The Teaford Inn is nestled about one hundred yards south of Route 60, twelve miles west of Lexington. The structure is located in the Kerrs Creek District, several miles from the communities of Denmark and Waterloo. The dwelling no longer serves as an inn; however, it retains "inn" as part of its name.

The Teaford family arrived in Rockbridge county in 1845, allegedly seeking finer agricultural land than they previously owned in Augusta County. The small cabin they moved into has experienced substantial structural growth and bears little resemblance to its original form. Nevertheless, one factor remains constant: the Teaford's ownership. Today, Mrs. Seatta Teaford carries on the tradition of her late husband's family.

The Teaford Inn served travellers using Route 60 for nearly 100 years. The building functioned as an inn from the time the Teafords moved settled in the area until the mid-1930's (with a few periods of purely residential use). Even after discontinuing its overnight services, the Teaford Inn served a Sunday Brunch into the mid-1940's.

TAVERNS AND INNS

Very little distinguishes a tavern from an inn. Although sources define tavern and inn differently, the primary difference relates to the sale of alcohol. In the past, both taverns and Inns provided refuge from the carriage roads. While a tavern offered both lodging and alcohol for its customers; most inns were dry. Inns typically accommodated travellers. Because of the beverages available, a tavern quite often served as a social
gathering point for a community: both travellers and members of the community.

The Teaford Inn upheld its identity as an inn. Two of my unofficial sources (a 1936 Richmond *Times-Dispatch* and Mrs. Seatta Teaford) claim that no alcohol could be found at the Teaford Inn. The *Times-Dispatch* made the following statement:

Unlike many of the caravansaries that sprang up along the stage coach routes, the Kerrs Creek inn bore a dignified atmosphere and catered to persons of refined taste. The jugglers and strolling players, peddlers and beggars and the rough and picturesque drivers of the great Conestoga wagons, all avoided Teaford’s.

Mrs. Teaford supported the allegation that the Teafords did not serve alcohol. She informed me that the Cunningham Family owned the nearest watering hole, about a mile to the south in Waterloo. Guests often jaunted from the Teaford Inn to Waterloo for a drink. [Please refer to the attached map of for a better understanding of this trip]. Although many of the Cunninghams’ buildings no longer stand, Cunninghams still reside in Waterloo and one house exists from the period the Cunninghams served alcohol. This building may have been a part of the Cunningham’s tavern.

**HISTORICAL RELEVANCE AS AN INN**

The Teaford Inn probably did not handle a large volume of business. While a picturesque home, it was not a huge resort hotel the caliber of those found around the springs of Southwest Virginia and West Virginia.

The significance of the hotel lies in its unique function as a small, stage-coach inn located in rural Virginia. The Teaford
Inn’s historical significance rises when put into the context of its service of Route 60. The *Times Dispatch* claimed that the Teaford Inn was a favorite stopping point for people on their way to resorts such as the Greenbrier and the Homestead. Should this supposition be a reality, then the Teaford Inn served a wholly unique purpose: the prelodging of well-to-do travellers on their way to luxurious resorts.

Additionally, the Teaford Inn provided a resting point before North Mountain. Before the invention of the all-powerful automobile, travellers had to calculate appropriate resting areas. Although I have no physical data to back my hypothesis, I feel it is entirely possible that the Teaford Inn received significant customer support from westbound carriages who wished to rest before climbing North Mountain. [Please refer to map for a better understanding of the Teaford Inn’s proximity to North Mountain].

**GATHERING DATA**

Very few documents or records exist regarding the Teaford Inn. Aside from the deed, will, and, tax books in the Lexington Court House, I found no official documentation of the Teaford Inn. The Deed books allowed me to verify the W.P.A. deed trace. The land (or tax) books helped me pinpoint the years in which additions were made to the house. The house value jumped from $350 in 1911 to $600 in 1912. This virtual doubling in value cannot be attributed to new land assessments; therefore, I conclude that Henry Hileman Teaford made the bulk of his home improvements in 1911. How about verification of date of original construction?
Unfortunately, the news record is somewhat incomplete. Lexington’s *News Gazette* carried no obituary for Jacob Teaford. Likewise, due to missing issues on microfilm, I could not locate Henry Hileman Teaford’s obituary. Both obituaries could have been valuable in my studies: Jacob was the first Teaford innkeeper; Henry Hileman Teaford was responsible for many of the structural changes to the dwelling. Frank and David Teaford’s obituaries were listed, but neither made reference to the family inn.

Despite my failure to find legitimate, official sources, I managed to find several unofficial documents pertaining to the structure. In 1936, the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* weekend section ran a feature story on the Teaford Inn. Although the article is subject to misconceptions of local folklore, it provides an interesting history of the home.

The *Times-Dispatch* detailed the Teaford emigration from Augusta County into Rockbridge County and its subsequent history as an inn. Again it is important to understand that all data provided by the *Times-Dispatch* article may have been altered by rumor or the commonly encountered faults of oral history. The author, Ruth Scott, attributes none of her information to sources other than Frank Teaford.

The article begins by depicting the Teafords as a rugged pioneer family who braved the rigorous trip from Augusta County into Kerrs Creek Valley. According to the article, the Teafords settled into a very old cabin which has since received numerous additions.
Scott continues to describe the family's using their home as an inn. According to Scott, travellers weary from the rugged stage coach paths found the Teaford Inn a perfect stopping point. Aside from its comfortable feather beds, prices were affordable. The Times-Dispatch listed the contemporary prices of 1850: warm dinner, 16 cents; cold lunch, 10 cents; hand snack, 5 cents. These prices allegedly raised enough revenue for the Teafords to raise sixteen children.

The Teaford Inn was a favorite stopping point for people on their way to resorts. Because of its charm, the inn retained heavy business, even after the introduction of railroads. Scott credits the hospitable nature of the Teaford family for luring guests. Scott specifically mentions H.H. for his reputation as a splendid innkeeper.

The article concludes with reference to the "Kerr's Creek Indian Raids" and the Teaford's bracing themselves during the period John Brown's raiders "threatened" the valley.

I used the Works Progress Administration (WPA) of the Virginia Historical Inventory as another source; unfortunately, I question its accuracy. Reported on October 6, 1936, the WPA report lists a deed trace, a physical description, and an architectural inventory of features. Although most data appearing in the WPA report seem correct, past reports issued by the WPA have been faulty. Therefore, I hesitate to rely on their report. Nevertheless, I include this report in the rear of this paper for any value it might offer. Lexington Courthouse records verify the deed trace listed by the WPA. Unfortunately, the WPA
report makes little reference to the significance of the structure in regard to its history as an Inn. Mrs. Seatta Teaford was my third unofficial source. Mrs. Teaford was able to account for when the Teafords used the structure as an Inn.

According to Mrs. Teaford, the Teafords used their home as an Inn from the moment they arrived in 1845. It was not until the late 1880s, when Henry Hileman Teaford was granted the house, that the house briefly stopped serving the public. Mrs. Teaford explained that H.H. Teaford discontinued using the structure as an inn until he moved to another location. H.H. Teaford allegedly reopened the inn when he no longer lived there.

Upon Henry Hileman Teaford’s death in 1926, the inn was turned over to Frank Blair Teaford who used the building as what the WPA refers to as a "tourist inn". One could lodge in the Teaford Inn until the 1930’s. During the 1940’s the Teafords served a Sunday brunch. Mrs. Teaford said that both the brunches and the hotel service fell to taxes and license requirement of the county. According to Mrs. Teaford, profits suffered when the inn was required to pay for assorted licenses and increased taxes. At this point, the Teafords had outside sources of revenue; it was no longer worthwhile to maintain the house as an inn.

ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURAL CHANGES OF THE TEAFORD INN

Structurally, the house has been and continues to pass through many phases. In 1845, the Teafords moved into a small cabin. Today, eastern and western additions surround the
Teaford made additions to the building. H.H. Teaford’s newer kitchen fell between the cabin and the former freestanding kitchen. Both kitchens would have been used to serve guests.

The original cabin remains relatively intact. Several years ago, the cabin’s central room (a former lobby of the inn) underwent interior renovations. During this time, a new cement floor replaced an older wooden floor; a new heater moved into the area occupied by the original hearth, and a new front door replaced an older door. Nevertheless, the floor plan has not changed and some detail remains from the era in which it served as an inn. The mantel clock is one such detail. The same mantel clock has remained in the Teaford family for generations. (Please note the Times Dispatch’s reference to the clock.)

FEASIBILITY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK

The Teaford Inn fills a significant niche in the history of local taverns. I believe that its place in the history of Rockbridge county and tavern culture warrants at least some archaeological fieldwork. Unfortunately, the farming, grazing, construction, and water damage caused from Kerrs Creek all account for major ground disturbances. These disturbances have eliminated many likely test sites. Some areas within the yard remain intact and would be excellent locations for test pits. But allow me to explain which areas would not suit archaeological survey.

The Teaford Inn has frequently raised its own produce. Much of this produce was raised in fields directly adjacent to the
house. The agricultural practices of the Teafords continue today. Farming over such a prolonged period of time has caused significant mixing of soil strata. Similarly, the grazing and trampling of various farm animals has had an impact on parts of the property. While the grazing and farming practices do not influence the immediate yard of the inn, they do effect land which may have otherwise been surveyed.

The flooding of Kerrs Creek and construction have damaged land within the yard. According to Mrs. Teaford, Kerrs Creek overflows its banks with some frequency. If flood currents were strong enough, many cultural artifacts may have been removed from historical context. This issue probably concerns the backyard more than the front yard (because of their respective proximity to the creek). The frequent construction around and on the house have made other significant damages to the ground near the house. At the present moment, the Teafords are reconstructing the West wing and kitchen. As the photographs in the rear of this paper demonstrate, their present construction has required the building of a new foundation. Within the mound of soil removed to accommodate a new foundation and piping, I found several cultural artifacts. Outbuildings, most of which have been in the rear of the house have also disturbed the site.

Overall, I feel that the constant and continuing disturbance of the yard and property around the Teaford Inn limit possibilities of excavation. Nevertheless, the archaeological significance of the house demands attention. As mentioned earlier, the front yard would be the most likely area to drop
original cabin.

This cabin had a bedroom and the main parlor/lobby on the ground floor. The top floor had two modestly-sized bedrooms which were accessible through a closet staircase off the parlor.

The house was inherited by Henry Hileman Teaford, who added the side wings in 1911. A new foyer, parlor, staircase, storage area, and bedroom constituted the East wing. Henry Hileman added a dining room and kitchen to the West side.

The east addition remains in its original condition. Heavy ornamentation changes the tone of this section of the home. Pine molding adorns the windows, doorways, and stairs of the eastern addition. By virtue of its formality, this section of the dwelling functioned as the preferred location for entertaining guests. After being added on, guests no longer entered through the informal bottom floor of the original dwelling.

The western addition no longer stands in its original form. Today, one part appears like any other contemporary kitchen. This room was formerly occupied by the dining room. This is the same dining room in which guests ate their meals.

Another part of the western wing has been demolished and will soon be replaced by a family room. Mrs. Teaford’s sons are still in the process of rebuilding this addition. Although the addition will be built entirely from scratch, the hearth and chimney of an old kitchen will remain to provide a focal point of the new addition. The demolition removed two previously used kitchens. Until recently, both kitchens were intact. I believe the back kitchen was separate from the house until Henry Hileman
CRM WORK AND THE TEAFORD INN

Cultural Resource Management (CRM) refers to the oversight provided by various government agencies and bureaus which ensures the appropriate handing of archaeological sites. When construction, dam building, rerouting of a river, etc. threaten an area, it has become common procedure to check the archeological value of the land before carrying out construction.

The first step generally taken in CRM work is to determine the validity of a site. The validity or invalidity of a site may be decided by a number of things. A site which has been continuously documented will not necessarily have value. It is the site of which little is known that draws interest. If little is known about a site, it is important to learn whether the site has historical or cultural significance. The validity of a site depends on the cultural activity which it has hosted. A site is not necessarily important because of its size or great quantity of artifacts.

Archaeologists must also consider the condition of a site. A preserved site obviously has more appeal than a littered site with an excessively disturbed soil strata.

Through my research, I have found that the Teaford Inn is a valid site. As I mentioned previously, the Teaford Inn fills an interesting niche in Rockbridge County tavern history.

Once a site has been determined invalid, or unworthy of either protection or further investigation, construction may
continue. If a site is determined valid, the second stage begins.

The second stage of CRM work requires the momentary protection of a site. All construction of a site must halt in order to find out the site's degree of importance. A small amount of archaeological site will usually determine whether a site should be permanently preserved. In most cases, a site will be excavated, data will be recorded, and it will be agreed that while an important site, it is not worthy of everlasting protection.

The purpose of CRM work is not to preserve; rather, the purpose of CRM work is to manage sites appropriately. A site of significance might be partially destroyed with the grace of archaeologists, if the archaeologists feel that all knowledge has been extracted from the site. CRM efforts will only protect those sites which can be preserved with little hassle (eg: the minor rerouting of a road), or those sites of extraordinary importance. If the Virginia highway board were to widen Route 60, the Teaford Inn would receive archaeological attention. Consequently, the Teaford Inn would be demolished or preserved, depending on the amount of importance to which it were attributed.

If construction does not mar a site (either by virtue of its importance, or by the canceling of plans), protection of the site falls into the hands of those of negotiating CRM work. It becomes necessary to ensure that future construction projects or site thieves do not tamper with the site.
Since 1906, great strides have been made in efforts to protect sites. Today, federal agencies regulate construction to avoid the destruction of areas of archaeological importance. Numerous Federal acts have been passed which ensure the safety of those locations recognized on the National Register of Historic Places. The states have also been granted a certain amount of authority in the protection of sites. Today, in addition to the various laws governing over sites, specific positions have been created which allow official to oversee archaeological issues (eg: SHPO).

Although no site is safe from protection, with the passing of recent laws and the public attention given to CRM work, sites have a much greater chance of avoiding premature destruction.
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Kerr's Creek Valley and Teaford's Home

A Likely Spot, Indeed by Ruth Scott

The pull to the top of North Mountain had been a hard one. The sleek coats of the horses were flecked with foam. They stood now, heads down, tongues lolling, resting.

To lighten the load on the steep climb, the driver had trudged beside the team. He came now to the wagon's head and paused. On the lazy-board, which projected slightly to the left near the front of the covered wagon, sat a woman, a baby at her breast. The man, his powerful frame attesting the rugged health of the pioneer-farmer, held out his arms and lifted the woman and child from the seat. Five curly-haired children tumbled out of the wagon after their mother.

Pleasant Valley Ends Trek

The family stood at the side of the road and looked down over giant oak trees, hemlock spruce and a mountainside road bordered with rhododendron, to a pleasant valley. The man turned to his wife. "A likely place," said he. "A likely place, indeed," replied the woman.

The family rearranged itself in the covered wagon. The team, refreshed by the brief rest, clattered down the winding road.

Thus Jacob Teaford and his wife and children entered that section of Rockbridge County known as Kerr's Creek Valley and took up their residence in the year 1845. Of Revolutionary American ancestry of Huguenot extraction, the Teafords had come from Augusta County through Buffalo Gap, Bell's Valley, Braxton's Run and over North Mountain, a long and arduous journey at that time.

The home they established in the valley still stands and is now the home of Jacob's grandson, Frank B. Teaford, of Virginia. For many years after the railways pushed westward, the old place continued to serve stage coach travel, although the number of such vehicles was curtailed.

Following the "adjustor" period, the place continued in favor, mostly as a summer resort and as such is operated today.

In 1889, the property fell to the first Teaford's son, H. H. Teaford. Eleven years ago, Frank B. Teaford inherited the place, thus being the third generation in occupancy.

Schoolhouses in Rockbridge County were built on Teaford acres near the inn. After years of use as a one-room school, the building was converted into a private dwelling and remains as such today.

H. H. Teaford, who operated the farm and inn from 1890 until 1926, was in the Internal revenue service during the Cleveland administration and was land assessor and justice of the peace. His reputation as a genial host brought scores of persons to the inn.

The valley that Jacob and his wife viewed from the mountain in 1845 had the War Between the States echoed up the valley as young men hurried away to join the forces of Lee and Jackson. Plainly visible from Teaford's Inn was the flare against the sky that met the burning of Virginia Military Institute. Reconstruction days in the valley marked an era of heartbreak. The call to arms in 1917 was answered by scores of farm boys. At times drought has withered the crops and often Kerr's Creek on a rampage has done irreparable damage. But in both good times and bad the valley folk look on life as an advantage worth living and will repeat the remark of that
children entered that section of Rockbridge County known as Kerr's Creek Valley and took up their residence in the year 1845. Of Revolutionary American ancestry of Huguenot extraction, the Teafords had come from Augusta County, Virginia to Buffalo Gap, Bell's Valley, Blue Bluff, Stony Run and over North Mountain, a long and arduous journey at that time. The home they established in the valley still stands and is now the home of Jacob's grandson, Frank B. Teaford.

Oddly enough, the place has been operated as an inn since the coming of the first Teaford. Situated on what is now Route 60 12 miles north of Lexington, it was a favorite stopping place for stage coach travelers in the old days. A large eddy of east and west travel collected at Teaford's Coaching Inn to enjoy the hospitality of "mine host." After a day of jolting over rough roads in the springless coaches, often inelegantly referred to as shake-guts, travelers no doubt found a deal of comfort in the inn's feather beds.

As in other taverns of the time, food was good and cheap. A warm dinner cost only 16 cents; a cold lunch, 10 cents, and a hand snack, 5 cents. A night's lodging with supper and breakfast set the guest back about 40 cents. Although the inn keeper's rates were low, compared to those of today, and it was harder to make a dollar than it is now, it was easier to save. Apparently, Teaford knew how to use his money to advantage, for he raised 16 children and provided well for them on the inn's bounty.

Ladies and gentlemen from Eastern Virginia, going to and from "The Hot and "The White," famed health resorts in the Alleghanies, made a special point to stop at Teaford's. Unlike many of the caravansaries that sprang up along the stage coach routes, the Kerr's Creek inn bore a dignified atmosphere and catered to persons of refined taste. The jugglers and strolling players, peddlers and beggars and the rough and picturesque drivers of the great Conestoga wagons, all avoided Teaford's.

Some of the State's most worthy leaders in the days immediately preceding the War Between the States gathered at the inn to discuss important issues. The coming of the iron horse failed to deprive Teaford's of its popularity, as it did many taverns in the western part

although the number of such vehicles was curtailed.

Following the "adjustor" period, the place continued in favor, mostly as a summer resort and as such is operated today.

In 1889, the property fell to the first Teaford's son, H. H. Teaford. Eleven years ago, Frank B. Teaford inherited the place, thus being the third generation in occupancy.

The present owner relates that the home was old when Jacob Teaford bought it and was of logs. Later, it was weatherboarded and a number of rooms added. On the mantel in the inn's lobby is the old clock brought by Jacob in the covered wagon. Near the barn stands an apple tree planted more than 100 years ago.

Mr. Teaford says that his grandfather made ready to defend his home and his guests when John Brown raiders came up the Valley in 1859. The knives used on the farm for cutting corn were brought into the inn and the boys of the family were instructed to make use of them should the raiders appear.

When the public school system came into being in Virginia, one of the first

the building was converted into a private dwelling and remains as such today.

H. H. Teaford, who operated the farm and inn from 1890 until 1936, was in the internal revenue service during the Cleveland administration and was land assessor and justice of the peace. His reputation as a genial host brought scores of persons to the inn.

The valley that Jacob and his wife viewed from the mountain in 1845 was not always as peaceful as it seemed that day. Once it had been the stamping ground of buffalo herds that designed by cloven hoof most of Virginia's early trails. Later, it was the scene of numerous raids by Indians. In 1764, Kerr's Creek Valley was attacked by a band of Shawnee Indians and half a hundred homesteaders were killed. Many of the early settlers found no peace at all in the valley and unable to wrest their faces toward the west and more abundant land.

In later years, Brown's raiders threw terror into the stout hearts of the valley people. Old-timers recall with a treace of bitterness their grandfathers' tales of that marauding band. Repercussion of

Plainly visible from Teaford's Inn was the flare against the sky that meant the burning of Virginia Military Institute. Reconstruction days in the valley marked an era of heartbreak. The jail to arms in 1917 was answered by scores of farm boys. At times drought has withered the crops and often Kerr's Creek on a rampage has done irreparable damage. But in between times down the valley folk look on life as an advantage worth trying and will repeat the remark of that early Teaford—"A likely place, indeed."

Plant Growing Pace Doubled Through Acid

INDOLE compounds, chemicals never found in a plant, are putting roots on shrubs quickly at Cornell University. The experiments have been reported by Henry T. Skinner of the department of botany and ornamental horticulture.

They point to realization of a scientific agricultural miracle—the growth of an artificial chemical out of nature. Mostly to plant improvements science has been confined to imitating nature. One imitation, to grow roots, has been use of starch, substances made by plants themselves.

But in a derivative of indole the chemist makes a magic, artificial lotion. It puts roots on rhododendrons and azaleas at about twice the speed of nature, roots of much better quality.

Indole is made synthetically, from amino acids. Its compounds can be made from natural products, especially indigo blue. But even then they are in a form which probably never existed in nature.

For putting roots on plants the indole compounds are made principally with acetic or butyric acid, both artificial. Acetic is the flavoring matter of vinegar; butyric the smell in rancid butter.

A single rhododendron leaf will grow into a bush with the lot of the magic lotion, if it has a bud at the end of the stem. The stem is soaked in the acid two hours, then planted in sand with the leaf above the surface.

The seven judges of Virginia's Supreme Court of Appeals are elected by the Legislature for 12-year terms,

Marker near the site of the Indian massacre.
## DEED TRACE
(I used the WPA report as a guide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANTEE</th>
<th>GRANTOR</th>
<th>DATE, DEED or WILL BOOK page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Borden</td>
<td>William Gooch</td>
<td>11/06/1739 DB: 18-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wilson</td>
<td>Benjamin Borden</td>
<td>1754 DB: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Wilson</td>
<td>James Wilson</td>
<td>05/04/1784 DB: A-431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Wilson</td>
<td>Moses Wilson</td>
<td>willed WB: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Wilson Evans</td>
<td>Margaret Wilson</td>
<td>03/23/1821 WB: 5-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wilchants</td>
<td>Margaret and Jacob Evans</td>
<td>09/29/1834 DB: P-476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosannah Wilchants</td>
<td>William Wilchants</td>
<td>08/29/1834 DB: S-278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wichants</td>
<td>Rosannah Wilchants</td>
<td>05/30/1836 DB: T-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWG Walkup</td>
<td>William Wilchants</td>
<td>08/17/1840 DB: V-335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Teaford</td>
<td>JWG Walkup</td>
<td>04/20/1849 DB: AA-386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Teaford</td>
<td>estate of Jacob Teaford</td>
<td>01/05/1887 DB: ZZ-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Teaford</td>
<td>Henry Teaford</td>
<td>01/08/1926 WB: 43-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Teaford</td>
<td>Frank Teaford</td>
<td>02/02/1943 willed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatta Teaford</td>
<td>David Teaford</td>
<td>06/16/1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOME OF HENRY H. TEAFORD

This write-up is a part of the Virginia W. P. A. Historical Inventory Project sponsored by the Virginia Conservation Commission under the direction of its Division of History. Credit to both the Commission and W. P. A. is requested for publication, in whole or in part. Unless otherwise stated, this information has not been checked for accuracy by the sponsors.
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1. SUBJECT:
   Home of Henry H. Teaford.

2. LOCATION:
   Rockbridge County, Virginia, about eleven miles west of Lexington, Virginia, on the south side of the Midland Trail, Route 160, one hundred yards from the highway.

3. DATE:
   1754 - 1849.

4. OWNERS:
   The land on which this house stands came from the "Borden Grant" of 95,100 acres, granted to Benjamin Borden by Governor William Gooch on November 5, 1759, and recorded in the Land Office in Richmond, Virginia, in Book 18, page 260.

   About the year 1754, James Wilson purchased this land from Benjamin Borden, and built the house that same year, and lived there until May 4, 1784, when he sold it to Moses Wilson. Deed Book "A" page 421.

   At the death of Moses Wilson, it passed to Margaret Wilson by inheritance.

   Margaret Wilson willed it to Margaret Wilson, who later married Jacob Evans, March 23, 1821. Will Book 5, page 136.

   Margaret and Jacob Evans sold it to William Wilc'hants on September 13, 1827. Deed Book "P" page 476.

   William Wilc'hants sold it to Rosannah Wilc'hants on August 29, 1834. Deed Book "P" page 278.


   William Wilc'hants sold it to J. W. G. Walkup on September 17, 1840. Deed Book "P" page 348.

   J. W. G. Walkup sold it to Jacob Teaford on April 20, 1849. Deed Book "AA" page 385.

   At the death of Jacob Teaford, it passed by inheritance to his heirs, and on January 8, 1887, these heirs deeded their interests to Henry H. Teaford. Deed Book "ZZ" page 97.
Henry E. Teaford willed it to Frank E. Teaford, will recorded on January 8, 1926. Will Book 48, page 33. Frank E. Teaford is the present owner, 1936.

5. DESCRIPTION:

The original building on this site was a two story log structure, erected in 1794, by James Wilson, and this was used as a residence by the various owners until 1849, when Jacob Teaford built a two story frame house, using the old log structure as a part of same. Since 1849, the building has been modernized, until today it is one of the most picturesque old homes in the community.

It is rectangular in plan with an "L" to the rear or west side, has a gabled roof, has two stories and the roof is metal. It has two porches, a large one story porch to the front or east side, twelve feet wide and twenty feet long. The other porch is in the front of "L" to the north side, and is smaller than the other porch. There is a large bay window at the north end of the main building, facing the highway. It is located well back on a large beautiful lawn, with several large trees of considerable age. It has three brick chimneys, one to the "L" and two near the center of the main building. The house has ten rooms and a cellar under the main building. The main entrance is from the large front porch into a hall, and from this hall, there is a two flight stairway, leading to the second floor.

Frank E. Teaford, the present owner, is a farmer, but he uses this home as a "Tourist Inn" and its location on the Midland Trail is so attractive, that many tourists stop over to avail themselves of the hospitality afforded.

6. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE:

This old home can be definitely traced back to the Borden Grant, and while there seems to be no outstanding item of interest of historical significance connected with it, yet it is one of the historical old homes in this section. It is located in the upper Kerr's Creek valley, which was badly infested by the Indians in the early days of this country, and its owners may have had some interest in the fortification against attack by the Indians which was located in the "Old McKee Home," only a few miles to the east, but there is nothing definite to connect this home with the McKee Fort. It is only a tradition.
7. ART:

Photograph:

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION:

Informants: Mrs. Frank E. Yeaford, wife of the present owner, Lexington, Virginia, E. F. D. D.

Mrs. Walter W. Dunlap, who was born and raised in this section, who is now eighty-two years old. She now lives in Lexington, Virginia.

Court Records: Clerk's Office of Rockbridge County, Lexington, Virginia.
ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING CALLED FOR IN

Name of Building: HOME OF HENRY K. TRAYFORD

EXTERIOR

1. Building Plan: Rectangular with an "L" to west side
2. No. of stories: (2) Attic classed as 1/2 story
3. Material: Brick (x) Frame (x) Stone (x) Log (x)
4. If brick, state what bond: Flemish ( ) English ( ) Common ( ) Other ( )
5. Kind of roof: Hip ( ) Gabled ( ) Gambrel ( ) Lean-to ( ) Deck ( )
6. If church, describe or draw sketch of roof on reverse side.
7. Roof Material: Slate ( ) Shingle ( ) Metal (x) Tile ( )
8. Chimneys: Number (2) Brick (x) Stone (x) Location Two near the center
9. Weatherboarding: Pine lumber ( ) Beaded ( ) Plain (x)
10. Cornices: Plain or Elaborate (x) Plain ( ) Material Wood
11. Windows: Number (16) Size and number of panes 2 down, 2 up, 4 down, 13 x 12, 1 up. A large bay window at the north end; double sash; 13 x 12 1 up.
12. Shutters: Describe: Full size; pine; lower half pivot; green.
13. Dormers: Number, and Shape of roof: None
14. Porch: Large one story at front; 18 by 20 feet; celled at bottom
15. Type of Entrance: From both porches; doors three feet wide; four panels; pine; painted brown
16. Columns: Doric ( ) Ionic ( ) Corinthian ( ) Square ( )

INTERIOR

17. No. of Rooms: (10) Large (8) Small (2) Approx. ceiling height 9 feet
18. Stairway: Open String ( ) Closed String ( ) Describe: Two flights; pine; newel and rail turned; balusters square; side panelled; brown
19. Cellar: Describe: Under the main house; one room; stone foundation
20. Doors: Style and type of wood: Four panels; pine; painted brown

21. Walls: Panelled, papered or painted: Plastered and papered
22. Interior Cornices: None
23. Hardware: Locks and hinges: Common hinges; locks outside: Iron
24. Floors: Pine planks; uniform; six inches wide; painted
25. Mantels: Pine; slightly curved; painted

27. Present condition and state if spoiled architecturally by remodelling: Excellent

28. Does occupant seem to appreciate old architectural features: Yes

Signed: W. L. Reeder
PHOTOGRAPHS:

1) Original structure (protruding) with east and west additions.

2) View from the east. Original--green door, under porch--entrance is barely visible. Note the two areas of soil disturbance: 1) in foreground, small agricultural plot, 2) behind house, addition currently under construction.

3) northeast view of 1911 addition and current changes to kitchen and west wing.

4) southwest view of west wing. Note the incorporation of chimney of former west wing kitchen.

5) Parlor: left-hand door leads to stairs, right-hand door is the original entrance to cabin. Note family mantel clock.

6) Parlor: Present stove and fireplace in previous location of hearth and fireplace. The door was installed to serve the 1911 addition.

7) Current Master bedroom. Located in original cabin.

8) Detail of original (?) plank wall. Original bedroom of cabin.

9) 1911 guest bedroom with furniture used during its time as an inn.