

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

THOMAS-BENTLEY HOUSE (Madison House)

HABS NO. MD-1375

- Location: 205 Market Street, Brookeville, Montgomery County, Maryland. The Madison House sits on an embankment above Market Street, which is the main thoroughfare through the town, designated as the Brookeville Historic District (MHT Site #M23-65, NR #1605705329). GIS Coordinates: 39.182136 N, -77.057443 W
- Owner: The current owners are Duane and Sandra Heiler.
- Present Use: The Thomas-Bentley House is now used exclusively as a private residence.
- Significance: Erected ca. 1798, the Thomas-Bentley House was the first substantial and enduring structure to be built in what would soon become the prominent market town of Brookeville, founded at about the same time by Richard Thomas, Jr. and his wife Deborah Brooke Thomas. Richard is believed to have constructed the Thomas-Bentley House, from which was operated the first store and post office in town. The house was situated adjacent to his preexisting gristmill property. Its construction along the Reedy Branch of the Hawlings River foretold of the growing prosperity of the greater Sandy Spring Quaker community and of the movement from a predominately agrarian economy to one enhanced by light industrial and commercial development. The town site was situated in one of most flourishing agricultural areas in Montgomery County, and generations of agricultural improvements now combined with an increase in industrialization and consumerism indicative of the period to reshape the existing landscape. In fact, within a broader context, the establishment of Brookeville as a commercial/artisan village was part of a social and economic transformation that occurred nationwide during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. By 1813, Brookeville included two mills, a tan yard, two stores, a post office, blacksmith shop, a private boy's school and approximately fourteen residences. By 1825 half of the Quaker community belonging to the Sandy Spring Meeting resided there. Brookeville expanded during the nineteenth century, embracing additional manufacturing and commercial interests, and by 1880 it boasted the third largest population in Montgomery County.¹

The Thomas-Bentley House is significant architecturally as a vernacular expression of the Federal style, although still in keeping with the Quaker tenet of simplicity embraced by its builder and early residents. The house is among the most notable examples of the structures within the greater Sandy Spring community believed to have been constructed by the Thomas family of Quaker master builders. It was the only one planned for a more urbane, village setting and as a merchant-class dwelling, rather than as the centerpiece of an agricultural estate. It is elegantly understated and includes many architectural refinements, such as built-in cabinetry, fine mantelpieces, and graceful stairway, yet as originally constructed it lacked the formality and scale of other middle to upper-middle

¹ See, National Register of Historic Places, Brookeville Historic District, Brookeville, Maryland, Site #1605705329; prepared by Julie Shipe, Sylvia Nash, and Candace Reed, 1978. Also see, Martha Nesbitt and Mary Reading Miller, et al. *Chronicles of Sandy Spring Friends Meeting and Environs* (Sandy Spring, Maryland: Sandy Spring Monthly Meeting, 1987), 72-73.

class homes in the region. Unlike the typical Georgian-style homes of the era, the plan of the Thomas-Bentley House does not include a center hall to mediate between public and private spheres. Instead, it consisted of a main block with an entry that led directly into the parlor or best room of the house, which adjoined a smaller dining parlor with a stair hall tucked behind. Within a few decades of its construction, however, the house was altered and expanded to conform to rising middle-class expectations. The revised plan imposed greater formality upon the use of the spaces within the house, which now included an entry hall, expanded dining room, and a rear kitchen ell. The changes were undertaken without compromising the integrity of the original design and instead add to the interest of the house. The Thomas-Bentley House is also distinctive in that it combines domestic with commercial functions; the symmetrically balanced wings that flank the main block originally contained to one side a kitchen and to the other, a combination workshop and store.

Finally, the house is important for its role in offering refuge to President James Madison during the 1814 British invasion of Washington, D.C., that took place as part of the War of 1812. On August 26, 1814, the British marched on the nation's capital and set fire to the White House and other government buildings, forcing a mass evacuation of the city. Then-owners of the Thomas-Bentley House, Caleb and Henrietta Bentley, provided food and lodging to Madison, as well as to Attorney General Richard Rush, General John T. Mason, and others in Madison's party including his guards and the soldiers encamped on the property. Despite the fact that the Bentleys had given up their best bedchamber for the president, he remained awake throughout the night, sending and receiving dispatches to his dispersed cabinet. Secretary of State James Monroe joined Madison at the Thomas-Bentley House the following day and together they returned safely to Washington.

Historian: Catherine C. Lavoie, HABS, 2011.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of erection: The Thomas-Bentley House was most likely erected between 1798 and 1800. It was in 1798 that Richard and Deborah Thomas sold the property to Caleb and Sarah Bentley and in 1800 that the census records indicate that the Bentleys were residing in Brookeville. A boundary stone bearing the Bentley's initials (a "B" above, flanked below by "C" and "S"), and the initials of surveyors Richard Thomas and William Roberson, and the date "179?" is still located in the southeast corner of the lot.² In addition, the Bentleys are enumerated in the 1800 census along with Samuel Wright, Israel French, and David Newlin all of whom had purchased lots in Brookeville that year.³ Furthermore, it is assumed that the house was standing in 1802, the

² The last digit of the date stone has been lost due to the splaying of the stone. It is interesting to note that Thomas and Roberson undertook the original survey conducted of James Brooke's property prior to his death, and subsequent surveys undertaken in an effort to settle his estate.

³ U. S. Census Records, Montgomery County, Maryland, 1783-1920, on microfilm at the Maryland State Archives (hereafter referred to as MSA), and online at: <http://ftp.uscensus.org/pub/usgenweb/census/md/montgomery>. In addition, enumerated one household away was John Holland, who lived at "Prospect Hill" which stood between

year Bentley was appointed postmaster of Brookeville, as the post office operated from his store located in the east wing of the house.⁴

Although it is less likely, the house could have been erected as early as 1792, when Richard and Deborah Thomas received legal title to this property, which sat adjacent to their mill. If so, then Richard Thomas may have built the house for himself and his family, perhaps using what became Caleb Bentley's store and workshop as his mill office. Evidence pertaining to the exact location of the residence of Richard Thomas, Jr. and his wife Deborah, at this time is inconclusive. However, it is worth noting that the value of the Thomas's property increases significantly in 1798, but remains constant after selling the four-acre lot to the Bentleys, suggesting that the Bentley lot was unimproved at the time of sale, and that the Thomases had erected another house in town and/or improved their mill site.⁵

2. Architect: The Thomas-Bentley House is a well-constructed and well-articulated vernacular expression of federal architecture, and thus it is likely that it was designed by an experienced builder. The Thomas family included a number of noted master builders, including Richard Thomas, Jr., his father Richard Thomas, Sr., and his uncle John Thomas (see: Builder, Contractor, Suppliers).

3. Owners and Occupants:

Richard Thomas, Jr. and Deborah Brooke Thomas, his wife; 1792-1798

1792 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber E, folio 428-435
Made 26 November 1792 (Recorded 7 November 1793)

Allen Bowie, et al, trustees

To

Deborah Brooke Thomas (along with her siblings Samuel Brooke, Mary Moore, Margaret Brooke, Sarah Bentley, Hannah Brooke, Roger Brooke, & Dorothy Brooke)

“At the Request of Samuel Brooke, Mary Moore, Margaret Brooke, Deborah Thomas, Sarah Bentley, Hannah Brooke, Roger Brooke, & Dorothy Brooke and pursuant to an order of

Brookeville and Brighton, the next town over, along what is now Brighton Dam Road. Prospect Hill is in proximity to Brooke Meadow Farm, along what is now referred to as Gold Mine Road, where the Bentleys were said to have lived prior to coming to Brookeville.

⁴ Caleb Bentley was appointed postmaster of Brookeville on 10 March 1802. One of his nephews by marriage (a son-in-law of Thomas and Deborah), Robert E. Garrigues was postmaster briefly from 21 December 1815, until Bentley was reappointed 20 August 1816. Bentley remained as postmaster until 2 November 1818 when the duty was transferred to Thomas L. Reece, to whom Bentley sold the house in 1819.

⁵ Tax assessment records for the Thomas-Bentley House property are somewhat contradictory to other forms of documentary evidence. Richard is assessed for the property (248 acres of Addition to Brooke Grove) with improvements in 1793 and 1795 at the same rate. The assessed value nearly doubles in 1798, the year the Thomases sell the house lot taken from the larger parcel to the Bentleys, yet the Bentley assessment for that same year is so low as to suggest no substantial improvement. The assessment for the Bentley's four-acre parcel does not increase significantly in improvement value until 1806, rising again in 1810, and then rising quite significantly in the 1816 assessment, two years after Madison's stay is recorded. The Bentley's sold the house in 1819; that year the tax assessment records indicate both his ownership and that of its new owner, Thomas L. Reese; the improvement value is the same for both parties.

Montgomery County Court the following Commission, etc. was recorded the 7th day of November 1793, to wit . . . Allen Bowie, Thomas Cramplin, Richard Wootton Thomas . . . Whereas Samuel Brooke hath petitioned the justice of our county court that Roger Brooke late of same county, father to the said Samuel Brooke died intestate and without any disposition of his lands and the said Roger Brooke left issue [as named above] . . . Now know ye that you make Equal division of the said lands which the said Roger Brooke died intestate thereof agreeable to an act of Assembly . . . passed at November session seventeen hundred and eighty six and make you return thereof to the justice of our County Court as speedily as may be within this writ. Witness Richard Potto Esquire Chief Justice of our said Court the 13th day of November 1792.” Montgomery County September 30th 1793 Richard Wootton qualified to execute the within commission agreeable to the direction of the act of assembly “Entitled” . . . having viewed and caused to be surveyed the lands whereof Roger Brooke died seized do divide and allot them to the partition in the following manner:

. . . “Seventhly, to Deborah Thomas all those parcels of land being part of a lot of land as laid off the Roger Brooke deceased in the Division of his deceased father lands for nine hundred thirty one and three quarter acres and called part of addition to Brooke grove part of the resurvey on Brooke park part of fair hill and long choice; beginning . . . [metes & bounds] containing one hundred and seventy three and three quarter acres more or less. As also all that parcel of land being part of addition to Brooke Grove included in the following . . . containing two hundred and forty eight acres of land more or less.”

The Settlement of James Brooke, the Elder’s Estate

The property that Deborah received was ultimately part of the estate of her grandfather, James Brooke. Transcription from the Equity Case following death of James Brooke; Brooke Papers, Maryland State Archives, Special Collections (00/09/03/29), D418, 1789-1790. A transcript is also available at the Sandy Spring Museum Library & Archives, “Dairies & Memoirs,” Book 1. State of Maryland, To Messers Thomas Cramplin, Richard Wooten, Allen Bowie & Benjamin Edwards of Montgomery County appointed commissioners to examine evidence in a cause depending on our High Court of Chancery; Roger, Richard & Thomas Brooke complainants, dated 20 October 1787; 14 November 1787 court house hearing & taking of testimony.

Caleb Bentley and Sarah Brooke Bentley, his wife (and Henrietta Thomas Bentley, his second wife); 1798 to 1819

1798 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber H, folio 116
Made 22 January 1798 (Recorded 21 April 1798)
Richard Thomas, Jr. & Deborah Brooke Thomas, his wife of Montgomery County, Maryland
To
Caleb Bentley & Sarah Brooke Bentley, his wife [and sister of Deborah Brooke], of Montgomery County, Maryland
Addition to Brooke Grove, four acres

In consideration of the sum of five shillings current money to them in hand paid by the said Caleb Bentley the receipt whereof they the said Richard & Deborah Thomas doth hereby acknowledge hath granted . . . the following tract or parcel of land situated lying and being in the county and

state aforesaid it being part of a tract of land called Addition to Brooke Grove and is contained . . . within the bounds . . . and on the west side of the said Richard Thomas, Junr's [Junior's] Mill on the Reedy Branch and running thence north . . . containing four acres of land . . . to have and to hold the said tract and premises together with all houses buildings and singular the appurtenances these unto belonging unto him the said Caleb Bentley, his heirs . . . the said Deborah wife of the said Richard Thomas, Junr [Junior] being by us privately was sworn out of the hearing of her said husband declared she made the said acknowledgement willingly and freely without being induced thereto by force or threat of ill usage by her said husband or fear of his displeasure."⁶

Thomas L. Reese and Elizabeth P. Thomas, his wife; 1819 to 1827

Deed (unrecorded), transfer made in 1819, based on tax assessment records
Caleb Bentley and Henrietta Thomas Bentley, his wife
To
Thomas L. Reese
4 acres of Addition to Brooke Grove

1823 Deed Montgomery County Land Records, Liber W, folio 433
Recorded 3 March 1823
Elizabeth P. Thomas, of Brookeville
To
Thomas L. Reese, Montgomery County, Maryland
Addition of one acre (to four acre parcel from Bentley)

Witnessed that for and in consideration of the sum of sixty dollars current money . . . that part or parcel of land . . . beginning for the same at the northwest corner of the lot numbered thirty in the plan of the town of Brookeville . . . containing one acre of land more or less to have and to hold

⁶ It should be noted that this deed was followed by Deed Liber H, folio 11, whereby Sarah and Caleb Bentley sold to Richard Thomas, Junr of the same county. "In consideration of the sum of five shillings current money to them in hand paid by the said Richard Thomas Junr . . . being part of a tract of land called addition to Brooke Black meadow and is contained . . . within the following courses . . . to the edge of Hawlings River at the end of four perches on the fourth lines of a lott (sic.) of said addition to brooke black meadow as laid off to Sarah Bentley in the division of the land of Roger Brooke deceased . . . containing two acres of land . . . together with all house buildings singular then appurtenances thereunto . . ."

In an Indenture also made that same day, Caleb and Sarah Bentley sold to Samuel Brooke [Sarah's Brother], seventy-one acres of land, that included among the metes & bounds, "to a stone marked "T" it being the corner of a lott conveyed by us this day to Richard Thomas, Junr" and also states "the said lands and premises together with all houses buildings and singular the appurtenances therein belonging unto him the said Samuel Brooke his heirs. . . in consideration of the sum of seven hundred and fifty pounds current money to them in hand paid by the said Samuel Brooke" Liber H, folio 117).

Also that day, Samuel Brooke sold to Caleb Bentley, 250 acres of Addition to Brooke Grove, etc. for 937 pounds ten shillings (Liber H, folio 119) The latter parcel was likely Samuel's portion of the estate of his uncle Thomas Brooke for which he and each of his siblings received 250 acres; the estate totaled 2,000 acres and included his "dwelling plantation" (see: Deed, Liber F-6, folio 79; and abstract from the settlement of Thomas Brooke's will, SSM, Diaries & Memoirs section, Book 1).

said land and premises together with all houses, buildings and singularly the appurtenances there unto . . .”

Equity Decree, dated 22 March, 1826; Reese declared insolvent debtor by the Montgomery County Court sitting as a Court of Chancery, and Caleb Bentley appointed trustee to dispose of property at public auction (no records of this case were found; referenced in next deed).

Roger Brooke, V; 1827 to 1840

1839 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber B.S. 9, folio 357
Property sold at auction 28 June 1827 (Recorded the 2nd day of May 1839)
Caleb Bently (sic.), trustee for Thomas L. Reese, and Henrietta his wife (she having a right of Dower), of Geo.Town District of Columbia
To
Roger Brooke [V], Montgomery County, Maryland
Four acres and a one acre lot contiguous; for the sum of \$2,024.00.
Abstracted from hand written copy of original; SSM Collection, Deed, 1997.0005.0618.

Witnessed that whereas by a Decree of Montgomery County Court setting as a court of chancery hearing date the 22nd day of March in the year 1826 the above named Caleb Bentley was appointed a Trustee and authorized and empowered to sell and dispose of the real estate of Thomas L. Reese an insolvent debtor in the county and state aforesaid, for the payment of his debts, that in pursuance of said Decree the said Caleb Bentley did on the 28th day of June in the year 1827 sell and dispose of to the above named Roger Brooke at Public Auction A Brick dwelling house in the Town of Brookeville in the count and state aforesaid and formerly in the occupancy of the said Thomas L. Reese with two Lots of ground lying contiguous and attached thereto with all and singular of the appurtenances thereunto belonging or in any wise appertaining for the sum of Two thousand and twenty four dollars current money and whereas the purchase money for the above described property hath been fully paid and satisfied that said Caleb Bentley is authorized to execute a conveyance for the same and hath agreed to execute these presents. . . . the following described lots or parcels of land on the west side of Richard Thomas Junr.'s Mill on the Reedy Branch Containing four acres of land . . . and also one other piece or parcel of land lying contiguous to the lot . . . beginning for the same at the North west corner of the lot Numbered 30 in the plan of the Town of Brookeville . . . containing one acre of land . . . with all al singular the buildings and improvements and appurtenances thereto belonging or in any wise appertaining”

Elisha J. Hall and Mary Brooke Hall, his wife; 1840-1841

1840 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber B.S. 10, folio 209
Made 9 May 1840 (Recorded 20 August 1840)
Roger Brooke, of Montgomery County
To
Elisha J. Hall and Mary Brooke Hall, his wife [daughter of Roger Brooke], of Montgomery County
Four acres with adjacent one acre lot

“Witnessed that for and in consideration of the sum of one Dollar current money to him in hand paid by the said Elisha J. Hall and Mary B. Hall . . . the following described pieces or parcels of land lying and being in Montgomery County . . . one piece or parcel being part of a tract of land called “Snowden’s Manor Enlarged . . . Containing two hundred and thirty one and one half acres and record in Liber B.S. No. 5 folios 270 and 271 . . . Also . . . containing four acres of land . . . and adjoining the land above . . . beginning at the southwest corner of lot Number 30 in the Plan of the Town of Brookeville . . . containing one acre . . . being the same conveyed by Caleb Bentley, trustee and wife to the said Roger Brooke. . . twenty third day of April 1839 . . . recorded in Liber B.S. 9 folios 357, 358, 359.”

Remus Riggs, 1841 to 1867

1841 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber B.S. 10, folio 400
Made 3 May 1841 (Recorded 4 May 1841)
Elisha J. Hall and Mary B. Hall, of Montgomery County
To
Remus Riggs [of Pleasant Hills], of Montgomery County
Four acres and adjoining one acre lot

“In consideration of the sum of eighteen hundred and fifty dollars current money . . . standing about ten perches from and on the west side of Roger B. Thomas’s Mill on the Reedy Branch . . . containing four acres of land . . . Also another piece of land adjoining the aforementioned tract . . . beginning for the same at the Northeast corner of lot Number 30 in the Plan of the Town of Brookville (sic.) . . . one acre . . . same as conveyed by Roger Brooke to Elisha J. Hall and Mary B. his wide by deed . . . ninth day of May eighteen hundred and forty and recorded in Liber B.S. No. 10 folio 209, 210, & 211 . . .”

Among the known residents during this era are Zachariah Waters and family, probably during the 1850s, and Zachariah Magruder and family, during the 1860s.

1865 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber EBP 2, folio 422
Made 4 December 1865 (Recorded 13 December 1865)
Remus Riggs and Catherine Riggs his wife, of Montgomery County
To
Artemus Riggs, of Montgomery County
Division of property and sale for construction and/or sale of neighboring house (207 Market Street)

“In consideration of four hundred and seventy five dollars . . . do grant and convey unto Artemus Riggs of the county and state aforesaid . . . a part of a tract of land called “The Addition to Brooke Grove” lying and being in the town of Brookeville . . . beginning on the North side of Market street and on the front line of Lot Number four . . . 3 acres and seven square perches of land. . . “[division and partial sale of the original four acres; the remaining property contains the house.]

Will, Remus Riggs, Liber JWS 1, folio 249, Montgomery County Register of Wills, probated 12 December 1867.

“To Thomas D. Riggs I give, devise and bequeath the farm on which he now resides containing about 242 acres To my beloved and affectionate daughter, Amelia J. Riggs, I give devise and bequeath the sum of one thousand dollars; also a riding horse, a saddle and bridle, two cows and calves (sic.), her choice; any portrait likeness; her Piano Forte, guitar, sewing machine and two beds and bedding, also her choice, and after the death of her mother, [unclear] of the household furniture and plate, also her choice [unclear].

To my son Thomas D. Riggs in the fullest confidence of his fidelity to the sacredness of the trust I give, devise and bequeath the whole of my houses and lots in the Village of Brookeville, viz, the house commonly known as the store house and dwelling, the house occupied by Samuel T. Murray and the smith and wheelwrights shops, respectively occupied by James Barnes and William Jones, In Trust for the use benefit and support of my beloved and affectionate daughter to descend to her lawful issue in fee simple, but in the event of my said daughter Amelia J. departing without lawful issue, then it is my will and direction that the said property included in this trust shall be equally divided among my remaining children, or their lawful issue, to share and share alike.”

Amelia Riggs, a.k.a. Amelia MacGill, Amelia Wood, 1867 to 1908

Note: Although legal owner of the property, it is likely that Amelia only lived here from as early as about 1878 until her death in 1902. The house and store were rented.

Equity Case #2362, Amelia Riggs MacGill Wood; Thomas D. Riggs vs. Florence M. Riggs, Margaret Riggs, and John A. Riggs; filed 17 September 1907.

Bill of Complaint, 1st—That Remus Riggs, late of Montgomery, deceased, was at the time of his death, seized in fee simple absolutely of a certain piece of property located in Brookeville, Mont Co, Maryland, containing about one and one-half acres of land and improved by a brick dwelling house, stable, storehouse and other outbuildings.

2nd—that the said Remus Riggs by his last will and testament, duly filed and probated in the office of the Register of Wills of Mont Co . . . devised and bequeathed to your orator, Thomas D. Riggs one of the sons of the deceased, the said property situated in the Village of Brookeville in special trust and confidence nevertheless for the benefit and support of Amelia J. Riggs to descend to her lawful issue . . . but in the event of the death of the said Amelia J. Riggs without lawful issue, then to be divided equally among the remaining children of the testor, or their lawful issue, share and share alike.

3rd—that the said Amelia has departed this life without issue and under the terms of the said will that the said property became the estate of your orator Thomas D., John A., and William C. Riggs.” That . . . William C. Riggs also departed this life, intestate, after death of Amelia . . . and left surviving him as his only issue, two daughters, Florence M. Riggs and Margaret

4th . . . property is not susceptible to division.

Final Order—“That they attended, in front of the premises in the Village of Brookeville, in said County, on Saturday, the fifth day of December in the year nineteen hundred and eight, at the hour of two o’clock P.M. and then and there offered the said property for sale by public auction and then and there sold all of the property mentioned and described in the preceding . . .

advertisement to Marshall P. Howard and for the sum of \$1075.00, he being then and there the highest bidder for the same.

Trustee's Sale! By virtue of a decree of the Circuit for Montgomery County sitting as a court of equity passed in a cause and said court wherein Thomas D. Riggs is complainant and Florence M. Riggs and defendants No. 2361 Equity. The subscribers will on Saturday December 5 AD 1908 at the hour of 2 o'clock pm offer for sale at public auction in the Village of Brookeville, Montgomery County, Md the real estate by said decree is decreed to be sold, This property contains of a lot on the main street of Brookeville containing about two acres of land adjoining the land of John H. Parsley on one side and Michael O'Toole on the other. The improvements consist of a comfortable brick dwelling house containing seven rooms with porch in front and a brick and frame store room and ware room attached. The house fronts on a nicely shaded lawn and there is a pump of good water at the back door. There are also on the property a combined stable for horses and cows and a corn house, a meat house, and other necessary outbuildings. Terms of sale as described by the decree: one-third of the purchase money to be paid in cash, the balance in two equal installments, payable respectably in six and twelve months from day of sale. Said deferred payment to bear interest from day of sale and to be secured to the satisfaction of the trustees either by notes by approved security or by way of mortgage of the property, or all cash, at the option of the purchaser. Conveyancing at the cost of the purchaser, Phillip D. Laird and Charles W. Prettyman, trustees.

"I hereby certify that I purchased the property described in written handbill at public auction for \$1075.00 to be paid in cash on ratification of sale December 5, 1908. (signed) Marshall P. Howard.

Marshall P. Howard (and Elizabeth Riggs Howard, his wife); 1909 to 1911

1909 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 202, folio 222
Made 19 January 1909 (Recorded 19 January 1909)
Philip D. Laird and Charles W. Prettyman, both of Montgomery County
To
Marshall P. Howard [husband of Elizabeth Riggs Howard], of Baltimore
One and three-fourths acre

Sitting as a Court of Equity, passed in a cause in said Court . . . herein Thomas D. Riggs in complaint, and Florence M. Riggs and others are defendants (No. 2362 Equity), the said Philip D. Laird and Charles W. Prettyman were appointed trustees to sell the property herein mentioned . . . on the fifth day of December in the year nineteen hundred and eight, all the said property to a certain Marshall P. Howard of the City of Baltimore. . . for the sum of one thousand and seventy five dollars . . . all of the property . . . lying and being in the Town of Brookeville . . . containing one and three fourths acres of land."

Purchased by Marshall Pleasants Howard, Brookeville physician for \$1,075. His wife was from the Riggs family and was among the heirs of Amelia Riggs.

Washington Bowie and Katherine G. Bowie, his wife; 1911 to 1919

1911 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 224, folio 381
Made 6 December 1911 (Record 15 December 1911)
Marshall P. Howard and Elizabeth R. Howard, his wife, of Baltimore city
To
Washington Bowie and Katherine Gaither Bowie, his wife, also of Baltimore City
One and three-fourths acre

“In consideration of the sum of Twelve hundred (\$1200) Dollars . . . the following property, the same being situated laying and being in the town of Brookeville . . . Northern edge of Market Street as laid down on the Plan of Brookeville . . . containing one and three fourths acres of land.”

It is likely that Henry Howard and family continued to reside here during the Bowie’s tenure.

William P. Jones, 1919 to 1955

1919 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 288, folio 393
Made 28 November 1919 (Recorded 4 December 1919)
Washington Bowie, Sr., widower, of the City of Baltimore
To
William P. Jones, of Montgomery County
One and three-fourths acre

“In consideration of the sum of ten Dollars and divers other good and valuable consideration as thereunto moving, I . . . do grant unto William P. Jones . . . all those lots . . . lying and being in the village of Brookville (sic.) . . . containing one and three fourths acres of land . . . and being also the same land which was conveyed to the said Washington Bowie and Catherine Bowie, his wife, by Marshall P. Howard and wife by deed dated the 6th day of December, A.D. 1911 and recorded in . . . Liber 224, folio 381. (Also lots 1 & 35 in village of Brookeville to Bowie from William Edward Action, et.al 14 September 1909, Liber 208, folio 445; same to Washington Bowie, Sr. from Jr. 28 November 1919).

Howard S. Musgrove and Josephine H. Musgrove, his wife; 1955 to 1958

Will, William P. Jones, Montgomery County Register of Wills, Liber EA 58, folio 3; Case #9567; filed 3 June 1952; appraisal dated, 13 July 1955.

“I give, devise and bequeath unto Howard S. Musgrove and Josephine H. Musgrove, his wife my house and lot in Brookeville and all the contents thereof, provided, however, that they shall continue to reside there and provide board and lodging for me, during my life under the present or under any future arrangement made between them and me for their use during my life.” (Property is otherwise to revert to niece, Evelyn J. Driver; dated 3 June 1952.) Later it was added, to the

Musgroves "I desire to enlarge the same to include all of the property of which I may die seized and possessed which may be situated in the Village of Brookeville." Jones died 14 March 1955.⁷

Gene Archer and Juanita Archer, his wife; 1958 to 1980

1958 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 2515, folio 435
Made 6 October 1958 (Recorded 6 October 1958)
Howard S. Musgrove and Josephine H. Musgrove, his wife
To
Gene Archer and Juanita N. Archer

"Witnessed, that for and in consideration of the sum of \$10.00 and other good and valuable considerations the Parties of the First Part do grant and convey unto the Parties of the Second Part . . . all that piece or parcel of land . . . being the same land conveyed by Washington Bowie, Sr. to William P. Jones, by deed dated November 28, 1919 and recorded . . . in Liber 288 at folio 393 . . . 2.763 acres . . . according to a survey made by Shepherd & Worthington, Inc. Land Surveyors, Silver Spring, Maryland, September 1958."

Richard S. Allan and Diane V. Allan, his wife, 1980 to 2007

1980 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 5581, folio 860
Made 12 September 1980 (Recorded 25 September 1980)
Juanita N. Archer, surviving Tenant by the Entirety of Gene Archer, he having predeceased by on October 4, 1978
To
Richard S. Allan and Diane V. Allan

"In the sum total of \$200,000 . . . Parts of tracts of land called and known as "MADISON HOUSE" Town of Brookeville . . . containing TWO (2.000) Acres of land, which is part of the same property which was conveyed to Gene and Juanita Archer from Howard S. Musgrove and Josephine H. Musgrove by Deed date October 6, 1958, in Liber 2515, folio 435."

Duane A. Heiler and Sandra I Heiler, his wife; 2007 to the present

2007 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 34365, folio 4
Made 17 May 2007 (Recorded 25 May 2007)
Richard S. Allan and Diane V. Allan
To
Duane A. Heiler and Sandra I Heiler

⁷ In inventory of Jones' household effects included: walnut three section sideboard, maple drop leaf table, 6 dining chairs, leather couch, walnut round extension table, Coleman oil heater, small oak roll top knee hole desk, Atwater Kent cabinet radio, silver plated cream and sugar set, tea pot, fruit bowl, antique mantel clock; Hall- drop leaf table (mahogany), Bedroom: oak double bed, marble top washstand, oak 5-drawer dresser, mirror, 6 straight back chairs, small wooden stand, small steamer trunk, chest of old time carpentry tools, double barreled shotgun; watch and chain; 1942 Ford sedan. EA 59/205: Inventory of Personal Estate of W Jones.

“In consideration of the sum of \$850,000 . . . Being parts of tracts of land called and known as Madison House, Town of Brookeville, Olney (8th) District, Montgomery County, Maryland . . . containing two (2.00) acres of land, more or less . . . Being the same lot of ground which by Deed dated September 12, 1980, and recorded . . . in Liber 5581, folio 960 . . . Conveyed by Juanita N. Archer to Richard S. Allen and Diane V. Allen . . . which has the address of 205 Market Street, Brookeville, MD 20833. (Saving and Excepting there from all that lot of ground described in a Deed by and between Richard S. Allan and Diane V. Allan, and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning commission, dated November 16, 2006 and recorded . . . in Liber 33349, folio 10 . . . containing a computed area of 43,560 square feet or 1.00000 of an acre of land, more or less.”

4. Builder, contractor, suppliers: According to local legend, the house was designed and erected by Richard Thomas, Jr., although no written evidence has been found to substantiate this claim.⁸ The only written evidence for his activities as a builder found thus far are in reference to the Sandy Spring Friends Meeting House, which he assisted his uncle, John Thomas (of “Clifton”), in building.⁹ Like the Thomas-Bentley House, the meeting house has oversized twelve-over-twelve-light sash windows. His father Richard Thomas, Sr., is also purported to have been a master builder, and is credited with building in addition to his own home, Cherry Grove, homes for other family members to include the nearby Norwood (for his son Samuel), Woodlawn,¹⁰ and Mount Airy (for his daughter Sarah) properties. It is also thought that Richard Thomas, Jr. may have built the nearby home Locust Grove, built ca. 1810 for John Howard Riggs, which does include a stairway very similar to that found at the Thomas-Bentley House, including the shadow railing.

5. Original plans and construction: The house was built as a symmetrically balanced composition consisting of a two-and-a-half-story main block measuring three bays across with the entry to the center, flanked by single story wings. The main block is slightly elevated so that the wings sit lower, and each was built with its own front-facing doorway (the one in the west wing has been filled in). The first floor of the main block was built as two adjoining rooms, one substantially larger, with a stair hall to the rear of the smaller room. Entry from the front was directly into the larger room, or parlor, with a corresponding rear entry. Along the interior west wall of the parlor are doorways into the smaller room (likely used as a dining or sitting room) to the front, and the stair hall to the rear. The stair hall, also open to the dining room, rises to the third (or half-story) of the house. Both the parlor and dining rooms have fireplaces with decorative mantels and built-in cabinetry. The moldings include chair rail throughout the house (no cornice moldings). Doorway and window surrounds are most elaborate in the parlor and dining room; they are

⁸ Sandra Heiler, current owner and architectural historian, interview with author at Madison House, 9 November 2010. The most noted reference to the Thomas family’s building legacy is: Roger B. Farquhar, *Old Homes and History of Montgomery County, Maryland*. Brookeville: American History Research Associates, 1952. Farquhar was a lifetime resident and a member of one of the community’s longstanding Quaker families and would likely have had knowledge via local oral tradition, perhaps even hearing directly from later members of the Thomas family. Unfortunately, Farquhar gives no sources for his information.

⁹ Annie B. Kirk, *Annals of Sandy Spring; Twenty Years History of a Rural Community in Maryland*, Vol. VI (Random Lake, Wisconsin: Times Printing Company, 1929), 22. William W. Farling was the mason.

¹⁰ The date for Woodlawn, originally thought to be ca. 1774, may be later, bringing into question the possibility of its construction by Richard Thomas, Sr., although it was owned originally by the Thomas family and thus could have been erected by one of the other Thomas builders.

simpler in the stair hall and other areas, including the second floor chambers, signaling their intended use by family members.

On the second floor were built three bed chambers and a stair hall. The finest bedchamber was located over the dining room, with the next best adjacent to it to the front of the house, over the parlor. Both of these rooms were heated by a fireplace, while the third bedroom, to the rear of the second bedroom, was unheated. The elegant stairway, with open balustrade and shadow rail, rises to the third floor where two rooms are separated by board partition walls and finished with plaster. The larger of the two spaces is located above the two secondary chambers while the smaller chamber conforms to the configuration of the best chamber.

The east wing was possibly built as a warehouse, but more likely as an artisan's workshop and general merchandise store and post office. It consists of a single room with the summer beam and overhead joists exposed. It originally had no internal connection with the main block. A former enclosed stairway provided access to a room above. Other significant features of this room include a heavy plank-board door to the front held by rose-head nails and hung by strap hinges, and similarly fashioned shutters on the windows. The window to the north rear still bears the iron bars that appear to have been installed post-construction (bars are set into the frame of the basement windows in this section). The original fireplace, since replaced, was to the center of the east side wall and consisted of a large, stone hearth with a brick stack. There is a cellar below that was originally accessed by a trap door in the floor.

The west wing, which sits two steps down from the main block, was built as the kitchen with a rear hall that contained a side entrance. It originally had a large stone fireplace on the side wall that matched the one built in the flanking (warehouse/store) wing.

6. Alterations and additions: A number of significant changes were made to the house, most likely ca. 1820, but perhaps as late as the 1840s, including the relocation of the front entry to the original dining room, the raising of the kitchen wing to a full two-and-a-half story height, and the addition of a new kitchen ell to the rear of the house.

The principal entry that was originally located to the center of the three bays along the front façade of the main block was moved to the western bay, displacing a window that was in turn moved to the former doorway and the lower portion filled in with brick; the original door and doorway and the window were simply reinstalled. The evidence for this is the fact that they match the still-extant doorway and door to the rear of the house, across from which it originally sat. A portico that once covered the front entry may have been made at this time (no longer extant).

The kitchen wing was raised to two-and-a-half stories, and the original kitchen was converted for use as the dining room, with the back hall removed. With the creation of a new and more sizable dining room, the original dining room in the main block became the entry hall, containing the relocated front entryway. A one-and-a-half story ell was added to the rear to contain the new kitchen with a "cook's room" above. An enclosed stairway that ran along the wall between the two rooms to provide access to the cook's room (with a pantry underneath) has since been

removed.¹¹ Passage from the old into the new kitchen was provided by the former exterior doorway. A single story appendage was also created that sat perpendicular to the kitchen and was used for wood storage. It was removed sometime in the 1940s and has since been rebuilt by the current owners, based on the original footprint (remnants of the original stone foundation) and the outline along the elevation of the exterior wall.¹² The added height of the former kitchen wing provided for a large bedchamber on both the second and third floors. Both rooms are accessed from the landings of the main stairway and require a few steps upward to accommodate the slightly raised height of the wing. It is assumed that these changes were made at the same time, since the reuse of the original dining room required the creation of a new dining room, which in turn required the construction of a new kitchen. Moreover, the molding profiles of the doorway and window surrounds in the second and third floor rooms over the original kitchen wing, and the new doorway between the old kitchen and the new, all match (the doorway surround between the old kitchen and the old dining room is consistent with the first period molding profiles).

The ca. 1820 date for the changes are based upon a significant increase in the tax assessment records between 1819 and 1820. While the rate dips down by 1832, it remains consistent to 1841, and although after that clouded by an assessment that groups this with other Brookeville properties, appears to remain fairly consistent until 1856.¹³ The molding profiles in the new section are fairly vernacular and may still have been used into the 1840s, although they would not have been reflective of the Greek Revival influenced profiles of the day.¹⁴ Thus it is possible that the changes date to the 1840s, following the purchase by the Riggs family.

¹¹ Sandra Heiler; the information was conveyed to her orally, by Calvin Musgrove, who lived here with his family in the 1940s and 1950s.

¹² Sandra Heiler. It is believed that the wood house was built at the same time as the kitchen ell to which it was attached based on the fact that the exterior brick wall of the kitchen where it joined with the wood house was left unpointed, suggesting that it was never exposed to the elements. The new addition, used as a pantry, follows the original footprint, with the exception of the far end wall, where the foundation had been removed to accommodate a well (infill with the construction of the addition).

¹³ The tax rate on the improvements to the property (for Thomas Reese) jumps from 750 in 1819 to 1,000 in 1820 and remains at that rate to 1825; the next assessment appearing in the extant records is in 1832 for the new owner (Roger Brooke) at 620. The cause for the dip is not known, but perhaps reflects an economic recession (there was a national economic crisis or "Panic" in 1819 and again in 1837). The 620 rate remains consistent during the Brooke family's ownership, to 1841. However, the new owner, Remus Riggs is assessed that same year, but the assessment includes the entire block in which the Thomas-Bentley House is located (sixteen lots in total) and appears as 1,500. Again, the property assessment remains constant at 1,500 until 1854, when it climbs to 1,900. However, the new assessment, again, includes the addition of other properties in Brookeville (a wheelwright and blacksmith shop) and thus likely reflects those additions and not improvements to the house. The next significant rise is in 1856 (at \$2,850) and again in 1866 (at \$3,500), which may actually reflect improvements to other lots, such as the construction of the large brick house on the adjacent lot for his son Artemus, which was deeded to him in December 1865. In short, the tax assessment does not increase again after 1820 until 1841, and while it is possible that Riggs made the improvements between May when he purchased the property and the end of the year when an assessment for that year could have been made, it is unlikely. Moreover, the Riggs family maintained their homestead (and extensive farmlands) in the Brookeville neighborhood and, based on census records, rented the Thomas-Bentley House out, until the late-nineteenth century, when daughter Amelia took up residence. It is likely that Roger Brooke did not reside, at least full-time, in the house during his ownership in the 1830s, thus raising questions as to whether or not significant improvements would have been made at that time.

¹⁴ They are not reflective of the later Greek Revival profiles with symmetrically almost pilaster-like surrounds with fluting or recessed fillets and cornerblocks. The trim appears in the 1817 Longwood house (erected by Thomas McCormick, according to the Maryland Historical Trust Inventory Form for the house), as well as the back section

The front portico was removed and a large porch was built across the front of the main block ca. 1914, which was removed during a “restoration” of the house in 1958.¹⁵ A porch was also added to the rear elevation of the main block.

When the house was purchased by the Archer family in 1958 it was still without indoor plumbing and central heat. The Archers added utilities, a bathroom in the smaller bedchamber on the second floor of the main block, and a modern kitchen, removing the former wood-burning cook-stove. A bathroom was also installed in the former cook’s room above the kitchen, although access to it from the kitchen was removed and a doorway and stairs providing access from the bedroom above the dining room (the new master bedroom) was added. The Archers also cut a hidden doorway into the wall of the parlor to create an interior entry into the former storeroom, converting it for use as a family room. They also removed the stair to the [unfinished] room above, which ran along the inside wall, originating near the front doorway (the only access to the space above is now through the windows in the gable end). The chimney block that had been in poor, unusable condition for many years was rebuilt. The Archers may have also been the ones to remove the original window that lit the first floor of the stair hall and replaced it with a casement window. At the same time, the shadow rail of the stair where it passed over the window was removed (still extant on the second floor). This was done to provide access to the porch from the stair.

A rehabilitation of the house by the current owners was made in an attempt to return the house to a more historically accurate condition while upgrading the service areas of the house. A portion of the store section about 4’ in depth was used to provide for a hall between it and the main block, as well as a half-bath, and a laundry area. A new kitchen was installed with the intent of being more in keeping with the age and style of the house, with no upper cabinetry on the walls. As mentioned, the former wood storage addition was recreated based on evidence of the original, to supplement available kitchen space. The bathroom located in the former “cook’s room” over the kitchen, with access from the current master bedroom, was remodeled.

B. Historical Context:

The Establishment of the Town of Brookeville

The construction of the Thomas-Bentley House along the Reedy Branch of the Hawlings River ca. 1798, in what would soon become the bustling market town of Brookeville, foretold of the growing prosperity of the greater Sandy Spring Quaker community and of the movement from a predominately agrarian economy to one enhanced by light industrial and commercial development. The town was established by Richard Thomas, Jr. and his wife Deborah Brooke Thomas. Both were members of long-standing and well-respected Quaker families responsible for the settlement and growth of this area, and among its

of the neighboring Italianate style house (#207 Market Street), likely built about 1865. The present owner of #207 claims that same trim appears in the addition to nearby Locust Grove, supposedly erected in the 1840s. Interview with Sandra Heiler.

¹⁵ Jean Barfield and Alice Koch, “Madison House, Seat of Government for a Day,” *The Montgomery County Story*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (November 1982), 10.

largest planters and landowners.¹⁶ Deborah's grandfather James Brooke erected the first house in Sandy Spring in 1728. He accumulated approximately 20,000 acres; much of the property that he did not farm himself he distributed during his lifetime to his children who established their own plantations and tenanted properties. Deborah's father was Roger Brooke, who at the time of his death possessed over 2,700 acres of land, representing an approximate one-sixth share of his father's extensive estate.¹⁷ The property upon which Richard Thomas laid out Brookeville's fifty-six lots was part of the 248 acres of the "Addition to Brooke Grove" tract that Deborah inherited from her father and grandfather. While perhaps not quite as affluent as the Brookes, the Thomas family was also well situated. Richard's father, Richard Thomas, Senior, had extensive landholdings and his home, Cherry Grove, is still considered as one of the finest Georgian houses in the county. At the time of his death in 1806 he owned 112 slaves who were then manumitted, forming the nucleus of a free black community within Sandy Spring referred to as Cincinnati.

At the time that Deborah received her lands, it is likely that Richard had already built a gristmill on the edge of the future site of Brookeville. While milling was not new to the area, and in fact the estates of both James Brooke and Richard Thomas, Senior, included mills, it was then a budding local industry. Most of the mills were built along the Patuxent and Hawlings rivers and their tributaries. The mills were important to the agricultural economy and to the advancement of this area as a prosperous farming region. The establishment of the town of Brookeville was a product of that prosperity, providing a center of commerce for the greater Sandy Spring community. Within a broader context, the period during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, known historically as the National Period, was characterized in part by the rise of commercial/artisan villages or small manufacturing towns such as Brookeville. According to historian Bernard Herman, "The American country side of the early National period was a landscape in the process of transformation."¹⁸ The rural landscape was being remade with an eye towards progress and industry; early dwellings were added to and refined, or replaced all together to meet the rising expectations of a more prosperous and growing middle class. As with the mid-Atlantic region in general, the greater Sandy Spring community had moved well beyond the period of early settlement, and crude log dwellings and meager farms had been replaced by brick manor houses and vastly improved agricultural plantations. According to one chronicler, in the 1790s,

The Quaker settlement of Sandy Spring was emerging from provincial days as a widespread but homogeneous country neighborhood. The sounds of the new nation building and pushing westward came faintly to the ears of most Sandy Springers, preoccupied as they were with changing ways at home, brought about in part by the breaking up of the provincial plantations into farms, the establishment of village centers within the bounds of the neighborhood, and by the arrival of new settlers, imbued with new ideas and the vitality and optimism of youth.¹⁹

¹⁶ Richard Thomas, Junior was the second son (third child) of Richard Thomas and Sarah Coale, and was born 21 February 1758. He resided at Brookeville, Montgomery County, Maryland. He married Deborah, daughter of Roger and Mary Brooke, who was disowned by Sandy Spring Meeting for her marriage, on 18 April 1783; she died 12 November 1814, and Richard, on 6 November 1821. Lawrence Buckley Thomas, *The Thomas Book: Giving the Genealogies of Sir Rhys ap Thomas, K.G.* (New York: Henry T. Thomas Company, 1896), 58.

¹⁷ Montgomery County Land Records, Deed, Liber E, folio 428; 7 November 1793. The deed distributes Roger Brooke's property among his eight children, including Deborah Brooke Thomas.

¹⁸ Bernard Herman, "The Model Farmer and the Organization of the Countryside," in *Everyday Life in the Early Republic*, Catherine E. Hutchins, ed. (Winterthur, Delaware: Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1994), 35.

¹⁹ Nesbitt, 74. The "sounds of new nation building" is a reference to the construction of the capital city in Washington, D.C.

Those of means sought to enhance their own potential and that of their communities through the development of associated industries and trades. The most lucrative of the supporting occupations within agricultural communities was milling.²⁰ Mill towns of every size sprung up along exploitable sources of waterpower. As historian Jack Larkin explains, “these [towns] were outposts of commerce and small-scale production, settlements of merchants and full-time artisans growing as centers of trade and service for the farming populations.”²¹ As places where local farmers came to grind, store, and/or sell their grain, mills became the center of community activity and provided the economic base upon which other associated trades could develop.

It was in this climate that Richard Thomas laid out the town of Brookeville near his preexisting mill, running along a main thoroughfare optimistically dubbed Market Street. Intersecting Market Street was High Street, which ran north one block and then headed south connecting to the road to Sandy Spring, the heart of the Quaker community. Market Street was also intersected by side streets, North, South, Spring, and Race, with Back Street paralleling it to the south. Richard and Deborah sold the first lot to Caleb and Sarah Bentley in 1798 and it was on this lot that their fine brick house was built, possibly the first in town. Thirteen, mostly quarter-acre, lots were next sold for \$12 apiece, on 31 October 1800.²² By 1806, twenty lots had been sold.²³ While Thomas’s mill held a local monopoly on the grinding of grain, by 1800 David Newlin’s mill on the other side of town sawed lumber and ground limestone for plaster, pressed oil from castor and flax seeds, and hulled clover seed.²⁴ The Brookeville Woolen Mill was later established on the outskirts of town as a fulling mill, producing laborers’ or “servants’ clothing” and heavy blankets.²⁵ Not far away, along the road from Brookeville to Sandy Spring, Mahlon Chandler’s mill also sawed lumber. These encouraged other mills in the area, including those at nearby Triadelphia, founded in 1809 by Brookeville residents and brothers-in-law Caleb Bentley, Thomas Moore, and Isaac Briggs. Triadelphia grew to include a cotton spinning mill, saw mill, grist mill, and a bone and plaster mill.²⁶ By the mid-nineteenth century seventeen water-powered mills operated within the area.²⁷

In addition to the mills, by 1813 Brookeville encompassed two stores, one of which contained a post office first operated by Caleb Bentley in the west wing of his house, a tan yard, blacksmith shop, a private boy’s school known as the Brookeville Academy, and approximately fourteen residences. By 1825, half of the members of the Sandy Spring Friends Meeting resided in or maintained a residence here. It was a

²⁰ Herman, 49. Grist and flour mills generally ground for both local consumption and export. Mills also functioned as local brokerages where farmers could store and sell their grain.

²¹ Jack Larkin, “From ‘County Mediocrity’ to ‘Rural Improvement’; Transforming the Slovenly Countryside in Central Massachusetts, 1775-1840.” in Hutchins, Catherine E., ed. *Everyday Life in the Early Republic* (Winterthur, Delaware: Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1994), 185.

²² Samuel Leeke purchased lots #44 & 45 (Montgomery County Land Records, Deed Liber I, folio 286), William Stabler purchased lots #48 & 49 (I:300), Samuel Wright purchased lot #18 (I:335), Israel French purchased lot #46 (I:347), Deborah Phillips purchased lot #41 (I:348), John Leeke purchased lots #10 & 11 (I:369), and Gerrard Brooke purchased lots #12, 13, 14, & 15 (I:385).

²³ National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, Brookeville Historic District, Brookeville, Maryland, prepared by Julie Shipe, Sylvia Nash and Candace Reed, 1978, item 8, page 8.

²⁴ Thomas Y. Canby, editor, *Sandy Spring Legacy* (Sandy Spring, MD: Sandy Spring Museum, 1999), 37.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 35.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 161.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 38. These included Haviland’s Mill on the Patuxent, built as a saw mill ca. 1840; B. Rush Robert’s Sherwood grain mill, in Sandy Spring; Brooke Grove Grist Mill, in Olney; William Bond’s Bone Mil, in Ednor, for the grinding of livestock bones for fertilizer; and the Muncaster and Bowie mills on the North Branch of Rock Creek.

unique community bound by common values; “Sandy Springers were building their own little world and doing a good job of it, in spite of, or perhaps because of their self-imposed isolation. Their mutual inheritance of land, kinship and Quakerism had fostered an all-enveloping unity that was at one the foundation on which the neighborhood was built and the source of its enduring strength.”²⁸ Despite their “self-imposed isolation,” the town was laid out along what eventually became the Brookeville Turnpike and thus provided them ready access to markets and communication between Washington, D.C. It led to Seventh Street in Washington, and was a major thoroughfare for Montgomery County farmers coming into the city to sell their produce.²⁹ Among the town’s best known occupants was Isaac Briggs, an educator, engineer, surveyor and mathematician who gained fame as Thomas Jefferson’s Surveyor General for the Mississippi Territory. Thomas Moore, whose Longwood home sat on the outskirts of town, was an inventor and engineer, who patented the first refrigerator, developed new plowing and fertilizing techniques, was the chief engineer of the C&O Canal, and laid out the National Road from Cumberland to Ohio.³⁰ Due to the Quaker heritage of Brookeville’s residents and their “testimony” against slavery, the town also included a free black community, whose members resided along the side streets or in the homes of local residents and worked mostly as farm hands, laborers, and domestics.³¹

The town expanded during the nineteenth century, embracing additional manufacturing and commercial interests such as blacksmithing and the production of agricultural implements, carriage and wagon building, harness and saddle making, shoe making, tailoring, and dress making. Many of the latter activities represented home manufacture or “cottage industries.” (This is reflected in the extant building stock in Brookeville, which includes very little in the way of commercial storefronts.³²) Such industries, as Herman points out, “offer evidence of the industrialization of the countryside and the changing economic and social order of the rural world in the early nineteenth century.”³³ Richard Thomas continued to operate the mill, passing it along to his only surviving son, Roger Thomas, ca. 1823. Roger lived across from the mill and continued to operate it until 1842 when it was sold to the Weer family, who operated it into the 1920s. Newlin’s Mill also passed from father to son, remaining in the family until 1865. As the town grew and prospered, it looked to the intellectual betterment of its citizenry. Miss Porter’s Cottage School for the Education of Young Ladies offered secondary education for girls between 1844 and 1864, complimenting that offered to boys at the Brookeville Academy. The town also included a debating society, and private circulating library that was among the first in the state, opening in 1838.³⁴ Brookeville also enjoyed the services of three physicians by that time.³⁵ And in 1865, Artemus Riggs

²⁸ Nesbitt, 75.

²⁹ Also known as the Seventh Street Pike, the road was established by the Union Turnpike Company in 1849, passing through “Sligo,” later Silver Spring. About 1906 it was renamed Georgia Avenue. Jerry A. McCoy and the Silver Spring Historical Society, *Historic Silver Spring* (Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Press, 2005), 59.

³⁰ Canby, 33-34.

³¹ See listings in, Mary L. Gardner, editor. *The Book of Names; a Genealogical Record of a Community* (Brookeville: Town of Brookeville and the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission, 1993).

³² The James Pleasants house was removed from Brookeville in the latter part of the twentieth century and parts were reconstructed at Winterthur where it is displayed as a shop front (Sandra Heiler interview).

³³ Herman, 50. Larkin also speaks similarly of patterns of growth in New England during this period, “From 1800 to 1840 there was great change. The rural economy of New England, and central Massachusetts in particular, was transformed. In the process its material world was to a large extent made new.” Larkin, 184.

³⁴ Gardner, 8.

³⁵ Henry Howard practiced between 1813 and 1837, joined by William Palmer, between 1815 and 1823. William B. Magruder practiced in Brookeville between 1825 and 1835. William Edward Magruder practiced between 1864 and 1870, and Artemus Riggs practiced between 1865 and 1884. See, Gardner, 70.

began practicing medicine in the separate brick office building that stood along the street in front of his large brick home, the grandest in town (later moved and appended to the side of the house).

By 1880, Brookeville boasted the third largest population in Montgomery County.³⁶ The town was incorporated in 1890 with a local government that included three elected commissioners. However, by the turn of the twentieth century, like other small self-sufficient communities in the region, Brookeville's industrial and commercial development was supplanted by larger operations elsewhere in the county. This transfer was facilitated in part by the fact that such industries were no longer dependent on waterpower for their operations and chose instead to locate near main transportation routes and railroad lines. By the 1920s the mills had all closed, as had the last of the blacksmithing, shoe making, and other manufacturing enterprises, although a few local merchants operated stores until the latter part of the twentieth century. Brookeville today is a quiet residential community, with a church, the restored Brookeville Academy now used as a community center, and a handful of local home-based businesses.

The Thomas-Bentley House

Deborah Brooke Thomas received her 248 acres of "Addition to Brooke Grove," in 1792.³⁷ The grist mill operated by her husband Richard on the edge of what would become the town of Brookeville is believed to have been built in 1794.³⁸ However, a document describing the distribution of Roger Brooke's property in 1791 mentions that Deborah's allotment began "at Mr. Thomas's Quarter 147 acres taking in the Mill Dam." This was property that was rented to Richard Thomas by Roger Brooke prior to his death, and for which Brooke was collecting rent in the form of tobacco, presumably part of Richard's yearly crop yield.³⁹ Tax assessment records for 1793 indicate improvements to their property, which is likely for the mill, but possibly for a residence as well.⁴⁰ Richard and Deborah Thomas owned a great deal of land, some of which including dwellings or other unspecified "improvements," making it difficult to determine when they took up residence in Brookeville and in which house they actually lived by this time.

Following their marriage on February 27, 1783, Richard and Deborah were living in the Ashton-Sandy Spring community.⁴¹ Like Deborah, Richard was also heir to considerable property, and while he did not

³⁶ J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*, Vol. I (Baltimore: Regional Publishing company, 1968), 655. The population of Brookeville at that time was 206. The only more populous towns in the county were Rockville with 688 inhabitants and Poolesville with 287.

³⁷ "Division of the Real Estate of Roger Brooke the 4th," dated 13 April 1791, abstract of Montgomery County Court Records, located in "Diaries and Memoirs" on shelf, Sandy Spring Museum Library & Archives, Sandy Spring, Maryland (hereafter referred to as SSM) Roger Brooke died intestate, however, a deed of partition also lists the property that Deborah received, two tracts, both part of Addition to Brooke Grove," one for 173-3/4 acres and the other being the 248 acres on which the house was built. Montgomery County Land Records, Deed, Liber E, folio 428-435 (see page 434 for Deborah's part).

³⁸ Scharf, 781. Scharf unfortunately gives no source for his information.

³⁹ "Division of the Real Estate of Roger Brooke the 4th." Richard Thomas is listed among those paying rent to Roger Brooke for use of part "Addition to Brooke Grove." Thomas paid Brooke in tobacco (1900 pounds), likely a share of his annual crop.

⁴⁰ Montgomery County, Maryland, Tax Assessment Records, 1793, copies available at the Montgomery County Historical Society Library (hereafter referred to as MCHS) and on microfilm at MSA. The value of the improvements listed in the tax assessment records does not transfer along with the four acres upon which the house was built when it transfers to the next owners, Caleb and Sarah Bentley.

⁴¹ Richard Thomas, Junior appears on the 1783 tax rolls living on tracts that go by the same name as that of his father's property. A 1788 map shows Richard Thomas, Jr. residing on his father's property in Ashton. Also, by

legally inherit the land until the death of his father in 1806, it appears that he was making use of it well in advance, as was common practice among the Brooke and Thomas families. An account of a land survey in the area mentions among the metes and bounds, “to the NW of the dwelling of Rich’d Thomas, Jr. and about 8 yds west of a branch that runs out of the said Thomas plantation . . . the beginning of a tract called addition to charley forest.” According to the account, Richard Thomas’s border was indicated by a boundary stone marked “RT 1789.”⁴² Charley Forest was part of Richard Thomas, Senior’s land holdings, including his home “Cherry Grove.” Thus it appears that Richard and Deborah were living on a portion of the home plantation dedicated for their use, probably beginning in 1789 as indicated by the boundary stone. The 1790 census shows that Richard’s household included besides himself, another adult male, a male child (his son Frederick, born in 1788), two females (his wife Deborah and daughter Eliza, born in 1794), one other “free person,” and sixteen slaves. The large number of slaves suggests that Richard was engaged in agricultural production.⁴³

It is uncertain when they left that location, but it is unlikely that it occurred before Deborah inherited the Brookeville property from her father and grandfather in 1792. It is clear that they were still living in the Sandy Spring community during the settlement of the Brooke estate and, in fact, the case was forced into Chancery Court in part due to a dispute over the initial distribution of the property to the young couple.⁴⁴ Deborah’s father, Roger Brooke, had requested that Richard Thomas, Senior, who James Brooke had retained to survey and partition his lands amongst his children, set aside what was referred to as “the Meeting house land” for Richard and Deborah. This would have been an advantageous situation for them, for as the testimony in the case revealed, “he [Richard Thomas, Jr.] would get the Meeting house Land, for this Tract *adjoined the Land he lived on*, and that his father in law the defendant Roger said the same day he would contend for the said land.”⁴⁵ Despite Roger Brooke’s attempts to leave his daughter well established nearby, it was not to happen. As the testimony goes on to reveal, the tract “was desired to belong to Elizabeth Pleasants [and] on the testors [James Brooke’s] death bed in presence of the trustee Richard Thomas” and various family members, James Brooke had so stated.

Although it appears that Richard Thomas, Senior, behaved unfairly in his role as surveyor, further testimony suggests that he was acting on James Brooke’s earlier instructions that each of his sons receive the land on which they currently resided, had “improved” or from which they collected rents, or that were adjacent to such lands.⁴⁶ According to one account, James Brooke “did not divide the land himself because he did not feel able to look after the surveying and felt Richard Thomas would do it in a

some accounts Richard and Deborah were married in November. It is possible that they were married twice, once by a “hireling priest” and once by the Sandy Spring Meeting. Richard was disowned for his military service and Deborah was disowned, then, for marrying a non-Quaker. However, both were later accepted back into the meeting. Nesbitt, 73.

⁴² Bentley Family Records, as compiled by Edith Helen Bentley Lea (date, ca. 1904), copy of hand-written manuscript, Sandy Spring Museum Vertical File, Bentley Family, 103. The notes for this document indicate that it was copied from papers found on Caleb Bentley’s desk; Caleb Bentley was the author’s grandfather.

⁴³ U.S. Census, Montgomery County, Maryland, district, 1790. He is enumerated next to Basil Brooke, who was one of Deborah’s uncles. While Basil’s “Falling Green” homestead was located midway between Ashton-Sandy Spring and Brookeville, he also owned the property in Sandy Spring near to which the Friends meeting house was later erected and in proximity to estate of Richard Thomas, Senior.

⁴⁴ Brooke Papers, MSA, Special Collections (00/09/03/29), D418, 1789-1790.

⁴⁵ Brooke Papers, folder #412, “Answer of George and Deborah Chandler and of Elizabeth Brooke to the Bill of Complaint of Roger, Richard and Thomas Brooke,” 13 February 1787.

⁴⁶ Brooke Papers, folder #467, “Testimony of Richard Thomas,” 4 December 1787; folder #437, “Report of the reexamination of Richard Thomas, 4 February 1788.

satisfactory way. On several occasions he went over his lands with his sons and Richard Thomas, pointing out the boundaries and telling them his wishes.” The lands were examined, viewed, and discussed as to quality, situation and relative value by Richard Thomas, Sr. and fellow surveyor William Roberson in the presence of the male heirs. As suggested, much of the land had already been distributed during James Brooke’s lifetime as he helped to establish his children within the greater Sandy Spring community. James Brooke’s daughter Elizabeth Pleasants resided with her husband Thomas in Virginia and thus had not laid any previous claim to her father’s estate. She was, however, to receive the disputed “Meeting House Land” upon which her daughter Deborah and her husband William Stabler erected their homestead known as Harewood, in 1794.

Those portions of James Brooke’s estate not previously designated for one or the other of his children was divided into six equal parts for the benefit of his five surviving children and the children of his deceased son, Roger Brooke. Deborah received property directly from her father in addition to the 248 acres of “Addition to Brooke Grove” including 173-1/4 acres of the “Miney Spring” Tract.⁴⁷ Richard and Deborah Brooke were married the year prior to James Brooke’s death in the spring of 1784, although his estate would not be settled for nearly a decade. Thus, it is likely that Richard and Deborah would not have felt compelled to leave Ashton-Sandy Spring prior to the settlement of both James and Roger Brooke’s estates, still hoping to enlarge their current farmstead adjoining his father’s Cherry Grove plantation. While there was no commercial development in Sandy Spring to speak of, their family homesteads were located to either side of the meeting house tract, which served as the center of religious and social life for the community.

With Deborah receiving legal title to her share of the Brooke estate in 1792 and the construction of Richard’s mill ca. 1791-94, it is possible that they were living in or near the future site of Brookeville by the early 1790s. If not in the Thomas-Bentley House, than perhaps they erected another house herein. Tax records indicate that the Thomas’s had improved upon their land here by 1793. While the “improvement” could possibly have been the Thomas-Bentley House, the assessment was not reduced by the sale of the house lot to Caleb and Sarah Bentley in 1798, nor did the Bentley’s assessment for the year of the sale indicate improvement. Actually the opposite was true; the Thomas’s tax assessment more than doubled in 1798, suggesting that they had built a house on another lot about that time.⁴⁸ However, like the 1790 census, that taken in 1800 appears to locate them not in the first district where Brookeville is located, but in the fourth district (likely still in Ashton-Sandy Spring). It may even be possible that they maintained both a house in the town of Brookeville and their plantation or farm in Ashton-Sandy Spring community, as it appears other members of the Quaker community may have done.⁴⁹ For example Isaac and Hannah Briggs owned both a house in Brookeville and a farmstead in Sandy Spring known as Sharon; and Roger Brooke V would later own the Thomas-Bentley House, was still known to have

⁴⁷ The Miney Spring tract was recorded as beginning “at Mr. Thomas’s Quarter 147 acres taking in the Mill Dam.”

⁴⁸ Richard and Deborah Thomas sold the four acres of Addition to Brooke Grove upon which the house was built to Deborah’s sister and her husband, Sarah and Caleb Bentley, in April 1798. At the same time, the Bentleys sold to the Thomases a two-acre plot of Brooke Black Meadow. Both deeds state “together with all houses, buildings and singular the appurtenances thereunto,” but whether the lots included dwelling houses is not known; it was a quid pro quo situation whereby they charged each other only the cost of recording the deeds. However, it could have been that they were exchanging actual residences. Sources indicate that the Bentleys were residing at the “Brooke Meadow” farm before coming to Brookeville, which was part of the property that Sarah received as her inheritance from either her father or their uncle, Thomas Brooke, in 1789.

⁴⁹ Richard Thomas did maintain his tobacco plantation, inheriting more property following his father’s death in 1806 (although Cherry Grove went to his brother William).

occupied his Brooke Grove plantation. According to some sources, the house that Richard Thomas built for himself was the one later used as the rectory for the Protestant Episcopal Church, which burned in 1911. This was supposedly built in 1801 as the first in the town of Brookeville (although perhaps built earlier, in 1798, as suggested by the tax records).⁵⁰ That house stood on Lot #40, and was among the four improved lots that Richard and Deborah Thomas passed on to their children.⁵¹ In addition, a claim was made that Richard Thomas was living in the largest house in town at the time that President Madison sought refuge there, in 1814; this house would likely have fit that description.⁵² The Thomases also had retained and passed on to their children the old stone house, later referred to as the “Miller’s House” that sits adjacent to the Thomas-Bentley House, which some have speculated was built by Richard Thomas, Jr., about the same time as his mill, ca. 1794.⁵³ They also owned two other small vernacular dwellings across from the mill site that passed to their children as well, one to their son Roger Thomas who used it as his permanent dwelling. The other, which passed to their eldest daughter, Eliza, still stands.⁵⁴

If not for himself and Deborah, then Richard built the Thomas-Bentley House for his ambitious, multi-talented brother-in-law and close friend, Caleb Bentley, the husband of Deborah’s sister, Sarah.⁵⁵ Based on tax assessment records, it would appear that the latter was the case. The Bentleys received the property, four acres of Deborah’s 248 acre tract, from the Thomas’s in 1798. Assuming that the house was built for Bentley, it would explain the need for and/or the desirability of the store house wing that likely served not only as the first store and post office in Brookeville, but also as a workshop for his clock

⁵⁰ J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland, Vol I*, (Baltimore: Regional Publishing company, 1968), 781. Scharf also claims that the mill was erected in 1794, but gives no source for his information. Two historic images provide clues as to the potential age and physical characteristics of the house. One is a watercolor of Thomas’s mill that also depicts a frame house sitting to the opposite side of the roadway and a bit further down, approximating the former location of the house on lot #40. The house is the only other structure in the image, suggesting it was among the first in town. An early photographic image of the house shows that it had similar over-sized windows and entry porch to the Thomas-Bentley house that might suggest construction by the same individual. In addition, this house was fairly large, measuring five bays across, and thus could have accommodated the Thomas family, which at that time included four children. This house later became the property of their eldest child, Eliza who ran it as a boarding house, occupied by students and/or teachers from the Brookeville Academy.

⁵¹ Prior to her death in 1814, Deborah distributed the Brookeville property that had been her inheritance to their children. The lots, both improved and unimproved, were situated along the eastern end of town near Thomas’s mill. The improvements to lot #1 is the small stone house that is now referred to as the “Miller’s House,” that went to Margaret, the wife of Robert Garrigues. Margaret also received unimproved lots #35 and #50. A vernacular dwelling that once sat on lot #37, nearer to the old mill site, was for many years the home of their only surviving son, Roger Thomas. Roger received the mill lot, which he continued to operate until retiring and selling it to the Weer family in 1842. He also served as postmaster from 1849 until 1854. In addition to what may have been the family residence built by Richard on lot #40, Eliza Thomas also received lot #36 that was improved by a small vernacular house likely built by Richard Thomas, Jr., and that is still extant. At the time that Richard died in 1821 he was deep in debt and may have been living with one of his children, most of who appear to have been living in Brookeville.

⁵² Warfield, “President Madison’s Retreat,” *The American Historical Register* (May 1895), 859.

⁵³ Maryland Historic Trust, Inventory Form for State Historic Sites Survey, Madison House, Brookeville, Maryland; M: 23/65-A, attachment sheet C.

⁵⁴ This is lot #36, 198 Market Street.

⁵⁵ Caleb Bentley was formerly of Loudon County, Virginia. He was the son of Joseph and Mary Bentley of Chester County, Pennsylvania. Caleb was married on 20 April 1791 to Sarah Brooke daughter of Roger and Mary of Montgomery County, Maryland, at Sandy Spring; among the witnesses were Deborah Thomas and Richard Thomas, Jr. Henry C. Peden, Jr. *Quaker Records of Southern Maryland, Births, Deaths, marriages from the Minutes, 1658-1800* (U.S.: Family Line Publications, 1992), 47.

making and silver smith businesses.⁵⁶ Certainly Caleb's store and post office in Brookeville would have dovetailed nicely with his brother-in-law's plans for the development of the town, and Richard would have been only too happy to comply. Caleb was named postmaster of Brookeville in 1802, and although the house was likely completed before that, it would have taken the construction of other homes and businesses to warrant the establishment of a post office.

Caleb Bentley was the son of Joseph and Mary of Chester County, Pennsylvania, born near the town of Doe Run on 29 January 1762. Caleb seemed to have his hand in just about everything that happened in the Sandy Spring community. In addition to his businesses in Brookeville, over the years he bought and sold a number of lots in town, at least some of which were rented. In 1804, Caleb purchased the tan yard in Brookeville from Thomas and Mary Moore. In 1809 he was one of the founders of the nearby mill town of Triadelphia, which included a company store, blacksmith shop, cooperage, wheelwright, cabinet shop and other businesses and eventually numerous single and duplex houses. Caleb also invested in land in Columbiana County, Ohio, where many Quakers were then migrating, including his nephew Joseph Bentley and his family, as well as Richard and Deborah Thomas's daughter Margaret and her husband Robert Garrigues and family.⁵⁷ He also served as trustee for real estate and business transactions within the community, and even helped Hannah Briggs with a pre-nuptial agreement. After establishing the first store and post office in Brookeville, about two decades later he did the same in nearby Sandy Spring. According to his granddaughter who later wrote a profile of Caleb, he was "highly educated for his time, understanding Greek and Latin. He enjoyed the best literature was very liberal in his views and most refined in manner and address to the day of his death."⁵⁸ Caleb Bentley was considered among the most influential members of the Sandy Spring community, as was Richard Thomas (and Roger Brooke, who would later own the Thomas-Bentley House). As such, they sat among the elders and ministers on the "facing benches" along the back wall of the meeting house that looked out over the members. In his recollections, William John Thomas wrote: "Uncle Johnnie sat at the head of the Meeting on one side, with Samuel Thomas and Roger Brooke on the upper bench, and Basil Brooke, Isaac Briggs, Thomas Moore, Bernard Gilpin, Caleb Bentley, William Thomas, Gerard Brooke, Richard Thomas and other on the benches facing the Meeting. Deborah Stabler, Margaret Judge and Hannah Wilson, ministers, with the two Mary Brookes and Hannah Briggs occupied the upper benches on the other side of the House."⁵⁹

Caleb's wife Sarah Brooke, born in Sandy Spring, was also a daughter of Roger Brooke IV. Caleb and Sarah were married on 20 April 1791; among the witnesses were Deborah Brooke Thomas and Richard

⁵⁶ The current owner has hanging framed in the house an advertisement for Caleb's clock making business in Brookeville.

⁵⁷ Emily Foster, *American Grit, A Woman's letters from the Ohio Frontier*, by Anna Briggs Bentley, (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 2002), 16, 19. According to Foster, in 1826 Joseph Bentley (nephew of Caleb) and Anna started on their long journey to eastern Ohio. Their destination: an established Quaker community in the rolling hills of Columbiana County where Uncle Caleb Bentley bought property in Ohio in 1806.

p. 19 Robert Humphrey Garrigues and his wife (Margaret Thomas, daughter of Richard and Deborah Thomas) moved to Ohio in 1828 and lived within a mile of the Bentleys the rest of their lives. Garrigues's mother was Isaac Brigg's sister, Hannah. Hannah Briggs Garrigues's sons Robert and William both emigrated to Ohio, Robert to Columbiana County.

⁵⁸ Edith Helen Bentley Lea, 46.

⁵⁹ Moore, Eliza N. *Annals of Sandy Spring*, Vol. II (Baltimore: Thomas & Evans, 1902), 31. Note that the Richard Thomas is mentioned is Richard Thomas, Junior; reference is to the new meeting house, built in 1817, eleven years after the death of Richard Thomas, Senior. Uncle Johnnie, or John Thomas, was the primary builder of the meeting house.

Thomas, Jr.⁶⁰ The couple first settled at the “Brooke Black Meadow,” property that Sarah had recently inherited following the death her uncle Thomas Brooke, located on what is currently Gold Mine Road, running between Brookeville and Sandy Spring. They presumably moved to Brookeville about 1798, following the purchase of their lot. The Bentleys had no children, and Sarah died at a relatively young age, in August 1806. Her sister Deborah presided over her death, which a distraught Caleb had requested that she document. The cause for Sarah’s death was not given; the only clue was Sarah statement that, “I cannot lay (sic), nor can I sit up, for my sight fails me, and I feel like fainting.” Sarah reassured her concerned sister that she did not fear death, but stated, “I could not help feeling a hope . . . that I might be spared a little longer on my Husband’s account, but for no other reason, for there is no joy in this world for me worth living,” adding to Caleb what “a sweet and engaging companion has thee been to me.” Sarah also expressed the hope that Caleb “endeavor to wind up thy business as quick as possible and break up housekeeping and go to some Town to live, where if thee wishes to engage in some little business for amusement thee can do it with more ease, and be at liberty to enjoy the company of thy friends.”⁶¹ Brookeville was at that time only beginning to develop and it is likely that Sarah saw him in a metropolitan area and engaged in more lively pursuits once on his own. Caleb had formerly worked as a clock maker and silversmith in Loudoun County, Virginia prior to settling in the Sandy Spring community and, in fact, one source claims that Caleb and Sarah lived in Georgetown in 1792 and 1793.⁶² (Years later, Caleb and his second wife would return to Georgetown). Sarah’s comment also suggests that the couple was not without means. In fact the house that they constructed in Brookeville was a respectable merchant-class residence, and their household in 1800 included two to four servants.⁶³

Rather than leave, however, Caleb remained in Brookeville, and in 1807 he married Henrietta Thomas, the daughter of Samuel Thomas, III and Mary Cowan Thomas of “Pretty Prospect” farm (now known as “Norwood”) in Sandy Spring. Samuel Thomas was the brother of Richard Thomas (Jr.) and thus Henrietta was his niece. She and Caleb lived at the Thomas-Bentley House for over a decade. Their daughter Mary Thomas Bentley was born there in 1808. Henrietta was six months pregnant with their second child, Sarah Brooke Bentley, during Madison’s visit in 1814, and in 1819, the year they sold their home in Brookeville and moved to Sandy Spring, their son Richard Thomas Bentley was born.⁶⁴

Caleb and Henrietta Bentley sold the house to Thomas Reese in 1819, the same year that Caleb opened the first general store in nearby Sandy Spring.⁶⁵ As the location of the Sandy Spring Meeting House, this was center of the greater Quaker community. The new meeting house, which had been erected on the site of the earlier meeting house only two years prior by members of the Thomas family, was just a stone’s

⁶⁰ Henry C. Peden, Jr. *Quaker Records of Southern Maryland, Births, Deaths, marriages from the Minutes, 1658-1800* (U.S.: Family Line Publications, 1992), 47.

⁶¹ Bentley, Caleb, Vertical File, SSM; in the preface is written: “Deborah Thomas: At the request of my Dear Brother Caleb Bentley I have taken down the following account of by Dearly beloved Sister Sarah Bentley’s last illness and dying expressions.”

⁶² Paper (hand written) entitled “Caleb Bentley Chronology,” clippings file, SSM 87.23.17.

⁶³ 1800 Census, Montgomery County, Maryland, 1st District, Maryland State Archives, Microfilm M32-11. The census lists one free white male and one female, both between the ages of 16 and 26, perhaps a couple and maybe even extended family; and two “other free,” presumably meaning free black, persons.

⁶⁴ SSM Card File “People,” entry for Caleb Bentley.

⁶⁵ Although a deed was never recorded for Thomas Reese, he appears as owner in the tax assessment records from 1819 through 1825. The date for the opening of the Sandy Spring Store by Caleb Bentley and James Stabler is mentioned in Thomas Y. Canby, ed. *Sandy Spring Legacy* (Sandy Spring: A publication of the Sandy Spring Museum, 1999), 55. Bentley’s move to Bloomingdale is discussed in Roger B. Farquhar, *Old Homes and History of Montgomery County, Maryland* (Brookeville: American History Research Associates, 1952), 102-103.

throw for Bentley's store. They inhabited the house known as Bloomingdale (later Bloomfield), the original section of which was supposedly built by Richard Thomas, Sr., for one of his overseers. The new owner of the Thomas-Bentley House, Thomas Reese, was the son-in-law of Thomas and Mary Moore of nearby "Longwood." Like Richard Thomas, Jr. and Caleb Bentley, Moore married one of the daughters of Roger Brooke, IV, Mary Brooke, who inherited part of the "Brooke Grove" tract along with her sisters.⁶⁶ Reese had already taken over as proprietor of the Brookeville store by July 1818.⁶⁷ Reese resided here with his wife and four young children, continuing to operate the store started by Caleb Bentley.⁶⁸ Reese also kept up the Brookeville Post Office started by Bentley, serving as postmaster from November 1818 through December 1824.⁶⁹

It is likely that Reese undertook the significant improvements that were made to the original house, for there is a sharp increase in its assessed value in 1820, a year after his purchase.⁷⁰ Unfortunately, Reese's tenure at the Madison House did not last long; by 1826 he was declared "an insolvent debtor" and was forced to sell the property. The cause of Reese's financial problems is not known, although in addition to improvements to his house, it appears that Reese was one of the investors in the development of the nearby mill town of Triadelphia. Caleb Bentley acted as trustee in Reese's law suit, suggesting that he may have held the mortgage to his former residence. A public auction was held 28 June 1827 in which the "Brick dwelling house in the Town of Brookeville" formerly occupied by Thomas Reese was sold to prominent Sandy Spring farmer and the brother of Deborah Thomas and Sarah Bentley, Roger Brooke,

⁶⁶ Thomas and Mary Moore had recently completed the construction of their home, Longwood, in 1817, just outside of the town of Brookeville.

⁶⁷ Thomas Moore, letter to Isaac Briggs, 13 July 1818, SSM "Diaries & Memoirs", volume marked "Letters." According to Moore, "The Brookeville Store is given up to Thos. L. Reese."

⁶⁸ Census Records, Montgomery County, Maryland, 1820. The census lists Reese's occupation, as well as his wife's as "commerce." According to Eliza Moore, "Thomas Moore resided where E.J. Hall now does, and was succeeded by Thomas L. Reese who kept a store there or at Brookeville." Eliza N. Moore, 34. And according to Thomas Boyd, in Thomas H.S. Boyd, *The History of Montgomery. County Maryland: from its earliest settlement in 1650 to 1879* (Baltimore: W.K. Boyle and Son, Printers, 1879).

Boyd, 89 "Thomas L. Reese lived for 6 or 8 years in Brookeville engaged in mercantile life."

⁶⁹ Card File, "Brookeville People," Sandy Spring Museum archives.

⁷⁰ Montgomery County Tax Assessment Records, 1819-1820. The property as assessed for Caleb Bentley prior to its transfer to Thomas L. Reese is the same, as both are assess for it in 1819. In 1820, the value jumps from \$750 to \$1000. It dips down after its transfer to the next owners and remains constant throughout the ownership of Roger Brooke and Elisha Hall, during 1830s and early 1840s. There was also a slight decrease in value as evidenced by the lower purchase price paid by the next owners, the Riggs family. The Riggs did not reside at Madison house probably until about 1878 or 1879, renting it out instead, and so it is unlikely that they would have made significant improvements before then. However it is possible that a family member resided here intermittently, or that they would have improved the house to make it more attractive or up-to-date for renters. It is difficult to determine whether or not the (original) kitchen wing was raised to a full three stories ca. 1820, or whether that change occurred later. The fact that this section has the same nine-over-six sash windows suggested that it was part of the ca. 1820 changes. It is curious to note that there is no evidence that the former chimney stack that serviced the original kitchen, located where the newer two-over-two-light sash window with patching now exists, rose above the first story. In fact, a nine-over-six light window sits where it would have logically been located, in the gable end. However, according to current owner, Sandra Heiler, the original chimney stack sat out from the wall, as with other examples in Brookville, and therefore may not have been raised with the addition. The rooms above it were not heated by fireplace, although by the twentieth century the second floor bedroom was heat by a stove, the pipe for which ran through the fireplace in the adjoining bedroom in the main block.

V.⁷¹ Despite the ill fortune that Reese experienced in Brookeville, he later went on to establish a successful grocery business in Baltimore.⁷²

Roger Brooke V was among the most highly regarded Quaker farmers in the region, known for his progressive methods for rejuvenating farmlands exhausted by tobacco production. Brooke provided a model to all area farmers. It is unlikely that Roger Brooke ever lived here, at least not full-time, as he was known to have resided at the “Brooke Grove” plantation in Sandy Spring that he inherited from his father. Over a decade after Brooke’s purchase of the Thomas-Bentley House he conveyed it to his daughter Mary and her husband Elisha J. Hall.⁷³ Although the Halls may have resided here during the early years following their marriage in 1838, they are known to have lived for many years at the nearby Longwood Farm that Mary inherited from her aunt and uncle, Thomas and Mary Moore. Elisha Hall was well known as a teacher and trustee of the famed Brookeville Academy, established in 1808. Less than a year after receiving title to Madison House, in May 1841, the Halls sold the property to Remus Riggs of the locally prominent family and whose long-time homestead, “Pleasant Hills,” lay just outside of town.⁷⁴

The Thomas-Bentley House remained the property of the Riggs family for decades, although they did not inhabit it during their entire tenure. Remus Riggs, like prior owners of Madison House, remained on his family farmstead. Among those renting the Thomas-Bentley House was Zachariah D. Waters, who is listed in a local newspaper as a Brookeville storekeeper in 1856.⁷⁵ A Brookeville store ledger from this period indicates the variety of items then available. Beyond foodstuffs, spices, and the like were items ranged from house wares to hardware, including fabrics, thread, buttons, and pins; bowls, tin cups, knives, and clothes pins; nails, sandpaper, putty, locks, and scythes. Clothing items such as pantaloons,

⁷¹ 1839 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber B.S. 9, folio 357, recorded the 2nd day of May 1839; also hand written copy available at the Sandy Spring Museum Library, #1997.0005.0618. According to the document: “Witnessed that whereas by a Decree of Montgomery County Court setting as a court of chancery hearing date the 22nd day of March in the year 1826 the above named Caleb Bentley was appointed a Trustee and authorized and empowered to sell and dispose of the real estate of Thomas L. Reese an insolvent debtor in the county and state aforesaid, for the payment of his debts, that in pursuance of said Decree the said Caleb Bentley did on the 28th day of June in the year 1827 sell and dispose of to the above named Roger Brooke at Public Auction A Brick dwelling house in the Town of Brookeville in the county and state aforesaid and formerly in the occupancy of the said Thomas L. Reese with two Lots of ground lying contiguous and attached thereto with all and singular of the appurtenances thereunto belonging or in any wise appertaining for the sum of Two thousand and twenty four dollars current money.” Unfortunately no record of the equity proceeding can be found and it is not listed in the equity index for that year.

⁷² He first became a partner of the wholesale firm Gerard T. Hopkins, for whom he had worked before coming to Brookeville, and in 1833 opened his own store on Pratt Street that was continued by his sons after his retirement in 1844. Boyd, 89.

⁷³ 1840 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber B.S. 10, folio 209, Recorded 20 August 1840, Roger Brooke to Elisha J. Hall and Mary Brooke Hall, his wife [and daughter of Roger Brooke].

⁷⁴ 1841 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber B.S. 10, folio 400, Recorded 4 May 1841, Elisha J. Hall and Mary B. Hall to Remus Riggs.

⁷⁵ “People, Places and Pot-pourri; Some Items of Interest from Some Montgomery County 19th Century Newspaper, compiled by Marian Water Jacobs & Mary Gordon Malloy, July 1988; MCHS, 929.3 MD M Jac; entries include: Water, Z. Brookeville store, MCS 17 May & 7 June 1856. Abstracts of buildings & RE in Mont Co Newspapers, 1855-1910; abstracted by Anne W. Cissel, 1977; entries for Brookeville; MCHS 929.3 MD M Cis. According to his obituary in 1908, Zachariah D. Waters was a “Brookeville merchant, who operated out of the historic storeroom of Caleb Bentley, adjoining residence *Madison House*.” He married the daughter of Dr. William B. Magruder of Brookeville and lived at the “Belmont” estate, later building “Ashwood.” 29 November 1908.

coats, hats, and gloves were also available, as were specialty items such as Port wine and tobacco.⁷⁶ The 1860 Census likewise indicates that Zachariah Waters was living here, along with his wife Elizabeth and their one-year-old son.⁷⁷ According to another source, “For a number of years Mr. Waters was known as the Brookeville merchant, occupying the old historic store room of Caleb Bentley, adjoining the residence wherein President Madison spent a night after his retreat from Bladensburg. Here Mr. Waters dealt our exact justice to a community whose entire confidence he held during his career.”⁷⁸ The latter comment suggests that Waters may also have acted as a justice of the peace for Brookeville. An 1865 map of Brookeville indicates that Zachariah Magruder was living in the house by that time.⁷⁹ Riggs did, however, sell a portion of the lot in 1865 to his son Artemus Riggs, a local physician, upon which he erected a fine three-story brick residence with a separate office structure at the corner of the lot along Market Street.⁸⁰

Upon his death on 18 December 1867, Remus Riggs conveyed “the house commonly known as the store house and dwelling” located in the “Village of Brookeville” to his daughter Amelia.⁸¹ Amelia was a minor at the time, and so the house was kept in trust for her by her brother Thomas D. Riggs, as per her father’s request. Amelia continued to reside with her mother at the family farmstead, where she appears in the 1870 census, although by then twenty-five years of age. She later married Robert MacGill and went to live in Frederick, Maryland, where her husband was engaged in the mercantile trade. MacGill died in 1879, leaving Amelia with considerable assets, much of which she used to buy from her brothers the nearby farms that they had inherited from their father. Brookeville was at that time a thriving village, as Thomas Boyd describes it in his 1879 history of Montgomery County, “The productions are large and increasing; business good.” According to his account, the town had a population of 250 which, based on the names and the list of twenty-nine residences engaged in farming, including the surrounding farmland. Also listed was a postmaster, three merchants, three blacksmiths, one carpenter, three carriage and wagon makers and one harness maker, two millers, two physicians, two shoemakers, one seamstress, and one watch maker. Brookeville’s population evidently expanded in the summer; Boyd also claims that it was “a fashionable resort in summer for health and pleasure seekers—the restorative qualities of a strong Chalybeate spring in the vicinity attracting many persons anxious to try its efficacy.”⁸²

It may have been at this point that Amelia first occupied the Thomas-Bentley House.⁸³ Amelia was certainly there by 1882, when her mother came to live with her, handing over the family farm to her

⁷⁶ Ledger, Brookville Store, from 27 June 1850 to 28 July 1857, SSM. The ledger does not give the name of the proprietor or the exact location. It is possible that it was Z. Waters who is documented as having operated the store during this time period.

⁷⁷ 1860 Census, Montgomery County, Maryland, First District; L.D. (Zachariah) Waters, 29, merchant; Elizabeth 26, B. Worthington, 1; enumerated after Anna Howard family.

⁷⁸ Rebecca T. Miller, *Annals of Sandy Spring*, Vol. III (King Brothers, 1909), 453.

⁷⁹ *Martenet & Bond’s Map of Montgomery County*, Maryland, from actual surveys by S.J. Martenet & assistants; drawn and published by Simon J. Martenet, 1865.

⁸⁰ Montgomery County Land Records, Liber EBP 2, folio 422, dated 4 December 1865. The out lot was 3 acres and 7 perches of the then 5 acre parcel (the original 4 acres plus an additional acre acquired by Reese in 1823).

⁸¹ Register of Wills Liber 5 folio 241; probated 23 December 1867, Liber JWS 1 folio 249 (see chain of title).

⁸² Boyd, 122. R.W. Gattrell, the individual listed as postmaster and merchant was located on Market Street at the corner of High Street, according to Griffith Morgan Hopkins, *Atlas of Montgomery County, Maryland, 1879*, reprinted Montgomery County Historical Society, 1975, and only Amelia appears at the Thomas-Bentley House, suggesting that a store no longer operated from the house.

⁸³ Amelia MacGill appears at Madison House on the 1879 Hopkins Atlas, although this could merely be an indication of ownership, rather than actual residence.

newly married son, William.⁸⁴ A few years after her mother's death, Amelia married William Eldridge at Madison House, on June 17, 1896.⁸⁵ By 1900, Amelia was again widowed. According to the census for that year, she was the head of a household that included her unmarried brother, Thomas, listed as single and a "farm manager," a black servant Synthia (sic.) Williams and her husband William, a laborer, both aged sixty-three, their twenty-two-year-old son Henry, a farm laborer, and a nineteen-year-old (white) servant by the name of Nellie Bettoni.⁸⁶ Thomas was likely still running the nearby farm that he had received as an inheritance from his father, while living at the Thomas-Bentley House where he remained until the house was sold, following the death of his sister.⁸⁷

The house was sold at a public auction held on the premises on Saturday afternoon, December 5, 1908. According to the an advertisement for the sale,

This property consists of a lot on the main street of Brookeville containing about two acres of land adjoining the land of John H. Parsley on one side and Michael O'Toole on the other. The improvements consist of a comfortable brick dwelling house containing seven rooms with porch in front and a brick and frame store room and ware room attached. The house fronts on a nicely shaded lawn and there is a pump of good water at the back door. There are also on the property a combined stable for horses and cows and a corn house, a meat house, and other necessary outbuildings.⁸⁸

Interestingly, a homeowner's insurance policy taken out on the house by the Riggs family in 1902 claims that the house consisted of nine rooms rather than seven rooms plus the storehouse wing indicated in the advertisement.⁸⁹ The seven rooms listed in the advertisement likely included the parlor and three bedchambers in the main block, the original kitchen (now the dining room), the new bedchamber above it, and the new kitchen, excluding the entry hall (former dining room), stair hall, and the more roughly finished third floor rooms (two in the main block and one over the original kitchen wing).

⁸⁴ According to Farquhar, when Amelia's brother William brought his new bride to live at "Pleasant Hill" in 1882 their mother Catherine came to live with Amelia, where she remained until her death in 1893, p. 248-249.

⁸⁵ Riggs Farm, JB Riggs, p. 388, SSM card file.

⁸⁶ Census 1900, Montgomery County, Maryland. 1900- Amelia Wood, head of house, 58; Thomas Riggs, brother 63, single, farm manager; Synthia Williams, 63 black female, servant; Wm Williams, BM 63, laborer (husband to Synthia); Henry Williams, son 22, farm laborer; Nellie Bettoni, WF 19, servant.

⁸⁷ The 1920 Census lists Thomas D. Riggs as a boarder in the Parsley household next door. The Parsley house had been erected by his brother, Brookeville physician Artemus Riggs, probably about 1865.

⁸⁸ Montgomery County Circuit Court, Thomas D. Riggs, complainant and Florence M. Riggs and defendants, Equity No. 2361, filed 17 September 1907, MSA. According to the court proceedings, Amelia died intestate and without issue, and thus the property became the estate of her brothers Thomas, John, William Riggs. William C. Riggs having also died intestate, after death of Amelia, his portion of the estate was left to his only surviving heirs, his two daughters, Florence M. Riggs and Margaret Riggs.

⁸⁹ Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Montgomery County, Policy No. 42335, Thomas D., John A., and William C. Riggs, applicants, July 1902; MCHS library. The house was valued at \$1,500 and the barn at \$150, and Thomas Riggs is listed as occupant. The main block is described as 22' x 44' and two stories in height with a "good" tin roof, and having two porches, three chimneys and two [working?] fireplaces. The kitchen is listed as measuring 14' x 16' and the "old store part" as measuring 20' x 35' with a wood shingle roof in bad condition. A note indicates that the chimney in the store was failing; as it was stated: "The old Store building has a flue which starts on joist [?], which is not used and applicants agree that it will not be used. A barn, located 60 yards north of the house, measured 18' x 38' and was one-and-half stories in height.

The highest bidder was Marshall P. Howard, a physician who formerly resided in Brookville, but was residing in Baltimore in January 1909, when the deed to the property was recorded.⁹⁰ The house was sold to Washington and Katherine Bowie, also of the City of Baltimore, in 1911.⁹¹ The Bowies had already purchased in 1909 the old stone “Miller’s House” that sat adjacent to the Thomas-Bentley House that was also believed to have been built by Richard Thomas, Jr. (date unknown, but speculated to have been among the earliest buildings in Brookeville).⁹² Despite the fact that the house was sold, Henry Howard was still living here in 1920, according to the census, which lists him as postmaster, another indication that he was operating out of the old storehouse.⁹³

Madison House was next the residence of William P. Jones, a bachelor and retired Brookeville area farmer, who purchased the house in 1919, and lived here until his death in 1955 at the age of eighty-seven.⁹⁴ During the last fifteen years of his life, Jones retained the help of Mr. and Mrs. Howard S. Musgrove, who resided in the house and provided him with “board and lodging” in exchange for the promise that they receive the house upon his death.⁹⁵ Jones evidently led a simple life, for the house was still without central heat or indoor plumbing, and only nominal electricity at the time that it was acquired by the next owners, Gene and Juanita Archer, in 1958. Josephine Musgrove recalled that the oil stoves were the only source of heat and that the hand pump at the back door was their source for water.⁹⁶ The

⁹⁰ 1909 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 202, folio 222, Recorded 19 January 1909, Philip D. Laird and Charles W. Prettyman, trustees to Marshall P. Howard. An insurance policy for the house lists Howard’s (business) address as 1319 Mount Royal Avenue, Baltimore; Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Montgomery County, policy #49544, Montgomery County Historical Society, Rockville, Md.

⁹¹ Montgomery County Land Records, Deed, Liber 224, folio 381; made 6 December 1911; Marshall P. Howard and Elizabeth R. Howard, to Washington Bowie and Katherine. The Bowies are listed as residences of Baltimore both at the time of purchase, and later, at the time of the sale of Madison House.

⁹² Maryland Historic Trust, It is suggested that Thomas built this house at about the same time that he built in mill, ca. 1794. The property had passed from Deborah and Richard Thomas to their daughter Margaret Garrigues in 1823, who sold it to Richard Brooke, in 1826. In 1846 he sold it to John W. Magruder, who in 1871, sold it to Michael O’Toole who eventually left it to his niece, Mary E. Action. It was Action who sold it to the Bowies.

⁹³ 1911 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 224, folio 381, Recorded 15 December 1911, Marshall P. Howard and Elizabeth R. Howard, to Washington Bowie and Katherine Gaither Bowie. Also, Census 1920, Montgomery County, Maryland, 1920 Henry Howard, 63 Postmaster; Mary, 48; Carolyn 18, teacher; and Marshall, 16. (enumerated next to John Parsley).

⁹⁴ 1919 Deed, Montgomery County Land Records, Liber 288, folio 393, Recorded 4 December 1919, Washington Bowie, Sr. to William P. Jones.

⁹⁵ Will EA 58/3; Case # 9567: William P. Jones. “I give, devise and bequeath unto Howard S. Musgrove and Josephine H. Musgrove, his wife my house and lot in Brookeville and all the contents thereof, provided, however, that they shall continue to reside there and provide board and lodging for me, during my life under the present or under any future arrangement made between the and me for the use during my life,” dated 3 June 1952. Jones died 14 March 1955. Inventory of Personal Estate of W Jones, EA 59/205, household effects: walnut three section sideboard, maple drop leaf table, 6 dining chairs, leather couch, walnut round extension table, Coleman oil heater, small oak roll top knee hole desk, Atwater Kent cabinet radio, silver plated cream and sugar set, tea pot, fruit bowl, antique mantel clock; Hall- drop leaf table (mahogany), Bedroom: oak double bed, marble top washstand, oak 5-drawer dresser, mirror, 6 straight back chairs, small wooden stand, small steamer trunk, chest of old time carpentry tools, double barreled shotgun; watch and chain; 1942 Ford sedan.

⁹⁶ Barfield, 8. Monica Schairer, “Nita Archer pioneered at Madison House,” *Montgomery County Courier*, 30 January 1980. An article written in 1949, while Jones was still in residence, described the “Madison House” as containing “a small front hall, a large parlor and a dining room and a kitchen on the first floor and four bedrooms on the second,” indicating that the two bathrooms now located on the second floor did not exist at the time. Roger B.

Archers undertook fairly extensive renovation to the house, most significantly to the systems, installing central heating and plumbing, including the addition of two bathrooms and a newly renovated kitchen. They moved into the house in October 1958, along with their four boys, despite the fact that the house was without basic amenities. Gene Archer was an NBC Television host, who started his career in 1938 as a singer on a daily radio show and a twice-weekly network show. He passed away in 1978 and his wife sold the property in 1980. She retained the old stone “Miller’s House” that, since its purchase by the Bowie family, conveyed as part of the Thomas-Bentley property, and rehabilitated it as her own residence.⁹⁷

The Design and Evolution of the Thomas-Bentley House within the Sandy Spring Quaker Community

Like his father Richard Thomas, Sr., Richard Thomas, Jr. may have been a master builder, as well as a farmer, miller, and land surveyor. The senior Thomas is known for the construction of a number of fine Georgian style homes in the Sandy Spring community including his own Cherry Grove as well as Norwood, Mount Airy, and Woodlawn. His brother John Thomas who lived at Clifton was also a builder, and it was he, with assistance from his nephews William and Richard Thomas, Jr. and others, who constructed the Sandy Spring (Quaker) Meeting House, in 1817.⁹⁸ Unfortunately there is little written documentation of the Thomas family’s construction legacy, despite the fact that it is a long-held tradition within the Quaker community.⁹⁹ The oldest of the Thomas family homes is Clifton, built ca. 1742 in the Tidewater style by John Thomas (the elder), the father of Richard Thomas, Sr. The Tidewater style of this house, most significantly identified by its Gambrel roof, was typical of the earliest houses in the Sandy Spring community, although few are extant, and none are as old.¹⁰⁰ Both of the early Brooke family residences, known as Charley Forrest and Brooke Grove, were of this style, although executed in wood frame. Cherry Grove, like Clifton, has numerous decorative features such as paneled walls, built-in cabinets, a prominent stairway with elaborately turned balustrades, and a sophisticated floor plan that provided for formal living with separate public and private spheres. Both have a main block with a four-room plan, with the formal entry and stair hall constituting one of the four rooms, and a separate service or kitchen wing to one side. At Cherry Grove, the kitchen was the largest room in the house. The other houses attributed to the Thomas family, Norwood, Mount Airy, and Woodlawn, are of the more typical Georgian center-hall plan.

The Thomas-Bentley House is a vernacular expression of the Federal style, which became popular along the eastern seaboard following the American Revolution and remained popular through the second decade of the nineteenth century. The Federal style is often associated with an urban-dwelling merchant class,

Farquhar, Sr. “Brookeville Home Sheltered President Madison in 1814,” *The Record of Montgomery County*, 30 September 1949.

⁹⁷ The Miller’s house had not been maintained for quite some time when purchased by the Archers. According to the Maryland Historical Trust inventory form, they rebuilt it in 1966 from the four fieldstone walls that remained, for use as a guest house. Juanita Archer added to and remodeled the house for her own use in 1980.

⁹⁸ Kirk, 22. “In charge of construction [of the Sandy Spring Meeting House] was John Thomas of Clifton . . . and Richard Thomas, Jr.” along with mason, William W. Farling.

⁹⁹ Again, Roger Farquhar’s *Old Homes and History of Montgomery County, Maryland* is the most noted reference to the Thomas family’s building legacy.

¹⁰⁰ Only a few in the area come close to the vintage of Clifton. One is the center portion of Greenwood the Davis family home outside of Brookeville, which according to Roger Farquhar was built ca. 1755. Farquhar, 170. The other is the Magruder house known as The Ridge, in Derwood, ca. 1750. A good, local example of a later manifestation of the Tidewater style is the Riggs family’s The Oaks II, in Laytonsville, built ca. 1804.

but was not restricted to use by the elite. In the wake of the Revolution, Americans in search of an architectural style that was symbolic of their democratic ideals looked to Greek and Roman forms. According to Carole Rifkind, “In these early years of nationhood the sense of American identity demanded an American architecture for the common man as well as the privileged.”¹⁰¹ As Rifkind and others have also pointed out, however, the style was actually closely derived from contemporary *English* handbooks. And in fact, the emergence of the style resulted from a renewed interest in classical Greek and Roman forms promoted largely by architectural tastemakers in England, such as Robert Adams (and thus commonly identified as “Adamesque”).¹⁰²

Although in America the style was introduced through architectural pattern books of English origins, American builders’ guides and pattern books were also later developed. These were first popularly presented through the works of Asher Benjamin; publications such as Benjamin’s *A Country Builders Assistant* (1797) were among the earliest sources of stylistic elements available to architects and builders in this country and adapted to conditions found in America rather than in England. While similar to the Georgian style, Federal architecture is known for its emphasis on verticality, symmetry, and its delicate and restrained details. The four-room, center hall Georgian plan is still prevalent in Federal period homes, although variety is seen in the size, location, and even the shape of the rooms (introducing elliptical forms). The plan is often that of a rectangular central block with flanking wings resting on a high basement, and the houses are general built of brick laid in Flemish bond. Compared to the Georgian, Federal details are more refined, as with window openings, which are significantly larger with delicate, thin muntins. Windows may be set in a recessed arch, but in simpler examples lintels appear more restrained with a flat or jack arch. Often doorways are set off by high-style refinements such as elliptical arches and sidelights, and perhaps covered by a classically ordered portico. Classical motifs such as urns, swags, reeding and gouge-work are often employed as ornament.

Applying these characteristics to the Thomas-Bentley House, it has elements of both Federal refinement and vernacular simplicity perhaps indicative of Thomas’s heritage as both a master builder and as a Quaker. The house is elegantly understated with many architecturally sophisticated features, yet it lacks the formality and scale of other houses built by Thomas’s contemporaries. Looking first at the exterior, it is constructed of Flemish Bond brick, and as originally built exhibited the characteristic symmetry in its center entry (later relocated) and flanking wings. As a “merchant class” residence, the Thomas-Bentley House has a separate wing for a workshop and store that is balanced by a kitchen wing. The original, expansive twelve-over-twelve-light sash windows (with twelve-over-eight-lights in the second story) that appear in the main block are among the most character defining and impressive exterior features of the house. In fact, windows of this same pattern can be found in Benjamin’s *A Country Builders Assistant* (Plate 13). The molding profiles, including doorway and window surrounds and mantelpieces are also consistent with those that appear in Benjamin’s 1797 publication.¹⁰³ Although without the more elaborate elliptical arches, the windows have elegant jack arch lintels. Likewise, the doorway is not defined by fanlight and sidelights, but boasts a transom light ornamented by the gouge-work that was indicative of

¹⁰¹ Carole Rifkind, *A Field Guide To American Architecture* (New York: Bonanza Books, 1980), 29.

¹⁰² Mark Wenger discusses the “growing Englishness of gentry houses” after the mid-eighteenth century and the frequent use of English architectural publications, as well as the use of English nomenclature for rooms, such as the use of terms like saloon, drawing room, and dining parlor. Mark R. Wenger, “The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space,” *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 2 (1986):144.

¹⁰³ These features remain fairly consistent, if not as complex, in Benjamin’s subsequent publications, *The American Builder’s Companion* (1806), and *The Rudiments of Architecture* (1814). Significant changes begin with the next volume, *The Practical House Carpenter* (1830), reflecting the emergence of the Greek Revival style.

the period. The verticality of the house is emphasized by the raised main block and by the usable third (or half) story, which is accessed on the interior by an open stairway that rises to the full height of the house.

The interior plan of the Thomas-Bentley House is somewhat unusual and seems to denote a more casual use of space than was typical of the period. The conventional Georgian plan consisted of a center hall or “passage” containing the stairway flanked by rooms, generally a best room or parlor to one side and a dining room or family dining parlor to the other, in the case of a one-room-deep structure. More elaborate houses were “double pile” or two rooms to either side of the center passage. The function of the latter element was to create an intermediate space between the social best room(s) and those used primarily by the family. While Georgian was a dominant style within English colonies throughout the eighteenth century, it appeared first in cities and towns. Georgian center passage houses were erected by middle-class occupants in areas within close proximity to urban centers by the mid-eighteenth century (and by wealthy planters earlier), however the plan did not begin to gain wide acceptance until the latter part of the century, becoming the predominate type within the first decades of the nineteenth century.¹⁰⁴ The more formal Georgian plan supplanted an earlier plan type prevalent in the mid-Atlantic region known as the hall-and-parlor plan. This plan consisted of two unequally sized adjoining rooms with no intervening passage and with interior access leading directly into the larger “hall.” Both rooms of the hall-and-parlor house were generally heated, although the more spacious principle room or “hall” contained a larger fireplace for cooking, and also an enclosed stairway to provide access to the second floor (often an open or partitioned half-story space or even an unfinished loft). The hall was a multi-purpose living space where the general functions of the household were undertaken, including cooking and other domestic activities, dining, and entertaining. In more refined homes, buffets or cabinets were employed for the display and easy retrieval of china and other accoutrements for entertaining purposes. The hall was augmented by the “parlor” a more private chamber used by the family as a separate living space and often for sleeping as well.

This arrangement was changed by the introduction of elements such as the central passage, and of the dining room as a separate space for formal entertaining. These changes were adopted by some of the elite in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, but it would take considerable time to gain general acceptance.¹⁰⁵ While the central passage served as the buffer between public and private spaces, the dining room allowed for the elimination of the dining function from the multi-use “hall.” This in turn allowed the former hall to become a more specialized and formal space. Both the center passage and the dining room reflected the rising spatial hierarchy in which rooms intended for use by the family were separated from those used by outsiders, both social peers and those of lesser rank or familiarity. As historian Mark Wenger states,

The promiscuous mix of persons and activities once accommodated in the hall was taken over by this new dining room. The old hall, in turn, became a formal ‘entertaining room’ where those possessions expressive of one’s station in society were assembled and placed on display. . . Access

¹⁰⁴ Wenger, “The Central Passage in Virginia, 137. According to Wenger, the central passage appears in Virginia during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, prior to which time, the hall-and-parlor plan was used even by the most elite planters.

¹⁰⁵ According to an analysis of eighteenth century tax records in Virginia conducted by Clifton Ellis, most planters continued to live in unpretentious one and two room, single story structures of less than 540 square feet, despite that increasing wealth, and that their houses became more finely appointed—with brick facades, interior plaster and molding—before they became larger in size. See Clifton Ellis, “Dissenting Faith and Domestic Landscape in Eighteenth-Century Virginia,” *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 7 (1997), 23-40.

to this setting was made increasingly selective by the new central passage through which visitors had to pass in order to reach the hall.¹⁰⁶

With the hall no longer used as informally, the domestic work once undertaken there was gradually pushed into spaces further from the view of visitors, and in the case of the more affluent, from the view of family as well (along with the domestic workers who inhabited them). This was eventually accomplished by the addition of a rear ell in which to house the kitchen, allowing the former kitchen to accommodate other functions. According to Marla Miller, “In the early years of the Republic, as ever larger numbers of men and women strove towards a standard of living that historians have termed “refinement,” ultimately creating what we now see as a middle-class sensibility, domestic workspaces were altered to reflect the shifting position of household workers in the evolving social and economic order.”¹⁰⁷ According to Richard Bushman, refinement among the elite began in America at the close of the seventeenth century with changes in manners, dress, and in architecture that lead to the gradual formation of “polite society” during the eighteenth. However, the majority of the population would not become accustomed to genteel living until the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century and the rise of a middle class of smaller merchants and professionals, ordinary well-off farmers and successful artisans. As greater segments of society sought to lead a more genteel life, enterprising industrialists and manufacturers would help them to more readily acquire the accoutrements of what Bushman refers to as “vernacular gentility.”¹⁰⁸ Brookeville and its citizens were no exception to these patterns.

The Thomas-Bentley House is of particular interest in this context because it reflects the transitions that occurred in the move toward increasing formality and specialization of space, particularly when considering the significant changes that were made to it within only a few decades of its completion. Although its plan had progressed well past the era of the hall-and-parlor, the main block of the Thomas-Bentley House as constructed consisted of a parlor, and a smaller adjoining room with the stair hall to the rear.¹⁰⁹ There was no hall or intervening space to mediate between public and private spheres and exterior entry was directly into the parlor or best room of the house. The stair hall was hidden to the rear of the house rather than in a more conspicuous location, as found in the center hall plan that defined most middle and upper middle class houses of the period. The adjoining room was likely used as a dining room or family dining parlor, perhaps used also as an informal sitting room. It is smaller and more intimate and connects to all the first floor spaces of the house including the more formal parlor, the stair

¹⁰⁶ Wenger, “The Central Passage in Virginia,” 138. As Wenger explains, the passage had as added level of specificity in the south where it was used as an informal hall for casual entertaining and sleep during the hot summer months due to its ability to take advantage of breezes that blew through the front entry and corresponding rear entry.

¹⁰⁷ Marla R. Miller, “Labor and Liberty in the Age of Refinement: Gender, Class, and the Built Environment,” *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 10 (2005):15.

¹⁰⁸ Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America; Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), xii-xiii.

¹⁰⁹ Few examples from the colonial or early republic period of a three-room plan type exist, although an interesting exception in the case of the Thomas-Bentley House is the “Penn” or “Quaker” plan recommended by William Penn to the early Quaker settlers in his Pennsylvania colony. The Quaker plan consisted of a large hall that ran the depth of the house and contained the exterior entry, with two small adjacent rooms for more private use. While the Thomas-Bentley house cannot actually be termed a Quaker plan since the smaller space to the rear is a stair hall rather than a chamber, it is interesting to speculate that it could have provided a functional model. Again, the Thomas-Bentley House is far more sophisticated than either the hall-and-parlor or the Quaker plan, although without a passage, because cooking and other domestic functions occurred in a separate wing of the house, furthest removed from the formal parlor. For a discussion of the Penn or Quaker Plan see, Gabrielle M. Lanier & Bernard L. Herman, *Everyday Architecture of the Mid-Atlantic* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 24.

hall (and upstairs bedchambers), and the kitchen. As Elizabeth Garrett points out, in the period from 1750 to 1870, the sitting room was often used as a dining room with one or more tables used for multiple purposes. She added, "Convenience dictated that the kitchen be nearby [this room]." ¹¹⁰ Such a room was intended for informal family use, including activities such as studying, reading, writing, sewing, and playing. While it often contained a china cupboard, it did not hold the fine china and silver pieces displaying in the parlor, but was often filled with more serviceable table china, plates, and dishes. ¹¹¹ The fact that a stove insert was placed in this room (still extant) adds to the idea that this was an often occupied space. The positioning of the attached commercial space within the Thomas-Bentley House, as exemplified by the workshop/store wing, could also be interpreted as an informal arrangement, although there was originally no passage between it and the house proper. The less-finished third floor likely provided for servants, another indication of the middle-class status of the family, as was the caged pantry in the cellar that would have restricted access to more valuable foodstuffs.

While lacking the formality that a house with a space used exclusively as an entry hall would create, the main block of the Thomas-Bentley House contains many noteworthy architectural elements including the stairway, built-in cabinetry, finely crafted mantels, chair rail, and other refinements and attention to practical details. The stairway is among the noteworthy features, expressing elements of both high-style and simplicity. It rises a full three stories and the balustrade is flanked by a shadow railing that runs along the outside wall. An interesting feature of the shadow railing is the sections of balustrade that run across the front of the windows that light the stair. ¹¹² The newel posts at each landing descend in a pendant and yet the post is simply turned, the balustrades plain and square, and the string closed, precluding an opportunity for the ornament scroll pattern often found in an open string stair (where each step is visible).

Elements such as the cabinets and closets, the built-in shelves that appear to the side of the fireplace in the dining parlor, and the pegged boards for hanging outerwear in the stair hall afford a high level of storage space. ¹¹³ The corner cabinets that appear in the parlor would have been used for the storage of china and other items intended for entertaining. The cabinet in the original dining room or family dining parlor also contain grooves in the shelves for the upright display of plates. Communication and transportation being what it was, people of the era were generally prepared for unexpected guests. Cabinets such as these located in the parlor provided easy access to plates, cups and saucers, decanters of wine, etc. and when left open allowed for a handsome display. Of note is the manner in which the corner cabinets abut the window surrounds in the parlor to create the appearance of a single, folding unit. Behind the paneled doors of the cabinets are scalloped shelves used to display fine china and other such treasured possessions. While built-in cabinets appear in the other rooms in the main block, including the bed chambers, these are the most elaborate, denoting its distinct status within the house. The built-in cabinets elsewhere provide for an unusual level of storage space and indicate that the family possessed luxury items such as multiple linen sets and other bedding items. The chair rail is aligned with the window sills and is found throughout the main block of the house. Interestingly, the molding profiles in the stair hall are not of the complexity of the two formal rooms, but are like those found on the second floor of the house, indicating its lower status and intended use by family only. In addition, the rooms are of a

¹¹⁰ Elizabeth Donaghy Garrett, *At Home; The American Family, 1750 to 1870* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1990), 62.

¹¹¹ Garrett, 64.

¹¹² The section was unfortunately removed from the window of the first floor during the twentieth century to provide egress onto the porch via a new casement window, but still remains in the second story.

¹¹³ A similar peg board for hanging outerwear is located in the kitchen and was probably moved here from the original kitchen (now the dining room).

relatively moderate size although they have a sense of spaciousness provided by the ten-foot-high ceilings.

The upper levels within the main block of the Thomas-Bentley House also demonstrate a certain level of finish and attention to detail. The molding profiles are less elaborate, although a bit fancier than those associated with the stairway and hall and those that carry up to the third floor. Of the three original bedchambers, two were heated by fireplace and include stylish mantelpieces and built-in cabinetry. The so-called “best” bedchamber is located above what was originally the dining parlor, with two other bedchambers placed back-to-back over the formal parlor, only the front room of which was heated. According to family legend, it was the best bedchamber that Mrs. Bentley gave up for the accommodation of President Madison in 1814. In addition to the fine fireplace, the room contains both a built-in cabinet with upper and lower storage areas, *and* a closet. The closet contains pegs for hanging clothes at two levels, which like the ones found in the first floor stair hall, are carved to form a hook-like configuration. At the time of the construction of the house, most Americans would have owned only a limited number of garments and this well-equipped closet, combined with the built-in cupboard, would have provided more than adequate accommodation.¹¹⁴ The two front bedchambers also include chair rail similar to that which appears in the first floor parlors, also aligning with the window sills. The third bedchamber, located towards the rear of the house, was not heated and likely did not include a built-in cabinet.¹¹⁵ On the third floor, two rooms have been partitioned off from the upper stair hall with beaded board, and there is plaster on the interior walls of the two rooms and on the ceilings. The molding profiles around the windows and doors are simpler here and there is no fireplace for heat, yet the level of finish indicates that the space was used as bedchambers, possibly for either children or servants. The general plan of this space follows that of the second floor except that there is only one room over the formal parlor rather than partition into two, and the spaces are more confined by the sloping, half-story roofline.

As suggested, the inclusion of separate areas designated as workspace, namely the kitchen and the workshop/store located in the flanking wings, also adds to the complexity of the Thomas-Bentley House. The service spaces are integral with the main block, yet they are set down from it and, in the case of the workshop/store, kept separate from the living spaces by providing no egress between the two (the current doorway was added ca. 1960). As was typical, the kitchen wing is located in proximity to the least formal room in the main block. It is interesting to note that the original service wing of the house represented one of the largest allocations of space, reflecting the great variety of domestic activities that would have taken place here, from food preparation to laundry and more specialized domestic activities such as cloth, soap, and candle making. The kitchen might even double as a family sitting and dining space, particularly in cold weather when one could take advantage of the warmth of the fire. The census records indicate that Sarah Bentley had two servants living in her household, and Henrietta, the second Mrs. Bentley, had three servants and one slave.¹¹⁶ As built, the service wing had a separate entry at the front of the house, as well as a hall and entry towards the back at the side elevation. The back entry provided access to the

¹¹⁴ According to Jane C. Nylander, before the industrial revolution, very few people had large numbers of garments of any kind. Women seldom owned more than four or five gowns and the accompanying petticoats and men owned a few coats, vests, and pairs of breeches, and about a half dozen shirts. Jane C. Nylander, *Our Own Sung Fireside* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), 156.

¹¹⁵ That room was converted for use as a bathroom and no evidence of a cabinet exists. However, the current owners created a new cabinet to resemble the originals that appear in the other rooms, for linen storage.

¹¹⁶ 1800 and 1810 Census Records. The record indicates “all other free persons,” meaning those living in the household that were not family members. They could also have been individuals working in the Bentley store or workshop.

dependencies located to the rear of the house including the still-extant log smoke house, a former barn (and presumably a privy and a well). Evidence also exists of a large exterior end chimney, which is believed to have resembled one formerly located in the flanking (store) wing of the house (rebuilt in the 1960s). It consisted of a large, stone constructed fireplace with a brick flue.¹¹⁷

The less refined level of finish exhibited in the storehouse wing is most appreciably demonstrated by the fact that the summer beam and joints in the ceiling have been left exposed, and the walls and ceilings are boarded rather than plastered.¹¹⁸ The front door and windows were designed with security in mind, perhaps due to Caleb Bentley's clock-making and silver-smithing; there is a heavy reinforced plank door and bars are still extant on the window to the rear. The chimney and fireplace surround have been replaced, and an enclosed stairway that once provided access to an unfinished attic was removed, probably to increase the room's capacity. That area has since been reclaimed to provide space for a back-to-back laundry and a powder room (accessed from the hall between the parlor and the old store room).¹¹⁹

Changes and additions to the house over the course of the nineteenth century indicate a more formal and specialized use of space within the Thomas-Bentley House. These include the removal of the front entry from the parlor to the original dining room, the reuse of the dining room as an entry hall and the kitchen as the dining room, and the subsequent construction of a new kitchen wing with a cook's room above and attached wood storage, as well as the raising of the old kitchen wing two-and-a-half stories to create a bedchamber on both the second and third floors. The date of these changes is not known. Based on a significant rise in the assessed value of the house, they most likely occurred during the occupancy of the Reese family in the 1820s. It is possible that the changes occurred during the ownership of the well-to-do Riggs family, beginning in 1841, although the house was likely rented until the latter part of the nineteenth century when occupied by members of the family. The introduction of an entry hall certainly lent a tone of formality to the house that was previously lacking, as did the relocation of the dining space to the old kitchen creating a spacious room more conducive to formal dining and the entertaining of guests. Whereas early dining rooms were usually smaller and less elaborate than the hall or "parlor" of the house, they grew in both size and sophistication as dining became a more formal and socially significant activity, at times even eclipsing the parlor.¹²⁰ And in fact, when the original kitchen of the Thomas-Bentley House was remodeled as the dining room, it rivaled the parlor in size (if not in ornamentation). According to Elizabeth Garrett, "A specialized dining room was a symbol of economic success, and a spate of nineteenth-century architectural design books, published both here and abroad, jealously guarded this indicant of middle-class status for those who had both sufficient money and admirable taste."¹²¹ However, many families did not see the need for a specialized room for dining and preferred to dine in a less-formal sitting room or in the warmth of the kitchen. The new kitchen in the Thomas-Bentley House appears smaller than the original, although augmented somewhat by the wood storage area that was likely constructed at the same time.

¹¹⁷ The fireplace so described as extant up until the 1960s when it was replaced by the current one. An insurance policy from the early twentieth century indicates that this chimney was already failing. A similar chimney appears on another house in town located on lot #36, which was originally a Thomas family residence.

¹¹⁸ This is, however, the same construction technique as applied to the main block, which is visible from the basement.

¹¹⁹ Access currently is via the window in the gable end.

¹²⁰ In fact, dining became such a formal social activity that the more elite felt the need to build smaller, informal family dining rooms for everyday use. See Mark R. Wenger, "The Dining Room in Early Virginia," 155.

¹²¹ Garrett, 78. Although as with other rooms in the house, even the formal dining room often accommodated a variety of activities.

Coupled with the addition of a maid's room above, the construction of the new kitchen likely signaled the adaptation of advances in domestic economies and technologies that lessen the burden of earlier days and allowed the mistress of the house to decrease her involvement in such activities. For example, it was no longer necessary to cook over an open fire as it would have been for Mrs. Bentley, and thus the new kitchen included a wood-burning cook stove. It was at this time that cookstoves were gaining popular acceptance.¹²² A growing inventory in the store, and the establishment of the nearby cotton and woolen mills, may have eliminated in need for the production of household items such as cloth and candles, etc. Likewise, as the town of Brookeville grew, its inhabitants were able to take advantage of consumer goods and services that allowed them to be less self-sufficient. Along with the conversion of the original kitchen was the creation of additional stories to create bedchambers that well out-sized those original to the house. The likely original owners of the house, Caleb and Sarah Bentley, were childless, although Caleb and the new Mrs. Bentley were expecting their third child and had four free blacks living with them at the time that they sold the house to its next owners, whose household included four children an adult male and three free blacks.¹²³ In fact, the Reese family declared bankruptcy while in residence, perhaps in part due to substantial expenditures made to the house. The later owners (1841-1911) were members of the prominent Riggs family, who were among the wealthiest local farmers and landowners. The Riggs rented the house for many decades following their purchase, and thus it is unlikely that they made significant changes to the house before the last decades of the nineteenth century when members of the family finally took up permanent residence here. Thus some of the changes could have occurred in the latter period, such as the addition of the pantry section (recently rebuilt) and the finish in the third floor rooms. The Riggs' were also not of Quaker heritage, as had been every owner up until that point in time, and thus any decisions that may have been made with regard to the design or use of space within the house for the sake of simplicity would have no longer been deemed important.

The White House for a Day

The house is now commonly referred to the Madison House for its role in sheltering President James Madison during the British invasion of Washington, D.C., on August 26-27 that resulting in the burning of the White House, Capitol, and numerous other federal buildings. While the event is largely forgotten today, the destruction that it caused to the newly created federal city was incredibly demoralizing to Americans at the time. There were those who believed that Washington would not recover from the setback to its governmental operations and its local economy caused by the fire. In fact, a vote in Congress to move the capital to another city to avoid the cost of reconstruction was only narrowly defeated.¹²⁴ The war for which the causes and events thereof were so ambiguous that it could only be called The War of 1812, had, up until this time, been fought largely in Canada and on the high seas. The latter is where much of the conflict had begun; the war was sparked by British commandeering of American ships, cargo, and sailors and the trade restrictions imposed on the states as a result of Britain's ongoing war with France.

¹²² According to Jack Larkin, who has examined everyday life in New England during the era of the early Republic, "After 1820 central Massachusetts village families began to install cookstoves to replace kitchen fireplaces and accepted the most significant change in the technology, and experience, of domestic heat since the fireplace itself had come onto common use in the Middle Ages. By the late 1830s even modest artisan households were adopting stoves to economize on expensive wood. Farm families, who cut wood from their own lots, were slower to abandon their hearths and brick up their fireplaces but by 1850 had begun to do so. Larkin, 188.

¹²³ 1820 Federal Census, Montgomery County, Maryland, District 4.

¹²⁴ Anthony S. Pitch, "The Burning of Washington," *White House History* (Fall 1998): 7.

Washington was still considered a backwater by most standards and thus Baltimore appeared the more likely target (Fort McHenry was attacked only weeks later). The invasion of the fledgling capital at Washington was, in fact, a strategic move by the British intended to humiliate Americans and perhaps even lead to the collapse of the United States. The British march on Washington was not anticipated until just a day or two before the attack, and thus the President and Mrs. Madison, along with much of the local citizenry, were forced into a hasty exodus, as approximately 4,000 British troops entered the city. According to historian Anthony Pitch, “As word of the British advance on land filtered through to Washingtonians, the uneasy calm turned into a full-fledged flight, driven by fear, then stark terror, in the widening pandemonium.”¹²⁵ President Madison was with the militia in Bladensburg, where a battle was mounted in the hopes of preventing the British forces from entering the city. Word was sent to Dolley Madison to vacate the White House while President Madison proceeded northward. Ironically, a meal prepared for forty military and cabinet officers planning to visit the White House that evening awaited the British invaders.¹²⁶ Initially destined for a hopeful rendezvous point with military forces at the Montgomery County Court House in Rockville, on August 26, 1814, Madison pushed onward, finding safety in Brookeville, at the home of Caleb and Henrietta Bentley.

President Madison and his party were not the only ones to seek refuge in Brookeville. Prior to his arrival, the town was already overrun by those hoping to escape the British attack. Among them was Mrs. Samuel Harrington Smith, wife of the owner of the *National Intelligencer*, who recorded the events that unfolded during her stay. She and her party (including family and servants) had been aroused during the night prior to the arrival of the British forces and began their flight from the city immediately, traveling by horse and carriage, and bringing with them a cart loaded with valuables. As she recorded, once they reached Brookeville,

We received a most kind reception from Mrs. Bentley [Henrietta T. Bentley] and excellent accommodations. The appearance of the village is romantic and beautiful; it is situated in a little valley embosom'd [sic.] in woody hills, with a stream flowing at the bottom on which are mills. In this secluded spot one might hope that noise, or rumour of war would never reach. Here all seems security and peace. Happy people: may you never be obliged to fly from the spot which now affords such a hospitable shelter to our poor citizens!¹²⁷

News of the events that unfolded reached those sheltered in Brookeville the following day, “Thursday morning we awakened by the sad news that our City was taken, the bridges and public buildings burned, our troops flying in every direction, our little army totally dispersed.” A troop of militia arrived in Brookeville on horseback soon after, and as Mrs. Smith noted, “Mr. Bentley kindly invited them in to rest and refresh.” Henrietta Bentley spent the better part of her time in the days that followed cooking and feeding the evacuees.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 9.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 16.

¹²⁷ Gillard Hunt, ed. *The First Forty Years of Washington Society; the Family Letters of Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 100; as cited in Barfield and Koch, 2. Last line is taken from: Brookeville File, SSM, “Extracts taken from Margaret Bayard Smith's Journal, published in Scribner's 1906, 98-104; wife of Samuel Harrison Smith, Editor of *National Intelligencer*, to Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mrs. Smith's sister; August 14, Brookville, Maryland.”

In her account of the events, Mrs. Smith captured both the torment of Washingtonians at the destruction of their city, and the bustle of activity that took place in Brookeville. She expressed her concern about the future of the new capital stating, “our anxiety has been kept alive all day, our poor men are coming in two, three or a dozen at a time, another troop of [men on] horse[back] just arrived, We hear that the Capitol, President’s house, bridges and many public buildings are burned. . . . Hundreds of our citizens are reduced from affluence to poverty in one night. For it is not to be expected that Washington will ever be the seat of Government again!” More and more people began to flood into Brookeville. Among them was Lewis Mechen, a government clerk who—not without some difficulty—located a wagon in which he loaded the U.S. Senate’s most valuable documents, including the only copy of the Senate’s quarter-century of executive history and a document that listed the names and positions of all the American military forces.¹²⁸ The evacuees were welcomed by the hospitable Quaker inhabitants, most of whom had put aside the anti-war sentiments that are a testimony of their religious faith, to provide assistance to those in need. As Mrs. Smith accounts,

The streets of this quiet village, which never before witnessed such confusion, are now filled with carriages bringing out citizens, and baggage wagons and troops. Mrs. Bentley’s house is now crowded. She has been the whole evening sitting at the supper table giving refreshment to soldiers and travelers. I suppose every house in the village is equally full. I never saw more benevolent people. ‘It is against our principals’ said she this morning ‘to have anything to do with war but we receive and relieve all who come to us.’ The whole settlement are [sic.] Quakers. The table is just being spread for the fourth or fifth time, more wanderers having just entered.¹²⁹

President Madison arrived in Brookeville during the night on August 26.¹³⁰ Traveling with him was Attorney General Richard Rush, General John T. Mason, State Department Chief Clerk John Graham, their servants and accompanying soldiers. The president eventually found his way to the Bentley residence. It is uncertain whether Madison had intentionally sought out the Bentleys or if it was a matter of happenstance. Sources suggest that as a former Quaker herself, Dolley Madison was already acquainted with Henrietta Bentley. Many of the troops were moving towards Baltimore and it could have been that Brookeville’s location made it a likely spot, being midway between the two cities, along a well-established roadway, and a safe distance from Washington. Needless to say, the Bentleys welcomed President Madison to their home. According to Mrs. Smith’s account,

Just at bed time the Pres[i]d[ent] had arrived and all hands went to work to prepare supper and lodging for him, his companions and guards, [and] beds were spread in the parlour, the house was filled and guards placed round the house during the night. A large troop of [soldiers on] horse[back] likewise arrived and encamp’d for the night beside the mill-wall in a beautiful little plain . . . The tents were scatter’d along the riverlet and the fires they kindled on the ground and the lights within the tents had a beautiful appearance. All the villagers, gentlemen and ladies, young and old, throng’d to see the President. He was tranquil as usual, and tho’ much distressed by the dreadful event, which had taken place, not dispirited.¹³¹

¹²⁸ Pitch, 11.

¹²⁹ Barfield and Koch, 33; Brookville File, Extracts from Margaret B. Smith; Night—10 o’clock.

¹³⁰ Not all the Quaker inhabitants were eager to receive him. Supposedly upon arriving at the first house in town, resident James Pleasants informed the President’s footman, that he would not be disturbed at that time of night by anyone, not even the President of the United States! It was also said that Richard Thomas, a known Federalist, refused the president as well, stating that he had no use for anyone who would carry on a war so distasteful. J. D. Warfield, 859.

¹³¹ Barfield and Koch, 2-3.

As Pitch put it, “The nondescript village of gentle pacificists was quickly transformed by Madison’s presence into a makeshift center of supreme authority.”¹³²

As their granddaughter would later recount from Henrietta Bentley’s stories of those events, she gave up her room, which was the best in the house, for the accommodation of the President.¹³³ The gesture is all the more gracious when knowing that Henrietta was six months pregnant at the time; she slept on the floor in another room with her daughter Mary, then six years of age. Despite the fact that Henrietta had given up her room, the President is said to have sat up all night sending and receiving dispatches. On Saturday morning, Secretary of State James Monroe got word to the president that British had left Washington. They had sailed on to Baltimore, Maryland where they would attack Fort Henry. Madison immediately directed his cabinet to return to Washington. Monroe arrived at the Thomas-Bentley House soon hereafter he and Madison together departed Brookeville at about noon for the burned and looted capital city.¹³⁴ All that remained of the White House were the fire-scorched walls; the Madisons would never live in it again. In fact, Madison also wrote a letter to his wife from the Thomas-Bentley House the prior evening reassuring her that he would find a place for them. As stated in his letter, “I know not where we are in the first instance to hide our heads but shall look for a place on our arrival.”¹³⁵

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: The Thomas-Bentley House is a vernacular expression of Federal period architecture. The exterior of the house displays the symmetry and formality of the prevailing Federal and Georgian styles yet the interior lacks the regularity of plan with which they are associated. Rather than contain the center hall flanked by rooms—either one room deep as seen in the ubiquitous I-house or the more spacious two-cell-deep form—the plan of the main block as originally designed can only be called a variation on the earlier hall-and-parlor type, expanded to contain a separate stair hall to the rear of one of the two principal rooms. Thus there is a certain informality demonstrated by the lack of a separate stair hall that would have served to mediate between the public and private spheres of the house. Unlike the hall-and-parlor plan, however, the Thomas-Bentley house includes flanking service wings that demonstrate a complexity in the use of space unknown to the multi-purpose rooms that constitute the hall-and-parlor type. The house was expanded a only a few decades after its construction, creating more specialized use of space while also increasing its capacity, through the addition of a formal entry, larger dining room, and addition bedchambers.

¹³² Anthony Pitch, *The Burning of Washington: the British Invasion of 1814* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1998), 162.

¹³³ The “best room” was likely the one over what is now the entry hall of the main block of the house. The current master bedroom, located over the original kitchen in the east wing, had not yet been erected, and this room had a fireplace, closet and cupboard, and looked out towards the front of the house with a view of the main street of town.

¹³⁴ Barfield and Koch, 3; Pitch, 163.

¹³⁵ James Madison, letter to Dolley Paine Madison, sent from Brookeville, 27 August, 1814. The James Madison Papers, Manuscripts Collection, Library of Congress (available online <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mjm&fileName=16/mjm16.db&recNum6...>)

The Thomas-Bentley House is also notable for its elegantly understated decorative elements executed in the Federal style, most pronounced on the interior. The exterior elements characteristic of Federal and Georgian architecture include its symmetry as originally designed, with a main block with a central entryway, and flanking one-story wings. Most noteworthy of the exterior details is the principal doorway that, while without a pediment or an entablature, includes paneled reveals and transom light surrounding by decorative gougework, and the original twelve-over-twelve light sash windows (twelve-over-eight-light on the upper stories) with jack-arch lintels (nine-over-six-light sash in the wings). The twelve-over-twelve-light windows and the Flemish-bond brick pattern are elements of eighteenth century architectural forms, which were often replaced during the nineteenth century by more popular six-over-six-light windows and common-bond brick. The interior elements of note include finely executed mantels, chair rail, three-part architrave window and door surrounds, paneled reveals, and paneled cabinets. The two formal rooms and the two best bedchambers include fireplaces with ornamental mantels and built-in cabinetry.

There are also numerous elements of a more utilitarian nature that add a certain refinement to the house including closets with hooked pegs for hanging clothing; similar pegged boards appear in the first-floor stair hall and in the current kitchen (apparently moved from the original kitchen). Two plain inset shelves appear to the side of the original dining room mantel, and there is a caged pantry in the basement for the safekeeping of valuable foodstuffs.

2. Condition of fabric: The Madison House has been carefully rehabilitated by the current owners and is in excellent condition.

B. Description of Exterior:

1. Overall dimensions: The main block is two-and-a-half stories high and three bays across, measuring 22' x 44', and is flanked by wings that are set at a slightly lower elevation. The wings were part of the original design and are integral with the main block as evidenced by the lack of seams in the brickwork between the various sections. While the wings were erected as a single story each, creating a balanced design, the west wing that housed the kitchen was later raised to a full two-and-a-half stories (seams in brick work are visible), meeting the roofline of the elevated main block. The west or original kitchen wing measures 22' x 22' and the east or old store section measures 20' x 35'. A one-and-a-half story kitchen ell was later added to the north rear of the original kitchen wing, measuring 14' x 16', with a single story wood house set perpendicular and to the west of it.

2. Foundations: The house sits on a stone foundation that is visible from inside the basement where the transition from stone to the brick of the outer walls is evident, and stone slabs form sills for the window openings.

3. Walls: The walls of the main block and the original flanking wings are of Flemish bond brick. The addition of a second and third story to the west wing was executed in common bond in a pattern of three-to-one. There is a simple water table along the front and rear façades.

4. Structural systems, framing: The house is of timber framing and load-bearing masonry construction. The framing consists of summer beams that are visible in the cellars of the main

block and the east wing (there is no basement under the west wing for viewing the beams assumed to be present) and in the ceiling of the east wing where they have been left exposed. Joists are set perpendicular and held by mortise and tenon. The timbers appear to have been flat sawn.

5. Porches, stoops: At the front entrance to the house is a brick stoop. The steps descend in either direction and there is an iron railing across the front. The stoop is not original although it is likely that there was a stoop here at the time the house was built. The original may have resembled the simple stone steps still found at the front entry into the warehouse/store section. During the early twentieth century, a porch covered the central portion of the front façade, and before it there was an entrance portico with a gable front roof supported by pairs of squared posts that also supported benches that flanked the front door.¹³⁶ According to the current owner, Sandra Heiler, the porch was added in 1913 and was removed in the 1960s. There is also porch located along the rear elevation. Rather than the traditional elevated wood floor, this porch covers a brick floor laid in the 1960s, retaining the roof of the original porch.

6. Chimneys: There is an interior brick chimney at each gable end of the main block, simply ornamented by two belt courses. An exterior brick chimney is located at the gable end of the storehouse section, which was rebuilt in the same location as the original in the 1960s and supported by a cinderblock foundation visible in the cellar. A similar, flanking chimney was once located in the opposing wing, built as the kitchen (now dining room). These flanking chimneys were originally built of stone with free-standing brick stacks (as seen at a neighboring house down the street that was also said to have been built by Richard Thomas, Jr.).¹³⁷ There is also a chimney in the gable end of the rear kitchen ell.

7. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The principal entry was originally located to the center of the three bays of the front façade, but was later moved to the western bay. The doorway is inset with (three) paneled reveals that correspond in placement to those of the six-panel door. There is a transom above, and the rail that separates the doorway from the transom is ornamented with gougework. The doorway has a jack arch lintel. An identical rear doorway and door appears opposite the original location of the front doorway (now a window).

Doorways were also originally located at the front elevation of both flanking wings. The front doorway into the kitchen wing has been infilled with brick, as has a former doorway to the southwest side elevation that once entered into a hall to the rear of the kitchen. The front doorway to the western wing remains. Also intact is the heavy, vertical plank door reinforced on the inside with diagonally laid beaded boards held with rosehead nails. A six-light window was later cut into the upper section of the door. There is also a doorway to the southeastern side of the storehouse to the rear of the chimney, as well as a doorway from the rear kitchen ell onto the porch (with a door built to resemble that of the front

¹³⁶ An image of this portico appears in Warfield's 1895 article in the *American Historical Register*, p.858. The later porch covered the front entry and extended to east to cover the first window of the parlor and equal distance to the west, ending before the windows in the wing.

¹³⁷ Interview with Sandra Heiler. Reference, again, is to 198 Market Street.

entry of the storehouse), and from the front of the newly restored pantry at the southwestern side.

b. Windows and shutters: The windows are original and include twelve-over-twelve-light sash in the first story of the main block, and twelve-over-eight-light sash in the second story, and six-light casement window in the gable ends of the upper story. The windows in both wings are nine-over-six-light sash. The exceptions are the new window located at the southwest side elevation in the location of the former chimney (two-over-two-light sash), a multi-light paired casement window that replaced the original in the stair hall on the first floor, and those six-light casements located in the gable end of the storehouse. Like the doorways, the windows have jack arch lintels. The windows include louvered shutters held by shutter dogs (excluding the side elevations). The shutters on the front and rear of the old store house are double thickness held with rosehead nails and closed with iron bars and are probably original.

8. Roof:

a. Shape, covering: All sections of the house have gable roofs covered with raised-seam metal.

b. Cornice, eaves: There is a simple boxed cornice to the front and rear elevations and a plain raking molding, slightly flared at the base, runs along the gable ends.

C. Description of Interior:

1. Floor plans: The main block currently consists of a large parlor with a small adjoining room, now used as an entry hall, to the rear of which is located a stair hall. The second floor follows a similar plan, with a stair hall and three rooms. What was originally considered the best bedchamber sits above the current entry hall and two bedchambers sit above the parlor (the one to the back of the house is now used as a bathroom). The third floor is finished with plaster and sectioned off by boarded partition walls into two rooms and a stair hall. The basement is unfinished, revealing the large summer beam and perpendicular floor joist of the structural system. The members appear to be pit sawn and are held by mortise and tenon. An interesting feature of the basement is a caged pantry area for the safe storage of valuable foodstuffs.

The main block is flanked by wings. The storehouse wing to the eastern end is a single story with a loft above that was formerly accessed by a stairway (since removed) located along the inside wall near the front entrance. The area where the stair was once located, and extending to the rear of the wing, now serves as a powder room and passage from the main block, where one originally did not exist. There is a full basement under the main block that was once lit by windows to the front and rear (now covered over). There is a full basement under the storehouse section accessible via a bulkhead from the outside, originally accessed by a trap door in the floor.

The original kitchen wing, now the dining room, was built as a single story as well, but was later raised to the full height of the main block. While the wing is of the same height as the main block from the exterior, floor levels of the rooms in this wing—like the storehouse wing to the other side—sit at a slightly lower level. Moving from the wing into the main block thus requires taking

a few steps upward from the dining room and upward from the stair landing into the bedchambers on the second and third levels. Above the dining room is the master bedroom. A master bathroom has been added over the rear kitchen wing that is accessed via a descending stair from the bedroom. Above the master bedroom is another bedroom with ceilings that rise to the full height of the roof. To the rear of the dining room is located a later kitchen ell, and from it, a newly reconstructed pantry section to replace an earlier room of similar size and configuration. There is a crawlspace beneath the original kitchen wing visible/accessible from the basement of the main block. From this vantage point can be seen a stone wall that likely provided support for the former wall that separated the original kitchen from a rear hall.

2. Stairways: An elegantly understated stairway runs from the first to the third floor of the main block. Each section includes a straight run to a landing from which the upper stories of the east side can be accessed via a few steps upward. The stairway then turns 180 degrees and continues in a shorter run to the next level. It is a closed string stair with a plain, squared balustrade and simple turned newel posts with a descending newel and pendant at the upper stories. The balustrade is flanked by a shadow railing that runs along the outside wall. An interesting feature of the shadow railing is the section of balustrade that runs to the front of the window that lights the stair on the second floor (it was removed from the first floor during the twentieth century to provide egress onto the porch via a new casement window). The wall along the stairway on the first floor is paneled and there is a stairway to the basement beneath it. A simple, plank stairway (without balustrade) runs from the first floor to the unfinished basement.

3. Flooring: Original heart-pine flooring is found throughout (the wood flooring in the kitchen is old, salvaged wood intended to resemble that found elsewhere in the house). Remnants of brick flooring were discovered during the recent kitchen remodeling, along it was probably laid by the Archers in the 1960s, as Calvin Musgrove, who lived there in the 1940s and 1950s, remembered the flooring in the kitchen as linoleum over wood.

4. Wall and ceiling finish: The walls and ceilings are of lath and plaster. The lath, visible in parts of the third story, appears to have been hand split. The exceptions to lath and plaster are the vertical board partition walls located in the third story of the main block. Evidence of early paint suggests that all the walls in the main block were painted and/or whitewashed white, and that the wood trim was painted light khaki beige with maroon baseboards (the trim in the storeroom was Spanish (dark red-ish) brown). These colors have been repeated in the recent rehabilitation of the house. The only evidence of varying wall treatment, paint colors or wallpaper, was in the kitchen ell and the small bedchamber of the main block, which appear to have been painted jade green. The Archers applied wallpaper to the dining room and the “cook’s room” over the kitchen ell (since removed).¹³⁸ There is no ornamental plasterwork or cornice in the house. A wood chair rail, however, appears throughout the main block, on both the first and second story rooms and in the stair hall. It is located at the height of the window sills and is integral to them. Pegged boards for hanging coats appear in the first floor stair hall, kitchen, and in the closets in the main block.

¹³⁸ Information regarding the wall treatment comes from Sandra Heiler, electronic correspondence, 24 January 2012, and was determined by investigating areas such as the interior of cabinets and removing paint from trim and other areas. It is interesting to speculate that the Quaker heritage of the early owners of the house and their adherence to the simplicity tenet may have prevented them from using colored paint or wallpaper. White is consistently used as the color treatment in Quaker meeting house, if not for the sake of simplicity, because it is effective in reflecting natural light and is therefore the practical choice.

5. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The doorways in the principle rooms of the main block include a three-part architrave surround (to include, moving from the inside out, a return or three-quarter bead, band, larger band, cavetto mold followed by a quirked or recessed bead and a outer fillet). The door surrounds in the stair hall, around the door that leads from the original kitchen into the original dining room in the main block, and on the second floor of the main block are similar, but much simpler, two-part arrangement (consisting of a three-quarter bead, wide band, and quirked cavetto with outer fillet). On the third floor, the surrounds consist of the back band without the larger, plain surround. The surrounds in the former shop are simpler yet, with a narrower wood piece and squared back band. The doors are six-panel, cross-and-open bible style. There is original hardware on the door on the first floor of the stair hall. It consists of an iron box lock on stairway side of the door with a small, slightly oblong, hollow brass knob and keyhole on the parlor side. (Currently there are no doors in the doorways between the entry hall and the stair hall, or between the entry hall and the parlor.) The second period surrounds that appear in the second and third floor chambers above the dining room, and in the doorway between the dining room and the kitchen ell are a somewhat condense version of the first period surrounds (consisting of a fillet or narrow band, quirked cyma reversa, narrow fillet and then a fillet that is set back). The antique-looking door in the kitchen doorway that leads to the back porch was built by the current owner, Duane Heiler.

b. Windows: The window surrounds follow the same basic pattern as the doorways. The windows in the main block are recessed; the window reveals are paneled, with the exception is the window frame that used to house the front doorway, a further indication of that change.

6. Decorative features and trim: The house as originally constructed had fireplaces in every room on the first and second stories with the exception of the back bed chamber on the second floor of the main block, and the third floor spaces; the added rooms above the original kitchen do not appear to have had fireplaces. As to be expected, the mantels are most decorative in the original parlor and dining room where they are flanked by simple pilasters and have a five-part panel arrangement with gougework below the mantel shelf. There is a cast-iron insert in the former dining room. The mantels on the second floor of the main block are simpler, lacking the five-part arrangement and there are dentils in the mantel of the best bed chamber and reeding in that of the second chamber, where there was gougework on those of the first floor. The fireplace was removed from the original kitchen wing and rebuilt in the shop wing. The mantel there is a reproduction of one found at the Hammond-Harwood House in Annapolis with a shouldered bolection molding.

7. Cabinets: The cabinetry is among the finer interior details. Cabinets are found in the parlor and (original) dining room and in the two bed chambers to the front of the house in the main block. Floor-to-ceiling corner cabinets are located to the east wall of the parlor. The surrounds match those of the windows and they are in fact aligned with the windows on the perpendicular walls to create an open-book effect. There are cabinets with paired doors below the chair rail, with taller cabinets with scalloped shelves above. All the cabinet doors are paneled with a

molded outer profile. The cabinet in the dining room is not a corner cabinet and is without the scalloped-shaped shelves, but otherwise resembles those found in the parlor. It is located to the north side of the fireplace; to the east are two simple corner shelf built into the wall, one resting on the top of the chair rail and the other about a foot below. The cabinets located in the upstairs chambers are located to one side of the fireplace (towards the front, outside wall). Well-crafted corner cabinets can also be found in the “new” dining room, although they were recently constructed by the current owner, Duane Heiler and his son Chris Heiler. The Heilers also built cabinets in period appropriate style in the kitchen and in the newly constructed pantry addition.

8. Mechanical equipment:

a. Heating: Central heating was added to the house after its purchase by Archers in 1958. A 1952 inventory of the household effects of the previous owner included a Coleman oil heater, perhaps indicating the primary means of heat at that time, beyond that provided by the fireplaces.¹³⁹

b. Lighting: Although not original to the house, period appropriate light fixtures have been added to many of the rooms by the current owners. The parlor has a brass chandelier with glass globes and matching, flanking sconces appear over the mantel and near the doorway into the dining room.

c. Plumbing: Plumbing was also added to the house after 1958. Prior to that, water was supplied via a hand pump near the back door.

D. Site:

1. Historic landscape design: The Thomas-Bentley House sits on an elevated location just above Market Street, the main thoroughfare through the town of Brookeville, which is a designated by the National Register and Montgomery County as a historic district. The house was built by the founders of the town, Richard and Deborah Thomas, and predates its establishment in 1800. It is likely the earliest extant house in Brookeville, located on the western edge, overlooking the Reedy Branch of the Hawlings River and the ruins of Richard Thomas’s former grist mill.¹⁴⁰ The land upon which Brookeville was established was part of Deborah Brooke Thomas’s inheritance from her father, Roger Brooke, for 248 acres of a tract referred to as “Addition to Brooke Grove.” As originally laid out, Brookeville included fifty-six lots. Market Street is bisected by North, South, North High (renamed Water), and Race streets. A boxwood hedgerow flanks the path to the front entrance and there is a nearly 200-year-old holly tree in the front near to where the main block meets the store wing.¹⁴¹ Old-growth boxwood can also be found along the current picket fence line that runs between the smokehouse and the house.

¹³⁹ See footnote #5.

¹⁴⁰ There are two small vernacular frame houses that also appear quite old. One is located across from the former Thomas Mill site and was occupied by Richard and Deborah Thomas’s son Roger, and was likely built by Thomas. The second is that the other end of town. It is of log construction and is banked into the hillside. The stone house, referred to as the Miller’s House, is also likely among the early houses, although it is much altered.

¹⁴¹ A core test done in 1976 indicated that the holly tree was then 156 years old. “House now for sale was seat of U.S. Government for 2 days,” *Montgomery County Journal*, (date unknown); SSM “Madison House” file.

2. Outbuildings: The only extant outbuilding that is still part of this property is a log smoke house that sits to the southeast of the house. The exterior of the smoke house is covered with wide plank siding laid vertically and has a steeply pitched roof covered by raised-seam metal. The insurance policies dating from 1902 and 1909 indicate that a one-and-a-half story barn, measuring 18' x 38' stood sixty years north of the house. A shed is also listed, which may actually be a structure later referred to as a carriage house/garage that was erected adjacent to the old store wing, which was later removed by the Archers. The old stone miller's house was purchased by previous owners and thus associated with the property from 1911 to 1980.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Early views:

Photographic image of the "Thomas House, Brookeville" (frame house formerly located on Lot #40, date unknown); SSM 2005.0002.0032.

"Residence of Caleb Bentley" appearing in Warfield, J. D. "President Madison's Retreat," *The American Historical Register* (May 1895): 857-861. (Shows house with front portico.)

Watercolor image of the Thomas Mill with what is likely the Thomas House (Lot #40) in the background, Brookeville (date unknown); SSM 1984.0035.0004.

B. Interviews:

Sandra Heiler, current owner, interview with author at the Thomas-Bentley House, 9 November 2010.

C. Bibliography:

1. Primary Sources:

Madison, James. Letter to Dolley Paine Madison, sent from Brookeville, 27 August, 1814. The James Madison Papers, Manuscripts Collection, Library of Congress.

Montgomery County, Land Records, Deeds, Montgomery County Court House, Rockville, Maryland and online via Maryland State Archives (hereafter referred to as MSA), MDLandRec.net.

Montgomery County, Register of Wills; Wills, Inventories, and Probate Records, Montgomery County Court House, Rockville, Maryland.

Montgomery County, Tax Assessment Records, 1790-1860, Montgomery County Historical Society Library, Rockville, Maryland (hereafter referred to as MCHS); and available on microfilm at MSA.

“People, Places and Pot-pourri: Some Items of Interest from Some Montgomery County 19th Century Newspaper, abstracts compiled by Marian Water Jacobs & Mary Gordon Malloy, July 1988, MCHS.

U. S. Census Records, Montgomery County, Maryland, 1783-1920, available on microfilm at the MSA, and online at: <http://ftp.uscensus.org/pub/usgenweb/census/md/montgomery>.

Records of the Sandy Spring Museum & Library:

Bentley Family Records, as compiled by Edith Helen Bentley Lea (Date, ca. 1904?), Vertical File Bentley Family, Sandy Spring Museum Library.

“Bentley, Caleb,” Sandy Spring Museum Library, Vertical File.

“Brookeville People,” Sandy Spring Museum Library, Card File.

Thomas Moore, letter to Isaac Briggs, 13 July 1818, SSM “Diaries & Memoirs,” Letters volume.

2. Secondary Sources:

Barfield, Jean and Alice Koch, “Madison House, Seat of Government for a Day,” *The Montgomery County Story*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (November 1982), 1-11.

Boyd, Thomas H.S. *The History of Montgomery County Maryland: from its Earliest Settlement in 1650 to 1879*. Baltimore: W.K. Boyle and Son, Printers, 1879.

Bushman, Richard L. *The Refinement of America; Persons, Houses, Cities*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Canby, Thomas Y., editor. *Sandy Spring Legacy*. Sandy Spring, MD: Sandy Spring Museum, 1999.

Ellis, Clifton. “Dissenting Faith and Domestic Landscape in Eighteenth-Century Virginia,” *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 7 (1997), 23-40.

Farquhar, Roger B. “Brookeville Home Sheltered President Madison in 1814,” *The Record of Montgomery County*, 30 September 1949.

Ibid. *Old Homes and History of Montgomery County, Maryland*. Brookeville: American History Research Associates, 1952.

Farquhar, William Henry. *Annals of Sandy Spring, Twenty Years History of a Rural Community in Maryland*, 2nd ed. Cottonport, Louisiana: Polyanthus, Inc. 1971 (original Baltimore: Cushings & Baily, 1884).

Foster, Emily. *American Grit, A Woman’s Letters from the Ohio Frontier, by Anna Briggs Bentley*. Lexington: University of Kentucky, 2002.

Gardner, Mary L., ed. *The Book of Names; A Genealogical Record of a Community*. Brookeville: Town of Brookeville, 1994.

Garrett, Elizabeth Donaghy. *At Home: The American Family, 1750 to 1870*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1990.

Herman, Bernard. "The Model Farmer and the Organization of the Countryside." In *Everyday Life in the Early Republic*, Catherine E. Hutchins, ed. Winterthur, Delaware: Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1994.

Hopkins, Griffith Morgan. *Atlas of Montgomery County, Maryland, 1879*, reprinted Montgomery County Historical Society, 1975.

Hutchins, Catherine E., ed. *Everyday Life in the Early Republic*. Winterthur, Delaware: Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1994.

Kirk, Annie B. *Annals of Sandy Spring: Twenty Years History of a Rural Community in Maryland*, Vol. VI, Random Lake, Wisconsin: Times Printing Company, 1929.

Lanier, Gabrielle M. and Bernard L. Herman. *Everyday Architecture of the Mid-Atlantic*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Larkin, Jack. "From 'County Mediocrity' to 'Rural Improvement': Transforming the Slovenly Countryside in Central Massachusetts, 1775-1840." In Hutchins, Catherine E., ed. *Everyday Life in the Early Republic*. Winterthur, Delaware: Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1994.

Martenet & Bond's Map of Montgomery County, Maryland, from actual surveys by S.J. Martenet & assistants; drawn and published by Simon J. Martenet, 1865.

Maryland Historical Trust, Inventory Form for State Historic Sites, Brookeville Historic District, Brookeville, Maryland, Site #M-23-65, prepared by Julie Shipe, Sylvia Nash, and Candace Reed, 1978.

Ibid, Madison House, Brookeville, Maryland, Site #M-23-65-2, prepared by Jean Barfield, 1979.

Miller, Marla R. "Labor and Liberty in the Age of Refinement: Gender, Class, and the Built Environment," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 10 (2005): 15-31.

Miller, Rebecca T. *Annals of Sandy Spring*, Vol. III. King Brothers, 1909.

Moore, Eliza N. *Annals of Sandy Spring*, Vol. II. Baltimore: Thomas & Evans, 1902.

National Register of Historic Places, Brookeville Historic District, Brookeville, Maryland, Site #1605705329; prepared by Julie Shipe, Sylvia Nash, and Candace Reed, 1978.

Nesbitt, Martha and Mary Reading Miller, et al. *Chronicles of Sandy Spring Friends Meeting and Environs*. Sandy Spring, Maryland: Sandy Spring Monthly Meeting, 1987.

Nylander, Jane C. *Our Own Sung Fireside*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Peden, Henry C., Jr. *Quaker Records of Southern Maryland, Births, Deaths, marriages from the Minutes, 1658-1800*. U.S.: Family Line Publications, 1992.

Pitch, Anthony S. "The Burning of Washington," *White House History* (Fall 1998): 6-17.

Ibid. *The Burning of Washington: the British Invasion of 1814*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1998.

Rifkind, Carole. *A Field Guide To American Architecture*. New York: Bonanza Books, 1980.

Schairer, Monica. "Questors are in Search of Madison," *Montgomery County Courier*, 30 January 1980 (SSM, "Madison House" file).

Ibid. "Nita Archer pioneered at Madison House," *Montgomery County Courier*, 30 January 1980 (SSM, "Madison House" file).

Scharf, J. Thomas. *History of Western Maryland, Vol I*. Baltimore: Regional Publishing Company, 1968.

Thomas, Lawrence Buckley. *The Thomas Book: Giving the Genealogies of Sir Rhys ap Thomas, K.G.* New York: Henry T. Thomas Company, 1896.

Warfield, J. D. "President Madison's Retreat," *The American Historical Register* (May 1895): 857-861.

Wenger, Mark R. "The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 2 (1986): 137-149.

Ibid. "The Dining Room in Early Virginia," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 3 (1989): 149-159.

PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

The documentation of the Thomas-Bentley House was undertaken in 2010-2011 by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) of the Heritage Documentation Programs (HDP), National Park Service, Catherine C. Lavoie, Chief, HABS; and Richard O'Connor, Chief, HDP. The large-format photographs were taken by James Rosenthal, HABS photographer; and the historical report was written by Catherine C. Lavoie. Special thanks to the current owners, Duane and Sandra Heiler, for their cooperation.

THOMAS-BENTLEY HOUSE
(Madison House)
HABS No. MD-1375 (page 51)

Figure #1: Watercolor view of Thomas's Mill, Brookeville, Maryland, with what was likely the Thomas House in the background, to left side of image (date unknown). Sandy Spring Museum Archives, SSM 1984.0035.0004.



THOMAS-BENTLEY HOUSE
(Madison House)
HABS No. MD-1375 (page 52)

Figure #2: Photographic image of the “Thomas House, Brookeville,” frame house formerly located on Lot #40, date unknown; Sandy Spring Museum Archives, SSM 2005.0002.0032.



Figure #3:

THOMAS-BENTLEY HOUSE
(Madison House)
HABS No. MD-1375 (page 54)

Figure: First period molding profile, main block, doorway in entry hall (former dining room); same as in parlor.



Figure : First period molding profile, main block, stair hall (service area); same as in second floor of main block, including bedchambers and stair hall.



THOMAS-BENTLEY HOUSE
(Madison House)
HABS No. MD-1375 (page 56)

Figure : Second period molding profile; second floor, bedchamber in west wing, over original kitchen (now dining room); same as in bedchamber above in third floor, and in doorway between original and current kitchen (ell).



Figure: Molding profile in third story, main block.

