NPS Form 10-900-b
(March 1992)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form

XX New Submission __ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Antebellum Resources of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri

B. Associated Historic Contexts

The Development of Plantations, 1830s-1860s
Agriculture and the Hemp Culture, 1830s-1860s
Plantation Architecture, 1830s-1870s

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Roger Maserang/Historic Preservation Coordinator

organization Pioneer Trails Regional Council

street & number 122 Hout Street telephone (816) 747-2294

city or town Warrensburg state Missouri zip code 64093

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Claire F. Blackwell 9 October 1997

Signature and title of certifying official Claire F. Blackwell/Deputy SHPO Date

Missouri Department of Natural Resources
State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper Date

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in **How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form (National Register Bulletin 16B)**. Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

	Page Numbers
E. Statement of Historic Contexts (If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	1-16
The Development of plantations, 1830s - 1860s	1-5
Agriculture and the Hemp Culture, 1830s - 1860s	5-9
Plantation Architecture, 1830s - 1870s	9-12
F. Associated Property Types (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	1-10
G. Geographical Data	1
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	1-2
I. Major Bibliographical References (List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	1

Introduction

Antebellum resources which are linked by their architecture and period of significance, although scattered over four counties in west-central Missouri, are addressed by this Multiple Property Documentation Form. The focus is on vernacular Greek Revival I-Houses which were constructed within the context of a plantation system of agriculture. Most of these houses were erected by migrating Southerners from the 1830s through the 1860s, although the architectural style persisted at least into the 1870s. Some Greek Revival I-Houses in the four counties were erected, and their associated plantations operated, by non-Southerners. The Missouri River serves as the northern boundary of two counties, Lafayette and Saline, which were part of the "Little Dixie" slaveholding belt across central Missouri. Here classic, Southern-type plantations developed (although on a smaller scale than in the Deep South) and the economy was largely hemp-based prior to the Civil War. The plantation system apparently was not a significant development in the other two counties (Johnson and Pettis), although slaveholding families from the Upland South operated large antebellum farms around Georgetown in Pettis County. East, west and south boundaries of this four-county mass are linear with indentions. Since 1967 when Show-Me Regional Planning Commission was created by local city and county governments to provide technical assistance and other services, this area has been known as the Show-Me Region. Recently, Show-Me Regional Planning Commission changed its name to Pioneer Trails Regional Council.

Related historic contexts include The Development of Plantations, 1830s-1860s; Agriculture and the Hemp Culture, 1830s-1860s; and Plantation Architecture, 1830s-1870s.

Eight individual nominations were initially prepared in connection with the MRA cover document:

Property Name	Location	NR Criteria
Napoleon Buck House	Waverly vicinity, Lafayette Co.	C
Minatree Catron House	Lexington vicinity, Lafayette Co.	A,C
James M. Dinwiddie House	Dover vicinity, Lafayette Co.	A,C
William Gentry House	Sedalia vicinity, Pettis Co.	A,C
Theodore Gosewisch House	Lexington vicinity, Lafayette Co.	C
George A. Murrell House	Napton vicinity, Saline Co.	A,C
William P. Robinson House	Lexington vicinity, Lafayette Co.	A,C
Thomas Shelby House	Lexington vicinity, Lafayette Co.	A,C

This document was immediately preceded by an intensive study of 70 antebellum and early postbellum resources in the Show-Me Region*, in 1991-93. Originally, these 70 properties were identified in individual surveys of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties. (For a more detailed discussion of the selection process, see Section G, Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods.)

Historic Context: The Development of Plantations, 1830s-1860s

*For purposes of this submission, the Show-Me Region is defined as the four counties of west central Missouri administered by the Show-Me Regional Planning Commission, the predecessor of the current Pioneer Trails Regional Council, and consists of the counties of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis, and Saline.

With its gently rolling hills, extensive acreage and rich loess soils, the Missouri River Valley area of central Missouri beckoned to many pioneers as the "edge of civilization" flowed westward in the early nineteenth century. This landscape was reminiscent of the plantation regions which many settlers left behind in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina and other states of the Upland South. The Boone's Lick area, centered in Howard and Cooper Counties, was the immediate destination of thousands of immigrants who arrived by wagon, keelboat and flatboat after the War of 1812. But it was also a jumping-off place for the many settlers who pushed farther into the wilderness, including those who settled in what became the Show-Me Region of the Missouri River Valley.

A particularly fine landing on the Missouri River's west bank, which became Arrow Rock in what today is Saline County, was described by William Clark (who camped there in 1808, while on an expedition to establish Fort Osage) as "a handsome Spot for a Town." He also described it as a good site for a fort, and a few years later directed that a blockhouse and trading post be established there. Although the Arrow Rock facility was soon abandoned because of Indian raids, settlement persisted.[1]

Permanent white settlement in the vicinity of Arrow Rock apparently began around 1810, five years before the end of the Indian Wars. The 1881 Saline County history credits Kentuckian Jesse Cox with being that area's first settler. In 1810, Cox is said to have built a log house and cleared a patch of land in the timbered hills. He was soon joined by members of his family and a son-in-law, William Gregg.[2] Many settlers were related or at least acquainted before their arrival, facilitating the diffusion of Southern culture.

Gilead Rupe was another early pioneer, probably arriving in the Boone's Lick area before the War of 1812. Apparently by 1815, Rupe found land more to his liking near the future site of Lexington, in what would become Lafayette County. His closest neighbor was said to be Jesse Cox at Arrow Rock.[3] After 1815, Indian warfare essentially ceased and the pace of settlement accelerated. In about 1819, William Jack started a ferry across the Missouri River where Indian trails and a road converged, and Lexington, platted three years later, grew up around the site of the ferry . Meanwhile, Nimrod Jenkins and other pioneers were filtering southwest from Arrow Rock into what became northeastern Pettis County.[4] Because it was farther inland than the region's other three counties, white settlement of the area that became Johnson County was delayed until around 1827. In that year, Pleasant Rice came from Tennessee to the present town of Columbus. Nicholas Houx came a few months after Rice, accompanied by several slaves.[5]

Names associated with the post-pioneer development of a local plantation system included Hicklin, Thomson, Catron, Shelby, Dinwiddie, Gentry, Murrell, Robinson, Slusher, Major, Campbell and many others who came, primarily, from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and North Carolina, plus a scattering of other states. Their pattern of westward migration often included months or years at an intermediate location before "final" settlement in the Show-Me Region. What was happening in the Missouri River Valley west of the Mississippi River was of course only a small part of a much larger pattern of settlement and diffusion.

Overall, the speed of settlement in the area was fairly rapid. The earliest settlers scorned the prairie land and built log houses in the timbered hills, but any doubts about the suitability of unforested prairie soil for general agriculture were presumably allayed by General Thomas Adams Smith in the 1820s. Smith's experimental prairie farm near what became Napton in Saline county was a profitable operation which

"succeeded in exploding the theory that prairie land was unfertile."[6] Because the culture already existed, the period between early settlement and the first plantations was only a couple of dozen years.

James Hicklin's Hicklin Hearthstone, a vernacular Greek Revival I-House east of Lexington, may have been constructed as early as 1838. Hicklin migrated from Blount County, Tennessee, in 1817 or 1818, and Hicklin Hearthstone became the centerpiece of one of the region's premier antebellum plantations. Although Hicklin engaged in diversified agriculture rather than the cultivation of hemp, his slave-based operation was conducted within the context of the Southern hemp culture. Already listed in the National Register of Historic Places (Hicklin Hearthstone, 12-28-82), the Hicklin property includes two outbuildings formerly used as slave quarters.[7]

Slavery, with its inherent dehumanization, was a defining feature of the plantation lifestyle. Missouri had been admitted to the Union under the Missouri Compromise as a slaveholding state. The background of many white settlers in the Show-Me Region included participation in a slavery system, and slaves were often brought along or purchased locally by the wealthier immigrants. Had Missouri not been a slave state, the Missouri River Valley undoubtedly would have been spurned by the vast majority of migrating Southerners in search of fresh opportunities, its other attributes notwithstanding. On the eve of the Civil War, slaves constituted a third of the total population in both Lafayette and Saline counties.

Lafayette and Saline counties are in the western portion of Little Dixie, Missouri's "slavery belt" along the Missouri River where Southern sympathies and Democratic politics prevailed at the time of the Civil War. The boundaries of Little Dixie have been variously defined, but seven counties are included when cultural and economic criteria--the number and percentages of slaves and the extent of their involvement in all aspects of society--are primary factors: Boone, Callaway, Clay, Cooper, Howard, Lafayette and Saline.[8] No county in Little Dixie had more slaves in 1860 than Lafayette County's 6,374. Saline County, with 4,876 slaves, was fourth.[9]

In August 1862, plantation owner Minatree Catron, in poor health and reportedly depressed over the expected loss of his 30 slaves and consequently a good part of his wealth at war's end, drowned himself.[10] Catron's failing health may have driven him to suicide, but the loss or anticipated loss of valuable slaves could be devastating. Slaveowners like Catron were among the wealthiest men in the area but slave prices plummeted when war broke out.

Missouri plantations had much in common with plantations in the Deep South but there were some important differences. In the years before mechanized agriculture, cheap slave labor was necessary for economically successful farming. In Little Dixie, however, planters owned fewer slaves than their counterparts in the Deep South. Missouri plantations also were smaller and more like family farms than the classic cotton, sugar or rice plantations of the Deep South, typically producing a variety of crops and livestock rather than depending on a single staple crop. Apparently, most owners of Missouri plantations personally supervised or worked along with their slaves in contrast to the system of overseers and gangs that prevailed in the Deep South.[11]

In the Deep South where most of the slaves were owned by wealthy agriculturalists, the largest plantations were operated by 200 or more slaves.[12] But in Missouri's Little Dixie, plantations with 20 or more slaves were the exception and "most masters...were small-scale farmers who needed extra labor

beyond that which the family could provide to move from subsistence to commercial agriculture." Only four percent of the slaveholders in Little Dixie owned at least 20 slaves and 500 acres in 1860. Census records indicate that in the Show-Me Region, only one slaveholder ever owned more than a hundred slaves. In 1860, Cynthia B. Smith of Saline County, widow of General Thomas Smith (d. 1855) owned 106 slaves. Smith was also the largest slaveholder in 1850, with 89.[13]

Census records do not indicate black overseers, but studies of antebellum agriculture in Little Dixie by R. Douglas Hurt and Philip V. Scarpino indicate they were not widely used by local slaveowners. When an overseer was employed, it probably was for hemp cultivation since the tasks involved were considerably more labor-intensive than general agriculture, often requiring a gang labor operation. Slaves were present regardless of whether hemp was produced, but the number of slaves was likely to be higher on plantations where hemp was a money crop. Prolific hemp grower Thomas Shelby of Lafayette County owned 41 slaves and harvested 47 tons of hemp in 1860. Pettis County's William Gentry, who grew no hemp but nonetheless operated a large plantation raising corn, oats, wheat, cattle, sheep and hogs, owned 16 slaves. True to form, Shelby also produced considerable amounts of corn, wheat, oats and potatoes while raising hogs as well as cows and beef cattle. Considering that he raised little or no hemp, James Hicklin's many slaves (36 in 1860) probably indicates that he was a slave trader or hired out slaves to his neighbors.[14]

Missouri plantation owners also appear to have spent more money on implements than their counterparts in the Deep South, to increase their slaves' productivity and maximize profits. In 1860, Little Dixie planters owned an average of $506 in implements compared with planters in the Deep South who apparently invested an average of less than $200 in farm tools. Receptive to new machinery including plows, harrows, cultivators, reapers, hemp brakes and corn shellers, "the planters of Little Dixie operated on a scale of technological investment and sophistication comparable to many commercial farmers in the North."[15]

In 1859 in a sort of portent, loss of the state's slave population--not necessarily for reasons of emancipation--was considered by the Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor. Southern buyers were offering high prices for slaves to meet a growing demand and if this continued it seemed to some that Missouri, bounded on three sides by free states, might soon "be stripped of her Negro population." Could Missouri River Valley farmland still be cultivated, using white labor? The editor thought yes, provided that the farms be reduced in size: "White labor pays, if a man does his own work, or works with his hired laborers." With "abolition interference" from neighboring states considered to be the cause of problems ranging from runaways to murdered masters, the Visitor suggested selling the slaves to Southern buyers while the market was good.[16]

Although the Civil War wrecked many lives, recovery for some plantation owners could be swift. "Ruined" Andrew Jackson Slusher, for example, bounced back nicely. A son of Christopher Slusher who migrated to the Dover Road area from Virginia with his wife and 10 children in 1828, Andrew Jackson Slusher farmed and lived in a single-pen log house until 1851, when he built what later became the ell of a central passage I-House. With the war winding down in 1864, he is said to have joined the Confederacy and participated in General Sterling Price's final series of skirmishes and battles. Despite the privations experienced by many overt Southerners at war's end, including the loss of his four slaves, Slusher rebuilt his farm and in 1869 added a Greek Revival front block to the previously constructed ell. Slusher had

less to lose than many of his neighbors but during the years of reconstruction he eventually accumulated over 1,200 acres.[17]

To summarize, a local plantation system emerged fairly quickly from humble beginnings once a foothold was established. An increasing demand for hemp, an important money crop in antebellum Missouri, was a primary factor in its development but general agriculture including livestock raising was also important. While the plantation system evolved over generations in the South, here it was simply transplanted. Within two decades of initial settlement, it was feasible for some pioneers or their descendants who had achieved self-sufficiency to develop personal visions of the good life, Southern-style. Cheap slave labor was necessary for profitable agriculture, particularly on plantations where hemp was also cultivated. After the war, many of the freed slaves who previously tended the crops and livestock returned to the farms, hiring themselves out as farm laborers.

Historic Context: Agriculture and the Hemp Culture, 1830s-1860s

Interest in hemp developed slowly in Missouri, with relatively little hemp cultivated statewide until after 1840. St. Louis had a "rope walk" for the production of rope from raw hemp fibers as early as 1809, however, and Lafayette County farmers were raising and shipping hemp to the markets at St. Louis and New Orleans as early as 1820. Production increased after 1840, peaking at 19,267 tons in 1860. For various reasons, much of the state's hemp was cultivated in the Missouri River Valley. After the Civil War the industry declined rapidly but, not unlike the lingering Greek Revival influence in architecture, interest in hemp as a commercial crop persisted into the 1870s and beyond.[18]

The degree to which the hemp culture dominated local agriculture is evident in period newspapers published in the river towns. Developments involving hemp warehouses or factories which were planned, under construction or temporarily closed were enthusiastically reported, information on tonnages of processed rope and raw hemp bales shipped was regularly published (the quantities often greatly surpassed those of other commodities), and forecasts and evaluations concerning hemp crops consistently made the news. "Farm for sale" advertisements often listed prime hemp land among the property's attributes. By the late 1850s, local inventors patented and sold hemp "brake" machines to expedite the harvesting process. Joseph O. Shelby, soon to achieve fame for his Civil War exploits, operated steam rope factories and warehouses at St.Thomas (today part of Waverly) and nearby Berlin, a vanished Lafayette County town west of Dover on the Missouri River. In 1861, hemp figured prominently in the Battle of Hemp Bales when Federal soldiers at Lexington were defeated by an advancing force of Confederates using large bundles of the fibrous crop as shields.

Factors in the development of a local hemp culture included expansion of the cotton industry which used hemp rope for baling and bagging, an increased protective tariff on imported hemp, access to river transportation, the influx of a sizable population already experienced in or at least familiar with hemp growing, the availability of enough slave labor to overcome the hardships of its cultivation, and, of course, favorable growing conditions. Two acres of land, on average, were needed to produce each ton of hemp. Several of these factors applied to other areas of Missouri, but a hemp culture only flourished in those counties settled by slaveholders from the Upland South. In 1850 and 1860, the state's four greatest hemp-producing counties were Lafayette, Saline, Platte and Buchanan.[19] Much smaller quantities of

hemp were produced in Johnson and Pettis Counties, a claim in the 1881 Johnson County history notwithstanding that hemp cultivation "was largely engaged in and brought considerable wealth to the farmers."[20]

In the river towns, hemp was received by local dealers or "forwarding merchants" who stored it in warehouses prior to shipment by steamboat to large markets at St. Louis and New Orleans. Lexington, in Lafayette County, was the primary shipping point for hemp in Little Dixie.[21] Waverly, Miami and Arrow Rock also were important export towns within the Show-Me Region, while even tiny Berlin, a long-vanished port between Dover and Lexington, shipped hemp and had a rope factory (operated by Joseph O. Shelby).[22] The raw hemp was compressed into bales or made into rope prior to shipment, and the hemp processing facilities were important local businesses. In 1853, Lexington's three rope factories--operated by Moore & Waddell, the McGrew Brothers, and Anderson & Gratz--manufactured and shipped approximately 3,000 tons of hemp rope.[23]

Despite past "pecuniary embarrassments," Waverly's steam rope factory which had been closed for repairs reopened in February 1860, and the Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Morning Visitor reported the news exuberantly:

> On Wednesday last, steam was raised, the old whistle sounded a prolonged signal of resurrection and life; the bands were strained on the pulleys, and the clatter commenced, which to persons of nervous temperaments, or with thumping headaches, is almost intolerable. On Thursday several of the jennies were set to work, and a splendid sample of new bale-rope, from new hemp, was produced. . . . The factory is now in complete operation, having undergone thorough repairs, under the supervision of Mr. Gyle, an experienced machinist. Every thing is now in complete order, and an effective corps of operatives are employed. Messrs. G. M. Alexander and Joseph O. Shelby, will always be in attendance. Mr. Alexander attends the duties of the office, and Mr. Shelby, with his coat off, will keep every hand to his place, and see that every picker, carder, condenser, spooler and spinner, is kept in constant motion. Mr. S. informs that the machinery of the Factory has now a capacity of turning off four tons of bale-rope per day, or about twenty-five tons per week. This, at $140 per ton, will furnish the snug little sum of $3,500 weekly, or *$175,000 annually, putting the rope at the low average of 7 cents a pound. The farmers in this* fine hemp growing section, are determined to sustain the Factory, and thus, by holding up the arms of enterprising men, make a ready cash market for their staple. Give our industrious manufacturers time to breathe, and they will extricate themselves from all pecuniary embarrassments.[24]

When rural property in the hemplands was offered for sale, its suitability for hemp production was often mentioned as a selling point. In 1860, Samuel F. Taylor advertised three large farms for sale "on the Lexington and St. Louis Railroad in the Hemp region of Missouri, convenient to good schools, to churches, and in a neighborhood of good society."[25] R. H. Creel advertised a 240-acre farm near Waverly, "more than half of which is prime Hemp Land." On the farm were "a comfortable Dwelling-house of six rooms; a good Frame house, of two rooms, for servants; a Stable, Hemp House, Carriage House, an Ice House full of ice, and other necessary out-buildings."[26] William Dickson advertised his 800-acre farm on the Santa Fe Trail three miles east of Dover, with "a large Brick Dwelling House and Ell, with six rooms and two halls; Kitchen and Smokehouse of brick; two Negro Cabins, one of stone, the other frame;

one Barn; an Apple Orchard (and) on another part of the Farm, a Frame Dwelling, with Apple Orchard and Stables. Both Dwellings have Wells of living water. The whole Farm is well supplied with Springs of running water. It is a good Hemp or Stock Farm."[27]

Just as all hemp growers did not build Greek Revival mansions, all builders of antebellum mansions were not hemp growers. Even in prime hemp country, hemp was much less of a universal crop than, for example, corn. Most hemp growers produced only one or two tons or less and some farmers seemingly had no interest in what others saw as a prime money crop, producing none or at least too little to report. No one, apparently, raised hemp exclusively. Hemp could be more profitable than corn, wheat or potatoes, but its cultivation was somewhat more of a gamble. Hemp prices could fluctuate wildly as they often did in the 1850s. Even in the most productive hemp regions, hemp fields sprawling over more than a hundred acres were the exception. Too, some farmers may have considered hemp cultivation somewhat plebeian. Still, local agriculture was dominated by the hemp culture for a couple of decades, most farmers in the river townships grew at least some hemp, and production was increasing on the eve of the Civil War.

In the year ending June 30, 1860, Lafayette County produced 4,604 tons of hemp, nearly double the 2,462 tons produced a decade earlier. Saline County produced 3,998 tons in 1860, also a significant increase.[28] "[Hemp] ultimately became the main income producing crop of [Saline] county, its cultivation continuing to increase in acreage and quantity up to the beginning of the Civil War."[29]

In Lafayette County's Lexington Township, one of the area's prime hemp growing areas, farmers also produced 185,980 bushels of corn in 1850 and 271,275 bushels in 1860. In addition to 6,530 bales of hemp and 8,356 coils of hemp rope, exports from Waverly in 1859 included wheat, corn, barley, potatoes, bulk meat and bacon.[30] During hemp's peak, Joseph O. Shelby offered "highest cash prices" for wheat as well as for hemp.[31] Tobacco, grown by relatively few local farmers, was also an important regional crop. In Lexington Township, 28,500 pounds of tobacco were produced in 1850, and 77,500 pounds in 1860. Most farmers raised livestock, and sheep were popular along with beef cattle and hogs. A few farmers raised mules, widely used as draft animals. Between 1850-60, the number of cows and beef cattle owned by Lexington Township farmers increased from 2,536 to 3,137, sheep diminished somewhat from 2,465 to 2,235, and hogs increased from 6,749 to 8,264.[32]

Hemp farmers were especially concentrated in Lafayette County's Middleton Township, which included the port of Waverly. Eighty-five per cent of the Middleton Township farmers (51 of 60) grew enough hemp for reporting in the 1860 census.[33] Middleton Township farmers harvested 839.5 tons of dew-rotted hemp, an average of 16.46 tons per farmer. At this level, the farmers were practicing commercial agriculture on a grand scale. Throughout the Show-Me Region, five townships produced greater tonnages than Middleton but none had a higher percentage of farmers raising hemp. The second highest percentage was in Saline County's Grand Pass Township, where 69 per cent of the farmers averaged 10.28 tons.[34]

The most productive hemp township, in the year ending June 1, 1860, was Miami Township in Saline County. Miami Township farmers led the Show-Me Region with 1,224.5 tons of dew-rotted hemp. Dover Township in Lafayette County was second, with 1,168 tons harvested. Third was Saline County's Grand Pass Township, 1,028.5 tons. Fourth was Lafayette County's Lexington Township, 952.5 tons. Fifth was Saline County's Marshall Township, 897.5 tons. Lafayette County's Middleton Township, with the greatest

concentration of farmers growing hemp, was sixth, followed by Clay (Lafayette), Davis (Lafayette), Jefferson (Johnson), Arrow Rock (Saline), Freedom (Lafayette), Washington (Lafayette), Salt Pond (Saline), Blackwater (Saline), and Sni-a-Bar (Lafayette) townships.[35]

For many farmers, geography determined whether they invested heavily in hemp, if at all. Both Thomas Shelby and Minatree Catron, who lived in prime hemp country in Lexington Township, devoted much energy to the cultivation of hemp while also engaging in diversified agriculture. Assuming favorable soil and an adequate labor force, proximity to a river port was the other main requirement. General farming sufficed where distances from hemp dealers made hemp cultivation impractical, such as in Johnson and most of Pettis County. Although Southern plantations utilizing slave labor were concentrated around Georgetown in Pettis County, hemp production was insignificant at this inland location.[36]

Missouri's hemp industry grew substantially between 1850-60. The most prolific hemp farmer in the Show-Me Region was Aaron F. Bruce of Marshall Township in Saline County. Bruce's plantation produced 150 tons of dew-rotted hemp for the year ending June 1, 1860. Lafayette County's most prolific hemp farmer that year was John Webb, who harvested 80 tons on his Middleton Township farm. Other major growers in Lafayette County in 1860 included F. H. Isaacs of Lexington Township, 75 tons; William Neale, 74 tons in Dover and Middleton Townships; Logan B. Young, 65 tons in Dover Township; and J. D. Allen, 60 tons in Dover Township. Minatree Catron harvested 18 tons of dew-rotted hemp in 1850, a relatively large amount for that year, and 34 tons in 1860. Thomas Shelby produced 12 tons of dew-rotted hemp in 1850, and 47 tons in 1860--an amount surpassed by only a handful of other Lafayette County farmers. Only one Lafayette County grower, John V. Webb, produced as much as 50 tons in the year ending June 30, 1850.[37]

After Bruce, Saline County's most prolific hemp farmers in 1860 were P. D. Booker, 57 tons, and R. E. McDaniel, 56 tons, both residing in Miami Township, and M. W. O'Banion, 50 tons, Marshall Township. George A. Murrell's 12 tons was a respectable amount for Saline County's Arrow Rock Township where only three other farmers produced more hemp in 1860: William B. Sappington, Willis Piper, and former Governor Meredith Miles Marmaduke. Marmaduke was one of Saline County's most prolific hemp farmers, with his acreage in Marshall and Arrow Rock townships producing 35 and 14 tons, respectively. Marmaduke owned 54 slaves.[38]

Compared with some of their neighbors, transplanted Virginians James M. Dinwiddie and William P. Robinson only dabbled in hemp despite favorable geography along Dover Road. Dinwiddie produced four tons of dew-rotted hemp in 1850, none in 1860. However, he grew corn, wheat and potatoes and raised livestock, and significantly expanded his agricultural production during this decade. Dinwiddie also is said to have engaged in land speculation and generally led a "life of leisure befitting a man of some wealth and distinguished lineage." Robinson harvested six tons of hemp in 1860, half a ton less than in 1850. Like Dinwiddie, he practiced general agriculture but on a somewhat smaller scale. In 1850 Theodore Gosewisch, a German immigrant rather than a Southerner, and with limited farming experience, managed to harvest three quarters of a ton of hemp. Some of their neighbors produced considerably larger amounts of hemp, but the amounts harvested by small-scale farmers like Dinwiddie and Robinson were closer to the norm not only in the Show-Me Region but throughout Little Dixie.[39]

Shortly before the Civil War, various "hemp brake" machines were introduced which reduced the manpower needed for breaking and cleaning the stalks of hemp. The mule-powered "Excelsior," one of three competing machines manufactured in Lafayette County, reportedly could process from 2,000 to 6,000 pounds of hemp a day and could be operated by whatever labor force was able: "men, women or boys, or hands that cannot do half-work with the hand-brake."[40] A hemp-cutting attachment also was available for the McCormick reaper.[41]

But with the outbreak of war and the end of slavery, the severing of trade relations between North and South and closing of the Mississippi River, Missouri's hemp industry declined rapidly. In 1870, statewide production of hemp was only 2,816 tons. Thomas Shelby, perhaps using one of the hemp machines invented and marketed prior to the Civil War, continued his hemp operation and produced 20 tons of dew-rotted hemp in the year ending June 1, 1870. But by this time the cotton industry, which had generated most of the demand for the fiber, was using iron wire instead of hemp rope for bagging bales, and other markets had also disappeared.[42] One of these vanished markets was the U.S. Navy, which almost become an important domestic buyer of hemp in the 1850s. In 1852, the federal government constructed a factory to manufacture rope for the Navy at Memphis, Tennessee. However, farmers from Missouri and other hemp-producing states were unwilling to produce the water-rotted variety which the Navy preferred because of its superior qualities, because its production was even more laborious than dew-rotted hemp. The government continued purchasing hemp from foreign sources and ultimately donated its rope factory to the city of Memphis.[43] After 1890, statistics on hemp production were not compiled in Missouri because the amounts harvested were so low. In Lafayette County, the last crop was reportedly harvested about 1880 on the Varian Dysart farm south of Dover.[44]

The extent to which mechanized hemp processors, once perfected, might have revolutionized the system by making hemp farming less labor-intensive will never be known. Probably, the Civil War merely hastened by a few years hemp's inevitable demise.

Historic Context: Plantation Architecture, 1830s-1870s

With allowances for local nuances, cultural geographer Fred Kniffen's characterization of the circa 1850 Upland South also depicts early settlement architecture in the Missouri River Valley. Kniffen, discussing folk housing as a key to diffusion, pointed out that plantation migrants initially favored a dwelling system that utilized log structures including houses which were often constructed in dog-trot form. With affluence, the log houses were converted into (or replaced by) I-Houses constructed of timber or home-made bricks. Large transverse frame barns also were built. Kniffen described the Upland South, circa 1850, as a large region inhabited by many small farmers who owned a few stock and hunted out of necessity, and by other migrants from a plantation background who developed areas where a plantation economy and settlement pattern prevailed. "They brought with them the 'big house' frame architecture, quarter cabins, and other settlement features of the old Tidewater plantation. . . . If the area possessed favorable natural attributes, notably extensive acreages of good soils, a plantation system arose." The Missouri River Valley's cultural as well as its architectural development was largely shaped by settlers much like those described by Kniffen.[45]

The area's early dwellings in simple single pen, double pen, dog-trot or saddlebag forms filled the basic requirements for shelter and security. Log cabins in the wooded hills were followed by more permanent structures on the prairie, once prairie soil was deemed suitable for cultivation. There was relatively little transitional architecture between pioneer dwellings and the first wave of plantation houses with classical features. Some pioneer buildings became ells to which the main blocks of I-Houses were attached.

When early local I-Houses were stylized, Federal references were more prevalent than Greek Revival. But after about 1835, as the transplanted Southern culture became more firmly established, Greek Revival styling predominated. There were exceptions, but, on the Missouri frontier, textbook architectural details usually were simplified even on the finer houses.[46] While the early builders often had to fabricate or do without, by the 1850s millwork and other house parts in standard forms were readily available or could be custom-made in local shops. Finished material also could be ordered from catalogs but perhaps because of the cost, the long wait for delivery or other reasons, possibly cultural, Southerners in a frontier setting often simply improvised. Typically, the original owners were also the literal builders, perhaps with help from other family members or local "mechanics."[47]

The owner-builders of antebellum houses in agricultural areas of the Show-Me Region also were usually their own architects. Persons with architectural training were available for hiring, but they were much more likely to be consulted by wealthy merchants erecting city houses than by the plantation owners. Typically, these pioneers' designs were remembered from the places they left behind, or they were interpretations of illustrations in books or magazines, or both. They projected their ideas of leisure and aristocratic gentility on the local landscape, employing the styles of the period, within the constraints of what could realistically be accomplished under frontier conditions. Once an antebellum neighborhood was established locally, the early properties provided their own influence on the buildings that followed.

Architectural texts with measurements and building tips were available even to the earliest builders. Asher Benjamin's books focusing on Roman and then Grecian schools of architecture, for example, provided plans for the construction of classical columns, pediments, architraves, door surrounds, mantels, etc. In his preface to The Practical House Carpenter (1830), Benjamin professed a strong desire to make his work useful to the "practical builder" without access to an architect. His target audience included virtually all of the early local builders:

> I consider it necessary that all practical house carpenters should be fully acquainted with the orders of architecture, particularly those who reside in the country, where they have no opportunity of consulting an architect: I have therefore been very particular in the descriptive part . . . [so] that a workman of ordinary capacity can make himself perfect master of the orders, without the aid of an instructor; and when he fully comprehends them, he will be able to understand the whole subject of this book. With a view to render this work completely a practical one, and to facilitate and assist the efforts of master carpenters, I have drawn all the architraves, base and sur-base moldings, and all other examples where it was possible to do so, at full size for practice, and I trust they will be found particularly useful to those carpenters who have not had an opportunity of learning to draw architectural subjects.[48]

While pattern book influences usually must be inferred, sometimes the resemblance of actual house parts to published drawings leaves little doubt of a relationship. For example, James M. Denny found mantels

and window enframements in the General David Thomson House in Pettis County which closely resembled plates in Benjamin's 1833 The Practice of Architecture (Thomson, General David, House, NRHP 10-4-82). Publication of Benjamin's book preceded construction of the Thomson House by seven years. The Thomson House is in the Georgetown area of Pettis County, where several Greek Revival I-Houses were constructed in the 1840s by slave-owning settlers (or their children) who came to the area from Virginia by way of Kentucky.

In the absence of formally trained architects, most pioneer areas usually had their local craftsmen or "mechanics," men who were better suited than others for building houses because of their innate abilities, experience or both. In northern Lafayette County, George W. Garr and Napoleon Buck were trained carpenters, while Christopher Catron Jr. was "of a mechanical bent." In the 1840s, Catron helped brothers Minatree and Stephen in the construction of their brick Greek Revival I-Houses, along with his own, in the hemp country between Lexington and Dover. Catron is said to have fired and laid his own bricks and to have fashioned many of his tools. (The elder Christopher Catron, who came to Lafayette County in 1818, originally built a log house.) Garr learned carpentry in his native Virginia, then came to Lafayette County where he assisted in the construction of various Dover Road homes prior to the Civil War. Buck practiced carpentry in the Lexington area for two years before settling near Waverly, where he ultimately constructed a Greek Revival I-House that became the center of a large postbellum farm. Too, slaves undoubtedly assisted in the construction of many local plantation buildings, with some becoming accomplished carpenters, bricklayers, stonecutters, shingle makers, etc.[49]

While the following applies specifically to Clara Vista, a Catron-built Dover Road house which is no longer extant, in general these same
techniques and materials were used in the construction of vernacular antebellum properties throughout the Show-Me Region:

> The shingles . . . were hand split, the floor joists hand hewn. The ceiling rafters in the ell rooms were small tree trunks cut from the forest and notched with a wedge inserted to keep them from sagging. In the front rooms the ceiling rafters were hand hewn timbers. The lath was hand split hickory. . . . The interior trim and doors were of white pine, which was a luxury because it had to be shipped from St. Louis. Walnut was not then considered so fine in as much as it was to be had in great abundance in the forest. The doors in the front part of the house are of an especially dignified and beautiful design. They are, of course, hand made, and are put together not with nails, but with wooden pegs. It is believed that Christopher Catron made the doors himself. Each of the three houses which Christopher Catron built exhibits fine mass and proportion.[50]

While normally sealed from view, the rustic underpinnings of these vernacular dwellings are readily visible in the Minatree Catron House where an upstairs ceiling has collapsed, exposing the sycamore poles used for rafters and the hand-hewn hickory used for laths, and where flooring is missing from the east parlor, revealing the native walnut logs serving as floor joists. The Napoleon Buck House and the James Dinwiddie House also are sufficiently deteriorated to reveal details of their floor and ceiling support systems and brickwork.

Bricks, until they became available from local commercial brickyards in the 1850s or so, were usually hand-fired from clay near the site of the house that was to be constructed. On Dover Road, bricks for the

circa 1855 Thomas Shelby House "were molded from the clay on this farm. The old brick kiln site east of the house . . . can be found by a sunken place in the ground."[51] The kiln for burning brick for the Minatree Catron House was apparently on the south side of the Santa Fe Trail (U.S. 24), a short distance south of the house.[52] Christopher Catron "burnt the brick for his house and laid it himself. Traces of the brick kiln a few yards from the house may still be seen."[53] Bricks for Hicklin Hearthstone were "baked on the place from clay out of Lafayette's own soil. The bricks have faded through the years to a soft rose red."[54] The kiln for the Stephen Catron House was "on the extreme south boundary of the place. Negro slaves made the bricks."[55]

Clay quality and firing techniques varied, but in general the home-made bricks were softer and less precisely formed than commercial bricks of the period. There were also variations in color, texture and density. The original mortar was more pliable than most twentieth century mixes.[56] By the 1850s, local commercial kilns were producing "superior front brick" as well as regular wall brick. But even this late and in a "city," it was still not uncommon to burn one's own brick:

> Mr. Wm. S. Thomas is now making the brick for a large addition to his old Warehouse (in Waverly), so that his building will be 200 feet front, by 40 deep, two story high. Mr. Thomas is putting up his kiln near his Warehouse site, but intends to burn enough besides, for his suburban residence south of town.[57]

Local Greek Revival I-Houses typically have bricks laid in common bond although an interesting variation, Flemish bond, is found in primary elevations of antebellum properties in the Georgetown area of Pettis County including the William Gentry House, the Lewis Redd Major House and the David Thomson House.

Vernacular Greek Revival architecture in the Show-Me Region involves such things as entrances with vertical sidelights and rectangular transoms, colonnades and pilasters referencing classical orders, shouldered architraves, entablatures (at least vestigial ones), 6/6 double-hung windows, symmetrical facades and, in the case of frame buildings, white paint. But the Greek style is a matter of degree. Relatively formal examples have well-articulated porticos, entrance arrangements and entablatures, but a simple doorway with transom and sidelights and at least a suggestion of columns or pilasters in the primary facade is sufficient to establish a link with Greek Revival.

Plain square Doric columns usually were substituted for the technically correct rounded and fluted type (as on the Spratt-Aull House in Lexington)[58] because they were easier to construct. Paneled octagonal columns such as those on the Thomas Shelby House are a fine frontier compromise, while panels enhance the George A. Murrell House's otherwise plain square columns. Even relatively threadbare Greek Revival houses often have unusual features and, at least within the Show-Me Region, no two of these houses are alike. The Minatree Catron House is unique for its full-height pedimented portico with columns of soft brick rather than wood. Non-Greek window arches with keystones are present on the Theodore Gosewisch House, a building believed erected by a German immigrant rather than by a Southerner. The most luxurious of the frontier mansions in the Show-Me Region--the William Limerick House, aka Linwood Lawn--has predominantly Italianate rather than Greek Revival styling.

In Missouri, Georgian and Federal styles were supplanted by Greek Revival architecture during a transitional period, roughly circa 1835-45. Greek Revival buildings tended to be larger, more elaborate

and forceful. Classical porticos and front entrances enhanced by sidelights and rectangular transoms (rather than fanlights, which apparently were uncommon locally) were standard for Greek Revival. Front doors of Greek Revival I-Houses were likely to be enframed by shouldered or "dog-eared" architraves, often on both stories. Cornices were likely to be boxed in Greek Revival houses.[59] Older examples such as the circa 1840s James Dinwiddie House and the circa 1843 Minatree Catron House probably should be considered transitional buildings because some of their features are not exclusively Greek Revival. Later examples such as the circa 1855 William Gentry House, the circa 1854 George A. Murrell House, and the circa 1855 Thomas Shelby House display relatively strong Greek Revival characteristics.

Greek Revival architecture, of course, did not end with the Civil War as is sometimes suggested. Apparently the style remained relatively popular in the Show-Me Region well into the 1870s.[60] For example in circa 1873, Napoleon Buck erected the type of Greek Revival mansion which he undoubtedly admired but apparently was not prepared to build prior to the war. Ultimately the style "which had formed imagination from Washington to Jackson" was a casualty of "the contemporary interest in medieval styles" which ushered in the Victorian era.[61] While perhaps "logic and the ostentation of the new-rich united to give the death sentence to the Greek Revival," it is not true that at the end of the Civil War "the last sparks of the Greek Revival tradition flickered and finally died."[62] Rather, as in Alabama, "despite a progressive drift away from the clear-cut Hellenic vision of the late 1830s and early 1840s, neoclassicism proved a hardy survivor. . . . [and] never flickered out completely . . ."[63]

Today the best Greek Revival/plantation landscape in the Show-Me Region is along Dover Road, a ten mile stretch of highway along the route of the Santa Fe Trail between Lexington and Dover in northern Lafayette County, but scattered antebellum and early postbellum properties have been identified in other parts of Lafayette County as well as in Johnson, Pettis and Saline Counties. Most of the builders pursued a Southern agricultural lifestyle, perhaps growing hemp as their primary money crop while engaging in diversified farming. The more prosperous agriculturalists aspired to develop their ideas of status and the good life, and this was reflected in the way they embellished their houses, in their architectural choices. Many of these Greek Revival properties have burned, collapsed or otherwise perished but the remaining fragments are strongly evocative of their past.

ENDNOTES

[1]Van Ravenswaay, Charles, "Arrow Rock, Missouri," Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 15 (April 1959), pp. 204-208.

[2]History of Saline County, Missouri (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Company, 1881), pp. 144-145.

[3]Campbell, R. A., Campbell's Gazetteer of Missouri (St. Louis: R. A. Campbell, 1874), p. 299.

[4]Campbell, op cit., p. 427.

[5]History of Johnson County, Missouri (Kansas City: Kansas City Historical Company, 1881), pp. 212-213.

[6]Van Ravenswaay, Charles, in Missouri: A Guide to the "Show-Me" State (New York: Hastings House Publishers, Inc., 1954), p. 64.

[7]Denny, James M., "Hicklin Hearthstone," National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, 1981.

[8]Hurt, R. Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992), pp. x-xii.

[9]Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Slave Schedule.

[10]Catron, Bess Davis, "Minatree Acres," in A History of Homes: A Collection of Historical Sketches of the Slusher Community (Slusher Homemakers Club, 1936), p. 37 (Typewritten and mimeographed, pagination varies.)

[11]Hurt, R. Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie (University of Missouri Press: Columbia and London, 1992), pp. 219-223; 267; Scarpino, Philip V., "Slavery in Callaway County, Missouri: 1845-1855," Missouri Historical Review 71 (October 1976), p. 23.

[12]Blassingame, John W., The Slave Community (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 159.

[13]Hurt, R. Douglas, op cit., and Manuscript Census Schedules, Slaves, 1850 and 1860, Saline County, Missouri.

[14]Manuscript Census Schedules, Slaves, Lafayette and Pettis Counties, Missouri, 1850 and 1860.

[15]Hurt, R. Douglas, "Planters and Slavery in Little Dixie," Missouri Historical Review 88 (July 1994), p. 407.

[16]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, July 23, 1859.

[17]History of Lafayette County, Missouri (St. Louis: National Historical Company, 1881), pp. 566-567; Portrait and Biographical Record of Lafayette and Saline Counties (Chicago: Chapman Publishing Co., 1893), pp. 586-587; Stewart, Mary, in A History of Homes: A Collection of Historical Sketches of Slusher

Community, 1936, pp. 60-61; Manuscript Census Schedules, Slaves, Lafayette County, Missouri, 1860.

[18]Eaton, Miles W., "The Development and Later Decline of the Hemp Industry in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review, Vol. XLIII No.4 (July 1949), pp. 344-347; Hurt, R. Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie, op cit., p. 103.

[19]Eaton, op cit.

[20]History of Johnson County, Missouri, op cit., p. 673.

[21]Hurt, R. Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie, op cit., p. 103.

[22]Waverly & St.Thomas Saturday Morning Visitor, November 27, 1858.

[23]The Lexington Express, March 1, 1854.

[24]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, February 18, 1860.

[25]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, September 29, 1860.

[26]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, April 2, 1859.

[27]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, September 10, 1859.

[28]Manuscript Census Schedules, Agriculture, Lafayette and Saline Counties, Missouri, 1850 and 1860. The Manuscript Census, which reports agricultural production for individual farms, apparently indicates a greater tonnage for Lafayette County in 1860 than does the Agricultural Census of the United States, 1860. The Agricultural Census indicates that Saline County outproduced Lafayette County by more than 300 tons in 1860.

[29]Napton, William Barclay, Past and Present of Saline County, Missouri (Indianapolis and Chicago: Bowen & Co., 1910), p. 132.

[30]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, December 24, 1859.

[31]Advertisement in Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Morning Visitor, February 5, 1859.

[32]Manuscript Census, Agriculture, Lafayette County, Missouri, 1850 and 1860.

[33]Amounts under 500 pounds apparently were not recorded.

[34]Manuscript Census Schedules, Agriculture, Lafayette and Saline Counties, Missouri, 1860.

[35]Manuscript Census Schedules, Agriculture, Lafayette and Saline Counties, Missouri, 1860, and Holmes, William Council Jr., "Nineteenth Century Hemp Culture in the Missouri River Valley," PhD dissertation,

Graduate College of Texas A&M, August 1982.

[36]In Mt. Sterling Township where Gentry lived, only four tons of dew-rotted hemp was produced in 1860 (by Clark Bouldin who also raised cattle, sheep and hogs and grew corn, oats, potatoes, etc.).

[37]Manuscript Census Schedule, Agriculture, Lafayette and Saline Counties, Missouri, 1850 and 1860.

[38]Manuscript Census Schedules, Agriculture and Slaves, Saline County, Missouri, 1850.

[39]Manuscript Census Schedules, Agriculture, Lafayette County, Missouri, 1850 and 1860.

[40]Advertisement in Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, September 10, 1859.

[41]Napton, William Barclay, Past and Present of Saline County, Missouri (Indianapolis and Chicago, B. F. Bowen & Co., 1910), p. 132.

[42]Manuscript Census Schedule, Agriculture, Lafayette County, Missouri, 1870, and Eaton, Miles W., op cit., pp. 357-359.

[43]Eaton, Clement, The Growth of Southern Civilization, 1790-1860 (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 189.

[44]Slusher, Elliot M., "Hemp As It Was Then," in A History of Homes, op cit., p. 41.

[45]Kniffen, Fred, "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 55, No. 4 (December 1965), p. 574.

[46]The spectacular William Limerick House (Linwood Lawn) southeast of Lexington is a notable exception. At the time of its construction in 1858-59, The Lexington Express gushingly described the Limerick home as "palatial," and "larger than any house west of St. Louis." Nothing had been spared, the writer said, to make it a fine example of "the progressive age in which it was built."

[47]This is confirmed for the Dover Road antebellums by an invaluable, privately circulated 1936 publication titled A History of Homes: A Collection of Historical Sketches of the Slusher Community. The various accounts by the several author/contributors leave no doubt that in terms of the design and construction of these antebellum homes, their ancestors "did it all."

[48]Benjamin, Asher, The Practical House Carpenter (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972 reprint), pp. v-vi.

[49]The History of Lafayette County, op cit., pp. 546 and 662; Fulbright, Edna Frey, in A History of Homes, op cit., pp. 73-77; and Portrait and Biographical Record of Lafayette and Saline Counties, op cit., p. 159.

[50]Fulbright, Edna Frey, op cit., pp. 73-77.

[51]*Moreland, Frances McFadin, op cit., p. 66.*

[52]Catron, Bess Davis, op cit., p. 36.

[53]Fulbright, Edna Frey, op cit., p. 74.

[54]Hicklin, Alma C., in A History of Homes, op cit., p. 48.

[55]Meyer, Charlene, in A History of Homes, op cit., p. 91.

[56]The original mortar was softer than most twentieth century mixes, so that when harder bricks and modern mortar are used for repairs, new stress problems often result. Ideally, damaged soft brick walls are repaired with similar soft bricks salvaged from a local ruin. Instead of typical modern mortar, a high lime mix is recommended.

[57]Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, July 16, 1859.

[58]The circa 1840/1850 Spratt-Allen-Aull House, 2321 Aull Lane, Lexington, was listed in the National Register on July 8, 1993.

[59]Denny, James M., "A Transition of Style in Missouri's Antebellum Domestic Southern Architecture," Pioneer American Society Transactions, Vol. VII (1984), pp. 1-12.

[60]Architectural surveys have been conducted in Johnson, Pettis, Lafayette and Saline Counties (the Show-Me Region) under Historic Preservation Fund grants administered by the Historic Preservation Program of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources' Division of State Parks.

[61]Patrick, James, Architecture in Tennessee, 1768-1897 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981), p. 140.

[62]Hamlin, Talbot, Greek Revival Architecture in America (Oxford University Press, 1944; reprint ed., New York: Dover Publications, 1964), pp. 336-337.

[63]Gamble, Robert, Historic Architecture in Alabama: A Primer of Styles and Types, 1810-1930 (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990), p. 78.

ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

Property Types Outline: Property types and subtypes are arranged as follows, but only variations on the Greek Revival I-Houses and Ancillary Structures and subtypes are discussed in terms of description, significance and registration requirements. Property types which may be developed under other historic contexts are listed but not discussed.

I. GREEK REVIVAL I-HOUSES AND COTTAGES

Description
A. Greek Revival I-House
(1) Central Passage I-House
(2) Side Passage I-House
B. Greek Revival Cottage
(1) Central Passage Cottage
(2) Side Passage Cottage
Significance
Registration Requirements

II. ANCILLARY PROPERTIES

Description
A. Barns
B. Other Ancillary Properties
Significance
Registration Requirements

III. DOUBLE-PILE DWELLINGS

A. Georgian Plan Houses and Cottages
B. Temple Front Dwellings
C. Side Hall (Townhouse) Dwellings

IV. MISCELLANEOUS LARGE DWELLINGS

A. Cross-Plan Dwellings
B. Asymmetrical Dwellings

I. Property Type: GREEK REVIVAL I-HOUSES AND COTTAGES

Description: Greek Revival I-Houses

Greek Revival is the most identifiable style associated with the development of antebellum plantations in the Show-Me Region from the 1830s-1860s, and the style persisted into the 1870s. The vernacular I-House, which evolved in the United States from English prototypes and symbolized economic achievement, was apparently the most common large dwelling form of the plantation builders in that portion of the Missouri River Valley consisting of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties. In this particular combination of form and architectural style, Greek Revival I-Houses are distinguished from other I-Houses of the period solely by the presence of predominantly Greek Revival detailing.

Greek Revival was a dominant style in American architecture in the mid-nineteenth century. The style was associated with classical Greece and the ideals of democracy, and builders of houses with Greek Revival styling perceived themselves as making a patriotic as well as an economic statement.[1] Greek Revival "represented the single serious attempt of the American architects to develop a national style from the architectural inheritance of Greece and Rome."[2] Greek Revival elements appeared not only on dwellings but also on churches, commercial and public buildings and other properties. Within domestic properties locally, the architectural range is from fine, high-style, temple-front mansions with bold ornamentation to simple tenant houses with little more than symmetry, sidelights and a transom linking them to Greek Revival.

Because the basic form of the vernacular I-House is so straightforward, these buildings could be made fashionable by adding details of whatever style was in vogue: They still looked good. Their strongly geometric form made them particularly suitable as a medium for Greek Revival architecture. Over a somewhat greater time span, elements of Federal, Georgian, Gothic Revival, Italianate and Queen Anne were incorporated in or superimposed on the basic I-House form, and traces or even major elements of these styles were sometimes combined with Greek Revival detailing. For example, Italianate brackets are present on numerous Greek Revival properties in the Show-Me Region. The George A. Murrell House in Saline County has such brackets. Other mixed or transitional I-Houses such as the James Dinwiddie and Minatree Catron properties in Lafayette County retain vestiges of Georgian and Federal styling in conjunction with their more forceful Greek Revival features.[3]

The Greek Revival I-House is a rectangular, two-story building of frame or brick construction with a parallel orientation and (usually) a side-gabled roof. Hipped and other roof forms are also seen. Greek Revival and other vernacular I-Houses vary somewhat as to floor plan, but one room depth is essential. The traditional form has a central hallway or passage containing the primary entrance, flanked by two comparably-sized rooms, one of which served as a parlor. The opposing room, perhaps not quite as well-appointed, was used variously as a dining room, bedroom or second parlor (See illustration, "Typical Greek Revival Central Passage I-House"). Similar but less ornate rooms upstairs were bedrooms. Usually, the base of the staircase leading to the second floor is in the hallway near the entrance. This form of Greek Revival I-House is called the Central Passage I-House. In their basic, unadorned form, I-Houses are relatively austere, symmetrical buildings. To be considered a Greek Revival I-House, some combination of shouldered architraves, sidelights and transom, boxed cornices, classical pilasters, porticos supported by columns, entablatures with raking cornices, etc., would be present.

In an important subtype, the main block consists of only one room and a hallway, rather than two rooms flanking a central hallway. This variation is called the Side-Passage I-House. Both Central Passage I-

Houses and Side Passage I-Houses also were constructed with truncated second floors, and these variations are called Central Passage Cottages and Side Passage Cottages.

Many Greek Revival I-Houses have a rearward extension (ell) of one or two stories originally containing a kitchen, dining room and other facilities. Two-story ells typically had bedrooms upstairs. The point at which an ell is attached to the main block varies. Some ells are directly behind the main block's central passage, resulting in a building shaped like the letter T, inverted. Some are flush with the left or right gable ends, resulting in a building shaped like the letter L. Others are somewhere in between. Two-story ells may or may not be of the same height as the main block.

In some cases, ells were lived in for a few years before owners became sufficiently prosperous to add a main block. Conversely the two-story ell of the Napoleon Buck House, which has a galleried porch, apparently was constructed after the main block.

Antebellum "pre-railroad" I-Houses in all forms have frames of braced timber or logs. The builders used whatever native lumber was available. Walnut and oak, both plentiful in the Missouri River Valley, were popular choices. These woods were relatively resistant to insects and dry rot and have survived unless subjected to moisture over an extended period. Joints were hewn and meshed in various ways, often with wood pegs to lock the members in place. Original framing is visible today in deteriorating houses, as well as in period barns. In some cases, interior walls were bricked up with nogging at the lower level. The walls were plastered, perhaps with a horse-hair mix for added strength, and then usually were papered. Wood-sided exteriors of most Greek Revival I-Houses were painted white, like a Greek temple.

With few exceptions, and perhaps none, bricks for local brick I-Houses were made by slaves in kilns near the construction sites. Some builders continued firing their own clay even after bricks could be purchased in the region's larger towns, because transportation to rural locations was always a problem. Homemade bricks vary in intensity and hue, but all are basically red. They also vary in density, size and hardness, although they are significantly softer than the commercial bricks that eventually became available.

Full-height pedimented porticos or relatively simple one-story porches supported by round or (much more often) square columns are typical. Square columns, or possibly octagonal columns, are more common than traditional round columns on vernacular Greek Revival I-Houses because they were much easier to construct using available material. Capitals and bases were also simplified.

Side-gabled roofs are the most common form, but hipped roofs are found on a few vernacular I-Houses. The George A. Murrell House, for example, has a low hipped roof along with a full-height portico. On the predominate gable-ended profile, roof ends may or may not be flush with the gable walls. Flush or nearly flush roof ends such as those on most of the local examples have been associated with Southern builders. Original roofing was either wood shingles or metal.

Pairs of end chimneys are more prevalent than central chimneys on I-Houses within the Show-Me Region, and end chimneys (inside or outside) are often associated with houses constructed by Southerners. The Napoleon Buck House has central chimneys, while the other seven properties nominated in conjunction with this cover document have interior end chimneys. Ells also have chimneys, typically at the rear wall or the inside wall where the kitchen was located. Regardless of the chimney placements, original fireplaces

in Greek Revival I-Houses were delineated with decorative pilaster mantels. Kitchen fireplaces were less likely to have an ornamental mantel.

Subtype: Central Passage I-Houses

The Central Passage I-House, in addition to being of two full stories and only one room depth, has a parallel orientation with two rooms and a central hallway in its main block. The primary fenestration is usually balanced, with either three bays or five bays flanking the central entrance. The number of window openings was primarily a matter of preference. Additional windows cost somewhat more money and took longer to construct, but they admitted more light and air. Some large and relatively elaborate properties (such as the William Gentry House) have only three bays while some smaller, relatively plain houses (such as the William P. Robinson House) have five. In all cases in this subtype, the primary entrance serves as the central bay. The Central Passage I-House subtype becomes a Greek Revival I-House when Greek Revival styling, as described above, is present.

Subtype: Side Passage I-Houses

The Side Passage I-House (aka Two-Thirds House), in addition to being of two full stories and one room depth, has only one room and a hallway in its main block. The primary elevation is two-bay or three-bay (with a room containing one or two window openings either left or right of the main entrance). The Side Passage I-House subtype becomes a Greek Revival I-House when Greek Revival styling, as described above, is present. This is a relatively uncommon form in the Show-Me Region.

Description: Greek Revival Cottages

Subtype: Central Passage Cottages

Central Passage Cottages are generally similar to Central Passage I-Houses, with a main block of one room depth consisting of two rooms flanking a central hallway, but these are not true I-Houses because they lack a full second floor. Instead, this subtype typically has a front-facing gable containing a window or possibly an upstairs doorway onto a porch deck. While there may be more than one upstairs room, the second floor is truncated so that upstairs rooms invariably have less headroom than in full-blown I-Houses. Central Passage Cottages become Greek Revival Cottages when Greek Revival styling, as described above, is present.

Subtype: Side Passage Cottages

Side Passage Cottages are generally similar to Side Passage I-Houses, with a main block of one room depth containing one room plus a hallway, but these are not true I-Houses because they lack a full second floor. The single upstairs room in the main block is reached by a straight-run staircase. Side Passage Cottages become Greek Revival Cottages when Greek Revival styling, as described above, is present. Like the Side Passage I-House, this is an uncommon form in the Show-Me Region.

Significance: Greek Revival I-Houses and Cottages

For many agriculturalists who left the Upland South seeking economic independence, the search ended in the Missouri River Valley. The centerpiece of the antebellum plantations they developed was often some form of vernacular Greek Revival I-House. Greek Revival I-Houses are significant under Criterion A in the area of Agriculture if they were associated with a documented plantation from the 1830s through the 1860s, particularly but not necessarily a hemp plantation. The houses are significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture if they are relatively intact, recognizable examples of the Greek Revival I-House property type which was almost universally favored by the Southerners who successfully applied their building traditions despite the limitations and privations of frontier society. If the builder was sufficiently well-known or important, individual properties also may be significant under Criterion B.

Some plantation owners apparently grew little or no hemp even when they lived in prime hemp country, but all practiced general agriculture, including the raising of livestock. Although less specific in their agricultural function than the barns and other plantation outbuildings, the plantation houses are usually the only buildings extant which represent antebellum plantation agriculture. Too, the plantation houses were usually the focus buildings from which the agricultural operation was directed, the centerpiece of the plantation.

With a reasonable amount of assistance and simple tools, most adult males of the period probably were capable of building some sort of I-House. Help with construction was sometimes provided by friends and relatives, and the migrating Southerners owned slaves who undoubtedly provided much labor, but the builders usually served as their own architects. Using designs found in pattern books or other sources,

the builders "Greek Revivalized" their I-Houses in various ways. Some of the more detailed buildings are fine examples of Greek Revival architecture in Missouri, while the more modest structures offer tangible evidence of what frontier builders considered important to include and/or practical to eliminate.
Greek Revival was the most conspicuous of the architectural styles embraced by the migrating Southerners and other builders who were similarly influenced. In constructing plantation houses, the builders projected their ideas of leisure and aristocratic gentility on the local landscape, and their houses are visual representations of their striving for success. If the point of elaborating on the basic I-House form was to make the owner's affluence obvious to his neighbors, it can be assumed that I-Houses displaying the most impressive Greek Revival features were usually the dwellings of relatively affluent landowners. In fact, Kniffen points out that even unadorned I-Houses--at least those associated with migrating Southerners--were representative of economic success within their agricultural context.[4] Later, with balloon-frame construction using commercial lumber shipped by rail, the basic I-House enjoyed a resurgence of popularity in midwestern and eastern states as a modest folk dwelling.[5]

Today these Greek Revival I-Houses, which survive in ever-diminishing numbers, may be appreciated for many of the same qualities which appealed to their builders: geometric forms arranged in symmetrical patterns and plans, and porticos, columns and pilasters suggestive of classical architecture, particularly the ancient Grecian temple. Even when poorly maintained, these buildings are evocative of the plantation culture from which they emerged. While frontier Greek Revival I-Houses may be "country cousins" compared to some of their antecedents in the Kentucky Bluegrass or Virginia and Carolina Piedmont regions, they are more elaborate than most other local house types with which they were contemporaneous. Even without classical details, the basic I-House has been called the "farmer's mansion."[6]

Achieving truly sophisticated architecture on the frontier could be difficult, but compromise was possible. An excellent illustration is how the frontier builders solved the problem of porch columns, a defining feature of Greek Revival architecture. While pure and "correct" examples normally have round and preferably fluted columns, this level of allegiance to formal style was apparently considered more trouble than it was worth. Instead, the frontier builders usually fabricated much simpler square, smooth pillars and capitals. The appropriateness of abbreviated elements was certified by builder after builder, with completed houses influencing those that followed. While the carpenters and brickmasons took liberties with the classical orders, they seldom dispensed with them entirely. Overcoming adverse conditions has universal appeal, and the significance of these dwellings is bolstered by the circumstances of their construction.

These vernacular Greek Revival properties embody the traditional styles, forms, artistic values and methods of construction which characterized plantation architecture in the Show-Me Region from the 1830s-1870s. The architecture produced primarily by transplanted Southerners transformed the local landscape and remains powerfully evocative of the plantation era in antebellum Missouri's Missouri River Valley.

Registration Requirements: Greek Revival I-Houses and Cottages

Vernacular Greek Revival I-Houses and Cottages are eligible for listing under Criterion A in the area of Agriculture if they were associated with a documented plantation constructed during the plantation era (1830s-1860s) in the Show-Me Region. Greek Revival I-Houses and Cottages are eligible under Criterion B if they were the homes of individuals who made important contributions within an appropriate area of significance, such as Agriculture, Politics and Government, etc. Greek Revival I-Houses and Cottages are eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture if they were constructed within the plantation landscape from the 1830s through the 1870s, and if they are relatively intact examples retaining integrity of design, materials and workmanship, while remaining evocative of the plantation era.

Under Criterion A, perhaps the strongest case can be made for buildings associated with a classic hemp plantation as documented by the manuscript census for agriculture (or otherwise), but cultivation of hemp is not required since all plantation owners did not cultivate this important money crop. The antebellum plantation house also is representative of the system of slave labor used by the farmers to increase their profits, and the association with slavery may be documented by the manuscript census for slaves or otherwise. Slaves made the bricks and presumably were involved in the literal construction of many properties. A strong integrity of location and setting also should be retained.

More specialized buildings representing various types of agricultural endeavors may have existed, barns and slave houses for example, but houses were the center of any agricultural operation. Today a house is often the only extant building on a farm site which represents antebellum plantation architecture. Therefore, boundaries must often be drawn to exclude later buildings which, though related to agriculture, more properly belong to a later period of productivity and significance.

Most of these properties were located in the gently rolling hills south of the Missouri River or farther inland. Appropriate historic contexts include the development of plantations, antebellum agriculture, and antebellum architecture in Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties.

Buildings eligible under Criterion A will also be eligible under Criterion C for architecture if they are sufficiently good examples of the vernacular Greek Revival I-Houses/Cottages property type.

In general, buildings will be eligible under Criterion C if they retain sufficient structural and stylistic features to identify them as vernacular Greek Revival I-Houses/Cottages from the 1830s-1870s period of significance and to evoke that period. Although Greek Revival architecture went out of fashion after the Civil War, the style was still favored by a few farmers who erected Greek Revival buildings through the 1870s, and these early postbellum properties are also eligible provided their appearance is essentially the same as that of the true antebellum examples.

The building's original exterior dimensions and form, including roofline and fenestration in important facades, should be essentially unchanged. While such details as braced timber frames with pinned connections are normally concealed, the vernacular forms described above should be obvious and sufficient Greek Revival detailing of pilasters, pediments, architraves, columns, sidelights, transoms and other elements should be present to clearly identify the style. Original materials should predominate.

Additions to a secondary or rear elevation are acceptable, provided they do not diminish the original design or detract significantly from the building's power to strongly convey a sense of its antebellum past.

The presence of Victorian additions, most often seen in replacement porches featuring ornate turned columns and spindlework, is acceptable because many Greek Revival houses were somewhat Victorianized in the late 1890s and early 1900s. The Victorian treatment, however, must not overwhelm the building's Greek Revival elements.

Although frame antebellum buildings are a rapidly dwindling resource, nominated buildings made of wood should have appropriate siding (not vinyl or aluminum) if their significance is only for Criterion C, in the area of architecture. If the building is significant under Criterion A and/or Criterion B, inappropriate siding (or other detracting features considered on a case-by-case basis) may be allowed if a sufficiently strong case for nomination can otherwise be made. However, significance under Criterion C would not then be claimed.

II. Property Type: ANCILLARY PROPERTIES

Description: Ancillary Properties

Line illustrations of plantations as they appeared in the early 1870s, such as were reproduced in county atlases of that period, confirm that a variety of ancillary properties were associated with antebellum agriculture in the Missouri River Valley. Unfortunately, the attrition rate has been high for all types of secondary buildings which were directly related to agriculture. The pre-Civil War barns and granaries, slave houses, summer kitchens, smokehouses, tool sheds and miscellaneous storage buildings, along with devices for breaking the stalks of hemp (hemp breaks) or compressing the hemp into bales (hemp presses) were more expendable than the nucleus Greek Revival-styled plantation houses. Hemp-associated properties, in particular, appear to have disappeared from the local landscape. Only a few slave quarters are extant in the Show-Me Region.

Unlike antebellum plantation houses which typically display elements of Greek Revival architecture, ancillary properties generally follow traditional forms without any particular stylistic references.

Later outbuildings constructed on many farms also may be significant but development of an appropriate agricultural context for postbellum properties is beyond the scope of this cover document.

Subtype: Barns

Transverse crib barns as well as simpler single and double-crib barns were associated with the local plantation culture. In their basic form, transverse crib barns have a central aisle beneath the roof ridge, flanked by a continuous series of cribs. According to Kniffen, this Upland South barn type evolved from the four-crib barn.[7] The Appalachian barn, characterized by a main front aisle perpendicular to the roof's ridge line, was another primary barn type which originated in the Upland South.[8] Marshall, in his study of folk architecture in Little Dixie, also identified English barns, mountain stable barns and German bank barns.[9]

Following traditional forms, antebellum barns have frames of hewn logs and cut joints that are likely to be secured with wooden pegs. Saw marks are usually visible on larger members produced by nearby mills. Siding is horizontal weatherboard or wide boards which may be installed horizontally or vertically. Unless the buildings have been given new foundations, sills are likely to rest on stone rubble foundations or on stone piers. Roofs were covered with wood shingles or metal. Barns and major outbuildings usually were built where they could be seen from the plantation houses.

Probable antebellum barns are extant near the William Gentry House in Pettis County. These consist of an Appalachian-type barn with an atypical floor plan (main aisles are perpendicular to the ridge line at both ends of the barn instead of at only one end), and a drive-through crib barn. At some point, concrete piers were installed in order to elevate the sills slightly. A circa 1876 drawing of the George A. Murrell farmstead in Saline County depicts the mansion house and six outbuildings which appear to include a transverse crib barn and a granary, as well as a stable, summer kitchen, slave house and another small building, but only the house is extant.[10]

Subtype: Other Ancillary Properties

Other ancillary property types which may be found within the local plantation landscape include slave houses, summer kitchens, granaries, stables, root cellars, wash houses, tool sheds and various forms of storage buildings. These ancillary properties vary as to form, size and material and in some cases their function can be inferred but not stated absolutely. A small, relatively square building made of soft brick, possibly used for food storage, is associated with the William Gentry House.

Significance: Ancillary Properties

Agriculture flourished in the Missouri River Valley where the fertile, well-drained soil and gently rolling terrain attracted many settlers from the Upland South. These slaveholding agriculturalists established plantations and, for several years prior to the Civil War, engaged in the cultivation of hemp as a "money" crop, but also diversified with considerable production of corn, wheat, oats, potatoes and livestock. With steamboats plying the Missouri River, local produce could be shipped to St. Louis and beyond from ports at Lexington, Arrow Rock, Miami, Waverly and other favorable docking points. Thousands of bales of local hemp, most of which eventually ended up in the Deep South where it was in great demand by the cotton industry, were initially dispensed from local warehouses to large commission firms at St. Louis. Ancillary properties including barns, granaries, stables, miscellaneous storage buildings and other secondary resources which were directly associated with plantation agriculture, including of course hemp-related facilities should any be found, are eligible under Criterion A in the area of Agriculture. Hemp warehouses and rope walks were normally in port cities rather than on plantations, but mechanical devices called hemp breaks and hemp presses were used by some growers to break the stalks prior to baling, and perhaps examples will yet be found. Antebellum summer kitchens, smokehouses, root cellars, slave houses and other secondary properties which complemented the plantation houses are also eligible under Criterion A because they contributed to the agricultural operation. If they are intact examples of their type, they are eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture.

Ancillary properties were necessary for carrying out various farm activities. Barns and stables housed beef and dairy cattle, sheep, horses and draft animals. Hay and grain was stored in the barns and granaries. Implements were kept in the barns and other storage buildings. Slave houses provided shelter for the slaves who worked the fields. These and other ancillary properties are significant for their contribution to the agricultural complex, and like the plantation houses with which they were also associated, are tangible links to the plantation era.

Registration Requirements: Ancillary Properties

Essential to plantation agriculture, ancillary properties consisting of barns and other types of outbuildings should retain their original form and materials to be eligible, but perhaps the highest degree of integrity should not be required since ancillary properties from the pre-Civil War period are in such short supply. These ancillary properties complemented the Greek Revival I-Houses in which the builders lived and it is desirable, but unnecessary, for ancillary properties to be associated with antebellum dwellings.

When ancillary properties and Greek Revival I-Houses are in close proximity so that they may be considered as a district, integrity of association as well as setting should be retained. Thus, the association should be obvious so that together as well as individually such properties will be evocative of the pre-Civil War plantation era in the Show-Me Region.

ENDNOTES

[1]Walker, Lester, American Shelter: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of the American Home (Woodstock, New York: The Overlook Press, 1981), p. 108; and Kniffen, op cit., pp. 553-555.

[2]Patrick, James, Architecture in Tennessee, 1768-1897 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981), p. 140.

[3]For an excellent discussion of the transition from Georgian and Federal to Greek Revival in Missouri, see James M. Denny's article, "A Transition of Style in Missouri's Antebellum Domestic Southern Architecture," in Pioneer America Society Transactions, Vol. VII (1984).

[4]Kniffen, Fred, "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 55, No. 4 (December 1965), pp. 553-555.

[5]McAlester, Virginia and Lee, A Field Guide to American Houses (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), p. 96.

[6]Marshall, Howard Wight, Folk Architecture in Little Dixie (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1981), p. 62.

[7]Kniffen, op cit., pp. 563-567.

[8]Noble, Allen G., Wood, Brick, and Stone: The North American Settlement Landscape, Volume 2: Barns and Farm Structures (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), pp. 5-6.

[9]Marshall, op cit., pp. 72-88.

[10]Atlas of Saline County, Missouri, 1876.

Geographical Data

The project area consists of Johnson, Lafayette, Pettis and Saline Counties, Missouri, a politically-defined area in west-central Missouri known until recently as the Show-Me Region. In 1967, Show-Me Regional Planning Commission was one of 20 such commissions created in Missouri under the State and Regional Planning and Community Development Act of 1966. With the concurrence of local governments, the commissions provide planning and other technical assistance in the counties under their jurisdiction. Historic preservation was among the programs operated by Show-Me Regional Planning Commission. In 1996, Show-Me Regional Planning Commission changed its name to Pioneer Trails Regional Council. The total land area in the four counties under the organization's jurisdiction is 2,901 square miles.

Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Prior to the preparation of this multiple property listing of antebellum resources of the Show-Me Region, the area's antebellum architectural resources were surveyed at two levels beginning with general county surveys in 1986. In Johnson, Lafayette and Pettis Counties, these surveys were conducted by Show-Me Regional Planning Commission under the auspices of the Missouri Historic Preservation Program. Primarily financed by Historic Preservation Fund grants awarded to Show-Me Regional Planning Commission by the Missouri Historic Preservation Program, these surveys identified and evaluated hundreds of primarily vernacular properties. In addition to the antebellum contexts developed in this cover document, numerous other historic contexts also were identified. Some significant properties undoubtedly were omitted, but the county surveys were fairly comprehensive in that every property that could be viewed from public roads and many that could only be viewed from private roads was accounted for on project maps by the survey teams. The properties which seemed most significant were photographed and described for inclusion in the Missouri Cultural Resource Inventory, using Missouri Architectural/Historic Inventory Survey Forms. Saline County, the most recent addition to the Show-Me Region, was primarily surveyed by the Missouri Valley Regional Planning Commission.

In 1990 and 1992, National Register-level surveys of previously identified antebellum and immediate postbellum resources were conducted by Roger Maserang, historic preservation coordinator for Show-Me Regional Planning Commission. Maserang, principal researcher in Lafayette and Pettis Counties, also participated in the Johnson County survey with Dr. Joy Stevenson and Warren Christopher. In the 1990 and 1992 projects, 70 primary properties were examined, along with associated ancillary structures. Physical information compiled for each property included exterior and interior dimensions. Exterior and interior photographs were taken, site plans were drawn, additional historic data were compiled for each property, and floor plans were drawn from the measurements. Numerous owner contacts were made and information about the National Register of Historic Places was distributed. In addition, associated property types and subtypes were defined and discussed and several historic contexts were outlined. Brief, tentative statements of significance and registration requirements also were prepared for each property type and subtype. Five of these antebellum properties and one immediate postbellum property, all in Lexington, were listed in the National Register in 1993.

Selection of the properties for intensive study was based on the earlier studies, with final selection by the state Historic Preservation Program staff.

In 1994, Show-Me Regional Planning Commission applied for a matching Historic Preservation Fund grant to prepare a Multiple Property Documentation Form and eight individual and district nominations for Greek Revival properties associated with the development of the Southern plantation lifestyle in the Missouri River Valley area of Show-Me Regional Planning Commission. In 1995, the project was approved and a grant of $18,350 was awarded by the Missouri Historic Preservation Program. Final selection of the eight properties was made by the state staff, in consultation with Show-Me Regional Planning Commission. The selected properties were chosen as exceptional examples of the Greek Revival I-House property type and because they remain evocative of their period of significance. The three historic contexts developed in this cover document are sufficient to facilitate the nomination of additional Greek Revival dwellings and other antebellum resources associated with the influx of Southern culture and the plantation landscape. Some additional antebellum property types are listed but not

described. Thanks to the multiple property format, this document can readily be expanded to accommodate additional historic contexts and property types.

The eight Greek Revival I-Houses nominated in conjunction with this cover document are former plantation houses. Three are among the extant Dover Road mansions: the James M. Dinwiddie House, the Thomas Shelby House and the Minatree Catron House. Three other nominated properties are also in northern Lafayette County's plantation landscape: the Napoleon Buck House, the Theodore Gosewisch House and the John D. Robinson House. The Buck property is near the Santa Fe Trail in the vicinity of Waverly. The Gosewisch and Robinson properties are near Lexington. Another nominated property, the William Gentry House, is in Pettis County's plantation country around Georgetown. The George A. Murrell House, the only frame building in the group, is near Napton in Saline County. Numerous antebellum properties in the Show-Me Region (primarily those within the city limits of Arrow Rock and Lexington) have been listed in the National Register.

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Denny, James M., "Form and Style in Missouri's Ante Bellum Domestic Architecture." (Paper delivered before 23rd Missouri Conference on History, April 1981.)

Denny, James M., "A Transition of Style in Missouri's Antebellum Domestic Southern Architecture," in Pioneer American Society Transactions, Vol. VII (1984).

Eaton, Miles W., "The Development and Later Decline of the Hemp Industry in Missouri," in Missouri Historical Review, Vol. XLIII No. 4 (July 1949).

Gentry, Richard, The Gentry Family in America, 1676 to 1909. (New York: The Grafton Press, 1909.)

History of Johnson County, Missouri. (Kansas City: Kansas City Historical Company, 1881.)

History of Pettis County, Missouri. (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Company, 1882.)

History of Lafayette County, Missouri. (St. Louis: National Historical Company, 1881.)

History of Saline County, Missouri. (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Company, 1881.)

Holmes, William Council, Jr., "Nineteenth Century Hemp Culture in the Missouri River Valley." PhD dissertation, Graduate College of Texas A & M, August 1982.

Hurt, R. Douglas, Agriculture and Slavery in Missouri's Little Dixie. (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1992.)

The Lexington Express, various dates.

Napton, William Barclay, Past and Present of Saline County, Missouri. (Indianapolis and Chicago: B. F. Bowen & Co., 1910.)

Slusher Homemakers Club, A History of Homes: A Collection of Historical Sketches of the Slusher Community, 1936. (Typewritten and mimeographed.)

U.S. Census Bureau, Seventh Census, 1850.

U.S. Census Bureau, Eighth Census, 1860.

Van Ravenswaay, Charles, "Arrow Rock, Missouri," in Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society 14 (April 1959).

Waverly & St. Thomas Saturday Weekly Visitor, various dates.