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They have forgotten that Mrs. Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin" is a novel.

Henson, 1881, pg. 242

You remember that when this novel of Mrs. Stowe came out, it shook the foundations of this world. It shook Americans almost out of their shoes, and out of their shirts… It left some of them on the sandbar barefooted and scratching their heads, without knowing where to go, or what to do or say.

Henson, 1881, pg. 242

Harriet Beecher Stowe, *The Key to Uncle Tom’s Cabin*:

The character of Uncle Tom has been objected to as improbable; and yet the writer has received more confirmations of that character, and from a great variety of sources, than of any other in the book. … [after citing other examples, Stowe concludes her chapter on “Uncle Tom” with Josiah Henson:] A last instance parallel with that of Uncle Tom is to be found in the published memoirs of the venerable Josiah Henson, now, as we have said, a clergyman in Canada…

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an analysis of a small house in Montgomery County, Maryland, which has been a private suburban residence since the 1930s. From ca.1800 to 1850, it served as the main farmhouse on the plantation of brothers George and Isaac Riley. As such, it was the property on which Josiah Henson lived on two different occasions prior to his 1828-30 escape from slavery. Henson discussed the Riley plantation, with some references to specific buildings in his widely read autobiography, published in several different editions between 1849 and 1881. The house is documented as the Riley family’s residence on maps published both twelve years before (Appendix F, page 12) Henson’s final return to the property in 1877 and two years afterward (Appendix F, page 13). In the 1881 edition of the autobiography, he discusses the ways in which the property had changed in appearance between the 1820s and his 1877 visit. The house remained in the ownership of Isaac Riley’s descendants until the 1920s.

Since at least as early as 1939, the Riley House has been associated locally with Henson because of an understanding in the community that this is the farmhouse of the plantation on which Josiah Henson lived and that Henson was a model for Harriet Beecher Stowe’s novel *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. The log wing provides a tangible reminder of the title of the 1852 novel. It is also possible that it is the kitchen that Henson describes in his autobiography. In 1853, in a second book entitled *A Key to Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Stowe acknowledged that Henson was a model of the character she portrayed in her fictionalized account of slavery (as were several other people associated with George and Isaac Riley’s plantation), and to capitalize on the connection, Henson added references to Stowe’s novel to the titles, introductory sections, and afterwords of revised editions of his autobiography that he published after 1853.

The log wing looks as if it could easily have been the dirt-floored kitchen that Henson describes, in the various editions of his autobiography, as a place where he was compelled to sleep in squalor for a brief period in 1828. It fits the description in several ways, although Henson never said what building materials the kitchen was constructed of or whether it touched the main house. In the 1881 edition of his narrative, he refers to an “outside kitchen,” describing the bustling farmstead as it was before he left the property in 1828, but also speaking of it as if it were still standing at the time of his return visit in early in 1878. Although Henson’s 1881 commentary appears to point to the wing that is there now, the available evidence does not conclusively prove that his references are to the log walls that are still standing today. He could be referring to another outbuilding that once stood near the house, as the description does not include enough detail to determine for certain that it was this building. For instance, the narratives do not say that the kitchen was “log.” It is also because the property was changed so thoroughly in the 1930s that much of the evidence was destroyed. The log and frame sections of the house were greatly altered in a project undertaken between 1936 and 1939. As was typical of Colonial Revival “restorations” of that time, the project included replacing many of the house’s materials and “correcting” various aspects of the house, such as the spacing of the windows, to reflect an idealized image of the Colonial era rather than an accurate restoration of this unique house. The rehabilitation involved replacing most of the interior and exterior surface materials, adding a new rear wing with modern kitchen and bathroom facilities, removing the front porch, adding porches to the south and west sides of the building, and making alterations to the fenestration patterns, door locations, and the interior layout. In the log wing, most of the logs, however, do not appear to have been altered in this project. The landscape was also changed in keeping with the emerging characteristics of residential design in newly developed suburban areas. Although other buildings, presumed to be quarters for enslaved workers, were mentioned in newspaper articles about the property in the 1930s and 1950s (and one reference from as late as 1961), no effort appears to have been made to preserve them, and consequently, they are no longer standing.
Evidence found within a cavity between the two sections of the building indicates that the frame house was built prior to the log house. The frame part of the house is believed to have been built between ca.1790 and ca.1815 by either William Collyer or George Riley (Collyer’s son sold the property to Riley in 1797, and George Riley died in 1815). A legend that was handed down to the Bolten family when they purchased the house in the 1930s was that the frame house had been built by a Revolutionary War soldier after he returned from the war (although no corroborating evidence has been located to confirm this story). The log section of the house was constructed at some point after 1820. It was originally built as an outbuilding of some kind that might have been needed in proximity to the house, most likely as a kitchen where enslaved labor prepared meals for the residents of the house. While food preparation is among the logical uses for which a small log building with a separate entrance and no internal connection (to the house it was serving) might have been built next to a larger house, no definitive evidence has been uncovered to prove that it was used for that purpose during Isaac Riley’s lifetime or more specifically during the time that Josiah Henson spent at the property. The log wing is known to have served as the house’s kitchen in the 1910s. In two recently conducted oral history interviews, Frances Mace Hansbrough, a Riley family descendant, has indicated that access from the frame house to this kitchen, in the 1920s, required exiting one building and entering the other (Hansbrough 2006 and 2007).

The question of whether the log section might have been moved a short distance at some time has been raised, and the conclusion of this study is that it is a possibility that it was in fact moved. The 1936 project included both adding an interior connection between the log and frame houses and relocation of the kitchen functions to a new rear wing to the west of the frame house, making it possible to have limited the disturbance to the log house. However, the log house was heavily disturbed in an effort to “restore” it, and as a result of the 1930s alterations (and subsequent ones), including replacement of the older floor and foundation, changes in the grade around the house, and similar changes, there is now no clear physical evidence to indicate if and when it would have been moved, or, if it was moved, how far.

Despite the removal of many of the house’s details in the 1930s project, the walls of the log building remain as an authentic example of typical hewn-log construction in the Mid-Atlantic Region during the time when Henson was on the property (he lived at this plantation from some point after 1797 until 1825, and then briefly in 1828, and finally for a short visit in 1878). As such, the log enclosure constitutes the most tangible and authentic visual tool available for explaining Henson’s relationship to the Riley plantation prior to the 1830s. The frame house to which the log section is attached was the residence of the Isaac and Matilda Riley family in the same era that the two parts of the building were constructed. The house’s framing, massing, and some of its details (such as its false-plate-based boxed cornice) are typical components of a well-known and historically important architectural type commonly used in building barnhouses in this area, the braced frame cottage as commonly found in the Tidewater area adjoining Chesapeake Bay. The three-room floor plan (which may be original, although the evidence was also lacking to confirm that all the interior partition walls are still in their original configuration) is a building type recognized by architectural historians and represented by other historic examples in the Montgomery County area.

There are several potential conflicts, logic constraints, and other possible pitfalls that arise when the appropriate “Treatment” of the house and “Interpretation” of the story of Josiah Henson and the Riley family are analyzed together. While the Henson / Riley story is central to the interpretation of the site, the visible aspects of the property actually represent a relatively intact example of a 1936 design with very few details remaining from the 1820s or earlier. The property is clearly the location and setting of several key passages in the story that Josiah Henson tells in his autobiography. With the interesting details that remain in place to relate to that story, such as the log-walled room attached to a modest frame farmhouse, and as the core building of the farmstead of what was once the Riley Plantation, it is the appropriate place to interpret the Montgomery County part of the Josiah Henson story. However, since the physical evidence and level of documentation needed to restore either the log wing or the frame section of the house to their appearance prior to 1936 are lacking, it is not possible to restore the house and property...
accurately to their appearance in the 1820s, as it stood in Josiah Henson’s earliest description of the property. Yet it is possible, in modifying the house, to represent some of the architectural elements that are missing (e.g., by lowering the floor of the log room and adding a loft in the upper portion of the space). However, because it is a good example of a Colonial Revival style “restoration” project of the 1930s, the building itself remains somewhat at odds with the intended use, the interpretation, that is, of the time Josiah Henson spent at the Riley Plantation. It is critical, therefore, that any conversion of this property to a museum use be undertaken with a realization of these limitations. In all future activities, the property should be presented in a way that is ethical, honest, and forthright about what is known and what is not known, including the architectural aspects of the house and landscape that are known well enough to be restored and those that are not.

Further research into Josiah Henson’s life and further development of interpretive strategies will afford tremendous opportunities to pursue additional research and encourage scholarship about the topics that the site represents. It will also afford opportunities to apply these insights in ways that increasingly enhance the depth of the visitor experience. This will be a way to clarify, through continual inquiry and periodically updated presentations, the relationship between Henson, Henson’s narratives, Harriet Beecher Stowe’s novel, the Kentucky and Canada components of the story, and similar themes. The study of slavery in Maryland, with a focus on Henson’s writings and insights, particularly the years before his escape to Canada, represents a tremendous opportunity for further historical inquiry. Researchers should be able to further develop Henson’s narrative of his life in Maryland based on untapped county and state sources and other new information as it becomes available. With the County’s efforts to support emerging scholarship, the image derived from Henson’s autobiography and subsequently reduced to an odious cliché of an Uncle Tom, “a black man who obsequiously seeks white approval or betrays his race” may finally begin to change to something positive, part of an important true story.
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STATEMENT OF APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The JMA, Inc., (John Milner Associates) team employed various means of investigation to research the written record and evaluate the age and condition of all parts of the house and the parcel on which it lies, within the current property lines. Henson’s narratives were carefully reviewed and placed into context by a historian who specializes in African American studies and has special expertise in the Midwestern routes of the Underground Railroad. Historic photographs, maps aerial views, deed surveys, and similar documents were researched both to document the story of the house and to illustrate its complex history. Information about the property came from the following sources: documents regarding the Riley family, the Riley plantation, several of the other farms that the plantation appears to have included, and other Riley real estate holdings in the vicinity; two oral history interviews with Frances Mace Hansbrough (a Riley descendant who is now in her nineties); records of later owners such as the Luchs family, developers of the Luxmanor subdivision around the house; and review of information on the Bolten Family, owners of the house in 1936 (as well as the owners after the Boltens). The kinds of records that were searched included: records of people enslaved on the property; census data; deeds; wills; estate accounts; real estate surveys; maps; historic images; newspaper articles; and photographs (including aerial views). The title history of the farm proved to be unusually difficult as the farm was assembled from several land patents and early land surveys and was later re-shaped with boundaries overlapping the lines of the earlier tracts.

Isaac Riley, his brother George, and other family members each owned several farms in close proximity, some with remarkably complicated boundaries. One reason the title history was difficult was that numerous deeds were on file for tracts of land that had been bought, sold, or otherwise transferred by Riley family members at various times, sometimes with no reference to acreage or boundaries and often with confusing references to much larger 18th century land patents that were no longer relevant. It appears that the plantation that was operated from this farmhouse had great variances in its acreage from year to year, not only in the deed for the farm containing the house, but also in the sense that the Riley family members may have been operating an agricultural domain headquartered at this farm that extended across several other tracts of land (with separate deeds). The Riley plantation may have included, at various times, farms belonging to other family members, just as some other family members are described by Henson as being, from time to time, part of the plantation’s operation. As is often the case with farms and plantations, land at the fringes was bought and sold routinely to expand the operations or to settle debts.

Adding to the complexity of these records, the title became even more difficult to follow by the 1820s due to a complicated series of lawsuits that unfolded, apparently splitting the legal record into two competing sets of legal documents. The lawsuits developed between Isaac Riley and several others, notably Arnold T. Windsor, his sister-in-law’s second husband. Riley and Windsor struggled over which part of the family had the better ability to control the assets of Isaac Riley’s deceased brother George after his 1815 death, and over what was in the best interest of George’s children. Isaac had been appointed in George Riley’s will as the executor of the estate as conveyed by way of the will. However, George Riley’s widow and young children had a financial interest in the profitable management of the estate’s assets. When Arnold T. Windsor was appointed guardian of George Riley’s children, he had a basis from which he could demand that Isaac Riley liquidate part of the estate to provide financially for the children. Isaac resisted doing so until his hand was forced by the court. The documents are not completely cross-referenced to one another, and some kinds of land transfers may not have been recorded. As a result, there are missing links in the chain of title as well as some suppositions as noted.
At the beginning of the project, the drawings that were prepared in approximately 1936\(^1\) by Lorenzo Winslow were studied and the existing conditions were checked to determine the degree to which the two conform to one another. The building was measured and drawn by a team of architects. It was also investigated by engineers as well as by a specialized preservation architect and two building material conservators. The site’s architectural history was meticulously traced from the data collected from others, as well as by careful review of the ca.1936 drawings by architect Lorenzo Winslow. After the building had been measured and drawn and the 1936 drawings had been analyzed, the team decided, in consultation with the client, that it was appropriate to perform selective destructive testing to determine actual composition of walls, including framing members, plaster, paint, and similar materials. The house was thoroughly photographed before, during, and after selective removals and material sampling. A dozen samples were taken of paint finishes, primarily those on the few remaining pre-1936 door and window casings and mantelpieces, with some samples also taken from newer materials for comparison. Nine core borings of the wood in the log walls were taken to be analyzed for information on the date when the logs were cut. Small openings were made in the interior plaster and floor boards in various locations to access and photograph hidden framing members. A few lath nails from an earlier plaster finish were discovered in one section of the framing of the front wall, and several of the nails were removed for analysis. Similar samples were taken of mortar in the log chinking, small pieces of flooring in the log room, and one or two other building materials. Research was conducted into the history of several twentieth century building materials and fixtures that are found in the house. Some of the materials could be identified based on notes included on the 1936 drawings (an example is the Celotex brand insulating lath panels that were used in plastering the house in 1936; for more detail on Celotex, see Appendix M; for more detail on other materials, see the Conditions Assessment and other appropriate sections in the report that follows).

Analysis was undertaken separately using archeology to evaluate the surrounding property, including a test unit adjoining the foundation of the house, where the frame section and the log wing meet. The property was also analyzed for its landscape, including plants, hardscape, and site features. The structural characteristics of the house were analyzed by a team of structural engineers. The information collected in these portions of the project was carefully compared to that collected through other means to determine the history of the house.

The report that follows addresses the history and character of the house from the point of view of many different disciplines. The emphasis of most of the various kinds of investigation undertaken was to determine the history of the house and its materials. The history of the site was traced, including a set of property records that were particularly complex, one reason being that the plantation was operated in Josiah Henson’s time by an estate that was contested in court by competing family interests. Generally, the house is in good condition as a result of materials added in the 1930s. The house’s story, on the other hand, was complicated in many ways. In order to determine an appropriate approach to treatment, it was important to sort out the historic context of the property, the legal history, the history of the building materials, and the ways in which the limited number of building materials predating the 1930s related to the similarly complicated story of Josiah Henson’s time here.

In the final stages of the project, a treatment plan was developed for the building and a tentative interpretation strategy was outlined. Although pre-1936 material evidence was lacking in several different aspects of the property, as discovered in the multi-faceted analysis that the team members undertook, the conclusions were carefully compared to Josiah Henson’s accounts and other 19\(^\text{th}\) century

\(^1\) Although the drawings are not dated, the project is known to have occurred approximately in 1936-1939. The caption of a newspaper photograph that appeared in 1939 (\textit{Washington Star}, July 30, 1939; see Appendix F, page F-2) reports on the project as having been completed. Throughout this report, the date for the drawings is assumed to be ca.1936, based on Bolten’s purchase of the property and the assertion in the 1939 article that the project had taken three years to complete.
sources that might shed light on the story of Henson and the Riley family. Every effort was made to keep in mind the importance of interpreting the Henson / Riley story at this site, regardless of the amount of 19th century material that could be identified in the architecture, landscape, and archeological materials. In the Interpretive Strategy that concludes the report, the focus is on telling as much of the story as possible using direct quotes from Josiah Henson’s narratives.

The report that follows was developed between May 2007 and June 2008. A 75% draft was submitted in September 2007. Comments from the staff of the Montgomery County Department of Parks, Park Planning and Stewardship Division, were received in October 2007. The 75% draft was also submitted to the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) for comment. The project manager for the Park Planning and Stewardship Division and the JMA project manager both followed up with representatives from MHT’s Office of Research, Survey, and Registration and the MHT National Register Program. All comments were incorporated into a 90% draft of the report, and the 90% draft was submitted in early June 2008. The Park Planning and Stewardship Division reviewed and commented on the 90% draft in June 2008, and the document was also sent again to the Maryland Historical Trust for review. The comments that were received have been incorporated into this final report, as completed by 30 June 2008, with some minor revisions made in July 2008.

The significance and integrity of the property were evaluated in terms of, and by the procedures established by, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the Regulations for the National Register, and other publications of the National Park Service. Consideration was also given to significance reflected in the local designation of the property as a Landmark in the Montgomery County Master Plan for Historic Preservation. The conditions of each building material were investigated and evaluated, as reflected in the attached conditions assessments for the two parts of the house. The future treatment of the house and property were carefully weighed against the various aspects of museum purposes that are under consideration. In conjunction with the treatment plan, an interpretive strategy was developed, with input from others, by a public historian with extensive experience planning museums and exhibits that interpret African American heritage.
THE RILEY HOUSE AND PLANTATION IN JOSIAH HENSON’S WORDS

We lodged in log huts, and on the bare ground. Wooden floors were an unknown luxury. In a single room were huddled, like cattle, ten or a dozen persons, men, women, and children. All ideas of refinement and decency were, of course, out of the question. We had neither bedsteads, nor furniture of any description. Our beds were collections of straw and old rags, thrown down in the corners and boxed in with boards; a single blanket the only covering. Our favourite way of sleeping, however, was on a plank, our heads raised on an old jacket and our feet toasting before the smouldering fire. The wind whistled and the rain and snow blew in through the cracks, and the damp earth soaked in the moisture till the floor was miry as a pig-sty. Such were our houses. In these wretched hovels were we penned at night, and fed by day; here were the children born and the sick — neglected.

Henson, 1881, pg. 23

I was now, practically, overseer. My pride and ambition had made me master of every kind of farmwork. But, like all ambition, its reward was increase of burdens. The crops of wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, corn, tobacco, all had to be cared for by me. I was often compelled to start at midnight with the waggon for the distant market, to drive through mud and rain till morning, sell the produce, reach home hungry and tired, and nine times out of ten, reap my sole reward in curses for not getting higher prices.

Henson, 1881, pg. 26

Gradually the disposal of everything raised on the farm,--the wheat, oats, hay, fruit, butter, and whatever else there might be,--was confided to me...

Henson, 1881, pg. 40

After putting my horse in the stable I retired to the kitchen, where my master told me I was to sleep for the night. Oh, how different from my accommodations in the free States, for the last three months, was that crowded room, with its earth-floor, its filth and stench! I looked around me with a sensation of disgust. ... Full of gloomy reflections at my loneliness, and the poverty-stricken aspect of the whole farm, I sat down, and while my companions were snoring in unconsciousness, I kept awake, thinking how I could escape from the accursed spot.

Henson, 1881, pg. 57
So, on the 24th of December, 1877, we started [from Canada] for the South, expecting to take our Christmas dinner with our sister… but we were delayed on the road, and did not arrive in Baltimore till the 26th. … Remaining here till the 3rd of March, we then proceeded to Washington, where I visited many of the old haunts which were so familiar to me in the long-ago days when I used to bring hither my master's produce….

And then we went to my old home. Fifty years, lacking only a few months, had passed since I last saw the old place. Fifty long years! since the day when I left the master's house to return to my family in Kentucky, walking with a swinging step and a jubilant heart, because my great object in life was gained (as I thought in my credulity), my freedom papers being safely stowed away in my bag.

I did not expect to find the old master who had played me such a cruel trick, still alive. … But I did almost unconsciously expect to see the old place somewhat as I had left it. Notwithstanding all I had heard of the great alterations which had taken place, since coming South, I still pictured to myself the great fertile plantation, with its throngs of busy labourers sowing the seed, tilling the ground, and reaping the valuable harvests as of yore. I saw the "great house," well furnished and sheltering a happy, luxurious, and idle family; I saw the outdoor kitchen, where the coloured cook and her young maids prepared and carried the dinners into the house; I saw the barns and storehouses bursting with plenty; the great cellars filled with casks of cider, apple-brandy, and fruit; and plainer than all I saw the little village of huts called the niggers' quarters, which used to be so full of life, and alas! so full of sorrow.

But the scales have fallen even from the eyes of my imagination, and I realise at last that a change, great and fearful, has indeed come over the land of the modern Pharaohs, who were visited with the Almighty's wrath because they refused to let His people depart out of their bondage.

The old place is situated in Montgomery County, Maryland, about twelve miles from Washington, and four from Rockville. Long before we reached the house where my old master used to live, I saw that it was indeed another land from that of my boyhood. The once great plantation is now but a wilderness; the most desolate, demoralised place one can imagine.

The fertile fields where once waved acres upon acres of tasselled corn, of blooming rye, and oats and barley; the once ploughed land where grew the endless rows of potatoes, which I have hoed so many weary hours; the rich pastures where great herds of cattles used to graze,--all these splendid lands are overgrown with trees and underbrush. The fences are all gone; the fruitful orchards worn out and dead; and when we drove at last up the grass-grown road to the house, I saw it standing there all alone, without a single barn or stable or shed to bear it company, and it was in such a dilapidated condition that the windows rattled and the very door sprang ajar as we drove up and stopped before it....

We went in, and there was the old mistress... Her bed was in the old sitting-room, which was the first place that I had seen that seemed at all familiar. The room and the old corner cupboard, where master used to keep his brandy, just as they were fifty years ago; but the furniture was scanty and dilapidated, and the floor was utterly bare; in fact, there was not a scrap of carpet in the whole house.

Henson, 1881, pg. 219
PART I. DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY
**HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

**Outlining Josiah Henson’s Life in Montgomery County, Maryland**

Isaac Riley, owner of the Riley Farm, is remembered today because of Josiah Henson, the man he once enslaved.¹ Henson memorialized slavery in Montgomery County and on the Riley Farm in a total of six editions of his narratives, four of which contained substantive changes or additions. Although Henson added much to the story of the latter half of his life, the inclusion of introductions written by notable and prominent Americans in the 1879 edition mark it as an important edition.² Within those six editions of the narrative, the essential facts connected with Henson’s early life in Maryland remained unchanged by Henson and were not investigated by scholars until recently.

The spare details of Henson’s early life have received minimal attention despite the fact that his autobiography stood as the third most popular slave narrative at the time it was published as well as the third most frequently studied slave narrative among scholars after Frederick Douglass’s seminal work. Douglass’s account of slavery on Maryland’s Eastern Shore ranked first among all slave narratives; the narrative of Olaudah Equiano second, and Henson’s third. In 1849, Henson’s autobiography first appeared in the July edition of a periodical subscribed to by the family of Harriet Beecher Stowe. This is the narrative that caught Stowe’s attention, and, coupled with an essay about slave narratives by Ephraim Peabody, helped shape the characters for her 1852 book *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (Starling 1988). The first two editions of Henson’s narrative reportedly sold a total of 100,000 copies largely as a result of Stowe’s publication of *A Key to Uncle Tom’s Cabin* which identified Henson as Tom (Foster 1994). Sales exploded, reaching a quarter of a million copies after John Lobb took over as editor of subsequent versions of Henson’s narrative in 1877 (Davis and Gates 1985).

Invariably an account of Henson’s life begins with virtually identical phrases taken directly from Henson: “He was born in June, 1789, in Charles County, State of Maryland, on a farm belonging to a Mr. Francis Newman, situated about a mile from Port Tobacco. His mother was hired out to work on this farm, being the slave of a Dr. Josiah McPherson, and here it was that she met with and was married to the father of Josiah” (Bleby, 1873; Bordewich, 2005).³ Henson’s earliest recollection was the appearance of his father with “his head bloody and his back lacerated.” Henson vividly recalled his father as being “beside himself with mingled rage and suffering.” The overseer had brutally assaulted his mother. The bloody head and

¹ This section of the report, “Outlining Josiah Henson’s Life in Montgomery County, Maryland,” was compiled by Cheryl Janifer LaRoche, Ph. D., a specialist in African American history and member of the JMA team.
² The 1879 edition has introductory letters by Wendell Phillips and John G. Whittier, and a preface was written by Harriet Beecher Stowe. An appendix entitled “The Exodus” (the escape of enslaved people out of the slave states and onto free soil) was also included. The appendix was written by Bishop Gilbert Haven, a leader of the Methodist Episcopal Church and a strong supporter of efforts to build educational facilities for people who had formerly been enslaved.
³ This exact quote is taken from the 1873 edition of *Josiah: The Maimed Fugitive, A True Tale*, by Henry Bleby. It can be retrieved online at [http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/bleby/bleby.html](http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/bleby/bleby.html), an electronic copy of Bleby’s book posted by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as part of the Documenting the American South, “a digital publishing initiative that provides Internet access to texts, images, and audio files related to southern history, literature, and culture.” The same source has been used for a number of quotes in this report. The same passage appears, almost word-for-word, as the opening of either the first or second paragraph of the narrative in the 1849, 1858, 1876, and 1881 editions available through the Documenting the American South collection. The point here, however, is that it has been quoted almost word-for-word, many times in other books mentioning Henson. Similarly, the two quotes following it are carried word-for-word from the autobiography into many other accounts.
lacerated back were a result of his father’s attempts to rescue his wife. As was true for so many enslaved children, Henson’s earliest conscious memories were of the most dreadful and bloodiest moments of slavery. His memory of the brutal beating of his father would foreshadow his own brutal beating at the hands of Brice Letton more than a decade later.

Henson’s father was subsequently sold south and the family was returned to McPherson for a period of relative stability. With the death of “kindly” McPherson, however, the family was divided and the mother sold away from her children. Henson recalled being five or six years old at the time. Although a more recent source indicates he was probably eight years old, the precise dates are unclear for this period of his life. After he was sold to Adam Robb, owner of a tavern in Rockville, young Henson’s health deteriorated to such an extent that Robb feared for the child’s life and traded him to Isaac Riley, the purchaser of Henson’s mother.

When Josiah Henson was born into slavery in 1789 on the plantation in Charles County Maryland, he was delivered into a system marked by brutal coercion and benevolent concern. The attempt to emphasize benevolent concern has led to such statements as, “In Maryland…the slaves, as a rule, were well treated” (Channing 1904:121). Despite statements of this kind, examples of brutality were rampant throughout much of the state and, based on Henson’s narrative, within Montgomery County as well.

Further research will be necessary to determine whether Henson’s childhood circumstances were atypical. The 1804 Tax Assessment records are the earliest documents consulted in a preliminary attempt to gain an understanding of the numbers of children enslaved in District 4 in Montgomery County. The Tax Assessment indicates that thirty-two percent of the enslaved populations in District 4 consisted of children less than eight years of age. If children ranging from the ages of eight to fourteen are included, the percentage rises. Nearly half (forty-nine percent) of the people held in bondage in County District 4 in 1804 were children under fourteen years of age. District 4 slaveholders were taxed for a total of 1,202 people held in slavery in 1804 and for 1,179 held in slavery in 1820. A decade later, for example, between 1831 and 1833, children under the age of fourteen comprised more than half the number of slaves held by Jane N. Beall, widow of Upton Beall and the daughter of Adam Robb, the tavern owner who purchased Henson as a child (Broadhurst).

The Montgomery County population census for 1800 indicates that there were 6,288 people held in slavery and 262 free people of color. When the white population of 8,508 is added to these figures, the total population for the County in 1800 totals 15,058. By 1820, the number of enslaved residents rose slightly to 6,396 and the free black population tripled, rising to 922. By 1820, the proportion of enslaved children under eight appearing in the tax assessment rolls dropped to thirty-one percent. A total of eighteen percent of the people held in bondage in the County were held by slaveholders who lived within Montgomery County’s District 4 (Carey 1845).
Isaac Riley does not appear on the 1804 tax rolls although he owned slaves during this time period. However, George Riley, his older brother, was assessed for 20 enslaved persons, six of whom were under the age of eight. Neither Isaac nor George appears on the 1820 Tax Assessment during the period when Josiah Henson would have toiled on the Riley Farm. The Riley family owned several farms of hundreds of acres each. The farm that the Collyar family sold to George Riley in 1797 (in other words the acreage associated with the current house) was known by deed as “Collyar’s Resurvey” because it had been resurveyed in 1787 and found to contain 282½ acres. The Rileys owned other farms in the same vicinity and may have been farming adjoining land with the workforce housed at the “Collyar’s Resurvey” farm. The properties belonging to or managed by Isaac Riley appear to have been operated as one large plantation. Josiah Henson appears to be referring to a plantation consisting of several different farms. When he returned to the property, ca.1830, from Kentucky, he noticed that Riley’s “best farms had been taken away from him, and but a few tracts of poor land remained, which he cultivated with hired labour after I took his slaves [to Kentucky]” (Henson, 1881:53). Yet Riley continued to operate his holdings with some enslaved labor until the time of his death. The 1850 slave census listing for Isaac Riley shows five enslaved individuals, four of whom are children. Other sources will need to be consulted to gain a precise understanding of slavery on the Riley Farm.

Most slaveholders owned farms ranging from 50 to 500 acres, with most of the enslaved workforce working the farms. This was certainly true for Henson. He once hoed the land and reaped the crops and tended agricultural matters on the property. According to Henson’s autobiography, Isaac Riley trusted the day-to-day management of the plantation to Henson. As overseer of the property and Riley’s affairs, Henson was intimately familiar with the land and with the surrounding area. He had knowledge of the business dealings pertaining to Isaac Riley. As superintendent of the farming operation, Henson was entrusted with produce which he transported and sold in Georgetown and Washington (Henson 1881:41).

Henson identified George Riley, Isaac Riley’s brother, as the model for the character “George Shelby” in Uncle Tom’s Cabin. “The incident of young George Shelby taking horse to overtake Haley the trader really occurred. The young man was George Riley” (Henson 1877). In Stowe’s book, this character slowed down slave traders pursuing “Eliza” allowing her time to escape (Stowe 1858). Henson reported in John Lobb’s “Editorial Note” of the 1877 edition of the narrative, “While I was at Litton’s (Mrs. Stowe’s Simon Legree) young George Riley (Mrs. Stowe’s George Shelby) really did visit me.” In both the narrative and the fictionalized description, George Riley typified to Henson and in turn to Stowe the, “good, kind-hearted slave holder” (Cissel 1984: 5). Nevertheless, George Riley’s overseer, Brice Letton, Stowe’s model for Simon Legree did, in fact, administer the brutal beating that left Henson’s shoulders impaired for life (Henson 1877).

---

4 George Riley died in 1815. Based on other indications, Isaac Riley appears to have made George Riley’s farm his residence either shortly before or shortly after 1815.

5 The words “farm” and “plantation” are both used in this document, following the way Henson used the words. Henson sometimes used both words on the same page (see: Henson, 1849: 10). Although the two words occasionally have interchangeable meanings, most uses of the “plantation” are in reference to the systemic agricultural activities, especially incorporating enslaved workers to plant and harvest hundreds or even thousands of acres of land. In those places where the word “farm” is used in reference to events occurring prior to 1850 (when Isaac Riley died), the word refers to individual farm-size tracts of land that have been recorded individually in county land records. In most instances, “farm” is used specifically in reference to the “Collyar’s Resurvey” farm, the tract that included the Riley House. Isaac Riley owned several other farms, apparently operating them together as one system. While Henson may not have been aware of the legally defined property lines between adjoining farms that were in Riley’s possession, his writing carry the implication that he and Riley were overseeing and operating an agricultural system that was larger than any one legally defined farm. As noted, the word “farms” (in the plural) is used when Henson is speaking of the better quality land that Riley had lost after Henson left for the first time to go to Kentucky.

6 Spelled Litton by Henson, also apparently spelled Lyddane or Lyddan, as found in county records and maps. The first name “Brice” is also spelled Bryce in some documents.
At eighteen, Josiah Henson experienced his powerful, and what would become his life-defining religious conversion while he resided on the Riley plantation. At the urging of his pious mother and with surprisingly little objection from Isaac Riley, Henson attended a religious meeting at Newport Mill (on Rock Creek near today’s Beach Drive) led by John McKenny. The fear of rebellion and escape of enslaved workers constantly plagued slave holders. Therefore, opportunities to leave or travel unassisted were controlled by the use of written passes to visit spouses, for example. Allowing Henson to attend such a religious meeting unassisted can be seen as a measure of Riley’s trust in the man since slaveholders “considered religious camp meetings to be hotbeds of conspiracies to escape” (Fields 1985). This all-important introduction into Methodism culminated in Henson becoming a minister in the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) church. The AME church, formally organized in 1816, had separated from the Methodist Episcopal church over issues of racist treatment of Blacks by the denomination. Henson preached to both black and white audiences throughout his career. His widely recognized honorific title was “Father Henson,” which he used only once in the title of the second edition of his narrative.

At twenty-two, Henson “married a very efficient, and...a very well-taught girl, belonging to a neighbouring family reputed to be pious and kind,” presumably in Montgomery County. “I first met her at the religious meetings which I attended.” In the 1877 edition of his narrative Henson identified her by name as Charlotte. According to Henson, she, too, became a character in Uncle Tom’s Cabin. “Aunt Chloe was my first wife, whose real name was Charlotte. She was famed as a good cook. Her beautiful singing of spiritual songs first won my heart. She was a true Christian…” (Henson 1877:41, 8).

There were a number of defining moments in Henson’s life, none more life transforming then his trek to Isaac Riley’s brother, Amos Riley’s plantation in Kentucky. At the inducement of Isaac Riley, who was facing bankruptcy, Henson faithfully escorted several Riley slaves through the free state of Ohio to Kentucky in 1825. Free blacks of Cincinnati urged Henson and the eighteen slaves under his charge all to seize the opportunity for freedom. Despite this insistence, Henson honored Riley’s trust in him and delivered himself, his family, and the enslaved workers to Amos Riley, which later caused Henson intense moments of regret. With the exception of Henson and his family, Isaac Riley sold all those Henson had delivered into continuing bondage in Kentucky to the Deep South in the spring of 1828.

That same year, when Henson returned to Maryland from Kentucky intent upon purchasing his freedom from Isaac Riley who continued to hold him in slavery, he carried with him a pass from Amos Riley, Jr., that affirmed Henson’s right to travel unmolested despite his enslavement and a letter of recommendation to a minister in Cincinnati. Henson attended the Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church where he received official permission to preach. In a quest to purchase his freedom, Henson preached throughout his return trip to Maryland and earned money he hoped would allow him to purchase his freedom from Isaac Riley.

Upon returning to Riley’s Maryland property, Henson found that Riley had lost his best farms and that only “a few tracts of poor land remained,” which Riley cultivated with hired labour since he had sent his enslaved workforce to Kentucky. Henson continued, “I rode up to the old house.” After greeting Riley, whom Henson later characterized as “old Riley, grim oppressor,” Henson quickly perceived Riley’s vexation at Henson’s apparent success for he was wearing finer clothes than Riley. Henson’s narrative at this particular point was infused with familiarity. He put his horse in the stable and then “retired to the kitchen, where my master told me I was to sleep for the night.” In reflecting on the use of this kitchen as sleeping quarters, Henson observes, “Oh, how different from my accommodations in the Free States for the last three months, was that crowded room, with its earth-floor, its filth and stench!” The only hint of change is Henson’s observation that all the enslaved workers “were strangers to me,” and with the death of his mother, he observed that “every tie which had ever connected me with the place was broken” (Henson 1877:26, 56).
After turning to Riley’s wife’s brother to help negotiate the terms of his self-purchase from Isaac Riley, Henson stated that he received his manumission papers on 9th March, 1829 (Henson 1969 reprint of 1881 edition:59). The County has a copy of Henson’s manumission papers with that exact date. The document contains a detailed physical description of Henson which indicates that although he is “straight and well formed, both arms are stiff being occasioned by some injury in the elbow joints.” Bruce Selby, the Clerk of the Court, was in all likelihood observing the after effects of the vicious beating Henson suffered at the hands of Brice Letton and three of his enslaved workers.

My sufferings after this cruel treatment were intense. Besides my broken arm and the wounds on my head, I could feel and hear the pieces of my shoulder-blades grate against each other with every breath…From that day to this I have been unable to raise my hands as high as my head…And so I have gone through life maimed and mutilated. Practice in time enabled me to perform many of the farm labours with considerable efficiency; but the free, vigorous play of the muscles of my arm was gone for ever (Henson 1858:40).

Indeed, a white Methodist Episcopal minister, Henry Bleby, who met Henson in Boston, observed that both his arms were crippled, so that he could by no means use them freely…When I was first introduced to him, I observed that he could not lift his hand to his head; and that when he had to put on or take off his hat he brought his head down to his hand. Both his arms appeared to be shorter than they should have been in proportion to his size, and he was stiff and awkward in the use of them (Bleby 1873:8).

Henson carried the lasting effects of his beating here in the County for the remainder of his days.

Josiah Henson maintained a life-long connection to Montgomery County, returning twice. He also carried the memory of his dear mother and his brother who apparently continued to be held captive in the County. Henson’s intention for the use of the proceeds from sales of the 1858 narrative motivated him to consult anti-slavery friends in Boston. He secured their agreement to publish the story of his life, “that I might be able, from its sale, to raise a sufficient sum of money to buy my brother's freedom” (Henson, 1876:154). Implying that he had been in frequent communication with his brother, Henson also indicated that he had by then “made several efforts to induce my brother to run away…. All my previous plans to rescue my brother had failed, but I was not at all disposed to relinquish the project. By the aid of friends, I learned that the mistress to whom my brother belonged would give him his freedom-papers for 400 dollars, and I concluded that I must raise 550 dollars, or about £110, so that I should be able to take him to my home in Canada.” According to Montgomery County historian Diane Broadhurst, Josiah Henson purchased his brother from Jane N. Beall for $250 in 1858 although the inconsistencies between Henson’s autobiography and the circumstances of Jane Beall’s life warrant further investigation (Henson 1877:152, 154).

In the winter of 1877, Henson explained nostalgically “a strange, inexpressible longing came over me to see again the home of my boyhood…So, on the 24th of December, 1877, we started for the South.” After a visit to the White House with President and Mrs. Hayes, Henson:

went to my old home. Fifty years, lacking only a few months, had passed since I last saw the old place. Fifty long years! since the day when I left the master's house to return to my family in Kentucky, walking with a swinging step and a jubilant heart, because my great object in life was gained (as I thought in my credulity), my freedom papers being safely stowed away in my bag… I did almost unconsciously expect to see the old place somewhat as I had left it. Notwithstanding all I had heard of the great alterations which had taken place, since coming South, I still pictured to myself the great fertile plantation,
with its throngs of busy labourers sowing the seed, tilling the ground, and reaping the valuable harvests as of yore. I saw the "great house," well furnished and sheltering a happy, luxurious, and idle family; I saw the outdoor kitchen, where the coloured cook and her young maids prepared and carried the dinners into the house; I saw the barns and storehouses bursting with plenty; the great cellars filled with casks of cider, apple-brandy, and fruit; and plainer than all I saw the little village of huts called the niggers' quarters, which used to be so full of life, and alas! so full of sorrow… when we drove at last up the grass-grown road to the house, I saw it standing there all alone, without a single barn or stable or shed to bear it company, and it was in such a dilapidated condition that the windows rattled and the very door sprang ajar as we drove up and stopped before it (Henson 1881:220).

On this, his final visit to Maryland, Henson’s mother was ever on his mind. “Then I spoke of the last thing which was on my mind, the desire to visit my mother's grave.” Riley’s widow said

…she knew where it was well, and directed her son-in-law to conduct me there. So we went out, and bent our steps toward a little collection of mounds, slightly raised above the surrounding level, but enough to show that they were the final resting-place of many who had passed away from this life and its sorrows. And there, a little removed from the others, was that of my poor, dear old slave-mother; of her who had first pointed me heaven-wards; whose early prayers were my salvation. I bowed myself to the ground, and hid my face in the grass that grows thickly over that beloved form. I wept, and prayed, and made new resolutions that in the days which may yet be before me, I may so live as to honour the memory of her who bore me (Henson 1881:224).

In conclusion, on both a national and international level, Maryland has the potential to make a tremendous historical contribution to Henson’s life story, particularly the years before his escape to Canada. In consulting untapped County and State resources, researchers should be able to further develop Henson’s narrative of his life in Maryland. So completely has Henson’s image become entwined with that of Uncle Tom that somewhere along the way, Henson’s powerful and dynamic life was reduced to an odious cliché of an Uncle Tom, “a black man who obsequiously seeks white approval or betrays his race.” With the County’s efforts to support emerging scholarship, this image may finally begin to change. As the County moves forward with this project, we see an opportunity to rescue Henson’s reputation and refute 150 years of character assassination.
**Plantation Life**

During Josiah Henson’s lifetime, the system in which he was enslaved increasingly grew into a powerful institution, as the country came to the point of Civil War. By the 1850s the plantation system in the American south had evolved to the point where the property owners did not personally contribute to the manual labor of working the land. Plantations where large-scale production occurred typically produced three crops for an international market and used the labor of twenty or more enslaved workers. The Riley property, unlike the stereotypical and popular image of large plantation homes in the Deep South, had a small main farmhouse which reflected the norm for many white slaveholders, particularly before 1850. The planter did not work the land, and cash crops were produced for an international market, but the size of the enslaved work force was smaller (LaRoche, 2003).

When discussing the plantation house, Cyril M. Harris identifies a plantation as “usually consisting of large acreage, on which cash crops such as cotton, sugar, rice, or tobacco were cultivated” (Harris 1998:251). Historian Carl R. Lounsbury defines a plantation as:

> A tract of cultivated land owned or rented by an individual. Throughout the colonial era and, at least in the upper South, into the 19th century, the term remained synonymous with farm. It was also used to designate the component quarters of larger holdings. Agricultural development of the land, not necessarily sustained with the labor of slaves, was the principal characteristic of the plantation. (Lounsbury 1999:279)

Another definition states:

> A large estate or farm where crops such as cotton, tobacco, or sugar are grown and harvested, often by resident workers. Plantations usually contain a variety of outbuildings, such as smokehouses, livery stables, blacksmith shop, and living quarters. (Bruden 2004:194)

The same author defines a plantation house as:

> The principal house of a southern plantation on which cash crops were cultivated; typically two stories with very tall windows, with a veranda across the entire front façade, supported by two-story columns. (Bruden 2004:194)

Although Maryland is considered a southern slave state, it is climatically aligned with the weather patterns of the Mid-Atlantic region. Cold winters and a shortened growing season dictate a different labor system from that generally required of the cotton growing southern plantations. Many small-scale plantations in Maryland and other States in the northeastern United States had fewer enslaved workers than the twenty to sixty that were the norm elsewhere (Fitts 1998, LaRoche 2003, and Toner 2003). Isaac Riley maintained his plantation with about fifteen enslaved workers (Census Records and Henson).

Regardless of size, the home of the farmer, or planter, was generally referred to as the main house. Plantations usually consisted of outbuildings of various sizes, including quarters for workers and often a kitchen which was separate from the main house. Typically a free-standing building, the kitchens were constructed in one of two basic building types: a one-room building with a fireplace and exterior chimney.
Detached kitchens were often located “some distance” from the main house, a decision believed to have been made in “response to practical considerations: the heat, noise, odors, and general commotion association with the preparation of meals” (Vlach 1993:43).

It is feasible that what is today the log wing of the Riley House historically functioned as a kitchen. In his autobiography, Josiah Henson describes sleeping in the kitchen when he returned from Kentucky in 1829. His memoirs state:

I retired to the kitchen, where my master told me I was to sleep for the night. O, how different from my accommodations in the free States, for the last three months, was the crowded room, with its dirt floor, and filth, and stench! I looked around me with a sensation of disgust. The negroes present were strangers to me, being slaves that Mrs. Riley had brought to her husband. “Fool that I was to come back!” I found my mother had died during my absence, and every tie which had ever connected me with the place was broken. The idea of lying down with my nice clothes in this nasty sty was insufferable. (Phelps, Chapter VIII, 1849)

After he returned to the site to visit Matilda Riley in late 1877 or early 1878, Henson described the kitchen again, in the 1881 edition of his book, along with the other buildings, crops, and general landscape characteristics, both as they looked up to ca.1828-1830 and as the looked in the late 1870s, noting that all the bustling activity he remembered from the 1820s was now gone, and the house looked forlorn, as all the barns and stables had been torn down (see the quote in the opening pages of this report).

Typically the cook (and the cook’s family) resided in the kitchen. Other slaves, such as the field workers, were housed in separate cabins, or quarters on most plantations. The slave quarters were often one-room, rectangular buildings with an exterior chimney at one end. An attic loft provided additional sleeping space in many instances. Sometimes the quarters included two rooms with a hall-and-parlor plan. Construction materials for the cabins varied; surviving examples and other evidence shows that logs, wood, bricks, and stones were all used as primary building materials for quarters in Montgomery County, Maryland (Vlach 1993).

There are several references to the slave cabins located on the Riley plantation. When discussing the accommodations in his autobiography, Henson states:

We lodged in log huts, and on the bare ground. Wooden floors were an unknown luxury. In a single room were huddled, like cattle, ten or a dozen persons, men, women, and children… The wind whistled and the rain and snow blew in through the cracks, and the damp earth soaked in the moisture till the floor was miry as a pig-sty. Such were our houses. In these wretched hovels were we penned at night, and fed by day; here were the children born and the sick--neglected. (Henson 1877:23)

When discussing daily plantation life, Josiah Henson gives the following description of daily food choices:

The principal food of those upon my master’s plantation consisted of corn-meal, and salt herrings; to which was added in summer a little buttermilk, and a few vegetables which each

---

7 In his book *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery*, John Vlach provides several examples of two-room buildings which were used as kitchens (1993). In addition to a kitchen space, these buildings often provided quarters for enslaved residents.

8 “Quarters” is a term Josiah Henson uses in his autobiography to identify the buildings in which he and fellow his slaves resided in. Henson also uses the term “cabin.”
might raise for himself and his family, on the little piece of ground which was assigned to him for the purpose, called a truck-patch. (Henson 1877:22)

Plantation owners would employ overseers to care for the daily management of the plantation and the supervision of the slave labor. This task would sometimes be delegated to one of the slaves, saving the owner the expense of paying a white overseer. Josiah Henson indicates that he was promoted to the position of superintendent of the farm while working on the Riley plantation. He also uses the term general manager to describe his position. At one point, Henson states, “I retained my situation as overseer together with the especial favour of my master, who was pleased with saving the expense of a large salary for a white superintendent” (Henson 1877:40). It is estimated that two-thirds of enslaved people worked under the supervision of enslaved or employed blacks (Genovese in Vlach 1993:139).
Historical Background of the Riley Property

The project site is now a one-acre property that was originally part of a 3,697 acre parcel of land patented with the name “Dan” (also spelled as “Dann” in some of the early deeds). As early as the 1760s, a small portion of Dan contributed to a larger plantation that deed records first associate with William Collyer (the name is also spelled Collier or Collyar in various records). According to deed records, the Colliers owned numerous tracts of land in this area in the 1700s. Sometime prior to 1797, the property was transferred from William Collyer to his son James Collyer.

On October 26, 1797, ownership of the property was transferred from James Collyer (the son of William Collyer) to George Riley. The deed includes the following description,

all that part or parcel of land known by the name Dan, also all that party or parcel of land known by the name Elder’s Delight, also all that party or parcel of land known by the name Collyar’s Resurvey corrected adjoining the above-mentioned part of Dan… (Montgomery County Deed Records; October 26, 1797)

In 1792, prior to purchasing the property, George Riley married Sarah Wilson (See Appendix J for a summary of the Riley Family genealogy). At the time of their marriage, Sarah had inherited land from her father’s estate. Although historical documents identify George Riley as a planter, he also served as a Montgomery County Commissioner and as a member of the House of Delegates (The Montgomery County Story, Montgomery County Historical Society). Records also indicated that George and Sarah Riley were involved in numerous real estate transactions.

Following Sarah’s untimely death in October 1810, George married Mary Richards. George died five years later, leaving Mary with their three young girls. In 1818, she married Arnold Thomas Windsor. Windsor was to play a pivotal role in Josiah Henson’s story just a few years later.

By the time of George Riley’s death in 1815, Isaac Riley, a younger brother, is believed to have been residing on the property. Isaac was the executor of George Riley’s will, and apparently he continued to operate the farm in that capacity after his older brother’s passing. It is evident that Isaac Riley remained on the property until his death in 1850.

Even before he had any claim to the land, Isaac did have title to enslaved workers. Before 1818, while still a bachelor, Riley family documents and census records indicate that he resided with a sister and several slaves. Census records from the 1820s indicate that the plantation had at least twenty enslaved workers, plus additional enslaved children. The produce, which included wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, corn, tobacco, hay, fruit, and butter, was sold at the local markets in Washington and Georgetown. Animals on the plantation included sheep, pigs, and chickens.

---

9 William Collyer and his wife Sarah signed a contract to lease this farm to a family named Lovelace in 1765. See: http://homepages.rootsweb.com/~lovelace/us/states/ky/Unknown_Counties/Published_Genealogies/harned.htm and Frederick County Deed Book J, p. 1203, 6-19-1765.

10 William Collyer’s will was written in January 4, 1792 and probated, two years later, in January 1794 (Montgomery County, Maryland Wills (Liber C, folio 36) from Ancestry.com, site accessed June 2007).

11 This could be the same Arnold T. Windsor (also spelled Winsor and Winser) who was sheriff of Montgomery County in 1816. See list of sheriffs on Montgomery County web site: http://www.mcsheriff.com/info/sheriffs.asp. Sheriff Windsor was involved in the prosecution of an enslaved individual called “Negro Jacob” who was executed in 1817 for killing his master, John Oneale. See: http://www.onealwebsite.com/RebelRose/JacobTrial.htm
The most recognized individual associated with Isaac Riley is Josiah Henson. Author of his own autobiography and an inspiration for Harriet B. Stowe’s novel, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Josiah Henson is the most identifiable slave from Montgomery County. He was separated from his mother at age five and was sold to tavern owner, Adam Robb, who lived approximately four miles from the Riley plantation. When he fell seriously ill, arrangements were made by the tavern owner to reunite the young Josiah with his mother. Henson was approximately six years old when he was reunited with his mother; for the next thirty years he was enslaved on the Riley plantation.\textsuperscript{12}

As a young man, Josiah Henson was entrusted with the management of the plantation; he identifies himself as superintendent of farming operations (Henson, 1849:10). His responsibilities included oversight of the production and sale of produce, as well as the oversight of his owner’s other slaves. At age 22, Josiah Henson married Charlotte, a slave from a neighboring plantation called Williamsburg.\textsuperscript{13}

In 1818, at age 44, Isaac Riley married Matilda Middleton. Approximately eighteen years old at the time, both of Matilda’s parents had passed away. At the time of their marriage, Isaac was appointed guardian of Matilda’s younger brother, Francis, who also came to live at the Riley plantation. In his autobiography, Henson describes his new mistress as “a young woman of eighteen, who had some little property, and more thrift. Her economy was remarkable, and she added no comfort to the establishment” (Henson 1877:41).

As noted, Isaac Riley’s sister-in-law Mary Richards Riley had a second husband, Arnold T. Windsor. Windsor claimed that Riley had been dishonest in the management of the George Riley property and filed a series of lawsuits on the basis that Isaac Riley was not managing the estate properly. The lawsuits dragged on for many years with at least four different equity suits filed by Windsor between January 1825 and March 1841. The suits were filed to allow for the sale of various tracts of land that had belonged to George Riley. In July 1825, Isaac Riley began to file counter suits against Windsor, “to stay proceedings on judgment.”\textsuperscript{14} At one different point, a deed was recorded giving Arnold Windsor title to the present Riley House;\textsuperscript{15} however, it appears that Isaac Riley did not relinquish the house and land at that time, but

\textsuperscript{12} Henson recalled being five or six years old at the time; precise dates for this period of this life are unclear.

\textsuperscript{13} It is not clear at what point Charlotte became enslaved by Isaac Riley, although it is assumed that she was in his possession when Riley sent her to Kentucky. In addition to Charlotte, Henson’s children also accompanied him to Kentucky. (In total, over the span of their marriage, Henson and his wife had eight children.) After forty years of marriage, while Henson was visiting England, his wife became very ill. Henson rushed back to Canada to visit her, but it was only a manner of weeks before her death. Years later, Henson did remarry (Henson).

\textsuperscript{14} The records of these actions include: January 22, 1825, Arnold T. Windsor vs. Isaac Riley, No. 25 Equity 1828, for payment of money and conveyance of land, dismissed September 7, 1830; July 1825, Isaac Riley vs. Arnold T. Windsor, admin., No. 25 Equity 1828 for payment of money and conveyance of land, dismissed September 7, 1832; July 11, 1828, Arnold T. Windsor vs. Isaac Riley, No. 25 Equity 1841, to stay proceedings on judgment, dismissed March 16, 1841; October 1, 1830, Arnold T. Windsor vs. Isaac Riley, No. 36 Equity 1841, for the conveyance of land, dismissed March 16, 1841; October 1, 1830, Isaac Riley vs. Arnold T. Windsor, No. 36 Equity 1841, for the conveyance of land, owner of land: George Riley, dismissed March 16, 1841.

\textsuperscript{15} On August 24, 1825, a deed was drawn up and recorded with the Montgomery County indicating that “all the said Isaac Riley’s right tile claim, interest and demand” regarding a series of real estate tracts in the George Riley estate were to pass to Arnold T. Windsor. Among the numerous tracts of land described in the deed, the document states:

\[\text{the said Isaac Riley doth hereby acknowledge [sic] hath given, granted, bargained, and sold and by these presents doth give, grant, bargain and sell unto him the said Arnold T. Winsor [sic] in trust for the purposes herein after particularly set forth...all the said Isaac Riley’s right, title, claim, interest and demand to all the following tracts...All that part and parcel known as Dann, all that part or parcel of land known by the name of Elder’s Delight, also all that tract of land known by the name of Collyar’s Resurvey corrected adjoining the above mentioned part of Dann being the same land deeded by James Collyar to George Riley by deed bearing the date the twenty ninth day of October seventeen hundred and ninety seven...} \text{(Deed of Trust, Y:132)}\]

This deed of trust appears to indicate that, in signing the document, Isaac Riley relinquished his rights to administer the George Riley estate to Windsor, whom the deed says is now the administrator of the estate, and that Isaac Riley relinquished any
rather filed a counter suit shortly after the deed was issued. By the time of his death, Isaac and Matilda Riley apparently had a clear enough title to the remaining land to leave (or in the case of one daughter, to sell) a tract of 49 or more acres each to six of their children.

The lawsuits filed by Windsor led to a declining financial situation for Isaac Riley. In 1825, fearing the loss of his entire estate, Isaac Riley instructed Josiah Henson to take his slaves to his brother, Amos Riley, in Kentucky. According to documents produced by extended members of the Riley family, Amos had established a large plantation in Daviess County, Kentucky. Under the leadership of Henson, the slaves traveled to the Riley plantation in Kentucky, passing through Ohio along the way. Residents of Ohio, a free state, tried to persuade Henson not to continue to Kentucky. Feeling committed to the journey, having given his word to Isaac Riley, Henson continued to lead the group to Kentucky. According to Henson’s autobiography, the traveling group consisted of twenty-two people, including his own wife and their two children (Henson 1877:44).

Josiah Henson (and other Riley slaves) remained in Kentucky until 1828. Unable to relocate his family to Kentucky as initially intended, Isaac Riley had sent an agent to his brother’s plantation to arrange for the sale of his slaves. Isaac gave the agent instructions not to include Henson and his family in the sale, hoping for their return to Maryland. While his slaves were in Kentucky, Isaac Riley had been struggling to recover from the ruinous lawsuit against him. “His best farms had been taken away from him, and but a few tracts of poor land remained, which he cultivated with hired labour… month by month he grew poorer and more desperate” (Henson 1877:53). In 1828, Isaac wrote to Amos requesting that Henson be returned. After sending his slaves to his brother’s plantation in Kentucky, Isaac Riley had used hired labor to cultivate his remaining land. Eventually, Isaac had acquired additional slaves to work the land.

As previously noted, Henson first found religion ca. 1807 at age 18, while listening to a sermon at the Newport Mill on the bank of Rock Creek, Montgomery County (Henson). While living in Kentucky, he became a minister and was admitted into the Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In March 1828, when he set out to return to Isaac Riley’s plantation in Maryland, he stopped to preach along the way back to Maryland. By preaching, Henson was able to earn $270, money he intended to use for the purchase of his freedom.

It is during this brief visit to Isaac Riley in Maryland, ca. 1828, that Josiah Henson records sleeping on the floor of the kitchen. If it can be proven that it was in place before 1828, it is possible that the existing log wing of the Riley house was the kitchen which Henson describes in his memoirs. With the assistance of Frances Middleton, Matilda Riley’s brother, Henson negotiated the purchase of his freedom from Isaac (manumission document dated March 9, 1829; filed with the Land Records of Montgomery County, BS2-167). When recalling the events leading to the negotiation of his freedom, Henson states:

…”he [Isaac Riley] agreed to give me my manumission-papers for four hundred and fifty dollars, of which three hundred and fifty dollars were to be in cash, and the remainder in my note. My ownership rights he had to the property where the house is located. It further stipulates that some property is to be sold to settle a debt between Riley and Winsor. The property listed in the transaction also includes some people who were enslaved on the property, but in naming them, does not name Josiah Henson. A second deed of trust of a similar nature, but regarding enslaved individuals and land that had been inherited by the Letton family, was issued in 1828 transferring Riley’s rights and those of several others to Winsor. Winsor was asking the court to confirm that he had previously purchased the land from the Lettons. It was recorded on November 21, 1828 (Deed of Trust, BS 2:76).

16 Isaac Riley’s remaining land consisted of the property he was able to retain after the lawsuits.
17 References to Isaac Riley hiring labor and acquiring additional slaves are found in Josiah Henson’s autobiographies; Henson does not specify the number of people involved.
18 Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission acquired property identified as the Newport Mill Park in 1955.
money and my horse enabled me to pay the case at once, and thus my great hope seemed in a fair way of being realized.

Some time was spent in the negotiation of this affair, and it was not until the 9th of March, 1829, that I received my manumission-papers in due form of law. (Henson 1877:59)

It was not until Henson returned to Kentucky that he came to the conclusion he had been deceived by Isaac Riley. Convincing Henson that the papers should be transported within a sealed document to his brother Amos, Isaac Riley forwarded what Henson believed to be his manumission papers to Amos. The papers reached Amos Riley before Henson arrived at the Kentucky plantation. Upon his arrival Henson learned that Amos Riley had communicated details of his manumission with his wife and children which differed from his recollection.19 In his autobiography Henson states:

Master Amos said I had paid three hundred and fifty dollars down, and when I had made up six hundred and fifty more I was to have my free papers. I now began to perceive the trick that had been played upon me, and to see the management by which Riley had contrived that the only evidence of my freedom should be kept from every eye but that of his brother Amos, who was requested [sic] to retain it until I had made up the balance I was reported to have agreed to pay. (Henson 1877:61)

Coupled with this news was the prospect of being sold by Amos to another, more southern owner and the potential division of his family. These thoughts led Henson to decide to escape with his wife and children. The threat of being sold into the Deep South was often one of the greatest fears of slaves. In addition to the prospect of being separated from one’s family, living and work conditions on southern plantations were reportedly worse than what slaves of more northern locations experienced. Adding to the situation was Henson’s final memories of his father before he was permanently separated from the family and taken south.

In 1830, Henson, his wife, and their four children, escaped from Kentucky to Canada via the Underground Railroad. Eleven years later, in 1841, he and his family moved to the outskirts of Dresden, Canada, where he established Dawn Settlement, a self-sufficient community which reached a population of 500 at its height. Dawn was primarily a rural agricultural settlement where lumber was produced. Many African Americans who escaped on the Underground Railroad settled there.20

Isaac Riley continued to reside on the Old Georgetown Road property until his death in 1850, at which point the property was bequeathed to his wife Matilda. The property is located within a geographic area which experienced the Civil War first hand. At one point a 20th century property owner was informed by neighbors that the local legend identified the property as the “scene of many activities of the Southern army… they were camped on the grounds on their way to Washington” (Smith 1939).21 According to the legend, the Confederate troops of General Jubal Early could be seen through the window in the loft of the cabin (the log house). According to staff of the Montgomery County Department of Parks, Park Planning

19 A copy of the March 9, 1829, manumission document was in the possession of Henson’s two surviving daughters in 1923. Daughters Matilda Henson Richey, then 81 years old, and Julia Ann Henson Wheeler, 72 years of age, were residing in Flint, Michigan, when interviewed for a newspaper article. It is not known how or when Henson (and/or his family) obtained a copy of the document. Considering that Henson was unable to read or write until later in his life, it is also unknown if he ever knew what the document actually said. (A Xerox copy of newspaper article filed in the Josiah Henson vertical file at Peerless Rockville; “‘Uncle Tom’s’ Daughters are Still Living.” February 9, 1923; the copy does not indicate the name of the newspaper or the author of the article.)

20 Relocated three times (within the Dawn Settlement land) the cabin where Josiah and his family resided at Dawn was opened as a museum during the 1940s. The Henson family cemetery is also located near Dresden.

21 In addition to the stories portraying the use of the property during the Civil War, prior neighbors have reported legends indicating that the original house was constructed after the Revolutionary War by a young soldier (Star July 30, 1939).
and Stewardship Division, if true, this event would be one example of a pattern of Montgomery County’s white slaveholders being southern sympathizers during the Civil War.

When Matilda died, June 26, 1890, the property passed to her daughter Frances [Fannie] Ruben Riley Mace. The Riley house and surrounding property remained in the family for three quarters of a century after Isaac Riley’s death. In a pair of oral history interviews, Frances Mace Hansbrough, granddaughter of Francis Ruben Riley Mace, recalled visiting the property as a child, during the 1910s and 1920s. Although the property was still owned by descendents of Isaac Riley, the house was rented out during this time. While residing in Georgetown, Mrs. Hansbrough would travel with her family on weekends to Montgomery County in order to visit the family’s “home-place.” Her father, Samuel Viers Mace, continued to maintain a garden on the property (Hansbrough 2006).

A 1919 newspaper article describes the property as:

A quaint home, with mossy shingles, log kitchen, rough, stout chimneys and a very old-fashioned air… It sits far back from the west side of the road. Around it cling vines and above it tall walnut trees spread their strong and crooked arms. Late roses were blooming in the garden… In the garden of the old house is a spring, whose sweet water is famous over a wide range of country. (Sunday Star October 19, 1919)

According to the newspaper article, the property was identified as the “Mace Place” for many years because of its association with the Riley-Maces. The great-grandson of Isaac Riley, Charlie Mace was a veterinarian and the primary resident of the house during in 1910s. In addition to Charlie Mace, the Bracket family also lived in the house in 1919; this supports Mrs. Hansbrough’s recollection that the house was rented out during this time.22

The property was transferred in and out of the Riley family before being purchased by the Luchs family in 1926; the new owners, Morton and Ernestine Luchs, owned a farm nearby.23 A real estate investor, Mr. Luchs established the Luxmanor Corporation in partnership with his wife. The corporation was the predecessor of the Washington, D.C. real estate company Shannon and Luchs.24 Luxmanor Corporation subdivided the property adjacent to the Riley house; the subdivision became the Luxmanor neighborhood.25 Although the subdivision was primarily a development of new construction, the Riley house and land immediately surrounding the house were retained.

In 1936, William and Levina Bolten purchased the house from Luxmanor Corporation.26 The Boltons, who owned the property until 1950, were responsible for the extensive renovation of the house during the late 1930s. The couple retained the services of White House Architect, Lorenzo Winslow, to complete an extensive remodeling of the house. The project included a Colonial Revival style remodeling to the

---

22 The Bracket family included Mr. and Mrs. William Bracket, their five children, and a niece of Mrs. Bracket (Sunday Star October 19, 1919).
23 The Luchs farm was located near the intersection of Old Georgetown Road and the Road currently identified as Tuckerman Lane (previously identified as Luchs Lane) (personal communications; Ken Luchs).
24 Although the name of the company has been changed, third generation real estate broker, Ken Luchs is still involved in the Washington, D.C. real estate market. Mr. Luchs has retained the real estate papers of his father and grandfather. A preliminary review of the records, conducted by Mr. Luchs, did not produce information pertaining to the Riley property.
25 The Luxmanor drawings within the Prints and Photographs Collection of the Library of Congress are associated with the Luch’s personal property. (“Alterations to a farm house (“Luxmanor”) for Morton J. Luchs, Rockville Road, Rockville, Maryland.” Arthur B. Heaton, Architect; [Emerich H. Bauer, Landscape Architect. [1927-1928]]
26 William Bolten immigrated to the United States in 1882. Born in approximately 1875, Bolten married Levina Woodworth, originally from Michigan, sometime prior to 1820. Levina’s brother, Benjamin Woodworth, was a joint tenant for the Riley property from 1938 until the time of his death in 1947. No records were uncovered to indicate that William and Levina had any children. (The primary sources for Bolton information were Census Records and Montgomery County Deed Records).
interior of the house and the log wing, as well as the construction of a new rear kitchen-wing. A newspaper article from the time of the remodeling refers to the “old log wing” as (both) the old slave quarters and prior log kitchen (Smith 1939). This 1939 article also makes one of the earliest documented references to the properties association with “Uncle Tom.” Entitled “Legendary Scene of Uncle Tom’s Cabin is Restored,” the article states that, “Material used by Harriet Beecher Stowe in Uncle Tom’s Cabin was based on life on an old plantation which is now the site of the remodeled home of Mrs. Levina W. Bolten… according to legend” (Smith 1939).

The remodeling project, designed by Lorenzo Winslow, was undertaken at some point between 1936 and 1939. It was typical of “restoration” projects in the 1930s and 1940s, removing and replacing many historic surface materials with modern materials, changing configurations in the floor plan to accommodate modern living patterns, and adding amenities, such as a modern kitchen and bathroom. The living room stairs appear to have been rebuilt as part of the project, so that they begin at the center of the house and rise to the west (they apparently rose to the east originally, to conform to the roof shape). The exterior siding and interior plaster were entirely replaced in the project, as were the doors, windows, and almost all the trim. In replacing the plaster and siding, the original studs were left in place in the walls, but modern lumber was added to create a superimposed second system of studs in order to make the walls thicker and more plumb on both sides.

The 1936 design included the introduction of several elements that do not appear to have been based on the original design of the house, but instead may have been introduced because they were characteristic of other early houses in the region. The 1936 design is an example of a Colonial Revival “restoration,” meaning the changes were based on other built examples, rather than on any documentation of the Riley house. An example is the thin brackets at the corners of the roof. The log room appears to have been “restored” more completely than other parts of the house. The original floor was replaced with a floor at a higher elevation, resulting in a major alteration to the fireplace hearth. The loft floor that had served as the room’s original ceiling was removed, as was the stair or ladder that had accessed the loft. The east window was replaced, and the west exterior doorway was converted to a window. All the roof framing was replaced as well. Most of these changes were made to allow for the insertion of an internal connection between the current dining room and the log room. Changes appear to have been made to the design after the drawings were finished so that Lorenzo Winslow’s drawings do not correspond exactly with what was built. The drawings call for wood paneling, for instance, on the vertical portions of the second story walls, but the paneling was never installed. The log wing is shown as if it were taller than it actually is, possibly an indication that some logs had to be removed due to rotting.

Winslow served as an architect in the White House for twenty years, from 1933 until his retirement in 1953. During this time he assisted with numerous expansion projects. Appointed the official White House architect in 1941, Winslow was responsible for the design and construction of the East Wing (1942) and oversaw the Truman Balcony addition to the South Portico (1948).

Records with the Office of the White House Curator indicate that Winslow had a residential practice in Greensboro, North Carolina, prior to his position as a government architect in Washington, DC. Winslow served as architect on other projects in and around the District of Columbia, including the restoration of Georgetown Presbyterian Church (1954) and interior restoration of the New York Avenue

---

27 On the surviving set of architectural drawings, Lorenzo Winslow identified the project as “Restoration and Additions to the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Bolten.”
28 Although Mrs. Bolten retained the property after the death of the husband, in 1938, several real estate transactions were recorded as she partnered first with her brother and later her sister-in-law.
29 The Lorenzo Winslow papers are part of the collection of the Office of the Curator, The White House. The papers officially entered the collection in 1984 as a gift of Mrs. Lorenzo Winslow. The Office of the Curator researched the documents, which includes papers, photographs, and architectural drawings, in an attempt to find information on the Riley property. Unfortunately, no mention of the property [likely identified as the Bolten property during Winslow’s tenure] was found in the collection.
Presbyterian Church (1968). The Lorenzo Winslow papers include designs for alterations to the Statue of Liberty and the Washington Monument, as well as designs for bridges in Rock Creek Park and approaches to the Memorial Bridge, both in Washington, D.C.

When the Boltens purchased the property in the 1930s, according to a newspaper report from the time, there were still “many old slave quarters and outbuildings” extant on the property (Smith 1939). In 1950, Mrs. Bolten and her sister-in-law (joint tenants) sold the property to William and Harriett Coburn. A newspaper article from 1955 indicates that, although “cabins” remained on the property at the time the Coburns purchased it, they had since been torn down (Sentinel, Sept. 29, 1955).

In 1963, the Riley property was purchased by Marcel and Hildegrande Mallet-Prevost. Apart from the transfer of title to the roadbed of Old Georgetown Road from the Mallet-Prevosts to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, the property remained in the Mallet-Prevost family until it was sold to Montgomery County Maryland in 2006.

30 Lorenzo Winslow’s plans for the church included the replacement of the existing façade (described as “Victorian”) with a plain Georgian exterior.
31 Owners of the Riley property from 1950 to 1963, very little information is known about the Coburns. The son of William Coburn, of Lewistown, Montana, William married Harriette Harnett Coburn, daughter of Col. and Mrs. Eugene H. Hartnett of Bethesda, Maryland, on June 22, 1940, in Washington, DC (Washington Post, June 23, 1940). It is believed that they purchased the property after Mr. Coburn retired from his position as Chief Clerk of the Senate Labor Committee. From the limited information it is known that Mrs. Coburn passed away in 1972, prior to her husband (Washington Post, Times Herald, February 18, 1972). There are no children listed in her obituary, and attempts to contact listed relatives were unrewarding.
Suggested Areas for Future Research

- Henson’s early life should be thoroughly researched. What can be learned about his parents?

- Is it possible to determine how Henson was viewed by other enslaved workers on the Riley property? What type of overseer was he; was he respected, feared, or hated?

- Any legal documents regarding Brice Letton’s beating of Henson and the subsequent litigation should be located. An article should be written about the findings.

- What was Riley’s position on the religious life of the people he enslaved?

- The business dealings of Adam Robb need to be carefully investigated. Slavery in the Beall family and their connection to Robb and Henson should be researched. Additional information on the Riley family’s business dealings would be helpful in interpreting the site.

- Further research should include any information that can be retrieved about Henson’s wife Charlotte. How and when did Isaac Riley retain possession or control of her (when Riley sent her to Kentucky)? Could she have worked in the log kitchen as a cook? Additional research could uncover information on Henson’s children, particularly the oldest two (who lived on the Riley Plantation).

- Can the former location of the slave quarters and the location of the grave yard be identified? Can other aspects of the historic landscape of the Riley Farm/Plantation be rediscovered (e.g., agricultural features that would help to define field and crop patterns)?

- Any other buildings that might still be standing on land the Rileys owned should be investigated. For instance, research the log smokehouse two miles northwest of the Riley House, part of the private residential property of Tina and Matthew Clarkson in the “Old Farm” vicinity. (It is located at approximately the western tip of the scythe-shaped piece of land that extended north and then west of the Riley House, the source of the name “Division of the Scythe” in the deeds for the land sold to George Riley). The owners claim it was once part of the Riley property (Patner, *Gazette*, January 30, 2002). They have a study that was prepared about this building, but they were not able to locate a copy of it for the JMA team.

- Annotate a bibliography of dissertations and theses that contain relevant references to Josiah Henson’s life.

- Clarify the manumission papers; it is not known how or when Henson obtained a copy of the document. Also, it is not known if he ever knew what the document actually said.

- Additional research should be conducted on the nineteenth century records relating to the Riley Plantation. This would include retrieval and analysis of the various court documents for lawsuits over control of the property between 1815 and 1840.

- Research whether there is any documentation to confirm the legend that the frame house was constructed by a young soldier after the Revolutionary War.

- A family named Bracket rented a portion of the house, ca. 1919. Is any additional information available through the descendents of this family?
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP
### Partial Chain of Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEED (Liber : Folio)</th>
<th>DATE (Recorded)</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32038:282</td>
<td>March 23, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Susanne Haley, personal representative of the estate of Hildegarde Mallet-Prevost</td>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31639:355</td>
<td>January 13, 2006</td>
<td>Marcel Mallet-Prevost and Hildegarde Mallett-Prevost</td>
<td>State Roads Commission of Maryland</td>
<td>Title to the bed of Old Georgetown Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3558:342</td>
<td>September (?), 1966</td>
<td>Marcel Mallet-Prevost and Hildegarde Mallett-Prevost</td>
<td>State Roads Commission of Maryland</td>
<td>Title to the bed of Old Georgetown Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388:9</td>
<td>June 1, 1950</td>
<td>Levina W. Bolten and Ednah C. Woodworth, joint tenants</td>
<td>William H. Coburn and Harriett H. Coburn, his wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142:319</td>
<td>April 2, 1948; 1:34 p.m.</td>
<td>Daniel King, unmarried</td>
<td>Levina W. Bolten and her sister-in-law, Ednah C. Woodworth, joint tenants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142:308</td>
<td>April 2, 1948; 1:33 p.m.</td>
<td>Levina W. Bolten, widow, surviving joint tenant of her brother, Benjamin H. Woodworth</td>
<td>Daniel J. King, unmarried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712:284</td>
<td>September 16, 1938; 10:28 a.m.</td>
<td>Margaret Horgan</td>
<td>Levina W. Bolten and her brother, Benjamin H. Woodworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712:283</td>
<td>September 16, 1938; 10:28 a.m.</td>
<td>Margaret Horgan</td>
<td>Levina W. Bolten, widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648:37</td>
<td>November 14, 1936</td>
<td>Luxmanor Corporation; Morton J. Luchs, president and Ernestine F. Luchs, Secretary</td>
<td>William R. Bolten and Levina W. Bolten</td>
<td>Consideration of $10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648:34</td>
<td>November 14, 1936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luxmanor Corporation; Restrictions in Luxmanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304:476</td>
<td>June 14, 1921</td>
<td>Albert M. Bouic, Franklin Mace, Jr.</td>
<td>“…also part of Lot No. 1 in the division of real estate of the late Isaac Riley made by the Circuit Court for Montgomery County in Equity Cause [sic] No. 107 to 1863.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210:51</td>
<td>September 30, 1909</td>
<td>Robert S. Woodward, Jason A. Barber and wife</td>
<td>“It being a part of the same land which was devised to Francis R. Mace by her mother Matilda Riley, and also a part of the same land which upon the death of the said Frances R. Mace, intestate, descended to the said Franklin Mace, Junior, Charles R. Mace, Samuel V. Mace, Arthur M. Mace and Fannie R. Berry and a certain Dora S. Counselman, her only children subject to the rights of the said Franklin Mace, her surviving husband.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200:60</td>
<td>August 18, 1908</td>
<td>Albert M. Bouic, unmarried; Franklin Mace, Jr., and Catherine B. Mace, his wife; Samuel V. Mace and Myrtle R. Mace, his wife; Fannie R. Berry and Winfred E. Berry, her husband; Charles R. Mace, unmarried; and Arthur M. Mace, unmarried</td>
<td>See Additional Documentation of Property Ownership chart below for documents relating to the period in which the title for the property was either contested, not recorded, or is otherwise unclear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:640</td>
<td>October 26, 1797</td>
<td>George Riley, James Colyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Additional Documentation of Property Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT (Reference)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200:60</td>
<td>March 26, 1904 (death of Frances Ruben Riley Mace)</td>
<td>Frances R. Mace</td>
<td>Franklin Mace, Jr., Charles R. Mace, Samuel V. Mace, Arthur M. Mace, Fannie R. Berry, Dora S. Counselmen (and children of Dora S. Counselmen)</td>
<td>This transfer is referenced in Montgomery County Deed Book 200, page 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200:60</td>
<td>June 26, 1890 (death of Matilda Riley)</td>
<td>Matilda Riley</td>
<td>Franc(e)s R. Mace</td>
<td>This transfer is referenced in Montgomery County Deed Book 200, page 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Case No.107 of 1863</td>
<td>Final Decree filed March 16, 1864</td>
<td>Matilda Riley, et al, plaintiffs</td>
<td>Samuel W. Magruder, defendants</td>
<td>Division of the land of the late Isaac Riley (Montgomery County Historical Society has a map of the Riley land division, “Map 18e”; see Appendix F, page 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber C.K.W. No.50, Folio 330</td>
<td>March, 12 1858</td>
<td>Isaac Riley estate</td>
<td>Matilda Riley</td>
<td>Lay-Off of Widow’s Dower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T.S.4: 466-468</td>
<td>March 1, 1850</td>
<td>Isaac and Matilda Riley</td>
<td>James E. Lyddane</td>
<td>By 1850, Isaac Riley legally held title to the land, as evidenced by his sale of two tracts of land (a tract of 17 1/2 acres and a tract of 20 3/4 acres) south of the Riley House to James E. Lyddane. A third adjoining tract in the same area was sold by the Riley family to the Lyddane family in 1861 (J.G.H. 8:306).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 14, 1830</td>
<td>Isaac Riley</td>
<td>Estate of George Riley</td>
<td>The third account Isaac Riley filed on the assets of the George Riley estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 36 Equity 1841</td>
<td>October 1, 1830</td>
<td>Arnold T. Windsor (vs.)</td>
<td>Isaac Riley</td>
<td>&quot;For the conveyance of land.” Dismissed March 16, 1841.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 36 Equity 1841</td>
<td>October 1, 1830</td>
<td>Isaac Riley (vs.)</td>
<td>Arnold T. Windsor</td>
<td>&quot;For the conveyance of land, owner of land: George Riley.” Dismissed March 16, 1841.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed of Trust, Liber BS 2:76</td>
<td>November 21, 1828</td>
<td>Isaac Riley</td>
<td>Arnold T. Winsor [Windsor], trus.</td>
<td>In this deed of trust, Isaac Riley was one of several parties, including Brice and Harriet Letton, who lost property to Arnold T. Windsor and a man named John Braddock. The deed references the indemnification of several enslaved individuals who were in the possession of the Lettons. It also addresses a tract of land that James B. Higgins, Isaac V. Riley, and Harriett Letton had inherited, which they had subsequently sold to Arnold T. Windsor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws of Maryland, 1827, Chapter 172, Section 1</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Special act of the Maryland Assembly passed to allow the sale of real estate from the George Riley estate, “if in the opinion of the judges of Montgomery County, it shall be more advantageous to the heirs of George Riley, to sell a part of their real estate, than their personal property… upon the application of Arnold T. Winsor…” (See Appendix K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity 1841</td>
<td>July 11, 1828</td>
<td>Arnold T. Windsor (vs.)</td>
<td>&quot;To stay proceedings on judgment.&quot; Dismissed March 16, 1841.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed of Trust Y:132</td>
<td>August 24, 1825</td>
<td>Isaac Riley, Arnold T. Windsor [Windsor], Trus.</td>
<td>In this deed of trust, Isaac Riley sold his rights to several tracts of property and other possessions in the George Riley estate to Arnold T. Windsor, including the current Riley House. However, he appears to have retained possession of the property and filed a counter-suit to keep Windsor from actually taking possession of the real estate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity 1828</td>
<td>January 22, 1825</td>
<td>Arnold T. Windsor (vs.)</td>
<td>&quot;For payment of money and conveyance of land.&quot; Dismissed September 7, 1830.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:640</td>
<td>1797, October 26</td>
<td>George Riley, James Colyer</td>
<td>This is the only known deed transferring the land to the members of the Riley family; upon George Riley's death in 1815, Isaac Riley took control of the property as executor of his will.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate 94</td>
<td>October 16, 1787</td>
<td>William Collyar</td>
<td>&quot;Collyars Resurvey Corrected; 262 1/2 Acres&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Record BC and GS 47, p. 174</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>William Collyar</td>
<td>Collyars Resurvey, 195 Acres; Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County Deed Book J, p. 1203, 6-19-1765</td>
<td>June 1, 1765</td>
<td>William and Sarah Collier</td>
<td>Collyers leased the property to the Lovelace Family. &quot;Granted to Let and to Farm one house and tract of Land being part of a larger tract called 'Den' in Frederick County, the boundary on the West is West of Main Road commonly called 'Rock Creek Main' and adjacent to Mr. Edward Burches (thought to be Captain E. Burgess of Montgomery County) land, part of the above tract containing 67 acres and another tract of land called 'Elder's Delight.'&quot; (see: <a href="http://homepages.rootsweb.com/~lovelace/us/states/ky/Unknown_Counties/Published_Genealogies/harned.htm">http://homepages.rootsweb.com/~lovelace/us/states/ky/Unknown_Counties/Published_Genealogies/harned.htm</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County Deed Book B:519-521</td>
<td>February 14, 1752</td>
<td>Thomas Elder, William Collier</td>
<td>50 acres of a tract called “elder’s Delight” adjoining the line of a tract called “Dann.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Land Patents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Record B 23, pp. 223-224</td>
<td>September 16, 1794</td>
<td>State of Maryland, Thomas Brooke</td>
<td>&quot;Dan&quot; or &quot;Dann.&quot; Original land grant for 3,697 acres, including the Riley House parcel and a large rectangle of land east, north, and south of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate 50, Liber EL#5, folio 504, Certificate 50, Liber EL#6, folio 291</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>State of Maryland, Thomas Elder</td>
<td>&quot;Elder's Delight.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** "Division of the Scythe" is name for a tract of land referenced in deeds, but it does not appear in the Maryland land patent index. It may be a "resurvey," of part of the land similar to "Collyar's Resurvey" and "Collyar's Resurvey Corrected." It probably refers to the shape of the farm west of the western line of Dan, where the Collyar's Resurvey farm took an unusual shape that resembled the form of a scythe, at a very large scale.
TIMELINE
### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1696</td>
<td>Area now identified as Montgomery County was located within Charles County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Area now identified as Montgomery County was located within Prince George’s County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Area now identified as Montgomery County was located within Frederick County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Montgomery County formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Isaac Riley - 2 years old, son of Hugh - 50 years old, and Sarah Riley - 39 years old; “Lower Potomack Hud. [sic],” Frederick County, Maryland (Maryland Census Records 1776 and Cook 1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Brice Letton born (Cissel n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Josiah Henson born near Port Tobacco, Charles County, Maryland (on the plantation of Dr. Josiah McPherson). Secondary sources list both June 6, 1789 and June 15, 1789 as the dates of Henson’s birth (Montgomery County Historical Society, Josiah Henson File).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1794</td>
<td>Josiah Henson’s mother was sold to Isaac Riley. Young Josiah Henson is sold to Adam Robb, tavern owner in Rockville, Maryland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795-1825</td>
<td>Josiah Henson enslaved by Isaac Riley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1797, October 26 | **George Riley obtained the ‘Riley property’ from James Collyer (George Riley is the brother of Isaac Riley).** The property is described as:  
*all that party or parcel of land known by the name Dan, also all that party or parcel of land known by the name Elder’s Delight, also all that party or parcel of land known by the name Collyar’s Resurvey corrected adjoining the above-mentioned part of Dan…* (Montgomery County Deed Book G: 640-641). |
<p>| 1797-1799| George Riley served as a member of the House of Delegates from Montgomery County (<em>Montgomery County Story, Montgomery County Historical Society</em>).                                                               |
| Ca. 1800 | Matilda Middleton (Riley) born.                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 1804 - 1806 | George Riley served as a County Commissioner.                                                                                                                                                        |
| 1805     | Hugh Riley, father of George, Isaac, and Amos Riley, died. He was approximately 80 years old. His will was dated August 10, 1805, and probated March 29, 1806 (Montgomery County Historical Society, Vertical File and Cook). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1807</td>
<td>Josiah Henson converted to Christianity, age 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1809</td>
<td>Henson attacked and beaten by neighbor and accomplices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Sarah Wilson Riley (George Riley’s first wife) died.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810, October 18</td>
<td>George Riley remarried; his second wife was Mary Richards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1811</td>
<td>Henson married Charlotte, a slave from neighboring Williamsburg Plantation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>When I [Josiah Henson] was about twenty-two years of age, I married a very efficient, and, for a slave, a very well-taught girl, belonging to a neighboring family, reputed to be pious and kind, whom I first met at the religious meetings which I attended. She has borne me twelve children, eight of whom still survive and promise to be the comfort of my declining years.</em> (Henson 1858:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Harriet Beecher Stowe born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td><strong>George Riley died.</strong> His will is dated May 9, 1815 (Liber 1, Filio 195).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818, August 18</td>
<td>Mary Richards Riley (widow of George Riley) married Arnold Thomas Windsor (ancestry.com).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Isaac Riley married Matilda Middleton (December 10); Riley was appointed guardian of Matilda’s younger brother, Francis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>At the age of forty-five, [Isaac] married a young woman of eighteen, who had some little property, and more thrift. Her economy was remarkable, and she added no comfort to the establishment.</em> (Henson 1877:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>Isaac Riley experiences financial difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Isaac Riley became involved in a protracted and financially draining lawsuit with a brother-in-law, who charged him with dishonesty in the management of property entrusted to him. In 1825, Riley lost the case and faced economic ruin.</em> (Ochs 1989:74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825 – February to April</td>
<td>Josiah Henson led Isaac Riley’s slaves to Daviess County, Kentucky (to the home of Isaac Riley’s brother, Amos Riley).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>There were eighteen negroes, besides my wife, two children, and myself [Josiah Henson]</em> (Henson 1877:44).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825-1828</td>
<td>Josiah Henson (and other Isaac Riley slaves) worked on Amos Riley’s plantation in Kentucky. During this time Henson became a minister; he was admitted by the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828-1829</td>
<td><strong>Josiah Henson returned to Isaac Riley plantation in Montgomery County, Maryland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henson left Maryland to return to Kentucky, in March 1829.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829, March 9</td>
<td><strong>March 9, Isaac Riley signs manumission document giving Josiah Henson his freedom</strong> (Land Records of Montgomery County, MD, BS2-167).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Josiah Henson, along with his wife, Charlotte, and their four children, escaped to Canada.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1842   | Henson and his family moved to Dresden, Canada, and established the Dawn Settlement. Henson’s autobiography states:  
  
  …after traversing the country for several months, we could find no place more suitable that that upon which I had had my eye for three of four years, for a permanent settlement, in the town of Dawn. We therefore bought two hundred acres of fine, rich land, on the river Sydenham, covered with a heavy growth of black walnut and white wood, at four dollars an acre.  
  
  (Henson 1849:74)  
  
  Arnold Thomas Windsor (Mary Richards Riley’s second husband) died in Lexington, Missouri (ancestry.com). |
| 1848, May 24 | Isaac and Matilda Riley conveyed 100 acres of their farm to their daughter, Sarah Ann Veirs (Deed Book STS 3:0482, May 24, 1848). |
| 1849   | **Josiah Henson – with Samuel A. Eliot: The Life of Josiah Henson. 1849.**  
  
  Henson’s his first autobiography was published in order to raise money for the school at Dawn Settlement. |
| 1850   | Isaac Riley listed as a resident of Montgomery County, 4th District, household members identified as:  
  
  Isaac Riley (75), Matilda Riley (49), Benjamin F. Riley (4), Frances Riley (14), Josephine Riley (9), Mary Riley (16), and Aron Wilbum (60)  
  
  At the time, Isaac Riley also owned one adult slave, two female children, ages 9 to 12, and two male children, ages 4 and 8 (1850 Census). |
<p>| 1850, July 5 | <strong>Isaac Riley died</strong> (age 75). His farm, which consisted of approximately 500 acres, was willed to his wife, Matilda Riley. Isaac Riley’s will was probated in July 1850. |
| 1851   | Harriet Beecher Stowe’s serial printed in National Era, abolitionist paper published in Washington, DC – “Uncle Tom’s Cabin or Life among the Lowly.” |
| 1852   | Josiah Henson’s wife, Charlotte, died (Henson 1858:204). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td><em>Uncle Tom’s Cabin</em> published, written by Harriet Beecher Stowe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A Key to Uncle Tom’s Cabin: Presenting the Original Facts and Documents upon Which the Story is Founded</em> published, written by Harriet Beecher Stowe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858, March 12</td>
<td>A legal document was recorded “to lay off widow’s dower” for Matilda Riley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Josiah Henson authored <em>Truth Stranger than Fiction: Father Henson’s Story of His Own Life</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-1864</td>
<td>Remaining Isaac Riley land divided among children, approximately 335 acres (No. 107 Equity 1863). Some land may have been sold between 1850 and 1863 to family members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Mary Richards Riley Windsor (George Riley’s widow) died (October 5, 1864 in Lexington, Missouri; her second husband, Arnold Thomas Windsor, died in Lexington, Missouri, in 1842) (ancestry.com).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865, December 6</td>
<td>13th Amendment, abolishing slavery, ratified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Josiah Henson, authored <em>Uncle Tom’s Story of His Life</em>, edited by John Lobb and published in 1877. The third version of Henson’s autobiography, this edition is regarded as the most extensive account.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Henson met with Queen Victoria, Windsor Castle, England.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Henson met with President Hayes in Washington, DC.</td>
<td>Henson also visited Montgomery County, and met with his former master’s wife, Matilda Riley. An 1897 map identifies the location of Matilda Riley’s property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Josiah Henson, author – John Lobb, ed.: <em>Uncle Tom’s Story of His Life, An Autobiographic of the Rev. Josiah Henson (Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe’s “Uncle Tom” From 1789 to 1877)</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Josiah Henson, author – John Lobb, ed.: <em>Uncle Tom’s Story of His Life, An Autobiographic of the Rev. Josiah Henson (Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe’s “Uncle Tom” From 1789 to 1879)</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883, May 18</td>
<td>Josiah Henson died (age 94).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890, June 26</td>
<td>Matilda Riley died (age 90). The farm passed to her daughter, Frances Ruben (Riley) Mace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow born; architect of 1930s restoration project (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Harriet Beecher Stowe died.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Although they retained ownership, the Mace family left the property; the house was rented out. The Mace family continued to visit the property regularly (Hansbrough 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>(Mrs.) Frances Mace Hansbrough born, July 2 (Hansbrough 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Historic map identifies Frances R. Mace as the property owner (Deets and Maddox).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Earliest known dated image of the Riley Farm house (appeared in “The Rambler” column of the Washington Star, October 19, 1919); image reflects how Ms. Mace Hansbrough remembered the house (Hansbrough 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923, February 9</td>
<td>Flint, Michigan, newspaper reports that two of Josiah Henson’s daughters, “the only surviving members of a family of eight children” are living with their son/nephew in Flint. The daughters are Mrs. Matilda Henson Richey and Mrs. Julia Ann Henson Wheeler. They possessed a document dated March 9, 1829, which gave Josiah Henson his freedom (Unidentified newspaper article dated February 9, 1923; copy at Peerless Rockville, VF).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Riley farm is sold outside of the family (Luxmanor Corp. – Morton Luchs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-1928</td>
<td>“Alterations to a farm house (‘Luxmanor’) for Morton J. Luchs, Rockville Road, Rockville, Maryland.”  Arthur B. Heaton, architect; [Emerich H.] Bauer, Landscape architect.  Drawings are for the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Morton Luchs; these drawings are not of the Riley House (Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Luxmanor Corporation Incorporated. Morton J. Luchs, President and Ernestine F. Luchs, Secretary (Montgomery County, Maryland, Deed Records; 648:37, November 14, 1936).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow designed the White House swimming pool (west Terrace) and “assisted with the West Wing expansion” (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Riley property purchased by Levina and William Bolten – extensive remodeling / “restoration” occurred, including remodeling to the interior of the house, the log house, and the addition of a rear kitchen-wing. Approximate date of drawings for remodeling project, as developed by Lorenzo Winslow, White House architect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow assisted with the “design of new roads, gates, and fences on the south grounds” of the White House (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-1938</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow assisted with the design of “new White House kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pantries in the residence, new work spaces for carpenter and paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shops under the north grounds” (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow assisted with the “changes to the ground floor White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Library for President Roosevelt (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Newspaper article about Boltens upon completion of the remodeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project made reference to Uncle Tom’s Cabin. The property is described</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“At the time Mrs. Bolten bought the property three years ago, many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old slave quarters and outbuildings remained. The main building, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one she has remodeled, was a simple, clapboard, two-story house with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an old log wing, used as a kitchen…neither plumbing nor electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had been installed at the time of her purchase.” (Smith 1939)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940, June</td>
<td>Miss Harriette Hartnett and William Coburn married (Washington Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1940).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow appointed official White House architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr. Winslow] assumed responsibility for the design and construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the East Wing (1942). At President Truman’s request, he oversaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the addition of the Truman Balcony to the South Portico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Ontario Historic Sites Board made Josiah Henson’s Canadian home a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>museum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow named “architect-in-charge” of the renovation of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White House, a project that continued until 1952 (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Riley property purchased by Harriet and William Coburn;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Coburn, a Congressional committee attorney, says there were other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cabins on the estate when he bought it in 1950 but they have been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>torn down (Sentinal [newspaper], Sept. 29, 1955).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951, July</td>
<td>Daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzo Winslow married; Priscilla Alden to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to William Seale, former White House Historian, Priscilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood later donated some of Winslow’s papers to the archives at the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White House (Seale, personal communication with project manager for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this report).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow retired to Florida (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>William R. Bolten died, May 5, Washington, DC (Montgomery County,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland, Deed; 712:283, September 16, 1938).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Roger B. Farquhar, author: Old Homes and History of Montgomery County,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Riley house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td><strong>Riley property purchased by Marcel and Hildegrade Mallet-Prevost</strong> (they remained until their deaths).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Mrs. Frances Mace Hansbrough moved to Warrenton, Virginia (Hansbrough 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Kentucky Historical Society placed highway marker at the Amos Riley property where Josiah Henson had resided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Application to register the Riley property with the Maryland Historical Trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Lorenzo Winslow died (<a href="http://www.whitehousehistory.org">www.whitehousehistory.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Josiah Henson became the first person of African American / African-Canadian descent to be featured on a Canadian postage stamp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><strong>Riley property acquired by the Montgomery County Department of Parks</strong> (January)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006, October 6</td>
<td>Joey Lampl (M-NCPPC) interviews Mrs. Frances Mace Hansbrough in Warrenton, Virginia (Hansbrough 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007, August 31</td>
<td>Joey Lampl (M-NCPPC) interviews Mrs. Frances Mace Hansbrough in Warrenton, Virginia. Ms. Lampl audiotapes the interview, while watching a video showing the current conditions of the property (Hansbrough 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Montgomery County Department of Parks plans to begin educational programming at the Riley Property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1936 DRAWINGS
Drawings Prepared in 1936 by Lorenzo Winslow
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND CHRONOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND INTEGRITY

The property now called the Josiah Henson site and formerly known as “Uncle Tom’s Cabin” is designated as an individual resource on the Montgomery County Master Plan for Historic Preservation. As such, it is protected under local preservation law. The house has not, however, been Determined Eligible for the National Register.

The Josiah Henson Site/Riley House, a frame house with a log wing, is primarily significant for its association with Josiah Henson, an enslaved worker who lived on the plantation that surrounded the current parcel from some point after 1797 through much of the 1820s. Since Henson’s own “log hut” on the property no longer stands, the structure of the Riley House, with its log wing, becomes the closest, most tangible artifact of Josiah Henson’s known existence on the property. It served as the main house of the plantation where Henson was enslaved. Events that unfolded on and near this property became central to a narrative, first authored by Henson in 1849, which provided a detailed account of slavery to an audience that stretched across the United States and the world. Henson’s narrative, written after he had escaped from slavery in 1830, helped change attitudes and eventually policies both in the era leading up to the Civil War and afterward. Harriett Beecher Stowe, upon reading Henson’s and other slave narratives, was inspired to write about slavery in a series of articles for an abolitionist periodical, The National Era. That series became the basis for her 1852 fictional account of slavery, the book Uncle Tom’s Cabin. In 1853, Stowe wrote The Key to Uncle Tom’s Cabin, naming Henson’s narrative as a critical source for several of her main characters and a series of events she described in the novel.

As a visible symbol of rural life in a slaveholding state in the late 18th/early 19th century, the house and the log wing in particular are deeply meaningful to the people of Montgomery County and to all people who continue to study the history of enslaved labor, plantation life, and the never-ending struggle for freedom. Part of a story that stretches from Southern Maryland and Montgomery County to Kentucky and Ontario — with threads connecting it to other parts of the world — this site is the most appropriate place to interpret the Montgomery County chapter of Josiah Henson’s life. Because Henson’s narratives continue to provide unique insights, the house represents an important opportunity to interpret slavery in Montgomery County and Maryland as a border state, physically and figuratively a “Middle Ground” between slaveholding and free states, letting Josiah Henson’s powerful words speak for themselves.

The interaction among Josiah Henson, Isaac Riley, George Riley, and others from Montgomery County became the core of Henson’s narrative. The house, dating from the late 18th or early 19th century and still standing today, was the home of Isaac Riley who purchased Henson in 1795. The log wing, which may have been a kitchen, is estimated to have been constructed at some point after 1820. With Josiah Henson’s assistance, George and Isaac Riley operated a plantation that incorporated several tracts of farmland and apparently one or two other complete farms from this modest home. After a series of lawsuits over the way he was managing the George Riley estate, Isaac Riley was on the verge of bankruptcy. In 1825, in order to avoid having his slaves seized by creditors, Riley put Henson in charge of a taking a group of enslaved workers to a plantation in Kentucky where his brother Amos Riley lived. Henson, a man of utmost integrity whose word meant everything, completed the painful job against tremendous temptations to flee himself or allow the fleeing of others under his watch to the Ohio River shore. Recognizing afterwards that being a man of one’s word was not valued and, in fact, only brought more injustice to enslaved African Americans, Henson became determined to earn his freedom. After rightfully doing so through paid preaching engagements, Henson returned to the plantation in Montgomery County in 1828 to finalize his manumission. In return for all he had done, realized he had been tricked by Isaac Riley as Riley reneged on an agreed-upon price, changing Henson’s sealed manumission papers to hide this deceit. Recognizing the deception played upon him, Henson determined
that his only recourse from slavery was to flee to Canada via the Underground Railroad. He returned to Kentucky in 1828/1829 to assist freeing others who were enslaved. He, his family, and others escaped to Canada, leaving Kentucky in 1830.

Once in Canada, Henson displayed tremendous leadership, founding a settlement in the Dawn Mills area of Kent County, Ontario1 for others who had escaped slavery. Education, freedom to worship, farming and vocational training were some of the remarkable opportunities he offered to newly free people at Dawn in a place called the British American Institute. In 1849, he published his narrative, or autobiography, the first of at least six editions that were printed between then and 1881. As a minister of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, he became a public speaker in great demand. He also had success as a business man at the Dawn Settlement, where the lumber company he founded produced polished walnut boards that Henson presented at the Great Exhibition of 1851 at the Crystal Palace in London, England. In 2005, the property known in Canada as the “Uncle Tom’s Cabin Historic Site” was designated a historic site under the stewardship of the Ontario Heritage Trust. The property contains the two-story dwelling in which Henson and his family resided, the church where he preached, and other buildings from the settlement.

As noted above, the house in Montgomery County was not Henson’s, but the “main house” or “great house” of the plantation upon which he toiled while enslaved. As the residence of Isaac Riley, it passed upon Riley’s death in 1850 to his widow, Matilda Riley. She lived in the house until she died in 1890. Henson made a final visit to the farm in early 1878 to see the place once again and visit Mrs. Riley. In 1881, he described Mrs. Riley, the condition of the house, and his impressions of the surrounding property in the last version of his autobiography, noting how the property had changed for the worse over the half century since he had escaped, a place barely recognizable as the plantation where he and fellow enslaved African Americans had toiled.

The house remained in the Riley family until 1926, although it eventually was rented in the 1910s and 1920s since the descendants’ primary residence was in Georgetown. The family would visit the old “home place” nearly every weekend, visiting a relative who acted as caretaker of the property and keeping a vegetable garden in the backyard. Between 1926 and 1936, the property passed out of the Riley hands and into the ownership of Morton Luchs, the developer who established the surrounding subdivision, Luxmanor. Apparently recognizing the value of the historic property, Morton Luchs preserved the house and the land was not subdivided further. In 1936, it was purchased by William and Levina Bolten, who learned from neighbors about the property’s historic association with Henson, Henson’s narrative, and the novel, Uncle Tom’s Cabin. The Boltens had both the frame section of the house and the log wing substantially altered, replacing almost all of the exterior and interior surface materials except for most of the logs in a project that was completed by 1939. The 1936-1939 architectural project was designed by preservation architect Lorenzo Winslow who was also at the same time serving as the Architect of the White House.

While the property derives its significance, therefore, from being the most tangible reminder of Henson’s life in central Maryland in the final years of the 18th century and first quarter of the 19th century (and has a building framework and logs that appear to date to the same period), the apparent character of the house, many of its finishes, and the surrounding landscape are more reflective of the 1936 design. Due to the loss of much of the site’s 19th century integrity, it is difficult to tie to present the property in a way that emphasizes the early 19th century with so many visible 1930s building materials and details. In fact, the property retains a high enough percentage of the materials from the 1936 Colonial Revival “restoration”

---

1 The Dawn Settlement was in the vicinity of the small town or village of Dresden and also in the vicinity of the village of Dawn Mills, in Kent County, Ontario. Dresden and Dawn Mills are just south of the line between Kent County and Lambton County. The next area to the north of Dawn Mills, in Lambton County, is called Dawn Township.
that appears to meet National Register of Historic Places standards for integrity for that later period. If one were to analyze the architectural significance of the house for its 1936 design under Criterion C for National Register eligibility, one would still need to weigh the Josiah Henson Site/Riley House against that of other Colonial Revival “restoration” projects of the 1930s to place it in proper context. For purposes of this report, therefore, only the site’s local designation status is operative.

As a result of strong associations from the early 19th century coming into contact with physical building fabric that has been altered, the task of telling the compelling story of Josiah Henson’s life in the 1800s will need to be undertaken carefully so as not to misrepresent the architectural history of the house. For further discussion on how future design decisions should be considered in the context of the treatment of historic materials, see the Treatment Plan section of the report.
Ca.1790-ca.1815/1820 — Construction of the Frame House — The frame portion of the house most likely dates to the 30-year period 1790-1820. Based solely on style, the frame house could have been constructed earlier than 1790; however, the house has some characteristics in hidden locations within the walls that are indicative of a date no earlier than the 1790s. An example is the use of nails rather than wooden pegs at the lap joints where the rafter pairs are joined at the top of the roof. The style of door and window casings used in the current library (the only first story room that retains early trim) is also consistent with this period, as is the evidence gathered through paint analysis for this area. In correlating this with deeds, family information, and similar documents, it would appear that the house was most likely built around the time that George Riley acquired the land in 1797 or shortly before this by the Collier family. Based on physical evidence, it was built before the log house. It is not likely that any major part of the house was built between George Riley’s death in 1815 and 1820 because the property was part the unsettled estate of a recently deceased owner, George Riley.

Ca.1820-ca.1850 — Alterations to the House While Isaac and Matilda Riley Both Lived There — Construction dates often correspond to family events, such as deaths and inheritances, or marriages. A logical time for some changes to have been made to the house would have been shortly after Isaac and Matilda Riley were married in 1818, just a year after Matilda Riley’s father died, and only three years after the death of Isaac Riley’s brother George who had purchased the property in 1797. Another related family event was the remarriage of George Riley’s widow in 1818 to Arnold T. Windsor (or Winsor). Windsor became guardian of George Riley’s children, while Isaac Riley retained control of the George Riley estate which he had held since 1815 as the designated administrator of his brother’s will. The two entered into a protracted series of lawsuits over whether some of the land could be sold, according to court records that begin at least as early as 1825 and continue into the 1830s and 1840s. Isaac Riley appears to have tenaciously held on to this house and the farm surrounding it until his death in 1850, leaving the land to his family even though there is apparently no deed on record indicating he had ever been granted clear title to it. The plantation activities became bogged down in legal and financial problems as a result of the lawsuits, and they also led to the Rileys sending Josiah Henson and other enslaved workers to Kentucky in 1828. Therefore, it is unlikely that the construction of any additional wings or other major changes to the house or plantation occurred between 1825 and the early 1840s, during the extended period of litigation. Because of the poor condition of the logs in the log house, among other obstacles, a conclusive date was not found for that part of the building in this project. Other clues, however, point to the log house being built no earlier than 1820, and possibly as late as the 1850s.

1797-1850 — Operation of the Property as a Plantation — The house and surrounding property were part of the larger land holdings of George and Isaac Riley in the period 1797-1850. Among the various Riley family holdings, this farm may have been the center of a consolidated operation throughout much of this period, a large working plantation with acreage that appears to have changed from year to year as numerous other tracts of land were bought and sold. Isaac Riley had purchased farmland as a young man and then inherited other land from his father. After his father’s death, he sold some of the land, possibly moving from the farm he had bought to the one he had inherited. Upon the death of his brother, George Riley in 1815, he appears to have lived at this house for the remaining years of his life, extending his position as administrator of George Riley’s will into a kind of permanent status, perhaps because this placed him in broad control of extensive land on which to operate the plantation, until his fortunes reversed with the ongoing lawsuits. He also held the ownership of enslaved individuals who worked on the land in this period. The number of individuals enslaved on the Riley property and the total numbers of acres the family owned varied from year to year due to purchases and sales that occurred between 1815 and Isaac Riley’s death in 1850. Despite the family’s substantial land holding, not all land transactions appear to be recorded uniformly. Other Riley family members held title to several different farms in various parts of the county, including several large tracts within a mile of the site in question. Isaac Riley also had an interest in the plantation owned by his brother Amos who had moved with other family members to Kentucky by the 1820s.
1850-1926 — Reduction of the Associated Land to a 50-Acre Farm — At Isaac Riley’s death in 1850, the property consisted of between 335 and 500 acres of land. This land was ultimately divided among his children. One of his daughters had purchased 100 acres of the farm before his death. The remaining land was divided into five or six farms of approximately 50 acres each, essentially one tract for his wife and one each for four of his other children (at the western edge of the farm, a much smaller tract was also created for another one of his children). Matilda Riley, Isaac’s wife, inherited “dower rights” to the tract surrounding the house. In 1858, the dower arrangement was dissolved so that she owned the property outright. Otherwise, Isaac Riley’s estate remained unsettled for 14 years. The other farms created by the division of land outlined in Isaac Riley’s will did not take effect until 1863-64, when Riley’s son-in-law Samuel Magruder filed suit to force a final settlement of the estate. After Matilda Riley’s death in 1890, the house and surrounding tract were passed down through her family until they were was sold. From Isaac Riley’s death until 1926, the Riley House was the farmhouse of a small farm. In the last decade of ownership by Riley Family descendants, the property was sold out of the family once and re-purchased. In the last year or two of family ownership, the house was kept as a second home for a descendant who visited it frequently and kept a garden there.

1926-1936 — Part of Luxmanor Development Project — Morton Luchs developed a larger tract of land including the 50-acre farm containing the Riley House into a new suburban subdivision. The area surrounding the house became known as Luxmanor, a new neighborhood between Tilden Woods and Montrose.

1936-2006 — Private Residence — The property was acquired by William R. Bolten and Levina Woodworth Bolten in 1936. Under the ownership of the Boltens, the frame house, log house, and surrounding landscape were completely rebuilt in the Colonial Revival style to serve as a private residence, typical of other suburban residences in the area, except that it had a log wing. It remained a private residence with very few changes until 2006. In 1950, it was purchased by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Coburn who lived there until 1963. Subsequently, it was purchased by Marcel and Hildegarde Mallet-Prevost. The Mallet-Prevosts lived there until Marcel died in 2000 and Hildegarde died in the fall of 2005 at 100 years of age. After the 1936 project, very few changes appear to have been made to the property during the ownership by the Boltens, the Coburns, or the Mallet-Prevosts. As a result, the 1936 design has a high degree of integrity.

2006-Present — Purchase by Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission — The house was purchased by the Montgomery County Department of Parks (a division of the M-NCP&PC) for use as a museum and community park.
ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION AND CONDITION ASSESSMENT
GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The Riley House/Josiah Henson Site is a timber frame house to which a one-room log house has been attached as a wing projecting from the north elevation. The timber frame portion of the house is constructed of hand hewn wood that is fastened together by mortise-and-tenon joints. The wood members vary in size so that each of the smaller vertical members measures in the range of three to five inches, while the largest horizontal members are up to approximately 12 to 14 inches in at least one dimension. It has a false plate cornice, diagonal braces, and other characteristics of Chesapeake Tidewater frame construction, the most common style of construction for wood frame buildings in the eastern half of the Mid-Atlantic States in the 18th and early 19th centuries. The frame part of the house is four bays wide, rectangular in plan, and clad in traditional clapboard-style weatherboarding. It has a side-gabled, wood-shingle roof framed by matching, interior brick chimneys with corbelled caps. The log portion of the house has a shouldered, exterior chimney, which is stone below the shoulder and brick above it. The chimney is corbelled to match the two other chimneys. Based on construction techniques and other evidence (such as the 1797 purchase by George Riley), the frame part of the house appears to have been built in the 1790s; but some details suggest a broader date range, from ca.1790 to ca.1820.1

In the first story, the frame house has a three-room plan, not counting additions. The plan consists of one larger room and two smaller rooms next to it. The larger room lies behind the southern three bays of the façade and runs the depth of the house, the northern one-third of the first story, while the two smaller rooms are found back-to-back in the remaining bay. The larger room has a fireplace near the center of the exterior wall on the south side of the room. The two smaller rooms have corner fireplaces sharing a chimney that is centered in the north wall.

The log building was originally built at some point after 1820, potentially close enough to the construction of the timber frame portion of the house to make the construction sequence and reasons for building the addition intriguing and relevant to the Henson story. The existence of weathered exterior siding in the cavity between the two buildings suggests that the frame house was in place first. At some point between ca.1820 and 1919 (or more narrowly between ca.1820 and ca.1850), it is possible that the log house was moved a short distance to place it closer to the frame house. It appears to be more likely, however, that it was not moved, at least not at any point after ca.1850. The evidence supporting this conclusion is the intact mortar in the chinking of the south wall of the log room: the mortar would have likely been dislodged and replaced by a more modern material as a result of the move. It is also unlikely that a move would have happened either when Isaac Riley was embroiled in legal and financial problems, or after his death, when the house became the home of his widow, Matilda Riley. The siding remnants, long hidden in a cavity between the two buildings, suggests that the frame house was in place for at least a decade or two before the log house was either constructed or moved over to touch the wall in question.

1 In a 1939 newspaper article, it is mentioned that the neighbors had heard handed-down legends about how the original house was constructed after the Revolutionary War by a young soldier (Star July 30, 1939; see Appendix F, page F-2).
The question of whether the log house might have been moved arises in many people’s minds from the way the two buildings are adjacent to one another but different in materials, and by the way that they were separated for over 100 years with no interior connection. Log rooms are often seen in use as kitchen ells or as separate kitchen facilities in 19th century frame, brick, or stone houses. The log construction and smaller scale frequently leads to the assumption that that part of the house was built first, and also that it was possibly inhabited as the owner’s residence before the more refined frame (or brick, or stone) building was constructed. The evidence, as stated above, does not indicate that particular sequence in this case. Instead of pointing to an earlier construction date, the more rustic construction technique (logs) may, in this case, be more connected to the kitchen functions and to the segregation of tasks in a society where meals were prepared by enslaved laborers. In his account of his return visit in 1878, Josiah Henson makes reference to his memory of an “outdoor kitchen, where the coloured cook and her young maids prepared and carried the dinners into the house” and then describes the major differences in appearance and activities between the 1820s and late 1870s. He also states that, in 1878, the house was “without a single barn or stable or shed to bear it company,” a statement that suggests that all the detached outbuildings he remembered from the 1820s were gone by the 1870s (Henson, 1881:219). Although he does not give enough of a description of the kitchen for the reader to be certain that it was still standing in 1878, the description he gives conveys the sense that the log building may have been the kitchen in question, that the only access to and from it had been by way of the exterior in the 1820s, and that the various parts of the house, as it was still standing in 1878, had not changed in form. The narrative seems to rule out the possibility that a detached log outbuilding from the 1820s had been moved over to touch the house by 1878.

Both the frame house and the log house were completely altered by the removal and replacement of almost all interior and exterior surface materials in a major “restoration” campaign in 1936-1939. At that time, a poured concrete footing was installed beneath the logs. The footing extends to three feet below grade. The log walls may have been shortened in the 1936 project, possibly to remove damaged logs. A new floor was constructed, on all new framing, at a level that was at least a foot higher than it had previously been, in part to make it possible to connect the log and frame houses with as few steps as possible. Raising the floor placed it approximately five feet below the log room’s ceiling, which consisted of the joists supporting the floor of the loft, above. The ceiling of the room was also altered by the removal of the loft to create a cathedral ceiling effect. The roof framing was also completely replaced at that time with new rafters, collar ties, sheathing, and a modern type of ceiling plaster using a base of Celotex panels and a sand finish. Also constructed in 1936-1939 is a two-story, frame kitchen and master bedroom wing to the rear of the frame house, built primarily to provide space for the current kitchen, bathrooms, and staircases.

The log wing is commonly referred to as a “cabin,” and the modifications made in 1936 may have been made with the intent of making it even more cabin-like than it had been. The local understanding of the link between the log building and both Josiah Henson and the book *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* appears to date from at least as early as 1939, when a newspaper article appeared in the Washington Star (*Star* July 30, 1939; see Appendix F, page F-2) featuring the “restoration” that Levina Bolten had undertaken over a three-year period. The strong association the property has with Josiah Henson, who was a model for the central character in Stowe’s book, and thus also with images of slavery, has led to a great deal of speculation about whether the log wing was a “cabin,” and whether it originally served as a kitchen or some similar use. The association itself (rather than any historical documentation), thus, raises the possibility that the log building could have been used to quarter some of the plantation’s enslaved workers, as the kitchen that Josiah Henson describes in his narratives was used in 1828. Henson describes a dirt-floored kitchen in which he was compelled to sleep for a brief period after returning from an extended trip to Kentucky. However, the renovations made in the 1936 project disturbed the site so thoroughly that no physical evidence has been found to confirm whether this particular log building did in fact serve as a kitchen prior to 1830 (while the Boltens were aware of Josiah Henson’s autobiography and
the link to Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel, as indicated in the 1939 Washington Star article on their project,2 keeping the design authentic to the house’s condition in 1820s was clearly not their goal, if it had even been within their reach: instead, they “restored” the house to an idealization of Colonial era architecture, typical of preservation efforts at that time). However, while the use of the log building after it was built is not clear in the information available at this time, it is known (from oral history interviews) to have been the house’s kitchen when some members of the last generation of the Riley family to own it would visit the property on weekends, as remembered by one surviving descendant. The log kitchen, at that time, had no interior connection to the frame portions of the house except by way of a porch that sheltered the former doorway in the north wall of what is now the library, apparently the most direct way to go from one building to the other until the 1936 alterations.

The frame portion of the house is four bays wide, with two evenly spaced 6/6 windows in one half of the façade and an 8/8 window in the other half. All of the exterior wooden surface materials and associated details and fixtures were replaced in the 1936 project. Almost all the frame house’s exterior surface materials have remained unchanged, so that they date from that specific time period. Near the center of the facade is a doorway flanked by fluted pilasters. The doorway has a four-light rectangular transom and is crowned with a dentiled frieze. The door is concealed behind a louvered single-leaf shutter that functions as a screen door. The windows also have louvered wood shutters. At the top of the façade is a box cornice with cut-out ornamental end brackets. The cornice is largely hidden behind a half-round hanging gutter with decorative collector boxes at the downspouts, placed prominently near the corners of the façade. The entrance is accessed by a small flagstone stoop, with two low risers leading up from the sidewalk that connects the main entrance of the house to the driveway.

The central mass of the house is flanked by the log building extending as a wing to the north and a gabled, screened-in porch that extends from the south elevation, nearly as large as the log wing and providing a counterbalance to it. The screened-in porch is supported by unpainted square wood posts.3 It has a sloped ceiling of unpainted exposed rafters for which standard modern lumber was used.

The log building is about eight log courses tall, joined at the corners by “V” notches, the most common kind of log joinery found throughout the Mid-Atlantic Region in the 18th and 19th centuries. It has a door near the southeast corner, about ten inches from where the log house and frame house meet. Roughly centered in the remaining portion of the east-facing façade is a 9-pane single sash casement window. Centered in the gable end is a shouldered, exterior chimney, which is constructed of random fieldstone in the portion below the shoulder, and with a brick stack rising from above the stonework. The brick stack continues for about 16 courses above the ridge line of the roof. The gable end is sided with clapboard-style lapped weatherboarding, as is found through the exterior of the frame part of the house. The brick portion of the chimney passes in front of the finished wood weatherboarding of the gable end, leaving a narrow gap. The chimney has a corbelled cap, matching the two brick chimneys on the frame part of the house. Near the center of the rear (west) elevation of the log building is a window that consists of a pair of side-hinged casements. A cut in the logs below the opening indicates that the opening in this location was originally a doorway. The door opening was partially closed-in to convert the opening to a window, as noted on the 1936 drawings. The logs have an indentation in them along the edge of the cut indicating where the logs had been cut to accommodate an exterior door casing that is no longer there.4 The log house’s current windows and doors have no architraves or casings beyond the narrow line of the exposed

2 Washington Star, July 30, 1939 (see Appendix F, page F-2).
3 The drawings for the 1936 project indicate that the joists that were to be taken out of the loft floor in the log room were to be used as the posts for this porch. The 1939 newspaper article about the project says that they were, in fact, moved to this location to serve this function. However, the current wood appears to be modern pine or fir, with a milled edge, apparently from a replacement project at some point after 1939.
4 This may be the rear door that Riley descendant Frances Hansbrough mentioned in recent oral history interviews. She remembers a door leading out from the rear wall of the house to the garden her father kept on the property.
and painted edge of the jambs (the door jamb on the east side of the house is not painted). Flanking the chimney in the log house’s north gable end, on either side there is a nearly-square, four-pane side-hinged casement window. The log house, like the larger frame section adjoining it, has a wood shingle roof and a box cornice with cut-out ornaments at the cornice ends.

The interior of the timber frame part of the house has plastered walls dating from 1936. The trim in most rooms consists of 1936 vintage mitered Colonial casings on the doors and windows. The only first story room with pre-1936 casings is the library (northeast room). It has surface-mounted mitered casings with applied back bands. The casings appear to date from before 1840. Below the stools of the library window are beaded aprons.

The mantelpieces at the three first story fireplaces are slightly different from one another, although each incorporates at least some elements that were added in the twentieth century, while a fourth mantelpiece dating entirely from before 1936 is found in the south bedroom, in the second story. The living room fireplace is larger than those found in the dining room and library, but it is also simpler and has fewer elements dating from the earlier period. The library mantelpiece consists of a mitered surround consisting of the same early-19th-century casing material found at the door and window openings. Above the casing is a wide frieze made of a single board ornamentally cut with ogival shapes at the ends, above which is the mantelshelf. At the inner edge of the casings, at the perimeter of the exposed area of the fireplace facing, is a delicate band of carved wooden ornament about 1/4” in width resembling a “string-of-pearls.” Although the moulding and “string-of-pearls” ornament appear to be of early 19th century vintage, the frieze and mantelshelf appear to date from the 1936 project. The mantelpiece in the adjoining dining room (northwest room) is similar in design, except that the mitered casing below the frieze appears to be composed of twentieth century materials. However, applied at the center of the dining room mantelpiece frieze is a rectangle of reeded wood that appears to be of 19th century vintage, perhaps re-used from an older mantelpiece.

The fireboxes of all four fireplaces were completely rebuilt in the 1936 project. Cast iron throat-and-damper systems were installed in the living room and library fireplaces at that time, and the throat of the dining room fireplace was sealed at part of the same project. The dining room fireplace has a shallow firebox and a facing of a cement finish (referred to as “cem. finish painted” on the 1936 drawings; the same drawings refer to the living room fireplace facing as a “cem. plaster”). The firebox of the library fireplace lined with firebrick and the fireplace opening has a red brick facing. The lining of the firebox at the living room fireplace is also firebrick, but the facing consists of a cement plaster, as indicated on the 1936 drawings. The firebox of the bedroom fireplace is lined with exposed brick. The date of the brick has not been determined.

Most other wooden finishes in the first story of the timber frame section of the house were scheduled for replacement in the 1936 drawings. Throughout the original three-room first story area, the flooring is wide random-plank pine boards. The 1936 drawings call for all new flooring in this area, but the flooring boards do not appear to be of 1936 vintage. The boards have a rough finish on the reverse side and are hewn in at the joists, characteristics of early wood flooring that suggest that they may not have actually been replaced in 1936. It is possible that the house’s original flooring either remained in place or was removed and reinstalled in the 1936 project, in spite of what the drawings say. The decision may have been made when the designers realized how difficult it is to remove and replace floor boards that have been cut in this way to match the uneven finish of a set of hewn log joists. The first story rooms have crown moulding and the dining room has a chair rail, all from the 1936 project. There are also built-in bookcases on two walls of the library dating from 1936, and in the dining room, there is a set of wood shelves above the mantelshelf, also dating from 1936. The dining room shelves are attached to a wall surface of vertical, random-width, beaded boards that extend from the mantelshelf to the ceiling.
In the kitchen wing, at the rear of the house, only a few of the details deviate from what the plans show when the wing was added in 1936. On the west wall of the room is a set of wooden base cabinets flanking the kitchen sink. The cabinets match what is shown on the 1936 drawings, except that the sink itself has been replaced and a section of wooden base cabinets that are similar in design has been added to the left of the sink, along the south wall of the room, creating an ell-shape countertop. On the drawings, the sink was to be open at the bottom, as was typical of kitchen sinks at the time. It was replaced with a ca.1960 sink that has an integral metal base cabinet. The countertop to the sides of the sink was shown on the drawings as having a linoleum top with a metal edge. The top surface has been replaced with mosaic tile, apparently in the 1960s or 1970s, using a type of mosaic tile that was popular at that time. Above the sink is a window. The window is flanked by wall cabinets as shown on the 1936 drawings. At the northwest corner of the kitchen is a small broom closet which still matches the design shown on the drawings. To the east of the broom closet is a small section of wall cabinets that were not shown on the 1936 drawings and do not match other details in the room. They have hardware and a type of construction often found in Hoosier-style freestanding kitchen cabinets from the early twentieth century. On the east wall of the kitchen are a refrigerator and a stove, modern appliances neither of which is shown on the 1936 drawings. In the northeast corner of the kitchen is a small broom closet which still matches the design shown on the drawings. The doorway accessed a pantry that formerly connected the kitchen to the dining room. The pantry was converted at some point after 1936 to a powder room. The wallpaper and flooring in this room are from the 1970s. Thus, the kitchen is a blend of intact details from the 1936 design and a number of details added since 1936. Enough authentic material remains and enough documentary information is found on the drawings that this room could be faithfully restored to its 1936 appearance, if desired.

The back porch is accessed from the kitchen. The doorway is located between the sink and the closet, just as it is shown on the 1936 drawings. The porch is a rectangular area of six feet by eight feet. The drawings show the porch as having open sides, but at some point in the 1930s or 1940s, the sides were closed in with large lights of glass in a wood frame above the balustrade.

The second story of the house contains three bedrooms and a bathroom. There is a bedroom above the kitchen, adjoining the bathroom, which is above the powder room, both of which are in the 1936 kitchen and master bedroom addition. They are at a lower level than the rest of the second story, accessed from a landing near the top of the stairs. The lower floor level allows the bedroom and bathroom to have nearly full-height walls. The other two bedrooms have sloped walls above a vertical knee-wall that is approximately three feet tall. The bedroom in the north half of the second story is ell-shaped, as a result of the location of the stairs and a short hallway above the top of the stairs leading into the south bedroom.

Within the original frame house, the interior chimney is apparent in each of the two bedrooms; however, only the south bedroom (above the living room) has a fireplace. The mantelpiece surrounding this fireplace appears to date from the early 19th century. Flanking this fireplace, the two gable end windows are quite different from one another. The one to the east of the chimney is a vertically oriented six-pane casement. The off-center location of the south chimney (see the discussion, above, on the fireplace in the living room, beneath this bedroom) makes it possible to have a larger window on the west side of the chimneybreast. The window in this location is a double sash 4/4, the only window of this style in the house. The windows flanking the chimney in the north bedroom are double hung 6/6, the style of window found in locations throughout most of the house.

The basement contains three sections: a laundry room beneath the kitchen, a fully excavated area adjoining the laundry beneath the dining room and part of the living room, and a partially excavated area with a dirt floor in the eastern half and southwestern corner of the frame section of the house. The frame section of the house has a stone foundation. The foundation of the 1936 kitchen wing is brick. Beneath the log room is only a cavity with no intended means of access, within the poured concrete foundation described in the discussion of the log house, above. The basement has metal casement windows. The
fully excavated areas of the basement have a poured concrete floor. A brick wall separates the fully excavated area beneath the western half of the frame house from the partially excavated area beneath the western half. The basement is accessed from the exterior by a small exterior stairwell leading a basement-level door at the southwest corner of the 1936 kitchen wing (the stairwell and door were constructed in 1936 in a different location from what was shown on the surviving set of plans).
CONDITION ASSESSMENT

Log House Condition Assessment

Detailed Architectural Description- The log wing of the Riley House is constructed of logs cut at some point after 1820. It was built so that it is structurally independent and may be referred to as a log house. The logs were dressed (hewn) with an ax to a nearly smooth vertical surface on the interior and exterior faces, although most of the sapwood is still intact in the rounded top and bottom portions of each log. In some cases, vestiges of bark are also still in place on these surfaces, where it has been concealed in chinking (the material filling the spaces between logs). The logs are joined at the corners with “V” notches, sometimes also called “steeple notches.” This style of notching, which was historically the most common kind of log joinery in the Mid-Atlantic Region and along routes from the Mid-Atlantic through the Appalachians, consists of an upside-down “V” shape cut into the bottom of every log at each end. The upper surface of the log was cut to create a corresponding convex triangular shape onto which the “V” notch was fitted at each joint.
In this style of joinery, the end view of each log is pentagonal and resembles the shape of a gabled house. The resemblance to a gable is not entirely a coincidence, as the joint is designed to shed water while also holding the log below and the log above tightly together. The water-shedding characteristic may explain why the “V” notch was as common as it was in the Mid-Atlantic region, which has a moist climate. In this region, the “V” notch is far more common than other kinds of notching, many of which are used to create joints that are more likely to retain water, such as lap joints.

The logs are held in place through gravity, with all the weight above a given joint pressing the “V” shape and the gable shape together and keeping them centered on one another at the vertex of the “V.” Either before or after they were assembled, extra pieces extending from the ends of the logs were trimmed (vertically) with a saw at the outer edge of each “V” shape, in order to give the building square corners. There is, however, a small area where the ends of the logs were not trimmed: at the southeast corner of the log pen, small segments of several logs in the east wall were left extending beyond the corner. The extra pieces were hidden in a cavity where the log and frame buildings almost touch; the cavity has been concealed for many years by a board covering. The extra segments of log are longer in the bottom two logs, although the ragged edge was also found at some of the uppermost logs at the same corner. A piece was trimmed from the extended area for investigation as a part of the present project.

Chinking and Mortar
The logs are chinked with stone and two different kinds of mortar. The older mortar is reddish-brown and appears to consist of local materials such as sand and clay. In spite of its make-up, the vestiges of older mortar are surprisingly hard. The mortar may be from the original construction, and the hardness may account for the fact that large sections of it appear to have survived, at least in the south wall. However, according to the ca.1936 drawings, the house was uniformly chinked again in the 1936 project with a modern mortar, apparently the present finish. The exposed material appears to be Portland cement-based. The work is called for in a note on the drawings, referring to the chinking materials simply as “stone and mortar,” but the drawings also say to “point [the walls] up smooth with cement and lime mortar.” Although the drawings imply that all the existing chinking was to be removed and replaced at that time, large areas of the old mortar were, in fact, left in place at least on the south wall of the log room, apparently because it was not necessary to replace all the mortar on the wall since it is not exposed to the elements on the opposite side. It appears, at least in the interior, that after the chinking stones and any new patches of heavier mortar were in place, a thin layer of a stronger material with a Portland cement base was applied over the joints to provide as smooth a surface as possible. The drawings also call for “2 coats of C.W. cement paint” on the exterior of the logs. The coating is apparent in some of the photographs taken of the exterior in the late 1930s. A vestige of the coating can still be seen in the interior side of the logs, but there is virtually no remaining evidence of it on the exterior side of the walls.
Alterations
The log wing at the Riley house qualifies as a log house rather than as a cabin by definition, as it was built of hewn logs with trimmed ends, has a stone chimney, and appears to have always had a foundation. It is unknown whether the house had a wood floor or an earthen floor in its original construction. Otherwise, the current log building is a “cabin” only in the sense that it was built as a one-room edifice with a loft. The logs are dressed and the ends are trimmed. The pattern of fenestration and door locations is relatively symmetrical (some of the openings have been changed, but the changes do not appear to have made it more symmetrical; the former rear doorway, for instance, was nearly centered, and now it is that wall’s lone window in the same location). Unfortunately, very little remains to indicate the original foundation design because most of the material below the bottom ring of logs now consists of a poured concrete footing extending to three feet below grade. The few stones and bricks at the edge of the foundation appear to have been placed there as decorative elements or at least altered as part of the project of pouring the concrete footing.

The floor of the log room is clearly not the original design. It is constructed of modern materials and supported by modern lumber at an elevation that would be too high for habitation had the loft floor not been removed. Notably, the floor was configured in an unusual way, placing it above the top of the second-from-the-bottom log (it actually appears to be one log higher on the west side of the house than on the east side). Thus, while the logs are closer to the soil line than they should be, the floor is high in relation to the ceiling and the heights of the windows. If the loft of the log house had not been removed in the 1936 project, the space would not be tall enough even for individuals of below-average height to stand up in. This limitation indicates that if the house had an earlier wood floor, it would have been at a lower point before the loft was removed.

It appears that the choice of where to place the current floor was driven as much by the new connection between the log and frame of the building as by the elevation of the grade line. If the floor had been placed a few inches lower, one more step would have been needed to enter the log room from the current dining room in the frame section of the house. The relative relationship between floor levels appears to have influenced the decision to remove the loft: it would have been impossible to create the current doorway connecting the log house to the frame house without removing at

---

2 However, if it could be proven that it was originally a kitchen, and the only kitchen the house had in the 1820s, then Henson’s description of a room with an earthen floor would be a description of this space.

3 The loft is mentioned in the caption of a photograph that appeared in a local newspaper published in the 1930s, depicting the house shortly after it had been renovated by the Bolten family (Star, 1939).

4 In excavating a builder’s trench unit at the edge of the foundation, the JMA team archeologists uncovered enough poured-in-place concrete to indicate that a new foundation had been poured in the twentieth century, apparently as part of the 1936 project.
least part of the loft, because the bottom edge of loft joists would have been located approximately three to three-and-a-half feet above the dining room floor.

The design of the log house has been altered in other ways as well, most likely all occurring in the 1936 project. The rear wall had a roughly centered doorway which was converted to a window in 1936, as per a note on the drawings. (The line of larger opening is still apparent, along with evidence that the opening had a casing recessed slightly into the logs.) The drawings depict the log walls as taller by at least 18 inches (approximately two more logs). This could be attributed to an inaccuracy in the way the existing conditions were drawn when the project began, but there are also other signs that the walls were altered. The rear elevation has two logs with square notches cut to receive the floor joists of the former loft. The notches are found less than five feet above the present floor, not high enough for the space to have contained a usable room. Additionally, there are two notched logs are in the west wall (one with the pockets oriented upward and the one above it in the inverted position), possibly a sign that the notched log from the front (east) wall was moved to the rear (west) wall during the 1936 project. Logs may have been moved from one wall to another in 1936 to make up for other logs that had to be removed and discarded to stabilize the structure because they were so badly rotted. This could have resulted in moving all the cut logs to the rear wall since the pockets were no longer necessary. With the joists removed, the pockets were filled with chinking.
Log House Conditions and Recommendations

The logs in the walls are generally in poor or damaged condition. However, the damage and other conditions problems arise from a variety of causes and date from different periods in the building’s history. Some of the problems are active or otherwise in need of attention at present. Many of the apparent problems, however, are merely the accumulation of years of damage, repair, and minor design changes that are not currently contributing to structural deterioration or instability. The walls are currently stable and generally plumb for a building of this type. The signs of damage that are apparent require careful review because correcting or reversing some of them conditions could do more damage than good. Therefore, what follows is an analysis of the weathered and slightly altered state of the building’s design; it is also an analysis that covers many kinds of minor deterioration and minor modifications most of which do not need to be corrected or reversed at this time.

Chinking and Mortar
The chinking and mortar are in good condition in most areas. In some areas, the original materials have been patched with inappropriate materials, such as standard gray Portland cement. Overall, though, the mortar and chinking have structural integrity. They also have nearly complete visual integrity based on their appearance after the 1936 renovation project, despite the small patches of Portland cement that appear to have been added more recently. Because of the high degree of integrity, it makes sense to avoid disturbing the chinking and mortar unless absolutely necessary.

In making future decisions about mortar and chinking repair, the following considerations may apply:

1. It would be unwise to seal the logs with a sealant that could trap moisture;
2. Integrity and period considerations, since the building is really a blend of two eras of design; while the design as a whole is largely intact to the way it looked prior to 1936, the patching methods used in 1936 (in spite of their historic appearance) were applied in ways that would not have been possible in the early nineteenth century with softer mortars; any decisions that are made regarding historic materials and integrity will need to address the philosophical questions of whether the future care of the building should involve treating the 1936 materials as historic or as inappropriate; and
3. Aesthetic considerations, since the layers of patches are in slightly different colors, making the most recent changes appear incorrect in contrast to the earlier earth-tone mortar colors.
4. The aesthetic and other issues relating to the accumulation of biological growth on the mortar patches on the north side of the house.

Portland-Cement-Based Patches on the Faces of Logs
There are several areas in the log walls where Portland cement mortar and in some cases a few chinking stones (and/or concrete) were used to fill in old gaps in the face of the logs. These areas generally appear to be stable and the patches appear to date mainly from the 1936 project or shortly afterward. However, there are actually several layers of patches in some places, where newer materials are patched over older ones. The patches are very hard, and they are shaped in a way that may direct moisture into the wood where it would become trapped by the impermeable Portland cement.

The patches do not appear to be currently causing active damage, although decay is occurring in other parts of the logs near them. The patches are representative of a twentieth century alteration to the building, but with the larger sections designed to look like nineteenth century chinking.

The kinds of mortar used prior to the 1880s would not have adhered in this way to the face of a piece of wood; the patches, therefore, were only possible after the development of Portland cement and similar materials.
The images above show some of the places where missing sections in the faces of logs were patched with a Portland-cement-based mortar at some point in the twentieth century. The patches were probably first installed in the 1936 project and patched again, over time, at the edges. Thin patches of this kind would not have been possible in the original construction because materials used before Portland cement became available could not be applied this way. Portland cement is an extremely hard material that behaves differently from the kinds of mortar used before 1880. Although the patches do not appear to be causing active damage, care should be taken in all future works to avoid sealing the stones and mortar more tightly to the wood. This is because the patches are shaped in a way that will make them more likely to trap moisture in the wood if the edges are sealed.
Beetle Damage

An example of early damage evident in the logs is the pattern of small holes resulting from beetle infestation on the west side of the chimney shoulder. While the holes made by the insects are easily seen, the kind of damage they represent is minor and is not by itself a cause for concern at this time. On the other hand, some logs are showing signs of decay as a result of moisture, and in those areas, the porous surface caused by the insect holes could be contributing to the moisture retention. It is important to keep rainwater and other sources of moisture away from the surface of the logs. It is also important not to disturb the drying process that occurs naturally in a porous material of this kind. In the drying process, the holes may be letting moisture back out as much as they are providing a way for it to get in. Some repairs and modifications that have been made over time are contributing to the retention of moisture and possibly other problems in the same locations.

The beetle damage appears to be from a hardwood species of powderpost beetles, an insect that was often present in freshly cut wood. Nests of powderpost beetle larvae typically hatched while the wood was still green, with each one boring its own exit path, resulting in the pattern of scores of tiny holes in the face of the timber. In most instances, the damage tends to be in the sapwood of the logs and can be negligible when the log retains sufficient structural integrity. For these reasons, beetle-damaged wood is often found in old buildings while other kinds of damaged wood would have been replaced long ago. The visible powderpost beetle damage at the Riley House is limited to a few logs, particularly short ones surrounding the chimney. At least one of these logs shows more recent damage from moisture. While the integrity of some logs may have been compromised by decay, the damage appears to be in locations where the compromised material is unlikely to contribute to structural destabilization of the remainder of the log enclosure.

Soil Line and Moisture

By contrast to the beetle damage, which is primarily aesthetic, the most serious problem with the logs is the fact that the soil line has been raised to a level that is too close to the bottom log. Any time that the soil line is less than six inches below the bottom log, there will be a strong possibility of two chronic problems of wooden buildings: moisture migrating up into the wood from wet soil and termites (and other insects) finding their way to the wood. Subterranean termites (the kind of termites found in Maryland) live primarily underground, and they generally can’t survive in the open air or in any other situation where they are kept above ground for prolonged periods of time. They are able to construct tubes that provide a protected path from the soil to the nearest wood, but generally they only do so when the wood is in close proximity to the soil line. Additional moisture is being conducted and retained by the ground plantings that touch the house. The moisture travels from leaves to the surface of the logs, but
much worse than this, in a completely shaded, confined environment, the wood never fully dries out. The migration and retention of moisture facilitate the growth of decay fungi and make the wood appealing to insects. The problem becomes compounded in a short period of time under certain circumstances, because at a certain point, the insect damage and decay can also lead to more retention of moisture.

**Areas with Moisture Retention and Signs of Active Decay**

There are signs of active decay in the exposed wood in a few areas that are close to the soil line. Some of these signs were observed specifically in areas where boxwoods or other plants have kept the logs in shade so that they do not dry out naturally.

The moisture problems are also compounded by the fact that some logs are located in areas that are always in shade as a result of the log house being a lower and smaller wing shaded by the larger form to the south of it. This is most apparent on the north side of the house, where biological growth is developing on the masonry of the chimney. The biological growth is more advanced in the hidden areas behind the boxwoods. Because it has been screened by the boxwoods, the moisture and decay in these hidden areas may have gone unnoticed for some time. For this reason, the boxwoods and other foundation plantings need to be removed (the boxwoods date to the 1960s or 1970s; see the Landscape Assessment, Appendix B.)

Foundation plantings in general, meaning anything taller and thicker than mown grass, are likely to contribute to moisture retention in several different ways and also to interfere with the building’s natural ability to dry out. Plants with dense root systems retain moisture in the soil, and thick shrubbery in particular keeps the soil in shade causing to be almost always moist. Boxwoods are especially problematic because they are dense, having large numbers of both small leaves and small branches. Boxwoods also have a leaf structure that tends to grow increasingly denser over time. They are dense enough to keep even the south-facing parts of the building in shade and they are thick enough to interfere with air flow.

Decay results from wood reaching a moisture level that invites decay fungi. Once the wood has reached the level of moisture that is supportive of the fungi, the wood can never again be considered structurally reliable. This principal is the same whether the wood is in tension, compression, or shear; however, moisture and decay are more critical issues for wood members placed in tension or shear, such as beams and joists, than they are for wood placed exclusively in compression. Structurally, log buildings consist of large amounts of wood stacked in a way that places them almost entirely in compression, the way that stones and bricks are traditionally used in building walls. Because each log consists of much more wood
than is needed to carry the loads placed above it, the structural system of most log buildings is highly redundant. As a result, log construction can tolerate more decay before it becomes a structural problem.

Over the years, decay, insect infestation, and other damage (such as shrinking and checking until cracks opened in the individual logs) have done more damage to the exterior half of each log at the Riley House than is typical of log houses of this period. However, the decay and damage do not represent a structural problem at this time. On the other hand, it will become a problem if the wood remains moist and more damage occurs. For this reason, the moisture retention problems must be addressed as soon as possible. Additionally, it is recommended that testing be undertaken during the design phase of future rehabilitation projects to determine the exact level of damage and the specific design strategy. A wood science specialist, for instance, can do sample borings to determine the amount of wood missing as a result of insect damage in hidden areas of the logs.

The issues surrounding the methods used in twentieth century patches, moisture retention, and decay all need to be considered in relation to one another. Because of the visual integrity of the mortar and patches installed in the 1930s, it is appropriate to treat the restoration techniques dating from that time period as historic details of the building as it now stands. An attempt to reverse the subtle changes made in the 1930s combined with steps that may need to be taken to reduce moisture retention could easily lead to a perceived need for extensive replacement of materials. Extensive replacement, however, is not recommended; what is recommended is to work with the patches and changes made in the 1930s. Because moisture retention may be occurring behind Portland-cement-based patches, as discussed above, some of the patches may need to be removed.

East elevation window, facing Old Georgetown Road. The patch below the window was made when the floor was raised and the window was greatly shortened from below.

West elevation window, rear elevation of the house. The patch below the window was made when the floor was raised and a former doorway was reduced in size to become a window.
Cuts in Logs from Re-aligned Door and Window Openings
The alterations that were made at both the east and west windows of the log house do not represent problems at the moment. However, it is important to note that the walls have been patched in this way, as the patches may be subject to future problems since they are not part of the adjoining logs and may have been made using much younger wood. The patch on west elevation, where the spliced-in logs appear to have been new in 1936, is due to the fact that what is now a window was formerly a doorway. The patch on the east elevation, where a section of an older log appears to have been used, may be additional evidence that the rotted logs were removed from the bottom of the building in the 1936 project, as the apparent window sill location is unusually low to the ground. As a result of such a change, the sill of the existing window opening would have moved down with the rest of the wall to a point where it was uncomfortably low with respect to the line of the new floor system installed at that time. Proportionally, the older opening suggests that a 6/6 double hung window was formerly in this location. The opening was probably reduced for aesthetic reasons, to create a smaller window which is proportionally wider. It is also possible that the decision was made to replace that unit in 1936 with a casement on the theory that it would look more Colonial in character.

Animal Hole at Base of Rear Wall
A missing section of log was noted in the bottom of the west wall of the log house during the data collection stage for this historic structure report. Other signs were noted as the project proceeded indicating that an animal, such as a groundhog or a skunk, may have been living in the space beneath the floor. When an opening was cut in the floor to investigate conditions around the chimney, a definite animal odor was noticed. The hole has since been filled with stones. However, it needs to be permanently closed-in with chinking and mortar. (It may also be wise to place a ventilation opening in the area as well, depending upon the final design and use of the log building.)

The animal hole before it was filled (left) and the crawl space as seen from the hole (right).

The animal hole was filled with stones during the course of the project. This was a good temporary solution, as it will keep larger animals out and still allows for ventilation.
The images on the left show that at least one of the V-notch joints has moved out of alignment so that the logs no longer touch. The movement may have been due to settling or to the logs having warped as they dried. The movement occurred some time ago, as indicated by the apparent age of the patch. Alignment problems in the logs are apparent in the area around the rear window casing, as seen in the two images on the right. In this case, the unevenness does not appear to represent a structural problem at this time.
Summary of Recommendations for Log House

- Choose the appropriate treatment strategy, including period that each room is to reflect, and base decisions on which building materials to keep, replace, repair, or otherwise change on a clear and unified approach to historic preservation standards and interpretation needs.

- Treat the logs to remove biological growth.

- Fill some openings from beetle damage and other kinds of damage/rotting, as well as openings from deterioration of mortar, but do not do so in a way that traps moisture at the bottom of each open area.

- The moisture retention problems must be addressed as soon as possible, particularly by removing shrubbery and diverting roof water away from the logs.

- Additional material testing to evaluate the solidity of the wood, moisture content, and other factors of the wood should be conducted by a wood science specialist in areas where the wood is moist as part of future design work. The material testing should be followed by additional analysis by a structural engineer. Perform additional analysis of the structural properties, wood conditions, and other aspects of the logs as part of the design phase.

- Limit corrections to mortar patches to removal of Portland cement, filling of upper edges and small openings where the new patch will not retain water, and similar conditions. Use a mortar mix that is compatible with the 1936 patches or softer. Allow for weep holes along bottom edges of patches. Treat patches and changes made in the 1930s as part of the building’s history, both to meet historic preservation standards and to avoid creating larger problems (such as the need to replace wood and chinking in larger areas).

- Correct openings along the base of the log perimeter (e.g., the animal hole on the west wall) and the loose logs beside the chimney. The animal hole at base of rear wall needs to be permanently closed-in with chinking and mortar. It is also recommended to place a ventilation opening in the area as well, depending upon whether the final design and use of the log building includes a crawl space.

- Replace the roof, in total (log house and frame house), as soon as possible.

- Scrape and prepare all previously painted exterior surfaces, and repaint.

- Leave log surfaces exposed on the interior and re-patch chinking to match the most recent design, but with a mortar that is as soft as possible.

- Keep Celotex ceiling in place and cover it with wood (to resemble the bottom side of the wood lath used in shingle roofs, or used this kind of a wood design in place of the Celotex. Install riven rafters to create the appearance of the bottom side of a typical 1820s log house roof.

- Re-install the loft floor, using hand-hewn oak timbers and pine flooring.
• Lower the floor of the room as much as needed to allow for appropriate head room below the loft floor joists. Consider making it a concrete floor that has a finish that resembles an earthen floor.
Log Houses vs. Log Cabins

The log wing at 11420 Old Georgetown Road has historically been referred to as a “cabin,” including in the label for the room on the 1936 drawings. One common definition for the word “cabin” is a one-room house, sometimes with a half story or loft above the one main room, and often constructed using a simple or rustic technique such as stacking horizontal logs. There is a tendency in modern American culture to refer to all buildings constructed of log walls as “cabins,” almost as if the two words mean exactly the same thing. However, an important distinction was drawn in the nineteenth century between log cabins and log houses. The term “log cabin” was customarily reserved for buildings that had been erected quickly on the frontier with the bottom logs resting directly on the top soil. Most log cabins consisted of a single room with a dirt floor. According to many accounts, such buildings were common in an early phase of frontier settlement. Some accounts note that round (un-hewn) logs were most often used for this type of building. Log cabins of this type did not survive because of the exposure to moisture and insects. A later phase of construction followed, a few years later, in which the log cabin was replaced on most farms with an entirely new log building, a house constructed for permanence, using hewn logs on a stone foundation.

The log cabin, in its crude form, was not only used on the frontier. It appears that both log cabins and log houses were found in use as quarters for enslaved workers on plantations. Some of the hewn log houses have survived, while there are also many references in writing to log cabins with crudely constructed walls and earthen floors. This may be the kind of building Josiah Hendon refers to as “log huts” in his autobiography: “Our lodging was in log huts, of a single small room, with no other floor than the trodden earth, in which ten or a dozen persons--men, women, and children--might sleep, but which could not protect them from dampness and cold, nor permit the existence of the common decencies of life.” (Henson, 1849, page 7)

The idea of the “log cabin” became greatly romanticized as a political symbol, especially from the presidential campaign of William Henry Harrison in 1840 to the presidency of Abraham Lincoln. At the beginning of this period in American history, saying someone was born in a log cabin was a way of suggesting that the person wasn’t sophisticated enough to hold public office. Politicians turned this stereotype around and began using “born in a log cabin” as a way of saying the candidate was a true American, like so many other voters who had been born on the frontier. Ever since this chapter in American history, the term “log cabin” has conjured up images that are iconic and deeply embedded in the American psyche. Another result, however, is that the term now tends to be used in an imprecise way that confuses several different aspects of the architectural history behind these buildings.
Log Buildings as Quarters for Enslaved Workers

After a frontier family had lived for a year or two in a temporary “log cabin,” they often built a second log building using hewn logs, intending this time to build for permanence. In the hewn form, the logs were a structural material that served as an alternative to brick, stone, or wood frame wall construction. Unlike log cabins, log houses had floors with excavated cellars or at least crawl spaces beneath them. The use of dressed logs was a step toward a more finished house in which the logs could be eventually covered with wood siding. However, in these buildings, the hewn logs were seen as an expedient way to create a structure, rather than as the finished product with an aesthetically acceptable exterior appearance. As a result, the log houses with foundations or floors more frequently had symmetrically placed windows and doors, and trimmed corners, and other details that made them suitable for a later installation of an outer layer of siding and trim.

Virtually all of the earlier era’s log “cabins,” on the other hand, had disappeared by the middle or end of the 19th century as a result of decay, particularly after they had been replaced by log houses or more refined dwellings. With logs resting directly on moist soil, the cabins had been susceptible to insect infestation and decay fungi entering the walls from the soils into the bottom logs. While it was possible to disassemble and reconstruct a log cabin on a foundation when a family decided to improve the quality of their living space, it was also highly unlikely. It was easier to achieve straight and flush walls and avoid carrying decay and insects into the new house by starting over with new unseasoned logs that could be more easily trimmed and hewn. Any seasoned logs (logs that had time to dry after cutting), on the other hand, were much more difficult to alter using hand tools.

The choice to use logs to build buildings had to do with what was available at the construction site as well as the knowledge and tools that were available to the builders. Among the different kinds of materials used for construction in the 18th and early 19th centuries, logs were carried the shortest distance. Log construction was a logical choice if a stand of suitable trees was in existence at a location that would be suitable for the building in the long run. The largest logs were used at the bottom of the walls, and because of their weight, the building was erected as close as possible to the location where the trees with the largest girth had grown. As a result, some log house experts report finding the stump from which the largest log was cut in the crawl space if the house was not built over an excavated cellar.
Frame House Condition Assessment

Detailed Architectural Description - The Tidewater Frame House and the Tidewater region
The frame portion of the Riley House is representative of a type of timber frame construction that was characteristic of the Tidewater areas of Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia (and some areas further south along the coast) in the 18th and early 19th century. The timber frame construction tradition of the Chesapeake Tidewater area differed from similar traditions in New England, the Dutch Settlements of New York, and other areas of the eastern seaboard such as Pennsylvania and New Jersey. This uniquely American style of framing evolved from the British building traditions on which it was based. It is a transitional form, with similarities to both the framing techniques that preceded it and those that followed it. The basic elements of the framing tradition were brought by settlers from the British Isles and were used in houses in the coastal areas of the United States where people from the British Isles settled. Several characteristics of the Tidewater frame developed as ways to improve on the framing techniques of the earliest examples of Anglo-American buildings, which are sometimes referred to as “Post-Medieval.” By the mid-19th century, these improvements led to other developments in American framing systems, and by the end of the American Civil War, methods for framing houses were evolving so rapidly that there was a marked different in appearance that distinguished the newer houses from the earlier Tidewater examples.
Geographically, the Tidewater frame also differs from some construction techniques used west of the Tidewater area in the Piedmont and Appalachian Mountain areas. The Riley House is found just west of the Fall Line, where the Tidewater area ends and the topography rises to form the Piedmont landscape. It is therefore near the western edge of the geographic domain traditionally associated with this type of framing. The V-notched log wing of the house, on the other hand, is an example of a construction type that is more typical of areas west of Montgomery County and carried by settlers along routes through the Trans-Appalachian frontier as it developed beginning in the latter half of the 18th century. Although the cultural geography lines that define these areas are generalizations based on field observations, and although examples of each tradition may be found on both sides of the fall line, the co-existence of a Tidewater frame house and a V-notched log house at this one site makes the site representative of two distinct cultural traditions.

Slightly Asymmetrical Floor Plans
The early frame houses in the Chesapeake Tidewater area were usually no more than one-and-a-half stories in height, one to two rooms wide, and from one to two rooms deep. The interior organization, if more than one room, was usually not symmetrical; instead, it included one larger room (hall) and at least one smaller room (parlor). The interior floor of the early Tidewater frame houses plans did not usually include a center hallway or a center chimney. Rooms were oriented toward focal points, such as fireplaces on the outside walls located in relation to chimneys that were centered in the gable ends. Staircases were not placed as focal points, but often occurred as a small enclosure placed in a corner. The typical asymmetry of the interior layout was usually reflected in a slightly asymmetrical pattern of fenestration and door openings.

The façade of the Riley House was originally less symmetrical than it is now. The location of the windows was probably selected to avoid conflicts with corner braces in the hidden framework. When the house was rehabilitated in 1936, the older, narrow windows were replaced with wider units with approximately the same number of sashes. An 8/8 window pane arrangement was used in the library (northeast corner room), probably because the room was not wide enough for two window openings. Use of an 8/8 unit in this room provided a slightly wider opening and a little more light than would have been provided by one of the 6/6 units that were used in the living room part of the façade. In arranging the new windows, however, the openings were moved just enough to make the spacing seem more uniform and to make the asymmetry less obvious. Placing shutters that nearly filled the space between the openings further disguised the irregularities.

---

1 The two-room plan of the Tidewater frame house is referred to as a “hall and parlor” house by some architectural historians and cultural geographers. The use of the word “hall,” in this case, is a reference to historic influence coming down from the large space at the core of the medieval English house. Use of the term sometimes leads to confusion with the modern concept of a hall being that of a corridor, such as a stair hall; not all scholars use the terms consistently.
The current spacing between window and door openings (bottom right image) provides a sense of symmetry that was not there before 1936 (bottom left image, published in 1919).
The Three Room Plan
The original frame portion of the Riley House is currently laid out as a three-room plan, with a room that is the full depth of the house in the southern part of the first floor and two smaller rooms to the north of it. The larger room has a fireplace in a wide chimneybreast, at the chimney that rises above the south gable end. The two smaller rooms have corner fireplaces served by a shared chimney in the north gable end. Several examples of similar three-room floor plans are found among early Montgomery County houses. This arrangement may be the original design of the Riley House, in conformance with these other examples.

Although the 1936 replacement of all the plaster (and possibly also the floor boards) took away almost all the definitive evidence of earlier wall configurations, the limited evidence that remains may point to the possibility that the house once had more rooms in the first story. The living room fireplace is off-center, a possible indication that the room was once divided. There is also an exposed summer beam in the ceiling that makes it clear that the chimney stack is entirely in the east half of the room. It meets the south wall of the room alongside the chimneybreast. This is a highly unusual condition, as the chimneybreast could have easily been made wider or moved over to relate it visually and structurally to the beam. The beam is rough-hewn and looks as if it was never intended to be exposed. A note on the 1936 drawings suggests that the summer beam was exposed at the time the project began and not incorporated into a wall. The note indicates that it was to be cleaned as part of that project to remove a coating of whitewash.

A Riley family descendant (Frances Mace Hansbrough) has indicated in an oral history interview that she remembers the house as having two first story bedrooms in the 1920s. The two bedrooms, if she is remembering the rooms accurately, were not in the front half of the house, so they would have been in addition to the eastern half of the present living room and the room currently known as the library. The current dining room, on the other hand, being in the back half of the first story, could have been one of the bedrooms Mrs. Hansbrough remembers.

These clues may indicate that the current living room was once divided into more than one room, perhaps with a partition that had been removed before the 1936 project began. Therefore, it is possible that the three-room plan is not the original configuration.
Distinguishable Components of the Tidewater Frame
The timber frame portion of the Riley House has a variety of distinguishable details that can be seen through openings in the plaster or floor boards or by observing the exposed first floor joists that are visible from the basement. The vertical framing members (studs and braces) were observed for the purposes of preparing this report by photographing them through small openings cut in the interior plaster of the house’s façade wall (west elevation) in the investigation phase of the project. The horizontal sills/plates to which the vertical members are tied were also observed through these openings, though at a greater distance. The framing details found in the floor framing and in the wall cavities vary both in the character of the visible wood and in the techniques used from one area to another, although they are all consistent with late 18th/early 19th century framing. For instance, some of the studs have a smooth finish (from being worked to a smooth finish by an adze or a plane) while others are either weathered from exposure to moisture or have rougher ax marks from when they were hewn. However, all the late-18th/early-19th century framing members that were observed appear to be contemporary with one another and consistent with framing techniques used between the 1790s and 1820s.

While the Framework is Intact, Nearly All Surface Materials at Frame House Date from 1936
The building’s original framework, as a whole, appears to be almost entirely as it was originally built. Almost all of the frame house’s surface materials, on the other hand, were replaced in the twentieth century. In the 1936 project, the drawings called for removing and replacing both the exterior siding and most of the interior plaster, as well as the first story floor boards. In so doing, nearly all the historic wall and ceiling surface materials were removed and discarded except in one or two small areas, and new studs were nailed in place within the framework both to reinforce the original studs and to fill the larger gaps between them. As was typical of braced timber frame houses, the studs were much further apart than the twentieth century norm of 16”. In timber frame buildings from before the Civil War, it was most common to have a hierarchy of studs, with the largest pieces of wood appearing at the corners followed by studs of a similar size at the one-half or one-fourth points of the wall and then smaller studs in between. This pattern could place the nearest studs at an interval of 24 to 36 inches. With gaps of this dimension between the studs, the wall surfaces on either the interior or exterior side of the wall, or both, could be uneven because the smallest studs were not as deep as the larger ones. The framing was usually done with lumber that was not yet dry, and as a result, additional unevenness was likely as framing members dried and warped. The extensive replacement of materials in 1936 may have been motivated by a need to address water or insect damage or apparent structural instability, but it also provided an opportunity to make the walls more uniform and plumb than they appeared to be in photographs taken ten to twenty years before the project.
THE TIDEWATER FRAME HOUSE FORM:

The Tidewater frame house evolved from the house forms of Medieval England. While some houses in eastern and central Maryland and eastern Virginia were built in the seventeenth century with designs and details that are recognizable as Post-Medieval English, a distinctively American variation appeared by the late seventeenth century. 18th Century buildings in the Tidewater Region with strong elements of Post Medieval English architecture were often constructed of brick and sometimes had Jacobean era features, like composite chimneys with diagonally-placed stacks. Some of these early buildings could easily be mistaken for buildings built in England, like the Keeling House in Virginia Beach, the Jones House near Newport News, or the Long House in Salisbury, North Carolina. On the other hand, the Tidewater tradition was distinctively American by a few decades later, and it continued to be the dominant form for small houses in the counties east of the Fall Line through the middle of the 19th century. Although many small gabled houses were built in the Tidewater Region in this period in brick, it was largely the innovations in wood detailing and frame construction that resulted in details that were uniquely American. Americans also adopted a less steep roof form as other roofing materials came to replace the thatched roofs used almost universally in England.

The prototypical Tidewater frame houses are consistently small, usually between one and four rooms. However, in this tradition, small houses appeared as the residences of wealthy farmers as well as poorer ones. Some of the owners of larger farms built several Tidewater frame houses on the same tract, as the need grew for buildings to house members of an extended family, as well as tenants, staff, and enslaved workers. Although the larger brick or stone houses in the same region often follow the highly developed architectural fashions of their Georgian and Federal eras, some farmers of means continued to build small frame houses in the Tidewater vernacular tradition for over a century.

Illustrations of English and American framing from Glassie, Folk Housing in Middle Virginia. The left image above is a very old English tradition using curved framing members, known as "cruck framing." The second example is the more common "jettied framing" used in medieval England. The two images on the right are of false plate cornices using a board as the false plate, as found at the Riley House.
THE FALSE PLATE AND BOX CORNICE DETAILS:
The boxed cornice is a typical detail that appears on Tidewater houses. It appears in almost all examples of frame Tidewater construction except when the lower edge of the roof is obscured by a porch or an addition whose roof continues from the main roof slope. The boxed cornice evolved with a distinctive American framing detail known as a false plate. The boxed cornice was the outward expression of the detail. The false plate evolved as a variation on a “raising plate,” a horizontal member placed at the top of the wall and located so that the bottoms of the rafters can be secured to it. In older types of construction, the joists of the attic level were joined into the top plate of the wall with mortise and tenon joints, so that the top surface of the joists was in the same plane as the top surface of the walls. The rafters were seated into the plate, with or without an overhang at the eaves, and they rose to a lap joint at the ridgeline. In this framing system, when deterioration or overloading of the roof (such as during a heavy snow) led to structural failure, the failure was likely to begin with the rafters pushing the plate outward, causing the tenons of the attic joists to slip out of their mortises so that the attic floor could begin collapsing into the story below. As American framing traditions developed, it became apparent that the triangle formed by the roof rafters and attic floor could act more effectively as a separate structural system placed on top of the top plate of the walls. In the consequent design innovation, the attic joists were usually cut to a length a little more than a foot longer than the width of the house, and then secured on top of the wall plate (frequently with a lap joint) so that there was an overhang of about six inches at either of the house’s two long elevations. A second horizontal member above the wall plate, called a “false plate,” was secured to the top of the joists, and the rafters were placed so that they were seated onto the top surface of this plate with no additional overhang (i.e., the bottoms of the rafters ended at the edge of the false plate).

Sometimes the false plate was a square hewn timber, approximately four inches by 4 inches, recessed in joints cut into the joists either just above the wall plate or just beyond the face of the wall. One way of seating the false plate was to cut V-shaped grooves in the joists and place the 4x4 plate on a diagonal to match the slope of the roof. This was called a titled false plate. The more common arrangement, though, as found at the Riley House, was to nail a thinner board, approximately one to two inches thick and approximately eight to twelve inches wide, directly onto the top of the joists and use this board in the seating of the rafters.

The false plate evolved in response to the moist American climate and the kinds of materials available in the New World. It was an important step as Americans moved away from using thatching as a roofing material. The horizontal extensions of the heavy-profiled attic floor joists lent themselves to the creation of a “box-shaped” finish, so that heavy cornices with horizontal soffits became an almost universal characteristic of Tidewater houses. The consequent overhang of materials below the surface of the roof provided some protection of the exterior walls from moisture by diverting rain as it ran off the shingles. This was especially important as the change from thatch to wood shingle roofing in American construction reduced the thickness of the roofing material and the amount of the overhang in the roofing material itself.

The extension of the attic floor joists beyond the walls contributed to the stability and longevity of the Tidewater houses, particularly because it made it almost impossible for the weight of the roof to cause the walls to bow out or for the roof to slump into a saddle shape, both of which are common problems in the gradual decline of older buildings where the rafters are tied directly to the top of the walls. However, while this innovation represented a move toward making the roof into a unified structure, rafters continued to be installed without a unifying ridgepole at their upper ends. Ridgepoles arrived as a later innovation that developed generally across the country about 1830. The frame portion of the Riley House does not have a ridgepole, and thus it reflects the older traditions; however, notably, metal nails (as opposed to wood pegs) were used in the lap joints at the ridge, a fastening method that would not have been available to most builders until about 1800 at the earliest.
Studs Were Reinforced in 1936 Making the Wall Cavities Deeper
In the 1936 project, new two-inch dimensioned wood was nailed to at least one side of each stud and to two or three sides of each corner post with the new wood extending the depth of the wall cavity in both directions. As a consequence, the original studs are not touched by either exterior sheathing material or the panel-lath layer of the interior wall plaster. While this technique preserved the original framework and reinforced its structural properties, it also resulted in the loss of nearly all original plaster and nearly all original sheathing and siding. Additionally, it added about two inches to the exterior dimensions of the house, and took away about the same amount in each direction in each of the house’s interior spaces.

Log Floor Joists
Most of the wood used in framing the house consists of hewn pieces that are approximately 3” by 4”, the exception being the joists supporting the first floor, which are undressed logs about 10” in diameter. The first floor was the only part of the house’s framework where whole logs were used as part of the system. As seen from the basement, the logs retain bark on most of their curved surfaces, although the tops of the logs were hewn to create a flat surface for the floor boards they support. The ends of the logs were cut in from the bottom to give each one a straight surface where they bear on the house’s sills. Surrounding the diagonal shape of the corner chimney below the dining room, some complicated joints were cut to place a diagonal log under the hearth, perhaps originally to support a hearth box (the hearth was rebuilt in the 1936 project). The floor boards were individually trimmed at the joists to match the hewn top surface of each log as perfectly as possible, a typical technique in the era. (This finishing technique, together with some other characteristics, points to the possibility that the first story’s floor boards were not replaced in 1936, despite what the drawings say, or that the original floorboards were removed and reinstalled in
approximately the same location; another possibility is that they were replaced by a skilled craftsman who knew how to replicate the late 18th/early 19th century method for doing this.)

*Framing members above the Line of the First Floor*

Framing members used above the line of the first floor are generally hewn to a size of approximately 3” by 4”. Diagonal braces are found tying the studs and sills together near the house’s corners. The hewn studs and braces vary from remarkably straight members that were dressed, apparently by an adze, with the characteristic wavy surface of a hand dressed wood, but done so carefully no obvious tool marks (imperfections cutting across the grain, etc.) were apparent in the studs that were observed. The members were dressed so precisely that they appear as if they had been planed in some areas, to slightly warped and twisted members in other instances. Some of the framing members have surfaces that appear to have been weathered, possibly a sign of long-term exposure to rain water or other forms of moisture coming in through the walls or the edge of the roof in some sections of the original wall cavities. No sawn surfaces were observed on the studs. (It was common in the 18th and early-19th centuries to dress a square section of wood on four sides with adzes and similar cutting tools and then saw the piece of wood down the center with a pit-saw or similar tool to create two studs; when studs of this kind are found, the saw marks found on one out of four sides of the members can provide evidence of age; although it is possible that such saw marks may be found in the future, no such sawn surfaces were observed in the limited number of openings that were cut for analysis in this project.)
Framing of the Roof

The roof was framed using a false plate. The false plate appears as a thick board nailed on top of the rafters just beyond the plane of the exterior wall. The rafters rise from the plate to a nailed lap joint at the ridge. They are held in place laterally by the sheathing as there is no ridge board. However, they are also supported near the mid span by knee walls that define the east and west sides of the second story bedrooms. The pairs are numbered with Roman numerals. Numbers of this kind were used, according to tradition, when a master carpenter was cutting the lumber to size in advance and the actual assembly was to be undertaken by other workers, sometimes journeymen who finished the job after the master carpenter had done his part.

In most areas of the attic cavity, the plate details (where the rafters are seated into the ends of the joists just above the exterior walls) are difficult to see because of a large amount of blown-in insulation. These images were taken through a small hole cut into the back wall of the bedroom closet just south of the stairs. A small section of the false plate is visible in the image on the right (in the circled area). It is a "board false plate" using a thick board, about 2½”–3” thick. The uniform sheathing boards are an indication that the original sheathing was probably replaced in 1936. In the center image, the vertical line on the left is a stud (possibly modern lumber in this case) within the bedroom kneewall, which provides some support to the rafters.

This image shows the lap joints at the tops of the rafter pairs, as seen in the attic. Although lap-jointed pairs without a ridge board are a common trait of house construction up to about 1830, the use of nails rather than pegs to hold the joints together did not become possible until at least the 1790s. A more likely date would be the 1820s. The Roman numeral “III” (or it may be a four, rendered in this case as “IIII”) is barely visible to each side of the joint.

The image on the left shows a row of lath nails in a wall cavity inside the front wall of the house. Only a few nails were found, in a row on one stud, while the nails were missing on several others studs that were checked. They were apparently left behind when the original plaster was stripped as part of the 1936 project. Several nails (see above right) were extracted for study. They are cut nails with flat hammered heads, and they appear to date from 1800-1820. Because the plaster is missing, there is no way to know for certain whether they are original, i.e., whether the plaster and lath had been replaced at any point.
Exterior Finishes
In the 1936 project, the older exterior finishes were removed and replaced with new diagonal sheathing and new Colonial Revival style wood siding. The siding resembles Colonial era clapboard siding, with a tapered or feathered profile. Although the siding is very similar to what was on the house in the early twentieth century (see the detail from the 1919 photograph, below), that siding was not the original. The original siding appears to have been wide boards, possibly with beaded edges. A few remnants of these wider siding boards can be seen in the cavity between the frame and log sections of the house. The boards are about 14 inches from top edge to bottom edge. There is some evidence of a bead (or a similar decorative edge added with a plane), a common technique to finish the bottom edges of siding boards used in houses of this style in the 18th and early 19th centuries. In the photographs that show the house in approximately 1919, the siding consists of uniform narrow boards. There is one major difference between the pre-1936 siding and the present siding: the present design has very narrow corner boards, about one inch wide, while the pre-1936 siding had corner boards that were approximately four to six inches wide.

Comparison of the siding in the 1919 image of the house (left) to the present (right) shows that the boards are now slightly wider and more uniformly spaced. There is an even greater difference in the appearance of the vertical corner boards.

Remnants of siding boards up to 14 inches in width, with what appears to be a thin vestige of paint, were found in the cavity between the log house and the frame house. Their presence in this cavity shows that either: a). the frame house was built first, or b). the log house was moved to its present location after the frame house was
Decorative Exterior Details
The 1936 changes to the house included numerous details that were characteristic of an “academic” approach to the Colonial Revival style. These details were not really “restoration” of a particular design for a house at this location, but rather the adoption of attractive details seen at other locations in houses of Colonial vintage. Examples would include the use of louvered shutters and historic-style shutter hardware, the creation of an architrave at the doorway using fluted pilasters, the decorative collector boxes at the tops of the rain leaders, and the jig-sawn end brackets on the box cornice. While these components of the house are generally in good condition and almost all appear to be intact to the 1936 design (with little evidence of later modifications), they are mostly decorative embellishments for the sake of reviving the spirit of the Colonial era rather than being a restoration of the unique characteristics of this house as it existed before 1936.

Exterior of 1936 Kitchen Wing
The rear wing added to the house in 1936 is designed to blend in with the historic massing and Colonial Revival style embellishments of the older frame part of the building. The wing was created with a taller, thinner profile in order to accommodate a bedroom over the kitchen with nearly full-height second story side walls. It also has a bathroom with standard fixtures that would have been difficult to place in the attic-like rooms of the original second story.
While it is framed with standard lumber on a concrete block foundation and has other characteristics of twentieth construction, the addition was wrapped in the same exterior siding and wood shingle roofing as the older house to make the addition match as closely as possible. The same style of windows was used in the addition as used throughout the house in the 1936 project, standard multi-pane wood sash units. The arrangement of the panes in nearly all the windows is 6/6, although some variations do appear. There are some places where the windows are placed at different levels due to conflicts with interior fixtures and cabinets and similar design issues. As a result, the spacing of the openings, driven by interior considerations, gives the addition a slightly different character from the older part of the house. In general, from the back yard, the addition has the appearance of a highly intact 1930s design.

*Rear Porch*

The rear porch accessing the west doorway to the kitchen uses detailing that is characteristic of the 1930s. An example is the porch enclosure, which consists of a framework of posts and rails with multi-pane sashes at eye-level and solid wood panels below. The panels are comprised of strips of bead-board held in place by mitered mouldings that are similar in profile to picture rail. The sashes are 9-pane units with two units placed side-by-side in each of the three exterior sides of the porch. The porch has a shed roof and is accessed by a set of brick steps. The porch floor is wood and is supported on two brick piers. Diamond-pattern lattice encloses most of the area between the piers.

*Dining Room to Patio Door and Stoop Now Converted to a Window*

In the original 1936 design, there was a doorway to the exterior in the southeast corner of the kitchen wing. Located at the south end of the small hallway that extends from the southwest corner of the dining room, it provided access to the patio area southwest of the house. This doorway was part of a set of design decisions, modern in their thinking, that show that either the owner or the architect had a flexible approach in mind that would accommodate a variety of dining styles and leisure activities, ranging from the formal to the informal. For instance, the butler’s pantry, separating the kitchen and dining room in the northern half of each room, provided a way to have formal dining without bringing the guests into direct contact with the kitchen. On the other hand, the hallway leading to the side door provided a small vestibule where, if the door to southeast corner of the kitchen were kept open, guests could have ready access to the kitchen facilities as well as the living room, dining room, and patio. This design made it possible to entertain casually in an informal atmosphere using both interior and exterior spaces. Although the door was converted to a window at some point, the exterior stoop, constructed of brick with a flagstone cap, is still in place.
Screened-in Side Porch

A second porch was added at the south end of the living room in the 1936 design. A nearly square space with a floor of brick pavers, it is only a few inches above grade. Essentially, as shown on the 1936 drawings, it was a covered patio space. The screens that enclose the space from the sides were apparently installed at some point after the roof and columns were built. The screens are attached to lightweight strips of painted wood which are fastened to the columns. An additional layer of unpainted wood on the inner side of the enclosure appears to be from a recent screen replacement project. Since screen enclosures of this kind are constructed of lightweight strips of wood and wire mesh, both of which are prone to fail within twenty or thirty years, it is quite likely that the enclosure has been rebuilt at least once.

The location of the screened-in porch at the house’s south end makes sense from the point of view of passive solar design, as it shades the side of the house that is most exposed to the midday sun. Lorenzo Winslow would have been aware of some of the principals now referred to as passive solar design. Placing such a large porch at this location creates a reserve of cool air that can be brought through the house by opening doors and windows and operating fans. It provided a large place for cooler air to collect in the mornings and to circulate through the house later in the day by cross ventilation.

The porch’s roof is a gabled form projecting outward from the house’s south wall. The massing of the porch mimics that of the log wing, giving the house a sense of symmetry and hierarchy. The exposed rafters and similar exposed and unpainted wood details are characteristic of the design of exterior spaces in the 1930s back-to-nature movement, which went hand-in-hand with that decade’s phase of the Colonial Revival. Despite the vulnerability of exposed lumber, the rafters and other visible framing members of the porch roof appear to be intact and in good condition.

The columns supporting the porch roof are softwood, either second growth pine or fir. Although the 1936 drawings say to re-use the joists of the log house loft in this location, the current columns are not consistent with what would have been used in the log house. They are modern milled lumber with a relieved edge, and there are no signs that they were re-milled from older hewn timbers. The species and quality of the wood is quite different from what would have been used as joists in a log house of this era. The joists were most likely oak, or another sturdy hardwood. It is also possible that old growth pine could have been used, but if so, it would have been straight-grained with few if any knots. Often even in the crudest log houses, extra attention was paid to exposed joists in the ceiling of the living space. They were often finished with hand planes, sometimes incorporating a beaded edge, sometimes with a horizontal dimension of as little as two-to-three inches. Joists of that type would look very different from the current porch columns, even if they had been re-milled to a smaller dimension than the originals. The columns, which appear to be at least 20-30 years old, have been heavily damaged, apparently by insects and/or woodpeckers (see the section on “Insect Infestation and/or Woodpecker Damage at Posts of Screened-in Porch,” below). It is quite possible that the log house joists were used in this location and replaced after suffering similar damage at some point before the late 1980s.
Interior Finishes
Most interior finishes were replaced in the 1936 project. This includes the plaster in the walls and ceilings, trim elements such as door casings, some doors, hardware, the staircase, and all the electrical and plumbing fixtures.

The interior plaster and lath were stripped from most walls and ceilings. Some small areas of the older plaster may have remained in place, such as in the chimneybreasts above mantelpieces where the older plaster was adhered directly to brick and was in good condition. In all the wall areas where the plaster was replaced, the walls were stripped down to the studs (including removal of wood lath although some lath nails remained in the cavities) and the studs were made larger, as described above in the discussion on the house’s framing.

Celotex Panel Plaster Lath System
A new product of the time was used in place of wood lath in the 1936 project. It consisted of panels that were nailed up to serve as lath, over which a thin layer of plaster was applied. The panels were specified to be by Celotex, a company that specialized in making building products from sugar cane fiber, a by-product of the sugar industry. The 1936 drawings call for the insulative version of the Celotex lath panels at all exterior walls. Celotex was one of several companies that introduced innovations of this kind in the 1920s and 1930s. (Another company that made insulative lath panels was Masonite. Although Masonite’s product was made from pressed wood fiber, it was similar in appearance to the Celotex panels. Another similar-looking product was called Homasote, a pressed fiber board made from recycled paper.) Essentially the panels were boards of pressed fiber, about 3/8” thick, with textured surfaces that could grip the wet plaster finish as it was applied. A layer of hard white plaster was installed over these and then sanded smooth. Although the drawings only call for the insulative panels at the exterior walls, the product used for the interior walls and ceilings was virtually identical. The same product was used in the ceiling of the log house as well. However, in the log room, the 1936 drawings also call for a “sand finish” (a thin layer of plaster containing sand for visual effect), which explains the difference in the appearance.

The panel lath was a very successful product, as seen in the unblemished appearance of the plaster in this house. The panels were installed in horizontal strips, about 16-18 inches tall, with the vertical edges aligned so that they were centered on the studs to which the material was nailed. The system was designed with metal clasps that kept the panels tightly connected, helping to keep the seams from showing. The plaster, as a result, has almost no signs of irregularities or cracks. There are few places in the first story where short diagonal cracks have appeared. These are the same places where the older plaster may have been left in place, where it had been installed on brick chimneybreasts. Where plaster occurs directly on brick, it is solidly adhered to the brick; the cracks appear where this well-anchored material meets the slightly more flexible Celotex-based system.

Colonial Casings and Older Casings
Once the plaster had been replaced, the door openings were trimmed with narrow strips of wood in a profile known as Colonial casings. The casings were mitered at the tops of the door and window openings. The only room where the older woodwork remains intact around doors and windows is the library (northeast corner room), where the casings are much wider and have mitered backbands, as was typical of the Federal period from the 1780s to the 1820s.
Staircase
The staircase from the first to second story also appears to date entirely from the 1936 project. A fairly convincing Colonial Revival style design, it has a quality and patina that could pass for much older than it is. The location and style of the original late-18th/early-19th century staircase, however, remains unknown. Most houses constructed in this period in this style had a small boxed stair with winding treads in the corner of one of the front rooms, but there is very little evidence to prove or disprove this possibility.

The only evidence of an earlier staircase that has been identified to date is a small scar in the floorboards of the second story hallway, directly above the bottom treads of the present stairs and also directly above the summer beam. The mark may have the location of a newel post that was fastened to the floorboards as part of the railing design of an earlier stairway. Its location is approximately where the railing met the top landing of the stairs in the second story. The location would make sense if the prior staircase rose toward the peak of the roof, as it most likely did (in the opposite direction from the current stairs). Before the addition was built, it would have been almost necessary for the stairs to rise toward the center of the house because the sloped ceilings of the second story perimeter areas are too low for the top riser to have been located anywhere within about ten feet of the building’s exterior wall (unless the stair terminated at the top in a dormer). However, because of the location of the summer beam, the stair opening could not have overlapped the center line of the house: it would have had to have been exclusively either in the east half or the west half house to avoid the beam.

A second piece of potential evidence turned out to be a false clue to the staircase location. There is a scar, consisting of a set of short floor boards in the floor directly over the front door in the west half of the second story. It resembles a stair opening in size and shape, although it would only have accommodated a very narrow stairway. Upon lifting the short floor boards in this area, however, one of the house’s original joists was found to be at the center of the area resembling an opening, ruling out the possibility of the stair being at this point. This possible location was also eliminated on the basis of the location of the front door. The front door (the location of which was not changed more than a few inches in the 1936 project) overlaps with the cut in the second story flooring. Had the stair been in this spot, it would have blocked the door. If the stairs had been in west side of the house, as described above, and had risen in the opposite direction, then the opening in the floor boards above the front door could be evidence of a different wall configuration and possibly a closet near the top of the stairs.
Frame House Conditions and Recommendations

Summary
Many of the house’s non-structural exterior materials are in poor or precarious condition. (The exposed surfaces of the logs are in poor condition, as are the columns of the screened-in porch, but both conditions are more cosmetic than structural at the present.) Problems include paint failure, signs of moisture and rotting wood, insect infestation, and some places where small structural systems such as the framing of the back (kitchen) porch and the screened-in are beginning to fail. The back porch is out square and possibly slipped at the footing level. The screened-in porch is suffering from moisture damage at its bottom edges and from insect and woodpecker damage in its columns. By contrast, the visible interior finishes throughout the first and second story are in very good condition, except in the bathroom and kitchen and one or two other isolated locations. The plaster is generally in good condition, as are the wood trim and the natural-finished wood flooring.

Roof
The most problematic part of the house at present is the wood shingle roof. The roof shingles appear to be well past their intended life. There is evidence that they are retaining moisture long after precipitation occurs. There are also visible indications that the wood shingles are rotting and other signs of other biological growth on the surface of the roof. The deterioration has reached the point where some whole shingles are missing. A strip of shingles has broken loose at the crest of the roof, next to the south chimney, pulling away as a group because they are still fastened to one another with the nails that were intended to hold them in place. The roof needs to be replaced, in total, as soon as possible.

Surface Materials in General
In general, the house’s surface materials are in the worse condition on the north and south elevations, as well as in shaded areas such as behind the foundation plantings. On the north side of the house, there is biological growth on some of the patched mortar of the log house chimney. The logs that touch the chimney show more signs of moisture and active decay than other parts of the log walls. The house’s most recent layers of paint are peeling more noticeably on the south side of the house, where exposure to direct sunlight is a contributing factor. The peeling is more obvious in areas where the wood is also exposed to extensive amounts of both sunlight and moisture in combination, such as where the south-facing siding meets the edges of the roof shingles of the screened-in porch.
The paint has failed on wood siding and other painted wood elements of the house. The paint failure is more severe in areas that are in shade or where excessive moisture is being retained. Heavy shrubbery around the perimeter of the house contributes by both creating blocking sun and air and by retaining moisture in the soil.
Paint and Siding

The house’s current paint finish is at the point of failure. While the peeling paint is still not obvious in many visible areas, the most recent layers have failed completely in several less noticeable areas. There are also several areas where old accumulated layers of paint have begun to break loose unevenly. This may point to a need for more than just a basic paint job. The old layers may need to be extensively sanded or stripped before the house is repainted. A contributing factor in the paint failure is the presence of thick foundation plantings, mostly boxwoods, on all sides of the house. The plants are leading to moisture retention and also are hiding some of the worst areas of paint failure caused by this moisture.
Plaster, Celotex Panels, and Gypsum Wallboard

In most of the frame house, the Celotex panel plaster system shows no signs of cracking, except where it comes into contact with other materials. However, in the log house, perhaps as result of minor movement in the logs and condensation in the attic cavity, the Celotex ceiling panels have begun to droop just enough that the seams are becoming apparent. Minor cracks have appeared in the plaster in some areas, such as at the chimneybreasts (as mentioned above), where the plaster on Celotex lath meets plaster adhered directly to brick.

The one obvious area of plaster failure is the section of gypsum wallboard added at the bottom of the opening when a doorway from the dining room to the patio was converted to a window. The patch may be of relatively recent construction, installed since the late 1960s, as it appears to be the kind of gypsum wallboard still in use today. Moisture has come in through gaps in the patched area in the exterior siding, resulting in discoloration of the wallboard. Because the gypsum wallboard differs in composition and density from the Celotex panel system around it, the moisture may have migrated in an uneven way so that it all appeared within the gypsum wallboard patch. The exterior wall should be prepared and repainted, with caulking in any gaps immediately behind the gypsum board. The roof and gutters also may need repairs in this corner, which will be corrected when the roof is replaced. The piece of gypsum board should be removed and replaced, or the opening should be changed back to a doorway.

A larger gypsum wallboard patch was installed more recently at the southwest corner of the living room, where the Mallet-Prevost family removed a built-in corner cupboard (the age of the corner cupboard is not known, but it was not shown on the 1936 drawings).2 This gypsum wallboard patch, however, does not show signs of moisture or other problems.

---

2 Josiah Henson reflects on the appearance of the “sitting room” and “corner cupboard” as they appeared in 1878, on his final visit to the house: "Her bed was in the old sitting-room, … the first place that I had seen that seemed … familiar. The … old corner cupboard, where master used to keep his brandy, just as [it was] fifty years ago." (Henson, 1881: 219). However, the room Henson is speaking of could be either the current living room or one of the other two first story rooms. No further information is known at this time about the corner cupboard removed by the Mallet-Prevosts, such as its age or appearance, is known at this time, except that the cupboard is not shown on the 1936 drawings (thus, it is likely to have been installed after 1936, and not likely to be the one Henson was speaking of). For the context of the quote, see longer version of the same passage quoted at the beginning of this report.
Wood Damage at Top of Stairs
The surface of a section of flooring next to the top part of the staircase is damaged from what appears to be insect infestation, possibly old damage caused by termites or carpenter ants. The same area also has some indications (droppings and nesting materials) of infestation by a larger animal. Although the wood was dry and active moisture infiltration was not observed in this area, past or present problems with flashing could be a contributing factor attracting animals and insects to the area. The area may be subject to moisture during times of heavy rain — notably, the damage is directly over the former doorway from the dining room to the patio where there currently is moisture damage in the gypsum wallboard patch. The wood joists immediately below the damaged floor boards remain structurally sound. This is also one of few places in the house where wood is exposed to direct sunlight throughout much of the day. Additionally, it is an area where the newer and older parts of the frame construction come together, with siding abutting a section of roofing.

Although the cause of the damage to the wood at the top of the stairs has not been determined (image on the left), it appears to include past damage from termites or carpenter ants. Rodent nesting material was also observed in the cavity below it (center image), as well as rodent droppings (image at the right).

Other Signs of Animal Infestation
Signs were observed of active infestation by rodents and other animals in hidden areas of the house, as photographs were being taken for this project. As noted above, recent rodent droppings were found, for instance, within what appears to be a rodent’s nest in the cavity between the joists near the top of the stairs (under the section of flooring where there appears to be insect damage). In June, a dove was also nesting in the hanging gutter at the back of the log house, where the end of the gutter is in close proximity to the dining room window.

Insect Infestation and/or Woodpecker Damage at Posts of Screened-in Porch
The most serious signs of animal infestation in the frame part of the house are in the posts of the screened-in porch. Large holes have been gnawed into nearly all the posts of this porch by either woodpeckers or some kind of insect. According to the 1936 drawings, the former joists of the log house loft were supposed to have been used as posts in this area. However, the current posts are modern, milled lumber, either fir or pine. It is possible that the historic material was used at first and had to be replaced at some point due to similar damage, and that the problem continued after the new material had been installed. The current posts are damaged to the point of needing to be replaced, and they should be replaced. If this area remains as a screened-in porch, simple posts such as these should be used, although a slightly larger dimension might be used, as the posts appear to be drawn at a larger size on the 1936 drawings. In the opinion of the author of this section of this report, the posts should remain simple in character, dark in color, and not so large or textured as to draw attention to themselves. Although the 1936 drawings say that the “Rough Hewn Col[umns] from [the] Clg. [ceiling] joist[s] of Cabin” were to be used here, it is not known if this was actually done, and exactly what they columns looked like or what their dimensions were is not known at this time. Therefore, the recommendation of this report is to avoid using wood columns that are rough hewn in an attempt to duplicate this effect.
Hole in Rear Porch Floor
There is a small animal hole in the southwest corner of the floor of the west (kitchen) porch. Neither the age of the hole nor the type of animal was obvious, but the hole is large enough that it needs to be repaired, even though it does not lead to an interior space.

In addition to the animal damage, the rear porch is also suffering from a number of other kinds of problems. The porch has layers of accumulated and peeling paint over complex clusters of wood (small strips of wood) that form the balustrade and glazed enclosure. The steps leading up to the porch are in poor condition, and the handrail at the side of the steps is leaning noticeable away from the steps. The steps and handrail should be replaced to match the 1936 design, and the footings and piers of the porch itself should be checked and re-laid if needed. Once any problems with the footings and piers of the porch are stable, the porch may be gradually brought back into plumb, while taking care not to damage the glazing and original wood components.

The hole in the floor of the back porch is approximately one-and-a-half inches by five inches. It was created by an animal seeking a way onto and off of the porch, although it leads from one exterior space to the exterior crawlspace under it.
Cabinets, Plumbing and Electrical Fixtures, and Other Twentieth Century Finish Items

The cabinets in both the kitchen and bathroom were created from various pieces of cabinetry and furniture, gradually patched together between the 1930s and 1960s. One section of wall cabinet in the kitchen, on the north wall, appears to have originally been a piece of furniture such as the top part of a Hoosier style kitchen unit. The large ell-shaped kitchen base cabinet is a combination of a kitchen sink base, flanking wooden cabinets that were shown on the 1936 drawings, and a second section of cabinets added later along the south wall forming an “ell” shape with the cabinets detailed in 1936. Exactly how these items will be treated will depend upon how the house is used. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), as the building’s owners, will have to choose whether to treat materials of this sort from the 1930s and later as historic materials or to replace them to make these spaces more functional. The Commission may decide to restore the 1936 cabinets to the design shown on the drawings, or to remove the cabinets completely in the process of making the rooms suitable for modern functions, such as space for museum exhibits and related functions and the interpretation of the important story the site has to tell to the public.

It is likely that the plumbing fixtures in the two bathrooms will need to be removed and replaced to make the spaces suitable for new museum or educational functions. If accessible rest rooms are provided in other locations, some of the 1936 fixtures, such as the kitchen sink, could remain in place. The powder room in the 1936 butler’s pantry space should not be treated as historic as it disrupts the building’s integrity to the 1936 design and it is not accessible and there would not be suitable as a museum rest room facility. Instead, the pantry could be restored to the 1936 appearance and possibly used as a circulation space, an exhibit area, or a storage room. However, in general, the residential plumbing fixtures, such as bathtubs and small lavatories, should be removed if they are not needed if the building is to have a museum-related function. If not removed, they need to be inspected and used periodically to keep supply lines, drains, and traps operating properly. Dried out plumbing traps can lead to problems with methane gas, and they can provide points of entry for rodents, insects, and other pests. Other concerns with active plumbing lines include the possibility of overflowing bathtubs and lavatory bowls when left unattended, leaking pipes, and moisture that accumulates from condensation. Old plumbing lines also often provide paths for insects and animals to enter spaces through the small holes in finish materials around pipes and fixtures. There are often hidden gathering areas for insects and mice just behind the finish materials near plumbing fixtures which can be sealed if the fixtures are removed.
One of the items in the house that can be reliably dated to the late 1930s is the wall-mounted can opener at the side of the window above the kitchen sink. The Can-O-Mat can opener was made by The Rival Company as part of a series of kitchen appliances and fixtures, with a bold Art Deco-style design, that premiered in 1936 with a juicer called a "Juice-O-Mat" and an ice crusher called an 'Ice-O-Mat." The appliances continued to be made until the 1960s, although it is quite possible that the Can-O-Mat has been mounted above the sink since the 1930s.
Summary of Recommendations for Frame House

- The roof needs to be replaced, in total, as soon as possible.

- Scrape and prepare all previously painted exterior surfaces, and repaint, as soon as possible. In some areas, it may be more appropriate to chemically strip the wood to remove heavily layered paint and unsightly peeling though multiple layers. It would also be appropriate to replace siding boards to match the current design, specifically in those places where the wood has been damaged by moisture and rotting and where such damage is contributing to paint adhesion problems.

- Replace the columns of the screened-in porch using a similar (possibly slightly larger dimensions) with a dark color and with a simple surface texture that does not draw attention to itself. If the porch is to remain as an open porch, as it is now, then the screens and the wood strips and frames holding them should also be replaced to allow the porch to serve its passive solar purpose of providing shade and a pool of cool air on the south side of the living room.

- Keep the existing wood floor boards on both floors and recondition/refinish the floor as needed to make it even in appearance and both even-surfaced and durable for public use. Sanding the floors throughout is not recommended, as it would destroy the patina and surface qualities of the flooring, although limited sanding may be necessary in some place to remove uneven areas where (and only where) they interfere with the public areas and accessible paths through the building.

- Keep Celotex wall and ceiling plaster in place and repair any holes with materials that create a completely even finish and are compatible with the Celotex in terms of expansion and contraction and moisture migration.

- Remove the gyp gypsum wallboard beneath the window that was formerly a doorway into the kitchen wing. Either use new gypsum wallboard, after correcting all sources of moisture (e.g., gutters, roofing/flashing, and exterior siding), or replace it with another material. An example of a replacement might be to put the door back in place, as a functioning entrance (see Treatment Plan), or to put a false door in this location, with lights above and solid panels below that would serve in place of the wallboard.

- Remove the damaged floor boards at top of the stairs, and replace them to match the existing design, species, finish, and color, only after all sources of moisture infiltration and animal access have been corrected or sealed.

- Address animal infestation in other parts of the house by contracting with an exterminator, and by sealing (or putting ventilation screens, as needed, over) points of entry. Repair damaged wood (such as back porch flooring and the lowest log in the west wall) so that the appearance and integrity of the building’s design are maintained, without drawing attention to the repairs.

- Replace steps and railing of rear (west) kitchen porch to match the 1936 design (if the porch is to be kept—see alternatives in Treatment Plan). Correct any settling or misalignment on the footings and brick porch piers. Carefully raise the porch back up until it is plumbing
(maintaining a standard porch slope of ¼ inch per foot from west wall of addition to western edge of porch).

- Remove residential plumbing fixtures, such as bathtubs and small lavatories, to the extent that they are not needed if the building is to have a museum-related function. If not removed, they will need to be inspected and used (flushed) periodically to keep supply lines, drains, and especially drainage traps operating properly.
EXISTING FLOOR PLANS
PART II: TREATMENT REPORT
RILEY HOUSE / JOSIAH HENSON SITE INTERPRETIVE STRATEGIES

The strategies proposed here are intended to support a historical exhibit that enables the public to come to know, appreciate, and put into context, the life of Josiah Henson, an African American Marylander who represents an iconic American image. Henson's Maryland years, especially the ones spent in Montgomery County at the Riley plantation, illustrate what slavery was like on the "Middle Ground," the cultural and philosophical situation that parallels the geographic “middle ground” of the border states.

Through Henson's experiences the exhibit will explore the childhood of enslaved persons; family life; work; travel and independence; spiritual life; punishment; and resistance. Whenever possible Henson's own words will give voice to the stories of his life.

The exhibit will address the following themes:

1. Slavery in Maryland during the first decades of the 19th century often separated families and created hardships to be endured.
2. Enslaved African Americans sought ways to keep their families together even under the most challenging of circumstances.
3. Enslaved African Americans claimed independence and responsibility when they could. Trusted to travel and return from places near and far, they used these opportunities to promote their own causes and satisfy their own desires.
4. Enslaved African Americans, considered chattel by many, demonstrated leadership skills and sought to be considered human beings.
5. There were whites in Montgomery County, Maryland, and the surrounding region that supported African American desires to be free and to be treated fairly.
6. The economic health of slaveholders and the types of work they did — domestic, industrial and agricultural — often determined the life conditions of enslaved people.
7. Myth, American literature, and history come together in the interpretation of this site. The complexities of slavery are revealed through the examination of: stories surrounding slavery, Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and relevant primary documents.
8. It is impossible to understand Josiah Henson's life in a historical vacuum. Riley family life and tradition are linked to the understanding of Henson's Maryland years.
9. Time and human circumstance determine how buildings change over time. The various stages of the Riley Farm's evolution, from its beginnings to the present, illustrate how historic sites develop into what exists today.

---

1 This section of the report was authored by Dianne Swann-Wright, Ph.D.
The exhibit, as a whole, will contain the following components, inspired by Henson’s own words:

Exhibit Component One: The Childhood of Enslaved Persons.

"My mother was the property of Dr. Josiah McP., but was hired by Mr. N., to whom my father belonged."

"My earliest employments were to carry buckets of water to the men at work, to hold a horse plough...and as I grew older and taller, to take care of master's saddle horse."

The examination of the lives of enslaved children in 19th century Maryland adds a special facet to the study of slave communities. Separation of families through sale and via auctions will be represented, particularly fear of the Deep South, as recalled by Henson. Verbal accounts recalling the mechanics of slavery will be displayed through words and will be joined by objects. The world of children's work such as carrying water, tending other children, weeding garden patches, as well as animal feeding and care, will be included.

Objects to include background scene and weighted water bucket and saddle with polish and cloths.

Exhibit Component Two: Family Life of Enslaved Persons.

"...the death of Dr. McP. brought about a revolution in our condition."

"The principal food of those upon my master's plantation consisted of corn meal, and salt herrings; to which was added in summer a little buttermilk, and a few vegetables..."

One of the first institutions enslaved people established on their own was the family. Family composition was constructed by economic, political and social circumstances. Family composition and separation through sale, slaveholder marriage and gift giving will be represented. The rudiments of daily life such as living conditions, diet, clothing, education, the development of character and abilities to determine one's own actions will be characterized.

Objects: Scale model of enslaved family living space; mannequins of 5-year-old Henson and his mother

Exhibit Component Three: Travel and Independence

"...That pride and ambition were as active in my soul as probably they ever were in that of the greatest soldier or statesman."

"I have toiled and induced others to toil...to win a kind word, or a benevolent deed..."

Enslaved individuals did not often stay in one place all of their lives. Through a series of four maps the travels of Henson will be illustrated. (From the Eastern Shore of Maryland to Montgomery County; From the Riley House Farm to homes, meeting places, and taverns in the neighborhood; From the Riley House Farm to Washington DC and Georgetown; and From Montgomery County to Kentucky. From Kentucky to Canada and the community where Henson and his family settled)

Objects: maps, travel pass, and sealed manumission papers
Exhibit Component Four: Spiritual Life

"I remember seeing her often on her knees, endeavoring to arrange her thoughts in prayers appropriate to her situation...[the prayers] have remained in my memory to this hour."

Spiritual Life was a sustaining resource for Josiah Henson. As was characteristic of many enslaved persons, faith life developed over time and under differing circumstances. This exhibit section will trace how Henson was introduced to African American faith traditions and how he came to claim his own. In this component of the exhibit, discussion of the Bible and spirituality also present an opportunity to interpret the topic of literacy. Many African Americans, having been denied the opportunity to learn to read, expressed the desire to read the Bible as their motivation for wanting to learn this precious skill.

Object: Bible and audio of woman saying the Lord's Prayer.

Exhibit Component Five: Punishment and Violent Interactions.

"In attempting to ward off the blow, my right arm was broken, and I was brought to the ground; where repeated blows broke both my shoulder blades..."

"Solicited in this way [through repeated pleading], with urgency and tears, by the man whom I had so zealously served for twenty years...impelled too, by the fear which he skillfully awakened, that the sheriff would seize every one who belonged to him, and that all would be separated, or perhaps sold to go to Georgia, or Louisiana--an object of perpetual dread.

The institution of slavery was held in place by violence — much of which took place within the confines of the law. Henson's father's punishment and his mother's will be discussed along with his own to illustrate the different conditions under which men and women lived.

Objects: Visual representations of what healthy and broken bones look like, wooden sticks and other objects used to inflict pain

Exhibit Component Six: Resistance and Struggle

"In passing along the State of Ohio, we were frequently told that we were free, if we chose to be so."

"...and sometimes I have picked out the best one I could find of the flock, or the drove, carried it a mile or two into the woods, slaughtered it, cut it up, and distributed it among the poor creatures, to whom it was at once food, luxury, and medicine. Was this wrong? I can only say that, at this distance of time, my conscience does not reproach me for it, and that then I esteemed it among the best of my deeds."

Flight was but one type of resistance. Using Henson's own words, other methods of seeking better treatment and freedom will be explored.
Exhibit Component Seven: Timeline and Map with Questions

A timeline highlighting Henson's life at the Riley House Farm will be part of this interpretative strategy. The following visitor-inspired questions will be part of the timeline and will enable immediate answers to frequently asked questions about Henson and the site.

Where was Henson born?  Who were his parents?  Did he have brothers and sisters?  What happened to his parents and siblings?

How did Henson get to Montgomery County?  Was there a large community of enslaved people in Montgomery County during his time here?

When did Henson’s work life begin?  What types of jobs did he perform?  Was Henson exceptional?

Were enslaved people paid for their labor?  Was Henson?

Since Henson traveled without white supervision, why didn't he run away?

What made Josiah Henson a model for the Harriet Beecher Stowe's main character, Uncle Tom?  How did Stowe’s treatment of the character change the association of the words “Uncle Tom” until, generations later, they came to be a source of resentment?

Are there still Henson descendents living today?  Have they visited this place?
This interpretative plan will explore the above-listed themes by incorporation of the following:

1. Research conducted as a part of the Riley House Historic Structure Report — especially Cheryl LaRoche's essay and notes, as well as this chapter of the report.
2. Interpretative strategies:
   - Exhibit signage
   - Exhibit brochures
   - Recommended Public Programs
   - Public Tours
   - Video Documentary
   - Outdoor Experience/Living History

The Path of the Visitor Experience:

The route the interpretative tour takes, whether self-guided or docent-led, should adhere to the following:

The tour should begin where Josiah Henson would have entered the site. This would have been from the outside and most likely on foot or horseback. The visitor should be made aware of what the landscape contained and how it appeared in Henson’s period. (A detached Visitors’ Center may serve as a location for a brief orientation to the site after the visitor has seen the exterior of the house and been greeted by docents.) The visitor would then enter the log building because it is the kind of building that Henson mentioned or would have been in most frequently. Reopening the former west side doorway of the log house (in the rear wall, where there is currently a window), would allow that side of the log building to serve as an illustration of how the setting of the quarters of an enslaved family might have looked in the period, as discussed in the Treatment Plan that follows. The next stop on the tour would be the main house, which could be accessed from the southwest corner, where there was formerly a doorway into the small hallway between the kitchen, dining room, and living room. As discussed in the Treatment Plan, reopening this doorway would allow for the creation of a new entrance that meets accessibility standards and a ramp that would not interfere with the appearance of either the front (east side) of the house or the area around the west wall of log house. The exhibit panels and artifacts within the house would support further discussion and questions. The outdoor landscape can include a small garden and other objects that would suggest Henson's life on the Riley Farm and in the community, perhaps beginning in the foreground of the west wall of the log house but extending west into the larger area behind the kitchen and garage where there is more access to sunlight. Since the exterior of the log house would be used to represent a family’s quarters, an interpretive statement should be included addressing log architecture and explaining that this is only a representation of the appearance of a family’s quarters. It should make it clear that this particular log house is not known to have actually been used for that purpose.
TREATMENT PLAN

Defining Treatment Plan
A Treatment Plan is a strategy for undertaking repairs and changes that are needed, recommended, or are otherwise appropriate in the care of a historic property. A fully developed Historic Structure Report provides a thorough basis for making such a plan. A Treatment Plan lays sufficient groundwork for the initial schematic design work to be performed at a later point when architectural services begin for an actual rehabilitation or restoration project. In addition to repairs, such a plan addresses whether it is possible or advisable to restore missing historic details, based on the degree to which adequate documentation of the earlier characteristics is available. Furthermore, it addresses the installation of new amenities, security and safety features, and accessibility features where modern use makes such changes necessary.

The Treatment Plan should be based on the building’s defined importance or Significance.1 If a building has already been (or can be) identified as “Eligible for inclusion in the National Register,”2 then it is appropriate to speak of its importance as “Significance” in the way that the National Register regulations define the term Significance. However, the Riley House has not been Determined Eligible for the National Register.

Although the house’s primary importance comes from its association with Josiah Henson when he lived on the plantation of the Isaac Riley family, the property no longer has the appearance (in terms of architecture or landscape) that it had in the 1820s, and it is no longer a resource that represents agricultural activities. The staff of the Maryland Historical Trust has concurred informally that the property may be “Eligible for inclusion in the National Register” based on the possible architectural Significance of the 1936 design. MHT staff has also has concurred informally with the conclusion that while the earlier importance of the property is clear by association, the property also lacks the Integrity of its 1820s components to be considered for listing in the National Register on that basis. While the house once served as the main residence on a large farm, the setting that surrounded it also contained many other resources at that time, including outbuildings, many additional acres of land, fence lines and fields, water features, and a variety of plants, all of which conveyed information about agricultural activities and the feeling and association of farming. Unfortunately, almost all evidence of these characteristics has been destroyed, and notably the same is true for almost all tangible evidence of the story of slavery on the property. Not only have most of the features (both above ground features and most archeological evidence) from the plantation/farming era been lost, but modifications have been made to the house and the landscape, in 1936-1939 and since that time, to transform it from a farmhouse to a suburban residence, giving it the appearance and functional characteristics that are appropriate to that function.

Even if the important association with Josiah Henson were not present, a 19th century farmhouse and farm in Montgomery County might be Eligible for inclusion in the National Register for its association with agriculture or as an example of the architecture of a farmhouse, or both. However, the property is

---

1 See the National Register Criteria in Appendix N of this report. The word is capitalized here to clarify that it is being used in the sense of the legally defined term. See discussion in footnote #2, below.
2 This is a reference to the term “Eligible,” as it is defined in the regulations for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The word is capitalized throughout this document to clarify that it is being used in the sense of the term as it is defined in federal law and in the related regulations. The concept that the NHPA follows is that “Eligibility” is the status of a historic property prior to formal listing in the National Register. Eligibility is treated as something that existed a priori of any action to taken to discover or prove it. See 36 CFR Part 800, Subpart C [definitions]: 800.16 (l) (2), at http://www.achp.gov/regs-rev04.pdf. 
not “Eligible for inclusion in the National Register” in either of these areas of Significance because of the loss of a high percentage of the agricultural and architectural details it had before 1936.

The Riley House may be Eligible under Criterion C for architecture as an example of a Colonial Revival style residential rehabilitation project that typified trends of that era, including the approach to restoration that was prevalent at that time, and it does appear to retain enough material from the 1936 project to meet the National Register’s requirements for integrity. While this strategy for Eligibility has not been fully demonstrated, it may be more difficult, on the other hand, to interpret the property’s important early 19th century associations if all, or almost all, aspects of the 1936 design were preserved without compromise to acquire and retain National Register status.

In the absence of a clear basis for evaluating National Register-level Significance and Integrity, the Treatment Plan for a given property may be based on the site’s local significance, or on its general value as a place where it is appropriate to interpret important chapters in history. The property’s local significance was established when it was individually listed on the Montgomery County Master Plan for Historic Preservation. Beyond this designation, as it is understood by the general public, the Josiah Henson Site/Riley House property is undeniably important as the scene of events of great interest in the history of Montgomery County, the setting of an autobiographical narrative that inspired a well-known novel both of which received international attention, and a story that had a well-established national impact both before and during the Civil War. As a result, it is a property with an important story to tell and one whose interpretation is meaningful to an undeniably large and far-reaching audience.

As exhibits depicting the character and feeling of the place in an earlier era are developed, it is important to distinguish between the authentic characteristics of the building from a given period and those materials added to aid in interpretation. There is a danger of blending authentic architectural features and details based on conjecture (in areas where there is an absence of documentation of what actually was on the property), potentially confusing the public and misrepresenting history. To avoid this pitfall, the authentic historic features of the Josiah Henson Site/Riley House as it now stands should be preserved, to the degree possible, and restoration to an earlier period should be avoided except in those places where adequate documentation of the property’s earlier appearance can be recovered. At the same time, to interpret the Henson story and meet the needs of the public, exhibits and other interpretive materials will be needed to create a sense of Josiah Henson’s time here, specifically to depict those aspects of the property that are not adequately documented or preserved to allow for a thorough Restoration approach. These exhibits and interpretive materials should be presented as representations of a prior time, but not as a Restoration of the property.

In choosing a strategy for Treatment (Restoration, Rehabilitation, Preservation, or a blended approach) the Significance or general historic value of a given property should be determined, assessed, and defined first, and the individual character-defining features of the building and site should be identified on the basis of the property’s Areas of Significance and Period of Significance. This assessment has been made in the earlier chapters of the present Historic Structure Report. Strategies for Treatment of the property as a whole and of each character-defining feature should follow one or more of the four Treatments defined in the Secretary’s Standards.
Many house museum properties reflect well-established themes of importance by way of intact architectural materials. In the case of the Riley House, only a limited amount of intact historic materials remain from the time of Josiah Henson and Isaac Riley. These materials are confined to the framing members and possibly the floor boards of the frame house, possibly the logs in the walls of the log building (approximately 25-30 logs), the interior wood trim of five or six wall openings, and some portion of the masonry and brickwork in the foundation walls and chimneys. There is not enough physical evidence from before the 1936 project in the building materials that remain in place, nor is there enough written documentation of the site of the right kind to support a project that would meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Restoration. The same is true of the Standards for Reconstruction. However, if it were desired, the house could be fully restored to its appearance in 1936 because almost all the building materials that were present as of that time are still in place and because the then-new work undertaken in the 1936 project is well-documented in the drawings prepared by Lorenzo Winslow to provide a basis for restoration of any missing details. While it is possible to restore the building to its 1936 appearance, the public interest in the story of Josiah Henson and the Riley family makes the 1936 design seem unrelated to the central purpose of the project.

Tempting as it is to connect the log building to the kitchen Henson describes in his autobiography, it is always possible that Josiah Henson never even entered this particular log building or the frame house to which it is attached. (The “outside kitchen” he describes in his autobiography could have been a completely detached building; additionally, the biography does not even specify that the kitchen he is describing was constructed of log.)
**Recommended Treatment Approach**

These issues make it appropriate to use an approach that blends a limited amount of restoration and/or rehabilitation with the construction of interpretive features purely for their didactic value. Some parts of the house could be restored to the 1936 design, while other parts could be restored to the earlier appearance, to the degree that that appearance can be known. Still other areas could contain an interpretation-driven representation of an early 19th century house on a Maryland plantation without being presented as a restoration. Some rooms of the house might be rehabilitated primarily for museum exhibits and other uses, and one room or two (such as the kitchen) might be restored following the information found in the 1936 drawings.

It would be appropriate to “restore” some of the characteristics of the log room interior to an earlier era based on the limited information that exists, adding other features to serve as exhibit material where needed to facilitate appropriate interpretation of the property. A partial restoration of the interior of the log wing is possible through minor modifications, such as lowering the floor to align with the bottom log, lowering the hearth to enlarge the fireplace to a more appropriate height, and installing a loft floor to serve as a ceiling of the space within the log room, bearing in mind that there will only be a limited possibility of demonstrating the accuracy of these design changes. In addition, some other features may need to be added for interpretation purposes, such as: a small vegetable garden outside the rear wall of the house, near the log building; some facsimile of a dirt floor within the log room; and a few rudimentary furnishings based on what Henson describes in his narrative.

It is critical to find some way of distinguishing between original details, restored details that have been based on documentation, and those that have been added purely for interpretation purposes. It is critical to the facility’s integrity that visitors be told that the blended design does not represent an accurate or uniform “Restoration,” but was undertaken primarily to facilitate the interpretation of the life of Josiah Henson and the Riley family while they lived on the property.

**Accessibility Issues**

The house is not currently accessible for persons with disabilities. Accessibility features, in general, can be added to the exterior of the house with less compromise of the building’s design integrity if a blended approach to rehabilitation design is followed. A ramp can be provided on the south side of the kitchen wing, out of view of the log wing, if the goal is interpretation of the Henson story and not a uniform restoration of the 1936 design. Accessibility to the house could thus be provided, creating a main entrance for all visitors including those with disabilities, without disturbing the key characteristics of the frame house façade or any of the three exposed elevations of the log house. Josiah Henson’s words provide a glimpse of the appearance of the form of house upon approaching it in the 1870s. Maintaining the integrity of the first impression that the house will make, through the form and façades of the log house and frame house, is particularly important at this site. As a second point in the entry sequence, a re-opened doorway in the rear (west) elevation of the log house may provide an opportunity to recreate the appearance of a typical quarter for enslaved workers on the Riley property in the 1820s using the log wall and landscape of the doorway’s foreground (this would be for exhibit purposes, and should not be portrayed in the accompanying interpretation text or by docents as a “restoration”). Entering the house at the southwest corner of the 1936 kitchen wing, one would encounter the passage connecting the kitchen, living room, dining room, and library. Some of the openings in this area are too narrow, however, in their current configuration. If the pre-1936 features in the frame house are to be treated as the most important, then one or two of 1936 later doorways will need to be enlarged along with some of the hallway characteristics in the area where the kitchen, dining room, kitchen, and the basement stairs come together.
Accessibility requires certain characteristics at operable doors and areas where wheelchairs would need to negotiate turns. One possible scheme for achieving accessibility may be as follows:

**Log House**
- Provide an accessible path to the log house, reopening the former doorway apparent in the logs on the west wall, cutting and fitting it to the width required by code.
- Lowering the log house floor and making it accessible from the accessible path described above.
- Close (or block) the internal circulation route between the log house and frame house, or at least close it to visitor traffic, because it can not be made accessible by code. As an alternative, the connection could be kept open to allow visitors to look into the log house or specifically the loft from the dining room without allowing circulation.

**Frame House**
- Provide an accessible path around the 1936 kitchen wing of the house, leading to a ramp on the west side of that wing.
- Build the top landing of the ramp over the stone stoop that formerly provided a way out of the southwest corner doorway of the 1936 kitchen wing.
- Reopen the former doorway at the southwest corner of the 1936 kitchen wing, cutting the opening to a slightly larger size than it was previously, and fitting it to meet code.
- Provide a ramp and entrance door meeting code requirements for door width, latch clearance, accessible path, and similar characteristics.
- Provide a turning radius immediately inside this door by enlarging the doorway under the present staircase (see diagram, below).
- Remove the door leaf at the doorway leading into the southwest corner of the kitchen (next to the basement stairs), as the doorway is wide enough only with the door itself removed.
- Secure the basement stairs to prohibit its use by visitors.
- The second story would not be accessible in this scheme, and would only be accessible if an elevator or similar mechanical device were constructed. Make accommodations, as needed, to provide for visitors and staff who have disabilities and who will not be able to access the second story. This accommodation may take the form of a virtual tour.
Above — One possible scheme for achieving an accessible path into the house and a logical sequence for the museum experience. This scheme involves converting the garage to a Visitors’ Center (or building a new or enlarged building in approximately the same location). Visitors would see the façade (the main elevation, facing east) of the frame house and log house first, then enter the Visitors’ Center, then pass through a small garden area to a doorway at what is now the rear (west) window of the log house. After seeing the log house, they would follow an accessible path around the 1936 kitchen wing, up a ramp, to the center of the house. All first story spaces of the frame house would be equally accessible for use as exhibits and other functions, such as library and gift shop activities. The connection from the frame house to the log house would not be used, although it could be kept partially open to allow visitors to see the space approximately as it would look from the loft, and a sleeping quarters exhibit could be provided in the loft exclusively for viewing from the present dining room.

The above enlargement shows the area around re-opened entrance, with the alterations required to achieve an open area for a 6'-0" turning radius.
Treatment of Specific Historic Building Materials

The frame house and the log wing contain several building materials that should be treated in special ways relating to the age and unique properties of that particular material. The Treatment of these materials will be virtually the same no matter what exact design is chosen for the rehabilitation of the house. For Treatment of the landscape materials, please see the landscape section of the report.

Logs

The logs should be treated with great care. Although they appear to be structurally sound, as a material where each log supports those above it in compression, the surface areas of the logs are in poor condition and contain sections of fragile, deteriorated or damaged wood. The short sections of logs that serve to complete the enclosure of the building, such as those to the sides of the chimney, support very little weight and are also subject to movement and fragility. Like other building materials that operate primarily in compression, the fact that they are not supporting weight makes them more subject to lateral movement. They need to secured with a hidden system of fasteners to tighten up the small sections of the log enclosure.

The first step in Treatment of the logs is to remove all potential sources of excessive moisture. For the sake of the longevity of the logs, the gutter system must be corrected immediately to include a downspout at the northwest corner of the log wing, where there is now a collapsing rain barrel. (The roof needs to be replaced, as is also the case with that of the frame house.) Additionally, all roof and gutter elements should be checked and cleaned regularly, and all drainage from downspouts should be directed away from the logs. Preferably, drainage from downspouts should be taken as far as possible underground to discharge away the buildings in a natural swale leading to a streambed. If underground extensions of the downspouts are not possible, then the downspouts should be directed as far away from the building, similarly to a swale leading or streambed, in an above-ground plastic extension from the bottom of each downspout. The logs should be checked regularly for moisture and deterioration.

When a rehabilitation project is undertaken, it may be appropriate to fill some gaps in the logs with an appropriate material, such as a wood consolidant. However, in general, natural checks and insect holes that are not collecting water (in other words, where the wood is stable and where the cracks and openings drain toward the ground) may in fact be helping keep the building dry and should be left as they are. Sealants or other coatings intended to seal out moisture should not be applied to the logs, as they will interfere with the building’s natural ability to dry out after precipitation or condensation. Replacement of rotted sections or whole logs with newly cut sections of wood should be undertaken only as a last resort, and particularly only if structural problems are encountered in the future. Limited application of biocides to the log surfaces may be appropriate, but only after testing the materials to avoid staining or other damage to the wood.

Chinking and Pointing at Chimneys

Repairs to the chinking should be made only in limited areas, avoiding the disturbance of the in-fill material from the 1936 project. Biological growth on the surface of the chinking may be treated with a biocide (such as aqueous borate solution). If biocide treatment is performed, the material should be tested first to make certain that it does not damage the appearance or integrity of the logs, and the application should ultimately be limited to the stones, mortars, brick, and painted wood surfaces. Limited areas of Portland cement (particularly post-1936 repairs with a gray cast) may be removed to install new tinted mortar. Removal should be done with chisels and hammers where possible, not with motorized saws. New mortar should be as soft as that used in 1936, with no more than a minimum content of Portland cement. The same standards and procedures apply to repairs to the pointing in the house’s foundations and chimneys.
Exterior Paint and Other Coatings
The wood parts of the exterior of the house, except for the logs and the posts of the screened-in porch, are almost all painted. The visible painted wood on the exterior all dates from the 1936 project. The exterior paint was not tested for lead as part of this study, but lead abatement may be necessary as part of repainting. Over the last 72 years, the paint has accumulated in many areas due to re-painting projects. In some areas, the paint failure includes many coats of paint peeling away together. It is possible to chemically strip paint in some areas, or to use the more traditional techniques of scraping and sanding. Stripping with chemicals will result in the loss of some of the historical evidence of paint schemes that have been applied to the house since 1936, including the original paint color and chemistry of that time. This information may be of interest to future generations, but it may not be a matter of concern for the present museum conversion under consideration, depending upon how important the possibility of restoring the building’s exterior appearance to the 1936 design is in the rehabilitation strategy.

Some of the exterior materials with painted surfaces have begun to rot or otherwise decay under the paint. In general, the damaged or deteriorated areas are small elements, usually wood siding near to the ground, in areas where it either receives too much moisture and too little sunlight, and thus does not dry out properly, or receives too much sunlight causing the paint to fail prematurely. A limited amount of wood siding and a small amount of other details will need to be replaced as part of a rehabilitation project.

Roof
The roof is constructed of modern plywood sheathing, other underlayment materials, and a modern wood shingle product designed to resemble 19th century wood roof shingles. Modern sawn shingles have a short life as roofing materials. Sometimes their life is extended by using chemical treatments, but the sawn grain surfaces still result in a shorter life than might be desired. The alternative, modern split shakes (as available on the open market) are too irregular and are not appropriate for historic buildings, both because of the inaccuracy of their appearance and the possibility that the unevenness will lead to future leakage. Because wood shingle roofing has always been part of the building’s design, as seen in the heavily weathered, very old shingles that show up in the oldest (ca.1919) photographs of the building (the appearance of which was roughly duplicated in the 1936 design), the new roofing material should be wood shingles. The most appropriate material may be sawn shingles treated for fireproofing and to extend their life. However, the exact product used should be carefully chosen for maximum life, to minimize the number of times the building will have to be impacted by construction projects once it is in use as a museum. Additionally, the county should be prepared to replace the shingles as soon as the stated lifespan comes to a close. The only alternative to sawn shingles would be to procure hand made shingles, made with a combination of splitting the shingles individually from very straight wood and careful dressing each one by hand with a draw knife, which was the standard way to make roof shingles in the early 19th century.

Interior Celotex Plaster System
Although plaster walls are often seen as a plain material in the background of other interior features, the Riley House actually has plaster that has remained remarkably intact throughout almost the entire interior since 1936 because a plastering system that incorporated a back-up material known as Celotex that was a new product in use at that time. The background of Celotex and the qualities of the Celotex system are found in material published at the time that the 1936 rehabilitation project was undertaken (see catalogue document on Celotex in Appendix M). The Celotex system produced a lath-like backing made of panels of pressed cane fiber, a by-product of the sugar industry, on which a very hard finish coat of wet plaster was applied. The Celotex panels were secured to new studs in the walls. The new studs had been placed there, next to the irregular original ones, to make a perfectly straight and plum wall surface possible. The material has some ability to resist moisture; in fact, a similar Celotex product was commonly used for many years as an exterior sheathing material on houses (although it was intended to be placed under a
final layer of siding, the sheathing panels were waterproof enough that they were sometimes left uncovered for extended periods of time). The plaster system has held up very well. It is the recommendation of this report that minor repairs be made where needed, and that the plaster of Celotex backing remain in place. Any future work impacting the plaster surfaces should be designed and specified to be compatible with this material. (A compatible plaster system would have a lath board similar in elasticity to that of the Celotex lath, to which a very hard finish coat of gypsum plaster would be applied manually. It may be appropriate to leave an expansion joint type of line in the plaster where one material meets another.)

A Note on Mechanical Systems
This report does not contain a section focused specifically on mechanical systems (heating, ventilating, and air conditioning) or plumbing systems. This is because almost all the systems noted are inappropriate for use in a museum. The house has forced air heat provided by an oil furnace. Forced-air furnaces that are fueled by oil produce residues that should be avoided in museums, and when the furnace is old, there is sometimes a possibility of the residue closest to the unit catching fire. The recommendation here is to remove and replace the furnace with modern system that is fueled by either natural gas or electricity. To minimize disturbance to the plaster and other finishes, an effort should be made to maintain the existing ductwork or at least the ductwork locations. None of the plumbing fixtures meet code for accessibility, and all are old and beginning to fail. All should be replaced or removed. Unused fixtures, such as bath tubs, should be removed because when not in use, such fixtures can become a route of entry for pests or methane gasses after traps dry out, and because there is also a danger of overflowing vessels or burst pipes when they are only used occasionally.

Architectural Alternatives
As part of preparing the Historic Structure Report, the client has asked the team to develop two to three different scenarios for Treatment of the building and site. Since, for the reasons cited above, complete and uniform restoration to a date before 1936 is not possible, the alternatives will be based on blending the following:

- restoration of some key details to either the 1936 design or an earlier configuration,
- rehabilitation of some parts of the building to adapt them to new uses, and
- the creation of some representational spaces that will accommodate interpretation.

One advantage of a blended approach of this kind is that it makes it possible to present a menu of choices with two or more different options for each of several different rooms. The Standards for Restoration will only have limited applicability to small areas of the house, but the Standards for Rehabilitation (which include restoration of some details) can be met in those areas of the house where the 1936 design can be respected. Areas where the word “restoration” should not be used would be those rooms for which the available documentation is not adequate to restore all the design details and meet a strict reading of the Standards for Rehabilitation. An example would be the log room where the original floor and missing loft/ceiling details are simply not well enough documented to undertake a technical restoration. Lowering of the log room floor to its presumed original location, for instance, as far as can be determined from the remaining physical evidence, would still not constitute a true restoration because very little reliable evidence is available about the original height, material, and appearance of the floor. Similarly, the re-introduction of a loft floor as a ceiling for the space would have to be undertaken mostly on the basis of conjecture (or by modeling it on other similar log houses in the area) because of the dearth of evidence about its exact configuration, material, and detailing. Because each part of the house would present different challenges in meeting the standards, a menu of several alternatives for several different parts of the house is given. One can choose “Option A” for one feature and “Option B” for another.
MENU OF OPTIONS

1. General Landscape Options
   - Option 1.a.: Keep landscape approximately as it is now, removing diseased trees, undergrowth, and some hardscape features that are no longer functional or are made extraneous by the change in use.
   - Option 1.b.: Remove boxwoods, some trees, and most twentieth century hardscape features (patios, walkways, barbecue, etc.) based on achieving a design that more closely resembles the property in Henson’s time. Create a facsimile of a slavery-era vegetable garden between the 1936 kitchen wing, the garage, and the log house extending back into the area behind the kitchen wing.
   - Option 1.c.: Do all of the items in Option 1.b., plus purchase adjoining property to allow for additional archaeology, the creation of larger representations of agricultural fields, and possible recreation of slave quarters and other outbuildings.

2. Driveway Options
   - Option 2.a.: Keep the road access as it is, but widen the driveway as much as is possible to create some additional parking.
   - Option 2.b.: Arrange with the neighboring property owners (the Aish HaTorah Synagogue) to use their parking area at certain times of the day and on certain occasions, and build a walkway with an accessible path as needed to the house.
   - Option 2.c.: Purchase some adjoining land (such as behind the neighboring synagogue) and build a new driveway access from Tilden Lane to the current parking circle, possibly abandoning (or at least limiting or locking) the access from the current curb cut on Old Georgetown Road.

3. Garage Options
   - Option 3.a.: Demolish the ca.1970-1980 Garage because it is not old enough to treat as part of the historic property.
   - Option 3.b.: Convert Garage to an orientation center at which a video can be shown and from which tours begin. The building may also be large enough to accommodate some small meetings, an admissions desk, and a display rack with free brochures and a limited number of items for sale. The building should include two accessible rest rooms.

4. General Restoration of Exterior Features (common to all alternatives)
   In all the alternatives, as outlined below, the approach to the building’s exterior will be the same:
   - Restoration of most finishes, including replacing the current roof with new wood shingles and appropriate underlayment;
   - Repairing and repainting the wood siding, trim, and window details;
   - Retaining and repairing, or restoring, almost all other current exterior details;
   - Reopening the rear (west) door of the log house that was converted to a window in 1936, in order to accommodate a lower floor in the log room and to allow visitors access to the log room from a confined truck garden exhibit.

5. Shutter Options
   The shutters are part of the 1936 design. Removing them could result in “softening” the 1936 Colonial Revival design and the suburban aspects of the current appearance. However, while the house did not have shutters in the oldest surviving photographs, simply removing them would not faithfully restore the façade of the frame house to its pre-1936 appearance, because the spacing and size of the windows and
the location of the entrance door have all been altered. (Note that one of the shutters closes over the main entrance door, serving a similar function to that of a screen door.)

- Option 5.a.: Restore the shutters, repairing damaged elements, and remaining faithful to the 1936 design.
- Option 5.b.: Remove the shutters to “soften” the character of the Colonial Revival reinterpretation of the house (the shutters and hinges should retained and stored on site, if this alternative is followed).

6. Windows and Entrance Door of the Frame House

Enough information exists in the oldest photographs of the house to allow for restoration of the windows and entrance door to the pre-1936 design, but doing so would heavily disturb other aspects of the house while only slightly changing the exterior appearance. Custom-made sashes could be made to recreate the earlier appearance, but going back to the earlier spacing would require replacing the wood siding of at least the house’s façade (east elevation). It would also disturb the house’s plaster system, requiring extensive patching and repairs. The historic siding material from the 1820s is not known, as the treatment shown in the earliest photographs of the house is characteristic of siding that would have been installed long after the 1820s (probably as late as 1880 or 1890). Because the studs were reinforced with modern lumber in 1936, the walls are now a few inches wider and more plumb than they were in the design seen in the pre-1936 images, making it even more difficult to duplicate the appearance seen in the historic photographs. It may be most sensible and make the most sense from a preservation point of view to retain the basic features of the 1936 façade.

- Option 6.a.: Keep the window and door design as they are now. Install interior storm windows if improved thermal characteristics are desired (as well as reduction of infiltration and ultra-violet light for other reasons, such as maintaining an appropriate environment for museum-quality collections).
- Option 6.b.: Replace the windows and doors to match the appearance seen in the photographs. It may be possible to improve the thermal qualities of the windows this way, by using new materials, as long as the pre-1936 design appearance is achieved. Replace siding using the current size of weatherboards and maintaining the current corner boards.
- Option 6.c.: Consider restoring the door, windows, weatherboards, and corner boards all at once to their appearance before 1936, including original window and door spacing.

7. Kitchen (West) Porch Options

The kitchen porch is an example of a detail of the 1936 design that has integrity to the 1936 design and conveys the appearance and feeling of the 1930s, but is in poor condition.

- Option 7.a.: Remove this porch and close-in the kitchen doorway (this alternative would permanently alter the design and integrity of the 1936 kitchen wing).
- Option 7.b.: Restore the porch, repairing or replacing damaged materials, following the 1936 design.

8. Window/Door from Current Library to Exterior

Exterior options would include reopening the door from the current library to the exterior and rebuilding the porch that once connected that doorway to the log building.

- Option 8.a.: Leave the current window as it is.
- Option 8.b.: Reopen the exterior doorway that formerly existed at the north wall of the current library and rebuild the porch, based on the photographs that exist, to provide a connection to the current front door of the log wing.

9. Southeast Window/Doorway to the 1936 Kitchen Wing

- Option 9.a.: Leave the current window as it is.
• Option 9.b.: Reopen the exterior doorway that formerly existed (in the original 1936 design of this wing) at the south end of the hallway from the dining room to the kitchen and living room, and use this as a way to provide an accessible path into the house by way of a ramp. The new doorway will have to be wider than it was in the 1936 design.

10. Log Room Interior
• Option 10.a.: Restore the room to its appearance in 1936-39. In this option, the logs would be left exposed, since they appeared that way in a 1939 photograph that appeared in a local newspaper (The Star) showing Mrs. Bolten, with a caption saying that she was “seated...in the restored old slave quarters and log kitchen” (Washington Star, July 30, 1939; see Appendix F, page F-2). Restore all other aspects of the room to match the 1936 drawings, with the 1939 photograph as back-up evidence.
• Option 10.b.: Treat the log room as a teaching environment to tell the story of kitchen spaces and log quarters on the property prior to 1828. Leave log walls exposed; re-open rear (west) door so that access can be made part of an accessible path from an orientation space in the garage; lower the floor to align with the lowest logs; create a floor surface that resembles a dirt floor (possibly tinted concrete with a slightly uneven surface and a sand finish); reinstall the loft floor to serve as a ceiling, using hand-hewn framing members.
  o Option 10.b.1.: Keep the stairs and doorway open to the current dining room.
  o Option 10.b.2.: Remove the current stairs, making access to the rest of the house only by way of going outside and coming back in a separate entrance, but keep the opening to allow visitors to see the loft area and the log room from the current dining room.
  o Option 10.b.3.: Remove the current stairs and close-in the doorway. Since patching the logs with new pieces of logs may not produce a satisfactory appearance and will disturb the adjoining areas where the log walls and some of the oldest mortar are intact, it may be appropriate to use the doorway area as a place to install a display case and/or an enlarged, or some similar interpretive material.

11. Library
• Option 11.a.: Keep the Library as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Interpret as a library. Possibly use shelves for books that can be used by visitors while doing onsite research.
• Option 11.b. Keep the Library as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Use as a library and use shelves for books that can be used by visitors.
• Option 11.c. Keep the Library as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Reopen the doorway where the north window is now, in tandem with restoring the missing porch that connected the frame house to the log house. Possibly use as part of the visitor path (though not accessible for those with disabilities).
• Option 11.d. Remove the book cases and other 1936 details, keeping fireplace as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match presumed 1820s-1880s design (based on Josiah Henson’s description of the property in the 1820s and during his return visit in 1878). Reopen the doorway where the north window is now, in tandem with restoring the missing porch that connected the frame house to the log house. Possibly use as part of the visitor path (though not accessible for those with disabilities).

12. Living Room
• Option 12.a.: Keep the Living Room as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Interpret as a living room, but also with some interpretive exhibits.
Option 12.b.: While keeping the plaster, fireplace, window details, and doorway details as they are, use the wall space and floor space for exhibit materials, such as enlarged photographs, interpretive panels, a timeline, display cases, interactive exhibits, etc.

Option 12.c.: Keep the Living Room as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Use as a meeting space with some exhibits on walls.

13. Dining Room

Option 13.a.: Keep the Dining Room as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Interpret as a dining room. Possibly use the room to display Riley family artifacts. (Note alternatives listed above under Log House for the doorway between the Log House and the Dining Room.)

Option 13.b.: Return some aspects of the Dining Room to the presumed design before 1936. Remove shelves over fireplace. Reverse other 1936 alterations to fireplace. Possibly recreate missing wall at west side of room where the space was enlarged in 1936. Possibly interpret the room as a dining room (or, it may have been a bedroom). Possibly use the room to display Riley family artifacts or as space for exhibits on both the Henson and Riley stories, perhaps showing the contrast between the formality and higher standard of living in the frame house and the conditions in the log house, seen at a distance looking through the opening that now connects the two rooms. (Also, note the other alternatives listed above under Log House for the doorway between the Log House and the Dining Room.)

14. Kitchen in 1936 Wing

Option 14.a.: Keep the details that date from 1936 in place. Remove cabinets and appliances that are not shown on the 1936 drawings. Restore the base cabinets and fixtures that are shown on the 1936 drawings to match the 1936 design. Replace wallpaper, mosaic tile countertops, and similar surface details to return the character of the room to the 1930s. Interpret as a kitchen and use it as a place to talk about the 1930s and modernization of historic houses in that era.

Option 14.b.: Keep the details that date from 1936 in place. Remove cabinets and appliances that are not shown on the 1936 drawings. Replace wallpaper, mosaic tile countertops, and similar surface details to something more fitting with the character of a room from the 1930s, but not purely to serve as an exhibit depicting a kitchen. Restore the base cabinets and fixtures that are shown on the 1936 drawings to match the 1936 design. Use the room as a combination of part exhibit on the 1930s and kitchen functions and part other uses, possibly including a small museum shop. It would also be appropriate to add a counter behind which a sales person could stand, with a glazed display case featuring key publications and other sales items.

Option 14.c.: Remove all appliances. Completely convert the room to contain interpretive exhibits on the plantation experience.

15. Screened-in Porch

Option 15.a.: Keep largely as it is, but repair damaged details and restore details that date from the 1936 design. At minimum, replace the damaged wood components (posts, screen framing) and correct problems with the brick pavers. Furnish as a covered patio/porch, and interpret it as such.

Option 15.b.: Completely rebuild this space to provide one more room for the house. New floor should be on level with interior of house, and room should be completely sealed as part of interior space. Use the room to house a research library and possibly a small museum shop.

16. Second Story

Option 16.a.: Repair where materials have been damaged and restore the design in accordance with the 1936 drawings (some details on the 1936 drawings may not have ever been built as
shown: examples are the wall that is shown dividing the current ell-shaped bedroom into a bedroom and a sewing room, the closet shown in the southeast corner of this space, and the paneling shown for the vertical sections of the walls). Use the space as limited office and storage space, to the extent that may be allowed by code. Consider offering a “virtual tour” for those visitors who are unable to access the second story.

- Option 16.b.: Repair where materials have been damaged without removing or destroying any details shown on the 1936 drawings. Reinforce the floors as needed and provide accessibility features (chair lift or elevator) to allow use by public. (The exact reinforcement requirements have not been calculated because not every joist was visible for this study; reinforcement may be possible by removing flooring and sistering joists in certain locations, depending upon the exact nature of hidden conditions.) Use the space as office and library space for a research facility, to the extent that may be allowed by code.

- Option 16.c.: Repair where materials have been damaged without removing or destroying any details shown on the 1936 drawings. Reinforce the floors as needed and provide accessibility features (chair lift or elevator) to allow use by public. Use the space as exhibit space, to the extent that may be allowed by code.
ALTERNATIVES

To provide a basis for comparison, three alternatives will be considered based upon elements from the above menu of choices. These alternatives are only hypothetical ways to combine the various choices for each part of the house, laid out here only as possibilities.

Alternative #1
Minimum Changes to the House, for use as a museum focused on Josiah Henson’s story, plantation life, and slavery with some interpretation of the Riley family and of the 1936-era architecture. This approach would be the least costly and would have the least adverse effect on the historic resources.

1. General Landscape — Keep landscape approximately as it is now. (Option 1.a.)

2. Driveway Access — Keep the road access as it is, but widen the driveway as much as is possible to create some additional parking. (Option 2.a.)

3. Garage — Demolish the ca.1970-1980 Garage because it is not old enough to treat as part of the historic property. (Option 3.a.)

4. General Restoration of Exterior Features (the same in all alternatives)

5. Shutters — Restore the shutters, repairing damaged elements, and remaining faithful to the 1936 design. (Option 5.a.)

6. Windows and Entrance Door of the Frame House — Keep the window and door design as they are now. Install interior storm windows for improved thermal characteristics. (All options assume the house would have an air-conditioning system and a forced-air heating system other than an oil-fired furnace.) (Option 6.a.)

7. Kitchen (West) Porch — Restore/repair the rear (west) porch adjoining the kitchen, replacing damaged materials, following the 1936 design. (Option 7.b.)

8. Window/Door from Current Library to Exterior — Leave the window as it is. (Option 8.a.)

9. Southeast Window/Doorway to the 1936 Kitchen Wing — Leave window as it is. (Option 9.a.)

10. Log Room Interior — Restore the room to its appearance in 1936-39. (Option 10.a.)

11. Library — Keep the Library as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Interpret or use as a library, possibly with books that can be used by visitors. (Option 11.a.)

12. Living Room — Keep the Living Room as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Use as a meeting space with some exhibits on walls. (Option 12.c.)

13. Dining Room — Return some aspects of the Dining Room to the presumed design before 1936. Remove shelves over fireplace. Use the wall space and floor area for exhibits about the plantation experience. (Option 13.c.)

14. Kitchen in 1936 Wing — Keep the details that date from 1936 in place. Remove cabinets and appliances that are not shown on the 1936 drawings. Replace wallpaper, mosaic tile countertops, and
similar surface details to something more fitting with the character of a room from the 1930s, but not purely to serve as an exhibit depicting a kitchen. Restore the base cabinets and fixtures that are shown on the 1936 drawings to match the 1936 design. Use the room as a combination of part exhibit on the 1930s and kitchen functions and part other uses, possibly including a small museum shop. (Option 14.b.)

15. Screened-in Porch — Keep it as it is, but repair damaged details and restore details that date from the 1936 design. At minimum, replace the damaged wood components (posts, screen framing) and correct problems with the brick pavers. Furnish as a covered patio/porch, and interpret it as such. (Option 15.a.)

16. Second Story — Repair any damaged materials and restore the design in accordance with the 1936 drawings (except those details on the 1936 drawings that were never built as shown. Use the as limited office and storage space, to the extent that may be allowed by code. (Option 16.a.)

**Proposed Budget for this Alternative:** $257,880.00

---

3 This figure is based on a compilation of rough estimates for the items listed plus a contingency. Some areas were estimated based more on budgetary priorities and emphasis than on actual costs. The figure is intended as an order of magnitude estimate and a beginning point for selecting alternatives and prioritizing and budgeting work. A more precise estimate will depend upon design development when design services for rehabilitation are under contract.
Plan of Alternative #1 — Museum, Minimum Changes
Alternative #2
More Extensive Changes to the House, for use as a museum focused on Josiah Henson’s story, plantation life, and slavery, also with interpretation of the Riley family and of the 1936-era architecture. This approach would entail a few costs over what is absolutely necessary and would have a more pronounced effect on the historic resources.

1. **General Landscape** — Remove boxwoods, some trees, and most twentieth century hardscape features (patios, walkways, barbecue, etc.) to achieve a design that more closely resembles the property in Henson’s time. Create a facsimile of a slavery-era vegetable garden between the 1936 kitchen wing, the garage, and the log house and in the area behind the kitchen wing. (Option 1.b.)

2. **Driveway Access** — Arrange with the neighboring property owners (the Aish HaTorah Synagogue) to use their parking area at certain times of the day and on certain occasions, and build a walkway with an accessible path as needed to the house. (Option 2.b.)

3. **Garage** — Convert Garage to an orientation center at which a video can be shown and from which tours begin. The building may also be large enough to accommodate some small meetings, an admissions desk, and a display rack with free brochures and a limited number of items for sale. The building should include two accessible rest rooms. (Option 3.b.)

4. **General Restoration of Exterior Features** (the same in all alternatives)

5. **Shutters** — Remove the shutters to “soften” the character of the Colonial Revival reinterpretation of the house. (Option 5.b.)

6. **Windows and Entrance Door of the Frame House** — Replace the windows and doors to match the appearance seen in the photographs. Replace siding using the current size of weatherboards and maintaining the current corner boards, or using wider weatherboards based on evidence found in the cavity between the log and frame houses. (Option 6.b.)

7. **Kitchen (West) Porch** — Restore the porch, repairing or replacing damaged materials, following the 1936 design in all aspects but keeping glazed storm enclosure. (Option 7.b.)

8. **Window/Door from Current Library to Exterior** — Leave the window as it is. (Option 8.a.)

9. **Southeast Window/Doorway to the 1936 Kitchen Wing** — Reopen the exterior doorway that formerly existed at the south end of the hallway from the dining room to the kitchen and living room, using it as part of an accessible path into the house by way of a ramp. (Option 9.b.)

10. **Log Room Interior** — Treat the log room as a teaching environment to tell the story of kitchen spaces and log quarters on the property prior to 1828. Leave log walls exposed; re-open rear (west) door so that access can be made part of an accessible path from an orientation space in the garage; lower the floor to align with the lowest logs; create a floor surface that resembles a dirt floor (possibly tinted concrete with a slightly uneven surface and a sand finish); reinstall the loft floor to serve as a ceiling, using hand-hewn framing members. (Option 10.b.)

11. **Library** — Remove the bookcases added to the room in 1936, but keep all other aspects of the room’s design as they are now. (Option 11.b.)
12. **Living Room** — Keep the Living Room as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match the 1936 design. Interpret as a living room, but also with some interpretive exhibits. (Option 12.a.)

13. **Dining Room** — Keep the Dining Room as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match 1936 design. Interpret as a dining room, possibly displaying Riley family artifacts. (Option 13.a.)

14. **Kitchen in 1936 Wing** — Keep the details that date from 1936 in place. Remove cabinets and appliances not shown on the 1936 drawings. Restore the base cabinets and fixtures shown on the 1936 drawings to match the 1936 design. Replace wallpaper, mosaic tile countertops, etc. to return the character of the room to the 1930s. Interpret as a kitchen and use it as a place to talk about the 1930s and modernization of historic houses in that era. (Option 14.a.)

15. **Screened-in Porch** — Completely rebuild this space to provide one more room for the house. New floor should be on level with interior of house, and room should be completely sealed as part of interior space. Use the room to house a research library and possibly a small museum shop. (Option 15.b.)

16. **Second Story** — Repair where materials have been damaged without removing or destroying any details shown on the 1936 drawings. Reinforce the floors as needed and provide accessibility features (chair lift or elevator) to allow use by public. (The exact reinforcement requirements have not been calculated because not every joist was visible for this study; reinforcement may be possible by removing flooring and sistering joists in certain locations, depending upon the exact nature of hidden conditions.) Use the space as office and library space for a research facility, to the extent that may be allowed by code. (Option 16.b.)

**Proposed Budget for this Alternative:** $788,400.00

---

4 This figure is based on a compilation of rough estimates for the items listed plus a contingency. Some areas were estimated based more on budgetary priorities and emphasis than on actual costs. The figure is intended as an order of magnitude estimate and a beginning point for selecting alternatives and prioritizing and budgeting work. A more precise estimate will depend upon design development when design services for rehabilitation are under contract.
Plan of Alternative #2 — Museum, Moderate Changes
Alternative #3
Generally, extensive changes to each part the House, for the most accurate or useful design of each of the house’s components as facilities for a museum focused on Josiah Henson’s story, plantation life, and slavery, with interpretation of the Riley family as well. This alternative has more focus on the 1936-era architecture in some parts of the house than the other alternatives. An exception would be in the kitchen, which would be gutted and rebuilt as an exhibit space. This approach incorporates some items that may be disproportionately costly, and in some areas, it would have a negative effect regarding some of the historic materials, particularly those dating from 1936.

1. General Landscape — Remove boxwoods, some trees, and most twentieth century hardscape features (patios, walkways, barbecue, etc.) based on achieving a design that more closely resembles the property in Henson’s time. Create a facsimile of a slavery-era vegetable garden between the 1936 kitchen wing, the garage, and the log house extending back into the area behind the kitchen wing. Purchase adjoining property to allow for additional archeology, the creation of larger representations of agricultural fields, and possible recreation of slave quarters and other outbuildings. (Option 1.c.)

2. Driveway Access — Purchase some adjoining land (such as behind the neighboring synagogue) and build a new driveway access from Tilden Lane to the current parking circle, possibly abandoning (or at least limiting or locking) the access from the current cub cut on Old Georgetown Road. (Option 2.c.)

3. Garage — Convert Garage to an orientation center at which a video can be shown and from which tours begin. The building may also be large enough to accommodate some small meetings, an admissions desk, and a display rack with free brochures and a limited number of items for sale. The building should include two accessible rest rooms. (Option 3.b.)

4. General Restoration of Exterior Features (the same in all alternatives)

5. Shutters — Restore the shutters, repairing damaged elements, and remaining faithful to the 1936 design. (Option 5.a.)

6. Windows and Entrance Door of the Frame House — Replace the windows and doors to match the appearance seen in the photographs. Replace siding using the current size of weatherboards and maintaining the current corner boards. Restore the door, windows, weatherboards, and corner boards all at once to their appearance before 1936, including original spacing. (Option 6.b.)

7. Kitchen (West) Porch — Remove this porch and close-in the kitchen doorway (this alternative would permanently alter the design and integrity of the 1936 kitchen wing). (Option 7.a.)

8. Window/Door from Current Library to Exterior — Reopen the exterior doorway that formerly existed at the north wall of the current library and rebuild the porch, based on the photographs that exist, to provide a connection to the current front door of the log wing. (Option 8.b.)

9. Southeast Window/Doorway to the 1936 Kitchen Wing — Reopen the exterior doorway that formerly existed the south end of the hallway from the dining room to the kitchen and living room, using it as part of an accessible path into the house by way of a ramp. (Option 9.b.)

10. Log Room Interior — Treat the log room as a teaching environment to tell the story of kitchen spaces and log quarters on the property prior to 1828. Leave log walls exposed; re-open rear (west) door so that access can be made part of an accessible path from an orientation space in the garage; lower the floor to align with the lowest logs; create a floor surface that resembles a dirt floor (possibly tinted concrete with
a slightly uneven surface and a sand finish); reinstall the loft floor to serve as a ceiling, using hand-hewn framing members. (Option 10.b.)

11. **Library** — Remove the book cases and other 1936 details, keeping fireplace as it is, restoring surfaces and fixtures to match presumed 1820s-1880s design. Reopen the doorway where the north window is now, in tandem with restoring the missing porch that connected the frame house to the log house. Possibly use as part of the visitor path (though not accessible for those with disabilities). (Option 11.d.)

12. **Living Room** — While keeping the plaster, fireplace, window details, and doorway details as they are, use the wall space and floor space for exhibit materials, such as enlarged photographs, interpretive panels, a timeline, display cases, interactive exhibits, etc. (Option 12.b.)

13. **Dining Room** — Return some aspects of the Dining Room to the presumed design before 1936. Remove shelves over fireplace. Reverse other 1936 alterations to fireplace. Possibly recreate missing wall at west side of room where the space was enlarged in 1936. Possibly interpret the room as a dining room (or, it may have been a bedroom). Possibly use the room to display Riley family artifacts or as space for exhibits on both the Henson and Riley stories, perhaps showing the contrast between the formality and higher standard of living in the frame house and the conditions in the log house, seen at a distance looking through the opening that now connects the two rooms. (Option 13.b.)

14. **Kitchen in 1936 Wing** — Remove all appliances. Remove exterior porch and seal doorway. Completely convert the room to contain interpretive exhibits on the plantation experience. (Option 14.c.)

15. **Screened-in Porch** — Completely rebuild this space to provide one more room for the house. New floor should be on level with interior of house, and room should be completely sealed as part of interior space. Use the room to house a research library and possibly a small museum shop. (Option 15.b.)

16. **Second Story** — Repair where materials have been damaged without removing or destroying any details shown on the 1936 drawings. Reinforce the floors as needed and provide accessibility features (chair lift or elevator) to allow use by public. Use the space as exhibit space, to the extent that may be allowed by code. (Option 16.c.)

**Proposed Budget for this Alternative:** $905,520.00  

---

5 This figure is based on a compilation of rough estimates for the items listed plus a contingency. Some areas were estimated based more on budgetary priorities and emphasis than on actual costs. The figure is intended as an order of magnitude estimate and a beginning point for selecting alternatives and prioritizing and budgeting work. A more precise estimate will depend upon design development when design services for rehabilitation are under contract.
Plan of Alternative #3 — Museum, Extensive Changes for Interpretive Purposes
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