NPS Form 10-900
(Rev. 8-86)

OMB No. 1024-0018

**United States Department of the Interior**
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

RECEIVED
OCT 5 1987
NATIONAL REGISTER

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations of eligibility for individual properties or districts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, styles, materials, and areas of significance, enter only the categories and subcategories listed in the instructions. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900a). Type all entries.

## 1. Name of Property

historic name PELHAM MILLS SITE
other names/site number Buena Vista Factory, Hutchings Factory, Lester Factory, 38GR165

## 2. Location

street & number [redacted] XX not for publication
city, town Pelham XX vicinity
state South Carolina code SC county Greenville code SC 045 zip code 29651

## 3. Classification

Ownership of Property
- [ ] private
- [XX] public-local
- [ ] public-State
- [ ] public-Federal

Category of Property
- [ ] building(s)
- [ ] district
- [X] site
- [ ] structure
- [ ] object

Number of Resources within Property

| Contributing | Noncontributing | |
|---|---|---|
| | | buildings |
| 1 | | sites |
| | | structures |
| | | objects |
| 1 | | Total |

Name of related multiple property listing: N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register N/A

## 4. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this [X] 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. [ ] See continuation sheet.

Christie Z. Jones, Deputy SHPO — 9/25/87
Signature of certifying official — Date

South Carolina State Historic Preservation Officer
State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property [ ] meets [ ] does not meet the National Register criteria. [ ] See continuation sheet.

Signature of commenting or other official — Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

## 5. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby, certify that this property is:

- [✓] entered in the National Register. [ ] 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:) _____

John J. Knoerl — 11/19/87
Signature of the Keeper — Date of Action

## 6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (enter categories from instructions)

Industry - Manufacturing facility

Current Functions (enter categories from instructions)

Vacant

## 7. Description

Architectural Classification (enter categories from instructions)

N/A

Materials (enter categories from instructions)

foundation N/A
walls N/A
roof N/A
other N/A

Describe present and historic physical appearance.

**Summary Statement**

The ruins of Pelham Mills and its precedents (38GR165) are the remnants of a cotton factory which operated under several different owners from 1820 to 1935 [redacted] The ruins describe a complex series of stone and brick foundations [redacted] In addition to the foundations, which are both free-standing and incorporated into local landforms (Figs. 1, 2), the site includes the bases of two steam smokestacks and a number of ditches and depressions associated originally with underground pipes, drains, and turbines at the cotton factory; nine brick pilings which supported the water turbine-driven shaft(s) that powered the mill's spinning machinery (Complex C, Fig. 3); the foundation-enclosed turbine area and corner wall of the mill's main powerhouse (Complex C, Fig. 3; Fig. 4); a large, cement slab floor and vat associated with a bleachery/dye plant (between Complexes A and C, Fig. 3; Fig. 5); several small, cement slab floors and a cement coal bin foundation associated with the mill's main steam generator (boiler/turbine)(Complex A, Fig. 3; Fig. 6); a large, mortared stone dam with six sluice gates, spanning the Enoree River (Fig. 7); and a channelized stream (Rocky Field Creek) with stone-reenforced sides (Fig. 3). The mill ruins and associated features are in good condition, as demonstrated by *in situ* remains of the dam and several building foundations and wall remnants.

Physical Description of Pelham Mills Site

The Pelham Mills Site is presently an undeveloped property. Vegetation on-site is immature hardwood overstory and understory; herbaceous growth is vigorous, but was hand-cleared in spring 1987 by the Greenville County Historic Preservation Commission. Site topography is highly varied, with relief ranging from ten to thirty feet; [redacted]

[redacted]

XX See continuation sheet

## 8. Statement of Significance

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:

☐ nationally ☒ statewide ☐ locally

Applicable National Register Criteria ☒ A ☐ B ☐ C ☒ D

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions) ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G

Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions)
Industry
Archeology - Historic - Nonaboriginal

Period of Significance
1820 - 1935

Significant Dates
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
Euro-American
Factory Workers

Significant Person
N/A

Architect/Builder
N/A

State significance of property, and justify criteria, criteria considerations, and areas and periods of significance noted above.

**Summary Statement**

Founded in 1820 as a modest 144-spindle factory operated by an itinerant New England minister, the manufacturing operations at the Pelham Mills Site epitomize the tenacity and deep-rootedness of the textile industry in the South Carolina piedmont, where abundant water and labor resources were concentrated (Dunlap 1983). Associated with an almost uninterrupted span of operation from 1820 to 1935, the cotton factory endured two antebellum episodes of destruction by fire, and three expansion-decline cycles, one during the antebellum period, one spanning the Civil War and late nineteenth century period, and a final one during the early twentieth century.

The archaeological significance of the site of the twentieth century Pelham Mills factory and its nineteenth century precedents is that this resource embodies physical evidence of the birth and growth of the piedmont textile industry, which has been one of the major shapers of South Carolina's present economic, social, demographic, and landscape character. No buildings associated with Greenville District's antebellum textile mills are known to exist; of the six cotton factories established in the district before 1860 (Lander 1969:19), no other site is known to possess the degree of archaeological integrity exhibited by the Pelham Mills Site.

The only other comparable industrial resource, in terms of function, period of use, and location, is the Batesville Factory, [redacted] Greenville County. This site lacks the integrity demonstrated by the Pelham Mills Site, however. Although the Batesville Factory was in existence during the antebellum period, the standing mill building was constructed in the early 1880s, and both this structure and the adjacent grounds have been extensively modified for commercial use.

The archaeological ruins and deposits associated with the Pelham Mills Site (38GR165) offer a detailed, microcosmic view of the physical character of the antebellum and postbellum factory site, as well as documentation of the

☒ See continuation sheet

## 9. Major Bibliographical References


Anonymous
1880 The Cotton Mills of South Carolina: Their Names, Locations, Capacity and History. News and Courier Book Press, Charleston.

Clark Publishing Company
1922 Directory of Southern Textile Mills. Charlotte.
1935 Directory of Southern Textile Mills. Charlotte.

Davison Publishing Company
1919 Directory for Salesmen. New York.

DeLorme, Charles Dubose, Jr.
1963 Development of the Textile Industry in Spartanburg County from 1816 to 1900. M.A. thesis, Department of History, University of South Carolina, Columbia.


[X] See continuation sheet

Previous documentation on file (NPS):
- [ ] preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- [ ] previously listed in the National Register
- [ ] 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
- [ ] Other

Specify repository: South Carolina Department of Archives and History

## 10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property [redacted]

UTM References

A [redacted]

| Zone | Easting | Northing |
|---|---|---|

B | Zone | Easting | Northing |

C | | | |

D | | | |

[ ] See continuation sheet

Verbal Boundary Description

[redacted]

[ ] See continuation sheet

Boundary Justification

[redacted]

[X] See continuation sheet

## 11. Form Prepared By

name/title Lesley Drucker, Senior Archaeologist// Susan Jackson, Project Coordinator
organization Carolina Archaeological Services date June 29, 1987
street & number 537 Harden Street telephone 803/254-3996
city or town Columbia state SC zip code 29205

[redacted]

Nearly all of the ruins at the Pelham Mills Site are associated with buildings and facilities constructed during the middle to late nineteenth century (Lester period), with certain renovations and construction dating to the early twentieth century (Pelham Mills period). The large steam generator and smokestack [redacted] of the mill complex were constructed during the Pelham Mills period, as was a smaller steam generator [redacted] (Fig. 3).

The Lester mill building, [redacted] appears to have been mostly brick, and may have included a wooden structural component (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987); archaeological evidence suggests that its northeast wing had brick partitions. Its roofing material is unknown. The southeast end of the building housed the power transfer gears which ran the mill's spinning machinery and other equipment. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Pelham Mills period), knitting machines were located on the top working floor of the Lester mill building, and a machine shop was located on the bottom working floor. A lower level, used for storage during the twentieth century, occurred at the south end of the building, and a basement (unused) underlay the entire structure. Natural lighting was provided by symmetrically placed windows on all sides of the building.

Smaller wooden buildings associated with a small steam generator and the manual processing of cotton and yarn stood between the Lester and Pelham Mills mill buildings. These structures were probably tar-roofed. Natural light was provided by clerestories and windows. [redacted] a channelized stream, ran under these buildings; water pumped up from the stream was used in the bleachery/dye plant and in the main worker areas for drinking water.

Archaeological investigation of the mill ruins by Carolina Archaeological Services in April 1987 generated a topographical map depicting major natural and cultural features, as well as the location of archaeological tests. Five 1x1 meter units and six 50x50 cm units were dispersed throughout the ruins in order to define structural components and activity areas, and to assess the content, integrity, and temporal association of different areas of the site, [redacted] (Drucker et al. 1987).

The maximum depth of archaeological feature deposits at the Pelham Mills Site is presently unknown. Post-occupational disturbance to surface deposits has been moderate, consisting largely of flooding, wood and brick scavenging, and visitors' displacement of articulated brick and surface rubble. Subsurface disturbance appears to have been minimal. Depending on the topography of the

original ground surface beneath the site rubble, 15 - 40 cm of industrial debris and rubble occur above sterile subsoil. Probing indicates that the builder's trenches, mill foundations, and large depressions situated on the river floodplain extend to greater depths, and that surface depressions deeper than one meter have become backfilled with structural debris.

Artifacts recovered during archaeological testing of the Pelham Mills Site corroborate industrial use of the site from the antebellum period through the early twentieth century. Temporally and functionally diagnostic specimens include cut and wire nails and spikes, window glass, and container glass. Brick and mortar fragments and iron machine parts were also recovered. A construction sequence and activity areas associated with the antebellum through the twentieth century factory complex can be identified on the basis of artifacts, stratigraphy, brick bond patterns, and historical evidence (Drucker et al. 1987).

material, organizational, and geographical changes which occurred as a result of its growth and decline from 1820 - 1935. This archaeological resource can yield scientific and historical information about the physical character, operation, and formation of industrial sites during the period from 1820 - 1935.

**Historic Context**

Historians, most notably Lander (1969), have recognized the importance of antebellum industries as precedent to the modern textile industry in South Carolina. In his examination of the state's textile history, Dunlap (1983) recognizes four stages of development: the Antebellum period (until 1860), the Civil War and Reconstruction period (1860 - 1879), the Cotton Mill Boom (1880 - 1920), and the Modern period (1920 to the present). The factory established at the Pelham Mills Site represents all of these developmental periods. The continuity and changes which occurred in the mill's operation -- from its establishment as possibly the earliest element of Greenville District's textile economy to its demise during the Great Depression of the 1930s -- identify its historic context as one with clear temporal and thematic elements.

After the American Revolution, newly invented European machinery began to arrive in American ports, making early mills powered by tidewater or mules and staffed by black slaves or white apprentices obsolete (Lander 1969:9). Cotton manufacturing soon shifted its focus from the lowcountry to the piedmont, since this region possessed an abundant source of reliable water power in its rivers and streams. Greenville District (later Greenville County) was one of the piedmont areas where large quantities of water power could be harnessed. Its attractiveness drew a large number of factory operators and workers, who established the pattern of dams and textile villages which came to characterize the historical landscape of this region.

**Manufacturing History of Pelham Mills Site**

What is thought to have been the first cotton factory in Greenville District was established [redacted] by the Reverend Thomas Hutchings. Primarily known during the nineteenth century as the Buena Vista factory, this cotton mill was also called the Hutchings Factory and later, the Lester Factory, and was associated with the establishment and growth of the Town of Buena Vista (now Pelham), South Carolina. After 1880, the factory was known as Pelham Mills.

Rev. Hutchings immigrated to South Carolina in 1816 from Rhode Island as one of a small group of men who sought to establish a cotton factory in Spartanburg District (Lander 1969:13-15). Like other members of this group, Hutchings soon left the Spartanburg factory to establish his own mills in Greenville District. In 1820 he purchased 307 acres [redacted] from Charles Dean (Greenville County Deed Bk. L. pp. 119-120), and within two months was operating a small factory.

Although Hutchings' tenure at the Buena Vista factory was short-lived, it was a successful operation, which initially housed a 144-spindle cotton mill [redacted]. Establishment of a second mill building at the site soon followed, with Hutchings obtaining a mortgage in 1821 to secure funds for the purchase of machinery (Lander 1969:16-17). A New Englander himself, Hutchings no doubt modeled his early Buena Vista cotton factory after the early New England textile factories. The mill buildings were probably built of wood on mortared stone foundations. After the larger of these two buildings burned in the 1820s, Hutchings rebuilt on the same site and continued to operate the Buena Vista factory for a few years.

In 1827, however, Hutchings was forced to sell his property to Philip C. Lester, who, along with Josiah Kilgore, had probably helped finance the rebuilding of the factory (Greenville County Deed Bk. Q, pp. 268-269; Lander 1969:17; Ward 1984:119). Lester and Kilgore became partners in the Buena Vista factory after Lester's purchase, and expanded its operation until 1853 (Lander 1969:77-78). By 1850 their investment in the real and personal estate of the Buena Vista factory was worth $20,000. In that year the mill employed five men and 20 women, who produced $12,000 worth of cotton yarn (Manufacturer's Schedule 1850:608).

Shortly thereafter, in 1853, the Buena Vista factory burned again. The fire caused the uninsured partners to suffer a loss of $12,000 in structures and machinery (Lander 1969:78). In 1853, Lester bought out Kilgore's half-interest, rebuilt the burnt structures, and installed about 500 spindles (Greenville County Deed Bk. Y, p. 278; Lander 1969:78; Ward 1984:120). Lester's sons, W. F., Archibald, and George, joined him as owners of the Buena Vista factory after the dissolution of the Lester-Kilgore partnership. At that time, the factory included a water-powered mill for the spinning of cotton yarn, along with wood-carding equipment (Greenville County Deed Bk. Y, pp. 661-665). It is likely that large-scale brick construction [redacted] factory began between 1850 and 1860; by 1855 Lester was carrying fire insurance on his manufacturing operations (Athenaeum Fire Insurance Company 1855).

It appears that the village of Buena Vista, a mill town including houses for factory workers, was in existence by 1860 (Greenville County Deed Bk. Y, pp. 661-665). The remnants of this village are incorporated today in the Town of Pelham, [redacted]

In 1860 the Buena Vista factory processed 90,000 pounds of cotton worth $10,000 into yarn worth $16,020. Three men and 14 women were employed to operate the 526 water-powered spindles. Also by 1860, a paper mill had been added to Lester & Sons' holdings (Manufacturer's Schedule 1860:599), either at the Buena Vista cotton factory (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987) or at another factory [redacted] (Ward 1984:119). This operation may have ceased after sale of the Lester holdings, and was only a memory by 1929 (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987).

The Lester firm, which became Lester & Brothers after Philip Lester's death, continued to expand its Buena Vista factory during the 1860s, despite the onslaught of the Civil War. No doubt because it served a desperate need for Confederate yarn, the mill employed 30 persons and operated 840 spindles by 1867. Despite the war's end, anticipation of doubled capacity by 1868 (Kohn 1907:19) appears to have been realized, and by 1870 the factory employed 57 women and men, and operated 1,500 spindles and an unspecified number of frames. Lester & Brothers was equally successful in its other manufacturing operations in Greenville County, including the gristmill, sawmill, blacksmithy and cotton gin (Manufacturer's Schedule 1870:1).

Although the Buena Vista factory prospered and expanded between 1830 and 1870, Lester & Brothers apparently did not invest sufficient capital to modernize its outmoded machinery. For this reason more than any other, the Buena Vista factory declared bankruptcy in 1880 (Anon. 1880:12):

> This factory, while like the Batesville, acquired considerable prominence during the war, is now under the cloud of a lawsuit and is not running. [redacted] Its capacity is 2,000 spindles and 40 looms. The machinery is all old fashioned, and the building itself is somewhat dilapidated. It is nevertheless a valuable piece of property. By a recent decree of the Court the portion of the property in Greenville County has been ordered to be sold shortly, and the portion in Spartanburg County is still in possession of the creditors of Lester & Bobo, the former owners. The water power under control is estimated at 100-horse power, and the entire property includes 600 acres of land. If purchased by the right sort of man, the property can be made very valuable and profitable.

In fact, the Lester factory was not unlike several others in the Greenville area which failed between 1880 and 1885. As a result of rapid advances in cotton manufacturing equipment and processes, the older factories faced stiff competition from large new establishments. Between 1880 and 1895, the number of spindles operating in South Carolina increased seven-fold (95,938 in 1880 to 775,224 in 1895), but Greenville County's share of the industry fell from 31.7% to less than 10% (Petty 1943:92).

The real property of Lester & Brothers was sold in 1880 at public auction for $13,400 to the Pelham Manufacturing Company. This sale encompassed

303 acres of land, upon which all of the existing mill buildings (housing spindles, looms, and other machinery), gristmill, and the former home of Philip C. Lester were located (Greenville County Deed Bk. KK, pp. 579-583). Pelham Manufacturing Company, headed by New York banker Arthur Barnwell, was a prosperous and influential operation. In the same year that the company purchased the Buena Vista factory, the name of the mill village was officially changed from Buena Vista to Pelham (Williams 1979), and by 1882 the factory was known as "Pelham Factory at Lester's Bridge" (Kyzer 1882).

In 1882 Pelham Manufacturing Company incorporated its Greenville County operation under the name "The Pelham Mills" (Statutes of South Carolina 1883:24). In that year, the mill employed 60 persons and operated 2,032 spindles (State Board of Agriculture 1883:581-583), or slightly more than the Lester & Brothers factory at its zenith around 1870. The corporation existed (Statutes of South Carolina 1883:24) for the purpose of:

> manufacturing, spinning, dyeing, printing, and finishing and selling all goods of every description or kind made of wool or cotton, or which wool or cotton or other fibrous articles may form a part, and any other articles of any nature or kind whatsoever which they may from time to time desire, and for grinding or milling wheat, corn and other grains, sawing lumber and selling merchandise and for producing and making all machinery, tools and implements necessary to or used for such purposes, and may erect such mills, buildings, gins, machine shops, stores, dwellings and other works as may be required or be necessary to carry out such branches of manufacture and business.

Despite construction of a large, mortared stone dam between 1880 and 1890 to better control the river flow (Jon Ward, personal communication 1987; Ola Greer, personal communication 1987), Pelham Mills was damaged by flooding in 1890. Shortly after this flood, the mill office was moved to its present [redacted] (not included in nominated property).

By 1895, the company had expanded, employing 250 workers and operating 10,000 spindles (DeLorme 1963:90-91; S. C. Department of Archives and History 1982). A large increase in production between 1882 and 1895 indicates that major expansion of the physical plant occurred during this period, including construction of a new mill building [redacted]. In 1896 the factory complex

included three major building areas. Comparison of the size, orientation, and relative location of these structures suggests that they included the old Buena Vista mill, a new mill building, and a large warehouse [redacted] (S. C. Department of Archives and History 1896). The sites of the new mill building and warehouse have been obliterated [redacted]

By 1907, after 20 years of steady growth, Pelham Mills was operating 10,752 spindles for the production of cotton yarn and twine. The mill village housed 500 persons (Kohn 1907:88, 94, 109), and the factory employed 300 workers, including three children under the age of 12. It is interesting to note that although the company school provided six grades of education and many children entered the textile work force upon completing grade school, children younger than 12, particularly those with siblings already employed in the mills, were often allowed to work in the factory. In these cases, grade school education ended as early as the third grade (Ola Greer, personal communication 1987).

In 1906-1907, Pelham Mills posted an annual payroll of $50,000 (Kohn 1907:182, 190). During that year, 4,359 bales of cotton were processed to produce yarn valued at $329,850.42. The mill continued to produce yarn, twine, and knitted goods (primarily cotton socks and stockings) throughout the remainder of its operation (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987).

In order to streamline its operation and compete with newer mills in the state, Pelham Mills supplemented its water-powered machinery with steam power; this conversion was in place at least by 1919 (Davison Publishing Company 1919:303). As expansion in yarn production slowed after 1907, the company added a dyeing operation (1919). In 1922 the number of spindles in operation dropped significantly (10,752 in 1919 to 10,156 in 1922), but the dyeing plant remained in operation. Capital stock invested in the company ($400,000) in 1922 was only slightly greater than that posted in 1907 (Clark Publishing Company 1922:164).

By 1935 production of cotton yarn, rope, twine, and knitted goods had again increased to 11,112 spindles, and capital stock had risen to $500,000. The factory was powered by steam and water until it ceased operations later that year (Clark Publishing Company 1935:188). The mill was vacated between 1936 and 1940, after its machinery was reduced and sold for scrap to a metal salvage company. During this period, residential lots in the Pelham Mills village were offered for sale, first to the mill workers, and then to the general public (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987; Greenville County Plat Bk. M, p. 58-59).

In the early 1940s, an accidental fire in one of the factory buildings destroyed the entire mill complex for the third and last time (Jon Ward, personal communication 1987). Although all the machinery had been removed by that time, the fire destroyed a number of cotton bales and packages of

knit goods which were stored in the warehouse (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987).

In 1979, the mill property was purchased by U. S. Shelter Corporation, which recently deeded 6.8 acres containing the Pelham Mills ruins to the Greenville County Historic Preservation Commission (Henry Robertson, personal communication 1987).

Archaeological Synthesis

Through limited archaeological testing, the archaeological deposits and structural ruins at the Pelham Mills Site (38GR165) have yielded information concerning the temporal and functional contexts of the factory's operations, as well as certain aspects of its construction sequence and activity areas (Drucker et al. 1987).

The archaeological deposits associated with the Pelham Mills Site provide specific documentation of the industrial activities which characterized its operation. These include the generation of water power, steam power, and electricity; the use of mechanized equipment; the piping of water under and into various buildings; and the use of windows and light wells in building facades. Numerous structures and interior rooms, as well as industrial features, can be identified archaeologically.

Architectural items such as nails, brick/mortar, stone, and window glass comprise the bulk of the artifacts recovered from the Pelham Mills Site. A large quantity of cut and wire nails were recovered as a result of archaeological testing; these machine-made, machine-headed nails are typical of flooring and roofing nails used during the middle and late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Nelson 1968). Their variably burnt condition and occurrence in shallow archaeological deposits containing ash and charred materials probably reflects the final collapse of building interiors, rather than earlier episodes of fire at the Lester period factory.

Over one-half of the total nail assemblage from 38GR165 is machine-cut, and probably represents the extended period of nineteenth century mill operation, rebuilding, and expansion. In terms of archaeologically defined areas, the highest percentage of wire nails occurs at Complex A (Excavation Units 1 and 2, 83%)(Fig. 3), while only one-third of the nails from Complex C are wire (Excavation Units 3, 4, and 5, 33.9%)(Fig. 3). This suggests that more twentieth century construction and renovation of wooden floors, lathing, and perhaps window frames occurred at the northwest end of the Lester mill building than at the southeast end. Given the probable nature of maintenance-oriented activities at the southeast (gearshaft and gear room areas) end of the building, repair/modification of processing areas would not be surprising.

In particular, Excavation Unit 4, located inside the central stone foundation of Complex C (Fig. 3), exhibits a high cut nail ratio, probably as a result of the collapse of burned floorboards which were laid during the middle nineteenth century (Lester period). Excavation Unit 3, located outside a foundation, yielded a single cut nail along with three indeterminate nail fragments; these materials are probably associated with the construction of flooring atop Foundation 3 during the early Pelham Mills period, i.e., prior to 1890. These artifact interpretations dovetail with the interpretation of construction sequences at Complex C derived from comparison of brick bond patterns (Drucker et al. 1987:36-37).

The lowest apparent percentage of wire nails (23.3%) was recovered from Complex B (Fig. 3); however, this may reflect the fact that many of these contexts comprised nearly solid brick rubble fill, in which wood was not present. On the other hand, twentieth century documentation suggests that Complex B may have contained relatively little pre-1880 construction and therefore should produce mostly wire nails. More clarity concerning the construction sequence in this area can only be derived from further archaeological investigation.

Although the limited scope and results of preliminary archaeological testing of the Pelham Mills Site allow only tentative conclusions, the artifact frequency distributions suggest that renovation of many areas of the Lester period mill complex occurred after 1882, particularly at Complex A. It is interesting to note that wire nails, which began to replace cut nails in common usage by the 1880s (Nelson 1968), predominate at Complex A, echoing the dilapidation of these buildings described in 1880 (Anon. 1880:12). The wooden elements of the north end of the Lester mill, such as walls, floors, window frames, and possibly roof, appear to have needed renovation and repair by the new owners.

Information derived from analysis of window glass is equally interesting, though probably biased somewhat by the small sample recovered. Since ventilation and sources of light at a cotton factory were important elements of architectural design, archaeological evidence of windows and light wells is not surprising. Several late nineteenth and early twentieth century episodes of paned glass breakage and replacement are represented at the site, probably reflecting major renovation and repairs. Analysis revealed that the earliest window glass recovered from 38GR165 occurred in the vicinity of the steam generator at Complex A (Excavation Unit 1, Fig. 3). Based on glass thickness, these windows were probably manufactured during the period 1870-1890 (Orser et al. 1982; Trinkley and Caballero 1983).

The most extensive use of window glass appears to have occurred at the north end of the Lester mill (Excavation Unit 2, Fig. 3) during the period 1903 - 1920. This building apparently contained numerous windows on

each of its four stories. In fact major renovation of the northwest end of the Lester mill after 1890 is suggested by the distribution of nails and glass, the mortar reenforcement of stone foundations, the addition of brick foundations atop stone foundations, and structural additions.

Abundant evidence of the fire which destroyed Pelham Mills in the early 1940s occurs in the archaeological record (primarily Complexes B and C) in the form of charred materials, fused glass, slag, small bits of twisted metal, and charcoal. While large quantities of brick rubble (collapsed foundations) remain at the site, most was salvaged by local residents, who used it for domestic construction (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987). Both main mill buildings probably had substantial wood structural members, such as thick floor sills, heart pine floorboards, large vertical posts between floors, framing for machinery and equipment, and wood siding; however, little salvageable wood survived the fire (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987). The mill machinery had already been removed from the buildings by the time they burned; consequently, few large metal artifacts, other than pipes and a turbine casing, can be observed archaeologically.

**Archaeological Research Questions**

The subsurface deposits and surface distribution of the mill's physical remnants, including interior elements, retain sufficient integrity for a detailed examination of the antebellum and postbellum construction and arrangement of industrial foundations, power generating mechanisms, subsurface drainage systems, and operations which characterized this small cotton factory. Documentation of the nature and durability of materials used for over 100 years of nearly continuous industrial operation (e.g., foundations and supports, building interiors, building facades, power generation, and fiber production/processing) at the Pelham Mills Site can be gained by large-scale exposure of archaeological deposits and excavation of specific foundation areas.

Thus, the site's archaeological potential for addressing questions of nineteenth century changes in physical form, layout and growth of the physical plant, continuity in the use of construction materials, and plant operation during the late nineteenth/early twentieth centuries is substantial. This is underscored by the fact that historical documentation of engineering plans, material inventories, and day-to-day operations at early cotton mills is almost nonexistent, and does not appear to exist at all for Pelham Mills. The archaeological remnants of the site therefore assume particular significance as a source of empirical data concerning the physical aspects of nineteenth century and early twentieth century textile operations in the South Carolina piedmont.

Topics which may be addressed using archaeological data from the Pelham Mills Site include:

A. Examination of the character and physical layout of the earliest, antebellum factories (Hutchings period, 1820-1827; early Lester period, 1827-1853). Limited archaeological testing has revealed what is thought to be an antebellum foundation associated with the nineteenth century (Lester) mill building at Complexes A and C (Fig. 3); its direct association with the Hutchings and/or Lester periods of ownership has not been established (Drucker et al. 1987).

B. Functional identification of late nineteenth and early twentieth century work areas, buildings, and/or rooms within the Pelham Mills complex (late Lester period, 1853-1880; Pelham Mills period, 1880-1935). The archaeological testing so far conducted at the site has identified the location, orientation, and probable extent of the Lester mill building; the water-driven powerhouse; the turbine-driven machinery rooms of the Lester mill building; at least one structural addition on the northeast side of the Lester mill building; a dye plant/bleachery; two steam generators; and coal bins (Fig. 3). Further information about the operation and by-products of these activity areas may be determinable through more detailed study of the ruins and the associated archaeological deposits formed as a result of destruction of the building interiors by fire.

C. Dunlap (1983) indicates that early piedmont cotton factories provided local services, in addition to employment, by operating facilities such as sawmills, blacksmithies, and gristmills. As textile villages grew, these local industries retained their importance to the local populace. Historical documentation indicates that a sawmill, blacksmithy, gristmill, and cotton gin were established on the Enoree River by the Lester family, in addition to the Buena Vista cotton factory (38GR165), as early as 1854. These services continued in operation at least until the 1880s, after Pelham Manufacturing Company purchased the Lester property (Manufacturers Schedules 1850, 1860, 1870; Statutes of South Carolina 1883). The Lester gristmill [redacted] (Greenville County Deed Bk. Y, pp. 663-664). It is not clear where the Lester Brothers' cotton gin, sawmill, blacksmithy, or a late nineteenth century paper mill were located. There is some evidence that they were located at the Pelham Mills Site (Denny Grubbs, personal communication 1987; Manufacturers Schedules 1850, 1860, 1870). Archaeological testing within and adjacent to the existing ruins may shed further light on the form and nature of diversification at nineteenth century industrial sites [redacted]

Drucker, Lesley M., Susan H. Jackson, and Debra K. Martin
1987 Historical Documentation and Archaeological Inventory of the Pelham Mills Site (38GR165), Greenville County, South Carolina.

Dunlap, James A.
1983 Historical Overview. In Survey Report for Textile Mill Survey. Ms. on file, S. C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

Greenville County Clerk of Court
1820 Deed Book L, pp. 119-120. Greenville.
1828 Deed Book Q, pp. 268-269. Greenville.
1853 Deed Book Y, p. 278. Greenville.
1859 Deed Book Y, pp. 661-665. Greenville.
1880 Deed Book KK, pp. 579-583. Greenville.
1939 Plat Book M, p. 58-59. Greenville.

Kohn, August
1907 The Cotton Mills of South Carolina. News and Courier Press, Charleston.

Kyzer, Paul B.
1882 Full Descriptive Map and Sketch of Greenville County. South Caroliniana Library, Columbia.

Lander, Ernest McPherson, Jr.
1969 The Textile Industry in Antebellum South Carolina. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge.

Manufacturers Schedule
1850 Greenville County, Butler Township. S. C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.
1860 Greenville County, Butler Township. S. C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.
1870 Greenville County, Butler Township. S. C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

Nelson, Lee H.
1968 Nail Chronology as an Aid to Dating Old Buildings. Leaflet 48, History News 24(11). American Association for State and Local History, Washington, D.C.

Orser, Charles E., Jr., Annette M. Nekola, and James L. Roark
1982 Exploring the Rustic Life: Multidisciplinary Research at Millwood Plantation, a Large Piedmont Plantation in Abbeville County, South Carolina and Elbert County, Georgia. Mid-American Research Center, Loyola University of Chicago. Submitted to National Park Service, Atlanta.

Petty, Julian J.
1943 The Growth and Distribution of Population in South Carolina. Bulletin 10, State Council for Defenses. Industrial Division Committee, Columbia.

South Carolina Department of Archives and History
1896 Plat of Survey of Greenville-Spartanburg County Line. Columbia.
1982 Nomination/Inventory Form, National Register of Historic Places - Arthur Barnwell House. Ms. on file.

State Board of Agriculture
1883 South Carolina: Resources and Population, Institutions and Industries. Walker, Evans & Cogswell, Charleston.

State Grants
1798 Volume 44, p. 349. S. C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

State Plats
1798 Columbia Series, Volume 37, p. 161. S. C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

Statutes of South Carolina
1883 Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, Passed at the Regular Session of 1882. Charles A. Calvo, Jr., Columbia.

Trinkley, Michael B. and Olga M. Caballero
1983 Additional Archaeological, Historical and Architectural Evaluation of 38HR127 and 38HR131, Horry County, South Carolina. S. C. Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Columbia.

Ward, Mrs. David
1984 William Bates and the Batesville Community. Proceedings and Papers of the Greenville County Historical Society, 1979-1983 7:118-124. Greenville County Public Library, Greenville.