\*\*

---

<sup>175</sup>Secretary Josphens Daniels to Hon. Lyon G. Tyler, Letter, 24 February 1921, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>176</sup>"W.H. Lee Dies At Home Here, Funeral of Scion of Old Family Set for Sunday," Newspaper clipping, 1936, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>177</sup>Francis H. Lee to Commander Boyd Brooks, Letter, 28 September 1955, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. It is possible the law Lee referred to is the 1662 law advocating brick construction projects in Jamestown; see The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, vol. 2, 1660-1684, edited by William Waller Hening (New York, NY: R & W & G Bartow for the editor, 1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA; The University of Virginia Press for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 172-175. This act outlined how Jamestown was to be rebuilt in 1662 of brick houses measuring 40'0" by 20'0" -- dimensions that correspond to Kiskiack's proportions.

Also, the article reporting the 1915 fire mentioned the blaze was discovered by Lee's son; perhaps it was one of the two children said lived there around that time. See, "Ancient Residence Burned Historic Lee Home in York County Wiped Out by Early Morning Fire," Richmond Times-Dispatch 26 February 1915, p. 9A.

Regarding the 1677 treaty, see The Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 325; "Virginia Colonial Records, Treaty between Virginia and the Indians, 1677," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 14, no. 3 (January 1907): 446-447.

<sup>178</sup>Personal Communication, Security Office, Gate 3, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, Fall 1997.

For specific information about the Hansford and Lee families in York County, please see the Supplemental Information section for genealogical, population schedules, parish, tax, and agricultural and manufacture census records.

## PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

### A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: In colonial Virginia, planters used the buildings and grounds of their plantations to distinguish themselves. These planters created a plantation landscape with established boundaries and filled it with costly items. As container of well managed improvements and material goods, the plantation setting symbolized the social and economic identities of their owners, who controlled the means of production. The plantation landscape confirmed the planter's power over his household, his ability to impose his will on nature, and his skill in extracting wealth from it. In the eighteenth century, Virginia's gentry class exhibited its authority through the nice things it possessed and by the work performed on the land.<sup>179</sup>

Because it was a brick house, Kiskiack represented what its occupants accomplished and what they aspired to do. The materials used to erect the house were local products but also involved the most expensive manner of construction available in colonial Virginia. To build it, the Hansfords had economic means; once standing, Kiskiack symbolized that affluence and exemplified work well done. Its very existence, then, implied a measure of control over labor and land that few achieved.

The cost of using brick lay in the labor needed to make it and make things with it. It was labor intensive. While the raw materials, sand, clay, and water, were readily available, the job cycle began with digging up the clay and ended by the firing of a brick in the kiln. It took all year. Each brick had to be carefully molded for a regular shape which required straight lines and sharply defined edges. Every surface had to be even for the brick to function as a building block but not overly so because the mortar had to adhere to it. If the clay mixture was lumpy, the bricks regardless of fine lines and flat planes would not fire evenly. Good bricks, then, came from clay that was of smooth consistency. The size of bricks were not left to chance either; the ideal proportions of each individual brick called for the length to be two times the width plus a mortar joint. In England, laws dictated the size of bricks specifically and so bricks were called "statute bricks" or in the colonies, "English bricks." Supposedly, one worker could mold up to five thousand bricks during a twelve hour shift; even so, about 80,000 bricks were needed to build a house 40 by 20 feet or the size of Kiskiack. Once made, a craftsman laid

---

<sup>179</sup>Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," Winterthur Portfolio 28, no. 1 (Spring 1993) : 29-31; Bernard L. Herman, The Stolen House (Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1992), p. 136; Allan Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves the Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800, (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986), p. 166-167; and Kathleen Mary Brown, "Gender and the Genesis of a Race and Class System in Virginia, 1630-1750," Ph.D. diss, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1990, p. 483.

the bricks in a bond or pattern that determined the appearance and strength of the wall itself.<sup>180</sup> Because of the time and labor expenses, brick construction was feasible only for the affluent in early Virginia. Most planters could not afford to turn resources away from tobacco production. Whether they knew the Hansford family or not, seeing their house told passers-by then and now that the family had money.

Inspired by the public building projects in Williamsburg, such as the Capitol building and the Governor's Palace, the fashion conscious and politically ambitious planters chose an English or common bond for the foundation walls of their houses beneath the watertable and used the Flemish bond above it. The Governor's Palace was laid in Flemish bond with glazed headers throughout the pattern. Work on the palace was completed around 1721.<sup>181</sup> Like the palace, Kiskiack's builders opted for structural decoration. They too used glazed headers in Kiskiack's walls of Flemish bond. The brickwork that made Kiskiack was luxurious; its ornamentation, literally embedded into the house walls, made a permanent statement that effectively communicated the Hansfords' status. The bricks said more than just "we have money" because the builder of Kiskiack emulated the brickwork of the Governor's Palace. The commonality suggests an equivalence in settings. Kiskiack as a socio-political setting, recognized through the same signs as the palace, bid for a place in the social hierarchy dominated by the crown's representative.<sup>182</sup>

Yet it was Mann Page's dwelling, not the Governor's Palace, that had the reputation of being the "best house" in Virginia.<sup>183</sup> The palace preceded, indeed inspired, a series of large brick structures

---

<sup>180</sup>Gabrielle M. Lanier and Bernard L. Herman, Everyday Architecture of the Mid-Atlantic Looking at Buildings and Landscapes (Baltimore, MD and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), p. 98-111, passim; Stewart Scrimshaw, Bricklaying in Modern Practice (New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, Inc., 1920), p. 14-15; Harley J. Mckee, Introduction to Early American Masonry, second printing, National Trust and Columbia University Series on the Technology of Early American Building (Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation and Columbia University for the NTHP, 1972; revised and expanded, 1977), p. 41-50, passim; Lewis Augustus Coffin, Jr., and Arthur C. Holden, Brick Architecture of the Colonial Period in Maryland and Virginia (New York, NY: Architectural Book Publishing Co., 1919), p. 1-10; as well as William Carver, Brick (Cleveland, OH: The Common Brick Manufacturers Association of America, 1925); Herbert A. Claiborne, Comments on Virginia Brickwork Before 1800 (Portland, ME: The Anthoensen Press for the Wapole Society, 1957); Andrew Plumridge and William Meulenkamp, Brickwork (New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1993); Suggestions in Brickwork (Washington, D.C.: Washington Hydraulic Brick Company, 1895); Nathaniel Lloyd, A History of English Brickwork, with an introduction by Sir Edwin L. Lutyens (New York, NY: William Helburn, Inc., 1928); Andrew Barry, "Brickmaking," Lecture, Fall 1995 and Brick Kiln Presentation, October 1998, The College of William and Mary and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; and Bill Weldon, "The Brickmaker's Year," Historic Trades 2 (no date): 1-40.

<sup>181</sup>Claiborne, p. 5-6.

<sup>182</sup>Dell Upton, Holy Things and Profane Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia (Cambridge, MA: Architectural History Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1986; reprint, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1997), passim; David Leatherbarrow, The Roots of Architectural Invention (Cambridge University Press, 1993); Personal Communication, Camille Wells, 1997.

<sup>183</sup>"Virginia in 1732 the Travel Journal of William Hugh Grove," edited by Gregory A. Stiverson and Patrick H. Butler, III Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 85, no. 1 (January 1977): 26.

that appeared during the 1720s. These brick houses were genteel structures and stood tall in the landscape -- literally multi-storied edifices crowned by chimney stacks -- and they symbolically challenged the position of the Governor's Palace through their craftsmanship. Mann Page I began his construction project around 1725; his dwelling, Rosewell, took another fifteen years to complete. In scale, its entrance hall alone dwarfed most Virginians' houses. Significantly, Rosewell was taller than the Governor's Palace. Rosewell had two cupolas gracing its rooftop instead of just the one looking over the palace.<sup>184</sup> By building a bigger, more expensive house than that of the Governor, Page competed with the crown's authority and vied for a position at the top of colonial society. The use of house building to establish political clout and status, however, was a costly endeavor. The financial investment of Rosewell was more than the Page family's fortune and yet with the house the Pages had the appearance of great wealth and so could maintain their status.<sup>185</sup>

The context in which Rosewell was built attenuates its significance as well as that of the other brick dwellings constructed during the 1720s like Kiskiack. The Virginia environment surrounding Kiskiack and its contemporaries along the York River was a sea of one room structures and hovels, with an occasional nicely finished wood-frame house.<sup>186</sup> When a householder acquired land, he sheltered himself and his family as expediently as possible. Planters just starting out built houses efficiently, conserving time, labor, and money. To do so they practiced an earthfast building technique. These planters used the woods around them, for the freshly claimed parcels had not been cleared, cutting the trees for timber. The earthfast houses varied; some had posts and studs stuck into

---

<sup>184</sup>Rosewell stood three full stories over an English basement. Besides its great height, Rosewell had projecting pavilions from the east and west sides. Four stone capped chimney stacks heated the interior. Rosewell was a brick house, of Flemish bond with randomly placed glazed headers placed throughout the walls. Rubbed bricks were used for the corners, the window arches and jambs, the panels beneath the sills, the belt courses, and in the doorways on the north and south walls. The window sills, doorway caps, keystones, and pilaster bases were made from Portland stone. Rosewell was built in Gloucester County, across the York River from York County and so Kiskiack. Site visit, "Rosewell," October 1997, Gloucester, Virginia; and Edward A. Chappell, "Rosewell's Architecture Revisited."

<sup>185</sup>Richard Bushman, The Refinement of America Persons, Houses, Cities (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1993); Cary Carson, "The Consumer Revolution in British Colonial America: Why Demand?" in Of Consuming Interests the Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century, edited by Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, p. 483-697 (Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia for the United States Capitol Historical Society, 1994); Edward A. Chappell, "Rosewell's Architecture Revisited"; T.H. Breen, Tobacco Culture: the Mentality of Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of Revolution (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985); and Personal Communication, Camille Wells, Fall 1997.

<sup>186</sup>Dell Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia," Ph.D. diss, Brown University, 1980, p. 175; and Cary Carson, Norman F. Barka, William M. Kelso, Garry Wheeler Stone, and Dell Upton, "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," in Material Life in America, 1600-1860, edited by Robert Blair St. George, p. 113-158, passim (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 1988).

Between 1736 and 1782, half of the households in colonial Virginia owned the land on which they worked. Of those that did possess land, fifty percent held 200 acres or less. The houses they built, and advertised, were most commonly twenty by sixteen feet, which is smaller than Kiskiack. These figures were gathered by Camille Wells from her study of the Virginia Gazette. Wells contributed to the research compiled by the Yorktown Victory Center for its exhibit of a "middling" planter's homestead, and that material is in the library, Yorktown Victory Center, Yorktown, Virginia. Wells' work with the Virginia Gazette was published, in part, as "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," in the Winterthur Portfolio.

the ground while others had specific post holes and sills. The nature of the post in the ground construction method made the timber dwellings “impermanent.” Earthfast buildings required perpetual care because the wood posts and studs rotted in the ground.<sup>187</sup>

The majority of planters lived in ordinary Virginia houses, which were one-story structures of wood and earthfast construction that consisted of two ground floor rooms. Sometimes an attic, loft, or lean-to was tacked onto the main part for additional space. If heated, the dwelling had exterior end chimneys, frequently made of wood. The exterior door opened into the primary living room or hall of the house.<sup>188</sup> Some wood-frame houses, belonging to wealthier people, rested on brick foundations and had exterior chimney stacks of brick. Durand de Dauphine, writing in 1686, evaluated the Virginia houses and the financial position of who lived in them. Poor people lived in unpainted wood-frame houses that also were unfinished on the inside. If a planter’s income allowed, the interior of the dwelling was plastered with an oyster shell lime, many of these houses had glazed windows and were “most agreeable” although few planters fixed up the exterior. Rich men lived in brick houses, however, regardless of means, Virginia planters kept the two room, hall and chamber plan.<sup>189</sup>

The brick houses belonging to the gentry were the private buildings that Robert Beverley described in 1705. Beverley noted that most (elite) dwellings were of brick with cypress shingles and had large, sash windows of crystal glass. Regardless of their increased presence in the landscape between 1686 and 1705, brick houses reflected an ability to command labor and materials on a scale usually reserved for public projects. The churches and courthouses were brick, but were funded by taxes levied specifically for the construction. Brick-making was cost-prohibitive because it was a year round chore as was tobacco cultivation -- the livelihood of most Virginians. Producing bricks and tobacco required extensive labor resources because the same person could not do both jobs. As a brick house, Kiskiack with its walls laid in a bond like that of the Governor’s Palace, attracted attention in a

---

<sup>187</sup>Upton, “Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia,” passim; Wells, “The Planter’s Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia,” passim; Carson, Barka, Kelso, Stone, and Upton, “Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies,” p. 113-158, passim; and Upton, “The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture,” in Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture (Annapolis, MD: Maryland Historical Trust, 1982), p. 45.

The earthfast building technology persisted in Virginia and Maryland. Around 1783, Edward Kimber encountered a town wherein the “parson [. . .] ha[d] the only Brick House in Town [. . .] The Church and all the Houses are built of Wood, but some of them have Brick Stacks of Chimneys: Some have their Foundations in the Ground, others are built on Puncheons of Logs, a Foot or two from the Earth, which is more airy, and a Defence against the Vermin.” [Edward Kimber], “Observations in Several Voyages and Travels in America,” The London Magazine (July 1745); reprint, Collections of the Georgia Historical Society, vol. 4 (Savannah, GA: J.H. Estill, printer, Morning News Steam Printing House, 1878), p. 43; also published in William and Mary Quarterly 15, no. 3 (January 1907) : 143-159 and no. 4 (April 1907) : 215-216. The William and Mary Quarterly version was edited by Lyon Gardiner Tyler.

<sup>188</sup>[Durand de Dauphine], Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee Traveling in Virginia in 1686, translated by a Virginian (Richmond, VA: privately printed, 1923), p. 111-113; Rhys Isaac, The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790 (New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1982), p. 72-73; Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, A Place in Time Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), p. 65-69; Upton, “Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia,” passim; and Carson, Barka, Kelso, Stone, and Upton, “Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies,” p. 113-118, 133-142.

<sup>189</sup>Durand, p. 111-113; Upton, “Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia,” p. 175.

context of one room timber dwellings because of its material (brick) and because of costs the material represented.<sup>190</sup>

Writing about Virginia several years after Beverley and closer to Kiskiack's creation, Hugh Jones said that houses in and around Williamsburg were brick. Not all of them, of course, but brick buildings had more than a token presence in the Virginia landscape.<sup>191</sup> In 1732, William Hugh Grove ranked ten of the thirty dwellings in Yorktown as "good houses." Of those, four were brick. The remaining twenty-six were wood-frame, primarily pine planks and covered by cypress shingles.<sup>192</sup> The allure of the brick buildings prompted seventeenth and eighteenth-century travelers to write about them; this fascination remained viable throughout the twentieth century. Periodically, architectural historians visit Kiskiack to examine its brick types, mortar joints, coursing, and watertable.<sup>193</sup>

2. Condition of fabric: The condition of Kiskiack is stable but poor. Left vacant since its acquisition by the United States Government in 1918-20, the house suffers from much deterioration. It also has endured insensitive repairs. The most notable example of sloppy workmanship exists on the exterior; the repointing and purple mortar smeared across the historic fabric obscure the evidence of construction and additions found in the brickwork.

In the mid-1980s, the Henry Lee House Fund, Inc., was established; that organization took the United States government to task for violating the Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Motivated by fears of "demolition by neglect," the Henry Lee House Fund, Inc., and the Naval Weapons Station

---

<sup>190</sup>Durand, p. 111-113; Robert Beverley, The History and Present State of Virginia, edited with an introduction by Louis B. Wright (London: printed for R. Parker, 1705; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1947), p. 289-290; Hugh Jones, The Present State of Virginia from Whence Is Inferred a Short View of Maryland and North Carolina, edited with an introduction by Richard L. Morton (London: printed for J. Clarke, 1724; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Virginia Historical Society, 1956), p. 71; Isaac, p. 72-73; Barry, "Brickmaking"; Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia"; Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes," p. 1-32; Carson, Barka, Kelso, Stone, and Upton, "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern Colonies," p. 113-150, passim; and specifically regarding the costs inherent in brick, Personal Communication, Camille Wells, 1997.

<sup>191</sup>Hugh Jones, The Present State of Virginia (reprint, New York, NY: Joseph Sabin, 1865), p. 32.

<sup>192</sup>"Virginia in 1732," p. 20-21. Also, in the 1730s, the General Assembly returned to the issue of fire-safety, advocating the clean-up of Yorktown. By 1736, chimneys made of wood were pulled down and fences raised to keep swine and goats from wandering through the streets. See The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, vol. 4, 1711-1736, edited by William Waller Hening (reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 465. Building in brick, as a fire prevention strategy, was an issue as early as 1662; its recurrence in the laws suggests that the colonists did not follow the statute and put up wood chimneys and buildings anyway. For brick to be re-dressed in the 1730s only emphasizes the significance of Kiskiack, and those four brick piles in town, in the Virginia landscape.

<sup>193</sup>R.H. Smethells, Public Works Officer, to Commanding Officer, Memorandum regarding Visit of Colonial Williamsburg Party to Lee House, 14 May 1965, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. The CW folks included Dr. Edward M. Riley, Director of Research, Mr. Ernest M. Frank, Resident Architect, Mr. Paul Buchanan, Director of Architectural Research and Records, and Mr. Ivor Noel Hume, Director of Archaeology.

attempted to resolve the dilemma of preserving Kiskiack. The Department of the Navy had an evaluation of the property done, in the form of an "Alternatives and Recommendations" report completed in August 1988. Based on the results of that study, the only feasible alternative for Kiskiack was "stabilization without restoration," that is, the Navy moth-balled the house.

Condition of the below-grade foundation is not known. Suggested by the archaeological tests, the foundations probably are in poor shape. The foundation walls lack depth, or have crumbled in situ, for the wildlife wanders in and builds homes of its own. Animal burrows are present.<sup>194</sup> Particularly weak is the foundation near the southwest corner.

The exterior walls are 1'2" to 1'4" thick, however, they are fragile because of the condition of the brick within them. Some of the bricks have disintegrated; some of these were replaced by or patched with a cement-like material. Inspections conducted in the 1980s reported that the deterioration of the bricks in the north and east facades was happening at an accelerated rate; in an effort to stop the process much repointing was done to the bond in those walls. The weak points of Kiskiack's remaining bricks were in the sand mortar joints; in the wake of this discovery, the Navy had to remove the (comparatively) new lime mortar from the building. The area below the watertable on east, west, and north sides was in-filled with cement. As an alternative to the cement-type repairs, the Park Service donated appropriate replacement bricks so that the Navy could fix the chimney caps. Presently, the south wall bows outward in the center; its bulge is roughly in the position of the fireplace. The wood parts of the house are painted white.<sup>195</sup>

Currently, the Navy practices a preventive maintenance policy on Kiskiack. They inspect the house and mow the grass around it routinely. Depending on what the inspection report says, Kiskiack is painted, its gutters cleaned, and windows re-glazed. Also, the house is treated regularly for termites.<sup>196</sup>

## B. Description of Exterior:

1. Dimensions: Kiskiack is a one-and-a-half story structure that is three bays across and visually weighted down by its steep gable roof. It measures about 41'0" x 20'0". At each end is a T-shaped chimney shaft, rising from interior chimney stacks. Kiskiack does not have a cellar, instead there is a crawl space beneath where the first floor framing members joined the walls nor does it have an attic. The house faces west toward the roadway.

---

<sup>194</sup>Site visits, "Kiskiack," 1997-1998, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>195</sup>"Alternatives and Recommendations for Kiskiack," Report prepared for the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Norfolk, Virginia, August 1988, p. 6-7, 33-39; Thomas H. Taylor, Jr., to Marley Brown, Letter, 1 October 1984, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; and Inspection Report, 7 October 1985, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>196</sup>"Alternatives and Recommendations," p. 33-38.

2. Foundations: Kiskiack rests on brick foundations. Archaeological evidence, from a test unit dug nearby the southeast corner of the building, suggests work was done on the foundation walls on three separate occasions, the latest occurring after 1779, to repair the bricks. Also present was an oyster shell layer added around 1890 to impede erosion caused by water dripping off of the roof.<sup>197</sup>

The watertable is notably absent from the gable end walls and damaged at the corners of the building. On the northern end of the east (rear) facade, below the watertable, the exterior bricks of the foundation wall have been replaced by concrete in a long patch; at the southern side, the watertable displays three kinds of molded bricks, a presence that suggests several repairs were made using whatever shaped brick was available. The concrete patches, however, merely allude to the watertable's location. The middle of the west (front) facade, the beneath the watertable mark, has been in-filled in the vicinity of the door. Across the north facade, another concrete-like area extends from the ground up to where the watertable should be. It is about three courses shy of the proper height at its northwest corner, leaving the profile of the original watertable on the west facade visible at that corner. The inference to a watertable and protruding foundation walls on the north facade is an earlier example than that concrete section seen on its front and rear elevations.

3. Walls: Made from local clay deposits, Kiskiack's Virginia bricks are arranged in English bond below the watertable and in Flemish bond above it. Glazed headers are used in the Flemish bond creating a dramatic, readily visible statement of its high quality construction. On the gable ends, the glazed headers are manipulated within the bond pattern so that they mimic the eaves line until reaching the chimney shaft. There, the glazed headers align themselves one on top of another leading up to the chimney cap. Throughout the structure, a typical brick size is about 2.6"x 4.2"x 3.6" while the wall thickness varies between 1'2" and 1'4". The wall bows outward on the south side. Also in the south facade is a brick inscribed "R.M.S. (/) 11857," raising the possibility it was marked either in November of 1957 or in the year 1857, as well as remnants of a whitewash applied to the wall below the gable.

4. Structural system: All that remains of Kiskiack, from before 1915, are its walls which were put up as load bearing masonry. Because of the fire, no evidence of saw marks or nails used in the original phases of construction exist. There is no ground floor framing although the points where the sleepers, or ground-floor joists, connected to the brick walls are obvious, occurring at regular intervals just over a foot apart. Between the joints built into the brick wall to receive the sleepers and the ground is the crawl space, about a foot in difference. The second floor joists come into the brick wall at thirty-five courses up and typically are spaced 1'4" apart. The roof rafters, some on the east side replaced in 1953, generally are 2 x 6 at 20" on center; several of the rafters are 2 x 4. The modern interior framing is present only to facilitate access to the roof. This is necessary to check for leaks and related damage during preventive maintenance inspections of the house.

---

<sup>197</sup>Thomas and Muraca, "The Archaeological Testing at Kiskiack," Investigation and Report for the Henry Lee House Fund, Inc., May 3, 1986, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, p. 25, 32, 40.

5. Porches: Between 1915 and 1937, Kiskiack had a small open porch that was squarish in plan with a pediment roof supported by four simple columns across its front edge. A railing, composed of a handrail and two other rails below it, enclosed the porch area. Attached to the front, this porch sheltered the entrance to the house. It appears in the 1918 and 1935 architectural drawings of Kiskiack.<sup>198</sup> In the Cook photograph, Tyler stands on this porch or a similar one preceding it, however, it is in disrepair. The northern most column is missing as is the railing on that side.<sup>199</sup>

In 1937, an enclosed porch abutted the house. It was brick, covered by a hipped roof, and was of equal proportions to the wood-frame porch. Across its west wall were two windows and a door into the house; on each side was another window. The fenestration in the porch was glazed sash with six-over-six lights. This porch remained attached to Kiskiack until the late 1980s. Today, simple wood steps lead up to the building; only the concrete in-fill of the front facade's watertable and foundation alludes to the porch's presence.

On the east (rear) side of the dwelling, a porch was constructed by the Navy and taken down years later without any documentation of its appearance. Currently, a step protrudes from the door but that is the only reference made to a missing exterior element. Perhaps the porch ran from the door to the north corner of the east facade, where the concrete section of the wall, below the watertable, is now. On the west facade, the concrete portions correspond to the location of the porch, so it is possible that the allusions to the watertable line and foundation walls below that point were created at the same time: when the porches were demolished. If so, it would have been necessary to replace the watertable and foundation walls only in the areas of the house where the porches adjoined.

6. Chimneys:<sup>200</sup> Kiskiack has two interior end chimneys made of brick laid in Flemish bond. They are T-shaped in plan, which accommodates the three flues inside each shaft. The level of architectural finish these chimney stacks represent suggests that the gable ends were built at one time, and structural changes made to the house were determined by their presence. For example, the main house kept its two room plan and any additions to it, such as the kitchen, worked around the location of its gable end walls. The kitchen, or wood-frame wing to the north, connected to the chimney so that a stove pipe could be routed through its flues. The hole punched through for the stove and subsequent exterior patch on the north's side chimney is visible.

---

<sup>198</sup>See Addison Worthington, Twelve Old Houses West of the Chesapeake Bay (Boston, MA: Rogers and Manson Company, 1918), p. 15; and "Kiskiack," HABS/HAER Collection, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. The Cooks also photographed a dwelling with a similar wood porch near Yorktown; this house belonged to African Americans. See "'Cast Down Your Bucket Where You Are': An Ethnohistorical Study of the African American Community on the Lands of the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, 1865-1918," 20 April 1992, p. 11, and Cook Collection, Valentine Museum, Richmond, Virginia.

<sup>199</sup>Lawrence A. Kocher and Howard Dearstyne, Shadows in Silver a Record of Virginia 1850-1900 in Contemporary Photographs taken by George and Huestis Cook with additions from the Cook Collection, (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), p. 83.

<sup>200</sup>Regarding chimneys, the "crowning" feature of a house, see Nathaniel Lloyd, Building Craftsmanship, p. 35-45.

## 7. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: There are three doors into Kiskiack, one each located in its west, east, and north facades. The east and west doors reflect one another, each from about the center of its wall. The front door sits in an unadorned frame capped by a slightly rounded lintel resembling a flat arch. It consists of three lower panels set below nine lights. A typical door panel measures about 3'1" across. There is no doorknob, although evidence that there was one exists. Today the door fastens by a padlock set between the top two panels at its north side. The door is approached by three wood steps that are made of treads only and have an open stringer. A handrail runs along the proper right side of these steps. The door, steps, and railing are painted white, along with the other wood portions of the house.

Sitting within similar wood frames are the doors in the east and north facades. The rear door, made of wood, is characterized by one large panel placed roughly in the center of the door. The panel consists of fourteen line louvers and measures about 2'0" by 2'5" overall. The entrance cut into the north facade replaced a window just east of the chimney stack. It like the east entry is a wood door with louvers except that it has two panels of louvers. These measure approximately 1'5" by 3'0" a piece. There are eleven louvers per panel. These louvered panels, inset into otherwise solid doors, allow the house to breathe without letting in the rain. Their presence in Kiskiack is a result of the decision to moth-ball the structure, an option chosen over the customary lights seen in the doors prior to 1988.

b. Windows and shutters: Kiskiack has two kinds of windows today. One is double hung sash glazed with nine-over-nine lights. Each light is 9" x 8". The windows rest on plain wood sills, with squared edges, that are about 3'0" long. The frames are like those around the doors, simple wood elements with a flat arch above. Evidence of shutters exist on the sash; moreover, in the Cook photograph, the west facade's shutters are in situ and closed. Two of these windows flank the doors in the west (front) and east (rear) facades, making a total of four examples of the type in the house.

The other kind found in Kiskiack today are small, unglazed windows each filled with panels of eight louvers. Their unadorned, wood sills are just under 2'0" long; their frames correspond to the larger ones made for the doors and glazed sash. These too have a flat arch above. The small louvered windows replaced sash glazed with at least four lights.<sup>201</sup> By the 1980s, the gable end windows each consisted of six lights. On the north facade, scars in the brick below each louvered window extend at least four courses; opposite, the damage runs just a couple courses down but above the western window some other repairs were made to the brick wall. These louvered openings are located in the gables, two per side, with a fifth example placed in the north facade's first floor level on the east end to fill in a larger window area. This last louvered opening assumed the position of a sash window glazed with four-over-four lights. All of these louvered coverings were installed according to the "Alternatives and Recommendations" feasibility study for Kiskiack.

---

<sup>201</sup>Cook Collection, Valentine Museum, Richmond, Virginia.

On the south facade, two windows on the first floor are filled in completely with bricks. This was done before the Cook photograph was taken. The south wall's first floor fenestration corresponds to the location of the door and small louvered window in the north facade. Presumably they matched the surviving double hung sash found in the front and back of the house.

8. Roof:

a. Shape, covering: A modern roof covers Kiskiack; the sheathing varies from just over three inches (0.3.4) to just over nine (0.9.4). It is made of fiber-glass, asphalt shingles and was installed in the late 1980s, replacing a roof repaired with mismatched cedar shingles. It is a gable roof that follows an angle of approximately fifty-three degrees. The steep roof line resembles that of Pinewoods, in James City County, which has a fifty degree pitch, and probably is representative of building practices of the time.<sup>202</sup>

b. Cornice, eaves: The wood cornice along Kiskiack's west (front) and east (rear) facades serves mainly as a vehicle to support the gutters installed during the late 1980s. The plain cornice was unadorned, with the exception of a coat of paint, and could be merely a box cornice composed of a cymatium, fascia and soffit boards nailed over the ends of the roof rafters, ornamented simply by a strip of molding. Attached to the vertical face of the cornice, the fascia or corona, is another board that appears to anchor the gutter. The soffit or underside of the cornice usually is recessed to encourage water to drip away from the structure, but at Kiskiack, it looks to be flush with the end of the fascia board. The cornice is a functional element and is not representative of the kind of architectural finish seen in Kiskiack before the fire. In the Cook photograph of Lyon Gardiner Tyler and Kiskiack, for example, the cornice profile is curved.

Kiskiack received metal gutters and down spouts when the asphalt roof was installed.

c. Dormers, cupolas, towers: In the pre-fire photograph of Lyon Gardiner Tyler standing on Kiskiack's front porch, there are two dormer windows in the west (front) facade and no weathervane on top of the house. Similarly, in the early architectural drawing of the house, made in 1918, there are two dormers present and no weathervane. Again in a 1950s era photograph published in Old Virginia Houses along the James, Kiskiack's dormer windows were boarded up. There was no weathervane at that time either.<sup>203</sup> Tradition holds that the Henry Lee descendants placed the "Lee" weathervane on top of the house during the 1970s, around the time they held a family picnic on the

---

<sup>202</sup>Henry Chandlee Forman used the steep pitch of Kiskiack and Pinewoods as well as that seen on top of the Adam Thoroughgood House to identify the structures as new world renditions of early gothic architecture. See Forman, Architecture of the Old South (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948).

<sup>203</sup>Worthington, p. 13-15; Cook Collection, Valentine Museum, Richmond, Virginia; and Emmie Ferguson Farrar, Old Virginia Houses along the James (New York, NY: Hastings House, 1955), p. 204.

grounds.<sup>204</sup> The weathervane and the dormers were removed during the late 1980s moth-balling of the house as a precaution against roof leaks.

C. Description of Interior:

1. Stairways: Between 1915 and the late 1980s, the stair rose from the central passage. Today, however, access to the second floor is by way of a permanent ladder constructed on a pre-cast concrete pad placed in the center of building. The ladder is made of plywood, and is a skeletal dog-leg stair with a landing several steps up. The stair from the landing to the second floor ascends on a forty-five degree angle. The steps consist only of treads, leaving the ends exposed in an open stringer. The handrail is about three and a half feet high on the landing and four feet for the stairs themselves and for the second floor level.

2. Flooring: There is no extant flooring on the first floor level of the house save the dirt of the ground itself. The second floor covering consists of modern plywood.

3. Wall and ceiling finish: The interior of Kiskiack was plastered, yet in some places, the exterior walls show through to the inside of the house. The fireboxes also were closed and covered with a plaster finish. The ceiling is simply the plywood installed for access to the second floor for maintenance purposes. On the second floor, the ceiling consists of the exposed roof rafters and underside of the roof. Ghosts of the dormer windows are visible in this area.

4. Openings, decorative features and trim: Because of the fire in 1915, there are no remnants of any decorative features inside the house, nor are there any extant interior doorways or doors.

5. Mechanical Equipment: Kiskiack presently is unheated. The only ventilation for the house is by way of the louvered slats in the gable windows and in the east and north side doors. These were put into the house in the late 1980s as a result of the decision to mothball the house.

Kiskiack's water came from a well. A Lee family photograph captured several of the children standing by well; this must be the late nineteenth and early twentieth century source for water. The ca. 1900 schematic plan of the property included a spring. Perhaps the well was in close proximity to that water supply. After 1927 when the Navy put a bathroom in the second floor, water was drawn from an exterior pump house. There is no indoor plumbing in the house today.

There is no interior lighting in Kiskiack. The 1927 plans for occupancy included running electricity to the house but never were initiated because its site was declared part of the restricted zone within the military base. Kiskiack remained, and will continue to be, vacant due to that designation

---

<sup>204</sup>Perhaps the Lee Family descendants replaced the weathervane in the 1970s. A weathervane appears in a 1939 photograph of the house, yet is missing in the 1950s image, and is back by the 1980s when it was removed for the mothballing procedure. See Figure 12.

throughout the twentieth century. No electricity is available on site today; power can be obtained through a portable generator provided it is grounded.

6. Original furnishings: Kiskiack is empty of decorative arts. The 1915 newspaper article reporting the fire and loss of the house stated that \$2500.00 in antiques went up in the flames.<sup>205</sup> A Lee descendant remembered her grandmother rescuing feather pillows from the house but leaving the family bible behind as she fled.<sup>206</sup> In March 1919 William Warren Harrison Lee said that there were a few objects in the house but those of little value except some books and pictures. Lee commented on the contents of Kiskiack after the fire and just before the Navy took possession. Because the family used Kiskiack as a summer camp, the replacement of the furniture engulfed in the blaze would have been unlikely, and probably, the pictures there in 1919 were of a more sentimental value than intrinsic worth.<sup>207</sup>

The original furnishings of Kiskiack descended through the Hansford family and so divorced from Kiskiack by over a half century when it burned, was repaired, and sold to the Navy. Probate inventories, or an account of the property a decedent owned at death, however, exist for the Hansford family. Although these lists may or may not reflect exactly what was in the house at a particular time, they do suggest how members of the York County Hansford family lived and so infer what was in their dwelling known today as Kiskiack.

The inventories have specific boundaries, as the format of a list dictates, beginning and ending with the decedent's property and dependent on the location of the objects to be evaluated. In a list format, categories of the personal property distinguished the livestock from labor and separated both from the decorative arts. Within the latter, the furniture items again were classified as chairs, tables, plate, and so on. Sometimes appraisers arranged the list on a room by room basis, counting everything in one space before moving onto another. These lists especially are valuable because the number and names of rooms within a decedent's dwelling and the outbuildings are apparent.<sup>208</sup>

As a source, probate records include what the deceased owned but not all estates were inventoried. County residents, rich and poor, escaped the appraiser's visit. Generally most inventoried estates belonged to free white men. Another bias present in probate records is that most of the decedents were older and wealthier than the people they left behind in the late seventeenth and early

---

<sup>205</sup>“Ancient Residence Burned Historic Lee Home in York County Wiped Out by Fire,” Richmond-Times Dispatch 26 February 1915, p. 9A..

<sup>206</sup>“Alternatives and Recommendations,” p. 71; Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>207</sup>William Warren Harrison Lee, the Jefferson, Richmond, Virginia, to Commanding Officer, Navy Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia, Letter, 27 March 1919, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; “Ancient Residence Burned Historic Lee Home in York County Wiped Out by Early Morning Fire,” p. 9A.

<sup>208</sup>Jack Goody, “What’s in a List,” chap. in The Domestication of the Savage Mind, p. 74-111 (London and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

eighteenth centuries. Children orphaned when their father died were maintained on the income, not the principal, generated by the estate. Neighbors were sworn in by the county to evaluate the decedent's estate; the courts argued that those close-by would be more likely to recognize if property was stolen, removed, or hidden from the view on the appointed day, which would make the list more accurate. Inventories included all personal property, except those legacies given in a will and the produce from gardens and orchards.<sup>209</sup>

The objects in the probate inventories represent how the deceased spent his money. The kind of labor available in a household, for instance, appears on the list as property. Servants' names and time owed were noted in the inventory process whereas the slaves were cited by first name, race, and monetary value. Servants and slaves were recorded along with the livestock and pots and pans. Other evidence of the economic condition lies in the tools and equipment owned and in the supplies on hand like tobacco, wheat, corn, and alcoholic beverages.

Labor, land, well-finished houses like Kiskiack, and consumer goods were the components of wealth in early Virginia. Ownership of these status-bearing assets elevated a planter's position in society. Social rank and economic advantages thus became virtually indistinguishable goals. In the Chesapeake, the achievement of status or its tangible underpinning wealth came through the acquisition or control of personal property variables of land, labor, and goods. Planters followed different routes to accumulate these assets; and the success of their decisions determined their households place in the Chesapeake's hierarchal society.<sup>210</sup>

Gauging degrees of prosperity in the colonial Chesapeake is more difficult to access than recognizing its foundation in labor and land. Because the Chesapeake economy was agriculturally based, the households can be compared through their plantation accouterments. Every planter needed them, and so, what and how many livestock and tools he owned provide a common denominator for measuring household assets. Probate inventories counted the deceased's personal capital which included

---

<sup>209</sup>Gloria L. Main, "Notes and Documents Probate Records as a Source for Early American History," William and Mary Quarterly third series 32, no. 1 (January 1975) : 89-99; Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, "Inventories and the Analysis of Wealth and Consumption Patterns in St. Mary's County, Maryland, 1658-1777," Historical Methods 13, no. 2 (Spring 1980) : 81-104. See also The Statutes at Large being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, vol. 2, 1660-82, edited by William Waller Hening (New York, NY: R & W & G Bartow for the editor, 1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation, 1969), p. 92-95.

<sup>210</sup>Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, A Place in Time: Explicatus (New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), p. 133-164, and refers to "Strata," chap. in A Place in Time, Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750 (New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), p. 128-163; and Edward A. Chappell, "Housing a Nation: The Transformation of Living Standards in Early America," in Of Consuming Interests the Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century, edited by Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, p. 214 (Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia for the United States Capitol Historical Society, 1994). Chappell observed that status was an obsession of the age; his assessment came from the buildings and words left behind.

See also Linda Lee Sturtz, "'Madam and Co.': Women, Property, and Power in Colonial Virginia," vol. 1, Ph.D. diss, Washington University, 1994, p. 200; John Michael Vlach, Back of the Big House the Architecture of Plantation Slavery (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1933), p. 1-17; and Gloria L. Main, Tobacco Colony Life in Early Maryland 1650-1720 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), p. 92.

livestock, labor, carts, harnesses, plows, and hoes, revealing how the planter had allocated his resources.<sup>211</sup>

Between the 1650s and 1720, planters living in the Chesapeake invested in livestock and labor. Most households owned swine and cattle, with the latter a priority for even the poorest of planters. Sheep, however, were a province of only the upper three-fifths of households. After 1700, chickens, turkeys, geese, and bees were raised.<sup>212</sup> Plantation tools, namely the hoe and the plow, also indicated degrees of wealth. The hoe was adequate for tobacco and corn cultivation but the plow was needed for sowing small grains especially in the Chesapeake where labor was relatively scarce. In fact, the plow appeared more often in the richer households than in the poor man's estate; ownership of a plow not incidentally coincided with mixed farming.<sup>213</sup>

In the 1660s, the Hansford family invested in labor and livestock. Ten servants and three Negroes were attributed to Edward Lockey's estate in 1667; another fifteen servants were attached to John Hansford's estate in 1661, at which time his widow married Lockey. On an outlying tract, cattle, swine, and sheep were raised.<sup>214</sup> In the aftermath of Bacon's Rebellion, Charles Hansford acted as executor to his brother, Thomas' estate. The deceased also chose labor and livestock for capital investments. Thomas Hansford possessed a man servant's time as well as cattle, horses, and bees, whereas in 1702, his brother and executor, Charles had four slaves, a grindstone, a boat, textile equipment, and wool, in addition to his horses and cattle. Absent from Charles Hansford's inventory are sheep, although their presence is implied by the wool.<sup>215</sup> By 1709, William Hansford kept slaves, horses, cattle, and swine on his property. Hansford had basic agricultural tools, such as a hoe, axe, and cross cut saw, with which to work his farm. Thomas Hansford's son Thomas bequeathed cattle to his children; his younger son, William, left no land in his will. He did, however, have horses, a calf, and some hogs, as well as one Negro. Near the century's close, Charles Hansford raised cattle, swine, sheep, and horses. He had textile equipment on site as well as carts and wheels, and nineteen slaves to work his holdings.<sup>216</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup>Main, "Adaption Under Fire," chap. in Tobacco Colony, p. 48-96, and on livestock, p. 59-68. In 1701, Francis Louis Michel noted the presence of horses, cattle, swine, and sheep, as well as a growing stock of poultry. See "Report on the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," translated and edited by Wm. J. Hinke, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 24, no. 1 (January 1916) : 36-37.

<sup>212</sup>Main, Tobacco Colony, p. 62-63.

<sup>213</sup>Main, Tobacco Colony, p. 74-77; and Herman, The Stolen House, p. 204.

<sup>214</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, &c., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 191-193; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, &c., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 194.

<sup>215</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, &c., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 123-125; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, &c., Book 12, 1702-1706, p. 27-29.

<sup>216</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, &c., Book 13, 1706-1710, p. 248-250; York County Records, Orders, Wills, Inventories, Book 18, p. 296, 308-309; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 15, 1716-1720, p. 639; York County Records, Wills & Inventories, Book 22, 1771-1783, p. 448-449.

Besides investing in plantation tools and animals, planter households bought amenities to make daily living cleaner and more comfortable. Earthenware and linens made eating more sanitary while tableware refined the process. Spices enlivened diet. The presence of books suggested literacy as well as leisure time. Planters, when they could afford it, purchased luxury goods for display. These luxuries were indicative of status; examples are wigs, timepieces, pictures, and silver plate. By the 1770s, tableware -- implements and ceramics -- surfaced in most households. Evidently, genteel dining props became affordable items or dining had become important enough for resources to be diverted toward the purchase of knives, forks, and fine earthenware across the economic scale.<sup>217</sup>

Along with the status inherent in ownership of non-essential goods, these amenities made existing in Kiskiack a cleaner experience. Their presence in the house improved the occupants' standard of living. Comfort bearing objects were beds and bed furniture, linens, tables, chairs, candlesticks, and a variety of cooking equipment.<sup>218</sup> The Hansford family possessed such creature comforts, as well as items indicative of a desire for cleanliness like chamber pots.<sup>219</sup>

Transcriptions of the inventories associated with the Hansford family in York County are in the field notes. These include Edward Lockey, 1667; John Hansford, 1661; Thomas Hansford, 1679; Josiah Moody, 1676; Charles Hansford, 1702; William Hansford, 1709; Thomas Hansford, 1720; William Hansford, 1736; and Charles Hansford, 1779. It is likely that the last lived in Kiskiack.

D. Site:

Although the area known as Chiskiack lies between King's and Felgates Creeks, the house site is just south of present day Lee Pond, near the head of Felgates Creek, and is about 100 yards off of Lee Road. Kiskiack sits on a flat rise near the edge a ravine thirty feet to the south. The house and its environs are surrounded by woods, although several cedar and hardwood trees grow in the (mowed) grass clearing. Ravines also cut through the north and east sides of the terrace where Kiskiack is located. Kiskiack lies in the Atlantic Coastal Plain about eighty to ninety feet above sea level. The soil is "loamey and clayey" with a high acidity level.<sup>220</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup>Carr and Walsh, "Inventories and the Analysis of Wealth and Consumption Patterns in St. Mary's County, Maryland, 1658-1777," p. 84; Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake," William and Mary Quarterly third series, 45, no. 1 (January 1988) : 137-138, 143; Neiman, Discovering Clifts Plantation: The "Manner House" before Stratford, p. 36-47; and Thomas and Muraca, passim.

<sup>218</sup>Carr and Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake," p. 139-142; Chappell, "Housing a Nation," p. 167-232; and Carson, "The Consumer Revolution in British Colonial America: Why Demand?" p. 483-697.

<sup>219</sup>Carr and Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake," passim. For more information on the increasing interest in cleanliness during the eighteenth century, see Richard L. Bushman and Claudia L. Bushman, "The Early History of Cleanliness in America," Journal of American History 74, no. 4 (March 1988) :1213-1238; and Norbert Elias, The Civilizing Process the History of Manners (reprint, 1978).

<sup>220</sup>Thomas and Muraca, p. 3-4.

In 1900, the parcel was about 250 acres. Trees surrounded the house. Close to the building two cherry trees, a walnut tree, two cedars, and two locust trees grew, but outside the yard, woods and fields abounded. Between Kiskiack and Lee Road were a corn field and orchard. Two roadways approached the dwelling, one corresponding to the dirt path used today and the other cutting through the property on a north to south line.(Figure 15) As part of a much larger entity called the Naval Weapons Station, the immediate house site was kept intact throughout the twentieth century but the cultivated landscape was not maintained.

An archaeological survey, conducted in 1985, hints at the organization and occupation of the Kiskiack house lot. The ca. 1900 map, as well as census records, suggest that the parcel was a working farm. The agricultural character of the tract infers that subsidiary structures would have been present to accommodate animals, equipment, and crops.<sup>221</sup> Two colonial period outbuildings were found on the east side of the house. To the northern side is a brick foundation, one brick wide and one course deep, bonded with shell-tempered mortar. The outbuilding itself was a wood structure that rested on the brick foundation. No function was determined during the preliminary study. The other colonial era outbuilding was a cellar, destroyed after 1769, off to the south of the house. The location of these buildings, flanking the house rather than clustering behind it, alludes to an eighteenth-century origin for the present Kiskiack.<sup>222</sup> The position of the outbuildings on the east side, as well as the location of Lee Road in the eighteenth century, indicates that Kiskiack always has faced west.<sup>223</sup>

Another outbuilding found on site was from the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. It probably was a barn and used until around 1910. There is the possibility other outbuildings existed on site; concentrated in the south side of the tract are architectural finds, implying other structures were there. Also, on the north side there is an unidentified feature that post-dates 1864 because of the presence of wire nails, clear non-lead glass, and whiteware ceramics in the test unit.<sup>224</sup>

Archaeological evidence identified the remains of several outbuildings, post holes, and a possible addition to the southern end of the building. Fence lines were not detected. Seventeenth-

---

<sup>221</sup>Between 1736 and 1782, in advertisements placed in the Virginia Gazette for parcels of land 200 acres or less, kitchen appeared most frequently in those that named outbuildings individually. Several of the listings simply referred to the improvements and appurtenances as "all convenient outbuildings" without specifying what buildings stood on the property. Barns were a close second to kitchens; next came tobacco houses, quarters, diaries, stables, corn houses, and then smokehouses. Three examples of the tracts 200 acres or less were in York County. See Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," p. 1-32; and the research compiled by Wells and others for the Yorktown Victory Center, Yorktown, Virginia. Incidentally, it was the Yorktown Victory Center's interest in re-creating a lost landscape, that of the middling sort living in York County at the time of the Revolution, which prompted its request to move Kiskiack off the Naval Weapons Station in the mid-1980s.

<sup>222</sup>Thomas and Muraca assert the eighteenth-century date based on their case studies of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sites and the placement of the outbuildings therein. See p. 47-51.

<sup>223</sup>In their report, Thomas and Muraca stated that it had been suggested that the house looked southeast initially. The authors concluded, however, that the house faced west -- the same way it does today. See p. 47-51.

<sup>224</sup>Thomas and Muraca, p. 32, 36, 42.

century artifacts discovered in the woods between Kiskiack and Lee Road suggest that an earlier structure was there.<sup>225</sup> Because of the relatively undisturbed archaeological nature of the Kiskiack tract, a full investigation is warranted.

### Lee Family Cemetery

The location of the cemetery in the front yard matches those found in other early eighteenth-century sites, such as Clifts Plantation, Virginia, and Middle Plantation, Maryland, and those York County cemeteries associated with the Wynne family.<sup>226</sup> On the ca. 1900 delineation of the Kiskiack parcel, two cemeteries are noted. Both occur in the northwest quadrant of the topographical map. (See Figure 8) One is called "Cemetery" and the other "Col. Cemetery" without an explanation for the difference. The last owner of the property, William Warren Harrison Lee, requested permission to be interred in the cemetery; the Navy agreed to his wish.<sup>227</sup> Unfortunately Lee did not ask the Navy himself, so no distinction was made between cemeteries in the 1921 correspondence.

In the 1920s, an iron enclosure protected the cemetery area.<sup>228</sup> Although no iron fence appears in family photographs taken between 1906-18, a seat constructed by the box tomb does. It was a wood bench that abutted the tree close by the tomb. Today the burial ground is marked at the corners by modern cement posts without the benefit of an iron fence or wood seat.

During the archaeological survey, four excavation units were placed within the confines of the cemetery's cement corner posts. Only the unit located near the center of the rise, and incidentally near the above-ground box tomb, revealed evidence of a grave shaft. Due to the acidic nature of the soil, discovery of skeletal remains is unlikely, but indications of other graves should survive.<sup>229</sup> More exploration is necessary to determine how many people are buried in the vicinity of the box tomb and what the parameters of the cemetery truly are.

Tradition attributes the mystery to "a quaint burial system," wherein the grave markers recorded the names of the deceased, but not the place of their burial. Instead their names were cut on

---

<sup>225</sup>Three of the four artifacts made before 1720 were found in the woods between Kiskiack and Lee Road. No seventeenth-century, datable objects turned up near Kiskiack itself. See Thomas and Muraca, p. 41-42.

<sup>226</sup>Thomas and Muraca, p. 51; see also, Fraser D. Neiman, The "Manner House" before Stratford (Discovering the Clifts Plantation) (Stratford, VA: The Robert E. Lee Memorial Association, 1980), p. 28-29; and "The Graveyard at Kiskiack," Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia 39, no. 3 (September 1984).

<sup>227</sup>Secretary Josphens Daniels to Hon. Lyon G. Tyler, Letter, 24 February 1921, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>228</sup>Commander A.H. Miles, "Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia," Paper, 1926, site file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, p. 17.

<sup>229</sup>Thomas and Muraca, p. 36, 52.

small stone slabs and cemented to a central piece, so the exact number of interments is not known.<sup>230</sup> Complicating matters, between 1925 and 1950, the Navy removed the pile of stones from around the box tomb and alined them just west of the tomb. At this time, it also staked out the cemetery with four cement posts, but the location of those corner markers was determined simply by what the Navy thought the boundaries to be. The box tomb itself is a hodgepodge of brickwork and grave stones. Three slabs, commemorating three different people, make up the top of the tomb. It is possible that the entire tomb was constructed as a memorial to the people whose individual tombstones had crumbled, and that the three along the top are what was left of the initial grave sites.<sup>231</sup> The idea of a memorial tomb and markers is substantiated by a descendent of William Warren Harrison Lee, who recalled her grandfather ordered the stones (which accounts for their nineteenth-century cement-like character) and arranged them around the box tomb.<sup>232</sup> This also explains the marker for William Warren Lee who was interred in New York state.

The nine grave markers, placed in a row, west of the box tomb are as follows:<sup>233</sup>

1. Francis H[arrison] Lee 1813-1875

He was William Warren Harrison Lee's half-uncle, and the brother of William Warren Lee and half-brother of Henry Harwood Lee, the father of the last owner of the property.<sup>234</sup>

2. Henry Harwood Lee 1819-1886

He was William Warren Harrison Lee's father. This Lee returned to York County in time for the 1880 census so it is possible he is buried at Kiskiack.

3. Francis Lee Born 1709,03?, 07? Died 1753 [1798] and Rachel Baptist Hi \_\_\_\_ [his wife]

Francis Lee was the great-grandfather of William Warren Harrison Lee and the grandfather of William Warren Lee.

---

<sup>230</sup>Miles, p. 17; Kristina E. Maddocks, "The Lee House Near Yorktown," Paper, The College of William and Mary, 1969, site file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, or Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, p. 7. See also the site file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, and Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

<sup>231</sup>"The Graveyard at Kiskiack," passim.

<sup>232</sup>"Alternatives and Recommendations," p. 73.

<sup>233</sup>Site visits, "Kiskiack," 1997-1998, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; "Alternatives and Recommendations," p. 83; Jessie Fay Forrest, Cemeteries of Poquoson, Virginia and Some Cemeteries of York County, Virginia, edited by James H. Mero, (Hampton, VA: Hugh S. Watson, Jr. Genealogical Society, 199?), p. 108.

<sup>234</sup>It is possible that this is the Francis H. Lee recorded in the 1870 census and 1870 agricultural census, but that Lee was fifty-eight years old in 1870, an age that puts his birth ten years after the Lee memorialized in Kiskiack's cemetery.

4. Richard [Harwood] Lee 1853-1885

He was William Warren Harrison Lee's brother.

5. Vestilla M. [Armstrong](/) wife of (/) Henry H[arwood] Lee 188(31-2?) -1886/7

She was William Warren Harrison Lee's mother.

6. Daniel J[ackson] Lee 1853(5-7?)-1882(&7) (/) [ Fra]nces Harwood, his wife (1867-1893)

Daniel Jackson Lee was William Warren Harrison Lee's brother. He also was in York County by the time of the 1880 census; Lee farmed the Kiskiack tract with his father, Henry Harwood Lee. Thus it is conceivable his mortal remains lie in the cemetery on the premises.

7. Elizabeth Wynne Lee (/) wife of (/) John R. Lee (/) Born 1783 Died 1855

She was William Warren Harrison Lee's grandmother, as well as the mother of William Warren Lee and Henry Harwood Lee.

8. Illegible [V.M. Lee 1867-1891]

The marker could be for Vestilla Matella, who was born in May 1867 and apparently named after her mother Vestilla Matella Lee (1832-86). This child died in 1892.<sup>235</sup>

9. William W[arren] Lee (/) of Kaskiskiac York Co., VA (/) 1809-1900

He was William Warren Harrison Lee's uncle, and the Lee who bought the property from John H. Lee in 1866. According to Lee family tradition, this Lee went to New York while he was a young man. While in New York, he married Adelia Arbuckle. They had no children and so William Warren Lee adopted Frederick McCready. The William Warren Lees lived in Staten Island, New York, and it is there that he died and his will probated. This Lee also thought William Warren Harrison Lee's grandfather fought in War of 1812 and William Warren Harrison Lee's great grandfather in revolutionary war and that family were all patriots.<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>235</sup>Lee family bible, transcription, library, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia, as well as in the Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. See "deaths," p. 107. Also the 1968 recordation of family cemeteries listed a marker for a "V.M. Lee 1867-1891," see Forrest, p. 108.

<sup>236</sup>[Dr. Francis Lee] to Commander Brooks, "References in General to Kis-Kiac and Lee Family," 22 September 1995, Henry Lee House files, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. In 1812, Lt. William Lee and Lt. Haynes Lee served in the 68<sup>th</sup> Regiment for James City and York Counties. See Stuart Lee Butler, A Guide to Virginia Militia Units in the War of 1812 (Athens, GA: Iberian Publishing Company, 1988).

According to the Henry Lee family genealogical chart: William Lee could have been the William Lee who married Elizabeth Wynne Lee and had William Warren Lee, but he is not William Warren Harrison Lee's grandfather. Haynes Lee could have the same person as the Haynes Lee who was Elizabeth Wynne Lee's uncle (her father, Higginson Wade Lee's brother) and

### PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

#### A. Architectural Drawings:

Historic American Buildings Survey, 1935. Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Newbill and Beale, Inc., 1980s; Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; copies also in the architectural flat files, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Worthington, Addison. Twelve Old Houses West of the Chesapeake Bay. Boston, MA: Rogers and Manson Company, 1918.

#### B. Early Views:

Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

The park has twenty-four pictures of Kiskiack, most of which date to the 1930s plus several others from the 1950s. Included in the images are photographs of a Lee family scrapbook; these illustrate the family members at Kiskiack. Whether the Lees pictured in these photographs actually lived on the property year round, or if they used it as a second home, or merely visited from time to time, is unclear. Access to the photograph collection at Colonial National Historic Park is by appointment. Copies of several images appear in this report as figure pages; permission is required to duplicate these copies.

Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

In the Rockefeller Library are the architectural site files. In the file for Kiskiack are several photographs; Xerox copies of these are included in the field notes.

The Cook Collection, Valentine Museum, Richmond, Virginia.

Lawrence A. Kocher and Howard Dearstyne, Shadows in Silver a Record of Virginia 1850-1900 in Contemporary Photographs taken by George and Huestis Cook with additions from the Cook Collection. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

In the Cook Collection is a photograph of Kiskiack, with Lyon Gardiner Tyler standing on its front stoop. William Warren Harrison Lee corresponded with Tyler in the 1910s. Their letters

---

uncle to William Lee (his father, Francis Lee's brother). Haynes Lee could not have been William Warren Harrison Lee's grandfather either. At this time, documentation of military service of either of William Warren Harrison Lee's grandfathers remains incomplete. His grandfathers were Higginson Lee and Henry Lee.

indicate that Tyler continued to be interested in Kiskiack after the photograph was taken of him by Huetis Cook during the 1880s. Lee wrote to Tyler from the Jefferson Hotel in Richmond, Virginia. In the transfer of property to the government in 1919-21, Lee is described as living in Richmond, and was "known" to Henrico County officials. This suggests Lee lived at the hotel and not in Kiskiack, which he referred to as "the old home."<sup>237</sup>

Also in Cook Collection is a photograph of freedman, standing and lounging in front of a structure quite similar to Kiskiack, with the exception of its wood front and rear facades.<sup>238</sup> This dwelling was close to Yorktown, and it too was consumed by the government for the creation of the Naval Weapons Station, in Yorktown, Virginia.

Daily Press, Newport News, Virginia.

The local newspaper maintains a photographic archive. For Kiskiack, there are eight photographs on record. Dates of the photographs are in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1980s. The newspaper charges seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) for a reference copy of a photograph from the archives, which explains why none are included in this report.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia.

In the architectural site file, there are nine exterior photographs; these were taken in July 1969.

### C. Bibliography:

#### 1. Primary Sources, Manuscripts, and Collections

##### a. Compilations, Indexes:

Cappon, Lester J. Virginia Newspapers, 1821-1935: A Bibliography. New York, NY: D. Appleton Century Co., Inc., 1936.

Cappon, Lester J. and Stella Duff. Virginia Gazette Index 1736-1780. Williamsburg, VA: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1950.

Gentry, Daphne S., compiler. Virginia Land Office Inventory. Edited by John S. Salmon. third edition. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library and Archives, 1988.

---

<sup>237</sup>Tyler Family Papers, Special Collections, Earl Gregg Swem Library, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

<sup>238</sup>See "Cast Down Your Bucket Where You Are": An Ethnohistorical Study of the African American Community on the Lands of the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, 1865-1918," cover illustration and figure 13, p.11, with the caption "In a rare photograph taken near Yorktown, during the Civil War, freed slaves and soldiers pose before a farm dwelling' credit Valentine Museum."

- Greer, George Cabell. Early Virginia Immigrants, 1623-1666. Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1960.
- McIlwaine, H.R., ed. Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia. 13 vol. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1905-1915.
- McIlwaine, H.R., ed. Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia. 6 vol. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1927-1966.
- Nugent, Nell. Cavaliers and Pioneers Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants, 1623-1800. Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press, 1934.
- Parks, Gary. Virginia Land Records from the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, the William and Mary College Quarterly, and Tyler's Quarterly. Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1982.
- Parks, Gary. Virginia Tax Records from the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, the William and Mary College Quarterly, and Tyler's Quarterly. Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1983.
- Statutes at Large being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature in 1619. Edited by William Waller Hening. 13 vol. Richmond, VA., New York, NY., and Philadelphia, PA.: 1819-1823; reprint, Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Jamestown Foundation of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1969.
- Swem, Earl Gregg. Virginia Historical Index. 2 vol. Roanoke, VA: Stone Printing and Manufacturing Company, 1934; reprint, Gloucester, MA: P. Smith, 1965.
- Virginia Publick Claims. Janice L. Abercrombie, comp. Athens, GA: Iberian Publishing Company.
- Works Progress Administration, Virginia Historical Inventory, York County, Virginia.

Microfilm reel 509, Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia. Transcriptions of some legal records and of oral histories about sites in York County. The Library of Virginia maintains the original files; the photographs are housed in the picture collection. Access to the picture collection is by appointment.

The Virginia Historical Inventory exists as part of a Works Progress Administration (WPA) program inaugurated in 1935, and running through 1939, by the federal government. Clerks, writers, and editors were employed to survey and record the historic, cultural, and architectural resources of the county. In the field, these New Deal era historians interviewed residents and described the sites, as well as photographed many of them. The WPA inventory they created is a mix of facts and local legends.

York County Marriages. Volume I: Bonds and Ministers Returns, 1769-1853. Michael Pollock, comp. 1994. (Microfilm reel 43, Library of Virginia)

b. Repositories:

- Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, Richmond, Virginia.

Founded in 1889, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) is the oldest statewide preservation organization in the nation. The APVA owns and/or administers thirty-six historic properties in Virginia. At its headquarters location, the Cole Diggs House in Richmond, the APVA maintains records regarding various its properties across the state as well as information on other, non-APVA sites; its branch activities; its board meetings, &c.; and a clipping file collected from newspapers. Although not by any means current, the APVA library and archives has good source material on early Virginia history.

The APVA does not own or operate a property in Yorktown, Virginia; however, its Yorktown Branch is an active force in the APVA's statewide preservation efforts and within the Yorktown community.

- The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

In the Special Collections Department of the Earl Gregg Swem Library are the University Archives as well as manuscripts and rare books. The archival section begins in 1683 with the founding of the college; publications, photographs, records, artifacts, and memorabilia from 1683 to the present live in the archives. Catalogued as part of the manuscripts and rare books section are local history materials, travel journals, and the family papers of eighteenth and nineteenth century Virginians, distinguished alumni, and political leaders.

The Tyler Family Papers, specifically those of Lyon Gardiner Tyler (1853-1935), a former President of the college, are of significance to this project. Copies of the photograph of Tyler standing on the porch of "Kis Kis Kiack" are prolific. This image appeared in the book, Shadows in Silver, and the caption reflects a nineteenth-century spelling of the place name.

Microfilm copies of the Virginia Gazette newspaper are available in the Earl Gregg Swem Library of the College.

- Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

The Yorktown site within Colonial National Historic Park maintains a library, map collection, photographic archive, and the archaeological and decorative art collections related to the historic properties in Yorktown under its auspices. Within the map and photographic collections are important images of Yorktown, the Peninsula, and significant sites throughout the region. Access to these collections are by appointment.

- Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Available in the Rockefeller Library are the Special Collections (maps, manuscripts), Visual Resources, architectural site files, architectural drawing collections, research report series, colloquium reports, as well as a book and periodical collection expected in libraries.

The "York County Records Project" lives in the Department of Historical Research. Systemically the records have been sorted, and abstracted, and filed according to family name. These biographic files can be cross checked by looking up the reference noted on each card - whether its from deed books, wills, orders judgements, orphans court, inventories, parish records, rent rolls, marriage bonds, etc. These references are filed according to type and date in the Department of Historical Research.

Also, available for viewing in Special Collections is the "1704" map compiled by Colonial Williamsburg from the county records. This tract map is mentioned in Colonial Williamsburg 7, no. 2 (Winter 1985): 11-12, 21, and the Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia 39, no. 3 (September 1984); permission to cite the map must come from the Department of Historical Research. Moreover, the "Provisioning Early American Towns" study, sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) concluded in September 1997, brings the 1704 county wide map forward in time, creating maps of the Williamsburg vicinity at fifteen year intervals, 1704 to 1770.

The archaeological survey of Kiskiack was conducted by the archaeologists from Colonial Williamsburg; it is likely that they have the artifacts exhumed since neither the Navy nor the Department of Historic Resources has the collection. A copy of the conclusions from this survey is available in the Rockefeller Library.

- Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

In its new location, 45,000 volumes of the 700,000 volume collection are in the main reading room. Other reading rooms house government documents, maps, rare books, and special collections; in addition, one reading room is reserved for works by Virginia authors. The Library of Virginia also publishes a quarterly journal, Virginia Calvacade, about the history and culture of the state.

As the research and reference library for the Commonwealth of Virginia, the library houses more than 83 million manuscripts that document four centuries of Virginia history. Examples of these manuscripts are tax lists, marriage and death records, bible records, county records, maps, Mutual Assurance records, military records, and patent records. The Library of Virginia offers its patrons more than 1.5 million books, serials, bound periodicals, microfilm, newspapers, as well as state and federal documents. Its Picture Collection includes 240,000 photographs, prints, engravings, broadsides, posters, and paintings.

- Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

The records for Kiskiack available on the base consist of correspondence between William Warren Harrison Lee and the Department of the Navy in 1919; it pertains to the exchange of keys for the house. Other files contain information collected on the Lee family. The architectural records jump from 1919 to the 1980s, when the Navy's stewardship of the house was questioned. This material relates directly to the 1988 report, "Alternatives and Recommendations for Kiskiack." Several maintenance reports also are included in the files as supporting documentation for the 1988 evaluation; the maintenance records tell, in part, what happened to Kiskiack under the Navy's care between 1927 and 1988.

Due to government downsizing, the Naval Weapons Station library was dismantled and shipped to Texas. Fortunately, the Naval Weapons Station kept the "Official Atlas of the Naval Mine Depot," 1919, in Yorktown, Virginia. Access to this atlas is by appointment.

- Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia.

As the State Historic Preservation Office, the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) maintains architectural site files for properties across Virginia. Usually these files consist of properties surveyed for nomination as a state landmark, a prerequisite for inclusion on the National Register for Historic Places. DHR also has archaeological files for places investigated throughout the state. The site number for Kiskiack is 44Y0504; however, DHR does not have the artifacts uncovered at the site.

In 1997-98, DHR moved into a wing for the Virginia Historical Society. This combined location facilitates the search of available materials on site specific basis as well as of broader resources in the library of the historical society.

- Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

At the Historical Society is the collection known simply as the "Gilmer Maps." Officially, the maps are part of the Confederate Engineers Maps, Jeremy Francis Gilmer Collection, and are housed in the library of the Historical Society. There are sixty-seven maps in the collection. Gilmer (1818-1883) commanded the Confederate Engineers Bureau, a division in charge of constructing coastal fortifications, building bridges, commandeering labor for those tasks, supplying iron to the railroad, assisting with the layout of defense lines, and revising maps of the terrain. As the war progressed, Virginia as a battlefield figured increasingly, and so too did maps of the Old Dominion. Therefore, most of the Gilmer Maps date from 1863 to 1865.<sup>239</sup> Gilmer rescued sixty-four of these maps from Richmond, during the evacuation of the capital city in April 1865. His daughter, Louisa Porter Gilmer Minis gave sixty-three of the maps to the Historical Society; the sixty-fourth went to the Bryan family of Brook Hill, who in turn bequeathed it to the society in 1988. The other three came from the 1946 merger of the Virginia Historical Society and the Confederate Memorial Association.

---

<sup>239</sup>*Eastern Virginia, 1864; New Kent County, Charles City County, James City County, and York County, 1863; and Richmond and York River Railroad, 1864, are the three charts that correspond to the vicinity of the house, Kiskiack. At the Historical Society, these charts are reproduced as sheet numbers 31-36, 60-61, and 68-69 respectively.*

Also, the Historical Society's library has a collection of maps for York County and Virginia. A significant number of the images date to the periods of the American Revolution and Civil War. Copies of the quarterly journal published by the Historical Society, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, are in the library as well. The Virginia Historical Index includes entries for this journal in its references to sources about the colonial period.

- Williamsburg Regional Library, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The local library has collected newspaper clippings and materials related to York County and the growth of Yorktown. The library also has copies of newsletters printed by the York County Historical Commission and genealogical information on the Lee family.

- York County Courthouse, Records Office, Yorktown, Virginia.

In the Records Office of the York County Courthouse are copies of all deeds, orders, judgements, wills, inventories, and chancery files relating to the county. The record books begin with Deeds, Orders, Wills, &c., Book 1, 1633-1694. The books are duplicates and placed on open stacks for public use. Several abstractions of these records were published and are available at the Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. Also available at the Library of Virginia in Richmond are microfilm copies of the records up to 1865.<sup>240</sup>

- Yorktown Victory Center, Jamestown/Yorktown Foundation, Yorktown, Virginia.

The Library of the Yorktown Victory Center has materials relating to the history of York County. The Library is open by appointment.

One of the propositions included in the report, "Alternatives and Recommendations for Kiskiack," was relocating it on the grounds of the Yorktown Victory Center. Moving the structure would have made it accessible to the public. Moreover, the Jamestown/Yorktown Foundation was in the financial position to preserve and maintain the historic structure once it was transferred to the Victory Center. The idea to move Kiskiack dovetailed with the curatorial decision to create and interpret life in York County around the time of the American Revolution. By 1781, the Hansford family's land had been divided among the heirs and the Kiskiack tract represented a planter's holdings of the more "middling" sort despite the existence of a status-bearing brick house. The Jamestown/Yorktown Foundation wanted a genuine historic artifact to interpret, however, Kiskiack was -- and is not -- in stable enough condition to survive the move. Changing the site also would sacrifice the building's status on the National Register of Historic Places.

---

<sup>240</sup>At the courthouse I hoped to discover information about a road docket for York Road or Stage Road, the thoroughfare connecting Williamsburg to Yorktown. A docket records the construction, location, abandonment, and opening of the road; names landowners and properties in its path; and sometimes has a sketch of road's courses, distances, and buildings along its way. Unfortunately I did not ask the question in a clear manner for my request generated confusion and prompted the suggestion that I call the State's Department of Transportation (VDOT). No one ever answered the telephone at VDOT.

The research conducted for the creation of a typical York County homestead is valuable, and while Kiskiack continues to live in the Naval Weapons Station, the Victory Center's research and exhibition should not be overlooked. The research generated for the typical planter's homestead and living conditions includes outbuildings, size of acreage, ownership of slaves, livestock, and agricultural tools, size of house, transportation methods, etc.

## 2. Bibliography

### Unpublished Materials:

- Boulton, Alexander Ormond. "The Architecture of Slavery Art, Language, and Society in Early Virginia." Ph.D. diss, College of William and Mary, 1991.
- Branyon, Elizabeth Gray. "Virginia as Seen through the Eyes of her Eighteenth-Century Historians." M.A. thesis, University of Georgia, 1972.
- Brown, Kathleen Mary. "Gender and the Genesis of a Race and Class System in Virginia, 1630-1750." Ph.D. diss, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1990; see also, Good Wives, Nasty Wenches and Anxious Patriarchs. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Carson, Cary. "Settlement Patterns and Vernacular Architecture in Seventeenth-Century Tidewater Virginia." M.A. thesis, University of Delaware, 1969.
- "'Cast Down Your Bucket Where You Are': An Ethnohistorical Study of the African-American Community on the Lands of the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, 1865-1918." Report prepared for the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Norfolk, Virginia, April 1992. Copy courtesy of the Department of the Navy, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Chappell, Edward A. "A Middling Farmstead for the Yorktown Victory Center." Document and correspondence, various dates. Yorktown Victory Center Library, Yorktown, Virginia.
- Clinton, Catherine. "The Plantation Mistress: Another Side of Southern Slavery, 1780-1835." Ph.D. diss, Princeton University, 1980.
- Grim, Ronald E. "The Absence of Towns in Seventeenth-Century Virginia." Ph.D. diss, University of Maryland, 1977.
- Hatch, Charles E., Jr. "The Bellfield Estate." Washington, D.C.: Office of History and Historical Archaeology, Eastern Service Center, October 1970. Yorktown Victory Center Library, Yorktown, Virginia, and Library, Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

- Hatch, Charles E., Jr. "The Nelson House and the Nelsons." Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, August 1969. Yorktown Victory Center Library, Yorktown, Virginia, and Library, Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia.
- Hatch, Charles E., Jr., and Jerome A. Greene. "Developed Sites and Colonial Rural Fences, Yorktown Battlefield." Denver, CO: U.S. Department of Interior, March 1975. Yorktown Victory Center Library, Yorktown, Virginia, and Library, Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia.
- "Henry Lee House (Kiskiack)." Nomination Form, 1969. National Register for Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Kelly, Kevin P. "A Demographic Description of Seventeenth-Century York County, Virginia." Paper, Institute of Early American History and Culture Colloquium Series, October 1983. Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Lovell, Barry. "Land, Labor, and Dwellings in York County, Virginia 1783-1790." Report, n.d. Yorktown Victory Center Library, Yorktown, Virginia.
- Maddocks, Kristina E. "The Lee House Near Yorktown." Paper, The College of William and Mary, 1969. Site file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia.
- Miles, Commander Art. "The Naval Mine Depot." Paper, 1926. Site file, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia.
- Mouer, L.D. "Digging Sites and Telling Stories: Critique, Narrative and Interpretation in Historical Archaeology." Contributions to International Historical Archaeology Series, edited by Charles Orser. New York, NY: Plenum Publishing, (forthcoming).
- Newbill and Beale, Inc. "Alternatives and Recommendations for Kiskiack." Report prepared for the Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Norfolk, Virginia, August 1988. Copy courtesy of the Department of the Navy, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Nicholls, Michael L. "Building the Virginia Southside: a Note on Architecture and Society in the Eighteenth Century." Report, n.d. Yorktown Victory Center Library, Yorktown, Virginia.
- Patrick, Vanessa E. "Partitioning the Landscape: The Fence in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." Report, Architectural Research Report Series, 1983. Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Richter, Caroline Julia. "A Community and its Neighborhoods: Charles Parish, York County, Virginia, 1630-1740." Ph.D. diss, The College of William and Mary, 1992.

- Richter, Julie. "Women and the Housing Revolution in Eastern Virginia, 1782-1850." Paper, n.d. Department of Historical Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Schlotterbeck, John Thomas. "Plantation and Farm: Social and Economic Change in Orange and Greene Counties, Virginia, 1716-1860." Ph.D. diss, The Johns Hopkins University, 1980.
- Sturtz, Linda Lee. "Madam & Co.: Women, Property, and Power in Colonial Virginia." Volume I & II. Ph.D. diss, Washington University, 1994.
- Snyder, Terri Lynne. "'Rich Widows are the Best Commodity this Country Affords': Gender Relations and the Rehabilitation of Patriarchy in Virginia, 1660-1700." Ph.D. diss, The University of Iowa, 1992.
- Thomas, Charles K. and David F. Murraca. "The Archaeological Testing at Kiskiack." Report, sponsored by the Henry Lee House Fund, Inc., May 1986. Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Upton, Dell. "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia." Ph.D. diss, Brown University, 1980.
- Wells, Camille. "Social and Economic Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Housing on the Northern Neck of Virginia." Ph.D. diss, The College of William and Mary, 1994.

Published Materials:

Books:

- Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover 1739-1741. Edited by Maude H. Woodfin. Richmond, VA: The Dietz press, 1942.
- Ayers, Edward L. The Promise of the New South. New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Bell, Landon C. Charles Parish York County, Virginia History and Registers Births 1648-1789 and Deaths 1665-1787. Richmond, VA: Library of Virginia, 1932; reprint, 1984.
- Beverley, Robert. The History and Present State of Virginia. Edited with an Introduction by Louis B. Wright. London: printed for R. Parker, 1705; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1947.
- Breen, T.H. Tobacco Culture: The Mentality of Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of Revolution. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985.

- Building Early America: Contributions toward the History of a Great Industry The Carpenters' Company of the City and County of Philadelphia. Edited by Charles E. Peterson. Radnor, PA: Chilton Book Co., 1976.
- Bushman, Richard L. The Refinement of America Persons, Houses, Cities. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Carr, Lois Green, Russell R. Menard, and Lorena S. Walsh. Robert Cole's World Agriculture and Society in Early Maryland. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1991.
- The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century, Essays in Anglo-American Society. Edited by Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman. New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton and Company, 1979; also published, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, n.d.
- Colonial Chesapeake Society. Edited by Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Common Places Readings in American Vernacular Architecture. Edited by Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach. Athens, GA and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Deetz, James. In Small Things Forgotten the Archaeology of Early American Life. New York, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1977.
- The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752-1778. Edited and Introduction by Jack P. Greene. Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia for the Virginia Historical Society, 1965.
- [Durand de Dauphine]. A Frenchman in Virginia Being the Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee In 1686. Translated by A Virginian. Richmond, VA: privately printed, 1923.
- Facts about Williamsburg and Vicinity. Richmond, VA: Whittet and Shepperson for the Business Men's Association of the City of Williamsburg, 1900.
- Fithian, Philip Vickers. The Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, a Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion, 1773-1774. Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., 1965.
- Forrest, Jessie F. Cemeteries of the City of Poquoson, Virginia, and Some Cemeteries of York County, Virginia. Edited by James H. Mero. Hampton, VA: Hugh S. Watson, Jr., Genealogical Society, n.d.
- Gender, Class, and Shelter: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture V. Edited by Elizabeth Collins Cromley and Carter L. Hudgins. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995.

- Glassie, Henry. Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: A Structural Analysis of Historical Artifacts. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1975.
- Greene, Jack P. Pursuits of Happiness the Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Herman, Bernard L. Architecture and Rural Life in Central Delaware 1700-1900. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1987.
- Herman, Bernard L. The Stolen House. Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- Isaac, Rhys. The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790. New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Ivy, Dick. Early Churches of York. Yorktown, VA: York County Historical Commission.
- Ivy, Dick. Kiskiack Indians and the Europeans. Yorktown, VA: York County Historical Commission, 1995.
- Jefferson, Thomas. Notes on the State of Virginia. Edited by William Peden. London: printed for John Stockdale, 1787; reprint, W.W. Norton & Company, 1982.
- Johnston, Henry P. The Yorktown Campaign and the Surrender of Cornwallis, 1781. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers, 1881; reprint, Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company, 1973.
- Jones, Hugh. The Present State of Virginia. Edited by Richard L. Morton. London: printed for J. Clarke, 1724; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press for the Virginia Historical Society, 1956.
- Kelso, William M. Kingsmill Plantations, 1619-1800, Archaeology of Country Life in Colonial Virginia. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc., 1984.
- Kulikoff, Allan. Tobacco and Slaves the Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986.
- Lanier, Gabrielle M. and Bernard L. Herman. Everyday Architecture of the Mid-Atlantic Looking at Buildings and Landscapes. Baltimore, MD and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Larkin, Jack. The Reshaping of Everyday Life 1790-1840. New York, NY: Harper Perennial, 1988.

- Main, Gloria L. Tobacco Colony Life in Early Maryland, 1650-1720. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Mason, George Carrington. Colonial Churches of Tidewater Virginia. Richmond, VA: Whittet and Shepperson, 1945.
- Material Culture and the Study of American Life. Edited by Ian M.G. Quimby. New York, NY: Norton for the Henry Francis DuPont Winterthur Museum, 1978.
- Material Life in America 1600-1860. Edited by Robert Blair St. George. Boston, MA: The Northeastern University Press, 1988.
- Noel Hume, Ivor. Here Lies Virginia. Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1994.
- Noel Hume, Ivor. Historical Archaeology: A Comprehensive Guide. New York, NY: 1969; reprint, New York, NY: Norton, 1975.
- Of Consuming Interests the Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century. Edited by Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert. Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia for the United States Capitol Historical Society, 1994.
- Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture. Edited by Camille Wells. Annapolis, MD: Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1982.
- Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture II. Edited by Camille Wells. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1986.
- Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture III. Edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press, 1989.
- "Remember the Ladies" New Perspectives on Women in American History. Edited by Carol R.V. George. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1975.
- Rutman, Darrett B. and Anita H. Rutman. A Place in Time Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750. New York, NY: Norton, ca.1984.
- Schoef, JoHann David. Travels in the Confederation [1783-1784]. Translated and Edited by Alfred J. Morrison. Cleveland, OH: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1911.
- Seaman, Catherine H.C. The Lees of Seventeenth-Century York County, Virginia: a Case Study of Family, Kinship, and Land Tenure. Sweet Briar, VA: Sweet Briar College Printing Press, 1985.

The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover 1709-1712. Edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling. Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press, 1941.

Shammas, Carole, Marylynn Salman, and Michel Duhlin. Inheritance in America from Colonial Times to the Present. New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

Shaping Communities: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VI. Edited by Carter L. Hudgins and Elizabeth Collins Cromley. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Sobel, Mechel. The World They Made Together Black and White Values in Eighteenth-Century Virginia. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Smith, Daniel Blake. Inside the Great House. Planter Family Life in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Spruill, Julia Cherry. Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies. New York, NY: Russell and Russell, 1938; reprint, Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

Stigloe, John R. Common Landscape of America, 1580 to 1845. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1982.

Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture. Annapolis, MD: Maryland Historical Trust, 1982.

Trudell, Clyde F. Colonial Yorktown being a brief History of the Place; Together with Something of its Houses and Publick Buildings. Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press, 1938.

Upton, Dell. Holy Things and Profane Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia. Cambridge, MA: Architectural History Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1986; reprint, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1997.

Vlach, John Michael. Back of the Big House the Architecture of Plantation Slavery. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Vlach, John Michael. By the Work of their Hands: Studies in Afro-American Folklife. Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1991.

Watkins, C. Malcolm and Ivor Noel Hume. The "Poor Potter" of Yorktown. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1967.

William Byrd of Virginia: the London Diary (1717-1721) and other writings. Edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Wolf, Stephanie Grauman. As Various As Their Land the Everyday Lives of Eighteenth-Century Americans. New York, NY: Harper Perennial, 1993.

Women in the Age of the American Revolution. Edited by Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert. third printing. Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia for the United States Capitol Historical Society, 1992.

Work and Labor in Early America. Edited by Stephen Innes. Chapel Hill, NC and London: The University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1988.

Yentsch, Anne Elizabeth. A Chesapeake Family and Their Slaves. New York, NY and Cambridge and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Journals/Periodicals:

"Ancient Residence Burned Historic Lee Home in York County Wiped Out by Early Morning Fire." Richmond Times-Dispatch. 26 February 1915. p. 9A.

Bergengren, Charles. "From Lovers to Murderers: The Etiquette of Entry and the Social Implications of House Form." Winterthur Portfolio 29, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 43-72.

Breen, T.H. "Horses and Gentlemen: The Cultural Significance of Gambling among the Gentry of Virginia." William and Mary Quarterly third series 34 (April 1977): 239-257.

Brydon, G. MacLaren. "The Antiecclesiastical Laws of Virginia." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 64, no. 3 (July 1956): 259-285.

Budahn, P.J. "Cheatham Annex: a Military Storage Center." Daily Press. 14 September 1990. section B, p. 2.

Bushman, Richard L. and Claudia L. Bushman. "The Early History of Cleanliness in America." Journal of American History 74 (1987): 1213-1238.

Carr, Lois Green and Lorena S. Walsh. "The Planter's Wife: the Experiences of White Women in Seventeenth-Century Maryland." William and Mary Quarterly third series 34, no. 4 (October 1977): 542-571.

Carr, Lois Green and Lorena S. Walsh. "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake." William and Mary Quarterly third series 45, no. 1 (January 1988): 135-159.

Chappell, Edward A. and Julie Richter. "Wealth and Houses in Post-Revolutionary Virginia." Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VII. Edited by Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

"Cheescake." Tyler's Quarterly 13, no. 3 (January 1932): 199-200.

- Elmore, Cindy. "Lees House History Is Untouched." Daily Press. 11 March 1985.
- Elmore, Cindy. "Museum Gives Up on Moving County's Oldest House." Daily Press. 9 August 1985. section C, p. 4.
- Grady, Preston. "APVA Opposes Dismantling Kiskiack." Daily Press. 14 March 1964. p. 3, 12:1.
- "The Graveyard at Kiskiack." Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia 39, no. 3 (September 1984).
- Henretta, James A. "Families and Farms: Mentalite in Pre-Industrial America." William and Mary Quarterly third series 35, no. 1 (January 1978): 3-32.
- Holland, C.G. "The Kiskiack/Chiskiack Path." Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia 39, no. 3 (September 1984): 150-176.
- Jeffrey, Tina. "Old Lee House Is Hidden But Not Forgotten." Daily Press. 15 June 1975. section B, p. 3.
- Jensen, Kurt. "300 Years Later, House May Be Saved." Virginia Gazette. 13 February 1985. p. 1A, 5A.
- "Journey of Francis Louis Michel." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 24, no. 1 (January 1916): 1-43; no. 2 (April 1916): 113-141; and no. 3 (June 1916): 275-303.
- Kierner, Cynthia A. "Genteel Balls and Republican Parades, Gender and Early Southern Civic Rituals 1677-1826." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 104, no. 2 (Spring 1996): 185-210.
- [Kimber, Edward]. "Observations in Several Voyages and Travels in America." The London Magazine (July 1745); reprint, Collections of the Georgia Historical Society, volume 4. Savannah, GA: J.H. Estill, printer, Morning News *Steam* Printing House, 1878; reprint, edited by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, William and Mary Quarterly 15, no. 3 (January 1907): 143-159 and no. 4 (April 1907): 215-225.
- "The Lee Family of York County, Virginia." William and Mary Quarterly 24, no. 1 (July 1915): 46-54 and no. 3 (January 1916): 215-216.
- "Lee Family Reunion." Daily Press. 22 June 1975.
- "Lee Home to Remain." Virginia Gazette. 10 August 1985.
- Lewis, Jan. "Domestic Tranquility and the Management of Emotion among the Gentry of Pre-Revolutionary Virginia." William and Mary Quarterly third series 39 (January 1982): 135-149.

- Linebaugh, Donald. "All the Annoyances and Inconveniences of the Country: Environmental Factors in the Development of Outbuildings in the Colonial Chesapeake." Winterthur Portfolio 29, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 1-18.
- Lounsbury, Carl R. "'An Elegant and Commodious Building': William Buckland and the Design of the Prince William County Courthouse." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 46, no. 3 (September 1987): 228-240.
- "Plans Are Being Made to Restore Lee House, One of Oldest Still Standing." Danville Register. 15 June 1975.
- Riley, Edward M. "Suburban Development of Yorktown, Virginia, during the Colonial Period." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 60, no. 4 (October 1925): 522-536.
- Roeber, A.G. "Authority, Law, and Custom: The Rituals of Court Day in Tidewater Virginia, 1720 to 1750." William and Mary Quarterly third series 37 (January 1980): 29-52.
- "Restoration Sought for Old Lee House." Roanoke Times. 15 June 1975.
- Rouse, Parke. "Kiskiack Once Was a Busy Settlement." Daily Press. 9 September 1990.
- Rutman, Darrett B. and Anita H. Rutman. "Rhythms of Life: Black and White Seasonality in the Early Chesapeake." Journal of Interdisciplinary History 11 (Summer 1980): 29-53.
- St. George, Robert Blair. "Bawns and Beliefs: Architecture, Commerce, and Conversion in Early New England." Winterthur Portfolio 25, no. 4 (Winter 1990): 241-288.
- Shammas, Carole. "How Sufficient Was Early America?" Journal of Interdisciplinary History 13, no. 2 (Autumn 1982): 247-272.
- "Shield Family." William and Mary Quarterly 3, no. 4 (April 1895): 268-271; 4, no. 1 (July 1895): 59; and 5, no. 1 (July 1896): 22-24.
- Simpson, Alan. "Williamsburg to Yorktown: Tracing the Last Miles of the American Revolution Following in the Footsteps of Washington and Rochambeau on the roads to Independence." Colonial Williamsburg 11, no. 4 (Summer 1989): 26-35.
- Stuart, David. "Dr. David Stuart's Report to President Washington on Agricultural Conditions in Northern Virginia." Introduction by Gertrude R.B. Richards. Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 61, no. 3 (July 1953): 283-292.
- Tinling, Marion. "Cawsons, Virginia, in 1795-1796." William and Mary Quarterly third series 3, no. 2 (April 1946): 281-291.

- Upton, Dell. "New Views of the Virginia Landscape." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 96, no. 4 (October 1988): 403-470.
- Upton, Dell. "Vernacular Domestic Architecture in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." Winterthur Portfolio 17, nos. 2/3 (Summer/Autumn 1982): 95-120.
- "Virginia in 1732 The Travel Journal of William Hugh Grove." Edited by Gregory A. Stiverson and Patrick H. Butler, III. Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 85, no. 1 (January 1977): 18-44.
- Walsh, Lorena S. "Plantation Management in the Chesapeake, 1620-1820." Journal of Economic History 49, no. 2 (June 1989): 393-406.
- Wells, Camille. "The Eighteenth-Century Landscape of Virginia's Northern Neck." Northern Neck of Virginia Historical Magazine 37, no. 1 (December 1987): 4217-4255.
- Wells, Camille. "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." Winterthur Portfolio 28, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 1-32.
- Aesthetics & Precedence in Virginia Architecture:
- Brownell, Charles E., Calder Loth, William M.S. Rasmussen, and Richard Guy Wilson. The Making of Virginia Architecture. Charlottesville, VA and London: The University Press of Virginia for the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1993.
- Farrar, Emmie Ferguson. Old Virginia Houses Along the James. New York, NY: Hastings House, 1955.
- Faulconer, Anne M. The Virginia House a Home for Three Hundred Years. Exton, PA: Schiffer Publishing Company, 1984.
- Forman, Henry Chandlee. Architecture of the Old South. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Kimball, Fiske. Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic. New York, NY: 1922; reprint, Dover Publications, 1966.
- Morrison, Hugh. Early American Architecture from the First Colonial Settlements to the National Period. Oxford University Press, 1952; reprint, New York, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 1987. (Illustrations ONLY)
- Pierson, William H., Jr. American Buildings and their Architects. Vol. I. The Colonial and Neoclassical Styles. New York, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1970; reprint, New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Rasmussen, William M.S. "Designers, Builders, and Architectural Traditions in Colonial Virginia." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 90, no. 2 (April 1982): 198-212.

Waterman, Thomas Tileston. The Mansions of Virginia 1706-1776. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945.

Waterman, Thomas Tileston and John A. Barrows. Domestic Colonial Architecture in Tidewater Virginia. New York, NY: Charles Scribners Sons, 1932.

Whiffen, Marcus B. The Eighteenth-Century Houses of Williamsburg: A Study of Architecture and Building in the Colonial Capital of Virginia. Williamsburg, VA: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1960.

Worthington, Addison F. Twelve Old Houses West of the Chesapeake Bay. Boston, MA: Rogers and Manson Company, 1918.

Upton, Dell. "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860." Winterthur Portfolio 19 (Summer/Autumn 1984).

D. Sources Not Yet Investigated:

- Henry Lee House Fund, Inc.
- National Colonial Farm, Accokeek Foundation, Accokeek, Maryland.
- Yorktown Public Library, Route 17, Yorktown, Virginia.

E. Supplemental Material:

1. Maps, York County, Virginia.

Kiskiack, sadly, is not the brick house marked on late eighteenth-century military maps of the Peninsula, but the Halfway House is shown as well as other landmarks that the Hansford and Lee families would have recognized.<sup>241</sup> Because several of the maps fall under copyright restrictions, reference-only copies are in the field notes. The maps included are as follows:

---

<sup>241</sup>For an explanation and map of the maneuvers of American and French armies on the Peninsula just before Yorktown in 1781, see Alan Simpson, "Williamsburg to Yorktown: Tracing the Last Miles of the American Revolution," Colonial Williamsburg 11, no.4 (Summer 1989): 28-29. Tradition held that Kiskiack, the Lee house, was the brick house recorded during the Revolutionary War cartographic efforts. For example, see J. Luther Kibler, Colonial Virginia Shrines, which was a guidebook to the historic triangle of Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Yorktown, Virginia.

"African-American Land Holdings." 1919. p. 19. "'Cast Down Your Bucket Where You Are': An Ethnohistorical Study of the African-American Community on the Lands of the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, 1865-1918." Report, April 1992. Figure 19.

Board of Public Works. "Richmond to York River Railroad." Map, n.d. Map Collection, Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

Bache, A.D., Superintendent of the Survey of the Coast of the United States. "Preliminary Chart of the York River, Virginia, from Entrance to King's Creek." 1857. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

"Carte de la partie de la Virginie." 1781. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Clonton, Cordelia Belle, comp. "Map of York County, Virginia. Schools, Residences, Public Places." 1902. Geographical and Map Reading Room, Madison Building, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

"Detail of Helm and Burret Farms," York County, Virginia. Map, revised 28 May 1910. Map #240-A, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO #37017, Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

"Detailed map of West Point on the York River at the confluence of the Pamunkey and Mataponi Rivers." In William and Mary Quarterly second series, 14, no. 4 (October 1934): 342-351.

Forman, Henry Chandlee. "Map of Jamestown's Suburb of Pasbyhayes." n.d. In Henry Chandlee Forman, "The Bygone 'Suburbs of James Citte,'" William and Mary Quarterly second series, 20, no. 4 (October 1940): 475-486.

"General Topography," York County, Virginia. Map, date unknown. Map #162-A, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO #36996, Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

"'Indian Field Farm' situated in York County, Virginia, Containing 580 3/4 Acres and bounded as shown on the MAP Surveyed February 14th 1896 for Frank H. and John C. Rocar..." Copy by Sydney Smith. Map #197-A, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO #37010, Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

"Key Map of Property Line Survey, Naval Mine Depot." 1919. In the Official Atlas of Naval Mine Depot, 1919. Map files, Facilities Planning, Public Works Engineering, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia.

"Major Roads used by African-Americans." ca.1900. p. 18. "'Cast Down Your Bucket Where You Are': An Ethnohistorical Study of the African-American Community on the Lands of the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, 1865-1918." Report, April 1992. Figure 18.

"A Map and Chart of those Ports of the Bay of Chesapeake York and James Rivers which are at present The Seat of War." 1781. Sir Henry Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan; reference-only copy available, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

"Map of Land of R.C. Davis, Nov. 30, 1892." Traced by C.F.N., Nov. 19, 1909. Map #150- B, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO #36987, Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

"Map showing the position of Government Farms, 1st District Negro Affairs, Department of Virginia and North Carolina." 1866. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia; see also, a copy credited to the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia, printed in "'Cast Down Your Bucket Where You Are': An Ethnohistorical Study of the African-American Community on the Lands of the Yorktown Naval Weapons Station, 1865-1918," Report, April 1992. Figure 15, p. 16

"Part of Anderson Est., Jan. 1853." Map #126-A, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO #36978, Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

"Plan of the Portsmouth & Roanoke Rail Road with a trace of Petersburg Rail Road." Map drawn by THos. H. Williamson under the Direction of Walter Gwinn, Engineer, 1838. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

"Region between York and James Rivers in Virginia." Land Ownership Map, 1862. Map Collection, Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia, and Geographical and Map Reading Room, Madison Building, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.<sup>242</sup>

"Robert Anderson Lands." Map #116-B, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO #36975, Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

Smith, Law [sic]. "A Plat of fifty Acres of land surveyed for Yorke County for a Towne." 24 September 1691. York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 9, p. 70-71.

---

<sup>242</sup>The Library of Virginia has a microfilm copy of the copy in the Library of Congress collection. The Library of Congress has a blueline print copy of a map made for the Honorable Eli Thayer, the original of which is preserved in the Eli Thayer Papers, Massachusetts. This is the only extant land ownership map for York County.

"Stony Point Farm." Traced 1910. Map #227-B, American Cement Engineering Company, 315 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Reference copy, COLO Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

Tiddeman, Mark, "Drought of Virginia from the Capes to York in York River and to Kuiquotan or Hampton in James River," 1729 in The Fourth Book of The English Pilot (London: 1732); Reference copy, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Topography, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia." COLO Map files, Nelson House, Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia.

"Tract Map." 1704. Department of Historical Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. Reference copy available in Special Collections, Rockefeller Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. However, permission to cite the map, or make a copy of it, must be obtained through the Department of Historical Research.

United States Geological Survey. Yorktown Quadrangle. Topographical Map, 19\_\_\_. Copy courtesy, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

"Virginia and the Carolinas, 1689" and "Virginia in 1652". p. 7. Harper's Atlas of America History. The American Nation Series. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1920.

"Williamsburg to Yorktown Landmarks on the Road to Independence Allied Routes from Williamsburg to Yorktown." Map, 1989. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Wyld, James, Geographer to the Queen. "The Yorktown Peninsula and Adjacent Counties, Route of the Federal Army." Frontispiece. Edge, Frederick Milnes. Major General McClellan and the Campaign on the Yorktown Peninsula. London: Trubner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row, 1865.

"Yorktown, 1781." Atlas of American History. Edited by James Truslow Adams. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Plate 81.

## 2. York County Records

### a. Transcriptions of York County Records, relating to the transfer of property

York County Records, Deed Book 39A, 1922:

p. 90

#### RELEASE

For the property taken over by the United States under Proclamation of the President dated 1918. (Public 182-65th Congress)

WHEREAS, William W.H. Lee and Margaret B., his wife, of Richmond, Virginia, was on August 7th, 1918, the owners in fee simple of the following property in Nelson District, York County, Virginia, to wit: - That certain Farm known as "Kiskiack Farm," containing by United States

Government Survey, 265.33 acres, bounded by the road to Felgates Creek, E. Wolf Estate, Florence S. McCandlish, G.W. Ridpley, Armistead Taylor estate, Thomas Lackey, C.H. and J.A. Shield, Margaret Ashlock, John Taliaferro estate, Mary Taliaferro estate, Ivordeen Bryan, and all right, title, and interest of the parties aforesaid in and to all that water and the land beneath, designated as the Mill Pond, as shown on the herein after mentioned survey; the said property being designated as parcel 20, on sheet 15 of a certain survey prepared by C.W. Booth, Surveyor, and entitled "Official Atlas of the Navy Mine Depot, Yorktown, Virginia, July 1919"; and recorded in the Office of the Solicitor of the Navy Department Washington, D.C.

BEING all of the property which was demised and bequeathed unto the said William W.H. Lee by the last will and testament of William Warren Lee, dated March 18th, 1886, and now of record in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of York County in Will Liber #17, folio 403, and which was also acquired by deed from Joseph S. Deneufville to the said William W.H. Lee, dated January 16th, 1911, and recorded among the Land Records of York County in Liber # 31, folio 24, etc., and also by Assignment of Deed from Henry Wilkinson to the said William W.H. Lee, dated July 22nd, 1920, and recorded among the aforesaid land records in Liber #37, folio 236; the original of which Deed together with the Assignment endorsed thereon to the said William W.H. Lee is on file in the Office of the Solicitor of the Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

WHEREAS, the said above described property was by Proclamation of the President dated August 7th, 1918, taken over and the title thereto in fee simple became vested in the United States on September 7th, 1918; and

WHEREAS, the owners aforesaid do hereby agree that the said sum of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars (\$17,500.00) and

WHEREAS, the owners aforesaid do hereby agree that the said sum of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars (\$17,500.00) is the just compensation for the said property.

NOW therefore KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that, we, the said William W.H. Lee and Margaret B., his wife, do hereby acknowledge receipt in full from the United States of the sum of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars (\$17,500.00), which amount is hereby accepted by William W.H. Lee and Margaret B., his wife, as the fair and just compensation for said above described property, title to which was taken over by the United States as aforesaid, and we do further by these presents for ourselves our heirs, executors, and administrators, successors, assigns, and legal representatives, remise, release and forever discharge the United States of and from all and all manner of claims, demands, and reckonings, whatsoever in law and in equity for or on account or by reason of the taking over of the property aforesaid and the vesting of title thereto in the United States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said William W.H. Lee and Margaret B., his wife, have hereunto subscribed their names and set their seals this third day of February, 1921.

William W.H. Lee (Seal)

Margaret B. Lee (Seal)

STATE OF VIRGINIA, County of Henrico, City of Richmond, to wit: -

I, Sophie H. Herrman, a Notary Public in and for the City of Richmond, State aforesaid, do, hereby certify that William W.H. Lee and Margaret B. Lee, his wife, whose names are signed to the writing above bearing date on the third day of February 1921, personally appeared before me in said

City the said William W.H. Lee and Margaret B. Lee, his wife, being personally well known to me as the parties who executed the said writing and acknowledged the same to be their Act and deed.

p.91

Given under my hand and notarial seal this third day of February 1921.

Sophie H. Herrmann  
Notary Public

Virginia, County of York, to wit:

In the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for the County of York, the 18th day of April 1924.  
This Deed was presented with the certificate and admitted to record at eleven o'clock A.M.

Teste: Floyd Hillmay  
Clerk

York County Records, Will Book 17, 1919:

p. 403

The People of the State of New York

By the Grace of God True and Indipecedents

To All to whom these presents shall C... or my concern, Greeting Know Ye, That we, having examined the records and files in the Office of the Surrogate of the County of Richmond, do find a certain last will and testament of William W. Lee, deceased, admitted to probates December, 10, 1900, and re-admitted to probate October 30, 1905, there remaining in the words and figures following, to wit:-

The last will and Testament  
of  
William W. Lee  
of Stapleton, County of Richmond, State of New York -

In the name of God, Amen

I, William Warren Lee, of Stapleton, County of Richmond, State of New York, being of sound disposing mind, memory and understanding, do make, publick and declare this my last will and testament, in manner following, that is to say -

1st: I direct that all my just debts, funeral and testamentary expenses by paid as soon after my decease as may be practicable \_

2nd: I give, devise, and bequeath to my brother, Henry H. Lee my farm in Nelson Township, County of York and State of Virginia, with on which he now resides, Containing about two hundred Acres of land, for and during the term of his natural life; And after his decease, I give, devise and bequeath the said farm to my nephew, William W.H. Lee, Son of my said brother Henry H. Lee. To have and to hold the same unto him the said William W.H. Lee his heirs and assigns, absolutely and forever -

3rd: All the rest, residue and remainder of my estate, real, personal and mixed, I give devise and bequeath to my beloved wife, Adelia Lee, to have, hold, receive, use and enjoy the rents, interest, issues, and profits thereof during the term of her natural life; And I also authorize and empower her at her discretion to sell, transfer, convey and mortgage the same and each and every part thereof, to such person or persons as she may chose, and I direct and declare that all and every persons and person

taking the same under and in pursuance of this power, shall take and hold the same pursuant to the terms of the Deed, Bill of Sale or Mortgage.

4th: Upon the death of my said wife, Adelia Lee, I give, devise and bequeath All that shall remain of my said estate, real and personal and mixed, unto my nephew and adopted son Frederick William McCready, who is currently called and known by the name of Frederick William Lee, if he shall survive my said wife. To have and to hold the same unto him the said Frederick William McCready (otherwise Frederick William Lee) his heirs and assigns, absolute and forever. If her, the said Frederick William McCready (otherwise Frederick William Lee) shall not survive my said wife, then I give devise and bequeath all that shall remain of my said estate, unto whomsoever my said wife shall by an Instrument, in the nature of a last will and testament, designate to take the same \_

Lastly: I hereby nominate and appoint my said wife, Adelia Lee, Executrix, and my friend George Lowe, executor of this my last will

p. 404

and Testament, hereby revoking and annulling any and all other and former wills by me at any time heretofore Made -

In Witness Whereof, I, the above named William Warren Lee, have hereto set my hand and seal this nineteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six -

Wm W Lee

The above testament was at the date thereof, signed, sealed, published and declared by the said William W. Lee, or and for this last will and Testament, in the presence of us, who, at his request and in his presence, And in the presence of each other, have subscribed our names as witnesses thereto -

David W. Price, 48 Pulaski Street, Brooklyn

Felix O'Hanlan, Stapleton, Staten Island, Richmond County

All which we have caused by these presents to be exemplified, and the seal of our said Surrogates Court to be hereunto affixed -

witness, J. Harry Tierman, Surrogate \_ Richmond County. The 24th day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen

(Seal) William Finley

Clerk of the Surrogates Court

I, J. Harry Tierman, Surrogate of the County of Richmond, and Sole presiding Magistrate of the said Surrogate Court, do hereby certify that William Finley whose name is subscribed to the proceeding exemplification, is the Clerk of the said Surrogate's Court, and that full faith and credit are due to his official acts. I further certify, that the seal affixed to the exemplification is the seal of our said Surrogates Court, and that the attestation thereof is in no other form, Dated, Richmond County, April 24th 1919

(Seal) J. Harry Tierman, Surrogate

State of New York }  
County of Richmond }

I, William Finley, Clerk of the Surrogate's Court of the County of Richmond do hereby certify that J. Harry Tierman, whose name is subscribed to the proceeding Certificate, is the sole presiding Magistrate of the said Surrogate's Court, duly elected, sworn, and qualified, and that the signature of said Magistrate to said Certificate is genuine.

In testimony Whereof I have hereto set my hand and affixed the Seal of the Surrogate's Court, this 24th day of April 1919.

(Seal) William Finley  
Chief of the Surrogate's Court

State of Virginia, to wit:

In the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of York County, the 18th day of July 1919, the foregoing certified copy of the last will and testament of William W. Lee, deceased, was presented and, with the certificates annexed, admitted to record at four or five o'clock P.M.

Teste: Sydney Smith, Clerk -

York County Records, Deed Book 17, 1866/67:

p.171

This deed made the 24th day of November in the year 1867 between John H. Lee and Sarah M., his wife, of James City County of the one part, and William W. Lee of York County of the other part. Witnesseth: that in consideration of the sum of nine hundred and fifty dollars (\$950.00) in hand paid or secured to be paid; the said John H. Lee and Sarah M. His wife do grant unto the William W. Lee a tract of land lying and being in the County of York and containing about one hundred and forty-four acres and bounded north by the lands of Felix Bennett, east by Filbutts Creek. South by the lands of the late Willis Wooten and West by the lands of James Kirby, and which is the same land conveyed by deed to the said John H. Lee by Robt H. Armistead, Commissioner in the suit of Croswell against Lee depending in the County Court of York County and which said deed is dated 22nd day of October 1866. And the said John H. Lee doth covenant to deed with the said William H. Lee that he will and doth warrant generally the said land hereby conveyed.

Witness the following signatures and seals.

Witness

John H. Lee (Seal)  
Sarah M. Lee (Seal)

State of Virginia County of James City to wit:

I Wm B. Wynne a Justice of the peace for the County of James City in the state of Virginia, do certify that Sarah M. Lee the wife of John H. Lee, whose names are signed to the writing above bearing date of 24th day of November 1866 personally appeared before me in the County aforesaid and being privily

p. 172

and apart from her husband and having the writing aforesaid fully explained to her. She the said Sarah M. Lee acknowledged the said writing to be her act and declared that she had willingly executed the same and does not wish to retract. Given under my hand and seal this 14th day of march, One thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven (1867).

Wm B. Wynne J.P. (Seal)

In York County Court Clerk's Office the 17th day of August A.D. 1868

This deed was acknowledged by John H. Lee party thereto and with the certificate thereon endorsed was admitted to record.

Teste

Samuel Van Bosterod  
Clerk

York County Records, Deed Book 17, 1866:

p. 425

Whereas by decree of the County Court of York County on the 20th day of August 1866 in the suit of Croswell against Lee a tract of land in said County containing about one hundred forty-five acres was directed to be sold & which land is bounded North by lands of Felix Bennett. East by Filgates Creek. South by the late Willis Wooten and West by lands of James Kirby and which land had been heretofore conveyed by the said John H. Lee to the said James B. Croswell who gave a trust deed thereon for the purchase at the price of fifteen hundred and seventeen dollars and twenty-five cents that being the principal and interest due up to the first day of October 1866 and which said sale has been duly confirmed and a deed having been directed to be given by the said Croswell to be filed with the papers in the said suit and which he has done.

Now this deed made this 23rd day of October in the year 1866

p. 426

between Ro. H. Armistead, Comm.r of the first part and John H. Lee of the other part Witnesseth that in consideration of the premises the said Ro. H. Armistead, Comm.r doth grant unto the said John H. Lee the said tract or parcel of land above described and the said Armistead Comm.r doth Covenant to and with the said Lee that he will warrant specially the property hereby conveyed.

Witness the following signature and seal

Internal Revenue Stp H200}  
(Seal)

Ro. H. Armistead, Comm.r

on original

City and Corporation of Williamsburg to wit:

I, J.S. Bourman a justice of the Peace for the City aforesaid in the State of Virginia do certify that Ro. H. Armistead whose name as Comm.r is signed to the writing hereto annexed bearing date on the 22nd day of October 1866 acknowledged the same before me in my City and Corporation aforesaid. Given under my hand this 20th day of January 1871.

S.T. Bouman J.P.

In York County Court Clerk's Office, this 22nd day of January A.D. 1871

This deed was produced and with the certificate thereon endorsed was admitted to record.

Teste

Samuel Van Bosterod,  
Clerk

York County Records, Deed Book 16, 1859/60:

p. 371

This Deed made this 10th day of October in the year 1859 Between James B Croswell of the one part and Robert H. Armistead trustee of the other part Witnesseth that the said James B Croswell doth grant unto the said RoH. Armistead the following property that is to say all that tract or piece of land lying and being in York County containing about one hundred and forty five acres (the same being granted by the tract and not by the acre) and is bounded in the North by the lands of Felix Bennett, East by Fillgats Creek, South by the lands of Willis Wootten and west by the lands of James Kirby Senr, being the same tract or piece of land conveyed to said Croswell by John H. Lee & Sarah his wife by deed of even date herewith and the said James B Croswell doth covenant to and with the said RoH Armistead that he will and doth warrant generally the said property hereby conveyed. In Trust to secure the payment of a note under seal executed on the 10th day of October 1859 by said James B Croswell to John H Lee for four hundred dollars due and payable on the 1st day of January 1860 on which said note is also to be given personal security, one other note under seal executed at the same time to said Lee by said James B Croswell for further Sum of three hundred and fifty dollars with interest from the 1st day of January 1860 due and payable the 1st day of January 1861 One other note under Seal executed at same time by same to same for the further sum of three hundred and fifty dollars with interest payable annually from the 1st day of January 1860 due and payable the 1st day of January 1862 and one other note under seal executed at the same time by same to same for the further sum of three hundred and fifty dollars with interest payable annually from the first day of January 1860 and which a last note is due and payable 1st day of January 1863. all of which said notes are executed and given for the purchase money of the said tract of land hereby conveyed

Witness the following Signatures & Seals, James B. Croswell (seal)  
Ro H Armistead trustee (seal)  
Jno H Lee (seal)

p. 372

The first named note for four hundred dollars due and payable the 1st day of January 1860 due by Jas B Croswell has been settled by him & which note I have delivered him.

John H. Lee,

State of Virginia  
City of Williamsburg Court:

I S.T. Bowman a Justice of the peace for the City aforesaid in the State of Virginia do certify that James B Croswell whose name is signed to the writing above bearing date in the 10th day of October 1859. Hath acknowledged the same before me in my City aforesaid. Given under my hand this 9th April 1860.

ST Bowman J.P.

In York County Court Clerk Office the 16th April 1860 this Deed was acknowledged and with the certificate thereon endorsed admitted to record.

Teste,  
Bolivar Sheild cofc

York County Records, Deed Book 16, 1859:  
p. 370

This Deed made this 10th day of October in the year 1859 between John H Lee and Sarah M his wife of York County of the first part and James B Croswell of Gloucester County of the second part Witnesseth: that in consideration of the sum of Fourteen hundred and fifty dollars, the said John H. Lee and Sarah M his wife do grant unto the said James B Croswell all that tract or piece of land lying and being in the County of York now owned and occupied by said Lee & wife containing about One hundred and forty five acres (the same being sold however by the tract and not by the acre) and is bounded on the north by the lands of Felix Bennett, East by Fillgats Creek South by the lands of Willis Wootten and west by the lands of James Kirby, Snr and the said John H. Lee doth covenant to and with the said James B. Croswell that he will and doth warrant generally the property hereby conveyed

Witness the following Signatures and Seals

Signed sealed & delivered  
In presence of

John H Lee (seal)  
S M Lee (seal)

p. 371

State of Virginia. County of York to wit:

We Richard M. Bucktrout & Ro M Garrett Justices of the Peace for the County of York in the state of Virginia do certify that Sarah M. Lee the wife of John H. Lee whose names are signed, to the writing above bearing date on the 10th day of October 1859 personally appeared before us in the County aforesaid and being examined by us privily and apart from her husband and having the writing aforesaid fully explained to her she the said Sarah M. Lee acknowledged the said writing to be her act and declared that she had willingly executed the same, and does not wish to retract it Given under our hands this 11th day of October 1859.

Richard M Bucktrout J.P.  
Ro M. Garrett J.P.

In York County Clerk's Office the 16th April 1860 this deed was acknowledged and with Certificate thereon endorsed, admitted to record.

Teste,  
Bolivar Sheild cofc

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 15, 1854:  
p. 423

Whereas John H. Lee by his deed dated on the 1st day of January in the year 1850 conveyed the lands herein after mentioned to a certain Bolivar Sheild, in trust, to secure a debt due Robert M Candlish to wit, the sum of four hundred and forty eight dollars besides interest, which deed is duly recorded in the

office of the County Court of York, and whereas the said debt has been fully paid. Now this deed made on this 15th day of May in the year 1854, between the said Bolivar Sheild trustee as aforesaid, of the first part, the said John H. Lee of the second part and the said Robert M Candlish of the third part, Witnesseth, that the said trustee being the party of the first part, for and in consideration of the premises, and of one dollar to him in hand paid by the said John H. Lee, hath released and by these presents doth release and give up to the said John H. Lee all his right title and interest in and to the tract of land in the said deed of Trust mentioned, called and known as the Brick house tract of land, late the property of Benjamin Hansford (Creek) of the County of York, according to the description and boundaries mentioned in the said deed, and to all the houses buildings and premises thereon To have and To hold the said lands & premises in as full and ample manner as if the said deed of Trust had not been made, And the said Robert M Candlish admits that his said debt has been fully paid In Witness whereof the parties have hereto set their hands and Seals on the day and year aforesaid.

Bolivar Sheild trustee (seal)  
(seal)  
RM Candlish (seal)

At a Court held for York County the 15th day of May 1854-  
This deed of Release was acknowledged by R M Candlish and Bolivar Sheild, and ordered to be recorded.

Teste  
Bolivar Sheild cofc

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 15, 1850:  
p. 119

This Indenture made and entered into on this 1st of January in the year 1850 between James Willson of the County of York and Uphama his wife of the first part, and John H. Lee of the same County of the second part Witnesseth That the Said James Willson for and in consideration of the Sum of five hundred and forty eight dollars good and lawful money of Virginia to him in hand paid, at or before the ensembling and delivery of these presents, the receipt whereof is hereby admitted hath granted bargained and Sold, aliened enfeoffed released and Confirmed assigned transferred and Set over and by these presents, doth grant bargain and Sell alien enfeoff release and Confirm, assign transfer and Set over unto him the Said John H. Lee his heirs and assigns all that certain tract piece or parcel of land Situate lying and being in the County of York, supposed to Contain one hundred and forty one acres and thirty two perches of land Be the Same more or less, the sale however Being in gross and not by the acre being the Same land sold by Benjamin Hansford to the said James Willson together with all the houses buildings and improvements on the Same belonging, or in any wise appertaining -- To Have and To Hold the said tract of land and premises to him the said John H. Lee his heirs and assigns forever. And the said James Willson for himself and his heirs doth hereby covenant promise and agree to and with the said John H Lee his heirs and assigns, that he will warrant protect and defend the title and possession of the said tract of land and premises to him the said John H Lee his heirs and assigns against the claim or claims of all and every person or persons whomever In testimony whereof the parties have hereto set their hands and Seals on the day and year aforesaid.



lying and being in the County of York supposed to contain one hundred and forty one and thirty two perches acres of land be the same more or less The sale however being in gross and not by the acre, being the same land Sold by James Wilson and wife to the said Lee together with all the houses buildings and improvements thereon To Have and To hold the Said tract of land and premises to him the said Trustee his heirs and assigns forever upon Trust nevertheless and This deed is on this express condition that if the said John H. Lee do and Shall will and truly pay or Cause to be paid to the said Robert M Candlish his heirs or assigns, the said sum of money by instalments of one hundred Dollars a year until the whole is paid with interest from the Date hereof, then the above obligation to bound or else to remain in full force and virtue - But if the said John H Lee do and shall fail to pay the said sum of money, as the same falls one with interest as aforesaid, then it shall and may by lawful for the said Trustee at any time after the whole of the said money Shall be Due, on the application of the said Robert M Candlish to advertize and Sell the said tract of land and premises, at the Courthouse of York County on some Court day, for Cash, having given four weeks previous

p. 121

notice of the time and place of Sale, to be pub.. at one or more ..in the County and out of the proceeds of Said Sale the said Trustee Shall in the first place pay the expenses of the Sale and of drawing and recording this deed, and then he shall pay the debt aforesaid or whatever Shall be Due of the same, and the reserve he shall pay over to the said Lee. -

In Witness whereof the parties have here to set their hands and Seals on the day and year aforesaid

Signed Sealed & Delivered

Jn.o H. Lee (seal)

In presence of}

Bolivar Sheild Trustee (seal)

At a Court held for York County the 19th day of August 1850 -

This Indenture of Trust was acknowledged by the Several parties thereto and ordered to be recorded.

Teste, Bolivar Sheild cofc

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 14, 1846:

p. 212

WHEREAS Benjamin Hansford and Elizabeth his wife by their deed of the 5th February in the Year 1841 which Deed is duly recorded in the County Court of York among other things conveyed to Robert M Candlish in trust for his creditors a tract of Land in the said County wherein he then resided supposed to Contain Two hundred acres adjoining the Lands of James Kerby and others. And whereas the said Trustee has duly advertised and Sold the said tract of Land according to the provisions of the Said Deed at which sale James Wilson became the purchaser at the price of nine hundred Dollars NOW This Indenture made this 16th day of March in the Year 1846 between the said Robert M Candlish trustee as aforesaid of the first part The said James Wilson of the second part and the said Benjamin Hansford Jr. and Elizabeth his wife of the third part, Witnesseth that the said Robert M Candlish trustee as aforesaid for and in Consideration of the Sum of nine hundred Dollars to him in hand paid by the said James Wilson at or before the ensealing and delivery of these presents the receipt whereof is hereby admitted hath granted bargained and sold aliened enfeoffed released and Confirmed assigned transferred and Set over and by These presents doth grant bargain and Sell alien enfeoff release and Confirm assign transfer and set over unto him the said James Wilson his heirs and assigns forever all

that certain tract piece or parcel of Land situate lying and being in the County of York containing by a late survey one hundred and forty one acres and some perches be the same more or less the Sale being in gross and not by acre being the same Land on which the said Benjamin Hansford Jr. lately resided adjoining the Lands of James Kerby & others together with all and Singular The Houses buildings and improvements belonging to or appertaining thereto To Have and To hold the said Lands and premises to the said James Wilson his heirs and assigns forever it being understood the said Trustee Conveys as trustee and not

p. 213

in his individual character And the said Benjamin Hansford & wife do hereby Confirm and approve the said Sale She relinquishing her right of Dower herein and he for himself and his heirs warranting the said Lands & premises to the said James Wilson his heirs and assigns against all claims whatsoever. In Testimony whereof the parties have hereto set their hands & Seals the day and Year aforesaid.

Signed Sealed & delivered

RM Candlish Trustee (seal)

In presence of|

James Wilson (seal)

G Cooper

Benj.am Hansford Jun (seal)

HH Hansford

Eliz.th (her mark) Hansford (seal)

Nath. Seburn

Rich.d K Harwood

York County to wit:

We James Kerby and Edw.d W Moore Justices of the peace in the County aforesaid do hereby Certify that Benjamin Hansford and Elizabeth Hansford his wife parties to a certain deed bearing date on the 16th day of March 1846, and hereunto annexed personally appeared before us in our County aforesaid and acknowledged the same to be their act and Deed and desired us to Certify the said acknowledgment to the Clerk of the County Court of York in order that the said Deed may be recorded Given under our hands and Seals this 27th day of April 1846.

James Kerby Sen (seal)

Edw.d W Moore (seal)

York County to wit: we James Kerby and Edw.d W. Moore Justices of the peace in the County aforesaid do hereby Certify that Elizabeth Hansford the wife of Benjamin Hansford parties to a certain Deed bearing date on the 16th day of March 1846. Thereunto annexed personally appeared before us in our County aforesaid and being examined by us privily and apart from her Husband and having the Deed aforesaid fully explained to her She the said Eliz.h Hansford acknowledged the same to be her act and Deed and declared that she had willingly signed Sealed and delivered the same and that she wishes not to retract it - Given under our hands and Seals this 27th day of April 1846.

James Kerby Sr (seal)

Edw.d W. Moore (seal)

In York County Court Clerks office the 28th day of April 1846

This Indenture was acknowledged by Robt M Candlish & James Wilson two of the parties thereto and With the Certificates of its acknowledgment by Benjamin Hansford and privy examination of his wife before two Justices of this County thereon endorsed admitted to record according to Law.

Teste

Bolivar Sheild D.C.

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 13, 1841:

p. 94

Whereas Benjamin Hansford of the County of Warwick justly indebted to Humphrey Harwood in the Sum of Two hundred and fifty Dollars with interest from September in the year 1839 and to Robert McCandlish in the Sum of eighty seven Dollars and Sixty Cents with interest from the 18th day of June in the year 1838 and to PSC Burwell in the Sum of one hundred and fifty Dollars with two years interest and to Rebecca Wills and Thomas Wills as their Guardian or as administrator of William S. Wills estate in the Sum of, say, five hundred Dollars and to William H Sheild in the Sum of Being the balance of medical account, and to Braxton McMannies in the Sum of Twenty Dollars with interest And to George W Southall in the Sum of Seventy five Dollars with interest and to Shelden & Maupen in the sum of Six hundred and Six Dollars and eighty Two Cents with Interest from the first day of January 1840 and to William W Vest & Co in the sum of five hundred and forty two Dollars and fifty Two Cents with interest from the first day of January 1840 and the said Benjamin Hansford being desirous to Secure the payment of the aforesaid Sums of money Now Therefore this Indenture made and entered into this fifth day of February in the year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and forty one. Between the said Benjamin Hansford and Elizabeth S. his wife of the first part and Robert McCandlish of the second part and the said Humphrey Harwood Robert McCandlish PSC Burwell Rebecca Wills and Thomas Wills as Guardian or administrators as aforesaid William H. Sheild B McMannies George W Southall Sheldon & Maupen and William W Vest & Co of the third part Witnesseth that for and in consideration of the promises and also for the further consideration of one Dollar of lawful money of Virginia to him the said Benjamin Hansford in hand paid by the said McCandlish Trustee at and before the ensealing and delivery of these presents the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged He the said Benjamin Hansford hath granted bargained Sold aliened enfeoffed and Confirmed and by these presents doth grant, bargain Sell alien enfeoff and Confirm unto the said MCandlish Trustee his heirs Executors administrators and assigns all that certain tract or parcel of land Situate lying and being in the County of York containing by estimation Two hundred acres be the same more or less being

p. 95

the land in which the said Benjamin Hansford lately resided adjoining the lands of James Kerby and others, also the following slaves and other personal property to wit the slaves named Frank, Ned, John, and Molly, and the other personal property Consisting of eight head of Cattle Two horses One gig and harness one Tumbrel cart four beds and furniture all his household and kitchen furniture and all his interest in right of his wife in the estate of Humphrey Harwood with all and singular the appurtenances to the said tract or parcel of land belonging or in any wise appertaining and the Sole female Slave, and all the estate right title and interest of the said Benjamin Hansford in and to the said tract or parcel of land and premises hereby granted To have and to hold the said tract or parcel of land and premises with

all their appurtenances As together with the aforesaid Slaves and the future increase of the said female Slave and all the other personal property hereby conveyed unto the said McCandlish Trustee his heirs executors administrators and assigns forever. And the said Benjamin Hansford for him self his heirs executors administrators and assigns doth hereby promise Covenant and agree to and with the said McCandlish Trustee his heirs executors administrators and assigns forever that the said tract or parcel of land and premises with all their appurtenances together with the aforesaid Slaves and the future increase of the said female slave and all the other personal property hereby conveyed unto the said M Candlish Trustee his heirs executors administrators and assigns forever that he the said Benjamin Hansford against himself his heirs executors administrators and assigns and every other person or persons Shall and will be these presents warrant and forever defend UPON TRUST NEVERTHELESS that if the said Benjamin Hansford Shall pay to the aforesaid parties of the third part the aforesaid sums of money with interest therein Then This Indenture shall be Void But if the said Benjamin Hansford Shall fail to pay the aforesaid Sums of money as above specified to the aforesaid parties of the third part Then the Said M Candlish Trustee his heirs Executors

p. 96

administrators or assigns Shall and Will Sell the said tract or parcel of land and premises With all their appurtenances together with the aforesaid Slaves and the future increase of the said female slave and all the other personal property hereby Conveyed either publickly or privately for Cash or on credit As he may deem expedient And if he Shall deem it expedient to have such sale publickly, he shall give four weeks notice of the time and place of Said Sale which shall be fixed at his discretion.

And acct of monies arising from the Sale he Shall in first place pay all reasonable charges attending the Sale and the Drawing and recording this Deed in the Second place retain out of the proceeds of the real estate hereby Conveyed to the Sole separate and exclusive use of the Said Elizabeth S wife if the said Benjamin Hansford that Sum which may be adjudged equivalent to her right of dower in the same in the third place pay the aforesaid debts with interest On the same pari passim share and share alike; in the fourth place, May all the debts which the said Benjamin Hansford may owe and which shall be made Known in Writing to the said McCandlish Trustee his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns within six months after the date of this deed And the residue of any pay to the said Benjamin Hansford his heirs executors administrators or assigns

In Witness whereof the aforesaid parties to these present have hereunto Set their hands and affixed their Seals the day and Year first above Written

Signed Sealed Delivered

In the presence of}

Benjamin Hansford (seal)

E S Hansford (seal)

York County to Wit

We Edward W Moore and James Kerby Sen Justices of the peace in the County aforesaid in the State of Virginia do hereby Certify that Benjamin Hansford, a party to a certain Deed bearing date On the fifth day of February in the year of our Lord 1841 and hereunto annexed personally appeared before us in Our County aforesaid and acknowledged the Same to be his act and Deed and desired us to certify the

p. 97

said acknowledgment to the Clerk's of the County Court of Warwick and of the County of York in order that the said DEED may be recorded Given under Our hands and Seals this 5th day of February in the year of Our Lord 1841.

Edw.d W Moore JP (seal)  
James Kerby Sen (Seal)

York County to Wit

We Edward W. Moore and James Kerby, Justices of the Peace in the County aforesaid in the State of Virginia do hereby Certify that Elizabeth S. Hansford the Wife of Benjamin Hansford parties to a certain DEED bearing date on the fifth day of February in the year of our Lord 1841 And hereunto annexed personally appeared before us in Our County aforesaid and being examined by us privly and apart from her husband do and having the Said DEED fully explained to her She the said Elizabeth S. Hansford acknowledged the same to be her act and Deed and declared that she had willingly signed sealed and delivered the same and that she desired not to retract it. Given under Our hands and seals this 5th day of February in the year of Our Lord 1841.

Edw.d W Moore JP (seal)  
James Kerby sen. (seal)

At a Court held for York County the 15th Feb'y 1841 This Indenture of Trust was produced in Court and with the certificates of its acknowledgment by Benjamin Hansford, Jun. and privy examination of Elizabeth his wife parties thereto before the Justices of the City of Williamsburg thereon endorsed Ordered to be recorded in this Court and also certified to the County Court of Warwick to be there recorded.

Teste

Sam. Sheild, cofc

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 11, 1834:

p. 461

Whereas Benjamin Hansford is indebted to William W Vest Dr Jesse Cole and others in considerable sums of money due by bond or note to which Samuel Sheild William Oail and William Taylor are bound as securities and whereas the said Benjamin Hansford is also indebted to Roscow Cole Richard Coke jr and others by bond or note to which there is no security all of which debts he the said Benjamin Hansford is desirous to secure to be paid in the order herein after stated, by a conveyance in trust on the whole of his property of every description

Now this indenture made and entered into on this 10th day of April in the year of our lord one thousand Eight hundred and thirty four between the said Benjamin Hansford of the county of Warwick of the first part, Robert MCandlish who is chosen trustee, for the purposes herein after mentioned, of the second part and the said Wm W Vest, Jesse Cole, and others creditors of the said Benjamin Hansford, of the third part, Witnesseth that the said Benjamin Hansford for and in consideration of the premises and of the further consideration of the sum of one dollar to him in hand paid by the said Robert McCandlish at of before the en sealing or delivery of these presents, the receipt of where of is hereby admitted, hath granted, bargained and sold, aliened enfeoffed released and confirmed assigned transferred and set over, and, by these presents doth grant bargain and sell, alien enfeoff release and

confirm assign transfer and set over unto him the said Robert MCandlish trustee as aforesaid his heirs and assigns forever, all that certain piece or parcel of land Situate in the County of Warwick on which the said Hansford at present resides including all the different pieces which he has purchased and attached to the same from time to time and all his interest in the Halfway house tract, all his real estate wheresoever situated and all the houses buildings and improvements thereon and all the appurtenances to the lands belonging or in anywise apart aiming with the rents issues and profits thereof Also the following slaves, being ten in number together with the future increase of the females thereof to wit, Dick, Polly, Jim, Disey, Molly, Louisa, William, John, Henry and [sembo] Also ten sheep eighteen head of cattle, seventy five hogs, five horses, Gig and harness all his household and kitchen furniture and plantation utensils of every description together with the crops growing at the growth present you also the fields due to the said Benjamin Hansford in and about the Towns of New Orleans & Natchez in the hands of Montgomery & Pascal for collection as his agents supposed be about three thousand dollars together with all and every description of property, of any kind, to which the said Benjamin Hansford may be at present entitled, To have and to hold the said property and the future increase of the slaves and stocks unto him the said Robert MCandlish trustee as aforesaid his heirs and assigns forever, Upon trust never the less, and this indenture is upon this express condition that the said Benjamin Hansford shall remain in possession of the said property and take the profits thereof till the same be required for the purposes of this Deed and then upon this further trust, that the said trustee shall be at liberty in the first place on the application of the persons aforesaid bound as security for the said Hansford and of all others so bound at any time after

p. 462

Judgement shall be rendered against them to sell at public or private sale for cash or on credit as the exigency of the case may require any part of the said property out of which he may satisfy such security debt upon which a judgement may have been recovered against the security it being the object and intention of the said Hansford in the first place to secure all his securities and for that purpose all the claims due to which there is security are to be made known to the trustee on or before the 1st day of Jany next and such as are securities and do not make known the claim to the trustee by that day are to forfeit their claim under this Deed, And the said Trustee is to have full power to sell any of the said property on the terms aforesaid. (he in all cases designating the time and place of sale altho' no judgement may be had on said claims, to satisfy the same whenever in his discretion it would be prudent to do so, for the benefit of all concerned or whenever the parties may agree on such sale. And when the whole of the debts are paid as aforesaid to which these shall be no persons bounds as security then the residue of the property is to be sold for the benefit of the other creditors of the said Hansford who shall exhibit their claims to the said trustee on or before the first day of January next and who are to be paid in proportion to the amount of their respective demands It being the object and intention of said Hansford to place this latter decryption of his creditors on the same footing share and share alike, the sale be for cash or credit as the Trustee shall determine & the time and place of sale to be at his discretion but the land when sold shall be on the usual credit for sales of real estate but all persons who may hold any such claim and does not give notice to the trustee of such claim by the time aforesaid are to forfeit all claims under the said Deed And the debts aforesaid when collected are to be applied first to pay the debt to Wm W Vest and Dr Jesse Cole to which there is security and the rest may go to relieve any other of the security debts

In Witness whereof the parties therefore to set their hands and seals on the day  
and year aforesaid -

Signed sealed & delivered  
in presence of

Benj Hansford (seal)

RM Candlish (seal)  
Trustee (seal)

In Warwick County Court Clerks office the 10th day of April 1834 This indenture of Trust between Benjamin Hansford of the first part Robert McCandlish of the second part and William W Vest Jesse Cole and others creditors of the said Benjamin Hansford of the third part was acknowledged by the said Benjamin Hansford and Robert McCandlish and delivered as and for their act and deed and was admitted to record.

Teste

Wm Robertson CloC  
\*copy

Teste  
Wm Robertson CloC

p. 463

At a Court held for York County the 21st day of April 1834.

This Indenture of trust was produced in Court and with the certificate of the Clerk of Warwick County Court of its acknowledgment by Benjamin Hansford and Robert McCandlish two of the parties thereto, in that county ordered to be recorded.

Teste

Sam Sheild, cofc

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 8, 1815:

p. 321

This Indenture made the ninth day of August one thousand Eight - Hundred and fifteen Benjamin Hansford Senr of James City of the one part and Benjamin Hansford Junr of York County of the other part WITNESSETH that the said Benjamin Hansford Senr in Consideration of the sum of Twelve Hundred dollars to him in hand paid by the said Benjamin Hansford Junr at or before the ensealing and delivery of these presents the Receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged have bargained and Sold and by these presents do\_ bargain and Sell unto the Said Benjamin Hansford Junr his Heirs and Assigns the whole of my Tract of Land lying and being in York County Bounded as follows - on the West by the Land of James Kirby on the North by the Land of William G Hubberd on the East by Philgates Creek and South by the Stage Road leading from York to Williamsburg together with all the Buildings Orchards tenements Woods Ways Water Courses hereditaments and appurtenances whatsoever to the Said Land belonging or appertaining thereto and the Reversion and Reversions Remainder and Remainders and profits thereof To Have and to Hold the said Land with the tenements hereditaments and all and Singular - the premises herein before mentioned, every part and parcel thereof with all My Right title and Claim unto the said Benjamin Hansford Junr his Heirs and

p. 322

and Assigns for ever to and for the Only proper use and behoof of him the said Benjamin Hansford Junr his Heirs and assigns forever and the said Benjamin Hansford Senr for himself and his Heirs the Land with all and Singular the premises and Appurtenances before Mentioned unto to the said Benjamin Hansford his Heirs and assigns free from the Claim or Claims of him the said Benjamin Hansford Senr his Heirs and of all and every person or persons whatsoever Shall will and do warrant and forever defend by these presents In Witness whereof the said Benjamin Hansford Senr have hereunto Set his hand and Seal the day and Year first above written

Signed Sealed and delivered

in presence of{  
Bennett Kirby  
Edmund Harwood  
Benjamin Hansford

Benjamin Hansford (SL)

At a Court held for York County the 21st day of August 1815

This Indenture was proved by the Oaths of Edmund Harwood and Benjamin Hansford Witnesses thereto and at another Court held for the said County the 18th day of September following the Said Indenture was acknowledged by Benjamin Hansford Senr party thereto and ordered to be Recorded

Teste

Sam Sheild CofC

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 6, 1787:

p. 343

This Indenture made this twenty first day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven Between Elizabeth Hansford of the County of York of the one part and Richard and Benjamin Hansford of the other part Witnesseth that the said Elizabeth Hansford for and in consideration of the natural love and affection which she beareth unto the said Richard and Benjamin her sons and also for and in consideration of the sum of five pounds to her in hand paid the Receipt whereof she doth Acknowledge, and therefrom doth acquit and discharge the said Richard and Benjamin Hath given granted bargained sold aliened enfeoffed and confirmed and by these presents doth give grant bargain sell alien enfeoff and confirm to the said Richard and Benjamin all that Land or parcel of Land situated lying and being in the County of York containing two Hundred and twenty Acres more or less and which tract or parcel of Land the said Elizabeth Hansford now holds by the last will of Charles Hansford which said will is recorded in the County Court of York as by reference being ... thereto will more fully and clearly appear. To have and to hold the ... tract or parcell of Land be the same more or less than two hundred and twenty Acres to them the said Richard and Benjamin their heirs and assigns to the use and behoof of them the said Richard and Benjamin their heirs and assigns forever and the said Elizabeth for herself the said Tract of Land with its appurtenances of every kind to them the said Richard and Benjamin will warrant and defend against the Claim and demand of her the said Elizabeth or any Person whatever In Witness whereof the said Elizabeth hath herewith sett her Hand and affixed her seal the year and day above written

Sealed and delivered

the Presence of us}  
Edmund Patrick  
Gerrard Roberts  
John Ga...ill

Elizabeth Hansford (SS)

York County Records, Wills and Inventories, Book 22, 1777-78:

p. 411

In the Name of God Amen I Charles Hansford of York County & York Hampton Parish being Weak of body, but of sound senses & Memory, do make my last Will & Testament in form as follows

Imp I give to my Daughter Elizabeth Camm, my Negro Woman named Judith and all her Increase, to her & her heirs forever

Item I give to my Daughter Mary Sheilds (after the Death of my Wife) my Negro Woman named Milley & all her increase to her & her Heirs, forever, but the Negro Woman named Peg I lent her to be returned

Item I give to my Daughter Martha Harwood, a Negro Girl named little Nanny and all her Increase, to her & her heirs forever

Item I give to my sons Richard & Benjamin, when they shall arrive at the Age of Twenty one Years, all my Tract or parcel of Land lying in Charles City containing Two hundred Acres, be the same more or less, to be equally divided between them, to them and their Heirs forever  
The

p. 412

The remaining part of my Estate be it wheresoever or whatsoever I lend to my loving Wife Elizabeth Hansford, so long as she shall remain a Widow and after her decease, I give to my sons Richard & Benjamin all lands, lying in York & Warwick Counties to be equally divided in quantity & quality between them, to them & their heirs forever

Lastly after the decease of my Wife Elizabeth, the remaining part of my Estate shall be equally divided between my five Children, Elizabeth, Mary, Richard, Benjamin, and Martha Harwood, if they be living, if Dead to their Children, if any, if none, to the survivors, And I do hereby Constitute & Ordain my loving Wife Elizabeth Hansford whole & sole Executrix of this my last Will & Testament Whereunto I have set my hand & affixed my Seal this third day of June 1777 -

In Presence of

Charles Miles

Mary (her mark) Hyde

Joseph(his mark) Blades

Charles Hansford (SI)

Since the Writing of my Will my son Benjamin hath not pleased me in a Circumstance which hath been acted between him & Mary Hyde. It is Will & desire that if he the said Benjamin do or shall at any time intermarry with the said Mary Hyde then such part of my Estate whether real or personal, which is or was intended by me for the said Benjamin, I give unto my son Richard to him & his Heirs forever, And as it will be attended with too much trouble for my loving Wife Elizabeth (who is heretofore mentioned as whole & sole Executrix of this my last Will) to perform such a business I do

therefore appoint my Friends the Revd John Camm, Samuel Shield & Ed Harrison in conjunction with my said Wife to execute this my last Will & Testament In Witness whereof I have set my hand & my Seal this thirteenth day of April One thousand, seven hundred & seventy eight  
Witness

Sam Hyde  
Eliz.a Jackson  
Mary (her mark) Yeatman

his  
Charles X Hansford (SI)  
mark

At a Court held for York County the 21st day of December 1778

This Will was proved by the Oath of Charles Miles & the Codicil endorsed was proved by the Oath of Elizabeth Jackson & Mary Yeatman Witnesses thereto And at a Court held for the said County the 15th day of February 1779 the said Will was proved by the Oath of Joseph Blades a Witness thereto and together with the Codicil Ordered to be Recorded And on the Motion of Elizabeth Hansford the Executrix therein named who made Oath thereto together with Edward Hansford her Security entered into & Acknowledged Bond as the law directs Certificate was granted her for obtaining a Probate in due form.

Teste  
Thos Everard Cl Cur

York County Records, Wills and Inventories, Book 21, 1758:  
p. 60

In the Name ....[torn] ton parish in York County [torn] life and the [torn] Will and Testament [torn]

p. 61

Item I give to my Son Charles Hansford and his heirs forever all my Lands wherever Situate lying or being; I also confirm to him all those gifts and bequests of Negroes, Stock, household Goods and Utensils which are now in his possession

Item I give and bequeath unto my executors hereafter named and their heirs the Remaining part of my Estate in trust to and for the following uses and purposes and no other that is to say  
For the necessary Support and Sole use and behoof of my Daughter Lucy now the Wife of John Hyde and her Children

Item It is my Will and desire that all my Estate viz my three Negroes; Silver, Sary, and Sam, and my Stock of Cattle and Hogs (which are now on the plantation of John Hyde;) together with all my household Goods; a Memorandum of which stock and household stuff may be seen in my book; with what Debts or money shall be found due to me be applied to Sole use and Support of my Daughter and her Children but that no part of my said Estate be Subject to the management of John Hyde in no sort whatever but that my Executors at their discretion sell my Stock and household goods and ... out the above named Negroes, Viz. Silver, Sary, and Sam, and the profits that shall arise from the said Negroes by made use to and for the Support and behoof of my daughter and her Children

But it is my will and desire that if my Daughter shall outlive her husband and be a Widow [torn] mentioned estate doe Revert and return [torn] that she have full power to manage and [torn] shall think

But if my said [torn] ble of action then my desire [torn] tors and that it be [torn] uel Elizabeth M  
[torn] hall arrive to [torn] twenty five or [torn] abeth Hyde

p. 63

Lastly I constitute and appoint my worthy friend Capt William Allen and my Son Charles Hansford  
Executors of this my last Will and Testament.

Signed Sealed and declared to be my last  
Will and Testament In the Presence of  
Robert Harrison  
John Chapman  
Samuel Hill

Char: Hansford (Sl)  
August the 4th 1758

Whereas at the writing and Signing of the Within Will my Grand daughter Lucy Hyde was not then  
born and is not mentioned; this is to make known that my will and desire is that the said Lucy Hyde  
have and enjoy an Equal part of my small Estate with her brothers and Sisters Written with my own  
hand this 13th of October 1760.

Char: Hansford Senior

At a Court held for York the 15th day of June 1761

This will was proved according to Law by the Oaths of John Chapman and Samuel Hill Witnesses  
thereto and the said Will with the Codicil endorsed of the Testator's hand Writing were sworn to by  
Charles Hansford one of the Executors and ordered to be recorded and on the Motion of the said  
Executor who together with John Chapman his Security entered into and Acknowledged Bond as the  
Law directs, Certificate was granted him for obtaining or [torn] erty being reserved for the other  
Executor [torn] the Probation or he shall think fit [torn] . Cur

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 6, 1757:

p. 100

This Indenture made the twenty first day of November in the Year of our Lord One thousand seven  
hundred And fifty seven and in the thirty first year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King George  
the second Between Charles Hansford Sen.r of the County of York of the One part, and

p. 101

Charles Hansford Jun.r of the same County Planter Of the other Part Witnesseth that for and in  
Consideration of the sum of five Shillings to the said Charles Hansford Sen.r In hand paid by the said  
Charles Hansford jun.r At or before the Sealing & delivery of these Presents the Receipt whereof he  
doth hereby Acknowledge & thereof Acquit and Discharge the said Charles Hansford Jun.r his Heirs  
Executors and Administrators forever by these presents - Hath Granted Bargained Sold Aliened  
enfeoffed and Confirmed And by these presents Doth Grant Bargain Sell Alien Enfeoff and Confirm  
unto the said Charles Hansford jun.r his Heirs and Assigns forever All that Plantation Tract or parcel  
of Land Situate Lying & being on the Head of Fillgates Creek Containing by Estimation two hundred  
Acres be the same more or Less Whereof one hundred Acres Of the said Tract or Parcel of Land was

formerly sold and Conveyed by William Hansford of Spotsylvania County unto the said Charles Hansford Sen.r by Deed of Lease Bearing Date the twenty fifth day of July One thousand Seven hundred and twenty Seven And Recorded in York County Court. And the Other Hundred Acres sold and Conveyed by Stephen Fuller and Elizabeth his wife of New Kent County Unto the said Charles Hansford Sen.r by Deed Bearing date the Thirty first day of October One thousand seven hundred and Thirty Seven and Recorded in the General Court of this Colony Relation Being thereunto had more fully may Appear. The said Tract or Parcel of Land Lying and being in the County's of York & Warwick and Bounded as Followeth That is to Say Beginning at a marked Hicory on the Lower side of a Swamp and Running Westerly along the Hill Side of the said Swamp to the Lines of Land ... belonging to William Hansford deceased and Given by his Will to Charles Hansford son

p. 102

of the above said Charles Hansford jun.r Then Southardly by the said Lines to York Road Then down the said Road till it comes against Mr. Nelsons Corner Post Then Crossing the said Road into Warwick Southardly by the Lines of land of the said Nelson to Matthew Hubbards Lines then by Hubbards Lines N. East to York Road again and Crossing the Road Northardly by the lines of Another Per.n that did belong to the said William Hansford decd (But given by his Will to William Harvey) down to a Branch thence down the water course of the said Branch to the main Creek and so to the place it first began, Together with all Houses Woods Waters Commodities and Appurtenances to the same belonging and the Reversion and Reversions Remainder and Remainders Tents Houses and Profits thereof and all the Estate Right Title and Interest of him the said Charles Hansford Sen.r of in and to the same or any part thereof with the Appurtenances To Have and to hold the said two hundred Acres of Land be the same more or Less with the Appurtenances unto the said Charles Hansford Jun.r his Heirs and Assigns To the only proper use & behoof of the said Charles Hansford Jun.r his Heirs & Assigns forever And the said Charles Hansford Sen.r For himself his Heirs Executors and Administrators doth Covenant Grant to and with the said Charles Hansford Jun.r his Heirs and Assigns By these presents That the said Charles Hansford jun.r his Heirs and Assigns shall Peaceably & Quietly have hold Occupy Possess and Enjoy the Premises hereby Bargained and Sold Without the Trouble or Molestation of any person whatsoever And free from every incumbrance In Witness Whereof the parties to these presents have hereunto ...changeably Set their Hands and Affixed their Seals The Day and Year first above Written.

Char. Hansford /s/

p. 103

Sealed and Delivered  
In Presence of}  
Matt. Hubbard  
John Chapman  
William Lee

Received November 21st day 1757 of the within named Charles Hansford, jun.r The Sum of five Shillings Being the Consideration money within mentioned.

I say Received ... me Charles Hansford

At a Court held for York County 21st: November 1757

This Indenture and the receipt indorsed were Acknowledged by Charles Hansford Senr party thereto and Ordered to be recorded.

Teste

Thomas Everard Cl. Cur:

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 3, 1727:

p. 471

This Indenture made the twenty fifth day of July in the thirteenth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord King George of Great Britain &c and the year of our Lord God one thousand seven hundred and twenty seven Between William Hansford of the County of Spotsylvania in the parish of St. George of the one party and Charles Hansford of the County of York in the parish of York Hampton of the other party and Witnesseth That the said William for & in consideration of sum of five shillings in current money of Virginia to him in hand by the

p. 472

the said Charles Hansford paid the receipt whereof the doth hereby acknowledge hath Bargained Sold and Devised and doth by these present bargain sell and devise unto the said Charles Hansford his heirs executors and assigns be all that plantation or tract of land situate lying & being in the parish of York Hampton in the County of York and on the head of Fillgates Creek esteemed and accounted to contain one hundred acres be the same more & less within the bounds hereafter expressed this said land being given to the said William Hansford by his father Mr. Charles Hansford Deceased by will and is bounded followeth Beginning at a marked Hickory on the lower side of a Swamp and running westerly along the hillside of the said Swamp to the land of John Hansford then turning southerly along the said John Hansford's land to a marked Poplar then westerly up to York road thence along the road to the land of William Stead thence easterly down Stead's line to a branch thence down the water course of the said branch according to the various turnings of the same to the main Creek and so to the place it first began the said plantation and hundred acres of land (more or less as aforesaid) with all and singular the houses outhouses orchards meadows woods swamps marshes creeks springs with all and singular the appurtenances and also the Reversion and Reversions, Remainder and Remainders thereof, To have & to hold the said hundred acres of land (more or less) with the plantation houses orchards tenements premises and appurtenances unto the said Charles Hansford his heirs executors admins assigns be from the day next before date hereof unto the end term and for and during the term of one year from thence next ensuing to the intent that by vertue thereof and of the Statute for transferring uses into possession the said Charles Hansford might be in actual possession of all the said lands and premises and be enabled to take and accept of a grant and Release of the same premises with this Inheritance thereof to him the said Charles Hansford his heirs and assigns for ever by one Indenture of Release & Confirmation intended to be made & executed by the said William Hansford to bear date the next day after the date of these presents to sell release and convey the before granted land plantation and premises with the Reversion and Inheritance thereof to him the said Charles Hansford his heirs and assigns forever according to the true intent and meaning of these present In Witness whereof the said William Hansford the party to these presents hath set his hand and Seal the day and year first above written-

Witness

Richard Ambler  
Wm Rogers  
John Gibbons

William Hansford (Seal)

At a court held for York County Augt 21st 1727

William Stark Gent by Vertue of a Power of Attorney from William Hansford presented and Acknowledged the Written deed of Lease for ... to be the Act & deed of the said William Hansford to Charles Hansford at whose motion the Same is Admitted to Record.

Test Phillightfoot ClkCur

This Indenture made the twenty sixth day of July in the thirteenth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord King George of Great Britain and in the year of our Lord God MDCCXXVII Between William Hansford of Spotsylvania County and St. George's parish of the one part and Charles Hansford of York County and York Hampton parish of the other part Whereas the said William Hansford by Indenture bearing date the twenty fifth of this instant month July for the consideration therein expressed did bargain sell and devise unto the said Charles Hansford one certain plantation and tract of land situate lying and being on the head of Fillgates Creek in York County and York Hampton parish esteemed and accounted to contain one hundred acres (more or less) within the following bounds hereafter expressed which said land was given to the said William by his father Mr Charles Hansford decd

p. 473

d. ed and is bounded as followeth Beginning at a marked Hickory on the lower side of a Swamp and running westerly along the hillside of the said Swamp to the land of John Hansford then turning southerly along the said John Hansford's land to a marked Poplar then westerly up to York road and thence along the road to the land of William Stead thence Easterly along Stead's line to a branch thence down the water course of the said branch according to the various turnings of the same to the main Creek and so to the place it first began the said hundred acres of land (more or less) as aforesaid lying and being as aforesaid the proper Estate and Right thereof being before the executing these Conveyances well and lawfully seated and vested in the said William Hansford with all and singular the plantations, orchards, houses, woods, springs, marshes &c with all and singular the premises and appurtenances thereunto belonging and also the Reversion and Reversions Remainder and Remainders thereof To have & to hold the said lands tenements and premises with appurtenances unto the said Charles Hansford his heirs executors and assigns &c from the day next before the date of the said executed Indenture unto the end and term of one year from thence next following to the intent that by virtue thereof and of the Statute for transferring uses into possession the said Charles might be in actual possession of the said lands tenements and premises and by thereby enabled to accept of and take a Grant and Release of the Reversion and Inheritance thereof to him and his heirs &c to have of him the said Charles Hansford his heirs and assigns &c for ever and by the said Indenture more at large appeareth Nom This Indenture Witnesseth That the said William Hansford as well for and in consideration of the sum of fifty pounds current money paid by the said Charles Hansford to the said William Hansford the receipt of the said fifty pounds the said William doth hereby acknowledge himself of these with fully satisfied and paid and of every part thereof doth hereby clearly acquit &

discharge the said Charles his heirs executors &c by these presents have given, granted, enfeoffed remised released and confirmed and do hereby freely clearly and absolutely give grant and bargain sell, lien, enfeoff, remise, release and confirm unto the said Charles Hansford in his actual possession now being by virtue of the said recited Indenture of bargain and Sale made to him of a year and of the said Statute and to his heirs executors and assigns for ever the aforesaid hundred acres of land with the hereditaments and appurtenances all the Estate, Right, Title, Interest, Claim and Demand whatsoever of him the said William Hansford his heirs &c of in and to the same & every part thereof and the Reversion and Reversions Remainder and Remainders thereof and of every part thereof To have and to hold the said lands tenements and premises with the appurtenances unto the said Charles Hansford his heirs executors and assigns for ever and to his and their proper use and behoof forever. And the said William for himself his heirs executors adminrs and assigns doth Covenant and grant to and with the said Charles his heirs executors assigns &c by these presents in manner following that is to say That after the sealing and delivery of these presents the said Charles Hansford his heirs and assigns shall & may from time to time and at all times for ever hereafter peaceably and quietly have hold and enjoy all the said granted lands, tenements and premises with the appurtenances with all plantations houses orchards woods pastures springs marshes Swamps &c with all other privileges and Commodities or advantages whatsoever there unto belonging And also that the said Charles his heirs and assigns shall for ever after the executing of this Indenture be and stand lawfully seized of a good perfect and absolute Estate of Inheritance in Fee Simple of in and to all and singular the before mentioned to be granted premisses with all its appurtenances to him his heirs and assigns for ever And further the said William doth Covenant and Grant to and

p. 474

with the said Charles his heirs and assigns that he the said William his heirs executors adminrs or assigns shall by virtue of these presents forever warrant and defend the before granted lands and premises to the said Charles Hansford his heirs & assigns forever against his and every of his heirs executors be and against any other persons whatever claiming or pretending to claim any Right or Title thereto or any part thereof and that the said William his heirs &c shall and will at the request of the said Charles his heirs &c make do seal and deliver and acknowledge any other further lawful or reasonable act or acts deed or deeds or conveyance in law whatsoever for the further surer and more prefect and better conveyance of the said granted lands and premises with the appurtenances to the said Charles his heirs and assigns for ever fully and clearly without any incumbrance whatsoever (the quit rents to his Majesty only excepted) And he the said William doth hereby grant covenant and agree to and with the said Charles Hansford his heirs &c after the sealing and delivery of these presents it shall and maybe lawful for the said Charles his heirs assigns &c to enter into or ... the said granted plantation and premises and to have hold & peaceably and quietly to possess and enjoy all and every part and parcel thereof for ever according to the true intent and meaning and purport of these presents In Witness whereof the said William Hansford the party to these presents hath set his hand and seal the day and year first above written.

Sign'd sealed and Delivered

in presence of

Will.m Hansford (Seal)

Witness

Richard Ambler Wm Rogers John Gibbons

At a Court held for York County Augt the 21st 1727

William Stark Gentl by Virtues of A Power of Attorney from Wm Hansford presented and acknowledged the Written Deed of the lease for lands to be the Act & Deed of the Said William Hansford to Charles Hansford at Whose Motion the Same is Admitted to Record -

Test Phi Lightfoot ClCur

Know all men by these presents that I William Hansford of Spotsylvania County and St George's parish me my heirs executors adminrs and assigns am held and firmly by these presents bound into Charles Hansford of York County & York Hampton parish him his heirs executors adminrs or assigns in the full sum of two hundred pounds lawful money of Great Britain for which payment well and truly to be made I bind myself my heirs executors adminrs &c firmly by these presents Sealed with my Seal dated this twenty sixth day of July in the year 1727.

The Condition of the above obligation is such that whereas the above said Charles Hansford hath bought and purchased of the said William Hansford a certain plantation and Tract of land containing by estimation one hundred acres which said lands the said William hath sold and conveyed to him the said Charles in Fee Simple by Indentures of Sale by way of Lease and Release to the Lease dated the day before the date hereof and the Release bearing date even date herewith

p. 475

Now of the said William his heirs &c shall and do at all times hereafter well and truly observe keep and perform all and every the articles, Covenants, Grants and Agreements mentioned and conveyed in the said Indenture which on his part and that of his heirs &c ought to be by them kept observed and performed so that the said Charles Hansford his heirs executors assigns &c be not molested or in any sort disturbed in the free and quiet possession and peaceable enjoyment of the said lands and premises but that he his heirs &c may fully peaceably and quietly possess and enjoy the said lands and premises against the Claim or Claims of the said William his heirs &c or other laying lawful Claim thereto Then this bond to be void or else to be and remain in full force & virtue.

Witness

William Hansford (Seal)

Richard Ambler William Rogers John Gibbons

At a Court held for York County Augt the 21st 1727

William Stark Gent by Virtue of a Power of Attorney from William Hansford presented and Acknowledged the Within Bond for performance of Covenants to be the Act and deed of the Said William Hansford to Charles Hansford at whose Motion the Same is Admitted to Record.

Test Phi Lightfoot ClCur

York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, 1702-1706:

p. 10

In the Name of God Amen I Charles Hansford of Hampton parish and York County in Virginia being Sick and Weake in body but of Sound and perfect Sense & Memory Thanks be to Almighty God do Make, Constitute, and Ordain this to be my last Will & Testament in Manner and form following Revoaking and Annulling all Will and Wills & Testament heretofore made by me Either by hand or Writing and this only to be my last Will... I give and bequeath my Soule into the hands of Almighty God.....

Of my Blessed Saviour & Redeemer to be Eternally Saved -- and my Body to the Earth from whence it came to be Decently buried at the descretion of my Executors hereafter named ... to what Worldly goods it hath pleased God to endow me with I dispose of as followeth -- Item I give and bequeath to my son John Hansford and [His?] for ever One hundred Acres of land out of the Divided I Now live on beginning at the Dividing line of William Huit Junr, Thomas Hansford at York Rhoad Including the Shop plantation crossing & .... Swamp to Richard Birt's line. Item I give and bequeath to my two sons Charles and William Hansford and their Heirs and Remaining part of my land to be equally divided between them my Son Charles to have that part whereon I now live by my Desire & Will that my two sons in law Mr. Henry Duke and Mr. Samuel Hill have land allotted for each of them a sufficient Quantity for them to have a livelyhood out of for the full ...& .... of ..... After my decease to be laid out & allotted them by my Loving friends, Wm Huit, Wm Hansford & Thos Barber out of my two sons Charles and William's part It is my will & desire as that if all or any of my said Sons shall dye and ... the age twenty-one Years or without Heirs Lawfully begotten Divide their part or parts Shall goe to the Survivors or to the Survivors of them and their Heirs forever Item I give and bequeath to my daughters Elizabeth and Mary Hansford Each of them a cow and cow calfe Item I give my daughter Lydia Duke a cow and calfe and to my daughter Hill one mare filly & my .. And my Will is that all the rest of my Estate be equally divided between my Loving Wife and my five children by name John, Charles, ... and Mary Hansford & I do nominate my son John Hansford ... Will Huit, Executr of this my Will In Witness whereof I have set my hand .....[illegible]

Charles Hansford

York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 1, 1700:  
p. 257

To all Christian People to whom those present shall come Greeting ... Whereas Mr. John Hansford senior formerly of CheisCake in the County of York Virginia Gent By his last Will & Testament bearing Date May the 9th 1654 Did thereby Give & bequeath unto his two oldest Sons John & William Hansford six hundred Acres of Land lying upon Claybank Creek on the Northside of York River, to be equally divided between them, & to be and remain to them and their heirs for Ever: And likewise did thereby also give & bequeath to his two Sons Thomas & Charles Hansford five hundred & odd acres of Land, lying at the head of ffilgates Creek, which he heretofore bought of Mr Westons Daughter to be Equally divided between them, but through default of the Writer of the said will did not Specify the same to be & remain to them the said Thomas and Charles & their heirs For Ever: Now know Yee That ffor as much as the said Default in the hereby before recited Will & Testament shall not cause or be deemed or taken to be the Occasion of any Differences, Suit Controversy or Dispute in Law or otherwise, whatsoever which may arise or hereafter happen William Hansford the Son of Wm. Hansford of Petso Parish in Gloster County Decd Have Remised Released & for ever Quit Claims, &

by those present for him his heirs Executor Administrators & Assigns do fully clearly & absolutely Remiss Release & for ever quit claim unto the said Charles Hansford One Moyoty<sup>243</sup> or halfe of the hereby recited five hundred & odd Acres of Land & premises as has the said Charles Hansford now being ... and in actuall possession thereof together with all & Singular the covenants hereditaments & appurtenances thereunto belonging or in any wise appertaining In & to his full & p..able possession & ... and to him the said Charles Hansford & to his heires & Assigns for Evr. All such Right Estate Tytle Interest Claim & demand whatsoever which the said William Hansford may have unto all ... or any of the said Moyotio of Land & premises by any wais or means whatsoever for or by reason of the said Executor & default in the hereby before Recited Will as aforesd, To have & to hold the said Moyatio or halfe part of the said ffive hundred & odd Acres of Land & premises with the Appurtenances for the only use and behoof of the sd Charles Hansford his heirs & Assigns for Ever. So that neither the said Wm Hansford nor his heires Executors Administrators or Assigns nor any person or persons for him or them or any or either of them, or in his stead or either, or in any of their ... or named, or in the place or stead of any or either of them shall or will by any wayes or means whatsoever hereafter have claims ... or Demand any Estate Right Tytle Dower or Interest of in or to the aforesd Moyotio of Land & premises or any part or parcell thereof Butt from all and every Action Estate Right Tytle Dower & Interest & Demand whatsoever is in or to the said Land & premises or any part or parcell thereof he the

p. 258

said William Hansford his heirs Executors Administrators or Assigns & every of them shall be utterly Excluded & Barred for Ever by those persons, Refar forth ... All Interests & purposes, as if those aforesd Words (to be & remain to the said Thomas & Charles Hansford & their heirs for Ever) had been really inserted in the hereby before Recited will of the aforesaid John Hansford Sen Deced. And also the said William Hansford doth hereby oblige himself his heirs & Executors Administrators & Assigns to acknowledge those present Deed of Release in the said York County Court, to and for the prop... and use of in manner & form herein before satisfied, In Witness whereof the said William Hansford hath .... putt his hand & Seal the nineteenth day of Sept Anno Dom 1700

W.m Hansford = the Seale

Signed Sealed & Delivered in the

Presns of  
Hen Watkins  
Charles Ramsey  
Tho. Holliday

In consideration for the above Acknowlegmt is one peece of  
Eight to be made fifty Shillings Sterling

York County September the 24th 1700

The above Deed of Release of Land was this Day proved in Court by the Oaths of Charles Ramsey & Thomas Holliday two of the Witnesses thereto, & acknowledged in Court by Mr. Thomas Collier by vertue of a Letter of Attorney from the above named Wm Hansford unto the within named Charles Hansford, being first proved in Court, & is Ordered to be Committed to Record.

---

<sup>243</sup>Moiety defined as part, portion, or half.

Tst William Sedwich ClCur

Know all men by those present That I William Hansford of Petso Parish in the County of Gloster Do by those present for me & in my Name place & stead Constitute Authorize & appoint my Loving friend Mr. Thomas Collier to acknowledge in York County Court any whole Right Title & Interest of one Deed of Release unto my Uncle Capt Charles Hansford bearing soon Date with those present, And what my Attorney shall Lawfully do in the premises, I do hereby Rattify and Confirm, In Witness my hand & Seal September the 19th An Dom, 1700.

Sealed & Delivered in the presens of  
Hen. Watkins  
Charles Ramsey  
Tho. Holliday

Wm Hansford -- the Seal.

Sept e Yorke County the 24th 1700

The within Letter of Attorney was then proved in Court by the Oaths of Charles Ramsey & Tho. Holliday two of the Witnesses thereto performed by the Attorney and is Recorded.

William Sedwich ClCur

York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 11, 1698-1702:  
p. 92

Excepting the land of Richard Stark physician those presents in Wittness a division of a tract of land lying in James City Warwick and York County: granted by pattent the thirteenth of December 1658 to Mr. John Hansford by his last Will given unto his sonns Thomas and Charles Hansford now soe itt is the said Charles Hansford of York County gent this day ano dom division of the said lands with the children of his said brother Thomas decd (viz.) - Thomas Hansford & William Hansford<sup>244</sup> in Right of his wife Mary daughter of the said Thomas Hansford decd (viz:) All the part of the land of lyes on the Northside of York Road to the said Charles Hansford (be the same more or less) All of other part of the said land on the South side of the said York Road to the said William Hewitt in Right of his wife one hundred fifty-three acres thereof, and seventy-eight of the remainder to Thomas Hansford ....ding at itt is this day [bo]unded and marked out by John Soan Surveyor ... And alsoe to the said Thomas seventy-five ... called chs... plantation in York County to make his part & parll with that of William Hewit In Witness .... of the said surveigh is for them & their heirs forever the plyatt .... Sett their hands & Seals the 26th of Aprill [torn]

So Signed and delivered

Ch[arles Hansford] the seal

---

<sup>244</sup>By naming William Hansford rather than William Hewitt, who married Mary Hansford and who is cited later in the same document, along with Thomas Hansford as the heirs of Thomas Hansford the deceased son of John, the clerk provided a way for William Hansford to claim the property. This error together with the omission of "& their heirs forever" in John Hansford's will are probably what prompted the Deed of Release in 1700 by William Hansford, grandson of John and son of William, who inherited property from his father/grandfather north of York River in what is called Gloucester today.

in the possession of ... being [torn]  
present att the .... between  
of the said land \_\_\_

William H[ewit the] seal  
Mary Hewit ... seal  
Thos Hansford the seal

Att a court held for York County August the 24th, 1698 the within division of land was thereby the severall & repsective psent within .... peaceably acknowledged to be by each and every of them that they are well satisfied & contented with their severall & respective parte & shares and ad...te the within measured bounds & is according to order admitted to Record. --

Teste, William Sedgwick, clcirt

York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672:  
p. 112.

Whereas Mr. John Hansford Deced did by his last will & testamt give & bequeath unto his two Sonns Thomas & Charles Hansford ffive hundred odd Acres of Land lying upon the head of ffilyabates Creeke purchased ... by the said Hansford Deced of Mr. Weston's daughter & it appearing that ... Tho Hansford Sonne of the decd hath Attained the Age of twenty one years old & by his option craving[petitions] that the Land bequeathed as aforesaid may be equally divided between the legaties as aforesd. It is therefore ordered that the land soe bequeathed (for the prevention of injury to each other) be equally divided between them according to the intent & naming of the said will.

York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, 1654:  
p. 121

In the Name of God Amen I John Hansford of Cheekiakic<sup>245</sup> (Chiskiakic or Chiskiake) in the County of Yorke being Sound of body and good & perfect memory calling To mind the uncertainty of death and the uncertainty of ... time when it Shall please God to call for me .... Life Doe profess and Declare this to be my last will and Testament.

First I Do hereby give and bequeath unto my two eldest Sonnes John Jr Hansford & William Hansford Six hundred Acres of Land lying upon Clay banke Crreke on the North side of Yorke River to be equally divided between them and to be & remain to them and their heirs forever. Item, I give unto the said John & Wm Hansford three coves a piece and to each of them two heifers and ffive steeres and a gelding a piece, that is to say one grey Gelding or money called Nobby I give to my Sonne John and another grey Gelding called George to my Sonne William and Three thousand weight of tobacco to each of them my two sonnes to be paid by my Executors and within the ... of one yeare after my decease. Item, I give & bequeath to my two Sonnes Thomas Hansford and Charles Hansford ffive hundred and odd Acres of Land lying at the head of Felgates Creek which I heretofore bought of Mr. Weston's daughter to be equally divided between them also I give to my Sonne Thomas one young

---

<sup>245</sup>From the microfilm copy of the court records, the spelling of Chiskiake resembles a later day script spelling "Cheescake."

Horse Colt now surking [suckling] and to my said Sonnes Thomas and Charles three coves, two heifers and ffive steerers a peece together with three Thousand pounds of tobacco a peece to be paid out to their use within one yeare after my decease. Item, I give & bequeath to my daughter Elizabeth my old Gray mare and three coves two heifers & Also ffive steerers together with Three Thousand pounds of tobacco to be paid within one yeare after my decease as aforesaid. Item, I give & bequeath to my daughter Mary my younger Mare and to the said Mary and my daughter Margaret three coves two heifers and ffive steerers a peece together with Three Thousand pounds of tobacco to each of them to be likewise paid to their use within one yeare after my decease / -Item, it is my will and pleasure that my daughter Margaret shall have the second Mare Colt that shall fall from my young mare and that my Sonne Charles shall have the ffirst mare colt that shall fall from my said young mare. Item, my will is that in case any of my said Children shall happen to Dye before they shall attain to yeares of discretion that is to say my Sonnes before they attain the age of one & twenty yeares & being unmarried and my Daughters before they attain to be age of fifteen yeares & then unmarried that the ... portions of them so dying shall be equally divided between the survivors of my said Children Also my will is that my Said children shall have the ... bequeathed unto them by this my Last will & Testament. Item, I give & bequeath to my daughter Elizabeth One Thousand Acres of Land lying on the South side of Matapony River the rights and bounds whereof doe appeare at the Office in James Towne. - Item, I give and bequeath to my God Sonne John Morley Sonne to my neighbour Thomas Morley one heifer. Item, I give to my servant Ennis one heifer with calfe to be delivered to him the first yeare of his freedom. Item, I give & bequeath unto my well-beloved wife Elizabeth Hansford my dividend of Seventy Acres of Land whereon my dwelling house stands for the term of hir naturall life & after hir decease to my sonne Thomas Hansford & his heires forever. Lastly ...will & pleasure ...wife Elizabeth Hansford to be Sole Executrix of this my last will & Testament also I appoint together Francis Willis & to my neighbor Edmund Peeters to be overseers of this my will to see All things performed according ... herein and for their care & pa.. .. I doe hereby give & bequeath each of them one thousand pounds of tobacco Item, I give & bequeath unto Robert Jones who now instructeth my Children ffive hundred pounds of tobacco ... of May 1654

John Hansford

Witness: John Rowlands, Ennis Mackentosh, Robert Jones

John Rowlands unable to come into court, was sworn by Mr. Edmund Peeters, Ennis Mackentosh sworn in court. 24 August 1661 and will recorded. Tho Ballard Cl Cur

York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, 1658:  
p. 27

In the Difference of Land between Capt Nathaniell Hurd and Mr John Hansford Referred to this Court from the Hon.ble Governr & Councill Lt Coll John Walker Esqre having Surveighed the lands of the sd John Hansford whose Pattent appeared (to a Court held for that purpose) of the a..stish Date a Jury (Sworne by that Court) being present att the Surveigh which the Surveigh unto the land of the Sd Walker and the said Jurys Verdict were presented to this Court -- Itt is ordered that the Sherr possess the said Hansford of the Lands soe Surveighed (the first Day of July next or before) according to the said Order of Quarter Court and Capt Hurd to pay Costs and Expens.

Cert is granted to Mr. John Hansford for Twelve hundred Acres of Land for transportation of 24 psons into this Collony viz. Rowland Thomas Charles Dunni [Dunne?] Thomas Symmons Mary P... Jonathan Higley Sarah Rugis Hannah ... Willm Johnson Ennis Mackentosh Joseph Taylor Hosokiah ... Tho Hopsan Joe Read Tho Walker Nicolas - Tho Abell Thomas Bell Thomas Dounkork Will. Boyden John Bartlett Elizabeth Smith Cl... Whyte John Rowland Jamison Griffim Franciss Sulbean.

b. Descendants of John & Elizabeth Hansford

2. John Hansford (by 1641-by 1671)  
    Moves to Gloucester
3. William Hansford (by 1641-by 1700)
4. Charles Hansford (d. 1702)
5. Thomas Hansford (d. 1677)
6. Elizabeth  
    m. Randolph Holt (1663)
7. Margaret (d. By 1675-76)
8. Mary  
    m. T. Robins (1666)
9. William Hansford
10. Elizabeth Hansford
11. John Robins
12. William Robins
1. John Hansford (d. by 1661)  
    m. Elizabeth (d. 1675-76)

18. William Hansford  
(by 1723- by 1758)
19. Elizabeth Hansford  
m. Buck
13. John Hansford (1684-85 - 1750)  
m. Rebecca (by 1709-10)
20. Ann Hansford  
m. Robinson
21. William Hansford
14. William Hansford (by 1686-by 1757)
22. Sarah Hansford
23. Charles Hansford
15. Charles Hansford (by 1686-by 1761)  
m. Susanna (by 1736)
24. Lucy Hansford  
m. John Hyde
4. Charles Hansford (1647-52 -1702)  
m. Elizabeth Foliott (1679)
16. Lydia Hansford (by 1683-84 - after 1702)  
m. Henry Duke (by 1699)
17. Martha Hansford (by 1683-84 - by 1718)  
m. Samuel Hill (by 1702)

25. Elizabeth Hansford  
m. Rev. John Camm (1769)
26. Mary Hansford<sup>246</sup>  
m. Rev. Samuel Shield (1775)
23. Charles Hansford (d. 1778)  
m. Elizabeth
27. Martha Hansford  
m. Humphrey Harwood
28. Richard Hansford<sup>247</sup>
29. Benjamin Hansford  
m. Mary Hyde?
35. Benj. Hansford<sup>248</sup>  
m. Elizabeth S.
15. Charles Hansford (by 1686 - by 1761)  
m. Susanna (by 1736)
30. Samuel Hyde
31. Elizabeth Hyde

---

<sup>246</sup>[Lyon Gardiner Tyler], "Shield Family," William and Mary Quarterly 3, no. 4 (April 1895): 268-71, and continued in William and Mary Quarterly 5, no. 1 (July 1896): 22-24. The Reverend Samuel Shield married "Molly" the daughter of Charles Hansford in July 1775 and he succeeded his brother-in-law, John Camm, as minister to Yorkhampton parish in 1792. See p. 271. Also, Landon C. Bell, Charles Parish York County, Virginia, History and Registers (Richmond, VA: Library of Virginia, 1932; reprint, 1984; third impression, 1996), p. 30-31.

<sup>247</sup>Richard Hansford was bound to James Vaughn as an apprentice in 1779. See York County Records, Orders, Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 25.

<sup>248</sup>It is possible Benjamin Hansford remarried in 1848 to a Mary Willis. Permission for the marriage was granted by Henry Willis.

24. Lucy Hansford  
m. John Hyde

32. Mary Hyde  
m. Benjamin Hansford?

33. John Hyde

34. Lucy Hyde

40. Thomas Hansford

41. William Hansford (1712-1736)  
m. Lucy

42. Elizabeth Hansford

43. S Hansford

44. Mary Hansford

45. Martha Hansford

35. Thomas Hansford  
m. Sarah (by 1710)

36. Mary Hansford  
m. William Hewitt

5. Thomas Hansford (d. 1677)  
m. Elizabeth Jones

37. John Hansford (by 1677 -1681-82)

46. Elizabeth (d. 1710)

47. David Hansford

48. Thomas Hansford

38. William Hansford (d. 1709)  
m. Mary Morce

49. William Hansford  
m. Mary Holt

39. Elizabeth Hansford  
m. Richard Burt (1688)

Hansford Family Members Who Did Not Live in Kiskiack

The part of York County wherein Kiskiack now sits was patented by Samuel Weaver, on the behalf of Thomas Weston, a mariner, in 1635. The parcel belonging to Weston was bounded by that of Richard Hansford by 1651. Shortly thereafter, John Hansford bought Weston's land. Both Richard and John Hansford immigrated to Virginia. That they acquired land soon after their arrival in the new world suggests that they came with some means. By 1660, John Hansford was a Justice of the Peace; at that time, no formal courthouse existed so the court met in the living quarters of its authorities. Thus, dwellings were centers of social and political importance.<sup>249</sup>

In his personal life, John Hansford married a woman named Elizabeth; they had seven children: John, William, Charles, Thomas, Margaret, Elizabeth, and Mary. In addition, Hansford sired another child, Mary Hansford, who used the surname "Jones." After Hansford's death, the courts assigned her upbringing to Elizabeth Lockey, Hansford's widow who remarried, because she was the "natural daughter of John Hansford" and her mother was unable to raise her. The child was bound into service to Lockey for ten years; when Lockey died, she bequeathed two cows, one featherbed, two

---

<sup>249</sup>Patent Book 1, p. 198, 517; Patent Book 2, p. 340; Patent Book 4, p. 244; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 1, p. 60; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 2, p. 147, 322-323; and York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, p. 27, 96, 120, 177.

blankets, a rug, one young mare with increase, two pewter dishes, one iron pot and hook to Mary Jones. The girl had to fulfill her service, though; the balance of Jones' time was spent in the household of Mary Robbins, the daughter of John and Elizabeth Hansford.<sup>250</sup>

John and William Hansford took up residence north of the York River after they received their legacy from Edward Lockey, their mother's second husband. John Hansford discharged Edward Lockey from all dues pertaining to his father's estate in 1665. Similarly, William Hansford gets his inheritance in Gloucester, and disappears from Kiskiack's story.<sup>251</sup> William Hansford did have a son, William, and a daughter, Elizabeth. The girl was born by 1675 for she is mentioned in her grandmother's will. It is likely that William's son William was younger than his daughter because the boy is not included in Elizabeth Lockey's legacies. Also omitted from Lockey's will were her son John and her daughters Elizabeth and Margaret. Elizabeth Hansford married Christian Wilson, and then Randolph Holt around 1663 when the Holts claimed her inheritance from Edward Lockey. Elizabeth Hansford's portion consisted of 3000 pounds of tobacco and a white mare, livestock, and 1000 acres of land. Moreover, her father owed Holt 1200 pounds of tobacco; perhaps this was her dowry. In lieu of the 1200 pounds, Lockey gave Holt a servant. The dispute went into arbitration. Margaret was alive in 1668 to receive her legacy in cattle along with her sibling, Charles; but her mother did not leave her anything in her will of 1675. Margaret probably died in the interim. Mary Hansford married T. Robbins; they had two sons, John and William. In 1666, she requested her portion from Lockey, which was ten head of cattle, one young mare, and 3000 pounds of tobacco. The Robbins went to Gloucester to live.<sup>252</sup>

Kiskiack's story, however, follows the two boys Charles and Thomas Hansford. Their father left them a parcel of land near the head of Felgates Creek. Only when Thomas Hansford came of age in 1666 was the tract divided.<sup>253</sup> Charles Hansford was a court justice, like his father. He owned enough acres to require the assistance of an overseer, Thomas Sharpe, in 1673.<sup>254</sup> His brother, Thomas Hansford, briefly was employed by Col. Digges to brand his horses; Hansford argued with William and Katherine Townsend over Digges' property in 1668 as well as over a charge that Townsend enclosed the highway. Thomas Hansford also appeared in court as jury member and as someone involved in economy. He contracted debts. Hansford also served as a key witness to a theft from a ship; he

---

<sup>250</sup>York County Records, (4 December 1675), p. 145. In 1661, Elizabeth Hansford married Edward Lockey; it was from Lockey that the Hansford children received their legacies. When Lockey died, the property belonging to John Hansford's estate that Elizabeth Hansford Lockey used was appraised. See York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, 1657-1662, p. 173; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 67, 94, 111, 139, 140, 214, 171, 191-194.

<sup>251</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 10, p. 315, 340; York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 1, p. 95-97, 257-258.

<sup>252</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, 1657-1662, p. 173, 179; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 65-67, 94.

<sup>253</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 112.

<sup>254</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, , Wills, etc., Book 5, p. 60,62-63, 111, 214.

brought suit against Abraham Ray for trespassing on his property. The courts ordered Ray to pay 200 pounds of tobacco in damages despite Ray's defense of chasing down a runaway horse. Two servants precipitated Hansford's presence in court. One, Richard Reade, petitioned for his freedom and the other, Elizabeth Keith, died while away from Hansford's dwelling.<sup>255</sup>

After he received his inheritance in 1667, Thomas Hansford pursued his wife's legacy. He married Elizabeth Jones, the daughter of Richard and Gabrielle Jones. Jones died in 1660, leaving his child Elizabeth an (legal) orphan; his widow married William Canfield.<sup>256</sup> Thomas and Elizabeth Hansford had five children: Thomas, Mary, John, William, and Elizabeth. When their mother died, she gave the five children property inherited from her parents. William received a parcel in Bruton parish; Elizabeth land in Hampton parish; Thomas and Mary that tract where she lived as well as her tenant, William Hallon; John the tract in New Kent County. William Cowan, her kinsman lived on the land bequeathed to William, but Cowan was asked to care for her son John, who was disabled. Cowan acted as John's guardian; her brother-in-law, Charles Hansford for Thomas and Mary; David Conden for William and Elizabeth.<sup>257</sup>

The significance of Elizabeth Hansford retaining her property is heightened when the fate of her husband is investigated. Thomas Hansford sided with Nathaniel Bacon in the uprising of 1676-77; his reputation was that of a "valiant stout man and a most resolved rebel."<sup>258</sup> In restitution for Hansford's actions, Governor Sir William Berkeley condemned him to death. Thomas Hansford hung. As further punishment, the government confiscated Thomas Hansford's house for use as a courthouse. The government paid rent, about 1000 pounds of tobacco annually, for the privilege.<sup>259</sup> Shortly thereafter, Charles Hansford sold his brother's property at a public outcry to settle the estate.<sup>260</sup> Because Elizabeth Hansford brought property to her marriage, custom protected it from the crown even

---

<sup>255</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 65-66, 94, 149, 194, 197-200, 284; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 5, 1672-1676, p. 16, 22, 26, 128, 161-162, 169.

<sup>256</sup>In 1667, Thomas Hansford acknowledged that he had received his estate from Lockey; this included the seventy acres left for his mother's use "during her natural life" that Hansford was to get when she died. York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, 1665-1672, p. 111-112, 140.

Richard Jones' will, dated March 1660, left property to his son Gabriel, then son Richard, and finally to Elizabeth. The boys must have died in order for Elizabeth Jones to receive the property, which was located in Middle Plantation and in Hampton Parish. Elizabeth Jones' guardian was John Roberts. Complicating matters, someone owed Robert Hubberd money. Thomas Hansford spent years battling for all of the Jones' estate, regardless of Hubberd's claims. York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 5, 1672-1694, p. 101, 133, 142, 160, 177; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 39.

<sup>257</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 39.

<sup>258</sup>Mrs. Hansford, Women of Virginia Project, Tyler Family Papers, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia; York Historical Series no 8 (December 1991)

<sup>259</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 9, 35.

<sup>260</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 59, 89, 123-125, 158.

as it took what belonged to her husband. In essence, the Jones' estate was Elizabeth Hansford's dower. As such, it was saved from the government in the wake of Bacon's Rebellion. As a widow, Hansford distributed her possessions in her own right.

Of the children, John Hansford died around 1681-82.<sup>261</sup> Elizabeth Hansford married a man named Richard Burt by 1688, which is when she claimed her legacy from her uncle Charles Hansford. They lived on the land given to her by her mother in Hampton parish bordering on Thomas Barber's parcel.<sup>262</sup>

William Hansford settled on the land in Bruton parish that his mother left him, which was around 300 acres. He married Mary Morce, daughter of David and Jane Morce. William Hansford sold his property on the Peninsula, 283 acres of it, in 1708 and died the following year.<sup>263</sup> After William Hansford's death, Mary Hansford remarried, to Richard Hall by 1711.<sup>264</sup> William and Mary Hansford's children were Elizabeth, who died in 1710, David, Thomas, and William. The last married Mary Holt, of Surry County, in 1729. They had a son, Lewis. William Hansford acted as guardian to his brother Thomas' children, as well as serving the public as a surveyor of Bruton parish and a church warden in 1728.<sup>265</sup>

Thomas Hansford's other two children, Thomas and Mary, jointly inherited the land in York County. Mary Hansford married William Hewitt in 1689, the occasion that prompted her to claim her inheritance.<sup>266</sup> Hewitt and Thomas Hansford sought their parcels from their uncle, Charles Hansford.<sup>267</sup> They also argued over access to the Hewitt's property from the Main Road; Hewitt charged that

---

<sup>261</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 39, 59, 89, 123-125, 397.

<sup>262</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 6, 1677-1684, p. 39; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 8, 1687-1691, p. 153. Elizabeth Burt lived until 1704. Their property appears on the Tract Map composed by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, and held in Rockefeller library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.

<sup>263</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, p. 38-39, 236; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 13, p. 248-250.

<sup>264</sup>Thomas Hansford acted as "friend" to his brother's orphans; he charged Richard Hall with embezzlement from their estate. York County Records, Orders and Wills, Book 15, p. 654, 665, 680-682; York County Records, Orders and Wills, 1709-1716, p. 123, 131, 154; York County Records, p. 205, 217, 286, 291.

<sup>265</sup>York County Records, Orders, Wills, Inventories, Book 16, p. 75, 80-81, 91, 101; York County Records, Orders, Wills, Inventories, Book 18, p. 64, 100-101, 303.

<sup>266</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 8, p. 349.

A William Hewitt died between 1732 and 1740, leaving land and a mill to his eldest son, Francis. His other children were William, ..., ..., Lucy, and Martha Wade. Is he the child of William and Mary Hewitt? York County Records, Deeds, Wills, Orders, etc., Book 18, 1732-1740, p. 19.

<sup>267</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 8, 1687-1691, p. 349; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 11, 1698-1702, p. 79.

Hansford deliberately blocked the public road from his plantation to the Main Road. Their brother-in-law, Richard Burt was surveyor of highways and was called upon to settle the matter. The road Burt found followed the "most ancient path" and its layout was approved by Hewitt and Hansford's neighbors, R. Hubberd, Jno Harris, and William Stark.<sup>268</sup>

Thomas Hansford got married by 1710 to Sarah; they had several children, Thomas, William, Elizabeth, S..., Mary, and Martha. He died in 1720.<sup>269</sup> Thomas and Sarah Hansford's son William (1712-36) married Lucy. They had a daughter Lucy, who faced charges of bearing an illegitimate child in the 1750s; she countered with a charge of rape and the case was dropped. The child in question was named Mary.<sup>270</sup>

Thomas Hansford and his descendants became superfluous to Kiskiack after the land division was reiterated in 1698, which left Charles Hansford's line as key to its development. Charles Hansford's wife, Elizabeth Folliot, was the daughter of Hampton parish's minister. She married Josiah Moody, who died in 1677, and so was a widow when she and Charles Hansford wed.<sup>271</sup> With her second husband, Charles, Elizabeth Folliot had several children: John, Charles,<sup>272</sup> William,<sup>273</sup> Lydia, and Martha. The boys received the tract where Kiskiack is located; they went to court to have the parcel divided between them in 1710.<sup>274</sup>

Charles and Elizabeth Hansford's son John married Rebecca; this generation of Hansfords also participated in the kinship network of Chiskiack. For instance, they served as guardians to Samuel Hill's children in 1716. As landowners, they appeared in the 1704 rent roll; John Hansford owned 100

---

<sup>268</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 14, 216-217, 286, 291.

<sup>269</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, Book 15, 1716-1720, p. 639, 654, 665, 680-682.

<sup>270</sup>York County Records, Wills and Inventories, Book 18, p. 296; Wills and Inventories, Book 20, p. 229; Orders, Wills, Inventories, Book 18, p. 307-309; Orders and Wills, Book 19, p. 254, 261.

<sup>271</sup>Elizabeth Folliot's sister, Mary, wed Dr. Henry Power and after his death in 1692, John Seale. See Boddie, "Foliot of York County," in Southside Virginia Families, vol. 2, p. 122-123; and York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 9, 1691-1694, p. 220, 229-230. Also note, York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 3, p. 122; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 4, p. 66, 112, 140, 214; and York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 13, p. 272.

<sup>272</sup>York County Records, Judgements and Orders, Book 3, p. 246; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, p. 387; York County Records, Orders and Wills, Book 16, p. 157-160; York County Records, Orders and Wills, Book 15, p. 665; York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 3, p. 471-472; York County Records, Orders and Wills, Book 19, p. 210; York County Records, Orders and Wills, 1702-1716, p. 7.

<sup>273</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, p. 10; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, Book 13, p. 272; York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 14, p. 7; York County Records, Deeds and Bonds, Book 3, p. 471-473; York County Records, Orders and Wills, 1709-1716, p. 7.

<sup>274</sup>York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 12, p. 1 (10).



- |    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                            |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|    | parents: Henry Lee and Elizabeth<br>b. 1793, @ Lee Hall, Warwick County<br>d.<br>m. Elizabeth Wynne Lee, 1816<br>issue: Henry Harwood Lee, Elizabeth<br>R. Lee (1819-49); Lucy Harwood Lee                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | parents: Francis Lee and<br>b.<br>d. Before 1815<br>m. Elizabeth Wynne Lee, 1809<br>issue: Ann Miller Lee (1807-1833); William Warren Lee; Francis<br>Harrison Lee                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                            |
| 4. | Francis Lee<br>parents: William Lee and<br>b.<br>d. 1798<br>m. Rachel Baptist, daughter of Edward<br>Baptist & Margaret Harwood, 1783<br>issue: William Lee, Jane Whitaker Lee,<br>Dorothy, Margaret Harwood Lee                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Higginson Wade Lee<br>parents: William Lee and<br>b.<br>d. Before 1816, Warwick County<br>m. Elizabeth Wynne (1765-99),<br>daughter of Thomas Wynne, 1787<br>issue: Elizabeth Wynne Lee (b.1792)<br>William (b.1789); Thomas (b.1796);<br>and Lucy (b.1798) | Henry Lee<br>parents:<br>b.<br>d. 1781<br>m. Elizabeth<br>issue: John Roger Lee, Sarah<br>H. Lee m. John Powers,<br>and a son, who m. Elizabeth<br>Harwood |
| 5. | William Lee, Warwick County<br>parents:<br>issue: Francis Lee, Higginson Wade Lee, William Whitaker Lee (d. ca. 1814), Haynes Lee, plus 3 others. <sup>280</sup><br>William Whitaker Lee left 122 acres in York County to Robert Lee. This Lee served as executor to his brother, Higginson<br>Wade's estate, as well as acting as executor for the estate of another brother, Francis, and as guardian to Francis' children.<br>Francis Lee's estate papers refer to "Francis Lee of Chiskiack." Like William Whitaker Lee, Haynes Lee lived in Warwick<br>County. Haynes Lee married a Harwood; he died around 1816. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                            |

The genealogical trail became cold here, perhaps because "the Lees preferred to live in Warwick County."<sup>281</sup>

#### d. Vital Statistics

Throughout the colonial period, the recordation of vital statistics was a duty of the parish. Laws passed in 1632, 1659, and 1713 directed the individual parishes to keep birth and death registers. Directives to the parishes, such as keeping vital statistics, were a prerogative of the state because it took an act of the General Assembly to institute a parish, that is, parishes were official bodies like the counties. As such, parishes received public funds and enjoyed state protection. Attending church was expected by the community and by the government. In the church, ecclesiastical and social rituals took place. Local control over the parishes was held by the vestry, or a committee of laymen who administered church business, such as building projects and electing a minister. The men sitting on the parish vestry also were the figures of authority in the county court system. In 1757, the vestries were self-perpetuating entities. After the disestablishment of the Anglican Church (in 1786) and the "great awakening" of Virginians to other denominations, individual families kept their own vital statistics registers in the guise of family bibles, scrapbooks, as well as records for the families from schools,

---

<sup>280</sup>Francis Lee's siblings are named in his will dated 1798.

<sup>281</sup>"The Lee Family of York County, Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (July 1915): 49.

membership in patriotic societies, insurance policies, military service.<sup>282</sup> The Virginia General Assembly authorized systematic recording of births and deaths in April 1853; the county clerks entered the statistics and maintained an index of individuals in registers. The recording provision was repealed by the General Assembly in 1896.

York County's Charles parish has the oldest surviving register, spanning 1648 to 1789, but nothing remains for Chiskiack parish.<sup>283</sup> Only twelve other Virginia parish registers survive, however, each is available in published form. See A Guide to Church Records, compiled by Jewell T. Clark and E. Terry Long, for the Library of Virginia. Cemetery records also have birth and death dates, and have been compiled for reference as Virginia Cemeteries, A Guide to Resources, edited by Anne M. Hogg with Dennis A. Tosh.

e. Census

In 1790, the United States government conducted its first federal census. The population was to be counted in each succeeding decade from that point forward. Between 1790 and 1840, census takers named only the head of each household, merely accounting for the other household members in groups distinguished by age and gender. From 1850 to 1860, slaves and slave owners appeared on separate schedules. Beginning with the 1850 census, free household members were named and their ages recorded as of their most recent birthday. Also noted was the place of birth for each (free) person named in the census record.

The census record data remains confidential for seventy years. Once available, the census records are indexed and transferred to microfilm and then placed in the microfilm room of the National Archives in Washington, D.C. The public may access the microfilm in the Archives building.

1st Census of the United States, 1790, Population Schedules

The specific rolls or schedules for each household counted in Virginia are incomplete. The York County records are missing, however, the total numbers for York and Warwick Counties are as follows:

In 1790, R. Saunders recorded for York County, Virginia, 530 free white males over age sixteen, 461 free males under age sixteen, 1124 free white females, 2700 slaves, and 358 other persons, for a county total of 5233. Saunders also tallied the population

---

<sup>282</sup>The Hornbook of Virginia History, p. 17. For a discussion of Anglican churches and rituals therein, see Dell Upton, Holy Things and Profane Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia (Cambridge, MA: Architectural History Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1986; reprint, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1997). See also Rhys Isaac, The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790 (New York, NY and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988).

<sup>283</sup>See Caroline Julia Richter, "A Community and its Neighborhoods: Charles Parish, York County, Virginia, 1630-1740," Ph.D. diss, The College of William and Mary, 1992.

living in Warwick County, Virginia. In Warwick County there were 176 free white males over age sixteen, 158 free white males under age sixteen, 333 free white females, 990 slaves, and 33 other persons for a county total of 1690 people.

2nd Census of the United States, 1800. Population Schedules

There are no records for York County, Virginia, from the census year 1800.

3rd Census of the United States, 1810. Population Schedules

Although the population schedules were partially destroyed by fire, names of the heads of households are preserved for York County, Virginia. Householders included Benjamin Hansford, Daniel Hansford, Lewis Hansford, and Thomas Hansford. A Charles Hansford lived in Warwick County, as did a Elizabeth Hansford.

4th Census of the United States, 1820. Population Schedules<sup>284</sup>

Names of householders in York County, Virginia, included Benjamin Hansford, Charles Hansford, Lewis Hansford, and two Thomas Hansfords. In Warwick County, one Elizabeth R. Hanford was counted.

5th Census of the United States, 1830. Population Schedules<sup>285</sup>

The Census recorded Benjamin Hansford, Jr., and Thomas Hansford in York County, while Benjamin Hansford lived in Warwick County, Virginia, by 1830.

6th Census of the United States, 1840. Population Schedules<sup>286</sup>

In 1840, Benjamin Hansford and Thomas Hansford lived in York County, Virginia, and another Benjamin Hansford resided in Warwick County. All three households earned their livelihood through agriculture.

---

<sup>284</sup>Population Schedules for York County, Virginia, are on microfilm roll #135 and for Warwick County, Virginia, on microfilm roll #138 at the National Archives.

<sup>285</sup>Both Benjamin Hansford and Thomas Hansford lived in the part of York County that fell into the District allotted to William Robertson by the Marshal of the Eastern District of the State of Virginia. The Population Schedule for York County, Virginia, is on microfilm roll #201 and Warwick County, Virginia, is on microfilm roll #197 at the National Archives.

<sup>286</sup>Population Schedules for York County, Virginia, and Warwick County, Virginia, are on microfilm roll #576 at the National Archives.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 133)

4<sup>th</sup> Census, 1820: York County, Virginia

Name	LH	TH	CH	TH	BH
Free White Males, age 0-9	1				
Free White Males, age 16-25		1			
Free White Males, age 26-44	1		1	1	1
Free White Females, age 0-9	2			1	2
Free White Females, age 10-15	1			1	
Free White Females, age 16-25	1				
Free White Females, age 26-44	2		1	1	1
Employed in Agriculture				5	3
Employed in Manufacture				4	
Slaves, Male, age 0-13		1		3	1
Slaves, Male, age 14-25		1		1	2
Slaves, Male, age 26-44				3	
Slaves, Female, age 0-13	1			4	1
Slaves, Female, age 14-25				2	
Slaves, Female, age 26-44		1		2	1
Slaves, Females, age 45 and over	1			2	
Free Colored Person, Male, age 14-25		1			
Free Colored Person, Male, age 26-44			1		
Free Colored Person, Female, age 14-25			1		
Free Colored Person, Female, age 45 and over			1		

5<sup>th</sup> Census, 1830: Warwick County, Virginia

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 134)

Name	Free White Males, age 0-4	Free White Males, age 5-9	Free White Males, age 10-14	Free White Males, age 15-19	Free White Females, age 0-4	Free White Females, age 5-9	Free White Females, age 10-14	Free White Females, age 15-19	Free White Females, age 20-29	Free White Females, age 30-39	Free White Females, age 40-49	Slaves, Male, age 10-23	Slaves, Male, age 24-35	Slaves, Male, age 36-49	Slaves, Female, age 0-9	Slaves, Female, age 10-23	Slaves, Female, age 24-35	Slaves, Female, age 36-54
BH	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	1	2	2	1

5<sup>th</sup> Census, 1830: York County, Virginia

Name	Free White Males, age 5-9	Free White Males, age 10-14	Free White Males, age 15-19	Free White Males, age 20-29	Free White Males, age 30-39	Free White Males, age 40-49	Free White Females, age 0-4	Free White Females, age 5-9	Free White Females, age 10-14	Free White Females, age 15-19	Free White Females, age 20-29	Free White Females, age 30-39	Free White Females, age 40-49	Slaves, Male, age 10-23	Slaves, Male, age 24-35	Slaves, Male, age 36-54	Slaves, Female, age 0-9	Slaves, Female, age 10-23	Slaves, Female, age 24-35	Slaves, Female, age 36-54	
BH, Jr.	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	3
TH						1						3		4	1	1	1	1	1	1	2

6<sup>th</sup> Census, 1840: Warwick County, Virginia

Name	Free White Males, age 30-39	Free White Males, age 40-49	Free White Males, age 50-59	Free White Males, age 60-69	Free White Males, age 70-79	Free White Males, age 80-89	Free White Males, age 90-99	Free White Females, age 0-9	Free White Females, age 10-19	Free White Females, age 20-29	Free White Females, age 30-39	Free White Females, age 40-49	Free White Females, age 50-59	Free White Females, age 60-69	Free White Females, age 70-79	Free White Females, age 80-89	Free White Females, age 90-99	Slaves, Male, age 10-23	Slaves, Male, age 24-35	Slaves, Male, age 36-54	Slaves, Female, age 0-9	Slaves, Female, age 10-23	Slaves, Female, age 24-35	Slaves, Female, age 36-54	
BH	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Nine of the eleven people living in Benjamin Hansford's household worked in agriculture.

6<sup>th</sup> Census, 1840: York County, Virginia

Name	Free White Males, age 15-19	Free White Males, age 20-29	Free White Males, age 40-49	Free White Males, age 50-59	Free White Females age 10-14	Free White Females age 15-19	Free White Females age 40-49	Slaves, Male, age 0-9	Slaves, Male, age 10-23	Slaves, Male, age 24-35	Slaves, Female, age 0-9
BH		2	1		1	1	1		2	1	
TH	1			1				1	2		2

Of the eleven people in Benjamin Hansford's household, eight worked in agriculture; likewise, of the nine in Thomas Hansford's household, four were in agriculture.

7<sup>th</sup> Census of the United States, 1850. Population Schedules<sup>287</sup>

In 1850, Hansfords living in York County included Richard Hansford, Thomas Hansford, Jr., Thomas Hansford, Sr., and Benjamin Hansford. The later lived in a hotel rather than a dwelling.

7<sup>th</sup> Census, 1850: York County, Virginia

Name	Age	Sex	Occupation	Value of Real Estate	Birth-place
Richard Hansford	25	Male	Farmer	\$500.00	York County, Virginia
Mary Hall	36	Female			York County, Virginia
Elizabeth Foster	21	Female			York County, Virginia
John Hall	11	Male			York County, Virginia
Thomas Hansford, Jr.	32	Male	Farmer	\$2506.00	York County, Virginia
Sarah	27	Female			York County, Virginia
Lewis	9	Male			York County, Virginia
Amelia Mason	14	Female			York County, Virginia
Thomas Hansford	6	Male			York County, Virginia
Ocadima	3	Female			York County, Virginia
Thomas Hansford, Sr.	60	Male	Farmer		York County, Virginia

---

<sup>287</sup>Population schedules for York County, Virginia, are on microfilm roll #982 and for Warwick County, on microfilm roll #953. Samuel Shield recorded the figures for York County.

James Wilson	60	Male	Farmer	\$2000.00	Elizabeth City, Virginia
Uama Wilson	50	Female			Elizabeth City, Virginia
Mary Wilson	17	Female			Elizabeth City, Virginia

7<sup>th</sup> Census, 1850: James City County, Virginia

Name	Age	Sex	Occupation	Value of Real Estate	Birth-place
Benjamin Hansford	38	Male	Tavern Keeper		Virginia
Sarah	37	Female			Virginia
Mary Wells	30	Female			Virginia
Lucy	26	Female			Virginia
Sarah	24	Female			Virginia
Rebecca	14	Female			Virginia
Richard	27	Male	Clerk		Virginia
Charles	27	Male	Merchant		Virginia
Martha Wooten	28	Female			Virginia
Elizabeth Wooten	24	Female			Virginia

8<sup>th</sup> Census of the United States, 1860, Population Schedules<sup>288</sup>

This census was taken on 24 July 1860 by Thomas M. Curtis; the area post office was the Halfway House. The only name connected to Kiskiack, or rather known through the chain of title, was that of John H. Lee.

Name	Age	Sex	Color	Job, if 16 years old or more	Value of Real Estate	Value of Personal Property	Birth-place	Attended school w/in the year	Deaf, Dumb, Blind, Insane, Idiotic, Pauper, Convict

<sup>288</sup>Population Schedules for York County, Virginia, are located on microfilm roll #1385 at the National Archives.

John H. Lee	41	M		Farmer	\$4500.00	\$4000.00	Virginia		
Sarah	36	F					Virginia		
Sarah	14	F					Virginia	yes	
Malvina	11	F					Virginia	yes	
Robert M.	9	M					Virginia		
Baker	6	M					Virginia		
Virginia	2	F					Virginia		
Jack Page	30	M	B				Virginia		Idiotic

9<sup>th</sup> Census of the United States, 1870, Population Schedules<sup>289</sup>

The Census, conducted on 25 July 1870, recorded a William H. Lee in York County, Virginia. This Lee was a farmer; the value of his real estate was \$1200.00 and of his personal property (for tax purposes) \$175.00. Lee was born in Virginia. Also in the William H. Lee household was a woman, named Lucinda, who kept house. She too was born in Virginia.

These Lees are the only William Lees mentioned in the census for York County, suggesting that William W. Lee had already decamped for New York state and that Henry Harwood had indeed moved his family to Richmond from his half-brother's property. There was not a Henry Lee recorded for York County.

Also living in Nelson Township, York County, Virginia, was Francis H. Lee, aged fifty-eight, and like William H. Lee, a white male born in Virginia. Francis H. Lee married Sarah F., who was forty-five in 1870, and occupied herself by keeping house. Living with Francis and Sarah Lee was Lucy H., aged forty, a white female described as "at home," and a male domestic servant, aged thirteen, who was mulatto. The servant could not read. Francis H. Lee was credited with \$1850.00 of real estate and \$350.00 in personal property. No one on the Lee family genealogical chart corresponds to this Lee, except perhaps the Lee who was born in 1812 or 1813 -- ten years earlier than this one counted in the census.<sup>290</sup>

Vines Foster, a mulatto male, aged twenty-seven, also lived in Nelson Township. Foster too was a farmer, however, no real or personal property values are listed beside his name. Vines Foster could neither read nor write at the time of the 1870 census, but he was a citizen of the United States. His wife, Sicily, was twenty years old, and her occupation was recorded as "keeping house." She could read. They had two children, George aged two and John, a one year old. Sicily Foster and her

---

<sup>289</sup>Population Schedules for York County, Virginia, are located on microfilm roll #1682 at the National Archives.

<sup>290</sup>A copy of the genealogical chart is in the field notes.

two boy children were categorized as “black” for the census. Each member of the Foster family was born in Virginia.

10<sup>th</sup> Census of the United States, 1880, Population Schedules<sup>291</sup>

Name	Age	Color	Sex	Relation	Marital Status	Job	Birth-place	Attended School within the last year	Can't read
Henry H. Lee	58	W	M		Married	Farmer	Virginia		
Vestilla	49	W	F	Wife	Married	Keeping House	Virginia		
Dan	22	W	M	Son	Single	Farmer	Virginia		
Elizabeth	19	W	F	Daughter	Single	at Home	Virginia		
Vestilla	14	W	F	Daughter	Single	at Home	Virginia	yes	
William	10	B	M	Servant	Single		Virginia		yes

There was no Vines Foster listed as living in Nelson Township in the 1880 census.

f. Colonial Period Taxes <sup>292</sup>

During the colonial period, land owners paid the king an annual “quit rent” for their land, generally taxed at a shilling per fifty acres of land held. In 1704, of the two hundred and ten family names listed, four are Hansfords tied to Kiskiack. In York County, Virginia, Elizabeth Hansford owned 100 acres, Jno Hansford had 100 acres, Thomas Hansford possessed 75 acres, and William Hansford was credited with 300 acres. These parcels, listed as belonging to members of the Hansford family are drawn on the “1704 Tract Map” produced by the research department of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.<sup>293</sup>

---

<sup>291</sup>Population Schedules for York County, Virginia, are located on microfilm roll #1682 at the National Archives.

<sup>292</sup>Gary Parks, Virginia Tax Records from the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, the William and Mary College Quarterly, and Tyler's Quarterly (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1983). The extant copy of the tax records lives in the British Public Records Office; a copy of the British records is at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., and a transcript of the Library of Congress's version is included as an appendix to the Virginia Tax Records book. It is this tax list that the researchers used to plot out the land parcels for the “1704 Tract Map,” compiled by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

<sup>293</sup>A reference-only copy of this map is in the field notes.

On the 1704 rent roll taken for Gloucester County, William Hansford possessed 500 acres of land in Petso parish; this is probably the William Hansford who relinquished any claim to the Kiskiack tract several years earlier. Across the York River, relatives by marriage of the Kiskiack Hansfords, Richard Burt, William Hewitt, and Samuel Hill had 200 acres, 150 acres, and 100 acres respectively in York County. William Hewitt and Thomas Hansford also were assessed for parcels in Warwick County. Hewitt had 150 acres while Hansford paid for 75. At the end of the Warwick County rent roll, a note stated that Thomas Hansford never paid for his 75 acres, and so, his 75 acres were factored into the county totals a second time.<sup>294</sup>

Because so many householders did not possess their own land, a head tax was imposed on able workers of the land. Householders paid a tax according to how many taxable people lived with them, or per tithables counted as their responsibility.<sup>295</sup> In 1763, for instance, John Camm recorded 184 taxpayers in Yorkhampton parish and 1109 tithables. At this time, Charles Hansford, senior, had three tithables and his son, Charles, had nine tithables. David Morse, related to the Kiskiack Hansfords by marriage, was assessed for eight tithables.<sup>296</sup>

g. Tax records, 1782-1850

1. Personal property

Beginning in 1782, personal property of each householder was taxed. These taxes covered the moveable wealth, the same items inventoried and appraised at death because of the potential to hide them, sell them, steal them or bequeath them without officials knowing it. The personal property tax lists include the householder's name, the number of white male tithables, that is to say, taxable workers, and black male and female tithables in the household. Tithable workers were age sixteen or older. The tax also assessed the number of slaves present in a household, ages twelve to sixteen, and then those slaves who were age sixteen or older. Free Negroes were counted as well. Livestock, such as horses and cattle, were given a monetary value. Likewise, a wheel tax was imposed. Vehicles such as gigs, riding carriages, and coaches, were identified by the number of wheels and taxed accordingly. Timepieces, watches and clocks, figured into the personal property tax. In the late nineteenth century, machinery, vehicles, and intangible property such as bonds became taxable.

In 1815, the items or categories of personal property were increased so that the government could pay for the War of 1812. It proved an unpopular tax and so was repealed the following year. Personal property taxed in 1815 included paintings, billiard tables, mahogany furniture, and dwellings appraised at five hundred dollars or more. Sometimes, the house value recorded in 1815 was the

---

<sup>294</sup>Parks, Virginia Tax Records, p. 528, 467-472, 463.

<sup>295</sup>The General Assembly defined tithable persons in its March 1658 session as all imported male servants, as well as all Negro and Indian male and female servants sixteen years old and older. See The Statutes at Large, vol. 1, 1619-1660, p. 454-455.

<sup>296</sup>Parks, Virginia Tax Records, p. 380-382.

difference between appraisal and the five hundred dollar base. No personal property taxes records survive for 1808 and 1864.

## 2. Land tax records

In 1782, land taxes were imposed. This system replaced the colonial quit rents, wherein a tax was paid to the crown. Between 1782 and 1819, the tax list recorded the land owner's name, the acreage in question, its value per acre, any value added to the property because of improvements such as buildings, the total value of the parcel that is the sum of virgin land plus the buildings on it, the amount of tax assessed based of the total value, and any remarks. The last category often accounts for a decrease in property value if a building burned down or likewise for an increase if a barn was added to the parcel. After 1819, the distance from the county courthouse was included in the tax information. Until about 1850, a one and one half story wood frame building was valued at five hundred dollars, a well finished frame building or modest brick one was appraised at fifteen hundred to two thousand dollars. "Modest" is defined as a two story structure that is one room deep. The "Georgian" house plan, two stories and two rooms deep on each floor, that was built of brick received a value of three thousand dollars or more.<sup>297</sup> Tax assessments decreased as the building aged, which could explain the relatively low appraisal of the Kiskiack house at two hundred dollars rather than the fifteen hundred dollar figure cited for houses of similar plan and material.

---

<sup>297</sup>John S. Salmon, "How to Research your Historic Virginia Property," Guide, n.d., Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia, p. 17-18.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 141)

Personal Property Taxes, 1782-1850<sup>298</sup>

Year	Name	Property Assessed		SL 12-16	SL16+	FN	Horses	Cattle	Wheels	Watches	Clocks	Tax
		WMT	BT									
1782	Elizabeth Hansford	7 tithables				0	5	20	2 coaches	0	0	14.15. <sup>299</sup>
1785	Benjamin Hansford <sup>300</sup>	1	3	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	
	Richard Hansford	1	2	1	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	
1790	Benjamin Hansford	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	
	Thomas Hansford	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
	Elizabeth Hansford	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Richard Hansford	1	0	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	
1795	Benjamin Hansford	1	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	
	Richard Hansford	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1800	Benjamin Hansford	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	\$2.32
	Thomas Hansford	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	\$0.34
1805	Benjamin Hansford	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	\$1.56
1810	Benjamin Hansford	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	\$1.44
	Thomas Hansford	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Lewis Hansford	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	\$0.56
	Thomas Hansford	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	

<sup>298</sup> Abbreviations used in the chart represent the following: WMT = white male tithable; BM = black male; BMT = black male tithable; SL 12-16 = slaves between the ages of twelve and sixteen; SL 16+ = slaves who are sixteen years old and older in age; FN = free Negro; and FMN = free male Negro; the numbers after "FMN" indicate the age of the group being counted for tax purposes.

<sup>299</sup> Tax includes one ordinary license.

<sup>300</sup> Includes ordinary license.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 142)

1820	Benjamin Hansford, Jr. Charles Hansford Thomas Hansford, Jr.	1 1 1	0 0 8	0 0 0	3 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	0 0 0	1 riding carriage @\$65 0 1 riding carriage @\$90	0 0 0	\$2.78 \$2.10 \$6.28	
1825	Benjamin Hansford, Jr. Thomas Hansford	1 1	0 0	2 8	0 0	0 0	2 3	0 0	1 gig@\$20 0	0 0	\$1.68 \$4.18	
1830	Benjamin Hansford, Jr.	1	0	1	3	0	1	0	1 gig@\$50	0	\$1.98	
1835	Benjamin Hansford, Jr.	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	1 gig@\$50	0	\$1.43	
1840	Benjamin Hansford, Jr.	3	0	1	2	0	2	0	1 gig@\$50	0	\$1.56	
1842 <sup>301</sup>	Benjamin Hansford Thomas Hansford, Jr.	2 2	0 0	0 1	1 1	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	\$2.65 \$2.80	
1844 <sup>302</sup>	Benjamin Hansford	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.40	
1845	Thomas Hansford, Jr. Thomas Hansford, Sr. Richard Hansford Lewis Hansford, Jr. Lewis Hansford, Sr.	1 1 1 1 1	2 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	\$1.04
1847	John H. Lee Thomas Hansford, Sr. Thomas Hansford, Jr. Lewis Hansford, Jr. Lewis Hansford, Sr.	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 carriage/2 wheels @\$20 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	\$1.04	

<sup>301</sup>In 1842, York County residents as a whole had 1121 slaves over age twelve, assessed at \$448.40; 626 horses at \$78.25; nineteen coaches at \$52.36; one stage valued for \$3.75; ten carryalls at \$12.50; eighty gigs at \$57.60; one piano at \$2.00; sixty-one watches at \$25.75; no plate; and twenty-two clocks at \$11.00.

<sup>302</sup>In 1844, there were twenty-three categories eligible for personal property taxes. They include white and black tithables; free Negroes and Mulattoes; horses and livestock; wheels; watches; clocks; pianos; gold and silver plate; fees earned as attorneys, physicians, dentists, office holders; bridges and ferries; and fees generated from probate and deed administrations.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 143)

1848	John H. Lee	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	\$1.16
1850	John H. Lee	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$1.24
	Lewis Hansford, Jr.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Richard Hansford	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Thomas Hansford, Jr.	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0.97

Personal Property Tax, 1815

Name	Property Assessed WMT	FMN 16+	ages 9-12	ages 12+ age 12+ All wood but mahogany	Horses	Cattle	Chest of Drawers <sup>303</sup> (w/ or w/o desk)	House in country	Tax												
Benjamin Hansford	1	0	0	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$3.89
Charles Hansford	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$1.07

Land Tax Records, 1782-1850

Year	Name	Residence	Title	# Acres/Tax per	Description	Value	Value b/c Buildings	Total Value	Tax
1782	E. Hansford			280/ 10.	In upper district of York County	140.00.0		129.10.0	1.18.11
1785	E. Hansford			280/		129.10.0		129.10.0	1.18.11
1791	R&B Hansford			280/		129.10.0		129.10.0	1.18.11

<sup>303</sup> Along with Benjamin Hansford's tithables, horses, cattle, and mahogany chest of drawers, other taxable items are: stud horses, both the number owned and the fee charged for covering mares; two wheeled riding carriages worth less than one hundred dollars; phaeton and stages worth less than two hundred dollars; public stages; all other wheels worth less than three hundred dollars; mills divided into two categories: mills valued above one hundred dollars and those one hundred dollars or more; gilt silver watches; single case, gold watches; double case, gold watches; houses in the country exceeding five hundred dollars; houses for private use and those from which things are sold; clocks with wood cases; clocks made principally of metal; clocks valued between fifty and one hundred dollars and those worth more than one hundred dollars; and mahogany furniture. See 1815 Personal Property Records, York County.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 144)

1795 <sup>304</sup>	R&B Hansford	280/ 9.3	129.10.0	129.10.0	1.8.11
1800	R&B Hansford	280/\$1.54	\$431.20	\$431.20	\$2.07
	T. Hansford	40/\$1.54	\$61.60	\$61.60	\$2.30
1805	R&B Hansford	280/\$1.54	\$431.20	\$431.20	\$2.07
	T. Hansford	40/\$1.54	\$61.60	\$61.60	\$2.30
1810	R&B Hansford	230/\$1.54	\$354.20	\$354.20	\$1.70
	T. Hansford, estate	40/\$1.54	\$61.60	\$61.60	\$2.30
1815	R&B Hansford by BH, Jr. on the land fee	230/\$1.54	\$354.20	\$354.20	\$3.03
	T. Hansford, estate By T. Hansford	40/\$1.54	\$61.60	\$61.60	\$2.30
1820 <sup>305</sup>	BH, Jr. on the land fee	80/\$4.00	\$320.50	\$520.50	\$1.65
	RH estate		\$200.00		

<sup>304</sup>The tax record for 1790 is missing. In 1791, the Hansfords owned for 280 acres of land in York County, for a total value of 129.10.00 and a tax due of 1.18.11. This assessment remained constant through 1794. The following year through 1797 taxed the property at 9/3 for a total value of 129.10.00 and a tax of 1.8.11. It is unclear if this is an error (1.18.11 and 1.8.11) or accurate transcription of the tax paid. See Land Tax Records, York County.

<sup>305</sup>In 1812, the land of Richard and Benjamin Hansford (230 acres @ \$1.54 per acre = \$354.20 and \$1.70 tax) was described as "bounded on the north by the land of WWG Hubbers, West by the land of James, the estate of Richard Hansford and the land of Roles, South by the Main Road leading from Williamsburg to Yorktown, and east by the land of Moore, William Lee, and Philgates Creek; Richard Hansford's portion bounded on the north by the lands of Benjamin Hansford and James Kirby, south by the Public road leading from Williamsburg to Yorktown, west by the land of Kirby, and east by the land of Ro Lee." In 1817, a note accompanies the tax entry, indicating ten acres were transferred to James Kirby; again in 1822, a note records the transfer of seventy-seven and three-fourths acres transferred to Kirby. See Land Tax Records, York County.

KISKIACK  
HABS No. VA-183  
(page 145)

1825	by E. Hansford	life	140/\$4.00	N: BH, W: J. Kirby & Stage Road, E: Wm Whitaker, est.	6W	\$560.50	\$0.00	\$560.50	\$0.70
1830	BH, Jr.	on the land fee	100/\$6.50	N: Hubbard est, W: JKirby E: Philgates Cr., S: Thos Kirby	5W	\$650.00	\$200.00	\$650.00	\$0.52
1835	BH, Jr.	on the land fee	100/\$6.50	N: S. Jones, W: JKirby, E: Philgates Cr., S: Thos Kirby	5W	\$650.00	\$200.00	\$650.00	\$0.52
1840	BH, Jr.	on the land fee	100/\$7.00	bound by James Kirby, Philgates Cr., Thos. Kirby	5W	\$650.00	\$200.00	\$650.00	\$0.52
1845	RH, estate	fee	140/\$4.00	James Kirby, Main Road, Wm Whitaker	6W	\$560.00	\$0.00	\$560.00	\$0.45
1850	BH, Jr.	on the land fee	100/\$7.00	James Kirby, Felgates Cr, Thos. Kirby	5W	\$700.00	\$200.00	\$700.00	\$0.70
1855	RH, estate	fee	140/\$4.50	James Kirby, Main Road, Wm. Whitaker	6W	\$630.00	\$0.00	\$630.00	\$0.63
1860	BH, Jr.	on the land fee	100/\$7.00	Kirby, Philgates Creek	5W	\$700.00	\$200.00	\$700.00	\$0.70
1865	James Wilson	fee	100/\$7.00 50/\$3.00	Kirby, Philgates Creek Moreland Bell & Wilson & Creek	5W 8SE	\$700.00 \$150.00	\$200.00 \$0.00	\$700.00 \$150.00	\$0.70 \$0.15

h. U.S. Census of Agriculture

James Wilson sold Kiskiack to John H. Lee in 1850, a census year. In 1850, James Wilson had fifty acres of improved land and fifty acres described as unimproved lands. The value of his farm was \$2000.00, and the value of his farm equipment was \$25.00. To help him work the tract, Wilson had two horses and four working cattle; he also owned four milch cows, fifteen other cattle, twenty swine, and possibly some mules and sheep. His livestock was appraised for \$300.00. On the property, Wilson grew Indian corn and oats. Thomas Hansford also lived in York County. He worked thirty improved acres and kept 100 unimproved acres of land. The value of his farm was \$2000.00, and like Wilson, Hansford had \$25.00 of farm machinery. Hansford's investment in livestock was less than that of Wilson for he had \$100.00 worth of animals in 1850. Trustees for the Kiskiack parcel, Robert McCandlish and Robert H. Armistead owned farms appraised for \$30,000.00 and \$5000.00 respectively. No John H. Lee appeared in the agricultural census for York County, however, there was a William Lee in Warwick County. Lee had 350 acres of improved lands and 461 of unimproved acres. The value of Lee's farm was around \$7299.00.

Recorded in 1860 were the farms of Richard Hansford and John H. Lee, the latter owning Kiskiack at the time of the census. Hansford's parcel was worth about \$400.00 and in it, ten acres were improved and five left alone. He had a milch cow, two cattle, and eight swine for a value of \$150.00. Hansford cultivated Indian corn and sweet potatoes. Also on the property were several pounds of butter and some hay. John H. Lee, living on the Kiskiack tract, worked fifty acres of land and left ninety as unimproved acreage. Lee's farm was worth \$4150.00 and his farm equipment \$50.00. Lee owned three horses, some milch cows and cattle, and swine for an estimated total of \$650.00. On his land, Lee tended to Indian corn and oats, peas and beans, sweet potatoes, Irish potatoes, hay, and market produce. Lee also made butter.

The agricultural census taken in 1870 included William H. Lee and Francis H. Lee, neither of whom could be definitely linked to the Henry Lee descendants or to Kiskiack. Vines Foster, however, was listed. Foster had five acres of improved land and was credited with \$50.00 of farm improvements and machinery. To assist him, Foster had several mules. He grew wheat, rye, oats, and tobacco on the property as well as garden produce for market.

In 1880, Henry H. Lee was counted as an owner of land, in the agricultural census, in Nelson Township. Twenty-five acres were tilled, five woodlands, and twenty had undergone some other improvements. The total value of the farm land was \$1400.00, of the farm equipment \$40.00, and of the livestock \$160.00. Lee spent about \$100.00 for twenty hours of a laborer's time for an estimated value of production at \$300.00. On the property was one horse; two milk cows, one with a dropped calf, and two that were sold; forty-nine swine; forty poultry and seventy-four eggs. Lee grew Indian corn, oats, Irish potatoes, and sweet potatoes.

There was no Vines Foster included in the agricultural census of 1880.

i. U.S. Census of Manufacture

Along with the population schedules, census agents recorded the industrial outlets in the county. In 1860, the majority of occupations listed for York County were oyster dealers.<sup>306</sup> There also were three saw mills, two grist mills, two boot and shoemakers, one ship yard, one coach maker, one wheelwright, and one "lumpher" getter. By 1870, the industries noted in Nelson Township, the part of the county near Kiskiack, consisted of two grist mills and a saw mill. Ten years later, no industries were included for Nelson Township.

#### PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

Documentation was undertaken in Fall 1997 by the Washington, D.C., office of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). The principles involved were E. Blaine Cliver, Division Chief, Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER), and Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief, HABS. The project was jointly sponsored by the Department of the Navy and by HABS/HAER. The documentation was initiated by Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief, HABS, with Catherine C. Lavoie, Supervisory Historian. The field recording was done by Project Supervisor Mark S. Schara with Frederick J. Lindstrom, HABS Architect, and Dana L. Lockett, HAER Architect, all of Washington, D.C. The project historian was Virginia B. Price (Washington, D.C.). Large format photography was produced by Jack E. Boucher, HABS Photographer.

The project could not have been completed without David A. Davis, Industrial Construction Specialist, Facilities Planning, Department of the Navy, Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia; and Richard L. Hayes, Preservation Architect, Department of the Navy, Alexandria, Virginia. Many, many thanks to Davies and Hayes, as well as to Margaret Cook, Special Collections, The Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia; Michael B. Newbill, Newbill and Beale, Inc., Virginia Beach, Virginia; Vanessa E. Patrick, Williamsburg Regional Library, Williamsburg, Virginia; Linda Rowe, Historian, Department of Historical Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; Richard Raymond, Curator, Yorktown, and Jane Sundberg, CRM Specialist, both of Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Thank you also to the reference staff in the libraries of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, and the Library of Virginia and the Virginia Historical Society, the latter two of Richmond, Virginia.

#### PART V. FIGURE PAGES

Due to copyright restrictions and because permission to reproduce the following items for this report differs from that necessary for downloading from the digitalized copy in the HABS/HAER Collection posted within the Library of Congress web-site, the figure pages have been pulled. The illustrations are available for reference-only use on the premises of the Library of Congress, in the Prints and Photographs Division that houses the HABS/HAER Collection and makes it available to the public. The captions for the figure pages are as follows:

---

<sup>306</sup>In the 1780s, travelers went to Yorktown to see the site of the siege and the oyster banks, so oysters represent a significant and long-lived enterprise in York County by the time of the 1860 census. See Johann David Schopf, Travels in Revolutionary Times, p. 57.

Figure 1: Main Street, Yorktown, Virginia, ca. 1870. Photograph courtesy Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Please note that permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 2: View of Main Street, Yorktown, Virginia, ca. 1900. This image includes the Cox house after its facade was altered to accommodate a store. Photograph courtesy Colonial National Historic Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 3: View of the Pate House, Main Street, Yorktown, Virginia. Photograph by author, February 1998. Also shown is a close view of the Pate House showing the glazed headers along the eaves line as well as a segmental arch above the window and a watertable. Please note the Flemish bond brickwork.

Figure 4: Pinewoods, James City County, Virginia, then and now. Courtesy of the HABS Collection, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 5: View of the Lynnhaven House, also known as the Wishart House, in Princess Anne County, Virginia. Photograph courtesy of the HABS Collection, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 6: View of the Adam Thoroughgood House, in Princess Anne County, Virginia. Photograph courtesy of the HABS Collection, Prints and Photographs, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 7: Map of the Naval Weapons Station, ca. 1920. Photograph courtesy of the Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 8: Copy of the ca. 1900 site plan of Kiskiack and its environs made by a member of the Lee family. Courtesy of Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 9: View of the Matthew Jones House, Fort Eustis, York County, Virginia. Please note the line where the original roof terminated, as preserved in the gable wall as well as the date carved into the bricks, "1727." Photographs courtesy of Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce these images.

Figure 10: Drawing of Want Water, also known as the Lyles House, in Prince Georges County, Maryland. Drawing by HABS and courtesy of the HABS Collection, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 11: View of Kiskiack's south gable end. Note the back porch and addition poking out of the east side. Photograph courtesy of Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 12: View of Kiskiack from the west, 1939. Note the brick porch/vestibule area, wood wing to the north side, and the weathervane. Photograph courtesy of Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 13: Map of Indian Fields, per 1896 survey. Courtesy of Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.

Figure 14: A Map of Virginia by John Smith, ca. 1609, published in 1624. Personal Copy of the author, of a map owned by the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Figure 15: Map of Yorktown, Virginia, drawn and surveyed by Lawrence Smith in 1691. Copy from the York County Records, Deeds, Orders, Wills, etc., Book 9, 1691-1694, p. 70-71.

Figure 16: Kiskiack, ca. 1900. Please note the road in front of the house and the outbuilding in the background. Photograph courtesy Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Virginia. Permission is required to reproduce this image.