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BACKGROUND OF STUDY

Glen Leven is located four miles south of Nashville at 4000 Franklin Pike, Nashville, Tennessee. Franklin Pike borders the property on the west, running north to south between Franklin and Nashville, and Interstate 65 borders the property on the East also running north and south. Glen Leven Presbyterian Church rests on the property’s northern border. Father Ryan High School and residential properties occupy its southern border. Historically, the Nashville & Decatur Railroad developed tracks east of the home running north to south. Few places are better examples of how the three great transportation revolutions—the turnpike movement, the railroad system, and the Interstate Highway—shaped the Tennessee landscape.

The history of Glen Leven began over two centuries ago. Almost as old as our country itself, this land, its structures, and the family that inhabited them provide a unique opportunity to gain insight into the significance of protecting and preserving our heritage. It is a story of birth and death, happiness and sadness, war and peace, tragedy and triumph, poverty and excess. Few families have spanned such a long period upon the same land or provided such a distinct record. This history tells the story of a landscape worth protecting for future generations to enjoy. Glen Leven, is composed of many unique elements, and an understanding of these elements will enable a better interpretation of the farm, including architecture, agricultural history, social history, development of transportation, war and its impact on the landscape.

The property is now owned by the Land Trust of Tennessee, a generous gift from the previous owner, Susan Thompson West, upon her death. She left detailed instructions as to future use for the property, with the general stipulation that the property cannot be further subdivided or developed and the house must be maintained. The Protected Tracts contain approximately 60.28 acres of land divided between two parcels. The first parcel covers approximately 12.70 acres. This acreage does contain a flexible boundary of +/-5 acres. The Hermitage Hotel currently uses Protected Tract I to organically produce vegetables for their restaurant. Protected Tract II is the majority of Susan West’s gift, and this section has the most stringent limitations.

1950s aerial of Glen Leven. Image courtesy of the Tennessee Department of Transportation.
This Historic Structure Report (HSR) is the result of a graduate seminar course in historic preservation at Middle Tennessee State University during the Spring of 2010. In 2008-2009, the Land Trust for Tennessee carried out various group discussions, meetings, and workshops about potential futures for the property. The firms of Tuck Hinton Architects and Hawkins and Associates developed a feasibility study for the property. The National Trust for Historic Preservation held a workshop at Glen Leven in October 2009. These various discussions identified the need for a more comprehensive history of the farm.

In the MTSU Historic Preservation seminar, seventeen students researched and assessed the property and provided recommendations for preservation and future use. The report was prepared and edited with the assistance of staff at the Middle Tennessee State University Center for Historic Preservation, including Director Carroll Van West, Programs Manager Anne-Leslie Owens and Projects Coordinator Elizabeth Moore. Staff assistance from the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area came from Preservation Specialist Michael Gavin.

Dr. West divided the class into six groups. The house exterior group prepared a detailed description of each elevation of the building, assessed preservation needs and photo-documented damage, conducted a paint analysis, and provided recommendations for preservation and future use. The house interior group prepared a detailed description of each room in the building, assessed preservation needs and photo-documented damage, conducted a paint analysis, and provided recommendations for preservation and future use. The outbuildings group measured and photo-documented each outbuilding, researched the historic use of each outbuilding, assessed preservation needs, and provided recommendations for preservation and future use. The farm landscape group measured and photo-documented each barn, researched barn and field historic uses and evolution, researched aerial maps and photographs of the property, assessed preservation needs, and provided recommendations for preservation and future use. The history team researched the history of the property and family, provided historical context, assessed and photo-documented existing environmental resources, and provided recommendations for further research and future use. The archaeology team prepared a Phase I archaeological report including assessment of archaeological potential, areas for further investigation, and recommendations for future archaeological work.
PROPERTY HISTORY

FAMILY HISTORY OF GLEN LEVEN FOUNDERS, 1780-1848

Thomas Thompson, the founder of the Glen Leven property, was born in Orange County, North Carolina, on November 24, 1759. Thompson was one of the six sons and three daughters of Robert and Letitia (Lettice) Thompson. He grew up living on two 640-acre land grants secured by his father in 1753. Almost twelve years later on May 16, 1771, Robert Thompson was killed prior to the Battle of Alamance Creek while part of a group called the Regulators. After repeated legal pleas for tax leniency, fighting seemed imminent between British Governor Tryon of North Carolina and the Regulators. In an attempt to quell the impending hostilities, Robert Thompson accompanied a pastor, Dr. Caldwell, to a council with Governor Tryon. Unfortunately, the exchange between the two groups did not produce the desired results for either side and hostilities ensued. Three separate and corroborating accounts of this meeting exist and although varying in detail, each confirms that Thompson was killed during or shortly after the initial meeting by Tryon or members of his militia. Family members contend that Robert Thompson’s “blood was the first shed in the War for American Independence,” and are proud to proclaim him as a “distinguished ancestor.”

Like his father before him, Thompson enlisted in the North Carolina militia between 1774 and 1779 and served for a period of ninety days during the initial stages of the American Revolution. Although exciting at times, Thompson found war a relatively boring and dangerous endeavor. Upon returning to Orange County in the late 1770s, Thomas decided to move westward into the interior wilderness. His objective was to move to a small bluff settlement on the Cumberland River that had been settled by men under James Robertson and financed by Richard Henderson. This was the beginning of the Nashville we know today.

Thompson began his overland travel with John Buchanan, his wife Margaret and children, James Mulherin, and Mulherin’s brother. During their travel the group chanced upon another group led by James Robertson and joined their party. Moving down from Kentucky, Thomas and the remainder of Robertson’s group arrived in Nashville after crossing the frozen Cumberland River. Conflicting sources show that Thompson arrived there between December 1779 and February of 1780. In the latter year, at age twenty-one, he built a cabin in the new settlement overlooking the Cumberland River.

2 Ibid, 26, 31, 41, 42.
3 Ibid, 31.
On May 1, 1780, the new settlers came together to draft and sign the Cumberland Compact. This document served two purposes for the 250 men who inscribed their names upon it. The compact served not only to govern their new settlement, but as a land-buying contract between Richard Henderson and the settlers.9

The American Revolution still raged in the fall of 1780, and Thompson decided to return to the Carolinas to rejoin the war effort. Unfortunately, his second experience in the militia did not end as well as his first, and Thompson was captured during one of British General Lord Cornwallis’ raids of the Southern Campaign. Little detail of his imprisonment is known, and he was eventually released under unknown circumstances.

Thompson returned to the bluff settlement in 1783 where he “endured the hardships of pioneer life and dangers of Indian attack.”10 In the late 1780s he returned once again to North Carolina where he married Nancy Thompson on January 22, 1789. Conflicting sources claim that Nancy was his distant cousin.11 Other sources deny that claim, but state that Nancy was of “somewhat better blood than Thomas.”12 Thompson brought his new bride back to Tennessee in 1790 where they made their home on a 640-acre tract of land granted to him as payment for his services during the Revolution. The date that Thompson acquired the land in one account was as early as 1780 when he first arrived at the settlement,13 while another placed this acquisition in 1783 after being released from British forces.14 Yet still another account contends that Thompson did not claim his grant until after 1789 when he returned to Nashville with his wife.15 The original grant deed however states the following:

THOMAS THOMPSON - NC – No. 255 – Reg. May 13, 1790
For 10 lbs per 100 acres paid by Thomas Thompson was granted a tract of land containing 640 acres in Davidson County on the south side of the Cumberland River and waters of Browns Creek adjoining Jonathon Drake’s corner and William Simpson’s line. Surveyed for Thomas Thompson July 15, 1785 by James Mulherin, D.S. in consequence of a Warrant no. 132. Located Jan. 15 1784. July 13, 1788.16

The language of this grant supports the second claim which suggests that the land was acquired in 1783, located by Thompson in early 1784, surveyed in 1785, and that while the Thompsons had already owned the property for seven years, it was finally registered in 1790. During this period he built a log house near modern-day Thompson Lane that became known as

---

13 Ibid, 32.
Thompson’s Station, which was later the site of the Beaman Bottling Company. This dwelling would not only provide a home for his wife and family, but also shelter against possible Indian attacks. One source claimed that a brother of Thompson’s surveyed the land, but evidence shows that James Mulherin completed the survey. Nonetheless, either through a faulty survey, or through unclear or inadequate documentation of land sales, disputes erupted between relatives and neighbors over Thompson’s land boundaries. By 1797 he had sold the southern portion of his land to Sampson Williams, and a middle section to his brother Jason Thompson. Both transactions were hampered by uncertain land boundaries. Because of these disputes, as well as financial difficulties stemming from resolving the debts of his friends, not only was Thomas’s acreage greatly reduced but financial problems began to build. It was stated that Thompson “was more full of energy than of business sense,” and that he was “greatly embarrassed on account of his going security for his friends” which soon led to a mortgage on his remaining land and legal actions that troubled him almost until his death.

By 1800, Thompson’s acreage was greatly reduced and through his later years it looked as if he might lose what remained of his lands. Years earlier, on June 1, 1793, Thompson and his wife Nancy had welcomed the arrival of their son John, who was born in the stockade on Brown’s Creek. Unbeknownst to Thomas at the time, John Thompson would become one of the first and most influential and prosperous, developers of Glen Leven. John was the first son of his parents’ five children, which included John’s brother Robert, who died quite young, and three sisters. John Thompson began working diligently as soon as he was old enough with only two slave hands. Thompson not only worked his father’s land, but also worked with other local farmers, taking whatever work was available from them. As John’s determination grew, so did his workforce, and it was said that as a young man he “worked in the fields beside his slaves” and “earned enough money to buy others.” This fact is presented in Davidson County Deed Book “T”, 1829-1835, which reads as follows:

300) JOHN THOMPSON OF PHILLIP & SALLY CAMPBELL
BILL of SALE - Reg 2 July 1832
We, PHILLIP CAMPBELL & SALLY CAMPBELL, his wife,
Have sold to JOHN THOMPSON all our interest in a certain negro
woman, named Milley, about thirty four years of age.
11 April 1832 PHILLIP CAMPBELL SALLY CAMPBELL
Test: ALLEN COTTON, JOHN SANDERS

Thompson, “The Thompson Family,” 32.
Clements, A Past Remembered, 82.
Clements, A Past Remembered, 82.
Ibid, 82.
Clayton, History of Davidson County, Tennessee, 68.
Clements, A Past Remembered, 84.
Mary Sue Smith, Davidson County, Tennessee, Deed Books T and W, 1829-1835 (Bowie, MD: Heritage Books INC., 1994), 112.
It has not yet been identified where Milley and the other Thompson slaves lived at Glen Leven, but during John Thompson’s years, the number of African American slaves owned by the family expanded steadily.

In a relatively short period of time, John Thompson earned enough money to pay off the mortgages against his father’s land and became the sole owner of the old home. 26 Eventually, Thompson “managed to accumulate enough money to not only salvage his father’s place, but to buy back the land which had been sold to Sampson Williams,” and to wage “a successful court battle to gain control of the disputed acreage which was claimed by his Uncle Jason.” 27

Although John Thompson was financially stable and successful in his business practices, his family life “was filled with misfortune.” 28 In 1823 Thompson married his first wife Mary Elizabeth Washington. John and his new bride made their home in a large log house that he built in 1824 as the “blockhouse was no longer suitable for a residence.” 29 This log building was the first of three dwellings built one half mile to the west of the blockhouse, facing east, and was located in about the same location as the present Glen Leven house stands today. 30 Mary Washington and John Thompson had two daughters, Mary E.W., and Margaret Adelaide, both of whom were tubercular and died during their teenage years in 1844 and 1841, respectively. 31 Mary Washington Thompson died in 1826 shortly after giving birth. 32 Two years later in 1828, John’s mother Nancy passed away in the log house and was buried in the Thompson family cemetery located on the property. The exact location of the cemetery on the property is unclear. However, five other family members would be buried in the cemetery before its removal on March 11, 1882. All eight of the Thompson family who were buried there were exhumed and re-interred in Section 9, Lot 91, Mt. Olivet Cemetery, Nashville, TN. 33

Thompson married again in 1830 to a widow named Betsy Turley Buchanan. Unfortunately, she died while giving birth to their son, John Jr., in 1831. John Jr. died in the summer of 1832. 34 In that same year Thompson married another widow named Martha Dunn Rawlings who had a son from her first marriage named Robert Rawlings. 35 John also had a

26 Thompson, “The Thompson Family,” 33; Clements, A Past Remembered, 82.
27 Clements, A Past Remembered, 82.
28 Ibid, 82.
30 Jordan, “Glen Leven,” 2; Orr Interview, January 1, 1963.
32 Clements, A Past Remembered, 82.
35 Thompson, “The Thompson Family,” 33.
daughter by Martha named Ann Elizabeth, who grew to adulthood and married Joseph W. Horton, a hardware merchant in Nashville.\textsuperscript{36}

During the 1830s Glen Leven first became known for its gardens, with family records showing that Thompson had ordered several varieties of flowering bulbs from Holland.\textsuperscript{37} Even as the fragrance and color of yellow narcissi, daffodils, and blue, white, plumed and grape hyacinths began to brighten the spring of 1837, John’s father Thomas died just as his wife Nancy had nine years earlier, upon the land that his son had saved and in the log house that he had built.\textsuperscript{38} He died as he had lived as a “plain, unassuming man, charitable towards all, and hospitable to the poor,” and was buried next to his wife in the family cemetery.\textsuperscript{39}

![Portraits of John Thompson and Mrs. John Thompson](image)

These portraits of John Thompson and Mrs. John Thompson were painted by famous Tennessee artist Washington Cooper. Having a Cooper portrait was a way the state’s planter and merchant elite underscored their social position in the 1840s and 1850s. It is believed that “Mrs. John” is Martha Dunn Rawlings Thompson. Portraits courtesy of Tennessee Portrait website, Colonial Dames.

At age fifty-five, John Thompson was forced to mourn the loss of yet another wife when Martha died in 1848.\textsuperscript{40} Intriguingly, Martha Thompson provides an interesting and conflicting account of how the property received the name “Glen Leven.” The most commonly known account of the property’s name was believed to come from a traveler who visited the property in the late 1850s after the third and final house had been built. This account states that “Late one evening, not long after the house was built, a well traveled visitor looked out over the rolling lands which lay along Brown’s Creek toward a range of hills rising in the distance. In the fading light the expanse of fields and pastures gave the appearance of water, and after the visitor commented that the view from the house resembled the view from the island castle at Loch

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, 33; Clayton, \textit{History of Davidson County, Tennessee}, 68.


\textsuperscript{38} Roberta Seawell Brandau, ed. \textit{History of Homes and Gardens of Tennessee}.

\textsuperscript{39} Clayton, \textit{History of Davidson County, Tennessee}, 68; Davidson County Cemetery Survey.

\textsuperscript{40} Orr Papers, “Genealogical Data of the Thompson Family,” Box 4, Item 6.
Leven in Scotland, the plantation was named Glen Leven.\textsuperscript{41} To the contrary, Mrs. Mary Thompson Orr, John's granddaughter, remembered in a 1963 interview that Martha, who was fond of reading Scottish literature and novels, had picked up the name from her readings, and named the property accordingly.\textsuperscript{42} The Peabody educator and Nashville novelist Alfred L. Crabb attributes the name to the novels of Walter Scott, who was very popular among the plantation elite. Crabb points out that several Nashville antebellum estates share place names taken from Scott's novels. Regardless of its origin, the name has steadfastly endured until the present.

In 1851, John Thompson once again married (His granddaughter Mary Thompson Orr later referred to him as “a marrying gentleman.”).\textsuperscript{43} He had made the acquaintance of a young widow named Mary Hamilton House after her husband, George W. House, had died of fever in September of 1850. John must have made an impression on twenty-eight year old Mary, and her letters attest that by the late summer of 1851 Mary was “writing her brother Joseph Daviess Hamilton about her impending marriage with the thrice widowed John Thompson of Nashville.”\textsuperscript{44} John and Mary married on October the 23, 1851, at a ceremony performed by Dr. John T. Edgar on the grounds of the Nashville Female Academy.\textsuperscript{45} At the time it seemed as if the Thompson name would end with John, because he was fifty-eight years old and had only daughters surviving from his first three marriages.\textsuperscript{46} (Mary also had a daughter named Sallie by her first marriage, which brought the number of girls living in the house to three.) In 1852 Mary had a son whom they named John Thompson, Jr. Two years later in 1854, they welcomed the arrival of their second son, Joseph Hamilton Thompson.

AN ANTEBELLUM PLANTATION

Throughout the early to mid 1800s, Thompson became “engaged in a variety of economic endeavors,” and “displayed a marked financial ability.”\textsuperscript{47} In addition to the plantation, Thompson and his ever-growing number of African American slaves operated commercial businesses in downtown Nashville.

In this period Thompson began accumulating “quite a fortune,” and his granddaughter, Mary Thompson Orr remembered that even with a limited education he was a “very meticulous and careful bookkeeper,” and stated that “Every time he sold a bunch of celery, he didn’t spell it right but he put it down.”\textsuperscript{48} Family legend attributes this prosperity to Thompson’s “innate canniness,” and that quality would continue to help him prosper and attain the title “John Thompson, Gold Farmer” from a local Nashville newspaper.\textsuperscript{49} John’s activities also garnered

\textsuperscript{41}Clements, A Past Remembered, 84.
\textsuperscript{42}Orr Interview, January 1, 1963.
\textsuperscript{43}Orr Interview, May 11, 1958.
\textsuperscript{44}Mary Hamilton Thompson Orr Papers, 1791-1896, and Addition, 1779-1955. “Scope and Content,” Box 4, Item 6, (Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, TN), 1969.
\textsuperscript{45}Orr Papers, “Genealogical Data of the Thompson Family,” Box 4, Item 6.
\textsuperscript{46}Jordan, “Glen Leven,” 2.
\textsuperscript{47}Clements, A Past Remembered, 82.
\textsuperscript{48}Thompson, “The Thompson Family,” 33.
\textsuperscript{49}Jordan, “Glen Leven,” 2.
him the notoriety of being the “last farmer of the family to make his acres pay,” and his activities eventually allowed him to “buy more and more land adjoining his Brown’s Creek plantation, which eventually grew to include nearly 1,000 acres.”

But it is misleading to portray Thompson solely as a farmer who raised himself to success through hard work. He actively pursued the latest in transportation technology for his farm. In the late 1820s, he supported and invested in the first major turnpike in Middle Tennessee. The creation of the Franklin Turnpike Company came at the last day of December 1829, five years prior to the 1834 state constitution’s endorsement of a statewide system of internal improvements and six years before later expansions in state internal improvement programs for turnpikes in the late 1830s. Turnpikes, along with banks and railroads, were the primary economic development tools pursued by state and local officials during these internal improvement campaigns. The Tennessee General Assembly approved the first state turnpike corporation in late 1829 by chartering the Franklin Turnpike Company. This charter was later amended in 1835 and 1837. When the turnpike opened for business in 1838, John Thompson was among the initial stockholders of the company.

Thompson aggressively pursued railroad development. In 1850, he was an initial member of the board of commissioners for the Nashville and Alabama Railroad (later the Nashville and Decatur), which passed through the northern part of his plantation once the route was developed later in the decade. A year later, on March 24, 1851, a law passed by the Kentucky legislature allowing for the incorporation of the Mississippi and Nashville Railroad Company listed John Thompson as one of the company commissioners for Nashville. Transportation so defined Glen Leven that one-third of the land between the pike and the railroad was known as the homeplace. The Thompson property was located in the ideal place to readily ship its agricultural harvest as well as its mature livestock.

The central location of Glen Leven in the region’s transportation system mirrored Thompson’s central position among Nashville’s plantation elite. As early as 1832, he contributed to the city’s cultural life by serving as the recording secretary for the Tennessee State Lyceum, an important early cultural institution. Probably in 1840s, Thompson and his wife sat for the noted portrait painter Washington Cooper. In 1947, Thompson received one of his first political positions as one of the inspectors for the Tennessee State Penitentiary.

Thompson’s level of slave ownership also separated him not only from the majority of Davidson County farmers but further distinguished him among the ranks of the county’s slave owners. In the 1830s John owned almost fifty slaves, and by the 1840s that number had grown to seventy-five.51 Compare those totals to the patterns traced by Donald L. Winters in his study *Tennessee Farming, Tennessee Farmers* (1994) where less than 5 percent of Tennessee farmers owned 20 or more slaves; far fewer still owned more than 50 slaves. The number of slaves working the lands and properties of the Thompsons distinguished the estate from those of their neighbors as much as the Cooper portraits hanging in the house.

Transportation advantages explain part of why slavery was so prosperous for Thompson. His property was also well equipped to cultivate crops and raise livestock, which not only provided for the family and slaves but also produced foodstuffs that were marketable in a wider regional market. The Middle Tennessee region is a fertile area for agriculture where cotton, wheat, oats, potatoes, tobacco, corn, and livestock flourish. The soil of the Glen Leven

50 Ibid, 2; Clements, *A Past Remembered*, 82.
property is composed of two distinct types of soil, both of which can produce impressive agricultural yields. The majority of the soil found on the property is Maury Silt loam (MaB), 2 to 7 percent slopes. This soil consists of a 7 inch surface layer of dark brown silt loam, with a three tiered layer of subsoil that extends to a depth of 65 inches. This lower level is described as “brown and reddish brown, friable silty clay loam in the upper part; reddish brown, firm silty clay in the middle part; and yellowish red, firm silty clay in the lower part.”\textsuperscript{52} This soil type is classified as good for grain and seed crops, grasses, wild herbaceous plants, hardwood trees, coniferous plants, open land wildlife, and woodland wildlife. The yields per acre of crops and pasture are as follows: 125 bushels corn; 3,300 pounds of tobacco; 40 bushels soybeans; 50 bushels wheat; and the pasture land can provide forage for 9.5 animals per acre for a 30-day period.\textsuperscript{53}

The second type of soil found on the property is Stiversville loam (StC), 3 to 12 percent slopes. This soil forms a peninsula that extends north-south through the lowland area of Brown’s Creek and is bordered on the east and west sides by Maury Silt loam (MaB). The surface layer is composed of 8 inches of dark brown loam, and the lower portion is composed of loam subsoil that extends to a depth of 53 inches. This soil contains small areas were limestone is present at depths less than 40 inches, and often exposed. Limestone bedrock is found at a depth of 60 inches. This soil has “medium potential for row crops and high for small grains, hay, and pasture.”\textsuperscript{54} From its formation, these rich soils helped the Thompson farm prosper until it ceased activity in 2007.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{thompson.jpg}
\end{center}

Early photograph of John Thompson, c. 1860 that was auctioned in the estate sale of 2007.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, 88, 76.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, 25.
During the 1850s John Thompson owned a total of sixty slaves, thirty-two males and twenty-eight females as recorded in the 1850 Slave Census. By 1860 John owned sixty-two slaves, thirty-five males and twenty-seven females. Living on the property, these men, women, and children had worked alongside John and they increased the worth of his holdings to almost $105,000 in land and $263,050 in personal property. The 1860 Tennessee Agricultural Census of Davidson County explained this further by showing that John owned 430 acres of improved land, 445 acres of unimproved land, the cash value of his farm was $97,500, he owned $600 worth of farm implements and machinery, and owned $4,650 worth of various livestock. The first two years of the 1860s would become the last in which John would be able to remember such prosperity, and the first three years would become the last that he would legally own slaves.

By the mid 1850s, John Thompson further distinguished his antebellum plantation by adding an architectural landmark, a proper classically styled brick house, complete with tall, dominating white columns. Thompson had promised his wife Mary he would build her “whatever kind of house she wished” and she began to prepare and design the plan for a new and luxurious home. Two years into the construction, in 1856, the new house had taken shape and was said to be “fancy enough to please any woman” and regarded as one of the “finest houses in Nashville.” Although happy about his wife’s design, Thompson commented that the new house had “far too many geegaws and closets to suit a man but if it was what she wanted, she should have it.” The house is believed to have stood to the north of the present location of the house. Unfortunately, the very night before the family was to move into the new house, “both it and the older house caught fire and, along with the kitchen where the fire started, burned down, forcing the Thompsons to live in a nearby washhouse until another home was built.”

On October 29, 1856, the Nashville Republican Banner reported under the headline “COUNTRY RESIDENCE BURNED,” the following description of the fire:

The residence of John Thompson, Esq., on the Franklin Turnpike, about four miles from the city, was burned on Monday morning about 5 o’clock. The whole premises were destroyed, including the kitchen where the fire originated, the old mansion and a new brick building just erected, adjoining. Most of the furniture was saved. The loss is estimated at about $8,000.

A conflicting source claims that Thompson was able to save the family’s silver, but not as much of the furniture as the Republican Banner article suggested. By knocking the wall of their bedroom out however, he was able save a “rosewood bedroom suit that he had recently made

---


57 Jordan, “Glen Leven,” 2.

58 Ibid, 2; Mielnik, “Glen Leven,” Property Nomination, section 8, 9.

59 Jordan, “Glen Leven,” 2.

60 Orr Interview, January 1, 1963.

61 Clements, A Past Remembered, 84.

62 Nashville Republican Banner, 29 October 1856, 3.
for himself and Mary" and with considerable troubles the "massive pieces were carried into the yard" to safety. At four years old, John Jr. remembered little of the fire except "his boots had been saved but that his brother, Joe, had none" and that "the next day he remembered carrying Joe on his back while he waded through the still warm ashes looking for something that might have survived the fire." The washhouse into which John moved his family had three small rooms with a porch on the front, and would have to suffice until yet another third house, the Glen Leven that we know today, could be built.

The Thomspsons immediately "set about building another house and he drew the plans for this one." With the plans completed, John entered into a contract with a local Nashville man named A.E. Franklin to build the new house. This contract is revealed by a letter dated March, 15 1856, which stated: "Mr. J Thompson Sir I will build your hose according to the plan and specifications gave me by your wife for $7,4,44 (sic) and give you round fluted columns in front and 9 white walnut doors without extry charge _ further I will bind myself to get your house done by the 10th of Sept next under a forfeit of $1000 dollars to give you all I agree to by you. A.E. Franklin."

The framing for the house was made from timber taken from the property and sleepers made of yellow poplar; these were placed across the cut-limestone foundation of the front of the house for the floor joists. The sleepers were cut too long and Mary Thompson Orr remembered being told that "they extended through one room and into the middle of the hall." The brick for the exterior of the home was reportedly not made on the property, although suspected kiln sites exist. By the end of 1857, A.E. Franklin had erected the "massive and stark building called Glen Leven." Just as Franklin had promised "Four fluted columns – imported from New Orleans" graced the front of the house while the rest was described as "plain and sturdy." The following excerpt from the Thompson family history gives a brief description of the layout of the home:

The house contained but a single closet and the only interior curved line was the graceful spiral stairway that rose in the central hall. Downstairs there were two double parlors and a bedroom and bathroom. Upstairs were five more bedrooms and the kitchen and other buildings were in the yard. The upstairs "daughters’ room" could be reached only by a staircase ascending from the cross hall just outside the parents' bedroom door.

The home, although not as luxurious as its predecessor, contained many popular attributes of the period. As the 1850s drew to a close a new trial loomed on the horizon that would further
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test the resolve of the Thompson family and many others of Nashville. With the dawning of the 1860s came the American Civil War and Nashville would be one of the first cities to experience the effects the war would have on Tennessee and the nation.

Historic photograph of Glen Leven House. Image courtesy of Travellers Rest Museum.

THE CIVIL WAR ERA

When the war began in 1861, Nashville occupied a very strategic position along the Cumberland River and southern railway lines. Historian Thomas Connelly stated of Nashville; “No other western metropolis—not even New Orleans—was so vital to the Southern war effort.” The river notwithstanding, the railroad connections running north from Louisville, south to Decatur, Alabama; southeast to Chattanooga and the Deep South; and, eventually, west via the Nashville & Northwestern Railroad all the way to the Tennessee River were consequential not just for the Confederate army, but the Federal army too. With transportation systems playing such an important strategic role in the war, the Thompsons’ Glen Leven—positioned between a turnpike and a railroad—was fated to become a significant place once the fighting reached Davidson County.

In preparing for war, it is almost inexplicable that Confederate leaders largely overlooked the importance of Nashville and its vulnerability to attack. Little was done to prepare the city for repelling an invading Federal force. Union forces captured Fort Henry on February 6, 1862, and Fort Donelson on February 16, 1862. The Confederate surrender of these strategic forts, vital to the defense of the waterways, opened the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers and laid the groundwork for the Union occupation of Tennessee. Although published reports in Nashville claimed the Confederate forces had driven their enemy back, by church time on February 16,
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1862, the news spread through Nashville that the Confederate forces had surrendered and Fort Donelson was under Union control. John Miller McKee observed that “a reign of terror and confusion ensued, the like of which was never witnessed in Nashville,” and he termed it “the great panic.”[75] Citizens feared that “35,000 ravening Yankees were approaching, and the gunboats would shortly arrive to shell Nashville into rubble. People milled about in the streets, circulating rumors, loading what they could carry into wagons and fleeing south.”[76] Nashville Union and American editor Leon Trousdale noted Nashvillians had to choose between becoming “virtual prisoners within the lines of the enemy,” or to flee as “fugitives without a crime.”[77] These descriptions obscure the reality that there were Unionists in Nashville, as well as enslaved and free African Americans who had high hopes for the Union arrival.


On February 24, 1862, Union Gen. Don Carlos Buell arrived in Nashville and made arrangements to meet Mayor R.B. Cheatham to negotiate the surrender of Nashville on the following day, making Nashville the first Confederate capital to fall to Union forces. The next morning, a lookout in the cupola of the Capitol spotted the gunboat Cairo leading several troop
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transports down the Cumberland River. The city of Nashville remained under Union occupation for the remainder of the war.

The arrival of Federal troops and surrender of the city caused additional citizens to flee, and T.O. Summers, a Nashville resident, observed, “to have seen the people running to get on the train [to Memphis] made one’s heart sick. The 2:30 train to Chattanooga was crowded to suffocation.” Witnesses also observed the “frantic exodus” along the Franklin Pike, including John McKee, who noted that many refugees “left on foot carrying with them such articles as they wished to preserve,” and another witness who wrote to the Richmond Daily Dispatch that “convalescent soldiers, quitting the hospitals were waddling along with their scanty baggage. Travelers in groups and squads had left the hotels, carrying carpet bag and satchel, and saddle bag in hand.” Although a thousand or more people fled the city, the majority stayed, including the Thompsons.

The transformation of Nashville from a small southern rail city to the most fortified Union stronghold, next to Washington, D.C., in the South impacted not only the people but the landscape. Nashville was converted to a supply base, military hospital center, and transportation hub for the Union army. The city was surrounded by defensive forts. In four months post commander Gen. James Negley constructed four strategic forts: Casino, Confiscation, Andrew Johnson, and Negley. Today, Fort Negley, built primarily by enslaved and freed African Americans in 1862, still stands on St. Cloud Hill. It was the largest fort west of Washington, D.C., and the most important Civil War structure that demonstrated African American artisans’ and laborers’ contributions to the battle landscape. The Thompsons’ home, Glen Leven, only four miles from Nashville on the Franklin Pike, offered a unique view of the Union fortifications around their property and the invasion of the Northern army. The Union army held Nashville for the duration of the war, making Nashville the center of the Union’s western war effort.

The heartland’s most intimate institution, the family, endured the heaviest affliction during this time, and the consequences of the three years of war on the physical landscape were truly evident. Wartime travelers bemoaned the stark ruination and sterility of the land as impassionedly as their antebellum counterparts had marveled at the landscape’s lush beauty. “This is a dreary, desolate, barren, and deserted looking country,” wrote a Confederate officer in late 1862. “The houses and stores are either closed or smashed to pieces. Everything is going to utter destruction.” The principle agent of destruction in Middle Tennessee was not armed conflict per se but the Union army. Middle Tennessee’s role as the breadbasket of the Federal army and strategic gateway to the Deep South brought down upon it the full effects of wartime occupation by a vast, hungry army. John Thompson and his family undoubtedly witnessed the
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retreat of their fellow townspeople and the Confederate army from their vantage point at Glen Leven.

The Federal army’s determination to hold and defend this region denied the Confederacy the ability to control railroads and rivers in Middle Tennessee. The Nashville and Decatur Railroad ran through the Thompsons’ property. This rail line was under constant surveillance by the Union army and was one of the main gateways in and out of the city.

Although Union occupation was quite benign the first year, many defiant supporters of the Confederacy suffered harassment, impoverishment, and imprisonment by war’s end. John Thompson was not spared these circumstances. After residents rejected the Union army’s initial efforts toward reconciliation, occupation became harsher from 1863 to 1865.

John Thompson, like many of his neighbors, was sympathetic to the Confederate army but by the time the war started “he was far too old to serve in the Confederacy” and “his sons were far too young.”\textsuperscript{86} John helped the Confederacy by providing “support in funds and equipment, until the Federal troops finally overran the area”\textsuperscript{87} and by making “heavy financial contributions to the Confederacy.”\textsuperscript{88} In December 1862, Military Governor Andrew Johnson decided to punish the wealthiest Confederates in the county. His order of December 13, 1862, read:

\begin{quote}
Whereas, There are many helpless widows, wives and children in the city of Nashville and county of Davidson, who have been reduced to poverty and wretchedness in consequence of their husbands, sons and fathers having been forced into the armies of this unholy and nefarious rebellion, and their necessities having become great and manifest, and their wants for the necessaries of life so urgent, that all the laws of justice and humanity would be grossly violated unless something was done to relieve their destitute and suffering condition: The following assessment is ordered in behalf of these suffering families from those who have contributed directly or indirectly in bringing about this unfortunate state of affairs. The amount annexed to each name may be paid in five months, the first payment to be made on or before the 20th of December, 1862.
\end{quote}

Johnson’s order assessed John Thompson $500, while some of his neighbors were assessed as high as $2500. Governor Johnson’s willing use of military force encouraged a grudging response from the reluctant community, and “between August 23, 1862, and January 9, 1864, the amount collected by these special levies was $22,372,095.”\textsuperscript{89} It is certain that Thompson was levied the tax of December 13, 1862; however, it is not certain if he or his wife paid that tax, or whether he was later charged additional levies.

On December 30, 1862, Union Gen. William S. Rosecrans ordered that “all citizens of Nashville and Davidson County who had aided the rebellion by word or deed should come forward within two weeks to make bond and oath, according to the forms provided and heretofore published by military authority” and “any who did not would be summarily dealt with,
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by fine, imprisonment, or exclusion from these lines.” Thompson was “eventually compelled by Federal authorities to give his word that he would withhold all future support of the south, although documentation of his oath has not been located with archival research.

Knowing Thompson was a strong Confederate supporter, the Federals tested his compliance with the agreement. A Federal soldier disguised in Confederate uniform came to the house and asked Mary Thompson for aid. The man “seemed frightened,” and he “was taken at his word when he said he needed help getting back to his unit.” Aware of Thompson’s agreement with the Federals, Mary did not tell her husband about the soldier. She hid him inside a closet, out of view of a Union soldier guarding the house. After nightfall, he was taken to a neighboring home and given directions back to Confederate lines. It is probable the soldier reported to his superiors that he had been helped and the agreement had been broken, as at some point John Thompson was imprisoned in Nashville for continuing to support the Confederacy. He may have been imprisoned in April 1863 when Gen. Rosecrans enforced his order of December 30, 1862; “Between seventy-five and one hundred people of well-known rebellious views and decided hostility to the Government were arrested by the military.” According to family history, Thompson remained in prison for the duration of the war.

With her husband away, Mary Thompson was left with her ten-year old son John Jr. and eight-year old son Joseph, and demonstrated more toughness and resolve than was expected of a woman in her situation. One example involved a confrontation with Federal forces in which Mary “encountered a lone Union horseman who made his way to the back of the house and began giving her orders as she stood on the back porch. She ignored his commands, and then his curses, and is said to have remained motionless when he fired his pistol toward her. The bullet reportedly passed beside her head, ricocheting off the brick of the house while she stood firm until the horseman rode away.” One relative jokingly remarked that the bullet fired at Mary “went through her night cap” but missed because the “Thompson height came from another branch of the family.”

Notable people visited Glen Leven during the occupation. The residence frequently received callers, held social gatherings, and on different occasions provided room and board for both soldiers and travelers. During the Federal occupation, Union Gen. Gates P. Thruston boarded at Glen Leven, as did Jim Hamilton, his wife, and their daughter Ida. Mary Thompson Orr remembered, “General Thruston was a Captain when they sent him over to the house one day for something, and Cousin Ida was there. When he came in, she drew aside her big skirt and flounced out of the room, and General Thruston said ‘A she scratch-cat.’”

Mrs. John F. Caldwell was a child during the war and remembered a somewhat different story: “Thruston entered a room where some young ladies, including Ida, were gathered, and
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that they thumbed their noses at him. He said “what an attractive bunch of hell cats – I am going to marry one of them.” Thruston kept his promise and although he had been snubbed by Ida Hamilton, “He retaliated by marrying her.”98 Gen. Thruston became a prominent and distinguished figure after the war, and he was said to have “left an indelible impress upon the history of his time, as a soldier, lawyer, archaeologist, author, and man of affairs, and whose character was the positive expression of a strong and noble nature.”99 He later carried out a major excavation of an ancient Native American village on Brown’s Creek, about five miles south of Nashville. Much of that collection now comprises the valuable Thruston Collection at Vanderbilt University.

What happened to the African American slaves of Glen Leven after President Abraham Lincoln pronounced the Emancipation Proclamation is unknown. (Although the proclamation excluded Tennessee, knowledge of it and the reality of Union occupation encouraged slaves who lived near Union territory to leave their owners.) When the Thompsons’ slaves left the farm and escaped to Union lines for safety is unknown. What we do know is that the most important development for Nashville African American males during the fall of 1863 took place when the ranks of the regular army opened to them with the formation of the United States Colored Troops (USCT). On October 2, 1863, the people of Nashville witnessed for the first time black soldiers marching in Union army uniforms through the streets of the city. For the Thompson family, their reaction to the Emancipation Proclamation is unknown. Further research must be conducted to provide a clearer picture into antebellum slave life and the war as it pertained to Glen Leven and the Thompson family during this period.

The Battle of Nashville in December 1864 brought heavy fighting and the horrors of war to the front gates of Glen Leven. It was the climax of a long chain of military movements and developments that began after the fall of Atlanta in September 1864. After losing control of Georgia, Confederate Gen. John Bell Hood made a sudden and unexpected movement north toward Union Gen. William T. Sherman’s rail line supply, and forced Sherman to pursue the Army of Tennessee out of Atlanta. It was there Hood decided on his bold move toward Middle Tennessee, but his Middle Tennessee campaign was anything but victorious.

Hood’s Army of Tennessee neared Nashville in late November. His army’s miscommunications at Spring Hill on November 29 and the devastation and horror at the Battle of Franklin on November 30 did not deter Hood from his main objective. By December 2, 1864, Hood’s ravaged army found itself south of Nashville, encamped in the farms along the turnpikes heading south of the capitol. Hood made his headquarters at Traveller’s Rest, the home of the Overton family, six miles south of Nashville. Hood immediately established his Confederate main line: “General Lee will form his corps with his center upon the Franklin Pike; General Stewart will form on General Lee’s left; and Cheatham on General Lee’s right.”100 For the Thompson family, Hood’s main Confederate line stretched across their property, placing them in the midst of the entrenchment before the battle began and once fighting commenced, during both days of the battle.

The arrival of Confederate troops gave the Thompson family a brief respite from occupation. Prior to the battle, Charles Quintard, Confederate chaplain and future Second
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Bishop of Tennessee, visited the Thompson home. Quintard’s diary entry for Sunday, December 11, 1864, states, “This afternoon walked with Miss Correy to Mr. John Thompson’s to see Miss Sue Clarke of Nashville where I had the pleasure of meeting General Clayton." 101 Confederate Gen. Henry DeLamar Clayton survived the war and went on to engage in planting, practice law, and serve as circuit court judge in the state of Alabama. 102 Quintard also survived the war and made great contributions to education. He oversaw the “rebuilding of the University of the South after the devastation of the Civil War” and “served as the first vice-chancellor of the University from February 14, 1867 to July 12, 1872, and made several trips to England to raise money for the University.” 103

Gen. Hood’s entrenched line at the time of the battle was hastily constructed under adverse and severe weather conditions. It was four miles long, and much shorter than the Federal line of defense. The Confederate right wing rested at a deep cut on the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad between the Nolensville and Murfreesboro Pikes, near where the road now crosses the Lewisburg and Northern Railroad. The main Confederate line crossed to the west of the Nolensville Pike at about the present Peachtree Street, to the principal stronghold of the right flank on top of Rain’s Hill, a commanding elevation. Further to the right, south of present-day Thompson Lane, a redoubt was later built on a high hill commanding the Murfreesboro Pike and protecting the right of the Confederate position. 104

Extending to the west, Hood’s line ran through the grounds of Melrose, the home of Aaron Brown, then continuing westward, it crossed the Franklin Pike at about its intersection with Thompson’s property (Thompson Lane today). The line ran eastward toward Granny White Pike, over the farm of James Caldwell, crossing Granny White at a sharp angle with the road a short distance south of the present Woodmont Avenue. The line then ran west towards Hillsboro Pike, stretching up the hillside in a redoubt, known as Redoubt number one, which crowned the elevation north of Woodmont and east of the Hillsboro Pike. This was where Hood’s line turned sharply back southward at a right angle, crossing Woodmont (still east of Hillsboro Pike) to another fortified work, Redoubt number two, that stood south of Woodmont and east of Hillsboro. 105

Redoubt number two entrenchment stretched diagonally across the pike to Redoubt number three, west of the Hillsboro Pike. Further support for Hood’s left was supplied by two more detached works west of the Hillsboro Pike—Redoubt number four, located on the hill where Hobbs Road is now, and Redoubt number five on top of the high hill immediately to the west of the pike. Construction of Redoubts four and five had been delayed due to the weather and the topography of the soil. They were hardly completed when the battle began. 106 Hood, realizing how close the Army of Tennessee was to the Federal defensive lines, had his engineers locate
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the stronger line to the rear. On December 10, 1864, this was occupied as the main line, and the abandoned entrenchment was occupied as a skirmish line. ¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

Battle of Nashville Map, 1864. Note troop movements across the Thompson property on Franklin Pike. Image courtesy of the Tennessee State Library and Archives.
Intense suffering was endured by many Confederates dressed in worn and tattered clothes. “The weather was bitter cold,” said the 18th Alabama’s Edgar Jones. “Many men were bare-footed, and more becoming so every day. There were no blankets except the ones we carried all summer.” Some men, already entrenched, dug into the cold ground to escape the biting wind. George Brewer reported that “the men dug holes in the ground, constructing fire-places in the earth on one side, with barrel chimneys. The holes were several feet deep, dug lower toward the fire place, thus leaving on three sides an elevated flat for seats and beds. Covers were improvised by piecing blankets, dog-flies, or anything that would shelter.” Edgar Jones added that the holes were large enough for the men to lie down in. He stated, “We got twigs of rushes or weeds or anything of the sort and laid them in the bottom of our pits, put our blankets down, reserving the larger part [for] cover...It was astounding how much warmer it was in the holes than on the top of the ground.”

From the battle maps and descriptions of troop movement, the Thompsons’ property fell within the boundaries of the Confederate main lines before the Battle of Nashville commenced. Once the battle began, the Thompsons found their farm situated between both sides on the battlefield. Maggie Vaulx was a young woman during the Union occupation and Battle of Nashville. Her home, Mount Alban, situated upon a hill northwest of the Thompson’s property was part of the southern and central most part of the Union lines of defense. Maggie, a prolific diarist, wrote in her diary before the battle, “that John Thompson’s land was a blaze with campfires.”

Soldiers were camped all around the house, and in addition to taking food they came in search of water. Both sides quickly found the cistern behind the house, and possibly several natural springs on the property. Soldiers trampled Mary Thompson’s garden after visiting the cistern, and it was completely destroyed. Maggie Vaulx lived just north of Glen Leven, and recalled a scene that the Thompsons also must have remembered all too well from the war years: “About dark a federal officer told Pa to come out and look at the light which shone as far as the eye could reach; it seemed as if a thousand fires were going in John Thompson’s Woods.”

Union Gen. George Thomas met with his commanding officers at the St. Cloud Hotel the morning of December 14, 1864. After deferring to his corps commanders for their views, he handed them their assignments. “The troops occupying the interior line will be under the direction of Major-General Steedman, who is charged with the immediate defense of Nashville during the operations around the city.” Steedman’s attack was designed to focus Confederate attention on the right of their line while Thomas sent the massed Union right against the Confederate left. Hood was attentive to Steedman’s advance, and the morning of December 15, 1864, the Union right with their cavalry on its extreme right, moved against Hood with a force equal in size to his entire army. The Confederate left was hit hard and driven back by Union soldiers. Before nightfall, Redoubts three, four, and five fell into Union hands.
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Throughout the first day of the battle, citizens of Nashville watched the battle from hilltops and rooftops around the city. A Union officer recalled, “the entire hill in our rear were black with human beings watching the battle, but silent. No army on the continent ever played on any field to so large and so sullen an audience.” Many civilians found their homes in the thick of the battlefield landscape. The Thompson family was in their home the days and nights of the battle. Mary Thompson was quite active throughout the battle, and was seen out in the battlefield. She attended to the wounded, and after the battle ceased, Glen Leven turned into a field hospital for Confederate soldiers, white Union soldiers, and United States Colored Troops.

Stewart appealed to Hood for reinforcements on the first day of the battle. Stewart was hopelessly outnumbered by the attacking forces. Hood responded by removing two brigades of Lee’s corps to Stewart’s left flank. Cheatham and Lee’s corps were held in a vise grip by Wilson’s and Steedman’s troops for the entire day.

As the first day of battle closed, both armies scattered across the fields. Hood’s army, beaten back two miles from their original position, shaped their line into jigsaw puzzle formations. Cheatham’s position on the far right flank by the Nolensville Pike was entirely evacuated. The two remaining division’s of Lee’s corps held firmly in the center of the Confederate line, but stretched incredibly thin. Union Gen. Steedman, apparently unaware of Cheatham’s withdrawal from their position, held the ground gained earlier in the day. Thomas ordered Gen. Thomas Wood to move towards the Franklin Pike and form his troops across the pike facing south. Stewart’s left flank, faced with an assault by Union forces twice as large as the Confederates had in the whole Army of Tennessee, recognized the Union soldiers were a half-mile beyond the Hillsboro Pike, “completely turning our flank.” Stewart pronounced the Confederate situation “perilous and extreme.” With three of their redoubts taken between the Granny White and Hillsboro Pikes, any hope of the Confederates retaking Nashville slowly faded.

By eight o’clock, Gen. Hood was convinced Gen. Thomas’s objective was to operate against the flanks of the Confederate army. Hood estimated the fighting of the 15th was favorable to the Army of Tennessee until Stewart’s “partially completed redoubts” had been lost. Retreating was not an option for Hood, as the failure to win at Nashville would probably cost Hood his command. He could only lose by withdrawing troops, but remaining south of Nashville, he might recoup his fallen military fortunes. Hood decided to gamble the fate of the Army of Tennessee, and dug in for another day of fighting. While maintaining the center of the line on Franklin Pike, Hood repositioned Lee further south and east to a high hill known as Peach Orchard Hill (Overton Hill). Situated between Granny White Pike and Franklin Pike, Stewart’s corps moved to the center left while Cheatham’s corps moved to the extreme left with Ector’s brigade on Shy’s Hill. The new line was two and a half miles long, but with the refused flanks on both sides, it presented a front of more than three miles.
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Gen. Thomas, the night of December 15, “watched his army’s campfires blossom where Rebel fires had burned the night before…the whole command bivouacked in the line of battle during the night whilst preparations were made to renew the battle at an early hour on the morrow.” The morning of December 16, 1864, was foggy and warm. The Confederates were well positioned on the high, rocky ground of Peach Orchard Hill, located just south of Glen Leven on the Overton’s farm. The point of attack—where present day Harding Place/Battery Lane crosses Franklin Pike—was a short distance west of the Nashville & Decatur Railroad tracks. From Peach Orchard Hill, the Confederates’ view shed spread over to Shy’s Hill. The repositioning of Hood’s army was an advantage. There was as much of a natural defensive strength of Peach Orchard Hill as the man-made obstacles confronting the Union soldiers. The hill was high and steep and the ground was generally clear, and provided an excellent field of fire for the Confederates. This was a killing field for the Union soldiers.

An awful, but breathtaking episode of the battle took place just a mile and a half south of the Thompsons’ farm on Peach Orchard Hill. This area of fighting on the battlefield at Nashville engaged numerous regiments of United States Colored Troops. The First Brigade consisted of the 14th, 17th, 18th, and 44th Regiments, U.S.C.T. The Second Brigade included the 12th, 13th, and 100th Regiments, U.S.C.T. These were under the command of Col. Thomas J. Morgan and Col. Charles R. Thompson. All of the regiments were raised in Tennessee except for the 18th. The African American troops played a vital role in the Battle of Nashville. Many of these regiments were under the command of Gen. Steedman. The forward sweep of the Union soldiers was accompanied by a fierce cannonade that darkened the sky with smoke, striking into the lines of the Confederates. After many hours of received shelling from Union artillery on Peach Orchard Hill, the Confederates welcomed the opportunity to return the favor.

The fire fight was desperate. The African Americans of Thompson’s brigade only had minimal combat experience. The 12th and 13th USCT had been at Johnsonville during Forrest’s recent attack, and their brigade had played a supporting role on the first day of the Battle of Nashville. None of these events compared to the fighting at Peach Orchard Hill. “Here for the first time,” Col. Thompson said, “these troops were under such fire as veterans dread.” Thompson ordered the USCT into battle. At six a.m. they moved past the Rain’s farm only to find the badly damaged enemy retreated two miles south along the Franklin Pike. The USCT headed east of Nolensville Road and along the Nashville & Decatur Railroad tracks until they joined with more Union regiments. These Union soldiers marched directly over John Thompson’s property to meet the awaiting Confederates on top of Peach Orchard Hill. The fighting at Peach Orchard Hill raged all along the line. Union soldiers looked for cover wherever they could find it. Without exception, they were thrown back, killed, or wounded during the assault. Several USCT survived the battle, but not without painful physical reminders of Peach Orchard Hill.

The African Americans that assaulted the Hill seem to have been the most aggressive. Pvt. Benjamin T. Smith, a Union soldier from Illinois, recorded in his journal the black troops charged “with a yell that sounded above the rattle of musketry.” He thought the Confederates
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were “awesomely” aroused when they “saw the black faces of their foe.” A single shell took out an entire file of men in the 12th USCT as they charged Peach Orchard Hill. Thompson’s men from the 12th and 100th USCT were out in front while the 13th USCT comprised the second line. Disaster struck when Col. Sidney Post’s brigade, originally to the right of the front, scrambled up the hillside toward the breastworks directly ahead of Thompson’s men. This forced the 12th and 100th to angle to the left to avoid running into Post’s troops. The result spelled disaster.124

It was close to a slaughter. More than a thousand Union casualties occurred at Peach Orchard Hill. This represented about one-third of Gen. Thomas’s losses during the entire Battle of Nashville. Even Confederate commander Gen. James T. Holtzclaw wrote, “I have seen most of the battlefields of the West, but never saw dead men thicker than in front of my two right regiments.” The Union attack did not end with the repulse of four regiments. The 13th USCT had arrived late in front of the works defended by Confederates. This USCT regiment was inexperienced in combat and served only one year of railroad duty in Tennessee. Numbering only 556 men and 20 officers, the 13th managed to push their way through the downed trees and other obstructions while the enemy’s attention was largely directed toward the 12th and 100th.

Many Union soldiers trapped on the slopes of the hill beneath the works watched in amazement as the 13th ran toward the line of Confederate breastworks. Five color bearers fell, but the men kept fighting. “They came to die,” wrote the amazed Confederate Holtzclaw. Impressed by the valor of these black soldiers, he formally cited their bravery in his battle report.126 The 13th USCT suffered the most casualties, with 55 men killed and 165 wounded; the majority of their casualties were African American soldiers. Further detailing the slaughter, Holtzclaw reported that “the great masses and disorder of the enemy” enabled his left regiment on Peach Orchard Hill “to rake them in flank,” while the regiment on his right, “with a coolness unexampled, scarcely threw away a shot at their front.”127 His accounts contribute to the local oral history that bodies of dead and wounded Union soldiers, black and white, were so numerous along the north side of Peach Orchard Hill that a bluish hue covered the ground and a person could have walked down the hill without touching the earth, simply by stepping from body to body.128

With the defenses strong on Peach Orchard Hill, the Confederates appeared to gain a small victory the second day of battle, but it was not to last. The Confederate left flank was no match for the Union. The Confederate position atop of Shy’s Hill was quite vulnerable. The Confederates placed defenses along the top most geographic line of the hill rather than along the highest line. In short, the Confederates’ defensive line was so far back they could not see the Union soldiers until it was too late.129 By four o’clock, December 16, Union soldiers had broken through the Southern position. Union infantry advanced and swept everything in its path. With enemy cavalry behind them and their own troops withdrawn to the south,
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Cheatham’s line was broken, and a swath of Union infantrymen overran their earthworks. Cheatham and Stewart’s corps, confused and dismayed, fell back and retreated down the Franklin Pike to the Brentwood Hills. Hood’s vision for the Army of Tennessee and the Confederacy was gone. Nashville remained in Union hands. Gen. Thomas issued General Order No. 5 to commend his troops. “The blood of white and black men has flowed freely together for the great cause which is to give freedom; Colonel Charles H. Thompson of the 12th USCT Regiment and his brigade of Colored Troops exhibited courage and steadiness that challenged the admiration of all who witnessed the charge.”

The aftermath of the Battle of Nashville brought mixed emotions. The citizens of Nashville were left to deal with the fallout of the battle. Many Nashvillians worried who was lying dead out on the battlefield. The greatest devastation to the surrounding landscape was the earlier cutting of thousands of trees and shrubs used for firewood and view shed for each army. E.E. Edwards wrote of “a medley of soldiers disappearing in battle smoke, galloping horsemen, riderless horses, the prostrate dead and dying, trees seared and splintered…the confused clamor of voices, the cries of the dead and dying…and atmosphere overladen with death.” Hundreds of dead and wounded flocked to the city’s sixteen hospitals.

Numerous homes were also filled with the dying, and the Thompsons’ home was no exception. Situated between the battle lines, Glen Leven was transformed into a field hospital. Mary Thompson attended to the wounded in her home and yard, where only several days before soldiers had trampled and destroyed the gardens and had drunk water from the well in back of the house.

The night after the battle ended, a light rain fell. Lightning strikes revealed stragglers moving into Nashville from the battlefield. The movement of lanterns showed members of the U.S. Christian Commission searching for dead and wounded men. The general field agent for the Army of the Cumberland saw commission delegates fulfilling their mission to “gather up the dead, identify them through their comrades, if possible, and mark them by a card.”

Approximately two thousand wounded, including Confederate and Union soldiers, were hospitalized in and around Nashville. Within the next several days, another eighteen hundred Union and two thousand Confederate wounded from the Battle of Franklin arrived in Nashville. Caring for the dead was of the utmost importance, but despite the efforts of the Christian Commission, many men were buried where they fell. Graves scattered from the Charlotte Pike to east of the Franklin Pike. Graves were placed “in yards, and gardens, near houses, by the wayside, in the meadows and tillage land, in the woods, by the fences, wherever
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the poor boys had chanced to fall." The poor boys had chanced to fall.” At Overton Hill, some fifty USCT were buried in a trench. These men, among the 1,909 USCT were later interred in the Nashville National Cemetery.

As historian Drew Gilpin Faust has stated, “The presence and fear of death touched Civil War Americans’ most fundamental sense of who they were.” By December of 1864, the prominence of bodies that covered the battlefield at Nashville depicted death and destruction. Faust has concluded, “The work of death was Civil War America’s most fundamental and most demanding undertaking.” Division field hospitals were established as near to the battle area as practicable, with strict orders for surgeons to “operate on the field upon all requiring it, previous to transferring the men to the general hospitals in the city.”

Another demonstration of Mary Thompson’s toughness is in her treatment of wounded soldiers in the area. She always tried to help Confederate soldiers, and her obituary in the Confederate Veteran read, “The death of this lovely woman...will cause sadness in the hearts of many Confederate soldiers, who had cause to remember her kindness to them in trying times.” She was not within military lines until the Battle of Nashville, December 15-16, 1864, when the armies moved southward across the fields at Glen Leven. Mary Thompson went into the field to help the wounded and “sent word to one of the surgeons that she had prepared several rooms for the reception of the wounded, and that she would be glad to have them brought there.” Glen Leven was used as a Union field hospital, the “back parlor was an operating room and Mary was called on to help with the amputations,” where she and the “surgeons labored under adverse conditions in their makeshift hospital, reportedly even being forced to use the piano as an operating table.” (Mary Thompson Orr later recalled, “When it was suggested to my father he have the bloodstains erased he would not.”)

Not only did the Thompsons’ farm have burials from Confederate and white Union soldiers, but also many unknown USCT soldiers. As the federal government undertaker, W.R. Cornelius kept burial records that indicated at least 59 white soldiers (the records do not specify individual allegiance but they were probably Union soldiers) and at least 32 USCT soldiers were buried at Glen Leven. While these findings are remarkable, it is unclear as to where these men were buried on Thompson’s property. Cornelius’s records indicate that some soldiers were removed from the property between 1864-1866. Under contract, W.R. Cornelius and Company of Nashville exhumed the soldiers’ remains and re-interred them in the Woodlawn Cemetery in
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Nashville,\(^{143}\) although the cemetery’s records are incomplete as to which soldiers are buried there.

While the names of the soldiers treated at Glen Leven are unknown, burial records held at the Tennessee State Library and Archives testified to ninety-one men, black and white, Confederate and Union, buried on the Thompson’s property. Cornelius’s records detail burial numbers at over 15,068, by September 1865.\(^{144}\) Not all of these burials are due to death on the battlefields. Many reflect death by disease or from wounds inflicted on the battlefield. Unfortunately, Cornelius’ burial records and the Nashville National Cemetery records do not give specifics as to where the men were buried at Glen Leven. Nor is it possible to deduce this information from this first survey. The only information available as to the interment in the Nashville National Cemetery is the date’s men’s bodies started arriving in 1866. Without a name, the Nashville National Cemetery is unable to provide information on the USCT or white soldiers. There may not be another avenue to uncover who actually was at Glen Leven during and after the Battle of Nashville.

Mary Thompson seldom talked about her war experiences, but John M. Thompson, Jr. did. He was hoeing onions with a field hand when “a shot from a cannon on a nearby hill struck a tree above the heads of John and the hand with whom he was working. The man fell to his knees and began to pray and John decided that he could pray just as effectively while running.”\(^{145}\) Family history also suggests that he used to tell his grandchildren about a hollow tree across Franklin Pike where Mary hid with John Jr. and Joseph “when a particularly vicious band of raiders came.”\(^{146}\)

Jane Henry Thomas remembered a Union soldier named Heeley that boarded in her home and claimed that he was “the grandest thief I ever saw.” Jane recalled that Heeley “went to Mrs. John Thompson’s one day, and came back with his pockets and arms full of towels and such things. He also had a pair of opera-glasses he had stolen. He stole all the clothes for his wife to wear, and she had seven stolen breastpins. They went foraging every day, and came back with all kinds of things.”\(^{147}\) Suffering was no respecter of race or class. Black and white, rich and poor felt the affliction of the war. Farmers in Nashville and the surrounding counties were called upon to furnish the main Union army in the western theater with food, equipment, and animals.

The consistency with which the foraging parties visited the farms was astounding. Farmers stood still and watched soldiers help themselves to anything and everything the farm and land offered. The Thompson family was not immune to these foraging parties, as Glen Leven was one of the best-stocked plantations in Davidson County.\(^{148}\) By 1860, “8,939 asses,
mules, and horses, 15,940 sheep, 36,940 swine, 12,708 cattle” and “1,114,901 bushels of corn were raised in [Davidson] county.” Eventually the armies took almost all of Glen Leven’s livestock and stored crops. Before his imprisonment, John kept detailed records, asking the officers who led the foraging parties to sign receipts listing what had been taken and in what quantity, and Mary continued the practice until the end of the war. After the war, John Thompson filed personal claims to the U.S. House of Representatives for “property destroyed by the Army.” The claims were never approved.

John Thompson was released from the Union prison in Nashville at the end of the war. Tennessee was the first state to rejoin the Union, and family history suggests “readmission to the Union brought with it a bill for taxes on real estate for all of the war years” as well as “an extra $5,000 tax to provide support and aid to the widows and orphans of Federal troops.” The latter tax did not apply to everyone, and family members remembered Thompson being visited by Federal officials who imposed this tax due to his support of the Confederacy. The enforcement of these taxes was “ruinous” for many neighboring farms and their lands were sold or seized to meet the substantial payment. John’s remarkable forethought to keep receipts from Union foraging parties saved the Glen Leven properties. Upon being presented with the tax bills, John “countered by presenting the receipts for produce and livestock that had been commandeered from his place,” and, although somewhat reluctantly, “the officials accepted them at face value.”

Family historian Joseph H. Thompson, Jr., the great grandson of John Thompson, presented a detailed account of these transactions in his history entitled The Thompson Family:

After the Civil War was over, the United States government levied taxes against property owners throughout the South to assist and aid the widows and orphans of Federal troops. Owners unable to pay their taxes suffered confiscation. Thompson, according to family oral history, had a five thousand dollar property tax lien. He offered up Confederate money, but that was not an acceptable form of payment. When asked if his Federal warrants kept during the Union occupation established a proper form of payment, the authorities accepted these warrants, and Thompson saved his land. While this is a good account of family history, it is unclear as to whether or not these warrants do indeed still exist. Deeper investigation is necessary to determine the validity of the oral history. The records for such warrants during the Civil War are held in the National Archives in Washington D.C. within the United States Treasury records and the Southern Claims Commission.

No documentation has yet been discovered that corroborates the amount that Thompson paid, or the exact date of his payments.
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Glen Leven survived the war, but John Thompson suffered losses with the emancipation of his slaves. He also lost most of his livestock, and many different buildings and structures on the plantation had been damaged. But, similar to many of the planter elite, he managed to recoup some of his fortune.\textsuperscript{157} A local historian observes that at Glen Leven the post-war years “were not filled with the financial hardship that was so prevalent throughout the region.”\textsuperscript{158} Thompson was able to salvage almost half of the tracts of city property he had owned.\textsuperscript{159} He had cash and the railroads in which he had invested were under repair and expansion. In the Reconstruction years Thompson was able to act as an informal banker.\textsuperscript{160} When he died in on April 18, 1876, at the age of eighty-three, he left a valuable estate to his three children.\textsuperscript{161} At the time of his death a friend wrote the following about John Thompson:

Mr. Thompson was a man of the strongest native sense, clear judgment, the strictest morals, and an integrity unstained and unquestioned. Sober, thoughtful, patient, kind in his feelings and expressions towards his fellow-men, he was honored and esteemed by those who knew him best in a very high degree. He was the kindest of husbands, and a loving, faithful father, sparing no pains and no expense to make all about him comfortable and happy. His home was the abode of hospitality. He leaves behind a large estate, and what is far better, that best heritage for his children, a good name.\textsuperscript{162}

Thompson’s granddaughter Mary Thompson Orr described him as “a most remarkable man and the ancestor for whom I have the greatest admiration.”\textsuperscript{163}

**GLEN LEVEN AS A TENNESSEE PROGRESSIVE FARM, 1876-1920**

John Thompson’s will divided his vast land and monetary holdings between his wife, daughter, and two sons. John left Glen Leven to his wife for her lifetime with instructions that it would become his son John’s property after her death. John also left her a “large amount of bonds so that Mary could use the income to maintain the old place in the same hospitable manner that had been his choice during his lifetime.”\textsuperscript{164} John Thompson, Jr., whom we will refer to as John M. Thompson from this point further to avoid confusion, would eventually receive the house and the property on the west side of the Nashville & Decatur Railroad known as Glen Leven. In order to provide his son Joseph with an inheritance that was equal with his brother’s, John Thompson left Joseph $10,000 dollars and the land holdings on the east side of the railroad.\textsuperscript{165} John’s only surviving daughter, Ann Elizabeth Horton, received a sizeable sum of
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money and his remaining business property. The effects and furnishings of the house were to be divided equally between the two brothers by Mary. It was written that Mary took this aspect of the will quite literally and “Joe got the set of red draperies for the parlors, John the blue. Six dining room chairs went to each son and the table was neatly sawed in half.”

With her husband then gone for many months, and after the details of his will were settled, which had occupied the majority of her time and thoughts, Mary Thompson presumably “settled into her widowhood and presided over the house for her rather dashing son although she had an idea that there would soon be a young mistress in residence.” John M. Thompson began another period of significance for Glen Leven, both in the realm of progressive agriculture and also in Tennessee politics. Thompson was a Vanderbilt-educated attorney at the time of his father’s death, but over the next 40 years, he would become one of the state’s leading agriculturalists and would host such luminaries as famed Democratic orator William Jennings Bryan at Glen Leven.

In 1878 he took his first significant steps in the direction of a new future for Glen Leven when he married Mary McConnell White Overton (known as “Conn”). Conn was one of the daughters of John Overton who owned the nearby Traveller’s Rest plantation. It was at that place on the sixth day of June that John Overton hosted his daughter’s marriage. Afterwards, John M. and Conn left Tennessee for a six-month honeymoon tour of Europe. Reaching the couple before they left New York, messages told John Thompson of a proposed lawsuit by his sister Ann Elizabeth Horton who was unhappy with her late father’s will and hoped to overturn it. The couple postponed their trip and returned to Nashville in order to settle the issue. The brothers soon began bargaining. John M. traded a part of his land on the west side of the railroad to Joseph. That particular section of property was bordered by the Franklin Turnpike on the west side and by Thompson Lane on the north side. In return, Joseph traded John M. an equal amount of acreage on the east side of the railroad. It is unclear what type of a deal the brothers made with their sister, but it was written that “an agreement was made that satisfied the sister.”

The year 1878 is also a benchmark year at Glen Leven as it marks the farm’s appearance as one of the region’s primary stock-growing operations. The Rural Sun, a key progressive voice in Tennessee agriculture during the decade, published a long front page story about Glen Leven in its January 10, 1878, edition. The story emphasized:

In selecting a nucleus upon which to build his future herd, Mr. Thompson has wisely avoided the course so fatally followed by breeders of late years, viz., pedigree without individual merit. Yet as to pedigree taken as a whole, the Glen Leven herd will probably rank any in the state, and individual excellence of its members will compare most favorably with the best. Profiting by the experience of older breeders, who began at the bottom and bred up to the top, Mr. Thompson has begun at the top, (hence the clean breeding of his herd,) and with the material he has for a foundation, he can take no other position than in the front rank of our most prominent breeders of Shorthorn cattle. His herd is
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represented by families that have added fame to the Shorthorn race wherever they are known. In looking over these cattle a short time ago, we were struck with the strong resemblance members of the same families bore each other in their general conformation. 170

This praise of Thompson’s herd is well founded, considering the many different breeds and bloodlines from which it was composed. Within Thompson’s herd could be found female roans of the desired bloodlines of Young Mary, Young Phillesse, Gwynn, Louan, Jubilee, Lavinia, and Victoria, as well as English imported breeds. From these prestigious breeds, twelve were mentioned in the article as coming from the finest of bloodlines and calving even finer stock. Thompson also raised young bulls which he bought from owners in Kentucky, where the majority of his herd originated. The author ended his article by further praising Thompson’s herd by stating “To say that we were pleased with the Glen Leven herd would only half express our feelings. We know that each animal had been carefully selected, but we were unprepared to see in one herd such high excellence and breeding combined.” 171

In 1878 John M. lived at Glen Leven, while his brother Joseph set about using his inheritance money to build a residence named “Brightwood.” The house was constructed on a hill overlooking a spring that ran along Thompson Lane that was “very near where his father was born” just in front of the site of the old blockhouse. 172 John M. Thompson’s wife Conn gave birth to their daughter Mary in 1879, Harriet in 1881, Conn in 1883, and John Jr. in 1885.173

John M. Thompson’s agricultural exploits as a stockman and a farmer of produce, corn, and wheat (which he sold to the Maxwell House Hotel owned by his in-laws, the Overtons) were not his only business enterprises. He was a Nashville attorney, and he also raised South Down sheep. The receipt stationary Thompson used proclaimed “John M. Thompson, Glen Leven Stock Farm, Shorthorn Cattle and South Down Sheep, I breed my Ewes to imported Rams.” 174 The prosperity, profitability, and number of Thompson’s sheep operation are largely unknown, but given the high regard of his cattle herd, the sheep were undoubtedly of high quality. He also invested in breded jersey dairy cattle, purchasing “Early Morn” in 1887 and “Pinkey Spry” in 1892.

In the 1880s, Thompson took additional steps to expand his influence and business. He served as the president of the Nashville Sulphur Springs Co. In 1885, the state legislature elected him as a trustee of the University of Nashville. In 1887, with the partnership of his brother-in-law May Overton and V. L. Kirkman, Thompson formed “an incorporated breeding farm situated about five miles south of the city on the Franklin Pike.” 175 The farm was named the “Hermitage Stud” and was “devoted to the rearing and development of trotting stock.” 176 In its prime, the Hermitage Stud was said to have housed over one-hundred finely bred trotters.
and brood mares, while providing feed and shelter for another sixty-five to seventy boarders. A contemporary, writing about a visit to the property in 1888, noted:

Ponce De Leon, Bow Bells, and Rosy Morn formerly were members of the celebrated Hermitage Stud at Nashville, Tenn. The farms owned by V. L. Kirkman, John Thompson, and May Overton afford a range of 2000 acres along the Franklin Pike, south of Nashville, in what was known as the heart of the Blue Grass region of Tennessee. This section had for many years been recognized as the birthplace of successful running horses, and there was no reason why the trotting horse should not be grown there.177

Thompson was co-owner/secretary in the venture, and on a tract of his wife’s land on the west side of the Franklin Pike, he built a race track, barns, and stables. According to his daughter Mary Thompson Orr, Thompson found a Confederate sword when Civil War breastworks were leveled to build the race track; he advertised the sword and its owner claimed it, telling Thompson he had hidden the sword when he realized he would be captured.

Harness racing at Cumberland Park race track in Nashville (above). The offices for the Hermitage Stud, located on Franklin Pike (below). (Beisel & DeHart, *Middle Tennessee Horse Breeding*).
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The year when Hermitage Stud was established, 1887, is the most likely year that Thompson modernized and updated Glen Leven in a more stylish Victorian fashion. A competitive stud farm had to appeal to possible buyers and investors—the house of his father reflected more of an 1840s aesthetic than one of the 1880s. It was also during these years—no definite date has been established—that Conn Thompson and her mother-in-law began planting a new flower garden on the property to replace the previous smaller one that had been destroyed years earlier. The duo designed their new garden “using a walk ten feet wide and one hundred feet long” with a “wisteria arbor” spanning the entire length. Many of the bulbs originally ordered from Holland were salvaged and were “replanted in beds and borders on both sides” while additions such as “peonies, lilacs, roses, lemon lilies, magnolias, snowballs, and a smoke tree” were planted as well. Victorian landscaping set off the renovated house quite effectively.

Research also has uncovered another possible reason for the house’s remodeling. In 1886, daughter Harriet Thompson, at age five, became seriously ill. The diagnosis was diphtheria, for which the doctors had no remedy. Her father nursed her day and night trying to provide the best care possible for his beloved child. It was written that “through the long hot nights he sat with her, bathing her as the fever rose and trying to transmit some of his strength to her wracked body,” and unfortunately, even with his loving care, she did not survive. This loss grieved John M. and his family, and he decided “that the germs of the disease were present in Glen Leven itself and he moved his family up the road to Traveller’s Rest as soon as the funeral was over.” Under these circumstances the family had no choice and they “stayed there for a year while John set about purifying the old place.” This purification project would bring about the largest renovations of, and additions to, the house.

The earlier National Register nomination for the property surmised that renovations of the house began in 1888 and were completed in 1890. In light of the fact that John M. “moved his family up the road to Traveller’s Rest as soon as the funeral was over,” and given the earlier death date of February 1886, it is logical to suspect that the renovations to Glen Leven would have begun two years previously than originally thought. Discrepancies aside, both histories corroborate that the family left Glen Leven and stayed at Traveller’s Rest for a year while the work was completed. Therefore, this new evidence proposes that the first large renovation of Glen Leven was completed in late 1887 or early 1888. A family history describes the work done at Glen Leven in the year following Harriet’s death:

The wall paper in the front hall was steamed off... the north side of the house was elongated by attaching a kitchen with pantries and a cross hall. Two servants’ rooms were built above the kitchen and the back porch was extended and an equally long porch built over it upstairs... A flush toilet was installed at the end of the upstairs back porch. A closet was built on the upstairs porch to hold fishing tackle and hunting gear. Down came the spiral stairway; in went the shiny
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massive horror that ends with carved newel in the center of the hall. The baseboards, cornices, moldings, and door frames of the north rooms were pulled out and replaced with cherry, also the double sliding doors between the rooms on that side of the house. The house was wired for electricity and a telephone was put in.\footnote{184}

Although flush toilets had been in use since 1829 in a few large cities, it was not until after 1840 that toilets could be found in homes other than those of the extremely wealthy or in expensive hotels. Telephones first became available in Nashville in 1877, and electric lighting made its debut in 1882.\footnote{185} Family history recorded the house as being designated “No. 476” upon the electricity being installed. It signified how “comparatively rare a convenience it was” to have electricity.\footnote{186} All three amenities provided convenience and underscored the wealth of the owners. A show farm needs a showplace—the renovated and modernized Glen Leven now met that standard.

Thompson promptly moved the family back to Glen Leven. To his disbelief, daughter Mary fell ill shortly after their return. As with Harriet, the diagnosis was confirmed as diphtheria with no clear source of origin. Thompson’s theories ranged from the household cat to neglected areas of the house not cleansed by the renovations. For weeks the parents cared for the child and “shared vigil, hoping and praying.”\footnote{187} Slowly, the illness released its hold on Mary, and through a long convalescence she became better, although suffering damage to her heart that would remain the rest of her life. Soon after, John M. Thompson “converted the south rooms on the first floor to family rooms, using the southeast room as his bedroom, and installing a bathroom in one corner of the room.”\footnote{188} In the years that followed, John M. and Conn welcomed the birth of their son Overton in 1888, followed shortly thereafter by Joseph in 1890, and their final daughter Elizabeth in 1892.

The Hermitage Stud brought John M. Thompson into the wider national market for racing horses. Family history states that Thompson traveled as far as California to purchase horses for the farm, one of which would bring the Hermitage Stud nationwide notoriety. The horse was named Wedgewood, and John M. reportedly paid $25,000 for the stallion.\footnote{189} On October 17, 1890, John M. became one of the incorporators of another equine-related business enterprise named the Cumberland Fair and Racing Association.\footnote{190} The corporation built a racetrack, grandstand, and stables on the Tennessee State Fairgrounds (later the location of the Tennessee Centennial Exposition and then Centennial Park). Nashville residents were so impressed with Wedgewood that “the road from the Cumberland Fair and Racing Association to Franklin Pike, leading to Glen Leven and the Hermitage Stud was named Wedgewood Avenue.”\footnote{191}
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The serious depression of 1893-94 dealt a death blow to the Hermitage Stud.\textsuperscript{192} In 1897 the Hermitage Stud ceased operations, and the horses were sold at auction at Madison Square Garden in New York.\textsuperscript{193} Thompson’s losses, however, were somewhat abated by the fact that the old fairgrounds had been transformed into the massive cultural event known as the Tennessee Centennial Exposition. And at its opening ceremonies, John M. Thompson, as Speaker of the Tennessee State Senate, stood on the stage and greeted the thousands gathered at the park.\textsuperscript{194}

Thompson’s political career meshed with his agricultural ventures. He was well educated, having studied law at Cumberland University and Vanderbilt University in the years prior to 1875, when he was admitted to the Nashville Bar.\textsuperscript{195} As an attorney and leading agriculturalist, Thompson, like others in his social class in the Victorian era, also wanted to be known for his community contributions. In 1890, he and other neighbors established the Glen Leven Presbyterian Church downtown (it moved to its present location adjacent to the house in 1961-62). The church hired former Army of Tennessee chaplain James H. McNeilly as its minister.

Thompson turned to politics in 1893, when he was elected to the Tennessee General Assembly. In 1895, Thompson was elected to the State Senate “where he served until 1903, serving briefly as Speaker of the Senate” from 1897-1899. As Senate speaker, Thompson also served as the state’s vice governor.\textsuperscript{196} Thompson had a strong following among the constituents of Davidson County.\textsuperscript{197}

At the turn of the century, Glen Leven lost its matriarch, Mary Hamilton House Thompson. Outliving her husband by twenty-five years, Mary Thompson died at Glen Leven on June 23, 1901. Reverend J. H. McNeilly of Nashville paid tribute to Mary Thompson in an article in the\textit{ Confederate Veteran}, of which an excerpt reads:

Mrs. Thompson’s tender heart always responded generously to the calls of disabled Confederates. She was one of the noblest of those grand women who were the glory of the old South…and her descendants have in her life and example a heritage beyond all price.\textsuperscript{198}

Fifty of Mary Thompson’s years were spent on the property at Glen Leven. With her passing, the Glen Leven homeplace legally became the sole property of her son, John M. Thompson.

A year later, Mary Hamilton Thompson married Samuel Holt Orr, a banker in Nashville, at the First Presbyterian Church. She became active as an officer in the Ladies’ Battlefield
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Memorial Association, a heritage group that later built the Nashville Peace Monument. Also in 1902, Conn Overton Thompson married Dr. Albert W. Harris in the front parlor of Glen Leven, the room where she had been born and where her funeral services would be held after her death. John Jr. followed suit in 1907, marrying Margaret Wade. Family history states that the house was far from empty and “soon there were half a dozen grandchildren.” This number was increased yet again by Overton Thompson, who married Margaret Lipscomb in 1911. Shortly after in 1915, Elizabeth Thompson married Dr. William Gillian Kennon, and in 1918, Joseph Hamilton Thompson married Florence Fonde. It was written that John M. Thompson “loved it all, beaming on the increasing tribe of which he was the unquestioned head.”

Thompson also continued to make changes to Glen Leven’s agricultural operations. Thompson drained a pond on the property in a field named the “pond lot” to plant cotton, and even went as far as building a gin. Another field, called the “Camp lot” on account of Andrew Jackson’s soldiers once camping there, was planted in wheat. In the “Woods lot” an engine was installed called the “Ram” to pump water from a spring to the house. Thompson even excavated areas of his land with hopes of finding phosphate. The change in land use was not the only modification Thompson made to the property, and the house came next. Thompson insisted that his wife add new hardwood flooring in the front hall and in the southwest family sitting room as well.

John Thompson faced the challenge of suburbanization and its impact on the family farm during the first decade of the twentieth century. Impressed by Nashville’s electric trolley system, Hunter M. Mayberry of Franklin and other concerned citizens had turned their attention to a faster, better connection from Franklin to Nashville and the new suburbs between. Mayberry realized that “for the city of Franklin to grow, an easy way to move residents to Nashville and back again must be found.” In 1902 the concerned parties met in Nashville. The meeting included businessmen and politicians from Nashville and the affected surrounding counties. During their conference the citizens organized the plans for two railways, the Nashville and Columbia, and the Nashville and Gallatin. Their main goal was to achieve “faster travel, saving of time and energy and the opportunity of farmers getting their produce to market much faster.”

This proposal faced four main objections. First, the Louisville and Nashville Railroad (which now controlled the earlier Nashville and Decatur line) did not want to lose passenger fares; second, Franklin merchants did not want to lose their revenue to Nashville businesses; third, turnpikes and toll roads stood to lose income; and last, many property owners did not want the tracks to cross their land. In 1905 the Interurban Board of Directors met, found solutions for their problems, secured financial backing, and hired surveyors to lay out the proposed course of the road. The route decided upon would parallel the Franklin Pike on both sides, crossing as needed, to avoid hills and prevent excess grading. When completed the railway would extend between the two cities for a distance of 88,840 feet.

---
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The proposed route of the Nashville Interurban Railway (NIR) directly affected the Thompson family. In mid 1907 and early 1908, the NIR began construction of a proposed electric railway that would operate between “Nashville in Davidson County and Mt. Pleasant in Maury County [where new phosphate mines had opened], by way of Franklin in Williamson County Tenn.” In January of 1908, the firm had already begun construction of the section of the railway between Nashville and Franklin. However, in order for the two cities to connect by rail, a right-of-way easement had to be secured by the NIR to cross through the Thompson family lands on the east and west of the Franklin Pike. The turnpike, and the surrounding family lands by this time were “practically a family enclave and most of the traffic belonged to the family. It was not unusual for someone to stop a wagon and tell the driver to deliver a package or a message to another house up the road.”

The Thompsons, unlike many other property owners, did not oppose the construction of the line across their property, and on January 22, 1908, family members consented to an agreement allowing the railroad to bisect their property. The signers included John M. Thompson and wife Mary O. Thompson, Sam H. Orr and wife Mary T. Orr, A.W. Harris and wife Conn T. Harris, John Thompson Jr., and the Nashville Trust Company. The land was largely donated, although an agreement was made for payment of $1,000, which would become null and void if the (NIR) commenced operation before January 1, 1910.

---


The agreement allowed for a fifty foot right-of-way on the west side of the Franklin Pike that entered the land of John M, Thompson from the north paralleling the pike; the track would then cross the pike onto the land of Mary O. Thompson on the east side of the pike, exiting her land to the south. The proposed path of the railway is described as follows:

Said railroad shall be located and constructed on the west side of said turnpike for the entire distance along said turnpike as far as said above devised John Thompson lands on the east side of said turnpike border upon said turnpike, and on to or about the south end of the right of way herein granted under the above stated conditions, and that the east rail of said railroad shall, at no point, be nearer to said turnpike than the west margin of said turnpike, for a distance beginning opposite the north boundary of the lands devised by said John Thompson, deceased, and continuing southwardly to where the right of way herein granted ends, and that after said railroad crosses said turnpike, as herein provided, the west rail of said railroad shall, at no point, be nearer to said turnpike than the east margin of said turnpike from the point where it crosses to the east side of said turnpike, on and to a point opposite the southern boundary.
line of said lands, conveyed to Mrs. Mary O. Thompson by John Overton, deceased.\textsuperscript{207}

Under the agreement, fences on the property were to be removed and replaced. All timber that was cut in the process of clearing would be cut into cordwood and stacked, and profitable timber such as Locust trees, were to be cut into seven foot sections. Grading was to be kept to a minimum, and low spots were to be filled to the level no lower than the turnpike, while cuts could go no deeper than the pike. Also of note, although unconfirmed, is a provision within the agreement for the (NIR) to construct a passenger station on the west side of the Franklin Pike, directly opposite of the Glen Leven home. It also states that between the station and Caldwell Lane a switch track or siding would be constructed to aid the purpose of receiving, loading, and unloading cars and freight. Conflicting dates show the first running of the (NIR) as December 24, 1908, or in April of 1909. The Thompsons undoubtedly noticed the first running from their vantage point at Glen Leven. Thompson family members may have even been present for the first run, “as the first interurban car from Nashville braked to a stop on the Franklin square,” where they would have heard “the sound of Dixie” played by a brass band.\textsuperscript{208} One of the perks of having a passenger railroad close by was that it “made it easier for relatives from town to come to Glen Leven to spend the day.”\textsuperscript{209} The railway operated until 1941, when it was converted into a bus line.

As the interurban was under construction, Thompson returned to Capitol Hill to serve in state government. On February 7, 1907, he accepted Governor Malcolm Patterson’s appointment as State Commissioner of Agriculture, serving until 1911. His primary responsibilities were compiling crop reports, inspecting livestock for disease, certifying fertilizers, feed stock, and seeds for purity, and organizing the annual Farmers’ Institutes.\textsuperscript{210} Tennessee was still an agricultural economy, despite industrial growth since the Civil War.\textsuperscript{211} At the time of Thompson’s appointment, there were three overlapping agricultural agencies in the state: the Tennessee Department of Agriculture, the College of Agriculture at the University of Tennessee, and the experiment station at the University of Tennessee. Farmers felt these agencies duplicated each other, but Thompson argued that they supported each other. “The business of the College Agriculture is instruction, the work of the Experiment Station of the College is investigation of the manifold problems of agriculture,” and “the Department of Agriculture executed the agricultural laws enacted by the state legislators.”\textsuperscript{212} In 1908, Thompson wrote, “the farmers of our state are more prosperous than at any time for 30 or 40 years past,” referring to increases in productive acres, crop production, growing farm income, and increasing value of farm property and products.\textsuperscript{213} He believed growing urban markets and
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Famers’ Institutes, which taught new methods to farmers, contributed to the success of agriculture in the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{214}

Thompson’s service as commissioner of agriculture was significant in that he worked closely with such agricultural reformers as Harcourt A. Morgan (later one of the three original directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority) and Brown Ayres, president of the University of Tennessee, to institutionalize progressive farming across the state. Thompson vigorously enforced the state’s recent laws and regulations to control diseases among livestock, even placing quarantines against regions where cattle disease broke out in 1907-1908. This action led to the Tennessee Supreme Court case of Bishop v. State (1909), where the Supreme Court upheld the Commissioner of Agriculture’s authority to place quarantines against a farmer’s livestock. Thompson urged farmers to use fertilizers to increase yields and in 1909 the agriculture department published a special bulletin on the use of fertilizers in Tennessee.

Another key contribution was the development of a statewide program of professional agricultural assistance to farmers. Thompson began by supporting farmers’ institutes, and other means, such as special railroad trains, to take the message of progressive farming practices to property owners. In the 1909 federal office of experiment stations official report, Thompson proudly listed Tennessee’s progress:

Growing live stock was a subject discussed at all regular farmers’ institute meetings last year, of which there were 64 sessions with an attendance of 55,300. There were also 18 independent institutes, the attendance at which was not recorded, and 33 sessions of round-up institutes with 6,000 in attendance. A railroad special which ran 100 miles stopping at 13 towns was visited by 2,000 people. The total cost of the institutes was $3,264, not including the salary and expenses of the director, which would add $600 to the cost. The state appropriation for the work was $5,000. Six members of the agricultural experiment station staff lectured, and 6 state lecturers were employed.

Thompson’s most important contribution came in his role working with Morgan, Ayres, and other reformers to transform the institutes into a permanent system, creating the University of Tennessee Extension Service in 1910.

In December 1910, Commissioner Thompson had the opportunity to address the Tennessee Dairy Association. With the address coming near the end of Governor Patterson’s administration, Thompson reviewed his career as agriculture commissioner, the contributions he had made to the state, and the need for Tennessee to retain a strong and adequately funded agriculture department.

I was appointed on June 1st, 1907, a little more than three years ago. Previous to that date I had received invitations from time to time to go with the various commissioners of agriculture in the State, and talk to the farmers and, in a way, I knew something of the workings of the office. When I took charge of the office I felt that it would be my duty to do what I could, not only to perform the duties of the office in an acceptable way to the people of the State and the farmers and to discharge my duties under the law, but I felt I ought to do something that would stir up a greater interest among the farmers of the State in the department.

\textsuperscript{214} Ibid.
As I have said to you, and repeated over and over again, agriculture has never been recognized in the State of Tennessee as it ought to have been. The farmers themselves have not attached sufficient importance to the teaching of agriculture in the schools, as was required by the law. The act which authorized the public school system in Tennessee, among other things, provided that agriculture should be taught in the common schools. No attention whatever had been paid, up to 1907, to that requirement. The school teachers were not qualified or equipped to intelligently teach the elementary principles of agriculture. The county superintendents had not required that those who applied for positions in the schools to be equipped for that purpose. The result has been that, up to the past year or so, the children of the public schools, in the rural districts, have been taught everything except agriculture, and taught everything to direct the thought and the mind of the children to other things than agriculture. In other words, the whole tendency has been to lead the child from the farm, and the result is our most talented young men have gone into other professions and other businesses.

After having been in the office for two years, the legislature met and gave us some legislation that was more wholesome. It provided for the erection of three normal schools that are in the course of construction at this time. Among the other provisions, the law demands that agriculture shall be taught in these normal colleges or schools, and that the teachers who shall graduate from those institutions shall be qualified to teach agriculture, and, as a result, many hundreds of teachers throughout the State have begun to write for the bulletins at the Department at Washington, many teachers throughout the State have taken the summer short course at Knoxville. So, all in all, I feel we have made quite a stride in the direction of disseminating information pertinent to agriculture, among the people of this State. You perhaps are aware of the fact that there is more general interest taken in farmers' meetings in the State than ever. Last year I spent some money that was given to the department for holding institutes, in holding a short course of six days' duration, in three or four counties. This year we have already held a week's school in Maury County; this week there will be a school held down at Jackson, Tenn. Next week, we will hold a school in Clarksville, in Montgomery County.

This system of disseminating information, teaching farmers, is meeting with a most enthusiastic reception. Week-before-last they had some two or three hundred farmers who attended the daily meetings in Columbia, and I am satisfied that the enthusiasm that was manifested indicates that a great and lasting work was done. Indeed, there were a number of prominent farmers from adjoining counties, who sought the Commissioner of Agriculture and desired to have similar meetings held in their counties.

All of you know—for most of you, I presume, keep abreast of the times—that in the very near future, the people of the United States and the people of Tennessee particularly, must change their methods if they provide for and take care of the population that we are to have very soon. Our methods must be changed, our acres must produce more than they do to-day.

I throw out these suggestions for your consideration. Your legislature is to meet within the next three or four weeks and you all have your representatives in the House and Senate. I hope you will take an opportunity to say to them that you want them to look fully into the condition of the Agricultural Department of the
State of Tennessee, and insist that they shall be liberal in the appropriations they make for the purpose of conducting the business of the Department of Agriculture.

I want the man who succeeds me in this office, to have a better opportunity to disseminate information than I have had. I do not want any department of the State to be in need of funds; certainly, if any of the departments are to be stinted and left out of a liberal appropriation, it ought not to be the Agricultural Department, and I hope you gentlemen will see to it, whether you are Republicans or Democrats, that you will for the time, waive your political predilections and insist that your representative shall look closely into the needs of this department and that they will vote liberal appropriations for the purpose of carrying on this work.

After a short hiatus from the affairs of the state, Thompson was once again elected to the Senate in 1917, where he served until his death in 1919. During the nationally recognized debate on woman’s suffrage in 1919, Thompson was characterized as “a violent ‘anti’” by Elizabeth C. Stanton. Thompson “also served on the board of directors of Montgomery Bell Academy in Nashville, during which time the preparatory school moved from its temporary site near the State Capitol in downtown Nashville to its present day location on Harding Road.”

Thompson had suffered from bouts of ill health since at least 1908. In 1912, his wife recalled another incident. It was “the night the horse barn burned” and the entire “household was aroused by the frantic ringing of the big bell atop a post outside the kitchen door.” The cause of the fire remains unknown, but after the fire Thompson was exhausted from organizing firefighters, saving animals, and destroying those he could not save. He began to lose weight, became tired easily, had an unquenchable thirst, and a boil growing on the back of his neck. His weakness soon left him bedridden, and he was examined by the family doctor, Albert W. Harris, and others. The diagnosis was diabetes because “sugar had been found in the urine” and “this was before insulin had been discovered as a means of controlling the disorder.” It would not be until 1922 that J.J.R. MacLeod would perfect the work of others before him to provide insulin for patients suffering with diabetes. Nonetheless, Thompson was cared for by nurses, and received visitors “propped up on pillows and with his black hat set firmly atop his head” while “family members came and the men on the place went through the morning ritual of asking for orders.” Shortly thereafter, Mary Hamilton Orr read an article about a new medicine called Celusin, which had been used with a favorable outcome with previous patients. The medicine was soon ordered by Dr. Harris, and seemingly overnight, Thompson recovered completely. During the remaining seven years of his life the illness did not return and “he did not even restrict his diet for he sat mornings at the head of the table, wearing his derby, and covered his cereal - oatmeal, none of your old crusty Kellogg things – with an inch of sugar.”

Joseph Thompson quit college before graduation, and returned to the property to help his father. He decided to become a farmer, and planned to start a dairy and ham-smoking operation. This eased the burden on Thompson, and he slowly let his son take over some of his
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The automobile age had arrived and Thompson bought a “new Buick touring car.” Speculation suggests that it was a 1916 model, which was very big and spacious for the family. Today these cars are known as “Pre-War Buicks,” meaning they were built prior to the First World War. Thompson reverted back to what he knew best on occasion and “still preferred Old Ross and his buggy for the shorter trips to the country.” For longer trips, such as driving the children to school, Thompson made use of his automobile “except when the day was too wet or too cold or too pretty to deem it otherwise.”

World War I also affected the families of Glen Leven. Joseph Thompson, who had vowed to become a farmer, joined the armed services just days after war was declared. Dr. Harris and Dr. Kennon also left their homes and wives to serve as part of the Vanderbilt Medical Unit. With this, Thompson regained control of the farm operation, and welcomed his daughters Elizabeth and Conn to stay at Glen Leven while their husbands were away. Mary Thompson helped her husband by taking care of the ten people living in the house. She also cared for the young children and babies while the other women “went to their war work, rolling bandages and making nightshirts.” The Brightwood house, which Thompson’s brother, Joseph H. Thompson had built on the northeast side of the property, now became the home of Joseph’s daughter Ida and her family. The war came to an end in 1918 and brought the return of those who had left the property to fight in the war. John M. Thompson died at Glen Leven amidst his family on September 25, 1919.

With John M. Thompson’s death, living at Glen Leven truly became “a complicated business.” Records of the Nashville Trust Company, dated as early as July 8, 1921, show that Thompson’s children did not wait to divide the estate of their father. Instead, they had the Trust draw up the necessary paperwork to divide the interest and property among themselves evenly, with clear instructions of how it would be accomplished. The documentation shows that the estate, both real and personal, was to be valued as of September 25, 1919. After that value was ascertained, it was to be split six ways with each heir receiving a sixth, with one sixth reserved to pay off John M. Thompson’s advancements and interest accrued by the Trust, and any outstanding debt that remained. Any residue remaining thereafter was to be split among the remaining five heirs. Initially, the advancements and debt were to be paid from the valuation of the whole estate, but this was quickly changed to be taken from Thompson’s sixth share. The appraisal was completed in the fall of 1921. His property included:

- Lot and building located at 321 Third Ave. N., Nashville, TN, rented to H.G. Hill Grocery Company at $791.67 per month.
- Lot and building located at 322 Second Ave. N., Nashville, TN, rented to Wilk Meat Market at $200.00 per month.

---
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Farm Located on the Franklin Pike, Nashville, TN. East side of Franklin Pike, 259 acres worth $95,000.00. West side of Franklin Pike, 153 acres worth $72,000.  

These initial figures were accurate for the property located in Nashville, but here inconsistent concerning the Glen Leven properties. A letter dated September 8, 1921, states that the acreage owned by Thompson was 371.55 acres combined, while the enclosure within the same letter shown above states that he owned 412 acres. It is unknown how or why this discrepancy existed, or whether it was corrected. However, the breakdown of the Glen Leven property is as follows as of September 25, 1919:

1- 227.8 acres on the east side of the Franklin Pike, known as the Home Place;
2- 25 acres east of the Home Place, and of the L&N railroad;
3- 66.4 acres on the west side of the Franklin Pike and opposite of the Home Place;
4- 35.7 acres on the west side of the Franklin pike and immediately south of the property of A. M. Hagan; and
5- 16.65 acres west of the Franklin Pike and lying on both sides of Glen Leven Road.

The value of the gross estate as of that same date totaled $352,581.09, including interest, notes, and advancements. Even with Thompson’s one-sixth share to cover these expenses, four heirs were required to pay $9,425.49 to settle the estate with the Nashville Trust Company. In order to “clean up” Thompson’s notes and interest, the Trust loaned the five heirs the said amount, securing the loan “by a mortgage on their individual interests in the Hill Building,” which was the most profitable of the revenue earning properties.

In early October, the widowed Mary M. Thompson consulted her lawyer, John C. Trabue, concerning the details of her husband’s will, which specified that he had “left his property to his grandchildren, with only life tenancy to his sons.” An agreement was made by the three sisters, Mary H. Orr, Conn O. Harris, and Elizabeth Kennon, that they would convey to their children “real property and improvements, including the Home Place, of the value of approximately $27,000, such valuations to be based on the recent appraisal, and this to be in satisfaction of their money obligations to the children of approximately $16, 500.” Likewise, Mary’s two sons, Overton and Joseph, would pay the sum of $10- or $11,000 which would be allocated to “take care of the taxes and insurance” incurred by and needed for the house. Mr. Trabue and Charles Hagan of the Nashville Trust Company decided that this arrangement was favorable, but the money paid by Overton and Joseph was “entirely insufficient to for purposes of maintenance, repairs, etc., especially in view of the fact that the residence is very old-fashioned and very large; and by way of illustration (they) mentioned the considerable expense that would be involved in repainting the residence, which would be necessary from time to time.” However, the duo were unmoved by this detail, and informed Mary that whatever excess funding was needed to complete the necessary maintenance would have to come
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directly from her own income, adding that the worst possible scenario would be that land would have to be sold to cover the costs. This blunt firmness was used due to the Trust’s obligation as guardian of the property, in order to ensure that it was “maintained in good condition so as to prevent its deterioration.”

The life tenancy arrangements between the five Thompson heirs are as follows, and could be forthwith divided amongst themselves as desired:

Conn Thompson Harris and Elizabeth Thompson Kennon:

**East Side of Pike**
- 66.93 acres
- 92.07 acres
- 26.7 acres
- Barn Southeast of Home Place
- Cabin in Thicket

**West Side of Pike**
- 4.8 acres (Curtis Woods)

Mary T. Orr, Overton Thompson, and Joe Thompson:

**East Side of Pike**
- 72.82 acres (Home Place)
- Improvements on same

**West Side of Pike**
- 58.62 acres (Caldwell Lane)
- Improvements on same
- 35.7 acres (South of Hagan)
- 12.57 acres (Curtis Woods)

This information was provided from a letter dated October 26, 1922. Upon the heirs’ receipt of said letter, for all intents and purposes, the legal issues of Thomson’s will had been settled and the property divided, although still held by the Thompson Family. That being said, the heirs continued to exchange and divide properties for some time afterward.

As mentioned above, Mary T. Orr and her two brothers received the Home Place and land on either side of the Franklin Pike. They divided these lands amongst themselves, with Mary T. Orr receiving the Home Place. She had been recently widowed, with her husband Samuel H. Orr having passed away in 1920. Therefore, she and her children moved in with her mother at Glen Leven. Mary O. Thompson died on January 15, 1924. Mary T. Orr could not afford to live in the large house, and she traded it with her sister Conn O. Harris. In return Mary
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received “ten acres to the north in what was the end of the park and part of the Camp lot.” Mary and Conn coordinated their moving to occur on the same day “so that Glen Leven was not empty, even for a night.” Their brother Joseph had received a piece of land just north of the carriage house, between the Home Place and the land Mary T. Orr had acquired. It was situated roughly where the Glen Leven Presbyterian Church stands today, and there he built a home for his wife Florence, and two children, Joe Jr. and Alice. Joseph gave up farming shortly thereafter, and took a job with the railroad. Overton Thompson acquired lands on the west side of the pike, and returned to Nashville and built a house on that acreage.

MODERNIZING GLEN LEVEN, 1925-1971

Conn T. Harris lived at Glen Leven for a total of twenty years. In that time, she and her husband oversaw many changes to the house and surrounding property. The changes included the installation of a bathroom in the upstairs cross hall, electric stoves to replace those burning coal, and an opening from the first bathroom to the servants rooms over the kitchen.

Transportation once again significantly impacted the property. In July 1928, a right-of-way agreement was reached with the State of Tennessee Department of Highways and Public Works to allow the Franklin Pike to be widened into what would be designated U.S. Highway 31. The agreement required the State to obtain a strip of land 1,636 feet long and totaling 1.32 acres. This was broken into two sections by width, with the south section requiring 22 feet from the east margin, or 33 feet from the original centerline of the Franklin Pike. The second northern section was 40 feet wide, extending east 40 feet from the original centerline. Records show that to achieve this proposed construction, sections of the historic rock fence in front of Glen Leven would have to be dismantled, moved, and rebuilt. A retaining wall was also built to hold the fill of the road, which somewhat protected the Spring House that was situated only two feet from the finished wall. Davidson County, under the charge of the State, drew up seven guidelines that were agreed upon by Conn and Albert Harris. For the purposes of explanation, numbers one, four, and five read as follows:

The County will restore ingress and egress and will reset the present stone entrance to fit the new guard rail on the north and retaining wall on the south, as it now fits the old guard rail and retaining wall, and, to take care of the lowering of the grade of the Franklin Pike at the driveway the County will restore the driveway on the same grade as it now is by cutting the same depth in the driveway at the top as the pike is cut at the bottom of the hill. The drainage at the entrance will be maintained and extended so as to give the same service to the driveway as it now does. The County will make a sketch of the present entrance so as to be able to re-locate it to the same lines as it now has.

The County will re-set the present fence along the top of the fill from the entrance toward Nashville at the outside edge of the shoulder so that it will be in effect a guard rail for that fill, the posts to be set in cement mortar, and from the Nashville end of the present guard rail the rock wall continuing from that point to the property line between the Harris property and Joe Thompson’s property will be curved in from the guard rail to join the rock wall on the 40 foot line, and thence
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with the rock wall to the property line between the Harris property and Joe Thompson.

The rock wall from the main entrance south, which is now in place as a retaining wall, will be re-set as a retaining wall behind the ditch line and into the bank so that the top of the wall will be clear the slope of the bank for at least half the distance of the cap.\footnote{State of Tennessee Department of Highways and Public Works. \textit{Right of Way Agreements for Public Roads.} July 6, 1928.}

With this type of construction taking place, it was only logical to connect the house to the Nashville water supply at the same time. Family history states that Conn Thompson Harris and her husband "put in city water so that there would no longer be an occasional bathless summer day."\footnote{Jordan, "Glen Leven," 12.} Dr. Harris signed a contract that specified he pay a $500 deposit for services rendered, upon which the house would be connected to the city’s eight-inch water main by a one-inch line. If this did not occur before August 1, 1928, the deposit would be returned.

Soon a drastic change affected the old historic family property to the west of the Franklin Pike and west of the house. W.B. Southgate surveyed the west land in September 1929, and the lands were subdivided, sold, and developed.\footnote{Davidson County Cemetery Survey.}

During the Depression era, Glen Leven had several family weddings and family members also continued to divide the historic family land. Mary T. Orr’s daughter was married there in 1929, her brother John’s daughter Conn was married there in 1931, and Conn Thompson Harris’ own daughter Conn was married there in 1934. Mary T. Orr’s son John, who was married around 1932, built a house just to the north of his cousin Joseph on his tract of land. After his death in 1940, his widow returned the land to Mary. Elizabeth, Conn T. Harris’s sister, later built a house on her land that was called the “Pond lot.” Thus “all the hilltop and some of the other land was still owned and occupied by the fourth and fifth generations of the descendants of old Thomas Thompson.”\footnote{Davidson County Cemetery Survey.}

In 1933, the home place was appraised at the order of the Nashville Trust Company. Conn T. Harris received a copy of the appraisal dated April 11, 1933. The peculiar addition of an “Appraisal Cost of Reproduction” is the only part of the document that raises curiosity as to the guardian and owner’s intentions. The document reveals a satisfactory recommendation regarding the condition of the house by J.B. Regen, General Contractor, which reads as follows:

The appraisal cost of reproduction (new) of the property has been determined by an analysis of the cost of materials, labor, and installation that would be required to construct the residence like new as it existed on April 6\textsuperscript{th} 1933 and in accordance with market prices current at that date. We have not taken into consideration the accrued depreciation on the property. The building is in excellent state of preservation, well maintained and neatly kept, and therefore would be subject to only a very nominal amount of depreciation.\footnote{J. B. Regen General Contractors to Mrs. A. W. Harris, Nashville, April 11, 1933.}
Conn Thompson Harris had contemplated installing a central heating unit during this period, and this appraisal may have been completed to justify spending the money on such an older house. Regen’s opinion of the reproduction value of the house, including a detailed list of various components, totaled $34,158.70.

In the late 1930s, the writers of the Federal Writers Project visited Conn Thompson Harris and her family at Glen Leven. The book, *Tennessee: A Guide to the State*, included a description of Glen Leven: “The wide lawn is shaded by many fine trees, including a giant paulownia, several English field maples which grew from Kew Gardens cuttings, and a number of yellowwood trees. The garden contains many varieties of narcissi, daffodils, and hyacinths; some of the bulbs were imported from Holland in 1837.”

Dr. Albert Harris died at Glen Leven on December 7, 1941, leaving Conn T. Harris alone in the large house with only her sisters and their daughters nearby. That same day, December 7, 1941, the Japanese Imperial Fleet in the Pacific launched a surprise attack against the American Fleet stationed at Pearl Harbor. Many family members joined the ensuing effort in World War II: Overton Thompson Jr., John Thompson IV, Joseph Hamilton Thompson Jr., and William Gilliam Kennon Jr.

Conn T. Harris continued to live on the property until the period of 1944-1946. Her two sisters still lived nearby, but all three were widows and chose to live alone. As she grew older, Conn found it much harder to maintain the house; once plaster fell from high above in the front hall ceiling, crashing to the floor. She did manage, however, to have the plaster repaired and the tin roof painted during that period. The family began to notice changes in Conn, who herself knew by that time that she had been diagnosed with Parkinson’s disease. Conn made preparations to move to Athens, Georgia, to live with her daughter Conn Overton West.

Before taking her leave, Conn Thompson Harris searched for a family member to take over the property. Conn’s brother Overton finally came to the forefront. In a “complicated sale and trade” his daughter Margaret assumed control of his house with her husband and family, allowing Overton to move back to Glen Leven in 1946. Soon after his arrival, Overton Thompson retired from his job with the glass company, and upon doing so it was said that “never was a man happier.”

Overton Thompson followed his father’s lead and focused on the remaining Glen Leven acreage as a modern farmer. He raised cattle and hay, rotated crops, and planted new trees. He renewed an old springs and renovated the farm’s last tenant house. To shelter and support his livestock, Overton built a barn on the eastern edge of the property around 1946. In 1957 Overton Thompson hosted a “cocktail party for the descendants of Glen Leven on the one hundredth anniversary of the completion of the house. The picture taken that day on the columned front porch shows more than forty folk. Many times Overton and Margaret [Thompson] were approached and asked to open Glen Leven to the public in behalf of some

---

244 Regen to Harris, April 11, 1933.
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246 Jordan, “Glen Leven,” 13; Mielnik, “Glen Leven,” Property Nomination, section 8, 12.
charity. Each overture was declined saying that it was a home, not a museum.” In a 1963 interview, Mary Thompson Orr described the house as very well taken care of under her brother’s care. “It’s hard to heat but very comfortable to live in,” she noted. “I am hoping there will never be anybody who will want to tear it down and put something more modern in its place.”

Overton Thompson died in 1968. His wife Margaret began living with her daughter at night and at Glen Leven during the day for an entire year before finally deciding to sell the house and a small parcel of property. Country music executive Shelby Singleton—fresh from producing the mega hit “Harper Valley P.T.A.” by Jeannie C. Riley—bought the house and a five-acre tract that it rested upon. Singleton never moved in, and the house sat empty for two years. Unknown parties vandalized the house for two years, breaking windows, taking doors off hinges, leaving behind empty alcohol containers, drug paraphernalia, and stealing the fixtures and hardware of the home. It seemed as if it might be the end for the historic home.

On Christmas day of 1970, a few of the family members met for their traditional eggnog celebration. Among those attending that day were John Thompson IV, Conn O. West, Conn’s

---
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daughter Susan West, and others. The talk of the gathering turned to Glen Leven, the pitiful shape it was in, and the bleak future of the house and property. Susan West decided to buy Glen Leven. West owned another farm in nearby College Grove. She went to look over the property before buying it, and the state of the place “wasn’t easy... It wasn’t cheap... It wasn’t happiness.”

There she saw that “no door remained on its hinges; every chandelier had been pulled from the ceiling; many egg-shaped brass door knobs were missing; marble topped stands for the pier mirrors had been smashed with axes and partially burned.” Susan West bought the house in 1971 and began the “long tedious task” of restoring it and the property back to a semblance of its original grandeur.

**The Susan West Era, 1971-2006**

The letters from Susan West to her mother Conn West in the early 1970s explain much about the early days of West’s tenure at Glen Leven. Her immediate concern—and one that continued for two decades—was to lessen the impact of Interstate I-65 on the farm. It is the story of a determined woman fighting the state department of highways (now Tennessee Department of Transportation or TDOT) to save what she could of the property. The land bordering I-65, which was then within the corridor of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, was willed to Conn West from her mother, Conn O. T. Harris. Conn West lived in Athens, Georgia, at that time. In the mid winter of 1970-1971, the state proposed to buy and finalize the purchase of 25 acres from Conn West to build a section of interstate across the eastern boundary of her land. Shortly thereafter in February, Susan West purchased the Glen Leven house and property for $74,000. Then on June 9, 1971, Conn West was offered $101,000 for the 25 acres along the proposed right-of-way “under threat of condemnation,” which was accepted after possibly being renegotiated and raised. Conn’s trustee, Third National Bank, negotiated the price.

With the land deal supposedly set to close in August 1971, Susan began to recess back her fence lines because she was allowed ninety days to vacate the property after closing. This was met with opposition from the state highways department (now the Tennessee Department of Transportation) and the Metro Water & Sewage Service (MWSS) due to a water main that ran east north east from the Church property north of the house to the railroad. Therefore, the MWSS paid Conn West an additional $7,000 for an easement of the land and to cover the cost of delaying the fencing of that side of the property. This brought the total amount paid to the Wests to $108,000. Metro flagged the water main, but worked painfully slow on the project, which tempted West to build her fence before the job was finished. Conn tried to persuade her daughter to hire a company to install chain-link fence, which she did on the side of the property most affected by the construction. But Susan West did not think that type of fencing would stand up to her cattle over time. Therefore, she hired hands and began cutting locust posts and stretching barbed-wire in some areas. West was very busy, often moving back and forth from her farm at College Grove to put up hay, and then back to Glen Leven to supervise. There she not only had to watch over her own fence crew, but also a fence and grading contractor. The chain-link fence was important, but West was more interested building up the grade on both
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sides of Browns Creek to help keep it within its banks. She was also concerned about the erosion runoff from the steep interstate grade, and insisted that drainage ditch be installed along her fence line.

Relations between Susan West and the state highway department were precarious, but as Interstate 65 neared completion their affiliation became more tolerable. To spend more time focusing on her cattle herd, Susan West leased her tobacco land to a neighbor. She also hired a tenant family to live on the property, although it is uncertain if they lived in the main house or in a cabin on the property.\(^{255}\) Nothing could have been more joyous for Susan as finally being relieved of the irritation caused by the interstate construction crews. On October 23, 1973, the last link of Interstate 65 opened to traffic between Harding Place and Berry Road. The opening ceremonies featured the Overton High School band, a color guard, and a ribbon cutting by Governor Winfield Dunn, Mayor Beverly Briley, and others.\(^{256}\)

Susan West continued to raise cattle on the farm at Glen Leven without any hindrance until the early 1980s. In the spring of 1982, Susan spotted surveyors on her property who were not near the interstate as usual, but near the house. Her curiosity aroused, she contacted the then renamed Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) to receive an explanation. Her contact at TDOT said that the men were surveying for a proposed interchange at Armory Drive, which was then in its preliminary planning stage. The contact assured her that TDOT thought that the construction would mainly occur on the east side of the interstate and that if any of her land was affected it would be minimal. In July 1982, archaeologists, environmentalists, and surveyors were seen on the property, shooting grades and doing plunge tests with metal poles in search of hidden graves.

In January 1983, West’s caretaker found a notice of a public hearing on the mailbox. This notice included a small map, and told where to obtain drawings and other important information. It also outlined the key points to be discussed at the hearing. Susan West missed the meeting due to a sleet storm, but her cousin Carolyn Kennon attended and was reportedly “steamrolled” by 100 Oaks businessmen who wanted the interchange to bring customers to their shops. Since she could not obtain information at the hearing, West acquired an Environmental Assessment and a set of preliminary plans elsewhere. Within these documents she found plentiful information to write a protest, and the most striking was that the whole area of Oak Hill was stated as an industrial area, and moreover, the interchange stood to affect 9.44 acres of her property. She contacted her lawyer, who believed a lawsuit was in order to claim compensation for any substantial damages to the property. She and her attorney also found out that the City of Oak Hill had not been contacted to review the proposal.\(^{257}\)

That next month, West brought this to the attention of the Oak Hill city officials, who immediately hired a lawyer to file a temporary injunction to review the plans, but it was never filed. The Oak Hill mayor walked the proposed tract at Glen Leven with West. The steepest part of the embankment was where the proposed interchange would be built. Mayor Simpson began a campaign to propose other locations, and Carolyn Kennon made annotated map inserts to circulate to the Brentwood Journal’s Oak Hill subscribers. This created a firestorm for TDOT, who fought back, believing that insinuations were made that they would connect Armory Drive with Franklin Road. Oak Hill residents began a letter-writing campaign, which initially

\(^{255}\) Conn West, Mrs. Conn West to Susan West, Nashville, ND.
\(^{256}\) Unknown Newspaper Article, “Harding to Berry Road I-65 Link Opens Friday,” October 26, 1973.
\(^{257}\) Susan West, Background Journal of Armory Lane Occurrences, Nashville, 1982-1983.
seemed successful. The city then demanded another hearing, and was denied, but then threatened to file suit and a second meeting was scheduled, and the suit dropped.258

On May 28, 1983, the meeting was held and the environmental assessors attacked every alternate proposal made by the City of Oak Hill. Then Mayor Simpson made the argument that Armory Drive should be stopped and the money used to improve Harding Place instead. This was a popular idea and a petition was circulated to that aim. On June 9, West had landscape architects look over the proposed land and review information. Their opinion was that the environmental assessment was inadequately prepared and contained mistakes that probably would not stop the project, but that might provide a means of compromise. On June 24, West met with Mayor Simpson again to look over documents that she had been unable to obtain from TDOT. Simpson had previously met with the Nashville Chamber of Commerce to discuss details and received a somewhat impolite reception. His best plan was to formulate a list of upsetting issues to present to the opposition at the hearing.259

In late 1983 after a heavy rain, West’s chain-link fence was destroyed by a landslide from the steep interstate embankment on the far northeast corner of her property near the utility easement. After a year of struggling with the fence, she wrote to the TDOT engineer in charge on February 13, 1985 to inquire how she was supposed to keep her cattle in without an adequate fence. Also causing a problem was the easement itself, which only had a single strand of wire across it to restrain her cattle. The workers often left the wire down after they moved through the fence, and her cattle often ended up on the neighbors’ land. Holes and gaps were left in her fence as the TDOT crews installed their new fence for the interstate, and not a strand of barbed wire was installed as promised. What angered West the most was that when the landslide was scraped away, she was promised that the dirt would be shoveled off the bottom of her fence, and that her fence would be repaired when the new fence was built. Not only were these things not accomplished, but no one would answer her inquiries.260 On March 29, 1985, West finally received a reply, but this was after she had confronted a representative of the construction company and fixed the problem herself.261

On April 2, 1985, a Petition for Condemnation was filed against Susan West by the Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County to obtain the land necessary to build the Armory Lane interchange. She was given five days to question or contest by formal objection, and if she did not reply the property would be seized by Metro. The tract of land in question was 8.243 acres, situated almost exactly where West had thought it would be.262 On April 9, her lawyers filed an objection stating that they “object to the condemnation of the subject property and deny that it is necessary, suitable or desirable within the meaning of T.C.A. 29-17-801.”263 After the filing of the objection the suit became inactive while the two sides studied their options. West was more concerned with erosion than anything, but due to a drought the effect could not be determined. The State did not press the issue either, until the Circuit Court Clerk contacted the Attorney General and requested that the case either be settled or set for trial in

258 Ibid
259 West, Background Journal.
262 Metro Government of Nashville and Davidson County, TN v. Mrs. Conn O. T. West; Susan West, Petition of Metro Government of Nashville and Davidson County, TN., (Jury Demand Servance, April 2, 1985).
the near future. Unfortunately, it is unknown what happened afterward except the interchange went forward. It is not known what Susan West was paid for the tract of land, but it is known that further action would be taken upon completion if erosion problems arose. The scheduled completion date for the Armory Drive Interchange was set for August 1, 1987.

Susan West continued to live and work on the property for almost two decades afterward. Paper clippings within the records of the Land Trust for Tennessee show that even into the early 1990s, West was still interested in the latest farming and livestock methods of the day, and was still quite concerned with soil erosion. Susan West owned the house and land for three decades, carrying on the tradition of her historic ancestors. There is no doubt that she loved the lands called Glen Leven as much as they did. Like the many other protectors of the property who came before, she wanted the land to be protected forever. To that aim, West willed the house and land to the Land Trust for Tennessee, “with a perpetual easement upon the property and protections for the historic house and outbuildings.” Upon her death in 2006, with the property safe once more, it could truly be said that Glen Leven had been “Built for the Ages.”

1970s photo of Glen Leven house. Photograph courtesy of the Land Trust for Tennessee, Susan West Collection.
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HOUSE AND RESOURCE DESCRIPTIONS

Glen Leven is a historic family farm of approximately 66 acres located at 4000 Franklin Pike in the City of Oak Hill (2006 pop. 4,726) in the southern section of Davidson County, Tennessee. The farm is centered on the 1857 historic house known as Glen Leven. The farm also retains several domestic and agricultural outbuildings, including a carriage house, cistern, springhouse, smokehouse, kitchen, old and new barns, and a subterranean greenhouse. The house received interior updates and modernizations in 1886-87, but has remained relatively unchanged throughout the twentieth century. Until 2006, Glen Leven remained a working farm, with cattle and pastureland, and retains the majority of its acreage in fields.

HOUSE EXTERIOR DESCRIPTION

Glen Leven is a two-story brick, central-hall plan Middle Tennessee I-house. Set on a cut-limestone foundation, with a low-pitched standing-seam metal roof, the house has a substantial ell wing in the rear. Added in three separate and successive phases, the ell grew in length over time, as additional space was needed.

Federal in style, the façade features an imposing two-story Greek Revival portico. According to family oral history, John Thompson felt that the first home at Glen Leven had "far too many geegaws" for his taste, but that his wife Mary could have whatever she wished. Although the earlier home burned just before the family could move in, the extant structure is a near replica; Mary’s taste, coupled with the stylistic trends of the period, could explain the presence of the imposing Greek Revival portico paired with symmetrical bays on the west façade.269

269 “Glen Leven.”
Greek Revival-style porticos and detailing could be seen throughout the Nashville area in 1854, when the home was designed. The facades of both the Hermitage and Belmont Mansion featured Greek Revival porticos and Corinthian columns, and possibly could have provided inspiration. The formal, symmetrical arrangement of the bays on the front elevation and the paired end chimneys with a parapet running between are features reflecting the Federal style that Thompson had seen throughout his life.

The contractor A. E. Franklin gave the Thompsons a traditional interpretation of the two-story, central hall, Greek Revival-style house. Vernacular builders often designed and constructed homes following the familiar methods and features used by the generation before them. Also, vernacular builders placed window openings and doors according to the function of spaces, often leaving the exterior asymmetrical in appearance. While the motive behind the varying symmetry on the other elevations is uncertain, this theory could explain the differences.

**EXTERIOR ELEVATION DESCRIPTIONS**

**West Façade**

The west façade has five symmetrical bays, with four double-hung 6/6 windows on each story. Windows are approximately 3.5 feet wide by 8.5 feet tall on the first floor; second story windows are approximately 3.5 feet wide by 8 feet tall. Each window is protected by a strip of metal flashing, to direct water away from its wooden lintel, sill, and frame. Wooden blinds (nine pairs of originals and seven pairs of replacements) flank each window.

---

The façade is dominated by an impressive two-story Greek Revival-style portico, consisting of four fluted wooden columns topped with cast iron Corinthian capitals. The leaves of the capitals are bolted onto a cast iron core. According to family history, these cast iron capitals were manufactured in New Orleans. The four white wood columns support a wide entablature with dentil molding, which extends across the façade. A second story balcony features a wood railing with turned columns, and tin sheeting covers the balcony floor. Three steps with iron handrails lead from the ground to the portico, where each column rests on a square limestone base. The iron handrails may date from the c. 1887-88 changes to the house. The front porch is made of rectangular limestone blocks. The steps also are composed of matching limestone. The foundation stones on the western façade are nicely dressed, while the foundation on the south, north, and east is composed of roughly-finished limestone blocks.

Note the different stone finishes at this northwest corner of the façade.

The front entrance consists of paired doors with a limestone lintel opening into a small entrance space with an elaborate c. 1887-88 decorative encaustic tile floor composed of multi-colored tiles in geometric and floral patterns. Microscopic analysis of paint samples taken by the MTSU Center for Historic Preservation reveal that the various panels in the entrance space were once painted the same teal and gold appearing in the ornate tiles (all paint samples mentioned in this report are stored at the Center for Historic Preservation). The paired front
doors feature a glass transom and were once painted green, although they are now white.\textsuperscript{271} The second-story balcony doors are paired, with transom and sidelights, and have a prominent wood surround featuring pilasters.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{image}
\textit{Tile flooring at entrance.}
\end{center}

\textit{South Elevation}

The western portion of the south elevation is the gable end of the I-house. It is brick, with three 6/6 windows on the first story, two 6/6 windows on the second story, and a smaller 4/4 window at the attic level, most of which have wood blinds. Both second story windows are missing their inner blinds at this time. Two chimneys flush with the outside wall rise above the parapet.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{image}
\textit{South and east elevations of Glen Leven House.}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{271} Glen Leven exterior paint analysis completed Spring 2010 directed by the Center for Historic Preservation at Middle Tennessee State University. See Appendix.
Extending east from the I-house is the south elevation of the ell-wing dominated by a two story wood porch, which is considerably set back from the end wall of the main house block. The balustrade is composed of a simple railing and chamfered columns. Evidence shows that the first story porch once had a balustrade that is no longer extant. The second story of the ell porch features redwood flooring, which probably dates to c. 1970. The shed roof of the porch incorporates the pitch of the gable roof of the front portion of the house. A small wood-sided enclosure at the east end of the second-story porch has a 4/4 window on both the east and south elevations. The limestone foundation along the south elevation features a rock face, ashlar cut pattern. The rear porch also includes an exterior stair with turned balusters along the southern wall of the ell (also visible on the east elevation).

The easternmost portion of the south elevation of the ell wing contains a one-story hip-roofed porch enclosed with wooden latticework. A wood 6/6 window is on the second story.

A barrier-free ramp has recently been installed to meet ADA requirements. It leads onto the porch along the south elevation.

South elevation detail.

East Elevation

The east elevation is the rear of the house and is dominated by the wood porch on the east portion of the I-house that forms an “L” with the porch of the south elevation of the ell. Enclosed within the porch is a c. 1992 kitchen.

The eastern elevation, or gable end, of the ell contains a single 6/6 window on the first floor. A small arched opening is located in the foundation below the window, accessing a storm cellar, and covered by a concrete enclosure with wood doors. Evidence suggests that the current entrance to the cellar is an addition to the original entryway. The limestone foundation stones along easternmost portion of the ell feature are either dressed or roughly-hewn.

The small one-story porch (easternmost portion of the south elevation) connects on the south side of the gable end. A wood post, approximately six feet tall and capped with a metal
dinner bell, is located just east of the house. A brick walkway leads from the rear porch to the north elevation of the house.

North Elevation

The north elevation consists of the main house and ell, and is approximately 122 feet long. The first floor has eight irregularly spaced bays, while the second floor has ten bays, generally placed directly above the first floor bays. A smaller 4/4 window is in the attic level of the I-house gable end. All bays on the first and second floors, except for one, are 6/6 wood windows, most with wood blinds, and are similar if not identical in size to those on the south elevation.

The wood blinds on the north elevation appear to be in considerably poorer condition than those on the west and south elevations. The gable end of the I-house duplicates the south elevation, with the exception of one first floor window on the south side, which does not exist on the north side. An elaborately carved Eastlake-style porte-cochere covers the single door on the north elevation, which is located in the ell at the juncture with the main house. The porte-cochere features a cross gable roof, slender square chamfered columns on limestone block piers, turned posts and dentils at the frieze, heavy molded circular motifs, and latticework in the gable ends facing west, north, and east. The north elevation also features a brick coal chute leading to the basement. The coal chute may date from c. 1890, when many Nashville residents converted to coal-burning furnaces. The foundation stones along the north elevation feature irregular layers of cut limestone with rough faces.
HOUSE INTERIOR DESCRIPTION

Glen Leven reflects a mid-nineteenth century house with late nineteenth century modifications and very few concessions to modern conveniences. Although bathroom and kitchen fixtures have been added, as well as central heat and air, these additions are unobtrusive and do not detract from the decidedly nineteenth-century feeling of the house.

FIRST FLOOR INTERIOR

Central Hall

Glen Leven is a double-pile, central-hall plan I-house, with a long rear ell extending east. Overall, the house reflects its appearance c. 1887, following several modifications made by John M. Thompson between 1886 and 1887, including the replacement of the main staircase, a change in woodwork and trim, the addition of rooms on the eastern portion of the ell, and the installation of both electricity and interior plumbing. The addition of hardware featuring Eastlake-style motifs throughout the house also reflects the renovation period.
The flooring consists of wood, either oak (probably added sometime in the early twentieth century), or pine (most likely the original flooring). The central hall is approximately 38.5 feet in length, and features an elaborately carved fireplace mantel along the north wall that was added during the 1886-87 renovations. The white painted mantel features carved vines with leaves and berries spiraling around engaged columns, with carved rosettes. Papyrus leaves, beaded trim, chamfered corners, and an inset tile firebox complete the décor of the fireplace. Wide crown molding runs along the top of the walls. The ceiling, baseboards, doors, and staircase are painted white. Five four-panel doors open from the central hall: two on the north wall, two on the south wall, and one on the east wall, into the kitchen. Door panels are chamfered, a usual design for paneled doors. The doors on the north and south walls are characterized by heavy door surrounds, featuring carved head blocks. An impressive staircase rises in the central hall, with an elaborately carved newel post, alternating squared and turned carved balusters, a sunburst motif in the carriage at the ground level, reeded balusters, and incised geometric patterns as part of the stair design. Most of the staircase is painted white, although the handrails and stair treads have a clear finish. The current stair replaced an earlier spiral staircase during the 1886-87 renovations.\textsuperscript{272}

\textit{Southwest Room}

The front four rooms of the house are approximately 18 feet by 22 feet. The rooms on the south side of the house were traditionally the family rooms. The southwest room (front) traditionally served as the family “living room”, and features large 6/6 windows on the west wall, facing the front of the house, with a large ornate decorative pier mirror rising floor to ceiling.

\textsuperscript{272} Parts of this description have been taken directly from Tara Mitchell Mielnik, “Glen Leven,” Property Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1995).
between the windows. The mirrors were purchased from an Andrew Hamilton by John Thompson at an estate sale and installed in the house c. 1888. Due to their height and weight, these mirrors are considered to be architectural features rather than mere decorative accessories.
The fireplace is centrally located on the south wall, with a 6/6 window to the east. The fireplace mantelpiece is not original to the house, but is a historic replacement, possibly dating to the 1886-87 renovation. It is very plain, with only a convex molding incised at intervals at the mantel frieze, narrow chamfering on the pilasters, and white paint. The firebox and hearth are square tile and are later additions. End-matched oak flooring was installed atop the original pine floor boards sometime in the mid-twentieth century and runs throughout both rooms on the south side. There is a thin layer of light blue paint on the walls at present, but it is believed that the walls were consistently wallpapered until recent years. Wallpaper found behind the pier mirror possibly dates to the 1886-87 renovations.273 Paint samples reveal that the trim in the room has traditionally been painted white.

Southeast Room

Large walnut pocket doors, quite possibly original to the house, feature arched paneling and separate the southwest room from the southeast room, which is similar in size.274 6/6 windows in this room flank a fireplace, which is larger and slightly more elaborate than in the front room, with convex frieze molding similar to the southwest room fireplace. The mantelshelf is believed to be a twentieth-century replacement piece and is supported by carved wood brackets and has paneled pilasters. This mantel, as in the southwest room, is painted white. The firebox and hearth consist of white rectangular tiles. When this room was converted to a master bedroom around the turn of the twentieth-century, a small space measuring approximately 10 feet by 5 feet in the northeast corner was enclosed for use as a bathroom. The current fixtures are not original but are replacements dating from c. 1940.

Walnut pocket doors leading to southeast room.

274 Jordan, Glen Leven, Typewritten Thompson family history; photocopy in the files of The Land Trust for Tennessee (Nashville, TN: Date Unknown, after 1970).
The bathroom has a ceramic tile floor and tub surround. A window and four-panel door on the east wall once faced the rear but now are both sealed. The door has a two-pane glass transom above. The narrow chamfering on the door panels is similar to that on the southwest room fireplace.

**Northwest Room**

The two front rooms on the north side of the house generally copy those on the south side. These rooms have more elaborate fireplaces and woodwork, implying their use as more public spaces. The northwest room features an ornate large pier mirror with a low marble base beneath between the 6/6 windows at the front of the house on the west wall, a twin to the mirror in the southwest room.

Wallpaper found behind the pier mirror possibly dates to the 1886-87 renovation period and features a paisley and rosette print in pink, aqua, and brown. An additional three layers of wallpaper were found on top of this print (sample taken from above pocket doors). The fireplace is centrally located in this room along the north wall.

The mantel is a twentieth-century replacement piece and is more elaborately carved than in the south rooms, with paired columns composed of rope molding flanking the fireplace.

---

pilasters. Rosettes and other sawn circular patterns are found on the fireplace mantelshelf and brackets that support it. The firebox and hearth are composed of rectangular yellow tiles.

The floors in these rooms are wide pine boards, as compared to the thin strips of the southern rooms, and were most likely carpeted for much of the twentieth-century. The ceiling corners in this room are coved (curved) rather than squared, and a wood-grained picture rail with egg and dart detailing runs throughout the room at the height of the top of the windows. There is a thin layer of buff paint on the walls at present, but it is believed that the walls were consistently wallpapered until recent years. The trim in this room is wood-grained.

Northeast Room

Large paneled pocket doors on the east wall lead into the northeast room and date to the 1886-87 renovations. The doors are surrounded by molded wood trim, a dentil cornice, and elaborate corner blocks that rise above the picture rail. The door surrounds for the pocket doors both on the west and east walls include a head block with a pyramidal cap and both horizontal and vertical reeding. It is similar to that found in the central hall. Pocket doors on the east wall open into a rear hall, which runs north to south from the porte-cochere on the north elevation to the kitchen. Large 6/6 windows on the north wall flank a fireplace with an elaborately carved mantel nearly identical to that found in the northwest room. Walls are painted light blue. Wallpaper found behind the mantel piece features a leaf print and has not been dated. Wood trim, including door surrounds, is wood grained.

Back Hall

The rear hall is approximately 10 feet by 20 feet. Pocket doors open on both the east and west walls. An exterior door is centrally located on the north wall, and opens to the porte-cochere. The walls are papered with early twentieth century wallpaper in a block pattern with floral highlights. Visible water damage to the ceiling and walls is apparent, especially on the north wall.

Water damage along the north hall is very apparent in the Back Hall space; note the Eastlake-style door frame leading to the porte-cochere.
A door on the south wall originally opened to the back porch, a portion of which was enclosed c. 1992 for a modern galley kitchen, which runs north to south along the east elevation behind the southern rooms. The kitchen has a vinyl floor over the original wood flooring of the porch, and paired French doors opening to the porch on the east side. Cabinets and appliances are installed on the west wall, against the brick of the back of the house, which is painted white. Paired doors on the west wall open into the central hall.

Ell-Wing Addition

From the rear hall, pocket doors on the east wall open into a large, 20 x 20 square room thought to be the dining room. Two 6/6 windows are on the north wall, while a 6/6 window and a door open onto the rear porch along the south wall. A fireplace is centered on the east wall, with a door opening just north of the fireplace. The floors are wide-plank wood, most likely original to the addition. Both doors are four-panel wood and feature heavy wood surrounds, with the carved head blocks as seen in the central hall and the north rooms. The fireplace mantelpiece in this room is original to the 1886-87 ell-wing addition and is elaborately carved, with fluted engaged columns with rosette bases and Corinthian capitals. A detailed floral motif, including elements of acanthus and papyrus leaves, is carved at the mantelshelf. The firebox and hearth are later alterations of rectangular yellow tiles, with a decorative iron insert. This room is painted green.

Ell-Wing Addition, Dining Room.
The door on the east wall of the dining room opens into a butler’s pantry leading to the rear portion of the ell of the house, added c. 1890 as a kitchen wing with servants’ quarters above. This section of the house has been used in recent decades as an apartment for the caretaker of the house and farm. The rear portion consists of an entry hall from the porch, a kitchen, food pantry, butler’s pantry, and a stair to the second floor. Although some modern conveniences have been added, this rear portion contains historic woodwork, including the built-in china press and screened food pantries, windows, doors, floors, and trim work.

SECOND FLOOR INTERIOR

Central Hall

The plan of the second floor of Glen Leven is nearly identical to the first floor. The wide central hall is accessed from the main staircase. At the top of the staircase on the east wall is a leaded glass window with colored glass, including teal and magenta diamond-shaped panes and a tortoiseshell-colored border. The window is surrounded by molded wood and bull’s-eye corner blocks. A four-panel door with bull’s-eye corner blocks accessing the second-story porch is just to the south of this window. Four doors open from the hall into the upstairs rooms; two on the north side and two on the south. A doorway centrally located on the west wall opens onto the balcony of the front porch.

Coal stove in second floor Central Hall.

A small coal stove is centrally located on the north wall between the door openings. The stove has a Locke Stove Company nameplate that says, "Warm Morning." A Kansas City company, the Locke Stove Company introduced the "Warm Morning" model in the late 1930s. The stove was popularized in the 1940s when it was selected for use by the armed forces during World War II; therefore, this stove is believed to be a historic replacement dating to the 1940s.\textsuperscript{276} The hall has molded wood baseboards, original pine wood floors, and plaster walls. The trim is painted white and the walls are painted pale yellow.

Southwest Room

The four rooms in the main part of the house on the second floor measure approximately 18 feet by 22 feet, with similar trim and wide plank wood floors. The southwest room has two 6/6 windows on the west wall. A fireplace is centrally located on the south wall, with a single 6/6 window east of the fireplace. The fireplace mantel is a modern replacement piece, very plain, painted white, with a tile firebox surround and stone hearth. Floors in this room, as in the central hall and the other rooms on the second floor, are wide pine planks, and the room is painted periwinkle blue. A single four-panel door on the north wall leads to the hall, and a single four-panel door on the east wall leads to the southeast room.

Southeast Room

The southeast room is painted light blue. On the south wall, a fireplace is centrally located, with a single 6/6 window to the west. The fireplace mantel dates to the 1886-87 renovation and is elaborately carved and painted white. It is similar to the elaborate mantels found in the north parlors on the first floor, with paired columns, rosettes, and dentils at the mantelshelf. Two 6/6 windows are on the east wall, overlooking the porch. A single four-panel door is on the north wall, leading to the hall near the staircase.

Northwest Room

The northwest room shows a good bit of water damage on the walls and ceiling. A single four-panel door leads to the room from the hallway on the south wall. Two 6/6 windows are on the west wall at the front of the house. A fireplace mantel is centrally located on the north wall, with a single 6/6 window east of the fireplace. This fireplace mantel dates to the
1886-87 renovation period and is nearly identical to the one found in the southeast room, elaborately carved, but unpainted. Wallpaper found behind the mantelpiece features a gold leaf, feather design but has not been dated. There are no openings on the east wall. The walls are painted dusty rose.

Northeast Room

The northeast room is entered from the hallway through a four-panel door on the south wall. As in the other rooms, the fireplace is centrally located on the exterior wall (north). In this room, the fireplace is flanked by 6/6 windows. The fireplace mantel is nearly identical to the ones found in the northwest and southeast rooms, and is painted white. A single four-panel door on the east wall leads into a small bathroom added c. 1920. The bathroom measures approximately 10 by 10.5 feet, and has a single 6/6 window on the north wall, mid-20th century bathroom fixtures, and a linoleum floor. The ceiling in this room has been lowered by approximately one foot and is covered with drywall. The walls are painted aqua green.

Ell-Wing Addition

A door on the east wall of the bathroom opens into a large back bedroom, measuring approximately 20 feet by 20 feet. This room is painted yellow, with two 6/6 windows on the north wall. A fireplace is centrally located on the eastern wall, with a carved mantelpiece, painted white, very similar to the other carved mantelpieces found in the other rooms on the second floor. Unlike the other fireplaces, this one has a brick firebox surround. South of the fireplace, paired four-panel doors conceal a narrow closet opening, with smaller two-panel doors concealing additional storage space above; these storage openings may date c. 1886-87. On the south wall, a 6/6 window and a four-panel door open onto the second-story porch.
Two additional smaller rooms, added as servants' rooms c. 1886-87 and accessible only from the interior rear stair on the first floor, are east of this room, and make up additional apartment space for the caretaker.

Storage Areas Off the Porch

From the porch another four-panel door opens onto a storage area measuring 10 feet by 9 feet. This storage area is immediately adjacent to second story bathroom and appears to have served as a linen closet. Enclosed built-in storage shelving dominates the east wall of this small room, while a steep staircase with turned balustrade rises along the west wall into the attic.

At the east end of the second story porch, there are two additional panel doors. The first opens to a small storage room built during the 1886-87 renovation to house fishing tackle and hunting gear.

Second Floor Bathroom, accessible only from porch

The second door leads into what was once the only bathroom in the home, added during the 1886-87 renovation. Only accessible from the porch, this small space measures approximately 13 feet by 9 feet and features a diamond-patterned paneled ceiling and walls of a dark-finished wood. There are bulls-eye corner blocks on the window trim. The door hardware matches the Eastlake design found on hardware throughout the house and date to the 1886-87
renovation period. An original iron light fixture hangs in the center of the room. The room once contained a flush toilet, stove for heat, and possibly a bathtub.
**Attic**

The house has a full, unfinished attic that is accessible only from the previously mentioned storage room off the porch. The attic is divided into three distinct parts: above the main house, above the family ell-wing, and the back part of the ell-wing directly above the caretaker’s apartment.

![Attic of Main House.](image)

The roof framing of the main house consists of tapered yellow poplar rafters that rest on a one-inch-thick false plate and meet at the peak with no ridge pole. The ell-wing framing is composed of regular 3” x 4” sash-sawn, yellow poplar rafters without a ridge pole; the rafters are butted together at the ridge. The decking consists of one-inch-thick, sash-sawn, yellow poplar boards and the sash-sawn yellow poplar ceiling joists that measure 2” x 8”. There is a brick wall with a small opening separating this part of the attic from the space directly above the caretaker’s apartment. This rear section of the ell-wing features circular-sawn, oak joists and sash-sawn, yellow poplar rafters butting against a circular-sawn ridgepole. The decking is made of sash-sawn yellow poplar. Roughly halfway down the roof line, the rafters change to 2” x 4” circular-sawn, pine dimension lumber.

**Cellar**

The house has a partial basement beneath the ell-wing addition dating to 1886. It is accessed through a pair of wood cellar doors on the east elevation of the house’s exterior. The cellar has dirt floors and stone walls with circular-sawn pine ceiling joists and herringbone bridging. Roughly half way into the cellar there is a coal chute along the north wall, and the cellar ends beneath the entrance on the north elevation of the house (beneath the portecocharere). An extremely tight crawl space exists underneath the main part of the house, and it eventually disappears because the floor joists at the front of the house barely clear the ground.
DOMESTIC COMPLEX OUTBUILDINGS

CARRIAGE HOUSE

The carriage house lies north of the main house. It is located on the circular drive that stretches from the front of the house, extends east through the porte-cochere, and then circles north to the carriage house. It was probably constructed about the same time as the house and the other brick outbuildings, ca. 1857. The Gothic-style roof detailing is similar to that found at the old barn. A circular louver/window is missing from the front gable. The building has a wooden floor, vented by openings on either side.

The carriage house was updated in the 1920s to accommodate modern automobiles rather than carriages. A vertical board partition was installed down the center to create two separate stalls. The building is in good condition.
Carriage house, interior dimensions.
**CHICKEN COOP**

The chicken coop is located northeast of the main house. It has a 5-V sheet metal roof with 2x4 rafters. It has wood floors and constructed with wire nails. There are no signs of updates have been conducted since its construction c. 1960.

Chicken Coop, interior dimensions.

**CISTERN**

Added between 1954 and 1976, the cistern sits just off the circular driveway to the north of the main house. It has a pyramid roof, covered with stamped sheet metal shingles, a solid concrete slab floor, and chamfered square wooden posts. It is in good condition with very little preservation work needed. The solid concrete slab is used to estimate a date as well as aerial photographs, which do not show the structure in 1954 but did in a 1976 photograph.

Image of Cistern, facing west.
The greenhouse is designed as a pit house with a slanted frame roof. There are five limestone steps leading down into the greenhouse from ground level. It has a dirt floor and two raised beds with a small path in between. The bricks on the north side have been replaced. Modern asphalt shingles surround the openings where the glass would have been located.

Greenhouse, interior dimensions (above), facing east (left) and facing north (right).
The kitchen, c. 1858, is located to east of the house. It has 3 x 4 yellow poplar rafters and 1 x 5 yellow poplar ridge pole. The original standing-seam roof remains. The structure is built with cut nails commonly used in the 1850s. There is a ceiling, which is historic but was installed at an unknown date. It creates an overhead space with the only access from the exterior of the structure above the door. Currently, it is used as storage; it may have earlier functioned as a servant’s dwelling. There is a cook stove c. 1900 located at the rear. An opening in the chimney to vent the stove is located above it. A toilet was installed c. 1950.

Clockwise: Kitchen and Smokehouse; west elevation of Kitchen; north elevation of Kitchen; interior of Kitchen.
**SMOKEHOUSE**

The smokehouse, c. 1858, is located east of the house, north of the kitchen. It has three tiers of 2 x 10 joists, all of which are pit sawn. There are 3 x 4 rafters, no ridge pole, and original standing-seam roof. The floor is concrete, although it was more than likely originally dirt. It stands 1 ½ stories. It changed use from a smokehouse to a workshop and is currently used for storage. To the east of the smoke house there is a raised bed. It stands about a foot off the side of the smokehouse and is the same width. It extends about five feet to the east.
Somkehouse, photographer facing northeast (above); Detail of Somkehouse wall (below).
Interior of Smokehouse.

Smokehouse, interior dimensions.
SPRINGHOUSE

The springhouse is located west of the house directly adjacent to Franklin Pike. Built in two phases, it was started sometime before 1850, and another phase occurred c. 1887, and is probably associated with the transformation of the property to a show farm. The earliest section was created in a dry stone manner. The later section is in better condition being made from cut stone and mortar. The entrance faces east, and there is a window on the north wall. The inside has two sections with vaulted ceilings. The walls are made of stone but the ceilings are made of brick. The exterior of the roof is covered with dirt and vegetation. The structure is very elaborate for a springhouse, featuring buttresses on all three exposed sides. It was used by a Nashville ice company for storage while making deliveries in this section of the city.

Springhouse, photographer facing west.

Springhouse, photographer facing south.
Interior of Springhouse.

Springhouse interior dimensions.
FARMSTEAD BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES, AND SIGNIFICANT SITES

Old Barn

This barn dates from c. 1887, and is probably associated with the Hermitage Stud period of the farm. The barn has a wooden frame and vertical board and battens for the exterior siding. The dimensions of the barn are 46 feet X 85 feet, and the distance from the foundation to the top plate is 12 feet.

Old Barn, west elevation.

Old Barn, south elevation.
The barn’s axis is east-west, and the double doors on the east and west walls consist of lattice-covered wooden frames. No images depicting the original doors of the barn have been located.

The lattice doors are flanked by two arched windows on the west wall and both the east and west walls have a hayloft entrance above the lattice doors. The foundation of the barn is constructed of stone approximately one foot high which rests on a somewhat leveled dirt floor.

The roof is covered with 5-V pattern sheet metal and has a hanging Eastlake trim, similar to the trim of the carriage house, which follows the eaves of the roof. Historically, the barn was painted white. Based on similar photos of the training barn at the Ewell Farm (National Register listed, located in Williamson County) in 1883, it is safe to assume the owners painted the barn white at its construction.277 White paint (not original) is currently peeling off the structure.

There are ten windows on the north wall of the barn, and on the south wall, there are seven windows. The windows have simple rectangular frames made up of four 1 X 4 pieces of wood. The owners covered three of the windows with square sheets of aluminum attached to the exterior of the southern wall. A fourth window is closed with wooden boards instead of an aluminum sheet. The north windows are more complex. The north wall windows have wooden bars spaced evenly within their frames. The original framing of the windows indicate the bars were square, not the circular dowels currently in use. These windows contain a sliding shutter instead of the more common hinged shutters.

---

277 Perky Beisel and Rob DeHart, Middle Tennessee Horse Breeding (Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 2007) 31.
Old Barn, interior dimensions.

The inside of the old barn contains four rooms; two at the west entrance and two at the eastern entrance. Plank doors provide entrances to the two rooms on the west side of the barn. However, the two rooms at the eastern entrance of the barn lack full doors. Instead, each room has a framed opening approximately four feet off the ground. The east rooms appear to be corn cribs. The two rooms at the west entrance were workshops and non-farm tool storage. The east rooms functioned as storage for hay, corn, and farming tools. The northwest room has historic graffiti along the exterior hall containing various initials and dates.

The interior space along the east-west axis contains outlines of old horse stalls along with tack. The north room at the west entrance contains the ladder to the hay loft. The loft is relatively stable and is an open space with a hay track at the center of the ceiling. The hay loft utilizes mortise-and-tenon construction for its framing on the series of joists supporting it.

The northeast room contains dozens of sling blades, many still in their original crates, obtained from a Nashville manufacturer.

The landscape around the old barn indicates the occupants planted non-indigenous plants including daffodils, ivy, some type of grass, and other scrub brush. On the north side of the barn there is evidence in the landscape that suggests the existence of a garden. The parcel of land immediately north of the old barn presumably once held a small riding yard. Perhaps this was used for potential customers to ride the horses they were interested in purchasing. At the east entrance of the old barn is an aluminum storage building with no door.
The old barn, probably from the era of the Hermitage Stud, still contains many artifacts from its 100 years of use.

Late twentieth century reinforcements can be found throughout the old barn.
**New Barn**

This barn dates from the decision by owners Conn Thompson Harris and Overton Harris to focus the farm on cattle and hay production. It dates c. 1940s. The large rectangular structure provided a space to feed cattle efficiently by enabling the farmhands to drop hay from the loft to ground level. The hay would fall into a manger where cattle could feed. Any extra hay pulled out fell onto a small flat surface insuring little went to waste. The barn is laid out on an east-west axis, constructed of wood, and has a metal roof. The dimensions of the barn is 40 by 81 feet.

The west wall has a 14-foot wide entrance. There is an iron rod along the top of the western wall. It is possible that the entrance originally had sliding doors of some form, but no images exist to support that fact -- many newer barns of this type had sliding doors rather than hinged ones. Along the west wall, on the south end, there is a door approximately two feet off the ground. This door leads to a cattle chute inside the barn. Mangers can be found along the interior of the north wall.

The hay loft is supported by wooden posts. In some instances, some of the original posts have had deteriorated sections removed and replaced with sound wood. The south half of the barn reflects a different purpose. There are feeding stations running along the south wall in a direct line with the entrance. Immediately to the south of this wall are separate stalls. Cattle could walk down the chute into holding pens. A loading ramp sits in the first pen.

![New Barn, interior dimensions.](image-url)
New Barn, west elevation.

New Barn, interior.
South wall of New Barn.
North wall framing has worked loose on New Barn. Repaired support for hay loft on New Barn.

**CONCRETE WATER TROUGH**

Other structures that supported livestock production during the mid-twentieth century were the c.1950 silo (only the concrete base remains) and the c.1950 water troughs for the cattle. Farmers used concrete for foundations and various farm structures in the early twentieth century, but typically they are post-World War II additions.
**CATTLE CHUTE**

Located south of the new barn, this wood structure allowed farm hands to move cattle up into vehicles. Among the historic images of the farm from the 1960s -- 1970s is a large livestock truck, with the name *Glen Leven Farms* on the door. The structure dates from the time of Conn Thompson Harris and Overton Thompson’s operation of the farm. It is dated c.1950.

![Cattle Chute.](image)

**FENCING**

As to be expected at a farm that has been in operation for 200 years, Glen Leven has a variety of fence types, most of which are metal, with metal or wood posts, used to define fields or to allow or deny access to certain areas and fields of the farm.

The stone gate entrance dates from the time of John M. Thompson, especially from the years of the Hermitage Stud in the 1880s to the construction of the Nashville Interurban Railway in the first decade of the twentieth century. This stone fence, constructed with mortar, differs from the longer extension of stone wall that extends southward along Franklin Pike. The last third of this fence is dry-stacked stone, similar to the remnants of a stone wall found along the historic road that fronts the new barn.

![Detail of stone front gate.](image)
Wire fencing from c. 1950.

Wire fencing against a deteriorated stone wall.
Remnant of dry-stone stacked wall along Franklin Pike, facing southwest.

Wire fence gate that once connected chicken coop area to farm field.
FARM ROADS

Historic roads and farm roads define relationships between fields and farm buildings.

One of the best defined roads that passes in front of the “new” barn.
This road dates to early 19th century.

Another well-defined road runs east of the “old” barn.
FIELD PATTERNS

Aerial photography tells us that the Glen Leven fields have changed from the mid-twentieth century, but in general the fields today mirror the patterns found from the era of Conn Thompson Harris and Overton Harris, when the property increasingly focused its production on cattle and hay.

"Hermitage Garden" field after plowing, February 2010.
East side of creek field, facing south.

East side of creek, north end of the farm, facing north.
Field at south end of the property, looking southeast.

Woodlot in field at the south end of the farm.
WATER SYSTEM STRUCTURES

East of the barns and near Brown’s Creek are two related structures that stored water for the cattle and farm. The exact function of the extant walls and foundations is unknown at this time.

Wall and foundation of water structures (above and below).
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

EAST FORK OF BROWN’S CREEK

The East, Middle, and West Forks of Brown’s Creek drain into the main creek near the intersection of Franklin Pike and Woodmont Boulevard south of downtown Nashville, which then drains into the Cumberland River east of downtown Nashville. The East Fork runs basically north-south through the easternmost agricultural fields on the Glen Leven property. It is small and appears to be free of any obvious pollution.

A large floodplain or wetland area is at the northernmost section of the creek where it is partially hindered by Interstate 65. There is an active beaver lodge just south of the floodplain/wetland with approximately three dams under construction at the time this report was prepared.
Considerable evidence of beaver activity exists near the farm’s wetland area.
NATURAL Springs

In addition to the natural spring adjacent to Franklin Pike where the springhouse is located, there are two more springs remaining on the property. One is adjacent to the East Fork of Brown’s Creek, in a northeast field. The other is located in the large southeast field.

Springs in southeast field, east of barns.

There also appear to be wildlife trails leading to the creek that are actively being used. The CHP team noted many mammals on the farm during their survey work.

Detail of wildlife trail.
NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

House Exterior

Despite nearly constant occupancy and care, preservation issues still exist at Glen Leven, particular in regards to the exterior of the home. Some of these issues need to be dealt with and combated promptly, while many others can be addressed at a later date, between one and five years. The following discussion will lay out recommendations for each elevation of the house and will be followed by a table that sets up a timeline for action. Consultation with qualified professionals is recommended for any and all work on the house.

Roof

The number one preservation priority at Glen Leven must be moisture and drainage control. Water problems need to be addressed from the top down, starting with a complete professional inspection of the roof followed by repair and replacement of any damaged or loose areas. Next, the gutters on all elevations need to be inspected and repaired or replaced. Plastic flexible drainpipe needs to be added to the down spouts to extend their length and lead water away from the foundation of the home. This is most evident on the north side of the house. Generally receiving less direct sunlight than the other elevations, the ground near and surrounding the foundation on the north elevation is extremely soft and spongy. Many of the gutters on this side of the house pour directly toward the basement or are completely unattached and need immediate attention.

West Elevation

Immediate areas requiring attention on the west façade include the re-glazing and repair of windows, as well as the replacement of all broken panes. The metal flashing at the top of the windows needs to be inspected as well, making sure that the wooden lintel of each window is protected from weather and rain.
Within one year, the columns on the Greek Revival portico need to be repainted, with special attention given to the repainting of the cast iron Corinthian capitals. Additionally, all of the blinds need to be restored. Pieces of the original louvers and frames are currently stored within the smokehouse, and possibly these components could be utilized in the restoration.

Within five years, the stone on the front porch and steps as well as the stone bases of the columns need to be cleaned professionally to remove biological growth. Professionals can use gentle cleaning and techniques to remove green growth on stone. Avoid any abrasive cleaning techniques.

![Biological growth on the stone steps at entry.](image)

*South Elevation*

Immediate areas requiring attention on the south elevation include the re-glazing and repair of windows, as well as the replacement of all broken panes. The metal flashing at the top of the windows needs to be inspected as well, making sure that the wooden lintel of each window is protected from weather and rain.

Within one year, all of the blinds need to be restored. Pieces of the original louvers and frames are currently stored within the smokehouse, and possibly these components could be utilized in the restoration.

Within five years, the stone foundation needs to be cleaned professionally to remove biological growth. Professionals can use gentle cleaning and techniques to remove green growth on stone.
East Elevation

Immediate areas requiring attention on the east elevation include the re-glazing and repair of windows, as well as the replacement of all broken panes. The metal flashing at the top of the windows needs to be inspected as well, making sure that the wooden lintel of each window is protected from weather and rain.

The most important action is for the chimney on the east wall at the rear of the apartment to be repaired. It may require complete removal and replacement, so the work should be done before the roof is repaired.

Within one year, all of the blinds need to be restored. Pieces of the original louvers and frames are currently stored within the smokehouse, and possibly these components could be utilized in the restoration.

Within five years, the stone foundation needs to be cleaned professionally to remove biological growth. Professionals can use gentle cleaning and techniques to remove green growth on stone.

Oxidized flashing above wooden lintels of windows. Leaning chimney on East elevation poses a major safety threat.

Ell-Wing South Elevation

Immediate areas requiring attention on the south elevation include the re-glazing and repair of windows, as well as the replacement of all broken panes. The metal flashing at the top of the windows needs to be inspected as well, making sure that the wooden lintel of each window is protected from weather and rain. Also, the railing needs to be restored on the first floor of the porch. This will be needed to meet building codes and can be modeled after the railing on the second story of the porch.
Within one year, all of the blinds need to be restored. Pieces of the original louvers and frames are currently stored within the smokehouse, and possibly these components could be utilized in the restoration. Latticework needs to be added as a barrier around the base of the porch, much like underneath the porch of the apartment. This will allow air flow but will also keep animals and pests out of the crawl space.

Within five years, the stone foundation needs to be cleaned professionally to remove biological growth. Professionals can use gentle cleaning and techniques to remove green growth on stone. Additionally, the modern kitchen, currently enclosed on the rear ell porch should be considered for relocation to the rear apartment or removed. The kitchen is poorly constructed and is probably too small and out-dated to be used effectively by caterers. It is an intrusion on the porch’s historic integrity as an open space.
**Rear Ell East Elevation**

Immediate areas requiring attention on the east elevation include the re-glazing and repair of windows, as well as the replacement of all broken panes. The metal flashing at the top of the windows needs to be inspected as well, making sure that the wooden lintel of each window is protected from weather and rain. Also, the railing needs to be restored on the first floor of the porch. This will be needed to meet building codes and can be modeled after the railing on the second story of the porch.

Within one year, all of the blinds need to be restored. Pieces of the original louvers and frames are currently stored within the smokehouse, and possibly these components could be utilized in the restoration. Latticework needs to be added as a barrier around the base of the porch, much like underneath the porch of the apartment. This will allow air flow but will also keep animals and pests out of the crawl space.

Within five years, the stone foundation needs to be cleaned professionally to remove biological growth. Professionals can use gentle cleaning and techniques to remove growth.

**North Elevation**

The north elevation is the best place to see the immediate need for better drainage around the house. Gutters and downspouts are broken or working poorly. As a result, this elevation has the most need of repairs. Besides an improved gutter system, the dirt near the foundation needs to be sloped from the house to lead rainwater away from the foundation. A French drain system is recommended to protect the basement from water infiltration.

Other areas requiring attention include the sealing and repair of the basement as well as re-glazing and repair of windows and replacement of all broken panes. The metal flashing at the top of the windows needs to be inspected, making sure that the wooden lintel of each window is protected from weather and rain.

Within one year, all of the blinds need to be restored. Pieces of the original louvers and frames are currently stored within the smokehouse, and possibly these components could be utilized in the restoration.
Porte-cochere

This key defining feature needs considerable attention. The decaying Eastlake details need to be repaired or replaced carefully to retain the structure’s architectural integrity. Inspect the juncture of the masonry bases and the wood posts for deterioration. The metal roof needs repairing, or possible replacement. Before work is underway, photograph the structure as it is so that the repair of the intricate woodwork is handled appropriately. Utilize qualified craftsmen to replicate woodwork where replacement is necessary. After the renovation is complete, repaint the structure.

Porte-cochere requires repairs and paint.

Basement/Foundation

The damaged or missing sections of the foundation need to be repaired or replaced. The north elevation has large areas missing and water is pouring directly into the basement. Within one year, a complete inspection and weather proofing of the basement should be carried out.

Examples of damaged foundations.
### Preservation Timetable for the House Exterior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Within One Year</th>
<th>Within Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Elevation</strong></td>
<td>Windows need to be re-glazed and repaired; Flashing at top of windows needs to be installed properly</td>
<td>Columns need to be repainted; blinds need to be repaired and repainted</td>
<td>Cleaning of stone foundation to remove biological growth by professional stone cleaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Elevation</strong></td>
<td>Windows need to be re-glazed and repaired; Flashing at top of windows needs to be re-installed properly</td>
<td>Blinds need to be repaired and repainted</td>
<td>Cleaning of stone foundation to remove biological growth by professional stone cleaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Elevation</strong></td>
<td>Chimney needs to be repaired and may require removal and replacement; Windows need to be re-glazed and repaired; Flashing at top of windows needs to be installed properly</td>
<td>Blinds need to be repaired and repainted</td>
<td>Cleaning of stone foundation to remove biological growth by professional stone cleaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ell-Wing South Elevation</strong></td>
<td>Railing needs to be restored on the first floor of the porch; Windows need to be re-glazed and repaired; Flashing at top of windows needs to be installed properly</td>
<td>Blinds need to be repaired and repainted; latticework needs to be added as barrier around base of porch</td>
<td>Possible removal of modern kitchen currently enclosed on rear ell porch; relocation of kitchen to rear apartment; cleaning of stone foundation to remove biological growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ell-Wing East Elevation</strong></td>
<td>Windows need to be re-glazed and repaired; Flashing at top of windows needs to be installed properly</td>
<td>Blinds need to be repaired and repainted</td>
<td>Cleaning of stone foundation to remove biological growth by professional stone cleaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Elevation</strong></td>
<td>Foundation needs to be repaired; all open spaces filled; Gutters repaired; Windows need to be re-glazed and repaired; Flashing at top of windows installed properly.</td>
<td>Sloping of dirt near foundation to lead water from foundation; blinds need to be repaired and repainted</td>
<td>Cleaning of stone foundation to remove biological growth by professional stone cleaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porte-cochere</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repair or replacement of decaying Eastlake details</td>
<td>Repainting of porte-cochere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td>Re-pointing/repair of damaged or missing sections of foundation</td>
<td>Weather-proofing of basement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof</strong></td>
<td>Professional inspection followed by repair; repair and replacement of gutters throughout</td>
<td>Trim limbs and branches touching roof or portico roof; repair and replacement of dentil molding around eaves</td>
<td>Full replacement of roof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many areas of the interior also need attention. Exterior repairs should precede many, if not all, interior repairs, especially those concerning water and drainage. Consultation with qualified professionals is recommended for any work on the house.

**Water Damage**

Uncontrolled water flowing off of the roof on the north elevation near the HVAC systems has caused considerable damage to the cellar and the foundation, as well as the wooden joists. The integrity of the wood in the cellar has been greatly compromised due to rot and mold.

Water from leaks in the roof has also caused parts of the plaster ceiling to crack or fall, especially on the second floor. The plaster walls in nearly every room display varying degrees of cracking.

Once water and moisture problems are addressed from the exterior, repair, restore, and replace as necessary on interior.
Flooring Concerns

Weakened floorboards in the rooms on the ell wing, as well as the entire second floor and staircase in general, may make them hazardous for public use. It is recommended that these rooms be closed off from traffic completely, or severely limit the amount of traffic. A full inspection by qualified professionals is recommended before heavy traffic usage in the rooms. Floor stabilization will likely be necessary before heavy usage.

Throughout the house, the original pine flooring has sustained damage from continued use, carpet nails, and carpet adhesive. If the house will be experiencing moderate to heavy traffic, it is recommended that the floors either be refinished or covered to protect them.

Floor stabilization will likely be necessary before heavy usage.

Ornamental Woodwork

Some of the ornamental elements of the interior also need to be addressed. Much of the woodwork, specifically the baseboards in the northwest parlor, has been damaged or is pulling away from the wall. The window sashes have also sustained some damage. Most of the mantels are also pulling away from the chimneys. The pocket doors have sustained damage to the bottoms from continued use. Repair and restoration is recommended.
Damage to window sash.

*Other interior areas of concern*

Damage to baseboard in 1st floor Northwest Room.

Damage to molding in 1st floor Southeast and Southwest Rooms.

Damage to main staircase newel post.
Windows

The leaded window at the top of the central stairs is in dire need of attention. The window has begun to bow out and is in an extremely delicate condition. It should be stabilized immediately. Several windows have broken panes that need to be fixed, including those located in the 1886 bathroom at the end of the porch on the second floor.
**Preservation Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Within one year</th>
<th>Within five years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>Address drainage problems on the North elevation; a French drain system is recommended to lead water away from the house</td>
<td>Reattach mantels and fireboxes to the walls</td>
<td>Consult pest control for existing termite damage and preventative maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspect roof and chimneys</td>
<td>Refinish floors for protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Floor Central Hall</strong></td>
<td>Cut off or limit traffic on staircase until further evaluation of its structural integrity can be done</td>
<td>Replace current finials on newel posts on staircase</td>
<td>Evaluate the structural integrity of the staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Floor SW Room</strong></td>
<td>Repair the windows that are broken or falling out of the frames</td>
<td>Evaluate the support of the pier mirrors, ensure they are stabilized and properly hung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Floor SE Room</strong></td>
<td>Limit use of pocket doors to prevent further damage from occurring</td>
<td>Evaluate pocket doors and address mobility issues and damage to the bottoms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Floor NW Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate the support of the pier mirrors, ensure they are stabilized and properly hung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Floor NE Room</strong></td>
<td>Discontinue use of pocket doors to prevent further damage from occurring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate pocket doors and address mobility issues and damage to the bottoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ell-wing</strong></td>
<td>Cut off all traffic to rooms until floors can be repaired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repair damaged floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Task 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor Central Hall</td>
<td>Consult a window specialist to evaluate and repair the leaded glass window</td>
<td>Assess water damage and flaking plaster</td>
<td>Evaluate the structural integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor SW Room</td>
<td>Repair the windows that are broken or falling out of the frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor NW Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess water damage and flaking plaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor NE Room</td>
<td>Repair the windows that are broken or falling out of the frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886 bathroom</td>
<td>Repair the windows that are broken or falling out of the frames</td>
<td>Clean out and remove storage items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>Remove all dead birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean up debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellar</td>
<td>Stabilize foundation</td>
<td>Repair or replace cellar doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspect wooden components for damage</td>
<td>Assess mold and water damage as well as damage resulting from pests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTBUILDINGS

Carriage House

The building is in good condition, but tree branches should be trimmed so not to damage the roof. The front doors are not secured and can be easily opened. The interior is cluttered and should be cleaned up. Note that hazardous materials and wastes may be present. Repair holes in the wood flooring.
**Chicken Coop**

This structure is modeled after standard Extension Service plans of the mid-twentieth century. Although impermanently constructed (located directly on the ground), the building is repairable and could serve a new function as storage. To better preserve the structure, the surrounding vegetation needs to be cleared and it needs to be lifted off the ground to slow decay. The entrance door needs repair.

![Vegetation around Chicken Coop and damage to entrance door.](image)

**Cistern**

The cistern is in fair condition, but is suffering from a leaky roof and deterioration to the framing, ceiling, and cornice.

![Damage to Cistern cornice.](image)
**Formal Garden**

After study from an ethno-botanist, the garden can be replanted and used for demonstration and education purposes.

![Area of Formal Garden.](image)

**Greenhouse**

The glass is currently being stored in the smokehouse. The wooden slants need to be replaced because the wood is rotting. On the south side, they are so deteriorated that they no longer touch the brick and are in danger of falling down. Some of the shingles also need to be replaced. Vegetation has overtaken the inside and surrounding area. This should be cleared to prevent further deterioration of the greenhouse.

![Damage to the Greenhouse walls.](image)
Overgrowth in the Greenhouse.

Kitchen
The mortar on the outside walls needs to be repaired. The entire inside needs to be cleaned out so floor can be properly examined. The gutters are falling off the building in several spots. The interior needs cleaning and repairing. The toilet should be replaced or removed. The roof is in fair condition; it needs to be cleaned and nailed back into place.

Smokehouse
Of all the domestic outbuildings, it is in the worst condition. The east wall is caving in, and should be stabilized immediately before it collapses. The brick shows signs of previous poor repair work through the use of heavy mortar (such as Portland cement patches, which have sped up the deterioration of the brick walls). Another need is that the branches need to be
cleared off the roof and overhanging limbs removed. The inside also needs to be cleaned out. The brick work on the raised bed is also in poor condition and needs to be replaced.

Damage to Smokehouse exterior (left). Previous repairs to brick using Portland cement (right).

Detail of damage to exterior walls.
Springhouse

Some time ago, the dry stone wall on the east side collapsed, covering the stairs leading into the interior. With the collision of stone on stone, the section of the wall directly above the entrance collapsed, exposing the underlying brickwork. This is in danger of falling even more. This rock debris needs to be cleaned up and the wall repaired. When the stairs are uncovered, it will be much safer to enter the springhouse. The vines attached to the north facing need to be removed as they can cause damage to the mortar and stonework.

Exterior damage to Springhouse wall.

Preservation Timetable: Domestic Outbuildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Within one year</th>
<th>Within 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Clear debris, vegetation</td>
<td>Fix holes in the floor, address stability of partition</td>
<td>Roof and foundation assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken Coop</td>
<td>Lift structure off ground</td>
<td>Repair door and other openings</td>
<td>Roof and foundation assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistern</td>
<td>Check roof for leaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repair damaged wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear vegetation, rebond walls</td>
<td>Re-shingle, replace support beams for glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Check roof for leaks</td>
<td>Fix gutters, nail tin roof, and holes in interior</td>
<td>Clean the roof, rebond walls, repair mortar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Garden</td>
<td>Keep development off</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full ethnobotany study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
<td>Repair east wall</td>
<td>Repair east wall, clear out interior; assess for damage</td>
<td>Roof assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springhouse</td>
<td>Clear vines and debris</td>
<td>Repair east wall, and retaining wall</td>
<td>Reinstall glass to make it functional again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Farmstead**

*Old Barn*

Overall, for a barn with more than a century of use, this structure is in surprisingly good condition. This barn, with proper maintenance, has many more years remaining. The barn's exterior walls should be repainted. Exposure to the elements has already occurred, but repainting would reduce future damage to the structure by creating a barrier protecting from the wood from storms or the sun. The floor boards of the hayloft need to be examined and any damaged boards should be replaced. An close examination of the metal roof is highly recommended.

The barn already has insects in residence. It is important to determine if the barn is infested with termites. Also, as an outdoor wooden structure, this barn is likely to attract vermin such as spiders and snakes. Additional hazards inside the barn include rusted and exposed nails. Visitors should be aware of these hazards before they enter the barn.

For both the “old” and “new” barns, consider removing the hay and bags of leaves currently scattered throughout the barns. This hay provides a suitable habitat for rodents to nest in. We understand that the hay is an attractive backdrop for photography, but after sessions, it could be neatly stored. At least, cover the hay so it does not get wet or scattered.

*New Barn*

The front half of the barn is sinking, and the posts need to be jacked back up. This sinking of supports has placed additional strain on the timbers. It is possible to jack up the barn in order to stabilize the supports, but this is an expensive and delicate procedure. The entrance doors are uneven, and the southern side is noticeably lower than the northern side.

If this course of action is chosen, once the barn is stabilized then repairs for the remainder of the barn can begin. Interior support posts have moisture damage. It is uncertain where this moisture developed as the barn has an adequate runoff channel around its exterior.
Damage to support posts.

The barn has no paint so the wood is exposed to the weather. Hackberry trees grow around the barn, and their growth has damaged the barn’s structure. The damage to this structure can be mitigated, but the future function of this barn should be determined before any large-scale repairs are made.

Structural damage to north wall.
## Preservation Timeline: The Barns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Within one year</th>
<th>Within five years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Barn</strong></td>
<td>Remove hay and manure. Exterminate insects/rodents. Remove brush adjacent to barn.</td>
<td>Jack up the appropriate columns, reinforcing the foundation. Repair the stalls and exterior wall panels.</td>
<td>Install replacement roof. Repair fencing around barn should it be used for heritage species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water trough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove brush around it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well houses</strong></td>
<td>Remove brush and repair the walls which have been damaged by the brush growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify function of structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AREAS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

This study has uncovered much about the history of Glen Leven. Even so, we are left with several key questions that need further investigation and analysis.

1. Dates are still unknown for the addition and lengthening of the ell behind the house, other than the lengthening of the ell and the porch in 1888 as a part of the Eastlake changes. A couple of theories have been developed throughout the documentation process although there is not enough evidence to support and prove the dates of changes.

   The first theory involves the construction of the brick house that burned. According to the Republican Banner article appearing October 29, 1856, “The whole premises were destroyed, including the kitchen where the fire originated, the old mansion and a new brick building just erected, adjoining.” The phrase “adjoining” may indicate that the new home was attached to the previous log house, where the family was residing up to the point of the fire. This would follow traditional building methods of creating a larger house attached to the old, smaller house. 278

   A second theory involves the rebuilding of the home following the fire. Early family descriptions of the home describe the rebuilt brick home as featuring two double parlors, a bedroom, and a bathroom downstairs, and five bedrooms and an “upstairs daughters’ room that could be reached only by a staircase ascending from the cross hall just outside the parents’ bedroom door.” 279 According to this description, following the fire, the first section of the ell (the first room on both stories) would have been rebuilt with the house. If the log house was attached, then this could have been the section to attach the new and old. A clear joint in the wall is visible on both the first and second stories at this point, and may provide evidence of this theory of addition.

Joint where ell-wing connects to the house.

278 “Country Residence Burned,” Republican Banner, October 29, 1856.
2. Although it is known that the pier mirrors in the first floor southwest and northwest rooms were purchased during the 1886 renovation by John M. Thompson from Andrew Hamilton of Nashville, their date and origin beyond that is still unknown. While this fact alone gives the mirrors historic significance within the house, their significance may be expanded through further research.

3. Further research on the wallpapers found throughout the house could reveal their era and origin as well. In-depth paint analysis to include rooms not sampled in this project is also recommended. Further research on the mantels, particularly those found in the double parlors on the north side, could determine which are original to the house, original to the 1886 renovation, and which are newer replacement mantels. Dates for the existing armoires throughout the house are unknown. Analysis of auction registers could determine what furniture used to reside in the house for possible interpretive purposes. Research on the light fixtures to determine dates and origins has not been done. Further investigation may reveal that some light fixtures are original either to the house or the 1886 renovation and have since been converted to electric lighting.

4. In the greenhouse, it is unknown what exactly was grown there, why a slant-framed pit house was built since it is very rare in Tennessee, and what conditions led to the rebuilding of the north wall.

5. It is also unknown who used the external kitchen and when was it occupied. Further questions for study include determining when the toilet and interior and exterior faucets were added to the kitchen.

6. At the New Barn, a metal cattle catching gate still sits in the first pen. Additional research is necessary to determine if gates like this were used to quarantine new cattle for the health of the herd, to separate out pregnant cattle so the farmers could better monitor delivery, or for other uses.

7. There is a concrete ring to the north of the newer barn. This is a composite material of river rock and concrete. When was the silo built? Of what materials? When was it demolished?

8. What function did the various outbuildings serve?

Two additional structures, possibly from the sharecropper period generate additional questions. Tenant housing would have existed at various intervals on Glen Leven. Unfortunately, all of the slave quarters and tenant houses were destroyed. In the pasture to the southeast of the newer barn, there are two brick and cement structures. Those are believed to be well houses. With oral interviews from the remaining family members, it may be possible to identify these structures accurately.

The first structure is surrounded by hackberry bushes making it difficult to approach. There is an iron pipe protruding from the western interior wall. Its location prevented the team from noticing it during the first visit to the property for field work. Was it a well house, or was it a

---

water meter considering Nashville sewer mains are located within a few hundred feet of the structure on the eastern side of East Fork of Brown's Creek?

Possible water structures.

Closer to East Fork of Brown's Creek is a similar, albeit smaller, structure. While the structure further north has walls a few feet above ground, the more eastern structure’s walls are predominantly below ground, reinforcing the notion of a well house or a connection to Metro Water and Sewer.

The well houses’ walls have suffered damage due to the root and tree growth forcing separation of the bricks.

Vegetation around well house.
9. **Was the Old Road the original Franklin-Nashville road?**

The landscape becomes even more confusing when reviewing the road running north to south in front of the newer barn. This road has shingles in the roadway and several sections have stone walls bordering it. The road has deep trenches that would correspond to wagons and carriages. The original Franklin Turnpike Company received its charter in 1829. Various theories have emerged dealing with this roadway, and one theory maintains this roadway is a remnant of the original Franklin Turnpike. Again, more research will be needed to determine the validity of this argument. A Phase II archaeological survey may yield more evidence regarding the road’s length and what types of vehicles traversed this road.

Old road, possibly the original Franklin-Nashville road.

Rock wall lining an old road (left). Stone and brick inlaid on old road (left).
10. Does the artifact scatter and springs at this southeast location signify that a dwelling once stood at this location of the farm?

Disputes arise as to where the original houses were located. Considering the existence of one spring in the southeastern pasture with debris in the vicinity, it may be possible that this is the site of an original home or early home.

![Possible original house site with brick on left and dressed stone visible in center.](image)

11. A vegetation and wildlife study for environmental resources.

The variety and maturity of trees on the property is impressive. A partial tree survey has been done, including the areas closest to the house, but a more extensive survey which includes at least the most significant trees on the remainder of the property is important. This information could be used for an interpretive nature trail. A wildlife survey would also provide important information for a nature trail. Since Glen Leven is sixty-six acres of relative undisturbed habitat, the property appears to be an urban wildlife oasis. A variety of bird species have been observed on the property, including songbirds, cavity-nesters, raptors, ground nesters, and waterfowl. Birdboxes and batboxes would enhance the visitor experience on nature trails, and could be interpreted as a how-to for backyards. Several mammal species have also been observed, including coyote and beaver. Animal trails on the property suggest large mammals are utilizing the field and creek habitats, and should be left undisturbed as much as possible but still interpreted to the public as part of the nature trail. The creek should be surveyed to determine if significant populations of fish, amphibians, and reptiles are utilizing the riparian zone on the property and if it is habitat for any endangered species. The wetland/floodplain area should also be assessed to determine if it is a true wetland and subject to protection under state and federal regulations.

    The natural springs should be clearly marked for visitor safety and interpreted for visitor education. Although significant construction around the springs is not recommended in order to maintain the integrity of the landscape, unobtrusive barriers and interpretive signage is suggested.

13.  A Phase Two Archaeological Study should be undertaken.
INTERPRETIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The House and its outbuildings. If used as part of a demonstration program, these buildings have significant potential for public education. The recommendation is not to restore the house and turn it into a historic house museum. This function is already filled by several historic homes in the region including Traveller’s Rest and Belle Meade Plantation in Nashville. In order to avoid duplication, it is suggested that the house be used as a learning lab and classroom on the first floor only until the second floor is stabilized. Since the house has a variety of architectural elements as well as many problems caused by water damage and deferred maintenance, it will serve as a place where students can gain hands on experience in the process of historic preservation. This process could also be interpreted to educate the public about the goals and methods of historic preservation.

   The south rooms downstairs could be set aside as an interpretive space for the house and property. These rooms are an ideal exhibit space for information about the property’s buildings, fields, and families. These exhibits should be temporary so they can be rotated periodically and not damage the historic fabric of the house. While recreating the family parlors is not recommended, this space could be used to display two or three original family pieces as an interpretive tool, if any could be obtained.

   Constructing a public restroom or converting an outbuilding to a public restroom is suggested to limit traffic through the house, and preserve the mid-century fixtures in the downstairs restroom.

   The outbuildings surrounding the house tell a story of plantation life during the late 1800s. These buildings have just as much importance as the house as they contribute to the way of life on the property. Besides this important aspect, it also shows how plantation life adapted to emancipation of slaves, introduction of automobiles, attached kitchens, and refrigeration.

   An audio tour, if combined with the rest of the property, would be as beneficial to visitors as signs and brochures. For this to make sense financially, it would have to be combined with the rest of the property instead of consisting of only the domestic outbuildings. To date, there is not enough information to justify the expense.

   For the best educational experience for visitors, a combination of brochures and audio (podcasts) could be used.

2. The Farmstead’s interpretive potential is significant and multi-disciplinary. The Land Trust should avoid construction of any parking lots until a research historian and an archeologist can examine the land and records for data undiscovered to this point. Susan West restricted the development of new roads along the property. The first task of the landscape team was to map any pre-existing roads. Using Google Earth images of Glen Leven, a singular document was created. To this was added blue dots symbolizing the location of the potential well house and water trough. Lines were draped over the map tracing both manmade pathways and animal game trails. The resulting map is below.
There are several roads and perhaps human/animals paths that potentially could be turned into visitors’ paths once a biological assessment has been completed to determine ecological impacts. A landscape architect or landscape design company would know the correct procedures to denote the paths for visitors to follow. People could move around the property in a manner that allows them to safely and proficiently view most of the historically significant structures and features of the property. A comprehensive Interpretation Plan could outline and analyze various options for the farm.

3. A large part of the farmstead's interpretive potential lies with its environmental resources. A nature trail would be the best interpretation of the environmental resources on the property; however, much research is still needed prior to developing a trail. Wildlife, tree, and wetland/riparian assessments are necessary to determine significant points for interpretation. This information is also necessary to determine the best location for trails and how to manage the fields without disturbing the current ecosystem. Once this research is complete, the nature trail could be incorporated into self-guided tours, podcast tours, and other interpretive programs described above.
4. Glen Leven is an important Nashville property for Civil War interpretation. The Battle of Nashville is one of the state’s 38 nationally significant battlefields. Glen Leven provides an opportunity to interpret this historic landscape. The first phase would include a complete archeological survey to examine possible Civil War trenches and earthworks as well as burial area locations. This archeological survey must come before any enhancements to the physical landscape begin in order to prevent damage to undiscovered elements. If it is possible, the use of GPS and GIS would enhance research findings and lend to the bigger picture. A full-time researcher is important for beginning a fully developed snap shot of the Civil War story at Glen Leven, including slavery, reconstruction, and agriculture, archeology, and interpretive analysis. The overarching objective is to have a clearer understanding of Glen Leven and how the landscape fits into the overall Civil War story.

5. Clearly Glen Leven is also potentially a key archaeology landscape. A complete archeological survey of the entire landscape is needed. This would enhance the research started by the Center, and should include an overview of the family cemetery, slave cemetery, earlier homestead sites, investigation of creek beds and brick structures, livestock and agriculture patterns, Civil War trenches and earthworks, and burial area locations. This archeological survey must come before any enhancements to the physical landscape begin. If it is possible, the use of GPS and GIS would enhance research findings and lend to the bigger picture. Parking lots and picnic table locations are recommended, but must not disturb potential and future historic interpretive sites. A full time research historian and on-site archeologist should begin the collection management process of the home and landscape continuing the beginning research conducted by the Center for Historic Preservation, and maintain a presence at the site.

Once the archeological assessment is complete, a landscape map detailing walking trails, interpretive markers, parking lots, and picnic table placement may be developed.

6. Long-Term Planning should continue. Development of a long-term strategic plan or master plan of the home, outbuildings, and landscape is recommended. It should include defined goals, bench marks, and measurable objectives, as well as plans for heritage tourism in partnership with similar sites in the region. It should also include long-term plans for staffing and daily operations, regular maintenance, and sustainability of the site.

Establishment of a sustainable revenue source is also important. Ideas may include campaigning for an endowment, or developing a plan for a portion of the property to be used for agricultural applications. Determining alternative uses of the property as a revenue source should be part of the planning process.
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APPENDIX I
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DRAWINGS OF GLEN LEVEN
BY ZADA LAW, MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
APPENDIX II
HOUSE EXTERIOR AND INTERIOR PAINT ANALYSIS

This report documents the paint analysis of the Glen Leven property in Nashville, Tennessee conducted by the exterior house team comprised of Hallie Fieser, Tyler Sandlerlin, and Rebecca Duke and the interior house team comprised of Lauren Pate, Catherine Hawkins, and Katie Randall. The paint analysis represents part of a Historic Structures Report (HSR) conducted by the Seminar in Historic Preservation class at Middle Tennessee State University and will serve an important role in the future preservation and potential restoration of the Glen Leven house.

In executing this paint analysis, both teams used procedures that are standard among historic paint analysts. The investigators collected samples at the site, mounted and catalogued the samples, analyzed these samples under a microscope, and created a brief summary of their findings. No attempt was made to match samples to the Munsell Color Notation System, though samples are available at the Center for Historic Preservation should they be needed for further microscopic analysis.

The Process

In order to collect appropriate data to analyze, preliminary decisions must be made regarding where samples should be taken. The exterior team decided that samples should be taken from selected areas of the interior portico, front doors, and columns from the rear porch. The interior team decided that samples should be taken from the north double parlors, southwest parlor, and central hall. Each group extracted small samples (approximately 10mm in size – easily patched for subsequent repainting) on site. The analysis was later conducted using a microscope at the Center for Historic Preservation offices.

Each sample was initially stored in a small coin envelope. A number along with the rough stratigraphy was penciled on the envelope. Each sample was labeled “GLV” along with the number of the sample to denote where each sample was taken from. Upon returning to the Center for Historic Preservation, the analysts removed sections of each sample and mounted them in wax-filled petri dishes for microscopic examination.

In order to understand the paint history of a building, it is necessary to establish the sequence of paint layers that were applied to various surfaces over time. The paint analysts examined a cross section and developed a comprehensive list of paint layers, ranging from the layer near the substrate (the oldest) to the currently visible layer (the youngest). These layers were described using common sense color names (e.g., “white”) along with any relevant notes on thickness, texture, etc. The team conducted a stratigraphic analysis on the paint samples using a stereo microscope with zoom capabilities and magnification ranging from 8x to 80x. Lighting was provided by a fiber optic illuminator with halogen lamp.

The Exterior Findings

The house exterior samples revealed a few points of interest. First, samples taken from the interior portico front door indicated that it was once a hunter green color. Historic images of
the home show a darker colored door, most likely confirming the paint analysis findings. The green layer existed between several layers of white paint and the door is currently white.

Secondly, samples taken from various locations throughout the entrance space with multiple chamfered panels at the main entrance included layers of gold and teal. These same colors appear in the omate tiles found on the floor here.

Third, several samples collected from shutters exposed multiple layers (15+) of green paint, suggesting that hunter green has been consistently used on the shutters and is original to the house. Several samples taken from different shutters confirm many layers of various shades of hunter green.

The last point of interest on the house exterior involved the posts on the rear porch. Two different columns were sampled; one of which was suspected to be a replacement post. The samples confirmed our suspicion that some of the posts had been replaced at one point. One post had 8+ layers of white and off white paint, while the newer post only revealed one layer of white.

*The Interior Findings*

The house interior samples also revealed a few points of interest. First, samples taken from the north double parlors reveal that the current buff color in the northwest parlor and the light blue color in the northeast parlor are only a single layer of paint. There was only a single layer of white paint, possibly a primer, found beneath that. It is believed that these rooms were consistently wallpapered until the recent past. Historic photographs of the house interior reveal wallpapered walls, helping to confirm the paint analysis findings. Additionally, the trim in these two rooms has been left a natural wood grain.

Secondly, samples taken from various locations throughout the center hall reveal that the wood trim and the staircase has a single layer of white paint, suggesting the woodwork was left natural historically. Paint analysis also revealed that this room only has a single layer of yellow paint on the walls with a single layer of white underneath. Again, it is believed that these walls were consistently wallpapered until recent years.

Lastly, samples taken from the southwest parlor reveal several layers of white paint on the window trim and baseboards. The mantel in this room was only found to have a single layer of white paint, and again only a single layer of blue paint with a single layer of white paint underneath was found on the walls. These walls are also believed to have been consistently wallpapered until recent years.

The samples collected in this paint analysis are stored and available for reference at the Center for Historic Preservation at Middle Tennessee State University in Murfreesboro, TN.
APPENDIX III
HOUSE INTERIOR WALLPAPER SAMPLES

Leaf wallpaper in first floor northeast room.

Paisley and rosette wallpaper in northwest room.
Four layers of wallpaper were discovered over the pocket doors in the first floor northwest room.

Needlepoint wallpaper from first floor southwest room.
Feather wallpaper from second floor northwest room.
APPENDIX IV
WORKING FLOOR PLANS OF HOUSE
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1. Name of Property
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NA not for publication
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### 5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ private</td>
<td>☑ building(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-local</td>
<td>☐ district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-State</td>
<td>☐ site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-Federal</td>
<td>☐ structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ public-federal</td>
<td>☐ object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name of related multiple property listing**
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

Historic Family Farms in Middle Tennessee, 1780-1960

**Number of Contributing resources previously listed in the National Register**

0

### 6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/secondary structures</td>
<td>DOMESTIC/secondary structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/outbuildings</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE/outbuildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek Revival</td>
<td>foundation: STONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastlake</td>
<td>walls: BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof: METAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other: GLASS, WOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Description**
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

See continuation sheets
8. Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

| A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. |
| B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. |
| C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity who's components lack individual distinction. |
| D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. |

**Criteria Considerations N/A**
(Mark "x" in all boxes that apply.)

- Property is:
  - A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
  - B removed from its original location.
  - C a birthplace or grave.
  - D a cemetery.
  - E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
  - F a commemorative property
  - G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

**Narrative Statement of Significance**
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

- 1856-1958

**Areas of Significance**
(Enter categories from instructions)

| ARCHITECTURE |
| SETTLEMENT |
| AGRICULTURE |

**Period of Significance**
1856-1958

**Significant Dates**
- 1856-57 (main house built)
- 1890 (significant interior remodeling)
- 1919 (death of John M. Thompson)
- 1957 (Glen Leven centennial celebration)

**Significant Person**
(Complete if Criterion B is marked)
- Thompson, John M. (1852-1919)

**Cultural Affiliation**
N/A

**Architect/Builder**
- Thompson, John, designer
- Franklin, A. E., builder

9. Major Bibliographical References

**Bibliography**
(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

- Previous documentation on file (NPS): N/A
- Preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- Previously listed in the National Register
- Designated 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

**Name of repository:**
- Metropolitan Historical Commission, Nashville, TN
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property: 66 acres oak Hill 308 SE

UTM References
(place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>519483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3995568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>520838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3995538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>521222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3995079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>520515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3995219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: Tara Mitchell Mielnik
organization: Metropolitan Historical Commission
date: 6/15/15
street & number: 3000 Granny Pike
Nashville, TN 37204
telephone: 615/462-7970

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets
Maps
A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location
A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs
Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional Items
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner
(Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name: The Land Trust for Tennessee, c/o Janet Henderson
street & number: 209 10th Ave S, Suite 530
Nashville, TN 37203
telephone: 615/244-LAND

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listing. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.)

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127, and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects (1524-0913), Washington, DC 20503.
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7. Description

Glen Leven is a historic family farm of approximately 66 acres located at 4000 Franklin Pike in the City of Oak Hill (2006 pop. 4,726) in the southern section of Davidson County, Tennessee. The farm is centered on the historic house known as Glen Leven, built c1856 with c1890 changes, primarily to the interior. The farm also retains several domestic and agricultural outbuildings, including a garage/carriage house, icehouse/springhouse, smokehouse, farm office, barns, and remnants of a subterranean greenhouse. The house received interior updates and modernizations c1890 and has remained relatively unchanged throughout the 20th century. Until 2006, Glen Leven remained a working farm, with cattle and pastureland, and retains the majority of its acreage in fields. The site is generally bounded by Glen Leven Presbyterian Church on the north, Franklin Pike (US Hwy 31) on the west, Interstate 65 (and Armory Drive ramp) on the east, and a mid-20th century subdivision and the Father Ryan High School campus on the south. At the bequest of the last private owner, Susan Thompson West, upon her death in 2006 the house and three tracts of land became the property of the Land Trust for Tennessee, with stipulations that the land cannot be further subdivided or developed, and that the house should be maintained in good condition. The house and farm retain a high degree of integrity and a strong sense of association, feeling, materials, and setting of a late 19th century/early 20th century Davidson County farm.

1. Glen Leven (1856-57, c1890) (Contributing building)

Glen Leven is a two-story brick, central-hall plan house, sitting on a cut-limestone foundation, with a low-pitched standing-seam metal roof, imposing two-story Greek Revival portico, and substantial ell wing. The house faces west, toward Franklin Road, and much of the Franklin Road frontage of the property is lined with a stone wall. Stone entry gate posts with a metal gate open onto the front drive from Franklin Road.

The west façade has five symmetrical bays, with four double-hung 6/6 windows on each story. Windows are approximately 3.5 feet wide by 8.5 feet tall on the first story; second story windows are approximately 3.5 feet wide by 8 feet tall. Each window is flanked by working wood shutters and features a projecting label molding along the top of the window. The façade is dominated by an impressive two-story Greek Revival portico, consisting of four fluted wood columns supporting a flat entablature with dentil molding. The dentil molding extends across the façade cornice. A second story balcony features a wood railing with turned columns. The Corinthian caps are cast iron and have the leaves bolted on. Three steps with iron handrails lead from the ground to the portico, where each column rests on a square limestone base. (The iron handrails may date from the c1890 changes to the house.) The front entrance consists of paired doors with a limestone lintel opening into a small entrance space with an elaborate c1890 decorative encaustic tile floor composed with multi-colored tiles in geometric and floral patterns. The paired front doors feature a glass transom. The second-story balcony doors are paired, with transom and sidelights, and have a prominent wood surround featuring pilasters.

The west part of the south elevation is brick, with three 6/6 windows on the first story, and two 6/6 windows on the second story, and a smaller 4/4 window at the attic level, all of which have wood shutters. Two chimneys flush with the elevation rise above the parapet roofline. On the east part, a two story wood porch dominates the ell. The balustrade is composed of a simple railing and chamfered columns. The shed roof of the porch incorporates the pitch of the gable roof of the front portion of the house. A small wood-sided enclosure at the east end of the second-story porch has a 4/4 window on both the east and south elevations.
The east elevation is the back of the house and is dominated by the wood porch on the east portion of the main house, and the south elevation of the ell. The rear porch also includes an exterior stair with turned balusters along the southern wall of the ell (also visible on the south elevation). A small one-story, shed roof, wood porch is on the easternmost portion of the ell, and is enclosed with wood lattice, painted white. The eastern wall of the ell contains a single 6/6 window on the first floor. A small arched opening is located in the foundation below the window, accessing a storm cellar, and covered with wood doors. A wood post, approximately 6 feet tall and capped with a metal dinner bell is located just east of the house. A brick walkway leads from the rear porch to the north elevation of the house.

The north elevation consists of the main house and ell, and is approximately 122 feet long. The first floor has eight irregularly spaced bays, while the second floor has ten bays, generally placed directly above the first floor bays, and a smaller 4/4 window in the attic level. All bays on the first and second floors except for one are 6/6 wood windows, most with wood shutters, similar if not identical in size to those on the south elevation. The wood shutters on the north elevation appear to be in considerably poorer condition than those on the west and south elevations. The main house section of this elevation duplicates the south elevation, with the exception of one first floor window on the south side, which does not exist on the north side. An elaborately carved Eastlake porte-cochere covers the single door on the north elevation, which is located in the ell at the juncture with the main house. The porte-cochere features a cross gable roof, slender square chamfered columns on limestone block piers, turned posts and dentils at the fascia, heavy molded circular motifs, and latticework in the gable ends facing west, north, and east. (Photos 5 & 6)

First Floor Interior

Glen Leven is a central hall plan house, two rooms deep, and a long ell extending east. Overall, the house reflects its appearance c1900, following several modifications made by John M. Thompson in the 1890s, including the replacement of the main staircase, a change in woodwork and trim, the addition of rooms on the eastern portion of the ell, and the installation of both electricity and interior plumbing. Floors throughout are wood, either oak or pine. The central hall is approximately 38.5 feet in length, and features an elaborately carved fireplace mantel along the north wall. The white painted mantel features carved vines with leaves and berries spiraling around engaged columns, with carved rosettes. Papyrus leaves, beaded trim, chamfered corners, and an inset tile fireplace complete the décor of the fireplace. Wide crown molding runs along the ceiling, and both ceiling and molded floor-level trim work, as well as doors and staircase are painted white. Five four-panel doors open from the central hall: two on the north wall, two on the south wall, and one on the east wall, into the kitchen. Door panels are chamfered, a usual design for paneled doors. The doors on the north and south walls are characterized by heavy door surrounds, featuring carved head blocks. An impressive staircase rises in the northeastern corner of the central hall, with an elaborately carved newel post, alternating squared and turned carved balusters, a sunburst motif in the carriage at the ground level, reeded balusters, and incised geometric patterns as part of the stair design. Most of the staircase is painted white, although the handrails and stair treads are natural. The stair replaced an earlier spiral staircase c1890. (Photos 22, 23, & 24)

The front four rooms of the house are all generally 18 feet by 22 feet. The rooms on the south side of the house were traditionally the family rooms. The southwest room (front) traditionally served as the family
“living room”, and features large 6/6 windows on the west wall, facing the front of the house, with a large ornate decorative pier mirror rising floor to ceiling between the windows. The mirrors were placed in the house around 1890 and are now considered part of the house rather than furniture. The fireplace is centrally located on the south wall, with a 6/6 window to the east. The fireplace mantelpiece is very plain, with only a convex molding incised at intervals at the mantel frieze, narrow chamfering on the pilasters, and white paint. The firebox and hearth are square tile. Thin-plank wood floors run throughout both rooms on the south side. (Photos 9 & 10)

Large wood pocket doors separate the southwest room from the southeast room, which is similar in size. 6/6 windows in this room flank a fireplace, which is larger and slightly more elaborate than in the front room, with convex frieze molding similar to the southwest room fireplace. The mantelshelf is supported by carved wood brackets and there are paneled pilasters. This mantel, as in the southwest room, is painted white. The firebox and hearth are white rectangular tile. A small room in the northeast corner of this room has been enclosed for use as a bathroom, with fixtures dating from c1940. The bathroom has a ceramic tile floor and tub surround. A four-panel door on the east wall opens to the rear porch, with a two-pane glass transom above. The narrow chamfering on the panels is similar to that on the southwest room fireplace. (Photos 12 & 13)

The two front rooms on the north side of the house generally copy those on the south side. As the more public rooms, these rooms have more elaborate fireplaces and woodwork. The northwest room features an ornate large pier mirror between the 6/6 windows at the front of the house on the west wall, a twin to the mirror in the southwest room. The fireplace is centrally located in this room along the north wall. The mantel is wood-grained, and more elaborately carved than in the south rooms, with paired colonettes composed of rope molding flanking the fireplace pilasters. Rosettes and other sawn circular patterns are found on the fireplace mantelshelf and brackets that support it. The firebox and hearth are rectangular yellow tile. The floors in these rooms are wide wood boards, as compared to the thin strips of the southern rooms. The ceiling corners in this room are coved (curved) rather than squared, and a wood-grained picture rail with egg and dart detailing runs throughout the room at the height of the top of the windows. This room is painted a buff color. (Photos 14 & 15)

Paneled pocket doors on the east wall lead into the northeast room. The doors are surrounded by molded wood trim, a dentil cornice, and elaborate corner blocks that rise above the picture rail. The door surrounds for the pocket doors both on the west and east walls include a head block with a pyramidal cap and horizontal and vertical reeding. It is similar to that found in the central hall. Pocket doors on the east wall open into a rear hall, which runs north to south from the porte cochere on the north elevation to the kitchen. Large 6/6 windows on the north wall flank a fireplace with an elaborately carved mantel nearly identical to that found in the northwest room. Wood trim, including door surrounds, is wood grained. (Photo 16)

The rear hall is approximately 10 feet by 20 feet. Pocket doors open on both the east and west walls. An exterior door is centrally located on the north wall, and opens to the porte cochere. The walls are papered with early 20th century wallpaper in a block pattern with floral highlights; visible water damage to the ceiling and walls is apparent, especially on the north wall. A door on the south wall originally opened to the back porch, a portion of which was enclosed c 1992 for a modern galley kitchen, which runs north to south along the east elevation behind the southern rooms. The kitchen has a linoleum floor over the original wood flooring of the porch, and paired French doors opening to the porch on the east side. Cabinets and
appliances are installed on the west wall, against the brick of the back of the house, which is painted white. Paired doors on the west wall open into the central hall. (Photos 17, 18 & 19)

From the rear hall, pocket doors on the east wall open into a large, 20 x 20 square room. Two 6/6 windows are on the north wall, while a 6/6 window and a door open onto the rear porch along the south wall. A fireplace is centered on the east wall, with a door opening just north of the fireplace. The floors are wide-plank wood. Both doors are four panel wood and feature heavy wood surrounds, with the carved head blocks as seen in the central hall and the north rooms. The fireplace mantel in this room is elaborately carved, with fluted engaged columns with rosette bases and Corinthian capitals. A detailed floral motif, including elements of acanthus and papyrus leaves, is carved at the mantelshelf. The firebox and hearth are rectangular yellow tile, with a decorative iron insert. This room is painted green. (Photos 20 & 21)

The door on the east wall of the dining room opens into a butler's pantry leading to the rear portion of the ell of the house, added c.1890 as a kitchen wing with servants' quarters above. This section of the house has been used in recent decades as an apartment for the caretaker of the house and farm. The rear portion consists of an entry hall from the porch, a kitchen, food pantry, butlers' pantry, and a stair to the second floor. Although some modern conveniences have been added, this rear portion contains historic woodwork, including the built-in china press and screened food pantries, windows, doors, floors, and trim work.

Second floor interior

The plan of the second floor of Glen Leven is nearly identical to the first floor. The wide central hall is accessed from the main staircase. At the top of the staircase on the east wall is a leaded glass window with colored glass, including teal and magenta diamond-shaped panes and a tortoiseshell-colored border. The window is surrounded by molded wood and bull's-eye corner blocks. A four-panel door with bull’s-eye corner blocks accessing the second-story porch is just to the south of this window. Four doors open from the hall into rooms; two on the north side and two on the south. A doorway centrally located on the west wall opens onto the balcony of the front porch. A small coal stove (c.1890) is centrally located on the north wall between the door openings. The hall has molded wood baseboards, wood floors, and plaster walls. (Photo 25)

The four rooms in the main part of the house on the second floor measure generally 18 feet by 22 feet, with similar trim and wide plank wood floors. The southwest room has two 6/6 windows on the west wall. A fireplace is centrally located on the south wall, with a single 6/6 window east of the fireplace. The fireplace mantel is very plain, painted white, with a tile firebox surround and stone hearth. Floors in this room, as in the central hall and the other rooms on the second floor, are wide plank wood, and the room is painted blue. A single four-panel door on the north wall enters the hall, and a single four-panel door on the east wall enters into the southeast room. (Photo 26)

The southeast room is painted light blue. On the south wall, a fireplace is centrally located, with a single 6/6 window to the west. The fireplace mantel is elaborately carved and painted white, and is similar to the elaborate mantels found in the northern rooms on the first floor, with paired colonettes, rosettes, and dentils at the mantelshelf. Two 6/6 windows are on the east wall, overlooking the porch. A single four-panel door is on the north wall, entering the hall near the staircase. (Photo 27)
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number  7    Page  5    Glen Leven
Davidson County, Tennessee

The northwest room exhibits a good bit of water damage on the walls and ceiling. A single four-panel door enters the room from the hallway on the south wall. Two 6/6 windows are on the west wall at the front of the house. A fireplace mantel is centrally located on the north wall, with a single 6/6 window east of the fireplace. This fireplace mantel is nearly identical to the one found in the southeast room, elaborately carved, but unpainted. There are no openings on the east wall. (Photos 28 & 29)

The northeast room is entered from the hallway through a four-panel door on the south wall. As in the other rooms, the fireplace is centrally located on the exterior wall (north). In this room, the fireplace is flanked by 6/6 windows. The fireplace mantel is nearly identical to the ones found in the northwest and southeast rooms, and is painted white. A single four-panel door on the east wall enters into a small modern bathroom. The bathroom measures approximately 10 by 10.5 feet, and has a single 6/6 window on the north wall, mid-20th century bathroom fixtures, and a linoleum floor. (Photos 30, 31, & 32)

A door on the east wall of the bathroom opens into a large back bedroom, measuring approximately 20 feet by 20 feet. This room is painted yellow, with two 6/6 windows on the north wall. A fireplace is centrally located on the eastern wall, with a carved mantelpiece, painted white, very similar to the other carved mantelpieces found in the other rooms on the second floor. Unlike the other fireplaces, this one has a brick firebox surround. South of the fireplace, paired four-panel doors conceal a narrow closet opening, with smaller two panel doors concealing additional storage space above; these storage openings may date from c1890. On the south wall, a 6/6 window and a four panel door open onto the second story porch. Two additional smaller rooms, added as servants' rooms c1890, and accessible only from the interior rear stair from the first floor, are east of this room, and make up additional apartment space for the caretaker. (Photo 33)

From the porch another four panel door opens onto a storage area measuring 10 x 9. (This storage area backs up to the small second story bathroom.) Enclosed built-in storage shelving dominates the east wall of this small room, while a steep staircase with turned balustrade rises along the west wall into the attic. At the east end of the second story porch, two small enclosures are accessed through separate doors. One of the upstairs porch storage rooms (wood paneled) was the c1890 bathroom.

Overall, Glen Leven reflects a mid-19th century house with late 19th century modifications, and very few concessions to modern conveniences. Although bathroom and kitchen fixtures have been added, along with central heat and air, these additions are unobtrusive and do not in any way detract from the decidedly 19th century feeling of the house.

2. Woodshed/cistern, before 1950 (contributing structure)
A small structure with pyramidal roof, separate from the house, sits north of the ell. The metal pyramidal roof is supported by four slender plain wood columns on a concrete pad, features latticework at the fascia, and is currently used to protect firewood. Before use as a shed, this was a cistern. (Photo 6)

3. Smokehouse, c1857 (contributing building)
This one-and-one-half story brick building sits east of the ell of the house. The gable roof is standing seam metal (gable ends face east and west). (Photo 34)

4. Farm office, c1857 (contributing building)
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This one story, brick building sits east of the house and directly south of the smokehouse. The building has a single 6/4 window on the west elevation, a single 6/4 window on the east elevation, and a four-pane half-glass door on the south elevation. The gable roof is standing-seam metal (gable ends face north and south), with an interior brick chimney in the north gable end. A stone wall remnant runs north-south just east of these buildings. (Photo 34)

5. Greenhouse, c.1850 (contributing structure)
Glen Leven was famed throughout its history for its gardens, and Conn Harris and Margaret Thompson were especially noted for their horticultural skill. The greenhouse sits southeast of the main house, near the remnants of the landscaped flower garden of Glen Leven. Brick and wood structural elements remain. Glass panels are currently stored in the smokehouse. Limestone steps lead down to a doorway on the east side of the brick structure below grade. Although some boxwoods near the greenhouse mark the location of the landscaped garden, the garden features have been lost. (Photos 35 & 36)

6. Horse barn, c.1890 (contributing building)
The horse barn lies farther south of the greenhouse and gardens, and appears to date from the Victorian era. This large rectangular building is of board and batten construction, painted white, with a metal roof and carved wood pendants in the bargeboard and at the roofline on the elevations. Some oral history suggests that the barn is older than the house and the bargeboard was added later. The barn has a central aisle with stalls and sheds on both sides, and a large hay loft. A small gable roof projects from the west over the loft door. (Photo 37 & 38)

7. Carriage house/garage, c.1920 (contributing building)
The one-story carriage house/garage sits north of the main house, on a circular drive travelling from the front of the house, east through the porte cochere, then circling north to the carriage house. Constructed of brick laid in the common bond, this square building features two bays with paired wood doors opening on the south elevation. The gable roof is composite shingle and features carved pendants, like those on the barn, in the bargeboard and at the roofline. (Photos 39 & 40)

8. Spring house/ice house, c.1850 and c.1900 (contributing structure)
One of the unique features at Glen Leven is the stone spring house which sits at the base of the hill on the western property line, just below Franklin Pike. This square building appears to have been built in two phases, probably first in the first half of the 19th century, and then shortly after the turn of the twentieth century. The earliest portion of the building appears to be constructed of dry-stone and, as in poor repair, but the later portion is constructed of cut stone with mortar and features buttresses on the east and west elevations. The spring house has a flat roof and features a large window on the north elevation. The building is constructed over a natural spring on the property, and local residents recall that it was used for a time as a storage facility for a Nashville ice company making deliveries in the southern section of the county. (Photo 43)

9. Stockbarn, c.1945 (contributing building)
A mid-20th century stockbarn lies east of the house and outbuildings, near the eastern property line. It is a rectangular-shaped building of vertical wood boards with metal roof, and gable ends on the east and west. It is of frame construction, with a central aisle and large hay loft. A gable roof projects from the west end over the loft door. (Photo 41)
10. **Entry gates and stone wall, c1900 (contributing structure)**
The western boundary of Glen Leven, along Franklin Pike, is marked by a stone wall with large stone pillars capped with circular features at the entrance drive. Metal gates are still attached to these stone pillars, but currently a modern cattle gate has been added to discourage trespassing. (Photo 42)

11. **Field patterns, c1945 (contributing site)**
The agricultural field patterns of the Glen Leven farm retain a great sense of integrity dating to at least Overton Thompson’s ownership of the property from the 1940s, if not prior to that date. Mature trees, historic fence lines, and maintained pastureland help define the agricultural from the domestic complex. Glen Leven is one of only a handful of remaining historic farmsteads in Davidson County, and as such, the field patterns should be considered a contributing site to the National Register nomination. (Photo 44)

12. **Dinner Bell, c1890 (contributing object)**
A wood post, approximately 6 feet tall, capped with a metal dinner bell is located just east of the house.
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8. Statement of Significance

Glen Leven, at 4000 Franklin Road in Oak Hill, Davidson County, Tennessee, is eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for its local significance in the settlement and agricultural history of Davidson County; under Criterion B for its association with John M. Thompson, a locally-significant farmer and horse breeder, state legislator, and State Commissioner of Agriculture who was also responsible for the Eastlake changes to the house; and under Criterion C as an extremely intact example of mid-19th century house with Eastlake detailing. This complex, including house, farm, and associated outbuildings, constructed between c1850 and c1900, is one of the few remaining examples of a historic farmstead in Davidson County, and contains perhaps the largest associated acreage. Although a number of historic 19th century homes remain in Davidson County, very few historic agricultural complexes remain in the largely urban and suburban county. Glen Leven is virtually unchanged from its c1900 appearance, with extremely limited modernization to the interior, and retains several outbuildings.

The farm complex represents the evolution of a historic family farm in Middle Tennessee from the mid-19th through the mid-20th century, and the changes in the house and farm represent both changes in agricultural practices as well as in the individual circumstances of the Thompson family, a prominent Davidson County family. Under criterion B, the farm is associated with prominent local farmer and attorney John M. Thompson, who was born at Glen Leven and lived and worked here for his entire life.

The nominated property also meets the registration requirements for historic family farms as outlined in the "Historic Family Farms of Middle Tennessee, 1780-1860" Multiple Property Submission and retains a high degree of integrity. Three of the most important characteristics as outlined in the "Historic Family Farms" MPS are that the nominated complex should include "a historic dwelling; outbuildings that are associated with the dwelling and/or associated with a significant agricultural period in the history of the farm; and historic fields that are associated with a significant period of agricultural production in the history of the farm." Glen Leven meets all three of these requirements.

Historical background

The 66 acres that make up the farm known today as Glen Leven are a small part of the original 990 acres owned by Thomas Thompson in the 1790s. Thomas Thompson was born in North Carolina in 1759, and along with friends, left the state in the late 1770s, joining up with a group led by James Robertson, which was establishing a new settlement on the bluffs of the Cumberland River, Fort Nashborough. Thomas Thompson was one of the signatories of the Cumberland Compact in May 1780, the document which governed the new settlement until the creation of Davidson County in 1783. Later in 1780, Thompson joined up with the Revolutionary forces and was captured; he returned to Davidson County in 1783 and received a grant of land south of the settlement. By 1790, Thompson had built a blockhouse and brought his wife Nancy from North Carolina to his lands. Due to land disputes with relatives and neighbors, resulting in part from an erroneous survey of the original land grant, Thompson's acreage was greatly reduced by 1800.

1 Carroll Van West, "Historic Family Farms of Middle Tennessee" Multiple Property Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1995), F-41.
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Thomas and Nancy Thompson had five children, including son John, born in 1793 and the only son who survived to adulthood. It was John Thompson who inherited the bulk of the remaining land, building a separate house on the property in the 1820s for his new wife, Mary Washington, whom he married in 1823. Mary Washington Thompson had two daughters but died while the girls were very young. John remarried in 1830 to a young widow, Elizabeth (Betsy) Turley Buchanan, but Betsy died giving birth to a son, who also died before his second birthday. John married another widow, Martha Dunn Rawlings, in 1832, and she also had a daughter, Ann Elizabeth. It was during these years that the Glen Leven property first became known for its gardens, with family records showing that John had ordered several varieties of flowering bulbs from Holland. Both Thomas and Nancy Thompson had died by the mid-1830s, and Martha died in 1848.

In 1851, the fifty-eight year old widower John Thompson married the twenty-eight year old Mary Hamilton House, who was herself a widow with a young daughter, Sallie. Within three years of their marriage, the Thompsoons had two sons, John and Joseph, and decided to build a new house for their growing family. The house, two years in the making, was said to have been one of the finest houses in Nashville, but sadly the home burned to the ground the night before the family was to move in, catching fire to the old house as well. The large family moved into one of the farm outbuildings during construction of the resulting Glen Leven, the two story brick central hall house that remains today. The house was constructed by A. E. Franklin of Nashville as revealed by a letter dated March 15, 1856: "Mr. J Thompson Sir I will build your house according to the plan and specifications gave me by your wife for $744.44 (sic) and give you round fluted columns in front and 9 white walnut doors without extra charge___further I will bind myself to get your house done by the 10th of Sept next under a forfeit of $1000 dollars to give you all I agree to by you. A. E. Franklin." Historian Paul Clements states that shortly after the house was finished, a visitor "commented that the view from the house resembled the view from the island castle at Loch Leven in Scotland," which is the reason the plantation became known as Glen Leven.

John Thompson was considered one of the wealthiest men in Davidson County, and through his business dealings, was able to regain the lands his father had lost, and added to those. Paul Clements reports in his study of antebellum Davidson County houses, A Post Remembered, that Thompson owned almost fifty slaves as early as 1830, and seventy-five by 1840. The 1860 census reveals that John Thompson held $105,000 in land and $263,050 in personal property. Family history relates that John Thompson was known for his willingness for hard work and his shrewd business sense, that he worked alongside the field hands in the fields, and that he operated almost as a bank with his investments and through loans to his friends, who repaid handsomely but fairly. Family tradition also holds that he "was well known as the kindest, most generous, most upright man in the community," and Clayton's History of Davidson County.

---

4Clements, 84.
5Clements, 84.
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Tennessee concurs that he was "charitable toward all and hospitable to the poor... a man of the strictest morals, the kindest of husbands, and a loving, faithful father, sparing no pains and no expense to make all about him comfortable and happy." 8

The Civil War and Glen Leven

As the Civil War broke out, John Thompson initially contributed heavily to the Confederate cause. But after the fall of Nashville in 1862, Thompson was imprisoned in Nashville and then pledged to withhold financial contributions to the Confederates. With John too old to enlist, and his sons too young, Mary and the children remained at Glen Leven during the war and hoped to avoid the fighting. The war came to Glen Leven instead, as the house fell between the lines of fighting during December 1864. Family history tells that on one occasion, Mary was standing at the rear of the house when a Union cavalryman rode up, barking orders that she chose to ignore. The rider aimed his pistol at her, and she stood firm. He then fired at her, missed, and rode off, leaving a bullet hole in the back wall of the house. Glen Leven was also used as a field hospital following the Battle of Nashville, and Mary cared for injured soldiers both on the battlefield and in the house. 9 Because of its location and significance in the Battle of Nashville, it is believed that the Glen Leven property may also be significant for its potential in yielding archaeological information, but the site has not been assessed for its archaeological potential. 10

During the Civil War, troops on both sites requisitioned supplies from Glen Leven. Guided by his business acumen, John Thompson provided whatever was required, but asked that the commanding officer sign a receipt indicating what his troops had received. Following the war, when taxed for his property both in town and at Glen Leven, Thompson presented receipts signed by Federal officers in lieu of taxes, saving Glen Leven and at least half of his town properties. John Thompson also retained a great deal of his business interests, and was able to keep the farm running a profit in the years following the war. 11

John M. Thompson (1852-1919)

When John Thompson died in 1876, he left the Glen Leven estate to his older son John M.; while leaving land and money to the younger son, Joe; and money and business property to his only surviving daughter, Ann Elizabeth Horton. Mary Thompson remained at Glen Leven for the rest of her life; she died in 1901. John M. Thompson married Mary McConnell White Overton (known as "Conn"), one of the daughters of John Overton at neighboring Travellers’ Rest plantation (NR 12/30/1969) in 1878 (after being turned down by her older sister, Martha). Their first child, Mary, was born the next year, and twin daughters, Harriett and Con, in 1883, followed by sons John in 1885 and Overton in 1888.

9 Clements, 84; [Author unknown], "Glen Leven," typewritten family history in files of The Land Trust for Tennessee, after 1970.
10 Metal detectors have found minie balls, belt buckles, etc. on the site but there has been no professional assessment of the archaeological potential for the site. See letter from James Kay, Battle of Nashville Preservation Society, to Jeanie Nelson, Land Trust for Tennessee, 25 June 2007 and 23 July 2007.
11 Clements, 84; "Glen Leven"; Thompson, 38-39.
In 1888, five-year-old Harriet died of diphtheria. Her heartbroken father vowed that the germs which had taken one child would not take his others, and he moved the family to their Overton grandparents’ house at Travellers’ Rest which had recently been enlarged, while he set about making Glen Leven safe. The family history describes the work done at Glen Leven in the year after Harriet’s death:

wallpaper in the front hall was steamed off... the north side of the house was elongated by attaching a kitchen with pantries and a cross hall. Two servants’ rooms were built above the kitchen and the back porch was extended and an equally long porch built over it upstairs... A flush toilet was installed at the end of the upstairs back porch. A Closet was built on the upstairs porch to hold fishing tackle and hunting gear. Down came the spiral stairway; in went the shiny massive horror that ends with carved newel posts in the center of the hall. The baseboards, cornices, moldings, and door frames of the north rooms were pulled out and replaced with cherry, also the double sliding doors between the rooms on that side of the house. The house was wired for electricity and a telephone was put in.12

The large gold leaf pier mirrors in the front parlors were purchased at this time at an estate sale in Nashville. The Thompson family lived at Travellers’ Rest for a year while the work was being done; shortly after they moved back in, daughter Mary fell ill with diphtheria, although she recovered. Not long after the renovations, John and Conn converted the south rooms on the first floor to “family” rooms, using the southeast room as his bedroom, and installing a bathroom in one corner of the room. Another son, Joe, was born in 1890, and another daughter, Elizabeth, in 1892.

During his ownership, John M. Thompson grew corn, wheat, and cotton at Glen Leven, as well as garden produce which he marketed to the Maxwell House Hotel (owned by his in-laws, the Overtons). He also raised livestock, including a short-lived venture in thoroughbred horses as co-owner/director of the Hermitage Stud farm adjacent to Glen Leven. Thompson and the co-owners were best known for their horse Wedgewood, who was so popular that the road from the Cumberland Fair and Racing Association (now the state fairgrounds) to Franklin Pike, leading to Glen Leven and the Hermitage Stud, was named Wedgewood Avenue.13 The Hermitage Stud closed at the end of 1897, with the horses sold at auction at Madison Square Garden in New York.14 In addition to running the farm at Glen Leven, John M. Thompson also practiced law, having studied at Cumberland University and Vanderbilt University, and was admitted to the Nashville Bar in 1875. After the birth of his children, Thompson began to dabble in politics in the 1890s.15 He was elected to the Tennessee General Assembly in 1893 and to the State Senate in 1895,

12Glen Leven.
where he served until 1903, serving briefly as Speaker of the Senate. He served as Tennessee's Commissioner of Agriculture from 1907 to 1911 under Governor Malcolm Patterson. He was again elected to the State Senate in 1917 and served there until his death in 1919. He also served on the board of directors of Montgomery Bell Academy in Nashville, during which time the preparatory school moved from its temporary site near the State Capitol in downtown Nashville to its present-day location on Harding Road.

In 1882, Thompson purchased a lot in Section 9 at Mt. Olivet Cemetery in Nashville (NR 11/25/2005), and had eight family members reinterred from the family cemetery at Glen Leven, including his grandparents Thomas and Nancy Thompson, and his father John Thompson.

"Living at Glen Leven is a complicated business" [17]

Following John's death in 1919, his children drew lots to divide the property. Daughter Mary, recently widowed herself, drew the lot containing the house parcel of Glen Leven, and she and her children moved into the house with her mother. Con Thompson died in January 1923, and Mary swapped her property with that of her sister, Con Thompson Harris, who had married Dr. A. W. Harris in 1902. The other Thompson children built houses on their parcels of the surrounding property, and thus the family remained close by. The Harrises lived at Glen Leven for approximately twenty years, modernizing the kitchens and bathrooms as well as the heating and cooling of the house during that time, and retaining a reputation for the gardens and hospitality to be found there.

Dr. Harris died in 1941, and a few years later Conn Harris left Glen Leven to live with her daughter. Her brother Overton Thompson and his wife Margaret moved in at Glen Leven in 1946, and over the next twenty years, Overton worked to recreate farm life at Glen Leven, working the land now owned by his sister in addition to the lands remaining with the house, primarily raising beef cattle and feed for those cattle. This increasing dependence on livestock on Middle Tennessee farms is highlighted in the "Historic Family Farms of Middle Tennessee" Multiple Property Submission: "The new emphasis on livestock kept corn production at relatively high levels, produced both as a basic item for the dinner table and for the consumption of the livestock." [18] The livestock barn at the eastern edge of the property was added during this time.

According to the family history, Overton "rehabilitated the last remaining cabin on the place," indicating that the slave cabins and tenant houses had all been moved or razed prior to 1960; none of the slave cabins or

---


[16] Quotation from "Glen Leven," regarding life at Glen Leven in the twentieth century.


tenant houses remain as of 2008. In 1957, the extended Thompson family celebrated Glen Leven’s centennial, with a family reunion at the house.20

Thompson family reunion at Glen Leven, 1957.
Photograph used with permission of Travellers Rest Plantation.

20"Glen Leven."
Overton Thompson died in 1968, and for the first time, a part of Glen Leven was sold out of the family, to country music industry executive, Shelby Singleton. The house and five acres were sold to Singleton but the remainder of the farm stayed with the family. Singleton had just produced his first number one hit, with Jeannie C. Riley’s “Harper Valley P.T.A.,” written by Tom T. Hall and originally recorded by Singleton’s wife, Margie Singleton. However, Singleton apparently never moved in at Glen Leven, and the house sat vacant for almost two years, when Susan Thompson West, a Thompson descendant, purchased the house and land in 1971. West owned the house and farmed the land for three decades. Upon her death in 2006, she willed the house and land to The Land Trust for Tennessee, with a perpetual easement upon the property and protections for the historic house and outbuildings.21
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10. Geographical Data

Verbal boundary description:
The nominated property includes 66 acres owned by The Land Trust for Tennessee, shown on the attached map as Parcels 11815000500, 11815000600, and 13203000100. The property is bounded on the north by Glen Leven Presbyterian Church, on the south by a mid-20th century subdivision, on the west by Franklin Pike, and on the east by Interstate 65.

Boundary justification:
The boundaries of the nominated property are those of the remaining 66 acres historically associated with the Glen Leven property, and include the house, outbuildings, and fields of Glen Leven that are now owned and protected by The Land Trust for Tennessee.
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1/43  Façade/west elevation, facing ENE
2/43  Façade/west elevation, facing ENE
3/43  South elevation, facing N
4/43  South elevation and ell, facing N
5/43  North elevation, facing S
6/43  Porte cochere and woodshed, facing E
7/43  Entry porch, tile detail
8/43  Center hall, fireplace detail
9/43  Southwest room, facing W
10/43  Southwest room, fireplace detail
11/43  Southeast room, facing SE
12/43  Southeast room, facing N into central hall
13/43  Southeast bathroom, facing N
14/43  Northwest room, facing W
15/43  Northwest room, facing E into northeast room, rear hall, and dining room
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/43</td>
<td>Northeast room, fireplace detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/43</td>
<td>Rear hall, facing N, door to porte cochere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/43</td>
<td>Rear hall, wallpaper detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/43</td>
<td>Kitchen, facing S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/43</td>
<td>Dining room, facing E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/43</td>
<td>Dining room, fireplace detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/43</td>
<td>Central hall, stair detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/43</td>
<td>Central hall, stair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/43</td>
<td>Central hall, looking down from stair landing, facing W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/43</td>
<td>Second story, central hall, facing E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/43</td>
<td>Second floor, southwest bedroom, facing SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/43</td>
<td>Second floor, southeast bedroom, facing S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/43</td>
<td>Second floor, northwest bedroom, facing N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/43</td>
<td>Second floor, northwest bedroom, fireplace detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/43</td>
<td>Second floor, northeast bedroom, facing NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/43</td>
<td>Second floor, northeast bedroom, fireplace detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/43</td>
<td>Second floor, rear bedroom, facing east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/43</td>
<td>Smokehouse and office, facing NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/43</td>
<td>Greenhouse, facing N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35/43</td>
<td>Greenhouse, facing E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36/43</td>
<td>Barn, facing W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37/43</td>
<td>Barn interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38/43</td>
<td>Carriage house, facing N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>39/43</td>
<td>Carriage house and drive, facing N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40/43</td>
<td>Stock barn, facing N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41/43</td>
<td>Front entry gates, facing W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42/43</td>
<td>Springhouse, facing S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43/43</td>
<td>Fields/setting, facing SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

In February and March 2010, Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) graduate students conducted an archaeological reconnaissance survey of Glen Leven, (40DV640), a historic family farm of approximately 66 acres in southern Davidson County, Tennessee. The farm centers on the historic house named Glen Leven, built c1856, and retains several domestic and agricultural outbuildings. Glen Leven remained a working farm, with cattle and pastureland, until 2006 when the owner bequeathed the farm to the Land Trust of Tennessee. The Land Trust has partnered with MTSU’s Center for Historic Preservation, local government, other higher education institutions, and the private sector to develop Glen Leven and its surrounding 66 acres as a demonstration center for sustainable approaches in land conservation, water quality issues, organic farming, historic preservation, heritage tourism, and education.

The archaeological survey of Glen Leven was conducted as part of a Historic Structures Report (HSR) prepared in MTSU’s Graduate Seminar in Historic Preservation (Spring Semester 2010) and the Center for Historic Preservation. Archaeological field studies were conducted on February 8, 15, and 22 and March 1, 22, and 27, 2010 by Zada Law and Lydia Simpson. A total of 65.5 acres (0.102 square miles) were investigated by this assessment.

The field inspection identified at least twenty-one historic archaeological features on the Glen Leven property. No prehistoric archaeological materials or features were identified by the field inspection. The historic archaeological features include:

- Two lines of possible military entrenchments
- A possible house site south of the access road
- Traces of a non-extant road in the yard south of the house
- Traces of a driveway on the north side of the house
- Traces of a sidewalk
- A possible trash midden east of the smokehouse
- Possible foundation stones from earlier structures reused as a retaining wall
- A possible earlier structure north of the carriage house
- A possible house site in the woodlot northeast of the house
- Archaeological deposits near the springhouse
- Stone fences along the east side of Franklin Pike
- A previously unidentified field gate in the dry stacked stone fence along Franklin Pike
- A rock wall remnant south of the access road.
- A square depression that may represent a non-extant greenhouse
- A mid-nineteenth century domestic refuse midden in the plowed field east of the old barn
- A possible tenant house site east of the old barn
- Vestiges of an older road bordered by a remnant rock wall west of the new barn
- A cement ring north of the new barn that may represent a silo foundation
- Old fence gates and paths representing earlier land use patterns
- Structural debris near a spring in southeast corner of property
- Small masonry foundations on the west bank of East Fork Brown’s Creek.
In addition to the field investigations, this study developed a model of expected archaeological features at Glen Leven and recommendations for future work. Recommendations include:

- Protecting the possible entrenchment features from impacts such as parking
- Conducting professional archaeological investigations prior to construction or ground-disturbing activities
- Continuing historical research to locate and interpret archaeological features
- Conducting a systematic intensive archaeological study of the entire property using a combination of excavation and geophysical prospection to determine the areal distribution and density of archaeological deposits and features at Glen Leven
- Including the results of archaeological research in interpretative programming
- Updating the Historic Structures Report with upon completion of every archaeological investigation, and referring to it when developing scope of work for future archaeological studies
- Developing a plan for curating artifacts and records such as maps or digital files showing the location of archaeological features.

The survey provides an understanding of the known and potential archaeological remains at Glen Leven based on the area’s environmental setting, historic maps, regional prehistoric and historic contexts, pedestrian surface inspection, and limited subsurface exploration. This survey provides baseline data for assessing potential archaeological impacts of proposed design and construction elements, design development and inspiration, development of interpretive themes, and identification of potential archaeological and historical research opportunities. The survey results are written in the format outlined by the *Tennessee SHPO Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Resource Management Studies* and may be used for consultation with regulatory and planning agencies.281

This study could not have been completed without the cooperation of several individuals whose assistance is gratefully acknowledged. Suzanne Hoyal, John Broster, and Sam Smith of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology and Stephen Rogers of the Tennessee Historical Commission provided access to state files, reports and maps and graciously shared their knowledge on this site. Elizabeth Moore and Michael Gavin of Middle Tennessee State University’s Center for Historic Preservation provided a wealth of background information and help on this project. Finally, the assistance of Benjamin Nance of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology was extremely helpful to our understanding of this site, and his daughters Sarah and Emily very patiently waited for their lunch and took wonderful photographs and videos as we walked the farm acreage on a warm spring day.

---

Boundaries of site 40DV640 and Glen Leven property boundaries, Nashville, Tenn.
METHODOLOGY

The objective of the archaeological reconnaissance survey of the Glen Leven estate was to identify known and potential archaeological features and deposits on the property through field inspection, limited subsurface exploration, and analysis of archaeological and historic records and maps. Prior to the field inspection, archaeological and historical records were consulted to determine the presence of previously recorded archaeological sites on the Glen Leven estate or within its vicinity. Sources consulted included the National Register of Historic Places, the Tennessee Archaeological Site and Survey Report files at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology in Nashville, the Tennessee State Library and Archives map collection, and digital images of Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.282

To identify the locations of non-extant structures and archaeological features on the property, historical maps were scanned, georeferenced, and overlaid on modern high-resolution aerial images using geographic information system software (GIS).283 Geographic control points for georeferencing included nineteenth century structures and landscape features visible on the historic maps and the modern aerial images. High-resolution aerial images from 1996-2009 and oblique aerial images from 2006-2007 were also examined to identify features such as patterns of foundations that may not be visible from the ground surface.284

Using the information obtained from the records search and the map analysis, a model of expected archaeological features on the Glen Leven property was developed. The model of expected prehistoric occupational features was based on the culture history of the middle Tennessee region and nearby prehistoric sites. The model of expected historic archaeological features, such as structure foundations or cemeteries, was based on historic maps and the summaries of Glen Leven’s history in the National Register Property Nomination and a Tennessee Department of Transportation Enhancement Program Application.285

Archaeological fieldwork at Glen Leven began by systematically walking the property to inspect the ground for archaeological materials, foundations, or other features. Most of the property is in pasture limiting visibility to patches of exposed ground in field paths and along stream cut banks. The vegetation growth along fence lines and in woodlots was open enough to traverse these areas and examine them for features. One field east of the house had been recently plowed and exhibited excellent surface visibility. This field was examined using transect intervals of 30+ feet (10+ meters). Artifacts recovered at Glen Leven were collected using a “grab-bag” surface collection approach. Digital photos were taken of the locations were archaeological materials or features were observed, and these locations were mapped using a mapping-grade Global Positioning System (GPS) unit and post-processing differential correction.

Over the course of the field inspection, the survey team consulted historic records and maps to interpret and understand observed landscape features and archaeological materials. The team identified sections of the Glen Leven property and artifacts requiring additional investigation and consulted specialists at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology and Tennessee Historical Commission. Ben Nance, a historic archaeologist with considerable experience in excavating Civil War earthworks, conducted systematic probing in the field adjacent to the access road, walked the property with the survey team, and examined several foundation features. Sam Smith, a historic archaeologist and pottery specialist at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology, was consulted to identify the historic ceramics collected on the property. Stephen Rogers, archaeologist at the Tennessee Historical Commission, was consulted about archaeological signatures of blockhouses and early historic structural features. Suzanne Hoyal, archaeological site file curator at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology, advised the survey team about recording Glen Leven as a new archaeological site.

The survey investigation concluded by comparing the expected archaeological features with what was observed, assessing the likelihood of unidentified archaeological remains on the property, evaluating the effects of proposed development at Glen Leven on archaeological features, and developing recommendations for further investigations and interpretation.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

PROJECT SETTING AND LAND USE

Glen Leven is located at 4000 Franklin Pike in Nashville, Tennessee, approximately 4.6 miles south of the Tennessee State Capitol building. The property is bounded by Glen Leven Presbyterian Church on the north, Franklin Pike (U.S. Highway 31) on the west, Interstate 65 and the Armory Drive ramp on the east, and a mid-twentieth century residential subdivision and the campus of Father Ryan High School on the south. The majority of the Glen Leven property remains in agricultural pastureland. The farm retains the two-story brick house known as “Glen Leven” and several outbuildings including a carriage house, a springhouse, a smokehouse, a detached kitchen, two barns, and a subterranean greenhouse.
**GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING**

Glen Leven is situated in the “Central Basin” physiographic region of Tennessee. Geologists have divided the Central Basin into two sections based on bedrock geology and topography. The Inner Basin section is characterized by gently rolling to almost level terrain with elevations averaging 600 feet above mean sea level (amsl) while the topography in the Outer Basin section is deeply dissected with elevations averaging 750 feet amsl. The low-gradient Cumberland River meanders westward through the Central Basin and drains the north-central portions of Tennessee.

---

**GEOLGY**

The Central Basin is capped by primarily Ordovician age limestone, shale, and dolomite. These rock formations may be exposed or shallowly covered by soil in level areas. During the Ordovician period, 500-430 million years ago, shallow seas covered Middle Tennessee depositing carbonate sediments throughout the region. The landscape formation model for the Central Basin suggests it was shaped by erosion of the Nashville Dome, an uplift structure created by tectonic forces in the Paleozoic Era (570-250 million years ago). As the top of this structural dome eroded off, the upper, stronger layers remained as a rim surrounding the basin, which developed in the weaker rocks in the center of the dome.

---
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SOILS

The Soil Survey of Davidson County, Tennessee maps the soils on the Glen Leven acreage as “Maury-Urban land complex, 2 to 7 percent slopes (McB)” and “Stiversville-Urban land complex, 3 to 25 percent slopes (SvD).” Urban land consists of driveways, house lots, and other areas where the soil has been disturbed for development. Stiversville soils are found in the lowlands along the tributary of Brown’s Creek near the eastern edge of the Glen Leven property. Maury soils are found on the uplands bordering the Stiversville soils. In undisturbed areas, Maury soils consist of a surface layer of dark brown silt loam that extends to a depth of 7 inches. The underlying subsoil can extend as deep as 65 inches below the surface. The Maury subsoil consists of a brown and reddish-brown friable, silty clay loam overlaying a reddish-brown, firm silty clay loam. The lower subsoil is yellowish-red, firm silty clay. Maury soils have moderate fertility and roots easily penetrate the soil. Undisturbed Stiversville soils consist of an 8-inch thick surface layer of dark brown loam above a subsoil of friable clay loam that extends to 53 inches below the surface. Bedrock is typically found at 60 inches below the surface.293

VEGETATION

According to the widely used map of forest communities developed by botanist E. Lucy Braun, Glen Leven is situated within the Central Basin section of the Western Mesophytic Forest Region.294 The Western Mesophytic Forest Region extends from northern Alabama and Mississippi to southwest Ohio and southern Indiana and Illinois. Its eastern boundary is the Cumberland Plateau, and its western boundary is the loess bluffs of the Mississippi River alluvial plain. The forest communities of the Western Mesophytic Forest Region are often dominated by a few species, with oak and oak-hickory communities increasing in dominance from east to west.295 According to Braun’s model, the Central Basin’s native vegetation profile suggests that uplands originally supported beech, chestnut, oak, hickory, and tulip tree and bottomlands were occupied by mixed deciduous species and cane breaks.296

The potential wild plant food resources that might have been available to aboriginal people in the Glen Leven vicinity included a variety of nut, arboreal and herbaceous fruits and berries, tubers, rhizomes and leafy greens. Large quantities of chestnut, walnut, butternut, hazelnut, acorn and hickory nutshells have been excavated from prehistoric aboriginal sites throughout Tennessee. Evidence for the collection of other wild plant foods includes the archaeological remains of seeds and fruits such as honey locust, persimmon, wild grape, wild bean, bedstraw, passion fruit, grasses, pokeweed, goosefoot, knotweed, strawberry, blackberry, and maygrass. Archaeological sites in Central Tennessee have produced evidence of aboriginal use of squash in the form of rind and seed fragments. The earliest known squash seed in Tennessee, excavated from a site in the Harpeth River Valley, dates to 6,900 years ago. Wild blueberry, sumac, amaranth, sunflower, and sumpweed were also used as food sources by the prehistoric inhabitants of Tennessee with recent archaeological evidence from the Duck

---
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River Valley suggesting that domesticated goosefoot was present as early as 2,600 years ago.  

**FAUNA**

Historically, the faunal resources in the general area of Nashville were rich and diverse. James X. Corgan and Emanuel Breitburg estimate that 124 species of commonly known mammals occur in eastern North America with 69 of these occurring in Tennessee.  

Aboriginal peoples in the region exploited fauna such as mollusks, turtles, water birds, aquatic mammals, and white-tailed deer during the spring and summer, and hunted bear, wild turkey, and deer during the fall and winter months. Other mammalian fauna used in the prehistoric Middle Tennessee diet include opossum, black bear, raccoon, groundhog, gray squirrel, Carolina beaver, eastern cottontail rabbit, and white-tailed deer.  

Gray wolf, eastern elk, and eastern woodland bison were also found in Middle Tennessee.  

A number of avian fauna have been recorded in Tennessee. Migratory waterfowl in this area include the common Canada goose and common mallard. Raptors in Tennessee include the eastern sparrow hawk, red-tailed hawk, bald eagle, eastern screech owl, great horned owl, and northern barred owl. Game birds found in the region include the eastern ruffed grouse, eastern bob white, and eastern mourning dove. Eagles, herons, quail, teal and the extinct passenger pigeon were also abundant in Middle Tennessee, and wild turkey is commonly found at prehistoric archaeological sites in this region.  

The rivers and streams of Middle Tennessee provided a number of exploitable resources for the aboriginal occupants of this area. Common fish species that have been recovered in Tennessee’s prehistoric archaeological record include gar, suckers, catfish, bullhead, black bass, sunfish, and fresh water drum. Turtle species used by prehistoric people include the snapping turtle, musk turtle, mud turtle and the spiny soft-shelled turtle. The eastern box turtle was also an important food resource.  

---
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CLIMATE

Prehistoric inhabitants of Middle Tennessee experienced a different climate from that of today. During the Pleistocene Epoch (1.8 million years ago - 10,000 years BP [before present]) of the Quaternary Period, continental glaciers covered a considerable amount of the northern half of the North American continent. Although the glaciations did not reach Tennessee, the glacial advances and retreats affected the climate, vegetation, and river systems with corresponding effects on the erosion and deposition cycles of inland streams and rivers. During most of the late Pleistocene, the mid-south was dominated by an Arctic air stream system that maintained a cold, boreal climate in the region with little seasonal fluctuation.

The Early Holocene Epoch (10,000-8,000 years BP) was distinguished by a southward penetration of the Arctic air stream and a northern influence of the Caribbean air mass creating a significant fluctuation in moisture and temperature gradients. At the beginning of this epoch, a northern mixed coniferous-hardwood forest existed in the mid-south region. During the Hypsithermal Interval in the Mid-Holocene (8,000-4,000 years BP), the climate changed from cool, moist conditions to a warmer, drier environment. Prevailing dry westerly winds blocked the Canadian and Gulf air masses and created a climatic optimum distinguished by warmer temperatures and drier conditions. Around the beginning of the Late Holocene Period (4000 years BP), the climate in the mid-south returned to a more mesic condition that is characteristic of the central portion of Tennessee today. From 4,000-200 years BP, precipitation levels increased, upland vegetation readjusted to the same areal distribution as it has today, and the mid-south experienced a return to a relatively cooler and moister climate.

The modern climatic pattern of the Central Basin is characterized as “mesothermal” with hot, humid summers, mild winters, and an occasional cold snap. In Nashville, summer temperatures average 78°F, winter temperatures average 40°F, and the annual precipitation averages 48 inches with just under half of this total falling from April through September. Prolonged dry spells often occur during the summer and fall periods. Snow occasionally falls in the Central Basin, but it comprises a minimal percentage of the annual precipitation totals.

---
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CULTURAL CONTEXT

While the question of when humans first entered the North American continent continues to be debated, well-documented archaeological evidence exists for human occupation throughout North America by at least 12,000 years ago with very good evidence from the Eastern Woodlands suggesting human occupation as early as 14,000 years ago.\(^{313}\) Through time, North America’s first peoples made fundamental and adaptive changes in their material culture, technology, settlement and subsistence patterns, and socio-political organization.\(^{314}\)

Archaeological research in Middle and East Tennessee shows a continuous and well-defined prehistoric cultural sequence that has been classified into the following periods: Paleoindian (12,000-10,000 BP), Archaic (10,000-2,900 BP), Woodland (2,900-1,100 BP) and Mississippian (A.D. 900-1600).\(^{315}\) Archaeological investigations in the Elk River watershed at Tims Ford reservoir, at the Bailey Site in Giles County, at the Meeks Site in Montgomery County, in sections of the Cumberland River Valley in the Outer portion of the Central Basin and Western Highland Rim, and in the Normandy Reservoir provide a general understanding of the prehistoric chronology and settlement-subsistence patterns in the Middle Tennessee region.\(^{316}\)

---


The Paleoindian period represents human cultural adaptation on the North American continent during the Late Pleistocene. By at least 12,000 years ago, humans were crossing the Bering Strait during peak glacial times and migrating into the heart of North America through an ice-free corridor that existed between the Laurentide and Cordilleran ice sheets. Environmental conditions and the subsistence base available for human exploitation were different during the Late Pleistocene than the present. For example, deposits dating around 16,000 years ago in Saltville, Virginia show the presence of musk ox, giant ground sloth, beaver and caribou in the Pleistocene faunal assemblage.\textsuperscript{317}

Archaeological research in the southeastern United States suggests that Paleoindians lived in small, mobile groups hunting large migratory game animals and used many of the plant resources available in the environment for food, fuel or containers.\textsuperscript{318} Middle Tennessee remained unglaciated throughout the Pleistocene, and grassland habitat suitable for range animals of the Pleistocene period may have existed in this area.\textsuperscript{319} At the Coats-Hines site (40WM31) in Williamson County, Tennessee, stone tools and lithic debitage from tool re-sharpening were excavated in association with mastodon skeletal remains that exhibited butchering scars. This site yielded dates suggesting human occupation in the Middle Tennessee region by 11,500 to 11,000 years ago.\textsuperscript{320}

The presence of fluted, lanceolate projectile points known as Clovis or the Eastern Woodland Clovis tradition characterizes the lithic technology of the Paleoindian period. Although Clovis points have been found in Middle Tennessee and Kentucky, other archaeological evidence of intensive Paleoindian use or occupation in this region is generally lacking.\textsuperscript{321} Only one site in the northern section of the Western Highland Rim has produced evidence of an intensive Paleoindian use or occupation.\textsuperscript{322} The results of systematic surveys and the general lack of Paleoindian projectile points in Middle Tennessee artifact collections suggest that Paleoindian population density in the central Tennessee region may have been sparse and dispersed.\textsuperscript{323} Archaeologists John B. Broster and Mark R. Norton suggest a difference between the Paleoindian adaptations in Middle Tennessee and West Central Lower Duck and Middle Cumberland Rivers in Middle Tennessee," (Nashville: Tennessee Dept. Environment and Conservation, Division of Archaeology, 1980).
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Tennessee. Broster and Norton suggest that Paleoindian sites along the Cumberland River in the Western Highland Rim and Central Basin are small, ephemeral expressions of tool manufacturing and maintenance activities. Paleoindian sites in the Kentucky Lake area were used more intensively and have a wider variety of tools in the assemblages suggesting longer occupations.\footnote{324}

The Late Paleoindian period (10,500 - 10,000 BP) is represented by transitional projectile point/knife forms including Quad and Dalton types and technological differences in tool manufacture and re-use suggesting adaptive functional changes.\footnote{325} The first datable Dalton site in the southeastern United States was the Stanfield-Worley Bluff shelter in Alabama. The Dalton zone at Stanfield-Worley yielded radiocarbon dates between 10,000-9,500 years ago, and the associated artifact assemblage included Dalton and Big Sandy type points along with re-sharpened points and blades. Faunal evidence at Stanfield-Worley, the Russell Cave site in Alabama, and the Rodgers Shelter site in Missouri suggests that the principal game animals utilized during the Late Paleoindian period included white-tailed deer, turkey, raccoon, and gray squirrel.\footnote{326} In Middle Tennessee, the late Paleoindian period has been documented primarily through surface finds along the Cumberland River and in artifact collections.\footnote{327}

**ARCHAIC (10,000-2,900 BP)**

Archaeological evidence points to a rather steady progression from the widespread Paleoindian cultural tradition to more regional specialization in the subsequent Archaic cultural period.\footnote{328} In the southeastern United States, the Archaic period represents a moderately mobile hunting and gathering economy. Technological developments included the use of the atlatl, the development of ground stone tools, and the beginnings of early horticulture. The appearance of ceramics in the archaeological record demarcates the general terminus of the Archaic Stage.

During the Early Archaic period (10,000-8,000 BP), the archaeological record shows increased use of caves and rockshelters as well as intensive occupation of riparian areas. These developments suggest cultural adaptations to changing environmental conditions during the Late Pleistocene to early Holocene climatic transition. The archaeological record from Early Archaic deposits shows an intensive use of arboreal seed crops such as hickory nuts and acorns, the lithic technology changes from fluted, lanceolate points to notched, hafted, re-sharpened blades. The Early Archaic occupation in the Middle Tennessee region is represented at the Meeks Site in Montgomery County and has been well documented by systematic survey and examination of collections in the Cumberland River Valley.\footnote{329}

The Middle Archaic period (8,000-5,000 BP) coincided with the peak of the Mid-Holocene post-glacial warming known as the Hypsithermal Interval (Altithermal climatic
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episode). The Hypsithermal warming resulted in decreased rainfall, shallower stream levels, and changes in forest composition. The archaeological record from Middle Archaic contexts shows greater regional diversity in projectile point styles and in the use of lithic materials other than chert including quartz, quartzite, and slate. The first evidence of the atlatl or spear thrower appears in this period, and there is an increase in the number of ground stone tools. The first appearance of shellfish use and the first shell middens associated with archaeological contexts appear in the Middle Archaic accompanied by an increase in the number of preserved human burials, the first evidence of the domestication of the dog, and the domestication of cucurbits (squash). A comparison of the number of Middle Archaic points versus the number of Early Archaic projectile points found in collections and systematic surveys in the Middle Cumberland Valley suggests that although the Central Tennessee region was inhabited throughout the Middle Archaic cultural period, the prehistoric population in the Central Basin and Western Highland Rim regions decreased during this time.

Archaeological evidence from the Meeks Site in Montgomery County, Tennessee suggests that during the Middle Archaic period, prehistoric peoples returned repeatedly to the same habitation areas over the course of thousands of years, most likely in the course of seasonal food procurement rounds. On the South Fork of Cedar Creek at site 40WI158 in Wilson County, Tennessee, a Middle Archaic component yielding radiocarbon dates of approximately 6400-6200 BP represents a specialized Middle Archaic occupation focusing on hickory nut processing. Middle Archaic archaeological sites in the Duck River and Harpeth River valleys in Central Tennessee have produced evidence of squash rinds and seed fragments as well as gourd. The earliest known squash seed in Tennessee, dating to 6,900 years ago, was found on an archaeological site in the Harpeth River valley. At the Ensworth Site (40DV184) in Davidson County, pit features, surface collections, and biface caches suggest a significant late Middle Archaic occupation that participated in regional trade networks.

The Late Archaic period (5,000-2,900 BP) is characterized by an increase in prehistoric population density and utilization of a more diversified subsistence base. Settlement-subsistence data from sites in the Little Tennessee River Valley in east Tennessee, the Columbia Reservoir in central Tennessee, and the Cloudsplitter Rockshelter in Kentucky, suggest a seasonal adaptive strategy with the beginnings of rudimentary plant cultivation in the latter part of the Archaic period. Populations became more sedentary with base camps occupied for much of the year. The faunal and floral assemblages recovered from the Late Archaic component at the Meeks Site in Montgomery County, Tennessee suggests that it was used as a base camp during the fall, winter and early spring for the exploitation of nut and other

331 Bense, *Archaeology of the Southeastern United States*.
332 Jolley, “Cumberland River Archaeological Reconnaissance.”; Jolley, "Lower Duck and Middle Cumberland Rivers Survey."
333 Benthall, "Meeks Site Excavation."
335 Law and Shea, "Tennessee before Columbus."
337 Bense, *Archaeology of the Southeastern United States*. 

198
plant foods available in the upland hardwood forests. Evidence of the cultivation of squash at the deeply buried Bacon Bend site (4,400-4,000 years BP) in east Tennessee postdates evidence of squash at sites in Middle Tennessee and Kentucky. Jolley’s 1978 survey of the Middle Cumberland River Valley recorded more Late Archaic period projectile points in the survey area than for any other period, suggesting that this portion of central Tennessee may have been more densely populated during the Late Archaic cultural period than during other cultural periods. Stemmed projectile points with relatively poor quality workmanship characterize the lithic technology although side-notched types also occur. Ceramic technology developed near the end of the Late Archaic period on the South Atlantic coast, spread west along the coastal plain and eventually throughout the southeast region. An increase in long-distance trade is represented in the archaeological record along with the beginnings of an earthen-mound building tradition.

WOODLAND (2,900-1,100 BP)

The Woodland period represents the stage between the hunting and gathering strategies of the Archaic cultural period and the intensive agricultural focus of the later Mississippian populations. During the Woodland period, projectile point shapes changed from stemmed points to a small, stem-less triangular points suggesting introduction of the bow and arrow. More durable house construction, cold and warm weather structures and denser midden deposits at habitation sites suggest increasing sedentism and year-round occupation of settlements. Elaborate mortuary assemblages, the construction of earthen mounds, and increasing ceremonialism may represent increasing societal complexity. Evidence of a burgeoning trade network with the Gulf Coast and the Midwest has also been recovered.

During the Woodland period, subsistence strategies reflect a continuation from the earlier Archaic period. Woodland dietary patterns reflect combination of cultivated and wild plant foods, deer, small animals and aquatic resources. A more intensive harvesting strategy is suggested by the procurement of herbaceous annuals and evidence of plant domestication. An increase in disturbance-favoring successional species, evidenced by burned fragments of wood excavated from archaeological sites, suggests that larger areas of forest were now being cleared and under cultivation than in the preceding Late Archaic period. During the latter part of the Woodland period, settlement patterns are generally that of small, seasonally occupied or year-round villages in river valleys with permanent houses. An overall increase in population is suggested by a greater number of sites in riverine environments and an increase in plant cultivation and dependence on starchy seed-bearing annuals for food.
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Woodland sites have been recorded in the outer portion of the Central Basin and the Western Highland Rim of Middle Tennessee. In the Western Highland Rim, a limited Woodland occupation was represented at the Meeks Site in Montgomery County where fragments of sand and limestone tempered-ceramic vessels were excavated from four features. In south central Tennessee, the University of Tennessee's extensive research on the Middle Woodland McFarland culture (ca. 2,200 - 1,800 BP) suggested that most settlements were on narrow floodplains with structures becoming more substantial as the settlements grew in size. Subsistence needs for the growing population were met by increased plant cultivation. Jolley suggested that prehistoric populations in the Outer Nashville Basin and Western Highland Rim may have been decreasing during the latter part of the Woodland period since very little Late Woodland material were found in this region.

**MISSISSIPPIAN (900-1600 CE)**

The Mississippian cultural period is characterized in the southeastern United States by a number of developments including the construction of earthen platform mounds on which temples, council buildings, and residences for the elite were built; the arrangement of mounds and individual household structures around open plazas; increased population and more stable settlements than in the preceding Woodland period; the emergence of organized chiefdoms and ranked societies; increased territoriality and occurrence of warfare; elaborate and well-developed ceremonialism; the dependence upon new and improved strains of corn and the introduction of beans for subsistence; and a fluorescence in ceramic styles. In Middle Tennessee, the Mississippian cultural manifestation is distinguished by the presence of a distinctive mortuary pattern characterized by stone box burials and is commonly referred to as the Middle Cumberland Culture. Survey data suggest that the Mississippian settlement pattern in Middle Tennessee is that of civic-ceremonial mound centers such as the Sellars site in Wilson County with associated villages, hamlets, and farmsteads.

Salvage excavations at the Averbuch Site (40DV60), a late Mississippian village and cemetery in north Nashville, provide some understanding of late Mississippian life in Middle Tennessee. Radiocarbon dates suggest that Averbuch was occupied 700 years ago. A lack of evidence indicating social ranking and craft specialization suggested that the Averbuch village had a subordinate role in the late Mississippian settlement hierarchy. The Averbuch village was situated on a small tributary in the uplands approximately 4 kilometers north of the Cumberland River. The location of the Averbuch village does not conform to the well-documented Mississippian settlement pattern model where villages are located near major
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fluvial systems and fertile soils. Walter E. Klippel and William M. Bass suggested that the explanation for Averbuch’s location might have been over-population in the Central Basin during the Mississippian period that forced occupation of less desirable hinterland areas. The considerable amount of biological stress evident in the human skeletal assemblage excavated at Averbuch suggests nutritional deficits and supports the population pressure hypothesis.

PROTOHISTORIC AND HISTORIC PERIODS

Information is sparse about the inhabitants of the Central Basin area during the protohistoric period of 1600-1700 CE. Available documentation suggests that the sixteenth-century Spanish expeditions of de Soto and Pardo were confined to the eastern portions of what became the state of Tennessee and perhaps the southwest corner of the state near Memphis. Euro-Americans are reported to have been in the Cumberland region area by 1692, and by the 1770s, permanent Euro-American settlements were being established in the region. French fur traders are reported to have been in the Cumberland region by 1692, but they were not a significant influence in the region until the early 1700s. Around 1769, the French-Canadian fur trader Timothy Demonbreun visited the springs near the Cumberland River at the French Lick, the future site of Nashville. While the French established fur trade networks in the Cumberland region, British subjects living on the frontiers of the Virginia and North Carolina colonies began to exploit central Tennessee as long hunters. By the 1770s, several long hunters and former military personnel had established settlements in Middle Tennessee. An archaeological site on Station Camp Creek in Sumner County has been identified as a long hunter base camp from which salt was discovered at Bledsoe’s Lick. Bledsoe’s Lick and other salt licks in the region attracted great herds of buffalo and deer.

In the winter of 1779-1780, James Robertson and a party of approximately seventy families entered the Middle Tennessee region and established a settlement at French Lick. Their log stockade, built on a river bluff, was named Fort Nashborough for Francis Nash, a commander in the Continental Army who perished in the Battle of Germantown. John Donelson followed with sixty families, and by the spring of 1780, several hundred settlers were scattered among a number of fortified stations that had been established across the Central Basin. The stations served as both protection and as a center of activities for early settlers in the region. Existing on the frontier of the Southwest Territory, these early white settlements were

354 Klippel and Bass, “Averbuch.”
359 Burns, Jones, and Ragland, Davidson County.
not provided with supplies or protection from the colonies struggling in the Revolutionary War. Because of their isolation, the Cumberland settlements formed a temporary government under the Cumberland Compact that provided for communal self-government until the 1780s when the North Carolina General Assembly recognized the formation of several counties in the region, notably Davidson and Sumner. Shortly thereafter, representatives of the Cumberland Settlements petitioned the North Carolina Legislature to recognize the formation of a new District to improve commerce in the region. Named after Don Estephan Miro, the Mero District was recognized in 1788 and included Davidson, Sumner, and Tennessee counties. In 1796, these counties were incorporated into the new state of Tennessee, with Tennessee County divided into Montgomery and Robertson counties.\(^{361}\)

In 1800, Nashville was a village, but within twenty years, it was a developing mercantile town and shipping and distribution center for the tobacco and cotton trade.\(^{362}\) Nashville became the permanent state capital in 1843 and rapidly grew into a thriving cultural, political, mercantile and manufacturing center prior to the onset of the Civil War in 1861. Steamboats brought

---


goods to Nashville from distant cities and carried produce and other goods from Middle
Tennessee throughout the southern region. Tennessee seceded from the Union in 1861, and
Nashville was occupied by the Union Army in February 1862 because of its river trade,
turnpikes, rail lines and strategic position in the Western Theater.\footnote{363}

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE GLEN LEVEN ESTATE STUDY AREA**

Glen Leven sits on a small portion of the 990 acres owned by Thomas Thompson in the
late 18\textsuperscript{th} century. Thomas Thompson was born in North Carolina in 1759 and accompanied
James Robertson to the Fort Nashborough settlement. Thompson received a land grant in
Middle Tennessee for his service in the Revolutionary War, and by 1790, he had built a
blockhouse on his land.\footnote{364} Until Glen Leven was donated to The Land Trust for Tennessee in
2006, the house and farm complex had been in almost continual ownership by the Thompson
family for 200 years.\footnote{365} The history of the Thompson family and their property has been
documented by the Thompson family and local historians and is summarized in the Glen Leven
National Register Property Nomination, included as Appendix B, and in the Glen Leven Historic
Structure Report.
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MODEL OF EXPECTED ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Glen Leven was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2008 for its significance as a property associated with historical events (Criterion A), as a property associated with significant historic individuals (Criterion B), and for its architectural significance (Criterion C). The archaeological site file at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology contains no records of prehistoric or historic archaeological sites previously recorded on or in the immediate vicinity of Glen Leven. Davidson County has been comprehensively surveyed for early frontier stations and Civil War Period sites. These surveys identified no frontier stations sites or Civil War archaeological remains within or near the Glen Leven estate. Three previously recorded archaeological sites are located within a one-mile radius of the Glen Leven Estate. These sites are described below.

Site 40DV3

Archaeological site 40DV3 is a Mississippian period habitation and burial site. The site was originally named “Cains Chapel,” but it is more commonly known as “Noel Cemetery.” In 1878, Edwin Curtiss of the Peabody Museum excavated possibly one-hundred burials and ceramic vessels from a large area in south-central Nashville characterized by dissected uplands and small, intermittent tributaries. Curtiss’ sketch map shows three mounds and stone box graves distributed across a sizeable area. The artifacts that Curtis recovered included negative painted animal and human effigy vessels, effigy figurines, shell gorgets and beads, stone celts and chisels, and bone artifacts including fishhooks. In 1973, the Tennessee Division of Archaeology conducted excavations on a portion of the site threatened by construction of Interstate 440 and found refuse pits, stone box graves, structures, and a palisade wall section. Radiocarbon dates from the 1973 excavation gave an uncalibrated date of 1220 ± 45 CE.

Site 40DV622

Archaeological site 40DV622 represents a small assemblage of Civil War ammunition recovered from the grounds of the Tennessee Governor’s Mansion prior to construction of an underground reception complex. Maps of the 1864 Battle of Nashville show Hood’s army moving through this section of south-central Nashville on December 15, 1864.

Trolley Railbed Site


The “Trolley Railbed” site does not have an official state archaeological site number, but its location is penciled in on the permanent site file maps at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology. The trolley railbed site marks the spot of an embankment where the Nashville and Franklin Interurban railway line crossed an intermittent stream. The Interurban was an electric railway between Nashville and Franklin started by the Middle Tennessee Railroad in 1909. The electric plant that furnished power for the interurban railway was established in Franklin in the early twentieth century by David Farr. The Interurban’s track has been removed, but a 1932 map shows the location of the interurban line along the west side of Franklin Pike, opposite the Glen Leven estate.

![Diagram of Glen Leven and surrounding area with trolley railbed marked.](image)


---

PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

No professional archaeological investigations have been previously conducted at Glen Leven estate. A thorough search of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology’s report files and citation index did not identify archaeological surveys relating to the construction of Interstate 65, the Armory Drive ramp, or improvements to US 31 (Franklin Pike). The survey team consulted Sam Smith and Ben Nance, Tennessee Division of Archaeology archaeologists, about their comprehensive survey of Civil War archaeological sites in Middle Tennessee. Smith and Nance could not access the Glen Leven property and did not find archival or military records to suggest that Glen Leven contained intact Civil War-era archaeological deposits.

In 2007, the Land Trust for Tennessee asked the Battle of Nashville Preservation Society to conduct a metal detector survey of the property and “recover all relics.” The society metal detected in the front and side yards of the house and recovered a small assemblage of Civil War-era military artifacts, including a Union Army breastplate and ammunition, and household artifacts. An inventory of the artifacts and map showing where they were recovered are included in Appendix C.


EXPECTED TYPES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

Expected Prehistoric Sites

A model of the types of prehistoric archaeological sites that might be expected in the Central Basin is provided by the Tennessee Division of Archaeology's survey of the middle Cumberland River valley conducted by Robert L. Jolley.\(^{372}\) Jolley’s results suggest the following: Paleoindian and Transitional Paleoindian sites, although few, are found on the floodplains and uplands along major waterways and secondary streams; Early Archaic sites occur more often on alluvial terraces, upland areas, and along secondary streams; Middle Archaic sites are more often found in upland areas; and Late Archaic sites are mostly found on uplands suggesting exploitation of seasonally available upland resources.\(^{373}\) For the terminal Late Archaic and Early Woodland, the results of the Cumberland River valley survey indicate that sites from these cultural periods are located on both floodplain areas and uplands whereas Middle Woodland sites occur most often along floodplains and Late Woodland sites occur predominantly in the floodplain. No stone or earthen Woodland mounds known to occur in this

---

\(^{372}\) Jolley, "Cumberland River Archaeological Reconnaissance."; Jolley, "Lower Duck and Middle Cumberland Rivers Survey."

\(^{373}\) Jolley, "Cumberland River Archaeological Reconnaissance." Seasonal exploitation of upland resources during the Late Archaic is also found at the Meeks Site. See Benthall, "Meeks Site Excavation."
region. Mississippian sites are most often situated on the floodplain or terraces of major waterways, although upland habitation sites and stone box graves located in secondary drainages were also recorded.  

The Glen Leven property is rolling upland terrain dissected by the intermittent East Fork Brown’s Creek. The physiographic setting of 40DV3, a Mississippian burial and habitation area, is similar to that of Glen Leven and indicates that similar features may be found on the Glen Leven property.  The Glen Leven land may also have been utilized by the population at site 40DV3. The Cumberland River valley survey model also suggests that the Glen Leven property may contain Middle Archaic or Late Archaic prehistoric cultural remains.

**Expected Early Settlement Sites**

A family history of Glen Leven indicates that Thomas Thompson built a blockhouse over a spring that is now the location of a bottling company on Thompson Lane and not within the modern boundaries of the Glen Leven property.

**Expected Pre-Civil War Sites**

According to the Thompson’s family history, two other houses were constructed on the Glen Leven property before the house was built in 1856. The two earlier structures were built by John Thompson, who was born in 1793 to Thomas Thompson and his wife Nancy. In 1824, John Thompson built a log house that faced the main road running to Franklin. Historian Paul Clements suggests that the log structure was built on high ground, but its exact location is not known. Thompson’s father, Thomas, died in 1837. John was his only surviving son and accumulated considerable wealth and prior to the Civil War. In the early 1850s, Thompson built a second, more modern house on his property. The night before the family was to move in, the new house burned, and the log house is said to have caught fire as well. Thompson immediately rebuilt, locating his third residence, the extant brick structure known as “Glen Leven,” on the hill above the spring and facing Franklin Turnpike. The present route of Franklin Pike was opened in 1838 by the Franklin Turnpike Company, in which John Thompson was a stockholder. Thompson’s wealth is evidenced by his sizeable slave holdings. In 1840, the U.S. Federal Census recorded that Thompson owned 75 slaves, and in 1850, Thompson

---

374 Jolley, “Cumberland River Archaeological Reconnaissance.”
376 Thompson, “The Thompson Family,” 32.
378 Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County and The Land Trust for Tennessee, “The Glen Leven Historic Highway Program: Tennessee Department of Transportation Enhancement Program Application FY2010.”
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382 Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County and The Land Trust for Tennessee, “The Glen Leven Historic Highway Program: Tennessee Department of Transportation Enhancement Program Application FY2010.”
owned 61 slaves. The 1860 U.S. Census Slave Schedule recorded that John Thompson owned 64 slaves and had 10 slave houses on his property.

Burned archaeological remains of the first two residences and associated domestic and farm remains may be present within the boundaries of the present day Glen Leven estate. Vestiges of the old road to Franklin may also be present on the property. The spring, located adjacent to Franklin Pike, was likely used by the Thompsons from their early occupancy of the property and may contain archaeological deposits around the springhouse. Archaeological evidence relating to the construction and occupation of the extant house are likely in the yard surrounding the residence. The amount of masonry in the house and extant outbuildings suggests the possibility of a brick kiln at Glen Leven, but the kiln may not have been located within the estate’s current boundaries. Based on the 1860 census, the Thompson property should have archaeological signatures of at least ten slave cabins, and slaves were likely buried on the Thompson property. Since Thompson’s property was considerably larger than the Glen Leven boundaries, the slave cabins and slave cemetery may be located outside the current property.

**Expected Civil War Archaeological Remains and Features**

Battlefield maps from the December 15-16, 1864 Battle of Nashville depict Confederate lines crossing the Thompson property north of Glen Leven’s present boundaries. Historian Stanley Horn notes that the Confederate line was hastily constructed due to the cold and unfavorable winter weather. Descriptions of troop positions and the battle maps suggest that the Thompson property would have been part of the battlefield. An eyewitness to the battle who lived on the hill approximately one mile northwest of the Thompson property wrote in her diary that “John Thompson’s land was a blaze with campfires.” The Glen Leven house was reportedly used as a field hospital, and burial records indicate that at least 91 Confederate, Union, and United States Colored Troops (USCT) were buried on John Thompson’s property and later removed to the U.S. Veterans Cemetery on Gallatin Pike.

No Civil War encampments or entrenchments have been officially recorded as archaeological sites on the Glen Leven property, but the Battle of Nashville Preservation Society recovered Union Army artifacts from the house’s yard using metal detectors. The artifacts and archival evidence indicated that the Glen Leven property might contain evidence of troop encampments, military engagements, field hospital activities, and burial areas.

---


384 U.S. Census Office, *United States Census (Slave Schedule), 1860*.
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389 See Appendix C for the report of the Battle of Nashville Preservation Society’s investigation.
Expected Late nineteenth and Early twentieth Century Archaeological Remains and Features

John Thompson died in 1876. The Davidson County Cemetery Survey states that at least eight burials in the Thompson family cemetery at Glen Leven were removed and re-interred at Mount Olivet cemetery in 1882. The location of the Thompson family cemetery on the Glen Leven property has not been identified, but it may be within the present boundaries of the estate. The Glen Leven property is also likely to contain archaeological evidence from non-extant buildings. An 1871 map shows the house and springhouse along with more outbuildings at the rear of the house than are presently extant in this location on the Glen Leven property. These outbuildings may represent the extant smokehouse, office, and subterranean greenhouse, but the relative positions of the extant structures differ slightly from the configuration of the buildings shown on the Foster map. A 1903 topographical map of Nashville shows only one structure within the present day Glen Leven property boundaries, but outbuildings may not have been depicted on this map.


A 1907 map of Nashville and a 1932 topographical map indicate that archaeological remains of at least two other early twentieth century residences may be present within the present boundaries of Glen Leven. Both maps show a house on the Glen Leven property approximately one-eighth mile south of the house. No structure presently exists in this location. The 1932 map also shows an unimproved road running from Franklin Road southeast past the Glen Leven house. This map shows a house situated adjacent to the unimproved road approximately one-eighth mile southeast of the house. Presently, no structure exists in this location.

The 1953 U.S. Geological Survey “Oak Hill” topographic map shows the house and an outbuilding, but does not show either of the two early twentieth century houses described above. The 1953 map suggests that these two early twentieth century houses were demolished prior to 1953, and archaeological remains of these structures may be present. The 1953 map has outbuildings mapped in the locations where the old and new barns are located.

An aerial photograph taken in 1954 was used to compare the visible structures and field boundaries from the mid-twentieth century to the current state of the farm. Interpretation of the photograph was problematic due to image quality issues in the available scanned version, but the image analysis suggests the need for further investigation in certain areas of the property. A possible structure was identified in a small field east of the old barn and south of the new one. The location of the possible structure in the photograph coincides with the location of several features on the ground including the presence of masonry and foundation stone, depressions,
and domesticated ornamental plants. These features could indicate a former habitation. 

Additionally, a possible structure or group of structures is visible on the 1954 aerials in an area east of the house near the current chicken coop that is now a wooded area. This feature is adjacent to a gate which is no longer in use, but at the time of the aerial photographs led to a path (visible in the photos) which crossed the field to a gate on the other side, near the new barn. There is also a visible change in the field to the east of the house that is now being used by the Hermitage Hotel to grow organic produce. In 1954, this field was divided into two smaller fields.


Current Glen Leven boundaries overlaid on 1954 aerial photograph. Arrows point to possible structures. (AER_2x-24, 3-7-54, Nashville, Tenn.: Metropolitan Government Archives, Nashville Public Library).
RESULTS OF FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

No prehistoric archaeological materials or features were identified by the field inspection. Since most of the ground surfaces were in pasture, field inspection was limited to surface reconnaissance and inspection of areas of exposed ground surfaces including a plowed garden plot, eroded field roads, and stream cut banks. Examination of high-resolution aerial photos did not suggest any prehistoric archaeological features.

The field inspection identified at least twenty-one historic archaeological features on the Glen Leven property including probable Civil War military entrenchments and an early-mid nineteenth century trash midden. Suzanne Hoyal, Site File Curator at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology, assigned one archaeological site number, 40DV640, to serve as an umbrella reference to the various historic archaeological components and features identified within the Glen Leven estate boundaries. The boundaries of 40DV640 are coincident with the property boundaries of the Glen Leven historic family farm with an area of 65.5 acres. The historic archaeological components of 40DV640 include:

1. Two lines of possible military entrenchments north of the access road represented by slight embankments and linear depressions.
2. Possible house site represented by two rectangular depressions approximately 15-20 feet in length and 8 feet wide in the low-lying area south of the access road and north of the tree line. These depressions may represent the location of the house south of the house shown on 1907 and 1932 maps.
3. Possible traces of an unimproved road south of the house shown on the 1932 map.
4. Traces of a driveway on the north side of the house.
5. Traces of a sidewalk leading from the stoop on the south side of the house's ell to the two boxwoods west of the greenhouse.
6. A possible trash midden in the vegetable garden east of the smokehouse and kitchen outbuildings.
7. Large rectangular dressed stones used as a low border near the greenhouse that may represent foundation stones from earlier structures.
8. Stone piers north of the carriage house possibly representing an earlier structure in this location.
9. Possible house site in the woodlot northeast of the house near the chicken coop represented by structural debris.
10. Archaeological deposits near the springhouse west of house near Franklin Road that may represent early occupation of the property.
11. A mortared stone fence along the east side of Franklin Pike with two curved, mortared stone entrances. The northern entrance is the formal entry to the house and is locked with a wrought iron gate. The southern entrance is presently used to enter the access road to the property and is shown on the map as the “access gate.”
12. South of the access road, the mortared stone fence transitions to dry stacked stone. The stretch of dry stacked stone fence includes a rusted metal field gate that is presently unused. This gate is shown on the map as the “south gate.”
13. A rock wall remnant in the tree line south of the access road.
14. A depression approximately eight feet square southwest of the old barn.
15. A domestic refuse midden in the plowed field east of the old barn that is presently farmed by the Hermitage Hotel.
16. A possible tenant house site represented by rectangular depressions and structural debris in the pasture east of the plowed field.
17. Vestiges of an older road bordered by a remnant rock wall west of the new barn.
18. A cement ring north of the new barn that may represent a silo foundation.
19. Old fence gates represented by a gate opening in the north-south fence line west of the new barn that is directly east of a gate in the fence line in the woodlot northeast of the house. The old fence gates may represent earlier land use patterns.
20. Structural debris near a spring in southeast corner of property.
21. Small masonry foundations on the west bank of East Fork Brown’s Creek accompanied by three linear depressions approximately ten feet in length.

Possible Military Entrenchments

Approximately 150 feet north of the current access road, running most of the length of the area from the fence eastward across the access road, is a linear low-domed earthen embankment with an elongated depression immediately to its north. Subsurface probing conducted by Ben Nance of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology indicated several changes in the depth of the topsoil in the area of the feature similar to that found in military entrenchments. A second entrenchment line may be present immediately north of the closer to the access road. These features may be hasty entrenchments constructed during the Battle of Nashville. The entrenchments are located in a field that is presently used for automobile parking.

Possible House Site

Two large rectangular depressions are situated in a low-lying area to the south of the current farm road entrance to the property and north of a field boundary and tree line. The depressions appear to be manmade. Subsurface probing conducted by Ben Nance from the Tennessee Division of Archaeology Division detected subsoil was detected less than six inches below the surface within the depressions but deeper along the margins. The eastern depression is larger and deeper than the one to the west, and the severity of the angle of its walls suggests recent alterations. Both depressions are approximately 15-20 feet in length and 8 feet in width with a depth of approximately two feet at their deepest point. These depressions may represent the location of a house that is shown on the 1907 and 1932 maps south of the house.

Former Access Road

A 1932 topographic map shows an access road south of the house. Archaeological traces of this road are likely to remain on the property and may be represented by slight undulations in ground surface that were observed on the lawn south of the house.

Driveway to North Entrance of House

A low, slightly domed linear feature on the north side of the house represents the former driveway that accessed the north entrance of the house and port-cochere. The feature is presently vegetated with grass but is clearly visible on the ground surface. No evidence of paving material such as gravel or asphalt was observed on the ground surface.
Archaeological features at Glen Leven, site 40DV640.
**Sidewalk**

A low, slightly domed long, curved formation in the yard on the south side of the house represents a sidewalk leading from the stoop on the south side of the house’s ell through the two boxwoods west of the greenhouse. The sidewalk may have been connected to a longer garden path that may have run through the current location of the greenhouse. The sidewalk feature is presently vegetated with grass but is clearly visible on the ground surface. No evidence of paving material such as brick or gravel was observed on the ground surface.

**Garden Midden**

A light scatter of ceramics was observed in the vegetable garden east of the smokehouse and kitchen outbuildings. A piece of china bearing a stamp that read “CFH” was recovered from the garden. The CFH stamp represents the Charles F. Haviland company. This garden area was under cultivation at the time of the fieldwork. No color changes in the soil or concentrations of artifacts were observed. The artifacts may represent a former use of this area for domestic refuse and may contain midden deposits relating to kitchen activity.

**Foundation Stones near Greenhouse**

Several large rectangular dressed stones are being used as a low border near the greenhouse. The top of the stones have remnants of a coarse aggregate cement. The stones appear to be similar in size to the house’s lower foundation courses and may be artifacts from earlier structures. No other architectural artifacts were observed near these stones.

**Stone Piers at Carriage House**

Directly north of the carriage house approximately five feet from its foundation garage is a flat, rectangular stone measuring approximately eight inches by four inches and visible on the ground surface. Subsurface probing conducted by Ben Nance of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology indicated that the topsoil around the stone was deep and encountered a similar stone ten feet east of the visible one. These stones may represent foundation piers from an earlier structure in this location.

**Possible Structure Site Northeast of House**

Northeast of the house, approximately fifteen feet southeast of the chicken coop structure is a deposit of stones that may have been used as foundation stones. Some of the stones are partially buried suggesting that they may have been in situ for an extended period. The 1954 aerial photographs of the farm show what could be a structure in the area where the chicken coop presently sits. The aerial photograph suggests a larger structure than a chicken coop. Northeast of the chicken coop in an area of less dense underbrush, a small concentration of wood structural debris was observed and may represent the remains of an earlier structure in this location.

**Springhouse Archaeological Deposits**

The current exterior of the limestone springhouse situated east of Franklin Road appears to be built over an older structure, which is visible within the springhouse’s main chamber. Archaeological deposits may be present near the springhouse that may yield information about the construction history of the structure and history of the spring’s use.
Mortared Stone Fences

The mortared stone fence along the east side of Franklin Pike has two curved entrance gates. The northern stone gate is the formal entrance to the house and is no longer used. The southern gate may represent a gate to the house shown to the south of the house on the 1907 and 1932 maps.

Dry Stacked Stone Fences

Approximately 100 feet south of the access road mortared stone gate, coincident with the end of a chain length fence, the mortared stone fence that runs along the western border of the property changes style and construction type. North of the change point, the stone fence is mortared and is topped with castellation. South of the change point, the stone fence is constructed from dry stacked limestone without mortar and with vertical stones stacked across the top. The fence is approximately ten feet below the current grade of the Franklin Pike. Approximately 370 feet south of the access road gate, the dry stacked stone wall appears to have been dismantled for insertion of a metal gate. This gate, shown on the map as the “south gate,” is rusted and does not appear to have been used recently.

Rock Wall Remnant

An low rock wall remnant was observed in the east-west tree line south of the access road. The wall appears to be made of dry stacked limestone and may represent a property or field boundary. No artifacts or structural debris were observed along the wall remnant.

Square Depression

A small square depression was observed southwest of the old barn and approximately 100 feet east of the access road. The depression is approximately 10 feet square. Subsurface probing conducted by Ben Nance of the Tennessee Division of Archaeology encountered subsoil at a depth of only 2-3 inches below the surface across the center of the depression. Probing of the margins of the depression yielded soil depths of more than 3 feet. The pattern of an earthen embankment around a depression is similar to that observed at the extant greenhouse on the property.

Hermitage Hotel Field Midden

A dense concentration of domestic artifacts including ceramics and glass were recovered from the surface at the southern end of a recently plowed field located east of the old barn. The field is presently farmed by the Hermitage Hotel’s organic produce company. The artifacts were recovered from an area approximately 150 feet in diameter. A sparse concentration of architectural artifacts and metal farm implements including square nails and metal tools were also recovered from this location. The heaviest concentration of artifacts was observed near the south end of the field. The soil around the artifact concentration is darker than the soil in the rest of the plowed field, suggesting that organic material was also discarded in this area. The ceramic artifacts include pearlware and patterns from the early and mid-nineteenth century. Few artifacts from the twentieth century were recovered from the field. Until recently, the field was in pasture land and not tilled. The age of the artifacts suggests that this is a refuse midden dating to the nineteenth century occupation of Glen Leven.
Tenant House Site

A possible tenant house site represented by the presence of rectangular depressions and structural debris were observed in the pasture east of the plowed field. The 1954 aerial photograph of the farm suggests a dwelling-sized structure at this location, approximately 250 feet south of the new barn, and the 1932 topographical map shows a structure in this location. However, the 1953 topographic map does not show a structure in this vicinity.

Old Road Remnant

Beginning at the westernmost edge of the field immediately north of the newer barn is a roadbed containing various types of paving stone. The road appears to be well-worn and rutted. The visible paving stones stop abruptly in near the southern end of the field immediately south of the newer barn, but it is possible that the road continues under the topsoil. This roadbed may represent vestiges of the road that pre-dates the construction of Franklin Pike in the 1830s.

Silo Foundation

Approximately 50 feet north of the northwestern corner of the new barn is a large concrete ring that may have at one time been the base of a silo. The concrete mixture is coarse aggregate. No other structural debris relating to a silo was observed in the vicinity.

Old Fence Gates

A gate opening was observed in the fence line west of the new barn. The metal gate appears to have been removed and is propped up against the fence nearby. The gate opening is directly east of a gate in the fence line in the woodlot northeast of the house. The 1954 aerial photograph of Glen Leven indicates a well-trod path or field road connecting these two gates. The fence lines, fence gates, and path may represent earlier land use patterns and occupation of the Glen Leven property.

Structural Debris Near Spring

A spring was observed on a terrace slope in the southeastern portion of the property approximately 100 feet west of East Fork Brown’s Creek. A dense concentration of architectural debris including masonry, stone, and coarse aggregate concrete was observed in the small woodlot immediately west of the spring. No archival or map evidence suggests a structure in this location, and no foundations were observed.

Masonry Foundations and Depressions

Three small rectangular concrete block and brick masonry foundations were observed near the west bank of East Fork Brown’s Creek accompanied by three linear depressions approximately eight feet in length. The structures vary in size. The largest of the foundations appeared to be less than 10 feet in diameter. The function and construction dates of these structures are unknown, though the age and location of trees with and around the structures suggest that they have been out of use for approximately forty years. Approximately ten feet to the southwest of the southernmost structure, three depressions were observed on the ground surface. The depressions are approximately ten feet long by five feet wide and two feet deep. It is unknown whether the structures and the depressions.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The story of Glen Leven’s past is written in the ground as well as in the history books. Over twenty archaeological features were discovered at Glen Leven by this study, but additional archaeological remains are likely to exist within the property boundaries, and most of these are unlikely to be visible on the ground surface. For example, the refuse midden east of the old barn had no surface expression until the Hermitage Hotel tilled this field. The model of expected archaeological features developed for this investigation suggests that archaeological remains of slave quarters, a slave cemetery, the family cemetery, burials of Civil War soldiers, remains of previous structures, and deposits related to military encampments or maneuvers are likely to be present on the Glen Leven property. The model of expected archaeological features and the results of the field investigation were used to develop recommendations for the archaeological components of the Glen Leven property.

PROTECT THE ENTRENCHMENT FEATURES

The field in which the entrenchments are located is presently used for automobile parking. Tire traffic can damage these features. Recommendations include:

- Avoiding parking vehicles on or near the entrenchment lines.
- Professional archaeological excavation to determine if the possible entrenchment lines are military features related to the Battle of Nashville.

CONDUCT ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION

Archaeological investigation prior to construction or ground-disturbing activities can prevent accidental destruction of archaeological deposits on the property. The results of the investigation may be considered in decisions pertaining to design alternative to avoid the archaeological features or whether to conduct archaeological data recovery excavations.

Archaeological investigation prior to construction is also recommended to investigate the presence of human remains in the construction zone. The historical evidence summarized in this study suggests that Glen Leven has been the site of numerous human interments, but the location of these interments has not been identified. Although many of the interred individuals are reported to have been removed and reburied off the Glen Leven property, some human skeletal material may remain in the ground. In the state of Tennessee, construction projects address the discovery and treatment of archaeological remains through compliance with State Archaeological Statutes pertaining to the treatment of human remains pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated Title 11, Chapter 6 (Appendix A) and compliance with relevant municipal regulations. Pursuant to TCA 11-6-107(d), if human skeletal material is encountered during construction work must be halted and the State Archaeologist at the Tennessee Division of Archaeology contacted immediately. Recommendations include:

- Conduct professional archaeological investigations in areas of proposed construction areas or areas where ground disturbing activity may occur.
- Use the model of expected archaeological features developed in this study as a baseline to interpret the results of future archaeological investigations.
- Consultation with a professional archaeologists in the event that archaeological materials are encountered during construction.
CONTINUE HISTORICAL RESEARCH AT GLEN LEVEN

Continued historical research at Glen Leven may provide information to determine the locations of archaeological features such as the slave quarters or the family cemetery. Historical research may also help interpret known archaeological features on the property such as who occupied the feature that has been identified as a non-extant tenant house. Continued historical research may also suggest the presence of previously unidentified archaeological features on the property. Recommendations include:

- Historical research to interpret the known archaeological features on the property.
- Historical research to determine the location of expected archaeological features on the property and identify additional features.
- Extend the historical research beyond the present Glen Leven boundaries to better assess the likelihood that features such as the slave cabins or the family cemetery are present on the property.

INTENSIVE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE PROPERTY

An intensive archaeological investigation of the entire Glen Leven property is the next step in understanding the archaeology of Glen Leven and the nature and distribution of archaeological materials across the property. An intensive archaeological study, including test excavations and geophysical prospecting, can determine where archaeological features are and are not present, identify the areal distribution and density of archaeological deposits, and interpret the archaeological remains on the property. Recommendations include:

- Systematic intensive investigation of across all sections of the property to determine the presence and distribution of subsurface archaeological deposits and locate expected archaeological features such as military encampments.
- Non-invasive investigation of targeted areas using ground penetrating radar or other geophysical prospection methods to determine the presence of subsurface archaeological features such as grave shafts or structure foundations.
- Archaeological excavation of specific features such as the suspected tenant house site or the square depression to interpret the nature of these features or to expose features such as the old sidewalk.

INCLUDE THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF GLEN LEVEN IN INTERPRETIVE PROGRAMMING

Archaeology often yields information about past inhabitants and use of a place that is not written in the history books. The results of archaeological research may provide a fuller understanding of Glen Leven’s history. On-going archaeological investigations also engage the public imagination with the possibility of new discoveries. Possible interpretive themes based on archaeology include but are not limited to:

- Tenant farming at Glen Leven and what archaeology reveals about tenant farming life
- Glen Leven during the Civil War including the house’s use as a Civil War hospital, the burial of soldiers on the property and their subsequent removal, and military engagements on and use of the Glen Leven grounds.
- Building styles and function of stone fences and rock walls
• Early 19th century transportation patterns and traces of early roads on the landscape.
• Changing patterns of land use at Glen Leven incorporating features such as the old field gates and traces of structures and roads on aerial photographs and old maps to tell the story of transformations through time.

**UPDATE THE HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT AFTER INVESTIGATIONS**

Historic properties that conduct archaeological investigations for varying purposes and needs are challenging with synthesizing and communicating the results of these investigations, incorporating previous results into future archaeological investigations, and maintaining control over artifacts and records. Amending the Historic Structures Report upon completion of every investigation and referring to it prior to developing the scope of work for investigations can help to address these challenges. Recommendations include:

• Add the reports of professional archaeological investigations to the Historic Structures Report.
• Include consultation of the Historic Structures Report as part of the required background research in archaeological investigations.
• Develop a plan for curating artifacts and records such as maps or digital files showing the location of archaeological features.
• Update maps showing the location of archaeological features as new information is forthcoming.
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APPENDIX A
APPLICABLE TENNESSEE ARCHAEOLGY, CEMETERY, AND BURIAL STATUTES

Tennessee Code
Title 11 Natural Areas and Recreation
Chapter 6 Archaeology

11-6-102. Definitions.—

As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

(1) "Artifacts" means all relics, specimens or objects of a historical, prehistorical, archaeological, or anthropological nature which may be found above or below the surface of the earth, and which have scientific or historic value as objects of antiquity, as aboriginal relics, or as archaeological specimens;

(2) "Burial Grounds" means a place used for or to be used for human burials. "Burial grounds" does not include an individual urn or other container for ashes of a person who has been lawfully cremated. The fact that any tract of land has been set apart for burial purposes, or that a part or all of the grounds have been used for burial purposes, shall be evidence that such grounds were set aside for burial purposes. The fact that graves are not visible on any part of the grounds shall not be construed as evidence that such grounds were not set aside and used for burial purposes.

(3) "Burial Object" means any cultural material, including but not limited to, whole or broken ceramic, metal or glass vessels, chipped stone tools, groundstone tools, worked bone and shell objects, clothing, medals, buttons, rings, jewelry, firearms, edged weapons, and the casket and parts thereof, that were demonstrably buried with an individual or the burial pit or mound associated with an individual or the structure created to house the body.

(4) "Diving" means any underwater activity using snorkel, scuba, submersible or surface air supply;

(5) "Excavation" means digging below the surface of the earth or water by hand or with mechanical equipment for the purpose of recovering artifacts, archaeological data, human remains or burial objects.

(6) "Field archaeology" means the study of the traces of human culture at any land or water site by means of photographing, mapping, surveying, digging, sampling, excavating, and removing artifacts or other archaeological material, or going on a site with that intent;

(7) "Human remains" means the bodies of deceased persons, in whatever stage of decomposition, including, but not limited to, skeletal remains, mummies, or body parts. "Human remains" does not include the ashes of a person who has been lawfully cremated. "Human remains" does not include body parts or tissue which is removed for transplantation or other medical procedures or research.

(8) "Site" means any location of historic or prehistoric human activity such as, but not
restricted to, mounds, forts, earthworks, burial grounds, structures, villages, mines, caves, shipwrecks, and all locations which are or may be sources of paleontological remains;

(9) "Submerged" means beneath or substantially beneath the territorial waters of the state;

(10) "Surface collecting" means walking fields, stream banks, or other locations to look for and collect artifacts lying on the surface of the ground, or which are partially exposed on the surface of the ground, or which have been disturbed by plowing or natural processes of erosion; and

(11) "Territorial waters" means the navigable waters of the state, and such other waters of the state as may be included within "lands beneath navigable waters" as defined in the federal Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987.

11-6-107. Discovery of sites, artifacts, or human remains - Notice to division, contractors and authorities.

(1) Any person who encounters or accidentally disturbs or disinters human remains on either publicly or privately owned land except during excavations authorized under this chapter, shall:

(A) Immediately cease disturbing the ground in the area of the human remains; and

(B) Notify either the coroner or the medical examiner, and a local law enforcement agency.

(2) Either the coroner or the medical examiner shall, within five (5) working days, determine whether the site merits further investigation within the scope of such official's duties.

(3) If the coroner or the medical examiner, and law enforcement personnel, have no forensic or criminal concerns with regard to the site, then the coroner or the medical examiner shall notify the department.

(4) Human remains and burial objects reported to the division of archaeology shall be treated as provided in §§ 11-6-104 and 11-6-119, and/or Title 46, Chapter 4, if applicable.

(5) A person who violates subdivision (d)(1)(A) or (B) commits a Class A misdemeanor;

(6) The provisions of this section do not apply to:

(A) Normal farming activity, including, but not limited to, plowing, disking, harvesting and grazing; provided, that if human remains are discovered or disturbed a report should be made to the officials specified in subdivision (d)(1)(B); or

(B) Surface collecting.

(7) Nothing in this part shall be construed to grant a right of access or occupation to the public without the landowner's permission.

(e) All archaeological site clearance work carried out pursuant to this section shall, in as far as practicable, be scheduled so as not to interfere with construction activities, and such clearance
work shall only be conducted at sites which have the potential to yield information significant to
the scientific study of Tennessee's aboriginal and historic past.

11-6-109. Private land — Trespass, vandalism, and unauthorized activities — Permission
— Artifacts — Prohibited storage, dumping or littering. —

(a) It shall be deemed an act of trespass and a Class A misdemeanor for any person, natural or
corporate, to excavate and remove artifacts from the private land of any owner without first
obtaining the owner's express permission.

(b) No person, corporation, partnership, association or any other entity shall excavate, damage,
vandalize or remove any artifact from or otherwise alter or deface any site listed in the
Tennessee register of archaeological sites without first obtaining landowner permission.

(c) No person, corporation, partnership, association or any other entity shall sell, offer to sell,
purchase or offer to purchase, or otherwise exchange any artifact from a site listed in the
Tennessee register of archaeological sites if the artifact has been removed or received in
violation of this section.

(d) No person, corporation, partnership, association or any other entity shall store, dump, litter
or otherwise dispose of any garbage, dead animal, sewage or toxic substance in any cave or
sinkhole listed in the Tennessee register of archaeological sites.

Tennessee Code
Title 46 Cemeteries
Chapter 4 Termination of Use of Land Cemetery

46-4-101. Grounds affected — Facts that justify termination of use. —

This chapter, which is enacted for the public welfare in the exercise of the police powers of the
state of Tennessee, applies to any burial ground in the state of Tennessee, including any land
owned or controlled by cemetery companies, that the court to which jurisdiction is given by this
chapter finds, for any of the reasons stated in this chapter, is unsuitable for its use as such and
as a resting place for the dead whose remains are buried in the burial ground, or the further use
of which for those purposes the court finds, for any of such reasons, is inconsistent with due and
proper reverence or respect for the memory of the dead or otherwise unsuitable for those
purposes, the reasons being:

(1) The burial ground is abandoned; or
(2) The burial ground is in a neglected or abandoned condition; or
(3) The existence of any conditions or activities about or near the burial ground that the
court finds render the further use of the burial ground for the purposes mentioned in this section
that are inconsistent with due and proper reverence or respect for the memory of the dead, or
for any other reason unsuitable for those purposes.
[Acts 1949, ch. 15, § 1; C. Supp. 1950, §§ 3936.1, 5379.1 (Williams, § 9720.1); modified; T.C.A.
(orig. ed.), § 46-401.]
46-4-102. “Interested persons” defined. —

As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires, “interested persons” means any and all persons who have any right or easement or other right in, or incident or appurtenant to, a burial ground as such, including the surviving spouse and children, or if no surviving spouse or children, the nearest relative or relatives by consanguinity of any one (1) or more deceased persons whose remains are buried in any burial ground.

[Acts 1949, ch. 15, § 2; C. Supp. 1950, § 5379.2 (Williams, § 9720.2); T.C.A. (orig. ed.), § 46-402.]

46-4-103. Suits for termination of use of land, removal and reinterment and for disposal of land — Municipal authority extended. —

(a) Any interested person or persons, and/or any county in this state in which a burial ground is situated, and/or any municipality in this state if the burial ground is situated in the municipality or within one (1) mile of the lawful corporate limits of the municipality and not beyond the limits of the county in which any part of the municipality is situated and not within the lawful corporate limits of any other municipality in Tennessee, may bring or join in a suit in the chancery court of the county in which the burial ground is situated, for the following purpose or purposes:

(1) To have the remains of all deceased persons buried in the burial ground removed from the burial ground and reburied in a suitable repository to be obtained for that purpose before their removal from the burial ground;

(2) To terminate the use of, and all rights and easements to use, the ground as a burial ground, and all rights and easements incident or appurtenant to the ground as a burial ground; and

(3) Thereupon, to partition or sell for partition the ground if the court finds that it belongs to two (2) or more persons and if any one (1) or more of the owners applies for partition. The authority of all municipalities in the state of Tennessee is extended, for the sole purpose of bringing or joining in the suit by the municipality, but for no other purpose, to a distance of one (1) mile from the lawful corporate limits of the municipality but not beyond the limits of the county in which any part of the municipality is situated and not so as to come within the lawful corporate limits of any other municipality of the state of Tennessee.

(b) In the suit, all interested persons who are not complainants shall be made defendants, and the owner or owners of the land or of any right of reversion or other right or interest in the land, if the owner or owners shall be or include other than the interested persons, shall also be made defendants. Interested persons who are minors or otherwise incompetent or under disability may become complainants by guardian or next friend. All known defendants who are minors or otherwise incompetent or under disability shall be represented by guardian ad litem. Nonresident and unknown defendants may be proceeded against by order of publication, and publication, in the manner provided by law.

[Acts 1949, ch. 15, § 3; mod. C. Supp. 1950, § 5379.3 (Williams, § 9720.3); T.C.A. (orig. ed.), § 46-403.]
46-4-104. Granting of relief — Provisions for reinterment. —

Such removal and reinterment, and other relief described in § 46-4-103, including partition or sale for partition if prayed for and if the court finds the conditions for partition exist as provided in § 46-4-103, shall be granted, authorized, decreed and ordered by the court upon the court finding, upon the hearing of the cause upon the entire record, including the pleadings and proof, that any one (1) or more of the reasons specified in § 46-4-101 exist, and that, due to the same, the burial ground is unsuitable for use as a burial ground and as a resting place for the dead whose remains are buried therein, or that the further use thereof for those purposes is inconsistent with due and proper reverence or respect for the memory of the dead, or for any other reason unsuitable for those purposes; but the removal and reinterment and such other relief shall be granted, authorized, ordered and decreed only upon it being shown to the satisfaction of the court that definite arrangements have been made, or before the removal will be made, for reinterment of all of the remains in a place found by the court to be suitable for reinterment; that for that purpose there have been obtained, or before the removal there will be obtained, either the fee simple title to the place of reinterment or adequate permanent right and easement to use the place of reinterment for reinterment, and adequate permanent right and easement of access to the place of reinterment for visitation; that the removal and reinterment of all the remains will be done with due care and decency, and that suitable memorial or memorials will be erected at the place of reinterment.


Title 46 Cemeteries
Chapter 8. Family Burial Grounds Protection

46-8-101. Short title — Legislative intent.
This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the “Family Burial Grounds Protection Act.” This chapter is intended to provide notice to buyers of property with known burial grounds and gravesites. It does not remove any protection to those sites under existing law.

[Acts 1996, ch. 921, § 1.]

46-8-102. Definitions. —

As used in this part, unless the context otherwise requires:

(1) “Crypt” has the same meaning as used in § 46-1-102;

(2) “Gravesite” means a space of ground used for lawful interment of a deceased person; and

(3) “Human remains” or “remains” has the same meaning as used in § 46-1-102.

46-8-103. Duty to protect graves or crypt — Disturbances prohibited — Transfer of remains. —

(a) A deed for real property that indicates the presence of a gravesite or crypt containing human remains on the property conveyed obligates the immediate and future buyer or buyers of the property to protect the gravesite or crypt from disturbance. The owner of real property has the responsibility for taking appropriate action, prior to conveying the property, to ensure that the deed reflects the presence of the gravesite or crypt on the property.

(b) Real property that has a deed that reflects the presence of human remains on the property is protected from disturbance or development as follows:

(1) A gravesite may not be disturbed in the area of ten feet (10’) surrounding the perimeter of the gravesite; and

(2) A crypt may not be disturbed in the area of five feet (5’) surrounding the perimeter of the crypt.

(c) The owner of real property that has a deed that reflects the presence of human remains on the property has the option of transferring the remains, at the owner’s expense, pursuant to the procedure for termination of use as a cemetery in chapter 4 of this title. However, prior to filing any action in chancery court to transfer the remains located in a gravesite or crypt, the proponent of the action shall first publish a notice in a newspaper of general circulation within the county in which the gravesite or crypt is located. The notice shall include the name of the proponent of the action, the location of the property where the remains are located and any name that can be discerned from the site of any person there interred. Upon complete transfer of all human remains from the property that are properly described on the deed, the buyer has the right to the use of the area previously containing the remains as is consistent for the remainder of the property.

[Acts 1996, ch. 921, § 3; 2008, ch. 1147, § 1.]

Tennessee Code
Title 68. Health, Safety and Environmental Protection
Chapter 3. Vital Records
Part 5 -- Deaths

68-3-508. Disinterment and reinterment. —

(a) Authorization for disinterment and reinterment, in cases of movement of cemeteries or parts of cemeteries or for reuniting families, shall be required prior to disinterment of a dead body or fetus.

(b) Authorization shall be issued by the state registrar to a licensed funeral director or person acting as funeral director, upon proper application.

39-17-311. Desecration of venerated object. —

(a) A person commits an offense who intentionally desecrates:
   (1) A place of worship or burial; or
   (2) A state or national flag.

(b) A violation of this section is a Class A misdemeanor.
[Acts 1989, ch. 591, § 1.]

39-17-312. Abuse of corpse. —

(a) A person commits an offense who, without legal privilege, knowingly:
   (1) Physically mistreats a corpse in a manner offensive to the sensibilities of an ordinary person;
   (2) Disinters a corpse that has been buried or otherwise interred; or
   (3) Disposes of a corpse in a manner known to be in violation of law.

(b) A person commits an offense who, without legal authority or privilege, knowingly offers to sell, sells, offers to purchase or purchases previously buried human skeletal remains. Any remains seized in violation of this subsection (b) shall be confiscated and subject to disposition as provided for in §§ 11-6-104 and 11-6-119.

(c) A violation of this section is a Class E felony.
[Acts 1989, ch. 591, § 1; 2006, ch. 896, § 1.]
0400-9-1-.01 MANNER OF REBURIAL. The reinterment of prehistoric and historic period Native American Indian skeletal remains shall be done in a manner consistent with original and/or traditional customs.

(1) When archaeological, tribal, or other documentation exists that specifies the original manner of burial, reburial of those remains shall be carried out in the same manner.

(2) When documentation on the original manner of burial is not extant, reburial of individual remains shall be done in subsurface grave pits at such a depth to prevent future disturbance. Remains shall be placed directly into the soil.

(3) Any religious or ceremonial activities carried out in conjunction with reburial shall not be the responsibility of the state.

Authority: T.C.A. §§ 11-6-116(b) and 11-6-119. Administrative History: Original rule filed October 11, 1991; effective November 25, 1991.

0400-9-1-.02 REBURIAL AREAS. All reburial areas should be as close to the original burial area as practicable and must be designated as a cemetery and registered with the county tax assessor’s office as same.

Authority: T.C.A. §§ 11-6-116(b) and 11-6-119. Administrative History: Original rule filed October 11, 1991; effective November 25, 1991.

0400-9-1-.03 MARKING OF BOUNDARIES. The boundary of any reburial area must be suitably marked and a permanent record of the location of reinterments kept by the landowner.

Authority: T.C.A. §§ 11-6-116(b) and 11-6-119. Administrative History: Original rule filed October 11, 1991; effective November 25, 1991.

0400-9-1-.04 NOTIFICATION. Anyone carrying out work which involves the removal of Native American Indian human remains must notify the Native American members of the Archaeological Advisory Council, the Chairman of the Tennessee Commission on Indian Affairs,
and the State Archaeologist. Notification of the intent to remove such remains must be in writing. Such notification shall be given at the time a petition is filed under *T.C.A.46-4-101 et seq.*, "Termination of Use of Land as Cemetery", or at the time an application for a permit is filed under *T.C.A. 68-3-508.*

**Authority:** *T.C.A. §§ 11-6-116(b) and 11-6-119.* **Administrative History:** Original rule filed October 11, 1991; effective November 25, 1991.

---

**0400-9-1-.05 OBSERVATION OF DISINTERMENT BY NATIVE AMERICAN OBSERVERS.** At least one (1) Native American observer is entitled to be present during removal, excavation or disinterment of Native American human remains. This person shall be a Native American Indian member of the Archaeological Advisory Council or person designated by such member. Additional observers may be present as field conditions warrant with the permission of the project director. Observers must make prior arrangements with the person in charge of excavation or burial removal. In some cases, such as on-going construction activities, observers may be required to follow special safety procedures.

**Authority:** *T.C.A. §§ 11-6-116(b) and 11-6-119.* **Administrative History:** Original rule filed October 11, 1991; effective November 25, 1991.
APPENDIX B

BATTLE OF NASHVILLE PRESERVATION SOCIETY METAL DETECTOR SURVEY

THE BATTLE OF NASHVILLE
PRESERVATION SOCIETY, INC.
P.O. Box 190493
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
www.bonps.org

June 25, 2007

VIA HAND-DELIVERY
Ms. Jean Nelson
Land Trust for Tennessee
209 10th Avenue South
Suite 530
Nashville, TN 37203.

Dear Jean:

It is with great pleasure that I deliver to you the first round of relics found on the lawn of Glen Leven Mansion. These were dug by a group of eight people on May 26, 2007. I estimate that there were probably 40 man-hours of time donated.

I have attached to this letter a list of all relics and coins that were found, as well as “Not to Scale” map of their locations. By far, the finest relics found were the two United States breastplates, one of which is in mint condition.

Glen Leven Mansion was a few hundred yards behind the Confederate line on December 15, 1864. The troops moved across the farm that night and the fighting on December 16, 1864 was south of the Glen Leven property. The relics found on the lawn definitely support what we know historically. We have found some fired bullets, some case-shot from artillery shells, some dropped bullets and even some lead where soldiers were camping and making bullets on the lawn. These findings show movement of troops during battle.

I also promised that you would get all of everything that was dug there and the second box is total junk.
We will continue this very important survey and I look forward to my next delivery.

Sincerely yours,

The Battle of Nashville Preservation Society, Inc.

By: James D. Kay, Jr.

Its: President

JDKjr/jlw
Enclosures as stated
# LIST OF RELICS FOUND MAY 26, 2007 ON THE LAWN OF GLEN LEVEN MANSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>United States breastplate (mint condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>United States breastplate (poor condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>United States infantry button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Coat button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Coat button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Coat button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.69 caliber minie ball (pulled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.69 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.577 caliber enfield (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.577 caliber enfield (dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.58 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.58 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.69 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.58 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>.58 caliber minie ball (dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>.58 caliber minie ball (dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>.54 caliber carbine (SP) bullet (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>.58 caliber Williams Cleaner (dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.58 caliber Williams Cleaner (dropped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>.58 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Caseshot (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Caseshot (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Caseshot (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Caseshot (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Caseshot (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Caseshot (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>.54 caliber minie ball (fired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Clay marble from unknown period – found in a hole with a bullet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Brass buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Brass buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Brass knap-sack buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Harmonica part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Harmonica part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Brass bayonet scabbord tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Lead piece (probably sabot from artillery shell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Lead piece (probably sabot from artillery shell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Lead piece from bullet making on lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Lead piece from bullet making on lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>3 lead pieces – could be from bullet making or from gutter repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Lead piece – unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Brass piece from belt or saddle – not civil war era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Old lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Knife – not civil war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Stirrup – probably from a child’s saddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Unknown broach or furniture piece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 46.     | **Miscellaneous Coins found**  
 | Nickel – 1899  
 | Penny – 1920  
 | Penny – 1929  
 | Nickel – 1964  
 | Nickel – 1964  
 | Dime – 1971  
 | Penny – 1975  
 | Quarter – 1977  
 | Penny – 1980  
 | Penny – 1981  
 | Penny – 1981  
 | Dime – 1982  
 | Quarter – 1988  
 | Penny – 1988  
 | Penny - ? |