

THOMAS FARM, HOUSE
(Araby)
Monocacy National Battlefield
4632 Araby Church Road
Frederick
Frederick County
Maryland

HABS MD-1251-A
MD-1251-A

PHOTOGRAPHS
REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS
FIELD RECORDS

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

ADDENDUM TO:
THOMAS FARM, HOUSE
(Araby)
Monocacy National Battlefield
4632 Araby Church Road
Frederick
Frederick County
Maryland

HABS MD-1251-A
MD-1251-A

PHOTOGRAPHS

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

ADDENDUM TO:
THOMAS FARM, HOUSE
(Araby)
Monocacy National Battlefield
4632 Araby Church Road
Frederick
Frederick County
Maryland

HABS MD-1251-A
MD-1251-A

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

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

THOMAS FARM, HOUSE (Araby)

HABS No. MD-1251-A

Location: Monocacy National Battlefield, 4632 Araby Church Road, Frederick, Frederick County, Maryland.

NAD 1983 UTM 18N -- 4,357,333.4N 293,936.6E

**Present Owner/
Occupant:** National Park Service.

The Thomas Farm is named for Christian Keefer Thomas, who owned the property during the Battle of Monocacy (July 9, 1864).

Present Use: Presently vacant, the house is undergoing preservation and restoration. It is intended to be used as an administrative center for the park.

Significance: The property known today as the Thomas Farm dates to a 1400-acre land grant called *Wett Work*, which was patented in 1729, although probably not occupied or improved until the 1740s. The completion of the Georgetown Road (later, Pike) by 1748 that connected Frederick to Georgetown and the establishment of a ferry at the road's Monocacy River crossing enhanced the property's importance. By 1754 a tavern had been built at the ferry crossing. Shortly thereafter, in 1758, Scottish-born merchant and factor James Marshall bought *Wett Work*. Marshall was then living in Prince George's County; by 1770 he relocated to his Frederick County property. The house on the Thomas Farm was almost certainly built for Marshall at an unknown date in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The house is two-stories tall with a partial cellar and an attic. Its walls were constructed of load-bearing brick masonry resting on fieldstone foundations while the interior floors and roofing were supported by traditional timber framing.

Marshall died in 1803, leaving his estate primarily to his children. The Thomas Farm parcel was inherited by his daughter Chloe, who in turn bequeathed her interests in the property to her brother William when she died in 1807. Several years later, in 1812, William sold 415 acres (including the Thomas House) to Colonel John McPherson. In 1828 the ferry was replaced by a wood bridge; two years later, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad track was laid along the Monocacy River, on the bank opposite the Thomas Farm. In the midst of these key transportation improvements, McPherson's son John inherited the property (in 1829) and had it re-surveyed

together with some other land holdings. He named the surveyed parcel, *Araby*. By 1844 McPherson found himself deeply in debt and these circumstances forced him to subdivide *Araby* into smaller tracts which were then sold. The “Mansion House Farm” passed through a series of owners until Christian Keefer Thomas bought it in 1860.

Thomas, who lived in Baltimore, bought the farm hoping to escape the impending Civil War. However, the farm’s proximity to Georgetown Pike and to the railroad made it a highly strategic location, and both Union and Confederate forces were active in the area throughout the period of conflict. Prior to the Battle of Gettysburg, General Winfield Scott Hancock used the Thomas House as his headquarters for three days in June 1863. In August 1864, General Ulysses S. Grant met with Generals Ricketts, Hunter, and Crook in the house to plan the Shenandoah Valley campaign.¹

The Thomas Farm was the focus of some of the most intense fighting during the Battle of Monocacy on July 9, 1864. The family hid in the cellar while the battle ensued. Control of the farm changed hands several times over the course of the day. The house was damaged, particularly in the ell and west elevation, having been hit by (reportedly) seven shells. Needing to repair the house after the war, Thomas chose to renovate. Likely it was at this time that the Italianate porch was constructed, replacing the Greek Revival portico. Inside, the front stair was removed and replaced with a more substantial single run staircase at the back of the extended center hall. Thomas died in 1889, and his daughter Alice inherited the house. When she died in 1910 the Thomas Farm passed out of the family’s ownership. It was acquired by the National Park Service in 2001.

Historian(s): Joy Beasley, Cultural Resources Program Manager, Monocacy National Battlefield; Thomas Vitanza, Senior Historic Architect, Historic Preservation Training Center; and Virginia B. Price, HABS, Winter 2008-09.

Project

Information: This recording project was a cooperative endeavor between Monocacy National Battlefield, National Park Service (NPS), Susan Trail, Superintendent; the Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC), NPS, Tom McGrath, Superintendent; and the Heritage Documentation Programs, NPS, Richard O’Connor, Chief. The principals were Joy Beasley, Cultural Resources Program Manager, Monocacy National Battlefield; Thomas Vitanza, Senior Historical Architect, HPTC; and Catherine C. Lavoie, Chief, Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). The field measurements

¹ The above passages were taken from a park leaflet highlighting the Thomas Farm (*Araby*) and from Mark Schara, HABS No. MD-1251-A, drawing 1 of 19. See also, J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland* (Baltimore: 1882; reprint, Regional Publishing Co., 1969).

and measured drawings, as well as the large format photography, were completed earlier. The historical report for HABS coincided with the Historic Structures Report undertaken by HPTC. The architectural description section was written by Virginia B. Price, HABS Historian, with input from Joy Beasley, Tom Vitanza, Mark Schara, Senior Architect, HABS, and Brandon Gordon, HPTC. Brandon Gordon, Catherine Lavoie, and Tom Vitanza assisted on-site. The historical documentation section was adapted from earlier research conducted by Joy Beasley.

Note: Room, window, door, and fireplace numbering in this report corresponds to that in the HSR. Floor plans adapted from the HABS drawings and including those numerical notations are appended to this report.

Part I. Historical Information

A. Physical History

1. Date of erection: Before 1795. The first period of construction for the Thomas House dates to before 1795 and includes part of the southern-most room (104). Around 1795 the main block with an ell (103) was erected; a two-story “back building” (104) also was on the property by this time. This date is based on material evidence in the house, such as the window glass and woodworking in the fireplace surrounds, cabinetry, and window muntins. Analysis of the wallpaper and wall finishes supports this date sequence; results of the paint analysis are pending.² The exterior walls of this Federal-period dwelling were enclosed during the nineteenth-century expansions.

2. Architect: The name of the architect or designer for the Thomas House is not known, but it is believed the two-room, central passage house with an ell that is the main block of the present house was constructed for James Marshall no later than 1795.

3. Original and subsequent owners, occupants, uses: The main house on the Thomas Farm has been occupied by various owner-occupant families, or by their tenants, since its construction for James Marshall in the late eighteenth century. Christian Keefer Thomas, who was from Frederick County originally but resettled in Baltimore, bought the farm in 1860.³ The Thomas family owned the property until 1910 and their stewardship during the Battle of Monocacy lends the farm its name today.

² Similarly, the house could be a candidate for dendrochronological investigation with the traditional timber framing in the attic, the summer beams, and exposed log floor joists in the south room (104).

³ The graffiti in the attic and under the threshold of the southeast room (203, D210) was done by Hiram M. Keefer shortly after Thomas purchased the property (it is dated 1860-61). Hiram M. Keefer also left his signature on the inside of the framing for the jib doors in the east parlor, putting the installation of the jib doors to 1860-61. It is possible that Hiram Keefer was related to Christian Keefer Thomas, although many families named Keefer lived in Frederick County at the time.

Although the Thomas Farm was once part of the Marshall family's larger land-holdings in the county, the following chain of title lists only the owners of the house tract:⁴

- 2001 The Clapp family to the National Park Service
- 1954 C. Edward Hilgenberg to Robert and Josephine Clapp
- 1949 Trustees for William G. Baker, Jr., estate to C. Edward Hilgenberg
- 1911 Eugene Sponsellar to William G. Baker, Sr.
- 1910 Trustee for Alice Thomas Anderson estate to Eugene Sponsellar
- 1894 Thomas heirs to Samuel S. Thomas and Alice Thomas Anderson
- 1860 John F. Wheatley and T. Alfred Ball to Christian Keefer Thomas
- 1856 Trustees for Taylor estate to John F. Wheatley and T. Alfred Ball
- 1852 Baugher heirs to Griffin Taylor
- 1847 Worthington R. Johnson to Isaac Baugher
- 1844 William R. Ross, trustee for John and Fanny McPherson, to Worthington R. Johnson
- 1812 William Marshall to Colonel John McPherson
- 1807 Chloe Marshall to her brother, William Marshall
- 1803 James Marshall to his daughter, Chloe Marshall
- 1750s James Marshall acquires land in Frederick County

4. Builder, contractor, suppliers: The U.S. Census of 1800 credited James Marshall with sixteen enslaved laborers. It is possible some of those men helped construct the Thomas House; no information about the trade skills of Marshall's work force is known but if there was a bricklayer or carpenter or blacksmith among the sixteen slaves then that person or persons likely contributed to the house project. The laborers, either Marshall's own or those

⁴The chain of title was taken from Joy Beasley, "Brief History of the Thomas House," Paper 12 December 2006. See also, Paula S. Reed, PhD, "Monocacy Battlefield, F-3-42 (Additional Information)" Nomination 2004, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, sec 8: 35-42.

he hired, were likely guided by a skilled artisan then living in the area. Details in the house, particularly the reeding, hyphenated fluting, and gougework preserved in the fireplace surrounds and in the dormer window surrounds correspond to details seen in other Frederick area houses, namely the Roger B. Taney House (ca. 1794); Jones-Sappington House (ca. 1798); and Rose Hill Manor (ca. 1789-95); as well as the Fisher House in Berks County, Pennsylvania. The Fisher House dates to around 1801.⁵

The early window glass, such as the cylinder glass with a greenish hue seen in W218, W212, and in the transom over D207, was likely manufactured at the Amelung Glass Works. The foundry closed in 1795 after about a decade. It had operated under John Frederick Amelung's supervision.⁶

5. Original plans and construction: There are no known plans or descriptions of the initial building campaign for the Thomas House. An early nineteenth-century advertisement for the property only hints at the appearance of the house. William Marshall posted a notice in the *Frederick Town Herald* in 1812 listing the 400 or so acres he inherited from his sister Chloe several years earlier as being for sale. The tract was then known as *Wett Work* and was divided by the “main road leading from Frederick to Georgetown.” To one side of the road were 250 acres “with a handsome brick building, as neatly finished as any in the country...”⁷ Over the years, the Thomas House passed from family to family, ultimately coming into the possession of Griffin Taylor in the 1850s. The sale of Taylor's property affords a similar glimpse into the appearance of the Thomas Farm. In 1856 the house parcel contained about 261 acres with improvements in the “best order.” The improvements to the property included the “large two story brick MANSION HOUSE with Back Building, suitable for a large family; ...”⁸ The suitability of the buildings, as well as their substantial nature, continued to be selling points. Even as late as 1894 the “large two-story brick dwelling house ... erected on an eminence commanding an extensive view of Frederick Valley, a beautiful lawn well set in shade and fruit trees in front...” was the highlight of the property description.

⁵See HABS No. MD-497; HABS No. MD-501; HABS No. MD-493; HABS No. PA-1027.

⁶Glassmaking was underway in Frederick County by the mid-1770s. Henry William Steigel operated a glass factory in nearby Pennsylvania (1764-77), which closed down during the Revolutionary War. Former employees of Steigel's relocated to Frederick, joining forces in the glassworks Foltz, Eberhardt, and Kramer. Conrad Foltz lived in Frederick County by 1779. Between 1774 and 1784 Foltz, Eberhardt and Kramer built the first recorded glassworks in the county; Foltz died in 1784 and his factory was offered for sale. John Frederick Amelung bought it. Financial difficulties forced Amelung to close the business in 1795. See Lawrence Jessen, “German Craftsmen and Ownership: Glass Manufacturing in Frederick County Maryland 1774-1812,” in *Backcountry Dutch: German Heritage and Decorative Arts in Frederick County, Maryland* Exhibition Catalogue (Frederick: The Historical Society of Frederick County, 2008), 7-13.

⁷Reed, sec 8:37-38, who cites *Frederick Town Herald*, 14 March 1812, microfilm, Maryland Room, C. Burr Artz Library, Frederick.

⁸Reed, sec 8:40-41. The newspaper was the *Frederick Examiner*.

In addition to the newspaper advertisements that described the farm and farm buildings in hopes of enticing prospective buyers, Isaac Baugher took out an insurance policy on the house in 1847.⁹ The insurance document provides a number of details about the dwelling. At that time, the overall form of the house consisted of a “two story Brick farm house and Brick back building attached.” The roof was covered with cedar shingles; three dormers punctuated the roof plane. Living space was extended by a portico supported by four square columns on the north front and a side porch to the east. The front and back doors had sidelights. The two-room deep, central-passage plan accommodated two rooms to the west with folding doors; the rooms here were finished with paper on the walls and ceilings. The windows and doors were embellished with architraves and moldings; the jambs were paneled. Across the hall, the doors and windows had the same treatment. Only the walls were papered. On this side, one room was a pantry. The upstairs consisted of four rooms, with similar door and window surrounds. The stair to the garrett, or third floor attic, was an “old fashioned ramp” stair. In the garrett were two rooms, but only one was finished. Similarly, the back building was described as “plain.”¹⁰ The back building was also two stories in height and its roof was covered with cedar shingles. On the first floor was a kitchen, pantry, and passage. Upstairs was one room and a passage.

Although the policy indicated that the (front) stair rail was made of mahogany, it also references a “centre peace in the passage supported by 2 round reeded columns.”¹¹ It is possible this describes the staircase.

6. Alterations and additions: Documentary and material evidence suggest at least six periods of construction beginning sometime before 1795 and ending with the mid twentieth-century modernizations. Intermediate phases date to ca. 1795, 1812-47, ca. 1850, 1860-61, and the post-battle (1864) repairs and remodeling. To either side of the main block are

⁹Isaac Baugher Application, No. 362, Mutual Insurance Company of Frederick County, copy on file at Monocacy National Battlefield.

¹⁰The use of the adjective “plain” could mean that the Federal-period mantle and the cabinetry installed to either side of the fireplace in the southernmost room on the second floor (room 2008, CH05/M204, CB208E&W) were not there then. Perhaps, too, the 8' bump-out of the rear wall also occurred after 1847. This scenario raises the possibility that the early-period cabinetry was taken from someplace else, perhaps during Griffin Taylor’s ownership (1850s). Taylor owned property in the area, including Arcadia from 1835 to 1851, and built Clifton. Or the change occurred during Thomas’s renovations in 1860-61. At that time, a (probable) Keefer cousin worked on the Thomas House; another Keefer bought Arcadia in 1851. Perhaps materials salvaged from one Keefer property were installed in another. Regarding Arcadia, see Catherine C. Lavoie and Philip E. Pendleton, “Clifton Farm,” Historic American Buildings Survey, Library of Congress (HABS No. MD-1052); Catherine C. Lavoie to Virginia B. Price, personal communication, December 2008 and February 2009.

¹¹This refers to the original stair rail, not the one installed in the 1860s.

smaller, one-story wings. These were appended in the 1950s renovations. To the west is a screened sun porch and to the east a garage.

Around 1795, a dwelling with two rooms and a central passage on the first floor was constructed for James Marshall. Most likely, an ell extending southward from the west parlor (102) was also created during this building campaign and almost certainly included the dining room (103). Likely a wood-frame porch and pantry built over the extant masonry foundation walls to the southeast extended the household's service and circulation space shortly thereafter. This accretion off the east parlor was later folded into the main block with a masonry expansion that created the current double parlor space (101a & b) on the east side of the hall (100). Initial wallpaper evidence, plus the profile of the muntins and moldings of the jib doors in the parlors, suggests this formal expansion was completed around 1850. Moreover, double-hung sash with boxed jambs like those seen in the Thomas House first appear in the county around mid-century. The interior surrounds of the windows (W101-02, W112-13) and door (D102) into the east parlor also differ from the others in the ca. 1795 block, further bolstering the argument for a post-1850 renovation date for this remodeling effort.¹² A recent discovery of a signature on several of the weight pocket covers in the jib door framing puts the installation just after mid-century. In 1860 and 1861 Hiram M. Keefer signed, and dated a threshold and roof rafter, along with the weight pocket covers, which suggests he worked for C. K. Thomas renovating the Thomas house.

Features predating the ca. 1795 building campaign by James Marshall (or one of his children living on the property) represent an earlier edifice of uncertain date and purpose. It was, nonetheless, subsumed in the two-story "back building" made of bricks that was cited in the 1847 insurance policy and in advertisements placed in 1856 and again in 1899. Oral history corroborates the documentary evidence; Carl Hilgenberg, a nephew of Charles Edward Hilgenberg who owned the house from 1949 to 1954, recollected staying in the second floor of the kitchen ell (likely room 204), a portion of the house lacking any internal communication with the front rooms of that floor. Access by way of a back stair to a landing, presumably connecting to the second-floor of the porch, reinforces the distinction of a "back building" apart from, and yet closely associated with, the mansion house in the nineteenth-century.

The following paragraphs identify changes in the fabric of the building on a room-by-room basis, alterations that speak to the renovations and repairs over time:

Investigation at the curve in the east wall of the hall (100), just past the south wall of the west parlor (102) and in line with the placement of the original stair, exposed the ca. 1795

¹² See HABS drawing 17 of 19; the surrounds of the windows and doors in the east parlor consist of a fillet followed by an ogee curve running into the plain board of the casing that terminates in a bead. The trough or quirk of the bead is also wider (therefore later) than that seen on the hall side (the earliest era of woodwork) and in the west parlor (102), family dining room (103) and the upstairs bedrooms.

exterior masonry wall. It has also been suggested that perhaps the outward curvature of the wall also supported the “continuous” stair that was the centerpiece of the hallway in 1847.

The rear parlor (101b) was the result of additions made to the house. Evidence from the surviving foundation walls suggest this addition was made of wood-frame initially and then – but with a slightly larger footprint – built of masonry around 1850.¹³ Early descriptions place a porch and pantry here so it is likely that space was gradually integrated into the building envelope in the first half of the nineteenth century. The presence of a pantry in this location would also imply that the northeast room (101) or its southern extension served as the formal entertaining space or dining room initially. The incorporation of the space into the main block likely provided the impetus for the installation of the sash and jib doors in 1860-61 as the formal areas of the house were remodeled.

Thus it is probable that the front door, window sash and jib doors all date to the same building campaign, as does the molded architrave trim in this room. Mirroring the fenestration of the north wall in the front parlor, there are two openings in the south wall (W112, W113). The eastern one (W113) is a sash window glazed with six-over-six lights; it was originally a jib door, but the opening has been bricked over on the exterior. The western opening (W112) does have an intact jib door, although the bottom sash is now screened with louvers while the six-light sash is repaired. The remaining jib door (W112) is hung on butt hinges and fastened by a sliding bolt lock into the floor. By the 1860s, the room functioned as a double parlor; yet the two fluted columns with elaborate Corinthian capitals that lent visual support to the boxed beam dividing the ceiling of the two rooms (this also marks the location of the original end wall) were not manufactured until the 1880s. Only the acanthus leaves on the bottom half of the capitals are extant; photographs from 1949 show the columns in-situ.

In the west parlor (102), south of the fireplace in the west wall there is a French door (D104) that opens onto the sun porch. Each leaf is glazed with three lights. The door sits beneath a three-light transom.¹⁴ The current doorway (D105) and built-in cabinets along the south wall are also later additions. Evidence of the original portal to the family dining room (103) has been lost over time as even the historic photographs raise more questions than they answer. One, from the mid-twentieth century, shows exposed bricks to either side of the door suggesting the opening was enlarged.¹⁵

¹³ The 1850 date comes from the surviving wallpaper fragment.

¹⁴ This was originally a window; it was changed when the sun porch was added in the 1950s. See drawings by Smith and Veale on file at the park.

¹⁵ The door (D105) between the west parlor and family dining room was hung on a pivot hinge to swing into either space. It is an older door, with the six-fielded panels so popular in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Like the door opening from this room (103) into the hall (100), this door (D105) has the squared field and molding carved along where the panels meet the rails and stiles. Evidence concealed by the present bookcase/china cabinet includes the

In the historic dining room (103) there is a masonry foundation under the east wall; as early as 1795 this was the exterior wall of the ell. The thickness of the door (D106) to the hall suggests it was originally the exterior door, a suggestion supported by the evidence of earlier hardware on the casing. Much of this wall became interior space in the 1812 to 1847 additions.

The back or southernmost room (104) is thought to have been the kitchen in the nineteenth century after eighteenth-century building campaigns incorporated the oldest extant elements of the present house into the two-room (101, 102) main block with a center passage (100) and an ell wing (103, 104) extending back from the west end. Seams in the exterior foundation of the west elevation and in the wall masonry of the east elevation are evident and point to the location of the end wall of this older structure.¹⁶

Inside, the tongue and groove flooring has been partially removed, exposing multiple generations of sub-flooring (three layers, varying in material), some hewn joists, sash sawn joists with chisel marks matching those seen elsewhere in the floor framing system, and framing for a chimneystack about 8' north of the current south end wall. No evidence, beyond the framed opening, remains of that chimney. No remnants of its foundation have been found. The framing for this no longer extant chimneystack also appears in a corresponding location in the room above (208) and in the attic, two floors up. The hewn joists could be part of the original structure or later repairs. The majority of the structural wood is sawn and has machine-cut nails, although the lath is hand-split.

The laundry (106) was created in the 1950s by enclosing a portion of the three-bay porch (the north bay) and it is located immediately to the south of the center hall and east of the secondary stair.

The secondary stair terminates in the side hall (206) on the second floor. In this space, the north doorway (D205) into the southwest room (204) dates to the twentieth century;¹⁷ the surround at the east jamb has been partially removed to expose the framing and wall construction. It was originally a cabinet. At the threshold, part of the brick masonry wall (exterior, ca. 1795) is visible. Similarly, under the twentieth-century plaster is the original two-layer plaster, painted black. The plaster stops at the chair rail and baseboard, confirming

header and paneled jambs of the larger opening. Historically the doors in the rooms west of the passage were folding doors.

¹⁶The brick work and pencil joints have been exposed at the east end of the original range of the wall.

¹⁷ It has been removed from the doorway, however, the hall-side (206) of the door had six-fielded panels with molding on either end of the bevel and the bedroom (204) side had flat panels elaborated with a bead and cavetto molding where the panel met the rails and stiles. See HABS drawing 16 of 19.

that those on the north wall of the side stair hall (206) are original finishes. The chair rail with its molded profile was constructed of several pieces of wood. It also wraps around the west wall and runs behind the south partition wall into the south room (208).

The south, rear room (208) has walls made of plaster on lath that were painted.¹⁸ Modern intrusions include the radiator heating system and the closet along the west wall. Flanking this closet are two windows (W210, W211); historically this sash was glazed with nine-over-nine lights and has muntin profiles like those of the dormer windows. The south window (W211) has the only remaining hand-planed, paneled jamb, matching that described in the 1847 insurance policy. The partition wall dividing this room from the stair hall runs over the jamb of the northern window (W210) and chair rail with the scratch bead from the stair hall that continues into and runs beneath the stool. Another window (W212), in the east wall, looks out onto the porch. It, too, is sash glazed with multiple panes (nine-over-nine). Several of the lights have a greenish hue. The upper sash is fixed. The moveable sash has been reworked; the sash weights have been replaced with spring-loaded sash balances. The interior stop (the beaded edge of the casing) also has been replaced. The surround consists of the crosstetted architrave with an ovolo molding and band with a beaded edge. The removal of plaster to the south (right) of this window exposed the original plaster with its black paint and the ghost of the chair rail that would have abutted the interior windowsill like that still evident for the northwest window (W210).

The floor joists run east to west, and are all sawn. The tongue and groove flooring has been partially removed, revealing the lath of the ceiling below and framing for the missing chimneystack several feet north of the south exterior wall. Partial removal of the plaster from the wall in this location at the level of the chair rail revealed a seam in the brickwork and a nail block; the masonry joint corresponds to the seam in the baseboard. The combination of exterior masonry, interior structural framing, and finish details confirm the presence of an end wall of a two-story building that was incorporated into the ell wing of the Thomas House. Confusing the chronology is the existence of the hand-planed, paneled jamb in the southwest window raising the possibility it was moved from the original south end wall when the space was expanded 8'. The insurance document describes paneled jambs like that preserved in W211, but W211 sits in the wall dating to the later expansion of the south room.

In the rear stair hall (205 and ST201a & b) there are no moldings or other applied ornamentation. The present incarnation of this space is the result of the 1860s and twentieth-century alterations. The east wall, for example, abuts the south wall. The masonry does not interlock; moreover, just opposite the partition and beneath the present floor level, is a remnant of ca. 1850 wallpaper. The wallpaper fragment attests to an earlier configuration of interior space, and suggests changes not only in the placement of the stair and stair landings but also in ceiling and floor levels. Along the west wall of the stair hall (205) some

¹⁸ Currently white, the paint covers over a salmon color and the original black.

of the wallpaper and plaster have been removed. In this area the original exterior walls of the house are evident, including penciling on the mortar joints.

In the front or center hall (200) includes the portion of the front stair (ST203) that is in its original location. This stair terminates at the summer beam. Visible, too, is the dropped pendant from the attic newel post. Likely there was a dropped pendant from the second floor newel as well. In the under-stair closet is evidence of some reused materials from the pre-1847 porch including a black-painted handrail. The riven lath (with cut nails) of the closet walls changes direction, suggesting that this closet was bumped out or expanded to the west. Here, too, the east wall is masonry while that on the west (partitioning the northwest bedchamber from the hall) is wood-frame. Perhaps the wall is needed for structural support of the summer beam or perhaps the partition wall came later.

The nineteenth-century graffiti “HMK 1860” found on one of the rafters matches that seen on the bottom of the threshold (D210) from the southeast bedchamber (203) and on the weight pocket covers of the jib doors (101 a&b).

B. Historical Context

The man credited with building the dwelling house on the present-day Thomas Farm is James Marshall. Marshall immigrated to Prince George’s County, Maryland, in 1747. He came from Glasgow, Scotland, and in Maryland he worked as an agent for the Glasgow-based firm John Glassford & Company. Glassford, like so many mercantile businesses, specialized in the export of Maryland tobacco to Great Britain in exchange for imported consumer goods, which were then sold at company stores along the Potomac River. Throughout the 1750s and 1760s Marshall advanced his commercial interests. He became manager of the firm’s Piscataway store and engaged in other independent transactions, such as land and timber speculation. In 1765, Marshall relinquished his management position to work as an appraiser, creditor, and administrator for the firm through 1768. Beginning in the late 1750s, and while still living in Prince George’s County and working for Glassford, Marshall bought property in Frederick County. By 1768, he held more than 900 acres in the county and most of that land consisted of tracts associated with the Monocacy River. Marshall’s land acquisitions also gave him control over the ferry (and tavern) crossing along the road connecting Frederick and Georgetown. Marshall rented or leased the operation to various tenants during the 1770s and 1780s; it is likely those tenants were replaced by slave labor.¹⁹ It was only after Marshall had become a significant landholder in the area that he first identified himself as a resident of Frederick County; this occurred in 1770.

It is not clear precisely where in Frederick County Marshall set up housekeeping; Frederick County Court minutes mention both his “Manor” and his “Quarter” in November 1771. The house on the

¹⁹For example, an 1806 advertisement describes a runaway slave named Lanham, who was “well acquainted with the ferrying business.” Lanham had run away the previous year from Marshall’s daughter Eleanor and her husband John L. Harding.

Thomas Farm was erected before 1795, traditionally said to be around 1780, so is too late to be Marshall's first dwelling. Nonetheless, when Marshall made his will in 1799, he noted that his son William was living in his "house at the ferry." This could refer to either the building housing the ferry tavern or to the Thomas House. By 1800, James Marshall had moved into town, residing in Frederick Town District No. 2 with sixteen slaves and three adult women. In the same census data, William Marshall is recorded as living alone with three slaves in the Buckeystown District, which included both the tavern site and the manor house. It seems more likely that William Marshall would have lived in the manor house rather than at the small (15x20) tavern, an hypothesis supported by the 1808 *Map of Frederick and Washington Counties, State of Maryland*, by Charles Varlé, which depicts "W P Marshall" on the west side of the Georgetown Road..

James Marshall died in 1803, leaving behind a substantial amount of real estate and other personal property.²⁰ Marshall's eldest three children served as executors to his will; two of them, William and Chloe, continued to occupy the parcel of land with the main house and ferry (later the Thomas Farm and Gambrill tract). William Marshall's landholdings increased in 1807, when his sister Chloe died and left him her share of their father's estate. In addition, William continued the ferry operation, even though the Georgetown Road was chartered as a turnpike by the State of Maryland in 1805.

In March 1812, William Marshall began advertising his property for sale in the *Frederick Town Herald*. In August of that year, Colonel John McPherson purchased 415 acres from Marshall including the parcel with the brick house and ferry. McPherson acquired land in the Monocacy area in the 1800s and 1810s as part of his plans for industrial and transportation development ventures. McPherson built a merchant mill complex, and likely sold rights-of-way to the B & O Railroad and the long-envisioned Monocacy Canal. The canal, however, was never constructed.

The McPherson family's purchases of property in the Monocacy area occurred around the same time as the conversion of the Georgetown Road to a turnpike. Other transportation improvements soon followed. Around 1828, a covered wood bridge carrying the Georgetown Pike over the Monocacy River was constructed. The bridge was located just upriver from the ferry crossing and necessitated realignment of the Georgetown Pike slightly east. Not long afterwards, the ferry and its associated tavern ceased to operate. Colonel John McPherson died in 1829, leaving his son John his extensive landholdings. In 1831, John McPherson, Jr., had the various parcels re-surveyed into a 1,111 ½-acre tract that he called *Araby*.²¹ Like his father, John McPherson, Jr., sought to capitalize on the area's potential for commercial development. He engaged in business ventures and land transactions, such as securing water rights and the merchant mill complex on the present-day Gambrill Farm.

²⁰Frederick County Will Book, Liber GM 3, Folio 577. Marshall only manumitted one of his slaves; her name was Jane. He freed her in 1800 and specified that her mulatto daughter Maria be freed when she reached twenty-five years of age. Marshall did not allow Jane's son Ned the same privilege. This difference may indicate the mulatto child of a favored female slave was indeed Marshall's.

²¹ *Araby* was subdivided into several smaller parcels which today form five of the six component properties at Monocacy National Battlefield: Gambrill Mill, and the Lewis, Baker, Worthington, and Thomas Farms.

By 1844 McPherson was in debt. These circumstances forced him to initiate the subdivision and sale of *Araby*. Worthington Johnson bought two of the parcels in 1844, including the one with the brick manor house. He only owned the property for a short time, conveying it to Isaac Baugher in 1847.²² In 1852 Baugher's heirs sold the 226-acre *Araby* or *Mansion House Farm* to Griffin Taylor, a wealthy agriculturalist. Taylor invested in his landholdings, building a house at the farm he called *Clifton*. After his death in 1855, his heirs sold *Araby* and *Clifton* to John F. Wheatley and T. Alfred Ball. These men entered into a partnership with James H. Gambrill, owner of the adjacent mill complex. Their plan was to raise rye or barley on the farmland which could then be ground into malt at Araby Mills. The distillery venture failed in 1860.

After the failure of the distillery, *Araby* again went up for sale. Christian Keefer Thomas acquired it at this time. Although he was a native of Frederick County, C. K. Thomas was a resident of Baltimore and a partner in the wholesale dry goods firm of Devries, Stevens, and Thomas, when he bought the property. He and his family returned to Frederick just before the Civil War.

The presence of the B & O Railroad, the Georgetown Pike, and the bridges carrying them over the river made Monocacy Junction a highly strategic location. Both Union and Confederate forces were present in the area; Georgetown Pike served as a major marching route for both armies' troops. As they passed through the area along the Georgetown Pike, for example, portions of both the Union and Confederate armies camped around Monocacy Junction particularly during the Maryland and Gettysburg Campaigns in 1862 and 1863. Moreover, just before the Battle of Gettysburg, Union General Winfield Scott Hancock used the Thomas House as his headquarters.

Material evidence of the escalating tensions dates to 1862. In that year, the B & O Railroad authorized the Union army to construct two blockhouses to protect Monocacy Junction: one south of the railroad tracks near the turnpike bridge, and a second on the north side of the railroad, just east of the river. The Union Army also established Camp Hooker, an encampment which housed between 800 and 1,000 soldiers from the 14th New Jersey Regiment during the winter of 1862 and 1863. Soldiers from Camp Hooker also constructed earthworks on the high ground above Monocacy Junction, including a gun battery and powder magazine.

By the summer of 1864, Confederate General Robert E. Lee hoped to relieve the pressure on his forces by distracting Union General Ulysses S. Grant's Army of the Potomac. After suffering staggering defeats at Lynchburg and Lexington, Union General David Hunter retreated into West Virginia, which left the Shenandoah Valley virtually defenseless. The Confederacy's opportunity to bring the war north was further facilitated when Grant moved most of the Union troops defending Washington, D. C., to Petersburg. Seizing his opportunity, Lee devised a bold invasion.

²² Frederick County Land Records, Liber WBT 4, folio 25; Frederick County Land Records, Liber WBT 5, folio 226; Frederick County Land Records, Liber WBT 5, folio 230.

In mid-June, Confederate General Jubal Early marched his army from Petersburg to Harper's Ferry, where they arrived on July 4. Agents of the B & O Railroad observed his movements and informed railroad president John Garrett, who pressured Secretary of War Edwin Stanton to take action in defense of the railroad. Garrett got little support from the Lincoln administration, and turned to Major General Lew Wallace, Commander of the 8th Army Corps and the Middle Military Department. Wallace gathered a force of approximately 2,800 men, comprised mostly of recent recruits and so-called "100 days" men, and positioned himself at Monocacy Junction. When Grant learned of Early's movements, he dispatched the 3rd Division of the 6th Corps under the command of Brigadier General James Ricketts to support Wallace.

On July 7 and 8, Wallace's troops skirmished with the advancing Confederate forces on the outskirts of Frederick. On the morning of July 9, the artillery duel began between Confederate forces on the west (north) side of the river and Union forces on the east (south) side. Infantry engagement followed, and as it escalated, Confederate cavalry under Brigadier General John McCausland forded the Monocacy River just downstream from the covered bridge over Georgetown Pike. The main Union force was aligned along the east (south) bank of the river, on the Thomas and Worthington farms. McCausland's and Rickett's troops confronted one another in a cornfield by the Thomas House fence. At around the same time, Union General Lew Wallace ordered his men to burn the covered turnpike bridge, denying the Confederates an easy crossing. This stranded several hundred Union men on the west side of the river.

In the second wave of fighting, McCausland gathered reinforcements and enlisted the support of the Confederate artillery positioned on the west side of the river. McCausland's attack drove Rickett's men from the Thomas House and all the way to the Georgetown Pike, but Rickett's veteran VI Corps immediately undertook a counterattack. By mid-afternoon, the Union troops regained control of the Thomas House, driving the Confederates back toward the Worthington Farm.

The third and final attack, led by General John Gordon, began shortly afterwards. The fighting took place around the Thomas Farm and its outbuildings. Fierce losses occurred on both sides, and the entire Federal line on the Thomas Farm collapsed. A general retreat across the Georgetown Pike ensued. In the meantime, the roughly 200 skirmishers who had been abandoned on the west side of the Monocacy River when the bridge burned succeeded in denying the Confederates access to the remaining river crossings, including the B&O railroad bridge.

Arguably the most important result of the battle was a 24-hour delay of Early's troops. This allowed the Union army time to send reinforcements from Petersburg in defense of the capital. By the time Early reached the outskirts of Washington, D. C., on July 11, the Confederates had lost both numeric advantage and the benefit of surprise. Sporadic skirmishing took place at Ft. Stevens on July 12, but Early was soon forced to turn away.

Some of the most intensive fighting during the Battle of Monocacy occurred on the Thomas Farm. The fighting was so fierce that the Thomas House changed hands three times over the course of the day, sustaining significant damage. One account notes that Union sharpshooters occupied the house,

which was penetrated by eight artillery shells.²³ In fact, a teenage girl named Mamie Tyler was visiting her friend Alice Thomas when the fighting broke out, a day she describes in her “Reminiscences” as filled with “suspense, anxiety, and at times terror.”²⁴ With “pieces of shell... flying too near to be pleasant,” C. K. Thomas and his family sought shelter in the cellar, while “minie balls slashed the shrubbery [and] the larger missiles of War’s fearful instruments twisted huge limbs from the trees, leveled down chimneys, & tore out an angle of the house.”²⁵

After the Civil War ended, the Thomas family began the process of rebuilding and recovery. Because the house and outbuildings sustained significant damage, extensive reconstruction was necessary. By 1868 the farm had sufficiently recovered to serve as the setting for 21-year-old Alice Thomas’s marriage to a 22-year-old Baltimore merchant named Julius Anderson.

By the late 1860s, C. K. Thomas had become active in local politics, serving as president of the Frederick County Agricultural Society beginning in 1867, as well as president of the county School Board beginning in 1868. In 1869, he was elected County Commissioner, and in that same year he entered into a partnership with John Worthington and James Gambrill to create the Frederick County Mutual Insurance Company. In addition to his political and civic activities, C. K. continued to farm with the assistance of his son Samuel, along with four black laborers and one white laborer.

In 1873, C. K. Thomas filed a claim for supplies taken from the farm during the Civil War, including “wood, a saddle and bridle, and hauling [?] in 1862, and quartermaster stores valued at \$6,088.” Apparently, Thomas never filed for damage to property or buildings, and was approved for reimbursement of only \$2,454.00.

In the 1870s and 1880s, the management of the Thomas Farm began to change and by 1889, the agricultural work at the Thomas Farm may have been done primarily by tenants. For example, on July 13, 1889, the *Frederick Evening Post* noted that a tenant on Thomas Farm was maimed by unexploded ordinance left over from the Battle of Monocacy. The 1880 census recorded C. K., age 62, as living “at home” with his wife Evelina (age 59), and his daughters Alice (Thomas) Anderson (Alice was no longer living with her husband), and Virginia (age 21). The household also included Evelina’s brother Edmund Stone (age 52) and his daughter Cecelia (age 20). The family owned the house until 1910.

²³ Scharf, 573.

²⁴ Mary T. Gatchell. “Some Reminiscences...” in United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection (MSA SC 213), Maryland State Archives. (Accession No. MSA 213-1-9).

²⁵ Ibid. Archeological investigations led by Joy Beasley in the Thomas yard area revealed a large sheet midden composed primarily of architectural debris intermixed with domestic refuse, percussion caps, and fired small arms projectiles; this “demolition layer” is likely the result of damage to the property sustained during the Battle of Monocacy.

While the landscape of the Thomas Farm was shaped in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, it is the Battle of Monocacy in July 1864 that immortalized the farmstead in the annals of American history. Christian Keefer Thomas owned the property at the time of the battle and its aftermath. The Thomas family held onto the house and the acreage surrounding it until 1910. It was not until 1949 that the appearance of the house changed. At that time, the Hilgenbergs purchased the Thomas Farm. They added modern conveniences such as electricity, heating, and plumbing to the house. They removed the front porch and installed the Colonial Revival frontispiece and beltcourse on the front façade. They also constructed one-story wings on either side of the house creating a sun porch and garage. The next owners, the Clapps, planted an English garden in back and enclosed the side porch to make a bathroom and laundry. Nonetheless the shape of the dwelling, and that of its agricultural landscape, owes much to the early stewards of the Thomas Farm.

Part II. Architectural Information

A. General statement

1. Architectural character: The house on the Thomas Farm is a two-story brick masonry structure erected over low, fieldstone foundation walls. Traditional framing provides the internal structure for the floors and roof, notably with massive summer beams running east-to-west and a principal rafter system in the attic. The dwelling is L-shaped in plan. A beltcourse placed to mark a division in the front façade at the second floor level accentuates the multi-storied interior, and also lends an element of horizontality to the front façade along with a three-step corbel of molded bricks at the cornice line. There are five chimneys, each with two-course corbelled caps, rising above the rooftop. The dwelling has Federal-period woodwork and materials, along with Greek Revival and Colonial Revival finishes, that together with its center passage plan create a material reminder of the prevailing turn of the nineteenth-century house type of the well-to-do that favored symmetry in composition, classical details for ornament, and segregated, specialized social space in plan and in use.

2. Condition of fabric: The Thomas House is currently under-going preservation and will be adapted for use as an administrative center. Architectural investigations of the building fabric include the removal of some plaster and floor boards as well as paint analysis in strategic locations throughout the building. The front door has been removed for repair and rehabilitation; other modern elements have been removed. As a result, the condition of the fabric varies from the repaired and rehabilitated dormer windows to the early stages of excavation in the southern-most room (104) to the partially removed appliances in the kitchen (103) that was historically used as a dining room.

B. Description of Exterior

1. Overall dimensions: The main block of the house is five bays across, with a centrally-located doorway enveloped by a 1950s-era frontispiece supported by pilasters. The frontispiece and beltcourse were part of a Colonial Revival make-over and replaced an Italianate-style porch, itself a nineteenth-century accretion. Two wings were added in the mid-twentieth century as well, a garage to the east and a screened sun porch to the west. The wings are one-story in height and each culminates in a gable roof that is covered with fiberglass shingles.

The rectangular two-room deep main block measures approximately 43' across, and the ell extends back another 45'.²⁶ Structural evidence suggests there was a chimneystack about 8' in from the present south end wall. This chimneystack is now missing. Interior space was created by enclosing the porch running along the east side of the ell wing, most recently for the mid twentieth-century bathroom (207) and laundry (106) that occupy the north bay of the three-bay porch area.

2. Foundations: The foundations are made of fieldstone. On the west elevation, the low fieldstone foundation walls bump upward at a location approximately 8'in from the south end wall. This alteration roughly corresponds to a change in framing inside, a seam in the floorboards inside, and a seam in the brickwork visible on the east elevation.

3. Walls: The walls of the Thomas House are constructed of brick masonry laid in Flemish bond on the front (north) facade and 5:1 American common bond on the sides and rear elevations. In the nineteenth century, the west elevation was re-clad in bricks laid in common bond; most likely the entire house received a brick veneer at that time. Holes in the exterior wall by the south rear door (D110) and evidence from the cellar entrance indicate the veneer was added in those locations. Seams suggestive of expansions are still evident on the east gable and in the east elevation of the ell.²⁷

4. Structural system, framing: While the brick masonry walls are load-bearing, the interior and roof are supported by a traditional framing system of summer beams, joists, principal rafters with purlins (in the main block) and common rafters with collar ties (in the ell). The rafters are half-lapped and pegged or nailed at the peak. There is no ridgeboard. Mortice, tenon, and pegged joinery characterizes the roof framing; early cut nails -some with wrought heads - proliferate the building. Some wrought iron spikes are evident in the attic as well. Some of the pegs in the attic have chamfered edges. All of the rafters are sawn.

²⁶ The full length of the west elevation measures 64' 4 7/8"; see HABS drawing 3 of 19.

²⁷The HABS drawings also show a break in the cornice on the east elevation that corresponds to the other evidence of the expansion on this side of the house.

Raising questions about the original configuration of this roof structure is the 1847 reference to wood shingles. Not enough nail holes in the present rafters exist to correlate the documentary evidence with the extant fabric. This could mean that part of the building was only one and one-half stories initially or simply that the lath and sheathing were replaced. Moreover, in the attic over the ell, all but the southern-most three rafters have the same marriage marks; these marks are in a full strike, Roman style. The three rafters beyond the half wall have quarter strike, Roman style marriage marks identical to those chiseled in the floor joists exposed in kitchen (104) and in the back room (208) on the second floor. At this juncture a rafter is sistered to the common rafter on the east side; notches placed at intervals run down the top side of this member, perhaps to take the cedar shingles mentioned in the 1847 description of the building. In the floor, also in the same location as the knee wall and rafter, there is framing for a chimney. This framing is also evident on the first and second floors (the floor boards in room 104 – the historic kitchen – and room 208 have been taken up).

5. Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads: The present frontispiece includes a segmental arched overdoor and fluted pilasters. The beltcourse, made of wood and painted white, was installed in the mid-twentieth century where the earlier porches had joined to the front facade. It wraps around the east wall until it abuts the garage addition. The beltcourse marks the transition from the first floor to the second; when a porch was there, the central sash window on the second floor functioned as a jib door. On the east elevation there is a two-story porch made of wood. Posts, also of wood, support the outer edges of the porch floor; the gable roof extends outward to cover the second-floor area. Beneath the porch roof, the east wall of the second floor is stuccoed, while the north wall of the porch is sheathed in clapboards. There is a bulkhead entrance into the excavated cellar that is accessible in the garage. There are three rounded steps leading up into the sun porch on the west side of the house.

6. Chimneys: There are five internal chimneys, each with two-course corbeled caps, warming the dwelling. Two are original to the construction of the ca. 1795 main block; these are the internal end chimneys located at the west and east gable ends. Another chimney is south of the east gable end chimney and dates to the expansion of the east parlor (101a, 101b) in the nineteenth century. The fourth chimney rises halfway down the ell extension; this was an exterior end wall originally and likely dates to the ca. 1795 construction period. The last chimney rises at the gable end of the south (rear) wall in the ell.

7. Openings

a. Doorways and doors: On the north (front) elevation there is a Colonial-Revival era frontispiece supported by fluted pilasters. Within the segmental-arched overdoor there is an eagle. The paneled front door sits slightly recessed within this envelope; it has an eight-light

transom. The paneled door is flanked by sidelights, which are twin, with three-lights set over a panel.²⁸

The remaining exterior doors all open from the south (rear) elevation of the house. In the ell, east of center is the primary entrance (D110) into the back of the house and it appears to correspond to the mid century sash windows and front door. It is a six-panel door with the doorknob placed in the lock rail; the fielded panels have a heavily molded profile where they join with the rails and stiles. The raised portion of the panels is squared off (90 degrees) rather than achieved by beveling. Over the door is a three-light transom. Shutters flank the whole and four steps made of brick masonry rise up to the first-floor level of the doorway.

Opening off the porch are another two doors (D208, D112). These are single doors, with six panels, but of a later vintage than those seen elsewhere in the house. They both have screen doors, as does the door (D110) into the ell.

The south elevation of the east wing (garage) is characterized by two large openings now in-filled.²⁹ The eastern opening (D117) has double doors made of wood and hung by modern cross-garnet hinges. The other portal (D116) features a single door hung from butt hinges. To the west, the door into the sun porch is the eastern-most opening on the south elevation. It is one of three arched openings capped by keystones; the other two are windows.

b. Windows and shutters: The first-floor windows on the front elevation are double-hung sash glazed with six-over-six lights set over a paneled jib door (W101-04). The panels of the mid nineteenth-century jib doors³⁰ are similar to those of the sidelights and front door; however, the approach to the front entrance has been altered. At least two porches preceded the present segmental arched overdoor. The second-floor windows (W201-05) are also sash glazed with six-over-six lights. The central window (W203) had a jib door, like those on the first floor, but the bottom section was closed in the mid-twentieth century.³¹ The windows (and jib doors) are shuttered, and all retain the requisite shutter dogs.

²⁸The front door was taken out for repair and rehabilitation at the time of the site visit in December 2008.

²⁹The in-fill was a temporary measure done by the Park Service during the exterior investigation and preservation phase of work in 2007-09.

³⁰Based on the Keefer signature, the installation of the mid-century jib doors is thought to have occurred in 1860-61.

³¹ Likely the jib doors, including the one on the second floor (W203), were installed at the same time as the Italianate porch. Stylistically the porch dates to ca. 1850-70, a time span that includes the 1860-61 graffiti in the jib door framing. The Italianate porch is shown in the 1880s photographs. The 1847 insurance document references a columned portico, implying something more classical – Greek Revival even – in appearance than the Italianate porch.

The north facing fenestration of the west wing consists of three arched openings each capped by a keystone, while that of the east consists of two sash windows glazed with six-over-six lights. Both of those windows have shutters, although the shutters on the western window (W122) no longer have their shutter dogs.

On the west elevation there are two double-hung sash windows (W106-07)³² glazed with six-over-six lights along the first floor, and six seemingly identical in size sash windows (W206-11) on the second floor. The glazing of the sash in the ell differs, however. The southernmost window (W211) has nine lights in its top (fixed) sash and six below; the corresponding window (W109) on the first floor displays the reverse with glazing six-over-nine. The next grouping (W210, W108) to the north is glazed with nine-over-nine lights.³³ **The remaining windows – and their glazing – appear to be the same generation as the sash with six-over-six lights on the front elevation.**³⁴ All ten sash windows visible on this elevation are shuttered and all have unadorned sills made of wood and have masonry jack arches above. The two casement windows (W304, W305) in the gable each are glazed with six lights.

Fenestration on the south elevation of the main block consists of four window openings – three of the double-hung sash glazed with six-over-six sash and one jib door (W112) like that seen on the north elevation. There is an outcropping of bricks along the western edge of the west window (W214) on the second floor, perhaps related to one of the building campaigns that enlarged rooms 101b and 203 in the nineteenth century. The only other window (W306) illuminates the attic of the ell; it is placed high in the gable end and slightly east of center due to the presence of an internal end chimneystack (CH05).

The east façade of the main block repeats that of the west with two gable end casement windows (W307, W308) in the attic. Each is glazed with six lights. There are also two double-hung sash windows (W216, W217) glazed with six-over-six lights on the second floor. The sash windows have jack arches and wood sills as well as shutters. There is no fenestration in the mid nineteenth-century extension of the main block (101b, 203).

³² Also W105 but it is not visible on the exterior as it is obscured by the sun porch.

³³ W210 is a modern replacement, made to resemble the other nine-over-nine light sash. The upper sash appears to be old. The lower sash is a poor quality modern replacement, and will be removed (and replaced) during the preservation and restoration of the building. Joy Beasley to Virginia B. Price, electronic communication, January 2009; Tom Vitanza to Virginia B. Price, electronic communication, February 2009.

³⁴ In the dining room (103), by December 2008, the multi-light sash (W106, 107) had been replaced with one-over-one panes at the time of the site visit. The one-over-one lights are actually the exterior storm windows left in place while the sash is restored. W107, moreover, was originally a larger opening. Tom Vitanza to Virginia B. Price, electronic communication, February 2009.

In the ell, part of the porch has been enclosed; this section is lit by a small sash window (W213) glazed with six-over-six lights on the second floor and by a casement window (W111) glazed with six lights per side on the first. The second-story of the porch reveals only the bottom sash of a window (W212); the double-hung sash window (W212) is glazed with nine-over-nine lights. In a corresponding place on the first floor of the porch – set within the brick masonry wall of the ell – is a sash window (W110) glazed with nine-over-nine lights.

8. Roof

a. Shape, covering: The Thomas House is covered by a side gable roof sheathed in slate over the main house and dormers.³⁵ A modern metal ice break runs along the north and west gables. Side gable roofs also cover the two wings. Those roofs are sheathed in fiberglass shingles.

b. Cornice, eaves: There is a three-step corbel made of molded bricks along the front facade. Along the south end of the west elevation is a simpler cornice, consisting of two rows of bricks protruding outward from the wall plane.³⁶

c. Dormers, cupolas, towers: There are three dormer windows punctuating the north slope of the side gable roof. The bottom sash of each dormer contains six lights while the arched top sash has six plus those divided by a Gothic-inspired tracery popularized by pattern books including the fretwork and railing designs of English cabinet-maker Thomas Chippendale as well as the designs of his successor, George Hepplewhite, for slat back chairs among other illustrations. The dormer sash is set within a molded architrave, flanked by fluted pilasters, and capped by a keystone.³⁷ The pedimented gable over the dormers is trimmed with a modified form of dentil molding, here a hyphenated fluting with a reeded band above. This motif appears on the cornice and fireplace surrounds of several Frederick County houses dating from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as well as in the chimneypiece of the southwest bedchamber of this dwelling. The muntins of the sash have a narrow, stepped profile akin to that seen in the oldest, extant windows in the house.

³⁵ The slate roof was replaced in-kind in 2007; the dormers were repaired and rehabilitated at this time as well. Joy Beasley to Virginia B. Price, personal communication, 2009.

³⁶ See HABS drawing 7 of 19.

³⁷ The fluted pilasters are modern replacements. The dormer windows were repaired and rehabilitated as part of the slate roof replacement project in 2007-08. The fluted pilasters and brackets were replicated from a historic postcard view. The dentils and the keystones are original. Joy Beasley to Virginia B. Price, electronic communication, January 2009.

C. Description of Interior

1. Floor plans: The floor plan of the Thomas House is a center-passage (100) flanked by rooms two deep. The stair (ST101) is recessed in the hallway, rising just beyond the first room on the east (101a) and so allowing the front portion of the hall to serve as a receiving room or social space. Four doors open off the hall, the first two (D102, D103) on axis and the others in secondary locations beyond the stair. These doors open into the hall, providing access to the southwest room (kitchen/family dining room 103) and the rooms of the ell. There is also a closet beneath the stair. Service functions are regulated to the ell, including the 1950s-era laundry and bathroom, as is a secondary stair (ST102). The rooms above (201, 203, 202, 204, 208) all served as bedchambers; the southwest chamber (204) was converted into a bathroom in the mid twentieth century. The north bay of the porch was enclosed, creating another bathroom (207) and rear hall.

Historically the attic has been described as having two rooms suggesting that the present hall (300) and east room (301) were originally one large interior space plainly fitted out, leaving the area to the west (302) unfinished. There is a baseboard and shoe mold along the west side, but only a quarter-round shoe molding along the north and east walls. The difference in finish corroborates the understanding that the southeast side was subdivided after 1847. The stair hall contains about 100 square feet, and is lit by one of the dormer windows (W302). Doors (D301, D302) open off the hall into the adjoining spaces.

Beneath the Thomas House is a two-room (001, 002) cellar underpinning what, proportionally, could have been an eighteenth-century hall-parlor dwelling. The larger of the two rooms (001) is located to the east and accessed by way of a bulkhead stair (ST103). This room was lit by three windows (W001, W002, W004) placed in the upper reaches of the walls; these were not glazed. Instead wood bars were placed horizontally across the openings. Evidence of this is seen in the south window (W004) frame. The cellar was subdivided, and the second space (002) was accessible through an interior doorway (D001) and lit indirectly through an opening in the partition wall (W003). The cellar walls are made of brick and stone masonry. Near the southeast corner the walls jut outward, forming a square extension, indicating the location of the original bulkhead entrance.

The south wall of the cellar can be seen from the rear parlor (101b) since the floorboards were removed over that section.

2. Stairways: There are two stairways in the Thomas House, one in the main block (ST101, 201a, 201b, 203) and a secondary stair (ST102, 202) in the ell. The front staircase has been altered. The pitch and position were changed. **The secondary stair (ST202) opens into a small east-west oriented stair hall (206) on the second floor.**

The front stair, installed in the 1860s, rises in a single run to a landing. From the landing, the primary stair turns 180 degrees and continues up the second floor, giving it an overall dog-leg form. A window (W218) with one fixed shutter is located in this stairwell, although it is

partially obscured by the door (D209) to the rear stair (ST201b). The window would have originally looked out onto the porch, and dates to the original construction period for the main block and ell extension. The main stair (ST101 and ST201a) has an open stringer with ornamental carved brackets on the finish or face string. There are two turned balusters per tread, a heavily turned bulbous newel, and a rounded handrail. The winder stairs (ST203) rising from the second to the third floor are original, and so strongly hint at the original location and style of the earlier stair leading up from the first floor. The stair (ST203) has an open stringer with carved brackets and two turned balusters per tread.

The back flight of the main stair (ST201b) is a single run of four steps leading up to a transitional space and bathroom (207) from the landing. There is a modern, round handrail here.

At the third floor level, the balustrade and handrail of the stair (ST203) become less complex; no longer turned, the balusters are square. The balustrade and handrail are evident on the north and west sides of the stair opening. The eastern extension is encased in the partition wall that created the separate southeast room (301); the newel post with a ghost of the handrail remains in place. The framing for the door into the southeast abuts the newel. Materials used to frame up this entrance were taken from the pre-1847 porch, including the chamfered posts.

The secondary stair (ST102, 202) is akin to a boxed winder, hidden behind a partition wall separating it from a now-removed bathroom (105) and behind a door (D108). The dog-leg stair closely resembles the upper portions of the front stair (ST203) – also turning 180 degrees but with winders – sharing a similarly proportioned balustrade, with two balusters per tread, carved brackets, open stringers, and low risers. The newel post and thin balusters of the secondary stair are turned. The balustrade is early, but not made for the space. Thus it is possible that the secondary stair was fashioned from remnants of the original front stair after the alterations of the 1860s that saw the installation of the present run of steps (ST101); certainly the balusters of the secondary stair are reused.

Yet, the turning of the balusters in the two stairways differs. Moreover the newel post of the secondary stair is turned in the middle section and the rounded handrail is elaborated with an astragal, or semi-circular bead flanked by fillets, on the sides. Nonetheless, the attenuated elements, like the balusters on both stairs, and the simply molded handrails are fashionable hallmarks of neoclassical design. The square balusters seen on the third floor of the main (front) stair (ST203) are also in step with Federal period tastes.

3. Flooring: Predominantly the flooring of the Thomas House is sawn, tongue and groove wood boards running perpendicular to the joists below. On the second floor, the floor boards mask the bridging between the joists in the southeast bedchamber (203) and how several of those joists appear not to run the full-length of the room, instead stopping and starting at intervals to tie the southeast addition into the framing of the original main block. Similarly investigation of the flooring in the back room (208) revealed a gap beneath the

closet on the west wall. Most of the joists were sawn. In the rear of the first-floor hall (100) by the closet, the tongue and groove floorboards have been removed and examination shows that they were hand-hewn. The floor of the laundry room (106) is covered in an imitation-brick laminate. On the second floor, the southwest bedchamber cum bathroom (204) has flooring consisting of black-colored linoleum, cut into tiles, overlaid on the wood.

4. Wall and ceiling finish: The walls of the Thomas House are plaster on lath, covered in paint or wallpaper or both. The lath is mostly riven or hand-split and secured by machine cut nails. A significant proportion of the nails have wrought heads. Cornice moldings and chair rails were added in the twentieth century; baseboard heaters supplanted the traditional molding.³⁸ More utilitarian spaces, such as the finished portions of the third floor, have only a shoe molding.

In the first floor hall (100) there is no cornice in the hallway, but there is a chair rail as well as a baseboard. Both moldings are modern, twentieth-century additions and are a combination of a fascia board and a bead. The baseboard accommodates low, floor-level heaters.

To the east, in the double parlor (101a, 101b) the walls and ceilings were originally plastered on hand-split lath, as commonly found in houses built during the Federal period. In keeping with neoclassical taste that persisted into the Greek Revival-era, the walls would not have been paneled but rather left plain and papered. Today there is wallpaper above the modern chair rail. The chair rail consists of a fascia board with a bead along the edge; the ogee curves of the cornice are separated by a half-hollow (or cavetto) molding.³⁹ The molded architraves of the jib doors are hip-mitered. The doorway reveal (D102) is paneled and the single architrave with band (ogee with a fillet) molding on the parlor side of the entrance has mitered corners. There is no crossette, but the casing consisting of a plain board and a beaded edge resembles that of the other doorways in the hall.

The west parlor (102) is also accessed off the center hall through a doorway (D103) with a paneled reveal. It is ornamented by a crossetted, single architrave with ovolo molding at the outer edge, as are the interiors of the windows (jib doors). Like the east parlor (101), the walls are papered above the chair rail and the surbase (chair rail) itself consists of a fascia with a bead. The cornice is more elaborate, with a reverse ogee crown molding terminating at an astragal and a plain fascia that ends with an ovolo mold.

³⁸The baseboard heaters are to be removed during the investigation/preservation/restoration of the house; it is possible some of the earlier period baseboard moldings survive.

³⁹The cornice appears to date from the twentieth century; the profiles of the millwork look shallower than nineteenth-century examples. A sample nail was a typical square-headed nail. The cornice was likely added at the same time as the chair rail. Further investigation of the cornice, and what is behind it, should clarify matters.

The entrance (D106) to the family dining room (103) from the hall (100) has a paneled reveal, like those to the front and more formal spaces, however, the secondary doors (D105, D107) do not. The reveal differs in that it consists solely of a single panel. The windows (W106, W107) have a similar molded double architrave with a crossette as seen in the hallway door surrounds, but the molding that separates the bands of the casing differs. The architrave on the family dining room side of the doorway to the hall (D106) appears to be the same as the crossetted surround seen upstairs and in the west parlor but it has been stripped of paint and varnished or stained; based on the thickness of the door (1 ¾"), it was made to go an exterior opening. There is a Dutchman along the top as well.

The surround for the door (D105) connecting the dining room to the west parlor (102) has been altered and dates to the 1950s. The corners of that plain surround are mitered. The molded cornice and chair rail notable for its beaded edge are of comparable finish to the applied moldings seen in the hall, and are not original finishes. These likely date to the room's conversion into a kitchen in the twentieth century. Similarly the baseboard has been altered in places for the heaters; a (historic) baseboard with a fillet runs along the south wall behind the cabinet. Elsewhere in the room there are intact baseboards with a beaded edge and v-shaped quirk, which date to before 1830.⁴⁰

In the back or southernmost room (104), the two west windows (W108, W109) have a modern surround consisting of a narrow, single architrave. The sills meet the chair rail, an applied molding matching that of the hall. The east window (W110) retains its original nine-over-nine glazing and fixed upper sash. The muntins of this window match those of the dormer windows and windows of the room (208) above. The baseboard lacks ornamentation except for a quarter-round shoe mold. The east wall features a built-in bookcase, hinting at the room's conversion into a library in the 1950s, and paneling. The surround of the doorway (D107) leading into the family dining room (103) has the crossetted, single architrave with the ovolo mold, which would suggest the presence of a cross hall or transitional space between the kitchen and dining room that would require demarcation or architectural embellishment to announce or reinforce the threshold into the formal social zones of the dwelling.⁴¹ The door (D111) into the present laundry (106), a space created by enclosing the north bay of the porch in the 1950s, is missing. So too are the transom lights above the transom bar.⁴² The doorway reveal is plain, but the casing consists of the same ovolo mold and flat band with a beaded edge seen elsewhere in the house.

⁴⁰Wallpaper fragments in this room (103) date to the twentieth century. A brick-patterned vinyl covering served as a backsplash over the modern cabinetry; behind it was a piece of floral and dot patterned wallpaper dating to the 1950s.

⁴¹Questions surrounding this opening also involve speculation as whether or not this was a cabinet originally (like that upstairs) that was turned into a doorway or if this was always a portal.

⁴²The transom lights were removed for repair.

Upstairs, the surround on both sides of the doorway (D209) from the rear stair (ST201b) into the bathroom (207) consists of a double bead; the corners are mitered. This surround matches that seen on the hall-side of the doorway (D210) into the southeast bedchamber (203). Inside the bedroom, however, the paneled door is hung within an ornamental, crossetted surround reminiscent of the single architraves with ovolo molding and banded casing with a beaded stop found on the first floor.

In the rear stair hall (205 and ST201a & b) there are no moldings or other applied ornamentation.

In the southeast bedchamber (203), the walls are plaster on lath and wallpapered above the chair rail; the two sash windows set within single architraves with a crossette. The fireplace surround and moldings are painted.

In the adjacent bedchamber (201), the surrounds of the four sash windows and three doors (D201, D212, D213) are crossetted. The window reveals are plain rather than paneled. The sills interrupt the molded chair rail. Similar to that seen in the west parlor (102), the cornice has an ogee molding separated from the fascia by a half-hollow (cavetto) molding. As seen in the southeast bedchamber (203), the plaster walls are wallpapered above the chair rail.

In the north wall of the hallway (200) is a jib door (W203), but the bottom section has been sealed. The space is now occupied by a small, built-in shelf. There are no cornice or chair rail moldings here.

The northwest bedchamber (202) closely resembles the two across the hall, however, its cornice is slightly more elaborate, having greater depth and curved moldings ending in a coved piece or cavetto. The cornice was installed in the twentieth century. Only the door (D202) to the hall has the crossetted surround; similarly in the southwest room (204) only one door (D204) has the crossetted architrave.

5. Openings

a. Doorways and doors: The interior doors of the Thomas House vary in age, though most are paneled.

The front door (D101) swings into the hall (100). It is a six-panel door with each fielded panel demarcated by a highly articulated bead. The entrance is augmented by sidelights, three to each side of the door set over a panel, and by an eight-light transom. The lights are held in place by narrow muntins. Inside, the door is surrounded by a single architrave with a pronounced bead (and wide quirk) and is flanked by pilaster-like elements.

The doors (D102, D103) opening into the east (101) and west (102) parlors and family dining parlor (D106) are also six-paneled doors set within a molded surround. The double architraves for these three portals are accented by slight crossette or ear on the hall-side and

the bands of the casing are separated by a cyma curve. The backband of the surround has an ovolo profile and ends with a fillet. The reveals are paneled. All three doors are hung by butt hinges with an ornamental pin. The parlor doors have fielded panels defined by molding at the edge of the raised portion (or field) and at the joining of the bevel to the rails and stiles.

The door (D106) that opens into the hall (100) from the family dining room (103) resembles those in the front part of the house with its six fielded panels and crossetted, double architrave. Like those doors, both sides are paneled with the same level of finish. For this door, the squared field is offset by a bevel and molding at the joint with the rails and stiles. The door (D113) to the laundry (106) is similar with the fielded panels, raised 90 degrees, and molded along the edge. Ghosts of earlier hardware are evident and the door is presently hung by butt hinges. The upper part of the surround is cut off by the stair, though the remaining portions are in keeping with the architraves seen in the west parlor and family dining room and upstairs. It is a single architrave terminated with a bead; the applied outer molding has an ovolo profile and ends with a fillet.

However the surround for the closet door (D114) resembles that of the front door with its pronounced beaded edge. The closet door is a modern six-paneled door.

The dog-leg stair (ST102) is enclosed after the second step; the door (D108) has six rectangular panels, with each field raised at an 90- degree angle rather than beveled, on both sides.

In the laundry room, opening out onto the porch is a modern, six-panel door (D112) with fielded panels cut out at a 90-degree angle on both sides of the door. The plain surround has mitered corners. A screen door opens out onto the porch to the south. A paneled door (D113) opens into the center hall.

Returning to the original kitchen (104) space, the south partition wall for the bathroom (105) has been removed, exposing more of the stair hall lath. The dog-leg stair (ST102) is enclosed after the second step; the door (D108) has six rectangular panels, with each field raised at an 90- degree angle rather than beveled, on both sides.

Upstairs, above the paneled door (D207) opening off the rear stair hall (206) is a three-light transom glazed with old glass; the reverse (hall side) of the door is flat. On the front (207 side) the panels have rounded molding carved between the bevel and field and at the juncture of the panel to the rails and stiles. The single architrave with the crossette is cut off by the south partition wall. It is possible this was an exterior doorway initially and so it would have opened onto the porch.

The door (D206) opening into the south room is paneled on both sides, with slightly raised fields.

A large door (D209) swings onto the stair landing and, when open, partially obscures an original-to-construction (ca. 1795) window (W218) with a wood sill and louvered shutters shielding the bottom sash. This door has six slightly fielded panels.

In the southeast room (203), the door (D210) from the stair hall has six panels, on both sides, which are fielded with an 90-degree angle (no bevel) and not elaborated with molding. The construction of this door (D210) itself corresponds to the door (D209) to the back rooms. Connecting the east side bedchambers is a single door composed of six panels (D212). The backs of the doors in this room are flat while the fronts contain six fielded panels with molding along the joint of the bevel and field and the joint of the panel to the rails and stiles.

Across the hall in the northwest bedchamber (202) there are two closets against the east wall, flanking the hall door (D202); the closets are elevated above the level of the (encased) baseboard heaters. The closet doors have two panels, and date from the twentieth century. The door (D203) into the adjacent room was cut in during the twentieth-century renovations. Previously there was no internal connection between the northwest front room and the space immediately south. Access to that room (204) was only from the porch.⁴³ Here there is an early door (D204) with a glazed transom opening into the hall. This door is the six-paneled, flat back variety seen elsewhere.

On the third floor, the door (D301) into the southeast room (301) has six slightly fielded panels on the front and is flat on the reverse. There is no surround or architrave. From the roughly finished, wide-board partition wall to the west, a door (D302) opens into the unfinished attic space. Its construction resembles a board and batten door, but the boards appear to be leftover chair rail molding (plain fascia board with a bead) from the twentieth-century renovations. The surround has mitered corners.

b. Windows: As described elsewhere, the windows of the Thomas House are mostly sash windows, with jib doors in the front parlors (101a, 101b, 102) and originally in the upstairs hall (200). Transoms over the exterior doorways borrowed light and thereby helped illuminate the interior rooms. Three-light transoms are located over the south rear door (D110) and the doors to the former porch on the first (D111) and second (D204 and D207) floors. An original window (W218) now looks out onto the stair hall. The molded architrave with a crossette indicates nineteenth-century openings, or rather openings augmented during

⁴³ If access to Room 204 was only from an exterior porch, it is possible access to the back room (208) was also through the porch, through the door (D207) to the current side stair hall (206). The chair rail and baseboards run along the north side of this space. The chair rail wraps the northwest corner to extend back along the west wall into the back room (208). It could be that this space was the two-story back building and the internal stair (ST102, ST202) added later. Moreover, the balusters, handrail, and treads indicate that the stair was transplanted to that space and there is evidence of an exterior wall on the second floor, dividing room 204 from 206. Further paint analysis or further removal of wall fabric at the northwest corner of the kitchen (104) could elucidate this matter, especially if it revealed a joint.

one of the renovations that added Greek Revival details to the interior. The sash windows (W214, W215) of the southeast bedchamber (203) have interior, louvered shutters.

6. Decorative features and trim: Ornamental features include the molded surrounds of the window and door openings, built-in bookcases (twentieth century), built-in cabinets (nineteenth century or earlier), and fireplace treatments. Bookcases were added to the south wall of the west parlor (102) and the east wall of the historic kitchen (104).

In the east parlor on the first floor, the fireplace (M101a) matches that of the rear parlor (CH02, M101b). Both have marble hearths and fireboxes with splayed cheeks. The mantelshelf is supported by pilasters with a variant on the classical egg and dart design motif that includes only the egg carving with a stylized anthemion at the corners. The entablature and pilasters of the chimneypiece are made of slate. Although painted monochromatically today, the pilasters and frieze were marbleized in the nineteenth century. Marbleizing was a popular decorative technique, much like the graining of common woods to resemble mahogany, that allowed for greater richness in color and material presentation without the expense.

The fireplace (CH03, M102) of the west parlor (102) is positioned in the west wall and its surround was changed in the second half of the nineteenth century. Like that seen in the adjacent family dining room (103) and similar to that seen in the southeast bedchamber (203) on the second floor, it features squat columns, elevated on plinths, flanking the firebox. The columns support an entablature consisting of blocks ornamented with a molded bull's eye and a frieze with a reeded band running parallel to the mantelshelf.

The most remarkable features in the dining room (103) are the fireplace (CH04, M103) and adjacent cupboard. The fireplace surround dates to the Greek Revival redecorating effort in the second half of the nineteenth century and lacks the depth of carving seen in the earlier woodwork (M202, M204, M201).⁴⁴ Like that in the west parlor (102) and in the southeast bedchamber (203), this fireplace surround has free-standing columns flanking the firebox. Elevated on plinths, the squat columns each support a three-part frieze consisting of blocks with a bull's eye turning in the center above each column and a middle section characterized by reeding running parallel to the unadorned mantelshelf.

In the Federal period, colonial preferences for built-ins persisted. Fireplace walls continued to offer space for cupboards or buffets with built-in shelving for household goods, especially those devoted to social interaction and rituals like the taking of tea and coffee or dining. These built-in cupboards were typically found in the dining rooms and formal parlors. Although in keeping with historical trends, and assembled in place, the cupboard positioned to the right of the fireplace was constructed after the baseboard (with its deep quirk)

⁴⁴ Evidence of any hand-planed workmanship on this mantelpiece was stripped along with the paint. It appears ca. 1880 but further material investigation would have to be done. The profile of the reeding is not earlier than 1850.

suggesting an early re-working of this interior space. The cabinet itself is plainly finished. The doors are fielded on the interior and surviving construction detail like the pinned panels in the cabinet doors suggests it was made before 1825. Analysis of the hardware, such as if it is cast or wrought, could push the date back into the Federal period.

The south wall of the back room upstairs (208) contains a finely carved cabinet with an arched top capped by a keystone and set within fluted pilasters on the east end, a narrow cabinet nestled within a crossetted architrave on the far west side, and a Federal period mantelpiece slightly west of center. The upper section of the east cabinet has six raised panels while the double doors of the lower section each have one raised panel. The paneled surround of the lower cabinet resembles that of the window jamb.

The interior shelving of the upper cabinet is modern, and most likely the upper portion of the cabinet was left open originally. Probably the upper cabinet had a similar crossetted surround as the others in the house; nevertheless, the surround of the upper section is old and the doors, which were cut by hand and have through mortice and tenon construction, have dutchmen along the bottom and evidence of earlier hardware. It has been suggested that the upper portion of the arched cabinet was moved into the Thomas House from someplace else.⁴⁵ This is possible since the detailing on the arched surround, with its fluted pilasters, molded keystone, and reeded echinus, corresponds to that seen on the adjacent mantelpiece as well as the chimneypieces in the bedrooms (201, 202, 204) and dormers. Such elaboration was popular in the Federal period and other examples of this kind of workmanship are known in the county.

The upper and lower portions of the arched cabinet are married together, and the upper portion put together in the twentieth century. Woodwork in the lower part of the arched cabinet matches that of the west cabinet and the windowsills. The doors of the cabinet in the southwest room (204) also resemble those of the lower cabinet and west cabinet in the south room (208) meaning that the cabinetry was made around the same time. These doors were ploughed out by hand. The crossetted surround (ovolo molding and backband) of the narrow cabinet is in keeping with that on the adjacent fireplace and those in the three bedrooms (201, 202, 204) as well as the door and window architraves from the early period.

⁴⁵ The Federal-period mantels and cabinetry could have been moved from the downstairs of the house when those rooms were expanded (as in the case of the east parlor (101)) or renovated. The arched cabinet also could have come from another house in the neighborhood; the Marshall family owned more than one farm in the area for instance. For example, the house, Arcadia, was more finely finished than the Thomas House and perhaps the early cabinetry was salvaged from there during a renovation and reused in the Thomas House. Marshall lived in Frederick by 1800, and sold Arcadia to Arthur Shaaf in 1801. The renovations to the Thomas House could have occurred as early as when Marshall's children inherited the property, or when the McPhersons bought it in 1812. The McPhersons also purchased Arcadia from Shaaf's heirs, but not until 1826. Or the change occurred around mid-century, when the Taylor and Thomas families owned the house and property nearby. Regardless of where it came from, the change seen in the Thomas House cabinetry was probably prompted either by a generational change in ownership or by a sale.

The fireplace surround (CH05, M203) in room 204 consists of a crossetted molding around the firebox opening surmounted by a frieze with alternating planes created by two pilaster elements and central, projecting panel that accommodates a recessed, pointed arch. The pointed arch of the frieze in the fireplace surround in the four upstairs rooms (201, 202, 204, 208) recalls the Gothic tracery of the dormer windows. Above the frieze, spanning the area beneath the mantelshelf (M204), are an ovolo band molding ornamented with gougework and a narrow panel of triglyph-like elements – here vertical gougework – alternating with metopes. The hearth is made of brick masonry and extends past the west side of the surround. It is built up with a lower layer of bricks on a plastered shelf as fireproofing.

The fireplace (CH02, M205) of the southeast room (203) is against the east wall. Its Greek Revival-styled surround is similar to that seen in the west parlor (102) and dining parlor (103) on the first floor.⁴⁶ Single columns flanking the firebox support an entablature with blocks embellished on the front and sides with bull's eye turning. The frieze is placed between the blocks. Rather than the band of reeding – or parallel set of small convex moldings – extending the full length of the frieze as it does in the west parlor (102) and family dining room (103), this variation on the motif has a large, semi-circular bead flanked by coved pieces. The brick hearth does not reach the left side of the chimney cheek and the firebox opening appears off-center in relationship to the mantelpiece. This off-set was to accommodate the flue from the firebox downstairs (CH02) in the east parlor (101b).

The fireplace (CH01, M201) of the northeast bedchamber (201) appears to be crafted in the Federal style with a molded surround, a band of gougework, and simple, alternating patterns, here in three parts beneath the gougework. The repeating gouged grooves, such as those seen in this fireplace surround as well as those for the chimneypieces in the northwest bedchamber and back, south rooms (202, 208) were a popular decorative device in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century chimneypieces. The hearth is made of brick. The fireplace (CH03, M202) of the northwest bedchamber (202) matches that of the northeast (201); it too has the crossetted surround and entablature characterized by gougework banding and three projecting panels, the center of which has a recessed pointed arch.

The fireplace (CH04, M203) of the southwest room (204) was flanked by built-in cabinets, an interior arrangement popular during the Federal period and retained in nineteenth-century interpretations of classical design. The remaining cabinet has the same type of crossetted architrave seen throughout the house. The top cabinet's double doors have three panels while those in the bottom section have only one. The panels have molding around the edge and between the bevel and field, an elaboration that matches that of the west cabinet in room 208 and the lower cabinet doors of the arched cabinet in the same room. The fireplace surround is more detailed than that seen in the northeast, northwest and south rooms on the

⁴⁶ The fireplace surrounds in the west parlor (102) and dining room (103) are identical; this one is similar to those but the molding along the frieze differs. There are also bull's eye ornamentation on the sides of the blocks above columns in this mantelpiece whereas the two downstairs have the turning only on the front of the end blocks.

second floor, although it exhibits similar gougework. It is further augmented with a band of hyphenated fluting spanning the entablature and running beneath the mantelshelf. Like the other fireplaces, the hearth is made of brick and like the hearth in the south room, the hearth extends farther out on the west side than it does on the east. The cabinet to the east (left) of the fireplace was removed and the space punched through to create a doorway (D205) to the back stair.

7. Hardware: Metalwork remaining in the Thomas House consists of hinges and locking mechanisms with the exception of the shutter dogs and the large, iron fireback decorated with a cartouche and cherub remaining in the firebox of the historic kitchen (104). The fireback is not original to the space. Otherwise, most of the doors are hung from butt hinges although several on the first floor have ornamental pins and faux-grained knobs. One (D207) is hung from cast, strap hinges. The door (D203) connecting the northwest and southwest rooms has an art moderne doorknob. Elsewhere there are key locks, sliding bolt locks, and rim locks, plus several thumb latches affixed the doors. Ghosts of earlier hardware are also in evidence.

8. Mechanical equipment

a. Heating, air conditioning, ventilation: The attic spaces were vented by louvered gable windows. Baseboard heaters and radiators are present throughout the first and second floors. Central heating was installed by C. Edward Hilgenberg after he purchased the property in June 1949.

b. Lighting: There were electric lights throughout the house. Most had been removed at the time of the site visit.

c. Plumbing: Modern bathrooms and laundry facilities were installed in 1949-50; the kitchen was remodeled about this time as well.

D. Site

1. Historic landscape design: The dwelling faces northeasterly to Araby Church Road and anchors the domestic complex at the heart of the 231-acre farm. Outbuildings include tenant houses, a pump house, a shed, a barn, and a corn crib.

Part III. Sources of Information

A. Architectural drawings: In addition to the drawings provided by HABS, there are plans for the renovations in the mid-twentieth century. The Hilgenberg's had an auxiliary heating system installed in the building; plans by their contractor, A.E. Fisher, are not dated. Drawings for the sun porch and garage additions were done by the firm Smith and Veale in

Baltimore.⁴⁷ Smith and Veale also provided plans for a new front porch, although these were not executed. The elevation drawings are dated August 20, 1952.

B. Early Views: The earliest views of the Thomas Farm include early area maps; renderings of the house appear in the late nineteenth century, including a ca. 1880 illustration in Scarf's *History of Western Maryland*; a ca. 1888 photograph looking to the front of the house; and another photograph dating to ca. 1893 in the Davis Collection. Twentieth-century images include those in the Fred Cross Collection (1930s), Hilgenberg Collection (late 1940s), and Clapp family photographs (1950s-1960s). All are on file at the park.

C. Interviews: On file at the park are transcripts of a conversation with Carl Hilgenberg, nephew of the owner; Hilgenberg relays his memories of what the building looked like as well as his recollection of staying in a room over the kitchen ell when he was a child.

D. Selected Sources:

Beasley, Joy. *Occupational History of the Thomas Farm* [draft]. In "Archeological Overview and Assessment and Identification and Evaluation Study of the Thomas Farm," [draft] edited by Joy Beasley. *Occasional Report* in preparation. Regional Archeology Program, National Capital Region, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., 2009. [Stephen R. Potter, Series Editor].

Bies, Brandon. *A Brief History of the Battle of Monocacy*. In "Archeological Overview and Assessment and Identification and Evaluation Study of the Best Farm," edited by Joy Beasley. *Occasional Report* No. 18. Regional Archeology Program, National Capital Region, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., 2005. [Stephen R. Potter, Series Editor].

Cooling, B. Franklin. *Monocacy: The Battle That Saved Washington*. Shippensburg, PA: White Mane Publishing Company, Inc., 1997.

Gatchell, Mary T. "Some Reminiscences of 'The Battle of Monocacy' Fought July 9th, 1864." In the United Daughters of the Confederacy Collection (MSA SC 213), Maryland State Archives. Copy on file at Monocacy National Battlefield.

Reed, Paula Stoner with Edith B. Wallace. "Cultural Resources Study Monocacy National Battlefield." Report prepared by Paula S. Reed and Associates, Inc., 1999 [Updated August 2001 and July 2004]. Copy on file at Monocacy National Battlefield.

⁴⁷The offices for Smith and Veale were located at 2127 N. Charles Street in Baltimore; the firm is still practicing today although the name has changed.

Weil, Andrew. “‘He is a Rebel When the Rebels are Here, and a Yankee When the Yankees are Here’: Araby and its Residents in the Civil War.” M.A. Thesis, University of Maryland-College Park, 2005. Copy on file at Monocacy National Battlefield.

E. Supplemental Material:

Drawings depicting the floor plans of the Thomas House with the rooms, windows, doors and fireplaces identified by number for the purposes of the HSR and referenced throughout the above text.





