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This report provides brief descriptive information on what is identified as the Bulow or Bulow Mines Cemetery, situated in the Red Top area of St. Andrews Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina. This is an African American cemetery that dates to the late nineteenth century and may, with additional research, be documented as likely originating in the antebellum as a slave cemetery.

The investigations consisted of a pedestrian survey combined with limited penetrometer study. Approximately 300 graves were identified (with about 200 marked in the field). Of these 15 were clearly marked with either marble, concrete, or wood headstones. Grave goods were common at the cemetery, including a wide range of ceramic, glass, and metal artifacts. Living memorials, while very likely present, were not noted because of the season of investigation.

It is possible that 600 or more graves are present at the cemetery and the grave yard is estimated to measuring about 350 feet east-west by approximately 500 feet north-south, encompassing approximately 4 acres. Graves appear throughout this area, often in clusters that may represent kin-groupings. The working boundaries of the cemetery are a dirt road to the north, dikes (separating the cemetery from low lands) on the east and west sides, and an artificial line at the southern area (about 100 feet north of a dirt pathway).

Although additional historic research is possible, the current work clearly indicates that the cemetery is eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance under Criteria C (physical characteristics) and D (potential to yield important information). The cemetery meets Criteria Consideration C for cemeteries since its significance involves design characteristics and forensic data.

The best preservation option is, of course, preservation in place or green-spacing the cemetery. The cemetery should be fenced securely to prevent vandalism and loss of graves goods. Initial efforts made by the local African American community to clear the cemetery should be completed. In order to protect the integrity of the cemetery, this work must be conducted by hand and no mechanized equipment should be operated within the cemetery boundaries. All debris (currently there are multiple cut piles) should be removed, again by hand. A landscape maintenance program should be implemented that utilizes no herbicides (since these are non-selective and will damage both the existing monuments and also any living memorials present on the cemetery).
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INTRODUCTION

This investigation was conducted by Dr. Michael Trinkley of Chicora Foundation, Inc. for Mr. Walt Martin of Associated Developers, Inc. (ADI) in Charleston, South Carolina. This is a preliminary document since at this point in time complete land use history is not available. However, we are able to provide at least some preliminary observations concerning the cemetery’s history and the use of the surrounding property. The cemetery has historically been identified as the Bulow Cemetery, Bulow Mines Cemetery, or Below Plum Patch Cemetery and was in use since at least the late nineteenth century. Additional investigation is being conducted and will be incorporated into a final study of the entire development tract.

The cemetery is situated at the southwestern edge of the Campbell Tract, being developed by ADI, in what has historically been known as St. Andrews Parish, Charleston County. The nearest modern community is Red Top, about a mile to the southeast. Historically, however, the cemetery was associated with both the communities that grew up on the Bulow (or sometimes Bula) Mines property, as well as nearby Johns Island.

The topography of the cemetery area is low, with an almost imperceptible slope to the
southwest, into the now heavily wooded swamps that were historically rice fields. The cemetery is situated on Yonges loamy fine sands. These soils have a dark grayish-brown (10YR4/2) loamy sand A horizon, although the clay content increases dramatically by at least 14 inches (Miller 1971). The depth to the seasonal high water table is only 1-2 feet, which likely made burials difficult and often unpleasant for the community. Nearby soils, however, are even less suitable; it is likely that a combination of the low topography and tendency to relegate African American burial grounds to less desirable lands, resulted in the selection of this location.

To the east and northeast is somewhat higher ground that was, in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries probably cultivated. The immediate area is dominated by generally young vegetation (Figure 2) – probably the result of intensive logging within the last 50 to 75 years. There is a dense understory of privet and oak, much of which has recently been cleared out by the black community in an effort to preserve and clearly mark their cemetery.

This work was conducted to obtain a better understanding of the cemetery, its history, the number of individuals likely to be buried at the site, and the boundaries of the cemetery. This study reveals that the cemetery is, in virtually all respects, consistent with and characteristic of, African American burial practices. Graves are marked with commercial marble stones, concrete stones, and at least one wood marker. While living memorials may be present, none were identified during this study, likely because the late summer season is not a particularly good time to identify may flowering bulbs, typical of African American cemeteries. Many burial or grave goods are present in the cemetery since its isolated – and until recently – heavily wooded condition precluded visitors, efforts at “cleaning-up” the cemetery, and idle curiosity seekers.

The cemetery is also marked by a very large number of sunken depressions – evidence of burials in wood coffins or perhaps even lacking coffins and covered only in shrouds. As the body and/or coffin decomposed, the ground sunk – leaving the rolling topography very typical of rural African American burial sites.
This investigation has identified approximately 300 graves, only 15 of which are marked. Another 300 might easily be present, suggesting an upper number of at least 600 burials. The cemetery is estimated to measure about 350 feet east-west by 500 feet north-south, encompassing approximately 4 acres.

This report will document our evaluation of the cemetery as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Our investigations have made it clear that the cemetery is eligible under Criteria C (physical characteristic) and D (ability to yield important information). As a result, the cemetery also meets Criterion Consideration D for cemeteries.

While South Carolina law does provide a means of grave relocation (S.C. Code of Laws, Section 27-43-10 et seq.), it is designed for the removal of “abandoned” cemeteries and we find no indication that the cemetery in question has been “abandoned” by the African American community. Moreover, the law allows removal only if the governing body finds that such removal is both necessary and expedient. As an anthropologist I find no necessary or expedient reason to remove this cemetery. Such a removal is contrary to African American traditions and would cause a tear in delicate fabric of Gullah lifeways. Organizations such as the National Park Service have recognized the pressures facing low country African American culture and are actively working to preserve and protect those lifeways. The removal of this cemetery is contrary to both African American cultural practices and good preservation.

Fortunately, the development company which has acquired the property on which the cemetery is situated has no desire to remove the cemetery and is committed to preservation in place. As a result, this report provides information to assist Associated Developers, Inc. achieve that goal of preservation in a manner...
that respects the historic and cultural values of the cemetery.
BRIEF HISTORICAL SYNOPSIS

Historical research for the study tract is not yet complete, but some aspects of the property’s history are already clear. For example, the early eighteenth century history of the property is clearly tied up in upland rice cultivation. Remains of the rice fields bordering Rantowles Creek are still visible on the modern topographic map. Isolated elements, including some dikes, are also still visible on the ground – although clearly there have been nearly 200 years of modifications, both environmental and

made-made.

By the antebellum period at least one map suggests that portions of the study tract were part of the Bulow Plantation. It shows the location of the Bulow settlement, as well as what appears to be a slave settlement to the northwest (Figure 4). While both are off the ADI study tract, the slave settlement is only about 3,000 feet from the Bulow Cemetery. This proximity suggests that the cemetery was likely associated with the plantation and the graves date from at least the antebellum.

At this early stage in the historical research of the property, the only other plat we have identified dates from 1872 and provides information on the settlement and geology of the parcel. The plat was prepared to determine the depth and amount of phosphate rock present on the tract, probably as a result of the Bulow purchase by William L. Bradley, a founding partner in the Marine and River Phosphate Mining and Manufacturing Company. By 1884 the
Figure 5. Portion of the 1872 plat of the Bulow Mine tract (McCady Plat 1160).
Bulow Mines had extracted 30,000 tons of phosphate rock and was employing 350 workers on this property.

The 1872 plat reveals that the main settlement and slave dwellings are still present – and also documents a number of more isolated structures, suggesting that the property was rapidly settled by freedmen after the Civil War. It appears that over time several large settlements were organized on the property – likely for the African American laborers that flocked to phosphate as an alternative to cotton production. A brief article in the June 20, 1891 *The Freeman* recounts the death of “Lazarus Myers, colored, at Bulow Phosphate Mines” by George Funnell, also an African American, on June 10. This not only documents the roughness of mining, but also the development of communities, known by the name of their associated mine.

That the cemetery was being used during at least the terminal period of phosphate mining at Bulow is illustrated by several burials dating from the 1890s and the name Bulow Mine found on at least one death certificate. Nevertheless, the name of the cemetery – Bulow – may just as easily refer to the much earlier plantation.

Beyond these few plats, little additional primary documentation has been found concerning the cemetery. It is not, for example, shown on any of the early maps of this region. Nor have we been able to see any indication of the cemetery on aerial photographs from 1949, 1954, or 1963. Of course this means little other than that the cemetery was well hidden by the dense woods and was likely known only by the African American community.

There are good indications that the cemetery was well known to the blacks in the immediate vicinity through the entire first half of the twentieth century. Four of the six stones with dates are from the twentieth century, with the most recent dating to 1939. One informant, Ms. Francis Horsley, explains that her grandfather, African American undertaker J.B. Moultrie, conducted frequent burials in cemetery. Moultrie began in business at least by 1925 and, by 1940, was known as the Moultrie Funeral Home. The business continued to at least 1950 (Trinkley 2005). As discussed in a following section, a number of other small, African American firms are also known to have buried individuals in this cemetery.
FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

Pedestrian and Penetrometer Survey

An initial step of this study was a penetrometer study. A penetrometer is a device for measuring the compaction of soil. Soil compaction is well understood in construction, where its primary objective is to achieve a soil density that will carry specified loads without undue settlement, and in agronomy, where it is recognized as an unfavorable by-product of tillage.

When natural soil strata are disturbed — whether by large scale construction or by the excavation of a small hole in the ground — the resulting spoil contains a large volume of voids and the compaction of the soil is very low. When this spoil is used as fill, either in the original hole or at another location, it likewise has a large volume of voids and a very low compaction. In consequence, such fill is artificially compacted, settling under a load as air and water are expelled.

In the case of a pit, or a burial, the excavated fill is typically thrown back in the hole not as thin layers that are then compacted before the next layer is added, but in one, relatively quick, episode. This prevents the fill from being compacted, or at least as compacted as the surrounding soil.

Penetrometers come in a variety of styles, but all measure compaction as a numerical reading, typically as pounds per square inch (psi). The dickey-John penetrometer consists of a stainless steel rod about 3-feet in length, connected to a T-handle. As the rod is inserted in the soil, the compaction needle rotates within an oil filled (for dampening) stainless steel housing, indicating the compaction levels. The rod is also engraved at 3-inch intervals, allowing more precise collection of compaction measurements through various soil horizons. Two tips (½-inch and ¾-inch) are provided for different soil types.

Of course a penetrometer is simply a measuring device. It cannot distinguish soil compacted by natural events or from soil artificially compacted. Nor can it distinguish an artificially excavated pit from a tree throw which has been filled in. Nor can it, per se, distinguish between a hole dug as a trash pit and a hole dug as a burial pit. What it does is convert each of these events to psi readings. It is then up to the operator to determine through various techniques the cause of the increased or lowered soil compaction.

The penetrometer is used at set intervals along grid lines established perpendicular to the suspected grave orientations. The readings may be recorded and used to develop a map of probable grave locations, or the locations may be immediately marked in the field.

In addition, it is important to “calibrate” the penetrometer to the specific site where it is being used. Since readings are affected by soil moisture and even to some degree by soil texture, it is important to compare readings taken during a single investigation and ensure that soils are generally similar in composition.

It is also important to compare suspect readings to those from known areas. For example, when searching for graves in a cemetery where both marked and unmarked graves are present, it is usually appropriate to begin by examining known graves to identify the range of compaction present.

We have used penetrometers on more than 25 cemeteries in South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia — finding very
consistent values for grave and non-grave areas, regardless of the state, soil, or topography. The ranges found are far more likely dependent on general soil characteristics (such as texture and moisture) than on cultural aspects of the burial process.

In the case of the Bulow Cemetery we found that the penetrometer – in spite of consistent previous results – revealed that the soils at this cemetery were overall very compressed. Readings in the upper foot of graves exhibiting noticeable sinking ranged from 150 to 250 psi. Areas without graves revealed compaction of over 300 psi. While the exact causative agents are not entirely understood, I believe that several factors are likely responsible.

The first is that the soils in the cemetery are historically very wet, with seasonal high water tables within 1-2 feet of the surface. The water problems are further documented by the construction of dikes on either side of the cemetery, probably in an effort to minimize water intrusion.

It is this water intrusion that has likely resulted in significant compaction. In the most general sense, the compaction of soil requires movement and rearrangement of individual soil particles. This fits them together and fills the voids which may be present, especially in fill materials. For the necessary movement to occur, friction must be reduced, typically by ensuring that the soil has the proper amount of moisture. If too much moisture is present, some will be expelled and in the extreme the soils become soupy or like quicksand and compaction is not possible. If too little moisture is present, there will not be adequate lubrication of the soil particles and, again, compaction is impossible. For each soil type and condition there is an optimum moisture level to allow compaction. It seems likely that we are seeing a situation where the soil moisture was correct – likely for prolonged periods of time – allowing extensive compaction to take place.

This compaction was likely aided by activities that have historically taken place on the site – perhaps nearby phosphate mining or, more likely, the operation of heavy equipment across the cemetery as part of logging operations during the early twentieth century.

Regardless, the penetrometer provided poor results in the cemetery, yielding what we believe to be a great number of false negatives (i.e., the compaction was so great overall that graves were likely being overlooked).

As a result, we identified boundaries based on a visual inspection of sunken depressions and the presence of grave goods (given the season it was not possible to use living memorials – such as bulbs – as another indicator). Fortuitously, these boundaries largely correlated with natural features – such as road to the north and dikes to the east and west.

We marked 200 graves using pin flags, identifying what appear to be kin-group grave clusters based on proximity to one another and internally consistent alignments that differ slightly from other nearby clusters. I estimate that an additional 100 graves are similarly readily identifiable, but were not marked since their location was not important in the effort to determine boundaries. Nevertheless, we may estimate that approximately 300 graves are readily identifiable at the Bulow Cemetery.

These graves are found scattered over an area measuring about 350 feet east-west by about 500 feet north-south – or approximately 4 acres.

**Grave Goods**

The presence of grave goods is well documented at African American cemeteries, although the function of these remains is not well understood. Bill Pollitzer comments:

> Broken bottles and other ornaments in an African
American cemetery are expressions of religion and magic; anything from a pitcher or tumbler to a clock or lamp chimney is piled upon the earth. Closer inspection may reveal a small headstone marking an individual grave. In light of the meaning behind this clustered assortment, it seems a sacrilege to call them grave decorations, for they are an integral part of the belief system of the interred and those who buried them (Pollitzer 1999:183).

So while the origin of the custom – or its meaning – are far from certain, the practice is recognized as having both very deep roots and to be an integral part of traditional African American mortuary practice.

What this means is that these assortments are of equal cultural value and legal importance as an iron fence or a massive family monument in a white, Victorian cemetery. Preservation plans must take these items into account and assure their long-term preservation.

Too often as soon as an area becomes “developed,” these remains rapidly disappear – being looted by those who either don’t understand or don’t care about the tradition or religion of the low country Gullah.

At the Bulow Cemetery there are a rather significant range of items. Those associated with graves are briefly itemized below in Table 1 (additional remains are present, but could not be associated with specific graves). The quantity and variety of remains is greater than I have seen for nearly a decade and closely resemble the richness that I observed several decades ago on remote Sea Islands such as Daufuskie, prior to development.

The remains also provide another source of chronological control. In some cases the remains may help estimate the date of the grave, while in other cases the remains offer an opportunity to compare the date of the objects placed on the grave to the date of the individual’s death.

These remains, while very limited, suggest association with graves dating from the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Grave Goods</th>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>amathyst pressed glass pitcher</td>
<td>pre-1919</td>
<td>Jones and Sullivan 1985:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decalcomania whiteware w/maker's mark</td>
<td>post 1904</td>
<td>Godden 1964:432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>milk glass candle holder</td>
<td>late 19th c. on</td>
<td>Jones and Sullivan 1985:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>clear glass canning jar</td>
<td>1876-1893</td>
<td>Lehner 1988:175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clear pressed glass wine glass</td>
<td>pre-1919</td>
<td>Jones and Sullivan 1985:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decalcomania whiteware w/maker's mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amathyst pressed glass pitcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>molded whiteware plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>clear glass cup w/Maker's mark</td>
<td>1920-1964</td>
<td>Toulouse 1971:239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Grove's Tasteless Chill Tonic</td>
<td>1891-1934, ca. 1900</td>
<td>Fike 1987:234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
first quarter of the twentieth century. Although the sample is small, it suggests that future research in African American cemeteries should expand on the work to determine if a terminal date for the active practice of grave good placement can be determined.

The remains also reveal that in two of the three dated cases, the grave goods date from the time of the burial or perhaps even before, suggesting that the remains could well have been associated with the individual. In only one case do the remains post-date the burial, suggestive of an item added to grave after the burial took place. Again, this line of research should be expanded to other cemeteries in an effort to more precisely associate the remains with the individual being buried.

**Marked Graves**

Table 2 lists the marked graves identified in the cemetery. This list reveals only 15 marked graves (marked is defined as exhibiting some form of headstone; it does not include graves that are “marked” by sinking, graves that are marked with grave goods, or those that may be marked with living memorials). This suggests that about 5% of the graves (or less) are marked (using the above definition).

While the low incidence of marked graves may be easily dismissed as indicative of the extraordinary poverty of African Americans during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this may be too simple of an explanation. Although poverty may play a role, many African Americans (like Euro-Americans) will spare no expense in the burial of a loved one. Consequently, some anthropologists have suggested that the absence of markers may represent an underlying cultural belief that while a marker of some type is important, a permanent marker is not (see Conner 1989:98-99).

The marked graves include a modest range of typical materials. The most common marker is commercial marble (n=6), followed by marble military markers (n=5). Commercial markers such as those in Bulow Cemetery could be had from not only local sources, but also such firms as Montgomery Ward & Co. and Sears, Roebuck & Co. for around $10 to $20. The military markers were furnished for veterans at no cost and of the five examples in Bulow Cemetery, four have recessed shields.
indicating markers for veterans of WWI or before. Only one marker is of the modern type, issued from WWII through today.

There are two concrete markers - one hand-made, the other commercially manufactured. The commercial concrete stone has nicely detailed lettering and a flowing ivy decoration at the top. It is identical to stones found in both African American and Euro-American cemeteries, although the manufacturer has not been discovered (see Little 1998:242, 244 for additional discussion and an example from North Carolina).

The hand-made stone is unusual, being an inverted triangle form with impressed letters. It appears that the first impression was not satisfactory and a skim coat was applied to the stone and a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>James Black</td>
<td>August 20, 1892</td>
<td>January 8, 1925</td>
<td>commercial marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>David Harmond</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[1903]</td>
<td>military marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter Williams</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[1919]</td>
<td>military marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daniel Grayson</td>
<td>March 15, 1853</td>
<td>December 19, 1899</td>
<td>commercial marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Benjamin Rodan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>military marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dresser top marble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7         | -               | -           | -            | wood marker w/marble "B.W."
| 8         | Anne Matthews   | May 7, 1875  | April 7, 1915 | commercial marble      |
| 9         | A.C.            | -           | -            | commercial marble      |
| 10        | H.C. Gibbs      | 1852        | November 2, 1892 | commercial marble      |
| 11        | Culliott Gibbs  | -           | [1914]       | military marble        |
| 12        | Charles Heyward | -           | October 6, 1939 | military marble        |
| 13        | Edna Gibbs      | November 22, 1917 | November 12, 1920 | commercial concrete |
| 14        | -               | -           | -            | marble                 |
second impression was made. This has caused extensive spalling and the stone is no longer decipherable. This stone is of special interest since concrete is a fluid medium that allows considerable artistic expression and it may be that these stones provide valuable insights into the South Carolina coast. They may represent either re-use of abandoned or broken materials, materials finding a higher and more pressing use, or they may be – in a sense – something akin to a grave good, representing an item used by the individual in life being converted to their memorial after death.

There is also one example of a dresser top used as a marble headstone. It is identifiable by its thinness, the bevel along two of the three exposed edges, and a hole at one edge where either a backsplash or mirror would have been attached. Similar marble dresser tops have been seen at other African American cemeteries along the South Carolina coast. They may represent either re-use of abandoned or broken materials, materials finding a higher and more pressing use, or they may be – in a sense – something akin to a grave good, representing an item used by the individual in life being converted to their memorial after death.

The last marker of special note is wood. It has the shade often described as human or humanoid – with a round top described as the head, above the shoulders and torso. Similar markers have been seen in both white and black cemeteries in South Carolina and Georgia. Conner, apparently not familiar with similar markers in white cemeteries, comments that the form may contain “West African elements,” perhaps indicating “an emphasis upon the individual man or woman” or – located at the head of the grave – may perhaps “indicate an Afro-American interpretation of the headstone concept” (Conner 1989:143).

The marker at Bulow Cemetery appears to be cypress and is well preserved. The left side of the marker reveals the careful execution of the form, suggesting that whatever the meaning, some effort was put into the physical form. Since there is no indication of carving, the marker was either painted or left blank. It seems likely that these markers were at one time far more common, but are today rare as a result of fire, decay, and theft.

**Figure 8. Wood marker at grave 7. At the foot is a plot corner marker, carved with the initials, “B.W.”**

**Individuals Buried at Bulow**

No detailed historical research has been conducted on the identified burials in the cemetery, although a brief examination has been made of the South Carolina Death Certificates (available from 1915 on) and also of on-line military records and Civil War pensions. Several individuals have been identified.
Figure 9. Plan of the Bulow Cemetery, showing marked graves and topographic features. Individual burials are not shown.
James Black

The stone reveals that this individual was born August 20, 1892, while the death certificate (22058) indicates a birth date of August 1893 with the individual being 31 years, 5 months, and 8 days old. This would result in a birth date of July 31, 1893.

The death certificate indicates that Black was single and lived at “Beaula Mines, SC, Johns Island PO, S.C. His occupation was listed as laborer and the cause of death was “nephritis parinclymataus [sic] chronic” or kidney disease. Pyelonephritis is an archaic term referring to a bacterial infection of the blood that invades the kidneys or an infection secondary to kidney stones or an enlarged prostate (Fishbein 1942: 455) His parents, both from South Carolina, were Peter Black and Peggy Mazyck. He was buried at “Bulow Mines” by A.C. Dayson on January 10, 1925 – two days after his death. Dayson is known to have operated between ca. 1920 and ca. 1938 as Dayson Undertaking House on Johns Island (Trinkley 2005).

David Harmond

Harmond’s stone indicates military service as Corporal in Co. D, 21 U.S. Colored Infantry. His Civil War pension was identified, revealing service in the 23 U.S.C.I.1 and the 1

1 The 21st USCI was organized from the 3rd and 4th Regiments, South Carolina Colored Infantry, March 14, 1864. It was attached to 3rd Brigade, Vogdes' Division, District of Florida, Dept. of the South, to April, 1864. Afterward it was attached to Morris Island, S.C., Northern District, Dept. of the South, to October, 1864. 1st Separate Brigade, Dept. of the South, to February, 1865. Garrison of Charleston, S.C., Dept. of the South, to August, 1865. Dept. of the South, to October, 1866. The regiment saw duty at Jacksonville, Fla., until April, 1864. It then moved to Hilton Head, S.C., thence to Folly Island, S. C., April 18. There was then duty on Folly Island, Morris Island and Coles Island operating against Charleston, S.C., until February, 1865. The Regiment participated in

S.C. Colored Infantry. His pension was paid to his wife, Rachel Harmond and the death date is listed as April 16, 1903. The record also indicates that David Hammond was an alias.

Peter Williams

Williams’ military stone indicates service, also in Co. D., 21 U.S. Colored Infantry. His Civil War pension records indicate that an alias was Peter Whaley and that his widow was Minty Williams. His death was February 8, 1919, and service in Co. D, 3 S.C. Colored Infantry and Co. D, 21 U.S. Colored Infantry.

Anna Matthews

The death certificate for Anna Matthews (6159) reveals that at the time of her death on April 7, 1915, she was living in downtown Charleston (48 Nassau Street) and was working as a “domestic.” Her birth date on the certificate is listed only as 1880, while the stone indicates a birth date of May 7, 1875. The cause of death is listed as broncho pneumonia. Her father was Henry Gibbs of Charleston and her mother was Betsey Manigault.

The place of burial on this death certificate is listed only as Johns Island – based probably on the Johns Island post office address for Bulow Mines. The undertaker was Eugene Gadsden – whose firm operated from about 1902 to about 1942 (Trinkley 2005).

Culliott Gibbs

The Civil War pension records reveal that Gibbs sometimes spelled his names Gibbes

the Expedition to James Island, S.C., June 30-July 10 and saw action on James Island July 2. They participated in the occupation of Charleston February 18, followed by garrison duty at Charleston and Mt. Pleasant, S.C., until August, 1865. They were then stationed at various points in South Carolina and Georgia until October, 1866 and the members were mustered out October 7, 1866.
Charles Heyward

The death certificate (13900) reveals that Heyward died on October 6, 1939, with burial the following day, October 7 at Johns Island. Heyward was married to Martha Heyward and while his birth date is not listed, his age (probably estimated) was listed as 42 years (suggesting a birth date around 1897). His occupation was listed as a labor with the W.P.A.

Heyward’s father was Mikell Heyward, born on Edisto Island and his mother was listed as Jerimia Gibbon of St. Paul, SC. The undertaker was A.H. Jenkins. This individual began business about 1923 and the Jenkins Funeral Home operated until about 1944 (Trinkley 2005). The cause of death was chronic mitral insufficiency, essentially heart failure.

Etta Gibbs

Listed on her stone as Edna Gibbes, we know that she was the daughter of Cornelius Gibbs. The death certificate (21874) reveals that Cornelius was her father (from “Bulo,” probably
the mine settlement), while her mother was Sarah Gibbs, from Pinckney. At only 3 years old, she died of “congestion of the lungs,” but was not under the treatment of a physician. She was buried at “Bulo Plum Patch” two days after her death on November 12, 1920. For undertaker the forms lists “Family Burial,” which was likely very typical for children.

Summary and Eligibility Evaluation

The cemetery contains at least 300 burials. Although additional research would be necessary to allow a defensible estimate, it is not unreasonable to expect at least an additional 300 burials not readily identifiable on the surface, for a total of perhaps 600 or more individuals.

The cemetery was used at least by 1892 (the earliest marked grave), although the presence of four Civil War veterans who would have been born in slavery, plus two additional individuals whose birth dates according to their stones would also have been during slavery, provides strong evidence that the cemetery dates at least to the antebellum and was likely associated with the Bulow Plantation.

The last date observed is 1939. Although I am unsure why the cemetery ceased being used, a terminal date in the first half of the twentieth century seems reasonable and is supported by the lack of concrete vault top markers, metal floral stands, and metal funeral home markers - all indicators of burials during the second half of the twentieth century.

With use spanning perhaps 100 years, 600 burials – or 6 per year – is not unreasonable. In fact, it seems suspiciously low, especially for the period prior to about 1930. Certainly a cemetery of 4 acres could contain a much larger population – perhaps as many as 3,200 individuals or over five times as many burials as currently projected.

In all respects, however, the cemetery is characteristic of African American burial grounds. There are abundant sunken depressions, few of graves are marked by permanent markers, where permanent markers are found they range from commercial stones to concrete to wood, there are abundant grave goods throughout the cemetery, and the graves are found loosely clustered (probably reflecting kin-based groupings).

Although the cemetery is known by the name of the late nineteenth century phosphate works on the property, the documented burials show no special association with the mine operatives. The presence of Civil War veterans, WPA laborers, and a domestic living in Charleston suggests that this was a community cemetery – not a mine cemetery. Looking at the situation another way, there is ample evidence to suggest that the cemetery was in existence and being used prior to – and after – the mine’s operation. It was likely being used by the African Americans who had ties with this property, whether they worked at the Below Mine or not.

The cemetery’s physical setting may have been affected by twentieth century logging. There is evidence of some rutting and the ground compaction is certainly very high. Nevertheless, the integrity of the setting is high. The cemetery is vegetated as African American cemeteries typically are (although the season of this study precluded identification of living memorials). The setting is also constrained by low, wet soils – resulting in dikes forming the eastern and western boundaries of the cemetery.

I recommend this cemetery as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria C (physical features) and D (information potential). The cemetery has the range of features and characteristics that are typical of African American burial places. It is, in other words, an excellent representation of the stylistic type.

The site retains excellent integrity, easily conveying the qualities that make the site
RECONNAISSANCE INVESTIGATION OF BULOW CEMETERY

The isolated, rural site easily conveys the feelings of the overall setting consistent with its use during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This feeling is assisted by the presence of the boundary dikes – providing a clear reminder of the economic origins of the plantation and the low, wet areas to which African American cemeteries were relegated by white land owners.

There is virtually no visible damage or modification to the cemetery nor is there evidence that any significant features have been lost. This is clearly revealed by the abundance of grave goods, the large number of clearly visible sunken depressions, the presence of a wood marker, and the presence of only one broken headstone. These characteristics are consistent of the cemetery’s period of historic use and help convey a feeling that is consistent with African American burial locations.

The cemetery is likewise eligible under Criterion D, information potential. There is a very strong potential for the recovery of bioanthropological data (e.g., skeletal remains) that would address a broad range of questions concerning the health, diet, and disease of rural low country African Americans during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The site would be of special interest since it does reflect a very rural population and it is likely that kin-groups would be recognizable in the arrangement and placement of the remains. The cemetery reflects a transitional period between plantation and modern medicine. There are suggestions, however, that African American health may actually have declined during the postbellum. Studies at sites such as the Bulow Cemetery would begin to allow these significant questions to be more fully examined.

In addition, the site would provide the opportunity to examine African American mortuary patterns typical of a rural, low income population. Several areas of study have already been briefly mentioned, such as the association of grave goods, and the temporal placement of those grave goods. Additional questions might involve the exploration of traditions documented through oral history, such as the use of coins on the eyes or the inclusion of salt in the coffin. Other research might involve the examination of soil samples to determine the frequency of embalming, which would be expected to leave tale-tell traces of heavy metals, such as arsenic.

There would also be an opportunity to explore the use of coffins and coffin hardware, looking at the incidence of trimmed verses untrimmed coffins, or the prevalence of shrouds as opposed to dressed bodies.

Finally, the cemetery offers an exceptional opportunity to explore maternal DNA to determine geographic origins of the African American population that called Bulow home. We have been successful in obtaining excellent samples from skeletal remains deposited both in sand and in marsh peat.

In fact, the recovery of an African American adult skeleton, in nearby perfect condition, for the Berkeley County Coroner from a wetland setting suggests that preservation at the Bulow property might be very good. Consequently, all of the research questions posed here would have a very high likelihood of being addressed – should the cemetery need to be moved at some future date.

Overall, the cemetery exhibits excellent integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The cemetery meets Criteria Consideration C for cemeteries since its significance involves design characteristics and forensic data.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Use of the Bulow Cemetery can be documented into the late nineteenth century. The cemetery was likely first used during slavery. The presence of individuals buried there who were born during slavery and who served during the Civil War, suggest that the cemetery was used during the antebellum. Whether it was used earlier – for example when the plantation was cultivating inland rice during the eighteenth century – is more difficult to support. However, given the importance of place in African American mortuary customs, it seems reasonable to envision continuity of use that might easily stretch back 300 years.

We can document the presence of 300 graves at the cemetery. It seems likely, based on experience with other similar African American cemeteries, that this number could easily be doubled.

The area thought to contain graves measures about 500 feet north-south by 350 feet east-west, yielding approximately 4 acres. The cemetery is bounded on two sides by dikes that likely date to the plantation period. The northern boundary is a dirt road whose antiquity is uncertain. To the south is an arbitrary boundary, based on our inability to discover additional graves.

The cemetery contains a variety of traditional African American mortuary behaviors, including the presence of concrete and wood memorials and an abundance of grave goods. All of the identified graves are sunken, indicating that wood coffins or only shrouds were used. Absent is evidence of use during the second half of the twentieth century, such as floral stands, metal undertaker plates, and concrete vaults. It seems that by about 1940, or about WWII the African American community shifted from this cemetery to other locations.

The cemetery is recommended eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria C and D at a local level of significance, and the cemetery meets Criteria Consideration C for cemeteries since its significance involves design characteristics and forensic data. Overall, the cemetery exhibits excellent integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It provides an exceptional example of nineteenth and early twentieth century African American mortuary customs, containing none of the later influences seen as these customs and traditions begin to be modified. It is also likely to contain a wealth of bioanthropological data ranging from the human remains to the grave goods to the coffin and its hardware. Should relocation ever be necessary, the cemetery has the potential to address a broad and impressive range of highly significant anthropological research questions.

While the lands surrounding this cemetery are in the process of being developed, the owners – Associated Developers, Inc. – are interested in preserving the cemetery in place and ensuring its continued existence in the African American community.

Although South Carolina law makes provision for the removal of abandoned cemeteries, there is no indication that this cemetery is “abandoned.” This law, S.C. Code of Laws, Section 27-43-10 et seq., also requires the local jurisdiction to determine whether removal is both necessary and expedient. It is unlikely this would be easy to demonstrate, especially in light of the recent decision in East Cooper Civic
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Club et al. v. Remley Point Development, LLC, Thomas D. Rogers, III, and Victoria Rogers.

Therefore, this report also outlines steps necessary to ensure appropriate preservation.

Recommendations

The local African American community has made significant steps toward clearing the cemetery of dense understory. This work, however, has not been finished and it has generated several large piles of brush. Once completed, long-term maintenance will be necessary. It will also be important to protect the cemetery from the curious and relic collector as it becomes more visible and better known. And finally, it is necessary to take steps to ensure the long-term preservation of those stones that are present. These recommendations, focus on these issues.

Clearing and Removal of Vegetation

The remainder of the cemetery should be cleared of scrub or volunteer growth under 2 to 3 inches in caliper. This work will need to be done by hand – as it has been thus far – since the operation of mechanized equipment on the site will cause significant damage to the graves and the stones. While this clearing may use chainsaws and trimmers fitted with saw blades, extreme care should be exercised to prevent damage to stones, monuments, and grave goods.

While I did not observe any living memorials during my visit, they may be present. No cedar, yucca, century plant, or similar non-indigenous plants should be removed. If in doubt, the plant should be allowed to remain.

All downed vegetation must be removed from the site. It is likely that the stacked vegetation is on graves. In addition, this stacked vegetation is attractive to snakes and poses a fire liability. The downed vegetation will need to be removed from the site by hand – again, no mechanized equipment may operate on the site. This means that all downed vegetation will need to be carried by hand to trucks operating only on the dirt access road.

Securing the Cemetery

Securing the cemetery takes two forms. One involves simply controlling access to prevent the idle curious and those seeking relics from accessing the property. This level of security needs to be designed to prevent unauthorized individuals from causing damage. The other involves ensuring the long-term preservation of the site by the descendants of those buried there. This level of security involves ensuring that long-term care and ownership is appropriately dealt with.

I recommend that the cemetery be fenced using a high security chain link. This will not only ensure that unauthorized individuals are excluded, but it ensures a longevity that will minimize future maintenance costs. A high security fence will minimally have 2½-inch square posts; the fabric will be held with clips, not bands; drive anchors for posts; and 1¼-inch 6-ga. mesh that is thermally fused vinyl coated. Both pedestrian and swing gates will be needed. The pedestrian gates should be fitted with mortise locks with dead bolts to allow easy access by the community, while providing high security.

Although the fence described will admittedly not be visually attractive, it can be dramatically softened through plantings.

The cemetery should be publicly dedicated, but closed to future burials (since the location of all existing burials is not known). Ownership may be vested in an organization designed to care for the cemetery or in a local church – depending on the wishes of the local community. What is important is that funding be established for the long-term maintenance of the cemetery. There is no doubt, for example, that at least yearly, an effort will need to be
made to remove new volunteer growth. Since herbicides are non-selective and will affect both stones and living memorials, all maintenance will need to be by hand – and this will require an endowment designed for long-term stability of the cemetery.

Conservation Efforts

Three markers at the cemetery need immediate attention. One marble marker is down and broken – it requires repair and resetting. A concrete marker is down and spalling – it requires stabilization to prevent future damage. And the wood marker requires treatment to ensure that it is not further affected by decay. These conservation treatments should be conducted once the cemetery is cleared and fenced.

The sunken graves should not be filled or leveled. Not only would this activity “lose” these graves and any grave goods that might be present, but it would change the landscape and character of the cemetery.

It is similarly important not to “beautify” the cemetery using plantings and designs that may be consistent with twentieth century white landscape designs, but which are totally inappropriate for nineteenth and twentieth century African American rural cemeteries. The character and historical significance of the cemetery must be taken into consideration during all rehabilitation efforts.

Integration of SHPO and Community Goals

It is important to understand that both the community and the SHPO will likely impose requirements on the preservation of the cemetery. As an eligible site, the SHPO will require that certain steps be taken to ensure that the development does not affect the visual or physical qualities of the cemetery. The SHPO will require that the cemetery be addressed in the preservation plan.

Similarly, in my conversations with members of the African American community, they too are concerned with the long-term preservation of the cemetery. Their immediate concerns involve the preservation of the cemetery and ensuring free access to the cemetery.
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CEMETERY FIELD SURVEY SHEET
INDIVIDUAL MARKER/MONUMENT

Name(s) on marker: Black, James

Type of Marker/Monument:  □ tablet headstone  □ die in socket  □ die on base
                □ government issue  □ lawn-type  □ plaque
                □ raised top  □ pulpit  □ die, base, cap
                □ bedstead/cradle  □ table tomb  □ box tomb
                □ ledger  □ obelisk  □ other:

Inscription: JAMES BLACK / AUG. 20, 1892 / JAN. 8, 1925

Inscription Technique:  □ carved  □ painted  □ other:

Material:  □ marble  □ granite  □ sandstone  □ slate
                □ limestone  □ fieldstone  □ other stone:
                □ cast iron  □ zinc  □ wood  □ concrete
                □ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in):  Height:  Width:  Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:  □ Bible  □ clapping hands  □ flowers
                □ willow and urn  □ cross  □ cross & crown
                □ lamb  □ dove  □ inverted torch
                □ Masonic  □ other fraternal order:
                □ finger pointing  □ other design:

Condition of Marker:  □ weathered  □ cracked  □ broken  □ vandalized
                □ unattached  □ loose  □ leaning  □ repaired
                □ biologicals  □ stained  □ portions missing:
                □ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:  City:  Location of Mark:

Footstone:  Material:  Design/initials:  Condition:

Coping:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Fencing:  Material:  Design:  Condition:

Grave Orientation: E-W  Marker inscription faces what direction: E

Grave Goods: none

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP  Date: 9/27/05
JAMES
BLACK
AUG. 20, 1892
JAN. 8, 1925
Cemetery: Bulow
Grave #: 2
Section #: Lot #: Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Harmond, David

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base
□ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque
□ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap
□ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb
□ ledger □ obelisk □ other:

Inscription: CORPL./ DAVID HARMOND / CO. 1 / 33 U.S.C. I.

Inscription Technique: □ carved □ painted □ other:
Material: □ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate
□ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone: □ concrete
□ cast iron □ zinc □ wood □ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:
Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible □ clapping hands □ flowers
□ willow and urn □ cross □ cross & crown
□ lamb □ dove □ inverted torch
□ Masonic □ other fraternal order:
□ finger pointing □ other design: in military shield

Condition of Marker: □ weathered □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized
□ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired
□ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:
□ other:

Stonemason’s Name:
City:
Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:
Coping: Material: Design: Condition:
Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: E-W Marker inscription faces what direction: E

Grave Goods: none

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP Date: 9/27/05
Chicora Foundation, Inc.  
PO Box 8664  
Columbia, SC 29202  
803-787-6910

**CEMETERY FIELD SURVEY SHEET**  
**INDIVIDUAL MARKER/MONUMENT**

**Cemetery:** Bulow  
**Grave #:** 3  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Williams, Peter

**Type of Marker/Monument:**  
- [ ] tablet headstone  
- [ ] die on socket  
- [ ] die on base  
- [ ] government issue  
- [ ] lawn-type  
- [ ] plaque  
- [ ] raised top  
- [ ] pulpit  
- [ ] die, base, cap  
- [ ] bedstead/cradle  
- [ ] table tomb  
- [ ] box tomb  
- [ ] ledger  
- [ ] obelisk  
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** PETER WILLIAMS / CO. D. / 21 U.S.C. INF.

**Inscription Technique:**  
- [ ] carved  
- [ ] painted  
- [ ] other:

**Material:**  
- [ ] marble  
- [ ] granite  
- [ ] sandstone  
- [ ] slate  
- [ ] limestone  
- [ ] fieldstone  
- [ ] other stone:  
- [ ] wood  
- [ ] concrete  
- [ ] cast iron  
- [ ] zinc  
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
- [ ] Height:  
- [ ] Width:  
- [ ] Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**  
- [ ] Bible  
- [ ] willow and urn  
- [ ] clapping hands  
- [ ] flowers  
- [ ] lamb  
- [ ] cross  
- [ ] cross & crown  
- [ ] dove  
- [ ] inverted torch  
- [ ] Masonic  
- [ ] other fraternal order:  
- [ ] other design: in military shield  
- [ ] finger pointing

**Condition of Marker:**  
- [ ] weathered  
- [ ] cracked  
- [ ] broken  
- [ ] vandalized  
- [ ] unattached  
- [ ] loose  
- [ ] repaired  
- [ ] leaning  
- [ ] portions missing:  
- [ ] biologicals  
- [ ] stained  
- [ ] other:

**Stonemason’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
**Material:**  
**Design/initials:**  
**Condition:**

**Coping:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
**Material:**  
**Design:**  
**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** E-W  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:** E

**Grave Goods:** glass vase, ceramic vase/pitcher (ETRURIA/MELLOR & CO.), milk glass candle base

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP  
**Date:** 9/27/05
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

**Cemetery:** Bulow

**Grave #:** 4a/b  
**Section #:**  
**Lot #:**  
**Photo No:**

**Name(s) on marker:** Grayson, Daniel

**Type of Marker/Monument:**  
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other:

**Inscription:** DANIEL GRAYSON / BORN MAR. 15, 1853 / DIED DEC. 19, 1899 / LORD HAVE MERCY, HAVE MERCY

**Inscription Technique:**  
- ☒ carved
- ☐ painted
- ☐ other:

**Material:**  
- ☒ marble
- ☐ granite
- ☐ sandstone
- ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone
- ☐ fieldstone
- ☐ other stone:
- ☐ cast iron
- ☐ zinc
- ☐ wood
- ☐ concrete

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**  
- Height:  
- Width:  
- Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**  
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing

**Condition of Marker:**  
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ cracked
- ☐ broken
- ☒ vandalized
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ loose
- ☐ leaning
- ☐ repaired
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ stained
- ☐ portions missing:
- ☐ other: out of ground, lying flat

**Stonecutter’s Name:**  
**City:**  
**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**  
- **Material:** marble  
- **Design/initials:** D.G.  
- **Condition:** good

**Coping:**  
- **Material:**  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:**

**Fencing:**  
- **Material:**  
- **Design:**  
- **Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:**  
**Marker inscription faces what direction:**

**Grave Goods:** none

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP  
**Date:** 9/27/05
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Bulow</th>
<th>Grave #: 5</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Rodan, Benjamin

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [x] tablet headstone
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** BENJ. RODAN / CO. 1 / 33RD U.S.C.T.

**Inscription Technique:**
- [x] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height:
- Width:
- Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] clapping hands
- [ ] flowers
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] cross
- [ ] cross & crown
- [ ] dove
- [ ] inverted torch
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] other fraternal order:
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] other design: in military shield
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [x] biologicals
- [ ] loose
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] stained
- [ ] portions missing:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [x] weathered
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] loose
- [ ] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] stained
- [ ] portions missing:

**Stonemaster’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** E-W

**Marker inscription faces what direction:** E

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP

**Date:** 9/27/05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Bulow</th>
<th>Grave #: 6</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** no name

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☐ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☒ other: dresser top

**Inscription:** none

**Inscription Technique:**
- ☐ carved
- ☐ painted
- ☒ other: none

**Material:**
- ☒ marble
- ☐ granite
- ☐ sandstone
- ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone
- ☐ fieldstone
- ☐ other stone:
- ☐ cast iron
- ☐ zinc
- ☐ wood
- ☐ concrete
- ☐ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height:
- Width:
- Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- ☐ other design: in military shield

**Condition of Marker:**
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ cracked
- ☒ broken
- ☐ vandalized
- ☐ loose
- ☐ leaning
- ☒ repaired
- ☐ stained
- ☐ portions missing:
- ☒ other:

**Stonemower’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
  - Design/initials:
    - Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
  - Design:
    - Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
  - Design:
    - Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** E-W

**Marker inscription faces what direction:** E

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP

**Date:** 9/27/05
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Bulow</th>
<th>Grave #: 7a/b</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on Marker:** W., B.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- □ tablet headstone
- □ die in socket
- □ die on base
- □ government issue
- □ lawn-type
- □ plaque
- □ raised top
- □ pulpit
- □ die, base, cap
- □ bedstead/cradle
- □ table tomb
- □ box tomb
- □ ledger
- □ obelisk
- □ other: wood, marble

**Inscription:**
- □ wood: none
- □ marble: B.W.

**Inscription Technique:**
- □ carved
- □ painted
- □ other:

**Material:**
- □ marble
- □ granite
- □ sandstone
- □ slate
- □ limestone
- □ fieldstone
- □ other stone:
- □ cast iron
- □ zinc
- □ wood
- □ concrete
- □ other material: wood appears to be cypress

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height:</th>
<th>Width:</th>
<th>Thickness:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- □ Bible
- □ willow and urn
- □ cross hands
- □ flowers
- □ clasp
- □ cross & crown
- □ dove
- □ inverted torch
- □ lamb
- □ other fraternal order:
- □ other design: in military shield

**Condition of Marker:**
- □ weathered
- □ cracked
- □ broken
- □ vandalized
- □ unattached
- □ loose
- □ leaning
- □ repaired
- □ biologicals
- □ stained
- □ portions missing:
- □ other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>Location of Mark:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Footstone:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material:</th>
<th>Design/initials:</th>
<th>Condition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Coping:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material:</th>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Condition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fencing:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material:</th>
<th>Design:</th>
<th>Condition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grave Orientation: E-W**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker inscription faces what direction:</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grave Goods:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveyor: MT/NS/JP</th>
<th>Date: 9/27/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Cemetery: Bulow
Grave #: 8
Section #: Lot #: Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Matthews, Anne

Type of Marker/Monument: ☑ tablet headstone ☑ die in socket ☑ die on base
☒ government issue ☑ lawn-type ☑ plaque
☒ raised top ☑ pulpit ☑ die, base, cap
☒ bedstead/cradle ☑ table tomb ☑ box tomb
☒ ledger ☑ obelisk ☑ other:

Inscription: ANNE MATTHEWS / Born May 7, 1875 / Died April 7, 1915

Inscription Technique: ☑ carved ☑ painted ☑ other:

Material: ☑ marble ☑ granite ☑ sandstone ☑ slate
☒ limestone ☑ fieldstone ☑ other stone:
☒ cast iron ☑ zinc ☑ wood ☑ concrete
☒ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: ☐ Bible ☐ Bible clasping hands ☐ flowers
☐ willow and urn ☐ cross ☐ cross & crown
☐ lamb ☐ dove ☐ inverted torch
☐ Masonic ☐ other fraternal order:
☐ finger pointing ☐ other design:

Condition of Marker: ☑ weathered ☑ cracked ☑ broken ☑ vandalized
☐ unattached ☑ loose ☑ repaired
☐ biologicals ☑ stained ☑ portions missing:
☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name: City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: E-W Marker inscription faces what direction: E

Grave Goods: glass jar, wine glass broken stem, ceramic pitcher, glass pitcher, frag of ceramic plate

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP Date: 9/27/05
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ANNE MATTHEWS.

Born May 7, 1875.

Died April 7, 1915.
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet
Individual Marker/Monument

Cemetery: Bulow
Grave #: 9
Section #: Lot #: Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: C., A.

Type of Marker/Monument: □ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base
□ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque
□ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap
□ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb
□ ledger □ obelisk □ other: footstone?

Inscription: A.C.

Inscription Technique: □ carved □ painted □ other:

Material: □ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate
□ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone:
□ cast iron □ zinc □ wood □ concrete
□ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: □ Bible □ clasping hands □ flowers
□ willow and urn □ cross □ cross & crown
□ lamb □ dove □ inverted torch
□ Masonic □ other fraternal order:
□ finger pointing □ other design:

Condition of Marker: □ weathered □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized
□ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired
□ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:
□ other: out of ground, lying flat

Stonecutter’s Name: City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: E-W Marker inscription faces what direction: E

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP Date: 9/27/05
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Bulow</th>
<th>Grave #: 10</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Gibbes, H.C.

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- tablet headstone
- die in socket
- die on base
- government issue
- lawn-type
- plaque
- raised top
- pulpit
- die, base, cap
- bedstead/cradle
- table tomb
- box tomb
- ledger
- obelisk
- other:

**Inscription:**

H.C. GIBBS / BORN 1852 / DIED NOV. 2, 1892

**Inscription Technique:**
- carved
- painted
- other:

**Material:**
- marble
- granite
- sandstone
- slate
- limestone
- fieldstone
- other stone:
- wood
- concrete
- cast iron
- zinc
- other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**

Height: Width: Thickness:

- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- clasp hands
- flowers
- cross
- cross & crown
- dove
- inverted torch
- other fraternal order:
- other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:
- other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material:
- Design/initials:
- Condition:

**Coping:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material:
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation: E-W**

**Marker inscription faces what direction:** E

**Grave Goods:** none

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP

**Date:** 9/27/05
H. C. GIBBS
Born 1852
Died Nov. 2, 1892
Cemetery Field Survey Sheet

Name(s) on marker: Gibbes, Culliott

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Grave #:</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Photo No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Marker/Monument:
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☒ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other:


Inscription Technique:
- ☒ carved
- ☐ painted
- ☐ other:

Material:
- ☒ marble
- ☐ granite
- ☒ sandstone
- ☐ slate
- ☐ limestone
- ☐ fieldstone
- ☐ other stone:
- ☐ wood
- ☒ concrete
- ☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:
- ☐ Bible
- ☐ willow and urn
- ☐ lamb
- ☐ Masonic
- ☒ finger pointing
- ☒ other design: shield
- ☐ weathered
- ☒ cracked
- ☒ broken
- ☐ vandalized
- ☐ unattached
- ☒ loose
- ☒ leaning
- ☒ repaired
- ☐ biologicals
- ☒ stained
- ☐ portions missing:

Condition of Marker: ☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name: 
City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: E-W Marker inscription faces what direction: E

Grave Goods: glass cup/tumbler

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP Date: 9/27/05
Cemetery: Bulow
Grave #: 12
Section #: Lot #: Photo No:

Name(s) on marker: Heyward, Charles

Type of Marker/Monument:
- ☒ tablet headstone
- ☐ die in socket
- ☐ die on base
- ☐ government issue
- ☐ lawn-type
- ☐ plaque
- ☐ raised top
- ☐ pulpit
- ☐ die, base, cap
- ☐ bedstead/cradle
- ☐ table tomb
- ☐ box tomb
- ☐ ledger
- ☐ obelisk
- ☐ other:

Inscription: CHARLES / HEYWARD / SOUTH CAROLINA / PVT. / 136 DEPOT BRIG. / OCTOBER 6, 1939

Inscription Technique: ☒ carved
☐ painted
☐ other:

Material: ☒ marble
☐ granite
☐ sandstone
☐ slate
☐ limestone
☐ fieldstone
☐ other stone:
☐ cast iron
☐ zinc
☐ wood
☐ concrete
☐ other material:

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features:
- ☐ Bible
- ☐ willow and urn
- ☐ lamb
- ☐ Masonic
- ☐ cross
- ☐ cross & crown
- ☐ dove
- ☐ inverted torch
- ☐ other fraternal order:
- ☐ other design:

Condition of Marker:
- ☐ weathered
- ☐ cracked
- ☐ broken
- ☐ vandalized
- ☐ unattached
- ☐ loose
- ☐ leaning
- ☐ repaired
- ☐ biologicals
- ☐ stained
- ☐ portions missing:
- ☐ other:

Stonecutter’s Name:
City:
Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: E-W
Marker inscription faces what direction: E

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP Date: 9/27/05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Bulow</th>
<th>Grave #: 13</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** Gibbs, Edna

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- ☑ tablet headstone
- ❏ die in socket
- ❏ die on base
- ❏ government issue
- ❏ lawn-type
- ❏ plaque
- ❏ raised top
- ❏ pulpit
- ❏ die, base, cap
- ❏ bedstead/cradle
- ❏ table tomb
- ❏ box tomb
- ❏ ledger
- ❏ obelisk
- ❏ other:

**Inscription:**
```
EDNA / DAU. OF / CORNELIUS / GIBBS / BORN NOV. 22, 1917 / DIED NOV. 12, 1920 / ASLEET IN / JESUS
```

**Inscription Technique:**
- ❏ carved
- ❏ painted
- ☑ other: cast

**Material:**
- ❏ marble
- ❏ granite
- ❏ sandstone
- ❏ slate
- ❏ limestone
- ❏ fieldstone
- ❏ other stone:
- ❏ cast iron
- ❏ zinc
- ❏ wood
- ❏ concrete
- ❏ other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**

- Height:
- Width:
- Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- Bible
- willow and urn
- lamb
- Masonic
- finger pointing
- other design: vine

**Condition of Marker:**
- weathered
- cracked
- broken
- vandalized
- unattached
- loose
- leaning
- repaired
- biologicals
- stained
- portions missing:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**

**Material:**

**Design/initials:**

**Condition:**

**Coping:**

**Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Fencing:**

**Material:**

**Design:**

**Condition:**

**Grave Orientation:** E-W

**Marker inscription faces what direction:** E

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP

**Date:** 9/27/05
EDNA
DAU. OF
CORNELIUS
GIEBS.
BORN NOV 22, 1917.
DIED NOV. 12, 1920.
ASLEEP IN
JESUS.
**Cemetery Field Survey Sheet**

**Individual Marker/Monument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery: Bulow</th>
<th>Grave #: 14a/b</th>
<th>Section #:</th>
<th>Lot #:</th>
<th>Photo No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name(s) on marker:** no name

**Type of Marker/Monument:**
- [ ] tablet headstone
- [ ] die in socket
- [ ] die on base
- [ ] government issue
- [ ] lawn-type
- [ ] plaque
- [ ] raised top
- [ ] pulpit
- [ ] die, base, cap
- [ ] bedstead/cradle
- [ ] table tomb
- [ ] box tomb
- [ ] ledger
- [ ] obelisk
- [ ] other:

**Inscription:** no inscription

**Inscription Technique:**
- [ ] carved
- [ ] painted
- [ ] other:

**Material:**
- [x] marble
- [ ] granite
- [ ] sandstone
- [ ] slate
- [ ] limestone
- [ ] fieldstone
- [ ] other stone:
- [ ] wood
- [ ] concrete
- [ ] cast iron
- [ ] zinc
- [ ] other material:

**Gravestone Size (ft/in):**
- Height:
- Width:
- Thickness:

**Gravestone Design Features:**
- [ ] Bible
- [ ] willow and urn
- [ ] lamb
- [ ] Masonic
- [ ] finger pointing
- [ ] other fraternity order:
- [ ] other design:

**Condition of Marker:**
- [ ] weathered
- [ ] cracked
- [ ] broken
- [ ] vandalized
- [ ] unattached
- [ ] loose
- [x] leaning
- [ ] repaired
- [ ] biologicals
- [ ] stained
- [ ] portions missing:
- [ ] other:

**Stonecutter’s Name:**

**City:**

**Location of Mark:**

**Footstone:**
- Material: marble
- Design/initials: none
- Condition: good

**Coping:**
- Material: 
- Design:
- Condition:

**Fencing:**
- Material: 
- Design:
- Condition:

**Grave Orientation:** E-W

**Marker inscription faces what direction:** E

**Grave Goods:**

**Surveyor:** MT/NS/JP

**Date:** 9/27/05
Cemetery: Bulow
Grave #: 15

Name(s) on marker: illegible

Type of Marker/Monument: ☑ tablet headstone ☐ die in socket ☐ die on base
☐ government issue ☐ lawn-type ☐ plaque
☐ raised top ☐ pulpit ☐ die, base, cap
☐ bedstead/cradle ☐ table tomb ☐ box tomb
☐ ledger ☐ obelisk ☐ other: triangular

Inscription: inscription is illegible; stamped concrete with a skim coat over base coat and letters in both; possibly representing a correction of original casting?

Inscription Technique: ☑ carved ☐ painted ☑ other: cast

Material: ☐ marble ☐ granite ☐ sandstone ☐ slate
☐ limestone ☐ fieldstone ☐ other stone: ☐ wood
☐ cast iron ☐ zinc ☐ concrete

Gravestone Size (ft/in): Height: Width: Thickness:

Gravestone Design Features: ☐ Bible ☐ clasping hands ☐ flowers
☐ willow and urn ☐ cross ☐ cross & crown
☐ lamb ☐ dove ☐ inverted torch
☐ Masonic ☐ other fraternal order:
☐ finger pointing ☐ other design:

Condition of Marker: ☑ weathered ☑ cracked ☑ broken ☑ vandalized
☐ unattached ☑ loose ☑ leaning ☑ repaired
☒ biologicals ☑ stained ☑ portions missing:
☐ other: out of ground, lying flat

Stonecutter’s Name: City: Location of Mark:

Footstone: Material: Design/initials: Condition:

Coping: Material: Design: Condition:

Fencing: Material: Design: Condition:

Grave Orientation: Marker inscription faces what direction:

Grave Goods:

Surveyor: MT/NS/JP  Date: 9/27/05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Bulow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave #</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) on marker</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Marker/Monument</td>
<td>□ tablet headstone □ die in socket □ die on base □ government issue □ lawn-type □ plaque □ raised top □ pulpit □ die, base, cap □ bedstead/cradle □ table tomb □ box tomb □ ledger □ obelisk □ other: uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>none; possibly footstone associated with #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription Technique</td>
<td>□ carved □ painted □ other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>□ marble □ granite □ sandstone □ slate □ limestone □ fieldstone □ other stone: □ wood □ concrete □ cast iron □ zinc □ other material: CMU with shell inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Size (ft/in)</td>
<td>Height: Width: Thickness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestone Design Features</td>
<td>□ Bible □ willow and urn □ lamb □ Masonic □ finger pointing □ other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>□ other material: CMU with shell inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Marker</td>
<td>□ weathered □ cracked □ broken □ vandalized □ unattached □ loose □ leaning □ repaired □ biologicals □ stained □ portions missing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonecutter’s Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footstone</td>
<td>Material: Design/initials: Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>Material: Design: Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Material: Design: Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Orientation</td>
<td>Marker inscription faces what direction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave Goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>MT/NS/JP Date: 9/27/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cemetery Preservation Plans

Historical Research

Identification of Grave Locations and Mapping

Condition Assessments

Treatment of Stone and Ironwork