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Following the instructions issued for the 1798 Federal Direct tax, Waller Holladay, the assistant assessor for Berkeley Parish, Virginia, evaluated 226 estates within his community. His accounts offer a view of its late eighteenth-century landscape, providing insight not only into the structures on the properties, but into the people who built and lived on them as well. Dominated by wooden buildings and lacking any slave quarters, the estates of Berkeley Parish challenge previous portrayals of plantations in the Tidewater and Piedmont regions and illustrate a variety of architectural choices. In doing so, they indicate cultural contexts and social processes different from those associated with conventional interpretations. Rather than debunking these narratives, however, the material life of Berkeley Parish questions their primacy by suggesting a wider array of possibilities from which to consider the constitution of elite status, women's influence on the landscape, and the nature of master-slave relations.
Chapter 1

THE CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE

For his 1915 book, *Historic Virginia Homes and Churches*, Robert Lancaster, Jr. compiled hundreds of photographs of Virginia buildings, looking "to secure pictures of as early a period as possible while [the structures] were in their original condition, so as to show the character of houses and churches our ancestors built."1 Fearing encroaching alterations to and eventual demolition of the structures, Lancaster sought to preserve them through his camera. He explained "that the work was done at the psychological time, for much information gathered in past years would now be impossible to secure and much of that recently added will soon be as inaccessible."2

At the center of Lancaster's pursuits lay not only an apprehension about the fleeting nature of the early Virginia landscape, but also a conviction in the ability of its buildings to provide windows into the past. Lancaster associated the "character" of the houses with the character of their past owners and residents, and by rescuing the edifices, hoped to recapture the lives of "our ancestors." Instead of surveying all standing structures, he selected a particular group of houses, establishing, according to architectural historian Dell Upton, "a canon of early Virginia buildings that remains substantially intact."3 Lancaster included in his inventory only the homesteads which he deemed of "historic interest" due to the distinguished figures who lived in or built them or
the outstanding events which occurred within their walls. For example, he describes the impressive plantations of revered Virginia families like the Byrds, Carters, Jeffersons, Randolphins, and Washingtons as well as comments on estates such as Cedar Grove, a less grand, but noteworthy site where John Tyler married his first wife Letitia. Of the houses dating from the eighteenth-century, most stood in the well-cultivated Tidewater and Chesapeake regions, while locations further west did not develop "characteristic" buildings until the nineteenth century.

Lancaster's volume presents an image of the early Virginia landscape as dotted with vast estates presided over by elite white men who "were imagined as genteel, religious people with closer cultural ties to England than to the other colonies." Although more critical of Virginia elites than Lancaster, several historians have also highlighted the gentry and used their great plantations as metaphors for elucidating the character of late eighteenth-century Virginia. Citing the architectural emphasis on order, balance, and symmetry, they claim that the plantation landscape mimics the hierarchy of early Virginia society and exemplifies the Anglo-inspired culture imposed and maintained by the gentry. The narratives convey a convincing portrayal of the planter with his meticulously ordered estate on which he lived "[I]ike one of the Patriarchs, [with his] Flocks and [his] Herds, [his] Bond-men and Bond-women...in a kind of Independence on every one but Providence." 

In this study of late eighteenth-century Berkeley Parish, Virginia, I intend to offer views of its landscape, architecture, and character that differ from the perspectives of Lancaster and other historians. Lacking the magnificent properties which scholars see as typical, the community suggests a much messier landscape and consequently, character,
than interpretations derived from genteel plantations allow. Berkeley Parish comprised the southern half of Spotsylvania County, and on a map of Virginia and its counties, historian Mechal Sobel places Spotsylvania on the border between the Tidewater and Piedmont regions with the caveat that "[t]he boundary between the Piedmont and the Tidewater is not a formal one, and many border counties are sometimes considered to be in the adjacent area." In other words, the distinctiveness of the Berkeley Parish landscape cannot be dismissed on the grounds of its geography; for, in many ways the community resembled its Tidewater neighbors more than the counties stretching west to the Shenandoah valley. From this position, the landscape and architecture of Berkeley Parish begin to question the primacy of elite, plantation-based interpretations and provide insight into the variety of early Virginia.

Clearly, many historians have addressed the gentry-bias in numerous works and looked for diversity when writing their narratives. With the advent of the new social history, scholars examined groups overshadowed in gentry-centric works, introducing the experiences of blacks, women, and small planters in order to explore more thoroughly the character of late eighteenth-century Virginia. Yet, in doing so, many historians adopted Lancaster's view of the landscape, seeing the elite -- as illustrated by their estates -- as dominating early Virginia society and its culture. Due to their acceptance of gentry preeminence, they argue for the development of distinct and exclusive cultures as well as for exclusive perspectives of the landscape among these under-represented groups. Variety in early Virginia, according to their histories, stems from separations along the lines of race, class, and gender. The interpretations posit women against men, blacks against whites, and yeomen against elites in a kind of culture/counter-culture construct.
that stresses singularity. In their noble attempts to compensate for years of neglect in the
study of these groups, scholars have defined women, blacks, elites, and poorer whites as so "other" from one another as to deny any possibility of interaction outside of conflict.

In part the direction of scholarship may be due to the evidence available. Traditionally, historians have relied on the rich trove of travel journals, diaries, correspondence, and accounts, while material culture scholars have drawn conclusions from remaining structures, objects, and archaeological artifacts. Both sets of sources usually reflect elite or exceptional examples, and as Lancaster lamented, even these are few and diminishing daily. Scholars approach their evidence correlating survival with cultural authority and cohesion, and therefore, in examining history from "the bottom up," assume that women, blacks, and poorer whites existed in opposition to and outside of elite culture. At the heart of their interpretations lies a concept of culture couched in polarities which "enter profoundly into the socialization processes that both maintain and transmit culture...Each culture endows the contrasting roles with a different degree of intensity and with a specific content drawn from the whole complex of action forms and meanings."¹⁰

Some scholars, however, have sought to investigate issues of interaction between groups. In her book, The World They Made Together: Black and White Values in Eighteenth-Century Virginia, Mechel Sobel explores the opportunities for exchange between blacks and whites. She asserts that "[i]t was not simply that the politically dominant racial group, the whites, maintained their traditions and imposed them on the blacks. On the contrary, the social-cultural interplay was such that both blacks and whites were crucially influenced by the traditions of the 'other.'"¹¹ Focusing on West African and Anglo attitudes toward time, work, space, and religion, Sobel construes similarities
between the two cultures as proof of cultural exchange, neutralizing the "otherness" of each group to promote the potential for interaction other than conflict. Nevertheless, in the very alleviation of variety and contrast, she reduces the actions and meanings of exchange to a sharing of complementary cultural traditions.

Despite its discrepancies, Sobel's work advocates a new approach from which to consider early Virginia, especially Berkeley Parish. The absence of grandiose plantations in the region indicates a community which defies interpretations responsive to elite dominance and its modes of expression, and yet, Sobel's emphasis on exchange rooted in likenesses belies an understanding of the diversity within the Berkeley Parish landscape. Still using Sobel's focus, however, the evidence for cultural exchange lies in the variety, not similarities, of experiences. As Clifford Geertz explains, culture develops as "webs of significance [that man] himself has spun" which are "superimposed upon or knotted into one another...[and] are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit." Diversity suggests multiple choices for individual action, and thereby, alludes to an interactive, constantly negotiated culture. As the new social historians have illustrated in their defenses of separate cultures, race, gender, and class provide valuable tools for analysis, but ultimately, culture consists of messy networks that transcend rigidly defined categories and result in a variety of experiences.

For Geertz, sorting through the layers within the networks uncovers meaning and yields an understanding of a culture, and in the case of Berkeley Parish, its domestic architecture composes the richest body of evidence for mapping out the possibilities. Buildings, by their very nature as objects, permit access into the multiple contexts that constitute culture. Archaeologist Ian Hodder argues that "[e]ach object exists in many...
relevant dimensions at once, and so, where the data exist, a rich network of associations and contrasts can be followed through in building up towards an interpretation of meaning. The totality of the relevant dimensions of variation around any one object can be identified as the context of that object."14 The structures of Berkeley Parish, as Lancaster suggested, provide windows from which to begin to unravel the myriad messy networks of the people who resided within their walls.

No late eighteenth-century domestic buildings survive in Berkeley Parish.15 Instead, the 1798 Federal Direct tax informs our vision of the Berkeley Parish landscape and its architecture. Following instructions as the assistant assessor for the tax, Waller Holladay evaluated 226 properties in the community and recorded them on two lists. The accounts include details about the structures, land, and organization of each estate, and due to the level of description as well as the number of properties considered, the tax, as a document, illustrates the variety within Berkeley Parish more than a survey of exceptional, extant edifices. Holladay’s records impart a kind of interpretive freedom, enabling a broader perspective of the landscape; yet, the 1798 Federal Direct tax lists also limit the scope of inquiry and hinder the drawing of some conclusions. Unlike surviving structures, the schedules offer little insight into the quality of buildings or the division and use of spaces, because as a tax account, Holladay’s records are quantitative rather than qualitative. His assignment was to assess and ascribe a monetary value to each property, listing only the attributes that affected each appraisal. Nevertheless, when pushing beyond the numbers, the tax lists provide a measure for considering the range of possible experiences -- the characters of "our ancestors" -- within the Berkeley Parish landscape.

Although Holladay’s version of the 1798 tax forms the cornerstone of analysis,
other sources such as wills, inventories, deeds, court records, personal papers, Mutual Assurance Society policies, newspaper accounts, and land tax records also contribute to the process of illuminating the nature of Berkeley Parish. Combining this evidence, each section evaluates different aspects of the landscape. Chapter Two surveys the properties in Berkeley Parish and investigates their implications for the way scholars envision late eighteenth-century Virginia, while Chapters Three, Four, and Five examine how residents lived within their domestic spaces. Chapter Three addresses issues of class in Berkeley Parish with particular attention to what constitutes the elite, and Chapter Four considers the lives of women, their impact on estates, and gender relations. Chapter Five approaches the community from a racial perspective, focusing on the variety of experiences among blacks and their relationships with whites. Taken collectively, the three chapters present a biography of the Berkeley Parish where its landscape and domestic architecture reveal a culture dictated by diversity derived not from an elitist hegemony, but from interaction and negotiation in the functions of everyday life.

Berkeley Parish distinguishes itself as a singular community in many ways. The area differs in its social and economic development from other parts of the state like the urban centers of Richmond and Alexandria or mountainous regions near West Virginia. Also, few parishes or counties in Virginia possess comparable evidence, especially the 1798 Federal Direct tax, making this case study almost as outstanding as interpretations gleaned from the handful of diaries and extant plantations of wealthy, white men. Berkeley Parish is not meant to represent all of late eighteenth-century Virginia or to discount previous narratives, but to enhance the image of early Virginia, introducing the possibilities of diversity, interaction, and negotiation ignored in other illustrations. This
case study of Berkeley Parish seeks to promote another perspective from which to reexamine early Virginia and its character in order to fold together the somewhat fragmented and disparate nature of its scholarship and narratives.
Chapter 2

ASSESSING THE COMMUNITY

On February 12 and 15, 1799, the *Virginia Herald*, a newspaper based in Spotsylvania County, published extracts from a recent act of Congress titled "An Act to Provide for the Valuation of Land and Dwelling Houses, and the Enumeration of Slaves within the United States." According to the newspaper, the act stipulated that "[a]ll persons owning or possessing any dwelling houses, lands, slaves, or having the care or management thereof, are to deliver separate written lists, specifying in one list, the dwelling houses; in another the lands; and in a third, the slaves owned, possessed, or superintended by them respectively." Although announced in 1799, all lists were to reflect property holdings as of October 1, 1798, and the declaration of the act in the *Virginia Herald* served as notification to the public, giving Spotsylvania County citizens -- including those in Berkeley Parish -- fifteen days to submit their lists.

Congress designed three schedules to facilitate the process as well as to insure the reception of all desired information. For, the act not only required value assessments of all properties, but also demanded specific details about their size, number, and condition. The first schedule, or "A," list included all estates where "each Dwelling House which with the out Houses apartment thereto, and the lot on which some are erected, not exceeding two Acres in any Case,...and exceeding the Values of One Hundred Dollars." Each
property owner on the "A" list reported his or her name; the name of the occupant; the number of dwelling houses; the dimensions, materials, and number of stories of each dwelling house; the number of windows as well as the number of lights and dimensions of the glass; the number, dimensions, and brief description of the outbuildings; the amount of land on which the primary dwelling house and outbuildings stood; location; valuation; and comments on the condition of the buildings. The second form, or "B," list contained dwelling houses valued at less than 100 dollars, the dwelling houses and outbuildings that stood outside of the two-acre primary dwelling house plot, and any additional land tracts. On the third schedule, each slaveholder recorded his or her name, parish, and the number of "all slaves, whether negroes, mulattoes, or mestizos, above the age of twelve, and under the age of fifty years,...except [those who] such as, from infirmity, or bodily disability, may be incapable of labor."21

In order to compensate for illiterate, absent, ailing, or even dishonest property owners, each district or parish appointed a principal and an assistant tax assessor. The officials guaranteed a standard of consistency in the assessments of properties by reviewing submitted lists as well as valuing estates. They possessed the power to hear appeals, to judge disputes in reference to estates, and to fine property owners who evaded the tax. As with county levies noted in Spotsylvania court records like the "Revenue Tax for 1793," the assessors most likely gave bond and security, promising to cover the balance of any uncollected sums.22 Typically, only men of substantial income could afford to front the requisite funds and to face the potential risk of losing money as tax collectors. Although no records referring the principal assessor survive, Waller Holladay, a man noted for his "probity, honesty & good demeanor," received the post of assistant assessor.
for Berkeley Parish in Spotsylvania County. In a decree of November, 1769, the General Assembly constituted Berkeley Parish by separating St. George's Parish into two districts. Berkeley Parish included all land in Spotsylvania County south of the Po River, flanked by Orange County on the west, by Caroline County on the east, and by Hanover and Louisa Counties on the south along the North Anna River: "the said parish of St. George be divided by the river Po, where it is intersected by the line of Caroline County, thence up the said river Po to the mouth of the run called [Robertson], thence up the said river whereon John Mitchell's mill now stands, until it intersects the line of Orange County." Numerous small rivers, like the Ta, Po, Mat, Pamunkey, and North East, traversed the area, and a few swamps and bluffs also marked the terrain. At least one road extended north from the parish to Fredericksburg, while several bridges contributed to the navigability of the region. A current general soils survey of the area indicates that Berkeley Parish existed within both the Piedmont and Coastal Plain uplands and possessed deep, well-drained soils suitable for agriculture. As assistant assessor, Waller Holladay was familiar with the topography of Berkeley Parish. The condition and natural resources of the land affected property worth, and since his duties required that he verify the values of each person's land and its improvements, Holladay most likely traveled through the community as he compiled and checked the lists. In his final evaluation of Berkeley Parish, Holladay recorded 226 properties dispersed throughout the area, and his accounts present more information on the components of the individual estates like dwellings and outbuildings rather than a sweeping overview of the landscape. Yet, the consideration of the categories on the lists illustrates how owners organized their individual landscapes and suggests the variety
among properties and residents that Holladay encountered as he rode through Berkeley Parish.

Of the total number of people whose estates Holladay assessed, over half of the owners possessed at least one dwelling house, several people owned two, and a few possessed three houses for a total of 166 owners and 190 separate dwellings in Berkeley Parish.²⁸ Holladay noted that 100 properties had at least one dwelling house worth more than 100 dollars, while he appraised 66 houses below 100 dollars. Regardless of the values assigned to their homes, residents overwhelmingly built in wood -- either frame or log -- and clad their buildings with shingles, boards, and slabs. (Tables 1 & 2) Benjamin Rawlings owned the only brick house in the parish, but despite its more expensive material, the house fared less favorably in Holladay's view than other wooden ones. He observed that "[t]he dwelling house [was] out of repair, [t]he Walls & one chimney injured by lightning."

Although Holladay commented on materials and occasionally on the condition of the buildings -- usually disparagingly as with the Rawlings' house, his assessments provide little information about methods of construction or the quality of interior and exterior finishes. Yet, his remarks on the absence of particular features indicate community building standards. For example, Holladay noted that Edward G. Hill's dwelling house was "unfinished...fram'd, shingled, & Weatherboarded only," suggesting that Berkeley Parish residents expected carpentry work like installed doors and windows and laid floors in a dwelling in order to deem it "finished." Holladay's descriptions of Thomas Cason's house, which lacked "plastering &tc.," and of John Carahan's dwelling, which wanted both plastering and lathing, imply that the community, or Holladay appointed its representative,
considered such wall treatments as integral to a well-constructed house.  

The valuation of glass windows in the dwellings also contributes to understanding measures of quality for Berkeley Parish house construction. Over half of Berkeley Parish dwellings had glass windows, but only four of the structures appear on the "B" list, indicating that most glass windows were associated with more expensive houses. In addition, the meticulous enumeration of not just the windows, but also of the number and dimensions of their lights, reveals the importance of windows as a standard for determining the worth of houses. More windows did not necessarily correlate with a higher dwelling value, however; despite having a house with eight windows, Holladay appraised Charles Carter's property lower than William Carter's, whose dwelling had only five.

As well as illustrating the array of materials and alluding to a communal syntax for denoting quality, the tax lists offer insight into the amounts of living space in dwellings. Most of the houses were one-story high in that Holladay noted only six two-story houses. The footprints ranged from Phebe Crawford's 12-by-12 foot log dwelling to Archibald Dick, Jr.'s 44-by-32 foot, two-story house, but over half of the owners lived in dwellings of less than 500 square feet. However, one-fourth of the owners increased the overall area of their dwelling houses by attaching one-story additions. Although the majority constructed one addition, several owners built either two or three. William Threlkeld began with a one-story, wood central house of 440 square feet, and by attaching two sheds, each measuring 20 by 12 feet, and a 20-by-15 foot addition, the overall area of his house almost tripled. Sheds and others simply called, "additions," appear most often on the lists, but a few Berkeley Parish residents added studies, porticos, and passages to their
central dwellings.

The frequent occurrence of additions on the list suggest that many Berkeley Parish houses were buildings in process. An owner adapted his or her dwelling continuously in order to fulfill arising needs or inclinations such as a growing family, a demand for more work space, or the latest style. Although most additions were probably attached later as improvements, some of the "unfinished" houses on Holladay's list also included additions. Thomas Turner's dwelling, which Holladay noted was "unfinished...fram'd and shingled only," measured 16 feet square, and instead of building a larger central house, Turner chose to supplement the space by incorporating a 16-by-10 foot shed. His dwelling indicates that additions functioned as part of the Berkeley Parish building vocabulary, providing a desired aesthetic or demarcation of space not attainable by simply enlarging the overall footprint of the central dwelling. Both as later adaptations and elements of building plans, the presence of additions introduces the possibility that the structures reflect not a haphazard method of construction, but a community in constant flux and reassessment.

Since most of the owners with additions are found on the "A" list, additions implied a level of economic prosperity and represented a significant investment of capital. For example, in 1802 Mildred Shackelford, administratrix of her husband Samuel's will, called on Lewis Holladay to pay his debt for work Samuel had completed in building a shed to Holladay's house. Mildred presented Holladay with an itemized bill which included charges for casing four windows; hewing and sawing the framing for the shed, weatherboard, and shingles; "making and casing 4 battern doors;" "making steps & hand rails pr doors;" "making 16 lights of Sashes;" and for "192 feet mop & chair Boards."
The bill for Shackelford's work totaled almost 15 pounds. Lewis Holladay also owed James Dickinson close to 13 pounds for his work on the addition: "molding & burning 1000 bricks," "bilding out side Chimney with too fier plases," bricking the cellar, and plastering. Not all additions were outfitted with the same improvements found in Lewis Holladay's shed, but it illustrates the possible expense involved in constructing an addition. As with windows, however, a greater number of additions did not necessarily guarantee a higher property value. Although William Cason Sr.'s dwelling incorporated shed and portico additions, Waller Holladay appraised General Jonathan Clarke's estate, which included a house with only one shed addition, 250 dollars higher than Cason's.

Berkeley Parish property owners also increased their living and work spaces with outbuildings, and the tax lists reveal a variety of outbuildings found in the community: kitchens, meat houses, corn houses, dairies, stables, barns, tobacco houses, mills, still houses, granaries, cider houses, weaving houses, laundry houses, lumber houses, store houses, a spinning house, a shop, a workhouse, a shoemaker's shop, and a warehouse. Holladay recorded a total of 421 dependencies divided among 117 properties, and of these, over three-fourths of the owners were on the "A" list. The "A" list owners possessed on average, four dependencies, while the "B" list owners only two. Consistent with their dwellings, Berkeley Parish residents preferred wood for outbuilding construction, selecting from log, frame, "hew'd" log, and "saw'd" log, and covered the dependencies with an array of materials such as shingles, slabs, planks, and long shingles. (Tables 3 & 4) Only one dependency, a mill owned by Edmund Clarke, stood two stories high, but some owners increased the size of their outbuildings with shed additions usually to their barns, kitchens, and granaries.
Kitchens, meat houses, corn houses, barns, and dairies appear most frequently, while fewer properties had stables, tobacco houses, mills, still houses, cider houses, granaries, store houses, and shops. (Table 5) Most owners organized their outbuildings within two acres of their dwellings, except for their barns, tobacco houses, mills, still houses, and granaries. Excluding mills, these dependencies typically enclosed areas of or over 400 square feet, rivaling the size of many dwellings. For example, Zachary Billingsley's house measured 32 by 20 feet, and his granary not only matched his dwelling dimensions, but included a 32-by-10 foot shed as well. Had Billingsley placed his granary closer to his house, the outbuilding would have challenged the centrality of his dwelling.

Often related to size, the functions performed in outbuildings helped to determine their locations. The larger dependencies were used for the initial processing of raw materials or to support field-based labors, and the unwieldy and sometimes unpredictable nature of the tasks made distance from the dwelling desirable. Barns accommodated multiple activities associated with farming, including sheltering cattle, storing fodder, and threshing, and due to the demand for a powerful water source as well as to cater to the community's need for access, owners built their mills away from their houses near the roads and navigable waterways. Like mills, most granaries in Berkeley Parish were situated by rivers or runs to facilitate the transport of crops to markets. Arranged around dwellings, kitchens, dairies, spinning houses, weaving houses, corn houses, cider houses, laundries, and meat houses extended domestic working space. They aided in the production of goods like food and yarn that people consumed or required daily and also sequestered some of the messier tasks like cooking, salting meats, and washing laundry away from the house. With storage facilities, such as stables, lumber houses, and a
shoemaker's shop, their proximity to dwellings provided convenient access to finished
materials as well as security against potential thieves.\textsuperscript{40}

Not only did outbuildings function as work and storage spaces integral to the
central dwelling, but according to architectural historian, Camille Wells, they participated
in social discourse of the community as well:

\begin{quote}
Across a countryside of plantation dwellings that were small, wooden, and
distinguished, if at all, by brick chimneys or glazed windows, service and
agricultural structures helped to make tangible the local hierarchies of
wealth and status. The quantity, size, and solidity of attendant outbuildings
offered an architectural index to each planter's means -- the diversity of his
activities and the scope of his influence.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

In Berkeley Parish, however, the valuations of estates with dependencies reveal that
outbuildings did not always serve as reliable indicators in a strict hierarchy of worth.
More or larger dependencies did not necessarily reflect higher property values. Samuel
Gibson's estate contained two houses as well as four outbuildings: a kitchen, meat house,
and tobacco house, each within two acres of his dwelling, and another tobacco house
located beyond the complex. Holladay assessed Gibson's two-acre plot with a dwelling
and three outbuildings at 130 dollars and his entire property at almost 575 dollars. By
comparison, Thomas Coleman rented to Henry Teele a two-acre estate with only one
dwelling and a store house which Holladay valued at 600 dollars. In part the discrepancy
between the two properties may result from the functions of their outbuildings. Perhaps
Teele's storehouse was prized over Gibson's domestic dependencies, but even when
planters possessed similar improvements, Holladay's assessments exhibit unexpected
differences. Charles Carter and Joseph Graves each owned a kitchen and corn house,
while Carter's property included a dairy and Graves's a meat house. Despite the
compatibility of the two estates in the size and functions of the outbuildings, Holladay appraised Carter's two-acre plot 180 dollars higher than Graves's.

As Wells asserts, quality contributed to the range of valuations, and unfortunately, Holladay's lists offer little insight into outbuilding condition. Nevertheless, Berkeley Parish properties without dependencies suggest that quality does not account entirely for the discrepancies in the assessments of estates with outbuildings. The properties with dwellings and outbuildings constitute about half of the total number listed, leaving many Parish owners with houses but no dependencies or with unimproved tracts of land. A few possessed estates with outbuildings and no dwellings. If improvements like dependencies designated greater property worth, then these less-developed estates should reflect lower assessments. However, Holladay valued Hugh Roy's property with one dwelling on two acres over 100 dollars higher than William Henderson's 77-acre plot with a house and two outbuildings. Margarette Carter's 98 acres with no improvements was assessed at 245 dollars, whereas Thomas Cash's 100 acres with "a cabbin 16 feet square" totaled just 50 dollars.

Holladay's assessments of Berkeley Parish properties suggest that its architecture did not ascribe to a hierarchical scale in which more was better. Installing numerous windows, adding a shed to one's dwelling, or owning six outbuildings did not insure a property more highly-valued than an estate with a house of fewer windows, no additions, and only two dependencies. Clearly, different factors affected property worth, but the array of combinations illustrates how owners selected from a variety of accepted choices of architectural expression to shape their own, individual landscapes. The absence of a clear architectural hierarchy alludes to the continual reconsideration and reconstruction of
the larger landscape, requiring residents like Waller Holladay as they rode through the community, to assess its contours continually. Rather than a "carefully orchestrated exercise" of processing through series of barriers, the Berkeley Parish landscape looked much messier, and its lack of clear hierarchy proposes a different outlook on how architecture functioned in the assertion of status and raises questions about what constituted the elite of Berkeley Parish.43
Chapter 3

CONSTITUTING THE ELITE

The master's house is...on a good site, either on a hillside or spacious plain and all around are the little dwellings of the overseer and the slaves, and likewise the kitchens and the barns, so that the whole complex looks like a small village.

Luigi Castiglioni, traveler in Virginia, 1786

In the spring of 1803 Larkin Stanard insured his plantation called Stanfield with the Mutual Assurance Society against Fire on Buildings of the State of Virginia. The company issued two "declarations for assurance" to Stanard: one for his mill and the other for his dwelling and three outbuildings, including a kitchen, stable, and laundry house.

Like Castiglioni's description, the illustrations accompanying the policies reveal the town-like organization of the estate with the house serving as the hub for a network of smaller, supporting structures. Each building within the complex appears ordered and symmetrical, reminiscent of the neat and restrained styles associated with the great plantations of the Virginia gentry.

Just twenty miles east or north of Berkeley Parish, however, few would have labeled Larkin Stanard's plantation as quintessentially elite. Stanfield commanded a less imposing position in the Virginia landscape when compared to the impressive brick edifices of the Chesapeake, adorned with porticos and flanked by tidy rows of dependencies and sculpted gardens. In 1798 Waller Holladay noted that the two-story,
32-by-28 foot, wooden dwelling had only three windows and was generally "out of repair." Stanard's 1803 policies indicate some possible improvements to the estate with the addition of two sheds to the stable and an increase in the number of windows and in the dwelling dimensions; nevertheless, the insurance agents deducted 600 dollars from the assessed value of Stanard's house and outbuildings due to their overall "decay and bad repair." Despite the poor condition of Stanard's structures, only two other properties in Berkeley Parish on the 1798 Federal Direct tax lists received higher appraisals for their dwellings and outbuildings, and Stanard ranked among the top six percent of male property owners for total values of both real estate and personal property.

Larkin Stanard presents a predicament for historians and their characterizations of the late eighteenth-century Virginia gentry. In many ways, he subscribes to the attributes associated with the elite. His wealth placed him among the uppermost class in Berkeley Parish, and his roles in the community reinforced his economic standing socially and politically. Between 1798 and 1803, he served as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates, while locally he held posts as a sheriff's deputy and tax collector. Yet, Stanard falls short of expected elite standards in the expression of his genteel status through his material world. Scholars have consistently linked the elite with opulent material display, making a stately property packed with the finest goods a requirement for gentry status. Historian T. H. Breen argues that Virginia was "a society in which material possessions counted for so much," and hence, an elite cultivated his material world in order to distinguish himself as much as possible, in a tangible and easily recognizable way, from other members of the community. Underlying this portrayal of the gentry is an assumption that late eighteenth-century Virginia elites needed to separate themselves
dramatically from their neighbors and to establish their exclusivity and social distance emphatically in order to feel secure in their station. With his "out of repair" estate, Stanard questions the grounds of this interpretation and offers other options for understanding, in the words of ethnographer George Marcus, the "myriad subtle ways" in which elites exercised their influence. Of course, in order to dodge taxes, some Berkeley Parish elites perhaps attempted to disguise their architectural status by reporting fewer outbuildings, numbers of windows, or smaller dwelling dimensions than existed on their estates. If some were distorted, however, the discrepancies had to be slight enough to remain believable, else Holladay, as assistant assessor, was responsible for paying the difference. A degree of truthfulness behooved Holladay, and so the picture that emerges, even taking in account ambiguities, still suggests not a gentry of a lesser scale, but a different perspective from which to consider what constituted the elite.

In examining these issues, the elites in Berkeley Parish are defined within the context of the 1798 Federal Direct tax in terms of their estates, representing the top ten percent of property holders according to Holladay's estimates. Clearly, property assessments do not comprise an absolute category for identifying elites, and many, like Stanard, also exhibited their station by frequently filling positions of action and authority in the community. Joseph Pollard, for example, qualified as a justice of the peace as well as for a justice of the county court in December of 1800, while William Carter served as an inspector of tobacco at the Fredericksburg warehouse. Men such as Jonathan Clarke and Thomas Towles held high ranks in the local militia, and others, including Hugh Roy, Edmund Clarke, and Edward Herndon, appeared repeatedly as judges, jurors, and witnesses in local court cases. Unfortunately, sources for Berkeley Parish prohibit an
exploration of these aspects of elite-definition, and instead, they promote an approach of
what historian Billy G. Smith calls "limited prosopography." The tax lists allow for close
scrutiny of how property participated in the shaping of status, and subsequently, of the
social and cultural processes implicated by the estates. In Berkeley Parish, the diversity of
elite properties illustrates a variety of experiences among the gentry, alluding to a status
based not on elite cultural consensus and segregation, but on communal negotiation.

According to the 1798 Federal Direct tax, the dwelling at Stanfield stood as one of
the largest and most expensive houses in Berkeley Parish. (Table 6) In a countryside
where the dimensions of dwellings owned by elites ranged from Oliver Towles Jr.'s 16-by-
10 foot house to Spilsby Coleman's 32-by-32 foot structure, most elites lived in houses
larger than their contemporaries. Like their less wealthy counterparts, however, few elites
resided in two-story houses; only half of Berkeley Parish's two-story dwellings appear on
elite estates: Larkin Stanard's house, an unfinished dwelling owned by Stephen Johnson,
and Edmund Clarke's structure which doubled as his house and tavern. Even though many
elite properties included dwellings with greater square footage than other houses in
Berkeley Parish, a particular house size did not necessarily correlate with a certain level of
wealth. For example, Samuel Hill lived in 16-by-16 foot dwelling with no additions, while
James McKenny, whose property value totaled only one-fifth of the amount of Hill's, also
resided in a 16-by-16 foot house. Listed with one 16-by-10 foot dwelling, Oliver Towles
Jr.'s house falls well below the average living space for all dwelling owners, containing
only 16 more square feet than Phebe Crawford's 12-by-12 foot dwelling -- the smallest
house recorded in the community.

Over half of the elites built additions to their dwellings, and most incorporated one
addition, while a few houses had two and one included three.57 The majority of additions consisted of sheds or simply "additions," but some owners like Zachary Lewis opted for porticos and studies. Despite their frequency on elite dwellings, additions appeared regularly on middling estates as well, and similar to trends in house size, a greater number of additions did not indicate a higher property value. Holladay assigned George Tyler's property, with a 20-by-16 foot, "old & decayed" dwelling house augmented by a 20-by-10 foot shed and 20-by-16 foot addition, an "A" list value of 130 dollars, whereas John Shackelford, Jr.'s 16-by-14 foot, "new & well-finished" dwelling with a 16-by-10 foot shed received an "A" list value of 190 dollars.

As the comparison between Tyler and Shackelford's dwellings intimated, elite housing did not imply better condition. Holladay commented on half of the primary elite dwellings as being either "old & decayed" like Tyler's or as with Stanard's, "out of repair." Following community preferences, the wealthiest men in Berkeley Parish built with lumber even when constructing a new dwelling.58 Stephen Johnson, whose unfinished house included a 42-by-20 foot, two-story "Main Body" with a 20-by-16 foot addition and a portico, used wood as building material, and Holladay recorded that the house had "Floors laid, covered and weatherboarded." A few elite insurance policies noted the use of brick and blocks as foundation materials. Agents described Larkin Stanard's dwelling as "underpinned with brick and a cellar," while Robert Crutchfield's house stood "on blocks 2 1/2 feet above the ground" with his shed addition "on blocks 3 feet above the ground."59 Although brick foundations hint at sounder and more costly construction in elite houses, Holladay fails to mention underpinnings in the 1798 tax lists which could indicate that masonry foundations were a common rather than atypical practice in Berkeley Parish.
Glazed windows also contribute to measuring the quality of elite houses, and on average, they included more windows than other estates. Nevertheless, the lists illustrate that, like other aspects of elite dwellings, the number of windows varied among houses, and quantity provided little guidance for valuation. Despite General Jonathan Clarke's dwelling incorporating the most windows among elite houses, Holladay appraised his property 150 dollars lower than Stanard's whose dwelling had the fewest glazed windows, only three.

The inability to characterize neatly -- in terms of quality, size, or construction -- the primary dwellings of the Berkeley Parish elite suggests different possibilities for understanding the relationship between gentry houses and status. Even though failing to meet the standards of a spacious Georgian manor, the elites used their houses to assert their position, but instead of encompassing all of the distinguishing characteristics, each member emphasized selected attributes that best suited him. Jonathan Clarke invested in glazed windows whereas Zachary Lewis opted for a stylish, new portico. Larkin Stanard expressed his status with the second story of his dwelling, and perhaps Robert Crutchfield's careful brick underpinning of his house and shed indicated his wealth and influence. Since no single dwelling emerged as the prototypical example of display, the houses, in their diversity and subtlety of distinction, describe less of an imposition of status from a cohesive upper class than a degree of community participation and sanction.

Some elite houses, like those belonging to Samuel Hill and Oliver Towles Jr., reveal that their owners opted not to distinguish themselves with their dwellings at all and imply that they expressed their status through other means. Even owners who endowed their houses with certain traits augmented their dwellings with additional material...
references to their station. A return to Castiglioni’s account offers insight into other opportunities for elite assertion. According to Castiglioni, late eighteenth-century elite houses stood not in isolation, but as focal points within complexes of buildings. A planter organized his estate with the outbuildings surrounding, yet subordinate to, his dwelling to create a hierarchical microlandscape which symbolically mimicked the social order: "The design of the whole not only provided a fine stage for the master's displays of high social worth, but also served as a template of the social hierarchy of which he was the patriarchal head." An elite affirmed his status through the ensemble of structures in his landscape, but an examination of the dependencies on Berkeley Parish estates suggests interpretations that further problematize the association between outbuildings and hierarchy.

Larkin Stanard, in addition to the mill, kitchen, laundry, and stable insured in his 1803 Mutual Assurance Society policies, owned a dairy and a meat house. As Stanard illustrates with his six dependencies, most elites in Berkeley Parish possessed properties that included more outbuildings than the overall average of four dependencies per estate. Yet, often the numbers differed by only one dependency, and outbuilding ownership varied among elites. Samuel Hill's estate possessed no dependencies, while Captain James Smith's property included twelve: two kitchens, a framed workhouse, a dairy, two meat houses, two tobacco houses, two corn houses, a barn, and a mill which he jointly owned with his probable relative, John Smith. The owner of the most valued property in Berkeley Parish, Thomas Powell, and James Mason, whose assessment totaled just 645 dollars, each held four outbuildings. Similar to the trends with dwellings, a greater quantity of outbuildings did not denote elite status.

As with middling properties, kitchens, meat houses, corn houses, and barns appear
most frequently on elite estates, showing a shared community interest in agriculture and its related production. Elites, however, figured predominantly in the ownership of particular types of outbuildings, especially mills and stables, often considered architectural indicators of wealth and influence. Stables and mills reflected a substantial commitment of capital in either horses or damming a water source and alluded to a broader scope of activities which involved the public more than a smoke house or dairy. Yet, elite possession of these kinds of dependencies was not exclusive. James King, whose total property Holladay assessed at 175 dollars, owned a "Stable of logs 16 feet square," and with an estate valued at one-seventh the amount of Thomas Powell's, James Crawford, Sr. operated a "Mill House cov'd with Shingles 12 by 12 feet with 1 pr. of Stones -- for family use only." In Berkeley Parish the presence of different outbuildings on estates of various values undermines an attempt to index influence, authority, and wealth according to the type of dependency.

Elite residents, like others in the community, built dependencies of frame or log construction covered with shingles, slabs, long shingles, planks, or boards. Within this building materials tradition, elites failed to define a mode of constructing outbuildings that would have distinguished them from those on other estates. For example, they did not all employ a frame and board construction, but instead, outbuilding materials differed among owners -- often even on the same property. Spencer Coleman erected his kitchen and meat house with logs and slabs, but decided to frame his tobacco house and to cover it with boards, and to use shingles for cladding his granary. Insurance policies reveal that occasionally owners underpinned their outbuildings with brick or stone. Larkin Stanard secured his laundry on a brick foundation, while Edward Herndon, Sr. insured his kitchen
and spinning house "underpinned with stone one foot above the surface of the ground." Whether such foundations were common or reflected a higher building standard, Holladay's accounts, as with dwellings, offer no insight, but he did note that several elite properties, such as Waller Lewis's, had "houses generally out of repair," suggesting that their outbuildings improved little in their condition compared to those on middling estates.

Although many elites owned larger dependencies than their less wealthy neighbors, their outbuildings hovered fairly close to community averages for area, except for barns, granaries, and tobacco houses. (Table 7) Whereas the difference in areas between elite and all Berkeley Parish dairies was only four square feet, elite tobacco houses stood, on average, over 200 square feet greater than the community norm. The discrepancy reveals a possible investment of value in buildings associated with farming rather than in service structures related to dwellings like kitchens and laundries. For example, George Tyler, in spite of his "old & decayed" house, owned two tobacco houses, measuring 48 by 16 feet and 48 by 14 feet, and a 24-by-24 foot barn with "12 feet sheds all around." Not every member of the Berkeley Parish elite invested in such buildings. Thomas Powell, the wealthiest property owner in Berkeley Parish, possessed a kitchen, meat house, dairy, and stable, and Oliver Towles, Jr. supplemented his small dwelling with only two log corn houses. Nevertheless, the greater-sized barns, granaries, and tobacco houses represent an option by which an elite expressed his wealth and authority, stating to his community that by possessing such a space, he farmed successfully and harvested the produce with which to fill his larger outbuildings.

As far as discerning the arrangement of outbuildings in relation to elite dwellings, Holladay's lists note only if the dependencies stood within the two-acre lot of the house.
Following community trends, elites usually located the larger, farm-related outbuildings outside of their two-acre plots and built service and storage structures closer to the central house. Mutual Assurance Society policies provide additional information about outbuilding location for some elite properties. Both Larkin Stanard's kitchen and laundry stood at a "Distance upwards of 20 feet" on either side of his dwelling, while the stable was about 100 yards away from the house. On Robert Crutchfield's estate, his smoke house and kitchen flanked his dwelling 40 feet to the south and 69 feet to the north, respectively. Despite the roughly symmetrical configurations on Stanard and Crutchfield's properties, the relationships between the dwellings and outbuildings lacked the "[c]alculated proportion and rigidly controlled symmetry [which supposedly] became mandatory" of eighteenth-century elite estates.

As seen in their outbuildings, some elite estates, like Stanard's with six dependencies, fit Castiglioni's description of the village-like plantation more closely than others such as Oliver Towles Jr.'s property with only two corn houses and Samuel Hill's with no outbuildings. Their diversity illustrates that Castiglioni's account was neither exclusive nor necessarily indicative of Berkeley Parish elite properties. Similar to aspects of dwellings, dependencies represented a possible but not a required option for the expression of status. Significantly however, "the little dwellings of the overseer and the slaves" were absent from the arrangements of all Berkeley Parish estates. Neither Holladay's lists nor the surviving Mutual Assurance Society policies list specific buildings designated as slave quarters, even though, according to the 1798 tax slave schedule and personal property tax records from 1798, all of the elites owned slaves. Elites possessed, on average, three times as many bondspeople as other slaveholders in the community, and
none of the elite owners employed superintendents or overseers. Like dwellings and
outbuildings, slave ownership varied among elites, illustrating a means but not a rule for
characterizing elite social status.

The absence of slave quarters on Berkeley Parish elite estates challenges not only
the image of plantations, but also interpretations of late eighteenth-century culture which
partially depend upon the presence of quarters. Claiming that "[t]he master's identity
became deeply involved with the successful regulation of the slaves' activities," the slave
quarter, according to several scholars, represented the power of the patriarch to contain
his bondspeople within his social system. Architectural historian John Michael Vlach
states that "[w]hen we compare the dwellings of slaves with the residences of the planters,
houses which were at least larger and more substantially constructed if not always
elaborately finished, we quickly understand that housing was an omnipotent means used
by masters to signal and enforce the subordinate status of their bondsmen and women." In response, many slaves subverted white imposition and used the quarter as arena for
developing their own social intercourse and distinctive culture; yet, an examination of
where slaves possibly lived on gentry properties in Berkeley Parish proposes an alternate
view which further questions the concept of what constituted the elite.

Several elites owned second or third dwellings on their properties, and since they
were not needed for overseers, slaves quite possibly occupied the additional houses. Of
the eight elite properties with more than one dwelling, two were unfinished, and their
considerable dimensions and number of windows indicate that they were designed as new
central houses for their owners. Spencer Coleman's estate included a 38-by-24 foot, two-
story, unfinished house outfitted with 17 windows. On the other six elite estates, which
combined, possessed eight additional dwellings, the houses appear smaller and generally older than the primary dwellings. An owner of 19 slaves, Captain James Smith lived in a wooden, "out of repair," 36-by-26 foot house with a 26-by-12 foot shed addition, and two log dwellings, each measuring 20 by 20 feet, also stood on his property; Jonathan Clarke, Joseph Pollard, and Thomas Towles possessed other houses which Holladay described as "old." These buildings of smaller dimensions and in poorer condition than the masters' dwellings offered an easy solution for the problem of sheltering slaves.

Although secondary dwellings may have served as slave housing, they appeared on only about a quarter of elite estates, and often the space they provided was not ample for the number of bondspeople on a given property. For example, Jonathan Clarke's spare, one-story, 20-by-16 foot dwelling could not have accommodated all 17 of his slaves. Hence, Clarke and those elite slaveholders without additional dwellings probably housed their bondspeople in outbuildings. Some of Thomas Coleman's 20 slaves may have lived in the loft of his barn, while a group of Captain James Smith's 19 bondspeople could have established a household in the 20-by-8 foot shed addition to the kitchen. Samuel Hill's estate, however, included no outbuildings, implying that his four slaves shared, along with Hill and his family, the 16 foot square log dwelling located on his property or that his bondspeople lived in makeshift shelters that Holladay deemed unworthy of valuation.

All four possibilities for slave housing on elite estates support historian Mechal Sobel's assertion that "[m]ost blacks and whites in the slave South came into daily and fairly intimate contact with each other." The sheer proximity in which elites and their slaves resided encouraged interaction. Samuel Hill's property illustrates the most extreme scenario with multiple opportunities for close, quotidian contact, and clearly, different
living arrangements produced a range of situations. Nevertheless, the overall nearness of elite and slave households affected master-slave relations in Berkeley Parish, making the master's superiority and the slave's subjugation open to constant negotiation.

Instead of illustrating a landscape in which elite estates "offered the image of an orderly society," elite properties in Berkeley Parish reveal a kind of messiness where variety rather than consensus reigned. Owners selected from numerous material means to exhibit their authority, wealth, and influence and combined the options in myriad ways on their estates that defy a simple hierarchical formula. The very diversity of configurations and the lack of any architectural exclusiveness demanded interaction and negotiation with the community, and as seen with slaves, occasionally on the individual plantations, in order to determine status. The broader context for the structures, namely the land, also contributed to position. As Castiglioni noted, a planter's complex stood "on a good site, either on a hillside or spacious plain," and although Holladay's lists provide little information about where properties were located topographically, his estimates on acreage help to elucidate the social importance of land ownership in Berkeley Parish.

Nestled on 873 acres along the Ta river, Larkin Stanard's estate Stanfield represented the average acreage for elite property owners, standing on a tract over four times greater than the overall average. Although almost all of the elites possessed landholdings at least two and a half times greater than the overall median, the elites did not monopolize the ownership of sizable holdings, and conversely, vast acreage did not guarantee elite status. Ephraim Beasley, Sr., owned over 300 acres more than Samuel Hill, but Holladay appraised Beasley's property at less than half the value of Hill's. Both George Tyler and David Sandidge received similar "A" list assessments and acreage.
estimates, yet Sandidge's total property value was nearly 2000 dollars less than Tyler's. In addition to the quantity of acreage, its quality impacted Holladay's appraisals and may account for the discrepancies in estimates like Sandidge's and Tyler's. For example, tracts located by one of the navigable waterways, like the East North East or Pamunky rivers, perhaps warranted higher valuations than land "near the bluff" or "between Robertson's and Warren's swamps." Also, improvements to the land, such as the amount of acreage cleared for crops or the irrigation of fields, contributed to its value; for, a higher percentage of land prepared for planting indicated the opportunity for more abundant harvests, and consequently, greater wealth.

Although estate lands provided a means of asserting status, several elites supplemented their plantations by accumulating additional properties and renting them to members of the community. General Jonathan Clarke lived on his 569-acre estate near New Market, but owned two other tracts in Berkeley Parish as well. One, a 197-acre plot of land also near New Market, he rented to William Smith, while the other, a 129-acre tract on Arnold's Run, Clarke reserved for his own use. Thomas Coleman leased a one-acre estate to Henry Teele located "at Cathy's old store." With a 32-by-20 foot, one-story, wooden dwelling in "very bad repair" and a 28-by-16 foot store house, Holladay noted that the property stood in a "good situation for a tavern," and perhaps Teele sought eventually to improve the dwelling to accommodate an ordinary -- with Coleman sharing in the profits. Through their rental properties, some elites increased their wealth from collected rents and exerted their influence in the community. Tenancy implies a degree of dependency, whereby an elite, by placing himself in the position of a landlord, made his tenants reliant upon him and recognize his elevated status. Unable to garner enough
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capital to purchase property, tenants like William Smith, who lacked the economic independence associated with owning an estate, answered to landlords like Jonathan Clarke. Not all elites owned and leased additional properties, however, and other members of the community possessed and rented other lands as well. John Hart, whose 383-acre estate Holladay appraised at about one-fourth the value of Larkin Stanard's, also owned a one-acre plot with a dwelling "near Rogers's mill" which Hart rented to Elijah Estes.84 Possessing only one property each, both John Wilson, Jr. and Benjamin Winn leased their estates to tenants rather than establishing their own households on the tracts, and Richard Long, who owned two properties each appraised at over 1100 dollars, elected to live on one, while renting the other to William Pritchett.

Although tenant properties in Berkeley Parish imply issues of class and dependency, they allude to other trends as well. For example, Spilsby Coleman served as the instigator in a series of interrelated properties involving family tenancy. Living on his 1227-acre plantation on the Ta river, he let his one-acre property near Caroline County to his relative Francis Coleman. In turn, Francis Coleman rented his 45-acre estate by Robertson's swamp to Lucy Chiles who, in 1797, had purchased a 102-acre tract on the swamp from Richard Coleman for 118 pounds Virginia currency.85 A similar, but more straightforward, pattern occurred in the Chandler family. According to Holladay's 1798 lists, John Chandler rented his "tract of land 106 acres purchased from Edward Hyde" to his grandson Claiborne Chandler, and upon his death in 1800, John bequeathed the estate to Claiborne.86 The property connections in both the Coleman and Chandler cases suggest that tenancy functioned as a preparation for the transfer of lands or estates between generations within families -- elite and otherwise. In addition, rather than dependency,
tenancy indicated economic expansion and a level of prosperity for some Berkeley Parish residents. Edmund Foster rented Ann Towles's 350-acre property valued at 1470 dollars, while also owning and operating his own 583-acre estate worth almost 875 dollars. Although Foster's case may represent his service as an executor or guardian of Ann Towles's property, he still increased his assets by leasing an estate almost twice as valuable as his.

The nature of land holding, and in particular tenancy, introduces another layer of possibilities into the construction of elite environments. Combining the diversity of architecture with the lands creates not a cohesive composite of an elite's estate, but a broad range of circumstances that emphasize the variety of the Berkeley Parish landscape. The myriad manipulations of properties indicate choices where in order to exhibit influence, individuals selected different means of display — windows, additions, acreage, outbuildings, slaves — and then negotiated with the Berkeley Parish residents to recognize their status. Interaction was essential; for, the lines of distinction between elite and other estates in Berkeley Parish were not hierarchical, clear, or permanent.

The display of wealth and authority through one's material world occurred not only through the architecture and surrounding landscape of an estate, but in the interior spaces as well. By purchasing objects, adding decorative finishes to interiors, or stocking his stable with race horses, an owner exhibited his ability to afford such items and to conduct, for example, in the case of a tea set, the rituals associated with the object. According to historian Richard Bushman, objects of refinement distinguished the genteel from the crude, and an elite needed to assert his status through the possession of genteel articles, using them as props in the perpetual performance of one's authority. Few sources survive for
examining the objects of the Berkeley Parish elite: the personal property tax lists from 1798 and four wills, two of which include inventories. Although the disparity of evidence stymies an overview and comparison of elite possessions, the tax lists and inventories suggest some of the possibilities for personal property. They, too, allude to a range rather than a specific formula for ownership and status.

In the spring of 1798, Anthony Frazer, a resident of Berkeley Parish and commissioner for Spotsylvania County, assessed the personal property of the members of his community. For each household he noted the numbers of whites and blacks above the age of 16; blacks between the ages of 12 and 16; horses, mares, colts, and mules; carriage wheels; ordinary licenses; and "covering horses." Each category exacted a particular rate, for example, 35 cents per slave and 9 cents for each horse, mare, colt, or mule. Of the 489 people evaluated on the lists, the average resident owed 53 cents, but Frazer assessed all of the Berkeley Parish elites well above the figure with many paying over 14 times the amount. However, taxes varied within the group from Stephen Johnson with $22.45 to Edmund Clarke who paid only 79 cents. Also, the elites according to Holladay's lists did not correspond with the top 20 on Frazer's personal property accounts; instead, the elites ranked from 1 to 233 on Frazer's records, indicating that several other Berkeley Parish residents possessed similar, if not greater, assets in slaves, horses, carriages, and the like.

A comparison of the estate inventories of Zachary Lewis and Stephen Johnson elucidates more thoroughly the means, especially in terms of personal property, and variety of expression in elite social status in late eighteenth-century Berkeley Parish. In 1798, Waller Holladay recorded that Stephen Johnson was in the process of building a
new dwelling on his 832-acre tract on the East North East river. The unfinished house stood two stories high, measured 42 by 20 feet, and included a 20-by-16 foot addition and a portico; eight outbuildings surrounded the dwelling: a kitchen, meat house, corn house, two tobacco houses, a cider house, weaving house, and a shop. According to Holladay's slave schedule, Johnson also owned the most slaves in Berkeley Parish with 25 bondspeople between the ages of 12 and 50.

When Lewis Holladay, George Tyler, and Benjamin Rawlings took an inventory and appraised the personal property of Johnson's estate in September, 1801, most of the total value derived from his slaves. At his death Johnson possessed 70 slaves worth $12,905, and much of the remainder of the inventory reflects property related to the work the bondspeople performed on the plantation. The list reveals investments in horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, and numerous implements such as "a parcel of Carpenters Tools," grubbing, weeding, and hilling hoes for planting tobacco, "A Set black Smiths Tools," ox chains, carts, saddles, bridles, flax wheels, a still with its worm and cap, plows, axes, and scythes among farm tools. Johnson possessed a stash of some products of his slaves's labor, including hogsheads of corn and tobacco, bushels of wheat, 110 gallons of brandy, "a parcel of Lumber in Lumber house," and "a quantity of fodder shucks and rubbish." In addition to the property associated with the diverse activities on his plantation, Johnson owned an assortment of furniture, house wares, and personal items. He outfitted his house with three tables, 40 chairs, a desk and bookcase, three chests, a "Virginia Carpet," "a parcel of kitchen furniture," and seven beds and bedsteads dressed with four pillows, 18 "Coverheads," 15 sheets, and three blankets. His tableware was mostly pewter or earthenware in incomplete sets, but he also possessed two silver tankards, a large silver
spoon, nine table and six tea spoons as well as seven decanters, six tumblers, and two wine glasses. Second to the seven beds with their draperies, Johnson's most valued belonging was a gold watch.

Johnson's household objects illustrate an investment in decorating his dwelling and person with refined goods, especially in comparison to other Berkeley Parish estates like that of William Coleman whose effects included a pot, a dutch oven, a copper skillet, one chest, two bedsteads, a cupboard, a spinning wheel, and some lumber.92 The emphasis on plantation tools, livestock, and slaves outweighs his interest in the goods displayed in his home; the blacksmith's tools appraised at 50 dollars were worth more than most items of his household and personal effects. Combined with his dwelling and the diversity of dependencies, Johnson's personal property reveals an assertion of elite status rooted in his role as the head of production on his plantation with little concern for acquiring a complete array of fineries.

Like Stephen Johnson's estate, Colonel Zachary Lewis's 1158-acre plantation included a dwelling surrounded by a variety of outbuildings. Standing one-story tall, Lewis's house measured 26 by 18 feet and included two sheds as well as 16-by-14 foot study. Four outbuildings -- a kitchen, meat house, stable, and barn -- were located within two acres of the central dwelling house, and according to Holladay's 1798 accounts, Lewis possessed the second highest number of slaves in Berkeley Parish, 22, just behind Stephen Johnson.

In November, 1803, John Lipscomb, Robert Hart, and Samuel Hill assessed Lewis's personal property following his death earlier that year.93 Like Johnson, Lewis had secured much of his wealth in his slaves, but his inventory reflected half the total
Johnson's. Lewis also possessed sundry plantation implements and a number of farm animals such as horses, mules, cattle, sheep, hogs, and geese. However, whereas Johnson's estate included a variety of property related to his plantation, Lewis's estate exhibited a greater diversity of and attention to household items. The assessors were descriptive in their accounts, noting a mahogany table, two walnut tables, a dozen painted chairs, and a tea board among other articles of furniture, and recorded how Lewis outfitted his six beds and bedsteads with six under beds, eight blankets, eight pairs of sheets, another sheet, one mattress, eight pillow cases, six bed quilts, and four counterpanes. His tableware displayed a wide assortment, ranging from a pair of silver sugar tongs, punch and soup ladles, and pickle and egg stands, to breakfast, deep, and shallow plates, china tea and coffee cups and saucers, and "Delph bowls." Not only did Lewis own an array of wares with specific functions, but he possessed more ambitious articles like an "Instrument for proving gold," a spy glass, and a pentagraph as well. These goods contributed to Lewis's cultivation of a genteel education along with a library of books housed in his study: 13 volumes of Swift's Works, a volume of Virginia Laws, three volumes of A Cure for the Spleen, one volume of Scott's Fencing Master, magazines, pamphlets as well as other books of music, philosophy, fiction, religion, politics, and history.

Lewis's wealth, illustrated by his slaves, architecture, and land holdings, helped to assert his elite status; yet, Lewis chose to accumulate a collection of household goods which, unlike Johnson's, did not highlight his role as overseer of production, but instead emphasized aspects of his life divorced from the farm and its duties -- entertaining, studying, sporting, and serving the public. Cloaked within a wooden dwelling usually not
defined as elite, Lewis assembled a material world centered on gentility and refinement.

Although Zachary Lewis and Stephen Johnson represent only two cases among the Berkeley Parish elite, the differences between Johnson's and Lewis's estates provide insight into the possible ways in which personal property affected the assertion of status in Berkeley Parish. They suggest that elite personal property, like elite dwellings, outbuildings, land holdings, and slave ownership, defies rigid characterization, offering a range of choices determined by the penchant of the owner and the sanction of the community. How then does Castiglioni's description fit within the late eighteenth-century Berkeley Parish landscape? Instead of discounting the traveler's account, the messiness of elite landscapes indicates that the property in Castiglioni's view was yet another combination of options from the variety available to elites in their multi-faceted expressions of status. His report serves not as the benchmark by which to compare other properties for elite status, but rather becomes incorporated into the composite narratives of elites.
Chapter 4
WOMEN OF INFLUENCE AND ACTION

Almost every Lady wears a red Cloak; and when they ride out they tye a white handkerchief over their Head and face, so that when I first came into Virginia, I was distress'd whenever I saw a Lady, for I thought She had the Tooth-Ach!9

Philip Fithian, tutor at Nomini Hall, December 13, 1773

According to her husband John's will dated 1797, Phebe Crawford inherited "the possession of the whole of [his] Estate both real and personal" for as long as she remained a widow.96 The property, located near New Market at the southeastern corner of Berkeley Parish, included 188 acres of land on which the Crawfords had built a log dwelling clad with shingles. Assessed at less than one hundred dollars, the house measured 12 feet square and stood one story high, and like many other properties with dwellings of similar value, the Crawford house contained no glass windows, and the estate lacked any outbuildings.

In addition to the labor-intensive task of raising crops, the inventory of the estate suggests an array of activities performed on the plantation. A spinning wheel and "Three Ewes and two Lambs" allude to the production of woollen stuffs for either home use, sale, or trade, while livestock like hogs, sows, cows, calves, a bull, and a heifer implies daily tending as well as the eventual slaughtering and curing of meat. "A Sett of Moulds for Casting pewter with the appurtenances," valued at over 20 pounds Virginia currency,
indicates that John Crawford had supplemented agricultural income by working as a pewterer for the local market.\textsuperscript{97}

Managing the diverse functions of the farm as well as three slaves and six young children, Phebe Crawford needed to oversee and to participate actively in the operations of her property, both indoors and out. Her "hands-on" lifestyle differs distinctly from Fithian's description of cloaked ladies carried through the landscape, and unlike Phebe Crawford's situation, his account complements traditional characterizations of the late eighteenth-century Virginia gentry. The portrayal of the patriarch relies on evidence not only of sharp delineations between classes, but also of oppositional gender roles. In contrast to the "bold-faced gentlemen" who continually and publicly vied with one another in contests of power and authority, Fithian's kerchief-carrying ladies sought to protect and remove their "delicate complexions from a [physical and cultural] climate considered ferocious."\textsuperscript{98} Some historians challenge the depiction of disenfranchised women and argue for a unique women's culture in which "women acted from a set of attitudes and values different from those held by men."\textsuperscript{99} Yet, by emphasizing the singularity of women, scholars subsequently deny them action within a broader context.\textsuperscript{100} Women still merely rode through the landscape as quickly as possible, leaving the wheel tracks of their husbands' carriages as their only imprints.\textsuperscript{101}

Properties like Phebe Crawford's in Berkeley Parish propose another perspective from which to interpret women and their roles in the late eighteenth-century Virginia landscape. With architecture indicative more of cultural variety than of strict polarities, the Berkeley Parish landscape offers an opportunity to explore issues of negotiation and interaction as they apply to class, as with the elites, and to gender as well. Its diversity
suggests an array of experiences among women, introducing their many roles in and contributions to shaping the contours of the community. Similar to Castiglioni's description for estates, Fithian's account then emerges as one aspect rather than a pithy synopsis of women's experiences in late eighteenth-century Virginia.

With the death of her husband and the inheritance of the estate, Phebe Crawford became one of 24 women who owned real property in Berkeley Parish, and although women possessed only 10 percent of the properties on the 1798 Federal Direct tax, their estates reveal a variety of ownership. Property total values ranged from 48 to 1821 dollars, but Phebe's estate, worth 376 dollars, ranked close to the average appraisal for women. Following overall trends in Berkeley Parish, total values did not necessarily increase according to the number of structures on the property or the amount of acreage. For example, the assessments for Mary Holladay's and Nice Coleman's estates differed by only 50 cents, even though Holladay's 408-acre property included a 36-by-16 foot dwelling and a 12 foot square, framed dairy, whereas a 30-by-30 foot barn stood as the lone improvement on Coleman's 384-acre estate. Waller Holladay assigned both Elizabeth Johnson's and Sarah Waller's properties "A" list values of 300 dollars, despite Waller's having twice as many dependencies within two-acres of her dwelling as Johnson.

Like Phebe Crawford's homestead, over half of the properties possessed one dwelling, while Sarah Waller's estate had two. Construction materials included logs, shingles, boards, and "wood," and footprints ranged from Crawford's cramped, 12-by-12 foot log house to Waller's 38-by-18 foot wooden dwelling, but most houses included at least 300 square feet. Elizabeth Johnson and Ann Towles expanded their dwellings by
building additions; Towles opted for a 36-by-10 foot shed, but Johnson attached to her 28-by-20 foot house two sheds, one measuring 28 by 12 feet and another 20 by 12 feet. Some women increased their available living and working spaces with outbuildings, and as with most Berkeley Parish properties, the dependencies reflected a wide array of functions. Of the eight women with both dwellings and outbuildings, kitchens, meat houses, corn houses, dairies, and barns appeared most frequently on their estates, and a few owned either a tobacco house, a stable, or a lumber house. Similar to dwellings, owners chose to build their dependencies with frame or log construction clad with shingles and boards. Holladay placed all eight estates with both dwellings and outbuildings on the "A" list, implying that the properties elicited higher values than estates without dependencies. Nevertheless, they did not monopolize the greatest appraisals; for, Elizabeth Pool's 550-acre property near New Market included only a 24-by-16 foot log dwelling, but received an assessment of over 1237 dollars, almost in spite of Holladay's appraising Ann Reisly's property with a larger dwelling and two outbuildings at 1208 dollars.

Although Holladay neglected to comment on the condition of Phebe Crawford's estate, he recorded remarks about several other properties with dwellings. Most he deemed either "out of repair" or "decayed," but he noted that Ann Towles's estate, albeit "old & decayed," stood in a location "good for a tavern." In addition to Holladay's quips about quality, windows supply another measure for considering the condition of dwellings. Over half of the houses incorporated glazed windows with most of the dwellings on the "A" list and only one, Sarah Waller's second house with one window, on the "B" list.107

Many of the women who owned real property with dwellings were probably
widows like Phebe Crawford. Clara Blaydes's husband John died in 1793 and "len[t] to
[his] beloved wife Clara Blaydes during her widowhood all [his] Estate both real and
personal...for the Purpose of Maintaining and schooling and upbringing [the] Children."\textsuperscript{108} Since Holladay listed her as the occupant owner of a 75-acre estate on the East North
East river with a 16-by-16 foot log dwelling, Blaydes probably did not remarry, but chose
to remain a widow and to keep her property. Other women, such as Sarah Goodloe and
Martha Waller, became widows shortly after the survey for the 1798 tax and received
both real and personal estates.\textsuperscript{109} However, not all widows in Berkeley Parish became the
administratrices of estates after their husbands' deaths. Some husbands, like William
Petties, stipulated that his property be sold and the proceeds used to provide for his wife,
and a few widows waived their husbands' bequests of estates.\textsuperscript{110} In 1801 Frances
Stubblefield declared that she "renounce[d] release[d] & Relinquis[hed] all Right Title
Interest Claim & Demand" to all legacies, including dower rights, left to her by her
deceased husband Harry, while Agnes Johnson claimed that the administration of her
husband Henry's estate was "ill-convenient" and granted Thomas Minor, Jr. authority over
the property.\textsuperscript{111}

Given the nature of eighteenth-century Virginia law which instituted "civil death"
for married women, if not widows, then other female property owners of estates with
dwellings were most likely single women.\textsuperscript{112} For example, Holladay distinguished Ann
Towles as unmarried and an exception by noting her as "Miss Ann Towles" on the tax
lists; yet, he also provided a title for Ann Reisly, who he recorded on the slave schedule
as "Mrs. Ann Reisly." Since no other Reislys appear on the tax lists, Holladay did not
need to delineate between "Mrs. Ann Reisly," the widow, and another, unmarried Ann
Reisly, indicating that perhaps she was a married women with an estate separate from her husband's.

The diversity among owners and their estates alludes to a range of different experiences for women in Berkeley Parish. Personal property, as enumerated in inventories, offers insight into the natures of their lives and illustrates how women interacted with architecture, landscape, and objects and affected them in sundry ways. Although the evidence emphasizes the environments of widows, their experiences show the variety among married women in the community as well. They imply that in many cases, widowhood meant the expansion of action and roles exercised while married rather than an introduction to them.

Phebe Crawford's personal property not only reveals that she oversaw and performed numerous tasks on the farm, but combined with her dwelling and the number of people living on the estate, suggests how the household functioned as well. Despite the domination of goods associated with production activities, the appraisers also listed some housewares on the inventory. Most of the household items relate to the basic needs required for eating and sleeping: "old pewter Dishes Bason plates and Spoons," wooden wares, a pot, a Dutch oven, a table, three chairs, a chest, and "Three beds three bedsteads and Sundry furniture belonging to the beds." The list provides little information about the quality or condition of the wares, but the lack of description intimates prosaic forms. Compared with the inventory of Mrs. Mary Herndon, which differentiates between "Leather bottom'd" and "flag" chairs and specifies two beds as "feather," the Crawford inventory enumerates less stylish furnishings. The household objects also reflect no specialization of design for a unique task. For instance, a pot and Dutch oven appear as
the only cooking implements on the inventory, indicating that Phebe or her slave prepared all meals without using more particular utensils such as kettles, frying pans, and spice mortars. The family ate from pewter dishes and plates with spoons, not requiring pickle stands or tea equipage, and drank from wooden ware vessels since the Crawfords owned no wine glasses or tankards. In addition, the furniture implies flexible application for multiple purposes. Her chairs lack any sort of designation like "easy" or "dining," and with only three of them, the family either ate at the table in shifts or if they chose to dine together, used the floors, the beds, and the chest as seating furniture.

Unless Phebe possessed other objects not assessed as part of John's estate, the scarcity of specialized housewares on the inventory coupled with the dominance of agrarian goods suggest that the Crawfords preferred to pour their profits into production. Although historian James Oakes overstates the emphasis in his characterization, the Crawford household represents, to an extent, a family "who spent every cent they could to enhance their property holdings, who endured great personal deprivation to buy one more slave or a few more acres of land, and who lived in a style not much different from their poorer, non-slaveholding neighbors."114 The Crawfords also may have been too poor to have afforded all but basic household goods, needing to concentrate on farming to insure survival. In either situation, however, production did not exclude women from impacting their households; for, the Crawford estate and the nature of its activities indicate how Phebe, both as a wife and widow, manipulated and organized her family's individual landscape.

Similar to the generalized nature of her personal property, Phebe's 12-by-12 foot dwelling lacked a floorplan of separate rooms in which each was associated with a specific
function. Instead, Phebe most likely assigned certain activities to different parts of the single-room house. As architectural historian Michael Ann Williams discovered with late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century single-pen houses in southwestern North Carolina, "although physical space was not architecturally divided into discrete units, it was indeed divided physically and conceptually, for practical, social, and symbolic purposes." By arranging the beds in one area of the room, Phebe segregated a corner for sleeping, while the hearth accommodated a variety of activities, functioning as the main station for cooking meals as well as providing a workspace for John's pewter casting. The placement of the table designated an area for eating and preparing foodstuffs. Because the house had no glass windows, and the inventory lists no lighting devices, Phebe spun by the open door on warm days and moved near the fire at night or when the temperature dropped.

Other tasks required more space than the dwelling permitted, and so Phebe worked outside of the house, too. Without any outbuildings, she needed to divide the yard into separate areas: one space for washing laundry, another for slaughtering hogs, another for cultivating a garden, and one for keeping the livestock and horses. Since the Crawfords owned only one adult slave and all six of their children were under the age of 16, Phebe toiled worked in the fields as well. Busy times, such as the harvest, demanded as many field hands as possible, and the Crawfords may have been unable to afford the expense of hiring extra workers, making Phebe's labor outside of the household domain essential to the property. The inventory also includes a woman's saddle, alluding to Phebe's active participation in the outdoor aspects of the estate and its production -- riding out to check on the crops, around the estate, and to neighboring plantations.

With the diversity of her work and the nature of her real and personal estates,
Phebe Crawford illustrates one possible experience among Berkeley Parish women as she organized spaces to accommodate her activities. Because her contributions were critical to the success of the farm, Phebe influenced the arrangement and appearance of the property not only when becoming a widow, but also while her husband lived. Her experiences then imply a degree of interaction and negotiation between Phebe and her husband as they moved within their shared spaces and attended to the functions of their farm.

Although in his 1795 will William Petties requested the sale of his estate rather than bequeathing it to his wife, who unfortunately was not referred to by name in the documents, Petties's property and the provisions for Mrs. Petties contribute to the variety of experiences among women with estates. Unlike the Crawford's, the Petties's property reflected a kind of architectural complex where outbuildings influenced the articulation of spaces and their related functions. The 376-acre plantation located near the Pamunky River included a one-story, 40-by-26 foot, "old & decayed," wooden dwelling along with a kitchen, meat house, and corn house. Six glass windows supplied greater light to the house interior, and given its dimensions, the dwelling was probably physically divided into at least two rooms. William Petties's inventory, as with Crawford's, illustrates that most of his wealth derived from agricultural goods: six slaves, "1 Yoke Oxen," two horses, a number of cattle, swine, and sheep as well as sundry plantation tools like scythes, barrels, hogsheads, a cart, and horse chains. Petties also possessed a loom, two spinning wheels, and two flax wheels which indicate some degree of textile manufacture on the estate. Despite the mutual emphasis on production, his inventory reveals a greater investment in housewares, furniture, and personal items than Crawford's. Petties's household goods
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consisted of one desk with books, three chests, one press, a safe, a chest of drawers, two tables, ten chairs, "4 beads, beadsteads and furniture," two looking glasses, a pair of "Money Scales," pewter tableware, fireplace equipment, and a variety of cooking utensils, including a frying pan, a spice mortar, a "Salamander," pot racks and hooks, and an assortment of jugs, butter pots, tubs, pails, trays, cases, and bottles.117

Like Phebe, Mrs. Petties participated in many of the activities that involved processing raw materials into consumable goods such as cooking, weaving, spinning, sewing, soapmaking, and baking, and also tended to the livestock, gardens, and their ten, but by 1798, mostly grown, children.118 Due to the very nature of her work, she assisted in the arrangement of the house interior. With two rooms the family could have placed the beds in one room for sleeping and also used it as a more formal room for entertaining guests, while the other served for dining and conducting business by the desk. Perhaps Mrs. Petties sectioned off an area by the hearth or near the windows for the loom and flax and spinning wheels.119 Outdoors, she affected the organization of the yard surrounding the house, designating particular areas to suit her needs. The presence of outbuildings, however, seems to diminish her possible influence in arranging spaces. With some of her activities moving out of the house and into the dependencies, she demanded less space in the dwelling, giving the appearance of the isolation of her tasks to the outbuildings. On the other hand, the dependencies also suggest that Mrs. Petties's authority and input extended beyond the house and its immediate vicinity to include the outbuildings and fields. William Petties's will confirms her influence on the larger estate. His will directs the sale of the property in order to purchase a small plantation for his wife outfitted with four slaves, her choice of a horse, a yoke of steers and a cart, a number of cattle and
swine, and "provisions sufficient to serve her one year in the opinion of my trustees." His bequest reveals his confidence that Mrs. Petties, given a new farm, some laborers, and goods to foster its production, could manage a property with enough success to support herself. Petties recognized the role of his wife in helping him to manage the estate in her positions in both the processing of items and the shaping of its fields and buildings.

The Petties example also indicates that widows and other female inheritors of property did not just maintain their properties, but actively developed them. Mrs. Petties perhaps illustrates an extreme case with the task of establishing her estate as a working plantation; yet, Berkeley Parish women appear regularly in Spotsylvania deed books as purchasers, and even sellers, of real property. Mary Ann Blaydes increased her holdings along the East North East river when she bought an 8-acre tract "[t]ogether with all Buildings gardens fences woods waters meadows and all other benefit and advantage whatsoever to the said land" for 50 pounds Virginia currency from Spencer Coleman. Having purchased in 1797 102 acres on the north side of Robinson's swamp from Richard Coleman, Lucy Chiles added to her estate a few years later by acquiring 40 acres from Fanny Coleman, and in 1800 Nice Coleman improved her lands when she bought an 88-acre tract for 167 pounds Virginia currency from Azariah King and his wife Mary.

Clearly, Mrs. Petties and Phebe Crawford represent only two cases out of several women who owned property with dwellings and of many more married women living on estates in Berkeley Parish. Nevertheless, their real and personal properties help to illustrate the some of the variety of experiences among these women. They suggest not a separate women's culture, but the ways in which, to borrow from historian Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, "boundaries between male and female domains might blur in a common
Their experiences allude to interaction between men and women and indicate that patriarchy also encompassed aspects of negotiation along with imposition.

Although over half of the female property holders in Berkeley Parish owned dwellings as part of their estates, other women's property defied the "common household setting." Some possessed land tracts -- with and without outbuildings, while others owned personal property and no real estate. Like their dwelling-owning counterparts, their properties contributed to the landscape of the community and illustrate how women operated outside of the household.

The remaining women on Holladay's 1798 tax lists all owned tracts of land, ranging from Sarah Morris with 32 acres near New Market to Hannah Carter's 490-acre plot located between the Po and Ta rivers, but over half of the women owned less than 125 acres. Most appraisals fell between 240 and 440 dollars. Typically, the properties incorporated no improvements, except the estates of Susannah Cason and Nice Coleman. A 30-by-12 foot, log and board tobacco house stood on Cason's 200-acre tract near the East North East river, while Coleman's 384-acres estate on the same river possessed a 30-by-30 foot barn, framed and covered with boards. Many women received the plots upon the death of a parent or another relative. For example, both Elizabeth and Margarette Carter owned 98-acre tracts near the Po river valued at 245 acres each. The similarities in their properties and surnames indicate that they were unmarried sisters whose lands constituted their equal shares of an inheritance. In January, 1800 the division of Captain Aquilla Johnson's estate included a land grant for his unmarried daughter, Salley Johnson, of "39 Acres of Land as described by No. 4 part of S[outh] River Tract," and in the
settlement of part of her mother's estate, which consisted of 432 "Acres of Land which was the Dower of the late Elizabeth Johnson deced lying on Mattapony River near Hams bridge," Salley inherited, along with her sisters Mary and Nancy and several of their brothers, a parcel of 156 acres. Women like Salley Johnson and the Carter sisters usually continued to live with their relatives, retaining their tracts for dowries and future use as married women rather than developing their lands for residences while single. Despite the bequest of his dwelling and lands to his son, Francis Turnley left a variety of personal property to his daughter Ann and stipulated in his will the desire that she remain "with her brother and have the use of [the] house without paying board as long as she lives single."

Some of the tracts, however, reflect enterprise among women. Lucy Chiles purchased 102-acres from Richard Coleman, while living as a tenant on Francis Coleman's 45-acre estate also near Robertson Swamp. Although the tenant property provided a one-story, wooden, 20-by-18 foot dwelling as well as a kitchen and corn house, Chiles expanded her holdings in order to generate more income with the hopes of either buying Francis Coleman's property or establishing her own estate. By owning a neighboring tract, Chiles, along with her five adult slaves and possibly her children and hired hands, could conveniently plant both plots and pay a percentage of her profits only from her rental property to Coleman. Susannah Cason and Nice Coleman also could have employed their lands with outbuildings as sources for income rather than as mere dowries. With Cason owning 3 slaves and Nice Coleman with 10, maybe each housed her slaves in the dependency and used them as a resident labor force to farm their tracts. Neither woman hired a superintendent for her slaves, suggesting that if Coleman and Cason chose to
improve their acreage, they played an active role in planning and supervising the operation.

Although many passively received lands in anticipation of establishing households with their future husbands, and others aggressively purchased and cultivated tracts, both suggest the possibilities of Berkeley Parish women participating in the landscape outside of their residences. Tangibly, they owned lands that contributed to the contours of the landscape, and culturally, they -- to a degree -- took part in the actions associated with land ownership. Yet, a few women appear on the 1798 Federal Direct tax who possessed neither estates with dwellings nor lands with or without dependencies; instead, they owned slaves which by the 1770s were treated as real, instead of personal, property according to Virginia law. Benefactors in Berkeley Parish, when able, frequently bestowed slaves as gifts to their children and other family members, especially their daughters. Samuel Hill directed in his will that his "negroes shall be divided among all my children but in the said Division each of my daughters shall receive double in value to what each son shall receive out of the value of the said negroes because I have left them no Land." Benefactors in Berkeley Parish, when able, frequently bestowed slaves as gifts to their children and other family members, especially their daughters. Samuel Hill directed in his will that his "negroes shall be divided among all my children but in the said Division each of my daughters shall receive double in value to what each son shall receive out of the value of the said negroes because I have left them no Land." Mary, Jane, and Susannah Hart illustrate single women who received two slaves each from a relative's estate as collateral for dowries. Although William Carter bequeathed land, bondspeople, and other personal property to his sons and grandsons, he elected to leave his daughters and granddaughters slaves and supplement their allotments with bond notes and household furnishings. For example, Lucy Aylet Carter inherited three slaves along with a bond note for 26 pounds and one bed and its furniture, while her brother John received two male slaves, a 220-acre tract of land, 55 pounds Virginia currency, and "all the cash and personal property heretofore given him." In several
cases like the Carters, the benefactors may not have possessed enough land to divide into substantial tracts for both female and male progeny or preferred to leave lands with male heirs since they could establish their tracts as independent estates with greater ease. In some ways, however, bondspeople proved more valuable assets for single women than lands. While unmarried and not living on their own working plantations, they could rent out their slaves and reap the profits of their labor, and the bondspeople could also be enlisted as personal attendants or as laborers for the estates on which the women lived.

Although an important and desirable asset for single women in Berkeley Parish without real estate, slave ownership figured predominantly in the properties of women with land or plantations. According to Holladay's 1798 accounts, 18 women possessed slaves between the ages of 12 and 50. Most women owned two slaves each, but 17 slaves belonged to Elizabeth Johnson. Many of the women on Holladay's slave schedule, as with estates, were widows like Crawford and Clara Blaydes who received slaves as part of their inheritances from their husbands. William Davenport lent to his wife Mary "during her Widowhood the following Slaves a negro Man named Handy A negro Woman named Jean [and] a Negro Boy named John," and William Carter also provided his wife with nine slaves as long for as she remained a widow.\textsuperscript{130}

In their roles as slaveholders, women in Berkeley Parish reveal another kind of experience within their individual environments as well as the larger community. The numerous bequests of slaves indicate that some women were familiar with asserting themselves as mistresses both inside the dwelling and out in the yards and fields. For, Phebe Crawford did not require three slaves to assist in the housekeeping of her 12 foot square log dwelling, but directed them in the fields with the adult woman Hannah tending
to more labor-intensive tasks and her two children Jane and Bob performing lighter work. As with William Petties's bequest of a new farm for his wife, women's inheritance of slaves, especially in conjunction with estates, implies that they knew from prior experience how to manage bondspeople effectively in running plantations. Their properties suggest that married women who lived on estates with slaves also participated in their handling both indoors and out, indicating another area of interaction and negotiation between men and women in their roles as slave masters and mistresses.

Several women living in Berkeley Parish owned neither homesteads, land tracts, nor slaves. Nancy Wilkerson, for example, died in April, 1801, and her inventory lists a bed and bolster, a woman's saddle and bridle, two counterpins and one sheet, two bed quilts, a spinning wheel, a chest, and a "Small Gift Trunk." Since she possessed no taxable property and was not associated with an assessed household, the lives of women like Wilkerson remain elusive. Perhaps she exemplifies a description more like Fithian's lady who rode through the landscape masked by her kerchief or illustrates a young single woman with still living with her parents or other relatives. In either case, she contributes to the composite portrait of women's lives in Berkeley Parish by adding another layer to their experiences.

Through their diverse material worlds, women in Berkeley Parish not only suggest a variety of experiences, but also indicate how interaction and negotiation with men contributed to shaping daily life. Although patriarchy dictated in many ways the social order of the community and confined the scope of women's influence, their experiences reveal a kind of flexibility. Instead of showing the sequestering of women into a separate and singular sphere removed from the "ferocious" climate, their material lives allude to
women's participation in and effects on their environments and subsequently, on the broader cultural context and landscape. The extent of their individual impact and degrees of interaction ranged from the seemingly isolated Nancy Wilkerson to the dynamism and activity of Phebe Crawford, and yet, the very variety among women promotes a new perspective from which to examine late eighteenth-century gender roles. As with Berkeley Parish elites and issues of class, the women in the community exhibit an array of expressive systems -- or ways in which to wield authority -- and in doing so, question conventional views of culture defined by oppositions between men and women.
Chapter 5

THE ARCHITECTURE OF MASTER-SLAVE RELATIONS

The more we observe the Negroes, the more must we be persuaded that the difference distinguishing them from us does not consist in color alone...Necessarily united by a common interest deriving from their situation, and brought together by the distinguishing badge of their color, they would doubtless form a distinct people, from whom neither succor, virtue, nor labor could be expected.\textsuperscript{132}

Marquis de Chastellux, traveler in Virginia, 1782

Around 1800 Major Lewis Holladay recorded the names, mothers, and dates of birth for the slaves residing on his 295-acre plantation on the East North East river.\textsuperscript{133}

Although in 1798 Waller Holladay noted that his relative possessed 14 taxable slaves, Lewis's lists reveal that by the beginning of the nineteenth century, he owned 54 bondspeople, ranging in age from Delphia and Suckey, both 38 years old, to Annes and Patty born in October, 1800. Thirty-one of his slaves were children under the tithable age of 12, however, and in December, 1795 Holladay perhaps anticipated an increase in the number of children and purchased for 17 pounds an "old Negro Woman Jenny" to look after them on the farm.\textsuperscript{134}

Slave lists are not necessarily unusual documents among the papers of Virginia planters, since many needed evidence of their bondspeople's ages for tax purposes. By including the mother's name for each slave, the record also confirmed a slave's status, following matrilineally, and hence legally, the lineage of each bondsperson.\textsuperscript{135} More
importantly for the interpretation of slavery in Berkeley Parish, Lewis Holladay's list offers insight into the slave families on his estate with some traceable through three or four generations. For example, Suckey, "Daughter of Jane" (probably deceased by 1800), had three children, one of whom, Queen, bore Suckey two grandchildren, Polley and James; Letty's children, Daphney, Phebe, and Phillis, produced a total of nine grandchildren.

While the overall ratio of men to women was nearly equal, Lewis Holladay possessed over twice as many mature female slaves as adult males.\textsuperscript{136} Hence, most of Holladay's bondswomen, if married, most likely had husbands on neighboring plantations.

According to historian Allan Kulikoff, the development of slave families in the late eighteenth century, as on Holladay's property, signaled a kind of stability among bondspeople which allowed for the cultivation of a separate black culture. For Kulikoff, the quarter, "built at some Distance from the Mansion-House,...set the scene for social intercourse" and provided an exclusive arena in which slaves could come together, much as the Marquis de Chastellux suggested, "united by a common interest deriving from their situation...to form a distinct people."\textsuperscript{137} Scholars often cite historian John Boles's statistical claim that "over half [of the slaves], 51.6 percent, resided on plantations of more than twenty bondsmen," in order to defend the use of large plantations as typical examples of black experience.\textsuperscript{138} They assume that ownership of twenty or more bondspeople necessitated the construction of slave quarters in which to house them and thereby, maintain evidence of cultural singularity as articulated in the spatial distance between blacks and whites.

However, like his contemporaries in Berkeley Parish, Lewis Holladay -- even though he owned over 20 slaves -- failed to incorporate quarters into the architectural
vocabulary of his estate. His property included a one-story, 20-by-16 foot, wooden dwelling with two shed additions, measuring 22 by 16 and 16 by 10 feet, and four dependencies: a kitchen with a shed, a meat house, dairy, and barn. Within the complex, Holladay's slaves lived in the interstitial spaces, spread out among the outbuildings and within the central dwelling. Some slaves could have established a household in the 20-by-10 foot shed attached to the kitchen, while others may have been sheltered along with the livestock out in the 24-by-24 foot barn. Perhaps a few bondspeople served as house servants and stayed in the 16-by-10 foot shed added to the dwelling.

Regardless of the possible slave living arrangements, the absence of quarters on Lewis Holladay's estate, as well as those of other slaveholders in the community, alludes to slave life and culture outside of the confines of the quarter. As with issues of class and gender in the community, the variety of properties and slave ownership in Berkeley Parish illustrates other slave experiences, especially on estates with fewer than 20 bondspeople, that problematize interpretations stressing slave singularity. In reducing the actual distance between black and white living spaces, the properties of Berkeley Parish introduce opportunities for interracial interaction and negotiation and present the potential for diversity among bondspeople and their experiences. Hence, although sustaining about half of the slave population, large plantations represent an aspect rather than a summary of slave lives.

Unfortunately, because the 1798 Direct tax focuses on blacks quantitatively and in terms of property -- in other words, as slaves, the schedule offers little insight into the experiences among free blacks in Berkeley Parish. Since Waller Holladay failed to note any of the property owners on the 1798 tax lists as being black, his accounts indicate that
no free blacks owned estates, even though court records show that several slaveholders emancipated bondspeople, and that once freed, many blacks continued to live in the community. For example, in January, 1798 Zachary Billingsley manumitted his "Negro man Slave Tom commonly called Tom Butler aged about thirty four years," while in 1799 Hugh Roy released his forty-five year old slave Laury "from all claim that [Roy had] in and to him and from the claim of all and every person whatsoever." Also in 1802, the Spotsylvania court reported that John Herndon and Anthony Frazer returned "a list of free negroes and mulattos in the county," but the document does not survive.

The presence of free blacks in Berkeley Parish and their absence on the 1798 Direct tax suggests that they, like slaves, resided in housing owned by others. Although a few probably squatted on lands, most likely many free blacks stayed on the estates of their former masters or mistresses, and others, unable to purchase or lease their own properties after manumission, rented themselves out for terms of service to local farmers. Judy Lewis, a "woman of Colour," stood accused of robbery in November, 1801, and after being found guilty and receiving "at the Publick Whiping Post 25 lashes on her bare back," the sheriff of the court conveyed her to "Elijah Estes who [was] intitled to her time of Service unexpired." Working and living on the estates of whites, free blacks shared experiences similar to those of slaves. At least by law, free blacks by their status gained greater mobility and economic opportunities to establish themselves; yet, in Berkeley Parish they remained -- perhaps unavoidably -- spatially and culturally tied to white residents. Clearly, their experiences differed in many ways from those of bondspeople, but slave lives, with their compatibility to the living situations of free blacks in some aspects, also illuminate how free blacks negotiated and interacted with their former owners.
According to Waller Holladay's 1798 slave schedule, Major Lewis Holladay possessed well above the typical number of slaves for Berkeley Parish residents. In fact not everyone in the community owned slaves; Waller Holladay listed only 143 slaveholders on the slave schedule with 123 owners also appearing on the 1798 property tax. Slave ownership ranged from holders like Nice Blaydes and Elijah Estes who possessed one tithable slave each to Stephen Johnson with 25. Just four residents owned 20 or more bondspeople, so that on average, most held about four slaves. However, the slave schedule represents taxable slaves -- those between the ages of 12 and 50 -- and as Lewis Holladay's personal slave list suggests with its number of young children, the number of bondspeople living on any single estate could have been higher. For example, in February, 1801 the local court ordered that "Phillis belonging to John Woolfork & Andrew a negro man belonging to Saml Hill are exempt from the payment of County Levy & also Daniel belonging to Ben Waller they being aged & infirm." Phebe Crawford, although in 1798 taxed for her one adult slave Hannah, also owned Hannah's two children, Jane and Bob, who did not appear as tithable property on Waller Holladay's assessment. Nevertheless, the statistics for the community indicate that most slaves lived in relatively small groups.

Perhaps since most slaveholders possessed only a few slaves, quarters seemed an imprudent investment to Berkeley Parish owners. Historian James Oakes argues that slaveholders with less than five bondspeople formed an unstable economic class and sometimes held slaves erratically, depending on seasonal needs. Moving in and out of the slaveholding class "may have been the rule rather than the exception for the majority of masters," and even when owning their slaves, many Berkeley Parish slaveholders
frequently toiled alongside their bondspeople, lacking the capital to purchase more slaves and hence, needing to exert their own labor in order to cultivate their lands. In such cases, quarters represented a luxury; yet, owners like Lewis Holladay with ten or more slaves and probably greater capital chose not to construct separate slave dwellings. When Stephen Johnson, the largest slaveholder in Berkeley Parish, designed his new estate on the East North East river in 1798, he failed to incorporate quarters on his property, even though he owned at least 25 bondspeople, which by his death in 1801, had increased to 70. Clearly, Johnson could have afforded the expense; for, during his architectural overhaul, he included a portico on his two-story, 42-by-20 foot central house and erected specialized dependencies like a cider house, weaving house, and a shop. Johnson's property indicates that even among the seemingly economically secure and the largest slaveholders in Berkeley Parish, slave quarters were deemed culturally unnecessary. Like smaller owners, they planned to house their bondspeople in outbuildings and central dwellings and found little need to delineate their architectural space so emphatically from that of their slaves' by building quarters. In their architecture Berkeley Parish slaveholding properties reveal different degrees of spatial distinction between blacks and whites which allude to interaction and the subsequent processes of negotiation.

Since 84 of the 123 estates had dwelling houses with dependencies, most Berkeley Parish bondspeople, like Lewis Holladay's, probably resided in their owners' outbuildings. The properties, however, included from one to nine outbuildings with a greater number of slaves not necessarily correlating with more dependencies. Captain Benjamin Waller owned 17 slaves which he housed in two outbuildings, while Colonel Thomas Towles, on whose property nine dependencies stood, possessed only 5 bondspeople. In addition to
the numbers of slave and outbuildings, the assortment and configuration of dependencies contributed to the diversity of estates and resulted in an array of experiences for Berkeley Parish slaves, describing not only where, but also how they lived on the plantations.

Consider, for example, the nature of Lewis Holladay's estate. Like his counterparts, Holladay developed a variety of interests on his property, and his slaves performed numerous tasks essential to its success. Many of the adults most likely tended to the crops out in the fields, and some of the older children helped with lighter field work especially during the busier times of the agricultural calendar. Holladay's kitchen, meat house, and dairy indicate that the adult slave women also cooked meals, slaughtered livestock, and cured meat as well as churned butter. In order to support his dairy, meat house, and fields, Holladay owned an assortment of farm animals, including hogs, cows, bulls, sheep, and horses, and probably the slave children attended to the herding.147 According to Holladay's records, he bought a "shoe makers Hammer" in 1795, and in 1801 owed Samuel Shackelford for two days of work on fixing a loom on the plantation.148 His accounts imply that one or more of Holladay's slaves developed skills as a shoemaker, while several women and adolescent girls spun and operated the loom. Such activities continued production and secured income for Holladay during the slow winters when his crops demanded little attention.

Without a superintendent, Holladay managed the daily functions of his estate, and consequently, no middleman or overseer served as a cultural buffer between Holladay and his slaves. Only three slaveholders in Berkeley Parish -- William Carter, Colonel Daniel Coleman, and Captain Robert Lewis -- hired superintendents so that most owners, like Holladay, handled the everyday supervision of their properties and bondspeople.149
Holladay may have appointed a male slave as an assistant for assigning tasks to and overseeing the work of fellow slaves; nevertheless, in order to insure success, he needed to participate actively in the running of his property. Holladay interacted frequently with his bondspeople, checking on their progress in the fields, yard, and outbuildings, settling disputes when necessary, and doling out punishments and rewards. Although he probably did not toil along with his bondspeople like many of the smaller Berkeley Parish slaveholders, his quotidian interaction with his slaves introduces instances for negotiation in master-slave relations.

The nearness of living spaces increased the opportunities for interaction between Holladay and his bondspeople; when the sun set and the day's work was complete, Holladay and his slaves did not retire to segregated areas of the estate. Dispersed among his kitchen, dairy, meat house, barn, and possibly, dwelling, the slaves lived in close proximity to Holladay and his family. Except for the barn, the outbuildings were within two acres of the main house, and since they supplied services connected with the house, Holladay most likely clustered the dependencies around the dwelling. The functions associated with the outbuildings, such as cooking and food storage, supported not only the Holladays, but the slaves as well. Lacking a separate quarter outfitted with fireplaces and root cellars, the bondspeople required areas for preparing their meals and keeping their rations. They did not share provisions with the Holladays; for, according to Holladay's records, he provided Sylvia, for example, "1 Barrel & a half of shelled Corn/ 7 half bushells in the Ears," while Captain received "1 Barrell & a half of shelled corn." Regardless, Holladay and his slaves utilized the same areas and would have negotiated with one another as they moved within the spaces.
Clearly, the sundry combinations in the numbers of slaves and outbuildings as well as the types and proximities of dependencies promoted different levels of interaction and negotiation. John Goodloe, who possessed two dwellings and seven outbuildings "in very bad repair" located on 550 acres, maintained a greater spatial and cultural distance from his eight slaves than Holladay did with his bondspeople. Since Edmund Clarke employed his two slaves with work required to run his tavern "on [the] main road from Stephen Johnsons to Chesterfield," they might have resided in the two-story dwelling, even though Clarke owned five outbuildings, in order to attend to the requests of guests at all hours of the night. Their living situation kept them in constant contact with whites -- and possibly their companion slaves -- outside of their owner's household. Reuben Massey owned a 16-by-17 foot, log and shingle house and only one dependency, a 12-by-8 foot, log corn house. With at least three slaves and maybe a family of his own to shelter, Massey's daily interaction and negotiation with his bondspeople may have been more frequent than Holladay's. They probably deliberated over living spaces, especially since his slaves needed to use Massey's hearth for cooking and keeping warm in the winter, and with the small dimensions of the corn house, a few of his slaves probably slept in the dwelling along with the Masseys.

Reuben Massey's household closely relates to the experiences of the 24 slaveholders in Berkeley Parish who possessed properties with dwellings, but without dependencies. As on Massey's estate, the bondspeople lived in the central houses along with their masters and mistresses, and the number of tithable slaves per household ranged between one and four. With only a few slaves to work their farms, the slaveholders spent their days laboring out in the fields and yards with and performing the same tasks as their
bondspeople, leaving little in the way of work that differentiated the master from his slave. Although also sharing their dwellings, some owners managed to segregate themselves somewhat from their slaves through their living arrangements. James Davenport, who outfitted his 16-by-14 foot frame and board dwelling with a 16-by-8 foot shed, could have reserved the addition to his house as a living space for his two slaves. Sequestering the slaves to another room provided a degree of separation and privacy at least for sleeping, but Davenport and his bondspeople still came into contact as they moved through and tended to everyday functions in the house. They overheard one another's conversations and witnessed family squabbles or personal moments, so that even with the shed wall separating them, the Davenports and their bondspeople continually interacted.

Most of the slaveholders' dwellings without dependencies, however, lacked additions and resulted, on many estates, in more permeable living environments than even Davenport's. Philip Young, for example, resided in a 16-by-14 foot, log dwelling with two slaves and possibly his wife and children. Like Phebe Crawford's family in their 12-by-12 foot log house, the Youngs may have spatially, but not physically, divided their 224 square feet into distinct areas for sleeping, cooking, working, and eating, and within the configuration, Young's slaves perhaps occupied a corner of the room. Yet, without any architectural barriers, the Youngs and their bondspeople saw and heard almost every aspect of each another's lives, setting a scene for exchange instead of singularity. Clearly, the potential for interaction varied according to the size of the dwelling and number of persons living in it. John Woolfolk, Jr. owned four slaves who resided, along with Woolfolk and his family, in an "out of repair," 38-by-16 foot, wooden dwelling. With an overall square footage almost three times larger than Young's, Woolfolk sustained a
greater spatial and cultural distance from his bondspeople, while Phebe Crawford's family of six and her three slaves negotiated in a space about half the size of Young's, drawing them even closer together.153

Although the majority of Berkeley Parish slaveholders listed on Waller Holladay's 1798 slave schedule possessed properties with at least one dwelling, several slaveowning estates defied a plantation arrangement. Three slaveholders owned properties with outbuildings, but no dwellings, while twelve held only tracts of land, and twenty slaveowners failed to appear on the 1798 tax lists with any estates. Nice Coleman, a mistress of 10 bondspeople, managed a 384-acre estate on the East North East river which included only a 30-by-30 foot, frame barn, and on the same river, William Hawes Blaydes owned two slaves and a 90-acre expanse without any taxable improvements. Jane, Mary, and Susannah Hart did not possess estates, but each served as the mistress to two bondspeople. While Nice Coleman and the other owners with outbuildings may have housed their bondspeople in the dependencies and utilized them as a resident labor force on the tracts, properties like Blaydes's and the Harts' suggest that their proprietors rented out the slaves to neighboring farms. Not needing their bondspeople to work their own plantations, the slaveholders reaped profits from their slaves' toil by leasing them and also avoided the demands of sheltering, feeding, and clothing their bondspeople.

Slave rentals in Berkeley Parish suggest different kinds of experiences. Instead of negotiating master-slave relations daily with their owners, rented bondspeople interacted most often with whoever hired them. Their terms of service could vary from a casual, verbal agreement for a day's work to a formal contract enumerating years of labor, and hence, a slave might move continually from one plantation to another, remain on a single
farm for an extended period of time, or any possibility in between. Some owners allowed their slaves to rent themselves out to whomever they chose, offering greater mobility and control to those bondspeople, while for others, their situations indicated instability as their masters and mistresses, according to their whims, dictated where slaves lived and for how long. Whether discussing with potential masters to determine terms of hire or shuffling from one plantation to another, rented bondspeople needed to adapt to their new environments quickly as well as to know how to deal with the white residents.

Like bondspeople who resided with their owners, the architecture on the estates affected the experiences for rented bondspeople and their interaction with their temporary masters and mistresses. Working on Lewis Holladay's plantation dispersed among several outbuildings resulted in an experience distinct from living with Philip Young and his family in their 16-by-14 foot dwelling. Leased slaves coped not only with new masters and the arrangement of their estates, but also with the fellow bondspeople present on the properties by whom they could be welcomed, spurned, or ignored. For example, Phebe Crawford's slave Hannah could have resented a rented bondsperson who further cramped their living space and stretched their rations or embraced the opportunity to have another adult slave to share the workload and keep her company. Several slaves were probably hired by men and women who could not afford to purchase any bondspeople, so that the slave rented by Thomas Brown resided with him in the 16-by-16 log and board house on the 100-acre property without interaction with other slaves.

Although the bondspeople owned by masters or mistresses without estates illustrate a strong possibility for the leasing of slaves in Berkeley Parish, proprietors of plantations rented out their bondspeople as well. In a deed dated January, 1799, Richard
Coleman gave his relative Robert three slaves to settle a debt for "sundry sums of money" which Robert advanced "to enable [Richard] to procure proper Cloaths and all other necessaries" required for an appointment in the United States army. Richard stipulated that his heirs possessed no claim to the slaves or to "the yearly hire and profits of the said Negroes," and in doing so, his deed implies that leasing bondspeople was an ordinary practice for earning additional profits among slaveholders in Berkeley Parish. Owners of artisan slaves probably leased their trained bondspeople to neighboring farms. Lewis Holladay's shoemaker slave not only catered to the needs on Holladay's plantation, but most likely provided his specialized services to the community at large and in turn, contributed to Holladay's income. Other slaveholders who included specialty shops on their estates like weaving houses may have hired slaves from nearby plantations intermittently to supply extra pairs of skilled hands needed for filling large orders.

Some of the slaveholders with unimproved or without lands resided with their slaves on estates owned by others. Benjamin Johnson, a master of one slave, did not possess his own property, but instead, rented Daniel Coleman's 339-acre estate near New Market and served as the superintendent for his slaves. Owning three bondspeople, William Carter Jr. lived as a tenant in a 20-by-16 foot, log and board dwelling on Robert Carter's 98-acre estate near the Po river, while the Reverend H. Conans Boggs occupied the church rectory with his one slave to wait on him. Also, Waller Holladay designated several owners as "Junior" or in the case of Thomas Duerson, "son of William," and others share the same surname such as Reuben, Edward, and Susannah Cason and Mary, Nice, and William Hawes Blaydes. They represent sons and daughters not yet established on their own estates, but residing with their parents or other relatives until they married or
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collected enough capital to purchase their own properties. For example, in his will of 1794, David Pulliam divided his eleven slaves between his children, but stipulated that his "Family continue to [live] Together if they Choose untill they marry." Like the experiences of slaves living on estates belonging to their masters or mistresses, the bondspeople of tenants resided and worked with their owners, implying a variety of possible interaction and negotiation which, unlike rented slaves, occurred most frequently between the slave and his or her owner. Whether rented or not, the degree of interaction and negotiation depended upon the architecture and other bondspeople on the estates.

Clearly, despite aspects of interaction and negotiation, blacks in Berkeley Parish cultivated aspects of their lives separately from white residents. As the Marquis de Chastellux observed, perhaps "united by common interest deriving from their situation and brought together by the distinguishing badge of their color" bondspeople sought haven in one another's company, and many citizens, especially in light of the slave revolution in Santo Domingo, feared black organization and rebellion. In November, 1802, the Spotsylvania court issued an indictment against James Crawford "for permitting the assemblage of negroes," while throughout the 1790s, several slaves were charged with, among other crimes, "preparing, exhibiting and administering sundry medicines with an evil intent," grand larceny, and "felony & insurrection." Berkeley Parish slaves struck out against their oppressors, discontent with their disenfranchised status, discrimination, and lack of control over their lives and families.

The architecture and landscape of late eighteenth-century Berkeley Parish shows, however, that interaction and negotiation with masters and mistresses were a part of bondspeople's everyday lives. Slavery did not necessarily consolidate black singularity as
typified architecturally by the quarter, but instead, the absence of separate slave housing in
the community indicates that bondspeople participated -- to an extent -- in shaping the
landscape around them. Within the diversity of their experiences, the slaves offer a
broader understanding of the messiness of their lives where the distinctions between slave
and master were not always black and white.
Chapter 6

SURVEYING THE LANDSCAPE

Although economic in intention, Waller Holladay's accounts of late eighteenth-century Berkeley Parish humanize its landscape by offering glimpses of the everyday material world. His view telescopes to the level of individual households and allows for an examination into the ways in which people and artifacts interacted in the making of meaning. According to archaeologist Ian Hodder, "Material culture does not just exist. It is made by someone. It is produced to do something. Therefore it does not passively reflect society -- rather, it creates society through the actions of individuals." Each estate, with its unique combination of architecture, lands, objects, and residents, reveals different experiences that, when taken collectively, suggest the diversity of actions and expression within Berkeley Parish. Holladay's tax lists recover the dynamism of the community as well as some of the fleeting, perishable encounters which shaped daily life, serving as the point of access for understanding its messy networks of significance and for considering the range of possibilities.

The variety in Holladay's vision, however, problematizes eye-witness accounts from contemporary diarists and travelers like Luigi Castiglioni, Philip Fithian, and Marquis de Chastellux. Although conventionally interpreted as pithy characterizations of Virginia landscape and culture, their observations fail to describe Berkeley Parish properties and
the lives of residents like Larkin Stanard, Phebe Crawford, and Lewis Holladay. Elites did not constitute their status by building "a small village," and women did not always hide behind their handkerchiefs, but participated actively on their properties and in the community. Masters chose not to segregate themselves architecturally from their slaves, implying that contact was close and perhaps exchange frequent. In light of Berkeley Parish, the sweeping statements of travelers and diarists emerge as particular examples from an array of possible experiences rather than synopses of the whole.

Although Holladay's accounts offer the opportunity to investigate the landscapes of particular households, how do we broaden the view to include all of Virginia or even the early Republic? In part, the problem lies in the singularity of the materials for Berkeley Parish which stymie comparative analysis. No complete 1798 Federal Direct tax lists or similar evidence survive for other communities in Virginia or south of the state, and only a few notable studies have been written for areas of the Mid-Atlantic and New England. Without more insight into other regions, an overall understanding of what the early American landscape looked like and how it was experienced remains elusive and limited; yet Berkeley Parish and its landscapes suggest a perspective from which to reconsider culture. With a diversity that defies rigid categories and their conventional roles, Berkeley Parish directs historical attention to examine issues of process, illustrating that landscape, culture, and meaning were constantly negotiated in the messy nature of everyday life.
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123. Fourteen out of the 24 women owned dwellings as part of their estates.

124. Three women owned tracts valued at more than 440 dollars, while only one woman possessed a lot appraised at less than 240 dollars. Four women owned more than 125 acres. Lucy Chiles's 102 acres near Robertson Swamp represent the median acreage as well as the median value of 255 dollars with assessments varying from 48 to 980 dollars.


127. Three women appear on the lists only owning slaves; Oakes, 27.


130. Ibid; will, William Davenport, June 1, 1795, Will Book F: 19-20.

131. Will, Nancy Wilkerson, October 23, 1801, Will Book F: 207, 234. Although Nancy Wilkerson does not appear on any of Holladay's lists nor on land and personal property tax records (she wouldn't since she owned no items that would qualify her for taxation), the appraisers of her property were local Berkeley Parish men (Thomas Cason, James Mason, and Larkin Luck), indicating that she probably lived in the community. Other Wilkersons appear on Berkeley Parish records, like Alice Wilkerson on the 1798 personal property tax.


133. Slave list, Lewis Holladay, accounts from Bellefonte, 1772-1820, Holladay Family Papers. Unless otherwise noted, all of the following data concerning Holladay's slaves was gleaned from his slave list.


136. Ratio of women to men: 28 to 26; ratio of adult women to adult men: 15 to 7.

137. Kulikoff, 368; Rice, 439-40.


140. August 3-5, 1802, Minute Book, 1802-1805: 58.

141. November 13, 1801, Minute Book, 1799-1802: 263. The court records differentiate between free and enslaved blacks by noting the owners of the slaves, while for free blacks the records note whether the person was black, mulatto, or "of Colour" like Judy Lewis.

142. Slaveholders with 20 or more slaves include Thomas Coleman (20), Spilsby Coleman (20), Stephen Johnson (25), and Colonel Zachary Lewis (22).

143. February 3, 1801, Minute Book, 1799-1802: 173.


145. Oakes, 40.


149. The superintendents include Charles Nixon (for William Carter), Benjamin Johnson (for Daniel Coleman), and Thomas Hackney (for Robert Lewis).


151. Only three other estates besides Davenport's included dwellings with additions, and each of these were rental properties owned by Daniel Coleman, John Hart, and Hugh Roy, and leased to Benjamin Johnson, Elijah Estes, and John Farrish respectively. All of the tenants, except Benjamin Johnson who served as Daniel Coleman's superintendent, owned at least one slave.

152. See discussion of Phebe Crawford's estate in section four and Williams, *Homeplace*. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
153. The square footage for Woolfolk's dwelling totaled 608 square feet, while Phebe Crawford's included 144 square feet.


156. As quoted in Rice, 439-440.


158. For further discussion of the relationships between artifacts and the making of meaning, see Bernard L. Herman, *The Stolen House* (Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1992).

159. Hodder, 6.

160. For an in-depth assessment of negotiation, objects, and meanings, see Hodder, especially chapter four.
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# APPENDIX

Table 1. Building Materials for Dwellings in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Number of Houses*</th>
<th>Percentage**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frame</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of dwellings = 190
** Percentages rounded to nearest whole number

Table 2. Covering Materials for Dwellings in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Number of Houses*</th>
<th>Percentage**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boards</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shingles</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slabs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of dwellings = 190
** Percentages rounded to nearest whole number
Table 3. Building Materials for Outbuildings in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Number of Outbuildings*</th>
<th>Percentage**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frame</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;hew'd&quot; log</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;saw'd&quot; log</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Covering Materials for Outbuildings in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Number of Outbuildings*</th>
<th>Percentage**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boards</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long shingles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planks &amp; shingles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shingles</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slabs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of outbuildings = 421  
** Percentages rounded to the nearest whole number.
Table 5. Variety of Outbuildings in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>Median Dimensions**</th>
<th>Median Area**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchens</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16 x 16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Houses</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10 x 10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Houses</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12 x 12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairies</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12 x 8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stables</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20 x 20</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barns</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28 x 16</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Houses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30 x 20</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20 x 16</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Houses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 x 20</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granaries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 x 20</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cider Houses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 x 12</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops/Store Houses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16 x 16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of outbuildings = 421

** Median dimensions in feet, median area in square feet
Table 6. Elite Property Values in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Owner</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot; list Value (in dollars)</th>
<th>Total Value (in dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Powell</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>7196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Coleman</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5852.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Lewis</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Coleman</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spilsby Coleman</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4584.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Tyler</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller Lewis</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Towles</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4062.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Stanard</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>4048.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Clarke</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Towles, Jr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Johnson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Clarke</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2834.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Pollard</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2750.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Roy</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Carter, Sr.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Hill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Herndon, Sr.</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Crutchfield</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Elite Outbuildings in Berkeley Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>Median Dimensions**</th>
<th>Median Area**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kitchens</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20 x 16</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat houses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12 x 12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn houses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16 x 12</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dairies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10 x 10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stables</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24 x 16</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barns</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32 x 20</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tobacco houses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40 x 16</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 x 16</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still houses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 x 20</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granaries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32 x 16</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shops***</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 x 16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>store houses***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 x 16</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cider houses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 x 12</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of elite outbuildings = 112
** Median dimensions in feet, median area in square feet
*** Shops include 3 weaving houses, 2 laundries, 1 workhouse, and 1 shop; store houses include 2 lumber houses and 1 store house