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ABSTRACT

In recent years several early Scottish dwellings in North and South Carolina have been lost by fire, neglect, or dismantlement. Several buildings of this nature were saved by local preservation groups and private citizens and have since been stabilized and restored. Eight early farm dwellings of Scottish settlers in North and South Carolina were chosen to be studied and analyzed to determine if Scottish vernacular building types were brought to the American colonies in the late 18th and early 19th century.

Before looking at Scottish dwellings in North and South Carolina a study of traditional Highland architecture is necessary to determine whether Highland settlers were continuing traditions of Scotland. A look at several different ‘types’ of buildings across the Highlands established a basis for the local traditions. This information is applied to eight early Scottish homes in North and South Carolina built between 1760 and 1828 to determine whether the Scottish vernacular influenced the design of these dwellings.

Analysis completed of the overall plans of these buildings, as well as several architectural elements shows that in fact, the Scottish settlers that built these farm houses had assimilated into local vernacular traditions of the Mid-Atlantic and Lowland South. One building in particular resembles a structure seen in the Highlands, though insofar as the author is aware it is the only one of its kind. This building represents what were most likely the temporary dwellings of settlers upon arrival to the colonies, though most have been lost over the centuries.
Never before has a study been completed exclusively of Scottish farm dwellings in this region of the United States. Generally, studies of this type cover a wide range of building types and ethnicities from which building types develop. Using these previously completed studies analysis has been done to determine where the early Scottish buildings fit in with local vernacular traditions. Highland settlers, used to hilly, cold, wet, and tree-less landscapes, arrived in North and South Carolina to hot, dry, flat land full of untouched forests. As in Scotland, they used what local materials could be spared for building, creating lasting structures that have survived over 200 years.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Vernacular architecture studies show us that general architectural traditions grow out of cultural and geographical influences that affect persons in a specific area, or over large regions. During the height of Scottish migration in the late 18th and first quarter of the 19th centuries, Highlanders, forced off estates as a result of agricultural improvements and farm enclosures, abandoned their homeland for the wild, unsettled lands of the southern colonies. Adapting to the new terrain, and liberated from the social stagnancy of tenantry, droves of Scottish settlers built a new life for themselves in the Carolinas.

Looking at Scottish building traditions here in the Carolinas shows that Highlanders successfully assimilated to life in the colonies. Before asserting this as truth it is prudent to address the cultural and architectural traditions of Scotland to determine if that early Scottish farmsteads in the Carolinas were built following a separate vernacular tradition than that of the Highlands. To achieve this one must look at materials, construction methods and techniques, design elements and overall plan within the cultural and geographical context.

Comparison of Scottish dwellings in the Highlands and early Scottish dwellings in the Carolinas shows a discontinuity of the vernacular traditions of each specific place. This group of eight dwellings was chosen for its representation of the farm dwelling and are, to the best of the author’s knowledge the only buildings of this type in the region. It should be noted that several other early Scottish building in the area exist, but are not included for their being larger plantation style dwellings, or town houses. In Scotland,
Highlanders followed the local tradition of one-story turf or stone cottages with two to three rooms arranged in a linear plan, while in the Carolinas they adopted characteristics of the hall-parlor and I-house plans. This change is affected not only by the local vernacular, but also by the drastic change in geography, which took Highlanders from the treeless hills of the northern United Kingdom to the forested, and rather flat, fields of the Carolinas. One exception to this rule will be looked at, though to the best knowledge of the author it is the only structure of its kind in the region.

Studies in vernacular architecture today identify that within each type of local traditions are variations that create several sub-types. None of the eight Scottish domiciles in North and South Carolina included in this study exactly follow the local traditions, making it difficult to type them as major examples of a particular type, but they rather exude certain tendencies associated with local vernacular types.
CHAPTER TWO

18\textsuperscript{CENTURY HIGHLAND VERNACULAR ARCHITECTURE}

Passing through the countryside of the Scottish Highlands today one sees a picturesque landscape of rolling green hills and houses of stone, turf or brick with thatched and slate roofs. Even as the modern era is among us, many Scottish Highlanders still inhabit buildings of the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century constructed of materials found simply by looking at the surrounding landscape. Scottish Highlanders of the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century were resourceful, building during a time when their role as land laborers was becoming obsolete by agricultural improvements. While the architecture of the Highlands is made of local materials, the level of craftsmanship was relatively high.

**Walling Construction Methods**

Exterior walls of these rural buildings were generally constructed of clay, stone, turf or some combination of the three. Stone, which is commonly seen in the Highlands, did not have the ease of construction, or the quick construction time as turf and clay, though it was still a popular material used in tenant housing. Walls of stone were assembled much like brick, in courses, and depending on the region were laid with or without lime mortar. Where stone was not easily accessible, Highlanders dug clay and turf from the ground, packing it tight to form thick sturdy exterior walls. Houses constructed of a mixture of both clay and turf are called creel or basket houses, and were commonly built
in the Highlands during the mid 18th century.¹ On the outside of many dwellings a white protective lime-wash was applied to give the structure a clean, neat appearance within the natural landscape.

Interior walls for common tenants and farmers were many times also constructed of wattle with mud or clay, though horizontal lath with clay plaster was also seen in Highland dwellings.² Stone with mortar is occasionally seen, though not as common, as it would have been a laborious task, without much difference in final effect. Walls might also be constructed of timber boards, though this was dependent, as is most Highland vernacular architecture, on the availability of material.


**Figure 2.1** Interior wall of sticks with a stone base. (Image: Fenton)  
**Figure 2.2** Interior wall of wooden boards. (Image: Beaton)
Roofing Systems

In the 18th century landowners often provided timbers for the roof structure of tenant dwellings, though the tenant was required to build walls himself of local materials like clay and stone. Timbers provided for roof structures were, however, property of the laird, or landowner, and not the tenant. In some instances roofing timber was considered to be “movable” and so the tenant would carry his own timbers while the walls belonged to the landowner. The rights of farmers varied in each situation and many of the ‘rights’ of a farmer were implied and based on tradition:

“The houses had to be built, not by the landlord as in the low country, but by the tenants or by their ancestors, and, consequently, were their property by right, if not by law. They were timbered chiefly with bog fir, which makes excellent roofing but is very inflammable: by immemorial usage this species of timber was considered the property of the tenant on whose land it was found. To the upland timber, for which the laird or the factor had to be asked, the laird might lay some claim, but not so to the other sort, and in every house there was generally a part of both. In former removals the tenants had been allowed to carry away this timber to erect houses on their new allotments but now a more summary mode was adopted by setting fire to the houses.”

Excerpt from Letter IV Evictions in Farr and Kildman

In truth, however, a tenant owned nothing but the furniture inside the house and a handful of personal belongings. Upon coming into the Cape Fear Valley of North Carolina and the Lowlands of South Carolina, Scottish settlers were no longer dependent on landowners for the purchase of timber as the land they owned was surrounded by expanses of forest.

Figure 2.3. This detail from Horatio McCulloch’s 1881 painting *Glencoe* shows the romanticism of the Highland landscape, though it is quite obvious how barren the Highlands could be. (Image: Wormald)
Roof trusses, where shaped lumber was not provided, were constructed of trees collected from the landscape and assembled from several individual pieces. As shown in figures 2.4 and 2.5, the natural bend of the trees was exploited to form a semi-circular roof skeleton that was placed on a damp course of stone piers. Though primitive in its construction, this method of roof construction was used well into the 19th century and its continued use was seen as folk tradition rather than associated with architecture. The method of cruck-truss framing was by no means rudimentary and required similar skills to regular carpentry, though not of the same caliber.

Figure 2.4 Drawing of typical cruck-truss design in Highland dwelling. (Image: Beaton)

Figure 2.5 Interior image of cruck truss framing from Laidhay Barn, Caithness. (Image: Beaton)

7 ibid, 33.
Where long pieces of timber could not be found to form the cruck, several small ones were laid together and attached with wooden pegs. Laid at 6 to 10ft. intervals these trusses were slightly squared with an adze or axe and joined with wooden pegs. Many times the truss was only squared at the joint as the process of squaring logs was quite laborious and time-consuming. Where the rafters and joists met, mortise and tenon joints or lapped and dovetailed joints were commonly used, and wooden pins were added to secure the joint.

These methods of joinery were also used in more traditional timber roofing constructions. By the beginning of the 18th century in rural and urban Scotland the collar-rafter and collar-beam construction methods were the preferred methods of roofing construction, for those with the necessary materials, and generally consisted of the collars being dovetailed or nailed into the rafter or purlin. In many cases roofing members were cut in a pit saw and assembled off-site. Roman numeral markings were carved into the wood parts so that they could be disassembled and correctly placed once on site, a method also used in America during this period.

While it is true that much of Highland architecture is dominated by stone and clay, exposure to timber framing in roofing systems introduced many Highlanders to the workability and limits of timber. Also, much like early construction of the American colonies, Scottish Highlanders were using the same tools and methods as settlers in North

---

11 ibid, 31.
and South Carolina. Adzes and axes, pit saws and augers were all tools used in the construction of wood members in Scotland, as also for buildings in the American colonies.

**Figure 2.6** Details of the John MacColl kitchen building in South Carolina show traditional building techniques; the Roman numeral ‘X’ on three pieces of timber were marked in another place and re-assembled.

(Image: Author)

**Figure 2.7.** Wooden pegs were used to secure mortise and tenon joints, in the same picture is a board spliced into a timber post.

(Image: Author)
Roofing Materials: Thatch and Slate

Thatch was the most common roofing material of tenants, who, in the 17th century, could not afford grander materials like slate. Reeds, straw, grass, heather, marran and broom have all been shown to form part of Highland thatched roofs and the use of each is dependent upon its abundance in each region. Thatching required a certain set of skills and if done well could last as long as most modern roofs with minimal maintenance.

Several different variations in thatching are seen throughout the Highlands, though as a whole this method is by far the most common for tenant farmers.

A common thatching method in the Highlands involved the placement of small branches over the roof purlins that were covered with sods of turf, which acted as insulation. On top of this was laid the thatching material and ropes of straw or heather were interwoven into the thatch to hold it down.\(^\text{12}\) The process of sewing heather or straw into the thatch is said to have come from the islands of Orkney and is commonly seen in Shetland, Argyll and Bute.\(^\text{13}\) Another method of securing thatch, seen in Kintyre, and also Ayrshire, is the thrusting of straw into a layer of turf with a specialized tool.\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^{14}\) ibid, 43
Several methods were employed to secure the thatch so that it would not be blown away by the strong Highland winds. In Skye and other regions it was common to see stones hung at the end of ropes anchoring the roof in place-preventing it from becoming loose.\textsuperscript{15} Flagstones in Caithness were laid near the eaves of the roof and parallel rows of straw wands in Lochaber and Inverness-shire also served this purpose.\textsuperscript{16} Wooden lathing in the Hebrides and other western regions was laid over the thatch, running perpendicular to the roof eave.

Figure 2.9. Anchoring thatch with stones hanging from ropes is shown here in a Highland houses in Skye. (Image: Sinclair)

Figure 2.10. Stones might also be laid across the bottom of the thatch as shown here. (Image: Sinclair)
As improvements in agriculture carried into the second half of the 18th century it became more common for thatching to be reserved for only the lowest class Scotsman; “economics rather than the fear of fire dictated the choice of roofing material at this period, and poorer folk had not choice.”  

Where it could be afforded, slate, quarried from sites in Argyll, Edinburgh and Easdale among others, was more commonly desired by the wealthy and small farmers. Soon, one could observe the social divisions of the Highland by looking at the roofs of its inhabitants.

Farmers that could afford slate commonly employed the use of slate in barns and byres because it allowed for better ventilation of animal gases and prevented the instance of rot in roofing timbers. Slate was laid in diminishing lap courses, with the largest and heaviest pieces being laid along the roof eave, which could better support the weight. Of similar note, S-shaped clay pantiles also are seen along the eastern coast of Scotland, though are not as common as thatch and slate. These tiles ran in price between slate and thatch and are only common after the 1850s.

---

19 ibid, 36.
Windows were not considered by Scottish builders to be anything more than a fitting and so were not a distinctive design feature of rural dwellings. Window openings were small and deeply recessed from the outer wall. Early on, glazed windows were uncommon in rural areas and most Highlanders used animal skins or wooden shutters to keep out the winds and cold. Around the mid-eighteenth century, sash and case windows, designed in the Scottish Georgian pattern, were more commonly used in country residences. The six over six sash window became widely used in both the countryside and city with the expansion of the manufacture of better quality crown windows.

---

glass.  

Highland farmers, though aware of the changing style of windows and sash, would not have been able to afford glass, and therefore would have, as in earlier times, resorted to wooden shutters to control light and ventilation in buildings.  

Doors in Highland buildings were generally very simple and few examples survive from the 18th century. Two distinct types are known to have been used by tenant farmers; these are the double-leaf plank door and the framed and lined door. Given the low ceiling heights in Highland domiciles, averaging around six feet, these doors were rather squat compared to their Georgian counterparts in wealthier residences. The double-leaf plank door was comprised, as the name suggests, of two wooden leafs that opened separately or together. This type of door was also used in barns in Westerross and Inverness-shire and was closed with a hurdle. Framed and lined doors are much like batten doors seen in America with lining boards placed over a wooden frame visible on the reverse side of the door. Occasionally, diagonal braces were used instead of horizontal ones.

---
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Highland Furniture

Furnishings in these rural buildings were limited to essentials as the scarcity of material allowed for simple forms.\(^{29}\) Depending on the size and number of rooms within the house the location of tables, chairs and bedsteads vary. Consideration of design and elaboration was given to the bench or dresser, which were oftentimes the most valuable possessions of the family.\(^{30}\) For long houses the living area of the house usually consisted of a long bench holding six to eight people, an armchair of straw, a spinning wheel, and a cupboard and a dye pot.\(^{31}\) Chairs, or stools, and a table were also common in the living area, a three legged stool for the wife and a simple chair or bench for the husband while the children sat on the floor.\(^{32}\) Bedsteads consisted of four crude wooden posts with narrow slabs for side pieces and had mattresses of straw, heather or fern. As with construction materials, furniture was made from elements in the surrounding countryside, and generally by a traveling carpenter.\(^{33}\)

---


\(^{30}\) Ibid, 45.


\(^{33}\) Ibid, 37, 38.
Figure 2.12. Common furniture of the Highlands included simple chairs and benches, as well as large kitchen dressers. (Image: Sinclair)
Scottish Highland Vernacular Traditions

While most of the housing of Highlander tenants and small farmers appears to be homogeneous, several distinct types have been identified by scholars: such as the longhouse, and also the Dailriadic, Hebridian and Skye types. Other categories are the black house, white house and ‘kind of white house’ which will not be described in depth as they simply refer to the building materials. A black house was built of turf with a turf or thatch roof, a white house was of masonry or stone with slate and a ‘kind of white house’ of the same material as a white house but with a thatch roof. Distinctions of type have been determined based on plan, outer appearance and location and many Scottish dwellings fall under more than one category. Cottages with lobby or entrance-halls became common as agricultural improvements continued in the 19th century, though the post-date the migration period covered in this study.

Most of these dwellings are one-story structures, though the addition of an attic space or half-story developed among houses of small farmers. By the 1700s, architectural ideas of symmetry had found their way into the Highlands and were expressed, whether consciously or subconsciously, in the housing of all social classes. This was possible as the central doorway, small and narrow windows and gable-ended chimneystacks could be adapted to houses big or small.

---

The longhouse, common in the North and West parts of Scotland as well as the Western Isles, was inhabited by both human and animal. Termed a longhouse because of its plan, this design involved the stacking of rooms in a line, with interior doors or entryways leading from one space to the next. Always present on one end was a byre, or cow barn, being crucial in regions where cattle spent colder months inside providing heat for the main house.36 Construction of the longhouse plan continued in Scotland until the beginning of the 20th century, when it was slowly phased out. Entering the single exterior door one first stepped into the byre and then, through a series of interior passageways, moved through the kitchen and bedchambers.

---

Figure 2.13. Typical Highland longhouse, 42 Arnol, Lewis, Western Isles. Floor plan is byre entrance with living area through lateral doorway. (Images: Beaton)

Figure 2.14. Plan of Highland longhouse from Laidhay, Caithness. Note byre entrance and lateral progression of rooms. (Images: Beaton)
The Hebridian, Dailriadic and Skye types identified by Colin Sinclair in the 1950s are characteristic of many small farm houses of the Highlands in the 18th and 19th century. Like the long house, the plans of these ‘types’ have rooms set along a linear axis. They included bedchambers, kitchens, small sleeping or storage rooms, and occasionally a byre. Several variations in the floor plans are seen among these small Highland houses.

Figures (top left, bottom left, right) 2.15-2.17. The three main types of rural house as identified by Colin Sinclair:
(2.15) Dailriadic
(2.16) Skye
(2.17) Hebridian
(Images: Sinclair)
As with traditional Scottish highland houses, the Hebridian, Dailriadic and Skye types have exterior stone walls, interior walls of wattle and clay and timber roofs covered with thatch. Stone walls were simply constructed without mortar and were several feet thick. However, several notable variations are seen in certain architectural elements in these types. In Hebridian type houses an interesting method of construction was the building of exterior walls six feet thick with inner and outer walls of stone course filled with gravel and earth.\textsuperscript{37} The thatch of the roof did not hang over the outer wall, but rather stopped half-way over the thickness of the wall. Equality of outer wall height is another characteristic that sets apart one type from the others. Skye and Hebridian types had outer walls of equal height as roofs were hipped, while that of the Dailriadic were gabled and so had taller side walls.\textsuperscript{38} Steeply pitched roofs are, however, seen in all ‘types’ and are a product of environment more-so than design as steeper pitches are better suited to shed water.

\textbf{Figure 2.18.} Hebridian type showing sheep grazing on earthen area between outer and inner wall. (Image: Sinclair)

\textsuperscript{37} Sinclair, Colin. \textit{The Thatched Houses of the Old Highlands.} Oliver and Boyd: Edinburgh, 1953, 22.

\textsuperscript{38} ibid, 41.
Figure 2.19 and 2.20. Skye type with hipped roof and evidence of earlier outer wall whitewash treatment, and Dailriadic type with gable roof and side wall chimney.

(Image: Sinclair)
Local materials came to define the rural architecture of the Highland landscape. Materials found in the surrounding landscape were both economical and accessible and so were commonly used for dwellings; this led to construction of one-story, long houses with turf or stone exterior walls, cruck-trusses and wattle and clay interior walls. Generally, these houses were divided into three parts, a living area, a barn or bedroom and a byre, or cow barn, each separated by a partition wall of sticks.  

---

CHAPTER THREE

CHANGES IN THE LANDSCAPE: AGRICULTURE AND LIFE ON THE 18–CENTURY SCOTTISH HIGHLAND ESTATE

The Changing Face of the Highland Estate

Scotland underwent a great social change in the 18th century that forever altered life in the Highlands, and subsequently led to the migration of over 20,000 Scottish Highlanders to North and South Carolina.40 While the changes are many, the two major catalysts are the breakdown of the clan system and the enclosure of estates for cattle and sheep farming.

Before the middle of the 18th century, land control and the clan system were interrelated. Land was not central to the wealth and power of the clan. Instead, Highland chiefs tried “to maximize the social product of the land rather than its cash return pure and simple.”41 In the early days clan size and military prowess dominated Highland society; people were the prized possession of the clan and land was simply a means of sustenance. Clan chiefs were patriarchal heads of the tribe and clansman “though subject to the arrangements as to rent, duties and services imposed by the chief in possession, to whom, though his own title might be equivocal, they habitually looked up to with a degree of clannish veneration.”42 Hierarchy of class was negligible as people worked and lived as one large, extended family for the benefit of all.

Figure 3.1. This scene depicts a Highland wedding, of note is the traditional dress worn by several of the Highland men and as well as the clues of Highland entertainment with the playing of the fiddle and bagpipes to the left and the ale cask pictured on the right. (Image: Wormald)
The run-rig system dominated the Highlands prior to 1750 and was based on a non-enclosure system of farming where groups of families lived in a ‘ferm town’- a small cluster of houses at the edge of the workable farmland.43 Tenants drew lots at the beginning of each planting season to determine which lot they would work that year, though the crop was determined by the laird. In this way economic gain by one clansman over another was prevented; families were in a “continuous state of flux” constantly moving around the farm.44 This rotation of farmers tired the soils and impeded agricultural improvement that might have lessened the need to abandon fields while soils replenished.

Control by the laird was guaranteed within the run-rig system because the tenant only ever earned enough to pay his dues to the tacksman. Tenants paid dues in three ways, in products like butter, cheese, poultry and eggs, in money, and in service to the clan, which usually involved the repair of roads or cutting turf blocks for houses and could last anywhere from six to forty-five days.  

Control by the laird was guaranteed within the run-rig system because the tenant only ever earned enough to pay his dues to the tacksman. Tenants paid dues in three ways, in products like butter, cheese, poultry and eggs, in money, and in service to the clan, which usually involved the repair of roads or cutting turf blocks for houses and could last anywhere from six to forty-five days. 

---

of independent tenants, being that they were so reliant on the clan chief for guidance. Also, in the absence of crop rotation tracts of land were left unused for long periods of time as the soil replenished. This tradition prevented the economic advancement of clansmen.\textsuperscript{46}

Figure 3.5. John Ainslie map showing run-rig divisions from Corshill, 1789.  
(Image: Gibson)
The success and tradition of the clan system lasted until Highlanders involved themselves in the power struggles of the English crown. In 1746, Highland Scots under the rule and protection of clan chiefs joined the Jacobean cause to overthrow the Stuart dynasty and end the religious and social restrictions that had been placed on them. The British crown, determined to prevent any further rebellion, enacted several restrictive laws that aided the breakdown of the clan system. Among the steps taken were making illegal traditional Highland dress and the playing of bagpipes, taking away Highlanders rights to bear arms and perhaps the most effective was removing the clan chiefs’ right to serve as judicial leaders and collect dues in the form of military service. As military forces became obsolete for the advancement of the clan chiefs the focus shifted to the exploitation of the land for the greatest profit.

Greed and power became driving factors for clan chiefs who had begun to adopt British commercial attitudes towards agriculture. The relocation of many chief landowners into the society of the Lowlands only added to this desire for wealth and power, and created further disconnect between clan chiefs and clansman. Now moving within two societies, the wealthy elite of the Lowlands and the rural kinship of the Highland, clan chiefs became more and more attracted to the lifestyle of the south and consequently abandoned the rough, rural Highlands for the comforts of a more established English society.

---

Initially, as clan chiefs moved into the Lowlands care of the land was left to
tacksmen. A tacksman was a middleman between the clan chief and the clansman for the
running of the farm and the collection of rents. This, however, was not his only job. He
was also the clan judge and policeman, settling disputes, protecting the land and keeping
order among tenants.\textsuperscript{48}

In 1751 the Turnpike Road Act passed by British Parliament created a series of
roads running from the Scottish Lowlands to the Highlands. For agriculture, new roads
meant new crops and innovations in farming equipment, while socially more marked
distinctions were made among the classes. Crop rotation became widely practiced and the
introduction of potatoes provided farmers with food year round allowing them to meet
the requirements of their landowners and make what attempts they could at planting for
personal profit. Unfortunately, with better transportation also came new forms of
economy that did not always favor farming, and tracts of arable farmland became fewer;
in some areas only 20 percent of arable land was cultivated at one time, with extended
‘outfields’ left barren.\textsuperscript{49} Highland chiefs constantly looked for new ways to support their
lavish Lowland lifestyle, which they found in cattle and sheep farming.

\textsuperscript{48} Kelly, Douglas F. \textit{Carolina Scots: An Historical and Genealogical Study of Over 100 Years of
\textsuperscript{49} Sher, Richard B. “Scotland Transformed: The Eighteenth Century.” \textit{Scotland: A History}. Wormald,
Figure 3.6. Economic Improvements in the 18th century included crop rotation shown here in a map from Murraythwaite in 1794. Crops like oats, beans, corn, wheat and peas, among others are listed according to year and field.       (Image: Gibson)
No longer were Highland chiefs limited to agriculture, but rather could move into other forms of economy. The first change came soon after the dissolution of the clan system with the clearance of tenants from estates and the enclosure of lands for cattle farming. As the Highland population boomed, growing 34% between 1755-1800 farming land diminished and tenants were pushed off farmland in Highland estates.\textsuperscript{50} In Donald MacLeod’s “Gloomy Memories” for the Edinburgh \textit{Weekly Chronicle} the expulsion of farmers from Sutherland estates by clan chiefs describes the tenancy changes occurring during this period of enclosure:

“In this kind of patriarchal dominion on the one side, obedience and confidence, on the other, did the late tenantry and their progenitors experience happiness, and a degree of congenial comfort and simple pastoral enjoyment. But the late war and its consequences interfered with this happy state of things, and hence a foundation was laid for all the suffering and depopulation which has followed. This has not been peculiar to Sutherlandshire; the general plan of almost all the Highland proprietors of that period being to get rid of the original inhabitants, and turn the land into sheep farms, though from peculiar circumstances this plan was there [Sutherland] carried into effect with more revolting and wholesale severity than in any of the surrounding counties.”\textsuperscript{51}

Cattle farming was the first, but not the only reason for enclosure in this period. Sheep farming, begun around the 1760s, is seen by some scholars to be the major factor in tenant expulsion and emigration abroad.

One result of enclosure farms for sheep farming was the purposeful increase of rents by tacksmen to expulse poorer farmers in the hopes of attracting wealthier sheep herders, who had slowly encroached upon the Highland region in the mid 18\textsuperscript{th} century. As sheep farmers began to work their way into the Highlands, grazing lands were established among enclosed farms for sheep and cattle. Tenants became displaced as new

boundaries for sheep herding were drawn and the advantage of having tenants earning twice as much as farmers was recognized by tacksman and landowners. On many coastal farms tenants were relocated to the coastal areas of the estate to work in the kelp industry. This work involved the burning of seaweed to make kelp and was a good way to keep the workforce on the estate. By the 1830s the kelp industry had almost entirely died out as the fishing industry concentrated itself into fewer ports. An account by the advisor to the Earl of Seaforth stated that “the entire population of Lewis could be reduced to 120 shepherds and their families and those who could make a living from kelp and fishing; but the majority of the remaining 10,000 inhabitants would have no place.” By relocating tenants the landowner kept a small workforce, but made a profit from sheep and cattle farming. An issue of Scots Magazine in 1775 stated that in Appin and Argyllshire, 1/3 of the land had been enclosed for sheep herding and many tenants had been expelled by landowners for this purpose.  

---

With no other place to go to farm, Highlanders began to look to the Western world in America and saw the opportunity to earn a living in the newly settled colonies of North and South Carolina. Letters from those already settled in America increased the interest of many tenants to emigrate. One such letter, written by the anonymous “Scotus Americanus” an immigrant from the Isle of Islay and published in Glasgow, spoke of the satisfaction that Scottish emigrants had with life in the Carolinas and how many had already written family members to follow them to America. Word of another letter, written by Gabriel Johnston, a Governor of North Carolina, to Scotsman friends reached

---

many Highland tacksman and encouraged the organization by tacksman of tenants to immigrate in large numbers to the Carolinas.\textsuperscript{56}

Some accounts coming from newspapers announced the arrival of persons of wealth on ships departing and arriving in America. While this was partly true it did not constitute the majority of persons on board. ‘People of property’ as they were called comprised a very small percentage of newly arrived immigrants and generally referred to the tacksman, who also saw the advantage of new opportunities, or gentlemen. In many ways tacksmen led the movement of immigrants to America. Pushed out themselves by the Highland chiefs eager to erase the middleman, tacksman held public meetings for those interested in making the journey to America.\textsuperscript{57} If enough people showed interest the tacksman would contract with a boat captain to carry the party to the America. Collecting passage from tenants, sometimes the tacksman would increase the price a shilling or two to in order to pay his passage.\textsuperscript{58} Highlanders went in droves to America, often traveling among persons from their own town or from surrounding localities, the sense of clan tradition still being strong among them; on the estate of Sir Alexander MacDonald an estimated two-thousand tenants made the journey in 1771.\textsuperscript{59} Another figure lists the number of emigrants from Skye at four thousand just between 1762 and 1773, an estimated one-fifth of the total population.\textsuperscript{60} Most people on board were poor tenant...

\textsuperscript{56} ibid, 83.
\textsuperscript{60} ibid, 76.
farmers that spent their entire savings on the passage or arrived with only pennies in their pocket. However, with farming skills already acquired from life in Scotland they did not arrive completely helpless.
Diffusion of Scottish Highland Immigrants in North and South Carolina

(Image: author)
Life in the Carolinas

Arriving in North Carolina most emigrants passed through port cities like Wilmington and Brunswick before moving inland for unclaimed farmland. Scottish emigrants settled throughout North and South Carolina, though the majority made the 90-mile trip from Wilmington to the Cross Creek region of North Carolina, now Richmond and Scotland counties, and the Cape Fear Valley, today Moore and Cumberland counties. Most settlements landed the Scottish along the rivers and creeks on tracts of land purchased either from the British crown or from settled colonists. Scottish settlement patterns in North Carolina were not random; like many immigrant groups the Scottish tended to settle among their own, forming tight-knit communities of persons practicing the same religion, sharing a similar history and even a common language, Gaelic.

Figures 3.8 and 3.9. Settlement patterns of Scottish Highlanders in the Cape Fear Valley from 1733 to 1775. Note the increase of land grants along the several waterways of the Valley. (Image: Meyer)
Once settled on their land most Scottish emigrants constructed temporary dwellings until a permanent residence could be erected. These were generally crude, one-story buildings of wood and/or clay with a couple rooms. One existing example of this temporary dwelling is the kitchen building of the John MacColl House in Marlboro County, South Carolina. Log cabins constituted the majority of early Scottish residences, though some were later replaced or modified using sawn or planned heart pine and though simple, were by no means poorly designed.61

---

**Figure 3.10** 1770 map of eastern portion of North Carolina showing major rivers. Shaded area shows region heavily settled by Highland immigrants; Cross Creek today is the Fayetteville area. Scottish immigrants followed the bend of the Cape Fear River settling along the waterway. (Image: Meyer)

---

Based on today’s evidence, some of these temporary houses followed the architectural tradition of the Highland region byre and even after construction of the main house were used for other purposes. Permanent residences were usually two stories with two to four rooms on the first floor and one or two second floor rooms. One fireplace usually provided heat, though occasionally two are seen in early Scottish dwellings. Kitchen and dining rooms might frequently be moved into outbuildings. This not only moved the services away from the living and entertaining space, but also protected the structure from the threat of fire.

Within the dwelling was furniture fashioned by the immigrants themselves or a local carpenter. This usually consisted of a table and a few chairs in the main living space and maybe a bed stand or small tables in the bedroom, though most beds were mattresses laid on the floor. Common pieces seen in North Carolina include lathe-turned slat-back chairs with split oak seats, small wooden chests either nailed together or joined and a cupboard for plates and other cooking utensils.62

Cupboards, the American equivalent of the Scottish dresser are, as their counterpart, the largest article of furniture in the home. Looking at the inventory of Flora McKay (see appendix C), the wife of a Scottish immigrant in this region, it is interesting to note that in the four page inventory the two seemingly largest pieces of furniture are a cupboard and sofa. The crockery and glassware mentioned in the inventory would have been placed on display in the cupboard, much like in the Scotland Highlands, and more

---

recently seen in the 20th century by Henry Glassie in Ireland. There, the dresser was still seen as a showpiece for chinaware and crockery, a tradition continued from historic times. An additional item seen in the inventory that harkens back to the Highlands is the listing of a crofting knife on page 5. The crofting knife refers to a tool used in Scotland, most likely to cut turf from the soil. The term croft was used to describe the new farming method implemented in the late 18th century whereby a tenant was responsible for a small parcel of land, which he farmed and cultivated. It was many of these tenants that were expelled from the land during the enclosures of the late 18th century. Scottish immigrants were using material culture to reflect the life they brought with them from Scotland. This, together with the Gaelic language, tight-knit communities and religion, helped keep their Scottish past alive in the American frontier.

Furniture was constructed with mortise-and-tenon joints or rabbets and shiplap and though simple, showed a skilled understanding of the working ability of wood. Whether these items were constructed by the immigrants themselves or by local craftsman is still a mystery; however, the quality of workmanship they exhibit shows a true understanding of the material. Several examples of early pieces fashioned in this way still exist in North Carolina today and offer a glimpse into the material culture of early settlers.

---
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Typical 18th century furniture from North Carolina homes includes:

- (top left, 3.11) Lathe-turned slat back chair
- (bottom left, 3.12) Kitchen cupboard
- (top right, 3.13) Sideboard
- (bottom right, 3.14) Table

(Images: Owen)
Incomes among Scottish farmers varied greatly and depended on what forms of work were performed. Husbandry, sustainable agriculture and sawmills were the major sources of income for Scottish settlers. No strangers to raising livestock and crops, Highlanders continued the practices known to them in Scotland. Some ran saw mills and were rewarded with profits as new settlements in the area continued to form.

Common among Scottish settlers was the practice of cattle ranching, a skill acquired from the Highland estates of Scotland. In America, Scottish immigrants practiced open grazing, allowing cattle to freely roam in common lands, much like the Highland estates prior to enclosure.65 These herds numbered from the hundreds into to the thousands and were rounded up each spring to be branded by their owners; these cattle were raised to make cheese and milk, and also to be sold in markets in Wilmington and Charleston.66 Saw mills became more common as a mean of income as wood was needed for new buildings, barns and buildings in settled areas. With locations along the rivers these mills could easily transport wood to other areas and facilitated the settlement along the Cape Fear Valley and Cross Creek region.

Corn, wheat, beans, peas, flax, sweet potatoes and oats are common crops that were rotated yearly by farmers and provided both personal sustenance and sellable goods. The farmsteads of Scottish immigrants were family affairs with delineations of tasks being given to several members of the family. Among these activities were the making of milk and cheese, beekeeping for honey and the laborious tasks of planting and harvesting.

Those who could afford it bought slaves who worked the land and mills; it is estimated that one-fourth of Highlanders owned slaves at an average of 4.7 slaves per family. Flora McKay, the wife of Daniel McKay, owned, at her death in 1832, at least 4 slaves that she willed to several family members.

From the cold, windy, treeless hills of the Highlands Scottish immigrants arriving in the Carolinas were met by hot weather, relatively flat terrain and abundant forests. In their own country they were being pushed off land and having their houses torn down by landlords, while in America they were met with, vast expanses of unsettled territory where they were themselves landlords. Unable to follow the traditional building techniques of Scotland, immigrants created new methods of construction to correlate to the available raw materials and built structures that have sometimes survived over 200 years.

---

68 "Property Inventory of Flora McKay, July 25, 1833". South Carolina Archives.
Bringing traditions with them, early Highland settlers continued their culture through religion, language and farming practices. While these previous habits were easily adaptable to colonial life, building practices were not. As a result, facets of Scottish mannerisms in the Americas developed. The architecture of their early buildings followed more traditional American types than that of the Highlands. Using the same instincts as those developed in Scotland, settlers looked to the surrounding landscape for building materials; they used the abundant heart pine timber and local clays and fieldstone to construct dwellings. Having to travel across parts of North and South Carolina to reach available land, early settlers were introduced to local architectural traditions of the southern colonies, which they adopted for their own dwellings. Eight early Scottish dwellings in North and South Carolina have been chosen for this study and illustrate the assimilation of Highland settlers to vernacular traditions. While Highlanders retained many traditions for themselves, because of the availability of material, Highland architectural traditions did not last long in the colonies. These eight were chosen not only for their proximity to one another, but also because they are to the best of knowledge the only remaining farmhouses of this type in the designated counties.
Early Scottish Dwellings in North and South Carolina


The McClendon Cabin and Bryant House are located on their original sites, about ten miles outside Southern Pines, North Carolina (see figure 4.9). The Moore County Historic Association bought both houses in 1969 for the purpose of serving as museum houses. These properties are shown in conjunction with the Shaw House properties in the town of Southern Pines.

Figure 4.9. Map showing the location of the Joel McClendon, Michael Bryant and Charles Shaw Houses in Moore County, N.C. (Image: Google Maps)
Joel McClendon immigrated to America from Scotland in 1758 to claim 200 acres promised him. He set up his farmstead next to Buck Creek and it was here that he farmed and built and operated a gristmill. In 1787 McClendon sold the property to Robert Graham, whose daughter married Michael Bryant, the builder of the Bryant House. While Bryant was not a Scottish immigrant he constructed a house in a type similar to other Scottish farmsteads of the region.

McClendon Cabin was constructed around 1760 and is reported to be the oldest structure in Moore County. It is set on its original sandstone foundation and still has the original sandstone chimney and front step. The floor sills and joists are made of large pine logs and the logs used to construct the cabin are notched together in a dove-tail pattern. A large, kitchen fireplace with simple mantel is located on the first floor and is original to the cabin.

A set of stairs notched out of a single pine log leads to the loft, which also has exposed walls showing the log construction and roofing system. No design alterations have been made to the house since its construction, though some restoration efforts have been made, such as the replacement of stone mortar and some timber replacements necessary to conserve the building.

Much larger in size, and more detailed in design is the Bryant House. It too sits on sandstone sills and has two chimneys, one of sandstone and the other of brick. The floor sills and joists were cut from heart pine boards and are joined with mortise and tenon and

---

wooden pegs. Framing was done with pine boards and all interior walls and floors are also constructed of pine.

Vertical pine boards laid flush to one another make up all the interior walls on the first and second floors. There is no wainscot on the first or second floors, but there is a surbase in all rooms on the first and second floors, though a couple of walls do not have a surbase. The stair from the first to second floor is enclosed with a railing and newell post on the second floor.

Two fireplaces on the first floor have the original mantels. These are on the same side of the house in the main parlor, and back bedroom. In a recent restoration several window sashes were replaced, though these were based on original examples. Original hand-blown glass panes are still present in many of the windows.
Joel McClendon Cabin
Moore County, N.C. - Circa 1760

Figure (left to right) (4.10) North elevation of McClendon Cabin showing front rain porch and limestone stair (4.11) East elevation, view of stone chimney and front rain porch, (4.12) North elevation with back door and vertical weatherboard covering original log cabin construction.

(Images: Author)
Joel McClendon Cabin
Moore County, North Carolina  Circa 1760
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Drawing 4.1.
Michael Bryant House
Moore County, N.C. - Circa 1790

Figure (left to right) (4.13) West elevation of Bryant House with rain porch and original columns and railings, (4.14) South elevation of house showing double chimneys in main parlor and back room, (4.15) East elevation of rear rooms with some replacement weatherboard.

(Images: Author)
Michael Bryant House
Moore County, North Carolina  Circa 1790
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Drawing 4.2.
Daniel McKay House

The McKay House (pronounced McCoy) was originally constructed on a site approximately a quarter of a mile from its present location (see figure 4.16). In the 1970s the building was moved across the road in Dillon County by the current owners. The McNeill family is descendant of the McKay family and still retains rights to the property of the original site.

Figure 4.16. Map of the location of the Daniel McKay House, Dillon, S.C. (Image: Google Maps)
Daniel Donald McKay immigrated to America sometime during the 1780s. He was born in 1754 in Kintire, Scotland, a small village in the Argyle province of the Highlands. He married Flora McMillan, the daughter of Scottish immigrants Gilbert and Christian McMillan70 of Fayetteville, originally from Kilcalmonel, Argyll, sometime after settling in South Carolina. Daniel and Flora had three children, two sons John and Archibald, and one daughter, Jane.71 Based on information from Daniel’s will, he also had two grandchildren, Hector McKay and Flora Anne McKay. A letter from 1824 tells of the death of Janie McKay, the sister of Daniel McKay in Campbellton, Scotland (near Kintire).

In 1786 Daniel McKay bought 200 acres of land in Georgetown District, S.C. (present day Dillon County) for the sum of four pounds and thirteen shillings.72 The land bought was “situate in the District of Georgetown on Horse Pen Branch the N.E. side of Little Pee Dee.”73 Over the next fourteen years the acreage of land owned by Daniel McKay would come to include almost 2,000 acres, all situated in Dillon County near the Little Pee Dee. By his death in 1832 Daniel McKay not only owned the 2,000 acres, but also livestock, a saw mill and several slaves. An inventory taken before the death of his

70 Of interest is the mother of Flora McMillan, Christian McMillan, who was a well-respected physician, serving the Sandhills region of North Carolina throughout the late 1700s. Most of the history gathered about Christian McMillan is the oral history of generations, but “during the Revolutionary period, she was the only person who could act as a physician in all of Scotch territory” Arthur, Billy. “House Calls.” Tar Heels History. The State. March 1994.
71 Jane McKay, the only daughter of Daniel and Flora, eloped with the son of an English immigrant Tristan Bethan. It is told that she climbed out the back room window and met with Tristan to be married. The reason for the elopement stemmed from the tradition among Scottish immigrants to marry with their own kind, and for marriages with outsiders to be looked down upon. Janie McNeill, Interview, October 12, 2008.
73 ibid, 39.
wife Flora shows the extent of the family’s personal belongings, which were either sold for profit, or left to members of the family. His holdings were divided among his family; the sawmill and a second residence built on the property was left to his son John, the 2,000 acres being divided among his wife Flora and son Archibald (with all the land going to Archibald upon his mother’s death) and the slaves Peter, Caesar and Bob divided between his grandchildren, Flora Anne and Hector.74

The Daniel McKay House was built around 1790 and exists today with few alterations from the original plan. Some confusion about the orientation of the house arises from the fact the house had been moved from its original location and from accounts there was no distinction between what was front or back. The current owner, Janie McNeill, grew up visiting the house as a child and remembered that the road originally ran along-side the house and that a brick patio used to be in front of what is now the back of the house. Whether the bricked area was made to signify a front or back patio is uncertain. However, by comparing the orientation of other Scottish farmsteads in the area, it can be deduced that what is now the front was mostly likely the back and vice versa. Also, the large, open porch was most likely the main entrance, as is seen in similar farmsteads of the period.

The McKay farmstead in Dillon is constructed of heart pine from the same region, which is used both on the exterior and interior of the house. Brick foundation piers are constructed of modern brick, and a few modern cinderblock reinforcement piers support the one and a half story farm house. Floor sills are made of large pine boards over one

74 “Will of Daniel McKay, February 28, 1833”. South Carolina Archives, Marion County Wills. South Carolina Archives, 245-246.
foot in width and with large pine joists that span the length of each room. Visible joints are mortise and tenon with the use of wooden pegs where necessary.

The interior walls are divided into two parts, separated by the surbase. On the bottom is a wainscot created by the laying of two boards horizontally and attaching them to the wall stud with iron nails. The surbase separates the wainscot from the upper part of the wall, which is formed by the laying of pine boards that reach from the surbase to the ceiling. This is common throughout the first floor of the house, while on the second floor all boards are situated horizontally with neither wainscot nor surbase.

The stair is located in the second parlor and has a door located near the return landing. In the landing is a small door with access to the empty space above the ceiling of the back rooms and porch. A railing, with a thoughtfully designed newell post, runs along one side of the stair (see appendix U).
Daniel McKay House
Dillon County, S.C. - Circa 1790

Figure (left to right) (4.17) North and partial West elevation of McKay house showing front rain porch, (4.18) East elevation back porch with porch columns and railing, room on left is traveler’s porch/shed where wall is missing (4.19) South elevation also showing front porch with columns.
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John MacColl (McCall) House and Kitchen

Originally located in Dillon County, South Carolina the John McCall House and kitchen building were moved the 22 miles to McCall’s Mill Pond on Appin Farm in 2000 by Catherine Gambrell Rogers, a descendant of John McCall (see figure 4.20). Though the exact date is unknown, 1810 has been determined the most likely year for construction. The kitchen house has been dated both before, and in the same year as the main house.

Figure 4.20. Map showing move of John MacColl House from its original location (A) to current location (1). (Image: Google Maps)
John MacColl was born on December 1, 1777 in Appin, Scotland in the region known as Argleshire. He came to America in the late 1700s from the Port of Appin, traveling with relatives on the ship *Industry* and passed through Wilmington on his way to Scotland County, North Carolina.  

He first stayed with his cousins in Scotland County before settling himself in Marion District, South Carolina, now Dillon County. John bought 100 acres of land in old Marion District (Dillon County) in 1809, and the next year he married Marie Currie from Richland County, North Carolina. Together they had five children: Solomon, John Lauren, Daniel, Samuel Allen and Laughlin Currie.

When MacCall died in 1858 the land known as Donoho Plantation passed to his wife and children. When Catherine Rogers visited the house in the 1980s the current front of the house faced a carriage road and had two ancient cedar trees on either side of the front door. The house was at that time on the property of the Calhoun family in Dillon County.

The kitchen building is set on piers of historic brick; some were part of the original foundation, while others were acquired for the project. The sills are large hewn logs of heart pine set on the piers, but not joined. Pine boards were used to form interior walls and exterior siding. A pine floor covers the smaller room floor, while the larger room had nothing more than a dirt floor. Framing of the end wall included squared timbers and also roughly hewn logs still today covered in bark.

---

76 McCall Family Genealogy. Email from Catherine Rogers. 2008.  
77 Catherine Rogers. E-mail, September 14, 2008.
A dividing wall of vertically set pine boards with a door separates one side of the kitchen from the other. A large central hearth on the dividing wall faces the smaller of the two room, with no opening the larger room. This small room has one window on the end wall. Two doors lead from the larger room to the outside, and one from the smaller room to the outside. There is not wainscot or surbase in any part of the kitchen building.

Also, the roof joists above the larger room are roughly hewn, while those above the smaller room are squared. All these timbers have mortise and tenon joints and wooden pegs. The ceiling has horizontal boards laid over the ceiling joists, and are laid flush to one another.

Original and acquired brick also form the piers for the John MacColl House. Floor sills and joists are either original heart pine squared logs, or replacements for other deteriorated area houses of the same period. Most of the pine boards of the porch have also been replaced, though most of the columns are original. The front and back stairs were also replaced with pine boards from other period houses. Any original pine doors, floors or walls that were salvageable were kept, with few needed replacements.

A wainscot in the main parlor is made of two large boards inset in panels with a simple molding profile bordering the panel. Above the wainscot is a surbase with a simple molding pattern. Fireplace openings on the first and second floor are original, though the original chimney and hearth were disassembled and several of the bricks replaced. Both mantels are original to the house as well.

An enclosed stair leads to the second floor loft. A railing, original to the house, was lost though the markings still remain in the floor and wall. Like the McKay house, a
diamond shaped board turns the corner between the wall and ceiling of this floor creating an angular transition. The second story ceiling obscures the roofing system though the wooden shingles of the roof are visible from the outside. Windows on the first and second floors are a mix of original and replicated sash, and only a few original glass panes survive in the house.

Of interest in the construction of this house, and seen only in the MacCall farmstead, is the placement of a triangle cut board where the wall meets the ceiling. This was done to create an angular, rather than instant, transition between the wall and ceiling (see figure 4.21). Also on the second floor is a wall, made of just one set of vertical boards, showing the skeleton of the framing of the wall on the side facing the stair, and divides the space into two rooms. There are no fireplaces on the second floor.
Figure 4.21. Ceiling of the MacColl House, arrows point to triangle cut corner boards at the junction of the wall and ceiling. (Image: Author)
John MacColl House
Marlboro County, S.C. - Circa 1810

Originally located in Dillon County, South Carolina
John MacColl House
Marlboro County*, South Carolina  Circa 1810
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*Moved from original location in Dillon County, S.C. in 1990s
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Lewis Garner House

Situated on the Shaw House properties is the Lewis Garner House. The original date of construction is unknown, though the Moore County Historical Association gives it construction date sometime between 1779 and 1800. The House was located north of Robbins, North Carolina along Smyrna Church Road, near Jugtown. It was bought in 1987 by the Moore County Historic Association and moved to its current site.

Figure 4.25. Map showing original location of Lewis Garner House (A) north of Robbins, N.C. to its current location in Southern Pines, N.C. (Image: Google Maps)
John Garner bought the land upon which the house sat in 1764 and raised his son Lewis there. If the house was indeed built in 1779 it would have been built by John, whereas, if it were built closer to 1800 it was probably by Lewis. Lewis is the first recorded inhabitant of the house, which he shared with his wife, Rebecca Yow, and their five children.\textsuperscript{79}

Fieldstones form the foundation of the house and were used to construct the chimney. The house is constructed of timber framing of pine with mortise and tenon joints and wooden pegs. The first floor interior walls are of horizontally laid pine boards set flush to one another. There is not presently, nor does there exist any evidence of wainscot or surbase elements in any of the rooms on the first or second story. Original hand-blown glass in the front two windows are set in a replacement sash created from the original design. The first and second floor fireplaces are original to the house, as is the first floor mantel. An enclosed stair leads to the second floor.

One large loft room occupies the second story with two windows on either side of the fireplace. These windows have no glass, but do have the original wooden shutters. The log construction of the house is visible on the second story as there are no boards covering the walls. Also visible is the framing of the roof, which was constructed by squaring off pine logs.

Lewis Garner House
Moore County, N.C. - Circa 1800

Figure (left to right) (4.26) East elevation of Garner house with half stone, half brick chimney, (4.27) North elevation front entrance with roof extension over porch, (4.28) South facing wall with awning over back door, and dove-tail notching visible at corner. (Images: Author)
Lewis Garner House
Moore County*, North Carolina  Circa 1800
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*House was moved from original location in Moore County by the Moore County Historical Association
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Drawing 4.5
Charles Cornelius Shaw House

The Charles Cornelius Shaw House is located on its original site, today at the corner of Pee Dee and Morgantown Roads in Southern Pines, North Carolina (see figure 4.9). It was acquired by the Moore County Historic Society in 1967 and is the central focus of the group of MCHA house museums. The construction date of the house is 1820, with additions being added in 1842 and the early 20th century.

Charles Cornelius Shaw was a first generation American Scot, born in 1791 in Cumberland County, North Carolina. His father Peter was from the Isle of Jural, Scotland and his mother from the Isle of Skye, Scotland. Charles Shaw set out to make a life for himself in Moore County and began by purchasing 125 acres from John McNeill. In 1821 he married Mary Ray, the daughter of the well-known Colonel John Ray, and together they had twelve children. Over the course of his life in Moore County, Shaw would accumulate 2,500 acres of land called Shaw’s Ridge, and have a very successful lumber business. After the Civil War the house passed to Charles Washington Shaw, his son, who lived in the house throughout his natural life.

Set on sandstone sills, the Shaw House has undergone several modifications since its construction in 1820. The floor sills and joists are constructed of large heart pine boards shaped with an adze. Pine boards are used on the interior for flooring, ceiling, and dividing walls between rooms. The chimney, like the sills, is made fieldstone.

---

81 ibid, 3.
Determining the original design of the first floor is difficult, as the walls would have been easily moved when necessary. All the interior walls of the original house are constructed of flush, vertical pine boards. There is no wainscot or surbase in any of the first floor rooms, and though not accessible, the attic story most likely lacks these elements as well. Windows in the original house still have the original muttons and most of the original hand-blown glass.

Several additions were made in 1842: among these are the front porch, two porch rooms, and a sandstone chimney off the first floor bedroom. These additions are of the same materials as the original house: sandstone for the chimney and pine boards for the porch and rooms. Another set of late 19th and early 20th century additions was also added onto the back of the house, though these are not relevant to this study.
Charles Shaw House
Moore County, N.C. - Circa 1820

Figure (left to right) (4.29) North elevation of C. Shaw House with enclosed front porches, (4.30) West elevation, view of parlor with limestone and brick chimney, (4.31) East elevation showing 1842 chimney addition of limestone and brick, also visible is later additions.

(Images: Author)
Charles Cornelius Shaw House
Moore County, North Carolina  Circa 1820

* Later additions are not relevant to this study

* Denotes additions made in 1843
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Drawing 4.6
John MacDonald Shaw House

On the site of the John Blue House in Scotland County, North Carolina, is the John McDonald Shaw House. The construction date of the house has been said to be anywhere from 1810 to 1850, however deed research done in the last ten years places the construction date around 1828. The house was moved in 1977 to its current location on the John Blue Complex on X-Way Road in Laurinburg, South Carolina (see figure 4.32).

Figure 4.32. Map showing original location of John Shaw House (A) and current location, northwest of Laurinburg, N.C. (Image: Google Maps)
John McDonald Shaw was born on the Isle of Skye in Scotland in 1768 and came to America as a young boy with his father, Daniel and mother, Sarah. The Shaw family settled in Richmond County, in a part now belonging to Scotland County, North Carolina. Daniel Shaw was a poor farmer but accumulated some wealth before his death and John grew up without an education. Practicing the same professions as his fellow Highlanders he not only practiced farming, but also husbandry. Upon his death in 1800, Daniel Shaw left the bulk of his properties to his wife Catherine and his two children from his first marriage: his daughter Gormel and his son John McDonald. His two sons Neil and Angus would receive, upon the death of his wife, the majority of the farmland, with a small section going to his daughter Catherine. His other four children were given the profits from the sale of the livestock, except the sheep, which were given to Catherine, until the amount to each child equaled that of Neil and Angus. John McDonald would follow in his father’s footsteps, but not before he set out to receive an education after which time he accumulated enough money as a teacher to purchase some land.

In 1802 John married Mary Patterson, whose parents lived north of Laurel Hill, and had four children by her before her death, and the death of two of his sons in 1816 to malaria. A little over a year later he remarried with Christianna McKinnon of Kintire, Scotland. John became the administrator for the estate of Colin Campbell in Scotland

---

County, off South Turnpike Road, and eventually bought the 100 acres of land in 1828.\textsuperscript{85} In that same year John Shaw bought 256 acres from Benjamin Barnes in the same area.\textsuperscript{86} On the land bought from Barnes was built the farmstead now on the John Blue complex. In 1835, 278 additional acres were purchased, creating a plantation known as Shaw Place.\textsuperscript{87} During this period John Shaw was both a teacher and planter, accumulating land, livestock and slaves. In an 1830 census of the County, John Shaw was listed as having ten slaves on his property;\textsuperscript{88} while ten years earlier no slaves were listed in the census. An error in the recording is unlikely and it can be assumed that John acquired the slaves over the ten-year period between censuses. From this information it is evident that Shaw was successfully making a living as a planter running the Shaw Place plantation.

After it was moved in 1977, the Shaw House was placed on cinderblock piers, though in a photo from The Laurinburg Exchange it is evident that the house had originally sat on brick piers. The house was originally a pine log cabin that was later covered in clapboard siding. In the 20\textsuperscript{th} century a brick veneer was placed over the front façade. The logs that form the walls are attached to one another in two ways: the chamber and notch, and the sharp notch style.

The interior walls were also covered in pine boards, but when the property was moved to the John Blue Complex the decision was made to expose the original log walls. Also, it was the decision of the John Blue property owners to leave open the view to the second story and attic story, as the flooring between the first and second floors had been

\textsuperscript{86} ibid, 2.
\textsuperscript{87} ibid, 2.
\textsuperscript{88} John Shaw. “Census 1830”. Richmond County Archives. No. 214.
removed earlier in the century and used for another restoration project. A report in 1979 speculates that there was no ceiling between the second story and attic story as the roof rafters were beaded at the bottom. The original log construction is therefore visible in all areas of the main front rooms on the first, second, and attic story. In the backrooms, though, the exterior walls are log construction, the siding has been left intact.

All that remains of the downstairs room and stair are the ghost marks of two walls to the right of the main parlor and notches for the stair wall. A window on the wall of one of the small rooms on the first floor looks into the back porch room, suggesting the later addition of the back room. Supporting this is a seam visible on the exterior of the house where the main rooms of the house meet the back room.

The first floor fireplace is large, and without a decorative mantel. The second floor has two windows on the front façade and one on the side wall opposite the fireplace. The fireplace might have been moved to its current location sometime after construction from the opposite wall, though this is only speculation, as there is no written or oral account to support or refute this.

Photographs from the 1979 survey and report do not show any evidence of window sash or glass remnants, and there is no written account of there being any. In these photographs however, are wooden shutters on two windows in the attic story. Today the house has wooden shutters on all of the windows in the Shaw House.

---

John Shaw House
Scotland County, N.C. - Circa 1828

Figure (left to right) (4.33) North elevation of J. Shaw House with off center front door and porch stair; (4.34) South elevation view, again with off center door to rear addition, (Top- 4.35) East elevation and (Bottom- 4.36) West elevation with brick chimney.

(Images: Author)
John McDonald Shaw House
Scotland County, North Carolina Circa 1828
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Daniel McNeill Log House

Like the John McDonald Shaw House, the Daniel McNeill House is an early Scottish log house farmstead moved from its original site in the 1970s (see figure 4.37). The date of the house was speculated to be 1810 to 1820, but deed research done in 2005 shows that it was more likely constructed in 1828. In 1976 John Marion McNeill, a descendent of Daniel McNeill, gave the building to the owners of the John Blue House.

Figure 4.37. Map showing original location of Daniel McNeill House (A) and current location northwest of Laurinburg, N.C. (Image: Google Maps)

---

Daniel McNeill was born in 1791 in Greenock, Scotland and came to America in 1819 aboard the ship Hugh Crawford; traveling with him were his mother, two brothers, sister, his wife, and two daughters. They arrived in Charleston, but passed through the city and up the Cape Fear River to Elizabethtown, N.C. His wife, Catherine, and his mother Margaret died shortly after their arrival in America, the former on the 8th of November 1819 and the latter on November 1, 1819. From Elizabethtown the family went to stay with their relative Archie McGoogan, who lived near Fayetteville, N.C.

By 1827 Daniel remarried to Sarah and by this time had acquired enough money to purchase several lots, totaling 132 acres, from John Kelly on the East side of Joe’s Creek in Robeson County, N.C. It was on this property, bought from Kelly, that the McNeill log house was built. Over the next fifty years he would expand his holdings to include almost 1,500 acres in Robeson County. In 1871, four years before his death, Daniel gave his two daughters from his first marriage, Christian and Margaret, their own acreage. His other five children John, James, Mary, Nancy and Daniel were given title to 724 acres to be held jointly. The will of Daniel McNeill does not list any livestock owned, though based on what is known of Scottish settlers in the Cape Fear Valley he probably owned some manner of livestock by the time of his death in 1875.

---

94 “Christian McNeill Pate from Daniel McNeill” and “Margaret McNeill Graham from Daniel McNeill”. South Carolina Archives. Book 4, 141-143.
Today, the McNeill House rests on cinder block foundations, though photographs from a 1970s report show the remnants of brick foundation piers. Like the Shaw House, the McNeill House was a typical log construction, which can be seen in the ‘70s photographs, and was covered with clapboard siding sometime after its construction. The boards used for the logs, the siding, and the interior walls are all pine. The front and back stairs were both replaced after the building was moved to its current site.

The interior walls are set with pine boards set horizontally to one another and laid flush to the wall. There is no wainscot or surbase in any of the first or second floor rooms. The second floor has no interior walls and the logs are visible to the point where the eave of the roof begins. This element was not changed from the original design, as can be seen in photographs before the house was moved. The roof is covered in tin sheathing, which is also consistent with the 1970 images and is the original covering of the roof from the original construction.

Original batten shutters still exist on all windows, which are six over six, with the original sash. Unique to this house is the asymmetry of the placement of windows, with only one on the front façade, and no windows on the fireplace wall of the main parlor. Glass panes in the windows are not original to the house, and have been replaced since the 1970s. Six panel doors in the main parlor and the batten door at the back are also original, with some members having been replaced since the house was moved.
Daniel McNeill House
Scotland County, N.C. - Circa 1828

Figure (left to right) (4.38) South elevation of McNeill House with asymmetrical window placement, (4.39) North elevation back door, again with asymmetrical window placement, (Top- 4.40) East elevation and (Bottom- 4.41) West elevation with brick chimney.
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John McNeill House
Scotland County*, North Carolina  Circa 1828
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CHAPTER FIVE
COMPONENTS OF EARLY SCOTTISH DWELLINGS

Floor Plans

The hall-parlor plan is dominant in all eight early Scottish dwellings included in this study. From the front porch, access to the house is gained by entering a door leading into the main parlor of the first floor. This is the largest room on the first floor and in all houses except the Charles Shaw house, which has an unheated hall parlor, and has a fireplace on the gable-end wall. In many cases this fireplace is the only one in the entire house and suggests this room to be the main living space of the family, where people gathered, ate, received guests, etc. The two most distinctive groupings of rooms in these dwellings is a multi-room plan and a single room plan. It must be noted that these groupings are based on the first floor plan, and not the second floor plan as it is more consistent in design.

Single room plans are seen in two log cabins, the McClendon and John Shaw houses, and consist of a single room opening to the outside on both sides. While an early

Figures 5.1 and 5.2. McClendon Cabin, John Shaw House (Drawings in this section are not to scale)
addition was put on the John Shaw House to make it a two room cabin the original design was a single room structure. Like the other Scottish domiciles these cabins too have front porches running the length of the front façade and access is gained through a slightly off-center door. The second floor in both structures was accessed by a ladder located on the first floor. In the John Shaw house two windows on the front façade are not mirrored in the original back façade, which has only one window and not two; the John Shaw house addition does address this issue with two windows mirroring the front façade. The McClendon Cabin doors are placed across from one another on the side walls though an irregularity is seen in the windows, one that is next to the fireplace and another centrally located on the gable-end wall opposite the fireplace.

One version of the multi room plan is a three room grouping on the first floor of the house, and is seen in the Garner and Charles Shaw houses of Moore County. Off the

![Figures 5.3 and 5.4. Garner House and Charles Shaw House.](Images: Author)

main parlor of these buildings are two smaller anterooms that served as bedchambers, or in the case of the Charles Shaw house, a small parlor. The orientation of these rooms varies: both rooms in the Garner house are situated opposite the gable end of the main
parlor while in the Charles Shaw house the two anterooms are located at both gable-end, with the hall-parlor being sandwiched between the two. Though not original to the house, the 1842 additions to the back of the house transform the linear plan in an “L” shaped house, which is a type typically reserved for Hall and Chamber or Passage and Chamber houses.96 Like the Charles Shaw house, which has two doors opposite each other in the main parlor with the other in the bedchamber, the Garner house has three doors on the first floor with access to the exterior, two also in the main parlor, and one in a side bedchamber. Placement of the door in the side bedchamber of both structures is curious and the reason for this is not explained in written or oral histories of either building.

The other multi room grouping is a four room plan on the first floor seen in the McKay, Bryant, MacColl and McNeill houses. A single door on the front façade leads into the main parlor, being the largest room on the first floor. From here several doors lead to other areas of the house, in some cases all interior rooms are accessed from this main parlor, while others require maneuvering through side rooms, though the way into these rooms is clear and easy. As with the other plans, access to the front and back of the house is only gained from moving through the main parlor, promoting the dual aspect of these rooms as public and private spaces.

Figures 5.5 -5.8. (top left to bottom right) Bryant, McKay, MacColl and McNeill houses.

(Images: Author)
While the hall-parlor plan is dominant in these dwellings, four of the structures have a vestibule, or variation of the form. One is an interior vestibule seen in the Bryant house, the other a covered exterior back porch in the McKay and MacColl houses, the third being a separate room perhaps used as an office or receiving space. While the roofed back porches in the McKay and MacColl houses are not vestibules in the traditional sense, being an anteroom or small foyer leading into a larger room, for the purposes of this study they will be grouped into this category.97 Vestibules and entrance halls are commonly seen in the Mid-Atlantic and South in the I-house plan derived from Georgian period dwellings in England, which consists of flanking rooms on either side of a central hall with stair.98

The Bryant, McKay and MacColl houses were built between 1790 and 1810 and the vestibule allows the movement from a private to public space. It is interesting to note that all vestibules are located at the rear of these buildings, and so may have social implications of the reception of persons of different social levels. The vestibule removes the visitor from the private familial space and makes an introduction into the main parlor necessary for movement through the house, while the front entrance hall-parlor design makes the introduction immediate. Similar rules might have applied to the back room of the McNeill House since historically a door separated this back room from the main parlor.

Figures 5.9, -5.12. (top left to bottom right)
Bryant, McKay, MacColl and McNeill houses- arrows point to areas showing vestibule, or areas denoted as such.
(Image: Author)
Three of the structures in this study have a room located on the first floor, though segregated from the house, often called a traveler’s or parson’s sleeping room. Original to the construction of the McKay and MacColl houses is such a room located in the back porch of the house. Though the wall to the parson’s room is missing in the McKay house, the window and ghost mark on the floor show evidence of the existence of this room. The importance of this room is the hospitality one is able to show without putting one’s family, and in the case of male visitors, one’s daughters, in a precarious situation. The house can still be closed to the outside without having negate the responsibilities of Christian hospitality. This room too shows this division between the movement from public to private spaces within the building, being that the occupant of this room would have had to ask permission to enter the private space, though a lodger of the family. Later 1842 additions to the Charles Shaw House include two porch rooms of a similar function. Like the MacColl and McKay rooms these porch rooms do not have direct access to the main house, though could have housed visitors. As with the two other examples, access to the private space of the house is still granted and not directly gained.
Another interesting use for the entire grouping of back rooms could have been a shed. A house in Winton, N.C., though a southern I-house, has a similar floor plan to the MacColl and McKay houses and historically used the back rooms as a rear shed. The shed is listed as being in three parts with the central portion left open as a porch, which is “not unusual in the Lowland South.”99 It is very possible that the back rooms were used as storage areas for food and other sundry items of the family.

The location of the hearth in these farmsteads speaks to social patterns and daily life of early settlers. Side chimneys in all early Scottish farmsteads of this study are common to the southern vernacular type, and are unlike the central ones of the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast regions. Central chimneys in colder regions are desirable to heat the whole house, while in the South, where summers and fall can be extremely hot, an exterior side chimney would localize heat in one or two rooms.\textsuperscript{100} In the study of architecture the placement of the chimney is helpful to determining which rooms were principal ones for the family as most of the daily domestic activities would occur around the fire such as eating, cooking, sewing and spinning.

Symmetry in these early farmsteads is not a main component of their design. In terms of size and orientation of rooms, symmetry is completely absent from the plans of

these early houses, with the front two rooms being fairly distinct in size and the back rooms being completely irregular. While the front and back doors are generally on an axis, the location of windows is very irregular. The location of windows is somewhat symmetrical in the front and back façades of the MacColl, John Shaw, Bryant and McKay houses with two windows somewhat evenly placed on either side of the door. Though by measurement these windows are not symmetrical the illusion is successful for the overall design. On the remaining Scottish dwellings no sort of symmetry is attempted with the placement of windows on the two main facades: function over form appears to be the guiding principle.

One trend seen in five of the eight dwellings is the placement of two windows on either side of the main parlor chimney; the exceptions being the McNeill and John Shaw houses and McClendon Cabin. It is interesting to note that the three aforesaid dwellings comprise three of the four log cabins included in this study. While no clear explanation may be found, it is important to note that cabins of this period and region tended to not place windows on either side of the chimney. On the second floors this pattern only continues in the Garner, MacColl, Bryant and McKay houses, though even here only the MacColl and Bryant windows are identical to the ones on the first floor.
Window placement on the second floor of these houses follows no clear pattern, as some have full second stories while the others are only half-stories. With full second floors, the John Shaw, MacColl and Bryant houses have windows on the front and back façades of the second floor. As with the placement on the first floor, windows on the main façades are not absolutely symmetrical, though again the appearance of symmetry is successful. Stated above, the placement of windows on the second floor does not follow any clear pattern and so analyzing the remaining buildings would come to no definite conclusions. In general it can be said that one or two windows are present on one, or both gable-end walls and that the size and style of these windows is incongruent with the first floor types.

A final element that should be noted is the location of the stair hall or ladder leading to the second floor. The traditional English I-house has a broad staircase located in the central hall, while the hall-parlor and Mid-Atlantic type, the stair is oftentimes
tucked into a corner in the one of the two front parlors. There are three distinct locations of the stair in this study of typology. They are, in a corner of the main or secondary parlor, in a hallway or vestibule and ladder access from the main parlor.

The ladder in the McClendon cabin is located in the main room of the first floor. In the McClendon Cabin an opening cut out of the floorboards of the second floor tells us the location of the ladder. Most log construction of this period in the Mid-Atlantic, has staircases in the corner of the main hall, though it is not uncommon for a cabin to have ladder access to the second floor. The McClendon cabin is rather small and to save space the family might have chosen to use a ladder in place of a stair, which would have wasted several feet of space. A 1970s survey of the John Shaw house shows an enclosed stair on the other side of a partition wall, though today this stair no longer exists. An enclosed, or box stair is common in period cabins and given the ample space in the parlor of the Shaw house would not take as much room as one would in the McClendon Cabin.
Figures 5.20 [a, b] and 5.21 [a, b]. Arrows show location of ladders in the McClendon Cabin and John Shaw house. (Top Left and Photos: Author) (Top Right Image: Stokes)
With the only true vestibule in this study, the Bryant house most closely resembles the traditional Southern I-house. However, as the vestibule is not a full hallway, the stair located in it adapts the traditional I-House plan to the Hall-Parlor type. As with the I-house, the Bryant house stair runs straight the entire way up to the second floor with no turn or mid-level landing. This stair is unique to the Bryant house and is not remotely identifiable in the other seven structures.

**Figures 5.22 and 5.23.** The hallway served as the location of the stair hall in traditional Southern I-houses, the Bryant house stair follows the partial plan of the I-house though with an entryway, not a full hallway.

(Left Image: Glassie) (Right Image: Author)

Three of the remaining four houses, the McKay, MacColl and Garner, follow the traditional hall-parlor plan in that the stair hall is tucked into a corner of a parlor. In the MacColl and Garner houses this is the main parlor, while the McKay stair is located in the secondary parlor. At the turn of the 19th century a change is seen in vernacular architecture of the Mid-Atlantic region where the broad open stair of the Georgian period
was replaced with a narrow boxed-in stair more in the Rhineland style of German peasants.¹⁰¹ It seems, however, this trend trickled down to the southern states where its influence is seen in a few of the early Scottish buildings. The Mid-Atlantic Pennsylvania German influence and Continental plan of Pennsylvania, both hall-parlor plans could also be seen as contributors to this stair placement. Direct contact with German settlers is possible as this group migrated into parts of central and western North Carolina, thought the most concentrated settlements of Germans were located around New Bern North Carolina, a full 80 miles northeast of the port of Wilmington.¹⁰²

As stated at the beginning of this chapter the second floor plans follow a more uniform pattern and can be divided into three categories, attic space, and one and two room areas. The McClendon Cabin and Charles Shaw houses both have attic spaces, accessed by a ladder, and are not quite tall enough for an adult to stand straight up in. Most likely the children were sent to sleep upstairs and more specifically boys, while the girls tended to sleep in closer proximity to their parents.

The next category is a one room loft space. The room ceiling is either around six feet with ceiling boards, or up around eight feet ending at the roof ridge. There are two methods of interior construction. In one, the ceiling is around six feet tall with ceiling boards, in the other the ceiling is around eight feet ending at the roof ridge. In log construction the walls of the loft or half-story are an extension of the outside walls ending

where the roof gable begins. Ceilings are seen in the McKay house, while roof ridge second floors are present in the John Shaw, Daniel McNeill and Lewis Garner houses.

Finally, two room second floors are seen in the Bryant and MacColl houses, though the Bryant house is the only one of its kind with a full second story. The McKay house follows the same pattern as the Bryant house, but has a rudimentary dividing wall with no door between the two spaces. The Bryant house, on the other hand, has two rooms divided by a wall complete with baseboard and door and has a full height ceiling of around seven or eight feet. It is the only house that has a second floor uninterrupted by the roof framing.

Figures (left to right) 5.24- 5.26. Photos of second floors of, McClendon Cabin attic space, McNeill House half-story and Bryant house full second story. (Image: Author)

All floor plans in this study exhibit a combination of 18th-century vernacular architecture principles. While variations exist, the general principles of the hall-parlor and on occasion the Southern I-house plan are identified in the floor plans of the McClendon Cabin and Bryant, McKay, MacColl, Charles Shaw, Lewis Garner, John Shaw and McNeill houses. While the floor plans of these early Scottish structures are not identical there exists a commonality of design in the studied counties of North and South
Carolina. Looking further into this comparison of vernacular study will assert the presumption that Scottish settlers were building according to local vernacular types of the southern colonies.

**Framing and Foundations**

Materials used for foundations are related to the region where each house was located. In Dillon County, South Carolina, brick foundations were used to raise the MacCall and McKay houses. Today, concrete blocks have been used to help support the McKay house, though originally only brick would have been used. These houses also have brick chimneys, which today include both original and replacement hand-made brick with lime mortar.

Brick and possibly wood was used as the foundation material in the John Shaw and Daniel McNeil houses in Scotland County, North Carolina; today both houses sit on concrete blocks. Original and replacement bricks with lime mortar were used to reconstruct the chimneys on both houses after they were moved in the 1970s to the John Blue complex. The dominance of brick in Dillon and Scotland counties is consistent with the landscape, as these counties are both flat, farming areas of large fields and forests without much field stone. Brick, made by local kilns, using local soils would have provided the masonry product.

Dominant in the foundation and chimney construction of hillier regions of North Carolina like Moore County is the use of local sandstones and a combination of stone and
brick. The foundations of the McClendon Cabin, and Shaw, Garner and Bryant houses are all made of sandstone. These stones are dry-stacked, without the use of mortar. Just the weight of the house above holds the foundation together. The McClendon Cabin and Garner House also have large sandstone blocks that serve as steps to the front porch and back door Garner House.

The McClendon Cabin has the only chimney entirely made of sandstone, though given its location in the hills of Moore County, and its early construction date of 1760 it is not surprising the family chose to use local materials. The mortar used between the rocks appears to be of lime, though some replacement mortar looks to have Portland cement in it. A mixture of sandstone and brick was used at the Shaw and Garner Houses, with stone being used up to the second story, where a transition to brick occurs. Still, the use of sandstone in the chimney dominates the use of brick. Somewhat unusual to its location is the use of brick in the two chimneys of the Bryant House. Though both chimneys sit on sandstone blocks, hand-made brick is the dominant material with some early lime mortar, and other modern replacement mortar with some Portland cement.

Two construction methods were used to build early Scottish Carolina farmsteads: log construction and timber framing. There appears to be no correlation between the year of construction and method used, though some similarities are evident among the houses within each county. Determining a Scottish type within the Carolinas based on construction method is not possible as several variables are present within the group as a whole. Connecting the Scottish Carolina framing method with the Highlands is also difficult as the immigrants assimilated to the materials and techniques of the American
colonies. While Scottish immigrants were aware of methods for timber construction, it was not used as extensively in Highland housing. Three methods of framing were used to construct these early Scottish farmsteads: they are log, log and timber and timber itself. The variances in method could be attributed to several factors including economics, prior influences and local vernacular traditions.

Log construction in the rural areas of the south and other expanding frontiers like Tennessee and Kentucky was very common for its ease, availability and quickness of construction. Log framing also required less work since there was no mortise and tenon joints, and eliminated the need for sundry items like nails. While log construction would have been physically challenging, it required less knowledge of carpentry and had a shortened time of construction. Log construction was used by immigrants as a simple solution to housing when first beginning life in America.

The most rudimentary example of log construction that I surveyed is the McClendon Cabin of Southern Pines, North Carolina. It is known as the oldest structure in Moore County, built around 1760.103 The logs are square with a dove-tail pattern as seen on the front façade corners. Vertical boards cover the back two corners, as does the vertical weatherboard. From the sides of the cabin, and at the loft level, one can see the horizontal roof purlins, constructed of rounded logs, which protrude through the sidewalls. This system has no collar ties or girts. It has wooden shingles over roofing boards.

In Scotland County are two examples of log cabins later covered on the exterior with beaded weatherboard. The dates of these changes are unknown. The McNeill House is log construction up to around three feet above the floor of the second story loft. It is the exposed walls of the second floor that reveal the log construction method. Squared purlins are joined into the last wall log with mortise and tenon joints. These rafters are roughly squared, and joined at the rafter peak with mortise and tenon joints. Horizontal roofing battens are used to attach the tin roof, though originally wooden shingles would have covered the roof. The other weatherboard-over-log construction house in Scotland County is the John Shaw House. Similar to the McNeil cabin the roofing system of this house is tied into the log construction with mortise and tenon joints. Purlins support roofing boards below the tin roof.

The Garner House of Moore County is constructed with both log and framed techniques. Dated to around 1800, evidence of the two construction methods is most visible in the walls of the second story loft. The dovetail construction of the log walls can

Figures 5.27 and 5.28. Roof system of McClendon Cabin with roof purlins protruding from the gable ends. (Image: Author)
be seen in the back exterior corners and in the corners of the loft story. Unique to the house is the transition from log construction to weatherboard in the gable walls of the roof. This change occurs around three feet from the floor of the second story. Wood studs support the weatherboard and frame two 4/4 windows. Rounded logs serve as rafters that connect at the peak with mortise and tenon joints. Why this type of transition was used is unknown, as no written or oral accounts exist for the change.

Traditional framing methods of the early American colonies were used in four early Scottish farmsteads: the John MacCall, Daniel McKay, Charles Shaw and Michael Bryant houses. These residences can be grouped within regions as the first two were built in Dillon County, South Carolina and the latter two in Moore County, North Carolina. From the sills to the roof these four dwellings were constructed using squared timbers joined with mortise and tenon joints and wooden pegs. Beaded weatherboard was used most often as siding, though some variations exist within the whole group. Unfortunately the roofing systems of these timber framed structures are not visible from the interior or exterior of the building, though a crawl space above the back porch roof of the McKay House allows a glimpse at the construction method with purlins and battens roofing boards. Wooden shingles are present on all four houses as well. The addition of the porch and porch rooms to the Charles Shaw house was also made using timber framing and is evident on the exterior of the house by the addition of vertical boards between the original house and the addition.

One interesting roofing system is the rain porch, which is an extension of the main roof over the porch. It is very common the southern colonies in structures built in
the early to mid 19th century. The only houses in this study without a rain porch are the
John Shaw, Daniel MacCall and Michael Bryant, Second story windows on the front and
back façades of these homes prevent the extension of the roof and are the only known
reason for the exclusion of the rain porch on the both façades. All other Scottish
farmsteads included in this study have a rain porch, and though the McNeil House rain
porch is slightly disconnected it can still be termed a rain porch.
Figures 5.29 and 5.30. Sandstone foundation of McClendon Cabin is the same for Garner, Bryant and Charles Shaw House properties, brick of MacColl House is similar to McKay, John Shaw and Daniel McNeill houses. (Images: Author)
Figures 5.31 and 5.32. Corner of Lewis Garner house with half-dovetail notching log cabin construction, and interior of Daniel McNeill House with log and frame construction methods with rafters of rounded timber.

(Images: Author)

Figures 5.33 and 5.34. Detail of porch construction of Daniel McKay House shows mortise and tenon joinery, as does the MacColl Kitchen house

(Images: Author)
Interior Walls

The interior walls vary within each house implying a disconnect between them and the construction of the exterior walls. There is, however, a correlation between the position and use of the interior wall and the way the boards are laid. Some connections can be made within construction techniques, while others can be made within counties. The existence of decorative elements like baseboards, wainscot and surbase is, however, directly related to the construction method, being of log or timber.

In Dillon County, the MacCall and McKay houses have similar interior walls. Both houses have baseboards, wainscot and a surbase in the front two rooms of the house. The wainscot of both of these dwellings is formed by using two large boards, each board around one foot wide, attached to the wall studs with hand-wrought nails. Wainscot in the MacCall house is framed within a molded border, while the McKay house is not. Above the surbase in these front two rooms are vertical boards reaching from the top of the surbase to the ceiling. Back room exterior walls in both buildings are boards laid horizontally with vertical walls separating the front two rooms from the back. Also, the walls facing the back porch are set vertically with one set of boards and no interior wall framing.

Closets in both structures underneath the stair are set with vertical boards, though the wainscot, baseboard and surbase are not continued on the closet wall. The second-story room(s) has horizontal boards on all four sides and on the ceiling. A dividing wall on the second story of the McKay House is set with vertical boards on one side, exposing
the braces and studs of the framing boards. A baseboard in the MacCall house is present on the second floor, though not in the McKay house. Unique to these two dwellings in the use of the diamond shaped board between the sloped side wall and flat ceiling, creating a smooth, angular transition between the wall and ceiling.

Similar to the two Dillon County houses is the Charles Shaw house in Moore County, North Carolina. Walls to the exterior are horizontal boards, while interior walls are made with vertical boards. These dividing walls were probably moved at some point after the original construction. This theory is supported by the fact that the walls are not permanent as they are missing framing with posts and braces, and is further shown by the removal of a wall from the McKay house in the early 20th century to convert the traveler’s room to a store. Decorative wall elements are limited to a surbase in the two side rooms of the Shaw house. There is baseboard in these rooms as well, but no wainscot. The surbase simply divides the vertical and horizontal boards of the interior walls. Though not visible, the loft story most likely resembles the crawl space of the McKay house, without interior walls.

The Bryant house is unique from the previous three buildings in that the interior walls are all clad with horizontal boards. All walls, whether to the exterior or dividing within the interior, have horizontal boards ranging between 10 and 14 inches. The only exception is the closet in the small front bedroom that is enclosed by a wall of vertically set boards. Walls on the second floor are the same as those on the first, with horizontally laid boards. The dividing wall in between the two rooms on the second floor is set with horizontal boards on both sides of the interior framing. This is different than the McKay
house, which has left exposed one side of the wall framing. On both floors of the house, and in all rooms, is a baseboard and surbase. No wainscot exists, in any room, and the surbase, like in the Charles Shaw house, simply divides the wall into two parts.

Walls within the log structures all share similar characteristics, especially those that have not been covered with boards. The McClendon Cabin is the most pure of all the log houses and has no interior boards covering the logs, or dividing walls. These interior walls, as they can be called, are horizontally laid, like the exterior. As this cabin was a rudimentary form of housing there are no decorative elements such as a baseboard, wainscot or surbase.

Cabins with the addition of interior walls also show similar patterning of the laying of boards. These boards are laid horizontally in the John Shaw, Daniel McNeil and Lewis Garner houses. Though most walls in the John Shaw house have been removed to reveal the original log construction one has been left as it was found to show what the interior would have looked like. As seen in the McNeil and Garner houses the dividing walls between rooms are also laid horizontally to the ground. While this might have been true in the John Shaw house the lack of boards on the division wall frame for the second front room prevents us from knowing if in fact the boards were laid the same way. Also, photographs from the 1970s survey are inconclusive to the orientation.

Just like the other buildings listed before, the Garner and McNeil houses have vertically laid boards forming the wall of the closet underneath the staircase. This construction is common in all structures with a closet beneath the stair. Though similar in this way to the other dwellings, these three cabins are different in that they have no
baseboards, wainscot or surbase on any walls, and no evidence to imply there ever was any one of these three elements.

**Figures 5.35 and 5.36.** Half-vertical paneling in the MacColl and McKay houses is seen only in timber-framed houses with wainscot. (Images: Author)

**Figures 5.37 and 5.38.** Horizontally laid interior walls are seen in all log cabin construction with interior wall paneling added after initial construction as the Garner and McNeill houses [it is also seen in the John Shaw House] (Images: Author)
Figures 5.39-5.41. (top to bottom) Interior dividing walls from the Michael Bryant, Charles Shaw and Daniel McKay houses. Of note is the vertical boards laid in the latter two dwellings, being the two movable walls. (Images: Author)
Doors

Several different types of door were used in these early Scottish farmsteads. Though some doors are of a similar type there is no general door design common throughout all the early Scottish farmsteads studied in this project. Doors in these buildings are both paneled and batten and in some cases consist of one, single large board. There is also no relationship between the structures and the type of doors in the exterior or interior of the buildings. Some consistency of door type is seen in four of the dwellings.

Batten doors are seen in the McClendon Cabin and the McKay, Garner and John Shaw dwellings. These batten doors are made with two or three boards laid vertically and connected with three horizontal boards laid across the top, middle and bottom of the door. The width of the vertical boards is varied. For example, in the McKay house the front and back exterior doors are made of three boards of equal length, while the door at the stair landing is made of three very large boards. The stair door also has only two horizontal components, which can be attributed to the location of the door inside.

For buildings like the Lewis Garner and the Daniel McNeil houses the influence of the original construction method is seen in the batten doors of these two log cabins. Another log cabin, the John Shaw house, has a batten back door, though the front is not: no reason for this is evident. The McClendon Cabin, being a true cabin, has batten doors for the front and back doors. Also with its original batten doors is the Garner house, except a one board sized closet door.
Four to six panel doors are seen in several residences. The MacColl and Bryant houses have six panel doors throughout with vertical boards forming the closet doors under the stair. Also with six panel doors is the Charles Shaw house, which has four total, three on the exterior and one on the interior. One six-panel door unlike the rest is the front door on the John Shaw house. Instead of the usual six-panel door with two larger bottom rectangular panels and two smaller top ones, the John Shaw door is made of six equally sized horizontal panels. Another distinct six-panel door is in the Charles Shaw house leading from the main room to the first floor parlor. This door is six panels, though a three over three pattern.

In addition to the batten door, and six-panel door, the John Shaw house also has a traditional four-panel door leading from the front room of the first floor to the back door. Variation in the types of doors in the John Shaw house is unique to any of the early Scottish farmsteads in this study. The reason for this difference is unknown, and no evidence could be found in oral, written, or photographic evidence.
Four and Six Panel Doors

Figures 5.42-5.47. Four and six panel door in these early Scottish dwellings are made from inset panels that are joined with mortise and tenon joints. (left to right) Bryant House [D 7], MacColl House [D 2], John Shaw House [D 1], Lewis Garner House [D 1], Charles Shaw House [D 5 and D 2].

(Images: Author)
Batten Doors with Cross Braces

Figures 5.48–5.50. Original batten doors with cross braces. These doors show no evidence of original locks, and most likely had rope latches. (left to right) Daniel McNeill House [D 1], Daniel McKay House [D 1] and Joel McClendon Cabin [D 1]

(Images: Author)
Most buildings in this study have retained the majority of the original glazing, and, in some instances, the original sash from the date of construction. Several homes have had replacement sash and glazing, such as the McClendon Cabin and Michael Bryant House, which has modern glazing instead of the historic hand-blown glazing. The most common type of window in these early farmsteads is six over six, though a few have four over four windows. Glazing is completely absent from the John Shaw House, and is the only dwelling without glazing throughout the structure.

Interestingly, a difference is seen in the presence, or absence, of glazing in openings on the second story of these Scottish farmsteads. The only structures with second floor glazing are the MacColl, Garner and Bryant houses. There is no connection between these dwellings that would warrant them being similar in this way, especially since the Bryant and MacColl houses have seven 6/6 windows and the Garner house has only two 4/4 windows. The McKay, Charles Shaw, McNeil and John Shaw houses all have one or two second story, or attic windows that have no glazing, but rather a batten shutter.

A comparison within regions does show similarities of the sash of window openings. In Dillon County, the McKay and MacColl houses both have 6/6 windows, still with much of the original glazing. In Moore County an interesting pattern emerges as the Garner and Charles Shaw houses both have 4/4 windows, again with much of the original glazing. Also in Moore County are the Bryant house and McClendon cabin that are
situated next to each other, and about 15 miles from the Shaw and Garner buildings with 6/6 windows. Most of the original glazing is still intact in the Bryant house. In Scotland County no connection can be made in relation to the windows, as the John Shaw house has no glazing, only window openings. The McNeil house has 6/6 windows, which can be connected to the vernacular type seen in other Lowland homes of the same period.

Shutters are only common in these early Scottish farmsteads if there were no windows. Those dwellings without glazing have batten shutters, with the exception of the McNeil house that has both glazing and batten shutters. Given the lifestyle of the farmstead owners it is not surprising that shutters were not a part of the architectural vocabulary of these buildings. Only one house, the Bryant house, is larger and more elaborate than the others and did have shutters. A couple of the original louvered shutters and several wrought iron shutter dogs are still intact on the house, though most have been lost over the years.
Figures 5.51-5.57. (top left to bottom right) Four over four original sash at the Lewis Garner House, while the six over six sash is seen in the Michael Bryant and John MacColl Houses (also the Daniel McNeill, Daniel McKay and Charles Shaw, not pictured). Batten shutters from the McNeill, John Shaw and McKay houses constructed with cross braces, and louvered wooden shutter with original wrought iron shutter dog on the Bryant House.

(Images: Author)
Mantels

There are three types of mantels that can be identified within the early Scottish farmsteads of the Carolinas. One is a very simple with little to no decoration, the other has inset panels, and the last has a geometric design. Generally, the types are related to region, though there are some correlations between building construction and mantel type.

In the three of four of the log cabin buildings, McClendon Cabin, John Shaw House and McNeill House, the fireplaces are large and the mantels are simple posts with lintels. This might be because of the log cabin construction of these three dwellings, which tends to be rather simple in its interior decoration. Even after the Shaw and McNeill houses were covered with siding and walling boards, the simple mantels from the earlier period were retained. More rustic in appearance is the mantel of the John Shaw house, which has a squared log as a lintel, but half-squared posts. The McClendon Cabin was never changed from its original design and so the mantel has also stayed the same. Unlike the other Scottish farmsteads the hearth of these three cabins is raised one brick height.

In Moore County there is a similarity seen in the mantels of the Charles Shaw and Bryant houses. Geometric patterns and reeded patterns are evident in the four mantels of these dwellings. The Charles Shaw house has two very large mantels, each a little over six feet in width. The mantel in the front parlor is the most elaborate with reeded patterns on the columns and on the facing panel. Also, small squares on the breast board are set vertically on the piers. In the original bedchamber of the same house is a very similar
mantel, though less decorative. Reeding is continued on the lower portion of the facing panel and the columns. The general design of the mantel, its columns, and division of panels is also the same between the Bryant and Charles Shaw mantels, though the bedchamber mantel has no protruding central panel.

Much smaller in size, at only about four feet in length, are the two mantels from the Bryant House. These too have very geometric designs with reeded patterns. The columns of these mantels are very thin with no capitals and only a scant division between the column and base. The central panels are both large with a centered panel containing decorative patterning. Here, as in the Charles Shaw house, the more decorative panel is located in the main parlor, while the less elaborate mantel is in the bedchamber.

The similarity of design in the Charles Shaw and Bryant House mantels is not uncommon since these buildings are located only ten miles or so from each other. Whether the owners themselves carved these mantels, or carpenters working in the area did, both parties would probably be familiar with the construction and design of other mantels in the area, by either personal account, or word of mouth.

In Dillon County, the mantels of the MacColl House and McKay House, though much simpler than those of the two Moore County properties, are still representative of the craftsmanship of the carpenter. The MacColl mantel has a large central panel, and there is no evidence of there ever being any decorative motif located within the space. This mantel is used for both the first and second story fireplaces, and would have saved the time of executing two separate designs. A keystone block is located at the center, just below the mantel shelf. Of the MacColl and McKay properties only the MacColl house
has a complete order of elements with all three parts of the column represented—base, shaft and capital.

The mantel of the McKay House is much more attenuated than the MacColl mantel and has a larger fireplace opening. Perhaps the most interesting element of the mantel is the three column capitals below the lintel with no column shaft or base, one on either end, and one at the center. No other design like this is evident in any of the early Scottish dwellings in this study, [need to look at some pattern books] and lends credence to the theory that Daniel McKay was the carpenter behind the design.

Though located in Moore County, the Garner House first floor mantel is more reminiscent of the Dillon County mantels than those of the Bryant and Charles Shaw houses. The fireplace opening is a bit smaller than the MacColl and McKay houses, but the simplicity of design seen in Dillon County is also evident here. A break of order is shown in the design of the Garner mantel, as there is a division of base and shaft, but no true capital. The central panel is divided into four equal parts, though there is no molding pattern within the recessed panels, as in the MacColl and McKay houses. The simplicity of the first floor mantel, and the rudimentary design of the half-story mantel, which consists of two posts and a lintel, suggests that John Garner was the craftsman behind the mantels. Also, given the original log cabin construction and the cabin size, a simpler mantel is more befitting the overall design of the house.
Mantels- Joel McClendon, John Shaw and Daniel McNeill

Figures (5.58) Stone pier and wood lintel and shelf of Joel McClendon Cabin varies from the (5.59) crude rounded posts and squared log lintel of the John Shaw house (5.60) The mantel of the Daniel McNeill house has squared logs as both post and lintel. (Images: Author)
McClendon, John Shaw and McNeill Mantels

McClendon Cabin, Moore Co., N.C.

John Shaw, Scotland Co., N.C.

Daniel McNeill, Scotland Co., N.C.

Drawing 5.1.
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Mantels- Daniel McKay, John MacColl and Lewis Garner

Figures (left to right) (5.61) Three inset panels of Daniel McKay house (5.62) Mantel with keystone and columns from the John MacColl house and (5.63) Stone chimney of the Lewis Garner house is evident in firebox of first floor mantel.

(Images: Author)
McKay, MacColl and Garner Mantels

Daniel McKay, Dillon Co., S.C.

John MacColl, Dillon Co., S.C.

Lewis Garner, Moore Co., N.C.

Drawn By: Bridget O'Brien
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Mantels- Michael Bryant and Charles Shaw

Figures 5.64-5.67. (top left to bottom right) John Shaw house main parlor mantel with some reeding and square applied carving is also echoed in the bedchamber mantel from 1842, though a little less elaborate. Both the Bryant and C. Shaw homes are located in Moore County, though around 20 miles from each other. Main parlor mantel from Michael Bryant House is made up of several reeds and has geometric patterning, which is also seen in the small back bedroom mantel with the same as are the rather thin posts.

(Images: Author)
Porch Columns and Railings

Though several variations in the size and width of porch columns exist between these early Scottish farmsteads, the column design is the same in all but two houses. Comparisons can be made within the dwellings of the same county, while differences are seen between the counties themselves. The same can be said of the design of porch railings.

Except for the John Shaw and Daniel McNeil houses of Scotland County, a lamb’s tongue design is seen in all other Scottish farmsteads of this study. Variations are seen in the size of the base, middle section and capital of the columns though the basic design is constant. A similarity of the designs within the counties shows a common language of architecture among these early settlers.

The McKay and MacColl houses have similar porch columns and railings, suggesting a communication of design within the county. These columns have tall bases and small capitals with an area cut out of the bottom for drainage. Lamb’s tongue design is seen in all the columns of the MacColl house, while the McKay house shows a combination of lamb’s tongue with a vase shaped design at the bottom of the capital. Railings on the front porch of the McColl house and the back porch of the McKay house are simple with squared balustrades set about 6 inches from one another. The only derivation is the McKay house front porch, which only has a top rail, and no evidence of a bottom rail or balustrade.
As with other architectural details the houses of Moore County can be divided into two pairs: the McClendon cabin and Bryant house and the Garner and Charles Shaw houses. The relationship between these dwellings is related to the location of each. Columns in all four houses use the lamb’s tongues design and have no drainage areas at the bases. The variation of the size of the base and capitals appears to be a personal choice as they are different among the houses. Railings at the Bryant house and McClendon cabin have the same design, an x, on the porch. Being next to one another it is not unusual that the later house, the Bryant, would be influenced by the design of the cabin. Closer to the town of Southern Pines, North Carolina the railing design is actually simpler. The Garner house has none at all, and no evidence of there ever being one, while the Charles Shaw house has only a top rail.

In Scotland County the John Shaw and Daniel McNeil houses have the most simple porch columns and rail. Squared logs serve as the columns with no drainage areas at the bottom. Columns of the McNeill House appear to be reused joists as they are rectangular boards. The porch rail is also very rudimentary and on both houses is a simple rounded log set into the column.
Porch Columns of All Dwellings
Arranged Chronologically

Joel McClendon
Ca. 1780

Bryant and McKay
Ca. 1790

Garner and MacColl
Ca. 1600/10

Charles Shaw
Ca. 1820

McNeill and John Shaw
Ca. 1828
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Hardware

While some replacements have been made for hardware in these early Scottish farmsteads, examples still exist of early hardware pieces used with the original construction of the farmsteads. Ghost marks on many doors shows where older hardware had sat before it was replaced. Properties owned by museum groups have had the most drastic upgrades in hardware, especially door locks, to prevent theft and vandalism. Correlations can be made among the period of construction and hardware type, as well as similarities within each county. Hinges in the Scottish farmsteads of the Carolinas are either made of wrought or cast iron, and while seemingly simple, follows the design scheme of hardware for this period in both Europe and America.

A common hinge in Dillon County is the pintel and strap hinge, and for closet doors, a butterfly hinge. Pintel and strap hinges are used for both of the main doors to the large parlor. These elements are wrought iron, and as such are attributed to the original construction of the house. One of several designs from the American Colonial period, this strap hinge follows the patterns for a rounded heart shaped design. As there is no evidence of the screws ever being removed from the pintel or strap of the hinge these are also attributed to the original construction. Evidence in the McKay house shows that a small butterfly hinge replaced a larger barn hinge. As the butterfly hinge appears to be of steel, and is not of cast or wrought iron this replacement was most likely made in the 20th century. Door hinges in the MacColl house are also wrought iron and original to the construction. The strap seems to be a combination of the early American ‘bean’ design,
and the ‘suffolk’ design. Like the screws in the McKay house, the screws used to latch the strap onto the door appear to be original to the house. No door locks from either the McKay or the MacColl are surviving from the original construction and have since been replaced with box locks. Ghost marks on the exterior doors of the MacColl house allude to an original mortise lock, though it had been replaced before the recent restoration. Evidence of a single rope latch in the McKay house is shown by two holes on the main porch door leading to the large parlor. Historically, Scottish Highlanders did not have locks on their doors because theft was not a major issue in the Highlands. In fact they were known to leave goods stored in outdoor sheds without locks. Whether this is the motive, or it was simply a matter of economics is not known. This Scottish tradition might explain the simple rope latch, as McKay built the house not only in an area settled by Scottish immigrants, but also very soon after his arrival in America signifying a continuation of Scottish tradition.

As with other aspects of architecture and design, the Garner House in Moore County shares similar hardware with the houses of Dillon County. Pintel and strap hinges are also used on the two main door of the parlor. Also, as with the McKay and MacColl houses no evidence suggests that these elements were ever replaced, as the nails holding the strap into the doors are concurrent with the original construction, these too are wrought iron. The design of the hinge is more similar to the McKay house, though a bit more elongated and follow the arrowhead strap pattern. Most locks in the Garner house

---

have been replaced with simple box locks, though the latch lock on the back door is original to the house. Not only does the shape and wrought nails suggest its originality, but also the arrowhead shape of the latch, which is the same as the strap hinges. An interesting lock is found on the side door leading to the outside and appears to be from the late 19th or early 20th century, based on its shape and design.

Also having pintel and strap hinges in Moore County is the McClendon Cabin. These hinges are similar to the ‘bean’ shape of the MacColl house and show no evidence of having been removed at any time. In fact, boards added to the inside of the door were placed over the hinge, so as to avoid disturbing it in any way. A few of the nails have been replaced recently, though several original ones still remain on the strap. A box lock on the front door might be original, though several holes in the vicinity of the box lock suggest earlier forms of locks or rope latches.

Another house in Moore County with a mix of original and replacement hardware is the Charles Shaw house. The variety and design of hinges seen in this house is most likely related to the elevated economic status of the Shaw family compared with the other Scottish farmsteads of the period. The Shaw house has, perhaps the most varying collection of hinges and can be related to the several additions made during the 19th-century. There seems to be a collection of hinges from different periods, from a T-hinge that appears to be the earliest existing hinge, a Steeple Tip hinge with vine pattern that is Victorian and a 20th-century butt hinge. The T-hinge that has had the tip broken off, as evidenced by the ghost mark on the door and has had a couple of the screws replaced.
recently. Deadbolts have been added for safety, but do not interfere with the early hardware.

With its original shutter dogs and box locks, the Bryant house still retains some of its original hardware. Wrought iron shutter dogs still exist on several first story windows, and are made in a common design of two curls, which is commonly seen in all levels of society in this period. Doors do not show evidence of locks other than the ones in situ, which leads to the conclusion that they are original to the house. What have changed are the door hinges that have been replaced with modern butt hinges.

In Scotland Country no original hinges exist on the doors or shutters. All have been replaced since the beginning of the 20th century, as shown by both material and design. The shutters of the McNeill House appear to be the earliest replacement being of iron, while the several hinges inside are of steel. The hinge is sometimes referred to as a barn hinge, a type of strap hinge, and is more utilitarian than decorative. These same steel barn hinges are also used on the interior of the John Shaw house, though some modern butterfly hinges have been used as well. While ghost mark evidence is not readily apparent, based on the location and type of construction it can be assumed that T or longer strap hinges were the original hardware pieces used on the doors and shutters.
Figures 5.68 - 5.72. (top left to bottom right) Bean shaped strap from back door of Joel McClendon Cabin and arrow-headed strap from porch door of Joel McClendon Cabin, heart-shaped strap from Daniel McKay House, bean-shaped strap from John MacColl House, and arrow-headed strap from Lewis Garner House. (Images: Author)
19th and 20th century Hinges from Early Scottish Dwellings

Figures 5.73-5.77. Victorian steeple-tip hinge with vine pattern, 20th century butterfly hinge, Charles Shaw House and 19th century T-hinge from Charles Shaw House, a modern barn hinge on rear window of shutter at the John Shaw House and modern barn hinge from front door of Daniel McNeill House. (Images: Author)
Original Locking Mechanisms and Door Knobs

Evidence for Original Door Locks and Latches

Figures 5.84 - 5.86. Evidence of an earlier box lock on the front door of the John Shaw House; ghost marks of a box lock exist on back door as front (shown here) in the John MacColl House, and double holes in the front (shown here) and back doors of the Daniel McKay House suggest the use of rope latches. (Images: Author)
No relationship is apparent in the molding profiles of the eight Scottish domiciles in this study. Profiles of existing door, interior and exterior windows and chair rails were documented and looked at to determine any correlations among the early Scottish settlers that built these dwellings. Though varied in the size and organization of patterns many of the molding profiles in these early Scottish buildings employ common Georgian elements like the cyma reversa and half-round. Distinction is made among different door locations with the addition of a simple ¼” bead, and is sometimes used to do the same for windows. Only four residences have chair rails, and even so several are only located in a few rooms. In the MacColl and McKay dwellings the chair rail is only in the front two rooms of the first floor, while in the Charles Shaw residence the chair rail is only in the front two gable-end rooms of the first floor. The Bryant dwellings, as with other architectural elements, is the most elaborate with a chair rail in all rooms of the first and second floors.
Door Molding Profiles

John MacColl

Daniel McKay

Lewis Garner

George Shaw

George Shaw Porch Molding

Michael Bryant

John Shaw

* John McNeill and Joel McClendon Cabin have no door moldings
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Interior Window Surround Profiles
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Drawing 5.8
Remnants of Highland Vernacular Architecture in South Carolina

As seen in the material culture of Scottish emigrants in America correlations between the Scottish Highlands and Scottish settlements in North and South Carolina can be made. Also, looking at the social and economic practices similarities are drawn between the two places based on language, religion, settlements among other Scots and the open grazing practices of cattle farming. In architecture, however, looking for similarities is much more difficult. Of the eight dwellings looked at in this study, not one is reminiscent of Highland vernacular architecture. The only structure showing evidence of Highland tradition is a kitchen building found on the site of the MacColl House. It is a simple two-room structure built around 1810 by John MacColl and strongly resembles the plan of a traditional Argyll longhouse. In so far as this study is concerned it is the only building of its type in the Carolinas built by Highlanders, and has the closest connection to Scottish vernacular traditions.

Used by the MacColl family as a kitchen house, it is possible that the structure served as the original dwelling for the family upon their arrival to South Carolina. After the main house was built, however, this space became secondary to the house, though it was probably still used as a barn for livestock. Several aspects of the building’s construction support its comparison to a longhouse. From the ground up the most obvious difference to note between the two spaces is that the smaller area not only has the hearth
of the chimney, but also has a wood floor, whereas the larger room is and was dirt. Heat and quality of materials immediately sets the two rooms apart. The location of heated rooms often tells us about how rooms are used, as the hearth is located in the smaller of the two spaces it can safely be said this is where the majority of daily activities occurred. The unheated side would have served well for housing livestock and might have been where some of the family slept, as this occurred in Scotland as well.

Analyzing the patterns of the roof trusses also alludes to the uses of these two rooms. All the roof trusses above the smaller side of the buildings are squared and joined with mortise and tenon and fastened with wooden pegs. Above the larger area are mortise and tenon joints and wooden pegs fastening logs squared only at the joints, while the rest of the logs are left rounded. In construction, in modern as well as historic times, areas of consequence tend to be of better materials and more properly decorated, while areas not seen by others or of little consequence are the least conscious of following design principles. The rudimentary treatment of the trusses over the large room supports the suspicion of its use as a barn.

In plan too, the kitchen house closely resembles a longhouse. While most longhouses were several rooms, the Argyll longhouse was shorter than most and had just two rooms, one familial and the other a byre. Given that John MacColl had emigrated from Argyll in the early 1800s it is very likely that the first structure he built resembled something familiar and traditional to his Scottish roots. Also, important to the interpretation of the MacColl kitchen house is the transition seen in Scotland in the 18th

---

century in the number of doors in the longhouse. One doorway for man and beast was abandoned for two, though still between the kitchen and byre was a door or passageway facilitating communication.\textsuperscript{107} The MacColl building, though with several windows and an extra doorway in the kitchen, is very closely related to this description.

While most of what remains of the Scottish farmsteads in the Carolinas is the house structures it is not entirely unlikely that more of these byre buildings existed and have since disappeared. As with the MacColl house it is quite possible that similar structures existed throughout the Carolinas in the early days and were converted into detached kitchen buildings, which is seen commonly throughout the colonies.\textsuperscript{108} It also could have been transformed into a small barn until a much larger one was built to sufficiently house livestock. As the manufacture of wood was laborious and costly, pieces of the early structures might have been recycled in other structures, possibly the main house. There are several ‘what ifs’ when talking about the possibility of Scottish byres in America as no other existing examples are known outside the MacColl kitchen house. However, given the large settlement patterns of Scottish Highlanders it is probable that others were also adapting the traditional Highland vernacular to the new American landscape.

\textsuperscript{107} ibid, 42.
Figure 6.1 - 6.3. MacColl kitchen building plan and gable-end elevation as compared to traditional Highland architecture of the Skye (top) and Hebridean (bottom) types. In the Highland dwelling the hearth would have been an open fire at the center of the ‘house’ portion. (Images: Author, Sinclair)
Highland vernacular architecture is very strongly represented in the design of the MacColl Kitchen house, though is absent elsewhere in this grouping of early Scottish farmsteads. Looking at the floor plans, craftsmanship and materials of the eight houses in this study several variations of American vernacular building types can be identified. Looking at the Scottish buildings by way of their floor plan is the most accurate way to discuss their relationship with the vernacular, and therefore access the assimilation of these immigrants into the local building traditions.

Not exemplary models of any particular building type, there exists a uniqueness to the designs of these dwellings. Derivations in vernacular types are dependent on local conditions and can be seen as achieving a ‘reality’ of the built environment.109 Vernacular architecture, while defined by commonalities in local building traditions, is not dependent on complete conformity to type. It is for this reason that more recent scholarship is focused on identifying vernacular types and their subtypes.”110

**Single Pen and Continental Cabins**

As with the previous information about floor plans this study will begin with the most basic plans in the study, the single room cabins. The log cabin tradition was common throughout the colonies and was especially popular in the Pennsylvania region among German settlers. The building tradition traveled south with Scotch-Irish and

---


110 ibid, 53.
English immigrants where it became widely used especially in the western part of North Carolina (see Appendix A). The single-pen dwelling as it is more formally called consisted of four exterior walls, with a front and back door and hearth on one of the gable-end walls. This type of cabin is seen throughout the United Kingdom and Ireland, and even has some relation to Scottish Highland architecture: the Dailriadic type of Scotland was known for its end walls rising to the ridge of the roof that made it suitable for fireplaces and chimneys.

Some variations are seen in this basic structure, much like the addition of windows of the McClendon Cabin, though the plan is still simple and clear. A stair tucked in the corner, as seen in figure 6.5, gains access to attic space. The McClendon Cabin again varies from this basic plan with a ladder tucked into a corner of the first floor room. Whether this was done, as stated before, to save space is unknown, and perhaps only the builder himself would be able to identify the purpose. The McClendon Cabin is the truest example of the single-pen dwelling of the two structures termed ‘log cabin’ in this study.

---

Figures 6.4-6.6 (top left to bottom right). Single pen cabins (left to right) Plan of McClendon Cabin, typical British cabin with corner stair and Single-pen cabin also with corner stair.

(Images: Author, Glassie, Foster)
With an addition attached to the back of the original one-room cabin the John Shaw House is an interesting adaptation of the tradition log cabin plan by its size and full story second floor. Evidence shows there was a movable wall in the original first floor of the cabin, suggesting a division of spaces, and an enclosed stair. Log cabins divided into several rooms by temporary walls are referred to as Continental plan dwellings and come from the Pennsylvania German tradition.\textsuperscript{113} Dividing walls were not notched into the outer log walls and so could be easily moved and removed. While the Continental plan is generally associated with the Mid-Atlantic region and had divisions concentrated around a central hearth, in the South gable-end chimneys are the norm. German settlements were littered from central to western North Carolina and with the migration of Scot-Irish and English settlers, this tradition further spread into the southern colonies.

The addition of the back room in the John Shaw House shows an evolution of the single pen cabin that is seen in rural areas in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} and early 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries, where second stories or additional rooms were added to the one room cabins. In the Mid-Atlantic it was common for Quakers and Germans to cover large log cabins with weatherboard, and is the same technique employed in the John Shaw, Daniel McNeill and Lewis Garner houses.\textsuperscript{114} While the latter two are also log cabin constructions they follow a separate vernacular pattern and so are not grouped with the McClendon and Shaw log houses.


\textsuperscript{114} ibid, 289.
Figures 6.7 and 6.10. (top to bottom) Plan of John Shaw house shows the evolution of the single-pen into a two room cabin, also in the several examples from the Mid-Atlantic. (Image: Author, Glassie)
Three Room Quaker and Early English Plans

Two of the eight early farmsteads of this study have three room plans on the first floor. The Lewis Garner House has a large hall-parlor and two smaller bedrooms off this main room, while the Charles Shaw House plan is a linear arrangement of three rooms, the central parlor being the largest of all. Looking at vernacular building types the influences of the Pennsylvania Quakers and English types of the Mid-Atlantic and Tidewater regions can described as the type under which these two sub-types exist.

Arranged with a side passage-hall at one gable end and three bay façade the Lewis Garner house is reminiscent of the traditional Quaker plan brought to North Carolina by Quakers that migrated south from Pennsylvania. Comparing the two plans shows several important similarities of type. The passage-hall of the Garner House is wider than
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the two smaller bedrooms on the first floor, which is typical in the early Quaker plan. The façade, because of the irregularity of room size and purpose, is slightly asymmetrical. While this irregularity is more easily seen when looking at the floor plan it is a common trait of the Quaker plan, though usually more pronounced. While the term ‘Hall-Parlor’ is used to describe the Garner House, this does not account for the overtly rectangular shape of the passage-hall versus the boxy shape of traditional hall-parlor plans or the two side rooms at the opposite gable end. An identifying feature of the Quaker plan is a chimney on the gable end of the passage, as in the Garner House. It further defines this house as a sub-type of the Quaker plan. It might seem odd to connect this early Scottish dwelling with the Quakers of Pennsylvania, however the migration to North Carolina might have introduced this type to Lewis Garner or, if any, the builder.

Also three rooms is the plan of the Charles Shaw House, with a large hall-parlor with a small parlor on one end and a small bedchamber on the other. The orientation of rooms in a linear pattern in this house is most likely related to an early English vernacular tradition of the I-house seen in the Mid-Atlantic and Tidewater region. This English type was a three room plan with hall, parlor and kitchen arranged in a row.\textsuperscript{116} It is known that the smaller parlor was an important social space, as it has an elaborate fireplace mantel,

and the central hall does not. The other small room with a fireplace was most likely the kitchen until the addition in 1842, when it is known a kitchen was added. There is no precedence for the plan of this house in the hall-parlor, or Southern I-house vernacular traditions, and little, if anything, exists of the early three room linear house plan. Given that Shaw was a first generation immigrant his exposure to this early tradition common in the 1600s might have come from his parents who immigrated in or before 1780.

**Four Room and Southern I-House Derivations**

The remaining multi-room plans appear to be derivations of the Southern I-house, though following a hall-parlor plan from the front entrance. Most closely related to the I-house is the Michael Bryant House, with the John MacColl and Daniel McKay houses somewhat reminiscent of the I-house and the Daniel McNeill house being the most difficult to type in this group. As their own sub-type, these buildings perform much better being similar in room orientation, and in some instances size.

Looking at the Michael Bryant House there are some immediate indications of its relation to the Southern I-house. While the front door opens to a parlor, the back door opens to a small vestibule in which the stair is located. Unlike the other three multi-room plans, this stair is straight, not tucked in a corner of the hall-parlor. The four room design of this house can be related to the Tidewater Cottage and Four Room plan house seen in Maryland and Virginia. These plans have a central passage with hall and parlor at the front façade and bedchambers in the two rear rooms. Tidewater cottages are described as
having roughly symmetrical façades with rectangular chimneys and sash windows and are common after 1750.\textsuperscript{117} The Bryant House has two gable-end chimneys on the same side of the house, one in the parlor and one in the back bedchamber. This is a trait seen in the two vernacular traditions. Of interest is a drawing done of a survey of the McNeill House in the 1970s that identifies a hearth having been in the back bedchamber also on the same wall as the current fireplace.

Figures 6.13 and 6.15. (top to bottom) Tidewater Cottage and Four Room plan as compared to Michael Bryant House and Daniel McNeill House. (Images: Foster, Author, Butchko)
Which colonial port Bryant migrated through is unknown. As little is known of his genealogy, the derivations of the vernacular might be explained by past influences. It is interesting that the floor plan of this house in the North Carolina hills is so similar to the MacColl and McKay houses built concurrently across state lines in the Lowlands of South Carolina. These two South Carolina buildings are almost identical in plan and can be compared to the Southern I-house in all but the center passage.

Like the Bryant House, initially the plan seems to be a hall-parlor house with the front door leading into the main parlor with gable-end fireplace. If analyzed further it is evident that these two structures are closer to the I-house than the basic hall-parlor with the addition of the porch rooms. A house in Hereford, North Carolina, identified as a Southern I-house, closely resembles the plan of the MacColl and McKay houses, except for the center passage. The Hereford house too has two small posterior rooms, one accessed from a parlor, the other from the open back porch.

Figures 6.16 and 6.17. MacColl House and house in Hereford, North Carolina, showing four room plan with shed or travelers room at the rear. (Image: Author, Glassie)
As stated before, the tucked stair of the Scottish buildings sets them apart from a traditional I-house, since the linear passage stair is seen in most I-Houses of the southern colonies. Fireplaces in the McKay House match the Hereford property, being on each gable-end, while the MacColl House has just one fireplace on the gable-end of the main parlor. There is some evidence in the Mid-Atlantic of German immigrants abandoning the broad open stair and hallway of the Georgian plan for a boxed-in corner stair, no hallway and three or four room Continental plan.118 The migration of Germans into the South might yet prove to have been an influence in these Scottish homesteads. Examples of the Pennsylvania-German tradition show a boxed in stair in the main parlor, though with three rooms instead of four.

The last of the multi-room plans, the Daniel McNeill House, has the most interesting room arrangement. Like the three previously houses discussed it too appears to be a hall-parlor plan with the front door leading directly into the main living space. As with the Dillon County properties a stair is tucked into a corner of the main parlor and a gable-end fireplace is located in this room as well. Also with four rooms the interesting phenomenon is the location of the rear door between the interior and exterior space. This is unique to the McNeill House, the Bryant interior vestibule and Dillon County covered back porches being formally defined entrances to the back of the house. Still, the McNeill House plan follows the same four-room pattern of the Bryant, McKay and MacColl Houses.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

Traveling through North and South Carolina on their way to a new life, Scottish Highland immigrants were influenced by local vernacular architecture of the Lowland South. Not entirely naïve about the Southern building techniques with timber and stone, Highlanders used skills already developed in Scotland to construct dwellings in their new settlements. While they brought some traditions with them, such as language, dress and religion, others, namely building design, were abandoned for new ones. Surrounded by forests, Scottish settlers began building solely with timber and log construction, adapting the design of local Mid-Atlantic and Southern traditions.

All eight of the early Scottish dwellings in this study follow existing vernacular building patterns of the region. Common in vernacular architecture is the instance of variation within an architectural type and these dwellings are no exception to this rule. Personal preference and economic status are common determinants in how a building evolves from the original model to reflect one’s own design. Even as similarities can be drawn between these early Scottish dwellings, there are still variances in architectural elements that show an independence from the norm.
Appendix A

Map of Settlement Groups in North Carolina
(from Highland Scots of North Carolina)
Appendix B

Letter from Jean McKay to her brother, September 9, 1820

Dear Brother,

I thought you might write me by the way to London and can scarce to write the letter in my haste, as I am very ill, I wish to give you an account of my health and how I am writing. My health is not very well, it is a little better now. My brother and his family are well, and they have a new servant. They are doing well. Do not write me often. My brother and his family are doing well. They are doing well. They are doing well.

The place is much altered, there is no more for poor people. All that has been gone to America.

From: Private collection of Mrs. Jane McKay
## Appendix C

Inventory Transcription of Flora McKay, dated 1832

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sow and 7 pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1(^{st}) choice hog</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sheep 2(^{nd}) choice</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sheep 3(^{rd}) choice</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 lot of sheep @ $9 per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cow and calf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cow and calf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 young cattle @ $4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bay mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 slack horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 oven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 irons smocking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 [illegible]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 beehive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 beehive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 beehive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 [illegible]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 churn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot cooper's ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot cooper's ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 basket of furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 chest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 side of leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 side of leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 side of leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 reed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 case of bottles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 coffee pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 stuff can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cupboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 keg of vinegar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 jug of linseed oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 meat tub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot of jars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 firkin crocker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tristan Bedhea     | 1 lot of jugs  
                      1 firkin of butter  
                      1 [illeg]  
                      1 cage and flowers  
                      1 case of razors  
                      2 plow hoes + stocks  
                      1 plow  
                      1 trunk  
                      1 bottle of caster ole [oil]  
                      1 to crockery + glass ware  
                      3 iron wedges  
                      1 skillet  
                      1 tenant saw  
                      2 spades  
                      1 [illeg] frame  
                      2 [illeg] hooks  
                      1 pot rack  
                      1 pair of tongs  
                      1 lot of beeswax  
                      1 lot of barrels  
                      1 Do Do Do  
                      1 Do Do stands  
                      1 set of tea spoons  
                      ½ set Do Do  
                      1 basket of veals  
                      1 demijohn  
                      1 candle box  
                      2 pair sheep sheers |
| John D. M. Rae     | 6 hogs @ $1 per head  
                      2 hides |
| [illeg.]           | 2 cows and pigs |
| Janus Mattus       | [illeg.]  
                      [illeg.] hogs $1.40 per hog  
                      4 young cattle @ $2.57 |
| Othaniel Trawick   | 1 sow and 7 hogs |
| Arch'd M Liam      | 1 sow and pig  
                      1 [illeg]  
                      1 table  
                      1 grid iron |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Y. Whitehead</td>
<td>6 hogs at $1.70 per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bay mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 sheeps skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 side saddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel McLauren</td>
<td>1 riding chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch'd McKay</td>
<td>2 cows and 1 pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yoke of oxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 beehive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 lot of [illegible]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 chairs - at 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 shovel + tongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 do crockery + glass ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 churn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 tub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 paddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 lot of geese @ 41 per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 lot of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 side board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 wash stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 lantern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 pr. of fire dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- loom gear + swift and wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 decanter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 prs. cows 1 scooter gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 plows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 tray and sifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 lot of sau [illegible]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McCormick</td>
<td>6 sheep 1&quot; choice sheep at 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ironing pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine McKay</td>
<td>1 cow and calf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 spider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 pair of wool cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 pails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 looking glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 chair seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine McKay (con’t)</td>
<td>1 lot of leather&lt;br&gt;1 lot pr. scales + 2 boxes&lt;br&gt;1 lot of boxes&lt;br&gt;1 lot of tubs&lt;br&gt;1 jug&lt;br&gt;1 tray and sifter&lt;br&gt;1 barrel and some flower to crockery + glass ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Sinclair</td>
<td>1 wheel&lt;br&gt;2 lambs&lt;br&gt;1 book&lt;br&gt;1 bedstead&lt;br&gt;1 plow + gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel M [illeg.]</td>
<td>1 lot of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M Gillvery</td>
<td>1 lot of coppers ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel M Insey</td>
<td>1 churn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McKay</td>
<td>2 grubing hoes&lt;br&gt;2 Do Do&lt;br&gt;1 [illeg.]&lt;br&gt;2 sives&lt;br&gt;2 Do&lt;br&gt;2 Do&lt;br&gt;1 [illeg.] hooks&lt;br&gt;25 pounds tallow&lt;br&gt;3 pigs&lt;br&gt;1 set of tea spoons&lt;br&gt;1 chest&lt;br&gt;1 [illeg.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch’d M Ray</td>
<td>2 axes&lt;br&gt;1 lot of barrels&lt;br&gt;1 Do Do&lt;br&gt;1 Do stands&lt;br&gt;1 [illeg.] + pan&lt;br&gt;1 set window curting&lt;br&gt;1 sofa&lt;br&gt;11 yards of Baggin&lt;br&gt;1 pair of scissors&lt;br&gt;2 shackels&lt;br&gt;2 [illeg.] of owls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 candlestick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 [illeg.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch'd M Ray (con't)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McKay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 head of cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 head of hogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 head Do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 head of sheeps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oxen + yoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 old chair + [illeg.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 black 3 years old colt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bay mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 old bay mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 head of geese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 plows and gear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 crofting knife'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bee hive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot of carting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot of cooper's ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot crockery knives + forks, + spoons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot tallow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot spun threads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot smoke house furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 spring wheel @ $2.50 + 50 cents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 shout gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cut reel + old side saddle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot books + do razor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot tea spoons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 booklet bottles + medicines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 old case + lot of glass ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot old crockery and castor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot knives and forks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot bottles and trunk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 looking glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot table cloths + towels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 clock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 table + slate pitcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 chairs old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 whip, hand bellows + whip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 chest and churn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed and furniture hide and table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 beds and furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 beds furniture [illeg.] and slide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 chests and lot bed cloths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot new cloths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lot wool blanket and bag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Crofting knives were tools used by the Scots to remove blocks of turf, or peat, from the ground. This tool was probably brought with Daniel McKay from Scotland.
### Item Totals of Interest:

**Livestock:**
- Cows... 53
- Calves... 3
- Pigs... 14
- Hogs... 31
- Geese... 16 + 1 lot
- Bay mares... 4 (1 old)
- Horses... 1 + 1 colt
- Sows... 2
- Sheep... 28 + 10 lots
- Lambs... 2
- Bulls... 1
- Yoke + Oxen... 3

**Furniture and Household Items:**
- Chairs... 21
- Bedsteads... 11 + 1 cot
- Tables... 3
- Chests/trunks... 8
- Sideboards... 1
- Cupboards... 1
- Crockery +
  - glass ware... 9 lots
- Fire dogs... 3 pair
- Pots/pans... 6
- Clocks... 2
- Looking glasses... 2
- Books... 2 + 3 lots

**Miscellaneous Items of Interest:**
- Plows... 9
- Crofting
  - knife... 1
- Beehives... 8
- Churns... 4
- Window
  - curtaining... 1 set
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Deed from State of South Carolina to Daniel McKay

STATE OF SOUTH-CAROLINA.

To all to whom these Presents shall come, Greeting:

KNOW YE, That for and in consideration of two pounds Sterling Money paid by Daniel McKay into the Treasury for the Use of this State, We have granted, and by these Presents do grant into the said Daniel McKay his Heirs and Assigns, a Plantation or Track of Land, containing one hundred Acres, Situated in the District of George Town on the West Side of Little Pee Dee River, Liberty County, on Horse Bluff, Bounding all sides on vacant Land

having such Shape, Form and Marks as are represented by a Plat hereunto annexed, together with all Woods, Trees, Waters, Water-Courses, Profits, Commodities, Appurtenances, and Hereditaments whatsoever thereunto belonging, To have and to hold the said Track of one hundred Acres of Land, and all and singular other the Premises hereby granted unto the said Daniel McKay his Heirs and Assigns, for ever, in free and common socage.

Given under the Great Seal of the State.

Thos. Pinckney, Esquire, Governor and Commander in Chief in and over the said State, at Charleston, this Third Day of March Anno Domini, One Thousand Seven Hundred and eighty eight and in the Twelfth Year of the Independence of the United States of America.

Thomas L. M. S. Pinckney

And hath thereunto a Plat thereof annexed, representing the same, certified

J. Bremar Esq. Surveyor-General.

4th January 1788
Appendix E

Will of Donald McKay, September 9, 1833

WILL OF

DONALD McKay

State of South Carolina, Darlington District, Know all by these presents, that I, Donald McKay of said state & District being weak in body but in perfect mind knowing that all men have come to die I constitute this my last will & testament to desire it may be received by all as such I most Humbly commit my soul to God who gave it receiving his most Generous Exemption of it thro' the all prevailing merits of his son Jesus Christ as he Ever liveth to make Intercession for returning Penitents in this Hope & Confidence I render up my soul with comfort praying the most Glorious Trinity one God to prepare me for the time of my Dissolution knowing these things in mind I first dispose & bequest my soul to God and as Touching my worldly Property I will & positively order that all my Just debts be paid Then I dispose & bequest unto my loving wife Mary McKay all my lands lying or situated on the west side of the creek that enters or runs into the head of the spring branch & then the various courses of said branch into the hill Pond also in a direction from the North end of said creek with the direction of said creek to the east side line of said land with all its improvements with the houses in which I now live with its contents or furniture of every description Likewise kitchen furniture & plantation utensils & any part of my horses also Plows & as many of my cattle as she Please with the whole of my sheep and hogs Likewise my Negro handy Jan & Henry good negro & Sarah & my Negro girl Hope & should the said those have any increase my wife is allowed Liberty to Dispose of them as she Pleases among my Grand Children I also dispose & bequest unto my son John McKay my Negro Ben Simon & one of the use of my Mills to saw his own lumber & grind his own grits & I give to my daughter Josey my Negress Jewly son John & Jose & I give unto my own ship one share all my land on the west side of that mentioned creek & branch & Distant line both in North & South Carolina with the exception that my son John McKay shall have the use of my mills as above mentioned and at the death of my wife I give unto her all the lands which I now hold unto her with its improvements said Mills & Place & I give unto my Grand Daughter Frances McKay my son John's daughter my Negroes Caesar & Peter & that the said Negroes Caesar & Peter to be left under the sign & direction of my sons John
Appendix E, 2

Donald McKay, 2

I, Donald McKay, do hereby make and publish my last will and testament, in the manner and form prescribed by law, as follows: I give unto my grandson, Hector McKay, the sum of $500.00, in cash, as a token of love and affection. I also give unto my servant, Bob, the sum of $500.00, in cash, as a token of loyalty and service. I direct that all other property and effects be divided equally among my children. This will shall take effect upon my death.

Donald McKay

Witnesses:

Daniel McKay

Alexander McKay

Witnesses:

Donald McKay

Recorded in Court No. 2, Page 236

Recorded Feb 28, 1853

Notary Public, 1st Dist.

Roll No. 545
Appendix F

MacColl Kichen Building Moving from
Original Site, and at Current Site
Appendix G

MacColl Kitchen Building and First Floor of Main Dwelling at New Site
Appendix H

MacColl Kitchen Building Interior-
Dividing Wall and Door

Appendix I

MacColl Kitchen Building Detail
of Weatherboard
Appendix J

Map of Original Location of John Shaw House,
Richmond County, N.C.
Appendix K

Deed of Sale from Mary Campbell to John Shaw dated 1819
Appendix L

Historic Sites Survey of John Shaw Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Access to the Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>Yes: Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Public Acquisition</td>
<td>Yes: Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Public Acquisition</td>
<td>Yes: Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Public Acquisition</td>
<td>Yes: Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner of Property**

A.B. Gibson (n.d. -- with whom is the owner)

**Location of Property**

Laurnburg, N.C. 28352

**Representation in Existing Surveys**

Title of Survey: [Blank]

Date of Survey: [Blank]

Depository for Survey Records: [Blank]

Street and Number: [Blank]

City or Town: [Blank]

State: [Blank]

Zip Code: [Blank]

County: [Blank]
### Appendix L, 2

Log 2 story house; diamond-notched corners, logs hewn smooth on inner + outer faces. No signs of mortar, thus must have been sided originally. Hand-hewn furring strips are pegged to the logs on the exterior faces. Presumably to hold the siding although no traces of early siding were visible. The gable ends were covered with beaded siding; 1 end, end chimney - a recent replacement. Orig. mantled, missing. Forth floor structure - exists, composed of large mortised + tenoned beams, but flooring is gone. Simple molded architraves on exterior & interior. Gable roof, window sash are missing on 1st floor. 2nd floor has square window openings - with milled lumber casings. No sash or other closings. Interior originally contained 2 rooms on 1st floor, with enclosed stair, Stair + partition wall + 2nd floor flooring now missing. Beaded flush sheathing orig. covered interior 1st floor walls & ceiling, but only traces remain, this was attached to furring strips which were pegged into logs. 2nd floor - beaded ceiling joists. Only saw marks visible were pit saw marks.

#### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Deteriorated</th>
<th>Ruins</th>
<th>Unexposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY</td>
<td>Altered</td>
<td>Unaltered</td>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>Original Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance.
Appendix L, 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>Pre-Columbia</th>
<th>6th Century</th>
<th>7th Century</th>
<th>8th Century</th>
<th>9th Century</th>
<th>10th Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th Century</td>
<td>12th Century</td>
<td>13th Century</td>
<td>14th Century</td>
<td>15th Century</td>
<td>16th Century</td>
<td>17th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC DATES (if applicable and known)</th>
<th>1st Qtr.</th>
<th>2nd Qtr.</th>
<th>3rd Qtr.</th>
<th>4th Qtr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE (check one or more as appropriate)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Religion/Philosophy</th>
<th>Urban Planning</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE (include Builder/Architect, Original & Subsequent Owners, Dates, Rooms, Etc.)**

probably oldest log house in Scotland Co., possibly entire se NC.
10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORNER</th>
<th>LATITUDE</th>
<th>LONGITUDE</th>
<th>LATITUDE</th>
<th>LONGITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIST ALL STATES AND COUNTIES FOR PROPERTIES APPROXIMATE ACREAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Survey and Mapping Unit
State Department of Archives & History

ADDRESS AND NUMBER:
120 East Jones Street, Suite 180
City or Town:
State Code

12. LOCAL ORGANIZATION OR INTEREST: INDICATE NAMES AND ADDRESSES

RECOMMENDED LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE: National [ ] State [X] Local [ ]
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Photos- Historic Sites Survey of John Shaw Property
Appendix N

Article from *Laurinburg Exchange* about John Shaw House
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An Example of An Early Cabin

You wouldn’t believe the old red wood house we saw today. It stood alone, a monument to the skills and craftsmanship of the early settlers.

The house was built in 1850, and it’s still standing. It’s made of hand-hewn logs, and it’s been occupied by the same family for generations. The structure is strong and sturdy, and it’s been through many storms and floods.

The roof is made of shakes, and it’s covered in bright red bark. The windows are made of glass, and they’re surrounded by white trim.

The interior is furnished with antique furniture. The fireplace is made of stone, and it’s been used for many years to keep the house warm.

The kitchen is equipped with modern appliances, but it still has the feel of an old-fashioned farm kitchen. The wood-burning stove is a centerpiece of the room.

The house is surrounded by a fence, and it’s enclosed by a beautiful garden. The flowers are in full bloom, and they add a touch of color to the scene.

On the porch, there’s a swing, and it’s the perfect place to sit and enjoy the view. The sound of the birds singing in the trees is music to the ears.

The house is a testament to the hard work and dedication of the early settlers. It’s a place of beauty, and it’s a reminder of the past.

An Example (Continued From Page 1)

The beams in the old house display the regular, even, axe marks characteristic of the hand hewn lumber. Considerable skill must have been needed to cut timbers from logs, using only an axe.

The logs forming the walls have a different surface from the beams. They were smoothed with an axe. This leaves a delicate ripple, an almost smooth surface. These were sometimes called "parlor beams", because they were made to be exposed.

Tastes have changed through the years. Modern designers seem to prefer the rougher look in their exposed beams.

The adze was a sharp tool with its chisel type blade at right angles to the handle. After the log was squared with a broad axe, the adze was used to cut enough wood off the surface to remove the board axe notches.

The logs in the Shaw house were joined with a variation of two common joints in early log houses. It appears to be a variation of the chamfer and notch, and sharp notch styles, bringing the best features of both together for a strong joint with flush ends. An axe was the only tool necessary for cutting the notches and slabs that fit the logs together.

As the house stands now, it is useful only as a storage shed. There are no plans to restore it, although the owner has considered moving and restoration. Prices are pretty high for that sort of work.
Appendix O

Will of John Shaw

In the name of God Amen I Daniel Shaw of Richmond County Planter
being sick and weak in body but of perfect mind and memory thanks be to God taking unto mind the mortality of my body and knowing that it is appointed for all once to die do make and ordain this my last will and testament that is to say principally and first of all I give and recommend my soul unto the hand of Almighty God that gave it to me and I commit to the earth to be buried in a decent manner at the discretion of my executors nothing doubting but at the general resurrection I shall receive the same by the power of Almighty God.

And as touching such worldly estate where with it has pleased God to bless mee in like wise I give devise and dispose of the same in the following manner and form.

First I give and bequeath to Catherine Shaw my beloved wife after my death to have use and possession of one third of all my lands messuages and tenements the body possessed and enjoyed during her life only and farther during the life of said Catherine I order that the rest of all my lands and tenements be reserved for equally benefit and livelihood and all my children illegible is that John and Joel Shaw my oldest children be excepted from the meaning of this article or clause for the benefit of all mentioned and for the better cultivation of the lands I order that my gray horse be particularly appropriated for that purpose Likewise after the death of my said wife I give and bequeath all my lands messuages and tenements to Joel Shaw and Angus Shaw my children to be equally divided among them two half to be enjoyed and possessed forever by them and their heirs likewise I order all the steers in my stock after my decease be sold and their value together with the value of my two young mares applied to purchase a likely Negro wench who with her issue shall remain on the plantation for the benefit of the family till the death of the said wife and that Negro and her increase if there be any together with all the then stock except the sheep to be equally divided amongst the rest of my children Archibald Alexander Mary and Catherine Shaw till their shares be equal or in amount in value to the shares of Joel and Angus, to whom I have bequeathed my real estate and farther if there remain a surplus to be equally divided among them all John & Gormet excepted. Further I give and bequeath to my said wife Catherine the whole of my sheep after my death to her and her heirs.

Further I give and bequeath to Gormet my daughter two shillings & six pence to be levied from my estate after the death of my wife. Lastly I give and bequeath to John Shaw my son two shillings and six pence to be levied out of my estate after the death of my wife.

Finally I constitute make and ordain Norman Shaw and Angus McGill sole executors of this my last will and testament and I do hereby utterly disallow revoke & disannul all other former testament wills legacies bequests and executors by me in anywise before named willed and bequeathed ratifying and confirming this and no other to be my last will & testament. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this eighteenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety nine Daniel Shaw (x his mark)

Signed, sealed, published, pronounced and declared by the said Daniel Shaw as his last will & testament in the presence of each other have hereunto subscribed our names James Stewart and Angus McLeod (x his mark). Proven January 1800.

[The printed copy made from book by Myrtle Bridges.
"First Words 772 original Wills of Richmond County 1754-1815"]
Appendix P

Map of Original Location of Daniel McNeill House
Richmond County, N.C.
Appendix Q

Deed of Sale from David Kelly to Daniel McNeill, dated 1827

[Image of the deed]
Appendix R

Historic Sites Survey of McNeill Cabin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Present Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Site</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Unoccupied</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Acquisition</td>
<td>Private Residence</td>
<td>Yes Restricted</td>
<td>Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>Yes Unrestricted</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Owner of Property**

- **Name:**
- **Street & Number:**
- **City, Town:**
- **Vicinity of:**
- **State:**

**2. Location of Legal Description**

- **Courthouse:**
- **Registrar of Deeds:**
- **Street & Number:**
- **City, Town:**
- **State:**

**3. Representation in Existing Surveys**

- **Title:**
- **Date:**
- **Federal:**
- **State:**
- **County:**
- **Local:**
- **Repository for Survey Records:**
- **City, Town:**
- **State:**
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[Handwritten notes and drawings]

Notes by David Ford Hood (his handwriting)

[Diagram with handwritten descriptions]
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INTEROFFICE RESEARCH DATA FORM: FOR NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION RESEARCH

TO: ______________________, researcher
FROM: ____________________, survey specialist

NAME OF PROPERTY: McNeil Log House
COUNTY: SCOTLAND
TOWN OR VICINITY: Laurinburg, N.C.

Use the back of the sheet for any data that will not fit on the front. Tell all.

1. CHAIN OF TITLE INFORMATION:
   - John McNeil
     - Eli McNeil purchased in 1865, not traceable
     - Marion McNeil junior, (1855 – 1915)
     - Possibly in Historic Properties Commission, 1970s

2. ARCHITECT AND BUILDER IF KNOWN

3. OTHER KNOWN HISTORY:
   - Nancy McNeil, sister of Daniel, lived in house around 1910, according to Marion McNeil’s memory.

4. DOES OWNER KNOW ABOUT AND WANT NOMINATION? NOTE ANY PROBLEMS:
   - Yes

5. SHOULD OWNER BE CALLED FOR INFORMATION? OTHER PEOPLE TO CALL: (Give phone number)
   - J. Marion McNeil, 2702 Main St., Laurinburg

6. WHAT IS THE GENERAL KNOWN SIGNIFICANCE? MOSTLY ARCHITECTURAL?

7. ABOUT WHEN DOES THE PROPERTY APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN BUILT? ANY ADDITIONS OR SUGGESTIONS ABOUT IMPORTANT TIMES TO WATCH OUT FOR, ETC.?
   - ca. 1820
   - Moved to John Biss Hayes property in 1911
   - Original location in Old Hundred vicinity

1 E-5
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Photos- Historic Sites Survey of McNeill Cabin
Appendix S. 2
Appendix U

Stairs of Early Scottish Dwellings

Linear stair of Michael Bryant House
(Image: Author)

Enclosed stair of Lewis Garner House
(Image: Author)

Exposed portion of stair and enclosed potion in Daniel McKay House - Arrow points to location of door.
(Images: Author)
Appendix V

Alexander McRae House, Marlboro County, S.C.

(Image: Marlboro Historical Society)
Appendix W

Argyll Plantation, Marlboro County, S.C.

Argyll plantation in Marlboro County, South Carolina, was built by a Scottish immigrant and burned in the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century. It is of a similar style as other early Scottish farmstead of the period, and appears to be a full Southern I-house.  

(Image: Marlboro Historical Society)
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Brochure for 2009 Scottish Heritage Symposium
St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, N.C.

St. Andrews Presbyterian College Scottish Heritage Center Presents

The Charles Bascombe Shaw Memorial Scottish Heritage Symposium
formerly "Our Scottish Heritage" established 1989

and the Nineteenth Annual Scottish Heritage Awards Banquet
March 20-22, 2009

Made Possible By
The Charles Bascombe Shaw Scottish Heritage Endowment Fund

With Additional Support From
North Carolina Scottish Heritage Society
Comfort Inn of Laurinburg
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Schedule of Events

All events held at Avinger Auditorium unless otherwise noted.

Friday, March 20
11 a.m. Ribbon Cutting for the Relocated Scottish Heritage Center
1:00 – 2:00 p.m. Registration
2:00 – 2:15 p.m. Opening Remarks and Welcome
2:15 – 3:15 p.m. “Local Sources for Global Communities: An Overview of the Local Collections Held by Argyll and Bute Library Service Highlighting Resources Pertaining to Early Emigrants from Argyll (Part 1)”
Eleanor Harris
3:15 – 3:30 p.m. Break
3:30 – 4:30 p.m. “Tartan Since Prescription”
Dr. Philip D. Smith, Jr.
6:00 p.m. Reception
William Henry Belk College Center
* reservations required for those not attending the symposium
7:00 p.m. Scottish Heritage Awards Banquet
William Henry Belk College Center
* reservations required for those not attending the symposium
(dress for this event is either Highland dress or business attire)

Saturday, March 21
9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Late Registration
9:30 – 10:30 a.m. “Bagpipes in the Movies”
Patrick King
10:30 – 10:45 a.m. Break
10:45 – 11:45 a.m. “Early Scottish Farmsteads in the Eastern Carolinas”
Bridget O’Brien
12:00 - 1:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 – 2:00 p.m. “The Songs of Scotland”
Isla St. Clair
2:00 – 2:15 p.m. Break
2:15 – 3:15 p.m. “Local Resources for Global Communities (Part 2)”
Eleanor Harris
3:15 – 4:15 p.m. Panel Discussion and Questions
A moderated forum for final questions and discussions with speakers
4:15 p.m. Closing Remarks
7:30 p.m. Concert
Featuring the prize-winning St. Andrews Presbyterian College Pipe Band with Scottish folk singer and recording artist Isla St. Clair

Sunday, March 22
11:00 a.m. Kirkin’ of the Tartans Worship Service
At Laurinburg Presbyterian Church
* Lunch following service – advance reservation required
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About the Speakers

Eleanor Harris is a native of St. Andrews, Fife. After earning a degree in music from the University of Strathclyde, she went on to study Library and Information Science at the University of Stirling. She joined the Angell and Ross Regional Council in 1985 first as a Reference Librarian and then later as Local Studies Librarian. She works at the regional headquarters library in Dunoon which houses the Local Collection much of which contains books, pamphlets, maps, photographs, postcards, newspapers, genealogical sources, and ephemera. Those with research interests in Scotland, and Angell in particular, will not want to miss her presentation.

Dr. Philip D. Smith, Jr. is one of the wealth top scholars of Scottish tartans. He is retired from academia, having served as a Dean of West Chester University. He is a faculty in Tennessee, Dr. Smith's expertise in Scottish topics includes Scottish Tartan as well as the history and use of tartan. He is a Member of the Guild of Tartan Scholars, President of the Scottish Tartan Authority - USA, and a member of the Board of Governors of that authority in Scotland.

Patrick King is a writer, director, and producer making documentary films for international broadcast, including PBS, the History Channel, AE, as well as BBC Channel 4. His focus has been on historical subjects. He is a member of the British Academy of Film and Television Arts and the European Film Academy and of the last 16 productions he has won major awards. His presentation will be a "behind the scenes" look at the making of his award-winning production "Instrument of War" and "When the Piper Play" which combine inspirational stories and songs with powerful images to give a unique insight into the affect of the Highland bagpipes on people in both peace and war.

Bridget O'Brien graduated from Boston College in 2005 with a B.A. in Art History. In 2007, after working in Europe, she took a teaching position in Ecuador, and a teaching position in Boston, she was accepted into the M.S. in Historic Preservation program jointly affiliated with Florida University and the College of Charleston. She will graduate in May of 2009. Her M.S. thesis was inspired by Caroline Orona at Monterey, S.C., who is restoring an 18th century wenton house in Madison County. O'Brien's presentation will document floor plans, building materials, and construction methods of several wenton homes in the High Point settlement as well as the genealogical information relative to the women who built them. She will also explore connections between Scottish and American architecture and these early homesteads.

Ina Clark lives in the North East of Scotland, growing up in Banff, Fochabers, and Aberdeen. She is a well-known expert of Scottish traditional song and was awarded the Instrument of War in 2007. She has performed with "The Chieftains," "The Dubliners," "The Corries," "Gaelic Band," "The Clancy Brothers," and "The Dubliners." She has also appeared in numerous television productions from Edinburgh to WIA Disney. Her recent documentary film productions include the Scottish Heritage Weekend. Her presentation will focus on the influence of Scottish culture on the American way of life.

Award Recipients

Dr. Philip D. Smith, Jr. will receive the Scottish Heritage Center Silver Award. Dr. Smith is a retired professor emeritus of Languages and Linguistics at West Chester University in Pennsylvania where he received several awards for service to the University. He has devoted much of his personal research and educational efforts toward Scottish topics including Scottish language and culture, and the history and use of Scottish tartans. He has written extensively on these topics and has contributed to the Scottish Heritage Center's efforts to promote and celebrate Scottish culture in the United States.

Mrs. Elizabeth (Betty) Holmes and Mrs. Margaret (Polly) Goffin will be jointly receiving the Ham Mac Donald Awards this year. Mrs. Holmes is the retired librarian for St. Andrews Presbyterian College where she first began gaining interest in the college's Scottish connections due to numerous library inquiries from individual and society groups who were interested in Scottish connections. She is now in place and has been working at St. Andrews. Mrs. Goffin is the retired librarian for St. Andrews Presbyterian College and was a key figure in the development of the collection's Scottish connections. She was also engaged in research related to Ham Mac Donald through materials held by the college, and assisted with the late Hugh Douglas and Ruthlith Hoffard MacDonald with their biography. She has also been actively involved in the Lauchung Scottish City Community. We are delighted to honor these two women who have contributed so much to the success of the Scottish Heritage Center over the years.

The Charles Bawcombe Shaw Memorial Scottish Heritage Symposium

The Eighteenth Annual Scottish Heritage Awards Banquet

March 22, 2009

Registration Form (Must be received by March 13, 2009)

Please include the names of all individuals who will be attending.

Name(s) ____________________________

Address ____________________________

City State ZIP ________________________

Daytime phone ________________________

Email address ________________________

---

* Symposium, Banquet, Concert ($100 per person)
   Includes all symposium lectures on Friday and Saturday, the
   Scottish Heritage Awards Reception and Banquet on Friday
   night for one person, Saturday lunch for one person, Saturday
   evening concert.

* Scottish Heritage Awards Banquet Only ($35 per person)
   Includes reception with single malt whiskies samples or wine,
   buffet dinner and the awards presentation ceremony.

* This is for those NOT REGISTERED for ALL EVENTS
* above.

Kilbret of the Tartan Lunch, Sunday March 22

Laurinburg Presbyterian Church (57 per head)

* Lunch reservations must be received in advance. If you wish
* to attend and decide to participate by bringing or carrying a tartan
* banner, please let us know.

Total Amount Enclosed:

* NO ENCLOSED AFTER MARCH 16

Method of Payment: Check or money order payable to

Scottish Heritage Center

Mail to: Scottish Heritage Center

St. Andrews Presbyterian College

1700 Dogwood Mile

Laurinburg, NC 28352-5558

For questions regarding reservations: Tina Van Hooser,

Administrative Assistant, (910) 277-5258 or email baggage@sapc.edu.
The 2009 Scottish Heritage Weekend - Symposium, Concert and Awards Banquet
Celebrating 19 Years - Come Join Us and Tell Your Friends!

The 2009 Scottish Heritage Weekend - St. Andrews Presbyterian College

Originally founded in 1989 as a celebration of the 250th anniversary of the coming of the first group of Highland Scots to North Carolina, the "Our Scottish Heritage" Symposium has provided an unparalleled opportunity for persons interested in Scottish and Scottish-American history and culture to learn from top scholars in their fields. The Charles Bascombe Shaw Memorial Scottish Heritage Symposium provides a forum for study and interaction for anyone interested in Scottish history, culture, and tradition.

St. Andrews Presbyterian College is pleased to sponsor and host this event. The College's annual Scottish Heritage Awards Banquet will be a featured part of the festivities. This prestigious event will feature the presentation of two awards: The Scottish Heritage Center Service Award, given for outstanding contributions to the preservation and perpetuation of Scottish history, culture, or traditions; and The Flora MacDonald Award, given to a woman of Scottish descent who has made an outstanding contribution to the human community. The 2009 recipients are Dr. Philip D. Smith, Jr., Mrs. Elizabeth (Betty) Holmes and Mrs. Margaret (Pimpy) Geffert.

Special hotel rates are available at the Comfort Inn of Laurinburg, recipient of the corporation's Gold Standard Award for twelve consecutive years. For reservations, call (910) 277-7788. You must mention the Scottish Heritage Weekend at St. Andrews Presbyterian College to receive the specially discounted rates.

We encourage you to make your reservations for these events as soon as possible. For any questions, please contact Tim Van Horser at (910) 277-5258. We look forward to seeing you!
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