

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-900

USDI/NPS NRHP Registration Form (Rev. 8-86)

OMB No. 1024-0018

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

Page 1

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Rosedown Plantation

Other Name/Site Number: Rosedown Plantation State Historic Site

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: US HWY 61 and LA Hwy 10

Not for publication: NA

City/Town: St. Francisville

Vicinity: NA

State: Louisiana County: West Feliciana Code: 125

Zip Code: 70775

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property

Private: ___

Public-Local: ___

Public-State: X

Public-Federal: ___

Category of Property

Building(s): ___

District: X

Site: ___

Structure: ___

Object: ___

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing

6

1

4

11

Noncontributing

14 buildings

___ sites

4 structures

13 objects

31 Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 0

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: NA

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this _____ nomination _____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property _____ meets _____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

Signature of Certifying Official

Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property _____ meets _____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of Commenting or Other Official

Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

- Entered in the National Register
- Determined eligible for the National Register
- Determined not eligible for the National Register
- Removed from the National Register
- Other (explain): _____

Signature of Keeper

Date of Action

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic: Domestic
Landscape

Sub: Single Dwelling/Secondary Structure
Garden; Street Furniture/Object

Current: Recreation & Culture

Sub: Museum

7. DESCRIPTION

Architectural Classification: Federal, Greek Revival

Materials:

Foundation: Brick

Walls: Weatherboard

Roof: Asphalt

Other:

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 4

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.**SUMMARY**

The focus of the Rosedown Plantation nomination is an antebellum estate with a grand “main house” at the end of a 660-foot oak allée, roughly eighteen acres of ornamental gardens, and several dependencies. The most notable dependencies are three latticed summerhouses and a Greek temple style building known as the doctor’s office. The two-story main house, reflecting the transitional Federal-Greek Revival taste, has a documented date of 1835. A one story Grecian wing was added to each side c. 1845. The extensive pleasure gardens combine two very different trends – the axiality of the Baroque and winding paths in the picturesque tradition. Rosedown is located near the intersection of US HWY 61 and LA HWY 10 on the edge of St. Francisville in West Feliciana Parish. The setting is peaceful and secluded despite the proximity (about a half mile) to these well-traveled highways. At its height, Rosedown Plantation encompassed 3,455 acres. Over the years this acreage has been subdivided, and today’s Rosedown is only 371 acres, all of which is included in this nomination. In November 2000 the Louisiana Office of State Parks purchased Rosedown and opened it as a State Historic Site.

Almost as famous as the establishment of Rosedown by Daniel and Martha Turnbull is a massive several year restoration of the property in the late 1950s and early 1960s by Mr. and Mrs. Milton Underwood of Houston, Texas. Ralph Ellis Gunn of Houston was the landscape architect, and George M. Leake of New Orleans the architect. The property remained meticulously preserved until the 1990s when a subsequent private owner removed important garden statuary placed there in the 1850s. Despite this notable loss, Rosedown retains the vast majority of its original character (both the gardens and the buildings) and hence easily conveys its national significance in architecture and landscape architecture.

The numbers on contributing/non-contributing are quite misleading as an indicator of Rosedown’s integrity. The thirty-one non-contributing resources are spread over 371 acres, are almost all traditional in character, and none are large in scale. (Thirteen are objects – see below.) Most importantly, the eighteen acre “heart” of Rosedown retains a high degree of integrity. There are only four non-contributing buildings, and they are “historic” in appearance. Two are reconstructions, one is a traditional looking small building, and one is an 1860 wing removed from the main house. The historic core also contains two non-contributing structures (the entrance gates and the brick terrace built on the footprint of the greenhouse) and thirteen non-contributing objects (the 8 replacement statues on the allée – see below -- and 5 fountains added during the Gunn restoration). Rosedown’s pleasure gardens retain most of their original design and garden structures and a notable amount of plant material.

The following important projects have been undertaken in the four years since the State of Louisiana acquired Rosedown: (1) a multi-phase archaeological investigation aimed at learning more about the property’s African-American history (see below); (2) listing of the property on the National Register of Historic Places for its national significance; (3) a historic interiors study by noted authority William Seale; (4) the replacement of some of the removed garden statues (see below); and (5) the incorporation of African-American history into the interpretive program (both on a daily basis and in special programs). This program will be enhanced as additional information comes to light on Rosedown’s enslaved Africans from the on-going archaeological investigations.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 5**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

THE OVERALL SETTING

Unlike the typical Louisiana plantation, Rosedown is not located on the Mississippi River or a bayou. The Mississippi, several miles away, is characterized by towering chalk cliffs as it meanders through West Feliciana Parish. The cliffs are part of a band of loess which stretches from Memphis to Baton Rouge, producing soil deposits of great depth and fertility. This yellowish soil, coupled with abundant rainfall, enabled West Feliciana to become an agricultural giant in the antebellum period -- one characterized chiefly by large plantation units.

The remaining Rosedown acreage, composed of 371 acres purchased by State Parks in 2000, is an irregularly shaped parcel of land much deeper than it is wide (see attached property plat). Alexander Creek forms the eastern side of the boundary while Gasper's Branch is the boundary for most of the western side. An access road begins at LA HWY 10 and continues past the main complex to the rear of the property, for a total distance of about one-and-a-half miles. For the most part the approach road is straight and tree-lined, which contributes to the overall feeling of an estate. One drives for about one-half mile, with meadows to each side, before the oak allée entrance appears off to the right. The lane is paved up to and past the oak allée entrance and then changes to gravel toward the rear of the property.

While the surrounding countryside is on the whole gently rolling, most of the Rosedown acreage is flat, although the ground falls off notably at the rear of the main complex towards Alexander Creek. The acreage on both sides of the approach road consists of open grassy fields, as is true of the land across from the allée, and most of the extensive acreage at the rear. None of the Rosedown acreage is under cultivation, nor has it been for some time. (The Underwoods ran an extensive cattle business on the property.)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Archeological resources have been located at Rosedown that represent the working side of the plantation -- the cotton agriculture and the enslaved people from Africa who made it all possible. When the State of Louisiana acquired the property, interpreting its African and African-American history and culture was a high priority and remains so to the present. However, the location of the quarters area, was not known. The norm was not applicable at Rosedown, which differs from traditional plantation layouts because of geographical constraints. The land drops fairly precipitously behind the main house complex, where enslaved Africans' quarters traditionally might have been located.

As a starting point, the state's Division of Archaeology's Regional Archaeology Program initiated investigations in 2002. This work is part of a phased investigation to take place over several years. As of January 2004, two areas designated Locus A and B, have been located and found to contain potentially significant archaeological resources. Both are located within the acreage purchased by the State of Louisiana.

Locus A, located approximately 2300 meters northwest of the main house, is the site of a tenant farmer's cabin. Historic maps and artifacts recovered from this site indicate that the cabin was occupied from c.1875 to c.1950. Excavations at Locus A also revealed that intact cultural features, such as post holes and trash pits, are present in this area. Although these excavations have documented the presences of such features, the nature, extent, and integrity of the deposits are still unclear.¹

¹ Rob Mann, *2003 Annual Report for Management Units IV and V*, Regional Archeology Program, Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University, August 2003.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 6**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Locus B, located approximately 1000 meters northwest of the main house, is the location of an enslaved African community (not the traditional configuration for plantation layout, as noted above). Ms. Nesta Anderson, a Ph.D. student at the University of Texas at Austin, conducted archeological investigations at Locus B beginning in the summer of 2002. Her work is ongoing. To date archeological deposits dating to the antebellum period have been found. Like Locus A, the project is still in its preliminary stages and the nature, extent, and integrity of the deposits are unclear.²

THE ROSEDOWN LANDSCAPE

For ease of identification and understanding, the resources at Rosedown can be grouped into five clusters: a ticket office at the entrance on Highway 10, a maintenance area just south of the main complex, the main complex, a visitor services area with parking lot immediately north of the main complex, and four buildings at the rear of the property, all at some distance from the main complex.

The landscape of Rosedown Plantation originally included the typical components of cotton plantations of the mid-antebellum period in the South – agricultural acreage planted with the cash crop, fields of fodder crops, pastureland for cattle, stables for horses, yards and pens for poultry and other farm animals, the quarters of enslaved Africans (where they typically had their own individual garden plots), a kitchen garden, an orchard, and the pleasure, or ornamental, gardens adjacent to the main plantation house, or the “Main House.” What distinguished the landscape of Rosedown, however, were its pleasure grounds, which were larger in scale than most of the region, and were highly refined in both their design and plant collections. These gardens were the passion of Martha Barrow Turnbull, the mistress of Rosedown, and the work of enslaved and later free African-Americans. Martha’s garden diary provides invaluable insight into the story of the garden’s planting and management. She recorded her first entry in 1836 and her last in 1895, a year before her death at the age of 87.³

Today there are no standing structures to represent the agricultural history of the plantation, but the main house and its eighteen-acre ornamental garden are largely intact along with three gazebos, or summerhouses, a hothouse and other dependencies. The remarkable survival of so much original fabric is, in part, a result of the carefully planned and executed restoration of the property by the Underwoods. The Underwoods hired Houston landscape architect Ralph Ellis Gunn to restore the gardens. Many of Gunn’s drawings survive and help document the conditions that existed in the garden at the time of the Underwoods’ purchase.

The extensive pleasure gardens at Rosedown survived into the mid-twentieth century, to be restored by the Underwoods, for two reasons: the continuity of care throughout Martha Turnbull’s long life and through the following two generations of her family and, very importantly, the lack of money to redesign them in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Martha’s modest, sometimes impoverished state is abundantly clear from her post-war garden diary entries. From June 1871, “I have no money in Mr. Unger’s hands & only \$100 in my drawer,” and from her last entry September 1, 1895, “My pension came. I had not one dime to pay Emma \$2 this month, August or any debt whatever.”

² The foregoing summaries of the ongoing archaeological work at Rosedown, were prepared by Erika Martin Seibert, NPS archaeologist, after various phone consultations in late 2003 with the two archaeologists doing the work – Robb Mann and Nesta Anderson. As work progresses, Locus A and Locus B may have the potential to meet Criterion D for the National Register of Historic Places.

³ Martha Turnbull had been a widow since 1861.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 7**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Of her labor shortage, Martha wrote in January 1869, "All work that ought to have been in October & November yet to be done . . . Can do nothing – no hands yet in garden, but John Prenter and he is worse than nothing." And from August 23, 1872, "Cleaned up my yard entirely by my own hands."

After Martha's death in 1896, the garden was cared for by her only surviving child, Sarah Turnbull Bowman. (One son died at the age of seven from yellow fever. The eldest son, William, drowned in 1856 not long after his marriage.) Sarah died in 1914, whereupon her four unmarried daughters inherited Rosedown. Sarah's husband James died in 1927 and the eldest unmarried daughter Corrie in 1929; this left Isabel, Sara and Nina Bowman to live in and manage Rosedown and its gardens. There would have been no money in the early twentieth century to pay for more than garden maintenance (if that). The Bowmans' income rested on agriculture, and West Feliciana lost its money crop with the boll weevil infestation of the 1910s. As a means of supporting themselves and paying for basic garden maintenance, the three sisters opened Rosedown to the public for tours and also sold camellias, azaleas, and other plants propagated from the original garden plants. Nina was the last of the three to die, and in 1955 her nieces and nephews inherited Rosedown and put it on the market.

Garden Design

Despite extensive documentary research, how the actual design of the gardens originated cannot be documented. While Martha's garden diary contains a wealth of horticultural evidence in terms of plants being propagated and grown in the garden, she does not comment on the design and laying out of the garden. Nor do the Turnbull-Bowman Papers housed at Louisiana State University provide any clues. They too provide only information on the plants ordered. In the absence of such documentation, one can only speculate, as is true of most other historic gardens.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were two stylistic currents in European garden design – the formal and geometric layout derived from the Renaissance and expanded in scale by the work of Andre Le Notre in seventeenth-century France; and the more current and popular romantic picturesque tradition which imitated the forms of nature, employing curvilinear lines and naturalistic groupings of trees and shrubs, introduced in eighteenth century England by Capability Brown, Humphrey Repton, William Kent and others. Andrew Jackson Downing championed the English picturesque taste in America. His influential *Treatise* was published in 1841. The gardens at Rosedown would include elements from both traditions, although the overall plan of the garden is dominated by the axiality of the major organizing lines. When one walks in the shaded portions of the garden, however, the curved lines of the paths and the spatial experience are more akin to the English picturesque tradition.

Southern landscape historian and former LSU professor Suzanne Turner, the co-author of this nomination, is presently editing Martha's diary for publication. She believes that the garden design was inspired by the Turnbolls' trip to Europe following their wedding in 1828. (According to tradition, Rosedown was named for a play they saw en route.) Documentation for this trip does not survive, so we do not know exactly what sites the couple toured. Given Martha's penchant for gardens, however, one assumes that they saw some of the major gardens on the continent, perhaps Versailles and Vaux-le-Vicomte, as well as some of the outstanding villa gardens of the Italian Renaissance.

The Turnbolls' library does not survive intact; so we do not know all the gardening publications that Martha might have read and no clues are offered in her gardening diary or account books. Within the last year, the State of Louisiana learned from the plantation's former owner, Gene Slivka, that the Turnbolls owned a copy of Downing's 1841 *Treatise*. (It is in Slivka's possession.) This should come as no surprise, given Martha's

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 8**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

passion for horticulture. Nor does it prove that Downing influenced her garden. The influential *Treatise* was published in 1841, and Martha's first gardening entry is in 1836. The garden design that we see today may have been completely in place by 1841, or the design may have developed over a several year period. If the latter, then Downing may have been a design inspiration, but we simply do not know.

Another gardening book in Martha's library has come to light: the apparently little known *American Gardener* by Thomas G. Fessenden, published in Boston in 1832. Presently in the "main house" collection, it is inscribed from D. Turnbull to M.H. Turnbull.⁴ Like the far more famous *Treatise* by Downing, it provides ideas on garden design, among other subjects.

The designer of the gardens also cannot be documented. Martha had traveled extensively in America and Europe, and could have laid out the gardens herself, based on the designs she had observed, although it would be unusual for a laywoman to compose and create such a large and sophisticated garden without the assistance of an experienced professional. One published account written by a granddaughter states that the Turnbells engaged the services of a Parisian landscape gardener from the school of Le Notre to accompany them to Louisiana and supervise the laying out of the grounds. This is not corroborated by any documentation. Another possibility is that she retained the services of one of the many itinerant gardeners who traveled the region (see Part 8). A letter in the Turnbull Papers, to Daniel Turnbull, refers only to "your gardener." The names of some of the enslaved people whose labor made the gardens possible are provided in Martha's garden diary, as previously noted. In terms of sources for plant material, the Turnbells' purchases from William Prince & Sons of Long Island, R. Buist of Philadelphia and New Orleans nurseries are documented in the Turnbull-Bowman Papers at LSU.

Description of Garden Plan⁵

The Main House was located on one of the highest points of the site, near the edge of a bluff. A few yards behind the house and to the south, is a small pond or reservoir, added during the 1960s restoration. An 1860 rear wing to the main house, removed during the restoration, overlooks the reservoir.

The Main House and its eighteen acre landscaped garden are approached from the entry lane through a handsome Greek Revival wooden gate. The earliest documentation for the gate is a photo dated 1913. The present gate is a flawless reproduction of the original dating from the restoration, per on-site investigations by the Division of Historic Preservation. The organizing element of the plan is a 660-foot long central allée of live oak trees which were either planted from seed or transplanted from the nearby woods as small trees. In the initial years, these trees would have been quite formal and regular in their appearance; it is only after the first thirty years or so that live oaks become more sculptural and irregular in their form, and annual pruning can delay this even longer. So during the peak of the garden's existence, from the 1850s to the early 1860s, the allée (Martha's "Avenue") would have appeared as a very ordered avenue of symmetrically shaped evergreen trees. To either side of the allée is a large garden.

The geometry and axuality of the allée were accented by eight, white marble, life-size, Italian sculptures which the Turnbells purchased in Florence, Italy in 1851. They arrived at Rosedown the following year. Resting on brick pedestals, these sculptures were located at the edges of the large gardens flanking the allée, between these

⁴ The H is for Hillard, Martha's middle name when she was a Barrow.

⁵ Garden structures such as the three summer houses, etc. are mentioned in the garden plan section of the narrative and then described in detail under the "Buildings and Structures (Main Complex)" section.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 9**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

gardens and the oaks, so that they accented the sides of the view down the allée without dominating the view. The statues were repeated where the allée branched off the oval forecourt to the main house, two on each side. A pair of large urns marked the terminus of the allée and the forecourt. Both the sculptures and the urns were removed within the last few years before the State of Louisiana purchased the property. The oval forecourt is bounded on the house side by a series of iron bollards painted white. Between the allée and the house is a diamond-shaped parterre that was planted in privet in the nineteenth century and is today planted in clipped dwarf yaupon with two tall water oaks flanking the house's front façade. Although replanted, the diamond shape is the same as that shown in a 1930s drawing.

Subsequent to the State of Louisiana acquiring the property, the urns have been returned. The State of Louisiana had eight of the original twelve statues replaced in 2002. (Four of the eight replacements are on the allée, and two on each side of the forecourt.) While the new statues are not exact copies of the originals, they are a very close approximation. Like the originals, they are of white marble, but the copies are not as intricately carved and they are slightly larger. Most importantly, the overall effect is quite good as visitors once again have the intended "feel" of the gardens, the way they were meant to be.

On either side of the main house are gardens of a detailed scale which may have been the earliest areas developed by Martha. On the south side is what Martha referred to as the "Flower Garden," which is today planted with varieties of roses since it is the most open and sunny area in the garden. In this portion of the garden, Martha probably planted annuals and perennials that were valued for their seasonal blooms. It probably included a great variety of plants rather than the mass plantings of single plant types that are presently shown. The garden is shaded by a very large live oak.

The layout of the Flower Garden combines rectangular forms and irregular, curved paths. The distinctive design remains the same as that documented by Richard Koch in the 1930s, with the exception of a few paths added by Gunn. In a report dated September 10, 1959 Gunn noted that the flower garden was "completely overgrown with seedling shrubs, trees and weeds" and that only the "most obvious paths have been cleared." He determined the design pattern by "the location of existing walks and the location of certain plants which suggest that a walk went between them." He then adjusted it some to accommodate the growth of "remarkable horticultural specimens" such as the live oak and added paths "to allow better use and maintenance of the area plus visual enjoyment." These adjustments should be considered minor because they were few in number and conceptually true to the distinctive layout. Gunn also added two small fountains to the Flower Garden and a dolphin fountain with a hexagonal basin northwest of the main house, on axis with the Flower Garden gazebo.

The Flower Garden is ornamented with an elaborate latticework gazebo and a subterranean hot house for overwintering tender container plants and seedlings. Near the hot house is a brick garden shed which was connected to a greenhouse. The greenhouse does not survive; its footprint was used as the basis of a terrace with a central fountain added by Gunn as part of the garden restoration.

On the north side of the house, some of the more utilitarian aspects of the household were sited, including the kitchen and a storage shed. It is not known where the kitchen garden was originally located. It would have been quite large based upon the numbers of vegetables being grown for the household as recorded in Martha's diary. Today, a small replica of a kitchen garden is located behind the kitchen.

A tall brick wall is all that survives of the large conservatory in which Martha propagated and protected many of the plants that would grace her garden in the warm summer months. Today this wall serves as a backdrop for a sculpture of Eve and a parterre that surrounds the sculpture, added during the garden restoration by Gunn. In her diary, Martha mentions both an orangerie and a greenhouse; this conservatory was probably what Martha

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 10**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

called the orangerie.

On a path between the conservatory ruins and the North Garden is a rockery (labeled grotto on map accompanying this nomination) in the form of a rock arch covered with vines. In Martha's account books we find the notation, "Rockery made in September, 1858."

The largest gardens at Rosedown are those flanking the allée, generally referred to today as the North Garden and the South Garden. Through each of these, wind sinuous paths lined with plantings of evergreen and deciduous shrubs. Each of these gardens has a latticework gazebo, or summerhouse, as a central feature. Their placement across from each other implies a cross-axis, and in the early years one could have seen one gazebo from the other; however, there was no path, line of trees, etc. re-enforcing the axis, as would be the case in a true cross-axis. Roughly eighty percent of the layout in the large North and South Gardens is original. Some 20% of the present paths were added in the restoration to give visitors access to outstanding and mature plant specimens.⁶ Almost all of the new paths are in the South Garden. In the North Garden Gunn added fountains with circular basins to each side of the gazebo.

The North and South Gardens (the "pleasure grounds" as Martha sometimes termed them) are particularly important from a horticultural standpoint. Within these large gardens survive many of Martha's original plantings, along with literally hundreds of seedlings of the camellias she planted. Hers was one of the earliest camellia collections in the Deep South. Her garden diary and other sources document purchase after purchase of her beloved Japonicas (camellias). From March 26, 1856, "had 130 japonicas." From February 1, 1856, "We went to New Orleans . . . We bought \$300 worth of plants. 1 pear a cheatery Yellow and all kinds of Japonicas." And on the eve of the Civil War (February 1, 1861), "Japonicas blooming most beautifully."

The major trees in these gardens; crape myrtle, cypress, pines and oaks, probably date from Martha's lifetime, and most of the mature shrubs do as well. Notable are very large *Osmanthus fragrans* (sweet olive), *Osmanthus fortunei*, pines, and cryptomeria, as well as the "hip gardenia," which has become one of the signature plants of Rosedown. Many of the plants that line the paths, such as moss roses, and cover the ground, such as ardisia, were propagated from original plantings during Gunn's restoration. Fully one-third of the woody plant materials in the North and South Gardens may date from the nineteenth century.

While Martha's garden diary is silent on the designer and design inspiration, she does refer to some of the above described character-defining features. For example, an entry for February 1, 1849 reads, "Finished [cleaning] the walks on one side of the Garden – began on the other." For November 6, 1852, "I propegated [sic] white Moss Roses & put them out through the ground . . . I took up also all the Roses on the Avenue [her term for the allée]." In 1876 she recorded that "Diley cleaned all the walks as far as the Summar [sic] house on Martha's side."⁷

The Garden Restoration/Evaluation of Garden's Integrity

The overall layout of the garden, its organizing features, architectural structures, and a significant portion of the original plantings survive in remarkably pristine condition. Certainly there have been changes made to the garden over the course of its 170 year existence, but the most noticeable change has been the growth and maturation of the trees and shrubs within the garden, creating a dense canopy in much of the North and South Gardens, and leading to the shading out of more sun-loving species. Much of the garden's authenticity can be

⁶ Ralph Ellis Gunn "Report on the Proposed Restoration of the South Garden, Rosedown Plantation," Copy in National Register of Historic Places Files, Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation, Baton Rouge, LA, March 1960.

⁷ Given the reference to walks and summerhouse, this must be either the large north or south garden.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 11**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

traced to the philosophical and practical approach taken by landscape architect Gunn as he went about the daunting task of “uncovering” the garden after over a half-century of marginal maintenance and unchecked growth due to the Bowman sisters’ modest resources. The process that guided Gunn’s initial site reconnaissance and decision-making was very progressive for the time, and parallels, for the most part, the “best practices” recommended for the preservation of historic designed landscapes today. A report submitted by Gunn to the Underwoods in March 1960 explicitly records his approach. He first completed “as found” plan drawings, or “existing conditions” surveys, for all major parts of the garden, identifying the principal plant materials and planting masses. This, in and of itself, is a significant undertaking for the roughly eighteen acres of heavily planted ornamental gardens.

For many years, Gunn’s plans were used to manage the landscape under the direction of site manager Ormond Butler. As tourism increased, and the canopy became denser, some changes in specific plant selections were made in order to either adapt to the changing microclimates or to extend the blooming season for year-round visitation. In some cases the use of mass plantings of plant varieties not available during the nineteenth century (i.e. dwarf azaleas, multiflora roses) resulted in a more “showy” and “colorful” effect than would have been experienced during Martha Turnbull’s lifetime, but the differences are subtle and fairly insignificant when compared to the overall feeling of the garden, which is still very faithful to the original intent of the plan.

The most serious threat to the garden’s design integrity is the loss of the original marble sculptures that lined the central axis for all of the garden’s lifetime, save the ten or so years of the most recent owner’s tenure. This is a serious loss for two reasons: (1) It leaves the allée without the feature that distinguished it from other allées across the Deep South; and (2) it leaves the garden’s central axis without its most specific reference to European gardens. However, as noted previously, eight of the statues have been replaced, and while they are not exact copies, they are very close approximations. The overall effect is there. Visitors can once again appreciate the original “feel” of the place.

In evaluating the integrity of the gardens of Rosedown, the most significant features of the garden’s personality survive intact – the sophisticated plan combining axial geometry with winding picturesque walks through landscaped garden spaces and the plant collection as established by Martha Turnbull, relying upon flowering evergreen shrub species (camellia, azalea, osmanthus, banana shrub), small flowering trees (dogwood, redbud, saucer magnolia), and large canopy trees native to the regional forest (live oak, cypress, pine, Southern magnolia). In short, for a garden of this age, what is more important is the amount of original layout and plant material that survive, rather than the paths and fountains added during the restoration.

When one considers that almost all of the pleasure grounds that once existed on southern plantations have been either totally obliterated or redesigned, the survival of so much at Rosedown is all the more remarkable. The design is the same as Martha Turnbull, and her enslaved African workforce, would have known it, with the exception of roughly 20% of the paths in the North and South Gardens (mainly the latter) and some minor adjustments in the Flower Garden. It is this sophisticated design, one combining the formal and picturesque, that is the character-defining feature of Rosedown’s gardens. Add to this the survival of a notable amount of nineteenth century plant material and the three latticework summerhouses. Unlike many a new owner of a historic garden, the Underwoods did not re-invent Rosedown, but were respectful of the original design. Undoubtedly the fountains were added for visitor enjoyment. With the exception of those flanking the north garden summerhouse and the dolphin fountain, they are quite small and/or inconspicuous. When compared to wholesale destruction or redesign (as is typical of gardens), and within the context of all that remains of the Rosedown domestic landscape, the fountains are fairly minor.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 12

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

THE BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES (MAIN COMPLEX)The Main House (contributing)

On November 3, 1834, Daniel Turnbull wrote in his journal, "Commenced hauling timber cypress for house." From another entry we learn that builder W. Wright began work on November 1, 1834 and finished May 1, 1835. The total cost was \$13,109.20.

Wright's agreement with Turnbull reads:

Proposition for doing the carpenter and joined work of a certain frame house the whole to be complete after the most modern stile the front to be executed with full gretio dorric collums and cornice the inside to be finished throughout the two stories complete one finish above the second story nor Dormer windows. The workmanship and stile not to be surpassed in the state . . .

The "most modern style" in question was transitional Federal-Greek Revival. Spanning the wide five bay façade is a double gallery with Doric posts, matching pilasters and a Doric entablature of triglyphs, metopes, and mutule blocks (Wright's "full gretio dorric collums and cornice"). At each corner of the eaves is an anthemion design. The gallery posts are smooth while the pilasters are fluted. The balustrades with their pronounced, quite bulbous balusters, are particularly distinctive. At the center of the composition, upstairs and down, is a handsome Federal style elliptical arch doorway distinguished by boldly formed fluting, a layered entablature, a keystone, and leaded patterns superimposed on the glass. The fanlight features a series of loops in a radial design, while the side lights feature ovals and roundels. The leaded members are held in place by patera and lion's head clasps. The door, with its six horizontal panels, is like those found most commonly on the interior. Handsome floor-to-ceiling fluted surrounds with smooth cornerblocks set off the façade's other openings, which are filled with six over six windows and a paneled section below. These surrounds and other woodwork in the house are transitional in that they are Federal in form, but bolder and "stouter" than typical of a style known for its lightness and delicacy. Although the elliptical doorways, a Federal style "signature," seem lighter in character than the window surrounds, even they are heavy in proportion when compared to c.1810 Federal woodwork. The original block's side elevations feature handsome wooden fan forms in the gable peaks.

In the mid-1840s the Turnbulls added a one story Grecian wing to each side of their home. The northern two-room wing has traditionally been known, and is still known as the Henry Clay wing. According to family tradition, the addition was made to accommodate a Gothic Revival bedroom suite originally intended for Henry Clay. Friends of Clay had it specially made for him when he announced for the presidency in 1844. It was to be for his use in the White House. When Clay lost the election, the bedroom suite was put on the market. Daniel Turnbull bought it, according to family tradition, and had to build a wing to accommodate it. To keep things in balance, he also built a one room Grecian wing on the south side known as the library. Sadly, the magnificent Henry Clay bedroom suite was removed from the property by a private owner in the 1990s and sold to various parties. The Dallas Museum of Art purchased the bed.

The principal elevations of the wings face to the side of the main block. Hence, when looking at the façade of the main block, one sees the secondary elevations (the sides) of the wings. The south wing, which takes the form of a Greek temple-like pavilion, culminates in a handsome three-bay Doric portico spanning its width. The north wing is the larger of the two; however, its façade has only a two column porch. In both wings the

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 13**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

columns are fluted while the pilasters are smooth. The Doric entablature and eave treatment of the main block is repeated on the wings. Each wing is topped by a balustrade with balusters similar in shape to those on the main block; however, they are considerably lighter in scale.

The most notable work to the main house during the Underwood restoration occurred at the rear. A drawing dated August 1957 and 1940s and '50s photos show two wings, both of which were removed. Located at the southern corner, "Miss Nina's Wing," named for the last of Martha Turnbull's granddaughters who died at Rosedown in 1954, featured a Greek Revival gallery of simple boxed columns on the front and back. Daniel Turnbull journal entries document its construction in 1860 (1859 according to family tradition). The drawing and photos reveal that it was located at the corner and communicated with the main house via galleries. The northern wing, which by the 1950s was quite ramshackle in appearance, was the kitchen. Some believe it to be the original free-standing kitchen which had later been moved up to the back of the house. Located at the north corner, it too could be accessed only by the gallery. Miss Nina's wing was moved a few yards to the rear of the house; the kitchen was removed and reconstructed.

At present the rear elevation has a small room on each side of a porch set under a shed roof. This configuration dates from the Underwood restoration. All available evidence indicates that originally there was only a three bay shed roof porch centered at the rear. The present porch is either original or a faithful reproduction.

Unlike many a period house, Rosedown does not have a hall running through the middle. The original block on the ground story is two rooms deep and three to four rooms wide. The front door opens into a large room containing an elegant, curving staircase. To each side is a fairly large, roughly equal size room. The rear range has at its center a broad dining room and adjacent butler's pantry. To each side is a smaller room. On the second floor, there are three rooms across the front, the central one containing the stair landing. The original configuration of the rear range upstairs is not certain. Today there is a small room at each corner with a T-shaped hall and two large bathrooms at the center. This configuration is most unusual. The bathrooms themselves date from the restoration, but the floorplan is shown "as is" in a Leake drawing.

Rosedown's entrance room was clearly meant to impress. The staircase's balustrade is of solid mahogany and its fascia is sheathed in crotch mahogany veneer.⁸ With its thin balusters, railing and spiral-formed newel post, the staircase is light and delicate in character.

As befits the home of a wealthy family, the principal downstairs rooms have marble mantels. There are a total of five black marble mantels -- three in the original block and one in each of the wings. The upstairs rooms and the two downstairs rooms flanking the dining room/butler's pantry feature wooden mantels. The marble mantel in the Henry Clay bedroom is very atypical for the period. According to an interview conducted in 1960 with George Leake, the mantel in this room was in a "thousand pieces" and was put back together on-site. However, the mantel does not look pieced together.

The four other marble mantels are for the most part strongly Greek Revival. Two feature free-standing Ionic columns, while the library mantel has Greek ear, or shoulder, molding. The fourth marble mantel has an entablature with a panel at its center and a block design above each pilaster. There are six original wooden mantels in two models, two downstairs and four upstairs, all with a transitional Federal Greek Revival character. The mantels are being described as transitional because they display certain Federal traits (multiple layers of molding) but are quite "chunky" in proportion as would befit the later Greek Revival. One model features a layered shelf, reeded pilasters and an entablature with multiple, very boldly formed moldings. The

⁸ An invoice documents the purchase of mahogany, an expensive wood, for \$129.73.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 14**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

other model is similar except it has heavy smooth round columns instead of reeded squared off pilasters. Above each column is a strongly articulated block with a convex panel inset on its front and outward-facing side. One wonders if the main block's marble mantels were added when the wings were built in the mid-1840s, or it is possible for the main block's marble and wooden mantels to all be from 1835.

There are two mantels upstairs (in the rear corner rooms) that one suspects are twentieth century. They are suspect for two reasons: (1) They are of a Federal style (almost Adamesque) that one would find c.1800 – i.e., considerably earlier than the house; and (2) They have certain features that make one think they are not true c.1800 Federal mantels - shallow, one dimensional panels and a sunburst and other moldings that are “overdone”. For the record, they are shown as existing when the Underwood restoration began.

Doors in the original portion of the house feature the same six horizontal panel treatment found on the front door. Molding profiles on the door and window surrounds of the original portion are of various types, although all feature bold profiles with a strong three-dimensional character. The molding is pronounced enough on some frames to be almost half round in profile. Door frames in principal downstairs rooms, for example, the staircase room, are capped by a pronounced cornice in the manner of a multi-layer mantel shelf. Each door of the main block has a wood panel above, where a transom window would typically appear. While unusual, all available evidence indicates that this treatment is original. The openings in the mid-1840s wings are quite chaste in appearance in comparison to those of the original block. Smooth, unadorned side members are capped by a molded entablature. The doors in the wings have four raised panels - two long panels with two small panels below.

Both wings feature elaborate cornices. The Henry Clay cornice has various types of molding, including two bands of enriched talon, one of bead and reel, and a band of large dentils. The molding found in the library features multiple boldly formed layers that extend several inches onto the ceiling. Ceiling medallions with typical motifs of the period, acanthus leaves, anthemions, etc., are found in the principal rooms. The one found in the entrance room is original while two found in the parlors flanking the entrance room, were added by Leake, and at least one found in the Henry Clay room is a partial reconstruction of the original.⁹

Another important interior feature is the punkah above the dining room table. Also known as a “shoo-fly,” a punkah is a fairly large piece of wood attached to the ceiling and pulled back and forth by a rope.

Whether or not the so-called “closets” found in three upstairs rooms are original is a matter of debate, although the weight of evidence is that they are. Although always referred to as closets, they are actually shallow cupboards located to one or both sides of a mantel. Such a treatment is quite unusual for a house of the period, but not unknown. What would have been typical, and what is found throughout the rest of the house, is a window to each side of a mantel. The moldings do look legitimate, but then the 1960s restoration work was so meticulous that it can easily fool the trained eye. However, if closets were added in the 1960s, one would expect them to have been typical deep closets capable of accommodating hanging clothes – i.e., furred out into the room flush with the front wall of the chimney flue rather than almost useless shallow cupboards recessed from the front wall of the flue. Also in support of the cupboards being original is a 1930s photo showing a portion of the north side of the house. No windows appear where the cupboards are now located. Finally, the same type of “closets” are found in the building known as the doctor's office, and one cannot imagine any reason for adding them in the restoration.

⁹ A pre-restoration photo shows a damaged medallion with only the present central portion remaining.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 15**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The Restoration

The massive Rosedown restoration project undertaken by the Underwoods lasted over an eight year period. A temporary metal building was erected on the property to serve as headquarters, and a small army of workers was employed for the gardens, buildings, and furniture restoration. Ralph Ellis Gunn of Houston was the landscape architect, as noted previously. Initially the architect was Richard Koch of New Orleans, the most prominent specialist in historic building restoration in Louisiana at the time. Koch had been head of the Historic American Buildings Survey in Louisiana in the 1930s and subsequently was responsible for the restoration of various major buildings in the state, particularly in New Orleans and along the Mississippi River Road. By 1960, Koch had been replaced by George Leake, also of New Orleans. Because Leake was the architect when restoration work on the historic buildings began in earnest, he is considered the architect of record.

Leake died a few years ago, and documentation on his work at Rosedown is fragmentary. Fortunately, his restoration philosophy is quoted in a 1976 Rosedown publication. "There are many diverse views on how a restoration should be approached," said Leake. "Some say that the progressive changes, additions and deletions over a great many years of the life of the property should be restored to reflect the various changes sustained through the years. . . . I cannot say that I agree with this method of proceeding. I believe that the goal of historic preservation should be to restore an area or building in the context and spirit of the time in which it was originally conceived. Williamsburg is the obvious example of this philosophy."

Leake went on to explain that because the Underwoods wanted everything to be authentic, he used in some places "the old systems, mortise and tendons (sic) with wood pegs. On exposed framing or boards, we had the timber hand split and dressed with old tools such as foot adze and draw knife. Hand forged square nails were used wherever they would be exposed, . . ."

The above described approach, of course, makes it extremely difficult for even a trained eye to determine original features from replaced features, and at Rosedown, even original dependencies from reconstructions. Most fortunately, there are enough pre-restoration and in-progress photos to make most distinctions possible in combination with some architectural clues that one cannot duplicate easily – most notably, the look of weathered wood.

Photos and a video done when the Underwoods acquired Rosedown in 1956 show that the house was in deteriorated condition, although not nearly as severe as that of many a plantation house in the region. In short, the house needed help and it needed it soon, but it was not on the immediate verge of collapse. To summarize, changes and replication of original architectural fabric to the main house, known to have been carried out during the 1960s restoration are as follow:

- Bees had bored into the solid wood columns on the main block. The damage was extensive enough to necessitate replication of several columns. The work was done so carefully that the only way one can tell replacement from original is to tap on each. The replacements are hollow.
- In-progress restoration photos show the Doric entablature of the main block removed. Either it was removed for restoration and re-installed or the present entablature is an in-kind replacement.
- Considerable work was done at the rear, as explained above.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 16**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

- Bathrooms were placed in the upstairs rear central space.
- Henry Clay Wing: The marble mantel was either added or “reconstructed.” The ceiling medallion is a partial reconstruction, and a modern bathroom was added. The wooden Gothic window cornices were added by the Underwoods. It is unknown if they are nineteenth century pieces or were crafted to complement the Gothic suite of furniture.
- As shown in extant plans, the mantels were fitted with electrical outlets in the top of the shelf for the purpose of small lamps and electrified candelabra.
- About half of the balusters are replicas (according to 1960 interview with Leake).
- All of the doors are original but they have been re-hung with new hinges. Presumably, as part of the restoration, the doors were removed for cleaning and repainting.

Assessment of Integrity for Main House

The only integrity issue for the main house is the work done at the rear, and while notable, it has made no impact on the overall architectural statement made by the house itself, and most importantly, the powerful *tout ensemble* of house and pleasure gardens.

McMillen Interiors

The prestigious New York firm of McMillen, Inc. was the interior designer for the restoration. Founded in 1924 by Eleanor McMillen, McMillen Inc. is considered the first full service professional interior design firm in the United States. Private clients were largely “top drawer,” including names such as Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford II, the Marshall Fields, Millicent Rogers and Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post. The firm also received such prestigious public commissions as the Jacqueline Kennedy-headed restoration of Blair House (they did five of the rooms) and the White House, where they designed the private quarters for President and Mrs. Johnson.

William Seale in his December 2002 *Historic Furnishings Plan Rosedown* summarizes the work done by McMillen and reproduces the firm’s pre-restoration photos of various rooms. In addition to using a published history of McMillen, Seale and his associates interviewed designers who were involved in the project. While interior décor (furnishings, wallpaper, etc.) are normally not within the scope of a NHL nomination, a brief summary will be made for the purpose of future scholars of this important firm. A true restoration was never the aim. As Seale observes, the McMillen work “was in fact an exercise in contemporary interior decoration with antiques, including some of the original artifacts and arrangements of Rosedown as it was known in the 1950s.”

Apparently most of the original furniture remained when the Underwoods acquired the property, albeit in need of restoration. Secondary pieces, notes Seale, were removed, leaving only the major “quality” pieces. McMillen then purchased many antique items for the home that were of the same quality or better than the originals that survived. “Rosedown restored,” concludes Seale, “was a ‘showplace,’ no longer a residence and not really a historic house, in the sense of authenticity.” Almost all of the furnishings added by McMillen are gone.

One hundred year old wallpapers were removed and copied but in silkscreen rather than the roll and/or block process originally used. The former does not yield the texture of the old process. Also, while the papers were copied, they were not always placed back in the same rooms. There is some difference of opinion concerning

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 17**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

whether the formal receiving room, where the stair is located, ever had a scenic print. The present one dates from the restoration.¹⁰ All of the wallpapers are today as McMillen placed them. Today's window treatments are also from the McMillen period with exception of the cornices and tiebacks.

Miss Nina's Wing (non-contributing)

As noted above, Miss Nina's Wing was built at the rear corner of the main house in 1860 and removed and relocated during the 1960s restoration (an excellent example of Leake's restoration philosophy). Because of the relocation, National Register guidelines require that the wing be listed as non-contributing. It has a simple boxed gallery on both of its long sides and a four room interior.

Although non-contributing, Miss Nina's wing looms large in Rosedown legend. According to tradition it was to this wing that Martha Turnbull retired in her later years when upkeep of the "main house" became too much. The last of her unmarried granddaughters, the aged Miss Nina Bowman, lived there alone for several years before her death in 1954.

Kitchen (non-contributing)

Without the aid of pre-restoration documentation, one would have thought the kitchen to be historic. It has a massive chimney made of old soft bricks and is of pegged construction. However, in-progress restoration photos show it under construction. Clearly the old kitchen wing was removed, judged to be beyond salvation and was reconstructed using the "old methods" proposed by the restoration's architect George M. Leake.

"Doctor's Office" (contributing)

The so-called doctor's office is one of several buildings and structures photographed by Richard Koch in the 1930s for the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). According to family history, this diminutive Greek temple style building was added to the plantation in 1844, one year after Daniel and Martha Turnbull's seven year old son died of yellow fever. Family history indicates it was the doctor's office for the entire plantation (i.e., the scores of enslaved people as well). The date is certainly believable, but one would not expect such a facility to be located where it is – set like a small jewel at one edge of the oval-shaped forecourt to the main house.

Regardless of its use, the wood frame building is a handsome adornment to the Rosedown gardens. A three bay Greek temple spans the façade. The unusual slender columns are splayed slightly and paneled. The paneling is particularly unusual, not being the standard bolection mold but rather a raised central section with a curvilinear cut, similar to cuts and molds found in the main house's mantels and door surrounds. Normally such a cut would have been formed on a plane, but the decorative cut actually splays as the column splays, indicating that it must have been hand-carved. Windows are nine over nine. The front door's transom is subdivided in a decorative pattern.

The back wall of the one room interior has a mantel with a cupboard to each side, similar to those described above for the main house. The mantel takes the form of an aedicule motif with pilasters featuring fluted-looking paneling similar to that found on the columns. They do not splay. The cupboard doors feature six

¹⁰ For a detailed analysis please see William Seale's "Historic Furnishings Plan, Rosedown," 2 vols. Prepared for Friends of Rosedown, December 2002.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 18**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

raised panels in the so-called “Cross and Bible” configuration. This type of door is not typical of the Greek Revival, but it is not unknown.

The siding on the sides and rear was replaced during the restoration.

Flower Garden Summerhouse (contributing)

Also documented by HABS in the 1930s, this latticed garden pavilion is a hexagonal structure with two round arch openings and an ogee roof culminating in an urn. The pavilion’s rafters are steamed and bent to form the ogee shape, as can be seen from the interior. There is a suggestion of an entablature. The pavilion is particularly distinctive because virtually every surface is of intricately made latticework – not just the walls but architectural features such as the pilasters defining each corner and the round arch openings. The latticework is of two sizes – larger for the walls and very small for the pilasters and round arch openings. It is closely “woven” so that the holes are fairly small, indeed tiny for the architectural details. The latticework wood is thick and the members are fitted together in the manner of a fine piece of furniture. Instead of one board simply lying on top of another, the boards interlock. The pilasters and round arch openings are particularly pronounced because of the smaller, very tightly “woven” latticework pattern. The openings are further reinforced visually by a wooden keystone with deep fluting and a wooden block on each side with a raised panel. The pavilion floor is brick, however a concrete foundation was added during the restoration.

There is no compelling reason to believe that the flower garden summerhouse is anything other than antebellum in date. It is constructed with square nails, indicating a date from before about 1880, and given the precarious financial state of the widow, Martha Turnbull, in the post-war years, it is clear that she had no funds to spend on “extras.” The first reference to a summerhouse in the garden diary is 1872.

North and South Garden Summerhouses (contributing)

As noted in the garden description, there is also a summerhouse at roughly the center of the large gardens to each side of the oak allée (the north and south gardens). The first known documentation on these two structures uncovered to date is from the 1930s, a garden plan showing their location and HABS photos. Identical, they are hexagonal latticed structures with an ogee roof culminating in an urn and rafters steamed and bent to form the ogee shape, but they are not as elaborately built and articulated as the flower garden summerhouse. Here the openings are square head and are formed of wood, as are the pilasters with molded capitals accenting each corner, and the latticework is of the more conventional overlapping type. The entablatures feature a delicate pearl molding. The latticework is of fairly thin wood and is held together with round head nails. The latter two clues indicate that the latticework must have been replaced at some time.¹¹ Like the flower garden summerhouse, the summerhouses in the north and south gardens are held together with square nails and there is no reason to believe that these two summerhouses are anything other than antebellum in date. The first reference to a summerhouse in Martha’s garden diary is 1872.

It is known that the south and north garden summerhouses were hidden in unchecked, jungle-like growth when the Underwoods purchased Rosedown. And while they did need some restoration work, the fabric appears to be largely original, except for the latticework as noted above. While George Leake apparently even used square nails in the restoration – at least where they would show – he could not have reproduced the look of weathered wood. Also, in-progress restoration photos show the summerhouses in fairly good condition except for perhaps

¹¹ For the record, it looks the same as that shown in the 1930s HABS photo documentation.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 19**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

the roofs. There is one photo showing repair work on one of the roofs.¹²

Milk House (contributing)

Documentation from the 1930s shows this building in its present location behind and to the side of the main house. Its original use cannot be documented, but it has been known as the milk shed as long as anyone can remember. It has a one room core of *piece sur piece* construction – a particularly skillful form of log construction wherein the members interlock very tightly. Small openings feature wooden bars.

The milk shed has a hip roof that extends beyond the building core by a few feet, supported by simple posts. 1930s photos show this configuration; however, 1960s restoration photos show the removal and in-kind replacement of the roof structure.

Garden Tool Shed (contributing)

Located just west of the flower garden, this small square brick building gives every appearance of being antebellum. It is laid up in common bond and has a gable end roof. A door on each side features a jack arch lintel. As noted previously, a greenhouse was originally attached to one side.

Log Shed (contributing)

Little is known about this small log building of unknown (although clearly historic) date. In-progress restoration photos show it in the present location.

Boiler Shed (non-contributing)

Located next to the log shed, this small clapboarded traditional-looking building is shown in restoration photos as under construction.

Privy (non-contributing)

While there was a privy on the property when the restoration began (per a photo), all available evidence indicates that the present privy, although identical in most respects, is largely a reconstruction.

Barn (contributing)

Located on the edge of the North Garden is a good-size barn formed of wood slats with an open passageway at the middle. There is no documentation on this building other than the knowledge that it was there when the Underwoods purchased the property. Given its location, its use must have been garden-related rather than agriculture.

Hothouse (contributing)

There is no reason to believe that this low, sloping brick structure is not from Martha Turnbull's period.

¹² One of the pavilions must have had its foundation replaced during the restoration. It is now of concrete with a brick overlay.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 20

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Fountains (5 non-contributing objects)

The two fountains flanking the North Garden summerhouse, the two fountains in the Flower Garden, and the dolphin fountain northwest of the house on axis with the Flower Garden gazebo were added during the Gunn restoration.

Brick Terrace with central fountain (non-contributing)

The brick terrace built on the footprint of the greenhouse adjacent to the garden shed and its central fountain were added during the Gunn restoration.

Buildings located outside of the main complex of historic buildings and gardens:

There are numerous non-contributing elements spread throughout the Rosedown acreage – apart from the four mentioned above within the historic core. They all date from the 1960s restoration and were built to accommodate Rosedown's new role as a major tourist attraction or as support buildings for the cattle business undertaken on the property.

At the property entrance on Louisiana Highway 10 is a wood frame ticket office built in the form of a traditional Louisiana *pigeonnier* (pigeon house). The gates also date from the restoration.

To the south of the Flower Garden is the maintenance area, which includes a long, open, board and batten shed and a greenhouse. There are numerous mature trees and other vegetation screening this utilitarian area from the rest of the property. In short, someone has to tell you that it's there and lead you to it.

Immediately beyond the North Garden is a small (roughly fifty car) visitor parking lot with an office, restroom building, and gift shop. The parking lot was created in the midst of numerous large trees and features a grassy area with trees in the middle; hence it is not as intrusive as might be expected. The office and restroom buildings, both of frame construction and small in scale, were designed to resemble historic cottages. The gift shop, the only modern-looking building at Rosedown, is a corrugated metal shed. Fortunately, its impact is mitigated by lush vegetation. Immediately behind the restroom building, but not accessible from the parking lot, is a small wood frame caretaker's cottage which is traditional in character.

At the rear of the Rosedown acreage are two small barns, a stable, and a cottage. The barns and stable are of board and batten construction. The small traditional looking cottage is sheathed in weatherboards.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 21National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTING/NON-CONTRIBUTING ELEMENTS

- Contributing site: gardens
- Contributing buildings: main house, doctor's office, milk house, garden tool shed, log shed, barn at edge of north garden
- Contributing structures: 3 gazebos, 1 hothouse
- Non-contributing buildings: (Main complex): Miss Nina's wing, kitchen, boiler shed, privy
(Outside of main complex): ticket booth at entrance on HWY 10, maintenance shed, office, restroom building, gift shop, caretaker's cottage, two barns, stable, cottage at rear of acreage
- Non-contributing structures: brick terrace with central fountain, main gate, modern greenhouse in maintenance area, parking lot
- Non-contributing objects: 8 statues lining the allée, 5 fountains

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Nationally: X Statewide: Locally:

Applicable National Register Criteria: A_ B_ C X D

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A_ B_ C_ D_ E_ F_ G

NHL Criteria: 4

NHL Theme: III. Expressing Cultural Values
 5. Architecture, landscape architecture, and urban design

Areas of Significance: Landscape Architecture
 Architecture

Period(s) of Significance: 1835, c. 1845 (main house)
 c. 1836-1865 (gardens)

Significant Dates: 1835, c. 1845

Significant Person(s): NA

Cultural Affiliation: NA

Architect/Builder: W. Wright

Historic Contexts: XVII. Landscape Architecture
 XVI. Architecture
 D. Greek Revival

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 23**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.**SUMMARY**

Rosedown Plantation is nationally significant in the areas of landscape architecture and architecture. The designed landscapes of the Southern plantation represent an important chapter in the history of design in America, and Rosedown's gardens, in and of themselves, are nationally significant in this respect – for their size, sophistication and overall integrity. Designed landscapes of the size and sophistication of Rosedown were in a small minority across the plantation South, and for such a fragile entity to survive with so much of its character intact is nothing short of remarkable. Additionally, Rosedown is particularly important as a *tout ensemble* to convey the appearance (to “tell the story”) of the antebellum plantation domestic landscape at its apex. As the perceived image of the antebellum South, Rosedown, due to its completeness, enables one to appreciate first-hand the domestic world of the South's wealthiest planters, a world made possible by enslaved African labor. Rosedown's imposing main house contributes mightily to that *tout ensemble*. The period of significance for the property deliberately ends in 1865 because Rosedown illustrates, to a high degree, the antebellum plantation owner's world on the eve of the Civil War, a conflict which was to drastically change that world.

The Southern plantation landscape was dominated by large amounts of acreage devoted to the cultivation of the cash crop – cotton, sugar, tobacco or rice. The fields of cropland typically surrounded the smaller components of the productive landscape – fruit orchards, vegetable gardens, fields of fodder crops, pastures for cattle. At the heart of the plantation landscape was the domestic landscape: the home of the planter and his extended family, generally surrounded by an ornamental landscape. Resources such as this are by definition fragile. More often than not they simply decayed. Sometimes new (Northern) owners reinvented (completely redesigned) them in the “country place” era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Today they are known to us almost entirely from paintings, other period documents such as travel accounts, and archeological research.

THE GARDENS

The historic context for the Rosedown gardens is the domestic plantation landscape of the slave-holding American South, specifically the ornamental pleasure grounds of the wealthiest of planters. And while they were a small minority, these large planters dominated the region politically, economically and culturally. Plantation agriculture, of course, peaked at different times in different parts of the South – moving from the Upper South to the Deep South. In the eighteenth century the crops were rice, indigo, and tobacco. The large plantations were in Virginia and coastal South Carolina. But with Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin in 1793, the South became a cotton kingdom, and agriculturalists from the Upper South moved away from exhausted soils south and westward into Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana. Rice remained king in the coastal Carolinas, and, with Etienne de Bore's perfection of the granulation process in 1795, sugar production created particularly immense wealth in southern Louisiana. The antebellum South's very large plantations were measured in square miles and the enslaved labor force for each in the hundreds. Presiding over the well-ordered plantation landscape, as symbols of the planters' wealth and authority, were great houses, typically with ornamental gardens of some type. Mac Griswold and Eleanor Weller in *The Golden Age of American Gardens* quite aptly term the heady decades before the Civil War the South's own Gilded Age – the South's equivalent of what is generally regarded as America's great age of gardening – the “country place” era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when industrial tycoons established grand estates. With plenty of money and labor, an accommodating climate, fertile soil, a long growing season, and a great interest in

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 24**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

horticulture and gardening, it is little wonder that gardening reached such heights in the antebellum South. Generally, the largest, most estate-like of gardens were on the plantations of the wealthiest planters.

Surviving paintings, travel accounts and other sources lead one to conclude that ornamental gardens of some type were typically found on large plantations, at least large plantations where the owner resided there. Ornamental gardens were generally either in front of the Big House, or flanking the sides of the house, or both. Design of these garden spaces ranged from something as simple as a grid of live oak trees, to a circle of cedars lining a carriage drive, to more elaborate and intricate parterre patterns planted in flowering plants and small trees. Those of the size and sophistication of Rosedown were in a small minority. It was here in “such exquisite creations” as Rosedown and nearby Afton Villa, conclude Griswold and Weller in *The Golden Age of American Gardens*, that the “plantation landscape reached its apogee.”

While Rosedown’s design combines elements from the formal and picturesque traditions, it is first and foremost a controlled, formal, axial garden. In this it is typical of antebellum plantation pleasure grounds. While Downing and the picturesque were quite popular in the Northeast, their influence in the South was limited. Southern garden design remained conservative, wedded to the old ideas of axuality and geometry— a conclusion reached by any number of scholars writing on the subject. Having just tamed a wilderness -- imposed order upon it -- planters preferred a landscape that reflected that new order. As Suzanne Turner concludes in *Louisiana Gardens: Places of Work and Wonder*, “A soft, naturalistic landscape held little appeal on the newly settled frontier, where order and security meant removing as much of nature as possible.” James Cothran writes in his just released *Gardens and Historic Plants of the Antebellum South* (November 2003): “During the antebellum period, with few exceptions, southerners remained wedded to formality and the principles of geometric garden design that had prevailed throughout the colonial period. Not only did geometric elements fit within the context of a symmetrical house and garden plan, but formalized landscape features. . . reflected a control over nature and served as a means of conveying wealth, taste and social prestige.” Cothran’s hypothetical symmetrical house, of course, is Greek Revival. And while the entire country embraced the Greek style, it was wildly popular in the South – to the extent that picturesque styles such as Italianate and Gothic Revival made limited impact. In short, a symmetrical, geometric landscape and Greek Revival architecture go hand in hand.

These ordered pleasure grounds had various authors.¹³ An interest in horticulture was the norm for any cultivated gentleman or lady. In some cases the southern gentry had a hand in their own garden design, relying upon garden books and travels in Europe. Others were designed by itinerant garden designers from Europe who advertised their services in the newspapers of cities such as Charleston and New Orleans. James Cothran (*Gardens and Historic Plants of the Antebellum South*) reproduces several such advertisements. J. Bryant’s advertisement in *The Charleston City Gazette* (June 6, 1795) reads: “The subscriber, well acquainted with the European method of gardening, being a native of England, and likewise well acquainted with it in this state [South Carolina] . . . proposes superintending ladies and gentlemen’s gardens in or near the city whether intended for pleasure or profit – he also plans and lays out gardens in the European taste on moderate terms.”

¹³For information about enslaved and free Africans and African Americans as “authors” of gardens please see Shannon Lee Dawdy, ed., “Evidence of Creolization in the Consumer Goods of an Enslaved Bahamian Family, *Historical Archeology* 34, no. 3 (2000); Grey Gundaker, “What Goes Around Comes Around: Circles, Cycles, and Recycling in African-American Yard Work”, In *Recycled Re-Seen: Folk Art from the Global Scrap Heap*, ed. Charlene Cerny and Suzanne Seriff (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1996); Grey Gundaker, “African-American History, Cosmology and the Moral Universe of Edward Houston’s Yard,” *Journal of Garden History* 13, no. 3 (1994): 179-205; Grey Gundaker, “Tradition and Innovation in African-American Yards,” *African Arts* 26, no. 2 (1993); Robert Farris Thompson, *Face of the Gods, Art and Alters of Africa and the African Americans* (New York: Museum for African Art, 1993); and Thompson, *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy* (New York: Random House, 1983).

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 25**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

In the pages of *The Bee* (New Orleans), February 1828, one Mr. J.C.G. claims to have learned his profession “under the most celebrated master gardeners of Europe.”

A plantations’ laborers, most often, members of the enslaved African community, can also be considered “authors” of these pleasure grounds as they were certainly part of the workforce that created them. In her extensive work on African American gardens in the South, Grey Gundaker notes that gardens where Africans were involved in the creation often combine southern European American gardening conventions as well as traditional African gardening conventions, including a perception of the garden as a cosmological model of a balanced moral and ethical conception of their universe, both in the past and present.¹⁴ She notes that African-American southern gardens can be studied by examining recurring themes, organizing principles and uses of space and particular objects and plants. Robert Farris Thompson also explores this issue noting that African-American spaces in the South show considerable continuity in their contents including certain objects and principles that share iconography and philosophical traditions from the Central African kingdom of Kongo, the origin of approximately one-quarter to one third of those enslaved in the antebellum South.¹⁵ Both Gundaker and Thompson note the use of rock boundaries, mirrors or reflective items, jars and vessels placed in particular locations, motion-emblems, Cosmo grams, herbs or flowers in particular locations as protective symbols, root sculptures, trees and shrubs hung with bottles, and other decorations such as shells, pipes, and rock piles.¹⁶ Though Rosedown’s pleasure gardens are planned gardens that seem strictly formal in their design and layout, it seems unlikely that the enslaved African workforce did not infuse their own philosophy into their creation, perhaps in unobtrusive ways, or merely unrecognized by the European American observer. This issue and others associated with African reflections on plantation landscapes as well as those related to African-American life and culture, are being explored in current work in African-American historical archeology.¹⁷ They seem ripe for exploration especially considering the archeological work in Locus A and Locus B that is just beginning at Rosedown.

It is by definition impossible to estimate the number of extensive, high-style plantation pleasure grounds comparable to Rosedown that existed in the slave states on the eve of the Civil War. They survive today almost exclusively in traveler’s accounts, the archeological record, and other sources, as do gardens of this antiquity in general. One Katharine Conyngham, in an 1860 letter to a garden publication, describes what must have been quite extraordinary plantation pleasure grounds near Natchez, Mississippi -- even taking into consideration the overblown writing style of the day. She enraptures:

The villa, or ‘great house,’ was visible half a mile off, fairly embowered in an island of the deepest verdure, for an island it seemed, surrounded by the ploughed, brown fields of the plantation. . . . At length . . . we emerged full in front of its handsome arched gateway. The enclosure was many acres, entirely shut in by a hedge that was spangled with snow white flowers. A slave opened the gate for our carriage. We drove through, and found ourselves within a horticultural paradise. The softest lawns, the loveliest groups of trees of the richest leaf, the prettiest walks, the brightest little lakes, with swans upon their bosoms, the most romantic vistas, met our enraptured gaze. Through this lovely place we drove over a smooth avenue, at one time almost in complete darkness from the overarching limbs interlaced above. . . .

¹⁴ Grey Gundaker, “African American History, Cosmology and the Moral Universe of Edward Houston’s Yard,” *Journal of Garden History* 13, no. 3 (1994): 179-205; See also Grey Gundaker, “What Goes Around Comes Around: Circles, Cycles, and Recycling in African-American Yard Work,” In *Recycled Re-Seen: Folk Art from the Global Scrap Heap*, ed. Charlene Cerny and Suzanne Seriff (New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1996).

¹⁵ Grey Gundaker, “Tradition and Innovation in African-American Yards,” *African Arts* 26, no. 2 (1993): 58-71; See also Robert Farris Thompson, *Face of the Gods, Art and Alters of Africa and the African-Americans* (New York: Museum for African Art, 1993); Robert Farris Thompson, *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy*, (New York: Random House, 1983).

¹⁶ Gundaker, “Tradition and Innovation in African-American Yards,” 63.

¹⁷ For example see Shannon Lee Dawdy, ed., “Evidence of Creolization in the Consumer Goods of an Enslaved Bahamian Family,” *Historical Archeology* 34, no. 3 (2000).

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 26**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Then from within the house: "Standing in the door of the main hall, we could command the main avenue of the garden, which descended in a succession of terraces to a small lake glittering at the extremity."

Joseph Holt Ingraham, traveling by steamboat on the Mississippi River in 1835, used a stop occasioned by mechanical difficulty to train his spy-glass on "one of the finest plantations below New Orleans" to see into "the very sanctum of the enchanting ornamental gardens, which the palace-like edifice was half-embowered." He writes:

At each extremity of the piazza was a broad and spacious flight of steps, descending into the garden which enclosed the dwelling on every side. Situated about two hundred yards back from the river, the approach to it was by a lofty massive gateway which entered upon a wide graveled walk, bordered by dark foliaged orange trees, loaded with their golden fruit. Pomegranate, fig, and lemon trees, shrubs, plants and exotics of every clime and variety, were dispersed in profusion over this charming parterre. Double palisades of lemon and orange trees surrounding the spot, forming one of the loveliest and most elegant rural retirements, that imagination could create . . .

Example after example of high style plantation ornamental gardens that once existed could be given, whether from Upper South states such as Virginia and South Carolina, where plantation agriculture peaked in the eighteenth century, or from the Deep South. This narrative will cite but a few. The South Carolina low country was justly famed for its plantation gardens, some on a manorial scale, but only one of these, Middleton Place (NHL, 1971), survives with sufficient integrity. For example, Drayton Hall (NHL, 1960) once had extensive gardens. Now it stands in isolation (albeit splendidly) as an architectural landmark. In Virginia, the gardens at Oatlands (NHL, 1971), Gunston Hall (NHL, 1960), and Madison's Montpelier (NHL, 1960) were refashioned as wealthy Northerners bought plantations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (as detailed under the heading "Northerners Head South" in *The Golden Age of American Gardens*). The gardens at William Byrd's Westover (NHL, 1960) have been made over many times. Mt. Vernon (NHL, 1960) and Monticello's (NHL, 1960) gardens are reconstructions, as would be expected of gardens of this vintage. The extensive loss of numerous plantation pleasure gardens in Virginia is documented in Peter Martin's *The Pleasure Gardens of Virginia*. Using traveler's accounts and other period sources, Martin documents, along the James River and its tributaries, grand designed landscapes, complete with bowling greens, orchestrated views, parterres, orangeries, axial walks, urns and other sculptural elements, etc. Today these landscapes are known to us through archeology or reconstructions.

Middle Tennessee boasted various large plantations where pleasure gardens of some type would have existed. The only known survivor today is Andrew Jackson's Hermitage (NHL, 1960), which has a modest one acre garden with a parterre at its center. Tragically, in 1998 a tornado decimated the double line of cedar trees leading to the main house. In Kentucky, the axial gardens at Oxmoor Plantation, seat of the state's third largest slaveholder, complete with a half-mile long locust avenue, were redesigned in the twentieth century.

The premier plantation domestic landscape in Alabama was at Gaineswood (NHL, 1973) in Demopolis. In the midst of a 1400 acre cotton plantation, Nathan Bryan Whitfield built an elegant mansion (1843-61) presiding over some fourteen acres of delightful pleasure grounds focused upon an ornamental, irregularly shaped manmade lake visible from the house. Whitfield's gardens were atypical for the South in being picturesque. A footbridge crossed the narrow midpoint and a boathouse was at one end. Near the lake, on a sight line with the house, was the music pavilion, a Greek-Revival circular temple. Adjacent to the house, on the north and south sides, were small formal parterre gardens. While the jewel of a house survives, the town of Demopolis has encroached upon the property, and the gardens are largely gone, including the lake. Most of the view sheds are modern, and a chain link fence surrounds the property. The pavilion survives, but has been moved closer to the

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 27**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

house. Other central Alabama plantations that once had extensive pleasure grounds include Rose Hill and Chantilly.

Louisiana, along and near the Mississippi River, was another area of “high probability” for plantation pleasure grounds. Here resided some of the wealthiest planters in America in some of the South’s grandest mansions. “The banks,” wrote Joseph Holt Ingraham in 1835, “are lined and ornamented with elegant mansions, displaying, in their richly adorned grounds, the wealth and taste of their possessors, . . .” Plantation houses on or near the Mississippi between Baton Rouge and New Orleans known to have had pleasure grounds include Nottoway, Oak Alley (NHL, 1974), San Francisco (NHL, 1974), and the legendary “Petit Versailles” of Valcour Aime. Above Baton Rouge is Rosedown’s own West Feliciana Parish, where the other survivors are Afton Villa Gardens (National Register) and Butler-Greenwood. The gardens at Afton Villa are not as extensive as those at Rosedown, not as original, and the famous Gothic Revival main house is gone. The formal garden at Butler-Greenwood is quite small in comparison to Rosedown and is not as intact. When recorded by the Historic American Buildings Survey in the 1930s, only about half of the boxwood parterre is shown as existing; the rest of the design is shown as conjectural. Butler-Greenwood retains an important summerhouse similar in character to that in the Flower Garden at Rosedown.

Most plantation pleasure grounds were long gone by the time of 1930s recordation projects such as the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Garden Club of America’s *Gardens of Colony and State*. Those not refashioned by “new” Northern money or encroached upon by new development simply decayed after the devastation of the Civil War and the loss of the enslaved African workforce. They simply no longer had the money or the forced manpower to maintain labor-intensive formal gardens, with all their parterres and axial vistas. The extensive pleasure gardens at Rosedown survived for two reasons. There was no money to redesign them and the property remained in the continuous care of the same family – with a love of gardening passed down from generation to generation. By the time the Underwoods rescued Rosedown, the north and south gardens were jungles, but the design elements and layout were still there, along with much of the nineteenth century plant material. Today the only comparable survivors are Middleton Place in South Carolina and Maryland’s Hampton Plantation, a National Historic Site since 1948. While the Middleton Place landscape, with its exquisite butterfly lakes, is some sixty years older than Rosedown, it nonetheless represents the same phenomenon – the ornamental domestic landscape of southern plantations. Middleton Place differs from Rosedown in that it no longer retains the Main House. The picture is not as complete. Maryland’s Hampton gardens were begun circa 1810 and added to in the decades immediately before the Civil War. Described at the time as a “palace in the wilderness,” the huge and grandiose Hampton main house (1790) featured an English style park at the front and a series of six parterres at the rear. The design survives with a fair degree of integrity.

Rosedown’s national significance is reinforced by the survival of so many of the plants introduced by Martha Turnbull in her lifetime. Hers was one of the earliest camellia collections in the Deep South. She also relied heavily on other plants newly imported from the Orient, such as the cryptomeria, azaleas, and crape myrtles. These she combined with indigenous species with ornamental qualities. Because we have access to Martha’s life story through her own words describing her labor in and love of the garden, Rosedown reminds us of the central place that ornamental horticulture held in the lives of most people living in the plantation South during the antebellum period and its aftermath. At Rosedown, outstanding garden design combined with an unusually intact collection of historic plants creates one of the most refined and horticulturally rich gardens remaining from nineteenth century America. It also stands as a testament to the labors of enslaved Africans in the South.

AFRICAN-AMERICANS AT ROSEDOWN

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 28**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The United States census taker in 1860 found 7 whites living in the main house at Rosedown and a workforce of 145 enslaved African-Americans (a ratio of roughly 20 to 1) living in 25 houses, with an average of six people per house. As is typical, there are no records from the perspective of those enslaved at Rosedown. There are no slave narratives to tell us about everyday life there. We piece together what we can of the lives and work of enslaved African-Americans through census records, the 1862 succession of Daniel Turnbull, and most notably, references in Martha Turnbull's gardening diary. Additionally, a few insights are found in the Turnbull and Bowman family papers at Louisiana State University, which are primarily business in nature and include correspondence with factors in New Orleans concerning the cotton crop and receipts for goods and services. It is hoped that the on-going archaeological investigations will contribute to the understanding of African-Americans at Rosedown.

At the time of the 1860 census Daniel Turnbull owned 444 enslaved African-Americans living on three plantations in West Feliciana Parish. At that time, in addition to Rosedown, Turnbull owned Styopa Plantation, with 225 enslaved people, and Hazelwood Plantation, with 74. Turnbull was one of the state's largest slaveholders, exceeded in total numbers by only 14 individuals, five of whom owned over 600 enslaved persons.

Large slave communities on one plantation, like the one at Rosedown, were common in Louisiana. In 1860, forty-eight percent of the state's enslaved African-Americans lived in holdings of fifty or more. By the time of Turnbull's death in 1861, the number of enslaved people at Rosedown had grown to 167. Reviewing Daniel Turnbull's succession list, filed in January 1862, the enslaved African-Americans at Rosedown emerge as more than just an anonymous labor force.

The enslaved African-Americans are separated in the succession list by ownership – either owned fully by Daniel Turnbull, owned jointly with his wife Martha, or owned solely by Martha. The succession provides names, ages, skin color, and price (see Appendix I). The most interesting name is Africa, age 9, son of Maria, age 32. Ages range from 70 to less than 1, with most being in their productive years. In a very few instances, occupations are given in the "special information" column. There are no notations for gardeners although occupations are given for nine individuals: "Old Jim," carpenter, age 65; "Old Adam," driver, age 65; John, blacksmith, age 55; Grace, cook, age 50; Robert, carriage driver, age 48; Hammet (?), carpenter, age 40; Richmond, house servant, age 11; Wilkinson, cook, age 40; and Aggy, washer woman, age 44. Also in the special information column is data on physical and mental illnesses and references to mother-child relationships.

The only known insight into any of the above named individuals comes from a letter to Daniel Turnbull from his New Orleans factor dated July 2, 1855. It concerns a bill of sale from W. Jacob Cohen of Charleston in which Cohen describes Aggy as "a very superior laundress tested in my yard," and later, "Aggy cannot be surpassed by white or black." It appears that Aggy was purchased with her two small children for a total cost of \$1050. It would have been useful to know more of "Old Adam," the driver, who was in a position of considerable responsibility as the immediate supervisor of the field hands at Rosedown.

Among the few items in the Turnbull and Bowman family papers that shed light on treatment of enslaved African-Americans are various bills from medical doctors for visits, prescriptions, and consultation with other physicians. Enslaved people received the benefits of "white" medicine for a variety of ailments, ranging from tooth abscess to childbirth. One interesting entry is for attendance upon an unnamed girl "threatening abortion."

From Daniel Turnbull's 1860 journal entries for Rosedown we learn there was a "slave hospital" on the property. He notes on several occasions a certain number of hands sick "in hospital" (6 in early March, 14 in

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 29**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

late March, etc.). Large plantations often had hospitals where sick enslaved people were isolated and treated. Turnbull's reference has to be for a plantation hospital. There were no hospitals in rural antebellum Louisiana, except for a state insane asylum in Jackson.

The Turnbull plantation journal (which survives for only January-July 1860) also provides information on the daily rhythm of plantation work. The terse, clinical entries comment on the weather and the tasks performed according to the cycle of crops: ginning cotton, pressing bales, shelling corn and hulling peas, planting corn, etc. "Women spinning" is a typical plantation journal entry, and Turnbull's is no exception. Another standard entry for January 25, 1860, is "Suckers [women breast feeding] raked up and hauled out manure." On July 24, 1860, "children scoured out ginhouse." The 1860 journal entries also show enslaved men assisting with the construction of a rear addition to the Rosedown main house. They assisted the bricklayers and plasterers and made lathes ("2 hands made 1200 lathes").

Historians believe that strong family ties, both traditional and extended, community life in the quarters, and religion enabled enslaved Africans and African-Americans to cope with slavery, and ultimately to survive and transcend it. Clearly the enslaved people at Rosedown lived in a group large enough to foster a sense of community among themselves in contrast to 1 or 2 individuals isolated on one property.

Although slave marriages had no legal standing in the antebellum South, enslaved people entered into such unions, and most enslaved people lived within a family unit. The only clue we have about families at Rosedown comes from Daniel Turnbull's succession, where enslaved people are grouped in mother and children clusters. There are 13 such clusters, involving a total of 60 individuals. Planters often listed enslaved people in clusters in inventories and other records. For whatever reason, fathers are not noted in the Rosedown list.

Enslaved Africans and African-Americans in general lived in constant apprehension that the family unit might be dissolved. The slaveholder might fall on lean times and have to sell some of his assets. Or perhaps he died and his estate was divided among heirs, causing family units to be splintered.

Like their counterparts across the South, Daniel Turnbull's slaves "stole a little freedom"¹⁸ by running away. While documentation is limited on this subject, we do know from the 1860 census that 22 of the enslaved African-Americans at Rosedown are listed "as fugitives from the state." Another source indicating acts of resistance among the enslaved people owned by Daniel Turnbull comes from Martha Turnbull's brother Bennett, who wrote in his diary: "Mr. Turnbull's negroes are cutting up a great many shines. 16 ran off & have defied him; are well armed, killed 2 of his dogs while in pursuit of them." We do not know which Turnbull plantation these individuals ran from.

The critical role of enslaved African-Americans in the creation and maintenance of the Rosedown gardens cannot be overestimated. It is no coincidence that the South's "golden age" of gardening is in the antebellum period. Without the forced labor of enslaved Africans and African-Americans, gardens such as those at Rosedown would not have been possible. As William Seale so correctly stated in a recent two-volume report on Rosedown, "The fields the slaves worked are gone to woods and pasture, but this garden they helped build survives."¹⁹

¹⁸ Term paraphrased from historian Freddie Parker.

¹⁹ Some would suggest "the garden they built."

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 30**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Martha Turnbull's gardening diary, through numerous entries (see Appendix II), documents both the menial and specialized work of enslaved African-Americans by name, which can then be linked to the list of slaves in Daniel Turnbull's succession. From reading the diary through this lens, some would argue that the Rosedown gardens are not Martha's but those of largely unknown enslaved African-Americans such as Augustus, Primus, Jane and Sarah.

Various themes emerge from the diary entries as they pertain to the labor force. The entries range from work in the orchard, to vegetables and fruits for the table, to the flower garden, to the extensive pleasure grounds. Most of the entries where names are given date from the post-war years when the widow Martha bargains with former slaves to work in her garden for money or foodstuffs.

It is clear from the pre-war entries, not to mention the size and nature of the gardens, that Martha Turnbull had a relatively large number of enslaved people at work. Only a very few pre-war entries provide numbers:

January 19, 1848: "So much like Spring I put 8 women to work & done all spading."

February 5, 1850: "9 women working in my Garden. Finished in a week."

April 25, 1856: "I had 18 negroes picking strawberries . . ."

January 18, 1860: "Jim has had 15 hands cleaning Garden for a month."

By contrast, the typical slaveholder in the antebellum South owned only 1 or 2 slaves, and their work was harvesting the cash crop.

Another clue about the enslaved African-Americans who worked in the garden comes from Daniel Turnbull's January-July 1860 journal entries. A constant refrain is "invalids in garden," consisting typically of five or six. Whether any of these "invalids" are the same people referenced by Martha in her gardening diary entries for the same months is unknown. Daniel Turnbull's entries suggest that workers not physically capable of fieldwork were used in the garden.

Martha's diary demonstrates that enslaved African-Americans performed specialized work in the gardens, in addition to all the menial maintenance work such as raking, potting, polishing the statues, etc. In short, some were gardeners, although Martha most likely would not have thought in these terms. These skilled workers performed such tasks as grafting and propagating.²⁰

The most prominently mentioned African-American working in the gardens is Augustus, whose name appears thirty-one times, far more than any other. Although it is purely speculative one can't help but wonder if Augustus was the "head gardener" among the African-Americans who labored in Rosedown's gardens both before and after the war. From Daniel Turnbull's succession we know that Augustus was 16 in 1861, one of seven children of Louisa, and valued at \$900. He is first mentioned in April 1858: "April we had 29 pretty japonicas [camellias] 59 from seed in ground 45 seedlings in Jars – 196 all together – 6 of them are of Augustus propagation." From January 20, 1861: "Many single Japonicas layed for engrafting on & an abundance of layers of every thing – bought Augustus a budding knife [specialized knife used in grafting] . . ."²¹

²⁰ The "layering" often referred to in Martha's entries is a method of propagation.

²¹ For all the Augustus entries, see Appendix II.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 31**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The name Charles appears prominently in the pre-war gardening diary entries, whether he be potting, putting down boxwood around the parterre, setting out suckers for pineapples, or propagating. Easily the most provocative Charles entry is for August 29, 1860: "Charles taking up his greenhouse plants that are in the open grounds – he potted & arranged his greenhouse plants."²²

Among the most tantalizing diary entries are those, admittedly very few, that suggest the independence of the enslaved work force as they worked in the garden, as independent as one can be within the context of slavery. The Turnbells were not constantly in residence at Rosedown. Various sources document trips to New Orleans, sometimes as much as a month, trips to the East, and in 1852, a five month trip to Europe. Who was in "charge" of the garden while its mistress was away? We simply do not know. One can't imagine the overseer being involved. His task was managing the big business, agricultural side of Rosedown. Whoever was in charge during the five month European trip had Martha's approbation. She picked up her garden entries after the trip with "We returned home 13th of Sept had a fine garden." Then there is the cryptic 1858 entry: "Garden, Greenhouse &c are in fine order so says Sarah." Could this be Sarah, her daughter? Or could it be the enslaved Sarah who "put down Japonica cuttings" in November 1855?

During and after the Civil War, some African-Americans stayed at Rosedown while others left. Among those listed as "now with the Yankees" by Martha Turnbull in 1864 is the esteemed washerwoman Aggy. Between 100 and 110 African-Americans are in Martha's list headed "All these ran off at the siege of Port Hudson [1863]." Whether these 100 to 110 were from Rosedown, or the entire Turnbull holdings, is not made clear.

A distinctive name repeated in the pre-war garden diary entries, but not mentioned after the war, is Primus (age 28 in Daniel Turnbull's 1862 succession and valued at \$1200). Primus is among those in Martha's list of enslaved people who "ran off" after the siege of Port Hudson (1863). Like Augustus, Primus performed both menial and advanced work. He and Augustus are sometimes referenced as working together on the same task.

While Primus left Rosedown during the war, his gardening co-worker Augustus is listed among the enslaved African-Americans who remained (as of at least 1864, when Martha Turnbull prepared the list). In an undated wartime entry he balked at working for his former mistress. Martha writes, "Augustus said he would not cut wood to put in my wood house when I told Ben to tell him to do it . . ." On June 17, 1864, he is referenced as being at work in the garden.

Curiously, there are no Augustus references in Martha's garden journal from between the above June 1864 entry and June 1870. One suspects he was away from Rosedown for some of this period, for his name is mentioned constantly from 1870 through January 10, 1889. The last Augustus reference is on August 11, 1894, when Martha writes, "All the walks on both sides of Garden in Perfect order never looked so nice since Augustus died." It is abundantly clear from this simple statement that Augustus was much valued and missed. This largely unknown "author" of the Rosedown landscape would have been only 44 when last referenced as being alive in 1889.

Martha Turnbull's diary entries in the immediate post-emancipation years show that she bargained with her former slaves to help maintain her garden, offering them either cash or food items in exchange for their labor. A typical entry reads: "1869 – Jany. 19th – Prenter trimming hedges - Penny cleaning front yard, gave her 2 lbs. Coffee – 2 lbs. Sugar – pint molasses." It is clear from these and numerous other entries throughout Martha's life that the work being done was bare maintenance, such as the hauling of leaves from the "Avenue," cleaning the front yard, cleaning the statues, etc.

²² Note Martha's use of the possessive "his."

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 32**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Like Augustus, formerly enslaved African-Americans sometimes balked: “When I ordered Celiame to scrub my kitchen she walked off and sat in her house for 3 days. Stepsy was impudent and would not cook. Elry laid up regularly every 12 days. For 9 days Lucinda refused to come and wait on me.”²³

TOUT ENSEMBLE

While Rosedown’s gardens are nationally significant in their own right, the estate as a *tout ensemble* – a whole greater than the sum of its parts – is of particular importance. With its “great house” (complete with Grecian wings) at the head of a 660-foot oak allée and its extensive pleasure gardens ornamented with summerhouses. Rosedown embodies the lifestyle of the antebellum South’s wealthiest planters in a way very few other surviving properties can. Writing in 1974 in his seminal study of enslaved African life, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*, Eugene Genovese singled out Rosedown as the “pinnacle”-- the “ideal.”²⁴ In addition to Rosedown, Turnbull in 1860 owned Styopa Plantation, with 225 enslaved people, and Hazelwood Plantation, with 74.

“On the Banks of the Mississippi many of the sugar and cotton planters live in edifices where within and without are exhibited all that artifice aided by wealth can produce.” This observation, made by a traveler in 1818, became even more apt in the heady prosperity of the 1830’s, ‘40s, and ‘50s when fortunes were made several times over by the South’s largest planters. While such individuals were only a tiny percentage of the total population in the South, they dominated the region economically, politically, and socially. Among them was Daniel Turnbull whose father had come to West Feliciana parish from Mobile, Alabama where he had established a trading post in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Daniel had gained an extensive education from a northern educational institution. In 1828 he married Martha Hilliard Barrow whose grandmother had brought her family to Louisiana from North Carolina. Both Martha and Daniel had inherited land from their families, but Daniel soon set out to increase his holdings by purchasing more tracts of land. In 1860 he owned three plantations with a combined labor force of 444 enslaved Africans.

The most visible sign of a planter’s wealth, taste and status was his residence, the “great house.” While most plantation houses were quite modest, mansions such as Rosedown loomed much larger in the collective psyche – and continue to loom much larger -- than their numbers would warrant. Frederick Douglass described growing up in the shadow of a great house and seeing it for the first time as a child: “It was a treat to my young and gradually opening mind to behold this elaborate exhibition of wealth, power, and beauty.” Genovese notes

²³ Undated wartime entry in Martha Turnbull’s gardening diary.

²⁴ Full quote: “Rosedown represents the pinnacle, the ideal, and by no means the common reality of plantation homes;” For further information on the history of enslaved African Americans in the American South see also: Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, *The Slaves’ Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas* (London: Frank Cass, 1995); Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Cultivation and Culture, Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993); J.W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); E.D.C. Campbell and K.S. Rice, eds., *Before Freedom Came: African-American Life in the Antebellum South* (Richmond: The Museum of the Confederacy, 1991); R.W. Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989); P.S. Foner and R.L. Lewis, eds., *Black Workers: A Documentary History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989); H.G. Gutman, “The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom: A Revised Perspective,” In *Power and Culture: Essays on the American Working Class*, ed. Ira Berlin, 357-379 (New York: Pantheon Press, 1987); J.M. Vlach, *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993); J.M. Vlach, “Not Mansions...But Good Enough: Slave Quarters as Bi-Cultural Expression,” In *Black and White: Cultural Interaction in the Antebellum South*, ed. T. Ownby (Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press, 1993); and J.M. Vlach, “Plantation Landscapes of the Antebellum South,” In *Before Freedom Came: African-American Life in the Antebellum South*, eds. E.D.C. Campbell, Jr. and K.S. Rice (Richmond: The Museum of the Confederacy, AF AM, 1991).

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 33**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

that though not the norm, “mansions like Rosedown dotted the landscape and fired the imagination of white and black alike, imparting that sense of power and permanence so necessary to sustain the claims of a landed ruling class.” For poor white farmers and enslaved Africans, who lived at best in adequate cabins and at worst in hovels, even a modest great house loomed as a mansion. One can only imagine “the awe and respect” commanded by a house the size of Rosedown set at the head of a 660-foot oak allée flanked by extensive pleasure gardens. By their very size and grandeur, such estates not only defined the planter’s wealth, but, according to Genovese, reaffirmed him as a powerful and dominating figure.

The great house image embodied by Rosedown has had a powerful hold on the imagination. Thanks to Margaret’s Mitchell’s enormously influential *Gone With The Wind*, people all over the world still equate the antebellum South with white columned houses of this and even larger size – houses where “within and without are exhibited all that artifice aided by wealth can produce.” What is remarkable about Rosedown is that there’s so much more than the main house, as impressive as it may be. There are comparable mansions from antebellum estates surviving in the South, but where else can one find so complete a picture of the immediate domestic setting around that mansion as at Rosedown? Even with the recent loss of the statues, Rosedown -- the *tout ensemble* -- remains a powerful image of the antebellum South.

The main house, as a work of architecture, contributes to the national significance of Rosedown. It was and is a major plantation residence - representing the small minority of great houses built by the South’s wealthiest planters. By and large, larger plantation residences took the standard form established in eighteenth century Virginia of a two story house, five bays wide, two rooms deep, with a central hall. This rigidly symmetrical model emerged as the standard gentleman’s house in Restoration-era Britain (mid to late seventeenth century). Its symmetrical and classical detailing marked the growing influence of the Renaissance ideal in Great Britain working its way down the social scale from royalty to the lesser gentry. This form and plan became the model for what was considered a “fine house” in the thirteen British colonies and later in the United States. Indeed, it held sway through the Greek-Revival era and beyond. In the southern United States it was the model for the larger plantation house, as seen in state after state.

The great house at Rosedown is one of a minority of plantation houses that aspired to something more. Instead of the standard central hall, it has a capacious entrance room, much more a room than a hall, with a graceful, curving mahogany staircase. Behind, where the rear of the hall would normally be, is a large dining room fully 23 feet long and 14 feet wide. The main block accommodates three substantial rooms across the front, giving it a wider and grander presence than the standard central hall plan so characteristic of large period houses. The substantial Grecian wings extend the façade considerably and add much to Rosedown’s stature as a mansion. Such a house would be impressive in any context, and so much more so when viewed through the perspective of a magnificent oak allée.

CONCLUSION

Pleasure gardens of the size and sophistication of Rosedown were in a small minority in the antebellum South and almost all of those that did exist, are long gone. The only comparable surviving properties are Middleton Place in South Carolina and Hampton National Historic Site in Maryland.

Many plantation houses across the South have been accorded NHL status, but they typically exist in splendid isolation as architectural landmarks - without the domestic landscape around them (including dependencies and ornamental gardens). Even Louisiana’s famed Oak Alley Plantation, as impressive as it is, is not nearly as complete a picture as Rosedown. At Oak Alley, a colonnaded great house stands at the head of a magnificent oak alley. The ornamental gardens and dependencies are long gone, as is true of other major River Road

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 34**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

plantation houses in Louisiana, including San Francisco (which stands amidst oil tanks) and Nottoway. Then there are the remarkably rare survivors like Evergreen Plantation (NHL, 1992) in Louisiana which has a main house, domestic dependencies, and a double row of twenty-two houses for enslaved Africans, but missing its once present ornamental gardens. Rosedown has the house and magnificent allée plus eighteen acres of pleasure gardens ornamented with a Greek Revival temple style building and three latticework summerhouses. Rosedown is a powerful image of an antebellum plantation domestic landscape at its very apex -- the world of the South's wealthiest planters -- a world made possible by the labor of enslaved Africans. It is distinguished as a designed domestic plantation landscape by its rarity, size, completeness and high state of integrity.

ROSEDOWN RECOGNITION

Much of the documentation for the gardens is from primary sources, either from the time of the garden's creation or from its restoration. In terms of secondary sources, historians of America's designed landscapes have generally focused on the Northeast, particularly the "country place" era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Scholarship on southern plantations generally has focused on well-known icons from Virginia such as Mount Vernon and Monticello, or coastal Carolina properties such as Middleton Place.²⁵ The earliest known references to Rosedown in published sources are William Spratling's *Old Plantation Homes of Louisiana* (1927), and two years later, Lyle Saxon's *Old Louisiana*. Its gardens are included in *Gardens of Colony and State* (1934), a massive tome compiled for the Garden Club of America. The entry, which includes two photos, repeats the family tradition of the gardens having been laid out by a French landscape architect and notes that the "many statues brought from abroad indicate the French taste."

Interestingly, Rosedown appeared in fiction with a "Gone with the Wind" description some five years before the legendary novel was published. The novel was *So Red the Rose* by Stark Young, who knew the Bowman sisters. Young made use of Rosedown as the main setting of his romantic best-selling story, calling it Montebello. "The three in the carriage," he wrote, "sat looking back at the house they had just come from. Along the avenue the light struck here and there on the statues with their marble pedestals, and on the walks with their green borders; and at the far end you saw the house, on which the last glow of the twilight rested, standing out among the garden trees . . ."

In a more serious and recent vein, Rosedown is featured in *Keeping Eden: A History of Gardening in America*, published by the Massachusetts Horticultural Society in 1992; *The Golden Age of Gardening in America* (1991); *If This House Could Talk . . . Historic Homes, Extraordinary Americans* (1999); and the just released *Gardens and Historic Plants of the American South* by James Cothran (2003). As noted elsewhere, the authors of *Golden Age* felt that the "plantation landscape reached its apogee in such exquisite creations as Rosedown . . . and Afton Villa." Although this book covers the country place era of 1890-1940, its authors "backtrack" for the South to the antebellum period, which they felt was that region's equivalent.

Most recently, Rosedown is one of four properties featured in the plantation gardens catalog section of James Cothran's *Gardens and Historic Plants of the American South*. The two featured from South Carolina and Georgia are quite small in comparison. The other, Evergreen in Louisiana, does not retain its ornamental garden. The extraordinary rarity and importance of Rosedown was confirmed in a

²⁵ For example, Ann Leighton's *For Comfort and Affluence: American Gardens of the Nineteenth Century* devotes only 13 pages of her 297 pages of text to the South.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 35National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

telephone conversation with Mr. Cothran in December 2003.

Mr. Cothran, president of the Southern Garden History Society, confirmed this phone conversation in a letter dated June 23, 2004 to the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office. In addition to “meeting the idealized standards of a large antebellum plantation (one that included both a fine house and high-style garden,” observes Mr. Cothran, “Rosedown possesses additional features that “sets it apart from other historic plantations of the period.” Among the most important distinguishing features cited by Cothran are: (1) the unusual combination of formal and informal design elements, a feature “seldom found in antebellum gardens of the American South;” (2) the gardens’ exceptional collection of period and heirloom plants; (3) the variety of surviving garden and landscape features (imposing avenue of oaks, hot house, gazebos, etc.); and (4) the “consistent level of stewardship that has existed throughout the history of Rosedown, resulting in a remarkable overall physical integrity of the property that is evident today.” Cothran concludes his letter, “ In summary, it is my opinion that Rosedown Plantation and Gardens has national significance and is worthy of landmark status as a quintessential antebellum plantation of the American South.”

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 36

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Bacot, H. Parrott, et al. *Marie Adrien Persac: Louisiana Artist*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2000.
- Berlin, Ira and Philip D. Morgan. *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas*. London, Frank Cass, 1995.
- Berlin, Ira and Philip D. Morgan, eds. *Cultivation and Culture, Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Blassingame, J.W. *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Bowman, James P., Family Papers. Lower Mississippi Valley Collection, Louisiana State University.
- Boyer, Marcel. *Plantations by the River: Watercolor Paintings from St. Charles Parish, Louisiana by Father Joseph M. Paret, 1859*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, Department of Geography and Anthropology, 2001.
- Brown, Erica. *Sixty Years of Interior Design: The World of McMillen*. New York: Viking Press, 1982.
- Brownstein, Elizabeth Smith. *If This House Could Talk . . . Historic Homes, Extraordinary Americans*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999.
- Campbell, E.D.C. and K.S. Rice, eds. *Before Freedom Came: African-American Life in the Antebellum South*. Richmond, VA: The Museum of the Confederacy, 1991.
- Cothran, James R. *Gardens and Historic Plants of the Antebellum South*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 2003.
- _____. Letter to author, June 23, 2004.
- Dawdy, Shannon Lee, ed. "Evidence of Creolization in the Consumer Goods of an Enslaved Bahamian Family," *Historical Archeology* 34, no. 3 (2000): 107-123.
- Fogel, R.W. *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery*. New York: Norton, 1989.
- Foner, P.S. and R.L. Lewis, eds. *Black Workers: A Documentary History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.
- Garden Club of America. *Gardens of Colony and State*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Genovese, Eugene D. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.
- Griswold, Mac and Eleanor Weller. *The Golden Age of American Gardens: Proud Owners, Private Estates, 1890-1940*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1991.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 37**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Gundaker, Grey. "What Goes Around Comes Around: Circles, Cycles, and Recycling in African-American Yard Work." In *Recycled Re-Seen: Folk Art from the Global Scrap Heap*, edited by Charlene Cerny and Suzanne Seriff, 72-81. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1996.

_____. "African-American History, Cosmology and the Moral Universe of Edward Houston's Yard." *Journal of Garden History* 13, no. 3 (1994): 179-205.

_____. "Tradition and Innovation in African-American Yards." *African Arts* 26, no. 2 (1993): 58-71.

Gunn, Ralph Ellis. Various drawings showing Rosedown's gardens "as is" and proposed, dated late 1950s through early 1960s, originals owned by Louisiana Office of State Parks.

_____. Rosedown slides. Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.

_____. "Report on Rosedown Plantation: Initial Survey." June 1956. Copy in National Register of Historic Places file. Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation. Baton Rouge, LA.

_____. "Report on the Proposed Design for the Restoration of the Flower Garden." November 10, 1959. Copy in National Register of Historic Places file. Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation. Baton Rouge, LA.

_____. "Report on the Proposed Restoration of the Gardens and Structures at Rosedown Plantation." December 1959. Copy in National Register of Historic Places file. Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation. Baton Rouge, LA.

_____. "Report on the Proposed Restoration of the South Garden, Rosedown Plantation." March 1960. Copy in National Register of Historic Places file. Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation. Baton Rouge, LA.

Gutman, H.G. "The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom: A Revised Perspective." In *Power and Culture: Essays on the American Working Class*, edited by Ira Berlin, pp. 357-379. New York: Pantheon, 1987.

Joyner, Charles. "The World of Plantation Slaves." In *Before Freedom Came: African-American Life in the Antebellum South*, edited by E.D.C. Campbell, Jr. with K.S. Rice, pp. 51-99. Richmond and Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1991.

Koch, Richard. Historic American Buildings Survey photos dated September 1934 and garden plan dated July 1930. From the private archives of Koch and Wilson, Architects, New Orleans, LA. Access to these materials provided by Robert J. Cangelosi, Jr., owner.

Leake, George M. Existing conditions floor plans of main house dated October 1960. Copy in National Register of Historic Places file. Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation. Baton Rouge, LA.

_____. Rosedown Plantation Pre-restoration photos. Provided by Mary Parke Luttrell.

Leighton, Ann. *American Gardens of the Nineteenth Century: For Comfort and Affluence*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 38**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

- Luttrell, Mary Parke. Interview by George M. Leake, March 1982. Typescript, National Register of Historic Places File. Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation. Baton Rouge, LA.
- Malone, Ann Patton. *Sweet Chariot: Slave Family and Household Structure in Nineteenth-Century Louisiana*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Mann, Rob. *2003 Annual Report for Management Units IV and V, Regional Archaeology Program, Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University*. August 2003.
- Menn, Joseph K. *The Large Slaveholders of Louisiana – 1860*. Pelican Publishing Co., 1964.
- Martin, Peter. *The Pleasure Gardens of Virginia: From Jamestown to Jefferson*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Massachusetts Horticultural Society. *Keeping Eden: A History of Gardening in America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1992.
- Otis, Denise. *Grounds for Pleasure: Four Centuries of the American Garden*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 2002.
- “Reflections of Rosedown.” VHS. Produced for the Underwoods. Copy on file in the Louisiana Office of State Parks.
- Rosedown Plantation Restoration Photo Collection, 1961-62. Louisiana State University Special Collections, Hill Memorial Library. Baton Rouge, LA.
- Seale, William. “Historic Furnishings Plan Rosedown.” 2 Vols. Prepared for Friends of Rosedown, December 2002.
- The Sixty Year Garden Diary of Martha Turnbull, Mistress of Rosedown Plantation, 1836-1896*. Published by Rosedown Plantation. St. Francisville, LA, 1996.
- Thompson, Robert Farris. *Face of the Gods, Art and Alters of Africa and the African Americans*. New York: Museum for African Art, 1993.
- _____. *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy*. New York: Random House, 1983.
- Turnbull-Bowman Papers. Lower Mississippi Valley Collection. Louisiana State University. Baton Rouge, LA.
- Turnbull, Daniel, succession, filed January 18, 1862. Original in West Feliciana Parish Courthouse, LA.
- Turner, Suzanne (author) and A.J. Meek (photographer). *The Gardens of Louisiana: Places of Work and Wonder*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1860 Slave Schedules, West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana. Washington, D.C., 1860.

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 39

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Vlach, J.M. *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

_____. "Not Mansions...But Good Enough: Slave Quarters as Bi-Cultural Expression". In *Black and White Cultural Interaction in the Antebellum South*, edited by T. Ownby. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1993.

_____. "Plantation Landscapes of the Antebellum South". In *Before Freedom Came: African-American Life in the Antebellum South*, edited by E.D.C. Campbell, Jr. and K.S. Rice, pp. 21-49. Richmond: The Museum of the Confederacy, AF AM, 1991.

Word, Ola Mae. "Reflections of Rosedown." Rosedown Plantation. St. Francisville, LA.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
 Previously Listed in the National Register.
 Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
 Designated a National Historic Landmark.
 Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #1101 (photos and data sheets only)
 Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #

Primary Location of Additional Data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
 Other State Agency
 Federal Agency
 Local Government
 University
 Other (Specify Repository): Louisiana Office of State Parks

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 374 acres

UTM References:	Zone	Easting	Northing
	A 15	654630	3408540
	B 15	655820	3409420
	C 15	656540	3407900
	D 15	655560	3407200

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION**Page 40**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Verbal Boundary Description:

The nominated acreage is shown as Lot F-1 on the attached property plat map entitled: *Compiled Map and Survey of Lot F-1, Being a Portion of Rosedown Plantation Located in Sections 67 and 68, T-3-S R-3-W, G.L.D., West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana.*

Boundary Justification:

The boundaries follow the current property lines of Rosedown Plantation to include all that remains of Rosedown's once extensive historic acreage that maintains integrity. (The property has been subdivided over the years since Milton and Catherine Underwood purchased it.)

ROSEDOWN PLANTATION

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 41

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Donna Fricker, National Register Coordinator [Landscape description and analysis by Suzanne Turner, Professor, School of Landscape Architecture, Louisiana State University.]

Address: Division of Historic Preservation
P.O. Box 44247
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70804

Telephone: (225) 342-8160

Date: March 2001

Edited by: Patty Henry and Erika Martin Seibert
National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Survey
1849 C Street, NW (2280)
Washington, DC 20240

Telephone: (202) 354-2216 and (202) 354-2217

DESIGNATED A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK
April 05, 2005