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(ABSTRACT)

Solitude, a nineteenth century farmhouse and historic landmark, located on the campus of Virginia Tech is currently slated for preservation. The purpose of this study was to trace the architectural history of the farmhouse and adjacent outbuilding through its existing millwork, hardware, and other architectural features.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century architectural pattern books and the knowledge of architectural historians were used to date the interior millwork and hardware in this building. The millwork and hardware produced evidence of at least three distinct design periods. To determine if millwork and hardware dates supported the approximate construction dates commonly thought accurate for the three major sections of this building. The 1801 and 1834 sections of the house exhibit Federal style. Greek Revival dominates the 1851 section, as well as the renovated 1801 section, and the later additions exhibit Victorian style details. The
adjacent log and frame outbuilding contained millwork that mixed Federal and Greek Revival elements.

Using this information, along with information obtained from researchers who previously studied Solitude, a sequence of floor plans was developed. These plans show the evolution of the house through two major additions, as well as three smaller ones. The evolution of the outbuilding was also noted.
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INTRODUCTION

Steadfastly guarding the north end of Virginia Tech's campus stands a stark white edifice known as Solitude. Built on the site of a bloody eighteenth century Indian attack, this house has been present through nearly two hundred years of change. This structure evolved through America's second war with England, providing a shelter of thick log walls for its occupants as Jackson fought in New Orleans. It grew into a family home and swelled in size as its owner prepared to command the 28th Virginia Regiment during The War Between the States. And, by the time Americans were "remembering the Maine", Solitude had become the cornerstone of a growing college. The building stood solid when the seemingly insignificant cost of repairs threatened its existence as a faculty house while Doughboys fought in France. And it welcomed home G.I.'s who returned from the Pacific, and those who returned from the hills of Korea, and the jungles of Viet Nam. Solitude has survived the education of hundreds of students and still clings to its foundation. This home/clubhouse/building has stood its ground for nearly two centuries. It has endured many changes, withstood environmental and economic threats, and has continued to serve as a source of comfort, knowledge,
and mystery for those who become acquainted with it. However, because the factors that have opposed its existence have been continual, their toll is now jeopardizing its future.

Today, preservation of historic sites and buildings has become an expected course of events. We expect to have elements of the past preserved as teaching instruments and as part of the inheritance that passes from generation to generation. However, even with increased awareness of the value of historic properties and increased appreciation for the living link they provide with our past, these properties face increasing danger. Environmental conditions such as pollution and natural weathering slowly deteriorate architectural details. Economic conditions often cause either a lack of funds needed to save historic properties and structures, or rapid development which sometimes leads to the immediate destruction of these properties.

One solution that preserves the historical context of a property while allowing, and sometimes even assisting, economic development and furthering education is adaptive reuse. As opposed to what is commonly known as restoration, adaptive reuse does not produce a period museum, rather it can preserve important historical elements, such as architectural features, while creating a new use for the property under consideration.
For instance, the Kentucky Building on the campus of Western Kentucky University in Bowling Green, houses a museum with both permanent and temporary exhibits, a library, and conference rooms -- all available to the public as an educational tool. The Kentucky Building, built in 1939 (Miller, 1983), retains the character of the original house while accommodating a modern addition.

Even though adaptive reuse appears to be the most economically feasible solution to preserving old buildings, restoration plays a vital role in educating people about the past. Campuses across the country have also used the idea of restoration to incorporate older buildings into active campus life. The University of Rhode Island in Kingston has restored an eighteenth century farmhouse to what is considered typical of late eighteenth century southern Rhode Island architecture. Before its restoration, the Watson House, named for its last private owner, was used for a farm manager's residence, a women's dormitory, a fraternity house, a men's dormitory, and a Home Economics Department nursery school and tea room. The current restoration provides a living example of how late eighteenth and early nineteenth century farmers of southern Rhode Island lived their daily life. Guided tours provide interested visitors with insight into the lives of these people through the
furnishings, household equipment and decorative objects displayed (Higa, 1983).

By combining the example of adaptive reuse and restoration, a building can most easily be used for educational purposes and self-sustaining profit. The Solitude property at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) in Blacksburg is an excellent candidate for this form of adaptive reuse. Overlooking the duckponds on the north end of campus, this building, listed on the National Register for Historic Places, is easily accessible to both visitors and students.

The historical importance of this building, as well as its outbuilding, involves both the University and the surrounding community. The evolution of a people, a community, or a country is often recorded in the evolution of its buildings. Because the history of Solitude spans nearly two centuries, and because its architecture and architectural details provide insight into changes that occurred during that time, the building provides an excellent learning tool for the history of the area, as well as a template for documenting the history of its contemporaries.

The use of millwork and hardware to date this building can provide an essential affirmation of previous research and a deeper insight into the history of the building and
its occupants. Also, it allows for the analysis of the more human aspects of the design, such as craftsmanship, to be examined. And, finally, it provides a cost effective method of documenting the age of houses that would otherwise be unable to afford the more costly scientific methods of analysis.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to trace the architectural history of a nineteenth century farmhouse and outbuilding, namely Solitude, by analyzing the style and origins of interior millwork, doors, windows, and hardware. Using millwork pattern books, resources on architectural styles, periods, and architects' and historians' knowledge of vernacular architecture, the existing architectural details provided a framework for mapping the interior construction of this nineteenth century farmhouse and outbuilding.

Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

1) to identify and date millwork, architectural details, and architectural hardware of Solitude and the adjacent outbuilding by period and origin through the use of contemporaneous pattern books.

2) to document the millwork, doors, windows, and hardware through line drawings.

3) to develop a series of floor plans illustrating the evolutionary development of Solitude and the outbuilding.
Justification of Study

One of the primary justifications for this study was that, according to regional historians, no study has been done in the Southwest Virginia region to document historical millwork. (However, millwork is often mentioned in local National Register Nominations for historical buildings in an effort to illustrate the historical importance of a particular building.) Also lacking in documentation was vernacular architecture. While period houses finished in high style are often noted, simpler, vernacular houses, produced by local craftsmen are often ignored.

Secondly, it was important to fully document as many aspects of Solitude as possible for purposes of preservation and restoration. In order for Solitude to be preserved and restored it must first be understood. Concealed within the architectural features of this building are nearly two hundred years of information. Information obtained from studying the millwork, doors, windows, and hardware of this house can support, add to, or perhaps produce new knowledge on the evolution of the Solitude house and outbuilding.

Finally, Solitude has played an important role in both the history of the University and that of the local community. As the oldest building on campus, as well as being the original farmhouse on the property that became Virginia Tech's campus, it provides the roots to the
University's existence. And as a result of its age, and its existing original details and structure, this house may provide insight into local and regional trends in millwork, doors, windows, and hardware that could be used for documenting the age and evolution of other local buildings.

Methodology

The data of this research was collected from both primary and secondary sources.

The primary data. Contemporaneous pattern books, tax records, artifacts, inventories, oral histories, structural reports were all primary data used in this study.

The secondary data. Current books, articles, and other publications reporting, evaluating, or commenting on life styles and available materials in southwest Virginia in the nineteenth century, were secondary sources of data used in this study.

Operational Definitions.

Architectural features may include such things as building or moulding seams (lines indicating a break or cut in the surface), sizes or changes in plank flooring, ghost marks, or changes in wall thickness or ceiling heights.
Architectural hardware refers to both functional and decorative features, usually made of metal, such as, door hinges, lock boxes, and knobs.

Dendrochronology refers to the process of dating cut logs through the use of "key-year" cross referencing. These key years indicate the last growth period (year) in which the tree was standing.

Ghost marks are evidence of building features, such as windows, doors, mantels, or mouldings, as seen through irregular lines or patterns on walls, floors, or ceilings.

Millwork refers to both functional and decorative features of an interior that include doors and door mouldings; base, chair rail, and ceiling mouldings; wainscot, windows and window mouldings; and parts of a stairway, such as, decorative stringers, railings, and newel posts.

Running bond refers to a brick pattern typical of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries where bricks are placed end to end in consecutive rows.

Organization of the Thesis. The background of this study is a compiled history of Solitude and the outbuilding in relation to its former owners and the local area, that is Blacksburg, Montgomery County, and Virginia Tech. This
section provides information concerning the buildings that was recorded prior to this investigation.

This chapter includes the following: a) history of ownership of the property; b) known history of the buildings; c) dendrochronology research conducted on the main house; and, d) archeological reports concerning the area around the outbuilding.

The ownership of the property in question was traced through Montgomery County, Virginia Deed Books, and property value increases (indicating possible building improvements) were traced through Montgomery County, Virginia Tax Records. Both of these sources were obtained from the Montgomery County Courthouse in Christiansburg, Virginia. The currently accepted history of the main house was obtained from various reports including the National Historic Register Nomination for Solitude (Worsham, 1988), "The Evolution of Solitude" (Ballard, 1991), and a dendrochronology report provided by Jack Heikkenen (1990). A list of artifacts recovered from the site of the outbuilding that are currently being processed, as well as an evaluation of these materials was also used.

The findings were reported in chapter form, as well as in a timeline (located in Appendix C) to provide an understanding of the history and the importance of the Preston family, Solitude, and the outbuilding in question.
Secondly, to add to the understanding of the history and the importance of the Solitude property, the history and genealogy of the Preston family of Smithfield and Solitude was traced. Because this family owned the Solitude property for nearly eight decades, and because they were instrumental in nearly every architectural change that occurred there, it is important to understand the Prestons' roles in forming their community and homes.

To accomplish this the Preston family was traced backwards, from the last private owner of Solitude, Robert T. Preston, and his children. This was done by reviewing primary sources such as letters, diaries, and memoranda, and secondary sources such as Dorman's *The Prestons of Smithfield and Greenfield in Virginia* (1982) and Johnson's *William Preston and the Allegheny Patriots* (1976).

The primary sources of information were obtained from several collections, one located in the Special Collections at Newman Library on the campus of Virginia Tech, and another in the Preston Collection at the Filson Club in Louisville, Kentucky, and a third exists at the University of Kentucky Archives in Lexington, Kentucky. Additional information on the Preston family is located in the Preston Collection at the Library of Congress, and in the Draper Manuscripts, on microfilm at the Newman Library. The data collected was compiled into a narrative of Robert T.
Preston, his immediate family, and his ancestors. A family "tree" was also constructed to facilitate references and was placed in Appendix D.

The first objective of the study was to identify millwork, architectural details, and hardware of both buildings by time period and place of origin, that is, whether it was locally made, or commercially made and imported into the region. Line drawings and profiles were made of existing millwork, doors, windows, and hardware and compared to line drawings and profiles found in nineteenth century pattern books and other resources.

To meet this objective the following were used: a) nineteenth century architectural pattern books, particularly those used in Southwest Virginia; b) information from historic architects on the styles of millwork used in nineteenth century Southwest Virginia; and c) a list of local nineteenth century carpenters and their tools, clients, and moulding profile patterns; d) the knowledge of architectural historians familiar with nineteenth century Southwest Virginia.

Nineteenth century pattern books and books on styles of millwork used in Southwest Virginia were obtained from the Art and Architecture Library and Special Collections at Virginia Tech, the Fine Arts Library at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, and the Roanoke Regional
Preservation Center in Roanoke, Virginia. Additional information was obtained from architectural historians Gibson Worsham, Montgomery County, Leslie Giles, Roanoke Regional Preservation Center, Charles Brownell and Edward Lay, University of Virginia, and, Tony Whitwell, Hollins College, and preservation publications.

Local nineteenth century carpenters are recorded in census records and in a comprehensive Montgomery County historic sites survey compiled by Worsham in 1986, both available at the Montgomery County Court House.

The data collected were used to analyze existing millwork, architectural details and hardware in Solitude and the outbuilding. The information on time periods and origin of the millwork was used to help trace the evolution of the construction of Solitude.

The second objective was to record the existing millwork, doors, windows, and hardware through profiles and elevation drawings. Through the use of a profile gauge and/or tape measure the following were documented, either in full-scale or in scaled drawings: all mantels; all entrances; ceiling, base and chair rail mouldings; "typical" doors and windows; stair details; and door lock boxes. These drawings were then used to compare the architectural features found in Solitude with those documented in nineteenth century pattern books and other sources. These
profile and elevation drawings also serve as a permanent record and point of comparison for millwork found in nineteenth century Southwest Virginia.

The final objective was to develop a series of drawings illustrating the evolutionary development of Solitude and the outbuilding. The following evolutionary phases were illustrated: 1801 phase, 1834 phase, 1851 phase, the log and frame outbuilding, and "later" additions. Through the use of the documented periods of the millwork, doors, windows, and hardware, along with dendrochronology reports and analysis of building seams or other visible features, the evolution of the buildings was followed. It was understood that no part of either building was to be destroyed or damaged in order to obtain a better understanding of any part of that building's development. Therefore, the attempt to identify placement of former windows, doors or other items relied on existing ghost marks, infrared photography, and conjecture.
CHAPTER I
THE HISTORY OF SOLITUDE

In the eighteenth century, Blacksburg, Virginia was part of a settlement known as Draper's Meadow. Earlier explorers had discovered acres of cleared meadows (possibly left by Shawnee) in the New River Valley. By 1755, several German and Scot-Irish families had established a permanent settlement in this area. In July 1755, an infamous Indian attack was believed to have occurred on or near the present site of Solitude. In all, eight people were reported to have been killed and Mary Draper Ingles and another woman were kidnapped (Givens, 1975). Both women eventually returned to their homes and their saga later inspired the outdoor drama "A Long Way Home". In 1843, Letitia Preston Floyd (great-niece of James Patton, who was killed in the raid), a former resident of Solitude, wrote a letter to her son describing the incident as it had been related to her,

...a party of Indians came up the Kanawha- thence to Sinking Creek, thence to Strouble's Creek. Ingles and Draper were living at Solitude, the present home of Col. Robert T. Preston....(Newman Library, Preston Collection).

This letter often led researchers to believe that part of the present structure of Solitude was standing in 1755.
However, dendrochronology studies have shown the earliest part of the structure to be constructed of trees that had been felled no earlier than 1798 (Heikkenen, 1990). Therefore, Letitia P. Floyd was referring to the area of Solitude, and not the home itself.

Possibly one of the first owners of Solitude, the home, was Phillip Barger, Jr. (Another Phillip Barger was reported by Letitia Floyd to have been decapitated by the Indians in the July 1755 raid). In 1803, Mr. Barger sold 200 acres at the headwaters of Strouble's Creek to James Patton Preston. This was part of the larger tract of 7,500 acres called Draper (Kegley, 1980). According to key-year crossdating methods, the oldest remaining section of Solitude contains floor joists that were hewed from trees that had been felled over a four year period from 1798 to and including 1801 (Heikkenen, 1990). Since trees were usually used soon after being felled it is most probable that the first section of Solitude was constructed prior to being purchased by James P. Preston in 1803.

This parcel of land was sold again in 1807 to Granville Smith (Deed Book D, p.13, 514), uncle of James P. Preston and brother-in-law of William Preston, builder of Smithfield. Granville Smith is credited with naming what is believed to be his retreat or second home "Solitude". The name first appears in a letter from Granville Smith to John
Preston on December 13, 1808 (Worsham, 1988).

During the time Granville Smith owned the property his niece, Letitia P. Floyd and her husband, Dr. John Floyd (later governor of Virginia) were reported to have resided there. Several letters written by Mrs. Floyd between 1814 and 1815 contain the heading "Solitude" (Worsham, 1988). However, one account gives the place of birth for Letitia's and John's son, John Buchanan Floyd (also a Virginia governor) as Smithfield (Dorman, 1982). Solitude appears again in 1816, when James P. Preston applied to the court for permission to build a water grist mill at Solitude (Will Book 2, p. 285), resulting in the first of the two ponds now located in front of Solitude.

The next report of a Solitude resident appears to be 1820, when John Hammet, overseer at the Horseshoe Farm, employed by then Virginia governor, James P. Preston, planned to build a distillery near the mill in partnership with a Mr. Gull, "tenant at Solitude". The distillery was objected to by Mrs. Preston "because it would ruin the negroes", and apparently, was never built (Newman Library, Preston papers, reel 12).

Granville Smith died in 1816 and his heirs, all of Richmond, sold Solitude back to James P. Preston in 1822 (Deed Book O, P. 605). At this point, the structure is believed to have been a one and one-half story log

On January 21, 1833, Robert Taylor Preston, second son of James P. Preston, married Mary Hart (Dorman, 1982) and the couple became the next reported residents of Solitude. By 1834, all threats of Indian attacks were part of history in Montgomery County and Solitude had become part of the thriving plantation of Smithfield. Robert Preston's occupation was listed as farmer (Yagow, 1985), and in 1834 his family began to grow. It was at this time that the first of several additions were made to Solitude. A second, larger log structure with limestone foundation was added to the original 1801 log structure. According to dendrochronology studies this structure was constructed of trees felled after the growing season of 1834 (Heikkenen, 1990), which means it was probably constructed in the Fall or Winter of 1834. This section of the house consists of two ground floor rooms and two upper floor rooms.

According to Montgomery County Deed Books, James P. Preston divided his property among his three sons before his death in 1843. William Ballard Preston received 120 acres and the home of Smithfield in 1828 (Deed Book K, p.246); Robert Taylor Preston, the second son, received 100 acres and Solitude in 1831 (Deed Book K, P. 545); and the youngest son, James Francis Preston received 400 acres known as
Whitethorn in 1840 (Deed Book M, p. 590). In 1865 another parcel of land belonging to Jane Preston Gilmer, sister of the three, was divided among the brothers, adding 300 acres to Robert's estate (Will Book 10, p. 114-15).

Apparently by 1851, Robert Preston was doing relatively well, and decided to make Solitude into a stately home. Basement and attic joists from the north corner of the present structure were constructed from trees felled after the growing season of 1851 (Heikkenen, 1990). Unlike the 1801 and 1834 sections this section is not a log structure; although the floor joists are log, the walls are supported by wood studs. Later, additions on the rear of the house at Solitude expanded the liveable space, providing three additional rooms.

It should be noted here that a mid-nineteenth century date has also been attributed to the log outbuilding at Solitude. Although no dendrochronology studies have been conducted to accurately date this building, an archeological dig, as well as a structural report suggest a mid-nineteenth century date for the construction of the log section of this structure.

On March 13, 1872 the Senate voted to donate one-third of the Morrill Act land grant money available to Virginia institutions to Hampton Industrial Institute for blacks (as was required by law), and two-thirds to the Preston and Olin
Institute for whites. However, an amendment to the Morrill Act required white institutions receiving money to give up their previous organizations (Kinnear, 1972). Therefore, Preston and Olin Institute became the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. In 1872, Preston sold the house, outbuildings and 244 acres of land for $20,790.85 to provide additional land for the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College (VAMC) which became Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and later Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, now known as Virginia Tech (Deed Book T, p.14).

During its tenure with VAMC and Virginia Tech, the main building at Solitude has functioned as a faculty home with the still extant outbuilding being used as a cook's residence, both buildings have served as student residences (Anderson, 1990), and later while the main house served as a club house, and classroom and office space, the outbuilding stood vacant and fell into disrepair. Both buildings now await extensive repair and renovation for future use.
CHAPTER II
PRESTON FAMILY HISTORY

Much appears to have been written about the Preston family of Smithfield and Greenfield in Virginia, but when trying to identify family members, their accomplishments, and relationships, one tends to find confusion. The following is a short narrative of the family history of the man who was the last private owner of the Solitude property, Robert Taylor Preston. A chronology of Blacksburg, the Prestons, and Solitude is located in Appendix C, for easy reference, as well as a family "tree" located in Appendix D.

The first Preston referred to in most reports is Archibald Preston of Londonderry, Ireland. Although little is known of him, it was his son, John Preston who first immigrated to the American colonies. Before coming to the Colonies, John was a carpenter and cabinet maker, working aboard ships. He eventually met and eloped with Elizabeth Patton, much to the disdain of her parents (Johnson, 1976). In his memorandum Francis Preston remembered his grandmother, Elizabeth Patton Preston.

...though she was old, a well looking sensible old lady...(Filson Club, Grigsby Collection).

Johnson (1976) states in her chronicles of William Preston, that both his mother and father were considered to be quite
attractive and were immediately attracted to one another. However, due to John Preston's lower social standing, Elizabeth's parents, Sarah Lynn and Henry Patton of Springfield Manor in Donegal, Ireland, did not welcome their son-in-law into the Patton family. Therefore, the couple, their young son, and three daughters left Ireland for America in 1738.

Elizabeth's brother, James Patton, had promised John Preston 4,000 acres of land in Virginia if he would accompany Patton to America as a shipwright (Johnson, 1976). It is this James Patton that both Letitia P. Floyd and her brother Francis Preston referred to in the 1755 Draper's Meadow Massacre.

...Col. Patton, the only man in the fort was waiting with his pistols on the table when the women gave the alarm, he discharged one without effect, was shot thro', ran out and fell in the yard (Filson Club, Grigsby Collection).

Although Letitia's account was slightly different, the outcome was the same. Patton died as a result of wounds received in the 1755 Draper's Meadow Massacre.

John and Elizabeth Preston had five children who lived to adulthood. Their eldest child, William was born at Newton Limavaddy, Londonderry County, Ireland, and was followed by four sisters: Lettice who later married Robert
Breckinridge, and became the mother of the author of the Kentucky Resolutions, John Breckinridge; Ann who married Francis Smith; Mary who married John Howard; and Margaret who married Rev. John Brown, and became the mother of the first Senator from Kentucky, John Brown. A sixth child, James, died in infancy (Dorman, 1982).

After the death of his father, William Preston apparently aided his Uncle James Patton in his many ventures. Upon Patton's death William Preston became executor of his estate, became more directly active in politics, and obtained a large parcel of land upon which he later built Smithfield Plantation.

With the aid of his nephews Robert (stepson of Lettice) and John Breckinridge, and his cousin Robert (who emigrated from Ireland), William Preston built Smithfield around 1775 (Johnson, 1976, Heikkenen, 1990). Named in honor of Preston's wife Susanna Smith (sister of Granville Smith), this grand frontier home housed their twelve children, as well as other relatives and visitors. Along with their own children William and Susanna Preston also raised Jane Buchanan, daughter of Margaret Patton and John Buchanan, and granddaughter of James Patton. This is interesting to note, in that Jane Buchanan married John Floyd, and their son, named after his father, later married William Preston's daughter, Letitia.
Upon William Preston's death, each of his children was granted a tract of land or sum of money (including his twelfth child, who was not yet born). His fourth son, James Patton Preston received Smithfield, including the Solitude property, in a rather indirect way. Although James P. Preston was the first child born at Smithfield (Dorman, 1982), his father placed a stipulation upon his inheritance.

...My said son James Patton is hereby ordered to pay his sister Anne fifty pounds on his being of the age of twenty one years, on interest from that date till paid. But he is not to pay his mother any gratuity, as whatever tract she resides on during life he is to enjoy as his share of my real estate at the age of twenty one year, or on his marriage as my wife thinks proper to give him as before...(Filson Club, Grigsby Collection).

Therefore, since Susanna Preston decided to remain at Smithfield throughout her life, rather than return to Greenfield, their previous residence (by then occupied by another of her sons), James P. Preston inherited Smithfield. James P. Preston and his wife Ann Barraud Taylor made their home at Smithfield along with Preston's mother who died in 1823. Preston later became one of three Virginia governors associated with the Smithfield and Solitude properties. His sister, Letitia, married Dr. John Floyd
(son of Jane Buchanan), and for a while lived with her husband in the earliest section of Solitude. Dr. Floyd and his son, John Buchanan Floyd, both served as governors of Virginia, bringing additional distinction to Smithfield and Solitude.

Prior to his death, James P. Preston allotted each of his three sons a parcel of land. The eldest, William Ballard Preston, a renowned lawyer and statesman, having served as Secretary of the Navy under Taylor and U.S. Commissioner to France (Dorman, 1982), retained Smithfield. At the time of his death, William B. Preston was serving as a member of the Confederate Senate. The second son, Robert Taylor, who appears to have been less active in politics and noted primarily as a farmer, was given Solitude, in which he was already residing, as well as 100 acres of land. Robert later became a board member of the Preston and Olin Institute. Named after his brother William B. Preston and Rev. Stephen Olin, this school, which had an often interrupted existence both before and after the Civil War, became the predecessor of VAMC. When the Civil War erupted, Col. Robert T. Preston became Commander of the 28th Virginia Regiment. The only letters concerning any immediate members of the Robert T. Preston family that were discovered during this investigation were from Col. Preston, written while he was away from Solitude, in which he spoke only of the state
of the War. The third son, James Francis, also a lawyer, received Whitethorn. Having served as a Confederate Colonel of the 4th Virginia regiment, the Stonewall Brigade, James Francis Preston helped capture Rickett's battery at the first Manassas battle and died soon after (Hardesty's, 1884).

By the end of the Civil War, Robert T. Preston was the only surviving son of James P. Preston. Robert had married Mary Hart in 1833 and produced three children. Their eldest son, Benjamin Hart died before the war, in 1851, at the age of fifteen. Their only daughter, Virginia Ann Emily married Dr. Robert Stark Means and moved to Birmingham, Alabama. Although the records indicate that the Means had seven children (Dorman, 1982), neither the Birmingham, Alabama nor the Richmond, Virginia archives show any trace of this family. Robert and Mary Preston's youngest child, James Patton Preston, apparently never married, but returned to Blacksburg after the Civil War where he died in 1901.

Since the time of the last Preston resident at Solitude the house and outbuilding have suffered from neglect and have been in a state of continuous decline. However, it is fortunate that during this time little has been done to permanently alter the architectural features of these structures. The following chapters will analyze those features of the buildings that have remained unchanged, as
well as look for clues of those features that did change. The result will be a compilation of information that will provide a series of drawings that illustrate the stages through which this historic house and outbuilding evolved.
CHAPTER III
CARPENTERS AND PATTERN BOOKS

Carpenters

A steady migration of settlers into and through the Appalachian Mountains during the last decades of the eighteenth century provided the population and organization necessary to incorporate Blacksburg as a town in 1798. James Patton Preston, residing at Smithfield, was one of the seven town trustees named by the General Assembly (Worsham, 1986). During the course of Preston's involvement in local, and later, state politics, the Blacksburg and Montgomery County area continued to grow in population, and with that growth came an influx of craftsmen.

Although little is known of the particular builders, carpenters, or craftsmen that constructed specific houses in Blacksburg during the late eighteenth and earliest part of the nineteenth century, evidence of their skill does exist. Most homes constructed during this period were of log, some simple single or double pen (one or two room) structures clad with beaded or plain wood siding. Interiors, although sometimes not finished immediately, exhibited whitewashed, sometimes plastered walls and simple mouldings around doors, windows and fireplaces.
A few, relatively more elaborate homes were of frame construction, such as Smithfield in Blacksburg and the Madison Farm home near Elliston (Worsham, 1986). At least one sawmill was in existence in the area during the last quarter of the eighteenth century (Kegley, 1980), as was the skilled labor needed for building the more elaborately finished houses and the more complicated frame houses.

By 1850 Montgomery County had eighty-four craftsmen directly involved in the building trades, sixty-five of which were listed as carpenters (Worsham, 1986). Twenty-four percent of the carpenters listed in the Montgomery County/U.S. Census resided in Blacksburg, with another twenty-four percent in Christiansburg. The remaining towns, communities, and districts each contained less than five percent of these craftsmen (Jost, 1986). Hidden within these percentages however, were chairmakers, cabinetmakers, sawyers, plasterers, painters, and farmers who were part-time carpenters. Of the sixty-five carpenters listed, only fifty-four percent, or thirty-five, of them lived in houses that were their own. Those carpenters not listed as owning their own home lived together in groups or with relatives. Seven carpenters boarded with George Hubbard, a prominent Christiansburg carpenter, and four resided with Christian Deagy, a farmer as well as a mill operator (Worsham, 1986).
Most of the recorded achievements of these early Montgomery County carpenters have been of public buildings rather than residences. The very active Hubbard and Jordan are credited with constructing several public buildings, such as the Methodist Church on North Franklin Street in Christiansburg (Worsham, 1986) and the Administration Building at Roanoke College in Salem (Whitwell, 1982). Also active during this period were Paul T. Woodward and David Page, credited with having built the first Presbyterian Church in Christiansburg. Carpentry as a family business was also evident, as was seen in Crush, Hickok and Company, an active group of builders comprised of James E. and George Y. Crush and James, Earnest, and Samuel Hickok, who together built the Montgomery Female Academy (Worsham, 1986). According to a report written by J. Nicolay (n.d.), the Hickoks used builder's guides in their work, constructing the 1852, Christiansburg Presbyterian Church directly from a plan by Richard Upjohn.

In terms of residential housing little is known of the specific carpenters responsible for vernacular houses in the Blacksburg and Montgomery County area. However, John Swope, who died in 1856, is credited with designing a number of houses in both Pulaski and Montgomery County, and may be responsible for some of the millwork at Kentland, a nineteenth century home now owned by Virginia Tech (Worsham,
1992). Appraisements after his death provided an inventory of finish carpentry tools, such as drafting instruments, planes, joiners, carving gauges, cornice moulding planes, keyhole dressing tools, saws, chisels, axes, squares, knives, mallets, augers, paint brushes and paint, grindstone, screwdrivers, ginlets, "sprigg awls", braces and bits, tool chests, and boxes, and two work benches (Worsham, 1986).

Many of these simpler tools were also found on large farms or plantations in the area. Because there was a constant need for either building or repairing the many buildings found on these farms, the landowner often had the manpower and tools necessary to conduct this work. And, although the occupations of slaves are not listed in Montgomery County census reports, it is reasonable to consider that slaves were responsible for some of the construction in the area. It is known that freed blacks worked with carpenters in the area. On September 15, 1857, Jordan and Hubbard, listed in the 1850 industrial census as builders, were taken to court by Caswell Raford (or Tazewell Radford - records are unclear), a former employee. Raford, "a free man of colour," had been issued a bond for payment on work he had performed and upon losing the bond requested that another be issued. Hubbard refused to pay, Raford sued for nonpayment and won his case. Elijah B. Williams, a
Christiansburg brickmason, testified that Raford had been employed by the company of Hubbard and Jordan and worked for several months on a church in Christiansburg (Worsham, 1986). It is not known whether Raford and other freed blacks in the area learned their building trades as slaves or as free men.

With the proliferation of the numerous and often anonymous carpenters in the area it is difficult to credit any specific craftsmen with the construction of the simpler, less documented homes. Sales records and payments may not have been recorded in many cases. Materials and labor were sometimes acquired through bartering, with no formal document outlining the terms or parties involved. Therefore, to answer "How?, When?, and Why?" these buildings took their forms, it is the remaining structures themselves that must be questioned.

Architectural Pattern Books

As the nineteenth century progressed, housing in Montgomery County became more elaborate both inside and out. Interior mouldings could be found in even some of the simplest houses. Skilled craftsmen began producing larger and more ornate residences in greater numbers. And, although logs remained a popular building material in the
area until well into the middle of the century (even later for remote areas and outbuildings), frame construction was being used more and more for homes (Worsham, 1992). Building forms and styles faced continual change throughout the nineteenth century. Much of this change was brought about through the introduction and use of American architectural pattern books, such as those produced by Asher Benjamin and Owen Biddle. Until the early nineteenth century, most pattern books used in America had been written and illustrated in England. These illustrated manuals provided theories, ideas, and instructions for creating the latest millwork designs within any home or public building.

These pattern book authors, while providing drawings for their readers, also provided the reasoning behind why a particular design worked or didn’t work. In "The Beauties of Modern Architecture", Minard LaFever (1835) stated that he preferred a particular style of architrave above a parlor window to be without a beaded edge because, "It appears more chaste, and is attended with less labor in its execution" (p. 16). As can be seen, a great emphasis was placed not only on the craft of constructing the patterns illustrated, but also upon the theories behind why it was done with a particular curve, the visual weight of the moulding, and why the moulding should be present at all.
Architectural theorist, C.H. Walker (1926) believed that the historical use of mouldings erupted from practical considerations. Buildings are composed of pieces, and the joints that are produced when these pieces come together are vulnerable to air, rain, and rot. Therefore, early builders developed applied mouldings to minimize air and water penetration, and reduce the occurrence of rot. However, this author does not belittle the importance of the "harmonious character" that the mouldings created within a space, but reminds readers that "restraint in their use is a virtue" (p.2).

The earliest moulding planes that have been dated in America were manufactured in New England in 1750. However, the majority of these planes were produced between 1800 and 1850. It is during this period that most of the hand planed moulding seen in historic homes was produced. The development of planing mills after 1850 led to the mass production of moulding and eventually the end of the hand-held wooden moulding plane (Gilmore, 1978). Still, the moulding plane has left an indelible mark on those periods in which it thrived.

Depending on the period in which a pattern book author published, one is likely to see various theories or reasons behind their designs. Georgian period (1700-1780) design books were imported from England after 1850, and contained
mouldings that were popular there. However, after the Revolutionary War, Americans attempted to display their independence through creating their own designs - to a degree. The Federal or Early Neoclassical Period (1780-1830) was characterized by restrained elegance, evident in straight lines and right angles, and relieved by simple geometric, usually circular curves (Faulkner & Faulkner, 1975). These precise linear shapes were displayed in rectangular ballisters and tapered geometric obliks that formed newel posts (Sandbeck, 1991). The Federal Period, which borrowed from Roman designs, also carried over elements from the Georgian Period, with both periods exhibiting six paneled doors, usually referred to as "cross and bible", with transoms. American craftsmen, borrowing ideas from England, adapted the designs of Adam, Hepplewhite, and Sheraton for furniture, as well as millwork. Robert Adam took the classical influence seen in the Georgian Period and refined it, creating a simpler and lighter style that was then copied by George Hepplewhite (1788) and Thomas Sheraton (1794). Examples of their designs displayed tapered legs, either round or square, and sometimes reeded. Similar influences are seen in the pilasters or columns adorning fireplaces or doors of this same period.

Eventually, the Federal, or Early Neoclassical style
gave way to the Greek Revival or Late Neoclassical style (1820-1860). This later period borrowed designs from the earlier Greek buildings, as opposed to the Roman designs, used in the Federal Period (Lay, 1992). Details became bolder, more imposing and monumental. Heavy, sculptural mouldings replaced the smaller-scale details of the Federal Period (Faulkner & Faulkner, 1975). Four panel doors with sidelights replaced six panel doors, and panels below sidelights and windows were recessed into the building, as opposed to being flush as they were in earlier periods (Nicolay, n.d.). Pedimented or triangulated lintels over windows and doors, as well as elliptical curves also became popular during this time (Lay, 1992). And by the 1850s, paired windows with four over four sashes and symmetrical mouldings had replaced the smaller pane, six over six, or nine over six windows of the Federal Period (Sandbeck, 1991). The heavy, solid, and rectilinear forms of the casepieces of the Late Neoclassical Period were mirrored in both wall panels and other millwork (Faulkner & Faulkner, 1975).

Comparing the Federal (Roman) and Greek Revival styles, Asher Benjamin (1927) explained his preference for the Greek style:

If mouldings are only composed of parts of a circle, and straight lines, they are called Roman;
because the Romans, in their buildings, seldom or never, employed any other curve for mouldings, than that of a circle; but if a moulding is made of part of an ellipsis, or parabola, or any hyperbole, the mouldings are then in the Grecian taste; hence it appears, that mouldings of the Grecian taste, are of much greater variety than those of the Roman, where only parts of circles are concerned....the bending or turning inward, of the upper edge of the Grecian, or quirk ovolo, when the sun shines on its surface, causes a beautiful variety of light and shade, which greatly relieves it from plane surfaces (p. 20).

Pattern books, like Benjamin's, gained great popularity during this period, providing illustrations of Classical orders and capitals, with adaptations of these, as well as other mouldings to fit or retrofit the American home.

Another source of ideas for architectural details during the middle and latter part of the nineteenth century was the mail order catalogues. Although these catalogues were being used in some areas during the mid-nineteenth century, they were not readily available in Montgomery County. The large number of carpenters practicing in the Montgomery County area until after the Civil War provided the labor needed to produce all of millwork for the area, making millwork
produced outside of the area unnecessary (Giles, 1991). Therefore, the mail order catalogue was not only unavailable for direct ordering, but was unlikely to have been used as a type of pattern book.

The expense of the pattern books themselves, as well as the expense of purchasing the additional moulding planes, may have excluded some craftsmen from adapting immediately to these new styles. It is probable that many craftsmen simply copied designs they had seen elsewhere, modified them, modified their planes, and therefore produced an adaptation of the mouldings found in the architectural pattern books. Even those craftsmen who owned such books may have allowed themselves artistic license in modifying the designs illustrated.

Still, evidence exists that demonstrates carpenters in the Roanoke Valley, if not Blacksburg, did copy designs almost directly from architectural pattern books. The Salem Presbyterian Church (circa 1850) in nearby Salem, Virginia exhibits exterior door and window details having remarkable similarities to details illustrated in Asher Benjamin's "The Practical House Carpenter" (1830) and "Practice of Architecture" (1833) (Whitwell, 1982). LaFever's (1835) designs also seem to have found their way to the Montgomery County area, as will be shown in the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV

DOCUMENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF
MILLWORK AND HARDWARE AT SOLITUDE

For centuries, historians have used a building's architectural features to determine its age. One of the most common methods employed has been to analyze accepted styles of building or specific details that correspond to a particular date. Usually used in conjunction with this is an analysis of the building methods and materials present and their availability before or after specific dates. More recently, the development of dendrochronology has allowed researchers to more accurately date structures containing log members. With this method, structures can be dated to the last growing season in which the trees forming the log members were cut.

Through the investigative work of dendrochronologist Jack Heikkenen (1990), three major sections of the main house at Solitude have been assigned construction dates. As stated earlier those dates are 1801, 1834, and 1851, as shown in Figure 1 (later additions were not included in the Heikkenen study). Further investigation into the architectural details of these sections, as well as later additions, will provide a better understanding of how the interior of the house evolved with each new addition.
In attempting to analyze each section of the house various methods were employed. Because the 1801 section of the house had been almost completely renovated during the 1851 addition, little visual or easily accessible evidence remains that indicates its former features. Therefore, infrared photography (thermographics) was used in an attempt to determine the position of former windows and doors. In theory, the areas where windows or doors were formerly located in the 1801 section would have been enclosed during the 1851 renovation. Those spaces were presumably infilled with something less dense than the logs composing the rest of the structure. The infrared equipment displays an image of "hot" and "cold" areas. Those areas experiencing heat loss, such as a window or door are displayed as "hot" on the exterior of the building. It should be noted that only exterior walls contain sufficient temperature differences to be analyzed using this method. The equipment used during this investigation was able to designate the location of the stud framing in the 1851 section, and the framing studs below the windows in the 1834 log section, but did not indicate any differences in wall density or heat loss in the 1801 log section, other than where the existing windows and chimney were located.

This may mean that the material used to infill the original 1801 exterior openings was extremely compacted and
an excellent insulator. Another possibility is that if the 1801 log house had windows (windows were rare in early log houses because they were sometimes difficult to obtain, as well as responsible for great heat loss), they were located only on the walls that are now interior, or they were located in the spaces occupied by the existing windows and chimney.

Another method commonly used to discover former locations of doors and windows, or other details is to employ a "raking light". In this situation a beam of light is passed across a surface at an angle almost parallel to that surface to emphasize irregularities through shadows. These shadows occur where a seam or uneven surface was left after a renovation. This technique is also used in analyzing the type of saw marks, whether pit sawn or circular, found on wooden beams, which in turn provides an indication of when a structure was built.

This use of the raking light on the finished walls at Solitude provided little insight into the original appearance of individual rooms. Seams and irregularities created by layers of wall papers and settlement served to camouflage the irregularities created by architectural features.
1801 Millwork and Hardware

To assist in understanding terms and locations of millwork illustrated in the following sections, Appendix A provides an illustration of the names and locations of architectural details. The figures of doors and window in the following sections will include a "type" designated by a letter for doors and a Roman numeral for windows along with a "number". These designations refer to tables and plans in Appendix B that specify locations and details of the millwork noted. Of the existing millwork in the 1801 section, only the closet doors and transoms (Figure 2) appear to date prior to the 1851 addition. During an investigation of the foundation (Figure 3) it was determined that these closets had previously flanked a fireplace (Ballard, 1991). The moulding surrounding the door is simple, containing the circular cyma curve typical of the Federal Period. Also typical of this period is the six panel, cross and bible door. Closer analysis of these raised panels indicates that they were carved as in a single piece with the recessed section of the panel, as opposed to being an applied moulding. According to architectural historian, Ed Lay, the technique for creating the applied moulding was developed later and used during the Greek Revival Period.
Figure 2. 1801 Closet door and profiles
As can be seen in Figure 2 (see Appendix B.3, A/1 and A/2), the transom above the door is not continuous with the door moulding, nor do the moulding profiles of the door and transom correspond. It is uncertain why a glass transom would have been added to a closet, but the panes located here correspond to the size of those in the transoms in the 1834 section. However, the mullion and moulding profiles of the transoms differ greatly between the two sections and therefore, may not have been added at the same time.

The analysis of lock boxes as a source for dating period interiors is not common. According to Lay, lock box ensembles usually contained some type of manufacturer's mark or stamp and the boxes may be traced in this manner. Many of the early ensembles were imported from England, and exhibit marks other than a manufacturer's name (Lay, 1992). However, by the early nineteenth century, America had established and expanded its own ironworks and lock box ensembles were being produced here. One of the later lock boxes, found in the 1851 parlor at Solitude, exhibited a stamp stating, "Made in USA".

Still, one of the most common methods used in analyzing the locks is through deduction and comparison. First, the ensemble's originality to the door is questioned. Lack of evidence of previous locks, as seen in ghost marks, as well as the lack of a finished or painted surface beneath the
lock testifies to the originality of the lock to the door. The period or date of the door is also deduced. The lock is then assigned a date relative to the door and similar locks that have been analyzed previously. The particular style or embellishments of the lock ensembles exhibited, parallel those details previously discussed for the Federal and Greek Revival Periods (Sandbeck, 1991).

The lock boxes shown in Figures 4A and 4B are located on the right and left closet doors, respectively. It is doubtful that either lock box ensemble is original to the door in its entirety. Lock box 4A is located on the interior of the right closet door (with only a knob seen on the exterior of the door), and is similar to the lock box found on the 1851 parlor door, stamped "Made in USA" (Figure 5A). The purpose of mounting the lock on the interior of the door is uncertain, but it is possible that a lock for this door was unnecessary and the inside mount simply reduced the visual clutter on the exterior of the door.

The simple, primitive, and functional appearance of lock box 4B suggests an earlier date than the ensemble seen in 4A (Calloway & Cromley, 1991). However, the receiving catch in 4B does not correspond to the box and vertical ornamentation that is commonly seen on ensembles from doors of a later period. It is interesting to note that the box located on a possibly twentieth century closet door (Figure
(A) 1801 Right closet, interior

(B) 1801 Left closet

Figure 4. 1801 Closet door lock boxes
(A) 1851 First floor parlor

(B) Twentieth century bathroom

Figure 5. Lock boxes similar to those on 1801 closet doors
5B) on the 1851 second floor area is an exact duplicate of that shown in Figure 4B.

When possible, lock box ensembles were removed to determine their originality to the door on which they were located. Unfortunately, attempts to remove the above locks were unsuccessful. However, locks in the other areas were removed and the absence or presence of bare wood beneath the lock provided an indication of their originality. In turn, the door's originality to the frame could be determined by analyzing the location and originality of its hinges to the door frame, thus providing a more complete analysis of the evolution of the interior.

It is assumed that the 1801 section was originally a single pen structure with a loft (Figure 6). A narrow stair, or possibly a ladder, would have provided access to the loft area. Analysis of the second floor finished floor planking does not indicate where a stair would have interrupted these boards. Therefore, this floor was probably replaced with the 1834 addition or sometime later. The large room now comprising the space above the 1801 ground floor section shall be referred to as the 1801 upstairs room. Again, it appears that the original 1801 details of this room were replaced during subsequent additions. The focal point of this room is an attenuated Federal mantel with full entablature (Figure 7). This
Figure 6. 1801 Floor Plans
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Figure 7. 1801 Second floor mantel
mantel, which stands slightly more than five feet high was probably added after this room gained additional ceiling height during one of the subsequent additions or renovations. Because the location of this mantel is opposite the wall where the 1801 chimney was located, the mantel may have been moved across the room during the 1851 addition. However, because this mantel closely resembles the 1834 upstairs mantel (Figure 8) it is possible that this room was renovated during the 1834 addition (perhaps the chimney was also moved) and the mantel was placed at that time. The windows, doors and mouldings for the 1801 upstairs room will be analyzed along with the 1851 Greek Revival details.

1834 Millwork and Hardware

The section Heikkenen (1990) identified as "1834" retains much of its original millwork and hardware. The ground floor of this section appears to have consisted of one large room and a center passage connecting this section with the 1801 section (Figure 9). This passage, sometimes referred to as a "dog trot" contains two doors with transoms (Figure 10). The door shown in Figure 10, which is original to its frame was altered sometime during the twentieth century by replacing the upper four door panels
Figure 8. 1834 Second floor mantel
Figure 10. 1834 Entrance door
with glass (those forming the "cross"). Two more examples of this period door exists on a smaller scale in the upstairs of the 1834 section (Figure 11). The cross and bible style entrance door, with its original transom is typical of the Federal Period.

Located next to the entrance door is a stair leading to the second floor (Figure 12). The simple, straight lines shown in the rectangular bannisters, as well as in the geometric newel post, wainscot, and base are all typical of the Federal style. The location of an additional floor joist below the stair, as seen on the foundation plan (see Figure 3) also provides evidence that the location of this stair is original to the 1834 construction.

Both ground and second floor windows in this section are original to the 1834, Federal design, as shown in their details (Figures 13 and 14). The moulding profiles for each window display circular, cyma curves along with a beaded edge. The ground floor windows are created using a six over nine configuration above a beaded chair rail. Beneath the chair rail is a simple wainscot (or dado), consisting of two plain horizontal boards, finished below with a beaded base board. With the exception of the six over six window pane configuration, the second floor millwork closely matches that just described. Infrared images indicate that the logs alls in this section were cut away from under the windows.
Figure 11. 1834 Second floor door
Figure 12. 1834 Stair
Figure 13. 1834 First floor window and profiles
Figure 14. 1834 Second floor window and profiles
A supporting timber was placed under the center of each window when during installation. The former presence of a mantel in the 1834 downstairs section is indicated by both the exterior chimney and differences in the chair rail, wainscot, and base board by the chimney wall that suggests alterations. The distance between the seams along the millwork measures 6'-3 1/2" (see Figure 16). The Federal style mantel located in the 1801 upstairs room, as well as an early Greek Revival mantel nailed to the wall in the extant outbuilding, are both too wide to have occupied this location.

The remaining mantel in the 1834 section is located on the second floor (see Figure 8). Although slightly simpler than the mantel located in the 1801 upstairs, this attenuated mantel exhibits a full entablature typical of the Federal Period.

Of the remaining hardware in the 1834 section all appears to be original to the addition, as can be seen through the lack of a finish beneath the locks and a lack of ghost marks on most doors (Figure 15). Ghost marks indicate that the large rectangular lock box present on the 1834 entrance door (Figure 15A) appears to have been moved when the door panels were replaced with glass. This simple lock is possibly the predecessor of some of the slightly smaller box locks found in the 1851 addition. The only remaining
Figure 15. 1834 Lock boxes
lock box on the second floor for this section is unique in appearance to any other lock in the house or outbuilding (Figure 15B). The simple and primitive design suggests an early nineteenth century date. The third, and last remaining lock box in this section is located on the closet door beneath the stair (Figure 15C). Although simpler and more primitive, this lock is somewhat similar to those shown in Figures 4A and 5A which are believed to be from a later period.

1851 Millwork and Hardware

By the 1850s, pattern books and carpenters had moved away from the light lines of the Federal Period and were experimenting with the heavier, Greek Revival Style. The 1851 section of the house identified in Heikkenen's (1990) study was a frame addition with log joists. As was typical of this era, larger homes provided double parlors, either side by side, or connected via a grand entrance hall (Figure 16). To complement the new Greek Revival parlor and hall of the frame section, the 1801 log section was renovated. All millwork except the six panel doors on the closets, was replaced with millwork typical of the Greek Revival Period. Double doors provided the entrance into this renovated 1801 room that was most likely the less ornate "family" parlor.
(Figure 17). Note the triangulated lintel over the door, typical of this room and the Greek Revival Period. Although slightly smaller in scale, the door connecting the 1801 and 1834 sections also exhibits the heavier wide moulding, triangulated lintel, and crossettes that date this millwork to the middle of the nineteenth century (Figure 18). Even though crossettes were used heavily during the eighteenth century Georgian Period, they experienced a great comeback with the Greek Revival style in the nineteenth century.

All of the windows in this renovated 1801 parlor display similar mouldings, along with a recessed horizontal panel located beneath the six over six double hung windows (Figure 19A). Located above the west end window in the renovated 1801 room is the only existing ceiling moulding found at Solitude (Figure 19B). This one and three quarters inches high wood moulding consists of a bead that meets the ceiling, then descends into reeding to intersect the apex of the window pediment. As can be seen in Figure 19A, it is unlikely that this connection was a planned design. The intricate reeding and small scale of the ceiling moulding contrasts with the simple, large scale window moulding that it interrupts. Both of these features are consistent with a late Federal or early Greek Revival Period. Ghost marks indicate that this moulding once continued around the
Figure 17. Renovated 1801 parlor doors
Figure 18. 1801/1834 First floor connecting door
Figure 19. 1801/1851 Parlor window and profile
perimeter of the room, but was later removed, leaving only the section above the window ornamented.

The mantel located on the west wall of this room contains heavy Greek Revival details, accented by elliptical curves. Figure 20 illustrates the similarities and differences found between the Greek Revival mantels found in the renovated 1801 downstairs parlor (shown on left) and the 1851 downstairs parlor (shown on right). Aside from slight dimensioning differences and the fluted pilasters seen in the 1851 parlor mantel, the details are basically the same and were most likely made at the same time, if not by the same craftsman.

Other similarities between the millwork of the two parlors can be found in both the doors and windows. The door entering the 1851 parlor (see Appendix B.3, I/3) from the main hall is identical to the one seen in Figure 18. However, the door moulding differs slightly. As opposed to a triangulated lintel, a straight pediment with crossettes surrounds the top of the door. Also present is a three and a half inches band of fluted moulding replacing the band of plain moulding seen in the renovated 1801 parlor. Figure 21 illustrates the door moulding found in the 1851 parlor (F/1). However, a period or date for the unusual paneled door shown was not determined. Although horizontally paneled doors were common in the latter part of the
Figure 20. 1801 and 1851 Parlor mantels
Figure 21. 1851 Parlor door moulding with later door
nineteenth century, this particular arrangement of raised horizontal and vertical panels is unique.

The window moulding for the 1851 parlor is identical to that of the doors (Figure 22). The window and recessed panel below match that found in the renovated 1801 parlor (see Appendix B.3, IV/1). This particular window, aside from the fluted edge moulding, has striking similarities to an example found on Plate 6 of LaFever's 1835 pattern book, "The Beauties of Modern Architecture". The existing east window (see Appendix B.3, IV/4) in this room differs slightly from the three other windows located on the north and south walls in the 1851 addition. Aside from the two over two panes that may have been added even later than the opening, this window lacks the recessed panel found in the other 1851 window details. This window may have been added when a porch was enclosed on the southeast corner of this section. The door shown in Figure 21 appears to have led to an open porch on the southeast end of the house. Moulding around the exterior (opposite the side shown in Figure 21) of that door matches the moulding found on the back entry door for the 1851 central hall. The east end window may have been added in an effort to bring in additional light and air once the porch was enclosed.

The central hall connecting the 1801 and 1851 sections is highlighted by a grand staircase (Figure 23). In
Figure 22. 1851 Parlor window and base
Figure 23. 1851 Stair
Haviland's (1829) "The Practical Builder's Assistant", he illustrates a Grecian scroll (plate 22) similar to the one found at the end of the stair rail. Similar illustrations were also found in Benjamin's (1830) "The Practical House Carpenter". The Greek Revival scroll on the newel post curves toward a low railing that is supported by hand turned spindles. Each spindle differs not only in the height of the end block, rather than the spindle shaft, but also in the width of the blocks and the diameter of the turns. Simple, recessed wooden panels, typical of both Georgian and Greek designs, compose the wall below the stair (Lay, 1992). The main entrance to this hall consists of six panel double doors with side lights above recessed panels (Figure 24). A profile of the door panel moulding illustrates the elliptical Greek Revival curve found in this detail. A Greek Revival pedimented lintel spans nearly eleven feet across the door and sidelights.

Located on the second floor, above the entrance door is a tripartite window (Figure 25, V/1). Common as early as 1810, this window was a favorite of American architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe, and became even more popular during the Greek Revival Period (Lay, 1992). This window is unique to the house in that the center is the only casement window existing in any of the sections of the house. However, the outward appearance gives the illusion of a double hung
Figure 24. 1851 Entrance doors and profiles
Figure 25. 1851 Second floor hall window
window, similar in dimension and scale to the double hung windows throughout the 1851 and renovated 1801 sections.

An identical window is also found in a very similar Greek Revival home belonging to a Mrs. Irene Walters. This house, located on Ellett Road in Montgomery County, contains many similarities to Solitude in millwork design, as well as an exterior plaster and wainscot facade unique to these two houses. Although it is not known who built the Walter's home, historically referred to as the Earhart home, it is reasonable to assume that the same carpenter constructed the 1851 section of Solitude.

During the 1851 addition and renovation of Solitude one upstairs room was added and the 1801 upstairs room was renovated (Figure 26). The second floor millwork contains the heavy Greek Revival style seen in the downstairs rooms, but retains the simplicity seen in the renovated 1801 "family" parlor.

The door and window moulding in the renovated 1801 upstairs room differs from other Greek Revival details in the house with the use of the plain corner blocks (Figure 27). Corner blocks, although used during this period, usually contained a more intricate detail, such as a rondell (bullseye), within the space of the block (Lay, 1992, Sandbeck, 1991). The windows in this room, although similar
Figure 27. 1801/1851 Second floor door
to other 1851 second floor windows (Figure 28), also contain the unornamented corner blocks.

The 1851 upstairs room was originally entered through the four panel door shown in Figure 29. However, this door was relocated when a twentieth century renovation carved a bathroom out of the large 1851 bedroom. The door was then moved to the addition wall, several feet from its original frame (see Appendix B, I/2 & J/3). Ghost marks from previous hinge location on both the door and the frame, as well as the door style and size, indicates its former position. Again, the pedimented lintel, crossettes, and elliptical panel moulding all point toward a mid-nineteenth century Greek Revival origin. Also, the heavy Greek Revival mantel seen on the ground floor is repeated in the 1851 upstairs room (Figure 30), while the renovated 1801 room retains the Federal style mantel (Figure 7) already discussed.

The lock boxes and hinges located on the Greek Revival Period doors appear to be original, with one exception. The door connecting the 1801 and 1834 downstairs sections shows evidence of having had a lock ensemble moved from one location to another, possibly more than once (Figure 31A). The existing lock box, manufactured by WBB & Co., appears to be post Greek Revival, possibly early twentieth century. Also, the receiving box differs from the lock box in both
Figure 28. 1851 Second floor window
Figure 29. 1851 Second floor door
Figure 30. 1851 Second floor mantel
(A) 1801/1834 Connecting door

(B) Common 1851 lock box

(C) 1851 Keyhole cover

Figure 31. 1851 Door lock boxes
style and vertical dimensions, and may be part of an earlier lock ensemble.

The remaining lock boxes located on the Greek Revival doors are all identical both in style and dimensions. Figure 31B show the lock box typical of these doors. Notice the similarities to the earlier version of this ensemble found on the 1834 entrance door (see Figure 15). Shown in Figure 31C is a key hole cover found on the opposite side of the door from the lock box located in the 1851 upstairs section. This is the only key hole cover still in existence in Solitude.

Additions and Outbuilding Millwork and Hardware

Some of the remaining millwork of note is located in a twentieth century addition on the second floor (Figure 32). A Victorian Period four panel door (Figure 33) with symmetrical moulding and rondell blocks provides the entrance to an early twentieth century bathroom (see Appendix B.4, J/2). A similar door and moulding are located within the bathroom (J/1) and an adjacent room (J/4, door absent) to provide access to closets. The four panel door, symmetrical moulding, and rondell blocks were all carried over from the earlier Greek Revival Period, but became more
Figure 33. Second floor, 20th c. addition door
delicate, and less imposing as Romanticism progressed toward the twentieth century (Sandbeck, 1991).

As seen in Figure 34, three one-story frame additions were added to the rear of the house sometime after the 1851 section. Building seams, as well as exterior and interior millwork and details suggest each room was added at a different time. However, the specific period in which these rooms were added is difficult to determine. Unfortunately, no dendrochronological investigation has been conducted on these additions and little millwork exists to provide information. Still, these rooms do provide information on how the house evolved.

As stated earlier the eastern-most addition was probably responsible for the addition of the east end window in the 1851 downstairs parlor. Even though the two over two sash window indicates a late nineteenth century to early twentieth century date, the moulding, similar to that in the rest of the room, suggests the addition occurred during the third or fourth quarter of the nineteenth century.

The southern-most addition possesses a hipped chimney created with reused bricks that form a running bond pattern typical of late nineteenth, or twentieth century construction (Roberts, 1991). This addition is interesting in that it contains a window identical, both in panes and moulding (some interior moulding has been replaced), to
Figure 34. Present first floor plan.
those found on the 1834 ground floor (see Appendix B.3, I/2 & I/3) and exhibits exterior beaded siding that is continuous with the adjacent 1834 section. The window may be easily explained in that, like the 1851 east-end window it was moved from the side wall in the 1834 section to an end wall in the addition when the addition took place. The beaded siding may also have been relocated in the same manner.

The final addition is located adjacent to the one just analyzed and is lodged in the corner of the "L" of the house. This addition is entered through the "dog trot" or hall of the 1834 section. Poorly planned building seams and mismatched windows indicate that this section was less "thought out" than other additions. The lack of any proximal, primary heat source, such as a chimney or flue, further indicates that this section was built sometime during the late nineteenth or early twentieth century.

The remaining millwork to be analyzed is located in the log and frame outbuilding next to Solitude (Figure 35). Both a structural report (Worsham, 1989) and an archeological investigation (Boyd, 1991) date the log section of this building to the mid-nineteenth century. The primary source of data in Boyd's research was collected from ceramic sherds (broken bits of pottery) and documented using a mid-range date for the manufacture of the finished
Figure 35. Log and frame outbuilding
ceramic. Although 1850 was the date assigned to the site, numerous sherds from the early nineteenth century were also found, providing a possible early date for the building.

An investigation of Robert T. Preston's tax records over a thirty year period, beginning in 1827, did not show any significant tax increases due to construction of buildings. Even though in 1851 the value of the land, with buildings, jumped from one thousand dollars in 1850 to two thousand dollars. Another increase occurred in 1854, when the tax was again raised another one thousand dollars. However, these increases were consistent with other property owners' tax increases during the same period. Therefore, it can not be concluded that these tax increases were due to the construction of buildings on the property.

The original single pen outbuilding (with loft) shows evidence of a fireplace having been on the wall now connecting the frame addition. The wood lath along this section is hand split to the space originally occupied by the fireplace and chimney. Machine cut wood lath was used in patching the wall surface once the chimney was removed, suggesting a late nineteenth century date for the addition. The existing millwork consists of a mantel nailed to the wall in the frame section and door and window mouldings in the log section (Figure 36). The mantel illustrated has mixed attenuated features of the Federal Period with the
Figure 36. Outbuilding mantel and door moulding
tapered columns and slightly heavier details of Greek Revival to create an example of early Greek Revival millwork, possibly early 1840s. The moulding seen around the doors and windows of the log section suggests a more Federal style, as seen in the slightly elliptical curves in the profile. Although it is not certain that the mantel is original to this building, an early to mid-nineteenth century date is suggested by the millwork.

For the additions and renovations made after 1851, as well as the outbuilding, only two lock mechanisms of note exist. One of these is located on a door in the addition to the main house adjacent to the 1851 frame section (Appendix B.3, F/1). The lock mechanism for this door provides further indication that the mixed horizontal and vertical panel door is not original to the Greek Revival door frame or the period. As can be seen in Figure 37A, the lock mechanism is located within the door as opposed to the outside lock box mount popular until the early twentieth century (Sandbeck, 1991). Therefore, it is possible that this door was not added along with the addition, but may have been placed later.

The only other type of lock mechanism found in the later additions is located on the door entering the 1851 upstairs bathroom and the closet door inside (Figure 37B). This ensemble exhibits strong similarities to a lock box
(A) 1851 Parlor door

(B) Twentieth century bathroom door

Figure 37. Lock ensembles in later additions
ensemble found on the 1834 closet door (see Figure 15C). Both bathroom doors show evidence of previous locks, indicating that the one shown in Figure 37B is not original to the door. It is also very probable that this easily relocated lock ensemble was salvaged from an older door.

Much of the millwork and hardware located in Solitude and the outbuilding is original to the date of construction. However, with the multiple uses these structures have served over the last two centuries many elements have been altered or replaced. The following chapter will analyze the meaning of all of these details and provide an overview of the evolution of Solitude.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Solitude is an excellent example of the evolution of vernacular and classical architecture in southwest Virginia. For nearly two centuries this building has been shaped by the cultural and environmental elements that surround it. This thesis was an attempt to map the sequence in which the building was shaped through an analysis of its millwork, hardware, and other architectural features. One of the most significant resources used to accomplish this analysis was the unpublished information stock-piled in the minds of architectural historians Gibson Worsham, Edward Lay, Charles Brownell, and Leslie Giles. This information, combined with that provided by published historians and pattern books, furnished the information necessary to begin to understand the clues Solitude offered for analysis.

Scaled drawings of the existing millwork at Solitude were analyzed by architectural historians, as well as compared to illustrations in eighteenth and nineteenth century pattern books in an attempt to assign a specific time frame to the construction and popularity of their details. It appears that pattern books exhibited some influence on the 1851 addition, as is seen in the parlor window details. However, it is likely that most of the
millwork designs resulted from the creative and adaptive styles of the carpenters that produced them. This information used in conjunction with the clues provided through lock boxes, hinges (their age and originality), ghost marks, building seams, and various other architectural features provided the narrative necessary to recreate the evolution of Solitude.

As was previously determined, Solitude began as a one and a half story, one room log structure around 1801. A two story log addition was added to the south wall of the original structure in 1834. The original millwork and hardware for both of these sections is Federal in style, as can be seen in the attenuated mantel, six panel, cross and bible doors, and circular moulding profiles. The next addition, begun in 1851, was of frame construction. The owners deferred to the popular style of the day, and created a Greek Revival structure. At this point the 1801 log section underwent extensive renovation, with the exception of two closet doors and a later upstairs mantel. The 1834 log section remained untouched. The Greek Revival influence is shown in the 1801 and 1851 sections through the use of pedimented, four panel doors, crossettes (Appendix A), heavy, symmetrical lines, and elliptical curves.

Additional rooms, added after the 1851 construction, do not exhibit moulding that is indicative of any particular
period. Building techniques and various architectural features, such as running bond brick pattern, and lack of primary heat sources indicate a late nineteenth century or early twentieth century date.

The extant outbuilding located behind Solitude has previously been analyzed by archeologist Cliff Boyd and architectural historian Gibson Worsham. Their findings suggested a mid-nineteenth century date for the log portion and a late nineteenth or early twentieth century date for the frame addition. Further investigation of the original mouldings found Federal and early Greek Revival period features that suggest a possibly earlier date than previous findings.

This study was conducted not only in an attempt to document and analyze the evolution of Solitude through millwork and architectural features, but also to provide a resource for analyzing other homes in the area as well. The evolutionary inconsistencies existing in Solitude may never be understood, but an evaluation of similar buildings may establish patterns in nineteenth century millwork and building practices in the local area. Additional studies in paint analysis, excavations for artifacts, and selective removal of plaster walls could also provide more information on the "How? Why? and When?" the evolutionary process took place.
In the meanwhile, Solitude should be appreciated for the outstanding example of vernacular architecture it is. It holds the honor of having been the site of a famous early settlement, of having been the home of two Virginia governors, and the birthplace of Virginia's first and largest Land Grant university. Therefore, it is only reasonable to acknowledge Solitude as a valuable cultural, educational and historic resource.
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Appendix A
Names and Locations of Architectural Details

Ceiling Moulding
Lintel
Crossettes

Chair Rail
Wainscot
Base
### Appendix B.1
#### Door Schedule *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Period</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801 Closets / 1st Fl.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Transom added later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1801 Closets / 1st Fl.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Transom added later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1834 Entrance</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4 Panels replaced w/ glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1834 Hallway</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Moulding present, door removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1834 2nd Fl. room</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1834/1801 2nd Fl. connecting door</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801/1851 Entrance from hall</td>
<td>Greek Rev.</td>
<td>Triangulated Lintel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801/1834 1st Fl. connecting door</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Original Moulding, door added later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1851 Parlor</td>
<td>Greek Rev. moulding/door unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1851 Entrance Hall</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801/1851 Upstairs room</td>
<td>Greek Rev.</td>
<td>Plain corner blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1851 1st Fl. rear entrance</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801/1851 2nd Fl.</td>
<td>Greek Rev.</td>
<td>Moulding present, door removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1851 2nd Fl.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Outermost moulding lightly fluted (see F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1851 1st Fl. parlor</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd Fl. later addition</td>
<td>Victorian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Moulding present, see H for door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>No door present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Location noted in Appendices B.3 and B.4
### Appendix B.2

**Window Schedule** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Style/Period</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1834 1st Fl.</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Southern-most 1st Fl. addition</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>May have been moved from 1834 section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1834 2nd Fl.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1834 2nd Fl. toilet addition</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1834 2nd Fl. hall</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renovated 1801 1st Fl. Parlor</td>
<td>Greek Rev.</td>
<td>Triangulated lintel w/ ceiling moulding above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1851 Parlor</td>
<td>Greek Rev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1851 Parlor - East end</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2 over 2 sash window w/o recessed panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1851 Upstairs Hall - Front</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1851 Upstairs room</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1851 2nd Fl. Bathroom Hall</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1851 2nd Fl. Bathroom</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1851 Stairway</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3 recessed panels below window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801/1851 2nd Fl. Room</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2 recessed panels below window, corner blocks replace pediment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot; - West End</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 recessed panel below window, corner blocks replace pediment. 9 over 6 configuration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Location noted in Appendices B.3 and B.4
First Floor Door and Window Locations

Appendix B.3
Appendix C
Blacksburg / Preston / Solitude Chronology

Blacksburg / Montgomery Co.

1755
Draper's Meadow
1776-83
American Blackburg Revolution Incorporated
1798
War of 1812
1861-65
Civil War (Confed. founded Territory)
1914-18
WWI
1941-45
WW II

1755
Uncle
James
Patton
killed at massacre

1843
James P. Preston
Dies

1880
Robt. Preston
Dies

Preston Family

1738
Wm. Preston comes to America

1776
James Patton Preston Born Smithfield Built

1809
Robt. Preston born

1833
Robt. Preston marries Mary Hart

1838
Benjamin H. Preston

1851
Robt. youngest child dies at age 15

1901
James P. Preston (Robt. Preston's last surviving child) dies

Solitude

1801
1st log cabin built

1807
Solitude bought by James P. Preston

1834
2nd log cabin built

1843
Robt. Preston inherits Solitude

1851
Frame section built

1872
Solitude sold to VAMC

1872
(Early 1900's)

1876
Used as Faculty housing

1876
Student housing trailer park

1975-92
Hokie Club

1975-92
Class room, lab and office space
Appendix D
Robert Preston Family Tree

Archibald Preston

John Preston m. Elizabeth Patton

Henry Patton m. Sarah Lynn

James Patton m. Mary Osborne

Jane m. Alexander Breckinridge

William m. Susanna Smith

- Elizabeth m. Wm. Madison
- John m. Mary Radford
- Francis m. Sarah Campbell
- Sarah m. James McDowell
- Nancy (Ann) died at age 13
- William m. Caroline Hancock
- Susanna m. Nathaniel Hart
- James Patton m. Ann Barraud Taylor
- Wm. Ballard
- Robt. Taylor m. Mary Hart
- James Francis

Virginia Ann Emily m. Robt. Stark Means

Benjamin Hart (died at age 15)

James Patton

Ann m. Francis Smith

Mary m. John Howard

Margaret m. Rev. John Brown

James (died in infancy)

Mary m. Wm. Thompson

Margaret m. John Buchanan

Jane m. John Floyd

Wm. Preston Floyd

John Floyd m. Letitia Preston

George Rogers Clark Floyd

Margaret m. John Preston

NOTE: Bold indicates owners of Solitude
Appendix E
Resources

Architectural Historians
Cliff Boyd, Radford Univ. (Archeologist)
Charles Brownell, Univ. of VA
Jack Heikkenen, Blacksburg, VA (Dendrochronologist)
Edward Lay, Univ. of VA
Peter Sandbeck, Greenville, NC
Tony Whitwell, Hollins College
Gibson Worsham, Christiansburg, VA

Association for State and Local History
1315 8th Ave. S.
Nashville, TN 37203

Birmingham, Alabama Archives
205/226-3645

Department for Historic Resources
Mimi Sadler & Hugh Miller
Richmond, Virginia
804/786-6330 (-3144)
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Filson Club
Jim Holmberg
1310 South Third St.
Louisville, KY
520/635-5083

Montgomery County Planning Dept.
Susan Swayne & Joe Powers
Montgomery County Courthouse
Christiansburg, VA
703/382-5750

Roanoke Regional Preservation Center
John Kern & Leslie Giles
Penmar Ave. SE
Roanoke, VA 24013
703/857-7585

Thermographics/Infrared photography
Mac McCord
Dept. of Engineering
Virginia Tech
703/231-3233
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University of Kentucky Archives
Bill Marshall
Lexington, KY
606/257-8611

Virginia State Library Archives
Richmond, VA
804/786-2306

Virginia Tech
Newman Library Special Collections
Glenn McMullen
703/231-9205
VITA

A. Sue Ballard

Date of Birth
September 19, 1964 in Bardstown, Kentucky

Educational Background
Master of Science (1992) in Housing, Interior Design, and Resource Management from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Bachelor of Science (1987) in Interior Design from Western Kentucky University

Work Experience
Graduate teaching assistant
(1990-92) Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA

Interior designer
(1991) The Design Center, Blacksburg, VA
(1988-90) Duckett Marchant, Alanta, GA
(1987-88) Winford Lindsay Associates, Lawrenceville, GA

Patient educator
(1990) Georgia Skin and Cancer Center, Atlanta, GA

Teaching assistant/Biological illustrator
(1982-87) Western Kentucky University, Department of Biology, Bowling Green, KY
Honors and Organizations

1991    IBD/Knoll Group Design Competition, honorable mention
1991-92 Interior Design Educator's Council, graduate member
1991-92 Kappa Omicron Nu, member
1991-92 National Trust for Historic Preservation, member
1984-92 American Society of Interior Designers, associate member
1987    Outstanding Interior Design Student
1987    Outstanding A.S.I.D. Member
1986    "Bios" (quarterly scientific publication) cover design
1986-87 International Youth in Achievement
1986-92 Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society
1984-87 Who's Who Among American College Students
1982-87 University Honors Committee, member
1982-87 Western Kentucky University President's List
1982-87 National Dean's List
1982    Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society