

Listed On:
VLR 12-13-1988
NRHP 08-08-1989

NPS Form 100-101
(Rev. 8-82)

DWBS No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Registration Form

VLR: 12/13/88

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations of eligibility for individual properties or districts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, styles, materials, and areas of significance, enter only the categories and subcategories listed in the instructions. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900a). Type all entries.

1. Name of Property

historic name: Mayfield Fortification
other names/site number: 44PW226

2. Location

street & number: [redacted] not for publication
city, town: Manassas vicinity
state: Virginia code: VA county: Prince William code: 152 zip code: 22110

3. Classification

Ownership of Property	Category of Property	Number of Resources within Property	
<input type="checkbox"/> private	<input type="checkbox"/> building(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Contributing	<input type="checkbox"/> Noncontributing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> public-local	<input type="checkbox"/> district		<input type="checkbox"/> buildings
<input type="checkbox"/> public-State	<input type="checkbox"/> site		<input type="checkbox"/> sites
<input type="checkbox"/> public-Federal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> structures
	<input type="checkbox"/> object		<input type="checkbox"/> objects
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total

Name of related multiple property listing: Civil War Properties, Prince William County, VA
Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register: 0

4. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this [x] 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 [x] meets [] does not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet.

Signature of certifying official: [Signature]
Date: June 16, 1989
State: Virginia Agency and Bureau: [redacted]

In my opinion, the property [] meets [] does not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet.

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. See continuation sheet.
 determined eligible for the National Register. See continuation sheet.
 determined not eligible for the National Register.
 removed from the National Register. other, (explain): _____
Signature of the Keeper _____ Date of Action _____

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (enter categories from instructions):

Defense: fortification

Current Functions (enter categories from instructions):

Landscape: unoccupied land

7. Description

Architectural Classification

(enter categories from instructions): N/A

Material (enter categories from instructions):

foundation:
walls: earthroof:
other:

Describe present and historic physical appearance. See continuation sheet

8. Statement of Significance

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

 nationally statewide locallyApplicable National Register Criteria A B C DCriteria Considerations (Exceptions) A B C D E F G

Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions):

Military

Period of Significance:

1861-1865

Significant Dates:

1861-1864

Cultural Affiliation: N/A

Significant Person: N/A

Architect/Builder: N/A

State significance of property, and justify criteria, criteria considerations, and areas and periods of significance noted above. See continuation sheet

9. Major Bibliographical References

See continuation sheet

Previous documentation on file (NPS): N/A
 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 #
 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: DHL
221 Governor Street, Richmond, VA 23219

10. Geographical Data

Acres of property: less than one acre

UTM References:

A [redacted] [redacted] / [redacted] /
Zone Easting Northing
C [redacted] [redacted] / [redacted] /
Zone Easting Northing

B [redacted] [redacted] / [redacted] /
Zone Easting Northing
D [redacted] [redacted] / [redacted] /
Zone Easting Northing

See continuation sheet

Verbal Boundary Description:

See continuation sheet

Boundary Justification:

The boundaries include the remains of Mayfield Fortification.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: L. Daniel Myers, Consultant Archaeologist
organization: Prince William County, Planning Office
street & number: [redacted]
city or town: Dunkirk

date: May 1989
telephone: (301) 257-3264
state: MD zip code: 20754

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 7 Page: 1

Property Type: 1st and 2nd Battle of Manassas

Summary Description

[REDACTED]

An archaeological investigation of this site in 1987 discovered a number of subsurface features and numerous artifacts. The majority of artifacts confirm the early 1860s date. Site integrity is high, but the site has been subjected to metal detection during the last 30 years.

Description

[REDACTED] Quartz veins, quartzite, and sandstone cobbles occur in the streambeds. Historically, an oak-hickory-chestnut forest association characterized the Piedmont Lowlands. At the time of the Civil War, this forest was destroyed for use in military activities. Today, small pines, cedar trees, poison ivy, honeysuckle, Virginia creeper, and patches of dense thorny vegetation are located on the site.

[REDACTED]

Confederate troops held the fort until March 1862. Union troops occupied the fort from August 1862 until November 1864 (Fehr 1937).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 7 Page: 2

The fortification or redoubt is a closed horseshoe-shaped earthen structure with an entrance to the south, according to McComb's 1862 map (Figure 1). This map shows three structures in the interior of the fort, and embrasures are shown circling the fort. Period photographs of several forts in the area show revetments on the exterior slopes of the parapet. Defined as a facing used to support an embankment, revetting was done with a variety of materials including planks, barrels, or vertical log poles with twigs and brush woven between layers of earth (Fehr 1987: 2). Due to the parapet walls and clay soils within the fortification, poor drainage makes the redoubt somewhat swampy (Fehr 1987: 4).

The construction of the redoubt was done by slave laborers and local troops. According to William King, who was stationed at Mayfield, he oversaw the "mounting [of] a part of the 24 thirty-two pounder guns" at the fort (Fehr 1987: 2). However, another witness

reported that (s)ome slight field-works constructed for the defense of the ~~defence~~ Manassas Junction were armed with fourteen or fifteen old twenty-four-pounders on naval carriages, and occupied by two thousand men. The heavy artillery was under the command of naval officers (Johnston 1874: 40).

Doug Harvey, of the Manassas City Museum, believes that the second report was in error regarding the gauge of the cannons and agrees with King's report of the thirty-two pounders (per. com., June, 1988). Currently, no one has certain knowledge on how many cannons were deployed or how many went to the Mayfield fortification.

Today, no details of the fort's architecture are apparent on the surface. The parapet is represented by only a low mound that slopes to the exterior and interior. Presently, the dimensions of the site are about 200 feet north-south (grid north) and 200 feet east-west (Figure 2). There is a break, approximately 20 feet long, in the southern wall of the fort which formed an entrance or gorge. In addition to the entrance, there is another break about 15 feet long in the southeast wall. Approximately 2 to 2-1/2 feet of the upper parapet walls are visible.

The 1987 archaeological investigation divided the site into two areas: one within the earthwork proper and the other outside the parapets of the fort. Artifacts found inside the parapets include:

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 7 Page: 3

bottle glass, ceramics, miscellaneous kitchen-related items, nails, window glass, plaster, pistol and rifle bullets, rifle balls, minie balls, buckshot, cannon fragments, a brass friction primer and fragments, brass buttons, brass buckle hook, a lead weight, a brass eyebolt fastener, a copper penny, a spike, swivel fasteners, an iron ring, forged bolts, a machine bolt head, a horse bit, chain links, a horse shoe, a possible scythe wedge, and a cast iron wheel hub fragment (Fehr 1987; Gardner and Walker 1987).

Six features inside the fortress walls were recorded archaeologically. Feature 1 is a stone foundation wall partially uncovered in the central northeast section of the fortification. It measures approximately 2 feet wide (north-south) and 13 feet long (east-west). No corners were encountered. Artifacts recovered were pearlware sherds, stoneware sherds, glass fragments, cut nails, and wrought spike nails. Features 2 and 3 are rock piles (functions unknown). Feature 4 consists of fire-cracked rocks. It is thought to be a small prehistoric hearth. Feature 5 is a stone foundation wall and possible stone floor. It is in the north central portion of the site and measures 2 feet wide (east-west) and approximately 6 feet long (north-south). A section of this feature may represent a floor or platform. Artifacts uncovered in Feature 5 include glass (window or bottle) and cut nails. Feature 6 is a dark unidentified stain which appears to have originated prior to the Civil War.

Outside the fortress wall, recovered artifacts include the following: glass fragments, ceramic fragments, metal fragments, leather pieces, coal fragments, quartz flakes, and one possible boneless brittle. No features were identified outside the fort.

Prehistoric artifacts were found both inside and outside the fort. One suspected Halifax projectile point, ranging from 3700 to 2500 B.C., and one sand-tempered Late Woodland pottery sherd were discovered through excavation. Other prehistoric artifacts were quartz flakes, a chert flake, a quartzite flake, quartz chunks, a quartz core, a quartz scraper, and a possible hammerstone. At this time, no identifiable cultural affiliation can be definitely associated with these artifacts.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 7 Page: 4

Construction of an apartment complex just east, south, and west of the Mayfield Fortification was started in 1986 by the Holladay Corporation. Relic hunters have known about the fortification for quite some time and have caused some disruption of the site.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 8 Page: 1

Summary Significance Description

The Mayfield Fortification site is significant for its association with the First and Second Battles of Manassas and for the potential information it would yield archaeologically. Although there is no direct evidence that the Mayfield Fortification was involved in combat activities at the time of these two battles, of the original forts that guarded Manassas Junction, it is the only fortification that remains intact. Archaeologically, other aspects of interest include artifact distribution, intra-site variability, the construction and maintenance of the fort itself, and the relationship of the Mayfield Fortification to other forts in and outside the area. Over the last 120 years, development has destroyed the other eleven forts that defended Manassas Junction.

Historical Background

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Manassas Junction was chosen for its strategic position in the Northern Virginia area. The building of fortifications in and around Manassas Junction was a key factor in the Confederacy occupancy of Northern Virginia. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] railroad tracks and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. After March 1862 Union forces occupied the fort and in late August, the redoubt probably was used in skirmishes led by General Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson (Fehr 1987: 2). Just before the Second Battle of Manassas, these skirmishes led to Jackson's recapturing Manassas Junction. This capture was brief and the Union forces regained control of the town shortly afterward.

The supervision of the construction of the Mayfield redoubt was done by Colonel G. H. Terrett, one of four Confederate engineers in the Northern Virginia area. Using slaves and local troops, Colonel Terrett directed the building of the redoubt until General Beauregard took command in June 1861. Both Beauregard and Terrett played vital roles in the Confederate occupation of Manassas Junction and the First and Second Battles of Manassas.

The Mayfield Fortification site could yield potentially significant information through archaeological research. There is a dearth of

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 8 Page: 2

Information about Civil War sites in general, and Civil War forts in particular. In the case of the Mayfield Fortification, artifact distributions from in and out of the fort need to be plotted and analyzed by particular level, provenience, etc., and compared with corresponding data from other excavation units. More specifically, the diachronic and synchronic placement of artifacts and their spatial arrangement within the site may be of archaeological significance. The intra-site variability of the above artifact and feature distributions of the site can be studied, archaeologically, to demonstrate artifact concentration or connections between individual features. Certain structural evidence may indicate that the site was built in different stages, revealing the construction sequence of the site. Examination of the structural and artifact assemblages and patterning has great potential for contributing to many themes in historical archaeology.

While development has destroyed the other eleven forts that surrounded Manassas Junction, two other fortifications that existed in the surrounding area, Signal Hill (44PW133) and Wakeman (44PW227) have been tested archaeologically. Fehr (1987) c.f., Gardner and Walker 1987) has done a preliminary test excavation at the Wakeman fortification and McGarry (1983) did a preliminary survey of Signal Hill. Each of these sites are functionally different. An undocumented fortification, Wakeman, in all likelihood, was used by Union troops to guard the Orange and Alexandria Railroad during the latter part of the war. Conversely, Signal Hill was a fortified, Confederate signal station during the first part of the war. While all three sites were used in different capacities, they all have certain characteristics in common. The materials of their construction, preparation, and maintenance are all factors that archaeological excavation can help determine. Their specific use may have changed during different Federal or Confederate occupations of the sites.

More specifically, additional archaeological research at Mayfield would likely reveal whether or not the fort and its troops participated directly in the battles of First and Second Manassas. Excavation of a portion of the parapets and selected areas such as the emplacements can provide the data necessary to reconstruct how the fort was built and its appearance during the war. These data could also be applicable to projecting the methods of construction and appearance of the other eleven Manassas Junction forts which have since disappeared. Artifacts, especially remnants of

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 8 Page: 3

artillery, may resolve the debate and how many and what kinds of artillery were located at Mayfield.

Once the physical design of the fort is determined, the researcher could be better able to determine what was in the minds of the Confederate military engineers and leaders when the Manassas Junction forts were built early in the war. For example, one could speculate that a fort built earlier rather than later in the Civil War would more closely approximate what forts were "suppose" to look like according to mid-nineteenth century military training and engineering texts. In all likelihood, as the war progressed and resources and labor became scarce and battle lessons were learned, the design and construction methods of forts changed. The designs of later forts probably more closely represent the specific military purpose of each individual fort rather than a general "ideal" fort design.

Artifacts such as buttons and decorative military items should yield information on the Confederate regiments that manned the fort which in turn would tell us more about the defensive positioning of other troops around Manassas Junction. With sufficient excavation and subsurface integrity and quantity of artifacts, statements might also be made about the organization of the troops while manning the fort. Presumably, there was a division of labor between officers and enlisted men. Perhaps this could be seen in a differential distribution of military clothing artifacts. Further archaeological studies would also provide information on the extent to which the Union army occupied the Mayfield Fort after the spring of 1862.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 9 Page: 1

Pehr, A. M.

1937 Archeological Investigations at 44PW226 and 44PW227, Two Civil War Earthworks in the City of Manassas, Virginia. Prepared by Thunderbird Archeological Association for the City of Manassas, Virginia.

Gardner, W. M. and J. M. Walker

1967 A Brief Summary of Archeological Investigations at the Hope House, the Mayfield Fortification, and the Wakeman Redoubt. Prepared by Thunderbird Archeological Associates for the Manassas City Museum, Manassas, Virginia.

Ranson, J. M.

1958 Drill Exp. Reminders... Manassas: National Capital Publishers, Inc.

Conston, J. C. , General.

1874 Narrative of Military Operations: Directed, During the Late War Between the States. New York: D. Appleton and Company

McCarry, T. E.

1983 The Phase I Survey of the Proposed Park Development in the Signal Hill and Union Mill Tracts, City of Manassas Park, Prince William County, Virginia. Prepared for the City of Manassas Park, Virginia.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number: 10 Page: 1

Verbal Boundary Description:

[REDACTED]