

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE
BENNETTSVILLE-BENNETTSVILLE PEC
230kV TRANSMISSION LINE,
MARLBORO COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**



CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 477

**CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE
BENNETTSVILLE-BENNETTSVILLE PEC
230kV TRANSMISSION LINE,
MARLBORO COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

Prepared By:
Michael Trinkley, Ph.D., RPA
and
Nicole Southerland

Prepared For:
Mr. Ken Smoak
Sabine & Waters
P.O. Box 1072
Summerville, SC 29483

CHICORA RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION 477



Chicora Foundation, Inc.
PO Box 8664
Columbia, SC 29202-8664
803/787-6910
www.chicora.org

September 24, 2007

This report is printed on permanent paper ∞

©2007 by Chicora Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or transcribed in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without prior permission of Chicora Foundation, Inc. except for brief quotations used in reviews. Full credit must be given to the authors, publisher, and project sponsor.

ABSTRACT

This study reports on an intensive cultural resources survey of an approximately 1.5 mile corridor in the central portion of Marlboro County, south of the city of Bennettsville, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist Sabine & Waters in complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The corridor is to be used for the construction of a 230kV transmission line. The topography is flat with no distinct ridge tops. Several drainage ditches cross the corridor.

The proposed transmission line will require the clearing of the corridor followed by construction of the proposed facility. These activities have the potential to affect archaeological and historical sites and this survey was conducted to identify and assess archaeological and historical sites that may be on or within sight of the corridor. For this study, an area of potential effect (APE) 0.5 mile around the corridor was assumed.

An investigation of the archaeological site files at the S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology identified nine previously recorded sites (38ML116-123 and 127). Site 38ML116 is a prehistoric and historic scatter; 38ML117 is a nineteenth to twentieth century scatter; 38ML118 is a prehistoric and historic scatter; 38ML119 is a nineteenth to twentieth century scatter; 38ML120 is a late nineteenth to early twentieth century scatter; 38ML121 is a prehistoric and late nineteenth to early twentieth century scatter; 38ML122 is a late nineteenth to early twentieth century scatter; 38ML123 is an early twentieth century scatter; and 38ML127 is a late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century scatter. All sites were recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The S.C. Department of Archives and History GIS was consulted for any previously recorded sites. No such sites were found in the project APE. The State Historic Preservation Office has completed two architectural reconnaissance surveys of Marlboro County in 1978 and 1981, with two sites found within the APE. No information was provided on these structures.

The archaeological survey of the corridor incorporated shovel testing at 100-foot intervals along the centerline of the 100-foot right-of-way. All shovel test fill was screened through ¼-inch mesh and the shovel tests were backfilled at the completion of the study. A total of 83 shovel tests were excavated along the corridor.

As a result of these investigations no sites were identified. This is likely due to the lack of any distinct ridge top and distance from a permanent water source.

A survey of public roads within a 0.5-mile of the proposed undertaking was conducted in an effort to identify any architectural sites over 50 years old, which also retained their integrity. No such sites were found, which is consistent with the previous architectural surveys.

Finally, it is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities. Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and,

if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures		iv
Introduction		1
Environmental Background		5
<i>Physiography and Geology</i>	5	
<i>Soils</i>	5	
<i>Floristics</i>	6	
<i>Climate</i>	6	
Prehistoric and Historic Overview		7
<i>Previous Research</i>	7	
<i>Prehistory of the Region</i>	7	
<i>Historical Overview</i>	11	
Methods and Findings		15
<i>Archaeological Field Methods</i>	15	
<i>Architectural Survey</i>	15	
<i>Site Evaluation</i>	15	
<i>Laboratory Analysis</i>	17	
<i>Conclusions</i>	17	
Conclusions		19
Sources Cited		21

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	
1. Project vicinity in Marlboro County	2
2. Survey area and previously identified sites	3
3. View of project corridor	6
4. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina	8
5. Portion of Mouzon's map of 1775 showing Welch Neck, including the project area	11
6. Portion Mills' <i>Atlas</i> showing the project vicinity	12
7. Portion of the 1938 <i>General Highway and Transportation Map of Marlboro County</i>	13
8. View of existing substation on Hwy. 38 S/Broad Street	17
9. Shovel test along proposed line	17

INTRODUCTION

This investigation was conducted by Dr. Michael Trinkley of Chicora Foundation, Inc. for Mr. Ken Smoak of Sabine & Waters in Summerville, South Carolina. The work was conducted to assist Sabine & Waters comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

The project site consists of a corridor measuring about 1.5 miles for use as a transmission line, situated in central Marlboro County just south of the city of Bennettsville (Figure 1). The corridor begins at an existing substation to the south and runs north, where it will terminate at a proposed second substation, not yet constructed (Figure 2).

The corridor consists of land that is generally level. Several drainage ditches cross the corridor, which is covered in a mixed pine and hardwood forest.

The corridor, as previously mentioned, will be used for a 230kV transmission line. Landscape alteration, primarily clearing, subsequent erection of the poles and other facilities, erecting lines, and long-term maintenance of the line, may cause damage to the ground surface and any archaeological resources that may be present in the survey area.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the transmission route may also have an impact on historic resources in the project area. Although the project will not remove any structures, transmission lines (as well as other above grade projects) may detract from the visual integrity of historic properties, creating what many consider discordant surroundings. As a result, this architectural survey uses an area of potential effect (APE) about 0.5mile in diameter around the proposed facility. However, no historic structures can be seen from the corridor.

This study, however, does not consider any future secondary impact of the project, including increased or expanded development of this portion of Marlboro County. In addition, the proposed substation to the north was not surveyed as part of this project.

We were requested by Mr. Ken Smoak of Sabine & Waters to perform a cultural resources survey in August of 2007. This included examination of the site files at the S.C. Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. As a result of that work nine previously identified sites (38ML116-123 and 127) were found. Site 38ML116 is a prehistoric and historic scatter; 38ML117 is a nineteenth to twentieth century scatter; 38ML118 is a prehistoric and historic scatter; 38ML119 is a nineteenth to twentieth century scatter; 38ML120 is a late nineteenth to early twentieth century scatter; 38ML121 is a prehistoric and late nineteenth to early twentieth century scatter; 38ML122 is a late nineteenth to early twentieth century scatter; 38ML123 is an early twentieth century scatter; and 38ML127 is a late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century scatter. All sites were recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Initial background investigations also incorporated a review of the site files at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. As a result of that work, the GIS failed to report any sites in the project APE. Two architectural reconnaissance surveys have been completed for Marlboro County and two structures were recorded, but no previously recorded information was found on those structures.

Archival and historical research was limited to a review of secondary sources available in the Chicora Foundation files and the examination of several local histories available at the S.C. Department of Archives and History.

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE BENNETTSVILLE-BENNETTSVILLE PEC TRANSMISSION LINE




Figure 1. Project vicinity in Marlboro County (basemap is USGS South Carolina 1:500,000).

INTRODUCTION




Figure 2. Project corridor and previously identified sites (basemap is USGS Bennettsville South 7.5').

Ms. Julie Poppell conducted the archaeological survey on September 18, 2007 under the direction of Dr. Michael Trinkley.

This report details the investigation of the project area undertaken by Chicora Foundation and the results of that investigation.

ENVIRONMENTAL BACKGROUND

Physiography and Geology

The survey tract is situated in the Upper Coastal Plain, south of the Fall Line and the Sand Hills found in the northern corner of the County. Elevations in the Upper Coastal Plain range from 100 to 270 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), with the topography being gently rolling. As Kovacic and Winberry (1987:20) observe, it can be very difficult to distinguish the Upper Coastal Plain from that of the Sand Hills or even the lower Piedmont. You find the flatter, and almost featureless, Coastal Plain topography further to the southeast, south of the Citronelle Escarpment (Orangeburg Scarp).

Marlboro County is drained by the Great Pee Dee River. Originating in North Carolina with the confluence of the Yadkin and Uwharrie rivers near Badin, North Carolina, the Pee Dee crosses the Fall Line in northern Marlboro County and begins its slow movement through a wide, swampy flood plain to the Atlantic Ocean.

Mills observed that the county was dominated by the Pee Dee which, "by its meanders washes the district for sixty miles" (Mills 1972 [1826]:632). The river was navigable for almost its entire distance through Marlboro County and much of the bottomland was cultivated. The smaller drainages, such as Carters Branch, located southeast of the survey area, "furnish margins of excellent soil; but little of this is yet brought into cultivation" (Mills 1972 [1826]:630).

Metamorphic and volcanic rocks of the Carolina Slate Belt outcrop north of the survey area in Anson County, North Carolina and west along the fall line in Lancaster, northern Chesterfield, and Kershaw counties in South Carolina. Mills referred to these areas as the "granite, or primitive formation" (Mills 1972

[1826]:629). The rest of the district, including the survey area, was part of the "alluvial region" where the "light and sandy" soils were underlain by a "clay bottom" (Mills 1972 [1826]:630). Today we recognize the complex geology of the Upper Coastal Plain where there are bedded sands overlaying kaolinic clays and clayey, quartzose sands (Murphy 1995:93).

Soils

The survey area is situated in an area characterized by the Norfolk-Ruston-Marlboro soil association -- soils which develop in areas with many drainages, streams, and Carolina bays (Craft 1965).

The survey area consists of five soil series - the poorly drained Coxville fine sandy loam, somewhat poorly drained Dunbar sandy loam and Lenior loam, the moderately well drained Craven fine sandy loam, and the well drained Norfolk loamy sand (Craft 1965).

Coxville soils have an A horizon of very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine sandy loam to 0.7 foot in depth over a gray (N5/0) fine sandy clay loam to 1.3 feet in depth. Dunbar soils have an A horizon of dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam to 0.9 foot in depth over a light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy clay loam to a depth of 1.2 feet. Lenoir loams have an A horizon of dark gray (10YR4/1) loam to 0.5 foot in depth over a grayish brown (2.5Y5/2) clay to 1.8 feet in depth.

Craven soils, which have a 0-2% slope, have an A horizon of very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine sandy loam to a depth of 0.7 foot over a yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sandy clay loam to 1.2 feet in depth. The only well drained soils are Norfolk, which comprise 10% of the total corridor. These soils have an A horizon of grayish brown (2.5Y5/2) loamy sand to 0.7 foot over a light




Figure 3. View of project corridor.

yellowish brown (2.5Y6/4) loamy sand to 1.2 feet in depth.

Floristics

In the early nineteenth century Mills comments that the river lands -- especially those adjacent to the Great Pee Dee -- were dominated by "the finest timber trees, composed of the cypress, sycamore, cotton-tree, the various kinds of oak, sweet gum, hickory, chestnut, poplar, bay, and a number of others" (Mills 1972 [1826]:633). In contrast, the uplands were dominated by pines. This situation is largely unchanged today. On the bluffs overlooking the rivers there is a pine-hardwood community dominated by loblolly pine, hickory, and various oaks. On the lower slopes the vegetation is dominated by species tolerant of the wetter conditions, such as white oak, sweet gum, willow oak, and black gum. In the river floodplains there are sweet gum, laurel oak, water

hickory, and tupelo (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:45).

The survey area is mostly wooded in a pine-hardwood forest.

Climate

Mills observed that the initial large planters settled on the rivers and swamps and regarded the small interior sand farmers as "a kind of curiosity, and half savage" (Mills 1972 [1826]:634). Eventually they realized that it was those interior sandy areas with good drainage that reduced the risk of malaria and he reported that "the owners and overseers now fly to these very sand hills, as the sickly months approach."

This portion of South Carolina is dominated by the movement of systems across the country, but there are relatively few complete exchanges of air masses in the summer. This results in few breaks in the midsummer heat, with temperatures ranging from the high 80s to the mid-90s. In contrast, winters are mild and relatively short. There are 46 inches of annual precipitation, with over 22 inches falling in the growing season (Craft 1965).

PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC OVERVIEW

Previous Research

Marlboro County is not a particularly well-studied part of South Carolina. There are, for example, only 14 reports for the county listed by Derting et al. (1991). Of these, nearly two-thirds (n=9) are the result of relatively small, or at least constrained, surveys associated with compliance projects. The remaining five studies include a county-wide historic preservation plan (of virtually no use archaeologically), two studies on the coffin hardware of the Clio General Store in northern Marlboro County, and two studies of the Cheraw or Pee Dee Indians.

The previously identified archaeological sites found in the corridor's APE were identified through a S.C. Department of Highways and Public Transportation project involving the widening of SC 38 (Roberts and Caballero 1987). All of the sites, however, were recommended not eligible for the National Register.

Prehistory of the Region

The Paleoindian period, lasting from 12,000 to 8,000 B.C., is evidenced by basally thinned, side-notched projectile points; fluted, lanceolate projectile points, side scrapers, end scrapers; and drills (Coe 1964; Michie 1977; Williams 1968). The Paleoindian occupation, while widespread, does not appear to have been intensive. Artifacts are most frequently found along major river drainages, which Michie interprets to support the concept of an economy "oriented towards the exploitation of now extinct mega-fauna" (Michie 1977:124).

Unfortunately, little is known about Paleoindian subsistence strategies, settlement systems, or social organization. Generally, archaeologists agree that the Paleoindian groups were at a band level of society (see Service 1966),

were nomadic, and were both hunters and foragers. While population density, based on the isolated finds, is thought to have been low, Walthall suggests that toward the end of the period, "there was an increase in population density and in territoriality and that a number of new resource areas were beginning to be exploited" (Walthall 1980:30).

The Archaic period, which dates from 8000 to 2000 B.C., does not form a sharp break with the Paleoindian period, but is a slow transition characterized by a modern climate and an increase in the diversity of material culture. Associated with this is a reliance on a broad spectrum of small mammals, although the white tailed deer was likely the most commonly exploited mammal. The chronology established by Coe (1964) for the North Carolina Piedmont may be applied with little modification to the South Carolina coastal plain and piedmont. Archaic period assemblages, exemplified by corner-notched and broad-stem projectile points, are fairly common, perhaps because the swamps and drainages offered especially attractive ecotones.

In the Coastal Plain of the South Carolina, there is an increase in the quantity of Early Archaic remains, probably associated with an increase in population and associated increase in the intensity of occupation. While Hardaway and Dalton points are typically found as isolated specimens along riverine environments, remains from the following Palmer phase are not only more common, but are also found in both riverine and interriverine settings. Kirks are likewise common in the coastal plain (Goodyear et al. 1979).

The two primary Middle Archaic phases found in the coastal plain are the Morrow Mountain and Guilford (the Stanly and Halifax

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF BENNETTSVILLE-BENNETTSVILLE PEC 230 kV TRANSMISSION LINE




Figure 4. Generalized cultural sequence for South Carolina.

complexes identified by Coe are rarely encountered). Our best information on the Middle Woodland comes from sites investigated west of the Appalachian Mountains, such as the work in the Little Tennessee River Valley. The work at Middle Archaic river valley sites, with their evidence of a diverse floral and faunal subsistence base, seems to stand in stark contrast to Caldwell's Middle Archaic "Old Quartz Industry" of Georgia and South Carolina,

where axes, choppers, and ground and polished stone tools are very rare.

The Late Archaic is characterized by the appearance of large, square stemmed Savannah River projectile points (Coe 1964). These people continued the intensive exploitation of the uplands much like earlier Archaic groups. The bulk of our data for this period, however, comes from work in the Uwharrie region of North

Carolina.

The Woodland period begins by definition with the introduction of fired clay pottery about 2000 B.C. along the South Carolina coast (the introduction of pottery, and hence the beginning of the Woodland period, occurs much later in the Piedmont of South Carolina). It should be noted that many researchers call the period from about 2500 to 1000 B.C. the Late Archaic because of a perceived continuation of the Archaic lifestyle in spite of the manufacture of pottery. Regardless of terminology, the period from 2500 to 1000 B.C. is well documented on the South Carolina coast and is characterized by Stallings (fiber-tempered) pottery. The subsistence economy during this early period was based primarily on deer hunting and fishing, with supplemental inclusions of small mammals, birds, reptiles, and shellfish.

Like the Stallings settlement pattern, Thom's Creek sites are found in a variety of environmental zones and take on several forms. Thom's Creek sites are found throughout the South Carolina Coastal Zone, Coastal Plain, and up to the Fall Line. The sites are found into the North Carolina Coastal Plain, but do not appear to extend southward into Georgia.

In the Coastal Plain drainage of the Savannah River there is a change of settlement, and probably subsistence, away from the riverine focus found in the Stallings Phase (Hanson 1982:13; Stoltman 1974:235-236). Thom's Creek sites are more commonly found in the upland areas and lack evidence of intensive shellfish collection. In the Coastal Zone large, irregular shell middens, small, sparse shell middens; and large "shell rings" are found in the Thom's Creek settlement system.

The Deptford phase, which dates from 1100 B.C. to A.D. 600, is best characterized by fine to coarse sandy paste pottery with a check stamped surface treatment. The Deptford settlement pattern involves both coastal and inland sites.

Inland, sites such as 38AK228-W, 38LX5, 38RD60, and 38BM40 indicate the presence of an extensive Deptford occupation on the Fall Line and the Coastal Plain, although sandy, acidic soils preclude statements on the subsistence base (Anderson 1979; Ryan 1972; Trinkley 1980). These interior or upland Deptford sites, however, are strongly associated with the swamp terrace edge, and this environment is productive not only in nut masts, but also in large mammals such as deer. Perhaps the best data concerning Deptford "base camps" comes from the Lewis-West site (38AK228-W), where evidence of abundant food remains, storage pit features, elaborate material culture, mortuary behavior, and craft specialization has been reported (Sassaman et al. 1990:96-98).

Throughout much of the Coastal Zone and Coastal Plain north of Charleston, a somewhat different cultural manifestation is observed, related to the "Northern Tradition" (e.g., Caldwell 1958). This recently identified assemblage has been termed Deep Creek and was first identified from northern North Carolina sites (Phelps 1983). The Deep Creek assemblage is characterized by pottery with medium to coarse sand inclusions and surface treatments of cord marking, fabric impressing, simple stamping, and net impressing. Much of this material has been previously designated as the Middle Woodland "Cape Fear" pottery originally typed by South (1976). The Deep Creek wares date from about 1000 B.C. to A.D. 1 in North Carolina, but may date later in South Carolina. The Deep Creek settlement and subsistence systems are poorly known, but appear to be very similar to those identified with the Deptford phase.

The Deep Creek assemblage strongly resembles Deptford both typologically and temporally. It appears this northern tradition of cord and fabric impressions was introduced and gradually accepted by indigenous South Carolina populations. During this time, some groups continued making only the older carved paddle-stamped pottery, while others mixed the

two styles, and still others (and later all) made exclusively cord and fabric stamped wares.

The Middle Woodland in South Carolina is characterized by a pattern of settlement mobility and short-term occupation. On the southern coast it is associated with the Wilmington phase, while on the northern coast it is recognized by the presence of Hanover, McClellanville or Santee, and Mount Pleasant assemblages. The best data concerning Middle Woodland Coastal Zone assemblages comes from Phelps' (1983:32-33) work in North Carolina. Associated items include a small variety of the Roanoke Large Triangular points (Coe 1964:110-111), sandstone abraders, shell pendants, polished stone gorgets, celts, and woven marsh mats. Significantly, both primary inhumations and cremations are found.

On the Coastal Plain of South Carolina, researchers are finding evidence of a Middle Woodland Yadkin assemblage, best known from Coe's work at the Doerschuk site in North Carolina (Coe 1964:25-26). Yadkin pottery is characterized by a crushed quartz temper and cord marked, fabric impressed, and linear check stamped surface treatments. The Yadkin ceramics are associated with medium-sized triangular points, although Oliver (1981) suggests that a continuation of the Piedmont Stemmed Tradition to at least A.D. 300 coexisted with this Triangular Tradition. The Yadkin series in South Carolina was first observed by Ward (1978, 1983) from the White's Creek drainage in Marlboro County, South Carolina. Since then, a large Yadkin village has been identified by DePratter at the Dunlap site (38DA66) in Darlington County, South Carolina (Chester DePratter, personal communication 1985) and Blanton et al. (1986) have excavated a small Yadkin site (38SU83) in Sumter County, South Carolina. Research at 38FL249 on the Roche Carolina tract in northern Florence County revealed an assemblage including Badin, Yadkin, and Wilmington wares (Trinkley et al. 1993:85-102). Anderson et al. (1982:299-302) offer additional typological assessments of the

Yadkin wares in South Carolina.

Over the years, the suggestion that Cape Fear might be replaced by such types as Deep Creek and Mount Pleasant has raised considerable controversy. Taylor, for example, rejects the use of the North Carolina types in favor of those developed by Anderson et al. (1982) from their work at Mattassee Lake in Berkeley County (Taylor 1984:80). Cable (1991) is even less generous in his denouncement of ceramic constructs developed nearly a decade ago, also favoring adoption of the Mattassee Lake typology and chronology. This construct, recognizing five phases (Deptford I - III, McClellanville, and Santee I), uses a type variety system.

Regardless of terminology, these Middle Woodland Coastal Plain and Coastal Zone phases continue the Early Woodland Deptford pattern of mobility. While sites are found all along the coast and inland to the Fall Line, shell midden sites evidence sparse shell and artifacts. Gone are the abundant shell tools, worked bone items, and clay balls. Recent investigations at Coastal Zone sites such as 38BU747 and 38BU1214, however, have provided some evidence of worked bone and shell items at Deptford phase middens (see Trinkley 1990).

In many respects, the South Carolina Late Woodland may be characterized as a continuation of previous Middle Woodland cultural assemblages. While outside the Carolinas there were major cultural changes, such as the continued development and elaboration of agriculture, the Carolina groups settled into a lifeway not appreciably different from that observed for the previous 500 to 700 years (cf. Sassaman et al. 1990:14-15). This situation would remain unchanged until the development of the South Appalachian Mississippian complex (see Ferguson 1971).

The South Appalachian Mississippian Period (ca. A.D. 1100 to 1640) is the most elaborate level of culture attained by the native

PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC OVERVIEW

inhabitants and is followed by cultural disintegration brought about largely by European disease. The period is characterized by complicated stamped pottery, complex social organization, agriculture, and the construction of temple mounds and ceremonial centers. The earliest phases include the Savannah and Pee Dee (A.D. 1200 to 1550).

Historic Overview

The early history of Marlboro was succinctly presented by Mills:

Soon after Braddock's defeat [reference to General Edward Braddock and his disastrous defeat in the Ohio Valley at the hands of the French] the frontier inhabitants of Virginia and Pennsylvania began to move southwardly; and this section of the state was settled by a few of them.

The progress of population was slow previous to the Indian treaty, in 1755; after which it began to increase; but received several checks, until the close of the revolutionary war, when a considerable accession took place (Mills 1972 [1826]: 629).

Much of this early settlement occurred in the area called Welsh Neck or Tract (see Figure 5). Not strictly a township, a large portion, from Crooked Creek to Hunt's Bluff, had been granted in small parcels by 1746 to such individuals as Daniel Lewis, Samuel Wilds, and Daniel James. These, and other Welch, came largely from Pennsylvania, attracted by the possibility of plants and crops such as hemp, flax, wheat, and barley (Wallace 1951:155).

On July 25, 1780, the only Revolutionary

War battle fought in Marlboro County occurred near the survey area. The battle, known as the Battle of Hunt's Bluff, was the idea of James Gillespie and Tristram Thomas, both patriots, who wanted to capture a British gunboat




Figure 5. Portion of Mouzon's map of 1775 showing the area of Welch Neck, including the project area.

carrying slaves from Cheraw to Georgetown (see Thomas 1897; Gregg 1982). A battery was built along the Pee Dee River and with fake cannons, made of logs, the British surrendered with "more than 100 prisoners" captured (Marlborough County Historical Society 1976). Still in use today as a boat landing, Hunt's Bluff was also used as a landing for cargo boats (Marlborough County Historical Society 1976).

McColl remarked that the first courthouse, built about 1787, was located near the Pee Dee River:

very near the road to Gardner's Bluff, not very far from the river and very close to the present cross roads leading from Bennettsville to Gardner's Bluff and from Evans' or Matheson's Mill to Cheraw (McColl n.d.:78).




Figure 6. Portion of Mills' Atlas showing the project vicinity.

small town until after the Civil War.

One author remarked that:

Prior to the war the citizens of the sand hill section did but little in an agricultural way, and their main industry was the raising of cattle and hogs, which roamed at large through the extensive forests (Gibson

Mills also notes that the courthouse was built close to the banks of Crooked Creek and remarked that:

there was built there three or four stores, and five or six dwelling houses, but no tavern. The village was called Winfieldsville (Mills 1972 [1826]: 631).

Mills also observed that the earliest settlements were consistently located along the Pee Dee River, an area thought, at the time, to be healthy. In fact, "the inhabitant of the sandy interior was deemed, upon the river, a king of curiosity, and half savage" (Mills 1972 [1826]:634). As the years passed, however, the planters began moving inland, into the sand hills, to get away from the swamps and the associated fevers and miasmas. Consequently, the courthouse was moved to its current location in Bennettsville in 1818. A brick courthouse and jail were erected in 1821 (rebuilt in 1852, 1885, and 1952). Bennettsville, named for Governor Thomas Bennett (1820-1822), remained a sleepy,

1902:5).

Where agriculture was practiced, it is clear from Mills that it was of the most ruthless kind:

the same ruinous system of cultivation practiced in other places is prevalent here. One piece of land after another is exhausted, and abandoned; nothing like farming; no husbandry of the natural advantages of the soil; forest after forest is felled, and reduced to ashes, without regard to the consequences of such waste (Mills 1972 [1826]: 637).

Mills' Atlas of 1825 (Figure 6) shows no settlement in the survey area. The main road to North Carolina, however, shows names such as John Thomas and David Bethea. In addition, the mill of General Thomas is shown along Crooked Creek.

PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC OVERVIEW

Prior to the Civil War many areas of Marlboro District became well known for their extensive mills, including those of General Thomas, Major Robinson, and Major Pledger (Mills 1972 [1826]: 632). About five miles north of Bennettsville Mr. Meekins Townsend built a water powered cotton mill on Crooked Creek. Gibson notes that, "a beautiful factory village occupied the high sandy level ridge east of the mill, "and that the mill burned shortly before the Civil War (Gibson 1902:16).

In 1850, on the verge of the Civil War, Marlboro County was about evenly divided between whites and African American slaves (5033 to 5600). With 621 farms, only six counties had a smaller agricultural base. In spite of this, Marlboro ranked 16th in cotton production, with 9501 bales. Other significant crops included Indian corn and wheat (DeBow 1854:304-305).

The Civil War was not particularly kind to Marlboro. Sherman's army passed through the county on its way from Columbia, South Carolina to Fayetteville, North Carolina. Nearly all the ginneries, some of the mills, and many of the residences were destroyed. Sherman and Howard both had their camps along Crooked Creek, in the vicinity of Goodwin's Upper and Lower Mills.

Like elsewhere in South Carolina the economy of Marlboro County was essentially destroyed. Renting and wage labor were the most common forms of black farm labor as late as 1884, although there were about 100 farms comprising 3000 acres owned by blacks (compared to about 6000 acres in 200 farms owned by whites) (Anonymous 1884). Significantly, 200 gins, 44 lumber mills, and 16




Figure 7. Portion of the 1938 General Highway and Transportation Map of Marlboro County showing the project area.

flour or grist mills were in operation only 20 years after the Civil War.

Col. C.S. McColl established a thriving mercantile business in the 1870s and eventually owned at least nine plantations, including Appin, Dundee, Steward, Islay, Pipkin, Cook, Ervin, Spears, and Cotton Hill. Described as a "100 plow" farm, as late as 1901 he planted 1600 acres in cotton, 600 acres in corn, and 300 acres in wheat and oats. He produced over 1000 bales of cotton a year and 1100 pounds of cotton seed per acre. Gibson remarks:

his mill . . . is only 22 miles west of town, on Crooked Creek, very fine water power, splendid ginnery and corn mill. The pond is well stocked with fish and the numerous ducks afford exhilarating and enjoyable sport

(Gibson 1902:7).

McColl's amalgamation of plantations, however, was unusual and most agriculture was conducted by "two, three, or four plows," where the farms are small and largely worked only their owner (Gibson 1902:7).

The number of Marlboro farms operated by owners declined from 818 in 1900 to 697 in 1910 and 454 by 1930. Through this period, the number of acres of cotton remained steady between 86,000 and 82,000 acres, although the yields fell dramatically from over 74,000 bales to less than 34,000 bales (Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1010 and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930).

The 1938 *General Highway and Transportation Map of Marlboro County* (Figure 7) reveals no structures within the survey area. SC 38 just west of the corridor does show at least two houses and one tenant structure, however these are not located in the project area.

METHODS AND FINDINGS

Archaeological Field Methods

The initially proposed field techniques involved the placement of shovel tests at 100-foot intervals along the centerline of the corridor, which has a 100-foot right-of-way. All soil would be screened through ¼-inch mesh, with each test numbered sequentially from the southeastern end of the corridor, heading northwest and then northeast. Each test would measure approximately 1 foot square and would be taken to a depth of at least 1.0 foot or until subsoil was encountered. All cultural remains would be collected, except for mortar and brick, which would be quantitatively noted in the field and discarded. Notes would be maintained for any profiles at any sites encountered.

Should sites (defined by the presence of three or more artifacts from either surface survey or shovel tests within a 50 foot area) be identified, further tests would be used to obtain data on site boundaries, artifact quantity and diversity, site integrity, and temporal affiliation. These tests would be placed at 25 to 50 feet intervals in a simple cruciform pattern until two consecutive negative shovel tests were encountered. The information required for completion of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology site forms would be collected and photographs would be taken, if warranted in the opinion of the field investigators.

These proposed techniques were implemented with no significant modifications. A total of 83 shovel tests were excavated along the transmission route.

Architectural Survey

As previously mentioned, we elected to use a 0.5 mile area of potential effect (APE). The

architectural survey would record buildings, sites, structures, and objects that appeared to have been constructed before 1950. Typical of such projects, this survey would only record a structure if it retains “some measure of its historic integrity” (Vivian n.d.: 5) and is visible from public roads.

For each identified resource, we would complete a Statewide Survey Site Form and at least two representative photographs would be taken. The site forms for the resources identified during this study would be submitted to the S.C. Department of Archives and History. At conclusion of the study, the survey staff of the S.C. Department of Archives and History would assign permanent control numbers.

Site Evaluation

Archaeological sites would be evaluated for further work based on the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Chicora Foundation only provides an opinion of National Register eligibility and the final determination is made by the lead federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

The criteria for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places are described by 36CFR60.4, which states:

the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting,

materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

c. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

National Register Bulletin 36 (Townsend et al. 1993) provides an evaluative process that contains five steps for forming a clearly defined explicit rationale for either the site's eligibility or lack of eligibility. Briefly, these steps are:

- identification of the site's data sets or categories of archaeological information such as ceramics, lithics, subsistence remains, architectural remains, or sub-surface features;

- identification of the historic context applicable to the site, providing a framework for the evaluative process;

- identification of the important research questions the site might be able to address, given the data sets and the context;

- evaluation of the site's archaeological integrity to ensure that the data sets were sufficiently well preserved to address the research questions; and

- identification of important research questions among all of those which might be asked and answered at the site.

This approach, of course, has been developed for use documenting eligibility of sites being actually nominated to the National Register of Historic Places where the evaluative process must stand alone, with relatively little reference to other documentation and where typically only one site is being considered. As a result, some aspects of the evaluative process have been summarized, but we have tried to focus on an archaeological site's ability to address significant research topics within the context of its available data sets.

For architectural sites, the evaluative process would be somewhat different. Given the relatively limited architectural data available for most of the properties, we would focus on evaluating these sites using National Register Criterion C, looking at the site's "distinctive characteristics." Key to this concept is the issue of integrity. This means that the property needs to have retained, essentially intact, its physical identity from the historic period.

Particular attention would be given to the integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Design includes the organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials. As *National Register Bulletin 36* observes, "Recognizability of a property, or the ability of a property to convey



Figure 8. View of substation on Hwy. 38 S/Broad Street.

its significance, depends largely upon the degree to which the design of the property is intact" (Townsend et al. 1993:18). Workmanship is evidence of the artisan's labor and skill and can apply to either the entire property or to specific features of the property. Finally, materials -- the physical items used on and in the property -- are "of paramount importance under Criterion C" (Townsend et al. 1993:19). Integrity here is reflected by maintenance of the original material and avoidance of replacement materials.

Laboratory Analysis

The cleaning and analysis of artifacts would be conducted in Columbia at the Chicora Foundation laboratories. These materials have been catalogued and accessioned for curation at the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, the closest regional repository. The site forms for the identified archaeological sites have been filed with the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Field notes have been prepared for curation using archival standards and will be transferred to that agency as soon as the project is complete.

Analysis of the collections followed professionally accepted standard with a level of intensity suitable to the quantity and quality of the remains. In general, the temporal, cultural,

and typological classifications of prehistoric remains follow such authors as Yohe (1996), Blanton et al. (1986), and Oliver et al. (1986).

Conclusions

As a result of this cultural resources survey, no archaeological sites were identified. Likewise, the architectural survey failed to identify any structures that would be potentially eligible for the National Register. The two sites within the APE found during the previous architectural reconnaissance surveys of Marlboro County, which were completed by the State Historic Preservation Office in 1978 and 1981, were no longer standing. It is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities (although none were identified during corridor testing).



Figure 9. Shovel test along proposed line showing poorly drained clay soils.

Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

CONCLUSIONS

This study involved the examination of an approximately 1.5 mile corridor in the central portion of Marlboro County, south of the city of Bennettsville, South Carolina. This report provides the results of the investigation and is intended to assist Sabine & Waters in complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the regulations codified in 36CFR800.

As a result of this cultural resources survey, no archaeological sites were identified. Likewise, the architectural survey failed to identify any structures that would be potentially eligible for the National Register. The two sites within the APE found during the previous architectural reconnaissance surveys of Marlboro County, which were completed by the State Historic Preservation Office in 1978 and 1981, were no longer standing.

It is possible that archaeological remains may be encountered in the project area during clearing activities. Crews should be advised to report any discoveries of concentrations of artifacts (such as bottles, ceramics, or projectile points) or brick rubble to the project engineer, who should in turn report the material to the State Historic Preservation Office or to Chicora Foundation (the process of dealing with late discoveries is discussed in 36CFR800.13(b)(3)). No construction should take place in the vicinity of these late discoveries until they have been examined by an archaeologist and, if necessary, have been processed according to 36CFR800.13(b)(3).

SOURCES CITED

- Anderson, David G.
 1979 *Excavations at Four Fall Line Sites: The Southeastern Beltway Project.* Commonwealth Associates, Inc., Jacksonville, Michigan. Submitted to the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.
- Anderson, David G., Charles E. Cantley, and A. Lee Novick
 1982 *The Mattassee Lake Sites: Archaeological Investigations Along the Lower Santee River in the Coastal Plain of South Carolina.* Commonwealth Associates, Jackson, Michigan.
- Blanton, Dennis B., Christopher T. Espenshade, and Paul E. Brockington, Jr.
 1986 *An Archaeological Study of 38SU83: A Yadkin Phase Site in the Upper Coastal Plain of South Carolina.* Garrow and Associates, Inc., Atlanta.
- Cable, John
 1991 *Archaeological Test Excavations on the Northeastern Perimeter of the Buck Hall Site (38CH644), Francis Marion National Forest, South Carolina.* New South Associates, Irmo, South Carolina.
- Caldwell, Joseph R.
 1958 *Trend and Tradition in the Prehistory of the Eastern United States.* *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* 88.
- Coe, Joffre
 1964 *The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont.* *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54(5).
- Craft, Richard W., Jr.
 1965 *Soil Survey of Marlboro County, South Carolina.* U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.
- DeBow, J.D.B.
 1854 *Statistical View of the United States.* A.O.P. Nicholson, Washington, D.C.
- Derting, Keith M., Sharon L. Pekrul, and Charles J. Rinehart
 1991 *A Comprehensive Bibliography of South Carolina Archaeology.* Research Manuscript 211. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Ferguson, Leland G.
 1971 *South Appalachian Mississippian.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Gibson, J.P.
 1902 *The Resources of Marlboro County.* n.p.
- Goodyear, Albert C., John H. House, and Neal W. Ackerly
 1979 *Laurens-Anderson: An Archaeological Study of the Inter-Riverine Piedmont.* *Anthropological Studies* 4, Occasional Papers of the Institute

- of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Gregg, Alexander
1982 *History of the Old Cheraws*. The Reprint Co., Spartanburg, South Carolina.
- Hanson, Glen T., Jr.
1982 The Analysis of Late Archaic-Early Woodland Adaptive Change Along the Middle Savannah River: A Proposed Study. *South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook* 14:1-38.
- Kovacik, Charles F. and John J. Winberry
1987 *South Carolina: The Making of a Landscape*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Marlborough County Historical Society
1976 *Historical Tours of Marlboro County*. Marlboro County Bicentennial Committee and Marlborough County Historical Society.
- McColl, D.D.
n.d. *Sketches of Old Marlboro*. State Printing, Columbia.
- Michie, James
1977 *The Late Pleistocene Human Occupation of South Carolina*. Unpublished Honor's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Mills, Robert
1972 [1826] *Statistics of South Carolina*. Reprinted. The Reprint Press, Spartanburg, South Carolina. Originally published 1826, Hurlbut and Lloyd, Charleston, South Carolina.
- Murphy, Carolyn Hanna
1995 *Carolina Rocks: The Geology of South Carolina*. Sandlapper Publishing, Orangeburg, South Carolina.
- Oliver, Billy L.
1981 *The Piedmont Tradition: Refinement of the Savannah River Stemmed Point Type*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Pattison, Kate C. and David G. Jenkins
2004 *Cultural Resources Survey of the Oak River Mill Tract, Marlboro County, South Carolina*. Brockington and Associates, Inc., Charleston.
- Phelps, David A.
1983 Archaeology of the North Carolina Coast and Coastal Plain: Problems and Hypotheses. In *The Prehistory of North Carolina: An Archaeological Symposium*, edited by Mark A. Mathis and Jeffrey J. Crow, pp. 1-52. North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh.
- Roberts, Wayne and Olga Caballero
1987 *Archaeological Survey of the SC 38 Widening, Marlboro and Dillon Counties, South Carolina*. S.C. Department of Highways and Public Transportation.
- Ryan, Thomas M.
1972 *Archaeological Survey of the Columbia Zoological Park, Richland and Lexington Counties, South Carolina*. Research Manuscript Series 37. South Carolina

SOURCES CITED

- Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Sassaman, Kenneth E., Mark J. Brooks, Glen T. Hanson, and David G. Anderson
 1990 *Native American Prehistory of the Middle Savannah River Valley*. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 1. Occasional Papers of the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina.
- Service, E.M.
 1966 *The Hunters*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- South, Stanley A.
 1976 *An Archaeological Survey of Southeastern North Carolina*. *South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology Notebook 93*.
- Stoltman, James B.
 1974 *Groton Plantation: An Archaeological Study of a South Carolina Locality*. Monographs of the Peabody Museum 1, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Taylor, Richard L. (editor)
 1984 *Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Pee Dee Electric Generating Facility in Florence County, South Carolina*. Commonwealth Associates, Jackson, Michigan.
- Thomas, J.A.W.
 1897 *A History of Marlboro County, with Traditions and Sketches of Numerous Families*. The Foote & Davies Co., Atlanta, Georgia.
- Townsend, Jan, John H. Sprinkle, Jr., and John Knoerl
 1993 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historical Archaeological Sites and Districts*. Bulletin 36. National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.
- Trinkley, Michael
 1980 *Investigation of the Woodland Period along the South Carolina Coast*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
 1990 *An Archaeological Context for the South Carolina Woodland Period*. Research Series 22. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia.
- Trinkley, Michael, Debi Hacker, and Natalie Adams
 1993 *Life in the Pee Dee: Prehistoric and Historic Research on the Roche Carolina Tract, Florence County, South Carolina*. Research Series 39. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia.
- Vivian, Daniel J.
 n.d. *South Carolina Statewide Survey of Historic Properties*. State Historic Preservation Office. S.C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.
- Wallace, David D.
 1951 *South Carolina: A Short History, 1520-1948*. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.
- Walthall, John A.
 1980 *Prehistoric Indians of the Southeast: Archaeology of Alabama*. University of Alabama Press, University.

Ward, Trawick

1978 *The Archaeology of Whites Creek, Marlboro County, South Carolina.* Research Laboratories of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

1983 A Review of Archaeology in the North Carolina Piedmont: A Study in Change. In *The Prehistory of North Carolina An Archaeological Symposium*. Edited by Mark A. Mathis and Jeffrey J. Crow, pp. 53-81. North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Williams, Stephen B., editor

1968 *The Waring Papers: The Collected Works of Antonio J. Waring, Jr.* Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 58.

**Archaeological
Investigations**

Historical Research

Preservation

Education

Interpretation

Heritage Marketing

**Museum Support
Programs**



Chicora Foundation, Inc.
PO Box 8664 • 861 Arbutus Drive
Columbia, SC 29202-8664
Tel: 803-787-6910
Fax: 803-787-6910
www.chicora.org