

Thoroughgood House
Lynnhaven Vicinity
Princess Anne County
Virginia

HABS No. VA-209

HABS
VA
77-LYNHA.V
1-

ADDENDUM
FOLLOWS...

PHOTOGRAPHS
WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA
District of Virginia

MULTIPLE
ADDENDUMS
FOLLOW...

Historic American Buildings Survey

Prepared at Headquarters Office
for District of Virginia

Adam Thoroughgood House
.1 mile west of Bayville Creek,
at east end of Thoroughgood Lane
Virginia Beach (independent city)
Virginia

HABS No. VA-209

HABS
VA
77-LYNH

Addendum to

Thoroughgood House
Lynnhaven Vicinity
Princess Anne County
Virginia

PHOTOGRAPH

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

ADDENDUM
FOLLOWS...

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

THOROUGHGOOD HOUSE
Lynnhaven Vicinity, Princess Anne County, Virginia

Owner: Miss Grace Keeler

Date of erection: Seventeenth century

Present condition: Good; repaired

Description:

Brick; story and a half; steep gable roof; end chimneys, south projecting north inside; all brickwork English bond except west front, Flemish bond; glazed headers; front four bays; door off-center to right; sash 9/9 lights; three gable dormers on roof, 6/6 lights. Interior has eighteenth-century paneled end and stair.

References:

Waterman and Barrows, Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia

S. S. and V. H. Kellam, Old Houses in Princess Anne, Virginia

Swem, Index of Virginia History

Thomas T. Waterman
11/1/40

ADDENDUM
FOLLOWS...

ADDENDUM
ARCHITECTURAL DATA FORM

ADDENDUM
FOLLOWS...

HABS
VA
77-LYNHA.VS
1-

STATE Virginia	COUNTY	TOWN OR VICINITY Virginia Beach (independent city)
HISTORIC NAME OF STRUCTURE (INCLUDE SOURCE FOR NAME) Adam Thoroughgood House		HABS NO. VA-209
SECONDARY OR COMMON NAMES OF STRUCTURE		
COMPLETE ADDRESS (DESCRIBE LOCATION FOR RURAL SITES) .1 mile west of Bayville Creek, at east end of Thoroughgood Lane		
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION (INCLUDE SOURCE) 1646-1660	ARCHITECT(S) (INCLUDE SOURCE)	
SIGNIFICANCE (ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORICAL, INCLUDE ORIGINAL USE OF STRUCTURE) One of the oldest surviving houses in Virginia, as well as the East Coast, the Adam Thoroughgood house is also significant as a good example of the central-hall plan, 17th century dwelling.		
STYLE (IF APPROPRIATE)		
MATERIAL OF CONSTRUCTION (INCLUDE STRUCTURAL SYSTEMS)		
SHAPE AND DIMENSIONS OF STRUCTURE (SKETCHED FLOOR PLANS ON SEPARATE PAGES ARE ACCEPTABLE)		
EXTERIOR FEATURES OF NOTE		
INTERIOR FEATURES OF NOTE (DESCRIBE FLOOR PLANS, IF NOT SKETCHED)		
MAJOR ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS WITH DATES In 1745, windows were enlarged and dormers added, in addition to several interior changes. Through restorations in 1923 and 1957, the house was returned to its original 17th century design.		
PRESENT CONDITION AND USE Presently used as an historic house museum.		
OTHER INFORMATION AS APPROPRIATE		
SOURCES OF INFORMATION (INCLUDING LISTING ON NATIONAL REGISTER, STATE REGISTERS, ETC.) National Historic Landmark (Information above taken from Landmark documentation)		
COMPILER, AFFILIATION Druscilla J. Null, HABS	DATE 7/28/83	

Addendum to
Thoroughgood, Adam, House
1636 Parish Road (Thoroughgood Lane)
Virginia Beach
Virginia Beach
Virginia

HABS No. VA-209

HABS
VA,
77-LYNHA.V,
1-

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, DC 20013-7127

ADDENDUM TO:
ADAM THOROUGHGOOD HOUSE
1636 Parish Road (Thoroughgood Road)
Virginia Beach
Virginia

HABS VA-209
HABS VA, 77-LYNHA.V, 1-

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

ADDENDUM TO:

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

ADAM THOROUGHGOOD HOUSE

HABS No. VA-209

This report is an addendum to the one-page summary by Thomas Waterman in 1940 and the inventory form completed in 1983. Both were previously transmitted to the Library of Congress, along with cover sheets for earlier sets of the documentation.

Location: 1636 Parish Road, Virginia Beach, Princess Anne County, Virginia.

In previous HABS documentation, the address was listed as 0.1 miles west of Bayville Creek, at the East end of Thoroughgood Lane. The National Historic Landmark database notes the property is on the Lynnhaven River.

The coordinates for the Thoroughgood House are longitude: 76.113448 and latitude: 36.894329. They were obtained through Google Maps (WGS84) in August 2013. There is no restriction on the release of the locational data to the public.

Owner: City of Virginia Beach.

Present Use: House museum.

Significance: Built in 1719-1720, the Thoroughgood House belongs to the generation of housing forms that emerged after demographics stabilized and plantation life became the norm in the early Chesapeake region of Maryland and Virginia. Its small scale, expensive building materials, and quality of craftsmanship exemplify the character of many planters' houses now long lost. Studying the form and interior room arrangements reveals construction techniques as well as about the lives and daily rituals constructed within those walls. The houses the planters' built, more so than the land they worked, offer insights to the world of the Chesapeake.¹

The materials of construction, namely the brick masonry walls, helped ensure the survival of the Thoroughgood House from the eighteenth century into the twentieth century. At that time, the historic character of the Thoroughgood House

¹ Author's note: The summary statement of significance draws from extensive scholarship about the early Chesapeake. Upon review by HABS, the footnotes citing key texts were deemed too lengthy and so too distracting to remain here. However, scholars and their works are cited throughout the report and in Part III, Section C.

became known and steps were taken to preserve it. The smaller size of the house than that of other dwellings recognized from the colonial period, such as the two-story mansions on the James River such as William Byrd III's Westover (ca. 1750) or Northern Neck of Virginia like John Tayloe's Mount Airy (1760s), led many to think of the early Chesapeake as an architectural landscape of small- and large-scale, well-built brick dwellings. In fact, brick houses were unusual because of the labor costs inherent in building them. Most buildings were wood. Many consisted of only one room. And many early Virginians found shelter in spaces containing one room or less. This intimate and less permanent form of building in wood proliferated throughout the Chesapeake.

The construction of the Thoroughgood House falls within a significant period of American architectural history wherein English building traditions were adapted to a Virginia context. Especially important are the use of a tilted false plate and the tapering of the rafters in the common rafter roof system seen in the Thoroughgood House. The tilted false plate alleviated the need for complicated joinery at the point where the roof superstructure met the wall framing, whereas the tapering encouraged the roof sheathing to lay flat. The practice of tapering the rafters came from traditional heavy timber framing, whereas the use of a false plate simplified house building in the Chesapeake and was further adapted by being tilted or set on edge (45 degree angle) to resist water and torque. Both modifications in framing the Chesapeake house occurred in the 1710s. The Thoroughgood House, therefore, is an early example of the evolving carpentry and construction methods used in the framing of dwellings in the Chesapeake as the box frame known in England was pared down and refined in Virginia.

Similar to the carpentry developed in the Chesapeake, the bricks used in the construction of the Thoroughgood House speak to the evolution of regional building practice. The front façade of the house is made of bricks laid in Flemish bond while the remaining three facades are laid in English bond. This hierarchy, or importance paid to the front, manifest in brick bonds and at times accentuated with glazed headers appeared by ca. 1700 in buildings in the Chesapeake. Besides the Thoroughgood House, the earliest examples include Yeocomino Church (1706) in Westmoreland County and the house known as Weblin in Princess Anne County.

Long standing preferences for structural ornamentation, such as exposed framing members and patterns in brick bonds created through the placement of glazed headers, continued through the first half of the eighteenth century. The Thoroughgood House exhibits these as well. Another legacy of seventeenth-century construction is found in the practice of building houses only 20' in depth.

This limitation in scale accommodated the common rafter roof which was a mainstay of Chesapeake framing techniques well into the nineteenth century.

Expediency and experimentation characterized house building in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake. A variety of floor plans, or the arrangement of rooms in a building, was tried. These choices reflected regional preferences known from England and on-going adaptations of those building practices in Virginia and Chesapeake region. By the century's end, the floor plans of the Chesapeake house predominantly consisted of one room or two as households accommodated servants and enslaved laborers in increasingly segregated ways. Outbuildings assumed the functions once housed in the dwelling; inside the house, social screening occurred on the porch, in the lobby or inside the multi-purpose and primary living area known as the hall. In houses with a two-room floor plan, the rooms were called a hall and a chamber. The hall-chamber house of the Chesapeake resembles that of the hall-parlor house built elsewhere in British Colonial America. The chamber (or parlor) was a semi-private space furnished with the best bed and seating furniture suggesting a social nature unfamiliar to our contemporary understandings of a private bedroom.

Refinements to domestic space continued into the eighteenth century. The emergence of the central passage is a particularly important evolution in Chesapeake house design. The Thoroughgood House is one of the earliest examples of a house with the central passage floor plan to be built in British Colonial America, and in the Chesapeake in particular. Others of similar scale and with similar spatial arrangements soon followed in Princess Anne County. As those buildings suggest happened, houses with center-passage plans began to proliferate in the predominantly wooden Chesapeake landscape of one- and two-room structures of varying quality from ramshackle to refined. Their presence in this setting was pronounced. So much so in 1732 a traveler to Virginia commented on the manner of house building – it was much alike – with dwellings consisting of two rooms to either side of a passage and chimneys at the gable ends. These were the houses in which to seek hospitality and a bed for the night. As the traveler quickly learned, and architectural historians later discovered, the significance of the central passage lies in its influence over how spaces were used in the house. The passage realigned spatial hierarchies and allowed for an increasingly specialized use of rooms, like the hall and chamber, as social stratification and genteel ritual demanded.

The passage ushered a designated entry space into the house proper and, as Chesapeake social lines solidified, the passage facilitated a drawing of boundaries according to status. It also became an informal living space because it was cooler

in the summer months. And, as house plans expanded in the eighteenth century, it too evolved. Stairways, like that seen in the Thoroughgood House, ceased to be built in the passage. Separating the passage and the stair further restricted access to rooms upstairs and further encouraged social engagement in the passage itself. Architectural embellishments, such as the wainscot and paneling of the Thoroughgood House or the articulation of the central block in Mount Airy, followed. By the end of the eighteenth century, the passage was a symbol of social rank as much as any other room in the house. It evolved from a space where that rank was enforced through social control – who could come in, who could go where – to a space that conferred distinction on its owner-occupant. Understanding the trajectory of the passage elucidates how the gentry house evolved and gives insight to the structures of daily life in the colonial period.

The Thoroughgood House is one of the oldest extant houses in what was British Colonial America. Its survival facilitated the study of how buildings were constructed in the period which in turn cast light on how society was constructed. These insights into past affected the interpretation of the historic house throughout the twentieth century. Scholars and tourists returned again and again to the house, each time coming closer to solving present-day puzzles of a partially known story. Architectural, archaeological and historical research together placed the Thoroughgood House's construction in the spectrum of Chesapeake house design. Innovations and continuities in construction speak to its early date, while the floor plan heralds an arrangement and reordering of domestic space that proved integral to Colonial Chesapeake society and the hegemonic planter culture that underpinned it. The socio-economic system gave rise to the mansions of Virginia and supported the politics of Revolution in the 1770s.

Historian: Virginia B. Price.

Project

Information: This report updates the HABS record for the Thoroughgood House. The drawings were completed as an early entry in the Peterson Prize competition (1986) and the historical data compiled during a 1940 survey by program leader, Thomas T. Waterman. The inventory card was completed in 1983 using information from the National Historic Landmark (NHL) nomination. The Adam Thoroughgood House was designated as a NHL in October 1960. The updated documentation was supported by the HABS program, Catherine C. Lavoie, Chief.

This report draws from research that provides new evidence of construction and dates the historic house to the eighteenth century. The discoveries made through

archaeological and dendrochronological studies in the late twentieth century pushed the dates of many Anglo-American houses back by years and, even, decades as they did for the Thoroughgood House. Still, the long history of the Thoroughgood House includes episodes of occupancy, physical changes and interpretation. This report chronicles those interludes and adds documentary detail to the interdisciplinary analysis presented in the recent archaeological assessment.

This report also responds, in part, to the call for a detailed history of Thoroughgood descendents. For HABS, the chain of title is an important sub-section of the outline guiding the information (and its organization) of the historical report. This report provides a compilation of family members oriented around the house itself. The “owners and occupants” sub-section of this report is, therefore, the beginning to the more complete genealogy of the Throughgoods and their extended kin network called for at the conclusion of the archaeological work.²

The author is grateful to many individuals who provided research assistance and generously shared their expertise, in particular Catherine Bishir, Cary Carson, Edward Chappell, Mary Christ, Willie Graham, Quatro Hubbard, Marilyn Ibach, Elizabeth S. Kostelny, Matthew Laird, Lauren Leake, Carl Lounsbury, Nicholas Lucchetti, Louis Malon, Anne Miller, Roger Reed, John H. Sprinkle, Jr., Bly Straube, Diana Sykes, Troy Valos, Dan Vivian, and Camille Wells.

² The recommendation comes from the interdisciplinary study led by archaeologist Nicholas Lucchetti. It is repeated in the updated nomination form for the property’s (already listed) entry in National Register of Historic Places. Nicholas Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment Adam Thoroughgood House*, Report, James River Institute of Archaeology, December 2004, 57; “Adam Thoroughgood House,” Nomination 2008, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Sec. 7, 7.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of erection: 1719-20.³

For much of the twentieth century the house was thought by many to have been built by Captain Adam Thoroughgood in the 1630s. The connection between the Captain's successful rise from immigrant to land holder and the well-built but small house fostered this interpretation. The 1630s-era interpretation of the house's construction date is also an early example of the integration of documentary and material evidence in architectural history; as such, the interpretation was also tested as those interested in early American architecture returned to study the house. Vernacular architecture fit uneasily into formal analyses based on English or high style precedent, and the Thoroughgood House provided history enthusiasts and scholars with one of Virginia's oldest buildings to explore and evaluate.

An alternative date of construction was soon hinted. In a 1920s-era survey, for example, Sadie Scott Kellam and Hope Kellam observed the existing house and the dwelling described at the Captain's death differed.⁴ Others also noticed, but accounting for the incongruences varied.⁵ Family historians wedded to the 1630s date countered these inquiries with detailed documentary accounts of the Captain's family and of house-building campaigns that both elucidated and muddied understandings of the present building.⁶ One persistent theory posited that the house was constructed in two phases.⁷

³ Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*.

⁴ Sadie Scott Kellam and V. Hope Kellam. *Old Houses in Princess Anne, Virginia* (Portsmouth, VA: Printcraft Press, 1931), 42-43. Their knowledge of local history placed the house on Church Point Plantation and traced it to John Thoroughgood, but the genealogical trail took a turn at that point in their research. The John Thoroughgood they referenced was the builder's uncle. Kellam and Kellam, 26-27.

⁵ Henry Chandlee Forman, "A New Story about the Old Thoroughgood House," *Norfolk Museum Bulletin* 12, no. 1 (January 1962). Forman correctly observed the builder and building date were as yet unproven. Yet his evaluation was couched in a critique of the restoration plans by Finlay Ferguson and garden restoration by Alden Hopkins. Moreover, his categorization of the building's appearance and construction as representative of a Medieval English style proved a red herring in the dialogue about the Chesapeake house. *The Chesapeake House*, edited by Cary Carson and Carl R. Lounsbury (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press in association with Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2013); Camille Wells, "The Multistoried House: Twentieth-Century Encounters with the Domestic Architecture of Colonial Virginia," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 106, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 372-73.

⁶ W. Paul Treanor, "Adam Thoroughgood The Man Historians Forgot," *The Chesopian* 38, no. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 2000), 2-3; W. Paul Treanor, "The Adam Thoroughgood House: The Truth about its Age A Brief History of Lower Norfolk County, Virginia," *The Chesopian* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 4-5; W. Paul Treanor, "Residents of the Thoroughgood House," n.d.; copy on file with the author; W. Paul Treanor to Nicholas Lucchetti, December 5, 2007, copy on file with the author.

This likely was born of an effort to reconcile the Flemish bond (front) façade with the three walls laid in English bond before hierarchies in building finish were fully understood in context. Thus, in the 1920s and again in the 1950s, owners of the house restored it to an appearance in keeping with a seventeenth-century interpretation of its construction date.

The Thoroughgood House nonetheless retains much of its original design and materials. A key example is the riven clapboard roof covering a steeply pitched gable. Architectural evidence, like the clapboards, joined ever more awkwardly with the seventeenth-century periodization of the building. Reconciling threads of evidence and identifying streams of influence placed the Thoroughgood House and its construction date at the center of Chesapeake studies and established the house as a lynchpin to understanding of early American architecture. Significantly, the Thoroughgood House represents the emergence of an eighteenth-century vernacular building tradition including a central passage plan and modest scale, large chimneys, tilted false plate, and interior plaster and paneled wall finishes.⁸

Rarely, however, does a vernacular tradition turn on a precise date. Elements of the Thoroughgood House, like the tilted false plate, surface in the Chesapeake in the 1710s while other forms, such as the chamfered joists (now covered) and patterned brickwork had longer periods of popularity. The latter places the house in a larger context of building preferences without narrowing the date of construction considerably. That would come with advances in investigative techniques, such as dendrochronology or tree-ring dating, and a fresh look at the surviving documentary record done in support of the archaeological study.

Dendrochronologists came to the Thoroughgood House on two occasions. The results of the first study by Jack Heikkenen, a pioneer in the field, remain unknown.⁹ The second examination took place in 2004. The resulting analysis of the pine samples taken from the floor joists and roof framing preclude construction before 1704. The analysis further

⁷ Research for the historic structure report by G. Alan Morledge included this topic. It also was addressed in the *Archaeological Assessment*. Cary Carson to Alan Morledge, September 24, 2004, copy on file with the author; Willie Graham and Cary Carson, "Architectural Analysis," in *Archaeological Assessment*, 20-21.

⁸ Graham and Carson, 14-22.

⁹ Marc Davis, "Historic House Not a First After All," *Ledger-Star* (Norfolk), n.d., clipping, copy on file with the author. In the newspaper article, the then director of the Historic House program for the Chrysler Museum Patrick Brennan referenced Heikkenen's dendrochronological analysis. He stated that that releasing the date would be misleading because the data came from a nailing block in the central passage that the Museum believed was not original. The Museum's position arose from the understanding of the house as a seventeenth-century building with eighteenth-century renovations (the paneling for example). These renovations, it was held, replaced timbers that would have been clear samples for the tree-ring analysis.

suggested it occurred a decade or so afterward, while the evaluation done for the oak samples extracted from the clapboards pushed the date to after 1716.¹⁰

Archaeological work by the James River Institute of Archaeology settled the long-elusive date of the Thoroughgood House. The archaeological project, which included documentary research, revealed a construction date of 1719 to 1720.¹¹ Moreover, the archaeological investigations by the James River Institute found no evidence of seventeenth-century occupation. Instead, the material evidence revealed Woodland Period artifacts and an eighteenth-century European presence.¹² Archaeological testing showed “extensive eighteenth-century remains to the south of the [house]...” The ground below the plow-zone is undisturbed and so further archaeological investigation would likely fill the south yard with colonial period outbuildings, gardens, and workspaces once again. The integrity of the site holds despite the installation of the garden on the east (water) side.¹³

The study substantiates the architectural investigations and interpretations that leaned toward an eighteenth-century date, despite long standing historiography that placed the house’s erection in the seventeenth century. Seminal studies by Cary Carson, in his thesis on seventeenth-century housing, and Dell Upton, in his dissertation, pushed the construction of Virginia landmarks like the Thoroughgood House and the church tower at Jamestown to no earlier than the third quarter of the seventeenth century. And, likely pushed them back into later decades.¹⁴ Dendrochronology tested the on-going analysis of the architectural landscape and confirmed Carson’s, Upton’s and others’ readings of buildings similar in scale and in form to the Thoroughgood House as eighteenth-century artifacts. Examples of those re-assessments include the nearby Lynnhaven House, once thought to date to ca. 1675 and dendrochronologically dated to 1725¹⁵, as well as the Keeling House and Kiskiack.¹⁶

¹⁰Daniel Miles and Michael J. Worthington, “The Tree-Ring Dating of the Adam Thoroughgood House, Virginia Beach, Virginia,” Oxford Dendrochronology Laboratory Report for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, December 2004.

¹¹ Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*.

¹² Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*; see also, “Fix Better Date for Thoroughgood,” [1983], clipping, copy on file with the author.

¹³ Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*, 57.

¹⁴ Cary Carson, “Settlement Patterns and Vernacular Architecture in Seventeenth-Century Tidewater Virginia,” M.A. thesis, University of Delaware, 1969; Dell Upton, “Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia,” Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1979.

¹⁵ Guy Friddell, “Tests Show Historic House Newer Than Believed,” [1983], clipping, copy on file with author.

¹⁶ HABS documentation for the Lynnhaven House dates to the 1930s era survey, as does that for the Keeling House. See HABS No. VA-11-16 (Lynnhaven) and HABS No. VA-11-17 (Keeling). Documentation for Kiskiack occurred much later. See HABS No. VA-183.

Collectively, the studies pointed to the 1720s as a time when building in brick became affordable as an investment of resources and desirable as a social statement.¹⁷ The ongoing architectural studies of the Thoroughgood House specifically, and the larger context created through surveys of the Chesapeake as a region, reinforced the conclusions of the archaeological assessment about the house's eighteenth-century date. The house referenced in legal documents surrounding Argall Thoroughgood's death in 1719 stands today. It is more fully understood and no less significant for the dialogue and debate over its construction date and building history.

2. Architect: Argall Thoroughgood II owned the property, and he died while the house was under construction.¹⁸

Given the practices of the day, constructing such a house would not have involved an architect; rather, the client would have employed carpenters and brickmasons to accomplish the work of their crafts.¹⁹ Argall Thoroughgood started the project, and his widow Susannah completed it.

3. Original and subsequent owners, occupants, uses: This section appears in reverse date-order, beginning with the current property owners and working back through time to the date of construction. It continues past the 1719 to 1720 building campaign to the land patent under Captain Adam Thoroughgood in the 1630s. Expanding the deed record is a summary of the generation each transaction represents. Historical information about the property owners – corporate or individual – was gathered from other primary sources such as census records. Throughout the eighteenth century the owner was also the

¹⁷ Carl R. Lounsbury, "Brickwork," in *The Chesapeake House*, edited by Cary Carson and Carl R. Lounsbury (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press in association with Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2013), 239-58; Camille Wells to Virginia B. Price, personal communication, var. dates; for a HABS reference, see Virginia B. Price, "Kiskiack," Report 1998, Historic American Buildings Survey, Library of Congress (HABS No. VA-183).

¹⁸ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 253.

¹⁹ Architectural practice as thought of today bears little resemblance to the circumstances in which settlers of the early Chesapeake found themselves. See, for example, Cary Carson, Norman F. Barka, William M. Kelso, Garry Wheeler Stone, and Dell Upton, "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," *Winterthur Portfolio* 16 (Autumn 1981): 135-96; Dell Upton, "The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture," in *Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture* (Annapolis: Maryland Historical Trust, 1982), 44-57; Willie Graham, Carter L. Hudgins, Carl R. Lounsbury, Fraser D. Neiman, and James P. Whittenburg, "Adaptation and Innovation: Archaeological and Architectural Perspectives on the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series, 64, no. 3 (July 2007): 451-522; Cary Carson, Joanne Bowen, Willie Graham, Martha McCartney, and Lorena Walsh, "New World, Real World: Improvising English Culture in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," *Journal of Southern History* 74, no. 1 (February 2008): 31-88; Willie Graham, "Preindustrial Framing in the Chesapeake," in *Constructing Image, Identity, and Place: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IX*, edited by Alison K. Hoagland and Kenneth A. Breisch (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003), 179-96; Carl R. Lounsbury, "The Design Process," in *The Chesapeake House*, edited by Cary Carson and Carl R. Lounsbury, 64-85. For summary of sources, please see the suggested bibliography in Part III, Section C of this report.

occupant. From the mid 1820s to late 1850s occupancy is unclear. Similar ambiguities exist from the late 1890s onward.

Chain of title:²⁰ Today the Thoroughgood House is owned by the City of Virginia Beach and operated as a historic house museum. The city acquired the property in 2003.²¹

2003 To the City of Virginia Beach Virginia Circuit Court
Instrument 20031105001813110.²²

Although the City of Virginia Beach operated the Thoroughgood House as a historic house museum beginning in 1999, the City of Norfolk retained ownership of the 2.29 acre parcel until September 2003. In September 2003, the City of Norfolk transferred title of the Thoroughgood House property to Virginia Beach. The transfer also included a plot containing two acres, more or less, adjoining the Thoroughgood parcel on the north side.

Prior to the City of Norfolk assuming title in November 1960, the historic property changed hands several times after Grace Keeler conveyed her interest to Thoroughgood Manor, Inc., in 1941.²³ Several foundations or incorporated entities owned the building and grounds between 1941 and 1960.

1960 To the City of Norfolk²⁴ Deed Book 676, folio 523-25

During the 1960s the Thoroughgood House received recognition for its historic character and importance in early American architectural history as well as from experts in the

²⁰ Author's note: The footnotes in the ensuing chain of title are lengthy. These provide contextual information about the individual land transactions and additional family members that are important to a broader understanding of the family genealogy and its relationship to the lands once held by Captain Adam Thoroughgood. These footnotes support the chain of title compiled specifically for the HABS report. Because of this, the supplemental historical data is presented as notes rather than as part of the main text. - vbp

²¹ "Old House, New Caretaker: Deal on Thoroughgood House," clipping, copy on file with the author. According to the newspaper article, in 1999 the City of Norfolk asked the City of Virginia Beach to take over the operations of the historic house. By 2001 the building needed repairs, notably to the chimneys, and it was recognized that the maintenance of a historic site located in another municipality had become unwieldy. Negotiations for the property settled with the City of Virginia Beach donating \$50,000 to the Chrysler Museum for five years and assuming title to the Thoroughgood House in exchange. The accounting of the transfer referenced Henry Clay Hofheimer's role in the preservation of the house in the 1950s. Hofheimer's philanthropy in the region is well known, and his support for the Chrysler Museum of Art in Norfolk likely brought the Thoroughgood House under the curator's care.

²² Also, Jorja K. Jean, [editorial] "Cities' Squabble Endangers Thoroughgood House," clipping, copy on file with the author.

²³ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 209, 33-36; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 676, 523-25.

²⁴ The Chrysler Museum of Art was originally known as the Norfolk Academy of Arts and Sciences; it was under this name that the association between the Museum and the Thoroughgood House began.

fields of archaeology and landscape architecture as the interpretation of the property expanded. As a Norfolk city property, and one of such significance, curatorial oversight of the house museum and its collections initially fell to the Chrysler Museum of Art and later it was run as a historic property alongside other city house museums such as the Moses Myers House in downtown Norfolk. Archaeological investigations of the south yard (1965) and house foundations (1967) were conducted by Floyd Painter. The gardens were designed by Alden Hopkins and recreated through the Garden Club of Virginia's restoration program in 1960.

Upon completion of the landscape installation, the Garden Club of Virginia formally presented the gardens to the city in April 1961. The director of the National Park Service, Stanley Abbott, marked the occasion with the announcement of the designation of the Thoroughgood House as a National Historic Landmark.

1955 To the Adam Thoroughgood Foundation Deed Book 418, folio 596-98

1955 To the Thorogood Corporation Deed Book 394, folio 459-62

Greenbrier Farms sold the property in February 1955 to the Thorogood Corporation while retaining interest in the nursery on the grounds for three more years.²⁵ The Corporation transferred the parcel to the Adam Thoroughgood House Foundation in August of that year.

1944 To Greenbrier Farms Deed Book 224, folio 585-87

1941 To Thorrowgood Manor, Inc. Deed Book 209, folio 33-36

In October 1941 Grace Keeler conveyed title to four parcels of land in Princess Anne County to Thorrowgood Manor, the first of which included the historic house. The description of the first parcel referenced a plat made in April 1890 when R.D. Garrison and Joshua Garrison partitioned the land they inherited from their father, George G. Garrison.²⁶ Robert Garrison's portion was noted as tracts "C" and "D" on the survey map; Keeler's conveyance of the first parcel included both of these tracts. The parcel consisted of almost 250 acres and included the oysters seeded, planted, and growing upon the land.

²⁵ The property was described as the "old Thoroughgood House" in "the Kempsville district." Two surveys were done in 1944 and are referenced in the conveyance to Greenbrier Farms in Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 224, 515 as well as Map Book 16, 41.

²⁶ W. R. Grimes surveyed the land. The plat was recorded in Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 61, 246.

The other parcels transferred to Thorowgood Manor included .194 acre of land in Bayville that Keeler acquired from E. Fillmore Truitt in December 1922,²⁷ another .144 acre of land acquired from Irving Truitt in December 1922,²⁸ and 5.95 acres surveyed by S. F. Day & Company in 1906. This last parcel was located in the cove between the Truitt property and that of Dr. L. Lankford, and it was conveyed by E. Fillmore Truitt et ux to the Keeler family in June 1906.²⁹ Keeler also transferred interest in oyster leases that she and her brother Rufus assumed in 1929 and 1930.³⁰ Thorowgood Manor entered into a deed of trust agreement to guarantee the installment payments of the \$50,000 purchase price. The Thoroughgood House property was described as "... about 255 acres lying on the western side of Lynnhaven River and on the Eastern Side of Pleasure House Road, sometimes called Ocean Park Highway, [...]."³¹

1906 To John D. Keeler, Grace M. Keeler, Rufus P. Keeler Deed Book 77, folio 382

Court records put Rufus Keeler in Norfolk at the time the Keelers bought the Thoroughgood House. It is unclear why, or for how long, he was in town.³² Rufus Keeler also appeared in the personal property tax rolls in 1909; his residence was listed as Princess Anne County, however, he owed taxes only for himself—as a male over twenty-one years of age—suggesting his occupancy was more occasional than permanent.³³

Occasional use of the property by Rufus Keeler is supported by data from the census records. The 1910 census placed the Keeler family in Albany, New York.³⁴ William Keeler was the proprietor of a hotel. He was born in Ireland, and made his home in New

²⁷ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 115, 294; Princess Anne County Court Records, Map Book 6, 309. The land is described as adjoining W.H. Keeler's estate. Joshua G. Moore surveyed the property.

²⁸ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 115, 295; Princess Anne County Court Records, Map Book 6, 259. The boundary description references Pleasure House Road, then known as Ocean Park Highway, but not the ordinary or tavern once operating there.

²⁹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 77, 385. At the time of this deed, from Truitt to the Keelers, John and Grace Keeler were living in New York and Rufus was in Norfolk.

³⁰ Princess Anne County Court Records, Oyster Lease Book 2, 224, 226, 228, 230, 232, 294.

³¹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 209, 237.

³² Additional research should be done once the main branch of the Norfolk Public Library re-opens in 2015. Tracing Rufus Keeler's, and his sister's, role in the city and likely affiliation with the Galt family and the chapters of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA, now Preservation Virginia).

³³ Princess Anne County Personal Property Tax Records, 1909, Library of Virginia.

³⁴ There was a New York branch of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA), so perhaps the Keelers knew of the house's significance through activities of the branch as their ties to early Virginia history and sites of memory are otherwise unknown. Another Rufus Keeler, married to Hattie and much older than Grace's brother, was in Kempsville in 1910. 13th Census of the United States, 1910 (NARA microfilm publication T624, 1178 rolls, T624_1643, 26B), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC (NAB)

York. His wife Kate E. Keeler was born in New York, and at the time of census survey, two of their children were counted among the household. Grace M. Keeler was thirty-two years old, and Rufus Keeler was twenty-six. Rufus worked as the manager of the hotel. Also in the household were two servants, Mary Burke and Katherine Grady. Both were Irish. Similarly, the 1915 state census located the family in Albany as well. Cemetery records also note Grace Keeler was buried in Albany; she died in 1958.³⁵

Records generated for the census in 1920 indicate Grace Keeler lived on the Thoroughgood House property before her restoration of the house; after, in 1930 and 1940, the census located her residence in present day Princess Anne Park rather than the farm near the Lynnhaven Inlet. Even so, it is unclear if she ever occupied the historic house, and it is thought she used a cottage on the property as her residence.³⁶ It is known that Keeler moved to take full ownership of the Thoroughgood House property around 1920. In July 1922 her brother John conveyed his one-third interest; in September 1930, Rufus followed suit.³⁷

Perhaps facilitating Keeler's relocation was Leroy Fairlee, a man from New York who served as the manager of the farm throughout her tenure in Princess Anne County, Virginia. In 1920, Keeler was forty-one years of age and Fairlee only slightly her junior, at thirty-four. Both were white. Rounding out the household in 1920 was Melvina White, a cook, who hailed from Canada.³⁸ Keeler's farming operation was established by 1930 with the production of staple crops. Fairlee continued as a lodger on the property, and possibly was assisted in the farm and gardens by William Skinner. Likely Alonzo Donley was Keeler's chauffeur and his wife Edith her domestic servant. The Donley family also came to Virginia from New York, although Donley was born in Ohio.³⁹

³⁵ 13th Census of the United States, 1910 (NARA microfilm publication T624, 1178 rolls, T624_921, 3A), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC (NAB); New York State Population Census Schedule, 1915, Election District 01, Albany Ward 18, Albany 18 (Ancestry.com, New York, State Census, 1915 (database online), Provo, UT: 2012, accessed April 22, 2014); Ancestry.com, Menands, New York, Albany, Albany Rural Cemetery Burial Cards, 1791-2011 (database online) Provo, UT: 2011, accessed April 22, 2014.

³⁶ Anne Miller, Curator, Department of Museums, City of Virginia Beach, to Virginia B. Price, personal communication, July 7, 2014.

³⁷ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 113, 110-11; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 159, 48.

³⁸ 14th Census of the United States, 1920 (NARA microfilm publication T625, 2076 rolls, T625_1906, 2B), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1920, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2010, accessed April 22, 2014).

³⁹ 15th Census of the United States, 1930 (NARA microfilm publication, T626, 2662 rolls, T626_2456, 24A), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1930, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2002, accessed April 22, 2014).

By 1940 Keeler is sixty-one years of age and the value of the house was listed as \$15,000. Keeler was there in 1935, as were Fairlee and Donley, suggesting a continuity of residents on the property and so, too, for how the house was used and experienced. Fairlee's rented quarters were appraised for \$20, while Donley's slightly less, at \$15. Fairlee earned \$1000 as superintendent of the private estate; Donley made \$720 as the caretaker. Bernice Petty lived with Keeler, working as a maid and earning \$312 for her labors. Petty was black and had only a sixth-grade education.⁴⁰ The next year Keeler sold the property.

Archaeologist Floyd Painter wrote that the house was occupied until 1935 and then used by the owner as a guest cottage for another decade. The owner lived nearby.⁴¹ The 1935 date he reported corresponded to that of the census records, and perhaps Painter's description of the house as a guest cottage reflected Keeler's use of the building.

1902 To Livius Lankford

Deed Book 71, folio 536

Lankford bought the property from the Columbian Building and Loan Association in July 1902.⁴² In August he transferred to E.F. Truitt the lands of the Joshua Garrison farm. The farm contained two tracts described as "A" and "B" on the 1890 land division between Joshua and his brother Robert Garrison.⁴³ Truitt paid \$2000 and assumed the note for another \$9000 owed to the bank for the property. Lankford retained the joint use and benefit of all four parcels and reserved a right of way that ran parallel to the house in tract "C."⁴⁴ He retained the property until June 1906 when he sold it to the Keeler family.⁴⁵

Livius Lankford and his wife Lucy Jones married in June 1897, and they set up housekeeping in Norfolk where Lankford was already well known.⁴⁶ City directories

⁴⁰ 16th Census of the United States, 1940 (NARA microfilm publication, T627, 4643 rolls, T627_4286, 5A), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1940, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2012, accessed April 22, 2014).

⁴¹ Floyd Painter, "Artifacts from the Thoroughgood Site," 130, copy on file with author.

⁴² Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 71, 536-41.

⁴³ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 65, 292; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 67, 142. Columbian Building and Loan and the Virginia Trust Company were affiliated; the Virginia Trust Company valued the property at \$20,000, which is the sale price to Lankford in 1902. In 1897, Columbian Building and Loan Association assumed the deed in 1897 for \$12,000. At this time the farm belonging to Joshua Garrison consisted of about 250 acres.

⁴⁴ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 61, 246; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 74, 336; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 77, 385.

⁴⁵ Accompanying the deed to the Keeler family in 1906 was a survey dated June of that year and recorded in Princess Anne County Court Records, Map Book 3, 83 as well as referenced in Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 77, 385.

⁴⁶ News of their wedding filled the newspapers; Lankford was originally from Southampton County, Virginia, while the Jones family was from Suffolk, Virginia. Lucy's father was Henry Jones and she had a sister, Lily.

place Lankford in Norfolk, with an office on Granby Street, and indicate he was a doctor. The 1900 census accounted for Lankford in Ward Two of the city, and note that his father Menacles was from North Carolina originally. The household was mixed, with Lankford family members ranging in age from seven to seventy-four and two (likely) un-related persons, John Babb (age twenty-one) and Daisy Darden (age twenty-two).⁴⁷ Lankford died in 1817. He was buried in Cedar Hill Cemetery in Suffolk, Virginia, and his epitaph praised his service to God and humanity.⁴⁸

Contemporary newspapers substantiate Lankford's epitaph. His contributions to the Medical Society and his tireless work as a physician were reported with equal enthusiasm to his devotion. Lankford's support of the YMCA and his wife's engagement in the Ladies Missionary association are illustrative of his religiosity. All accounts recorded his home as in Norfolk. The newspapers noted his father's arrival from North Carolina as well as his mother's illness; his wedding to Lucy Jones of Suffolk and their European wedding trip received attention. For all of Lankford's appearances in the social columns, his purchase and subsequent sale of the Thoroughgoods' historic Church Point plantation surprisingly escaped remark.⁴⁹ Only once, in 1902, did the society column note Lankford's "cottage at Cape Henry." Lucy's father, Henry Jones, and her sister Lily visited her there. The Lankfords' residence was still in Norfolk, suggesting the cottage at Cape Henry was a seasonal or occasional retreat.⁵⁰

Lankford paid personal property taxes in 1899 to Princess Anne County; however, neither he nor the Garrison brothers appeared in the tax records between 1900 and 1909. Lankford's tax assessment in 1899 corresponds to the use of the property implied by the

⁴⁷ 12th Census of the United States, 1900 (NARA microfilm publication T623, 1854 rolls, T623_1735, 2A), Records of the Bureau of the Census RG 29, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC (NAB) (Ancestry.com, 1900, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2004, accessed April 23, 2014). City Directories, 1903-1910 (Ancestry.com, accessed April 23, 2014). A WPA account stated that the property descended – devolved – from Adam Thoroughgood until 1906 when the Keelers purchased the estate. This infers Lankford was a descendent. See Morledge, Sec. 3, 1.

⁴⁸ 13th Census of the United States, 1910 (NARA microfilm publication T624, 1178 rolls, T624_1639, 43B), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1910, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2006, accessed April 23, 2014); *U.S., Find a Grave Index* (Ancestry.com, accessed December 3, 2014); *Directory of Deceased American Physicians* (Ancestry.com, accessed December 3, 2014).

⁴⁹ *Norfolk Virginian* January 2, 1897; *Norfolk Virginian* June 2, 1897; *Norfolk Virginian* June 6, 1897; *Norfolk Virginian* June 10, 1897; *Norfolk Virginian* June 13, 1897; *Norfolk Virginian* September 7, 1897; *Norfolk Virginian* October 3, 1897; *Virginian Pilot* April 9, 1899; *Virginian Pilot* April 23, 1899; *Virginian Pilot* May 12, 1899; *Virginian Pilot* September 1, 1899; *Virginian Pilot* October 25, 1899; *Virginian Pilot* May 18, 1900; *The Times* November 8, 1901; *Alexandria Gazette* November 8, 1901; *Richmond Dispatch* August 19, 1902; *Times Dispatch* May 5, 1906; *Times Dispatch* May 6, 1906.

⁵⁰ *Richmond Times Dispatch* August 31, 1902.

deed of transfer to Truitt. He owed \$115 in taxes for two horses, twenty cattle, a wheeled vehicle, farm implements, and a gun.⁵¹

It remains unclear if the Lankford family actually lived in the house, although most likely they did take up residence in the area on occasion as the newspaper observed in 1902. The Cape Henry sojourn, if in the Thoroughgood House, would make them among the last owner-occupants.⁵² Thomas Waterman and John Barrows suggest in *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia* that African American tenants were living on the property before Keeler's restoration, and they comment on the house's condition. Likely the "precarious condition" they noted comes from a nineteenth-century photograph that looks to the south gable end.⁵³ It is probable that a tenant family, possibly an African American one, occupied the building in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, before the Garrison family took up residency.⁵⁴ It is possible another tenant group worked the property and lived in the house after the bank took possession from the Garrisons and into the Lankford and early Keeler ownership periods.⁵⁵ By 1909,

⁵¹ Princess Anne County Personal Property Tax Records, 1899-1909, Library of Virginia.

⁵² The language of the deed to Truitt in 1902 anticipates use of the land and expectation of its profits. It is possible the language relating to use and benefits was standard, or invoked in this instance for continued tenant farming. Robert Garrison, for example, leased land to cultivate from the Jones Company in this era. By this time, Virginia Beach was known as a resort area and wood cottages proliferated. It is possible they had the farm and rented a cottage on the coast for pleasure.

⁵³ This photograph is reproduced in the Waterman and Barrows book and attributed to Cook, meaning the photograph collection of George and Huestis Cook that is archived with the Valentine Museum in Richmond, Virginia. However, the photograph was reproduced in another publication, and the print – from the same negative – shows an addition to the west side, that the door cut into the upper floor and porch connected to the main house. The addition was adjacent to the house, not integral, and suggests perhaps an outbuilding was either moved or constructed there. G. Alan Morledge, *Historic Structure Report for Adam Thoroughgood House*, draft February 2006, Sec. 3, 2-3, copy on file with author; Waterman and Barrows, 3, 5. Another view from this era is printed in the *Norfolk Ledger* in April [1917].

⁵⁴ A map of Lynnhaven Bay made in 1861 identifies the location of the Thoroughgood House. The house, as in earlier maps, was identified by its owner/occupant, which at that time was "Garrison." The author thanks Troy Valos, Sargeant Memorial Collection, Norfolk Public Library, for bringing the map to her attention.

⁵⁵ Thomas T. Waterman and John A. Barrows, *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932). It is difficult to ascertain who these tenants were as the tax rolls were segregated, and names were listed alphabetically on the "white" or "colored" rolls. Reconstruction of neighboring lands, if the tenants were taxed, could be done through the distance from the courthouse; Church Point plantation, as the Thoroughgood House property was known, measured eighteen miles west. It was also in the Kempsville district. Princess Anne County contained three districts at this time: Kempsville, Pungo, and Seaboard.

Tenant farming emerged early in Virginia with large land holders like Captain Adam Thoroughgood leasing land in the seventeenth century. The leaseholders cleared the property and their improvement ensured men like Thoroughgood held onto their patents. Willard F. Bliss, "The Rise of Tenancy in Virginia," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 58 (1950): 427-41; Lorena S. Walsh, "Land, Landlord, and Leaseholder: Estate Management and Tenant Fortunes in Southern Maryland, 1642-1820," *Agricultural History* 59 (1985): 373-96.

however, the house was in good repair. Its tidy condition in 1909, and again ca. 1920, is incongruent with Waterman's and Barrows's fleeting description.

To James S. Garrison (1858-97)

Deed Book 48, folio 249

Financial reversals, and repercussions from the 1893 economic crash, caused foreclosure on the Thoroughgood House property. The Virginia Trust Company held a mortgage from the Garrison family in 1895, and not long after, in 1897 and 1898, the Columbian Building and Loan Association of Richmond took possession of Garrison land.⁵⁶

The brothers mortgaged their parcels separately with the Virginia Trust Company. In May 1895, Robert Garrison mortgaged his portion of Church Point plantation, known as tracts C and D from the 1890 partition, for \$16,000.⁵⁷ Robert followed Joshua; in January Joshua Garrison mortgaged his farm, which consisted of two tracts of 209 acres and 41 acres more or less, with the Trust. His mortgage was for \$20,000.⁵⁸ The Columbian Building and Loan Association assumed the mortgages in May 1897 to keep the Garrisons from default. Joshua and Virginia Garrison agreed to have the land advertised for sale in *Turf, Field and Farm* in New York, in a Norfolk newspaper and a Richmond newspaper. The tracts were valued at \$3000 each.⁵⁹ Robert remained on the land tax rolls in 1898, with his portion known as Church Point plantation and containing 207 acres, and the adjacent 41 acres of woodlands known as tract "D", conveying to the Columbian Building and Loan Association in October of that year.⁶⁰ Joshua Garrison's last entry on the personal property tax rolls for Princess Anne County was in 1896; the clerk stamped "insolvent" by his tax assessment. Many, that year, shared his predicament. Robert Garrison remained on the rolls through the 1898 tax year; his farming operation was smaller than his brother's.

⁵⁶ Princess Anne County Personal Property Tax Records, 1896-1898, Library of Virginia. In several of the April 1897 issues of *Turf Field and Farm*, an advertisement ran for the upcoming auction of the "finest" Lynnhaven oyster bottoms attached to the "best" farm in southeastern Virginia. The farm had beautiful scenery and green grass all year. Besides, only a line fence separated the grounds from the home of four-milers Wagner and Zingane. The Virginia Trust Company posted the notice; the auction was held on April 30th. This was the notice of the pending sale of Joshua Garrison's tracts of the old Church Point plantation. In the 1890s the personal property tax assessments for Joshua Garrison accounted for nine to sixteen horses (etc.) and a number of wheeled vehicles, possibly suggesting his engagement in the horse and racing community. Without a buyer at the auction, the Columbian Building and Loan Association assumed the mortgage on May 1st. *Turf, Field and Farm* 64, no. 17 (April 1897); Princess Anne County Personal Property Tax Records, 1890-1896, Library of Virginia. A longer advertisement posted by the auctioneers appeared in the *Norfolk Landmark*; see, for example, *Norfolk Landmark*, April 8, 1897, 4.

⁵⁷ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 65, 471-73.

⁵⁸ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 65, 292-95.

⁵⁹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 67, 142-45.

⁶⁰ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 68, 210.

For much of the nineteenth century, census records hold clues to the Garrison household.⁶¹ In 1840, James S. Garrison lived in the eastern district of Princess Anne County and his household included thirty-five people, twenty-two of whom were enslaved, six were free blacks, and seven were free whites. He married Eliza Glenn in Norfolk in November 1820 and together they established roots in the county.⁶² Land-tax records from the 1850s and 1860s assess Garrison for land in Bayside and in Little Creek and attest to the family's presence in the area.⁶³ The agricultural census of 1860 provides a snapshot of the Garrison farm in the Kempsville district of Princess Anne County. Garrison had 450 acres of improved land, and 300 unimproved acres, and his farm was appraised at \$25,000. The valuation included farming implements, livestock and crops. Garrison owned two horses, twelve mules, three milch cows, ten cattle, and seventy-five swine; he cultivated wheat, Indian corn, and oats.⁶⁴

⁶¹ The WPA account that maintained the house remained in the family until 1906 would also suggest the Garrison family descended from Thoroughgood. Genealogical research of the family, not tied to chain of title, could respond to this inference. Perhaps it was through James S. Garrison's wife Virginia Burroughs that the familial connection was maintained. Court records show that the Burroughs family interacted with the Thoroughgoods, witnessing documents, appraising estates, marrying into the same families. Reconstruction of these networks was done for two Virginia counties – Middlesex County and then Accomack and Northampton, on the Eastern Shore, treated as one – and provide an example for such a study here. Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, *A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1984) and James R. Perry, *Formation of a Society on Virginia's Eastern Shore 1615-1655* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1990). Also, Lorena Walsh's "Community Networks in the Early Chesapeake," in *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, edited by Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, 200-41 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), provides a Maryland-based example.

⁶² 6th Census of the United States, 1840, (NARA microfilm publication M704, 580 rolls, M704_574, 195), Records of the Bureau of the Census RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1840, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2010, accessed April 23, 2014); Ancestry.com, *Virginia, Select Marriages, 1785-1940* (database online), Provo, UT: 2014. Garrison's son, and namesake James S. Garrison, Jr., married Virginia C. Burroughs. Garrison, Jr., had financial difficulties and ultimately, in February 1860, George G. Garrison served as a co-trustee holding his property. Likely George was Garrison, Jr.'s half-brother, unless he was dead by the time Eliza Garrison wrote her will in 1868. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 46, 1856-1858, 72, 171, 295-96, 305, 377; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 47, 1859-1865, 216-17; *Marriages of Princess Anne County*, compiled and published by Elizabeth B. Wingo (1968), 71, abstracted from Princess Anne County Marriage Book, 1842-1850, 34-34a. James S. Garrison and Virginia C. Burroughs married on February 15, 1844, and her father, William C. Burroughs, gave consent for the bride. Land tax records for Princess Anne County note Virginia Garrison as a landholder with property in Bayside and on the Lynnhaven River in the 1850s through to 1872. James and Eliza Garrison had another son, Albert, in 1833; Albert died in 1867 in Bayside. Virginia, *Death and Burials Index 1853-1917* (Ancestry.com, accessed December 3, 2014).

⁶³ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1851-1867, Library of Virginia. Garrison's estate remains on the tax rolls throughout the 1860s and 1870s. His is separate from the parcels acquired by George Garrison from Richard Baker, the Special Commissioner appointed to auction the Thoroughgood estate.

⁶⁴ 8th Census of the United States, 1860, (NARA microfilm publication T1132_7, 16), Records of the Bureau of the Census RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, Selected U.S. Federal Census Non-Population Schedules, 1850-1880, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2010, accessed December 3, 2014).

Garrison died in December 1865. His wife Eliza was his heir and she died not long after, leaving their son George and daughter Emile Mullins as her beneficiaries. Eliza identified herself as living in Bayshore.⁶⁵

The children of George G. Garrison and Annie J. Dabrymple [or Dalrymple] inherited the Thoroughgood House. George G. Garrison was born in 1834, and he married Annie Dabrymple in November 1856. Their sons Joshua (born 1860) and Robert (born 1868) grew up at the Thoroughgood House.

In 1860, however, George and Annie lived in a hotel in Norfolk and George worked in town as a merchant.⁶⁶ By 1870 they were living in the Kempsville area of Princess Anne County, and Joshua (age ten) was away at school. Two Irish boarders rounded out their household, with Peter Fagan, age forty-five, working primarily as a laborer and Mary McGee, age twenty-one, working as a domestic servant on the property. The value of the real estate was entered into the record as \$15,000 and that of personal property recorded as \$2500.⁶⁷ Ten years later, Annie Garrison was a widow. She was forty-six years old. Joshua returned from school, Robert was away at school, and their younger sister Grace was nine years of age.⁶⁸

By that time, in 1880, the value of the Garrison farm settled at \$15,000. Two hundred acres were improved and another 400 acres or so were left as woodlands. Annie Garrison spent \$75 the previous year repairing the buildings on the property and paid \$400 in wages for 25 weeks of labor. The productiveness of the farm was assessed at \$1000. Garrison had four horses and seven mules, as well as five milch cows, nineteen swine, and thirty chickens. She cultivated Indian corn, oats, two kinds of potatoes, and apples. Her market yard yielded \$200 in income.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Princess Anne County Superior Court Record Book, Wills, etc., No. 1, 1831-1894, 147; Princess Anne County Court Records, Will Book 4, 1824-1871, 450, also in Anne E. Maling's abstracts of county records, 229, 234. Eliza Garrison's will was recorded in Princess Anne County Will Book 4, 1824-1871, 475. James and Eliza had a son, Albert, in 1833; he died in 1867, just as George assumed ownership of the Thoroughgood House property. *Virginia, Death and Burials Index, 1853-1917*, NAB (Ancestry.com, accessed December 3, 2014).

⁶⁶ 8th Census of the United States, 1860 (NARA microfilm publication M653, 1438 rolls, M653_1366, 449), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1860, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2009, accessed April 23, 2014).

⁶⁷ 9th Census of the United States, 1870 (NARA microfilm publication M593, 1761 rolls, M593_1673, 255A), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1870, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2009, accessed April 23, 2014).

⁶⁸ 10th Census of the United States, 1880 (NARA microfilm publication T9, 1454 rolls, T9_1386, 125A), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1880, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2010, accessed April 23, 2014).

⁶⁹ 10th Census of the United States, 1880 (NARA microfilm publication T1132_28, 214), Records of the Bureau of the Census RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, Selected U.S. Federal Census Non-Population Schedules, 1850-1880, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2010, accessed December 3, 2014).

In another twenty years, in 1910, Robert lived in Portsmouth, with his wife Lily Augustine Dodd Kearns and her brother Henry. Robert married in July 1905.⁷⁰ Joshua married Virginia H. McBlair in 1887, and by 1900 they were living in Norfolk with their five children: Virginia, George G., Joshua, William, and Dalrymple [sic]. They remained in Norfolk through the 1910 census.⁷¹

In 1920 and 1940 Robert and Lily Garrison return to the census rolls of Princess Anne County. In 1920 they rented a house near Lynnhaven and Robert worked as the manager of an oyster bed. He earned wages rather than a salary. By 1935 they bought a house in Princess Anne Park, near the intersection of Princess Anne Road and Dam Neck and near to where Keeler lived. Their house was valued at \$5000, Keeler's at \$15,000. Keeler also had "other income sources."

Deed records offer further insight into the Garrison family tenure.

In 1858 county officials appointed Richard Baker as the Special Commissioner in the case *Batte Trustees vs. McPheeters*, and Baker oversaw the auction of the property held in trust for the late Susannah Thoroughgood.⁷² James Garrison bought the property known as Church Point plantation, a tract that included the Thoroughgood House. The *Daily Dispatch* reported the sale on November 4, 1858, noting:

Land Sales – In Princess Anne County, Va., on Monday last, were sold, "Church Point" farm on Lynnhaven river, 414 acres to J.S. Garrison for \$8600. Eighty-seven acres of wood land for \$1700; 93 do. for \$1340; 200 acres for \$1820.⁷³

⁷⁰ 13th Census of the United States, 1910 (NARA microfilm publication T624, 1178 rolls), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1910, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2006, accessed April 23, 2014); Ancestry.com, *Virginia, Select Marriages, 1785-1940* (database online), Provo, UT: 2014. (Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, Library of Virginia, Ancestry.com, accessed December 16, 2014).

⁷¹ 13th Census of the United States, 1910 (NARA microfilm publication T624, 1178 rolls, T624_1638, 14A), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1910, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2006, accessed April 23, 2014); 12th Census of the United States, 1900 (NARA microfilm publication T628, 1854 rolls, T628_1735, 2B), Records of the Bureau of the Census, RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1900, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2004, accessed April 23, 2014); Ancestry.com, *Virginia, Select Marriages, 1785-1940* (database online), Provo, UT: 2014.

⁷² Of the plantations identified in the pre-nuptial agreement, Church Point and Linkhorn were accounted for in sales. The Indian Hill parcel was bought at auction by Jacomine Joyce. Puggett's Neck was bought by Richard Baker. Both transactions occurred in 1859. Joyce had a mortgage with Norfolk Savings Institute. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 47, 1859-65, 251, 258-59.

⁷³ "Land Sales," *Daily Dispatch* 14, no. 108, November 4, 1858, Library of Virginia.

Church Point plantation took its name from the nearby Old Donation Church, so called for Thoroughgood's donation of land to the parish. Garrison paid \$386.08 in cash for the 414 acres of Church Point plantation and owed another \$4000. In April 1866 the court recognized the bond as paid and confirmed the Garrison's title to the land. James Garrison was dead, and so his widow Eliza and son George received it in fee simple.⁷⁴

Land tax records distinguish between James S. Garrison's estate and the property acquired by his son George G. Garrison. The estate continued to be taxed through 1886. The almost 2400 acres in Cape Henry Desert proved the most difficult for heirs to divest.⁷⁵

George Garrison's ownership of the Thoroughgood plantation known as Church Point was recorded in 1867. Garrison added to his holdings in 1877 with another 83 acres. After his death in 1879, the 421 acres in Church Point that were credited to his estate remained on the tax rolls through 1889. His son Joshua entered the real estate market in 1883 with his first purchase of land in the county.⁷⁶

Garrison's acquisition of the two parcels, one known as Church Point plantation consisting of 232 acres more or less and another in Bayside consisting of 205 acres more or less, occurred between the tax assessments in 1866 and 1867.⁷⁷ The assessor made no notation of a monetary value added to the land because of the buildings, although the land value per acre including buildings was much higher for the 232-acre parcel.

In 1869, the property or land tax records indicate Garrison bought another 334 acres. In the interim, he also had sold 100 acres of the 205-parcel and, significantly for the Thoroughgood House story, some adjustment for the buildings and improvements on the land of the 232-acre parcel were made by the tax assessors. Garrison's Church Point plantation then had buildings appraised at \$2320. These values held in 1870. Yet in 1871 the assessment for the buildings on the land increased to \$4000. In 1873 there was a note referencing an ordinary and a change in value to \$400. That number was likely a

⁷⁴ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 40, 381-83; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 48, 249-50. Land tax records also document the transaction, with the parcels identified with the estate of John Thoroughgood being sold by Richard Baker to George G. Garrison. In 1867 the estate disappeared from the tax roll, and Garrison's name assumed its place. Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1866-1867, Library of Virginia. A map drawn in 1861 recorded property owners in the county; Garrison was identified among them. G.F. Lathrop, *Map of Norfolk and Vicinity* (Norfolk, VA: 1861), Sargeant Memorial Collection, Norfolk Public Library.

⁷⁵ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1885-1886, Library of Virginia.

⁷⁶ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1883-1890, Library of Virginia.

⁷⁷ The 232-acre parcel belonged to John Thoroughgood's estate and contained the house; the 205-acre parcel belonged to Mary A.S. Thoroughgood, and with the Church Point parcel represents the last part of the property held in the trust administered by Peter Poythress Batte. Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1866-1867, Library of Virginia.

typographic error. The \$4000 valuation returned in subsequent years without a significant shift in taxes owed.⁷⁸

After George Garrison's death in 1879, the property passed to his widow Ann and their children, Joshua, Robert and Grace. In the 1880s, valuations of George Garrison's estate fluctuate and so then the taxes owed, however, the \$4000 appraisal remains constant.⁷⁹

In 1889-90 Ann Garrison deeded her interest in the plantation to her sons, who shortly thereafter drafted a deed of partition and had the land surveyed.⁸⁰ Grace Garrison then ceded her interest in the estate to her brother Joshua.⁸¹ Land tax records showed Joshua Garrison received 421 acres in Church Point, some eighteen miles distant from the courthouse, from his mother in 1890. This parcel included \$4000 worth of buildings on the land. The following year, assessments credited Joshua with 249 acres in Church Point and Robert with 251 acres. The parcels transferred from George G. Garrison's estate. Robert's portion included the \$4000 valuation for buildings on the land.⁸² This held throughout 1895, the year both brothers mortgaged their property with the Virginia Trust Company, and remained constant through 1898, the year the Columbian Building and Loan Association assumed the mortgages. In 1899, both parcels held by Columbian contained buildings worth \$1000.⁸³

The mortgages provide circumstantial evidence for the construction of the wing and the re-roofing of the original house in clay pantiles. The weight of the tiles required the installation of ancillary rafters; joining the addition to the original house required cutting off rafter tails and ceiling joists from the southeast corner inward to the sixth joist. This also altered the false plate and another system for carrying the load of the rafters was needed. Likely the mortgage financed the construction of the wing, which itself likely was a renovation of the earlier addition to the living space made by the Garrisons through the relocation of a dependency close to the house.⁸⁴ Given the economic recession that persisted through the 1890s, and the steady tax appraisal of buildings on Church Point, it

⁷⁸ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1870-1879, Library of Virginia. The \$400 figure remains on the books from 1873 to 1876. In 1890 Garrison's parcel was northeast of the courthouse, in 1891, west. This suggests an error in recording the cartography or a move of the courthouse building.

⁷⁹ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1800-1889, Library of Virginia.

⁸⁰ Most likely the Thoroughgood House is the rectangular mark on the plat, in tract "C", as the other marks are asymmetrical in appearance and the rectangular mark corresponds with the house's location to the cove and its placement in the 1822 partition.

⁸¹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 48, 249; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 61, 1, 241-47; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 62, 300-01, 302-05; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 65, 292-95; Princess Anne County Court Records, Will Book 5, 53.

⁸² Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1890-1891, Library of Virginia.

⁸³ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1890-1899, Library of Virginia.

⁸⁴ Morledge, iii, Sec. 1, 2, Sec. 3, 2-4.

is probable that the Garrison brothers improved upon what was available and reused structure and materials.

To John Thoroughgood (-1824)

Argall (II) and Susannah Thoroughgood's son John (ca. 1713-1763) had nine children, eight of whom survived him.⁸⁵ At the time of his death he was married to Margaret, the daughter of Mitchell Scarborough; a guardian was appointed for his six minor children: William, Argall, Pembroke, Sally Scarborough, Mitchell, and Thomas Scarborough.⁸⁶ In 1768, his widow Margaret remarried and a year later was dead. John Thoroughgood's children then sued her then husband Thomas Hunter for the nine slaves bequeathed by their father to Margaret for her natural life and then to them in perpetuity. Argall is not named as a party to the lawsuit which suggests he too had died.⁸⁷

John Thoroughgood's neighbors, William Keeling and Jonathan Saunders, witnessed his will in 1763. Thoroughgood left 400 acres to his eldest son John (II).⁸⁸ This child occupied the Thoroughgood House in 1781. The initial homestead at Bayside that was constructed in 1636 burned in 1650, however, the site was recorded on the 1781 map of the area.⁸⁹

To his younger son William he bequeathed the parcel known as the "old House plantation" and containing 240 acres more or less.⁹⁰ William was living in the old house on Little Creek in 1781.⁹¹

⁸⁵ Previous reports suggest John (I) married Mary or Margaret Keeling, and that Margaret Scarborough was his second or third wife. Margaret's father Mitchell wrote his will in September 1762; in a codicil he noted his daughter Dorothy died. The estate was appraised in 1764 and the will entered into court record in 1768. Princess Anne County Court Records, Wills &c., 1761-1767, 215, 452.

⁸⁶ Princess Anne County Court Records, Accounts 1, 1736-1773, var., and Guardian Accounts 3, 1777: 10. In 1777, the records refer only to Pembroke and Sally.

⁸⁷ Princess Anne County Court Records, Chancery Causes, 1769, 12.

⁸⁸ John (II) married Patience Wainhouse by December 1766 when they sold a tract of land to James Mason; see Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 9, 649. Patience bore him a son, John Wainhouse. John (II) died in 1800; John Wainhouse in 1804.

⁸⁹ [Princess Anne County], Map 5-E-7, Henry Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

⁹⁰ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 9, 225.

⁹¹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 6, 205; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 9, 225. After his death in 1700, Argall Thoroughgood's third wife, Ann(e) Church Thoroughgood, continued to live in the house she had shared with him. At her death in 1743, the unencumbered property descended to Argall's grandson, John. John, in turn, bequeathed it to his younger son William. What is known of William is recounted in the text.

William married Jacomine Harper in 1767, and they sought assistance from the court to settle her inheritance from her father John Harper with her brother James.⁹² William Thoroughgood and Jacomine Harper soon had a son, John Harper Thoroughgood, who became of age in 1794.

William held the “old house” plantation tract from his father John (I), referred to as his “manor plantation” in the 1780s, and he used the 225-acre tract as security for a land transaction with his brother John (II). John (II) loaned William money and, as repayment in 1786, William transferred a parcel known as Denbys that belonged to his wife Jacomine and so, after her death, to their son on his maturity. John Harper Thoroughgood transferred title to his uncle John (II) in 1794 and leased his father the manor house parcel for five shillings. If John Harper Thoroughgood wanted to cultivate or improve the parcel, he reserved the right to do so on the eastern side, with a line marked from a white Mulberry to a gap in Mr. Moore’s line. These negotiations account for the title and occupation of the old house, the one Argall (I) left to Argall (II) in 1700.⁹³

Other children named in John (I) Thoroughgood’s will and named in guardian accounts include Peggy, who had married Thomas Hunter, Jr.,⁹⁴ as well as the younger children Argall,⁹⁵ Pembroke,⁹⁶ Sally,⁹⁷ Mitchell,⁹⁸ and Thomas.⁹⁹

⁹²Elizabeth Thoroughgood, the daughter of William, married into the Nimmo family in 1777; it is unclear if William, son of John, was her father or if the marriage license indicates another line of the Thoroughgood family. Similarly, marriage records suggest William’s re-marriage (to Mary in 1787) and a cousin of the same name.

⁹³Regarding William Thoroughgood’s estate, Princess Anne County Court Records, Will Book 2 and Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 3, 93. John Harper Thoroughgood directed the land be sold on his father’s death to benefit his four sisters, Molly, Elizabeth, Amy Moseley and Frances. Sully Moseley and John Mackie served as administrators of John Harper Thoroughgood’s will. Elizabeth Mackie bought the land for £1800. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 25, 182-84. John and Mary Mackie conveyed the eastern portion of William Thoroughgood’s land (that reserved for John Harper Thoroughgood’s cultivation) to John Wainhouse Thoroughgood. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 25, 204. Tracing the title of William Thoroughgood’s plantation helps to recreate the immediate physical geography of the Thoroughgood House. It also illustrates the social geographies of the kinship network in the county and the significance of land ownership, especially as William encountered financial difficulties and as his children sought to keep the property in the family. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 23, 214-18.

⁹⁴Peggy Thoroughgood was married in 1762; John’s widow Margaret married Peggy’s father-in-law, Thomas, in 1768. Thomas and Peggy Thoroughgood transferred 330 acres to her brother John in 1771. The parcel was Thomas’s inheritance from his father; the father Thomas bought the parcel from Henry Moore. It was described as being on Linkhorn Bay. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 12, 204.

⁹⁵Argall likely died after August 1765 when his guardian accounts were entered into the record, but before the lawsuit regarding the inheritance of nine slaves.

⁹⁶Marriage Bond records indicate that Pembroke married Neil Jameson in 1779.

⁹⁷Marriage Bond records indicate that Sally married Thomas Kempe in 1779.

⁹⁸Mitchell witnessed his brothers’ wills (John (II) in 1800 and William in 1799).

⁹⁹Princess Anne County Court Records, Guardian Accounts, No. 1, 1736-1773 (microfilm 1158); Princess Anne County Court Records, Guardian Accounts, No. 3, 1777-1787. Thomas Scarborough’s estate is appraised in

John (II) Thoroughgood occupied the Thoroughgood House until his death in 1800. At the time he wrote his will, John Thoroughgood had three children: John Wainhouse, Adam, and Susannah.¹⁰⁰ Susannah married James Thoroughgood and they had a son, John (III), by 1800.¹⁰¹ She was also pregnant. John Thoroughgood's will also named another grandchild, James,¹⁰² a grand-daughter Susannah Wainhouse, and a god-daughter, Mary Thoroughgood, a nephew James Kempe, and his brother, Mitchell.¹⁰³ All three grandchildren were the children of James and Susannah Thoroughgood.

John Wainhouse was the child of John's first wife, Patience Wainhouse; Adam and Susannah were the children of his second marriage, to Frances.

John Wainhouse married Martha White in 1792, and after her death, wed Frances, daughter of William Thoroughgood (possibly John Wainhouse's uncle who lived on the "old house" tract), in 1798.¹⁰⁴ Frances in turn remarried in January 1806 and with her husband Henry Wells arranged an informal partitioning of the property with James's widow Susannah and a lease of another portion to Isaac Singleton in 1807-08.¹⁰⁵

1788 and audited in 1789. Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 1, 146; Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 2, 301.

¹⁰⁰ Princess Anne County Court Records, Will Book 2, 1795-1807, 209.

¹⁰¹ This child married Elizabeth Mackie in October 1816.

¹⁰² James Thoroughgood married Rebecca Ellegood in October 1814; Rebecca married again in 1820. Her second husband was James Nimmo. James Nimmo and Rebecca his wife were parties to a Chancery case along with Susannah (Susan), the daughter of John Thoroughgood (III) in 1833. Peter Singleton sued them over land in Indian Fields; this likely represented residual settlement of John Wainhouse's estate and the 1822 partition between his heirs (his sister Susannah's children). Title was cleared and the land sold by Susannah Thoroughgood's (Susan Thoroughgood) trustee, Peter Poythress Batte, in 1842. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 41, 1843-44, 4-7. Singleton is later associated with the Thoroughgood House, such as in historical summary written by Grace Keeler after she restored the building.

¹⁰³ Mitchell Thoroughgood married Margaret Wishart in November 1802, allying the families of the present day Lynnhaven House and Thoroughgood House.

¹⁰⁴ Marriage records for the county suggest John Wainhouse Thoroughgood married for the first time in 1792, to Martha. His marriage in 1798 to Frances was his second.

¹⁰⁵ Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 7 1818-21, 434; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 28, 251-52; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 29, 92. Frances had use of the property until her death; her estate was appraised in November 1820. Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 7 1818-21, 434. Likely her death is what precipitated the land division in 1822. For the lease between Henry Wells and Frances his wife and Isaac Singleton, Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 28, 251-52; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 29, 92. Wells already lived in the house on the land; the land was adjacent to James Thoroughgood's property then occupied by William M. Christian and Susannah his wife (widow of James). It was also part of the land owned and occupied by John Thoroughgood at the time of his death. The lease to Singleton was valid as long as Frances was alive. Also in 1807, in an effort to clarify the rights and interests in the lands and tenements of John Thoroughgood Senior and John Junior, both deceased, an agreement was made that would last for Frances's natural life. Essentially the fee simple settlement was postponed. In the interim, William Christian and Susannah Thoroughgood Christian leased from Wells the property on the west side of the Lynnhaven River. The

The lease agreements were essential because, at the time of John Wainhouse's will in October 1804, the property from his father John (II) remained undivided. No settlement had been made between John Wainhouse and his sister Susannah. In his will, John Wainhouse recognized his nephews, John and James, and a niece Sukey Wns Singleton.¹⁰⁶

John Wainhouse's brother Adam received a tract of land from their father John (II) in September 1800. The deed of gift was witnessed by Henry Mackie, James Kempe, and Isaac Singleton, and recorded in 1801. Similarly, in 1801, the three friends witnessed John Thoroughgood's gift to his grandchildren, Susannah Wainhouse, James and John, the children of James and Susannah; John bought four slaves from his son-in-law James in 1799 and in 1801 transferred the slaves to his grandchildren. The names of the slaves were Amey, Jeffery, Kate and Ned.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, Adam Thoroughgood died before his father and so the slaves he would have inherited were divided among his siblings in 1803.¹⁰⁸

After James Thoroughgood's death, Susannah married again in December 1805. Susannah Thoroughgood had a child with her new husband, William Christian; they named their daughter Elizabeth.¹⁰⁹ In February 1804, James and Susannah's daughter Susannah married Isaac Singleton, with whom she has a son Peter, and after Isaac's death she married Robert Smith. Records of the Chancery Court described Elizabeth Christian and Peter Singleton as infant orphans in the case brought by John (III) Thoroughgood to divide the land held in John Wainhouse Thoroughgood's estate in 1822.¹¹⁰

Of the three children of John (II) Thoroughgood only Susannah had issue; of Susannah's three children with James, their son John (III) inherited the property with the house.¹¹¹ In

Wells's portion fell between the parcel wherein William Christian lived (James's land) and the tract "which did belong to" William Thoroughgood (the old House plantation). It was known as Linkhorn.

¹⁰⁶ Princess Anne County Court Records, Will Book 2, 1795-1807, 248. James and Susannah's son James Thoroughgood dies in 1818. Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 10, 1825-28, 223.

¹⁰⁷ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 26, 22, 28-29.

¹⁰⁸ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 27, 46.

¹⁰⁹ A map of Norfolk County made under direction of Brigadier General Taylor in ca. 1812 notes "Christian" as the occupant of the Thoroughgood House. The houses of their neighbors, Barkwell (?), Hunter, Walke, Denby, Kellum, and Ellegood, as well as that at witch duck and the Old Donation Church are drawn. Similarly Pleasure House is represented on the map with the notation it burned in 1812. Robert B. Taylor, *Map of the County Contiguous to Norfolk* (Norfolk, VA: ca. 1812), Sargeant Memorial Collection, Norfolk Public Library. The author thanks Troy Valos, Norfolk Public Library, for bringing the map to her attention.

¹¹⁰ Princess Anne County Court Records, Reports in Chancery 1, 1814-1829, 227-29; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 41, 1843-44, 4-7.

¹¹¹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Reports in Chancery 1, 1814-29, 227-29.

the division of land with Peter Singleton and Elizabeth Christian, Thoroughgood retained the “old house,” in which he lived, while the dwellings on the other two parcels were occupied by Joel Cornick and Jeremiah Cain. These houses were adjacent to oyster coves off of Pleasure House creek and were in the vicinity of the Pleasure House ordinary and house that William Thoroughgood inherited in the 1760s.¹¹² In the 1823 plat, the Thoroughgood house is depicted as three-bays across, with a door in the center, with three dormer windows and an exterior end chimney at both gable ends.¹¹³

In later years Peter Singleton was remembered as an occupant of the Thoroughgood House, likely a conflation of his ownership of land originally held by John Thoroughgood and subdivided in the 1823 plat. Singleton’s wealth inspired many tales, such as the lighting of his pipe with five-pound notes or the burying of money (gold) about the plantation. Neither the Garrisons nor their black tenants ever found the hidden treasure, despite looking beneath floor boards or sifting through soil layers during a renovation of the building in the 1890s.¹¹⁴

John Thoroughgood married Elizabeth Mackie. John and Elizabeth’s daughter Susannah was the last Thoroughgood to own the property along the Lynnhaven River known as Church Point plantation. John and Elizabeth Thoroughgood died from a fever they allegedly caught while visiting Norfolk, and their deaths left Susannah an orphan at age three. Joshua Moore served as her guardian until her marriage to James McPheeters in 1842.¹¹⁵

In February 1842 the child Susannah, now of age, signed her name as Susan to a deed of release for Moore. She complimented his integrity. Examination of the accounts suggested Moore owed her \$1656.42 and she forgave this obligation because of her regard for him and his care of her estate.¹¹⁶ Susan Thoroughgood then enlisted Peter Poythress Batte as her trustee and entrusted her family property to him before she married

¹¹² Princess Anne County Court Records, Reports in Chancery 1, 1814-29, 229. A map of Lynnhaven Bay made in 1861 identifies the location of Pleasure House, and that it burned in 1812, in relation to the Thoroughgood House. The author thanks Troy Valos, Sargeant Memorial Collection, Norfolk Public Library, for bringing the map to her attention.

¹¹³ Princess Anne County Court Records, Reports in Chancery 1, 1814-29, 229. Also, Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1824, Library of Virginia.

¹¹⁴ “To Mark the Oldest House in Virginia: Tablet to be Placed on Adam Thoroughgood Home Thursday,” *Norfolk Ledger Dispatch*, April 20 [1917], clipping on file with the author. These accounts were further integrated into the history of the house by Grace Keeler. The photograph accompanying the newspaper article shows the addition of the house, the two-story building constructed (or moved) adjacent to the historic house.

¹¹⁵ Princess Anne County Court Records, Minute Book 28, 1827-29, 171; Princess Anne County Court Records, Order Book 5, 249; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 40, 381; Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 10, 1825-1828, 448.

¹¹⁶ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 41, 1843-44, 45-46.

McPheeters.¹¹⁷ Batte sold one parcel of land (approximately 160 acres) for her in 1844. This was the Linkhorn tract. She died in childbirth not long after; her daughter, Susan Thoroughgood McPheeters, lived until 1874.¹¹⁸

Cemetery records substantiate the recollections printed in the *Standard*, and those in the court documents, that located McPheeters in Raleigh, North Carolina. James McPheeters and Susannah (Susan) Thoroughgood were buried in City Cemetery; his monument to her was an obelisk inscribed with the words, “Susan the beloved orphan wife of James G. McPheeters born February the 22nd 1821 died May the 7th 1845 She was all my heart desired O Grave! How dost thou rend in sunder whom love has knit and sympathy made one!” Their daughter is also buried there, and census records in 1860, place in the home of relatives and at age seventeen just out of school. James McPheeters lived until 1883.¹¹⁹ His younger brother Alexander transferred a portion of the Thoroughgood estate to Richard Baker, the same who acted as the Commissioner in the auction of Thoroughgood lands, in 1859. Baker bought 119 acres in Puggett’s Neck.

The pre-nuptial agreement provided Susannah (Susan) and her husband with income during her lifetime. It transferred her inheritance from her guardian to her trustee. McPheeters lived in Raleigh, North Carolina, and while Batte was in Petersburg, this arrangement ensured custodianship of the estate in Thoroughgood’s absence. It enabled her to act as a femme sole even under coverture, that is, she could choose to whom her property went despite her martial status and ensuing loss of legal rights. McPheeters was her beneficiary, ultimately, as she pre-deceased him and left an infant behind. The plantation at Church Point, as well as lands in Christians, Linkhorn, Indian Hill, Puggett’s Neck, and a small parcel near Ashby’s Bridge were included in the trust. So, too, were a number of enslaved persons. Some enumerated took last names, while some children were passed as property merely with the notation “names not known.” The names listed were: Ned Thorowgood, Tom, Frederick, Sam, Thorowgood, William, Bill Beaver, Collin, Jim Thorowgood, Henry Vaughn, Peter Thorowgood, Toney, John, David Gibson, Peggy McKay, Selia, Fanny, Jenny, Violet and her children, Jane and William, Pleasant, Big Philis and her five children their names not known, little Philis and her two children names not known, Old Rachel, Old China, Rose, Lettice, Susan McKay, Caroline, Julia, Jane McKay, Sarah, Robert, Toney, Jim Dickson, child of Selia, name not

¹¹⁷ Marylynn Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 41-57, 81-119.

¹¹⁸ “Thorowgood Family of Princess Anne County, Va.” *The Standard* (1881), transcript on file Virginia Department of Historic Resources; Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1844-1845, Library of Virginia; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 41, 1843-44, 4-7.

¹¹⁹ U.S., *Find a Grave Index* (Ancestry.com, accessed December 3, 2014); 8th Census of the United States, 1860 (NARA microfilm publication M653_916, 311), Records of the Bureau of the Census RG 29, NAB (Ancestry.com, 1860, United States Federal Census (database online), Provo, UT: 2009, accessed December 3, 2014).

known, and the two children of Jenny, names not known. The land, and the enslaved persons, could be leased or hired out, publically or privately, as Batte deemed appropriate.¹²⁰

Although Thoroughgood's trustee was charged with distributing the property, the estate remained intact for a decade. As a result of a lawsuit between McPheeters and Batte, as trustee, the lands were subjected to a public auction in 1858. James Garrison bought Church Point plantation and in 1866 finally received the deed.¹²¹

However, the household contents were appraised and sold at auction in 1824. While the dining room, kitchen and "front room upstairs" were named, the furnishings suggest heated spaces and bedchambers, literacy and lighting equipment, and political and societal position. Beyond the Windsor chairs, tea sets, glassware, and silver spoons, the inventory hints at the productivity on the plantation from weaving to livestock to planting. The family maintained an investment in enslaved labor, with seventeen individuals enumerated: Will, Tom, Peter, Bob, Jack, Peggy, Pleasant, Celey, Susan, Tom, Jane, Rose, Jinny (and three children), Ned, Samuel, Jim and Phillis.¹²² The enslaved persons were not sold, although much of the property was, including some building materials (plank, plank for flooring, and 900 shingles). Court documents identify these slaves, and their children, again in 1842 when Susannah (Susan) Thoroughgood took possession of her inheritance.

To Argall Thoroughgood II¹²³ (1700-1719)

In 1621 Captain Adam Thoroughgood came to Virginia as an indentured servant bound to James Waters. Five years later, Thoroughgood bought his first tract of land. This 150-acre parcel in Lower Norfolk County (now Princess Anne County) served as the nucleus for the estate he would amass in the next decade.¹²⁴ In 1627 Thoroughgood returned to England where he married Sarah Offley. They had three daughters, Ann, Sarah, and

¹²⁰ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 40, 381.

¹²¹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 40, 381; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 48, 249. One parcel was sold in 1844; others in Puggets Neck and Indian Hill were auctioned per court order like Church Point. These were transferred in 1859. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 47, 251, 258.

¹²² Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 9, 351, 354.

¹²³ For genealogical summaries of the early Thoroughgood family, work by Paul Treanor has been a ready reference. See for example, W. Paul Treanor, "The Adam Thoroughgood House The Truth About its Age: A Brief History of Lower Norfolk County, Virginia," *The Chespeian* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 1-13. Differences arise in who built and occupied the house, not in the family chronology or in ownership of the estate. Key documents are Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 4, [217-18]; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 1, 248-49, 265; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 253.

¹²⁴ *Adventures of Purse and Person*, edited by Virginia M. Meyer and John Frederick Dorman, 608; Floyd Painter, "The Chesopean Site," *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia* 13, no. 3 (1959).

Elizabeth, and a son Adam.¹²⁵ After Thoroughgood's death in 1640, Sarah married Simon Oversee, whom Adam requested serve as his guardian after his mother died in 1657. At the time of her death, Adam Thoroughgood II was nineteen years old.

Adam Thoroughgood I obtained the bulk of his property through a grant in 1635 for 5350 acres, and he patented another 400 acres in the same year. The house he built was made of wood, despite the various laws and statutes specifying dwellings should be constructed of brick. In 1638, for example, Governor Wyatt renewed this covenant for landholders with 500 acres or more.¹²⁶ Because of Thoroughgood's sizeable estate, many ascribed the brick house standing today to him.¹²⁷

Captain Adam Thoroughgood and his family lived first in Elizabeth City, and then moved into a wood dwelling near the Lynnhaven River. This building burned around 1650.¹²⁸ The site of the present building was not inhabited during this interval; archaeological evidence indicates a Woodland Period presence as well as an eighteenth-century occupation.¹²⁹ Thoroughgood, however, owned the land on which it would later be built. In his will of 1640, Thoroughgood bequeathed his wife

One mare and foal, [...], and one of the best calves in the pen, with a half dozen breeding goats and four breeding cows, together with all the houses and the orchard with the plantation at Lynnhaven, so far as it extendeth, to with from the pond to the further stile that parts it and the ground called the Quarter, during her lifetime.

He then bequeathed to his son Adam (II) the rest of the houses and lands in Virginia and elsewhere, with the "land, housing, and orchard" left for the use of Sarah Thoroughgood during her lifetime passing to him at her death.¹³⁰

Adam Thoroughgood II married Frances Yardley ca. 1659, and they assumed a leading role in the county's social and political affairs. They lived near Little Creek.

¹²⁵ Norfolk County Court Records, Will and Deed Book D, December 15, 1657 (misc. reel 45, 1656-1666).

¹²⁶ As cited in Harold D. Eberlein, *The Architecture of Colonial America* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1915), 84.

¹²⁷ *Norfolk Museum Bulletin* 12, no. 1 (January 1962).

¹²⁸ Painter, "The Chesopean Site," 1959, 13-15; Matthew W. Laird, "Historical Background," in Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*, 7-8; Helen Crist, "Surface Barely Scratched," in *The Beacon* [Virginian Pilot], September 14, 1977, 5.

¹²⁹ Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*.

¹³⁰ Thoroughgood's will was printed in *The Standard* in 1881, reflecting a growing interest in early Virginia history, and, interestingly, a genealogy not yet connected to the house. Without the nineteenth-century transcription, the contents of the will would be lost to history.

Thoroughgood died in 1685, and their eldest son Argall inherited the property after his mother's death.¹³¹

Adam Thoroughgood and Frances Yardley had five boys: Argall, named for her father per custom in Virginia, John, Adam (III), Francis and Robert. They also had a daughter named Rose. Adam left the plantation "where I live to the full quantity of six hundred acres to be lying most convenient to my house I now live in and at her own choice and discretion with all and singular the houses, orchards, gardens all profit and privileges there unto belonging ... during her natural life and after her decease to go to my son Argall Thoroughgood and his heirs forever." Argall inherited the property but would not come into full ownership until after his mother died.¹³²

An inventory of Frances Thoroughgood's estate in June 1687 valued the household contents and six enslaved persons at just under £120. The slaves owned by Frances at the time of her death were named Harry, 34 years old; Robin, 40 years old; Peter, 60 years old; Nanny, about 48 years old; Sue, 28 years old; and Rose, only 3 years of age. Harry and Robin were appraised at £24 and £20 respectively. At over £70, the slaves represented the bulk of Frances's wealth.

Adam (II) and Frances Thoroughgood lived in a multi-story dwelling over a cellar. It was approached by a porch, likely a porch tower like that seen at Bacon's Castle today, given the porch chamber enumerated in the inventory. The appraisers began their assessment on the upper floor, beginning in the chamber over the kitchen, moving into the chamber over the porch entry and into the chamber over the parlor, and then to the passage; on the first floor, they inventoried the parlor and then the hall. Work spaces were assessed last. These included a cellar and the kitchen. Housing with a passage plan on the upper floor, and a hall-parlor or hall-chamber plan on the first, was not uncommon.¹³³

Argall (I) Thoroughgood came into his inheritance in 1687. He married three times and died in 1700. His first wife, Pembroke Fowler, bore him three children: Frances, Adam (IV), and Argall (II). She died in 1692. Thoroughgood remarried in 1695, to Mary Robinson, and they had one child, a son named William. Mary was dead by 1698 for Thoroughgood married Ann Church in that year; they had a daughter named Elizabeth. William Thoroughgood married Ann's younger sister Patience around 1719, further

¹³¹ Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 4, 247; see also, W. Paul Treanor, "Notes on Adam Thoroughgood II" and "The Case of the Purloined Will," *The Chesapeake* 39, nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 2001): 11-19; Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 4, [218].

¹³² Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 4, [218]. The pagination is incorrect. A transcription was made available to the author.

¹³³ Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 5, 1686-95, 30.

intertwining the families.¹³⁴ At Argall Thoroughgood's death, he left his estate to his son with Pembroke Fowler, Argall (II).¹³⁵ As his father and grandfather had done, Argall left the house he lived in, some land, to his wife and afforded her the discretion to choose among the "houses, orchards, and gardens"; of the 600 acres he received, 400 went to his son outright and 200 remained for the use of his wife Ann. The condition was residence, rather than remarriage, which meant Ann occupied the house and 200-acre parcel well into the eighteenth century.

The appraisal of his estate included a room-by-room inventory as the contents of the house were inventoried for probate.¹³⁶ The first-floor rooms included the hall, parlor chamber, and kitchen, with a porch chamber, kitchen chamber, and hall chamber above. The chambers – semi-private rooms with bedsteads – were identified in relation to the spaces below; a porch chamber or upper floor space in a projecting porch tower refers to a feature the extant Thoroughgood House lacks. The appraisers also noted a cellar and milk house. It is unclear if the cellar and milk house were additional work spaces inside the main house or if they were housed independently of it in individual outbuildings or in one combined.¹³⁷ This was neither the present Thoroughgood House, nor the initial house (1630s-1650) occupied by Captain Adam Thoroughgood at the head of Pleasure House Creek.

Argall (II) Thoroughgood and his step-mother Ann Church continued to live in the house near Little Creek as she held rights to the property for her natural life.¹³⁸ Argall married

¹³⁴ William served as the executor to his brother Adam's will in 1719. At that time, William had two children, Adam and Mary. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 260.

¹³⁵ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 1, 248-49. Argall (II) chose successive relatives as his guardian, beginning with Henry Spratt in 1702, and then Adam Thoroughgood in 1705/06. He also was identified as the father of a bastard child with an Irishwoman named Mary. Princess Anne County Court Records, Order Book 1691-1709, 323, 430-31, 492. Taking responsibility for one's illegitimate children was urged by the vestry and court structure; unless the father acknowledged the child, the parish would have to support it. The loss of labor to the owner of an indentured servant's time during pregnancy and childbirth would also have to be made up. Beyond the merely economic, attitudes to bastard children and to sex in early Virginia are skillfully presented in John Ruston Pagan's *Anne Orthwood's Bastard* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003). Also, Walsh, 379-83.

¹³⁶ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 1, 265.

¹³⁷ Laird, 8; Kellam and Kellam, 44-47; on room names of the period, see Dell Upton, "Vernacular Domestic Architecture in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," in *Common Places*, edited by John Michael Vlach and Dell Upton, 315-35 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), and more recently, Carson and Lounsbury, eds., *The Chesapeake House*.

¹³⁸ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 6, 205. Ann (Church) Thoroughgood remarried and her will went to probate in 1742. She remembered her grandchildren, and no mention of the house was made. John (I) Thoroughgood inherited the house from his grandfather, as his step-grandmother Ann outlived his father Argall (II). John left this house – "the old house" – and plantation to his son William. The spatial relationship of the plantations was recorded for General Henry Clinton in the American Revolutionary War; see [Princess Anne County] Map 5-E-7, Henry Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

Susannah Sanford in 1709. They had a son John (1713-1763), who was six years old in 1719 when Argall died.¹³⁹ Susannah completed the brick dwelling known today as the Thoroughgood House.¹⁴⁰ John married in 1732, and likely it was his mother's death in 1749 that prompted the changes to the interior of the building.¹⁴¹ John Thoroughgood's renovations included the paneling and other finishes that concealed the structure of the building just as the rules of etiquette and genteel living refined the social activities occurring within.¹⁴²

4. Builder, contractor, suppliers: At this writing the names of the builders of the Thoroughgood House remain undiscovered. Argall (II), and then his widow Susannah, oversaw the construction project but the masons, carpenters, and plasterers that made the dwelling are not known. Clues could be found in the court records particularly as Susannah moved the settle Argall's estate and account for the expenses. She also remarried, and took precautions to secure her children's inheritance.¹⁴³

Court records preserved Sarah Thoroughgood's negotiations with a brick-layer in the seventeenth century, for example, and those accounts afforded insight into whose skilled labor assembled a building on the vast holdings of Adam Thoroughgood. However, the exchange was taken as evidence of the present house's construction or interpreted as evidence of the present house being built in phases. The latter interpretation wed the documentary reference to the material of the house, but the use of Flemish bond in the principal façade and English bond elsewhere was a common practice in the Chesapeake.

¹³⁹ Argall (II) and Susannah also had a daughter named Pembroke. She is mentioned in a deed of gift from Susannah to her two children in 1724. Princess Anne County Court Records, Minute Book 3, 213, 263, 265; Princess Anne County Court Records, Minute Book 4, 195; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills, 3, 572; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 4, 57. In 1726 both John and Pembroke choose Anthony Walke and Christopher Burroughs [sic] as their guardians. Their mother remarried, to Richard Cheshire, and his death in March 1725/26 precipitated a series of suits by creditors during the administration and settling of his estate. The protection of John's and Pembroke's inheritance likely was a result of these negotiations.

¹⁴⁰ In 1736, Susannah gave her son John 400 acres of land and marsh in the upper precinct of the Eastern Shore (of the Lynnhaven River) in Back Bay or Nannis [sic] Creek. Susannah reserved the right to keep stock on the tract. To her daughter Elizabeth Cheshire (with her second husband, Richard Cheshire) she gave a feather bed and furniture, cattle, steers, sheep, four flagg [sic] chairs and an iron pot. This allocation was in keeping with gender, giving the female portable property and land to the male heir. John's sister Pembroke (and Elizabeth's half-sister) was married to a man named Wright by this time and only mentioned as a residual heir to Elizabeth. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 5, 58; Princess Anne County Minute Book 4, 304; Marylynn Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 14-40; Virginia B. Price, "Feminine Designs, Legal Estates," *ARRIS* 20 (2009): 26, note 14.

¹⁴¹ Princess Anne County Court Records, Minute Book 6, 192. Susannah's daughter Elizabeth Cheshire presented her mother's will in court. The will went to probate in January 1749/50.

¹⁴² Graham, "Preindustrial Framing in the Chesapeake," 179-96.

¹⁴³ Legal protection for the lands of orphaned children came early to Colonial Virginia. See William W. Hening, ed., *The Statutes at Large Being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature, in the Year 1619...*[1809-1823], I: 260-61, 443-44.

Although in the 1720s planters began to use one bond pattern throughout, the tradition for building with Flemish in the front and a secondary bond on the other facades persisted in some areas.¹⁴⁴ Argall (II)'s choice was in accordance with tastes of his era, even as those would shift soon after his death in 1719.

Thus, with the construction date known, further mining of the extant records for correspondence and payments by Susannah Thoroughgood might yield a laborer's name. Similarly, artisans hired out or enslaved persons with skills in the building trades owned by family members might also offer hints to who the builders of the historic dwelling were. The craftsmen could have been slaves or indentured servants; they also could have been free white artisans. Likely the contractual agreement was oral and likely, as was true for Sarah Thoroughgood, only when the verbal agreement failed did the parties go to court.

Nonetheless, the low-fired bricks could have been made on-site or acquired from a nearby kiln. The oyster-shell mortar was likely made nearby as well. The blacksmith who made the nails and garnets mentioned in the appraisal has not been identified, though he too likely worked close by.

5. Original plans and construction: The inventory of Argall (II) Thoroughgood's estate provided an accounting of the house under construction, as well as ancillary structures on the property such as a shed, store, and kitchen.¹⁴⁵ The house was heated, as suggested by the fireplace equipment, and was more than one story, as noted by the contents ascribed to the "dwelling house loft." Moreover the appraisers observed that since the house was then being built, in the assessment of the estate, Susannah Thoroughgood should be exempted from the value of the nails and hardware reserved by Argall for the house project.¹⁴⁶

Material evidence of the form and plan of the dwelling completed by Susannah Thoroughgood in 1719-1720 remains in the house we see today. Built as a one-story house, and just one-room deep, the Thoroughgood House is laid out on a center-passage

¹⁴⁴ Graham and Carson, 18, 20.

¹⁴⁵ His step-mother Ann Church continued to live in house at Little Creek described in Argall (I) Thoroughgood's inventory.

¹⁴⁶ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 253. An additional inventory was submitted to court, including a child's chair and a "wigg much eaten with worms" and including four servants, three black (Sambo aged 50, Tom aged 25, and Peter aged 14) and one woman, race not specified, named Moll who was about 40 years old. Argall (II) also had 11 shillings and six pence in cash. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 262. Final accounting of his estate came in July 1722, and left £ 258.17.11 ½, 3726 pounds of tobacco, thirty-six cattle, and three Negroes: Sambo, Moll, and Tom. Susannah Thoroughgood requested the accounting. Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 457; Princess Anne County Court Records, Minute Book 3, 147.

plan with a room to either side. There is no cellar. A ladder stair connected the first floor rooms to the upper floor in the attic or garret space. Field investigations indicate that the ladder stair likely rose between the eighth and ninth joists out from the south end wall. The distance between these joists at 30 ½” is the widest spacing seen in the placement of joists in the house. Evidence of a vertical board partition (nail holes) and a plaster trace on the joist suggest where the north partition wall of the passage was on the upper and lower floors.¹⁴⁷

Although there is a trap door in the floor east of the north chimney in the garret, the framing prevents the construction of an alcove stair here. The original ceiling joists are embedded in the chimney brickwork.

Chimneys at either end of the house accommodated the fireboxes needed to warm the rooms on both floors. The chimney at the south gable end was an exterior feature, while the chimney at the north gable end was inside and so left the exterior wall plane flush on the north gable end. The eighteenth-century fenestration included conventionally proportioned wood sash, yet the openings could have accommodated sash or leaded casements. Both window types were used at the time and so it is unknown which were installed in the original building campaign.¹⁴⁸

The center-passage as a feature of floor plans appeared in some Virginia houses by the 1690s as planters experimented with room arrangements. Yet the passage remained uncommon, particularly in Princess Anne County, until the 1720s. Its floor plan, therefore, situates the Thoroughgood House at the forefront of what would become the double pile house type so emblematic of the colonial period in the region. The use of the tilted false plate is in keeping with architectural innovations of the period, while much of its assembly rests on the older traditions developed in the Chesapeake, thereby tightening its construction date through material evidence. These building features include scale, masonry, and framing. The modest scale led many to assume an earlier date, misreading the prevalence of neatly framed one-room houses as well as the housing described by travelers like Francis Louis Michel in the 1700s and William Hugh Grove in 1730s.¹⁴⁹ Its brick bond patterns, the glazing at the eaves and alternating in the jack arches over the original windows, and the gable wall beltcourse reflected vernacular preferences and tastes that would shift by mid century. The framing of the roof rafters at 2 ½”, the use of a trestle cut rather than a pit saw, and the tapering of the rafters to lie flat against the roof

¹⁴⁷ Carson, July 22, 1986; Morledge, Sec. 1, 8.

¹⁴⁸ Graham and Carson, 16-18.

¹⁴⁹ “Report of the Journey of Francis Louis Michel [...]” Part II, translated and edited by Wm. J. Hinke, *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* Part II 24, no. 2 (April 1916): 113-41; William Hugh Grove, “Virginia in 1732: The Travel Journal of William Hugh Grove,” edited by Gregory Stiverson and Patrick H. Butler, III *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85 (1977).

plane also harkened to traditional building practice in the Chesapeake that would disappear by 1750.¹⁵⁰

6. Alterations and additions: The earliest known alterations to the Thoroughgood House come in the mid-eighteenth century.¹⁵¹ John Thoroughgood updated the dwelling he inherited, completing the building's evolution into the plastered and paneled, refined house of the genteel. In the 1740s, the passage was widened to 10' and the wainscoting, cornice, and present staircase were installed. Much of this trim, the upper portions of the stair, and the paneling are intact today. The remodeling of the interior under the direction of the architect Finlay Ferguson saw the balusters switched out, but even so, Ferguson's work left significant portions in-situ. For example, the architraves, mantels, and stair paneling are not robust and are representative of prevailing tastes in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. Also, in a letter summarizing field notes taken in 1986, historian Cary Carson identified joists, beginning at the south end wall (#1), with the south partition wall at the sixth joist, an earlier partition at the ninth joist, and the present, north partition wall to the passage at the tenth.¹⁵²

Under the staircase was a closet; a door was made and hung at this time as well.¹⁵³ The exposed framing was covered in plaster and, if originally installed, the casement windows were likely replaced with sash at this time as well. Dormers were cut into the roof to better light the second floor. By the middle of the nineteenth century, a door and a window were cut into the south end wall.¹⁵⁴ The window glazing was replaced with the larger, two-over-two arrangement of lights by this time as well.

¹⁵⁰ Graham and Carson, 19-20.

¹⁵¹ Field notes from July and October 1986 reveal (and record) that the lap tenons for the north (joist #10) and south (joist #6) partitions are different; the south is earlier than the north. Moreover, evidence that the ceiling was plastered after the construction of the house came through the examination of the joists, against the west wall, a mortise cuts through a plaster ghost. Carson, July and October 1986; Morledge, Sec. 1, 8.

¹⁵² Graham and Carson, 14-16, 21. Also in Carson's notes to Alan Morledge, who was leading the Historic Structure Report, he discusses the alterations to the tilted false plate and the joint at the ninth joist. If the house was built in two phases (i.e., a seventeenth century house added onto in the eighteenth century), the false plate would have lapped over the width of the joist and pinned at the center. Instead the ends butt one another and each is pinned to the joist. Alterations to the false plate – how it joins to the structural frame – occurred when the 1890s addition was integrated into the house. The ends of the false plate, as well as their connection at joist #9, remain unchanged.

¹⁵³ This is the only original door in the house today. Anne Miller to Virginia B. Price, personal communication, July 7, 2014.

¹⁵⁴ Morledge, Sec. 3, 2-3. Morledge also referenced Carson's evaluation of the knee wall (oak) and Carson's suggestion that these knee walls came in the mid eighteenth-century changes ("Georgian" to distinguish from the original construction campaign, then understood to be much earlier). Morledge suggested the nail holes Carson observed in the collars could have accommodated the boards needed for closets; Morledge dated the installation of closets to the other alterations in the garret that saw the creation of dormers and the stud partition wall at joist #10. Morledge, Sec. 1, 8-9.

Although the Garrison family owned the Thoroughgood House from 1858 through the 1890s, the dwelling retained its mid nineteenth-century form until those last years. In the 1890s the Garrisons shored up the main floor and added a two-story wing to the east. It has been suggested that the wing was the kitchen outbuilding moved to abut the house, and then adjoined.

An early photograph places a two-story building and well to the southeast of the house, as well as records the presence of a porch with a shed roof on the west elevation. Repairs to the chimneys are also visible in the photograph; brickwork in the upper stacks and the lower portion of the south chimney was re-pointed. Wood shingles covered the gable roof and at least three dormers punctuated the roof planes, two visible to the west and one visible to the east. The west dormers contained sash windows glazed with six-over-six lights. The first-floor windows in the west elevation were glazed with four-over-four lights and the glazing pattern represents a nineteenth-century change to the historic fabric. Other changes to the historic fabric are evident in the south wall where the photograph shows a door cut in to facilitate access into the house from the outbuilding off the southeast corner of the building. A wood porch covered this pathway. Similar access, via a deck, linked the outbuilding and main house at the second floor. A gable window is evident in the photograph.

The wood shingles of the roof shown in the historic photograph were replaced with clay pantiles when the addition was built. Auxiliary rafters were installed to support the weight of the tiles, while the ends of the joists at the east were cut off and the tilted false plate removed in part to accommodate the addition. When the addition was removed in the 1920s, extensions were joined to the ceiling beams and repairs to the false plate were made. Vertical struts were also installed. The east dormer was converted to a door to allow for access into the addition from the second floor.

Also during the Garrison alterations, the floor was underpinned. Joists were replaced; how many is not known because of the renovations in 1968 that renewed or replaced the remaining joists and creosoted them. The floor boards were random width pine and interlocked with tongue and groove joints. The upstairs floor boards were also tongue and groove and cut nailed in place. Behind the knee wall the floor boards differ; the boards are 1" thick, sawn face down, and have shiplap joints. Likely the original flooring was of this type.

Photographs record the Garrison addition or ell and so allow for comparisons between the earlier expansion of living space with the two-story outbuilding and ad-hoc connections to the main house and this more integrated building form under the pantile covered roof. For example, between the 1890s and 1910s, plumbing was installed and the west porch and well disappeared. The window glazing remained the same, with four-over-four lights

in the first floor windows and six-over-six in the dormer windows of the west elevation. The gable window, however, had four-over-four lights in the later, 1910s-era photograph. A screen porch obscured the south elevation of the addition but it appeared to be made of brick, possibly a veneer, and shingled above. Visible windows were glazed with four-over-four lights like those seen in the main house.

Photographic views, such as those of the Garrison addition, supplement sketches on plat maps or fleeting references made in advertisements of a property sale about the appearance and condition of the house at key intervals. As noted above, the first photographs correspond to when the Garrison family held the property and picture the wing they added to the house that Grace Keeler later removed. The removal of the wing restored the integrity of the eighteenth-century Thoroughgood House in form and in plan. The photographs are important clues to how the building was adapted during the Garrison occupancy and are clues to the shifts in domestic space and interior arrangements implied in those changes.

The earliest pictures of the property include a view looking to the south end elevation. They show three dormers on the west slope of the gable roof and a glimpse of the southernmost on the east slope. The west gable window is a casement and is left open in the photograph. The first-floor, west window contains double-hung wood sash and there are curtains hung inside the window. A small opening, not much taller than the watertable, is cut in at ground-level at the far western end of the south elevation. East of the south chimney is a door opening to a wood walkway, likely connecting to the addition that anticipated the two-story wing that would extend from the house at this corner. The first-floor opening east of the chimney is also a door; it opens to an integral porch created by the exterior passage to the east. Wood steps lead up to the porch. Along the west (land) elevation is a small wood porch with a shed roof. The wood flooring is supported by brick piers.¹⁵⁵

Two other images record the 1890s addition extending from the south end of the east elevation.¹⁵⁶ One shows the house in the distance, but the west elevation and wing are clearly visible. In the closer view, taken looking to the southeast, the clay roof tiles correspond to those in 1909 photograph and so likely are a Garrison-era change. The ell is covered by a gable roof; there is a central chimney that is corbelled just below the cap.

¹⁵⁵ Adam Thoroughgood House, Photograph ca. 1890, Cook Collection, The Valentine, Richmond, Virginia. Another print, from the same negative, appears in Harold Donaldson Eberlein, *Architecture of Colonial America* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1915), between 88-89. In this print, a two-story addition adjacent to the house is shown. See also Robert Lancaster, *Virginia Homes and Churches* (1915).

¹⁵⁶ Adam Thoroughgood House, Photograph(s) ca. 1920, William Palmer Gray Collection, The Valentine, Richmond, Virginia. There are three photographs, one taken looking to the southeast, one taken looking to the south, and one taken from across the fields also looking to the southeast.

Three double-hung, wood sash windows light the second floor. The glazing is four-over-four lights. The upper floor of the south elevation of the ell is shingled and a screened porch extends along the first-floor level. A shed roof covers the screened porch. The porch connects to the main house at the south chimney and uses the existing east end door as an entrance. At the upper floor, access to the wing is likely occurred by converting the east dormer into an interior door. The exterior door cut into the south gable at the upper story is not visible in this image. It is possible it was closed at the time of the addition. Ivy is growing up the chimneystack and simple wood steps lead up to the west elevation door. There is a screen door at this entrance, and a square plaque over the door head lintel. The Norfolk Branch of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) formerly recognized the building's historical significance in a ceremony in May 1917; the plaque dates to that event.¹⁵⁷

A traveler's photograph from 1909 captures the west (land) side of the house. Three dormers punctuate the slope of the gable roof; the glazing of the wood sash in the dormer windows is six-over-six. Similarly, three double-hung, wood sash windows, one to the south of the door and two to the north, are present. The wood sash is glazed with nine-over-nine lights. The surrounds are simple and there are no shutters. The door lintel is visible, as is damage to the brickwork around the opening. The door is a single wood door glazed above the lock rail. There is a brick platform along the front of the house, possibly a replacement for the former porch flooring. The south exterior end chimney with its tiled weatherings is clear, and the sash window cut into the west end of the south elevation is just visible as is the addition off the east side. The shadows on the roof highlight the clay pantiles.¹⁵⁸

From 1922 to 1926 Grace M. Keeler oversaw a restoration of the Thoroughgood House that essentially removed the Garrison-era addition of the 1890s. Charles Cornelius, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, allegedly guided her efforts although he lacked architectural expertise. Cornelius was an expert in decorative arts and so provided insights into period appropriate furnishings and settings. Keeler had a plaster ceiling hung in the cockloft, a change dateable because the workman inscribed his name and date into the chimneys: "Plastered by F.D. Dockery, Oct 17, 1923". Keeler's restoration team also embellished the house with a sash window in the east end of the

¹⁵⁷Placing a plaque at the site was contemplated, as early as 1911 and 1912, and likely several years beforehand as well. *APVA Yearbook* (Richmond: Whittet and Shepperdson, Printers, 1919), 17; *APVA Yearbook* (Richmond: Wm Ellis Jones' Sons, Inc., Printers, 1913), 14; "Adam Thoroughgood House, Princess Anne County," Photograph ca. 1920, Harry C. Mann Collection, Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia. Placement of the honorary plaque was reported in "Many Tablets Unveiled," *Richmond Times Dispatch* January 6, 1918; as well as in an account of the APVA's meeting in *Richmond Times Dispatch* June 13, 1917.

¹⁵⁸Roger Reed to Virginia B. Price, var. dates; the photograph was taken by his grandfather in 1909. A copy is on file at the Department of Historic Resources in Richmond, Virginia.

north wall, with a slate roof and with semi-circular steps made of stone at the entries.¹⁵⁹ They also affixed lightening rods to the roof and chimneys, removed paint from the paneling, and installed a bathroom upstairs in the south room at northeast corner and east dormer.

A majority of the historic photographs record the house after Keeler's restoration. These include those taken by Frances Benjamin Johnston and those taken for the Historic American Buildings Survey. The architectural drawings of the building by Thomas Waterman date to this period as well. The drawings were published in his book with John Barrows, *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia*, and accessioned as part of the collections held by the Library of Congress.

Most images of the house from this era also show the south end of the building, with the exterior chimney stack, or consist of a perspective view that includes the east (water side) elevation and the south end elevation. After Keeler's restoration, the east elevation was three bays across, with the doorway appearing off-center. The wood, double-hung sash windows were glazed with nine-over-nine lights and the wood paneled door recessed in a simple surround with a lintel above the doorhead. Stone steps led up to the doorway. Two shed dormers pierced the east slope of the gable roof. The watertable is visible on the east elevation while the beltcourse is visible on the south. West of the chimney is a double-hung sash window glazed with nine-over-nine lights and east of the chimney is a single, wood paneled door. Three steps lead up to the doorway. There are two gable windows, each glazed with four lights, to either side of the chimney, that light the second floor rooms. These are casement windows, opening out. The use of alternating glazed bricks in the jack arches over the window openings, like that seen in the gable, is an original construction detail unaffected by the later alterations.¹⁶⁰

Another photograph shows the south elevation not long afterward. Ivy has grown up the chimney stack and a screen door is installed in the southeast door. This suggests the house may be occupied, at least as the guest cottage in the oral histories, since the ivy growth was cultivated. The screen offered bug-free ventilation to those indoors.¹⁶¹

The north elevation also had ivy growing up the gable end, suggesting it was planted and trained to do so by Keeler. In the photograph, the two gable end windows are visible, as is a double-hung sash window glazed with nine-over-nine lights. The sash window is east

¹⁵⁹ Morledge suggests this window east of the chimney in the north gable end was an original opening. Sec. 2, 2-3. He then writes of Waterman's and Barrow's visit, and their book, wherein they note a bricked in window west of the north chimney and covered by paneling inside and the larger opening for sash east of the chimney as a conceit by Keeler. Sec. 4, 4.

¹⁶⁰ Regarding the alternating glazed and unglazed bricks of the jack arches, Graham and Carson, 20.

¹⁶¹ www.loc.gov/pictures.

of the chimney.¹⁶² If there was a corresponding window opening west of the chimney, it was hidden by the ivy. When the architect Finlay Ferguson drew the house, he observed a “bricked up opening” here so it was likely covered at the time of photograph. When the opening was created, and closed, remains undetermined.¹⁶³

Once the Thoroughgood House ceased to be a residence and became a house museum, another restoration and research effort was undertaken, again with leaders in the museum and preservation fields guiding the work and upholding the highest standards of the time. In the mid 1950s, the Adam Thoroughgood Foundation initiated its restoration under the direction of Henry C. Hofheimer II. Hofheimer consulted with the architect Finlay F. Ferguson, Jr., who knew the building from his Historic American Buildings Survey days and through his site visits with Thomas Waterman. The contractor for the project was E. A. Moore, while the roofing was installed by the Ludowici Company and the reproduction hardware manufactured by Donald Streeter of Iona, New Jersey.

At this time, the refurbishing of the house reversed some of Keeler’s interpretations of period –appropriate architectural features. For example, the dormer windows were removed and the size of the window openings was reduced. The smaller openings allowed for the installation of casements glazed with leaded glass. New exterior doors imitated those known from Christ Cross in New Kent County. Inside the Thoroughgood House, Hofheimer had the plaster removed except in the parlor (north room). Glass inserts in the wall surfaces exposed the original construction and so facilitated interpretation to the general public. The plumbing was taken out, and there were some repairs to the fireplace hearths as well as to the exterior wall and south chimney. New balusters were fashioned for the stairs. Doors were hung at the entrances to the north and south rooms from the first-floor passage, as well as inserted into the partition wall for the south room upstairs.

In the 1960s and early 1970s, further explorations took place and maintenance of the building continued. Archaeological excavations were done south of the house, by Floyd Painter, in 1965, and inside the building the HVAC was replaced (in 1966), the flooring renewed by the Gresham Company (in 1968), and more extensive work was done in the south room repairing the plaster and repainting (in 1967). Also at this time, the thresholds, the back door, and the north room door were replaced. Some repointing was also carried out. In 1971 vandalism claimed twenty-nine quarrels of leaded glass and in 1975 the house was burglarized. The repairs done in 1968 had the most impact, however, for in the replacement of some of the wood in the basement with termite-repelling

¹⁶² The photograph referenced here was reproduced in *Waterman and Barrows*, 5. Likely it was taken by Harry C. Mann; Mann’s collection is in the archives of the Library of Virginia, although some duplicates are available through the Norfolk Public Library.

¹⁶³ Finlay F. Ferguson, “Restoration of the Adam Thoroughgood House, Princess Anne Co., VA,”

creosoted timbers an arch was discovered. Theories surrounding the arched openings origins led to some archaeological work and to stories involving a tunnel for smuggling and security purposes. The arched opening proved shallow, and likely accommodated the utilities to the wing added by the Garrison family in the late nineteenth century.¹⁶⁴

B. Historical Context:

Thoroughly Preserved: The Thoroughgood House in the Twentieth Century

In *Domestic Architecture of Colonial Virginia* (1932) historical architects Thomas Waterman and John Barrows highlight Virginia's oldest and finest houses.¹⁶⁵ They drew from the well-established canon of early Virginia architecture that broadly defined the buildings as belonging to the colonial period and with significance derived through connections to leading members of society.¹⁶⁶ The Thoroughgood House with its interior and exterior end chimneys, steeply pitched gable roof, and diminutive scale *looked* colonial. Its connection to Captain Adam Thoroughgood, who rose to prominence in Princess Anne County and who owned much of it when he died in 1640, confirmed its rightful place in Waterman's and Barrows' study.

Domestic Architecture of Colonial Virginia resonates because the authors' measured drawings of the buildings and their interviews with the buildings' owners provide insight into the evolving practice of preservation as well as societal values in the early twentieth century. Waterman's and Barrows' investigation of the Thoroughgood House, then believed to date to the 1630s, is key to understanding its restoration history. The drawings and research notes they made allowed for later evaluations of the material evidence they recorded when, generations later, historians returned to the house seeking to understand its construction and the cultural consciousness embedded in those choices. Waterman's and Barrow's visit to the Thoroughgood House predated the mid-century restoration campaign that obscured clues to the past found in window openings,

¹⁶⁴Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*; Morledge, Sec. 3,6, and Sec. 6, 4 Painter, "The Secret Tunnel at the Thoroughgood House," *The Chesopian* 6, no. 4 (1968): 100-06.

¹⁶⁵ On the authors, see Fay Campbell Kaynor, "Thomas Tison Waterman: Student of American Colonial Architecture," *Winterthur Portfolio* 20 (1985): 103-47; Edward A. Chappell, John A. Barrows and the *Rediscovery of Early Virginia* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1991).

¹⁶⁶ It was not until the designation of Hampton as a National Historic Landmark that the National Park Service would recognize architectural significance independent of historical associations with important people. Until then (and persisting still) houses were important because historical figures like George Washington slept there. Broadening the narrative to include those left out – introducing gender, ethnicity and race for example – shifted social and intellectual history as well as how the architectural landscape was understood. John H. Sprinkle, Jr., "'Both Historic and Artistic': Hampton National Historic Site and the Designation of Architectural Significance," draft manuscript, copy on file with the author. The "new" social history is less new but no less important. One of the results of looking for evidence to reconstruct the circumstances and choices of those who left no traces was a material culture approach to the built environment that included the close examination of buildings. Working out what they saw and how to interpret it gave rise to the Vernacular Architecture Forum (VAF) in 1980.

stair placement, and room use. Their book, then, became part of the building's architectural history.

Throughout the twentieth century, investigative techniques for the study of historic buildings developed through the careful scholarship of practice Waterman and Barrows encouraged.¹⁶⁷ The architectural recording they did was at the forefront of the interdisciplinary effort made to "extract truth from tradition" in the words of historian Camille Wells.¹⁶⁸ Material evidence, when asked, pointed to patterns of use that in turn hinted at the lived experience of all household members. Waterman and Barrows added narrative to the details their drawings presented through their oral interviews, again a harbinger of the integrated approach coming to the study of early Virginia. However, in the 1930s, those conversations pivoted on an understanding of the historic buildings as artifacts in social seclusion, devoid of class and race and overlaid in legend.¹⁶⁹ At the Thoroughgood House, for example, the association with Captain Adam Thoroughgood lent the old house distinction. Reverence attracted the cultural tourist to Thoroughgood's house and simultaneously pushed the historic Thoroughgood House further out of reach.

A touchstone to the country's beginnings, and not yet recognized as such, the Thoroughgood House faced an uncertain future at the turn of the twentieth century. Keeler's stewardship returned integrity of form and floor plan to the building. It also altered perceptions of the past in an effort to reintroduce Thoroughgood to the land he once held.¹⁷⁰ Keeler wrote that she embarked on the restoration so the house would survive into other centuries. By adding her role in ensuring the house's preservation to its history, she aligned her actions with a long line of occupants who bequeathed the house to their heirs.¹⁷¹ Her legacy ensured theirs. The appropriation of Thoroughgood's stature in the interpretation of the house offered one view of early American history; the celebration of his remarkable story protected the house.

A number of historic houses survive in Princess Anne County, including the Thoroughgood House and its contemporaries, the Keeling House and Lynnhaven House. However, many of

¹⁶⁷ Virginia B. Price, "Measured Preservation: Reconstructing a History of Architectural Practice through the Historic American Buildings Survey," presentation for the Southeast Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, Athens, Georgia, October 18, 2012; Camille Wells, "Old Claims and New Demands," *Old Claims and New Demands: Vernacular Architecture Studies Today*, in *Perspectives In Vernacular Architecture II*, edited by Camille Wells (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), 1-10.

¹⁶⁸ Camille Wells, "The Multistoried House: Twentieth-Century Encounters with the Domestic Architecture of Colonial Virginia," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 106, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 362-73, quotation, 365.

¹⁶⁹ Regarding the interplay between historical myth and historic preservation, see Virginia B. Price, "Setting and Artifact," in *Keeping Up Appearances*, M.A. thesis, College of William and Mary, 1998, 2-16; James Gordon Buelow, *The Last Patriarch of Westover: The Life, Legend, and Legacy of Colonel William Byrd III, 1728-77*, M.A. thesis, College of William and Mary, 1999.

¹⁷⁰ Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *Invention of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

¹⁷¹ [Grace Keeler], "Old Thoroughgood House," pamphlet, ca. 1927-28, copy on file with the author.

similar architectural style disappeared in the middle decades of the twentieth century, like Fairfield, Eastwood, and the Hudgins House. Their loss made the survival of others more precious. The rarity afforded to the extant affirmed mystic and held popular imagination. The restoration of the Thoroughgood House in the 1920s completed the transformation the old house into one such self-affirming oasis. Surveyors in the spirit of Waterman's and Barrows' methodology recorded the early buildings, including the Thoroughgood House and those now-lost.¹⁷² This survey feature of early preservation, seen in the photography of Frances Benjamin Johnston for the Carnegie Survey of Southern Architecture, in the entries to the Historic American Buildings Survey, and in historiographies like *Old Houses of Princess Anne County*, provided documentation of a by-gone era rapidly disappearing from view.¹⁷³

While contemporary housing developments and the construction of the Oceana Naval Base obliterated the historic landscape in the middle decades of the twentieth century, the extant historic structures survive as an oasis in an otherwise innocuous setting of low-rise retail and subdivisions. Weblin and the Thoroughgood House, for example, anchor twentieth-century residential developments. The Francis Land House sits back from the heavily commercial Virginia Beach Boulevard. And yet hints to the communal networks of the vanished past come in the street and venue names, such as Witchduck, Pleasure House, Pembroke and Kempsville.¹⁷⁴ These historic place names proliferate and their persistence provides an underlying geography of place. Other examples, such as the Eastern Shore Chapel, attest to this. The church moved from its original location in the twentieth century, but its name is a reminder of its role as the place of worship for the eastern part of the parish.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² Early photographs, as noted elsewhere in the text, hold key evidence of constancy and change. For example, Johnston's photographs of the Thoroughgood House show the trace of the Garrison-era addition, once you know to look for the ghost on the east facade, and the presence of dormers. Their removal revealed key pieces of original fabric, just as conservation work opened up plaster walls and made evidence of the initial stair visible.

¹⁷³ This mitigative cast to preservation led to a focus on endangered buildings in the early HABS surveys and was a precursor to the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106/110. For an insightful introduction to the ways historical significance was (and is) understood, evaluated, and protected, see John H. Sprinkle, Jr., *Crafting Preservation Criteria* (New York: Routledge, 2014). For perspective on how photographers interpret cultural meaning and tying those interpretations to shifts American society, see Timothy Davis, "Beyond the Sacred and the Profane: Cultural Landscape Photography in America, 1930-1990," in *Mapping American Culture* edited by Wayne Franklin and Michael Steiner (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992), 191-230.

¹⁷⁴ "The Thoroughgood Family of Princess Anne County, Va.," *The Standard*, December 31, 1881, following transcriptions of court documents and citations from W.S. Forrest's "Sketches of Norfolk and its Vicinity" attesting to the cultivated sociability of those early Virginians, the author (T.H.E.) adds Meade's recollections (as told in *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia*) of "the best society" early Norfolk and Lynnhaven Parish. Meade evoked the time of Anthony Walke, minister of the parish, when "...the social glass, the rich feast, the card-table, the dance, and the horse-race were all freely indulged in through the county. And what has been the result? *** In no part of Virginia has the destruction of all that was old been greater." The author continued, introducing his own oral history to the narrative. He wrote of his mother's recollection of "a ball given to her at Kempsville when she was on a visit to her brother William, at the 'Pleasure House' circa 1807."

¹⁷⁵ Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia*.

Saved from disrepair and tenancy, the richly restored Thoroughgood House heralded the seventeenth-century immigrant success story. Its preservation set the building apart. In complimenting Keeler's restoration of the house, Waterman and Barrows whitewashed its recent past as part of a farm and lucrative oyster bed. They glossed over its primary assets not just to burnish the lore of Thoroughgood's many achievements, but also to validate the restoration work they did and Keeler supported. Their use of race to cast its pre-restoration condition as perilous reflects social conditions at the time, and in the twenty-first century, points to the absence of race in those first preserved histories.

Historically, the nineteenth-century owners of the house mimicked the experience of the eighteenth-century Thoroughgood family as they found success in agriculture and adapted the house to their needs. The Garrisons, who bought the property from the last Thoroughgood's estate, lost their investment in the house and the land in the aftermath of the financial crises of 1893. Because the extant tax records are segregated, it is difficult to know if the Thoroughgood House was occupied or tended to by African American tenants in the years before Keeler purchased the property as Waterman and Barrows suggested. Nor it is readily discernible just whose labor replaced the enslaved laborers owned by the Thoroughgood and Garrison families in the antebellum period. Census records suggest most of the immediate neighbors were white.¹⁷⁶

Nevertheless, Waterman's and Barrows's observation documents the house's transition from merely old to historic. The need to separate the building from its surroundings was a significant part of the preserving the past and seeking affirmation in the legacies of another age. Their interpretation segregated its restored present from a seemingly more ordinary trajectory and from a history populated by Virginians black and white. Distance lent romance to history.¹⁷⁷ It also honored traditions of that past and held onto socio-economic hierarchies in a rapidly changing world that included and would transform the Jim Crow South.

Reviving Colonialisms

Reverence for Virginia's antiquity, like that held by historic architects like Waterman and Barrows and by preservationists like Grace Keeler, entered the national consciousness in the wake of the American Revolution. In the 1790s, in one of the earliest known examples of this trend, former Alderman of London William Lee urged his son to eschew the Lee name in favor of his wife's family name of Ludwell. Lee viewed the Ludwells' ties to seventeenth-century

¹⁷⁶ The newspaper accounts in the 1910s suggest African American tenants occupied the Thoroughgood House while the Garrison family owned it. Perhaps they did so until the Garrison renovation in the 1890s, and perhaps the tenants remained on the property but no longer resided in the house. Information about tenants is not found in the chain of title documentation. Yet the presence of African American tenants was accepted as a part of the property history by the time of the APVA ceremony in 1917 and Keeler's subsequent restoration in the 1920s.

¹⁷⁷ "Virginia Historic Shrines and Scenic Attractions," brochure ca. 1926.

Virginia as more significant historically than his (the Lees of Virginia) and identified strongly with them.¹⁷⁸ Similarly, in August 1796, architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe argued for the preservation of the old Ludwell house at Green Spring. This was the dwelling Lee's son inherited and about which he solicited Latrobe's advice. Before the Lees and Ludwells occupied the house, it was Governor Sir William Berkeley who built and lived in the mansion from the 1640s through Bacon's Rebellion in 1676-77. The architectural style of the crumbling mansion was by the 1790s old fashioned, but Latrobe wrote that its age warranted stewardship.¹⁷⁹ Ultimately Lee's son ignored his father's nostalgia and sense of history as well as Latrobe's preservation urging. Lee kept his name and demolished the house. He chose to identify himself with one vision of eighteenth-century Virginia, not the raucous and too foreign past associated with the old mansion his father bequeathed him. His allegiance instead to the ideals and tastes of his father's generation was made evident in the house he built. The new dwelling, with its center-passage plan, looked back to the two-story, double pile gentry-house type the floor plan of the Thoroughgood House hinted would come. His choice presaged an admiration for early America and its architectural record that would be popularized through the Colonial Revival movement at the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth.¹⁸⁰

Historians long have recognized a fascination with colonial times that Lee's decisions illustrate was present in the early national period and that more broadly characterized the post-bellum decades. As it did for William Lee and his son, affiliations with ever earlier epochs of the colonial period provided nineteenth-century Americans with a vehicle for self-definition and distinction that simultaneously created a broader sense of societal belonging through shared ideals and idioms.¹⁸¹ A yearning for a simpler age motivated, at least in part, this turn away from the industrial upheavals and changes that steady immigration wrought at the end of the

¹⁷⁸Lee was one of five brothers who each played a prominent role in the Revolutionary era. He spent his childhood at the family house of Stratford Hall.

¹⁷⁹[Benjamin Henry Latrobe], *The Virginia Journals of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, 1795-1798* (New Haven: Yale University Press for the Maryland Historical Society, 1977), 182-83.

¹⁸⁰ Virginia B. Price, "Green Spring, 1643-1803," M.A. thesis, University of Virginia, 2000, 150-53. It also would come in the manumission of his slaves but that is a story told elsewhere, in Virginia B. Price, "From Green Spring to Hot Water," paper presented at the Virginia Forum, Fredericksburg, Virginia, April 12, 2008. Also, Alan Axelrod, ed., *The Colonial Revival in America* (New York: Norton, 1985) and Daniel J. Vivian, *A New Plantation World: The Leisure Plantations of the South Carolina Low Country, 1900-1940* (forthcoming) and from that, the chapter, "Creating Mulberry Plantation," 190. In his historiography and analysis of the Colonial Revival movement that creates contextual understanding for the work at Mulberry Plantation, Vivian recasts the Colonial Revival from a time-bound architectural impetus to a cultural phenomenon as a foundation to his argument about the selective history restorations present. He cites Kenneth Ames's Introduction to *The Colonial Revival in America* and Richard Guy Wilson's essay, "What Is the Colonial Revival?" in *Recreating the American Past*.

¹⁸¹ Dell Upton elucidated the distinctions between style, mode and fashion (or taste) in an effort to add the intangible cultural facets to seemingly static aesthetic choices, meticulously drawn and reassembled for twentieth-century purposes. Performance and setting, ritual and precedent guided colonial society; distinctions within the milieu were important. Although the essay has been misplaced, these determinations are developed in his *Holy Things and Profane* (1986) that outlined the elites hold on power and their right to it.

nineteenth century. Identifying with republican principles of Classical Greece and Rome infused a moral purpose to a divided country and segregated citizenry. It also reinforced an Anglo inheritance and provided English prototypes like that found in Palladian building traditions for a Colonial Revival interpretation of a restored, idyllic past renewed for modern purposes.¹⁸²

In the Colonial Revival movement, the perceived architectural syntax of the colonial period defined architectural education. These perceptions of what the past looked like further impacted the vocabulary of building practice as the historical architect took to the field.¹⁸³ A by-product of the studies of the appearance and construction of historic buildings were the measured drawings those antiquarians and historical architects created.¹⁸⁴ In those drawings they recorded and interpreted the historic structure they saw. This emphasis on building detail and an object-level focus informed restoration projects, influenced new designs, and led to period-room installations as the colonial period buildings were reconstructed, retrofitted, and represented in public and private commissions.¹⁸⁵ The material culture of the colonial period became the cultural material

¹⁸²In his forthcoming manuscript, *A New Plantation World*, Daniel J. Vivian offers a synopsis of this Colonial Revival impulse, providing the context that nourished it and then analyzing the complications behind a restoration, see chapter three, “Creating Mulberry Plantation.” Vivian elucidates the ideological effects of restoration projects and the material result of an “iconic colonial heritage [becoming] part of the national landscape as never before.” Vivian references David Lowenthal, *The Past Is a Foreign Country*, 238-43, and then outlines his (Vivian’s) interpretation of the importance of how a structure displays age. “[Restored buildings] signify age through forms and features treated in a specialized manner. The difference centers on untouched evidence of age and treatment rooted in perceptions of historical value.” Vivian, 192, note 11. It is this perception of history and of what historic buildings looked like and how they could be use that “rescued” the Thoroughgood House during the Keeler’s ownership. Vivian’s significant study of the Lowcountry estates and their northern restorers shapes our understanding of Tidewater’s Yankee saviors as well. The Keelers were among several New Yorkers reaching across a sectional divide to restore early Americana and, with it, a traditionalism that included slavery’s legacy of discrimination and segregation.

¹⁸³ Wells, “The Multistoried House,” 355-77; Dell Upton, “New Views of the Virginia Landscape,” 404-70.

¹⁸⁴ Among the first examples of this practice – recording buildings as part of historical research – is found in Henry David Thoreau’s journal and the first book published using architectural evidence as source material rather than documents was Norman Morrison Isham’s and Albert Brown’s *Early Rhode Island Houses* (1895). Henry David Thoreau, *The Journal 1837-1861*, ed. By Damion Searls (New York: New York Review Books, 2009), 551; Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, eds., *Common Places* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 149-50.

¹⁸⁵ The woodwork in Eastwood was removed and preserved in a period-room installation; Eastwood was a house in Princess Anne County of comparable scale to the Thoroughgood House. This is just one example.

In the period, one early guide informing how Keeler approached her restoration could have been Charles Edward Hooper’s *Reclaiming The Old House* (New York: McBride, Nast and Company, 1913). In his preface, Hooper proclaims that to study old houses, we all must be antiquarians and we need not look farther afield than our doorsteps. In the last he was accounting for the local interpretations of architecture, the vernacular variations in essence. He opens with “for one who has an atom of poetry in his soul, there is a tremendous fascination in the antique.” He acknowledges many who “have taken up old places and made homes of them.” (13) Keeler fit this description initially, and perhaps heeded the next when she moved to a house nearby, leaving the Thoroughgood House for guests and tourists, “For the most part this experiment has destroyed the character of the subject; [...]”. Hooper offers advice on selecting an old house and for sensitively adapting it. He identified several plan types, and drew them for his readers’ reference. Hooper highlighted a house in Yorktown with a central-passage plan and

of the twentieth century Revivalist. Fiske Kimball, who founded the architectural school at the University of Virginia, and his protégé, Thomas Waterman, profoundly influenced twentieth-century understandings of the Virginia house, including Thoroughgood's, in this way.¹⁸⁶

This preoccupation with sites of early America – from Latrobe in the 1790s to Waterman in the 1930s– also sparked the campaign to preserve George Washington's Mount Vernon. It inspired successive preservation initiatives that enshrined sites of memory across Virginia during the nineteenth century.¹⁸⁷ In his review of the activities and purposes of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) of 1889 and its New England counterpart (SPNEA), James Lindgren engendered preservation. Lindgren's study marginalized the commemorative aspects of the movement and empowered restoration with the former cast as sentimental and feminine and the latter as scientific and male.¹⁸⁸

The Thoroughgood House was on the receiving end of both impulses. In the early 1910s, the Norfolk branch of the APVA celebrated the house as that built by Captain Adam Thoroughgood and bequeathed to his son in 1640. Having origins in the 1630s tied the house to Virginia's beginnings in at Jamestown. With this early date the house became British Colonial America's oldest standing brick structure. This claim symbolized a larger cultural stake: a reassertion of Virginia's place in the American historical narrative dominated by Plymouth and the victors of the Civil War.¹⁸⁹ The house anchored Thoroughgood's story and renewed his prominence. Moreover, the memorialization of Thoroughgood by the APVA Norfolk branch is what likely prompted Grace Keeler's restoration of the house in the 1920s.¹⁹⁰

exterior end chimneys as an example found in the colonial period. (38-39). Hooper's approach to restoring/renovating old houses was grounded in antiquarian practice and provides insight into Keeler's effort as well as to Waterman's work.

¹⁸⁶ Wells, "The Multistoried House," 358-73. Upton's analysis of the modern-day preoccupation with Colonial Virginia reveals how this reliance on visual analysis excluded contextual interpretations of social relationships and the intangible forces at work in architectural decisions that tie specifics into a larger whole, or system. In casting for English precedent, Waterman and Kimball stripped away the cultural consciousness of the historical builders much as inappropriate (to their view) fabric was removed. Upton, "New Views of the Virginia Landscape," 404-70.

¹⁸⁷ James M. Lindgren, *Preserving the Old Dominion: Historic Preservation and Virginia Traditionalism* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993); James M. Lindgren, *Preserving New England: Preservation, Progressivism and the Remaking of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Dona Brown, "Purchasing the Past: Summer People and the Transformation of the Piscataqua Region in the Nineteenth Century," in Sarah Giffen and Kevin D. Murphy, eds., *'A Noble and Dignified Stream': The Piscataqua Region in the Colonial Revival* (York, ME: Old York Historical Society, 1992), 3-14; Wells, "The Multistoried House," 353-418; Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991; paperback ed., Vintage Books, 1983), 1-52, 89-90, 101-31.

¹⁸⁸ Lindgren, *Preserving the Old Dominion*.

¹⁸⁹ Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*.

¹⁹⁰ Richard T. Couture, *To Preserve and Protect: A History of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities* (Richmond: APVA, 1984); Nancy E. Packer, *White Gloves and Red Bricks: APVA 1889-1989* (Richmond: APVA, 1989); Dell Upton, "New Views of the Virginia Landscape," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 96, no. 4 (October 1988): 404.

The Thoroughgood House illustrates just how sentimental perceptions and contemporary contextualization effected even the most careful of restoration projects. Sentiment saved the building. Its restoration confounded studies of early American architecture for decades. In the nineteenth century, as the APVA was coalescing and as Pamela Ann Cunningham closed the deal on Mount Vernon, stories of provincial leaders were printed in newspapers. Their successes were measured in land held and ranks achieved, evaluated in the present much as history indicated they assessed themselves. For Adam Thoroughgood it was his personal story, apart from the house, celebrated in the 1880s *Standard*. Genealogical and documentary emphasis traced a family divorced from the dwelling they built at Church Point Plantation.¹⁹¹ Nor were the Thoroughgood House's historic association selling points in 1898. Linking the man to the house proved to be a twentieth-century phenomenon born of sentiment and science.

Traditionalism Transcends: Preservation of the Thoroughgood House

Despite differing approaches to the care of architectural sites associated with the colonial period, proponents in the North and the South shared in a devotion to the country's built heritage. They advocated for a common history preserved through the stewardship of architectural relics and extant buildings. These understandings underscored a belief in the cultivated taste of the early settlers and founding fathers, as well as became expressions patriotism, education, and sophistication of the surveyors, shrine markers, and restorers themselves.¹⁹² The blurred lines of veneration for the colonial past and intimate knowledge of it defined Colonial Revival studies and the ensuing surveys it generated, like that of Edith Tunis Sale and Robert Lancaster in the 1910s.¹⁹³ The presentation of the colonial period was as selective as the recreations of it in restorations of historic buildings such as the Thoroughgood House and at Lee family's Stratford Hall. The Thoroughgood House received new balusters and its golden hued oak paneling was stained a dark brown to be more in keeping with perceived colonial-period tastes, whereas

¹⁹¹ Grace Keeler perpetuated these interpretations in a booklet prepared for tourists in ca. 1927-28 that was available for purchase at the house. In it she called the building "the old Thoroughgood House" attributing it to the captain, and then recognized later family names associated with the property such as Allgood, Singleton, Garrison, and Lankford. She, however, suggested Allgood and Singleton owned the house. Keeler notes the Garrison family's "overhaul" of the building and a search for [historic fabric?] led the floors being taken up and the discovery of "some old Spanish coins" but "nothing of interest." She described her motivations for restoring the house as a hope it would live for other centuries. She does note, too, the construction of the original parish church on Thoroughgood's land. She separated the house from Thoroughgood's vast acres by saying Church Point was the Truitt farm.

¹⁹² Wells, "The Multistoried House," 354-57, 418; Daniel J. Vivian, "Creating Mulberry Plantation, 1915-1935: The Colonial Revival as Estate-Making Idiom," 187-95, chapter in forthcoming manuscript, copy on file with the author.

¹⁹³ Wells, "The Multistoried House," 354-57; the examples mentioned here, and analyzed by Wells in her text, are Edith Tunis Sale, *Mansions of Virginia in Colonial Times* (1909) and *Interiors of Virginia Houses of Colonial Times* (1927) as well as Robert A. Lancaster, *Historic Virginia Homes and Churches* (1915). Also of note is the inclusion of the un-cropped, photograph of the Thoroughgood House in Lancaster's book. The image holds significant information about the building's nineteenth-century form.

Kimball removed original fabric from the stairhall at Stratford. He installed a Colonial Revival confection in its stead. Similarly, Colonial Revival gardens often swept away vestiges of early Virginia for formal plans grounded in English precedent. This happened at the Thoroughgood House with Alden Hopkins's installation in the mid-twentieth century.¹⁹⁴

Around the time the Keeler family bought the Thoroughgood House property, the house assumed new significance as a historic artifact and one worthy of homage. Travelers visited. Photographers paid their respects.¹⁹⁵ The APVA commended it and raised monies for a plaque. Likely, too, it was in this era that the "AdT" was inscribed in the brick some twenty courses up on the south end of the west (front) façade.¹⁹⁶ Keeler's initial efforts at the house kept it neat and tidy, but her care of the property had not yet become a full restorative campaign. Screen doors and sash windows in the gable ends remained in place. Even so, the family's purchase of the property falls within a larger cultural pattern that saw northerners acquiring old plantations and refashioning them into estates.¹⁹⁷ Keeler's brother Rufus was in Norfolk for the transfer of title, and it is entirely plausible he was aware of Church Point Plantation's tie to Thoroughgood through the New York branch of the APVA and its familial connections to one of the founders of the organization, Mary Jeffery Galt. She was based in Norfolk and helped launch the APVA in the late 1880s.¹⁹⁸

It is likely the Jamestown Exposition of 1907 that was held in Norfolk influenced either the purchase of the property or a change in the Keeler's use of the property. The Exposition introduced the potential of heritage tourism in a resort area already fed by steamship lines ferrying New Yorkers to the Virginia coast and back again. Organizers of the Jamestown commemoration chose Norfolk as the site for it was the city they hyped through popularized Virginia history and not the historic place.¹⁹⁹ The perception of historical significance, and what history looked like, guided heritage tourism for decades to come just as it remade, recast or removed colonial period artifacts that didn't look colonial enough.

¹⁹⁴In "New Views of the Virginia Landscape," Upton illustrates how this "visual self-reliance" characterized the work of Waterman as well as of Arthur Shurcliff with whom Hopkins worked.

¹⁹⁵ Henry Mann's photographs document the house from the land side (west), recording the axial drive (walkway) and line of boxwood (likely) across the west front just off the patio. The attempt to re-orient (historically not physically) the house to the water had yet occurred.

¹⁹⁶This homage to the Captain marks the intersection of early documentary history and the architectural record. The date stone or builder's mark substantiated Colonial Revival interpretations of the building and etched an impression of how life in Virginia was experienced in the seventeenth century that captured the imagination of so many in the twentieth. The Thoroughgood's early date linked it to Jamestown and conscious efforts to capitalize on heritage tourism.

¹⁹⁷ Vivian, "Creating Mulberry Plantation," 187-242.

¹⁹⁸ Records for the New York branch and the Norfolk branch of the APVA are missing.

¹⁹⁹ Carl Abbott, "Norfolk in the New Century," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85 (1977): 86-96; Upton, "New Views of the Virginia Landscape," 409.

Grace Keeler's work at the Thoroughgood House in the 1920s, therefore, belongs to a larger trend within the Colonial Revival movement that preserved the house as well as a particular view of the past. The Keeler family took possession of property better known for its loose associations with horse racing farms in the county and with a ready supply of oysters. The lure of coastal property and historically rich land must have been irresistible. Undoubtedly activities of the APVA Norfolk branch and those surrounding the Jamestown Tercentennial increased public awareness of Princess Anne County's seventeenth-century history; joining Captain Adam Thoroughgood to the house offered Keeler a piece of the true cross and place at the forefront of Virginia's history not too distant from Jamestown's settlement.

The restoration Keeler commissioned in the 1920s benefitted from the attention of preservationists. With the house's history firmly established, all that remained was the removal of later intrusions that detracted from its origins and the installation of a Colonial Revival veneer. As Daniel Vivian found in the restoration of Lowcountry plantations, Keeler's restoration similarly appeared authoritative. She, too, altered the symbiosis between past and present, one that the restoration in the mid-century would perpetuate as dormer windows came out and stone steps stayed in place; authorities guiding the work lent the changes further creditability. The interpretation of the house's appearance recounted origins – the Captain's and the Colony's – without a connection to its immediate context or the architectural evolutions in form and spatial arrangement that occurred as the seventeenth century gave way to the eighteenth. Lauding the 1920s salvage of the seventeenth-century house were experts like Waterman and Barrows. Architect and preservationist Henry Chandlee Forman²⁰⁰ followed, as did the historical architect Finlay Ferguson. Ferguson would return at mid-century to remove Keeler's alterations from the historical reference.²⁰¹

²⁰⁰ Forman's career highlights include his tenure in the National Park Service, where he participated in the excavations at Jamestown and edited records for HABS for the Library of Congress. Particularly valuable to latter day historians are his sketches and survey of buildings on the Eastern Shore of Maryland as a document of what was extant. Problematic is his categorization of early Chesapeake buildings as "Medieval English" in style or character. "Medieval" evoked the Middle Ages, well receded by the 1600s, and a period of construction based in oral traditions and apprenticeships. For Forman, a "medieval" label dovetailed with his interpretation of a chronological explanation for Colonial period houses: small houses were seventeenth century, while larger ones were of the eighteenth. Although "Medieval English" was a misnomer rather than a valid stylistic assessment of Colonial Virginia's houses, Forman was not alone. Others such as Fiske Kimball used a "medieval" to describe architectural forms and details in Colonial-period buildings that were unaffected by Renaissance design. This perception was in keeping with studies by contemporary historical architects such as Thomas Waterman who looked to English architectural practice and pattern-book models for Virginia housing rather than a Virginia context for the design process. Understanding that context drove scholarship on the Chesapeake for more than a generation at the end of the twentieth century (see Part III, Section C). For an assessment of Forman's interpretation of Colonial architecture, especially the Chesapeake house, see Wells, "The Multistoried House," 372-73.

²⁰¹ *Norfolk Museum Bulletin*; Graham and Carson, 14-22.

Transcending Traditionalism: Public History and Preservation at the Thoroughgood House

The reference to early Virginia endured. Heritage tourism brought many to the house, and following Keeler's initial foray into opening the house to the public, various foundations took possession and completed its transformation from a "shrine of Virginia's Princess Anne" to house museum reinterpreted to the seventeenth century.²⁰² The interpretation created a seventeenth-century hall (south), while leaving an eighteenth-century parlor (north) intact. What was missing from the interpretation was a relational understanding of the use and social meanings of domestic space and how those evolved. Historians came to study the Thoroughgood House, noting its antiquity and questioning its age, and they slowly reintroduced the world of the early Chesapeake to the lands once held by Thoroughgood. They did so using the tools of the Colonial Revival. The analysis of historical fabric continued to play a role and notes in the form of measured drawings recorded evidence; this time, however, new views of the multi-storied house expanded the cultural landscape of early Virginia.²⁰³

History integrated the house sentiment saved, and that restorations remade, with its colonial past. Understood as representative of seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century choices, the Thoroughgood House clung to its earlier date.²⁰⁴ Some proponents for the building argued for the 1630s date; others pushed its construction to the 1670s as Chesapeake demographics and life-ways came into view.²⁰⁵ Dendrochronology confirmed an eighteenth-century building campaign, though in deference to tradition, historians let the seventeenth century date stand with caveats. When considered with the archaeological surveys conducted on the site, the lack of seventeenth-century material in the timbers and below ground led to the most recent re-evaluation.²⁰⁶ This confluence restored the Thoroughgood House's context and affirmed its place at the forefront of American architectural history.

Placing the Thoroughgood House in Architectural History Today

In the 1720s, house building in the Chesapeake underwent a shift as a greater number of planters could afford to erect well-appointed houses of wood and brick. Brick houses, like the Thoroughgood House, remained the province of the affluent. Within the prevailing mode, however, an increasing number of early Virginians displayed their awareness of fashionable trends through the buildings they made that mirrored their tastes. Brick foundations and

²⁰² "Shrine's of Virginia's Princess Anne," *Baltimore Sun*, 1932; Helen Christ, "Adam Thoroughgood House Reflects the Seventeenth-Century," *Virginian-Pilot*, July 21, 1974.

²⁰³ Upton, "New Views of the Virginia Landscape," and Camille Wells, "The Multistoried House."

²⁰⁴ Graham and Carson, 20-21.

²⁰⁵ Carson, "Settlement Patterns and Vernacular Architecture in Seventeenth-Century Tidewater Virginia"; Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia"; Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, eds., *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979).

²⁰⁶ Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*.

chimneys added to wood dwellings; structural ornamentation in patterned bricks on the exteriors comingled with plastered walls and paneling on the interiors as preferences commanded. More neatly appointed dwellings set in the middle of outbuildings, gardens, and fields appeared on the landscape.

It also in this period that archaeologists learned the use of ceramics mushroomed; spatial implications of these dining accouterments included storage as well as a place for the social ritual to occur. Closets were added. Room use altered. The introduction and incorporation of a central passage into the floor plan of the dwellings of the aspiring, and the genteel, taste makers corresponded to uptick in consumerism that sought comfort, encouraged cleanliness, and distinguished class. In the second quarter of the eighteenth century the small scale, brick buildings of these planters were erected and, of these, those that survived to the twentieth century were recognized as among the Chesapeake's earliest. The construction of the Thoroughgood House in 1719 to 1720 places it at the cusp of this building boom. Its one-room deep, central-passage plan also serves as a precedent for the double pile, or two-room, deep central passage house type of the elite who led Virginia in the second half of the eighteenth century and during the early federal period.

For many years, interpretations of the architectural character of the Thoroughgood House, overlaid a seventeenth-century immigration success story on an eighteenth century building. Captain Adam Thoroughgood's move up the social ladder from indentured servant to wealthy landowner was one many hoped to emulate and few could.²⁰⁷ His story captured the imagination of many at the turn of the twentieth century as well. They connected the story of Adam Thoroughgood to the land he owned. This link led to the preservation of the house with an emphasis on seventeenth-century architectural forms. Two restoration efforts attempted to return the house to a dwelling the Captain would recognize. Nonetheless, the building retains significant vestiges of original fabric and of the modifications to it that came a generation after Argall (II) and Susannah initiated their house-building project. The eighteenth-century material and form of the Thoroughgood House illustrate the hegemonic character of architecture and its role in maintaining hierarchal order.

Early advocates recognized the building as an early colonial-period house type, albeit one of the seventeenth century rather than the eighteenth. They read the materials and finishes as hallmarks of a successful planter, here, those of Captain Adam Thoroughgood. The Captain accumulated significant acreage before his death in 1640 and had already erected a dwelling made of wood near Lynnhaven Creek, in what is now Bayside. He had the means and the experience in construction to embark on an expensive house-building campaign. However, wherewithal proved to be only circumstantial evidence of authorship. Deeper historical analysis and detailed field studies of the early Chesapeake demonstrated that building in masonry only began in earnest in

²⁰⁷ Tate and Ammerman, eds., *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century*.

the 1720s and 1730s.²⁰⁸ The Thoroughgood House sits at the cusp of this uptick in construction of brick houses by Virginia planters such as Adam Thoroughgood's great grandson, Argall (II).

In early Virginia, the choice to build in brick carried significance. Brick was a tool of the gentry, a material distinction and permanent presence, and a disproportionate number of brick buildings survived the colonial period skewing latter-day impressions of the architectural landscape in the early Chesapeake, the vast bulk of which involved wood. Contemporary accounts reference brick houses by material as well as those made of wood on masonry foundations, thereby highlighting their distinctiveness.²⁰⁹ Extant examples, like Bacon's Castle in Surry County date to the second half of the seventeenth century. Bacon's Castle was built in 1665 and the tower of the church at Jamestown was built ca. 1680. Ruins of others, like the Jamestown Statehouse complex, Green Spring plantation in James City County, and the Custis homestead on the Eastern Shore, join those two and inform our understanding of structure and the shaping of social space.²¹⁰ Their presence also suggests a wave of construction activity beginning around 1670, perhaps made possible as demographics stabilized. The scale and styling of the Thoroughgood House recommended a similar construction date to architectural historians when they first examined housing in the Chesapeake.²¹¹

Throughout the seventeenth century, Colonial Virginians experimented with floor plans as they negotiated increased standards of living, accommodated social rituals, and segregated servants and service within the household. Ultimately a house plan with refined social spaces emerged.

²⁰⁸ Graham et al., 520-21; Lorena S. Walsh, *Motives of Honor, Pleasure and Profit: Plantation Management in the Colonial Chesapeake, 1607-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2010), 242-45.

²⁰⁹ Wells, "Planter's Prospect," 1-31; Hugh Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, edited by Richard L. Morton (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956), 71; William Hugh Grove, "Virginia in 1732: The Travel Journal of William Hugh Grove," edited by Gregory Stiverson and Patrick H. Butler, III *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85 (1977): 28.

²¹⁰ Nicholas M. Lucchetti, with contributions from Edward A. Chappell and Beverly A. Straube, "Archaeology at Arlington," Report for the Virginia Company Foundation and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, 1994. In the third quarter of the seventeenth century, when Argall Thoroughgood I was alive, the Colony's most affluent invested in public building projects in the capital city of Jamestown. A few erected distinctive brick houses with bold silhouettes and floor plans that separated social and circulation spaces, segregated family and service spaces, and differentiated in room use. Workplaces became show places. Examples include Bacon's Castle, Green Spring, and Joseph Bridger's White Marsh in Isle of Wight County. John Custis's Arlington on the Eastern Shore anticipated the well-known gentry house of the mid to late eighteenth century with two rooms to either side of a passage; it too was two rooms deep. The house likely had a lobby entry as well. As refined, and also with a lobby entry, was John Page's dwelling in Middle Plantation and the Ludwell's Rich Neck. Carson et al., "New World, Real World," 31-88; Graham et al., 451-522; and archaeological files, Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

²¹¹ Carson, "Settlement Patterns and Vernacular Architecture in Seventeenth-Century Tidewater Virginia"; Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia"; Carson et al., "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies."

These spaces were found in houses with one room or more.²¹² The removal of service from the dwelling, one room houses with a loft dotted the landscape alongside two-room houses heated by exterior end chimneys, recorded archaeologically and in the travel journal of Durand de Dauphine in 1686.²¹³ Durand observed regardless of wealth, Virginians chose not to build large buildings. Instead they erected several houses of similar scale, generally with two rooms, throughout their estates. The plantations, therefore, resembled little villages with separate kitchens, tobacco barns, slave quarters, and manor houses. The Bishop of London's Commissary, the Reverend James Blair outlined what accommodations a clergyman would need, echoing Durand's observation, by suggesting a house of at least one story, with cellar and garret, neatly framed and heated with brick chimneys. The windows would be glazed casements, the walls plastered, and roof shingled. Housing would also include a detached kitchen and outbuildings.²¹⁴ The seventeenth-century house with the porch chamber and cellar near Little Creek that Argall (II) Thoroughgood inherited was one of these.²¹⁵

The present Thoroughgood House, and those dwellings built soon after by neighbors and kin, represent the continuing evolution of house plans and forms in the Chesapeake. Similar to the two-cell module with exterior end chimneys that accommodated framing technologies and social needs early in the seventeenth century, house plans also expanded into three rooms and contracted to one, and were accessed by porches, lobby entries, and cross passages during these years as well. The variety of house types within an arch of Virginia building characterized the last quarter of the seventeenth century; it is remnants of the finest of these that we see today alongside the ca. 1680 church tower at Jamestown.

In Princess Anne County, a number of these early houses survived to the early decades of the twentieth century. Together they articulate the language of building that had developed in the Chesapeake and that accounted for preference within a prevailing idiom. Photographic surveys by Frances Benjamin Johnston and for the Historic American Buildings Survey recorded several of these buildings; more examples were included in the Kellums' *Historic Houses of Princess Anne County*, who categorized the early houses by roof type, material, and scale. Gable-roofed companions to the Thoroughgood House included the Lynnhaven House, the Keeling House, and Weblin plus those no longer extant such as Eastwood, Fairfield, and Hudgins House. Gambrel-roofed houses were also common, on the Eastern Shore and throughout Tidewater in this time

²¹² Graham et al., 451-522.

²¹³ Durand de Dauphine, *A Frenchman in Virginia being the Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee in 1686*, translated by a Virginian (Richmond: 1923), 111-13.

²¹⁴ Samuel Clyde McCulloch, "James Blair's Plan of 1699 to Reform the Clergy of Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly* third series 4 (1947): 79-80.

²¹⁵ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 1, 248-49; Walsh, 416-18.

period. Those recorded in early surveys were the Francis Land House, Salisbury Plains, Wolf's Snare, and Jonathan Woodhouse's dwelling.²¹⁶

Two most often compared to the Thoroughgood House are the Lynnhaven House and the Keeling House. The Lynnhaven House long was understood as a ca. 1680 building and contemporary of the Jamestown church tower. Its small scale and building footprint, steeply pitched gable roof, massive exterior end chimney, and exposed joists all pointed to a seventeenth-century origin. The discovery of a leaded glass quarrel of a casement window reinforced this interpretation of the evidence. However, dendrochronology dated the timbers used to construct the house to 1724 and the quarrel was secured by turned lead made in 1730. Like the Thoroughgood House, the structure of the one and one-half story Lynnhaven House provided ornament with its English bond brickwork, exposed eaves, tilted false plate, and ogee moldings on the ceiling joists in the hall. It, too, had a paneled and closed string stair, although the floor plan was the earlier hall-chamber (hall-parlor) arrangement.²¹⁷

Structural evidence of its construction in the 1720s is found in the brickwork of the Lynnhaven House. The walls are laid in English bond, and corbelling completes the eaves. Flat or jack arches were used in the windows, while segmental arches topped the door openings. The bricks in the jack and segmental arches were not rubbed or gauged as they would be in mid-century houses.²¹⁸

Similarly, the Keeling House has a steeply pitched gable roof with common rafters and half-dovetailed collars. The use of Flemish bond and raking in the gables created through the use of glazed headers is especially fine; the large exterior chimneys support fireplaces on both floors inside. Keeling House follows the Thoroughgood House in form with a central passage and a room to each side, a well-proportioned stair, and wood paneling. The paneling on the fireplace wall extends from floor to ceiling and accommodates closets to each side of the firebox. The closets are lit by windows in the gables. The paneling in the north room of the Thoroughgood

²¹⁶ These buildings also appeared in the 1780s map of the county; cartographic work occurred during the American Revolution and recorded house sites and owners, churches, bridges, and urban clusters along with the waterways and coastline. The Cape Henry lighthouse was not yet built. [Princess Anne County], Map 5-E-7, Henry Clinton Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan. The roofline of the Lynnhaven House and Weblin were popped up, although the Lynnhaven House's change was reversed. Weblin now has a gambrel roof although the line of the original gable is clear. For the Eastern Shore, the best record is Richard J. Rivoire's *Homeplaces* (La Plata, MD: Charles County Community College, 1990).

²¹⁷ Lynnhaven House, archives, Preservation Virginia, Richmond, Virginia; "Lynnhaven House," Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; site visit, July 7, 2014. Willie Graham and Orlando Ridout observed plans for an ell extension to the building in the racking of the wall, but it is unknown if the ell was constructed. Willie Graham and Orlando Ridout V, notes for file, June 1986, Lynnhaven House, APVA and Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

²¹⁸ Lounsbury, "Brickwork," 239-58.

House surrounding the fireplace is also an expression of the prevailing taste in the second quarter of the eighteenth century.²¹⁹

Another house representative of this generation of housing in the Chesapeake led by the Thoroughgood House is Weblin. The one and one-half story, two-room dwelling was once thought to have been built around 1670, however, Weblin belongs to the second quarter of the eighteenth century as well. Weblin exhibits a variance in brick bond, with Flemish bond in the front (west) façade and in front of the chimneystack on the south end wall. English bond is used for the watertable and to the rear of the chimney and for the rear (east) façade. A later addition obscures the other end wall, where American bond is visible. The interior chimneystack is in the north end wall and it is possible it dates to when the gambrel roof was added. The south chimney is reminiscent of that at the Thoroughgood House with its tiled shoulders, beltcourse and corbelling at the top. The T-shaped stack suggests multiple flues. The chimney is not integral to the end wall, raising the possibility it pre-dates the wall or was constructed later and made to look older in the twentieth century. Interior woodwork is Federal in profile and design.²²⁰ Significant parallels between the Thoroughgood House and Weblin include similar use of brick bond and patterned glazed headers as structural ornament, similar placement of the end chimneys, and changes to the fenestration. At Weblin, the window openings were enlarged, with the sill dropping a course or two, but the interior jambs remain insitu. Jack arches are also present.

The small brick houses of Princess Anne County represented a significant shift in construction and plan, and yet were only one piece of a larger architectural landscape. A more complete picture of the domestic landscape of eighteenth-century Virginia was drawn through advertisements in the *Virginia Gazette*. Historian Camille Wells found references to 1019 land holdings, of those, 919 mentioned houses and 77 percent of the dwellings were made of wood. Of the 919 dwellings, only 273 highlighted interior partitions, meaning most families occupied small houses of one or two rooms on the main floor. The smallest examples of housing listed in the newspaper accounted for only 120 square feet, and the largest up to 576.²²¹ These statistics contextualize the one and one-half story Thoroughgood House and highlight its significance in that wooden setting.

²¹⁹ DWH Miles and MJ Worthington, "The Tree Ring Dating of the Adam Keeling House, Virginia Beach, Virginia," Interim Report, December 2006, copy on file with the author. Willie Graham and Orlando Ridout recorded similarities in stair construction in the Lynnhaven and Keeling houses, meaning the handrails, balusters and stringers were toe-nailed into place, and suggested this could represent an iteration of joinery developed and used in the construction of these gentry houses. Graham and Ridout, notes for file, June 1986, Lynnhaven House, APVA and Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

²²⁰ Site visit and field notes, Camille Wells with Mark R. Wenger and Harry J. Bradley, "Weblin House," , Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; "Weblin," Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia.

²²¹ Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (Spring 1993): 1-9. Ten of the advertisements were in Princess Anne County.

Moreover, the use of a central passage floor plan in combination with structural ornamentation makes the Thoroughgood House a pivotal building in the evolution of housing in the early Chesapeake. The pulling inward of the circulation areas and liminal social spaces foreshadows a concealment and simplification of the carpentry in the Virginia house. Social rules ordered behavior and architecture expressed and enforced class distinctions. Plaster walls and paneling, for example, covered the posts and joists and reduced an awareness of the structural elements of the house frame.²²² This occurred in the Thoroughgood House in the mid eighteenth-century renovations by John (I) Thoroughgood.

While the passage further delineated space on the interior of houses, the exterior end chimneys, patterned brickwork, and ornamental hardware distinguished houses like that built by Argall (II) and Susannah Thoroughgood from those of their less affluent neighbors. The use of a tilted false plate to carry the rafters had both practical and polite motivations. Tilting the false plate allowed the framing to better shed water and resist the thrusts of the rafters and joists; it also acted as a decorative feature. Repeating a shared vocabulary of construction and inherited Chesapeake building tradition kept the Thoroughgood House in context with its surroundings and in communication with the smaller, more impermanent dwellings. It also indicated Argall's ability not just to refashion the old plantation house at Little Creek, but to build anew in keeping with modern societal needs. That the corresponding examples of brick houses in Princess Anne County were built shortly after the Thoroughgood House and by their extended family and friends speaks to the society that had coalesced along the Lynnhaven River in Lower Norfolk County.²²³

The significance of the central passage floor plan seen in the Thoroughgood House, and repeated in others like the Keeling House, lies in the cultural forces that shaped society, and those in the Chesapeake who could, responded by further separating and segregating their living spaces from work spaces. Henry Glassie, in *Folk Housing of Middle Virginia*, and Dell Upton, in *Domestic Vernacular Architecture* among other texts, reinterpreted patterns of room use and reexamined when new rooms came into house plans, such as the dining room and passage. Mark Wenger's investigation of those two spaces, as well as bedchambers, builds on their analyses and elucidates how Virginia planters pulled apart their houses from the catch-all hall to specialized rooms accessible from a passage.²²⁴ They arranged their dwellings to differentiate social hierarchies, and to establish boundaries for more private areas even as their houses continued to function as

²²² Graham, 179-96; also, Mark R. Wenger on Belle Air, Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

²²³ This network of the Thoroughgood family and friends could be reconstructed and teased out as Rutman and Rutman did for Middlesex County.

²²⁴ Wenger, "The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space," Wenger, "The Dining Room in Early Virginia," and Mark R. Wenger, "Eighteenth-Century Bedchambers," Draft of essay, September 2000, copy on file with the author.

civic and socio-political settings. By the end of the eighteenth century, dining rooms and bedchambers were at opposite ends of the house signaling a separation between public duty and private affairs. Call bell systems and porches similarly pushed service within reach but out of sight.²²⁵

Circumstances of place, here the Chesapeake climate, effected how buildings were used even if the climate had less influence over form than initially proposed.²²⁶ Wenger's interpretation of the progression of passage to saloon underscores this point. The passage separated the seventeenth-century hall and chamber. It represents the culmination of a period of experimentation in house plan that tried the un-enclosed cross passage and the lobby entry; these circulation spaces and spaces of encounter were pulled into the house proper as the passage. In addition to the social sorting the passage offered, it became a less formal, more temperate place to live during the sticky Chesapeake summers. Even so, as the passage accommodated more social activities and civic rituals it became more formal.

Over the course of the eighteenth century, the passage evolved again. Floor plans rearranged the placement of the stair, either removing it from the passage altogether or pushing it back from the main entrance into a stair hall. The relocation of the stair left the social purpose of the passage akin to that of the English Saloon, a name the space soon appropriated.²²⁷ In the Thoroughgood House, with the installation of the paneling and plaster and the well-proportioned stair, the passage became a symbol of the social order it enforced. It also morphed into a demarcation of public and private spaces within the Virginia house by the end of the eighteenth century.

Echoing the early informality of the passage, and the continued use of the upper passage as a family space, was the dining room.²²⁸ With the introduction of a separate space for dining, the chamber became a private place as planters positioned the public dining room at opposite lengths from the bedchamber and family areas. In smaller dwellings, like the Thoroughgood House, the semi-private chambers (or parlor) moved upstairs as a desire for more private spaces emerged. In houses like the Thoroughgood House, that used architectural embellishment to articulate social hierarchies, the finely detailed woodwork of the stair and stair hall ascended as far as the first-floor visitors' eyes could see. The upper passage served a different role than the passage of the first floor; it accommodated familial needs much like the informal dining room had, including

²²⁵ Wenger, "Eighteenth-Century Bedchambers"; *The Early Architecture of Tidewater Virginia: A Guidebook* (Williamsburg: Architectural Research Department, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, for VAF, 2002), 75-77.

²²⁶ Donald Linebaugh, "'All Annoyances and Inconveniences of the Country': Environmental Factors in the Development of Outbuildings in the Colonial Chesapeake," *Winterthur Portfolio* 29 (1994): 1-18.

²²⁷ Wenger, "The Central Passage in Virginia." In his proposal for the renovation of the house at Green Spring, for example, Benjamin Henry Latrobe named both a dining room and a saloon in the plans. The proposal was prepared in 1796-1797. This is one example of how an existing space received a new name, signifying a shift in use and meaning.

²²⁸ Wenger, "The Dining Room in Early Virginia."

storage and ad-hoc uses. With doors to either chamber in the garret, for example, the small upper passage in the Thoroughgood House had a necessary and yet subservient role to play in the ordering of the household. Lofts in smaller dwellings, like those with one-room plans, fulfilled similar roles as the chamber did for those living in the Thoroughgood House.

In conclusion, the materials and scale of the Thoroughgood House situate the dwelling within the Chesapeake building tradition as it evolved and, by the second quarter of the eighteenth century, settled on a house type with a two-room floor plan and end chimneys. Houses with two rooms, and brick chimneys, allowed for social rituals and spatial sorting. Those of the same scale, made of brick rather than wood, signified affluence. These were the dwellings a traveler to Virginia would recognize and associate with genteel hospitality, namely a spare bed in a chamber or loft and appointments to pass a comfortable night, as William Hugh Grove described in 1732. Their presence in the landscape today signals a similar recognition of status and introduces to modern-day guests a more nuanced understanding of the character of early Virginia society and of the characterization of architectural forms produced.

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: The one and one-half story, gable-roofed, brick masonry dwelling known as the Thoroughgood House represents a significant shift in the design of early American houses. By 1720 when the house was erected, the older methods of construction were giving way to permutations developed in the Chesapeake and to those changes dictated by prevailing taste. These shifts included floor plans and framing.

Its construction in 1719 to 1720 put the house at the forefront of those built with a central passage plan by affluent planters and those planters of middling socio-economic status in Colonial Chesapeake society.²²⁹ Equally important to the innovation in floor plan is the presence of a tilted false plate.²³⁰ The false plate represented a technological innovation

²²⁹ Mark R. Wenger, "The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space," in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture II*, edited by Camille Wells (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), 137-49; Edward A. Chappell, "Housing a Nation: The Transformation of Living Standards in Early America," in *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994), 167-232 with particular emphasis to 181-93, and note 29. Historian Billy Smith examined the lives of the "lower sort" in Philadelphia, and eighteenth-century diarist Ebenezer Hazard, among others, commented on social class in Virginia. Hazard's journal was transcribed and printed in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 62 (1954). For more on the middling ranks of Colonial Chesapeake society, see Section III, Part D of this report.

²³⁰ Graham, "Preindustrial Framing in the Chesapeake," 179-96; Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia"; Garry Wheeler Stone, "Society, Housing, and Architecture in Early Maryland: John

in construction that was developed in the Chesapeake to more quickly raise the structural frame of a building. The false plate eased the construction of the eaves by joining the roof system to that of the wall frame below.

Carpenters in the early Chesapeake substituted a tilted false plate for a complex joint (mortise, tenon, and peg) to connect the rafters and joists or tie beams at the wall plate. Because the false plate rested on the ends of the joists and rafters rested on the false plate, the roof and wall structures were independent of each other. Sometimes the false plate was notched into the joists at a 45 degree angle; false plates installed in this way were called tilted false plates. The development of the false plate was encouraged by circumstances of the Chesapeake wherein wood was a plentiful resource and labor was not. The use of the false plate took advantage of a readily available resource (wood) to compensate for the rarer (carpenters and time) in order to complete construction of a dwelling or a large tobacco barn and hasten workers return to economically productive work in the fields.²³¹

False plates are an especially important signpost of the Virginia house as it evolved in the seventeenth century Chesapeake, and they appear as early as 1665 in Bacon's Castle (HABS No. VA-75). Documentary sources also record the early use of false plates, including one in 1673. These sources and the example of Bacon's Castle suggest builders incorporated the false plate into their repertoire in the third quarter of the seventeenth century. False plates simplified the joinery between the rafters and the joists, and by the 1710s were tilted to better shed water and resist torque. As a counter to the thrust of the rafters, false plates functioned in much the same way as purlins. The false plate also served as structural ornamentation when builder/occupants thought exposed framework was fashionable, as seen initially in the Thoroughgood House.

The oldest extant example of a tilted false plate is at Sotterley (HABS No. MD-181), in southern Maryland. The dendrochronological analysis dated the tilted false plate to

Lewger's St. John's," Ph.D. diss, University of Pennsylvania, 1982; Chappell and Richter, "Wealth and Houses in Post-Revolutionary Virginia," 3-22; Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (Spring 1993); Cary Carson et al., "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," 135-96; Upton, "The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture," 44-57; Graham et al., "Adaptation and Innovation," 451-522; Cary Carson et al., "New World, Real World," 31-88; and Carson and Lounsbury, eds., *The Chesapeake House*. The significance of the framing developed in the Chesapeake is summarized in the historical report for HABS No. VA-960.

²³¹ Upton, "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia," 65-113; as well as Carl R. Lounsbury, ed., with Vanessa E. Patrick, *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1993), 136.

1715.²³² Sotterley is a contemporary of the Adam Thoroughgood House and so reinforces the importance of the dwelling in the lexicon of early American architecture.

The architectural significance of the house is amplified by the story of Captain Adam Thoroughgood and the social mobility possible in the second quarter of the seventeenth century that his life represents. Thoroughgood came to Virginia as an indentured servant and rose to landowner. Land ownership was a measure of wealth and so the amount of property held conferred social status. This socio-economic valuation also brought political clout, though most planters had a few hundred acres or less and worked the land themselves.²³³ Thoroughgood assumed a place among the county elite and won a place on the Council of State. After his indenture ended and some initial lands rented, Thoroughgood returned to England and married. Shortly thereafter, he brought his bride to Virginia and counted her among his headrights thereby adding another 50 acres to his total acreage and bringing his claim to over 5000 acres for transporting people to the colony.

Immigration policy in early Virginia included a provision that any person settling in Virginia, or paying for another's transportation and settlement, could receive fifty acres of the land, per immigrant. This provision of a headright, i.e., the right to fifty acres per head, began by order of the Quarter Court in 1618. Patents for land claimed by virtue of the headright system were recorded beginning in 1634 and the practice continued until 1779.²³⁴

Intertwining Thoroughgood's story with the architectural evolution occurring in the early Chesapeake as demographics stabilized and the plantation economy structured society is the brick inscribed with "AdT" seen at the south end of the west (front) façade of the house. For many years it was understood as a date stone or attribution to the builder.²³⁵ The presence of the Thoroughgood brick substantiated Colonial Revival period interpretations of the building as a seventeenth-century structure. Its reference to the seventeenth-century Captain also helped etch an impression of how life in the Colony

²³² Willie Graham to Virginia B. Price, personal communication, November 2010; Graham, 185-86; Lounsbury, *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape*, 136.

²³³ Walsh, *Motives of Honor, Pleasure and Profit*.

²³⁴ Daphne Gentry, *Research in Virginia Documents*, on-line series for the Library of Virginia (http://www.lva.virginia.gov/public/guides/va4_headrights.htm), as well as Robert A. Stewart's introduction to *Cavaliers and Pioneers* by Nell M. Nugent and Lorena Walsh's summary in *Motives of Honor, Pleasure and Profit*, 368-70.

²³⁵ It is likely Grace Keeler added the date stone or attribution brick during her restoration of the house; two accounts in the 1910s fail to mention the brick, something Thomas Waterman later described as faded by weather over time.

was experienced that captured the imagination of many in the twentieth century and so ensured the building's preservation.

2. Condition of fabric: The Thoroughgood House is in good repair although access to the second floor is limited. After the archaeological work was completed, funds to restore the house were obtained through the *Save America's Treasures* program and matched by the City of Virginia Beach. Primarily in the 2009 to 2011 rehabilitation effort measures were taken to mitigate water damage to the bricks around the exterior doorways. These included removing the stone steps installed during Grace Keeler's restoration of the house in the 1920s and repairing the interior bricks of the wall structure on either side of the doors. A wood lintel replaced the steel lintel above the doors, reversing an earlier attempt to shore up the entries. The wood sills were changed as were the wood doors themselves. New wood steps with treads dovetailed into the stringer were made; these are more in keeping with the date of the house than the stonework was and they allow for water to drain away from the wall fabric. The mortar was renewed at this time as well; the oyster-shell mortar is similar to that initially used in building the house and corrected deficiencies found in earlier re-pointing campaigns. A new HVAC system and fire detection system were installed, superseding those servicing the house since the 1950s.

A preservation easement protects the property and ensures future work will also be sympathetic to the period of construction.

B. Description of Exterior:

1. Overall dimensions: The Thoroughgood House measures approximately 45' by 22' and is three bays across its front (west) and rear (east) elevations. Two end chimneys heat the interior, and the main floor has a room to either side of a 10' wide central passage. Doorways, not quite in alignment or on center, open from the passage to the exterior on the east and west elevations. The one and one-half story building is covered by a side-gable roof.
2. Foundations: The Thoroughgood House foundations are made of brick and historically little more than a crawl space existed below it. A trench, likely for the utilities extending to the late nineteenth-century addition, elicited several theories, including smuggling goods and safeguarding the family from pirates or the local Native American tribes.²³⁶ This is located off the southeast corner of the building.

²³⁶ George H. Tucker, "A Mystery Arch in Adam's House," *The Virginian-Pilot*, [1968?], clipping on file with author.

3. Walls: The walls of the Thoroughgood House are made of brick masonry laid in English bond with Flemish bond on the west (land) façade.

Some have suggested that the house was constructed in two phases.²³⁷ One scenario posited that Adam Thoroughgood died while building the house, leaving three walls of brick laid in English bond completed. The fourth wall, laid in Flemish bond, was completed by his widow, Sarah. In 1645-46 she hired James Smyth to “cover” part of her house and to complete a malt house.²³⁸ In 1650, Sarah’s third husband, Francis Yeardley, contracted with William Eale for work on two houses, one in Lynnhaven and one in Keyconton [sic]. The latter house lacked doors and a roof and Eale was hired to repair the brickwork. The house in Lynnhaven, interpreted as the present building, had a dining room, a yellow room, and a chamber over the kitchen among other spaces.²³⁹ Dendrochronological analysis was done to address the possibility of a phased construction campaign for the Thoroughgood House; the framing members had consistent test results and so eliminated this theory. Although not for this house, the documentary record of Sarah Thoroughgood’s contractual negotiations and the construction of buildings add much to what is known of the early Chesapeake.

Another example of a house with the varying brick bonds is the 1720s house in King William County known as Sweet Hall. Flemish bond is used on the front façade, and English bond is used elsewhere. The use of conventional trusses, with common rafters, false plates, and collars, as well as the presence of riven clapboards make Sweet Hall an important counterpart to the Thoroughgood House.²⁴⁰

The walls of the Thoroughgood House are two bricks thick (about 13”). Bricks vary in size from 4” x 2”, 8 ½ x 2”, and 5 ½ x 2” and the mortar is scored. Original oyster shell lime mortar is evident on the south chimney as are several original bricks notable for the preservation of the accidental pawprint from an animal crossing through the brick yard. The glazed headers were close to cobalt in color initially.

²³⁷ Graham and Carson address this theory in their analysis, see 20-21.

²³⁸ W. Paul Treanor, “The Adam Thoroughgood House: The Truth about its Age: A Brief History of Lower Norfolk County, Virginia,” *The Chesopiean* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 4-7; Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book B, 61. Treanor also suggests the wood house, abandoned by Sarah once the brick house was complete, became an ordinary. Moreover, Treanor argues that this seventeenth-century ordinary was the Pleasure House ordinary recorded on later maps and preserved in the place name for Pleasure House Creek and present-day Pleasure House Road. Note: “Keyconton” refers to Kecoughtan (present day Hampton).

²³⁹ Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book B, 177.

²⁴⁰ “Sweet Hall,” report June 2009, rev. July 2009, file, Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

A watertable of English bond wraps the base the building and the use of a bullnose stretcher at the cap is in keeping with the use of molded or shaped brick during the early eighteenth century. Generally six to seven courses are visible above grade and the watertable measures just under 2'0".

There is a two-course string of Flemish bond at the eaves on each gable end, and similar to the embellishment of the string or belt course, is the use of glazed bricks in a diagonal along the roof line.

During the 1950s restoration of the house, modern brickwork filled in around the seven mid-eighteenth century window openings and the nineteenth-century door east of the chimney in the south elevation. The corbels at the eaves were also reconstructed. Masons created segmental arches above the window and door openings and reworked the jambs.

In the west elevation, some twenty courses above the watertable is the "AdT" brick. No longer perceived as evidence of Adam Thoroughgood's occupancy of the house in the 1630s, the brick was in place by the time of the 1930s publication by Thomas Waterman and John Barrows, *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia*.

In a Historic Structure Report drafted in 2006, Alan Morledge attributes the rebuilding of the southern end of the west (land) elevation to the soil disturbance caused during the construction of the 1890s wing. Morledge notes that the repaired brickwork is more obvious in the Flemish bond pattern than in the English bond of the east gable end. The east foundations were reinforced as well; there is also a 6" slope in the cornice line running from the north to the south. The sandy soil shifted from under the house into the excavation for the wing's cellar or basement and the settling damaged the brick. Further evidence is seen in the wall above south jamb of the west door.²⁴¹ Similarly water trapped between the twentieth-century stone steps and the historic fabric damaged the structure. Water infiltration impacted interior bricks of the exterior walls up to 3' to either side of the doors.

4. Structural systems, framing: The exterior walls are load-bearing masonry that supports the interior framing, such as the joists and rafters. The walls are two bricks deep, and the (original) structural framing, i.e., wall plates, first-floor studs, ceiling joists, tilted false plates, common rafters and collars, are pine.

²⁴¹ Morledge, Sec. 7, 3. In an earlier section, he also observed a rebuilding and/or thickening of the foundation from the east corner to joist #6 (the south room). This rebuilding could have been prompted by settlement from the addition.

None of the first-floor joists are original, however, the joist pockets were re-used and cut nails slipped into the original nail holes to maintain the initial nailing pattern. A combination of girders and brick piers support the new joists.

On the other hand, the ceiling joists are original. They are made of yellow pine and are notched over the wall plate and project around 5" past the wall face. At the east end of the house the joists were sawn off to accommodate the Garrison family's 1890s addition. The rafters and collar ties are also original.²⁴²

5. Porches, stoops: The wood steps were installed after the archaeological work near the house was completed by the James River Institute. The steps consist of treads almost 12' in width dovetailed into a stringer. There are no risers. On the east (water) side, there is a landing about 5' square and made of modern bricks; the wood steps lead from this surface to the doorway. The door is recessed 8" from the wall plane.

6. Chimneys: The T-shaped chimney stacks rise above the ridge line and are corbelled at the caps. The T-shape suggests multiple flues and so fireplaces to warm the upper and lower levels of the house. While both chimneys are end chimneys, meaning they are placed in the gable end wall elevations, one is internal (north) and the other is external (south). The exterior end chimney measures about 11' across and has sloped weatherings, which are tiled with bricks measuring 2" thick and 8" square.

7. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: There are two doors visible from the exterior, one each in the east and west elevations. These are replacement, single doors made of four beaded boards positioned vertically and joined together. Each door is approximately 3' wide, and the openings just under 4'.

b. Windows and shutters: Casement windows with leaded comes of diamond-shaped glass or quarrels light the interior of the house; there are no shutters. On the first floor, there two double casements measuring about 2' each in the east and west facades. Strap hinges secure the leaves of the casements to the frame. Above the leaves is an inoperable transom, also with leaded quarrels, and whole rests under a segmental arch.

²⁴² Ferguson's restoration altered the collars by removing the plaster and inserting boards above to create a cockloft and to create what was thought to be an earlier arrangement of the space. During the Garrison period, additional rafters were installed, some sistered to the originals, to support the pantile roof.

8. Roof:

a. Shape, covering: The Thoroughgood House has a steeply pitched gable roof that is shingled. Portions of the original riven oak clapboard covering remain in place.

b. Cornice, eaves: In the mid twentieth-century restoration, the architects extended the eaves to resemble later Georgian or Classical Revival proportions; the deeper eaves and exterior cornice hid the tilted false plate. Today there are brick corbels at the north and south ends with a wood box cornice, painted brown, left in-situ.

c. Dormers: There are no dormers present. For two centuries five dormer windows punctuated the face of the gable roof, two on the west (front) and three on the east (water); in historic photographs, the glazing of each dormer consists of six-over-six lights arranged in double-hung sash. These were removed in the mid twentieth-century restoration, and in two of those locations, evidence of the original clapboard roofing was found.

C. Description of Interior:

1. Floor plans: The house has a central passage floor plan with a room opening off the passage to the north (19' x 17') and to the south (13' x 17'). A stair rises against the north wall of the passage and turns across the west (rear) wall. The door to the south room is below this landing. In the garret, there are two rooms, although the partition for the north room was taken down. Evidence of the doorway into that space is visible in the floorboards.²⁴³

2. Stairways: The present open well stair has a half pace landing. The steps rising along the south wall of the passage to the landing have an 8" rise. The treads measure almost 12". The balusters are tightly spaced and so visually there are approximately three per step. The handrail terminates in a square shaped newel post. The woodwork of the stair, as well as the wainscot in the passage, is made of oak and presently stained a dark brown.

²⁴³ The position of the floor boards corresponds to a partition wall for the chamber over the hall (north room); the partition and flooring are contemporary to each other and this correlation suggests the possibility that much of the flooring on the second floor is intact. Graham and Carson, 15. Note: The partition wall was removed in the 1950s restoration led by Ferguson.

The landing runs the width of the passage, against the east wall, and steps rise from the landing to the second floor. Initially the turn would have been much tighter, or would have been a ladder-type, with the stairs abutting the wall at the ninth joist/original position of the north partition. The rise is lower in this section of the stair.²⁴⁴

3. Flooring: The flooring on the first-floor was replaced in 1968 by E. T. Gresham,²⁴⁵ the flooring consists of random-width boards made of hard pine. The floor boards have tongue and groove joints and are nailed with cut nails.

4. Wall and ceiling finish: The walls and ceilings are plaster on lath painted white; oak wainscot paneling distinguishes the passage and north room. The firebox in the north room (seventeenth-century parlor) was reduced in size and paneled, leaving an arched opening finished with plaster. In the south room, the walls are painted and plastered, and the ceiling joists are exposed. The firebox is left open and interpreted with cooking implements in place. Small arched openings in the cheeks of the firebox could provide warming shelves or these alcoves could provide a place for candles, offering light in the evening hours.²⁴⁶

5. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The wood doors leading to the rooms on the first floor, as well as to the south room in the garret, are replacement doors made in the twentieth century. The wood paneled door to the closet under the stair dates to the 1740s, and to John Thoroughgood's renovations of the house he inherited. Hinges attach the door to the surround, and a thumb latch locks it into place.

b. Windows: The wood and glass casement windows date to the 1950s restoration of the house; the location of the east and west casements became apparent once the plaster was removed and so the initial fenestration pattern could be recreated.

6. Decorative features and trim: The house is notable for its oak paneling and wainscoting; the stair was highlighted in early photography, such as those images created by Frances Benjamin Johnston.

²⁴⁴ The original stair was likely a ladder stair rising between joists #8 and #9. The wall studs for the south partition wall of the passage, at joist #6, also date to the installation of the stair and likely the rebuilding occurred to accommodate the door opening. Carson, October 1986. Seriation of the stair is the initial ladder stair, the paneled stair and expansion of the passage northward from joist #9 to joist #10, and the changes in balusters in the 1950s.

²⁴⁵ Morledge, Sec. 3, 4-5. Gresham's repairs followed the Garrison-era changes. On the upper floor, behind the knee wall, the 1" thick floor boards are ship lapped and sawn face down. These represent an earlier installation.

²⁴⁶ See Virginia B. Price, "Pear Valley," Report, 2012, Historic American Buildings Survey, Library of Congress (HABS No. VA-960), 19, and notes 56-58.

7. Hardware: The hardware dates to the 1950s restoration and was made by Donald Streeter, Iona, New Jersey, for the house and in a style in keeping with the seventeenth-century interpretation of the construction date.

8. Mechanical equipment:

a. Heating: A new Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system was installed during the recent restoration project.²⁴⁷

b. Lighting: Electricity came to the Thoroughgood House early in the twentieth century, and while not interpreted as such, remains in the building today.²⁴⁸

c. Plumbing: The plumbing installed by Grace Keeler was removed during the 1950s renovation and restoration overseen by Finlay Ferguson. Individual wells supplied water to the Thoroughgood House and surrounding area for a number of years, and by the 1920s, when the Keelers owned the house, electricity fed the water pump. A well on the property continues to be used for irrigation purposes today.

9. Original furnishings:²⁴⁹ There are no original furnishings associated with the Thoroughgood House today. Two objects on a long-term loan to the house are representative of the seventeenth century and used for interpretative purposes. They are both cupboards made of oak.

The seventeenth-century court cupboard and press cupboard were thought to be in keeping with the furnishings known to have belonged to Captain Adam Thoroughgood. In keeping with precedent for a dower rights, certain furnishings were reserved for a widow's bedchamber and this was true for Adam and Sarah Thoroughgood. In a partial transcription in *The Standard* (1881), Sarah (since remarried) claimed a bed with furnishings/linens, a table with carpet, linens, flatware, a cupboard, chairs, stools, cushions, pictures, basin and ewer, snuffers, warming pan, bed pan, andirons and fireplace equipment and a child's chair made of wicker. In the cupboard, she had a salt cellar, bowl, tankard, wine cup, and a dozen spoons. The reference to the cupboard is significant here, and likely prompted the gift. This list was recorded at a Quarter Court in James City in April 1641.

²⁴⁷ This system replaces the one installed in 1992 that in turn replaced the one installed in the 1950s.

²⁴⁸ Morledge does not believe Keeler electrified the house, though perhaps in this section he is recounting historical reports about the work Keeler did and evaluations of those sources come later. Sec. 4, 2.

²⁴⁹ Jan Kirsten Gilliam and Betty Crowe Leviner, *Furnishing Williamsburg's Historic Buildings* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1991), provides an entrée for furnishings of the period.

Other period furnishings referenced in the mid 1970s include Dutch delftware, a Jacobean footstool, a brass candleholder, two cane-backed chairs, a spice cupboard made of oak, and a candle snuffer.²⁵⁰

A desire for comfort shaped the standards of living among all social classes in the eighteenth century. Research by Lois Green Carr and Lorena Walsh found that it was this more than distinction or even necessities like food, shelter, clothing that guided patterns of consumption. Each investment in household goods allowed poorer and middling income Virginians the ability to eat with forks and drink from individual vessels. These Virginians exchanged the merely utilitarian for the commonplace by acquiring earthenware and plate; these purchases also enabled them to accommodate a measure of social ceremony practiced by the more affluent. Quantitative analysis by Carr and Walsh, moreover, determined wealthy estates were those valued at £225. The poorest hovered at £50 or less.²⁵¹

Planters, such as Argall (II) Thoroughgood, had furnished beds, and bedsteads such as those were generally the most expensive items inventoried in any decedent's estate, excepting slaves and livestock. This held true even though his estate was influx as the house was under construction. Primarily, though, the furnishings in the incomplete building were described as "old", like the ten chairs and the five broken rush chairs, or were linens. Extending day into night were the brass candlesticks and easing service of foodstuff were the earthen plates and stone(ware) jugs. Two bibles and five old books were found among the housewares. Still, the value of Argall's estate presented to court came to £135.14. Omitted were thirty-six head of cattle and the construction materials.²⁵²

The material life inside the Thoroughgood House shifts to John (II) in the 1760s and comparable lifeways of his brother, William, in the old house near Little Creek.²⁵³ As for their father, John (I) Thoroughgood invested in materials to work the land and in his labor force. His twenty-six slaves were the most valuable of his assets, above the livestock and farm equipage and well above the beds, tea spoons, pewter ware, earthenware, glassware, and china. His widow Margaret received just over £70 as her dower, including two beds and furniture and a desk and bookcase, but primarily a horse, calves and sheep. She also

²⁵⁰ "Thoroughgood Break-In: Valuable Antiques Found Undamaged," *Virginian-Pilot*, December 20, 1975, clipping, copy on file with the author.

²⁵¹ Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behavior in the Colonial Chesapeake," in *Of Consuming Interests*, 59-166; Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, "The Standard of Living in the Colonial Chesapeake," *William and Mary Quarterly* third series 45, no. 1 (January 1988): 135-59; Neiman, *Discovering Clifts Plantation*, Carson, "Why Demand?"; Mark R. Wenger, "The Dining Room in Early Virginia."

²⁵² Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 253.

²⁵³ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 9, 679-81; Princess Anne County Court Records, Minute Book 8, 289, 292, 298, 494, 500; Princess Anne County Court Records, Audit Book 3, 93. William died in 1799.

had life rights to nine slaves: Harry, Will, Jammey, Tom, Betty, Pegg, Phillis, Amy, and Hagar. Margaret was the guardian for Thomas Scarborough and Mitchell, and both children received slaves with Own, Affrica [sic], and Sarah reserved for Mitchell and Little George, Frank and Dinah for Thomas Scarborough. His daughter Peggy Hunter received beds and their furnishing as well as slaves, as did her eldest brother John (II).²⁵⁴ Other items in the inventory were a bible, a sword, and money scales. These provide evidence of John (I) Thoroughgood's status in the county with hints to service on the vestry, leadership of the militia and honorary engagements through a gentleman's weapon, and engagement in trade.

Personal property taxes illustrate a continued emphasis on land and labor as the main indicators of wealth. The earliest extant list accounted for assets owned by John Thoroughgood (II) in the 1790. He was taxed for his son John Wainhouse, who was sixteen years old, as well as nineteen black laborers and seventeen horses.²⁵⁵ The personal effects of Marshall Anderson passed to John (II) Thoroughgood in 1795, further illustrating the value of horses and consumer goods to the increasing comfort of life in the early Chesapeake. Anderson pledged specific items to satisfy a debt of £25.8.2; his two horses' names were Dreadnough and Fearnough. Household and kitchen furnishings highlighted in the agreement included feather beds, with the bedsteads and furnishings, a pine table, six flag bottom chairs, and a safe. Likely the most valuable were the beds and the two horses, plus a yoke of steer, given the sources of wealth throughout the eighteenth century and underpinning the Thoroughgood's estate in Princess Anne County.²⁵⁶

D. Site:

1. Historic landscape design: It is generally accepted that the Thoroughgood House occupies land once held by the Chesapeakes. Archaeological evidence records a significant Native American presence late in the Woodland Period.²⁵⁷ The Chesapeakes disappeared from Virginia, and in 1618 William Strachey accounted for their elimination by Powhatan in his history of the Virginia Colony. Although Strachey attributed Powhatan's conquest to his fears of an empire rising from the Chesapeake (i.e., the British), the date of conquest is unknown. Powhatan consolidated his authority, attacking the Chesapeakes, the Keoughtan (1597), and the Piankatanks (1608). Late in 1607,

²⁵⁴ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 9, 679-81. William Keeling was the initial guardian to William and Argall Thoroughgood. Argall's inheritance likewise included enslaved laborers. They were Jack and Rachel.

²⁵⁵ Princess Anne County Land Tax Records, 1790, Library of Virginia. See, also, Gloria L. Main, "Notes and Documents: Probate Records as a Source for Early American History," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series 32, no. 1 (January 1975): 89-99; Chappell, "Housing a Nation," 214; Rutman and Rutman, 128-63.

²⁵⁶ Princess Anne County Court Records, Deed Book 24, 33-34.

²⁵⁷ Floyd Painter's excavations as well as those of the James River Institute for Archaeology support this.

Powhatan finally subdued the Chickahominies who then agreed to pay duties to him and to support him in war. Ethnohistorian Helen Roundtree argued convincingly that this means Powhatan was expanding his confederation and that his dominion over the Coastal Algonquins was relatively new when the British settled Jamestown.²⁵⁸ The Chesapeakes shared the Eastern Algonquin language with the Powhatan Confederacy, but archaeology suggests they belonged to the Carolina Algonquin line. They maintained three towns, Skicoak, Chesepioc, and Apasus; the last could be near the Thoroughgood House. With the recent acquisition of the adjacent parcel, the possibility of further archaeological investigation of the Thoroughgood House property opened.²⁵⁹

In June 1635, Captain Adam Thoroughgood received a patent for 5350 acres of land in lower Norfolk County and in what would be Lynnhaven Parish. He received this parcel because of the settlement policy then in effect wherein he received 50 acres per person brought over the Colony.²⁶⁰ The headright he claimed included himself, his wife Sarah and 105 others. Thoroughgood also patented 200 acres, which were his by right as an “adventurer” to the Colony, and purchased additional tracts. He owned around 7000 acres at the time of his death.²⁶¹

Given the acreage he accumulated and the socio-political status Adam Thoroughgood achieved after completing his indenture, early twentieth-century historians interpreted the one and one-half story brick dwelling as his. Brick was a marker of wealth and permanence in a transient age and the evolution of the Chesapeake house was not yet understood. Early reconsiderations of the architectural landscape, informed by social history, material culture, folklore, and archaeological inquiries, pulled the house date forward in time, to the last quarter of the seventeenth century.²⁶² Documentary evidence similarly suggested the Thoroughgood House differed in form and location from Captain Adam Thoroughgood’s homeplace.²⁶³

²⁵⁸ Helen C. Roundtree, *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia: Their Traditional Culture* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989), 140-41.

²⁵⁹ “History Has a Lot Going for It,” *The Beacon*, February 26, 2006, 8-9.

²⁶⁰ See note regarding headrights above.

²⁶¹ Nell Marion Nugent, *Cavaliers and Pioneers: Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants, 1623-1666*. (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1983), 21-22, 70-71, 79-80, 110, 136, 143, 145.

²⁶² Camille Wells, “Old Claims and New Demands,” 1-10; Carson et al, “Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies,” 135-96, Henry Glassie, *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia* (1975; third printing, Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987), and Fraser D. Neiman, “Domestic Architecture at the Clifts Plantation: The Social Context of Early Virginia Building,” in *Common Places*, 292-314.

²⁶³ Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 4, 217; Lower Norfolk County Court Records, Deed Book 5, 30; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 1, 265; Princess Anne County Court Records, Deeds and Wills 3, 253.

Yet still situated in the seventeenth century by its stewards, the Thoroughgood House restorations installed period-appropriate finishes, such as the quarrels of leaded glass rather than glazed sash, and furnishings, such as the cupboards lent by the National Trust of Historic Preservation or the delftware. This effort to research and represent seventeenth-century life, here of a successful immigrant to landholder and indentured servant to councilor, led to the study of gardens and the interplay between architecture and landscape in the world of the early Chesapeake.²⁶⁴ At the time, the Colonial Revival movement shaped how the investigations and subsequent installations were done, and a preference for active preservation, such as a restoration or rebuilding, brought the Thoroughgood House to the Garden Club of Virginia's attention. The Garden Club adopted the Thoroughgood House as its signature project and turned to the preeminent landscape architect, Alden Hopkins, to lead the effort.²⁶⁵

Alden Hopkins (1905-1960) practiced as a landscape architect in a ground-breaking era of conservation and stewardship of historic sites. Hopkins trained at Harvard's Graduate School of Design and continued as the Garden Club of America fellow at the American Academy in Rome. Hopkins returned to the U.S. and immersed himself in the study of colonial life while working at Mount Vernon. This experience helped him win a position with Colonial Williamsburg as the Foundation's first resident landscape architect. Arthur Shurcliff led the landscape program; Shurcliff's field recording of thirty-eight Colonial era gardens supplemented with the Frenchman's Map of 1782 and by Claude Joseph Sauthier's drawings of the gardens he saw in eighteenth-century North Carolina generated a template of materials, forms, and patterns for use in the Williamsburg projects.

As the lead designer for Colonial Williamsburg, beginning in 1946, Hopkins built on Shurcliff's methodology. He carried the tenets of the Colonial Revival forward, and his efforts in Williamsburg concentrated on the east end of the Duke of Gloucester Street. Hopkins also maintained a private practice, serving the Garden Club for twelve years and through eight projects: Woodlawn, Gunston Hall, the Thoroughgood House, and the ten pavilion gardens at the University of Virginia. Hopkins's hand shaped the landscape of Stratford Hall, Wilton, the Rolfe-Warren House, and the Mary Washington Monument as well. Outside Virginia, Hopkins installed gardens at Hampton (Maryland), the Dickinson Manor (Delaware), Governor Stephen Hopkins House (Rhode Island), and the Van Cortlandt Manor (New York), and offered advice for modifying a Beatrix Farrand garden

²⁶⁴ Ann Leighton, *Early American Gardens: 'For Meate or Medicine'* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986); Ann Leighton, *American Gardens of the Nineteenth Century: 'For Comfort and Affluence'* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987); Peter Martin, *The Pleasure Gardens of Virginia: From Jamestown to Jefferson* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 185.

²⁶⁵ Mary V. Hughes, "Alden Hopkins (1905-60)," in *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*, edited by Charles A. Birnbaum and Robin Karson (NY: McGraw-Hill, 2000), 170-75.

at Dumbarton Oaks. In 1955 Hopkins received the Sarah Gildersleeve Fife award and in 1958 became a fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects.²⁶⁶

Just as Hopkins learned from Shurcliff, the Garden Club of Virginia embraced restoration projects with members' expertise and experts in the landscape architecture field to guide them. The first restoration endeavor took place at Kenmore, and the gardens were one feature of many re-buildings on the site. The house dates to the eighteenth century but the other buildings from the era are no longer extant such as the wood "kitchen, laundry, dairy, two storehouses, meat house, slave quarters, and farm structures." Little is known of the eighteenth-century garden, except for the terraces to the east, and work to restore the grounds began in 1929. This effort also launched Virginia's historic garden week in 1933 and proceeds from the annual event continue to fund preservation/restoration work by the Garden Club. Charles Gillette conceived of the garden plan and enclosing wall and James Greenleaf, president of the American Society of Landscape Architects, acted as a consultant for the project; both lent the effort at Kenmore the fullest support of the field and their involvement reflects the detailed research that characterized Colonial Revival installations. As at the Thoroughgood House, little to no evidence of the eighteenth-century garden was present at Kenmore, and so the restoration was a recreation of a period tableau and perhaps obscured historical clues in the making of a significant interpretative element in the first part of the twentieth century.

Following the Kenmore effort was that at the nearby Mary Washington House. Ralph Griswold and Thomas Borellis led the installation, and in the absence of eighteenth-century artifacts, they employed Colonial Revival signatures, like the boxwood-lined brick path, sundial, and magnolias, and colonial period preferences for a separate kitchen and pleasure garden. Similarly at Wilton, Arthur Shurcliff designed a Colonial Revival setting for the house to create a sense of place in the building's new site through a series of terraces and treed boundaries to screen the surrounding neighborhood from view. Shurcliff looked to the plans by Herbert Claiborne, who oversaw the house's relocation in the 1930s. Shurcliff used boxwood and hollies here, as he had at Smith's Fort Plantation in Surry, continuing a planting pattern that would informally come to define the Colonial Revival garden. Alden Hopkins added to Shurcliff's structure, augmenting the landscape around Wilton in Richmond in 1959.²⁶⁷ The garden Hopkins designed for the Thoroughgood House, therefore, is an integral part of a nationally significant program in the twentieth century and the Colonial Revival period landscape is a vital piece of the historical narrative for the house site.

²⁶⁶ Hughes, 170-75.

²⁶⁷ "The Garden Club of Virginia, House Sites," collections and resources, www.vahistorical.org. The Virginia Historical Society is the repository for the Garden Club of Virginia archives.

Although Adam Thoroughgood amassed significant land holdings in the county, today the site consists of 4 ½ acres and is surrounded by a modern subdivision. The reduced acreage and scale of the house determined the extent of the garden layout and Hopkins worked within the existing plot to design a domestic landscape derived from English precedent and within the context of its Virginia setting.

Alden Hopkins described the restoration of the Thoroughgood House gardens and placed the design in a context of historical understanding of the early seventeenth century. At the time of the project, historians favored the use parterres in reconstructions of gardens like that of the Thoroughgood House. Parterres are enclosed regulated areas with topiaries, arbors and raised planting beds; this design program was popular in the Tudor period. By the time of Adam Thoroughgood's emigration from England the gentry turned to Renaissance practices yet these new tenets came later to the Colonies and so the older parterre was recreated here. A combination of red pickets and post and rail fencing marked the periphery, while a boxwood-lined walkway led to the house. Magnolia trees were planted in the yard, while the parterre garden was recreated on the water side of the building. Two parterres were built, and along the central walk were supports for the dwarf pear trees and hollies planted for arbor cover. In the parterres, topiaries occupied the center and corner points. Periwinkle ground cover filled in around them and perennials bloomed throughout the season beginning with early snow drops and iris, summertime color with daylilies, yucca, bleeding heart, peonies and lilies. Fall crocus rounded out the seasonal palette with accents of evergreen from the cedar, live oak and magnolia trees. Boxwood framed the garden, sometimes as bordering walls or edges of garden zones, and at the Thoroughgood House it was used to delineate garden from yard in an evergreen line.²⁶⁸

Specific plant material selected for the Thoroughgood garden includes the following: live oak, Eastern red cedar, flowering dogwood, redbud, Southern magnolia, cherry laurel, tree box, dwarf box, yaupon holly, peony, yucca, pear, vines, periwinkle and English ivy; perennials such as galax, yellow primrose, bleeding heart, orange daylily, German iris, and Florentine iris; and bulbs like crocus, anemone, snowdrop, grape hyacinth, Guinea hen flower, narcissus, daffodils, iris, lily, squill, and tulips.²⁶⁹

2. Outbuildings: Photographic evidence tells us that there were outbuildings on the property, likely including a kitchen, and this structure was most probably moved adjacent

²⁶⁸ "Adam Thoroughgood Garden Re-Creation Is Project for Year," [*The Virginian-Pilot*], April 12, 1959, clipping, copy on file with author.

²⁶⁹ Alden Hopkins, "The Adam Thoroughgood Garden Reconstruction by the Garden Club of Virginia," Report, n.d., copy on file with the author.

to the house to provide additional living space.²⁷⁰ An ad-hoc connection was fashioned through the south gable via a walkway and porch.

Floyd Painter's excavations in the 1960s opened sixty-three five-foot squares in the south yard. Evidence he found consisted of "post molds, an unfinished well, brick and brick rubble walkways, a wine cellar pit, a small brick foundation (of an outbuilding), brick pedestals and shallow pits." Painter traced the outline of two outbuildings and likely what was one other. At this time, no evidence of a kitchen was discovered but broken ceramics, glass and metal objects were strewn across the site. Each generation, including the last tenant farmers, contributed to the debris and the use of the south yard as a garden in the twentieth century meant the artifacts were inter-mixed.²⁷¹

Painter's summary in 1988 of his archaeological work included reference to a frame building in the south yard. It was a wood structure resting on brick piers and was heated by a chimney made of poorly fired bricks. It covered a root cellar. This outbuilding likely served as a food storehouse. The chimney was dismantled and the bricks reused; the remains of the wood-frame outbuilding soon faced a similar fate. Another storeroom was constructed in the second of the eighteenth century, and this replaced the older frame outbuilding. In the nineteenth century the outbuilding was taken down and the cellar was filled.²⁷²

Painter repeated the local tradition that the house became a guest house during the period of Keeler's ownership,²⁷³ and that tenants occupied the house. Prior to Keeler's purchase, the house was reduced further in status to serve as a storehouse for hay. Painter's recollection of the Thoroughgood House's history was similar to the summary of the building's use presented by Keeler in the 1920s and by Waterman and Barrows in the 1930s.

In 2004, the James River Institute for Archaeology submitted a proposal for a new survey of the site to be done as part of the research project undertaken by the City of Virginia Beach. The archaeologists planned to use the evidence Painter uncovered as a guide, specifically the fireplace for a (presumed) detached kitchen, the refuse pit, rubble walkway, the "wine cellar" lined with wood, postholes for two earthfast buildings, a

²⁷⁰ The print made from the same negative as that in the Valentine's Cook collection and printed in Lancaster's *Virginia Homes and Churches* shows the end of this two-story outbuilding and the improvised connection.

²⁷¹ Floyd Painter, "Artifacts from the Thoroughgood Site," 130, 132-35, copy on file with the author; Floyd Painter, "Excavations at the Thoroughgood House 1965: Reexcavation and Summary Report 1988," *Chesopian* 26, no. 3-4 (Summer-Fall 1988), 24-36; George H. Tucker, "Old House Relatively Young," *The Virginian-Pilot*, n.d., clipping, copy on file with the author.

²⁷² Painter, "Excavations at the Thoroughgood House: Re-excavations and Summary Report," 34-35.

²⁷³ This is substantiated in the census records that place Grace Keeler living in present-day Princess Anne Park.

pedestal for the addition (the Garrisons' wing at the southeast corner), and a circular pit. The brick cellar for the Garrisons' wing was about 5' below grade. A look for the secret tunnel prompted archaeologists to dig a trench along the north end of the east façade and across the north gable end; it was during this investigation that a pit was discovered. No artifacts were found inside the pit to date the feature.²⁷⁴

Like all farmhouses, then, the Thoroughgood House stood among a series of outbuildings essential to the operation of the homestead and the farm. None of these survives on the site, although archaeological work identified structural remains in the south yard and the yard near the visitors' center is undergoing archeological testing. Nonetheless, the landscape of which the dwelling was but one part remains open and uncluttered as it would not have been in its first years; even under construction the subsidiary buildings like a shed and store existed in tandem with the dwelling not unlike poorer planters, or the overseers' of plantation quarters, who lacked subsidiary buildings for cooking, washing, and storage and so used the yards outside their dwelling as living and work space.

The large fireplaces, with the north firebox reduced in the mid eighteenth century, suggest cooking could have taken place inside the Thoroughgood House at least seasonally. Likely cooking was moved outside to a kitchen outbuilding; this outbuilding was later relocated next to the house and folded into its social space. By the time John (I) owned the house and inserted the paneling and plastered the walls and ceiling, the segregation of social space from that needed for food processing and storage was understood, albeit accommodated in varying degrees, and concurrent to an increase in standards of living with creature comforts afforded through the Atlantic trade.²⁷⁵

Fraser Neiman in *The Manner House Before Stratford (Discovering The Clifts Plantation)* uses the spatial distribution of pottery shards and clay pipestems to identify how architectural space was constructed and used, with the early manner house as the center of social and work activities and the quarter a poorly lit, inadequately heated storage and sleeping space.²⁷⁶ Social segregation inside the manner house occurred via the cross passage; the addition of porches (like that at Bacon's Castle) provided a measure of privacy with a lobby entry as did the enlargement of the chamber. The dwelling shifted from the nexus of domestic and agricultural life to that of a polite house, a residence, increasingly filled with objects of refinement needed for display and participation in the genteel rituals of eighteenth-century society. The food processing and storage needs of a farm – or plantation in the Chesapeake – moved elsewhere. Since so

²⁷⁴ Lucchetti, *Archaeological Assessment*.

²⁷⁵ Neiman, *The Manner House Before Stratford*.

²⁷⁶ Neiman, *The Manner House Before Stratford*.

few rural buildings dating from before the second quarter of the eighteenth century survive, archaeological excavations such as Neiman's at Stratford are key to understanding not only of architectural space but also the wider, cultural landscape in which those buildings were placed.

The character of the outbuildings may be derived from information about contemporary sites. In her analysis of the advertisements of property offered for sale in the *Virginia Gazette*, Camille Wells found that eighteenth-century Virginians emphasized certain details, such as size and building material, when it was to their advantage and omitted others, such as the wood frame that linked the brick foundations and chimneys and completed the architectural space or the tobacco and corn houses implicit in the well-tended, cultivated fields. Sixty-three percent of the tracts listed amounted to 200 acres or less, much like the individual Thoroughgood parcels in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. That the holdings were in accordance with the majority of plantations advertised helps to contextualize the dwelling and its outbuildings in a rural setting.²⁷⁷

Completing the domestic social and work space were the outbuildings where tasks were done, tools were stored, and laborers slept. Sixty percent of the houses advertised in the *Virginia Gazette* had an auxiliary structure, most often a kitchen as the Thoroughgood House had. Diaries and smokehouses followed; accommodating agricultural production were barns. In the Chesapeake these were primarily for storing grains and fodder. Tobacco houses and grain storage facilities, such as granaries and corn cribs, were highlighted in many of the advertisements but likely were more prolific.²⁷⁸

Similar to the percentages Wells gleaned from the eighteenth-century newspapers were the proportions of extant agricultural structures that Gabrielle Lanier and Bernard Herman documented, although the surviving building stock predominantly postdates the colonial period.²⁷⁹ Lanier's and Herman's work reinforces the importance of material evidence to uncovering how the various buildings of a farm landscape relate to one another, specifically how each was used. The interior space of the barns they catalogued could accommodate any number of functions, from storage to housing workers, leaving their architectural signals somewhat ambiguous.²⁸⁰ These barns sheltered lumber, laborers, poultry or other animals and served as cart sheds; the Thoroughgood House found itself in similar straights, reportedly as home to hay before being restored. In the

²⁷⁷ Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (Spring 1993): 1-9. Ten of the advertisements were in Princess Anne County.

²⁷⁸ Wells, 12-18.

²⁷⁹ Lanier and Herman state that most agricultural architecture from the Colonial period is known through archaeological and documentary evidence, thus underscoring the importance of Neiman's work at Clifts Plantation and Wells's mining of the *Gazette*. 177.

²⁸⁰ Lanier and Herman, 207-11.

eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the ambiguities receded as the agricultural buildings were made more substantial in accordance with increased prosperity and ambitions.²⁸¹ That the Thoroughgood House would tumble from a planter's dwelling to tenant occupancy to hay storage attests to the uncertainties of the market in the late nineteenth century and the changes in standards of living that ensued; that its kitchen was commandeered for living space echoes the hardship felt.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural drawings: Drawings of the Adam Thoroughgood House were completed by Thomas Waterman, some of which can be seen in *Domestic Colonial Architecture* and in the *Mansions of Virginia*, and some are in the collections of Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress. There are also the sketch drawings done by Henry Chandlee Forman. Forman's collection is held by the University of Maryland, but the papers are incomplete.²⁸² At mid-century, architect Finlay Ferguson drew the house as restoration efforts got underway.

B. Early views: Frances Benjamin Johnston photographed the building in the 1930s; Johnston took interior and exterior views and these images are available in the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress, along with those taken for HABS later in the twentieth century.

Earlier views of the Thoroughgood House are held in the collections of the Valentine Museum in Richmond, Virginia. One image, the earliest known picture of the house, is in the Cook Collection; the negative was also used to make an illustration for *Architecture of Colonial America* (1915) and is attributed to J.B. Lippincott and Co. The William Palmer Gray Collection at the Valentine also has three images of the house; these were taken about 1920 and capture the two-story addition at the southeast corner of the building. Other photographs from the late 1910s include those taken by Harry C. Mann (1866-1926) and are preserved in the archives of the Library of Virginia. Mann's photographs of the Norfolk area date primarily to the years before and after World War I. The Sargeant Memorial Collection of the Norfolk Public Library includes some photographs dating to the late 1920s to 1950s era as well as several key maps (ca. 1790, 1812, and 1861) and a 1881 topographic map.²⁸³

²⁸¹ Orlando Ridout V, "Agricultural Buildings" in *The Chesapeake House*, edited by Cary Carson and Carl R. Lounsbury, 179-203.

²⁸² Henry Chandlee Forman Papers, Archives and Manuscripts Department, University of Maryland Libraries, College Park.

²⁸³ Citations for the maps are: Robert B. Taylor, *Map of the County Contiguous to Norfolk* (Norfolk, VA: ca. 1812); G.F. Lathrop, *Map of Norfolk and Vicinity* (Norfolk, VA: 1861); and Conway Whittle Sams, *Atlas of Princess Anne County* (Norfolk, VA: 1930), map 1. Sargeant Memorial Collection, Norfolk Public Library.

The papers of Sir Henry Clinton held by the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, also include several significant cartographic representations of the Thoroughgood House and its environs. Clinton led the British forces in the American Revolutionary War and maps made, including one by Benedict Arnold, aided his maneuvers.

Other views of the house come as sketches on plat maps or in deeds of partition recorded in the county court. In 1822, for example, the house is shown as having two end chimneys, three dormers, and a door in the center bay.

C. Suggested Bibliography:

While much has been written on the history of the early Chesapeake, two events some thirty years apart were conceived to capture and present the scholarly direction of contemporary investigations of the world of the early Virginia and research examining the Chesapeake in particular. The first was a conference held in November 1974 with its findings now immortalized in Thad Tate's and David Ammerman's volume, *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth-Century*. This conference, and the essays it prompted, announced the arrival of new social history with its inquiries into the past that tried to bring into focus a broader picture, one colored by inequalities and injustice, disease and death, but one brightened by emigrants' survival and their establishment of socio-political stability within the British Empire. The second, a conference held in 2009 in St. Mary's City, Maryland, was entitled "The Early Chesapeake: Reflections and Projections."

Since the conference in St. Mary's City, the University of North Carolina Press released *The Chesapeake House*, edited by Cary Carson and Carl Lounsbury. Through *The Chesapeake House*, the authors structure our understanding of place and join together patterns to build a nuanced picture of the region. The book represents a generation of scholarship every bit as revolutionary as Duke of Gloucester Street was in 1776.

The Chesapeake House meticulously reconstructs how domestic architecture evolved in early Virginia and reminds its readers that architects were few and far between in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake. Those few that were there involved themselves in the most elaborate buildings of the day. The work of Catherine Bishir, for example, revealed the practice of one such architect, John Hawks, in New Bern, North Carolina. While Hawks was active in the late 1760s, the more widely known Benjamin Henry Latrobe is generally described as America's first trained architect. Besides Hawks, many professional builders and amateur architects preceded Latrobe, including the gentleman-architect whose knowledge of architecture was the privilege of class, dependent as it was on having leisure time for reading and for travel, and whose knowledge of the classical world positioned him as an arbitrator of taste. Thomas Jefferson is perhaps the most famous of this kind of architect.

The emergence of the architect and the perpetuation of a classical-design ethos in what was British Colonial America is tied to Andrea Palladio and the diffusion of his designs through translations of his treatise *Quattro Libri (Four Books of Architecture)*; however, like the architect, the American-authored pattern book was a late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century phenomenon. The first was Asher Benjamin's *Country Builder's Assistant*, but shortly thereafter, Minard Lafever followed suit with the *Modern Builder's Guide* and Owen Biddle with the *Young Carpenter's Assistant*. House-builders selected motifs or particular design elements from these guides, rarely adopting a full reproduction. In the (southern) British American colonies, for example, only two houses are true pattern-book models. Drayton Hall (HABS No. SC-377) outside of Charleston, South Carolina, followed Palladio (book two, plate 56) and Mount Airy in Virginia (HABS No. VA-72) corresponded to James Gibbs's *Book of Architecture* (plate 58). The Hammond-Harwood House (HABS No. MD-251) in Annapolis, designed by William Buckland in 1774, was modeled on Palladio's Villa Pisani, and so is also a pattern-book house.

For a still indispensable overview, see William H. Pierson, Jr., *American Buildings and Their Architects*, vol. I: *The Colonial and Neoclassical Styles* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1970); as well as Thomas Tileston Waterman, *Mansions of Virginia, 1706-1776* (NY: Bonanza Books, 1945). Waterman's presentation of the Virginia house includes a discussion of pattern-book sources, English models, and colonial derivatives throughout the Georgian period. See also Kenneth Hafertepe and James F. O'Gorman, eds., *American Architects and their Books to 1848* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 2001), and Dell Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860," *Winterthur Portfolio* (1984): 131-33; and Catherine W. Bishir, *Architects and Builders in North Carolina: A History of the Practice of Building* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

Recommended Readings

Andrews, Stephen, ed. *Bacon's Castle*. Richmond: Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, 1984.

Beckerdite, Luke. "William Buckland and William Bernard Sears: The Designer and the Carver." *Journal of Early Southern Decorative Arts* 8 (November 1982): 6-41.

Beckerdite, Luke. "William Buckland Reconsidered: Architectural Carving in Chesapeake Maryland." *Journal of the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts* 8 (November 1982): 43-88.

Beirne, Rosamond and John Scarff. *William Buckland: Architect of Virginia and Maryland*. Baltimore: Gunston Hall, Hammond-Harwood House, 1958.

Bell, Alison. "Emulation and Empowerment: Material, Social and Economic Dynamics in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Virginia." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 6, no. 4 (December 2002): 253-98.

Bellion, Wendy. *Citizen Spectator: Art, Illusion, and Visual Perception in Early National America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Berland, Kevin Joel. *The Dividing Line Histories of William Byrd II of Westover*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Billings, Warren M. *Sir William Berkeley and the Forging of Colonial Virginia*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.

Bishir, Catherine. "Good and Sufficient Language for Building." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IV*, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 44-52. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991.

Bourne, Michael, Orlando Ridout V, Paul Touart, and Donna Ware. *Architecture and Change in the Chesapeake: A Field Tour*. Annapolis: VAF/MHT, 1998.

Bragdon, Kathleen, Edward Chappell, and Willie Graham. "Scant Urbanity: Jamestown in the Seventeenth Century." In *The Archaeology of 17th-Century Virginia*, edited by Theodore Reinhart and Dennis Pogue. Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1993.

Brandt, Lydia Mattice. "Recreating Mount Vernon: The Virginia Building at the 1893 Chicago World's Columbian Exposition." *Winterthur Portfolio* 43, no. 1 (Spring 2009): 79-114.

Brown, Bennie. "The Ownership of Architectural Books in Colonial Virginia." In *American Architects and their Books to 1848*, edited by Kenneth Hafertepe and James F. O'Gorman, 17-33. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.

Brown, Marley R., III, and Andrew C. Edwards. "Re-excavation, Reflexivity, and Responsibility at Colonial Williamsburg: The Archaeology of Archaeology and the Refinement of Site Interpretation." In *Between Dirt and Discussion: Methods, Methodology and Interpretation in Historical Archaeology*, edited by Steven N. Archer and Kevin M. Bartoy. New York: Springer, 2006.

Brownell, Charles, Calder Loth, William Rasmussen, and Richard Wilson. *The Making of Virginia Architecture*. Richmond: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1992.

Buchanan, Paul. "The Eighteenth-Century Frame House of Tidewater Virginia." In *Building Early America*, edited by Charles Peterson. Radnor: Chilton Book Company, 1976.

Buchanan, William T. and Edward F. Heite. "The Hallowes Site: A Seventeenth-Century Yeoman's Cottage in Virginia." *Historical Archaeology* 5 (1971): 38-48.

Carr, Lois Green, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, eds. *Colonial Chesapeake Society*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1988.

Carroll, Abigail. "Of Kettles and Cranes: Colonial Revival Kitchens and the Performance of National Identity." *Winterthur Portfolio* 43, no. 4 (Winter 2009): 335-64.

Carson, Cary, Norman F. Barka, William M. Kelso, Garry Wheeler Stone, and Dell Upton. "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies." *Winterthur Portfolio* 16 (Autumn 1981): 135-96.

Carson, Cary. "Banqueting Houses and the 'Need of Society': Among Slave-Owning Planters in the Chesapeake Colonies." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series 70, no. 4 (October 2013): 725-80.

Carson, Cary. "The Consumer Revolution in Colonial British America: Why Demand?" In *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter Albert. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994.

Carson, Cary. "The 'Virginia House' in Maryland." *Maryland Historical Magazine* 69 (1974): 185-96.

Carson, Cary, et al. *When Virginia was the Wild West: A Williamsburg Comic Book*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1999.

Carson, Cary and Carl R. Lounsbury, editors. *The Chesapeake House: Architectural Investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Chappell, Edward. "Acculturation in the Shenandoah Valley: Rhenish Houses of the Massanutten Settlement." *Proceedings, American Philosophical Society* 124 (February 1980).

Chappell, Edward. "Architectural Recording and the Open Air Museum." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, II*, edited by Camille Wells. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986.

Chappell, Edward A. "The Colors of Williamsburg: New Analysis and the Chesapeake Town." In *Architectural Finishes in the Built Environment*, edited by Mary A. Jablonski and Catherine R. Matsen, 30-44. London: Archetype Publications, 2009.

Chappell, Edward A. "The Gentry House in Paget." In *Bermuda's Architectural Heritage: Paget*, 201-25. Vol. 6, Historic Buildings Book Project. Hamilton: Bermuda National Trust, 2010.

Chappell, Edward. "Housing a Nation: The Transformation of Living Standards in Early America." In *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter Albert. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994.

Chappell, Edward. "Looking at Buildings." *Fresh Advices*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1986.

Chappell, Edward A. "Reading the Buildings of Smith's Parish." In *Bermuda's Architectural Heritage: Smith's Parish*, 1-13. Vol. 5, Historic Buildings Book Project. Hamilton: Bermuda National Trust, 2005.

Chappell, Edward. "Rosewell's Architecture Reevaluated." In *Discovering Rosewell*, edited by Rachel Most. Gloucester: Rosewell Foundation, 1994.

Chappell, Edward. "The Restoration of Blandfield." *Colonial Williamsburg* (Autumn 2000): 44-49.

Chappell, Edward A. "Resurrecting the Coffeehouse." *Colonial Williamsburg Interpreter* 29, no. 3 (Winter 2008/2009): 7-16.

Chappell, Edward A. "Understanding Buildings in Hamilton Parish." In *Bermuda's Architectural Heritage: Hamilton Parish*, 1-11. Vol. 4, Historic Buildings Book Project. Hamilton: Bermuda National Trust, 2002.

Chappell, Edward and Julie Richter. "Wealth and Houses in Post-Revolutionary Virginia." In *Exploring Everyday Landscapes: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VII*, edited by Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry, 3-22. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Clairborne, Herbert. *Comments on Virginia Brickwork before 1800*. The Walpole Society, 1957.

Cotter, John L. *Archeological Excavations at Jamestown, Virginia*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1958.

Crump, Nancy Carter. *Hearthside Cooking*. 2nd ed., rev. ed., with foreword by Sandra Oliver. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Deetz, James. *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977.

Deetz, James. *Flowerdew Hundred: the Archaeology of a Virginia Plantation, 1619-1864*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993.

Dulaney, Paul. *The Architecture of Historic Richmond*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976.

Edwards, Mark. "Dating Historic Buildings in Lower Southern Maryland with Dendrochronology." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, I*, edited by Camille Wells, 153-58. Annapolis: Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1982.

Ellis, Clifton. "Dissenting Faith and Domestic Landscape in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." In *Exploring Everyday Landscapes: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VII*, edited by Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry, 23-40. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Ellis, Clifton and Rebecca Ginsburg. *Cabin, Quarter, Plantation: Architecture and Landscapes of North American Slavery*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Forman, Henry Chandlee. *Virginia Architecture in the Seventeenth Century*. Williamsburg: Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corporation, 1957.

Francis, Phyllis W. "Some Lineal Descendents of Captain Adam Thoroughgood (1602-1640), Lynnhaven Parish, Princess Anne County, Virginia." *Virginia Genealogist* 16 (1972).

Galle, Jillian E. "Costly Signaling and Gendered Social Strategies among Slaves in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake: An Archaeological Perspective." *American Antiquity* 75 (January 2010): 19-43.

Galle, Jillian E. and Amy L. Young, eds. *Engendering African American Archaeology: A Southern Perspective*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004.

Gilliam, Jan Kirsten and Betty Crowe Leviner. *Furnishing Williamsburg's Historic Buildings*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1991.

Glassie, Henry. *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975.

Graham, Willie. "Genteel Punches and Drunken Balls: The Creation of a Recognizable Tavern Form in the Early Chesapeake." *The Bulletin of the Northumberland County Historical Society*, 1990.

Graham, Willie. "Chesapeake Colonial Family Kitchens." In *The Cook's Room*, edited by Alan Davidson. NY: Doubleday, 1991.

Graham, Willie. "Preindustrial Framing in the Chesapeake." In *Constructing Image, Identity, and Place: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IX*, edited by Alison K. Hoagland and Kenneth A. Breisch, 179-96. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003.

Graham, Willie, Donald Linebaugh, et al. *A Preservation Plan for the Matthew Jones House, Fort Eustis, Virginia*. College of William and Mary, Technical Report Series No. 3, 1991.

Green, Bryan C., Calder Loth, and William Rasmussen. *Lost Virginia: Vanished Architecture of the Old Dominion*. Charlottesville: Howell Press, 2001.

Green, Bryan C. "The Structure of Civic Exchange: Market Houses in Early Virginia." In *Shaping Communities: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VI*, edited by Carter Hudgins and Elizabeth Cromley, 189-203. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Heck, Marlene. "Building Status: Pavilioned Dwellings in Virginia." In *Shaping Communities: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VI*, edited by Carter Hudgins and Elizabeth Cromley, 46-59. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Herman, Bernard L. "Continuity and Change in Traditional Architecture: Folk Housing in Virginia's Eastern Shore." Ph.D. diss, University of Pennsylvania, 1978.

Herman, Bernard L. "Slave Quarters in Virginia: The Personal Behind Historic Artifacts." In *The Scope of Historical Archaeology*, edited by David G. Orr and Daniel G. Crozier, 253-83. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.

Herman Bernard L. *The Stolen House*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.

Hidden, Martha. *How Justice Grew Virginia Counties: An Abstract of their Formation*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1980.

Hill, Martha. *When Virginia was the Wild West, 1607-1699*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1999.

Historic American Buildings Survey. *Virginia Catalogue*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976.

Hofstra, Warren. "Private Dwellings, Public Ways, and the Landscape of Early Rural Capitalism in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley." In *Gender, Class, and Shelter: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture V*, edited by Carter Hudgins and Elizabeth Cromley. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1995.

Hood, Graham. *The Governor's Palace in Williamsburg: A Cultural Study*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1991.

Horning, Audrey. *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Hudgins, Carter. "Robert 'King' Carter and the Landscape of Tidewater Virginia in the Eighteenth Century." In *Earth Patterns: Essays in Landscape Archaeology*, edited by William Kelso and Rachel Most. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990.

Isaac, Rhys. *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Jablonski, Mary A. and Catherine R. Matsen, eds. *Architectural Finishes in the Built Environment*. London: Archetype Publications, 2009.

Jarvis, Michael. *In the Eye of All Trade: Bermuda, Bermudians, and the Maritime Atlantic World, 1680-1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Kaynor, Fay Campbell. "Thomas Tileston Waterman: Student of American Colonial Architecture." *Winterthur Portfolio* 20 (1985).

Keene, John T. "The Nail Making Industry in Early Virginia." *Chronicles of Early American Industries Association* 25 (1972): 1-9.

Kellam, Sadie Scott and V. Hope Kellam. *Old Houses in Princess Anne, Virginia*. Portsmouth, VA: Printcraft Press, 1931.

Kelso, William. *Kingsmill Plantations, 1619-1800: Archaeology of Country Life in Colonial Virginia*. Orlando: Academic Press, 1984.

Kern, Susan. *The Jeffersons at Shadwell*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Kern, Susan. "Where did the Indians Sleep?: An Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Study of Mid-Eighteenth-Century Piedmont Virginia." In *Historical Archaeology, Identity Formation, and the Interpretation of Ethnicity*, edited by Maria Franklin and Garrett Fesler, 31-46. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1999.

Kimball, Fiske. *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and the Early Republic*. New York: Dover, 1966.

Kimball, Gregg D. "African-Virginians and the Vernacular Building Tradition in Richmond City, 1790-1860." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IV*, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 121-29. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991.

Kornwolf, James. *So Good a Design: The Colonial Campus of the College of William and Mary: Its History, Background and Legacy*. Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, Joseph and Margaret Muscarelle Museum of Art, 1989.

Knott, Sarah. "Female Liberty? Sentimental Gallantry, Republican Womanhood, and Rights Feminism in the Age of Revolutions." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series 71, no. 3 (July 2014): 425-56.

Krusen, Jessie Thompson. "Tuckahoe Plantation." *Winterthur Portfolio* 11 (1976): 103-22.

Kulikoff, Allan. *From British Peasants to Colonial American Farmers*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Kulikoff, Allan. "The Spacious World of Eugene D. Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese." *Southern Quarterly* 47 (Summer 2010): 191-207.

Kulikoff, Allan. *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake 1680-1800*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Lancaster, Robert. *Historic Virginia Homes and Churches*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1915.

Lane, Mills. *Architecture of the Old South: Virginia*. Savannah: Beehive Press, 1987.

Leviner, Betty. "Rosewell Revisited." *Journal of the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts* 19 (November 1993): 1-61.

Lindgren, James R. *Preserving the Old Dominion: Historic Preservation and Virginia Traditionalism*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993.

Linebaugh, Donald. “‘All the Annoyances and Inconveniencies of the Country’: Environmental Factors in the Development of Outbuildings in the Colonial Chesapeake.” *Winterthur Portfolio* 29 (1994): 1-18.

Loth, Calder. “Notes on the Evolution of Virginia Brickwork from the Seventeenth Century to the Late Nineteenth Century.” *Association for Preservation Technology* 6 (1972).

Loth, Calder, ed. *The Virginia Landmarks Register, 4th ed.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999.

Lounsbury, Carl. “Anglican Church Design in the Chesapeake: English Inheritances and Regional Interpretations.” In *Constructing Image, Identity, and Place: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IX*, edited by Alison K. Hoagland and Kenneth A. Breisch, 22-38. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003.

Lounsbury, Carl. “Architecture and Cultural History.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, edited by Dan Hicks and Mary C. Beaudry, 484-501. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Lounsbury, Carl. “Beaux-Arts Ideals and Colonial Reality: The Reconstruction of Williamsburg’s Capitol, 1928-1934.” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 49 (December 1990): 373-89.

Lounsbury, Carl. “‘An Elegant and Commodious Building’: William Buckland and the Design of the Prince William County Courthouse.” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 46 (September 1987): 228-40.

Lounsbury, Carl. *Essays in Early American Architectural History: A View from the Chesapeake*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Lounsbury, Carl. *The Courthouses of Early Virginia: An Architectural History*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004.

Lounsbury, Carl. *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape*. 1994; Reprint, Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1999.

Lounsbury, Carl. "The Structure of Justice: The Courthouses of Colonial Virginia." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture III*, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard Herman, 214-26. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989.

Lounsbury, Carl. "Take a Seat, but not just any Seat: The Accommodation of Slaves in Early Virginia Churches." *The Interpreter* 12 (November 1991): 4-5, 10.

Maccubbin, Robert, ed. *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City before the State 1699-1999*. Williamsburg: City of Williamsburg, 2000.

Main, Gloria L. *Tobacco Colony: Life in Early Maryland, 1650-1720*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Mancall, Peter C. *The Atlantic World and Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Mansfield, Stephen S. *Princess Anne County and Virginia Beach: A Pictorial History*. Norfolk: Donning Company, 1989.

Martin, Ann Smart. "Commercial Space as Consumption Arena: Retail Stores in Early Virginia." In *People, Power, Places: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VIII*, edited by Sally McMurry and Annmarie Adams, 201-18. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000.

Martin, Ann Smart. *Buying into the World of Goods: Early Consumers in Backcountry Virginia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Martin, Peter. *The Pleasure Gardens of Virginia: From Jamestown to Jefferson*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Martin, Peter. "'Promised Fruits of Well Ordered Towns': Gardens in Early Eighteenth-Century Williamsburg." *Journal of Garden History* 2 (1982): 209-24.

Marzio, Peter. "Carpentry in the Southern Colonies during the Eighteenth Century with Emphasis on Maryland and Virginia." *Winterthur Portfolio* 7 (1972): 229-50.

Maynard, W. Barksdale. "'Best, Lowliest Style!': The Early-Nineteenth-Century Rediscovery of American Colonial Architecture." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 59, no. 3 (September 2000): 338-57.

McDonald, Travis. "Constructing Optimism: Thomas Jefferson's Poplar Forest" In *People, Power, Places: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VIII*, edited by Sally McMurry and Annmarie Adams, 176-200. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000.

McDonald, Travis. "The East and West Wings of the White House: History in Architecture and Building." *White House History, Journal of the White House Historical Association* 29 *Special Spaces* (2011): 44-87.

Meacham, Sarah Hand. *Every Home a Distillery: Alcohol, Gender, and Technology in the Colonial Chesapeake*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.

Meade, William. *Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia*. 2 vols. 1857. Reprint, Baltimore: Genealogical Pub. Co., 1966.

Miller, Marcia and Orlando Ridout V. *Architecture in Annapolis: A Field Guide*. Annapolis: Vernacular Architecture Forum and the Maryland Historical Trust Press, 1998.

Mooney, Barbara B. *Prodigy Houses of Virginia: Architecture and the Native Elite*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

Morledge, G. Alan. "Adam Thoroughgood House Historic Structure Report." Draft report, 2005.

Moser, Jason, Al Luckenbach, Sherri M. Marsh, and Donna Ware. "Impermanent Architecture in a Less Permanent Town." In *Constructing Image, Identity, and Place: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IX*, edited by Alison K. Hoagland and Kenneth A. Breisch, 197-214. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003.

Most, Rachel, ed. *Discovering Rosewell: An Historical, Architectural and Archaeological Overview*. Gloucester: The Rosewell Foundation, 1994.

Muraca, David. "Martin's Hundred: A Settlement Study." M.A. thesis, College of William and Mary, 1993.

Musselwhite, Paul. "Annapolis Aflame: Richard Clarke's Conspiracy and the Imperial Urban Vision in Maryland, 1704-1708." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series 71, no 3 (July 2014): 361-400.

Neiman, Fraser D. "Domestic Architecture at the Clifts Plantation: The Social Context of Early Virginia Building." In *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, edited by Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, 292-314. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Neiman, Fraser. "Temporal Patterning in House Plans from the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake." In *The Archaeology of 17th-Century Virginia*, edited by Theodore Reinhart and Dennis Pogue. Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1993.

Nelson, Lee H. "Nail Chronology as an Aid to Dating Old Buildings." *History News* 19, no. 2 (1968).

Nock, Anne B. *Child of the Bay: Past, Present, and Future*. Norfolk: Hampton Roads Publishing Company, 1992.

Noël Hume, Ivor. *Archaeology of Martin's Hundred*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 2001.

Noël Hume, Ivor. *Martin's Hundred*. New York: Knopf, 1982.

Nugent, Nell Marion. *Cavaliers and Pioneers: Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants*. I: 1623-1666. Richmond: Virginia State Library and Archives, 1992.

O'Dell, Jeff. *Chesterfield County: Early Architecture and Historic Sites*. Chesterfield: Chesterfield County Planning Department, 1983.

O'Dell, Jeff. *Inventory of Early Architecture and Historic Sites, County of Henrico, Virginia*. Richmond: County of Henrico, 1978.

O'Malley, Gregory. *Final Passages: The Intercolonial Slave Trade of British America, 1619-1807*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

O'Neal, William and Christopher Weeks. *The Work of William Lawrence Bottomley in Richmond*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1985.

Packer, Nancy. *White Gloves and Red Bricks: APVA 1889-1989*. Richmond: Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, 1989.

Painter, Floyd. "The Chesapean Site." *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia*. 13, no. 3 (1959): 24-36.

Painter, Floyd. "Excavations at the Thoroughgood House 1965: Re-excavation and Summary Report 1988." *The Chesopean* 26, nos. 3-4 (1988).

Perry, James R. *The Formation of Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1615-1655*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1990.

Peters, John O. and Margaret T. *Virginia's Historic Courthouses*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

Pettigrew, William A. *Freedom's Debt: The Royal African Company and the Politics of the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1672-1752*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Price, Virginia B. "Constructing to Command: Rivalries between Green Spring and the Governor's Palace, 1677-1722." *Virginia Magazine of History & Biography* 113, no. 1 (April 2005).

Price, Virginia B. "Feminine Designs, Legal Estates: Elizabeth Allen and the Renovations to Bacon's Castle." *ARRIS* 20 (2009).

Princess Anne County Court Records, Virginia Beach District Court, Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Library of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

Rasmussen, William. "Palladio in Tidewater Virginia: Mount Airy and Blandfield." In *Building by the Book*, edited by Mario di Valmarana, 75-109. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984.

Rasmussen, William. "Sabine Hall: A Classical Villa in Virginia." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 39 (1980): 286-96.

Reiff, Daniel. *Small Georgian Houses in England and Virginia: Origins and Development through the 1750s*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986.

Reinhart, Theodore. *The Archaeology of Shirley Plantation*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984.

Reps, John. *Tidewater Towns: City Planning in Colonial Virginia and Maryland*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972.

Rivoire, J. Richard. *Homeplaces: Traditional Domestic Architecture of Charles County, Maryland*. La Plata: Southern Maryland Studies Center, Charles County Community College, 1990.

Romney, Susanah Shaw. *New Netherland Connections: Intimate Networks and Atlantic Ties in Seventeenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Rushforth, Brett. *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Saint George, Robert. "Material Culture in Folklife Studies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, edited by Dan Hicks and Mary C. Beaudry, 123-49. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Sarudy, Barbara. *Gardens and Gardening in the Chesapeake, 1700-1805*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1998.

Sayre, Gordon M. and Carla Zecher. *The Memoir of Lieutenant Dumont, 1715-1747: A Sojourner in the French Atlantic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Scott, Mary Wingfield. *Houses of Old Richmond*. Richmond: The Valentine Museum, 1941.

Sharp, Henry K. "An Architectural Portrait: Prospect Hill Spotsylvania County, Virginia." M.A. thesis, University of Virginia, 1996.

Sharp, Henry K. "*on the great falls of Patapsco River*" *A Case Study of Industry and Urbanism in Late-Colonial and Early-Republican Maryland*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2010.

Shields, David S., ed. *Material Culture in Anglo-America: Regional Identity and Urbanity in the Tidewater, Lowcountry, and Caribbean*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2009.

Simpson, Pamela. "The Molded Brick Cornice in the Valley of Virginia." *Association for Preservation Technology Bulletin* 12 (1980): 29-33.

Smith, Daniel Blake. *Inside the Great House: Planter and Family Life in Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Stanton, Gary. "'Alarmed by the Cry of Fire': How Fire Changed Fredericksburg, Virginia." In *Shaping Communities: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VI*, edited by Carter Hudgins and Elizabeth Cromley, 122-34. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

Tate, Thad W. and David L. Ammerman, eds. *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1979.

Tomlins, Christopher L. and Bruce H. Mann, eds. *The Many Legalities of Early America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Traver, Jerome D. "A Preliminary Report Excavations at the Thoroughgood Site." *The Chesopean* 3, no. 5 (1965).

Turner, Florence Kimberly. *Gateway to the New World: A History of Princess Anne County, Virginia, 1607-1824*. Esley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1984.

Upton, Dell. "Board Roofing in Tidewater Virginia." *Association for Preservation Technology Bulletin* 12 (1976): 22-43.

Upton, Dell. "Early Vernacular Architecture in Southeastern Virginia." Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1979.

Upton, Dell. *Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Upton, Dell. "New Views of the Virginia Landscape." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 96 (October 1988): 403-70.

Upton, Dell. "The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture." In *Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture*. Annapolis: Maryland Historical Trust, 1982.

Upton, Dell. "The Traditional House and its Enemies." *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1990): 71-84.

Upton, Dell. "Vernacular Domestic Architecture in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." *Winterthur Portfolio* 17 (Summer/Autumn 1982). [also, In *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, edited by Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, 315-35. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.]

Upton, Dell. "White and Black Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." In *Material Life in America, 1600-1860*, edited by Robert St. George. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988.

Van Horne, John C. and Charles Brownell. *Latrobe's View of America, 1795-1820: Selections from the Watercolors and Sketches*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Vlach, John Michael. *The Planter's Prospect: Privilege and Slavery in Plantation Painting*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Walsh, Lorena S. "Mercantile Strategies, Credit Networks, and Labor Supply in the Colonial Chesapeake in Trans-Atlantic Perspective." In *Slavery in the Development of the Americas*, edited by David Eltis, Frank D. Lewis, and Kenneth L. Sokoloff. Cambridge: 2004.

Walsh, Lorena S. *Motives of Honor, Pleasure and Profit: Plantation Management in the Colonial Chesapeake, 1607-1763*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Waterman, Thomas and John A. Barrow. *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia*. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

Waterman, Thomas. *The Mansions of Virginia, 1706-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945.

Wells, Camille. "Dower Play/Power Play: Menokin and the Ordeal of Elite House Building in Colonial Virginia." In *Constructing Image, Identity, and Place: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IX*, edited by Alison K. Hoagland and Kenneth A. Breisch, 2-21. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003.

Wells, Camille. "The Eighteenth-Century Landscape of Virginia's Northern Neck." *Northern Neck of Virginia Historical Magazine* 37 (1987).

Wells, Camille. "The Multi-Storied House: Twentieth-Century Encounters with the Domestic Architecture of Colonial Virginia." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 106 (Autumn 1998): 353-418.

Wells, Camille. "The Planters Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia." *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (Spring 1993): 1-31.

Wells, Camille. "Social and Economic Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Housing in the Northern Neck of Virginia." Ph.D. diss, College of William and Mary, 1994.

Wells, Camille. "Virginia by Design: The Making of Tuckahoe and the Remaking of Monticello." *ARRIS* 12 (2001): 44-73.

Wells, John and Robert Dalton. *The Virginia Architects, 1835-1955*. Richmond: New South Architectural Press, 1997.

Wenger, Mark R. "The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture II*, edited by Camille Wells, 137-49. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1986.

Wenger, Mark R. "The Dining Room in Early Virginia." In *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture III*, edited by Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 149-59. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989.

Wenger, Mark R. "Gender and the Eighteenth-Century Meal." In *A Taste of the Past: Early Foodways of the Albemarle Sound Region, 1585-1830*, edited by James C. Jordan. Elizabeth City: The Museum of the Albemarle, 1991.

Wenger, Mark R. "Thomas Jefferson and the Virginia State Capitol." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 101 (January 1993): 77-102.

Whiffen, Marcus. *The Eighteenth-Century Houses of Williamsburg*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1960.

Whiffen, Marcus. *The Public Buildings of Williamsburg*. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1958.

Whitelaw, Ralph T. *Virginia's Eastern Shore: A History of Northampton and Accomack Counties*. 2 vols. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1968.

Whitewell, W. L. and Lee Winborne. *The Architectural Heritage of the Roanoke Valley*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1982.

Wilson, Richard Guy, ed. *Buildings of Virginia: Tidewater and Piedmont*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Wittkofski, J. Mark. "An Archaeological Study of the Eastern Shore of Virginia." M.A. thesis, College of William and Mary, 1988.

Wright, Gavin. "Slavery and American Agricultural History." *Agricultural History* 77 (2003): 527-52.

Zimmer, Edward and Pamela Scott. "Alexander Parris, B. Henry Latrobe, and the John Wickham House in Richmond, Virginia." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 41 (1982): 202-11.

D. Likely Sources Not Yet Investigated

Defining the "middling sort" for Princess Anne County and thereby more fully contextualizing the socio-economic status Thoroughgood family and the house they occupied in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is a next step in the research and interpretation of the property.

Houses of the middling planters were as varied in size and material finish as the middling ranks were themselves. Middling planters owned anywhere from about one hundred acres of land to one thousand acres; slave ownership was typical, but ranged from none to twenty. An understanding of middling status developed in the eighteenth century; most like Argall (II) Thoroughgood fell into this category, skewed to the upper end of society and yet not the landholder Captain Adam Thoroughgood was.²⁸⁴

In contrast to Captain Adam Thoroughgood's holdings, many of the land parcels were small. Families worked alongside their laborers. With land and labor, a planter managed middling status, escaping poverty and serving in government and ecclesiastical positions of authority. In the seventeenth century this avenue to freedom, to the liberties of free men, was also open to those of African descent. By the mid-eighteenth century, market upheavals and racially discriminating policies restricted economic opportunities and the socio-political mobility it brought to impoverished whites and blacks. Virginians' preoccupation with and expression of rank in the eighteenth century is explored in Rhys Isaac's *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1982), 30-42, 70-80, 88-114; more specific in focus is the study by Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman entitled *A Place in Time* that looks at an network analysis in Middlesex County, Virginia, and the strata among neighbors and kin, 94-163.

In her dissertation, Alison Bell analyzed the material evidence gathered from four house sites and the material possessions accounted for in just over four hundred probate inventories recorded in Virginia's Essex and Louisa counties. The empirical data allowed Bell to explore and test her theories of how those in the middle strata used material culture to craft their identities and further socio-economical goals. Bell followed the Rutmans' categorization of low, middling and high status and she distinguished between acreage owned and markers of social rank. Some planters accumulated several hundred acres of land, but held no public office. These planters were the middle ranks of society in Essex and Louisa counties. They were also her subjects of study.²⁸⁵ The cultural accord in which they acted, responding similarly "with forward-looking intentionality and creativity" belies the notion the lower and middling sorts foppishly imitated the elite. They made cultural choices, highlighting affiliation and distinction, and this agency manifested itself in house plans and consumer goods.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁴ This synopsis comes from Edward A. Chappell and Julie Richter, "Wealth and Houses in Post-Revolutionary Virginia," in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture VII: Exploring Everyday Landscapes*, edited by Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 4.

²⁸⁵ Alison Bell, *Conspicuous Production: Agricultural and Material Culture in Virginia, 1700-1900*, PhD diss., University of Virginia, 2000.

²⁸⁶ Alison Bell, "Emulation and Empowerment: Material, Social and Economic Dynamics in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Virginia," *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 6, no. 4 (December 2002): 253-98, quotation, 262.

In Princess Anne County, the material evidence comes, in part, from the photographic surveys done in the early twentieth century that catalogue a series of houses similar to the existing Thoroughgood, Keeling, Lynnhaven and Weblin houses and those with subtle variations. These were the houses of the affluent in the early eighteenth century. An analysis of the socio-economic hierarchy in the county would reveal much about the “cultural accord” of the builders in the second quarter of the eighteenth century and their heirs.

Quantifying the acreage specifically needed in Princess Anne County to become a middling planter can be done through the land tax records paired with vestry rolls, court records, and newspapers. *The Lower Norfolk County Antiquary* (5 vols.) offers a starting point, along with the land tax rolls, as helpful details were gathered for the volumes by Edward James (I-III) and Peter Smith (IV-V) in 1951.