

The Effingham Manor Slave Quarter, Prince William County, Virginia

Douglas W. Sanford, Virginia Slave Housing Project

June 2019

Introduction

On June 6th and 12th, 2019 Douglas W. Sanford and Juliet W. Sanford, affiliated with the Virginia Slave Housing Project, recorded the slave quarter at Effingham Manor and Winery near Nokesville in Prince William County, Virginia. Documentation methods included (1) a standardized, architectural survey form; (2) field notes; (3) a set of digital color photographs; and, (4) measurements for a plan drawing of the building's ground floor. Copies of these materials are being provided to Effingham's owner and staff.

The following report provides a summary description of the Effingham quarter, while placing the structure in a broader historical and cultural context, including that for Virginia slave housing in general. I bring to bear available background information and historical evidence to the building's interpretation, especially since the quarter was modified to a significant degree in the modern era, during and after the mid-1950s. Readers should refer to the survey form and field notes for more complete architectural descriptions of the quarter and its current appearance.

The Effingham Slave Quarter

This outbuilding on the former Effingham plantation property consists of a one-story frame structure with a garret space beneath the gable roof. It rests on a field stone foundation and similarly has an exterior stone chimney at each gable end. The quarter measures about 16 feet wide (east-west) and 32 feet long (north-south). With respect to a slave housing format, the building represents what was known as a "double quarter" or duplex, in that it originally had two rooms on the interior ground floor, with each room intended for a separate slave household (see discussion of duplexes below) and having its own fireplace.

Original, hand-hewn timbers remain in place on the quarter's gable end walls, namely the girts on either side of the chimneys, and then posts at the chimneys' sides, which are joined and pegged to the girts. Similarly, hewn sills are visible atop the foundation at the quarter's exterior, southeast corner. Based on the building's traditional timber framing and the presence of machine-cut nails, the duplex likely was constructed in the 1820s.

Modern alterations to the building included the removal and replacement of the roof framing, the removal and replacement of the flooring and wall finish on the ground floor, and the removal and replacement of the exterior siding. More recently, vinyl siding served to cover the replacement siding of the 1950s and all windows were repaired, incorporating vinyl sash. Thankfully, a series of post-1933 Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) black-and-white photographs offer clues to the quarter's historic appearance, although only on the exterior. For example, modern asphalt shingles currently cover the roof, while in the early 20th century it had wood shingles, probably a replacement for earlier generations of such shingles. Similarly, the photographs reveal that at that time, the building had an exterior siding of horizontal clapboards.

Marking clear evidence for the building's duplex format, the Effingham outbuilding originally had two exterior doors on the front (west) façade, one for each room, whereas today only one door exists. For unknown reasons at present, the southern door on the west wall had a lower height in relation to the northern door. The northern door's lintel is at the same height as the windows to either side. In addition, the southern window on the west wall had vertical wooden bars. Such barred windows are relatively rare for Virginia slave quarters in the antebellum period, but a documented example exists on a surviving duplex in Pittsylvania County (Windsor Farm) wherein interior wooden shutters supplemented the window's vertical bars.

While we only can speculate as to the building's interior arrangements, the Effingham quarter's typical duplex qualities allow a reasonable degree of confidence. The first floor would have had a central interior partition of frame construction situated between the two exterior doors. This partition divided the two rooms and prevented direct communication between the enslaved households. The quarter would have had two sets of stairs, one for each room, allowing access to the garret. Thus, the garret space probably had a central partition as well, resulting in two unheated rooms upstairs, used for sleeping and additional storage. There is insufficient evidence surviving within the quarter's interior to know the exact location and format of the stairs. Still, common arrangements included open ladder-type stairs or enclosed corner staircases placed either along the central partition or in a corner to one side of the chimney.

Following arrangements observed at other Virginia duplexes, the two front wall windows of the Effingham quarter align with the two windows on the rear (east) wall, which along with other building elements demonstrate a purposeful, symmetrical design. Finally, this duplex's dimensions parallel the most common size for surviving double quarters in Virginia, 16 by 32 feet, which encompassed 512 square feet.

Effingham Property Ownership

The following brief and selective summary of Effingham's ownership over time largely derives from the Effingham Manor and Winery's website and the National Register nomination form completed by Frazier Associates of Staunton, VA in August 1988. The property became listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register in December 1988 and then was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in November 1989.

The main house's construction occurred in the late 18th century, ca. 1777, in association with the property owner, William Alexander, who died in 1814. Architectural evidence suggests the building was expanded over time, likely by a later owner, perhaps Lawrence Gibbons Alexander, William's youngest son, who received his father's estate. In its final form, Effingham stood as a two-story frame, double pile, central passage house with a raised brick basement. Each gable end has two exterior brick chimneys, connected by an enclosed pent. Lawrence Alexander lost the property in 1828 by defaulting on debts. The next owner, William Foote died soon after acquiring Effingham and his heirs conveyed the property to Allen Howison in 1833. Howison remained the property owner during the U.S. Census of 1860, with evidence from this source discussed below. Howison died in April of 1876.

During the suspected period of the manor house's expansion, the owner probably undertook other property improvements, including the construction of additional outbuildings, such as the surviving duplex. By the time of 1930s HABS photographs the property as a whole and its various structures had fallen into disrepair, suffering from neglect and lack of maintenance. Consequently, the 1955 owners of Effingham, Dr. Engh and his wife, carried out substantial alterations to a seriously deteriorated stock of buildings. In the process the Engh's demolished a number of outbuildings, while the surviving duplex quarter was highly modified to reach a state of usefulness, namely as a guesthouse.

Slave Housing within the Main House Complex at Effingham

Available documentation, especially the 1930s HABS photographs, point to Effingham as having three slave quarters close to the mansion house. As a typical plantation complex, that at Effingham incorporated the main house; a smokehouse, a well house and other small outbuildings; and, a frame kitchen. Additional structures included the frame slave quarters and at a greater distance to the west, a stone blacksmith's shop.

The building closest to the main house on the south side, likely a detached kitchen-quarter, has an interior, slightly off-center chimney. In the HABS photographs this outbuilding has a gable roof covered with wood shingles. A door on the rear wall (away from the house) apparently served to access a work yard and/or garden space, shown as fenced. The central chimney provided fireplaces for the kitchen to one side, and then a heated quarter to the other side. With its large garret, the kitchen-quarter building easily could have accommodated two rooms upstairs for enslaved African Americans.

The next building to the south is another one-story frame structure with a garret. Based on its two exterior doors, it likely functioned as another duplex, with two rooms downstairs and two rooms upstairs in the garret. The upper stack for the quarter's interior central chimney appears to have collapsed or been removed down to the roofline. Somewhat unusual is the lack of windows on the front (west) wall. Another door was added on the south gable end, near the building's southwest corner, presumably to access the fenced in yard between this building and the surviving quarter.

To the south of the surviving quarter is one more frame outbuilding, which has a gable roof and a large (wide) stone chimney at the north gable end. This one-story with garret structure has a central exterior door and two windows on the west (front) façade. The roof rafters largely are exposed, but had been covered earlier with tarpaper, likely a temporary repair after the removal of the roof's former wooden shingles. The front door is offset slightly to the north and the nearby window is smaller than the window to the south, suggesting that the northern room differed in function and size in comparison to the southern room. Hence, the building may have had a heated workspace in the north room, such as for a laundry, while the southern room represented an unheated quarter. Interior stairs would have allowed occupants to reach probably two rooms upstairs, serving as additional quartering spaces for slaves.

The Historic and Cultural Context for Duplexes within Virginia Slave Housing

On larger plantations, owners frequently utilized what were known as double quarters closer to the main house. These buildings, referred to as duplexes by architectural historians, combined two slave households within a single structure, signaled by the presence of separate exterior doors for the two rooms on the ground floor and the lack of interior communication between these spaces. Duplexes tended to have a centrally placed chimney that provided a fireplace for each of the two rooms, but a common alternative entailed the use of end chimneys, either on the interior or exterior side of the gable end walls. Another duplex variation was to combine the use of end chimneys with a single exterior door leading to a central passage that had interior doors for the first story rooms and a set of stairs to access the rooms in a garret or second story. The Effingham duplex has exterior end chimneys and originally, featured two exterior doors situated close to the building's center. Duplexes had solid medial walls, whether of masonry, log, or frame construction, with the latter material comprising the Effingham quarter's central partition. Each room of this duplex would have had its own stairway by which the enslaved occupants reached the garret rooms above, which also were divided by a central wooden partition. The latter rooms typically served as spaces for sleeping and storage.

In most cases, duplexes represented larger and better-built outbuildings, often of frame or masonry construction. At times, these slave quarters had exterior elements of architectural styling in keeping with that of the main house, as the owner perceived the structures to be part of the formal architectural complex at the plantation's core. Both the multiple slave quarters near the main house at Effingham and other outbuildings within the plantation core depended on the same frame construction as the main house. The placement of these slave houses and the likely kitchen-quarter in an aligned north-south fashion to the south of the mansion house, demonstrates the estate's planned design and the owner's desire to have slave labor near at hand.

Measurements for duplexes in Virginia underscore a familiar and shared model for plantation slave quarters, one discussed in agricultural journals by large-scale property owners in the early national and antebellum periods. Many duplexes exhibited a two to one ratio of dimensions (length versus width), centering on buildings 32 feet long and 16 feet wide, as seen at Effingham, with these structures having 512 square feet on the ground floor.

Within the duplexes of the main house complex, plantation owners frequently placed enslaved African Americans who worked as domestic servants or in skilled trades. Plantation masters determined the number and composition of the slave households that lived in their cabins and quarters. Such groupings could be family based, but often represented a mixture of genders and ages that the owner found useful and convenient for the work at hand. Research of census data for antebellum Virginia indicates that owners typically placed three to six

enslaved African Americans within each room of such quarters. Hence, the Effingham duplex may have housed between six and 12 slaves.

Starting in the late 18th century and continuing into the antebellum period, upper class plantation owners converted to what became known as “improved” slave housing for structures within the main house complex. In contrast to the earlier reliance on small log cabins with dirt floors and wood-and-mud chimneys, upscale owners purposely shifted to better built structures, either those of masonry construction or frame quarters with brick chimneys and raised wooden floors that were set on masonry foundations or piers. Improved slave buildings also incorporated larger and more windows, reflecting owners’ decisions to have better lighting and air circulation. Sizeable glass windows partly signaled the greater availability and lower cost of machine-produced window glass in the antebellum period, but also a means to maintain slaves’ health and hence, work productivity.

The Effingham duplex meets several of the defining qualities of improved slave housing found on Virginia’s larger plantations: its frame construction; its symmetrical design; the investment in a stone foundation and stone chimneys; the presence of a raised wooden floor for the downstairs rooms; and, its relatively large windows. These qualities also fit a building considered a contributing part of the formal mansion complex and landscape. Based on the evidence at hand, the Effingham plantation complex contained two duplexes and then two buildings that combined slave housing with another function, namely the kitchen-quarter and a possible laundry-quarter.

Effingham Slavery and Slave Housing via the 1860 U.S. Census

As did previous U.S. census efforts, that for 1860 recorded standardized information related to both free and enslaved individual Americans. Schedule 1 of the census provided data on “Free Inhabitants,” both white and of color (such as free blacks), while Schedule 2 gathered the names of white owners and employers of enslaved African Americans, but also a range of information on the slaves themselves. Data categories included: the number of slaves per owner or employer, their ages and sex (male or female); whether a slave was black or mulatto (based on (skin) “Color”); and, if a slave had physical or mental disabilities, such as being blind, “deaf and dumb”, and “insane, or idiotic”.

In addition, census marshals were required to ascertain if slaves were either “Fugitive from the State” (runaways) or “Manumitted,” that is, legally freed by their owner. Finally, and in contrast to previous U.S. censuses, the 1860 census instructions directed that marshals determine the number of slave houses per owner or employer. While not all marshals recorded slave houses consistently or in the same manner, the gathered data do allow estimates of the housing stock in Virginia counties and cities, and within limits, the size and composition of enslaved households.

In the 1860 census for Prince William County, Allen Howison, as the owner of Effingham and the property’s household head, was listed in Schedule 2 as having 34 slaves and six slave houses. Howison ranked as the fifth largest slaveholder in the County and his six quarters had him tied for second place in relation to the largest owners of slave houses. In Schedule 1, Howison, age 62, clearly stands apart a wealthy individual, with his occupation listed as a “Farmer.” In the 18th century, Howison would have been considered a planter, indicating the plantation scale of his agricultural operations and his significant land and slave holdings. Further reinforcing his upper-class standing are his real estate value of \$28,000 and his personal estate of \$45,800, with much of the latter sum explained by his numerous enslaved African Americans. Howison’s wealth was in keeping with the County’s other plantation owners, whereas most other white households had values in real and personal estate totaling from under \$100 to a few hundred dollars.

Howison’s white household consisted of his daughter Harriet E. Howison, age 24; Harriet W. Beedle, age 65 (who had \$2,000 in real estate and \$5,130 in personal estate); and Thomas C. Roach, age 64 and whose occupation was listed as a weaver, with \$100 in real estate and \$10 in personal estate. The afore-mentioned National Register nomination for Effingham references a former weaving house with a corner chimney that

stood in the yard north of the main house. This craft-level industry likely utilized some of the plantation's slave labor.

Allen Howison was listed a second time in Schedule 2, immediately after the listing above. The marshal recorded Howison as "in charge" of the estate of Louisa C. Muschett, a deceased neighbor (died ca. 1858) and property owner. Her estate involved 10 slaves, four females and six males, ranging in age from four to 60 years old. No slave houses were noted for this property.

Slave ownership: For Prince William County as a whole in 1860, 361 households either owned and/or employed 2,356 enslaved African Americans. Slave ownership ranged from one to 80 slaves, with a mean number of 6.5 slaves per household and a more accurate median of four slaves per household. In sum and as in other Virginia counties and cities, the majority of white owners and employers in Prince William had few slaves. Over one-third (35%) of Prince William households had only one or two slaves and a majority of 56% relied on the labor of between one and four slaves. Only 10% of the County's households had more than 15 slaves.

Howison's 34 slaves placed him solidly within the County's gentry elite and distinguished Effingham as a large plantation, rather than as a farm. Howison's estate stood out from those of most of his neighbors and within the small category of other plantation owners. In total, 23 county households in 1860 had 20 or more slaves, qualifying the properties as plantation-scale entities, with their owners comprising only 6.4% of all households.

Slave house ownership: Based on the 1860 census, Prince William County presumably had 225 slave houses in total, although as discussed, this count likely forms a very low estimate. Of the 361 households with slaves, the census marshal only recorded one or more slave buildings for 108 households, a mere 30%. Logically and as seen in other cities and counties, owners and/or employers with one or just a few slaves would not have any cabins or quarters. These African Americans probably resided within the owner's or the employer's house or in other outbuildings, such as kitchens, laundries, or stables that the census marshal would not consider a "slave house."

Still, the 244 county households without slave houses, 69%, form an extremely high result compared to other analyzed municipalities. Apparently, the Prince William marshal either did not count slave quarters consistently and/or only recorded those easily in sight. In some cases, the households in question had 10, 20, or more slaves and yet no slave houses, which does not seem feasible. Nonetheless, for the households with slave buildings, ownership ranged from one to seven houses, with the mean of 2.08 houses per household and the median of two houses per household closely approximating one another. Owners and employers with only one slave house formed the largest grouping, at 43%. The overwhelming majority, 75% of households with slave buildings, had one or two houses.

Hence, Howison's ownership of six slave houses again put him in an elite group, as only 6% of households with quarters had more than four. If we count the two duplexes and another outbuilding within the mansion complex at Effingham as three slave quarters, then the other three quarters may have consisted of log cabins located farther away. These buildings would have housed "field hands," slaves working on the plantation's farm fields. It should be kept in mind that other slaves at Effingham likely lived and worked within the main house and in other outbuildings, such as the detached kitchen discussed earlier.

Slaves per house: Dividing the number of slaves per household, for those properties with slave houses, by the number of slave buildings allows a basic estimate of the number of slaves per house. For the Prince William County data (the 108 households with slave houses), such estimates range from 0.5 slaves per house (rare cases of having only one slave, but two slave houses) to 32 slaves per house, an exceptionally high value that probably is inaccurate given the census marshal's biased methods for recording slave quarters. Again, the mean and median values are close, with the former amounting to 6.8 slaves per house and the latter six slaves per house. These results are somewhat higher than normal in comparison to other Virginia counties, with this result again a factor of the marshal underestimating the number of quarters per property.

Dividing Howison's 34 slaves amongst six slave houses produced an average of 5.67 slaves per house, in keeping with the average figures above. One third (33%) of the county households with slave houses had one to four slaves per house, while a majority of 57% had between one and six slaves per house. Relying more on duplexes, larger slave quarters that could house more slaves, serves as an explanatory factor for the Effingham value. Still, slave housing involved considerable variation as to household composition and as noted above, Howison probably had some slaves residing within the main house and in other outbuildings.

Effingham's enslaved African American community

From a demographic standpoint it is worthwhile to re-think Effingham plantation as a predominantly black community, since enslaved African Americans comprised the largest portion of the residential population (34 of 38, 89.5%). Researchers repeatedly find this figure at other large plantations within 18th- and 19th-century Virginia and in other slaveholding states. From a broader scale perspective, most slaves lived either by themselves or with a few other of their own kind on small farms and on town and city lots. Oppositely, a county's plantations contained larger slave groupings and when viewed together, the plantations' owners commonly held a significant minority, often 30 to 40%, of a given county's enslaved population.

Importantly, research has shown that the enslaved communities on these large plantations represented critical centers for African American families, extended kinship, and vital community and cultural networks. In typical fashion then, Effingham's 1860 slave community involved 18 males (52.9%) and 16 females (47.1%), with this near balance of sexes reflecting part of a regionally stable and self-reproducing population. The plantation's labor force ranged in age from one to 55 years old, with this group incorporating a substantial majority of younger individuals, as 19 of Effingham's 34 slaves (56%) corresponded to people 14 years old or less.

Finally, using the skin color-based categories of race as employed by whites, the census marshal listed 21 (61.8%) of Howison's enslaved African Americans as "black." The remaining 13 slaves (37.2%) were considered "mulatto."

Slave Housing Data Base

Building Name: Effingham Manor Slave Quarter
Evidence Type: Extant
Site ID:
Historical Site Name: Effingham
City: Nokesville
County: Prince William
State: VA
Longitude: 77° 31' 19" W Latitude: 38° 38' 15" N (@ NW corner)
Investigators: Douglas W. Sanford, Judy W. Sanford
Institutions: Virginia Slave Housing Project, Inc.
Project Start: 6/6/19, 6/12/19 Project End: 6/12/19

Summary Description:

Given the extensive nature of the exterior and interior changes to the building in the modern era, from the mid-1950s onward, the following description focuses on the quarter's historic qualities, as best as can be determined from surviving evidence and historic photographs. More details for the modern alterations are provided in the field notes section at end of this document.

The frame outbuilding at Effingham is a one story with garret, three-bay (originally four), and gable roofed structure with two exterior end, stone chimneys. The roof currently is covered with modern asphalt shingles, but a series of post-1933 Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) photographs indicate the building earlier had a wooden shingle roof. Historically, the building served as a double quarter or duplex for enslaved African Americans. Resting on a continuous stone foundation, the quarter measures 16.1.3 wide (east-west) and 32.4.2 long (north-south), encompassing about 523 square feet, a common size for Virginia duplexes.

As a typical duplex, the Effingham outbuilding originally had two exterior doors on the front (west) façade, one for each room, with a central interior partition. The HABS photographs reveal that at that time, the building had exterior siding of horizontal clapboards, and that the southern door on the west wall had a lower height in relation to the northern door. The northern door's lintel is at the same height as the windows to either side. Also, the southern window on the west wall had vertical wooden bars. The front wall windows are aligned with the two windows on the rear (east) wall, which along with other building elements demonstrate a purposeful, symmetrical design.

Given the building's duplex arrangement, it would have had two sets of stairs, one for each room, allowing access to the garret. Thus, the garret space probably had a central partition as well, resulting in two rooms upstairs. Based on the building's traditional timber framing and the presence of machine-cut nails, the duplex likely was constructed in the 1820s.

Principal Construction Type: Frame One Story – With Garret

Footprint: Indicate door and window locations.

Number of Rooms: 2 total (1 up, 1 down; 4 originally – 2 down, 2 up)

Dimensions: (1) 15.1.1 (E-W) x 31.0.0 (N-S), 7.8.3 (H – from floor to bottom of ceiling joists) – formerly 2 rooms with central partition
 (2) Garret: not measured, since roof framing is a modern replacement

Doors: Key location to the footprint. See additional sheets for more doors.

Number: 3

	W. wall, N (1)	W. wall, S (2)	E. wall (3)
Type:	3/3 glass panes over 2 panels	Former door opening, covered over in modern era (post-1930s)	Open doorway, modern insertion
Dimensions:	3.0.0 (W) x 6.8.0 (H), 0.1.3 thick	Unknown, likely same as Door 1	2.8.0 (W) x 6.5.0 (H)
Hardware:	Modern, 5-knuckle butt hinges (brass)	NA	NA
Swing:	In	Unknown	NA
Replacement:	Yes, modern replacement, but original opening	NA	Doorway to kitchen-bathroom addition

Windows: Key location to the footprint. See additional sheets for more windows.

Number: 4 total

	Rm. 1, N (1)	Rm. 1, S (2)	Rm. 1, N (3)	Rm. 1, S (4) (5) (6)
Type:	4/4, double-hung sash (on west façade)	4/4, double-hung sash (on west façade)	4/4, double-hung sash (on east façade)	4/4, double-hung sash (on east façade)

Dimensions:	2.1.0 (W) x 3.5.0 (H)	2.1.0 (W) x 3.5.0 (H)	2.1.0 (W) x 3.6.0 (H)	2.1.0 (W) x 3.6.0 (H)
Hardware:	Plastic thumb latch	Plastic thumb latch	Plastic thumb latch	Plastic thumb latch
Shuttered/ Slide/ Swing:	Modern, vinyl replacement (original opening)	Modern, vinyl replacement (original opening)	Modern vinyl replacement (original opening)	Modern, vinyl replacement (original opening)

EXTERIOR

Foundation:

Continuous Masonry: Stone (reddish field stone – likely silt or mud stone)

Thickness: cannot be observed/measured

Height: 0 to 0.7.0

Bond: Irregular coursing where visible

Mortar Type: Shell – Sand

Joint: Unknown (original joint not visible)

Repaired: Yes – with cement

Shed/Porch:

No (but note rear additions, see field notes)

Location: Indicate on footprint and see graph paper.

Roof:

Roof Form: Gable

Roof Covering: Asphalt shingles

Roof Framing:

Exposed: Yes

Form: Common Rafters (not described since are modern replacements; see field notes)

Rafter Number:

Rafter Dimensions:

Collar Ties: Yes

Collar Dimensions: (not described since are modern replacements)

Method of Joining:

Height from Roof Peak:

Height to Floor:

Building Height: @ SW corner

Ground to Soffit: 8.6.0

Ground to Top of Eave: 9.0.0

Walls:

Frame:

Material: Vinyl siding over modern (ca. 1950s) wooden clapboards

Cladding: Horizontal boards

Beaded: No

Chimney(s):

Chimney (1): North gable end

Material: Stone

Location: Exterior – End

Height: 20.1.1

Chimney (2): South gable end

Material: Stone

Location: Exterior – End

Height: 20.10.1

INTERIOR

Wall Framing: Unknown as to original material and format

Wall Finish: Modern, vertical wood planking

Fireplace (1): North gable End – Center

If altered, note original location: End – Center

Fireplace Material: Stone

Fireplace Overall Dimensions: 6.4.2 (E-W) x 0.7.0 (N-S)

Fireplace Opening Dimensions: 2.11.2 (W) x 2.4.0 (H) x 1.8.2 (D)

Hearth Material: Stone

Hearth Dimensions: 6.0.2 (E-W) x 2.0.2 (N-S)

Fireplace (2): South gable End – Center

If altered, note original location: End – Center

Fireplace Material: Stone

Fireplace Overall Dimensions: 6.3.0 (E-W) x 1.1.0 (N-S)

Fireplace Opening Dimensions: 2.10.2 (W) x 2.2.1 (H) x 1.11.0 (D)

Hearth Material: Stone

Hearth Dimensions: 6.2.2 (E-W) x 1.8.3 (N-S)

Stairs: None at present, likely two stairs originally, one for each room

Note: Include the location on the footprint.

Type: Unknown

Stairwell Dimensions: unknown

Number of Treads: unknown

Stair Tread Dimensions: unknown

Subfloor Pit: No

Note: Include the location on the footprint.

Number:

Location(s):

Dimensions:

Depth:

Lined: Yes – No

Material:

Floor: Wood – modern, square “tiles”; unknown as to original flooring, presumably wooden boards

Floorboards Dimension:

Dating:

Dendrochronology Date:

Other Date:

Dating Evidence: ca. 1820s, based on machine-cut nails

Saw Marks: Circular Sawn

Nails: Machine Cut – Wire

Comments: Note certain construction methods or materials used that relates the building to a specific time period.

Field Notes

This building turned into a “guest house” in the 1950s, has been extensively modified, including two additions on the rear (east) wall. Modern alterations included: the removal of the interior central partition; the replacement of the historic exterior wooden siding; the removal and replacement of the entire roof framing, including the ceiling joists of the first floor level; the removal and replacement of the interior room’s flooring and its walls’ covering; the removal of the presumed interior stairs to reach the garret; and, the repointing of the exterior end chimneys and the reworking and repointing of the interior fireplaces. The main rear addition is a kitchen-bathroom dating to the 1950s, which extends eastward from the central portion of the quarter, while a later porch, at the original building’s SE corner, became enclosed in the modern era. Around the 1970s or ‘80s, vinyl siding was added to the main walls of the quarter and of the kitchen-bathroom addition. At the same time, the quarter’s and the addition’s windows were reworked and replaced with vinyl materials.

Exterior:

Taken at the NW corner, the compass bearing along the nominal north gable end, looking east, is 120⁰.

The exterior wall thickness is approximately 6 inches. At the SE corner, portions of the original sills are exposed and look to be hand hewn.

A segment of the quarter’s rear (east) wall, towards the SE corner (now within the enclosed modern porch (sitting room)), is exposed and has the ca. 1950s exterior siding that also is observed for the kitchen-bathroom addition. The modern siding is attached with wire nails and in profile, has a flat-faced section for the bottom two-thirds and then a concave section for the upper third.

Chimneys: The chimneys’ stonework has been repointed with cement and the tops of the stacks have been rebuilt. The height of the northern chimney’s shoulders is at 8.6.2 from the ground surface; while the height for the southern chimney’s shoulders occurs at 9.2.0 above the ground.

Kitchen-bathroom Addition: This ca. 1950s rear addition has a cinderblock foundation, a gable roof (asphalt shingle covering), and measures approximately 18.2.2 (N-S) by 12.0.2 (E-W). The addition originally had a horizontal clapboard siding that later became covered with vinyl siding.

Porch Addition: Originally a screen porch for the kitchen-bath addition, this addition became enclosed more recently. It has a cinderblock foundation and a shed roof, and it measures approximately 8.1.2 (N-S) by 11.11.2 (E-W). The addition projects 1.1.2 to the south from the quarter's SE corner.

Interior:

Room 1, First Floor: Originally, this space involved two rooms divided by a central partition, with each room accessed separately by the building's two exterior doors. Each room had a single window on the front (west) and rear (east) walls, aligned with one another.

Ceiling joists: This room has exposed ceiling joists, which are circular sawn and likely modern in origin. These timbers measured 3 inches thick and are 5.5 to 6 inches high and are spaced at 24-inch intervals (center to center). Where the joists' ends reach the wall plates, circular-sawn ledger boards have been added to fill the spaces between the joists. There are multiple nail holes on the joists' undersides, but these holes do not occur on all of the joists, suggesting there was no lath and plaster ceiling. Starting with joist 1 (J1) at the north gable end wall, the following joists have nail holes to greater or lesser extents: J4, J7 (about the room's center), J9, J10, J11, J14, and J15.

Given the removal of the original ceiling joists, no evidence survives for the framing of the presumed stairs on the first-floor level.

Gable end girts: The timbers at the gable ends, at either side of the chimneys, look to be original, hand-hewn framing members. At the south end wall, the girts are joined and pegged to the surviving posts on either side of the chimney. Machine-cut nails occur on both posts. On the north end wall, the girt's joint with the post on the east side of the chimney is obscured by the modern siding, but the girt and post on the chimney's west side do show the same pegged joint.

Interior chimney faces, fireplaces: As part of the quarter's modern (1950s) alteration, the stones of the original chimney faces have been reworked and reset in more uniform fashion, including with the addition of small shelves and a central niche on the southern chimney face. The stone hearths were reworked in similar fashion and each fireplace's interior received firebrick. The original fireplace lintel stones do appear to have been reset in their approximate original positions.

Room 2, Garret: While the original garret space and its materials have been removed, there is evidence of a wood stove pipe hole in the northern chimneystack, suggesting that the northern garret room was heated at some point in time. No stove pipe evidence occurs at the southern chimneystack.

Kitchen-Bathroom Addition: The addition's two rooms are accessed from the duplex through a doorway (Door 3) inserted on the duplex's rear (east) wall. Also, builders installed a pass-through (a window-like opening) immediately to the south of the doorway, allowing food and drink to be transferred back and forth between the kitchen and the duplex's main room.

Roofing:

The modern, replacement roofing involves circular-sawn, dimensional lumber, largely consisting of 2 x 4's. The rafters are butted to a ridge board, which consists of a tongue-and-groove floor board. The framing uses smaller collars and roofing boards.

Research Recommendations

1. Review the U.S. censuses for 1810 through 1850, to ascertain the white and enslaved residents at Effingham and how the plantation's African American community changed over time.
2. Review the Prince William County personal property tax records for Effingham owners. Besides containing information regarding the owners, these records also list slaves older than either 12 or 16 years of age. County land tax records similarly may reveal significant changes in the property's value, possibly related to the construction or loss of key buildings.
3. Research historic period maps that included Effingham, including those of the Civil War. Such maps often recorded buildings, cemeteries, and landscape features, such as fields, creeks, fences, etc.
4. Undertake dendrochronology (tree-ring dating) for the main house at Effingham, both to determine the structure's date of construction and to find evidence for the presumed second period of construction, as well as for other changes. Dendrochronology also could be applied to the smokehouse.
5. In relation to #4, have a qualified architectural historian undertake a close analysis of the main house's architectural elements as to framing and masonry, construction sequences, and stylistic elements. This research should help with understanding the building's presumed construction phases and its history of alterations.
6. If the opportunity arises, through removing modern wall and flooring materials on the surviving duplex quarters, it would be possible to check the nature and condition of the building's original framing and floor joists. Surviving saw marks, nails and/or nail holes, and plaster or whitewash marks could help refine the building's estimated construction date and determine the type of original interior finish.
7. Undertake an oral history research program, interviewing past property owners, tenants, workers, and related individuals and descendants to better understand the current and former buildings on the property, the different uses of the land, and the property's evolving landscape.
8. In relation to #7, undertake an oral history research program to find and interview descendants of Effingham's former slave community. This research also could help create a more detailed context for the presumed slave cemetery located east of the surviving duplex quarter.
9. Through non-invasive methods involving archaeology, land-clearing, and remote sensing technology (such as Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)), further investigate and demarcate the presumed slave cemetery in preparation for its preservation and interpretation.

References

Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS VA-575)

“Effingham, State Route 646 vicinity, Aden, Prince William County, VA.” Accessed from the Library of Congress website: <https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.va0868.photos?st=gallery>

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

1988 National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for “Effingham”, Prince William County, Virginia. Form completed and submitted by Frazier Associates, Staunton, Virginia.

United States Census (U.S. Census)

1860 Population of the United States in 1860 Compiled from the Eighth Census. List of Free Inhabitants (Schedule 1) and List of Slave Inhabitants (Schedule 2), Virginia, Prince William County. Accessed with the Ancestry website: www.ancestry.com.