NPS Form 10-900
(Rev. 10-90)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES REGISTRATION FORM

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

1. Name of Property

historic name King Cemetery

other names/site number 38CH1590; U/19/0000/2480734.01

2. Location

street & number 1.1 mi. ne. of jct. US 17 and S-19-38 not for publication N/A
city or town Adams Run vicinity X
state South Carolina code SC county Charleston code 19 zip code 29426

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property X meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant ___ nationally ___ statewide X locally.
(___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Mary W. Edmonds 4/28/2000
Signature of certifying official Date

Mary W. Edmonds, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, S.C. Dept. of Archives & History, Columbia, S.C.
State or Federal agency and bureau

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

Signature of commenting or other official Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby certify that this property is:

X entered in the National Register 6/13/00
___ See continuation sheet.
___ determined eligible for the National Register
___ See continuation sheet.
___ determined not eligible for the National Register
___ removed from the National Register
___ other (explain): _____

for Signature of the Keeper Date of Action

King Cemetery
Property Name

Charleston County, SC
County and State

5. Classification

Ownership of Property (Check as many boxes as apply)

- X private
- ___ public-local
- ___ public-State
- ___ public-Federal

Category of Property (Check only one box)

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

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing	
___	___	buildings
1	___	sites
___	___	structures
___	___	objects
1	0	Total

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

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register
0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions)

Cat:	Sub:
FUNERARY	Cemetery
LANDSCAPE	Forest

Current Functions (Enter categories from instructions)

Cat:	Sub:
FUNERARY	Cemetery
LANDSCAPE	Forest

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions)
N/A

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions)
foundation N/A
roof N/A
walls N/A
other N/A

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

King Cemetery
Property Name

Charleston County, SC
County and State

8. Statement of Significance

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

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

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

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

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions)
ETHNIC HERITAGE: Black
SOCIAL HISTORY

Period of Significance
1838-1949

Significant Dates
N/A

Significant Person
(Complete if Criterion B is marked)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Architect/Builder
N/A

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

9. Major Bibliographical References

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

Previous documentation on file (NPS)
___ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
___ previously listed in the National Register
_X_ previously determined eligible by the National Register
___ designated a National Historic Landmark
___ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #
___ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #

Primary Location of Additional Data
_X_ State Historic Preservation Office
___ Other State agency
___ Federal agency
___ Local government
___ University
X_ Other

Name of repository: SC Inst of Archaeology & Anthro

King Cemetery
Property Name

Charleston County, SC
County and State

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 2.84 acres

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
1	17	558000	3625700	3			
2				4			

___ See continuation sheet.

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

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

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Michael Trinkley, Director

organization Chicora Foundation, Inc. date August 6, 1999

street & number PO Box 8664 telephone 803-787-6910

city or town Columbia state SC zip code 29202-8664

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps
A **USGS map** (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
A **Sketch map** for historic districts & properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

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

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

Property Owner

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

name (1) Greater St. Mark AME Church (2) Russ and Lee Pye (dba Justin Enterprises)

street (1) 8816 Old Jacksonboro Rd (2)8654 Savannah Highway telephone (2) 843-889-3567

city or town (1) Parkers Ferry (2) Adams Run state SC zip code 29426

Description

The King Cemetery is situated in rural southern Charleston County, about 30 miles southwest of the City of Charleston and about 3 miles east of the South Edisto River. Originally the location of many large rice and cotton plantations, the area today consists primarily of planted pine woodlots, mixed agriculture, and scattered residential lots and farms. The cemetery is situated in a tangle of vines and herbaceous vegetation, with scattered hardwoods and pines. During the spring the cemetery is visually dominated by massive banks of daffodils (*Narcissus* spp.) and snowflakes (*Leucojum* sp.) with multiple yucca (*Yucca* sp.) plants marking individual graves. The topography is extremely rolling, quite distinct from the surrounding land, and is suggestive of dense burials with associated mounding, sinking, and disturbance. Although relatively few burial goods, frequently placed on the graves of low country blacks, are visible on the surface, they are found slightly below grade, having been covered by recent soil accretion. Named for the primary nineteenth century plantation owner, the King Cemetery is thought to have been used by the area's African-American community since at least the late antebellum, and contains at least 183 graves. Oral history documents the extensive use of the graveyard during slavery and continuing into the first half the twentieth century (the four traditionally marked graves span a period from 1891-1949). The property, recognized as a cemetery and considered an outparcel for most silvacultural activities, retains its integrity of location, setting, and feeling. Likewise, its design features have not been substantively altered and are still recognizable apart from the recent second growth vegetation. The cemetery's integrity of materials is consistent with its age – plant materials and durable materials such as stone, are still present. Wood planks, known to have marked many African-American burials in low county graveyards, are no longer present, but they are non-durable materials and would not be expected to survive. The cemetery retains integrity of workmanship, still clearly revealing the intention of the families who buried their dead in this cemetery. King Cemetery also retains integrity of association – being clearly recognized by the local African American community and conveying exceptional feeling and historical character.

The cemetery is situated just beyond the upland agricultural fields associated with what historically has been called Encampment Plantation and a short distance from lowland swamp areas which may have been cultivated in rice during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Over the past 20 years the agricultural field has moved southward, leaving a buffer of old field vegetation between the cultivated field and the cemetery. On the east side of the cemetery there is a well-preserved remnant of a dirt farm road, called in oral history, Johnson Road (Stockton 1996:83).It was this road that funeral processions used to reach the King Cemetery during the early twentieth century. Today it bordered by live oaks and agricultural fields, often planted in corn. It continues to convey the rural feelings and sights which would have characterized the cemetery during most of its history.

Although the King Cemetery has been logged at least once in the recent past, it retains the characteristics ascribed to rural African American graveyards in the South Carolina low country. Within the woods, north of the adjacent old field, the topography is rolling with a series of low mounds and depressions. This topography is the result of extensive, and intensive, use of the cemetery. As each grave is dug, the fill is thrown out, forming a heaped-up mound. Afterwards, the grave shaft is imperfectly filled, leaving an uneven terrain. Although some graves may have been periodically remounded, there are some oral histories which suggest that remounding graves was considered bad luck – suggesting that many grave shafts would be filled in only superficially by adjacent grave digging. As this process is repeated through time, it leaves a very characteristic mark on the landscape.

A combination of visual inspection, coring, and penetrometer survey has identified at least 183 graves, all oriented ESE by WNW (Jones et al. 1996; Trinkley and Hacker 1997). The graves occupy an oval area measuring about 275 feet north-south by 450 feet east-west, encompassing about 2.84 acres. Although a map of the cemetery suggests several "blank areas," penetrometer work in these areas has identified unmapped graves. There are estimates which place the number of graves at the King Cemetery between 800 and 1,000 (Trinkley and Hacker 1997:23). It seems likely that the cemetery was a focal point in the African American community, being extensively used until relatively recently.

There are four "traditionally" marked graves in the cemetery, three with small marble headstones and one with a metal funeral home plaque. Burial 24 is marked by a stone inscribed, "MARY / BELOVED WIFE OF / CHARLES SIMMIONS / 1888-1933 / AT REST". Burial 62 is marked by a stone inscribed, "SACRED / To the memory of / VENUS POLITE / Relict of MOSES POLITE / Died April 25, 1891 / AGED 95 YEARS". Burial 76 is marked with a stone inscribed, "IN MEMORY OF / SARAH CAMPBELL / OCT 18, 1879 / MCH 17, 1924". The last marked grave is Burial 117, identified only by a partial funeral home plaque. The individual's name is "ANDERSON" and the one date on the marker (probably a death date) is 1949. The firm is Fielding Home for Funerals, a black undertaking firm which began in 1912 (Charleston *Post and Courier*, 1/5/98, 2/15/99).

A number of large areas of snowflakes (*Leucojum* sp.) with other areas of daffodils (*Narcissus* sp.) are present throughout the cemetery area. There are also a few areas where the plantings have not spread out, which still define individual graves. The snowflake bulb is particularly hardy, with one author commenting that they can survive a very long time without care or division (Bales 1992:62). They tend to bloom a long time in shade and are self-sowing. The daffodils present at the cemetery appear to belong to what is called Division 10 plants as defined by the Royal Horticultural Society of England (Bales 1992:68-69). Although those observed in the cemetery are not among the showier of the heirloom or antique bulbs, they are nevertheless fragrant and several reveal double blooms. Like the snowflakes, these bulbs are very long lasting. Other

flowering plants of special note include specimens of blue violet (*Viola papilionacea*) and periwinkle (*Vinca minor*), both likely initially planted at the site. There are also several large clumps of yucca (*Yucca* sp.), which may be propagated from seeds, from stem portions, or root tip.

The overstory is dominated by mixed hardwoods, primarily oak and sweetgum. The understory includes both hollies and also several clumps of chinaberries (*Melia azedararch*). Although chinaberry can be propagated by bird droppings, they are known to have been extensively used by African-Americans (Morton 1974:95) and the seeds have been found in several African American slave sites (see Gardner 1986 and Trinkley 1983).

Statement of Significance

The King Cemetery is a good example of the distinctive, regionally important type of African-American cemetery found in the lowcountry of South Carolina, qualifying for nomination under Criterion C. Typically associated with a plantation and reflecting the continuation of burial rituals and patterns originating in slavery, these cemeteries often reflect use into the early to mid-twentieth century. Distinctive characteristics include the placement of grave goods, ranging from ceramics to bottles to household furniture, on the grave; the use of white or reflective materials and objects; the use of alternative methods of grave marking; and the use of plant materials. Equally characteristic of these cemeteries is the different way they were arranged and subsequently cared for. The King Cemetery has not been dramatically altered and is largely intact – it has not, for example, been "cleaned up" or "beautified," changing its basic character. Nor have grave goods been collected – they remain preserved several inches below the current ground surface. Although logged, the feeling and character of the cemetery has not been changed. It also reflects the kin-based nature of the African-American rural community, rather than either a church-based or family-based cemetery. As a result, the cemetery meets the requirements of Criteria Consideration D, deriving its significance from distinctive design features which represent a broad pattern characteristic of African American graveyards of the lowcountry. The King Cemetery also exhibits the ability to address archaeological, bioarchaeological, and forensic research questions and is eligible for nomination under Criterion D. The cemetery exhibits both considerable time depth and a large number of burials. As such it could contribute information concerning changing practices of grave decoration, use of burial hardware, and burial practices. The cemetery may also contribute very significant information on life span, health, and population dynamics.

The Nature of African-American Cemeteries in the Lowcountry

Understanding how African groups buried their dead might help us better understand the early development of African-American cemeteries in the lowcountry. This is, unfortunately, much more difficult than might be imagined. Africa is a large continent

with many different cultural groups. Many are poorly understood. The 10 to 20 million African-Americans forcefully transported as slaves to the shores of the United States came from a number of different cultures. Further complicating this approach is the interaction of different religious beliefs once the slaves arrived on the plantations – most planters were Christians, while some blacks were Moslems and many others held other religious beliefs.

One anthropologist, Margaret Washington Creel, has examined a range of African beliefs and religious practices in an effort to better understand slave religion. In her study, *"A Peculiar People": Slave Religion and Community-Culture Among the Gullahs* (Creel 1988), she explores the beliefs of the BaKongo, Ovimbundu, and other groups on the Windward and Gold Coasts. Approaching the issue from a different perspective Mechal Sobel (1979) has tried to document the adoption, and adaptation, of the Baptist religion by African Americans. In addition, studies of some urban African American populations are suggesting that burial practices outside the lowcountry may be dramatically different (see, for example, Trinkley et al. 1999).

It is even more difficult to discover the religious beliefs of African-American slaves. Planters were rarely interested and often took steps to curb, or at least carefully monitor, the religious training and activities of their slaves. Very few planter diaries recount the events surrounding slave burials.

Yet it is well documented that these African-American slaves died by the thousands. One study, for example, found that the mortality rate of black children on the South Carolina and Georgia coastal rice plantations was astonishingly high – nearly 90% of all children died before they reached the age of 16 years. Even on more interior cotton plantations it is likely that nearly one out of every three slave children died before adulthood (Dusinberre 1996). Death was certainly a way of life for African-American slaves and they had ample opportunities to make the trip from slave settlement to cemetery for their friends and family.

Thomas Chaplin, a Sea Island cotton planter on St. Helena Island in Beaufort County, South Carolina, mentions the making or purchasing of coffins for black slaves on only two occasions. He describes only one African-American burial, on May 6, 1850:

> Got Uncle Ben's [slave] Paul to make coffin for poor old Anthony. The body begins to smell very bad already, had it put in the coffin as soon as it came. Buried the body alongside of his son about 11 o'clock at night. . . . There were a large number of Negroes from all directions present, I suppose over two hundred (Rosengarten 1987:496).

At another nineteenth century South Carolina slave burial reported by Creel:

> The coffin, a rough home-made affair, was placed upon a cart, which was drawn by an old Gray, and the multitudes formed in a line in the rear, marching two deep. The procession was something like a quarter of a mile long. Perhaps every fifteenth person down the line carried an uplifted torch. As the procession moved slowly toward "the lonesome graveyard" down by the side of the swamp, they sung the well-known hymn:
>
> "When I can read my title clear
> To mansions in the skies,
> I bid farewell to every fear
> And wipe my weeping eyes."
>
> . . . . the corpse was lowered into the grave and covered, each person throwing a handful of dirt into the grave as a last farewell act of kindness to the dead. . . . A prayer was offered. . . . This concluded the services at the grave (Creel 1988:314-315)

Yet another slave burial, on Georgia's Butler Island, was described by Frances Anne Kemble in early 1839:

> Yesterday evening the burial of the poor man Shadrack took place. . . . just as the twilight was thickening into darkness I went with Mr. [Butler] to the cottage of one of the slaves . . . who was to perform the burial service. The coffin was laid on trestles in front of the cooper's cottage, and a large assemblage of the people had gathered round, many of the men carrying pine-wood torches . . . . the coffin being taken up, proceeded to the people's burial ground. . . . When the coffin was lowered the grave was found to be partially filled with water – naturally enough, for the whole island is a mere swamp, off which the Altamaha is only kept from sweeping by the high dikes all round it. This seemed to shock and distress the people . . . (Kemble 1984:146-147).

All of these slave burials are similar. They seem to have invariably taken place at night, possibly to allow slaves from neighboring plantations to attend, but just as likely because no other time was available (Roediger 1981:166; Twining 1977:223). This may help explain why so many African-American burials continued to be held on Sundays even into the early twentieth century. All of the accounts suggest that the burials were rather significant affairs, with prayers, singing, and sometimes even an air of a pageant. Sometimes the service was reported to continue until the morning. Many accounts from the mid- and late-nineteenth century reveal that African-Americans were uniformly buried east-west, with the head to the west. One freed slave explained that the dead should not have to turn around when Gabriel blows his trumpet in the eastern sunrise. Others have suggested they were buried facing Africa (see also Cohen 1958:96; Puckett 1926:94; Roediger 1981:170-171).

Even where the slaves were buried seems similar. All seem to represent marginal property – land which the planter wasn't likely to use for other purposes. The burial spots have been described by Elsie Clews Parsons (1923:214-215) as "ragged patches of live-oak and palmetto and brier tangle which throughout the Islands are a sign of graves within, – graves scattered without symmetry, and often without headstones or head-boards, or sticks . . . ." Frances Anne Kemble (1984:307) reported that while an enclosure was erected around the graves of several white laborers buried on Butler Island, the graves of the African-American slaves were trampled on by the plantation cattle.

A black cemetery in the South Carolina up country was described by John William DeForest shortly after the Civil War. He commented that while a few marble and brick headstones were present, most were "wooden slabs, all grimed and mouldering with the dampness of the forest. . . ." (DeForest 1992). At the time, some of the wooden slabs had painted names and dates. The paint likely flaked off only shortly before the wood itself rotted away.

Graves were marked in a variety of ways besides wood or stone slabs. Sometimes unusual carved wooden staffs, thought perhaps to represent religious motifs or effigies, were used. Some graves were marked using plants, such as cedars or yuccas, and anthropologists have suggested this tradition may reflect an African belief in the living spirit. This tradition can be traced at least to Haiti, where blacks, probably mixing Christian religion with African beliefs, explain that, "trees live after, death is not the end" (Thompson 1983:139) Yuccas and other "prickly" plants may also have been used "to keep the spirits" in the cemetery. Other graves were marked with pieces of iron pipe, railroad iron, or any other convenient object.

At times shells were used to mark the grave. One anthropologist in the early 1890s remarked that "nearly every grave has bordering or thrown upon it a few bleached sea-shells of a dozen different kinds" (Ingersoll 1892:68). This practice has been traced back to at least the BaKongo belief that the sea shell encloses the soul's immortal presence. There was a prayer to the mbamba sea shell:

> As strong as your house you shall keep my life for me. When you leave for the sea, take me along, that I may live forever with you (quoted in Thompson 1983:135).

Even into the twentieth century some Gullah explained the use of shells on graves as representing the sea:

The sea brought us, the sea shall take us back. So the shells upon our graves stand for water, the means of glory and the land of demise (quoted in Creel 1988:319).

Probably the most commonly known African-American grave marking practice was the use of "offerings" on top of the grave. One of most detailed discussions of this practice is provided by John Michael Vlach, in *The Afro-American Tradition in Decorative Arts* (Vlach 1978). He notes that the objects found on graves included not only pottery, but also "cups, saucers, bowls, clocks, salt and pepper shakers, medicine bottles, spoons, pitchers, oyster shells, conch shells, white pebbles, toys, dolls' heads, bric-a-brac statues, light bulbs, tureens, flashlights, soap dishes, false teeth, syrup jugs, spectacles, cigar boxes, piggy banks, gun locks, razors, knives, tomato cans, flower pots, marbles, bits of plaster, [and] toilet tanks."

This practice may be traced back to Africa, where a wide variety of items used by the dead individual were placed on the grave. Some believe that the symbolism is that of the body destroyed by death. Others trace the practice to a belief that the practice guards the grave, preventing the dead from returning to direct the lives of those still living. Some suggest the symbolism of the various items is particularly important – with reflective items, like glass and mirrors, used to show the "mirror image" of this life compared to the next. Other items focus on water as symbolism, both as representing how African Americans were transported as slaves and also as representing how they will be transported into the next world. A number of the grave goods are also "killed," or deliberately damaged. This is to perhaps help the item to stay in the afterlife with its owner.

No one explanation may be adequate, although the practice of decorating graves was recognized by whites at least as far back as Dubose Heyward's day, when he wrote about the practice in the short story, "The Half Pint Flask" (Heyward 1929).

Parsons (1923) commented that African-American cemeteries did not typically preserve family groupings. Although generations of related kin would be buried at the same graveyard, the tie was to the location, not to a particular 3 by 6 foot piece of ground. The Bennett Papers, in the South Carolina Historical Society, reveal several stories of African-Americans wanting to be buried in very specific graveyards, although specific plots are never of concern. In one case a black was reported to have specifically warned his friends, "don't bury me in strange ground; I won't stay buried if you do. Bury me where I say." A somewhat similar account is provided in an article from the *Journal of American Folklore*. An article recounts the legend of a slave who begged not to be buried in the graveyard of his mean-spirited master. When his dying request was ignored, he found retribution by haunting the plantation (Backus 1896:228).

Creel offers one of the more detailed explorations of African-American beliefs toward death during slavery, noting that many of the spirituals provide rare glimpses of the slaves' belief systems. One, in particular, was especially telling:

I wonder where my mudder gone;
Sing, O graveyard!
Graveyard ought to know me;
Ring, Jerusalem!
Grass grow in de graveyard;
Sing, O Graveyard!
Graveyard ought to know me;
Ring, Jerusalem!

Creel(1988:309) observes that while the anguish is clearly conveyed by this song, so too is a sense of hope – most clearly revealed in the line, "Grass grow in de graveyard." She relates this to the BaKongo tradition that although there is certainly death, there is also life and rebirth. She wonders if the line, "Graveyard ought to know me" is a reference to the many trips slaves took there burying their friends or family, or whether it might have a deeper meaning, perhaps referring to the slaves' previous journeys to the world of the dead as "seekers."

The Archaeological Potential of Lowcountry African-American Cemeteries

Relatively few African-American cemeteries have been explored archaeologically. There are several reasons for this – many cemeteries dating from the eighteenth or nineteenth century plantations are just never found, others are removed by undertakers without the benefit of archaeological study, and a very few are simply preserved or set aside.

One of the very best studied African-American graveyards in the South Carolina low country was exposed just outside Charleston during the construction of a motel (38CH778). No archaeological survey had been required, so it's uncertain what above ground indications, if any, there might have been. Archaeologists and forensic anthropologists were called in only when the ground was littered with bone, and the remains were excavated for study and reburial. While only 36 skeletons were identified, all dated from about 1840 through 1870.

This study helped confirm some of what is known historically and added much knowledge about African-American diet and disease. The average age at death for males was a young 35 years, while females lived a few years longer, to about 40. There was evidence among both the males and females of severe dietary stress during childhood, especially during the period from about 2 to 4 years old. Anemia was a significant

problem, being found in about 80% of the subadults and over a third of the adults. There were indications of infections in many of the individuals buried at this graveyard. There was likewise clear skeletal evidence of the demanding physical labor these people were forced to undertake. The shoulder and hips were especially affected by degenerative changes. Perhaps most surprisingly, chemical studies also revealed that these African-American slaves were exposed to very high levels of lead in their diet, probably from the ceramics from which they ate (Rathbun 1987).

This cemetery also helped us better understand burial practices among slaves and freedmen shortly after the Civil War. For example, the burials were typically fairly shallow, with none being deeper than perhaps four feet. There was evidence of both coffins and bodies wrapped in shrouds. A large number of coffin hardware items were recovered, including handles, thumbscrews, escutcheons, studs, coffin screws and tacks, and several coffin plates. In fact, at least seven silvered coffin plates were found. Curiously, there is one account of African-American folklore in the Bennett Papers which explains that a "silver coffin-plate with the name of the deceased is believed to confine the spirit of the dead to its proper resting-place to constrain it to remain within the coffin."

Cemeteries are exceptional data sources, even if they are never excavated. There are a number of research issues appropriate to archaeological investigation that do not require destructive techniques. The use of a penetrometer, for example, can often help document the exact location and orientation of graves. Mapping a cemetery to reveal its size, complexity, and nature of above-ground features may provide information on socioeconomic status and social organization. There may be above ground features or artifacts that can provide information on ethnicity and the burial ritual itself. There may also be evidence of previous burials exposed and on the surface if the cemetery has a long history of use. The markers, their materials, and their execution may provide information on trade and business patterns (which may tie into consumer choice studies being conducted using strictly archaeological materials at nearby sites).

Comparison of African-American and Euro-American Cemeteries

Even this brief overview of African-American cemeteries reveals that there are a number of differences between traditional African-American and traditional Euro-American cemeteries. Some of these differences can be traced to different religious beliefs. Some are probably only the by-product of one group being enslaved by the other.

The location of African-American graveyards in marginal areas, for example, was probably the result of blacks being enslaved. Not only did owners not want to lose valuable land to slaves, but controlling even where the dead might be buried was yet another example of the power plantation owners had over their slaves.

The use of plants to mark graves, however, is likely related to African antecedents. Marking the graves was important, regardless of what was used, at least for the current generation. The predominance of temporary items – plants and wood planks, for example – suggests that it wasn't particularly important for future generations to know the location of any specific grave.

In fact, the use of temporary markers helps, in its own way, to ensure that the cemetery is always available to those who want to be buried with their kin. As one modern black man explained, "there is always room for one more person." This, of course, sounds impossible to many whites, who see cemeteries in terms of a finite number of square feet. But this is simply not how African-Americans have traditionally viewed graveyards.

Cynthia Conner, an archaeologist who studied South Carolina low country plantation cemeteries, remarked that the very ideology of black and white graveyards is fundamentally different. In white cemeteries, the:

> idealization of death is paramount. The romanticization of the landscape is intended to create heaven on earth in the cemetery grounds and deny the blunt reality of death. This is initially accomplished through placement [of the white cemetery] in a favorable location. . . . The setting is further enhanced through the simultaneous control of unrestrained natural growth and the use of a few select trees such as live oaks to create a parklike atmosphere. . . . The black cemetery, on the other hand, is not directed toward a parklike environment, or, I believe, the denial of death (Conner 1987).

African-American cemeteries have grave depressions and mounded graves. There is no attempt to make grass grow over the graves or create special vegetation. Trees, typically, are neither encouraged nor discouraged. Cemeteries, as previously mentioned, appear "neglected" or even "abandoned" in contrast to the neat, tidy rows of a white cemetery. The mapping of African-American cemeteries reveals the somewhat random placement of graves.

Old African-American cemeteries are rarely documented. They infrequently appear on maps and almost never are shown on historic plats. It just wasn't important to most plantation owners to show the location of "slave burial grounds." These graveyards, used for generations by tradition, are rarely delineated by deeds or other legal instruments. These cemeteries, however, are often well-known to the rural African-American communities.

History and Oral History at King Cemetery

Stockton (1996) provides a detailed account of the land transactions associated with Encampment Plantation, on which King Cemetery is situated. The plantation initially began as a tract of about 800 acres, and was transferred from James and Archibald Bullock to Abraham Hayne in 1759. Hayne passed the property by his will to William Hayne, who in turn conveyed it to Robert Young Hayne. At some time prior to 1832 the property passed out of the Hayne family to James King, Sr. who owned considerable property in St. Paul's Parish. In 1840 the plantation passed to his son, Major Hawkins S. King. This King owned the property up to the Civil War, with substantial crops of cotton, rice, and subsistence crops being produced by a substantial slave population. By the early 1880s it appears that a number of the King family members were vieing for the plantation, with the result that between 1884 and 1891 there were three forced sales as the family fought over assets. At the final sale the plantation passed from the King family to Elizabeth L. Lucus. At this point the owners of the plantation appear to have focused on rudimentary extraction and plunder – phosphate mining and logging. Lucus sold the planation to Thomas B. Saunders after only three years and he, in turn, began subdividing the tract with the portion containing the King Cemetery being sold to William Ross and Martha Fox in 1898. The property was again stable for the first half of the twentieth century, until 1970 when it passed from the Fox family to William F. Whitfield. The tract continued to be sold, in 1976 passing into the holdings of Westvaco. Curiously, throughout all of these deeds – and the several accompanying plats – the cemetery was never mentioned or indicated. In 1999 Westvaco deeded a 2.32 acre parcel containing King Cemetery to the Greater St. Mark AME Church (Charleston County RMC, Deed Book O320, page 718).

Stockton, from oral history interviews, found that burials were being allowed at the graveyard since at least the time of "Major King." Since the Kings' ownership began to unravel in the postbellum, it seems likely that elderly African Americans are remembering stories passed down to them of Major Hawkins S. King's operation of the plantation during the late antebellum. In the postbellum there are also accounts of funerals proceeding from St. Mark's AME Church, on the south side of US 17, to the cemetery using the farm road, known as Johnson Road, passing through Encampment Plantation. He also reports that "the hand-made caskets containing the remains of the deceased were transported by wagons drawn by horses or mules" (Stockton 1996:83).

Elderly members of the African-American community remember that the cemetery at one time was surrounded by a wire fence, probably to keep cattle and other animals out the cemetery. At least one gate for the cemetery was on its western or southwestern edge, although there may have been another, on the east side, providing access for the Johnson Road. Oral history accounts also focus on vegetation which was in the cemetery, including planted flowers and also large trees – which frequently served as "landmarks" for the burials of different family members.

Summary

The King Cemetery is significant because it embodies so many of the elements of African American mortuary practices and graveyards discussed here. It probably contains slave burials, providing an account of early African American religious beliefs. The graveyard's location – removed from the main house, but likely near the slave settlement – is also characteristic of African American burial spots. So, too, is its invisibility in the historic record, never being mentioned in deeds or other legal instruments. Just as African Americans during this period were marginalized people, so too were their places of final rest. It certainly includes burials from the postbellum and documents the use of grave goods by the Sea Island blacks of this region. It documents a variety of grave marking practices, including the use of permanent markers, the use of plantings, and probably also the use of impermanent markers of wood. In particular, this cemetery clearly reveals the importance of plants and their association with grave plots, not only as items of lasting beauty, but also as lasting – and living – markers. While no shells have been documented at the King Cemetery, it may be that the use of white flowers serves much the same purpose. Moreover, the King Cemetery clearly reveals the importance not of well-marked and permanently identified family plots, but rather of the area – the space. Oral history has kept alive the importance of this space, in spite of the black community's fragmentation and the gradual loss of many cultural practices.

Bibliography

Backus, E.M.
1896 Negro Ghost Stories. *Journal of American Folk-Lore*. 9:228-230.

Bales, Suzanne F.
1992 *American Gardening Series: Bulbs*. Prentice Hall, New York.

Cohen, Hennig
1958 Burial of the Drowned Among the Gullah Negroes. *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 22(1):93-97.

Conner, Cynthia
1987 The Living Ancestor in the Black Burial Place: Black Mortuary Practices on the East Branch of the Cooper River, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Charleston, South Carolina.

Creel, Margaret Washington
1988 *"A Peculiar People" Slave Religion and Community-Culture Among the Gullahs*. New York University Press, New York.

DeForest, John William
1968 *A Union Officer in the Reconstruction*. Archon Books, New York.

Dusinberre, William
1996 *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Gardner, Paul
1986 Appendix F: Analysis of Plant Remains from Lesesne and Fairbanks Plantations (38BK202), Berkeley County, South Carolina. In *Home Upriver: Rural Life on Daniel's Island, Berkeley County, South Carolina*, edited by Martha Zierden, Lesley Drucker, and Jeanne Calhoun, pp. F-1 – F-23, Carolina Archaeological Services and The Charleston Museum, Charleston, South Carolina.

Heyward, Dubose
1929 The Half Pint Flask. Farrar & Rinehart, New York.

Ingersoll, Ernest
1892 Decoration of Negro Graves. *Journal of American Folklore* 5:68-69.

Jones, David C., Christopher T. Espenshade, and Jeffrey Holland
1996 *Cultural Resource Survey and Testing of the Shepperd Tract, Charleston County, South Carolina*. Garrow and Associates, Atlanta.

Kemble, Frances Anne
1984 *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839*.University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Parsons, Elsie Clews
1923 *Folk-Lore of the Sea Islands, South Carolina*. Memoirs 16. American Folk-Lore Society, New York.

Post and Courier (Charleston)
1998 Fiedling Continues Long Family Tradition. January 5, page 2D.

1999 Minority-Owned Business a Study in Contrast, Diversity. February 2, page 16D.

Puckett, Newbell Niles
1926 *Folk Beliefs of the Southern Negro*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Rathbun, Ted A.
1987 Health and Disease at a South Carolina Plantation: 1840-1870. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 74:239-253.

Roediger, David R.
1981 And Die in Dixie: Funerals, Death & Heaven in the Slave Community 1700-1865. *Massachusetts Review* 22:163-183.

Rosengarten, Theodore
1987 *Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

Sobel, Mechal
1979 *Trabelin' On: The Slave Journey to an Afro-Baptist Faith*. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.

Stockton, Robert P.
1996 Encampment and Battlefield Plantations at Pon Pon: An Historical Study. Ms. on file, Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia.

Thompson, Robert Farris
1983 *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy*. Random House, New York.

Trinkley, Michael
1983 Ethnobotanical Analysis of Specimens from Greenfield Plantation, Georgetown County, SC. In *An Archaeological Assessment of the Greenfield Borrow Pit, Georgetown County,* edited by Martha A. Zierden and Jeanne A. Calhoun, pp. 57-69. The Charleston Museum, Charleston, South Carolina.

Trinkley, Michael and Debi Hacker
1997 *Additional Boundary Research at the Kings Cemetery (38CH1590), Charleston County, S.C.* Research Contribution 214. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia.

Trinkley, Michael, Debi Hacker, Sarah Fick
1999 *The African American Cemeteries of Petersburg, Virginia: Continuity and Change*. Research Series 55. Chicora Foundation, Inc., Columbia.

Twining, Mary Arnold
1977 *An Examination of African Retentions in the Folk Culture of the South Carolina and Georgia Sea Islands*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

Vlach, John Michael
1978 *The Afro-American Tradition in Decorative Arts: Catalog of an Exhibition at the Cleveland Museum of Art*. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.

Verbal Boundary Description

The King Cemetery is located about one mile northeast of Parkers Ferry, Charleston County, South Carolina. The cemetery includes one entire tract, owned by the Greater St. Mark AME Church and accounting for 2.32 acres, and a small portion of an adjoining tract, owned by Russ and Lee Pye (dba Justin Enterprises) and accounting for 0.08 acre.

The major portion of the recorded property includes 2.32 acres and the property boundaries are as follows:

> Beginning at an iron pipe marking a common property corner for lands of Justin Enterprises, the County of Charleston, and the herein described parcel, thence with the Justin Enterprises line N52-23-46W 449.25 feet to an iron pipe, thence departing lands of Justin Enterprises, a series of new lines (four calls) N32-49-44E 105.97 feet to a rebar, thence S84-17-13E 174.61 feet to a rebar, thence S71-59-16E 196.49 feet to a rebar, thence S41-24-13E 168.04 feet to a rebar in an old road bed, thence with lands of the County of Charleston S47-27-49W 235.17 feet to the "Point of Beginning." All of which will more fully appear on a plat by G.A. Simmons, P.L.S., and K.A. Mahoney, P.L.S., dated November 30, 1998 [attached to this nomination] (Charleston County RMC, Deed Book O320, page 721).

The portion of the King Cemetery owned by Russ and Lee Pye is situated immediately southwest of the Greater St. Mark AME Church property. It extends southwest from the church property line for 50 feet, forming a rectangle measuring 449.25 feet by 50.0 feet, accounting for 0.52 acres.

The area of burials are plotted on a map initially developed by Jones et al. (1996:Figure 25) with additional burials and other features added by Trinkley and Hacker (1997:Figure 7). This latter map is attached to this nomination.

Verbal Boundary Justification

The more confined area of known graves, accounting for 0.1 acre, is based on intensive archaeological investigations which included pedestrian survey (identifying sunken deposits, markers, and plantings), coring, and penetrometer survey. These efforts are described by Jones et al. (1996) and Trinkley and Hacker (1997).

The cemetery's legal boundaries were struck off by Westvaco to ensure that any outlying burials and any features which might have been associated with the cemetery would be included. The 2.32 acres are essential to ensure that the cemetery retains its landscape, topography, character, and feel – all of which are critically important to the historical significance of the site.

That 0.52 acre portion lying on the property of Russ and Lee Pye (dba Justin Enterprises) contains burials documented through a penetrometer survey and visible evidence of landscape alteration.

Photographs

Location of Original Negatives: Chicora Foundation, Inc.

The following information is the same for all photographs:

Name of Photographer: Michael Trinkley
Chicora Foundation, Inc.

Date of Photographs: February 1997

Photo	View
1	View of undulating topography at the King Cemetery, suggestive of extensive graves. View is to the north.
2	View of the woods between the old field and road on the Pye property. View is to the southeast.
3	Large area of snowflakes on the portion of the cemetery now held by the Greater St. Mark AME Church. One of the four stone monuments is seen in the left center of the photograph. View is to the northeast.
4	Clump of snowflakes mark the location of a grave in the undulating topography of the graveyard. View is to the north.
5	Outline of grave planted in snowflakes, characteristic of African American use of living markers. View is to the west.
6	Debi Hacker (Chicora Foundation), conducting a penetrometer survey in a portion of the King Cemetery. View is to the southwest.

NPS Form 10-900-a
(8-86)

OMB Approval No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _____ Page _____

SUPPLEMENTARY LISTING RECORD

NRIS Reference Number: 00000586 Date Listed: 06/13/00

King Cemetery	Charleston	SC
Property Name	County	State

N/A
Multiple Name

This property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the attached nomination documentation subject to the following exceptions, exclusions, or amendments, notwithstanding the National Park Service certification included in the nomination documentation.

for Signature of the Keeper — Date of Action: 6/13/00

==========

Amended Items in Nomination:

The Areas of Significance has been amended to include:
ARCHEOLOGY: Historic-Non-Aboriginal

Cultural Affiliation is:
African-American

*This amendment has been discussed with the South Carolina SHPO Office.

DISTRIBUTION:
National Register property file
Nominating Authority (without nomination attachment)