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ABSTRACT

This thesis represents the assembly of physical architectural analysis, archival investigation, and the study of the work of previous historians on the subject of the main house at Medway Plantation. Medway is a property whose origins can be traced back to the seventeenth century. Since then, it has changed form many times. A great amount of research has been conducted on Medway by historians, both amateur and professional. Few, however, if any have ever been able to study Medway with the stucco removed from the exterior and walls and floors exposed on the inside.

This was the impetus for researching Medway as a thesis topic. In 2012 after Medway was purchased by its current owner, it underwent a large-scale restoration. The work included removing a majority of the stucco from the building and interior finishes to assess the integrity of the structure and to make necessary upgrades to mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems. Exposing the “bones” of the structure provided the opportunity to study Medway holistically and see it in a way it had not been previously seen, maybe ever.

When the investigation was finalized, a more complete understanding of Medway’s structural evolution became apparent. Medway’s history is presented chronologically throughout the chapters in this thesis. In the end, there are four major building phases that are identified and discussed as effecting the overall structure of Medway, while a fifth phase describes the more recent period of minor, mostly aesthetic, changes.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND CURRENT CONDITIONS

Introduction

How do you interpret a building that is more than 300 years old, has had more owners than can be counted on two hands, with a floor plan that is anything but typical, and whose “bones” are covered by plaster and stucco? The short answer is, not easily. The longer answer is by archival research, pouring over the work of previous historians, and examining the structure in its most revealed state in recent history – a unique opportunity made possible by the current owner’s ambitious restoration project.

Medway Plantation, in Mount Holly, South Carolina, is the subject of this thesis. It was built in 1691 by an early settler of the King’s colony in Carolina, but the oldest extant walls were laid in 1705. Subsequent owners transformed Medway time and time again. What stands today near the banks of the Back River is a nearly intact architectural record representing three centuries of changes. Fortunately for the sake of its architectural history, most of the additions to Medway were made with sensitivity to the earlier historic fabric.

The intent of this thesis is to document the structural evolution of the house at Medway Plantation. This has been attempted several times in the past. Though previous researchers’ findings were invaluable to this work, none of the earlier historians had been able to see Medway holistically as was the case during the preparation of this thesis.
In 2012, Medway was purchased by its current owner, who undertook a large-scale restoration of the building. Part of the work included removing the majority of the stucco from the exterior, exposing bricks and mortar that had not been seen in a century or more. Studying the bricks, mortar and their bond patterns provided evidence to support distinctions in building campaigns and to put them in historical context. On the interior, structural repairs were required in areas that were previously concealed in addition to upgrades to the building’s mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems and finish work. Similar to the exposure of bricks on the exterior, structural clues to the building’s evolution were found in these previously unexposed areas.

In some cases, information gleaned from the structural analysis of Medway could be confirmed by documentary evidence of construction records found during archival research. In other cases, clues discovered by the physical investigation are supported by larger trends in building construction locally and regionally. It is important to understand that the information presented in this thesis is the author’s interpretation of the structural and stylistic evolution of Medway.

To support the writing and help with readers’ understanding of this thesis, conjectural drawings of the building in each of the identified construction phases have been included. Much of the work on the measured drawings of the existing building at Medway was completed by two International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) interns working for the Historic Charleston Foundation in summer 2012, Mr. Mesut Dinler and Ms. Fabiana Yambay. Similarly, Mr. Larry Leake, an employee of
Richard Marks Restorations, Inc., contributed greatly to some of the drawings included in this thesis. Their contributions are much appreciated.

It should be noted that the drawings included in this thesis are not considered final. At the time this thesis was written, the drawings started by the ICOMOS interns were still in progress. Once completed, they will be submitted to the Historic American Buildings Survey, or HABS. The anticipated submission date is summer 2013.

As a tool to guide readers through this thesis, the following list introduces the key figures who have shaped Medway’s physical appearance in chronological order.

- Thomas Smith purchased the land on which Medway was built in 1685. He built a brick building there circa 1691.
- Edward Hyrne greatly changed the shape of Medway following a devastating fire in 1704. The building that he built in 1705 is the oldest remaining portion of Medway today.
- Peter Gaillard Stoney expanded the footprint of Medway in 1835 by adding a stair tower to the east. He also added another level to the house at this time.
- Again, Peter Gaillard Stoney added to Medway; this time, with a large, asymmetrical wing on the west in 1855.
- Sidney and Gertrude Legendre purchased the property in 1930 and made mostly interior changes to the building.
- The current owner bought Medway in 2012 and funded a large-scale restoration of the building, making very few changes to the overall structure.
Current Conditions

Medway Road off US-52 just north of the town of Goose Creek, South Carolina, crosses the railroad tracks, passes Allstate Crane Rental, a small one-story house neighborhood, and a sign that says “End of State Maintenance,” and approaches a curiously heavy-duty metal bridge over a relatively small creek. The ruts in the dirt road begin to get deeper the farther one goes. Ahead are a gate and a small log cabin to the left. On the other side of the gate, farther down, a sign reads “Medway: Circa 1686.” Eventually the road reaches a fork: a sign indicates the right fork is for guests and the left fork for service vehicles and deliveries. Taking the left fork, the road continues to be rutted and has muddy trails leading off in different directions. A log truck pulls off the road, yielding to the oncoming car. Its load is evidence of the modern day Medway’s commercial enterprise – in stark contrast to the crop-based agricultural system that built the plantation. Continuing along, the road takes a hard right while a less traveled road to the left indicates the entrance to the old Pine Grove Plantation. Finally, the road passes a couple of modest houses and some barns. The sand and gravel turns to finer pea-gravel and smooth stone. Unlike the bush-hogged road banks, the grass flanking this section of road is manicured with precise mowers and clippers by an attentive staff. A peach-colored mass of a wall peaks through the leaves of a live oak tree, signaling one’s arrival at Medway.

Medway was not always a pine tree plantation. In years past its primary purposes included growing rice and making bricks; but changing market demand, climate, and
mechanization altered the landscape significantly, especially in the 20th century. Today, Medway Plantation covers nearly 7,000 acres, about 4,500 acres more than it was for most of its 320-plus year history. It is used by its current owners and guests as it was by the previous ones. Medway is a privately operated pine tree farm and hunting preserve. An easement placed on the deed in December, 1991, protects the land and buildings that make up the eighty-two-and-one-half acres of Medway Plantation’s core.¹

Most of the land is timbered though some of the lower land is swampy, particularly near the large pond a few hundred yards south of the main house. Prioleau Creek, which connects the pond to the Back River, is also surrounded by low, swampy ground mostly covered in scrub brush.

The conditions of the house following the 2012 restoration work reflect its current use. The drawings of the existing floor plans, however, were completed prior to the restoration. They are suitable for use in the discussion of the current conditions and as a room key because there were no significant structural changes made during the 2012 work. For discussion purposes, the walls and openings on the drawings are accurate representations of the rooms after the restoration.

Figure 1.1. Overview Map of Medway Plantation, Mount Holly, South Carolina. Image from Google®
Figure 1.2. Core Grounds of Medway Plantation. Image from Google®
Architectural Description: Exterior Overview

The landscape and uses of Medway have transformed several times since it was first built, and correspondingly the shape and function of the house has changed. Looking at the house’s bulky, asymmetrical floor plan now yields no clue that it originally was a long, narrow rectangle, a footprint somewhat contrary to Lowcountry vernacular architectural styles. For the purpose of this architectural description there are three sections of the house: west wing, east wing, and the original, or central, portion.

The main house at Medway Plantation, or Medway, is a three-story brick structure with an asymmetrical floor plan as a result of multiple periods of construction. The exterior is covered with stucco except for the west wing, which is brick painted the same color as the rest of the exterior. The east wing contains the stair tower, which is three stories and is flanked to the north and south by matching one-story rooms. The north room serves as the kitchen and the south room is the gun room. Chimneys – five in all – rise out of the gables on the north and south end of the central portion of the house, the north side of the west wing, and the kitchen and parlor on the east side.

The building’s principal entrance is on the east, at the top of a brick stoop. A wooded door with six raised panels is flanked by side lights with circular and elliptical muntins and topped by a fanlight. The brick arch above the door and fanlight is the only area of un-stuccoed bricks on the east elevation. A secondary entrance is off the southwest patio, into the stair hall between the west wing and the original portion of the house. This door contains four raised panels and a four-pane transom light. Other
entrances include a set of French doors leading from the patio into the library on the first floor and a door from the pantry to a stoop on the north side, directly above a door accessing the cellar.

The north and south gables of the three-story portion of the house and the west wing gable have Dutch-style, stepped parapet walls. The north and south gables have six steps over a stuccoed belt course in the pediment where the roof meets the wall, while the west gable has only four steps. The west wing gable’s belt course is a series of three layers of corbelled bricks, stepped out with each ascending layer. The gable on the east stair tower is different; it is characterized by two pointed spires on each end with a slightly higher point in the center above a stuccoed belt course. Regular sloping gables show the roofline of the one-story flanker wings that flank the east side.

The original portion of the building has a full cellar, while a mechanical room was excavated in the 1930s under the kitchen wing. The cellar also serves as additional, dry storage area for the house.

Appendix D contains an architectural description and photographs of each room.
Exterior Photos (starting on the north and moving clockwise around the building).

Photos courtesy of Richard Marks Restorations.
CHAPTER II

“...THE BEST BRICK-HOUSE IN ALL THE COUNTRY.”

Earliest history through 1701

The title of this chapter is taken from a letter written by Edward Hyrne in 1701 to his brother-in-law, Burrell Massingbred, after the former’s recent purchase of a plantation on the Back River in Goose Creek. In that letter Hyrne writes of acquiring “2,550 acres of land whereof 200 clear’d and most fenc’d in tho wants repairing; 150 Head of Cattle, 4 horses, an Indian Slave, almost a Man, a few Hogs, some Householder stuff, and the best Brick-house in all the Country; built about 9 years ago, and cost £700, 80 Foot long, 26 broad. Cellar’d throughout.”

The content of this chapter, however, is not concerned with Mr. Hyrne. Rather, it explores the origins of the main house at Medway, a rather complicated subject. Early researchers contend that Medway was owned and built by a Dutchman, John D’Arsens, around 1686. More recent findings, however, credit Englishman Thomas Smith with laying the first bricks. The information presented in this chapter is derived from research writings, historical plats and maps, and physical investigation on-site at Medway Plantation.

---

2 Edward Hyrne, Charles Towne, to Burrell Massingbred, Jan 19, 1701/2, Massingbred Mundy Deposit, Lincoln, England, UK, M 21/7
John D’Arsens, whose name is spelled at least six different ways in research documents, led a group of colonists from Holland to the Carolinas in or about 1686. The Lords Proprietors of Carolina issued an instruction to Carolina Governor Colleton to grant land to D’Arsens on October 29, 1686. The instruction was worded as follows:

“Mr. John D’Arsens seigneur of Wernhaut being a Person of Quality and the First of his Nation that hath undertaken to Plant in our Province of Carolina…Have thought fitt and doth hereby Require you to order the Surveyor Generall to admeasure out such a Quantity of Land for the said Mr. D’Arsens as he shall desire not exceeding Twelve Thousand Acres…And alsoe We Will That (when he shall desire it) The Lands be erected into a Manor with all the Priviledges of a Barony.”

Mr. D’Arsens arrived in the Carolinas sometime in early 1687 most likely. On July 3rd of that year, his wife, Sabina de Vignon, wrote to Carolina Governor Colleton to request that she be granted proper administration of the estate as her husband had recently passed away. John D’Arsens, then, in a span of just over eight months was granted 12,000 acres of land in the Carolinas to be laid out somewhere in Saint James Goose Creek Parish, traveled to America, and died. Given the time requisite to construct a dwelling in the seventeenth century, it is unlikely that John D’Arsens would have been able to build a house during that eight-month period, let alone a large brick building measuring some 80’ feet north-to-south.

---

4 Court of Ordinary, 1672-1692, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 290. From Salley, A.S., *The House at Medway*, The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Vol 33, No. 3 (July 1932), 245-246
Further complicating this is the fact that when he died, John D’Arsens left a rather large inventory of items, many indicating that he held a substantial household. Thomas Smith, James Barbott and Abraham Barbott completed the inventory of the Dutchman’s personal property, and it was recorded by the Secretary of the Province, records of which are located at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History in Columbia, South Carolina (Administration Bond, Records of the Secretary of the Province (1675-95), page 290). Mr. Smith and Mistres Barbott noted that in his possession,

“…besides the fine household items, D’Arsens bought large quantities of cotton, duffills, broadcloth, and serge. Knives, scissors and looking glasses were listed by the dozens. Bedding, blankets and buttons were big items on the inventory list. The Indian trade was anticipated with 116 pounds of beads. He brought building supplies, a whip saw, hinges and hooks. The Dutchman’s own wearing apparel was appraised at 30 pounds, a handsome sum. Also listed were nine cows, fourteen plush chairs and a pearl necklace valued at six pounds.”

One possible explanation for John D’Arsens’ large inventory is when he arrived he settled on land with an existing house. If this were the case, Mr. D’Arsens could have relatively quickly assembled the numerous items in the inventory. In 1686, however, the area of Saint James Goose Creek was rather sparsely populated and the chances are slim that there could have been a home site available for D’Arsens to move in to.

If Mr. D’Arsens did not have the convenience of moving himself in to an already-built house, perhaps he set up temporary residence near the site where he was building his home. It is possible that D’Arsens quickly had built a portion of his Carolina home. He

---

5 Baldwin, Agnes L., Thomas Smith and Medway, Research Papers, Box 17/ Folder 142/17/01, South Carolina Historical Society, Manuscript copy, Chapter 2, page 9
and his wife Sabina, then, could have lived in a relatively simple area of a house under construction; all they would have needed to survive would have been a single room with a roof overhead and a fireplace for warmth and cooking. This theory seems unlikely because a man of D’Arsens’ nobility would have enjoyed comforts afforded by a more substantial building, perhaps like ones that were being built in Charleston. Unfortunately, there is no mention of John D’Arsens residing in Charleston or outside the town limits.

By the time of his death, D’Arsens’ domicile might have been large enough to store the household items listed in the inventory, though it is still unlikely that it would have been complete. The Smith, et al., inventory does not actually mention a house, which is quite curious. In fact, the only mention of D’Arsens owning a house came through a declaration of his widow’s death from Carolina Governor Seth Sothell in March 1690 or 1691. The declaration stated that Thomas Smith, then husband of Sabina de Vignon, asked at least four men to witness her burial. The gentlemen Governor Sothell wrote about were “…the Honble Colonell Andrew Percivall Lieut’ Rob’t Quary, Chief Judge of the Court of Pleas Ralph Izard and James Moore Esqrs,” who “…verily belive did see the Body of the said Sabina Devignon buried…” at the house formerly belonging to her late husband, John D’Arsens.⁶

If Thomas Smith had taken over the house built by John D’Arsens when he married Sabina de Vignon, Governor Sothell might have simply written that she was buried at the house belonging to her then-husband, Mr. Smith. At the cemetery at

⁶ Court of Ordinary, 1672-1692, 456.
Medway Plantation a tombstone marks the internment of Thomas Smith I, but there is no marker for Sabina de Vignon. This, coupled with the evidence presented in the declaration from Governor Sothell, may indicate that Ms. de Vignon was not buried on the Medway property and therefore her former husband’s house was not the same one that Thomas Smith called home.

Finally, in the aforementioned letter from Edward Hyrne to Burrell Massingbred in 1701, Hyrne writes that the house he had recently purchased from Thomas Smith II, the first Thomas Smith’s son, was “built about nine years ago,” which roughly dates the house at Medway to 1691 or 1692. If Hyrne’s estimation of the construction date is even remotely accurate then it stands to reason that John D’Arsens could not have built the house since he died in 1687, and that Thomas Smith I was most likely the builder.

---

Thomas Smith and his family traveled to the Carolinas in 1683 and obtained a warrant in 1684 for a grant of 650 acres on the Wadmalaw River, which divides present day Johns Island, Kiawah Island, and Edisto Island southwest of Charleston, South Carolina. He quickly sold it and instead in 1685 purchased 400 acres on the Back River, which was also known as Medway River.8

---

7 Hyrne, letter to Burrell Massingbred, Jan 19, 1701/2
8 Beach, Virginia, Medway (Charleston: Wyrick and Company, 1999), 12
Smith’s first wife, Barbara Atkins Smith, died in 1688 and not long after her death he married John D’Arsens’ widow, Sabina de Vignon. On March 20, 1688, Governor Colleton issued a license to the Reverend William Dunlop to marry Madam D’Arsens and Thomas Smith Esquire. Two days later, Rev. Dunlop issued a certificate of marriage.  

Smith’s marriage to D’Arsens’ widow proved to be a lucrative relationship. Smith stood to take over the estate of John D’Arsens, who had been granted 12,000 acres of land and with it the rights and privileges of a baron. At the South Carolina Department of Archives and History in the British Public Records Office Col. Entry Book Vol. 22, page 162 contains a letter from the Lords Proprietors to Governor James Colleton, authorizing him to transfer John D’Arsens’ grant to Thomas Smith. The letter, written 9 December, 1689, reads as follows:

“Now our good friend Tho Smith Esq. having signified to us that he hath married the widow of the sd Seigneur de Wernhout and desiring that he may have the Benefit of the Sd order for twelve thousand acres of land with which his request we being willing to comply do require you to observe the sd order and cause the sd land to be admeasured for the sd Tho Smith and pass grants to him for the same as we have in our sd order directed it to be done to the sd Seigneur de Wernhout…”

---

9 License from Gov. Colleton to Rev. William Dunlop to perform ceremony, SC Archives, Records of the Secretary of the Province (1675-95) p 298. From Agnes Baldwin Research Papers, Box 17/ Folder 142/17/01 “Thomas Smith and Medway”, South Carolina Historical Society

10 Baldwin, Agnes L., *Thomas Smith and Medway*, Chapter 2, 10
Smith’s marriage to Sabina de Vignon did not last long. Sabina died within a two to three years of her marriage to Smith, and as previously cited, was buried on her former husband’s property. One author writes that Sabina’s resting place was, in fact, near the Medway house,\textsuperscript{11} citing \textit{The Olden Times of Carolina}, a book written in 1855 by Elizabeth Anne Poyas that is a compilation of letters and genealogical history of the Thomas Smith family. Ms. Poyas, a relative of Thomas Smith, highly romanticizes the Smith family history as was often done by family members relating personal histories during the nineteenth century.

Apparently conflating Sabina de Vignon and Barbara Atkins, she writes whimsically about a woman who was married to Thomas Smith and conjures an image of,

\begin{quote}
“the fair one, with rosy cheeks and cherry lips, with magnificent large blue eyes, and a face of German contour. Her hands and feet, we may readily imagine, were wonderfully small and delicately formed; this chef d’oeuvre caught up her first-born, and Hagar like, “fled to the wilderness,” where lending a helping hand, they made part of it “to bloom as the rose,” happily they settled down on a plantation on Back river, and caused to be built the first brick house in the province, beyond the precincts of the town. (It is now the property of Mr. P. G. Stoney.) There they engaged in that art of arts, agriculture, without which man would be a savage to the end of time, and the world a desert ever.”\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Poyas, Elizabeth Anne, \textit{The Olden Time of Carolina} (Charleston: Courtenay & Co., 1855), 19
\end{footnotes}
Though most of this prose is Ms. Poyas’ made-up image of Thomas Smith’s wife, whose name is not given, parts of it appear to be valid. First, she states that the plantation on Back River is now (in 1855, the published date of the book) the property of Peter Gaillard Stoney. Mr. Stoney did own the Medway property at the time of this book’s publishing. Second, the author writes that this woman had a child and then “fled to the wilderness,” which may be translated as the journey of Thomas Smith, his wife Barbara Atkins, and their sons, Thomas and George, to the Carolinas in 1683-1684. Further, it is significant that Ms. Poyas describes the house as the first brick house in the province. This may indicate that,

1) Thomas Smith built Medway, which was described as a brick house [see: Edward Hyrne letter to Burrell Massingbred, quoted above], and

2) Mr. D’Arsens could have had a house near the Back River, but it was probably not built of brick and therefore was not the house at Medway.

Later, Ms. Poyas writes that Thomas Smith “…was buried on his Back River plantation, by the side of his Barbary.” Barbary may well be a misspelling or a reference to Smith’s first wife, Barbara Atkins Smith. Therefore, evidence indicates that Thomas Smith was not buried next to his second wife, Sabina de Vignon, but rather beside his first wife and mother of his children, Barbara Atkins Smith. Furthermore,

13 Heitzler, 237-238
14 Poyas, 32
15 Since Barbara Atkins Smith died in 1688, and as Ms. Poyas’ words may be interpreted, was laid to rest adjacent to where her husband would later be buried, which is certainly at Medway, this raises the question of what kind of structure the Smith family lived in and where before Medway was built in 1691. While
this evidence substantiates the fact that Sabina de Vignon was buried on the property of John D’Arsens, her former husband, which could not have been Medway Plantation.

---

Thomas Smith, after his profitable marriage to Sabina de Vignon, rose in status in the Carolina society. In 1690 one of the Lord Proprietors appointed him Governor of the Province; however, he did not get a chance to serve as governor at that point because Seth Sothell was still holding the office. On 13 May 1691, he sat on the grand council of Carolina. Also in 1691 Smith was given the title Landgrave, which entitled him to the land of four baronies, or 48,000 acres in all. About a year later he was appointed deputy for one of the Lord Proprietors. In April 1693 he was made Sheriff of Berkeley County and was exempt from a rule allowing the governor to remove a Sheriff, so clearly he was in the favor of the powers that be. In November 1693, Landgrave Thomas Smith finally assumed the position of Governor of the Province.

Governor Smith would serve only for one year before his death in 1694 at the age of 46. Smith was described by the Proprietors in 1695 as “…a man not only of great parts, integrity and honesty but of a generous temper and a nobleness of sprirt as to the

---

searching for information on that subject would prove to be interesting and possibly relevant to this thesis, it was not pursued due to time constraints. It should be studied further by subsequent researchers.

16 Smith, Henry A. M., “The Baronies of South Carolina.” The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Volume 13, No. 1 (January 1912), 16
17 ibid, 14
18 ibid, 16
19 ibid
public good as is scarcely to be met withal in this age."  

In his will, Smith gave the majority of his lands to his eldest son, Thomas Smith II, including his Back River property. A codicil to the first Thomas Smith’s will in 1693 stated his intent to transfer his Landgrave patent and all of his relating baronies to his friend Joseph Blake, but later Thomas Smith II procured the title and became the second Landgrave Thomas Smith.

Later, on February 28, 1701, the younger Smith sold the land on which Medway was built along with several other parcels to Edward Hyrne. The land totaled 2,550 acres, 400 acres of which was the land that Thomas Smith (the senior) had purchased in 1685. D’Arsens’ land was likely adjacent to the 400 acres of land that Thomas Smith I purchased on the Back River in 1685, as described by Richard Côté and also by Michael Heitzler. Heitzler stated that 2,100 acres of Medway was a parcel to the north of Mr. Smith’s original 400 acres. These 2,100 acres were taken from the 12,000 acres originally granted to John D’Arsen. The remaining fifty acres were from an additional grant to make up for land missed during an earlier survey of Smith’s holdings.

---
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24 Côté, Richard, *Preserving the Legacy: Medway Plantation on Back River*, (Charleston: Published by the author, 1994), 3. Mr. Côté compiled this pamphlet of information based on the research of Agnes Leland Baldwin, who was an expert historian whose research focused on plantations in the Lowcountry. A large portion of her research was focused on Medway Plantation.  
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That the house was said to 26’ feet broad by 80’ long when it was first built seems odd given Lowcountry vernacular architectural styles. Generally in the early years of colonization, building plans were closer to squares than the stretched-out rectangular shape Edward Hyrne described to his brother-in-law in 1701, which sounds like a large, more modern shotgun-style New Orleans house. Without any of the original structure exposed above ground, archaeology is the only means to determine first if the extant structure is built on the original foundation, and second, how its floor plan was laid out.

For the 2012 project, the oversight of an archaeologist was required per the conservation and preservation easement on the Medway property held by Historic Charleston Foundation. Mr. Andrew Agha, archaeologist, was on site for several days while a trench was being excavated for the installation of a French drain. The drain runs roughly latitudinally across the south side of building. It was projected based on the mostly level grade of the south lawn that if the original foundation was in fact 26’ by 80’ its remains would be found there.

During the excavation, which was all from zero to one foot below ground surface (bgs), Mr. Agha periodically processed the soil spoils with a 1/4” sieve screen. Among the artifacts that were collected during the excavation were many ceramics. These objects could have been deposited randomly, but in most cases their presence indicates that where they were found is an interior area. Further, differences in soil color and composition were consistent with what would have been a builder’s trench. These deposits were found in two locations along the trench, both roughly in-line with the
north-south running walls of the central, or oldest, portion of the house. Finally, several burned bricks were excavated from the French drain trench bed, near the deposits believed to be a builder’s trench. This is an important find because it may confirm not only that the building was originally larger than its current earliest plan, but also it was the same building site that was burned in 1704 and later rebuilt upon by Edward Hyrne.

The archaeological investigation at Medway is very helpful for interpreting Medway’s earliest history. To fully understand the floor plan and how Thomas Smith’s building was used, a large scale archaeological dig, the use of ground penetrating radar (GPR), or a comparable technique is necessary.

---

In summary, Thomas Smith was most likely the builder of the first house at Medway. The complicated and interweaving histories of the D’Arsens and Smith families muddy the waters of research, but when the cloud settles some very important evidence appears. The most obvious testimony is found in the letter from Edward Hyrne to Burrell Massingbred, placing the date of his recent acquisition at no earlier than 1691, a full five years after John D’Arsens died. Also important to the conclusion that Thomas Smith built Medway is the fact that Sabina de Vignon was buried on her former husband’s property. Finally, the house at Medway was built on the 400 acres that Thomas Smith purchased in 1685, which was not part of the land granted to John D’Arsens though it was bounded by D’Arsens’ land to the north. Archaeological
excavations completed in Fall, 2012, confirm that the house purchased in 1701 by Edward Hyrne was much larger than the one he and his wife rebuilt after fire destroyed it in 1704. Burned bricks that were unearthed during that dig give validity to Hyrne’s letter describing the house as 80’ by 26’.
LANDGRAVE Thomas Smith II must have been a trusting man like his father the first
Landgrave Smith. He agreed to sell his father’s plantation, Medway, essentially on good
faith and the promise that money would eventually be paid for the property. The
purchaser was Englishman Edward Hyrne, who had fled his home country to avoid
paying his own considerable debts. Smith’s generosity continued when years later –
though the note on the property had still not been paid – the house burned down and he
allowed the Hyrnes to rebuild it. In fact, Smith never was paid fully for the property and
it reverted to him in 1711 after the Englishman was thrown into prison on a risky return
trip to England to plea for his wife’s inheritance.

These events occurring between 1701 and 1811 marked the first and possibly most
significant transformation of the house at Medway. This claim is not made to diminish
the significance of the subsequent additions and renovations, but because from 1705 to
the present a relatively intact architectural history remains. Prior to a devastating fire in
1704, however, very little is known about the physical form of Medway other than that it
was a brick building about 26’ by 80’ with a full cellar.
MEDWAY PLANTATION, MOUNT HOLLY, SOUTH CAROLINA
PHASE 2: CIRCA 1705 CONJECTURAL DRAWINGS
NEALE C. NICKELS | NOT TO SCALE
Edward Hyrne was in his forties and significantly in debt when he married young Elizabeth Massingbred, who stood to inherit a small fortune. Though it would be easy to conclude that Hyrne was a fortune hunter, heartfelt letters the two exchanged indicate that they were in love and intended to make their own fortune in Carolina.

Elizabeth Hyrne was the oldest daughter of Sir Drayner Massingbred, born in Lincolnshire, England, in 1680. Her father died when she was only nine years old and the estate was left to her younger brother, Burrell. Elizabeth’s portion of the inheritance was £1,500, which she was unable to claim until her twenty-fifth birthday in 1705. She married Edward Hyrne at the age of 17, in 1697.26

Edward Hyrne had been accused of mismanaging monies amounting to £1,400 that were paid to him as the Port Collector for the government.27 Since he could not afford to pay the debt, he fled overseas. A letter written in 1699 between Hyrne’s brother-in-law, Burrell, and Burrell’s cousin, William, indicates the Massingbred family’s distress over Elizabeth and Edward’s situation. William writes,

“yesterday your sister Hyrne was with me, who saith that her husband is in such circumstances that there is no staying for him in England & therefore he designs for some of the plantations, & hopes he may do well there, if he had some money to carry with him to set up with, & when he is settled in & got into a way, she intends to go over to him…Your brother Hyrne conceals his intention of going beyond the sea for fear his creditors should watch the ships to take him again.”28

27 ibid, 27
28 ibid, 29
Before joining her husband in Carolina, around 1701, Elizabeth wrote to her brother Burrell in 1700, relating that her husband Edward believed the best way to make a living there was to purchase a plantation and farm it. Furthermore, a bout of sickness and death had created opportunity to purchase property at a reasonable price, and Elizabeth’s inheritance would make such a purchase possible. There were several plantations, Elizabeth related to her brother,

“to be had great penny worths particularly one with in a mile of the principell town of the place £12 5s per Annum a good house upon it several out houses for Negroes about five hundred head of cattle and it is supposed it will be sold for about five hundred-six hundred pounds…if he might have my fortune to settle this upon me and mine.”

The Hyrnes did not purchase the plantation Elizabeth mentioned in the letter nor did Burrell agree to finance the purchase of any plantation. Subsequently, Edward Hyrne met Landgrave Thomas Smith II and made a deal that allowed the Hyrnes to settle on their first piece of property in the Carolinas.

The contract between Edward Hyrne and Thomas Smith allowed the Hyrnes to live on Medway on credit with the promise that upon the receipt of Elizabeth’s inheritance in 1705, it would be paid for. Hyrne’s arrangement provided him and his family with a “brave plantation” on the Back River. The property deed clearly states that the house was on the 400 acre tract on the southernmost bounds of the property.

---
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Writing to Burrell Massingbred on January 19, 1701, Edward Hyrne describes the property: “It consists of 2,550 Acres of land, whereof 200 clear’d, & most fenc’d in, tho wants repairing; 150 Head of Cattle, 4 Horses, an Indian Slave almost a Man, a few Hogs, some Householdstuff, & the best Brick-House in all the Country; built about 9 years ago, & cost £700, 80 Foot long, 26 broad, cellar’d throughout.”

Even though the Hyrnes had arranged the purchase, they were far from financial freedom. Later in 1701, Elizabeth wrote to her youngest brother, Henry, who conveyed her words to Burrell in a letter. Henry wrote that their sister was in “miserable condition” and they needed £200 at least, or else they would be forced to work the land themselves. As Henry said, that would be “very hard for them who have lived here in plenty, and more for her who hath been well bred.”

Financial troubles were just the beginning of hard times for the Hyrnes. In early 1704, Elizabeth wrote to Burrell and told him about the difficulties of the previous year:

“On the 20th of the same instant [June] we lost a Negro Man by the bite of a rattlesnake which was a very great lose to us being just in the height of weeding…rice. On the 25th of August I lost my Dear little son which went very near to me. In September we lost our Cattle hunter. But the greatest of all of our losses (except my dear Harry) was on the 12 day of Janwery last on which we as burn…[torn] out of all our house taking fire I know not how in the night and burned so fircefly that we had much to do to save the life of poor burry and two beds just to lye on which was the chief of what we saved we also ha all our rice and corn and all sorts of our proveshons burnt. Cloes and every thing nothing escaped the fire so that if it had not been for some good people we must have perished. My dear child was forced to be taken naked out of bed being left without close enough to keep him from the cold. And now I am big with Child expecting to lye inn the beginning of next June so that you may easely imagining

---
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our messerable condission. But blessed be God we have mett with some kind
friends in this place or elce we had not bin for you ever to have heard more of us.
For it is impossible for you to think how sad a thing it is to be burnt out of all in a
nights time.”

When Elizabeth Hyrne turned 25 in 1705, she was eligible to receive her
inheritance. Her brother, Burrell, however, had different plans, turning it over to a third-
party account holder. He apparently never approved of her marriage to Edward Hyrne, a
debtor and fortune seeker in his eyes. Elizabeth wrote Burrell in 1705 and expressed her
disappointment that he had chosen to turn her fortune over to the Court of Chancery,
saying that his decision to do so “will be our utter undoing for you know very well we are
to pay £1000 for our plantation and that the first £500 will be due the first of January next
year.”

Edward Hyrne made the risky decision to travel to England to make the case in
person for his wife’s inheritance. Unfortunately, his creditors had him arrested and
thrown in prison. Elizabeth Hyrne followed to try to free him, but unfortunately they
were never able to make a payment on Medway and it reverted to Landgrave Thomas
Smith in 1711.

34 Beach, 13-14
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The fire in 1704 drastically changed the shape of Medway. It had been a rather large brick building, but the Hyrnes, already low on finances, were only able to hastily rebuild a house at less than half the original size and probably of poorer quality materials. After Hyrne lost the property and Smith took it over in 1711, it changed hands relatively quickly over the next few decades. Thomas Smith sold the property to Abraham Satur, who was followed by James Hasell and James Wathen.37

James Wathen posted a for-sale advertisement for the plantation in the *South Carolina Gazette* on August 3, 1738. The listing described the property and the house as follows:

“To be Sold the Plantation belonging to James Wathen on Back River, containing about 800 Acres of Land…having a good Brick-houfe 36 Feet in length, 26 in Breadth, Cellars and Kitchen under the Houfe, with a well of good Water, a Barn and Outhouses, distant from Charlestown about 22 Miles by Land or Water, and 4 from Goofe Creek Church.”38 (Figure 3.1)
The dimensions of the house given in Mr. Wathen’s advertisement match fairly well with the dimensions of the oldest portion of Medway as measured today. The advertisement is the first printed evidence of the form of Medway following the 1704 fire. What the advertisement was not clear about, however, was what the house looked like, i.e., how many stories, whether it was stuccoed, and if not, what the brick bond and joint work were, and how the fenestration was laid out. Some of the answers are obtainable through site investigation while other information is conjecture based on other South Carolina Lowcountry buildings of similar size and shape.

To recap, what was known about the post-fire house at Medway was that it was made of brick, measured roughly 26’ x 36’, and had a cellar. The rest of the form and function of the second-phase Medway presented in this thesis is based on site
investigation, research, and conjecture based on contemporaneous vernacular architectural forms.

The house at Medway that the Hyrnes built in 1705 was a one-and-a-half story brick building laid in English bond, struck with a grapevine joint. The floorplan was most likely a hall-and-parlor, with the larger room on the south side of the building. The building was accessed by doors that mirrored each other and were centered on the east and west walls. The doors were about 4’ above the finished grade and accessed by stairs. The east and west sides also had three bays with windows on either side of the door providing light to the two rooms on the first floor. On the second level, two small windows flanked the chimney and lighted the interior, as did two dormer windows on the east and west sides of the roof. The chimneys extended several feet over the ridge of the roof. The gable was simple and matched the slope of the cypress-shake roof. It probably did not have a parapet.

On the north and south exterior walls, fireplaces provided warmth and possibly cooking for the spaces. Windows flanked either side of the chimneys. A narrow stair in the hall probably gave access to the half-story, which was most likely used for sleeping. The half story, or attic level, was composed of two similarly-sized rooms, probably with a dormer window on the east and west sides and a knee wall that met the pitch of the roof.

The evidence for this conjectural image of Medway in 1705 follows.
One clue that confirms the layout of the second phase house at Medway lies in the thickness of the former exterior walls on the first floor of this section of the present day house. Those walls are about 24” wide, much wider than any interior walls would need to be; so, clearly they were once exterior brick walls. Figure 3.2 shows the old doorway on the west side of the house, which now joins the foyer from a nineteenth-century addition and the current dining room.

Figure 3.2. The yellow arrow indicates a wall thickness of about two feet. This doorway is between the dining room and the west entry foyer. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
Around the same doorway shown in the image is more physical evidence that the Hynes built a smaller version of Medway in 1705. In the 1980s, plantation manager Bob Hortman noticed that the door in that opening was sticking. The problem seemed to be larger than normal shrinking and swelling, so a more thorough investigation was launched. The workers found that the entire west wall of the central portion was in desperate need of repair. Nearly all of it was replaced with modern material. During the process, workers and Mr. Hortman noticed strange marks about the size of a nickel in several of the bricks around the doorway. A closer look revealed that the impressions were a family seal, later identified as the Hyme coat of arms, made in the soft clay bricks before they were fired (see Figures 3.3 and 3.4).\textsuperscript{39}

![Brick moved during 1980s renovations imprinted with the Hyme family seal. Photo from the Medway Collection](image)

\textsuperscript{39} Undated photo, Medway Collection
A great deal of information about the former shape of Medway was revealed during the renovations conducted by Richard Marks Restorations & Architectural Conservation, Inc., in 2012. A large part of that effort was removing and replacing hard Portland cement and failing stucco, revealing numerous cracks in the brick from years of storms, earthquakes, and settling. The restoration work also disclosed very early, soft bricks and mortar as well as the outline of the old chimney.
This important finding indicates the height of the second-phase chimneys, whose tops are mid-way between the windows now on the third, or attic, level. Not only was the edge of the chimney visible as a cold joint with the later-added bricks (see Figure 3.5), but even the corbel detailing was intact. The corbelling was particularly visible on the north façade (see Figure 3.6).

Figure 3.5. Photo of the south gable end of Phase II Medway showing the outline of the chimney, now surrounded by bricks laid in a later building campaign that added a third story. The chimney used to terminate at what is now the third story but it was most likely rebuilt, possibly during the campaign by Samuel Stoney in 1906. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
Though many building and repair campaigns were undertaken throughout the years at Medway, sections of very soft bricks laid in English bond remain, especially at the lower levels of the 1705 structure (see Figure 3.7). Also, the mortar bonding these areas is struck with a grapevine joint (see Figure 3.8). The bond pattern and mortar joint
indicate two things: that the building built by Edward and Elizabeth Hyrne was not originally intended to be stuccoed and that these areas likely represent the earliest remaining period of construction of the building.

English bond was popular in the Americas beginning in the early eighteenth century, and though there were often regional variances this trend applied to Charleston as well. As Marie Ferrara Hollings discovered during her thesis research, the Wren Building at the College of William and Mary, built in 1695, was laid in English bond. There are numerous examples of eighteenth-century buildings in Charleston that are also laid in English bond. No. 10 Tradd Street, for example, is an English bond building, built in 1726.

George Fore, an architect based out of Raleigh, NC, confirms Ms. Hollings’ finding that English bond was one of the most common early bond patterns in Charleston and adds that the most popular eighteenth-century mortar joints were ruled, or scored joints. In Charleston scored joints are often referred to as grapevine joints.

The final clue to the age of the bricks that were laid in English bond is how soft they were compared to the surrounding bricks. Many of the bricks, as the following images will indicate, were very red-pink to red-brown. These bricks were often called salmon bricks, referring to their hue. They were the softest bricks that were produced in

---
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kilns or clamps because they were the farthest away from the heat source.\textsuperscript{43} Generally these bricks were not used in areas that were exposed to the elements; however, in the case of the Hynes’ low-budget rebuilding campaign some quality may have been sacrificed for speed in restoring their shelter. The majority of the bricks that were laid in a different campaign or campaigns are face bricks and the occasional clinker, or over-fired brick.

Based on the research of Ms. Hollings and Mr. Fore and the structural evidence found during the 2012 restoration at Medway, it is probable that the walls of the Hynes’ Medway were indeed English bond with a scored grapevine joint.

Figure 3.7. English bond evident on the lower level of the south gable. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.

\textsuperscript{43} ibid, 12
The second story, or attic level, of the 1705 building was split into two rooms and was probably used for sleeping quarters. Based on evidence found in the space behind the knee wall of the current third level it is assumed that the level was a finished space and that it was lighted with a total of four dormer windows.

During the 2012 restoration, access was made to the crawl spaces behind the knee walls of the bedrooms on the third floor, which was a later addition. Gaining access to this area enabled the restorers to properly assess the structure and provide insulation between the roof framing members. There were no hatches or doors to allow entry to the spaces, which were refinished during the twentieth century. Most of roof rafters are sash-
sawn pine. They rest on a pine false plate and meet the opposite rafters at the ridge with mortise and tenon joints. These machine sawn members measured approximately 2 3/4" x 5". However, several of the timbers are hewn and pit-sawn, which is a technique that predates machine sawing (Figures 3.9 and 3.10). The hewn and pit-sawn timbers measured approximately 3 1/2" x 4 3/4".

These older rafters are hewn on one side and pit-sawn on the other side. This indicates an earlier technique for milling. After a tree was felled, laborers would use an adze or a broadaxe to hew the log into rough dimensions. Then it would be set upon sawbucks high enough for one man to stand below the log. Another man stood above the log, and together the two of them, grasping a saw with handles on each end, would saw the log down the middle to produce two timbers. The marks left by pit-sawing are characteristically unique, with two general angles: one stroke of the saw makes a mark that is mostly perpendicular to the top and bottom edges of the timber while the other stroke produces a mark that is at a slight angle, so a “V” shaped mark is left on the wood.⁴⁴

---

Figure 3.9. Hewn roof rafter in the third floor crawl space on the west side of the south room. Photo by author.

Figure 3.10. Pit-sawn roof rafter in the third floor crawl space on the west side of the south room. Photo by author.
The hewn and pit-sawn members also have ghosts of plaster in between lath marks on their underside that terminate about 2’ west of the current knee wall horizontally (Figure 3.11). One of the older rafters not only showed plaster ghosts on its underside, but also on one of its vertical faces (Figure 3.12). The same rafter had a notch cut out of it which appears to have been made to butt against a vertical framing member. A closer look at the nails driven into this portion of the wood indicate that the nails are machine cut with a double-struck head, which indicates they are not contemporary with the age of the timber and were most likely driven at a later time since double struck nails were not seen until the later part of the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{45} (Figure 3.13).

![Figure 3.11](image)

Figure 3.11. Plaster ghosts on underside of a roof member on the west side of the south bedroom on the third floor. The arrow indicates a distance of approximately two feet. Photo by author.

Figure 3.12. Hewn and pit-sawn rafter with plaster ghosts on both the horizontal and vertical faces taken in from the west side of the south room on the third floor. Photo by author.

Figure 3.13. Machine-struck nails in early framing member. Photo by author.
The evidence gleaned from studying the roof framing members at Medway indicates some key pieces of information about the second phase of Medway. The hewn and pit-sawn roof rafters were most likely recycled from the earlier one-and-a-half story roof while the rest of the rafters were sash-sawn. Sawing wood was expensive, so re-using large framing members wherever possible was a common practice. For example, in the small space behind the west knee wall of the south bedroom on the third floor, of the thirteen rafters in that area, six were recycled and seven were sash sawn. The other crawl spaces on the third floor revealed a similar proportion of salvaged timbers.

The plaster and lath ghosts on the horizontal faces of the salvaged members indicate that the second floor of Medway, as built in 1705, was a finished space, and that its floor space was about 4’ wider east-to-west than the top level is today. The plaster ghosts on the vertical face of one of those members is a likely indicator that dormer windows were used to light the east and west sides of the upper level, since a projection would have turned the corner at a rafter’s edge and it would have been plastered as well. Because the spaces upstairs were finished and intended to be used probably as bedrooms, it is logical that they would have had dormer windows to provide additional light and air movement.
Summary

Based on the on-site research at Medway along with the 1738 South Carolina Gazette advertisement and the documentation of the Hyrne family crest in bricks near the old west door, there is conclusive evidence that the central, earliest portion of Medway that remains today was built by Elizabeth and Edward Hyrne. Further, it is clear that the dwelling they built was one story with a finished garret, laid in English bond brick and pointed with grapevine mortar joints. There were two windows on each side and each level of the house, including dormer windows on the roof.

The house remained this way for some time after 1738 and until 1855 at the latest, when a large wing was added on the west side. There were likely several changes, some minor and some more significant, to the structure in that time span, though documentary evidence on those years is sparse. The following chapter discusses this, the next phase of the structural history of Medway.
CHAPTER IV

MEDWAY’S ADOLESCENCE

1738 through 1855

In 1738, Medway was probably one-and-a-half stories, definitely made of brick laid in English bond with grapevine mortar joints, and possibly stuccoed. It had doors on the west and east sides and two windows on each side of each level of the house, 16 total. The building was fairly modest, rebuilt by a couple that did not have much financial security to speak of. Over the next century or so there were significant changes to Medway; although, as of this writing, no archival research to indicate exactly what the changes were, if any, or when they occurred has been discovered. It was not until 1855, as Samuel Stoney points out in his book, that any written words indicate a change to the shape of Medway.

The information presented in this chapter paints a picture of Medway as it evolved between the time the newspaper advertisement was written in 1738 and when Peter G. Stone added a wing in 1855. Since there is very little in the way of correspondence, documentation, or other archived information, the conjectural image of Medway during this time period is based largely on what was discovered during the major restoration efforts in 2012.
Sometime between 1738 and 1855 the house was raised to two full stories and a half, or attic, story. A stair tower was added on the east side, which emphasized it as the principal entrance to the building. As its owners changed hands and required a grander house for entertaining and doing business, Medway grew and became a bit more formal.

James Wathen was the owner who listed Medway in the South Carolina Gazette in 1738. After him, proprietors included Thomas Wright, Aaron Loocock, and Thomas Drayton. John Bee Holmes probably purchased Medway from Drayton, and Holmes is listed as the owner on a plat made by Joseph Purcell in 1775. A plat made in 1792 shows the Back River and Prioleau Creek, which feeds into the lake at Medway. On the north side of the creek the surveyor made a note that reads “Formerly belonging to Landgrave Thomas Smith Plate [sic] Thomas Drayton now lands belonging to John Bee Holmes esq”

John Bee Holmes failed to pay taxes on the property and it was purchased by Theodore Samuel Marion. Theodore was the nephew of General Francis Marion, the famed “Swamp Fox” of the Revolutionary Army. When Theodore Marion died in 1827 he left the land to his grandson, Theodore Samuel Dubose. Dubose married Jane Porcher, who is credited with planting large live oaks and ornamental trees near the house.

---

46 Heitzler, 240
47 Plat of Medway, 1792, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, South Carolina, catalog number 33-62-12
48 Heitzler, 241
Anna Maria Porcher, sister of Jane Porcher, married Peter Gaillard Stoney, and they purchased Medway from Theodore Samuel Dubose in 1833 or 1835. Anna Porcher, wanting a grander entrance to their new property, oversaw the construction and landscaping of one of the most defining features of Medway – the double allee of oaks leading to the west side of the building.\(^49\)

Peter Stoney made his own contributions to Medway’s grandeur. In 1855 he is credited with adding the asymmetrical west wing, which will be discussed in the following chapter.\(^50\) Before that, however, the building was raised to three stories and the east stair tower was added. This was the most significant change to the building since its reconstruction after the 1704 fire. It demonstrated that the once-modest country house was beginning to grow up to reflect its gains in agricultural and brickmaking significance in the Lowcountry.

---

In general, the biggest changes to any building occur fairly soon after its acquisition by new owners. In the case of Medway, during the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries ownership changed hands frequently, and most of its owners probably did not stay long enough to make much of a mark on the house. For them,

\(^{49}\) Côté, 5
\(^{50}\) Stoney, Samuel Gaillard. *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country* (Charleston, SC: Carolina Art Association, 1977), 47
Medway was possibly more of an investment property, or a farm with a simple farmhouse where they might stay when they were not at their primary house.

John Bee Holmes owned Medway for at least seventeen years. He may well have lived elsewhere, for he was listed as a member of Saint Michael’s Parish in the 1790 census. † Theodore Samuel Marion also owned the property for a long period of time, purchasing it in 1797 and leaving it to his grandson upon his death in 1827. Peter Gaillard Stoney, who became the owner in either 1833 or 1835, intended to not only profit from Medway’s productivity, but also to live there, and he did so for many years.

These three men – John Bee Holmes, Theodore Samuel Marion, and Peter Gaillard Stoney – are possible candidates that can be credited with raising Medway to three stories and adding the east stair tower. Investigation of framing members, bricklaying, and mortar analysis in the context of building construction trends in the Lowcountry helps to understand not only how the building evolved but also who was behind it.

---

Attic spaces, where framing members are exposed, often contain a wealth of information about the way a building has developed. In the case of Medway, much of the attic space was concealed behind plastered knee walls with no access hatches. The 2012

---

† Heitzler, 240
restoration offered an opportunity to explore those areas, however, and revealed some key details.

First, in the space to the west of the south room on the third floor, room 301, hand-split cypress shakes were found intact on purlins along the rafters (Figure 4.1). They were left on, thankfully, when the west wing was added in 1855. Being in the area where the hip of the west wing meets the pitch of the central roofline, the shingles are protected from the elements. The shingles show some weathering, though it is difficult to determine based on their appearance how long they had been exposed.

The shakes were attached with machine-made cut nails, 1-1/2” in length. The nails appear to be similar to the Type 8 nail listed in Tom Wells’ article for the Society of Historical Archaeology journal, which were most common between 1820 and 1891. Wells’ Type 8 nails are face-pinched cut nails. They are perfectly uniform and consistent within a sample. They have machined heads and a flat point, and a rectangular-to-square cross section. Figure 4.2 is an image of a nail in-situ, Figure 4.3 is an image of a nail that was removed from one of the shingles, and Figure 4.4 is an image taken from Mr. Wells’ article.

The nails that were studied in Wells’ article are from Louisiana, so the chronology should not be considered the gospel for South Carolina since there are regional variations in building construction technology, especially before industrialization. However, adding validity to the dating evidence in Wells’ article is a report on 79 Anson Street in

---

Charleston, South Carolina. In that report, made for the Historic Charleston Foundation, in period II of the building’s construction, ca 1827, machine-made cut nails were used in framing members. In the first period, built in 1806, the framing nails were hand-forged wrought-iron clasp nails with double-struck heads. The authors of this report note that machine-made cut nails were available in the Lowcountry by the late 1810s and predominantly used between the 1830s and 1880s.\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{cypress_shakes.png}
\caption{Cypress shakes, remnant of the roof prior to the addition of the west wing. Photo by author.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{53} Graham, Willie, Carl Lounsbury and Orlando Ridout V, \textit{An Architectural Investigation of 79 Anson Street, Charleston, South Carolina}, a report for the Historic Charleston Foundation, 2005, 29
Figure 4.2. Cut nails in-situ in third floor, southwest crawl space. Photo by author.

Figure 4.3. A machine-cut nail that was removed from a cypress shake in the third floor attic space. Photo by author.
As discussed earlier, some of the roof framing material over the Hyrne-period footprint of Medway was hewn and pit-sawn lumber, most likely from the Hyrne-era roof. When the third story was added, some of the framing from the lower roof was undoubtedly recycled for the construction of the new roof. Whereas the lower roof was probably a principal rafter system, the extant roof is a common rafter system. The majority of the framing material for the roof is sash-sawn lumber (Figure 4.5). The sash

---

Figure 4.4. Image of a “Type 8” nail from Wells[^54]

[^54]: Wells, 92
[^55]: Put simply, principal rafters are large roof framing members designed to support heavy loads. Common rafters are smaller than principal rafters and are designed to carry less than a principal rafter. There may be common rafters as a part of a principal rafter system in between large principal rafters but a common rafter system will be made entirely of smaller, regularly spaced common rafters.
sawn members are a more consistent size than their hand-sawn predecessors, measuring 2-3/4” x 5”.

Sawmills were in use in Charleston in the early nineteenth century, but in their infancy they were still relatively expensive to operate so manual sawing was still common. Up-and-down sash saws were usually operated by a mill wheel powered by moving water. They produced consistent parallel marks that were generally perpendicular to the edges of the timbers. By about 1820 in Charleston, most framing material was sash-sawn. This milling method was the most popular during the first quarter to the middle of the nineteenth century in Charleston. Buildings built about 1850 show the first circular-sawn framing material.
The attic investigation at Medway clearly shows that before the west wing was added, the building gained a story. The presence of the cypress shakes is the most obvious reason to draw this conclusion. However, even if the third-story-builder had not left such a revealing piece of evidence, the fact that sash-sawn material was commonly employed in the roof and floor framing of the garret level also provides evidence to support the chronological sequencing of the building.

Based on the style of the cut nails that were used to fasten the shingles and the presence of the sash-sawn lumber, both common after about 1820, it seems probable that Peter Gaillard Stoney added the third level to Medway shortly after he became the owner in 1833-35.
Adding another level to the house was not the only change that happened when Peter Stoney became the proprietor. He also more than likely removed the stairs from the hall on the first level and added a stair tower and formal entry-way on the east side of the building. This change provided access to the second floor while creating more room in the main block of the house. The stair tower was probably only two stories high with only a small access stair leading to the third floor. The garret level may have been intended for storage or possibly servants’ quarters.

The bricks that form the walls of the stair tower provide the basis for the reasoning that it was only two stories high originally. With the stucco removed by Richard Marks Restorations, Inc., the brick bond patterns were studied and mortar samples were taken for analysis. Wrapping the stair tower at about three feet above the ridge of the current one-story wings on the east is a rowlock course (Figure 4.6). A rowlock is a course of header bricks laid on the short side instead of the long side as they would be in normal brick courses. Rowlock courses typically signal a transition in the structure – in many cases, the termination of a wall and the start of a cornice. Such is the case at Medway. The rowlock course that was revealed on the stair tower indicates that it was two stories high when Peter G. Stoney constructed it, probably shortly after 1833.

The surrounding bricks substantiate this claim. Though repair work makes it hard to distinguish, below the rowlock course the bricks appear to be primarily laid in three-course American bond, which consists of a course of headers alternating with three courses of stretchers (Figure 4.7). Above the rowlock is five-course American bond,
which is a course of headers with five courses of stretchers in between (Figure 4.8). This clearly represents two different building campaigns.  

Chronologically, three-course American bond preceded five-course American bond. In Virginia, where bricklaying trends were quicker to appear than in the Lowcountry, three-course American bond was used fairly early, though almost never before the 1780s. The West Lawn between Pavilions VI and VII at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, built in 1817, is laid in three-course American bond. Thomas Jefferson, ever the progressive, chose to erect parts of the East Lawn, built in 1825, in five-course American bond. In Charleston three-American bond became common in the early nineteenth century and persisted through the middle of the century, when five-course American bond became widely used.

---

58 During the investigation of brick bond patterns it was sometimes difficult to discern clear bond patterns from areas where the wall had been repaired. Undoubtedly, many repairs to the old structure were made, especially after significant events like the Earthquake of 1886. This can be said for the entire house, not just the stair tower. Enough areas of what are believed to be original bond patterns exist to make the claim that below the rowlock course the walls were three-course American bond and above it they were five-course American bond.

Figure 4.6. South wall of east stair tower. Rowlock course. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.

Figure 4.7. East wall of stair tower. Three-course American bond located just above the entry door. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
Figure 4.8. North wall of stair tower. Five-course American bond above the rowlock course. Header courses are visible at the second and eighth courses above the pink stucco where the temporary roof meets the wall. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.

---

The mortar on the third level of the original portion of the house and on all areas of the stair tower does not appear to be a finish mortar, nor does it have any tooling. Three-course and five-course American bond patterns were typically used because they were economical, not for their aesthetics. This evidence is reason to conclude that when the third story and the stair tower were added, they were stuccoed. Of course, this begs the question, whether this was the first time Medway’s walls had been parged with stucco. Fortunately, the original chimney bricks divulge more than the height of the Hyrne-era building. Bright white stucco remains on the edges of some of the bricks that
formed the outline of the old chimney, both on the north and south sides of the house (Figures 4.9 and 4.10).

Exactly when the stucco was added is not clear; however, it should be taken into consideration that the bricks the Hyrnes used to build Medway were of a fairly poor quality. The addition of stucco to the exterior surely would help protect their fragile, soft faces from the elements. It is conceivable therefore that the stucco was added in the eighteenth century.

Figure 4.91. Stucco on the side of the Hynre-era chimney on the north wall. The chimney bricks are the bright red-orange bricks on the right side. Photo by author.
Doors and windows are often indicative of time periods as well and should not be ignored. In the case of the third phase of Medway, which we can now date to the first addition by Peter G. Stoney after 1833, tripartite windows and Greek Revival entryways help validate the date estimated for the construction of the garret and stair tower. An engraving in an 1875 edition of *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* shows Medway from the east (Figure 4.11). The door leading to the stair tower appears to be Greek revival, as does the tripartite window on the second floor of the tower. Figures 4.12 and 4.13 show

Figure 4.10. Close-up of the stucco on the side of the Hyrne-era chimney. Photo by author.
the same details from different views. Figure 4.12 was taken after 1906, as evidenced by the presence of the stepped gables, which then-owner Captain Stoney, nephew of Peter G. Stoney, rebuilt,\(^{60}\) and Figure 4.13 was in the Medway Collection at the College of Charleston’s Special Collections but was not dated.\(^{61}\)

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure4.11}
\caption{1875 Engraving in Harper's New Monthly Magazine, from the Medway Collection. Note the Greek revival elements on the stair tower.}
\end{figure}

\(^{60}\) The stepped gables were added prior to 1875 as the Harper’s engraving shows, but they fell off during the Earthquake of 1886. Captain Stoney restored them after he became the owner in 1906. This will be discussed further in a later chapter.

\(^{61}\) Figure 28 is probably from shortly after the Legendre’s purchased Medway in 1929, but before they changed the door to its current one.
Figure 4.12. Post-1906 east view of Medway, from the Medway Collection.

Figure 4.132. Another view of the Greek revival elements on the east elevation of Medway, from the Medway Collection. Date unknown.
The Greek revival elements shown in the figures are most likely the work of Peter G. Stoney in the 1830s. Greek Revival architectural style was sweeping Charleston at the time, and building owners all around the Lowcountry began to update doors, windows, columns, pediments, and parapets to keep up appearances. One of the most prominent houses in Charleston and certainly an example to aspire to, the Aiken-Rhett House on Elizabeth Street, featured Greek revival elements. The house was built in 1820 but was renovated after 1833 when William Aiken, Jr. and his wife moved into the house. The 1830s renovation was undoubtedly influenced by the Greek revival style, and Stoney was likely influenced by it, too.

The door shown in the Harper’s engraving appears to have four panels, characteristic of Greek revival design. This is confirmed by what is shown in figures 4.12 and 4.13. The door is flanked by sidelights and topped with a transom window. Following the earlier Federal style, Greek revival windows became simpler. Often, windows were replaced with tripatrite windows, where sidelights frame a regular sash window. This was the case both at the Aiken-Rhett House and at Medway. The figures above clearly show Greek revival influence. This style was popular in America up through about 1850.

---

64 ibid, 211-212
65 Graham, et. al, *Architectural Investigations at the Aiken-Rhett House*, II-3
66 Calloway, 206.
To many, the stepped gable ends on the north, south and west of Medway are its character-defining features. Many assume that the gables are and always have been of Dutch influence. This claim makes sense on some levels, since until relatively recently most historians believed that Dutchman John D’Arsens broke the first ground at Medway. In *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country*, Samuel Stone writes that D’Arsens’ (whom he refers to as Jan Van Arrsens) architectural influence kept Medway “looking as if it had good right to be standing over a canal in the Low Countries of Holland” rather than adjacent to “a rice field in the Low Country of South Carolina.” 67

However, now we are aware that it was not D’Arsens, but the Englishman Smith who built the first Medway, and he would not have been likely to add Dutch-style stepped gables. When Smith’s Medway burned in 1704, the financially-troubled Hyrnes could not afford even good face bricks for rebuilding walls, much less the addition of fanciful stepped-gables.

Evidence points to Peter Gaillard Stoney. He wanted to make a statement when he became the owner of Medway, and he wanted a country manor house. The nineteenth century was a period of romanticism, and it is entirely possible that Stoney romanticized Medway by adding the stepped gables. Stepped gables were not only a Dutch-inspired design element. In Glasgow, Scotland, stepped gables were very prominent. There are many examples, but Cardarach house near Robroyston, northeast of Glasgow, is so

67 Stoney, *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country*, 47
similar in form to Medway that it can be considered a cousin (Figure 4.14). According to a date over the doorway, it was built in 1625.68

Figure 4.14. Cardarroch near Robroyston, watercolor by William Simpson, image from www.theglasgowstory.com

Unfortunately, the stepped gables at Medway, shown in the 1875 Harper’s New Monthly Magazine engraving (Figure 4.11, above), were cast off in the Earthquake of 1886 whose epicenter was not far from Goose Creek. Captain Samuel Stoney, nephew of Peter G. Stoney, rebuilt them in 1906 when he took over the property. The bricks and

mortar would indicate nothing of the previous form and age of the gables. While it seems probable that Peter G. Stoney romantically added the stepped gables to Medway, their true origin remains a mystery.

---

The first major makeover of Medway after it was rebuilt in 1705 occurred more than 100 years later. The arrival of Peter Gaillard Stoney and his family in the 1830s began the longest dynasty that Medway has seen. Stoney clearly intended to make Medway into more than a financial investment; he wanted a home and a place where his business associates and friends could be entertained and properly received. Taking the simple, one-and-a-half story hall-and-parlor building to a full two-story house with a formal river-facing entrance was just Peter Stoney’s first step in creating the more familiar form of the building as it stands today.
CHAPTER V

THE ROMANTIC LEGACY OF THE STONEYS

1855 through 1930
Under the care of Peter Gaillard Stoney, Medway began its transformation from a modest country house into a larger, somewhat more formal building, more like what could be found at an estate. Stoney probably felt that the house should be an outward expression of the plantation’s achievements. Medway Plantation, after all, witnessed great success in growing crops and making bricks.

Stoney continued the profitability of the plantation, which began with timber and livestock and later thrived on rice. Farming “Carolina Gold” rice was pivotal to the strength of the Carolina economy in the eighteenth and 19th centuries. Remnants of rice plantation landscapes exist all across the Lowcountry. Peter Stoney, in fact, experienced great success with rice cultivation at Medway. He developed water reserves to serve his large rice fields, undoubtedly operating on a system of canals and rice trunks.69

With good clay along the banks of the Back River, Stoney produced fine Carolina grey bricks. Bricks had been made at Medway probably since the senior Landgrave Thomas Smith built the first house there with bricks made from the soils and sands of the Back River, but it is said that Peter Stoney improved their quality greatly. Stoney bricks were purchased by the Federal government and used in the construction of Fort Sumter,70 and no doubt countless numbers of buildings in nearby Charleston. In a ten-month period between 1852 and 1853 alone, Medway produced and shipped out some 594,000 bricks.71

69 Heitzler, 241-242  
70 ibid, 241  
71 Wayne, Lucy B, “Burning Brick and Making a Large Fortune at It Too: Landscape Archaeology and Lowcountry Brickmaking”, Carolina’s Historical Landscapes (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 102
Lowcountry brick researcher Lucy Wayne notes that the overseer’s daybook showed a maximum of eighteen hands a day in the brickyard. The typical daily entry indicated that there were either six or twelve hands supporting brickmaking on one or two molding tables, and the maximum production from these two tables appears to have been 10,000 bricks a day. Activities listed included molding, stoking the kiln, hauling wood, carting clay and unloading the kiln.\textsuperscript{72}

Many of the Stoney family’s personal papers are archived at the South Carolina Historical Society in downtown Charleston. An account book kept by John Stoney highlighted some of the business transactions between Medway and the community. Mostly, it lists things like shipping freights, wharfage fees, commissions, and payroll.\textsuperscript{73} An 1852 copy of the plantation overseer’s daybook is a fascinating look at life on the farm in the nineteenth century. Typical kinds of activities listed in the daybook’s entries include hoeing rice, hilling corn, minding potatoes, hoeing peas, sawing wood, splitting shingles, molding bricks, loading sloops with rice and bricks, tending the barnyard, working on the road, and making wheel barrows, just to name a few.\textsuperscript{74}

By the 1850s Medway was a bustling enterprise. Peter Stoney must have enjoyed his success, for in 1855 he expanded the size of the main house considerably. His

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} ibid, 102
\item \textsuperscript{73} Stoney, John Stafford, \textit{Medway Account Book 1872}, Medway Plantation, 1872, Stoney Family Documents, 1775 - ca. 1935. South Carolina Historical Society
\item \textsuperscript{74} Stoney, John, \textit{Overseer’s Day Book}, Medway Plantation, 1852. Stoney Family Documents, 1775 - ca. 1935. South Carolina Historical Society
\end{itemize}
asymmetrical west wing added about 1,500 square feet to the house.\textsuperscript{75} The west wing is laid in five-course American bond and does not appear to have been stuccoed, though it has been painted.

The addition of the west wing coincides with Stoney’s wife’s, Anna Maria Porcher, contribution to the landscape of Medway. She furthered the planting work of her sister, Jane Porcher, and added the iconic double allee leading to the west side of Medway.\textsuperscript{76} This transformation is significant because it placed emphasis on guests arriving by the road to the west rather than by the Back River to the east. Perhaps the east, or river-side entrance, was intended to be used by businessmen coming up the Back River with their barges to load with bricks, while guests of the Stoneys would enter a different part of the house. Certainly the new entrance into the west wing, with a curving stair opposite the door and a living room to the left, would have been more impressive than stepping into the narrow stair hall on the east.

Samuel Stoney, the author, wrote with confidence that Peter Gaillard Stoney added the west wing in 1855. He is not clear, however, who added the one-story wings on the north and south of the stair tower. He writes “whoever added the low, spreading wings on the river front was sufficiently infected with the feeling of the old work to make his own seem part of it.”\textsuperscript{77} It is possible that those one-story rooms were added at the same time as the west wing, however. They were laid in the same bond pattern as Stoney’s west wing: five-course American bond. If they were not added at the same time

\textsuperscript{75} Stoney, Samuel G., \textit{Plantations of the Carolina Low Country}, 47
\textsuperscript{76} ibid, 48
\textsuperscript{77} ibid, 47
as the west wing, they must have been built near 1855 but after the stair tower was added in about 1835. Perhaps as the oral history of Medway was told to subsequent generations, the story of the one-story wings was overshadowed by the larger work on the west end of the house – both on the building as well as the landscape.

One final addition to Medway likely occurred at the same time as the west wing. The stair tower was raised to reach all three stories. As mentioned earlier, during the 2012 restoration of Medway much of the stucco was removed from the building. Doing so revealed a rowlock course above the second floor of the stair tower. Below the rowlock course is three-course American bond brick and above it is five-course American bond brick. This transition marked an earlier height of the stair tower. Because the brickwork matches the west wing and the one-story wings, it is likely that Peter G. Stoney also raised the height of the stair tower. By adding the third level of the stair tower, Peter Stoney not only provided better access to the third level, which he may have also made habitable at this point, but also he kept the east-west roofline along the same plane. The gable of the stair tower is the only one of the gables that is not stepped except those of the one-story wings. Rather, it resembles a pediment with two pointed spires on each end. It existed this way by at least 1875, when it is shown as such in the Harper’s New Monthly Magazine engraving (Figure 4.11).
The Earthquake of 1886 wreaked havoc on the Lowcountry. It caused hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage to buildings within a wide radius of its epicenter. Brick buildings especially were affected, since they do not flex like wooden structures. Medway, being an all-brick building, suffered damage. While it is not certain how much of the building was affected, based on the large areas of repair that were observed during the 2012 restoration, it appears the damage was extensive.

One thing is clear, however: The stepped gables were missing before 1906. In that year, Peter Gaillard Stoney’s nephew, Captain Samuel G. Stoney, bought the plantation, which he had surveyed at 5,492 acres. Captain Samuel Stoney rebuilt the gables sometime after 1900, which had been cast off in the earthquake, but photographic evidence confirms that they went missing at some point after 1875 when the Harper’s engraving clearly shows that they were there. A photograph from the Medway Collection at the College of Charleston’s Special Collections shows Medway from the west, with Anna Maria Porcher Stoney’s double allee, which is behind the image’s photographer (Figure 5.1). The stepped gables are missing, and the gable ends are boarded up with clapboard. This photo is not dated, but it was probably taken around the time that Samuel Stoney purchased Medway.

---
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79 Baldwin, Agnes L., Susan Baldwin Bates and Richard Côté, Medway Plantation, Back River: An Historical Outline, 1684-1993, the Medway Collection, 36
80 Unnamed photograph of Medway from the Medway Collection, no date given.
Figure 5.1 also shows that there were no windows on the garret level. This could mean that the garret was not intended for use as living space, or that after the earthquake its use changed to storage and windows were no longer necessary.

---

As Captain Samuel Stoney aged in the early twentieth century, maintenance of the house and property at Medway suffered. After his death in 1926, the family was unable
to care for Medway and decided that after nearly 100 years in the family it was time to let Medway go to new owners. The Stoney family left the largest mark on the house at Medway since its humble rebirth after the fire in 1704.

Starting in the 1830s, Peter Gaillard Stoney added a level to Medway along with a stair tower and Greek revival elements to the fenestration. At some point, either during the 1830s work or later in 1855, Stoney added the romantically inspired stepped gables, now an iconic and much-discussed architectural element of Medway. In 1855 he increased Medway’s footprint by adding a west wing to accommodate and impress visitors to his plantation. Peter Stoney’s wife, Anna Maria Porcher Stoney, did her part in 1855 by redesigning the entrance to Medway with an impressive double allee leading to her husband’s new west wing. Less glamorous but no less important was the addition of the two one story wings on either side of the stair tower, probably built at the same time as the west wing.

Though the building suffered damages in the Earthquake of 1886 and probably during other weather events in the nineteenth century, it remained standing. Its stepped gables were rebuilt when Peter Stoney’s nephew, Captain Samuel G. Stoney, became Medway’s caretaker in 1906. Unfortunately, Captain Stoney’s ailing health was mirrored by Medway’s disrepair. Nonetheless, Medway’s allure was strong enough to attract a young couple who purchased it in 1930.

The Stoney family’s contributions to the house at Medway remain largely unchanged today. With great foresight, Peter Gaillard Stoney and Captain Samuel
Gaillard Stoney left a majority of Medway’s earlier historic fabric intact. The subsequent owners adopted the same ethic and as a result Medway’s architectural record can be studied today.
CHAPTER VI

“LORD, PLEASE SEND US A RICH YANKEE”

1930 through the present
MEDWAY PLANTATION, MOUNT HOLLY, SOUTH CAROLINA
PHASE 5: 2012 MEASURED DRAWINGS
RICHARD MARKS RESTORATIONS, INC | NOT TO SCALE
After Captain Samuel Gaillard Stoney died in 1926, his family struggled to maintain Medway. They tried leasing it as hunting, timber and cattle land but with limited success; not enough to keep up with the grounds and the buildings. Captain Stoney’s son of the same name was heard many times exclaiming in desperation: “Lord, please send us a rich Yankee!” His prayer was answered in 1929 when a young couple from New York visited Medway Plantation. In 1930, Gertrude and Sidney Legendre bought Medway from Captain Stoney’s wife, Louisa, and their children, Sam, Augustine, Harriet and Louisa, for $100,000. The property was surveyed at 2,530 acres. The Legendres also bought neighboring Spring Grove and Pine Grove Plantations, as well as portions of several other plantations, which brought the size of their Lowcountry estate to about 7,600 acres.

Gertrude Legendre’s first impression of Medway was not exactly glowing. Ms. Legendre and Sidney were visiting their friends the Kitteredges whom Gertrude knew from her childhood in Aiken, South Carolina. Someone suggested they have a picnic at Medway. In an interview with Gertie, as she was called by her friends, she is quoted saying, “As we neared Medway, I remember peering under a festoon of gray moss dripping from huge oak trees and catching sight of an old, eerie pink structure. The setting was weird and mysterious. It reminded me of one of Arthur Rackham's drawings.”

---
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Yet the mystery of Medway was undeniably attractive to Gertrude and Sidney Legendre. When they purchased it they understood that it would require a fair amount of work to restore and modernize it. The intrepid Legendres pushed on and made many changes to Medway, though most of them were simply cosmetic. Indeed, the Legendres preserved the majority of the historic fabric, as had previous owners.

Local architect Albert Simons investigated the house in 1931 and drafted sketches for the probable arrangement of the floorplan when it was first built (Figure 6.1). He also proposed plans for its renovation. The most significant changes were upgrades to the plumbing and electric service to the house, modernizing the bathrooms and kitchen, adding paneling to several rooms, changing some of the doors and windows, transforming the stairway in the west wing, and renovating both of the one-story wings off the east stair tower.
Figure 6.1. Conjectural floorplans and existing elevations by Albert Simons and Frank Seel in 1931. Image from the Medway Collection.

Figure 6.2, from the Medway Collection, probably shows what Medway looked like shortly after the Legendres arrived. The porch roof and columns that existed previously over the patio had been removed and the door leading into the west wing still had a full transom and sidelights. This door was probably moved to the location shown in the photo from its earlier location on the west side of the 1705 portion of the house when Peter G. Stoney added the west wing. It matches the simple Greek revival door at the east entrance, which is visible in Figure 4.13.

At some point, the Legendres removed the sidelights and shortened the transom over the door pictured above. They also removed the tripartite window on the west side of the central portion of the house and expanded the opening to accommodate French
doors leading from the dining room to the terrace. Depicting the same view of Medway in Figure 6.2, Figure 6.3, though undated, shows the house as it would later become.

Note the transition of the door leading to the west wing and the addition of French doors to the dining room, installed after April 1937\textsuperscript{84}. For much of the Legendre era at Medway, portions of the house were wrapped with creeping ivy, also shown in Figure 33.

Figure 6.2. Undated photo of Medway from the southwest, probably taken shortly after the Legendre’s arrival. Image from the Medway Collection.

\textsuperscript{84} Charleston Constructors, Inc., Proposal for construction work at Medway, April 26, 1937, from the Medway Collection, College of Charleston Special Collections
The Legendres must have also changed the stairs off the west wing shortly after their arrival at Medway. Presumably when Peter Gaillard Stoney added the wing in 1855 it included a foyer with a stairway leading to the second floor. Unfortunately, no evidence was found indicating the design of that set of stairs, however they may have been relatively simple compared to the grand curving stairs that exist currently. Two photos in the Medway Collection taken of the north façade show that a fenestration change took place where the stairs in the west wing currently exist.

The earlier photo (Figure 6.4) was taken after Captain Stoney rebuilt the stepped gables, which was as early as 1906. It was probably taken before the Legendres bought Medway or shortly thereafter. It shows two tripartite windows where the stairs are now.
which implies that the stairs did not wrap around the north wall as they do today. Rather, they possibly could have been narrow and built tight against the old exterior wall of the central portion of the house.

The newer photo (Figure 6.5) from the Collection is also undated, but was probably taken sometime relatively soon after the Legendres began their work at Medway. In the foreground of the photo the ground appears to be disturbed perhaps by a tiller. This landscaping work could coincide with the grading that the Legendres had done not long after their purchase of Medway. On the north façade where the stairs are, in contrast to the previous photo, there is only one tripartite window and it is in between the first and second floors, which is how it looks presently. Though the photo does not show what the stairs look like, it is likely that they curve around the north end of the foyer as they do today (Figure 6.6).
Figure 6.4. Photo taken between 1926 and 1930, from the Medway Collection. It shows two tripartite windows where the west stairs currently exist.
Figure 6.5. Photo taken in the early to mid-1930s, from the Medway Collection. Only one tripartite window exists where the west stairs are, as it exists currently.
The earliest round of renovations that the Legendres conducted at Medway was probably supervised and carried out by Dawson Engineering Company, Inc., Registered Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors, Construction Engineers. In the early months of 1931, they billed Sidney and Gertrude Legendre for lots of miscellaneous work at Medway. Some of the line items on the bills include shower rods, a glass door for a shower, miscellaneous carpentry work, electrical work, gutters, plumbing, cedar closets, pantry cabinet work, and work in the library which included building the chimney, millwork, and electrical work. Also listed on the bills were granite and costs associated with painting. One line item on a bill dated March 2, 1931, at a cost of $66.29, was for
extra work on stairs including a new mahogany rail. This could be in reference to the spiral stairs in the west wing.\textsuperscript{85}

The Legendres were not finished with renovating Medway in 1931. In 1932 they began working on specifications for what they called the gun room, which is the southern one-story room off the dining room and east stair tower. Treanor and Fatio, Architects, from New York City designed specifications for the renovations to the gun room and also for a guest wing addition to the south end of the gun room which was never built. Their very detailed specifications for the guest addition included what ratio of mortar to mix, the brick bond pattern to be used, how to apply the plaster and lath and what materials to use, what species and dimensions of lumber should be used, and how to construct the exterior millwork and shutters.\textsuperscript{86}

For reasons unknown the guest addition was never added. However, Treanor and Fatio’s specifications for the gun room itself were carried out. Their specifications were as follows\textsuperscript{87}:

- The floor in the gun room would be 7/8” tongue and groove of random, width, quarter-sawn oak boards ranging from 6” to 12” and that they would be blind nailed and screwed to the rough floor.

- The walls were to be moulded 7/8” tongue and groove, random width pecky cypress planks that were to be jack planed.

\textsuperscript{85} Dawson Engineering Co., Inc., Miscellaneous bills for work at Medway from 1931, located in the Medway Collection, College of Charleston Special Collections
\textsuperscript{86} Treanor and Fatio, Architects, Specifications for Guest Wing Addition to South End of Gun Room, Residence of Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Legendre, Medway Plantation, Charleston, SC, 3 East 44th Street, New York City, New York, October 31, 1932, from the Medway Collection
\textsuperscript{87} ibid
• The doors were to be built of the same material as the walls with blind batters running horizontally.

• The present door between the gun room and the hall was to be rehung as shown and present wood reveal cut down to meet new conditions.

• A gun case was to be built of the same materials as the walls with glazed doors.

• The ceiling beams were to be of solid pecky cypress, rough hewn and securely fastened to the existing ceiling joists with lag screws.

• The new opening to the dining room was to be paneled, both the jambs and the soffit, with white pine, and the work should match in detail and color the present finish of the dining room.

• A secondary closet under the stairs off the gun room was to be installed with white pine doors, shelves, lining and frame.

Figure 6.7 is what the current gun room looks like. Its interior exists as originally specified by Treaner and Fatio in 1931. Possibly around the same time as the renovations to the gun room the roofs of the one-story wings were changed. A portion of those roofs was originally sloped like a shed roof coming from the central portion of the house, as shown in the Harper’s engraving (Figure 4.11) and a photograph taken after 1906 (Figure 6.4). A more recent image from the Medway Collection shows that the Legendres removed the shed roof portion of the one-story wings and made it a simple peaked roof (Figure 6.8).
Figure 6.7. Medway's gun room as it exists today. Photo by author.

Figure 6.8. Undated photo of Medway from the east, showing the one-story roofs after the shed-roof was removed. Photo from the Medway Collection.
Figure 6.9. Ghost of former shed roof on the south wall of the east stair tower. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.

Also evident in Figure 6.8 above is a new entrance on the stair tower and the removal of the tripartite window above the door. The previous door was the same style Greek revival door that is shown in Figure 6.2 near the beginning of this chapter. The current door, shown in Figure 6.10, is a Colonial revival door. The circular and semicircular muntins on the sidelights and the elliptical fanlight above the door provide the main emphasis of the opening. 88

88 Calloway, et al., 207
In addition to painting and wallpapering many of the interior walls, wood paneling was added to two of the rooms: the living/dining room and the master bedroom. In his archaeology report on Pine Grove Plantation, Carl Steen wrote that woodwork from the interior of Pine Grove, which dated to the mid-eighteenth century, was adapted for use in the remodeling of Medway in the 1930s.\(^9\) Indeed, the Georgian-styled cypress paneling from neighboring Pine Grove, pictured in Figure 6.11, ended up in at least one

room at Medway. A letter from Charleston Constructors, Inc., in April 1937 to the Legendres described their proposal to remove the cypress paneling from Pine Grove and reinstall it in the living room at Medway. Page one of the letter is shown in Figure 6.12.

Figure 6.11. Undated photo of Pine Grove Plantation, from the Medway Collection.

---
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Figure 6.12. Proposal for work by Charleston Constructors, Inc., in 1937. From the Medway Collection.
Figure 6.13 is an image of the paneling as installed in the dining room at Medway. It was taken near the completion of the 2012 restoration work. Figure 6.14 is a photograph of paneling in the second floor master bedroom, which is in the west wing. Though it was not mentioned in the proposal shown in Figure 6.12, it is similar to the paneling in the dining room and may have also been salvaged from Pine Grove, though possibly at a later date. It was also taken near the completion of the 2012 restoration work after having been stripped of paint and sealed.

![Figure 6.13. Cypress paneling from Pine Grove installed in the living/dining room at Medway. Photo by author.](image-url)
During the summer of 1984, the east wall of the front hall collapsed and had to be rebuilt. Parts of it were re-constructed with cinder blocks. During the work, several bricks that were embossed with the Hyrne coat of arms were exposed (Figure 6.15).

Also in the 1980s, Gertrude Legendre had major work done on the kitchen wing. Work included new flooring, framing, wall-covering, cabinetry and appliances. An image retained by Richard Marks Restorations shows some of that process (Figure 6.16). After Hurricane Hugo damaged many of the old growth trees on Medway Plantation, some of the fallen trees were milled and stored for future use. The kitchen cabinets were upgraded with heart pine timber salvaged from Hugo’s destruction (Figure 6.17).
Figure 6.15. Hyrne family coat of arms in bricks exposed during the 1984 reconstruction of the east wall of the front hall. From the Medway Collection.

Figure 6.16. Photo of 1980s work on the north wall of Room 105, the kitchen. Photo retained by Richard Marks Restorations.
Sidney and Gertrude Legendre were certainly passionate about their new life in the Lowcountry. As any new owner might do, they added their own personal touches to Medway, but piously and thankfully they retained most of the original building fabric. Medway became a refuge from the rest of the world for the Legendres. It was a gathering place for friends and diplomats, but also it was their home. In a diary entry from May 10-13, 1937, Sidney Legendre wrote, “There is nothing so pleasant as reading in the evenings here. The dogs sleep on the floor, and occasionaly [sic] groan from the amount
of food that they have eaten.” It is easy to imagine such a happy scene with the couple and their canine companions, perhaps in the cozy gun room with a fire warming them.

To protect the legacy of Medway, Gertrude Legendre placed 82.5 acres of Medway Plantation, the area surrounding the core of the property, the main house, and surrounding buildings, in a conservation and preservation easement. The deed describes the legal considerations associated with the easement and it defines the prohibited actions to protect the exterior of the buildings and the appropriate processes that may be undertaken during necessary restorations and renovations.\(^\text{92}\)

The good stewardship of Medway continued in 2012 when it was purchased by its current owner. Like his predecessors, the Legendres, the current owner elected to maintain the majority of the original material deposited over more than 300 years by previous owners of Medway Plantation. The restoration work, as discussed in Chapter 1, was mostly focused on maintenance of the interior finishes and millwork, upgrading mechanical, electrical and plumbing services, and removing stucco, repairing broken bricks, and reapplying stucco to the exterior of the building.

---

\(^{91}\) Legendre, Sidney, *Diary of Life at Medway Plantation, Mount Holly, South Carolina, Beginning the Month of May 1937*, May 10-13, 1937, the Medway Collection, 5

\(^{92}\) Historic Charleston Foundation, *Deed of Conservation and Preservation Easement*
CONCLUSION

Not long after English colonists first landed at Charles Towne Landing, Thomas Smith and his growing family purchased four hundred acres of land on Back River, a tributary of the Cooper River. Smith’s selection of this land for a plantation was strategic: he knew that the navigable waters of the Back River would allow for easy access to the city now known as Charleston where he could sell crops and bricks. He would soon marry the widow of a Dutchman who had been granted 48,000 acres and all of the rights of a Barony. This lucrative marriage entitled Mr. Smith to the land, and the Lord’s Proprietors made him a Landgrave. Around 1691, Smith built a brick house that possibly measured 26’ by 80’. He later became the Governor of Carolina but died not long after his appointment and was buried at his Back River plantation.

Edward and Elizabeth Hyrne purchased Medway in 1701. The couple struggled to make ends meet financially the entire time they lived in Carolina. True misfortune met them in 1703 when they lost a slave to a rattlesnake bite and their infant child. Like pouring salt in their wounds, in early 1704 the house that Thomas Smith built burned completely to the ground. The Hyrnes escaped with their lives but with little else. They rebuilt Medway as best as they could, which meant that it was smaller and laid with bricks of a relatively poor quality. They lost the property several years later, and it exchanged hands many times over the next hundred years or so.
By 1738, at least, it appears the building had been unchanged since the Hyrnes rebuilt it. It was listed for sale in a newspaper advertisement in that year. The only details about the structure given in the ad were that it was made of brick, measured 26’x 36’, and sat above a full cellar.

Little documentary evidence is available that could describe in more detail what the house looked like and how it began to evolve as owners made their own marks on it. Some information was discovered during the site investigation phase of this thesis research, including that the building stood at one and a half stories after the fire and that it was laid in English bond with a struck grapevine mortar joint, meaning that it was not intended to be stuccoed. Also it probably had four dormer windows in the garret level, which would have been finished and used as sleeping quarters most likely. Since the bricks the Hyrnes laid were fairly soft, the building was probably stuccoed some years after to try to protect the integrity of the structure. Remains of a thin white stucco coat on the sides of the 1704-05 chimney indicate that the stucco was added before another story was added.

It seems likely that Peter Gaillard Stoney made the next large-scale changes at Medway. He and his wife arrived in the 1830s. Not long after they became Medway’s stewards, they probably added the third story to the building as well as a two-story stair tower and formal entry hall on the east side. As was fashionable in Charleston in the 1830s, the Stoney’s updated some of the windows and doors at Medway to ones inspired by Greek revival architecture.
Romanticism wasn’t only fashionable in Charleston; it was spreading across the country during the middle of the nineteenth century. Sunnyside, the romantically-inspired home of Washington Irving in New York, bears a strong resemblance to Medway with its stair tower and stepped gables. Irving and Peter Stoney were probably influenced by similar architectural trends – whether they were cues from Dutch, Scottish, or other countries’ vernacular styles.

The much-discussed stepped gables, one of Medway’s hallmarks, may have been added during Peter G. Stoney’s first renovations of the house. The middle of the nineteenth century was a period where architecture was often romanticized. Since the Dutchman, John D’Arsens, was not the original progenator of Medway as was speculated until recent years, Medway probably did not always have the stepped gables, though they were commonly found in Dutch architecture. Rather, drawing from Dutch colonial or even Scottish architectural styles, Peter Stoney probably added the stepped gables to Medway.

Another change occurred in 1855, when, as Samuel Stoney wrote, Peter Stoney added the asymmetrical west wing to Medway, corresponding with his wife’s landscaping work and the addition of a double allee leading to the west entrance. It is likely that during this construction phase, Stoney added a level to the stair tower on the east as well to provide full access to the third floor.

From 1855 to the present, the structure of Medway has remained much the same. A devastating earthquake in 1886 knocked the gables off of Medway, but they were
restored by Peter Stoney’s nephew, Captain Samuel Gaillard Stoney, after 1906. Gertrude and Sidney Legendre bought the plantation and several neighboring properties from the Stoney family in 1930. It had fallen into somewhat of a state of disrepair, but the Legendre’s restored the exterior and the landscape and made mostly cosmetic changes to the building’s interior.

Finally, Medway was sold in 2012 to a new owner, who hired Richard Marks Restorations to conduct an extensive restoration of the main building as well as some of the outbuildings. It was this restoration work that provided the opportunity to study the building as it had not been done before. With stucco removed, bricks and mortar could be closely studied and linked to different building campaigns. With interior walls and void spaces exposed for repair work, the building’s structural members – its genetic code, if you will – could be researched.

The information collected during the restoration helped create a more complete view of Medway’s structural evolution. Combined with archival research and the studies of other historians, this thesis represents the clearest interpretation of the building history of Medway available to date. Certainly, there is room for error in this thesis. It is simply one researcher’s conjectural study of Medway. The pursuit of knowledge is always encouraged. It is hoped that as long as Medway stands, interested parties will continue to search for the clues to its past.
Appendix A

Mortar Analysis: Medway Plantation, Mount Holly, South Carolina

1. Introduction

The intent of mortar analysis by acid digestion is not necessarily to identify specific dates of building campaigns. Rather, by comparing results from different areas of a building the analyst is able to detect similarities and differences in the mortars. The differences may be indicative of separate building campaigns. For example, one mortar sample may show a binder-to-aggregate ratio of three-to-seven while a sample from another area is comprised of two parts binder to one part aggregate. The difference in the ratios in this example could be attributed to two different building campaigns. When compared to documentary and other investigatory evidence, mortar analysis can often provide more weight to a theory about a building’s evolution.

Like most architectural history investigations, however, mortar analysis should not be cited as the lone source of information used to determine the relative age of a building or addition. Degrees of error in analysis stem from the time the mortar was laid to collection of the sample to processing in the laboratory. Masons’ mortar mixes are subject to change with each shovel of sand, clay or lime. It is easy to imagine how rough measurements of materials could result in very different mortars, even in the same course.
Adding to the equation of variance, different people may create different mixes because of the accuracy of their measurements or even how they were taught to measure out mortar. One mason could have learned one ratio of measurements and another a different set, and switching back and forth between laying and mixing could result in the diversity of mortar. Further, the degree of mixing can vary greatly. With sample sizes of twenty grams or fewer, the chances of collecting a sample that is not necessarily representative of the overall campaign should not be dismissed.

Finally and certainly in the case of Medway, repair work should be considered as a reason for differences in mortar samples. Any building that is more than three-hundred years old is bound to have had several rounds of general maintenance. At Medway, there was clear evidence of brick repairs. The samples that were chosen were believed to be original mortar from the various additions.

The potential for error into consideration, mortar analysis can be an effective tool for determining the chronological sequencing of a building. The more samples that can be collected, the better the data set will be. At Medway, samples were chosen based on what are believed to be different building campaigns. This was determined by documentary research as well as site investigation; for example, different brick bond patterns were interpreted to be from different construction phases.

The results of the mortar analysis in general support other evidence and help establish a timeline for additions to Medway. Overall, the materials that were used in the composition of the sampled areas were similar. It was always assumed that the aggregate
used in the mortar at Medway was mined locally from the banks of the nearby Back River. Though the proportions of aggregate discovered during analysis varied, the constituents appeared to match. There were several outlier samples, which will be discussed further in the results section of this report.
2. **Methodology**

ASTM International, formerly the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), has designated a Standard Test Method for Examination and Analysis of Hardened Masonry Mortar, C1324. This method covers petrographic examination and chemical analysis of masonry mortar samples. The results of the test allow proportions of the components of mortar to be determined. The following procedures for the testing of mortars and stuccos are adopted from ASTM Standard C1324. They are the same testing procedures that are used in the Conservation Laboratory courses at Clemson University and the College of Charleston’s joint graduate program in historic preservation in Charleston, South Carolina.

2.1 **Sampling Method**

Samples were collected using brick hammers and chisels and were placed into plastic bags, sealed and labeled.

2.2 **Equipment**

The following equipment is required in the laboratory for mortar and stucco analysis:

---
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2.3 Procedure

1. Collect 20-30 grams (or as large as possible) of bulk sample and record its weight.

2. Examine the sample and record the following characteristics: general appearance, layer structure (if any), bulk color (Munsell), texture (texture calibration board), inclusions, snap strength, hardness (Mohs).

3. Photograph the bulk sample.
4. Powder the sample with a mortar and pestle.

5. If the sample is retaining moisture, dry the powdered sample in a No. 120 incubator for 24 hours, weigh it and record the weight.

6. Place the powdered sample in a 600 ml beaker after weighing the beaker first and moisten it with water.

7. In a fume hood, slowly add a 14% solution Muriatic acid. Observe and record the observations.

8. Place beaker with sample and acid on mechanical stirring plate. Agitate for 24 hours, leaving a watch glass on top of the beaker to prevent the escape of corrosive acid liquid and/or gas.

9. Add a few drops of the 14% Muriatic Acid solution to the sample. No reaction will confirm that digestion is complete.

2.3.1 Separation/Filtration/Sieving

10. Label the a piece of filter paper, weigh it and record the weight.

11. Fold the paper into quarters and place it in a funnel. Position the funnel so that it will drain into a large beaker or flask.

12. Slowly add water to the remaining sample material and stir with a glass rod to suspend the fines.

13. Slowly pour the liquid with suspended material through the filter, being careful to keep the aggregate at the bottom of the beaker.

14. Repeat steps 12 and 13 until the water added to the beaker remains clear,
indicating that all of the fines are separated from the aggregate.

15. Dry the fines collected on the filter paper and placed on a watch glass in a No. 120 incubator for 24 hours.

16. Leave the aggregate in the beaker to dry for 24 hours in a No. 120 incubator.

17. Weigh the filter paper with the dry fines. Subtract the weight of the filter paper to determine the weight of the fines.

18. Weigh the dry aggregate and container. Subtract the weight of the container and record the weight of the aggregate.

19. Express the amount of aggregate as a weight-to-weight percentage of the whole sample. Express the amount of fines in the same manner. The amount of dissolved binder is calculated by summing the weights of the aggregate and fines and subtracting from initial weight of the sample.

2.3.2 Characterization of Aggregate

20. Examine the aggregate with a microscope. Record physical characteristics (color, grain size, shape, porosity, hardness, texture).

21. Sieve the aggregate in a small standard sieve set to determine the particle size distribution. Express the amount of each particle size as a percentage of the whole (either as % passing or retained).

22. Further characterize the aggregate by screen size; color, roundness, and size.
2.4 Safety Precautions

1. While performing acid digestion, use the fume hood and wear nitrile gloves and safety glasses.

2. For all activities involving acid solution outside the fume hood, use safety goggles and nitrile gloves.
Sample Location Key

The sample locations are color coded to represent the building phases they are probably associated with. Orange represents a 1705 building era, red represents an 1830s (referred to as 1835) building era, and blue represents additions made in 1855.
This drawing is adapted from one created by Richard Marks Restorations INC to show the sample locations.
Analysis Sheets
# Medway Plantation
Mount Holly, South Carolina

## Mortar Analysis: All weights expressed in grams (g)

### Sample Identification: M-E-M-1

**Sample Location:** East side, southern one-story wing, below window E/W-2

**Analysis:** N. S. Nickels

**Performed by:**
- **Date Sampled:** 6/5/2012
- **Date Analyzed:** 2/15/2013

### Description of Sample:

- **Type/Location:** Mortar
- **Surface/Appearance:** Tan-yellow color, fine aggregate with some larger, dark and white flecks
- **Color:**0.5
- **Texture:** 150 grit
- **Hardness:** 5

### Gross sample photo: Closeup photo:

#### Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Weight of beaker:</th>
<th>Aggregate weight:</th>
<th>Percent weight:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176.22</td>
<td>7.119</td>
<td>42.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fines:</th>
<th>Color:</th>
<th>Filter weight:</th>
<th>Total weight:</th>
<th>Percent weight:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5Y/8/3</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>8.447</td>
<td>39.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime</th>
<th>Weight:</th>
<th>Percent weight:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.997</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aggregate characterization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Small pebbles</td>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>5YR/4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very coarse</td>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>2.5Y/8/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>2.5Y/8/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>subrounded</td>
<td>10YR/8/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>medium fine</td>
<td>angular</td>
<td>10YR/8/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>10YR/9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>10YR/8/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container:</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container:</th>
<th>Mass retained:</th>
<th>Percent retained:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>8.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.059</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1.707</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>5.963</td>
<td>4.176</td>
<td>58.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>5.386</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>24.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aggregate Photo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage check:</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>line</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggregate</td>
<td>82.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8 ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medway Plantation
Mount Holly, South Carolina
Mortar Analysis: All weights expressed in grams (g)

Sample Identification: M-E-M2
Sample Location: Left of the door on the stair tower, three feet south of the door five feet above the stoop
Analysis performed by: Scale Nickels
Date Sampled: 6/5/2012
Date Analyzed: 2/17/2013

Description of Sample:
Type/Location: Mortar
Surface/Appearance: Fine sand with white and red/dark flecks
Color: Munsell 10YR8/2
Texture: 150 grit
Hardness: <5
Breaker weight: 179.535
Total weight: 184.249
Sample weight: 4.714

Gross sample photo: Closeup photo:

Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate:</th>
<th>Weight of beaker: 179.535</th>
<th>Aggregate weight: 2.747</th>
<th>Percent weight: 1.58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fines:</th>
<th>Color: 2.5Y7/1</th>
<th>Filter weight: 0.000</th>
<th>Total weight: 0.000</th>
<th>Percent weight: 0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime</th>
<th>Weight: 1.084</th>
<th>Percent weight: 21.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of reaction: Small reaction, minor fusing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filterable color: 5Y/8/4
Composition: 

Aggregate characterization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very Coarse</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>10YR8/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>7.5Y5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>7.5Y5/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>medium fine</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y7/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>angular</td>
<td>2.5Y7/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y7/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>1.937</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>2.065</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>17.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>55.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.993</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Photo

Percentage check: 100.00%
line: aggregate: 77.00%
2:8 ratio
**Sample Identification:** M.E.M3

**Sample Location:** East side, northern one-story wing, bottom right side of window TW1-4 (northern window on east wall)

**Analysis performed by:** Scale Nickels

**Sample Analysis: Date Sampled:** 6/5/2012

**Date Analyzed:** 2/15/2013

**Description of Sample:**

**Texture:** 150 grit

**Color:** Mansell 10YR 7/1

**Hardness:** <5

**Sieve Characterization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.774</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>2.631</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>28.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregate characterization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.774</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>2.631</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>28.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross sample photo:**

**Closeup photo:**

**Components:**

- **Aggregate:**
  - Weight of beaker: 180.034
  - Aggregate weight: 2.813
  - Percent weight: 23.19%

- **Fines:**
  - Color: 2.5Y 8/1
  - Filter weight: 1.724
  - Total weight: 8.942
  - Percent weight: 59.52%

- **Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime:**
  - Weight: 2.097
  - Percent weight: 17.29%

**Description of reaction:** Very light fizzing, small reaction

**Filterate color:** 5Y 6/3

**Composition:**

**Percentage check:**

- 100.00%

- 17.29%

- 82.71%

- 2:1 ratio
Sample Identification: M.S-M1

Analysis performed by: Steele Nickells

Date Analyzed: 2/14/2013

Description of Sample:

Type/Location: Mortar, bed mortar

Surface Appearance: Fine grained sand

Color: Munsell 10YR7/4

Texture: 150 grit

Hardness: <5

Weaker weight: 173.435

Total weight: 173.897

Sample weight: 2.462

Aggregate characterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very Coarse</td>
<td>Subrounded 2.5YR/8/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>2.5YR/9.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>10YR/8.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>medium fine</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>2.5YR/9.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5YR/9.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>2.5YR/9.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>10YR8/3/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>1.713</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.631</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>69.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Photo

Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Weight of beaker: 173.435</th>
<th>Aggregate weight: 0.046</th>
<th>Percent weight: 1.87%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fines:</td>
<td>Color: 10YR8/3</td>
<td>Filter weight: 1.72</td>
<td>Total weight: 3.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter:</td>
<td>Fines weight: 1.805</td>
<td>Percent weight: 8.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime</td>
<td>Weight: 0.341</td>
<td>Percent weight: 30.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of reaction: Small reaction

Filter: color: 5Y/2

Composition:

Percentage check: 100.00%

lignite
aggregate
30.10%
39.90%
3:7 ratio
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Medway Plantation  
Mount Holly, South Carolina  
Mortar Analysis: All weights expressed in grams (g)

### Sample Identification: M-S-M2

**Sample Location:** Just below the window on the south façade of the southern one-story wing

**Analysis performed by:** Scale Nickels  
**Date Sampled:** 6/5/2012  
**Date Analyzed:** 2/15/2013

**Description of Sample:**

**Type/Location:** Mortar  
**Surface Appearance:** Fine sand, clay, some dark flecks and light/white flecks  
**Color:** Munsell 10YR/7/4  
**Texture:** 150 grit  
**Hardness:** <5  
**Breaker weight:** 178.344  
**Total weight:** 183.1  
**Sample weight:** 4.756

### Aggregate characterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.851</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>29.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>16.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>12.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>2.199</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>40.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aggregate Photo

**Aggregate Photo**

---

### Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Weight of beaker</th>
<th>Aggregate weight</th>
<th>Percent weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178.344</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fines**

- **Color:** 2.5Y/6.5
- **Filter weight:** 1.725  
- **Total weight:** 4.913

**Organic Matter**

- **Fines weight:** 0.186  
- **Percent weight:** 40.03%

**Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime**

**Description of reaction:** Very small, similar to the reaction for sample M-I-M3

**Filterable color:** 5Y/6/4  
**Composition:**

---

**Percentage check:**

- **aggregate:** 20.44%
- **lime:** 79.56%
- **2:8 ratio**

---

125
Midway Plantation  
Mount Holly, South Carolina  
Mortar Analysis: All weights expressed in grams (g)

Sample Identification: M-S-M1

Sample Location: 12' from SW corner of central portion on south façade, level with window sill
Analysis performed by: Scale Nickels
Date Sampled: 6/5/2012
Date Analyzed: 2/14/2013

Description of Sample:
Type/Location: Mortar from English bond bricks with grapevine joint
Surface Appearance: Fine grained sand, some dark flecks
Color: Munsell 10YR 7/2
Texture: 150 grit
Hardness: <5
Breaker weight: 181.085
Total weight: 187.847
Sample weight: 6.762

Gross sample photo:

Closeup photo:

Aggregate characterization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>2.5Y 9.5/2</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>subrounded</td>
<td>10YR 6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y 9.5/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y 9.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y 9.5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>10YR 6/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* sieve 40 contained what appeared to be conglomerate pieces of pan-sized materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.955</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Photo:

Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Weight of beaker</th>
<th>Aggregate weight</th>
<th>Percent weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>181.085</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color:</th>
<th>10YR 6/1</th>
<th>Filter weight:</th>
<th>1.71</th>
<th>Total weight:</th>
<th>3.750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter:</td>
<td>Fines weight:</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>Percent weight:</td>
<td>59.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime

| Weight: | 1.961 | Percent weight: | 28.11% |
| Description of reaction: | Violent and fast |

Filterable color: 5Y/8/4
Composition:

Percentage check: 100.00%
Line: 28.11%
Aggregate: 71.89%
3:7 ratio
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Medway Plantation  
Mount Holly, South Carolina

**Sample Identification:** M-S-M4

**Sample Location:** On the south façade, central portion, top right corner of second story window, on west side

**Analysis:** Scale Nickels

**Date Sampled:** 6/5/2012  
**Date Processed:** 6/5/2012  
**Date Analyzed:** 2/14/2013

---

**Description of Sample:**

**Type:** Mortar  
**Surface Appearance:** Fine silty sand, a few dark flecks, a few bricks white flecks  
**Color:** Munsell 10YR 7/2  
**Texture:** 150 grit  
**Hardness:** <5

**Gross sample photo:**  
**Closeup photo:**

---

**Components:**

**Aggregate:**  
**Weight of beaker:** 174.56  
**Aggregate weight:** 22.7725  
**Percent weight:** 66.42%

**Fines:**

**Color:** 10YR 7/2  
**Filter weight:** 1.730  
**Total weight:** 9.373

**Organic Matter:**  
**Fines weight:** 7.657  
**Percent weight:** 22.27%

---

**Aggregate characterization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very Coarse Subrounded 2.5YR 8/2</td>
<td>2.5YR 8/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse Subrounded 2.5YR 8/2</td>
<td>2.5YR 8/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse Subangular 2.5YR 9/2</td>
<td>2.5YR 9/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Medium fine Subangular 2.5YR 9/2</td>
<td>2.5YR 9/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fine Subangular 2.5YR 8/2</td>
<td>2.5YR 8/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine Subangular 2.5YR 9/2</td>
<td>2.5YR 9/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Silt Subangular 10YR 7/2</td>
<td>10YR 7/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Aggregate Photo:**

---

**Percentage check:**

- line: 100.00%
- aggregate: 11.31%
- fine: 88.69%
- percentage ratio: 1:9 ratio

---
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## Medway Plantation
Mount Holly, South Carolina

**Sample Information:**
- **Sample Location:** M-0W-ENT-2FL-North
- **Sample Description:** Second floor interior sample from the master bathroom in the west wing, from below the window sill around what appears to be original bricks
- **Date Sampled:** 7/26/2012
- **Date Analyzed:** 2/17/2013

**Description of Sample:**
- **Texture:** Fine grains, high clay/silt content
- **Color:** Munsell 10YR/7/2
- **Surface Appearance:** Fine grains, high clay/silt content
- **Hardness:** <5
- **Breaker weight:** 181.113
- **Total weight:** 196.083
- **Sample weight:** 14.972

### Gross sample photo:
![Gross sample photo]

### Closeup photo:
![Closeup photo]

### Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fines</th>
<th>Weight of beaker</th>
<th>Aggregates</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Filter weight</th>
<th>Percent weight</th>
<th>Description of reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181.113</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>2.5Y/8/1</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>Very, very small reaction. Very little fizzing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>Total weight: 11.225</td>
<td>Description of reaction: Very, very small reaction. Very little fizzing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aggregate Photo

![Aggregate Photo]

### Aggregate Characterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very Coarse</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>2.5Y/8/1, 2.5YR/4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td>2.5Y/8.5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td>2.5Y/8/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Medium fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y/7/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y/9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y/9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flakes</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y/8/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>1.968</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.877</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>4.561</td>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>83.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregate Photo:**
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**Sample Identification:** M-E-central-2FL

**Sample Location:** Northeast second story wall on the east side of the central parson, three feet above the kitchen roof, 6 feet north of stair tower wall

**Analysis performed by:** Scale Nickels  
**Date Sampled:** 7/24/2012  
**Date Analyzed:** 12/20/2012

**Description of Sample:** Grainy sand, tan color, some white flecks (lime?)

**Surface Appearance:** Grains, some white flecks

**Color:** Munsell 10YR/8/2

**Hardness:** <5

**Breaker weight:** 173.235

**Total weight:** 189.600

**Sample weight:** 16.373

**Gross sample photo:**

**Closeup photo:**

### Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate</th>
<th>Weight of beaker</th>
<th>Aggregate weight</th>
<th>Percent weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173.235</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fines:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Filter weight</th>
<th>Total weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5Y8/1</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>14.342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organic Matter:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fines weight</th>
<th>Percent weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>77.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Percent weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>7.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of reaction:** Small to moderate reaction

**Filter color:** 5Y6/4

**Composition:**

### Aggregate characterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very Coarse</td>
<td>subrounded</td>
<td>5YR8/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>5YR4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>varied</td>
<td>5YR4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>medium fine</td>
<td>subrounded</td>
<td>5YR4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y8/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y9/5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Silty</td>
<td>subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y8/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aggregate Photo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>4.356</td>
<td>2.431</td>
<td>98.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUM:** 2.466

**Percentage check:** 100.00%

- lime: 7.86%
- aggregate: 92.14%

**1:9 ratio**
Medway Plantation
Mount Holly, South Carolina
Mortar Analysis: All weights expressed in grams (g)

Sample Identification: M-N 2/3 chimney

Analysis performed by: Scale Nickels
Date Sampled: 1/10/2012
Date Analyzed: 2/2/2013

Description of Sample:
Type/Location: Mortar
Surface/Appearance: Sandy - small grains. Some white flecks
Color: Munsell 10YR 7/4
Texture: 150 grit
Hardness: < 5

Gross sample photo:

Closeup photo:

Aggregate characterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Roundness</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Very Coarse</td>
<td>Subrounded/subangular</td>
<td>5YR 6/4 (bricks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Medium coarse</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>5YR 4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Medium fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y 9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Very fine</td>
<td>Subangular</td>
<td>2.5Y 9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Subrounded</td>
<td>2.5Y 8/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve #</th>
<th>Mass of container</th>
<th>Mass of sample and container</th>
<th>Mass retained</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>1.863</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>97.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggregate Photo

Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate: Weight of beaker: 174.256</th>
<th>Aggregate weight: 2.646</th>
<th>Percent weight: 17.63%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fines:
- Color: 2.5Y 6/1
- Weight: 1.334
- Description of reaction: Small to moderate reaction
- Filtrate color: 5Y 3/4
- Composition: 5Y 3/4

Acid-soluble fraction a.k.a. lime (starting weight minus [fines plus aggregate]):
- Weight: 1.334
- Percent weight: 8.89%

Percentage check: 100.00%
- lime: 9.89%
- aggregate: 91.11%
- 1:9 ratio
### Sorted by Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Building Period Phase</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-S-M1</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Just below the first floor window, east of the chimney in the central portion of the house on the south façade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-S-M3</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12&quot; from SW corner of central portion on south façade, level with window sill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-N-2FL-chimney</td>
<td>1705*</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Buried in the wall by one wythe of bricks from a more recent campaign. From the side of the original chimney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-WW-INT-2FL-North</td>
<td>1855*</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Northeast second story wall on the east side of the central portion, three feet above the kitchen roof, 6 feet north of stair tower wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-central-2FL</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Just below the window on the south façade of the eastern one-story wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-2FL-chimney</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Buried in the wall by one wythe of bricks from a more recent campaign. From the side of the original chimney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M1</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>East side, southern one-story wing, below window EW1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M2</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Left of the door on the stair tower, three feet south of the door five feet above the stoop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M3</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>East side, northern one-story wing, bottom right side of window EW1-4 (northern window on east wall).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M4</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Just below the window on the south façade of the eastern one-story wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-WW-INT-2FL-North</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Just below the window on the south façade of the eastern one-story wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-central-2FL</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>On the south façade, central portion, top right corner of second story window, on west side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-2FL-chimney</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Northeast second story wall on the east side of the central portion, three feet above the kitchen roof, 6 feet north of stair tower wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M2</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Left of the door on the stair tower, three feet south of the door five feet above the stoop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sorted by Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Building Period Phase</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-S-M1</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Just below the first floor window, east of the chimney in the central portion of the house on the south façade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-S-M3</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12&quot; from SW corner of central portion on south façade, level with window sill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-N-2FL-chimney</td>
<td>1705*</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Buried in the wall by one wythe of bricks from a more recent campaign. From the side of the original chimney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-WW-INT-2FL-North</td>
<td>1855*</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Northeast second story wall on the east side of the central portion, three feet above the kitchen roof, 6 feet north of stair tower wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-central-2FL</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Just below the window on the south façade of the eastern one-story wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-2FL-chimney</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>On the south façade, central portion, top right corner of second story window, on west side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M1</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>East side, southern one-story wing, below window EW1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M3</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>East side, northern one-story wing, bottom right side of window EW1-4 (northern window on east wall).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M2</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Just below the window on the south façade of the eastern one-story wing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-E-M4</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>On the south façade, central portion, top right corner of second story window, on west side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These cells are left colorless because they represent outlier samples that do not match with the rest of the samples in their building phase category when compared to the overall linkage between building phase and mortar ratio.

---

### Medway Plantation
Mount Holly, South Carolina
Mortar Analysis
CONCLUSIONS

Three major building campaigns were undertaken at Medway following the fire of 1704: first, in 1705 by Edward Hyrne, then in the 1830s by Peter Gaillard Stoney and again by Mr. Stoney in 1855. There were certainly other owners who had work done to Medway, though mostly it consisted of repairs to the exterior and refinishing the interior. For the sake of mortar analysis, the three building phases listed above were the targets.

Correspondingly, after acid digestion and characterization of the aggregate there were three ratios of binder to aggregate that were identified: 1:9, 2:8 and 3:7. Since multiple samples were taken from each of the three suspected building phases, links could be made between phases and mortar types. Though there were outliers in each sample set, in general it appears that the 1705 mortar was a 3:7 ratio, the 1830s a 1:9 ratio and the 1855 addition a 2:8 ratio.

1705 Samples:

The samples identified as $M-N-2FL$-chimney, $M-S-M1$ and $M-S-M3$ were collected from what was believed to be the earliest areas of remaining original wall at Medway. Original in this case means what was built after the fire in 1704 since it is believed that none of the walls from the pre-fire building at Medway remain above ground.

Two of the samples, $M-S-M1$ and $M-S-M3$, contained three parts lime, or binder, to seven parts aggregate. Each of those samples showed the highest proportion of
aggregate distribution in the pan size, indicating that the mortar was high in silt and fine particulate content. Sample *M-N-2FL-chimney*, however, was identified as a 1:9 ratio of lime to aggregate. This sample was taken from side walls of the chimney on the north side of the building in an area that is almost certainly original material. The fact that it does not match the other two samples in this set, which are also strongly believed to be from 1705, could be because of improper mixing of the mortar or any of the possible variances discussed in the introduction to this report (page 141). It is noteworthy, however, that sample *M-N-2FL-chimney* has an aggregate distribution that is very similar to sample *M-S-M3*.

*1830s Samples:*

The samples that were collected and categorized as originating in the 1830s construction phase came from the stair tower addition and the second floor addition to the central portion of Medway.

Two of the samples were identified as a 1:9 ratio and one was a 2:8 ratio. Samples *M-S-M4* and *M-E-central-2FL* were the 1:9 samples while *M-E-M2* was 2:8 ratio of lime to aggregate. Apart from the overall ratios of binder to aggregate, the samples did not correspond to one another based on aggregate characterization. Sample *M-E-central-2FL* had a very high proportion of pan-sized aggregate at nearly 99% of the non-fines aggregate. The other two samples, though they differed from each other, both showed high proportions of aggregate and a relatively low percentage of fines, as the
photographs in the individual report sheets indicate. The weight of the fines for samples 
*M-E-M2* and *M-S-M4* were both around 20% of the overall weight of the sample.

**1855 Samples:**

The samples that were taken for the 1855 group came from the one-story wing additions and the interior of the west wing. It is written that the west wing was added in 1855 by Peter Gaillard Stoney, and though there is no documentary evidence about the addition of the one-story wings on the east, they are laid in the same bond pattern as the west wing: five-course American bond. Sample *M-WW-INT-2FL-North* was collected from the interior of the second floor master bathroom. An exterior sample could not be obtained because at the time of sampling mortar was not exposed on the west wing.

Samples *M-E-M1*, *M-E-M3* and *M-S-M2*, taken from the one-story wings, were all identified as 2:8 mortars while sample *M-WW-INT-2FL-North* was found to be a 1:9 ratio mortar. The three samples from the east wings all showed a relatively high proportion of larger sized aggregate and fines weights ranging from about 40% to 65% of the total weight. Though the majority of the aggregate distribution of the interior sample was pansized, the overall sample was similar to the other three in that about 60% per the overall sample weight was fines.
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Conjectural Floor Plans and Elevations
Medway Plantation, Mount Holly, South Carolina
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Appendix C

An Alternate Development Scenario in the Nineteenth Century

Keeping in mind that the preceding document is the author’s interpretation of Medway’s evolution, there is evidence that suggests a different structural development of the building in the nineteenth century. This appendix describes a development pattern beginning around 1835 with Peter Gaillard Stoney where the building that was built by Edward Hyrne was first raised to two full stories with stepped gables and shortly thereafter gained a stair tower and one-story wings on the east side. Later, in 1855, the building received a large, asymmetrical west wing. What distinguishes this possible construction sequence from the one presented in chapters four and five is that under this alternate scenario, the two-story stair tower and the one-story wings that flank it were built at the same time rather than some twenty years apart.

Identifying Brick Bonds

Because of repair work in so many places on the brick walls, it is difficult to read the bond pattern and therefore draw firm conclusions linking building campaigns. Further complicating the matter, Stoney intended to stucco the walls and because of this his masons may not have taken care to use a consistent bond pattern. The brick bond identification problem is present with the stair tower. In some areas it appears to be laid
in three-course American bond, and in other places it is clearly five-course American bond. Still in other areas on the tower the bricks are laid with no pattern at all.

In the main body of this document it was determined that the lower levels of the stair tower were originally laid in three-course American bond and the upper level in five-course American bond. The one-story wings and the 1855 west wing are both five-course American bond. For the purpose of this construction scenario, the author assumes that the stair tower is entirely built with five-course American bond. Figure C.1 illustrates an area on the tower below the third level which is clearly five-course bond. If this is the case, then one can begin to assume that the stair tower was added contemporaneously with the one-story wings.

Figure C.1. The stair tower, right, with five-course American bond brick work. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
Peter Stoney probably raised the building to two stories plus an attic around 1835. Curiously enough, the east wall, second story, above the one-story wings does not have any windows. Generally, even infill work done by skilled masons can be identified as a repair. But at Medway, the second floor east walls of the central portion of the building show no signs indicating the presence of windows (Figures C.2 and C.3). Figure 3 shows repair work completed during the 2012 restoration, but there is no apparent evidence of previous repair or infill work indicating the presence of a window.

Figure C.2. Second story east wall of central portion of the building. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
It seems odd that a second floor would have been built without windows for lighting and ventilation. Not to mention, that without windows on the second floor the symmetry and rhythm of the fenestration would be missing. In a time when symmetry was as important as lighting and ventilation, Stoney probably would not have excluded windows from the second floor unless he intended a different design for his east façade.

This reasoning may be explained by the one-story wings flanking the stair tower on the north and south. The one-story wings originally had shed roofs extending from the east wall of the central portion down to their eaves. The 1875 engraving from *Harper’s*
New Monthly Magazine (Figure 4.11) clearly shows the shed roof, and the outline where the roof was prior to twentieth century renovations is visible in Figure C.1 above. The roofline would have intersected if not completely covered up any windows on the east wall, rendering them useless. Identical wings flanking a central stair tower would have maintained a sense of regularity and symmetry.

By adding the stair tower and the flanking rooms, Peter Stoney may have intended to create a space where he and his associates could do business, separate from the main, more private areas of his house. It is conceivable that Stoney also meant to move the kitchen out of the main body of the house and into the north one-story wing, which not only provided more space on the first level for entertaining, but also moved the heat away from the private space by offsetting the cooking chimney from the central portion.

Again, it is difficult to understand the brick bond pattern(s) of the east wings at Medway, but looking at the junction of the stair tower and the one-story wings, it seems possible that they were built together. The bricks remain mostly continuous across the joint and a break in the joint which would indicate separate building campaigns is not clearly evident. Figure C.4 illustrates the area where the stair tower meets the south one-story wing.
Figure C.4. Possible continuous joint between the stair tower and the south one-story wing. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.

The brick bonds, which vary across most of the stair tower and throughout portions of the one-story wings, lend a sense of ambiguity to the possibility of the east stair tower and the one-story wings evolving together. Also, there does not appear to be any evidence of framing members being keyed in to the east wall where the shed roof met the wall. Regularly-spaced pockets in the bricks for the rafters should be present, but at Medway no such pockets exist nor does evidence of infill work concealing the pockets following the razing of the shed roof. If the roof framing was not built in to the east wall, then it would appear to be an afterthought and was attached later by some other means of
anchoring. The lack of windows on the second level is hard to ignore, however. Perhaps Peter Stoney began his renovations by raising the 26’x36’ building to two stories with plans for the east additions in mind for a later date, hence leaving out windows from his second story.

Adding weight to this theory is the fact that the stair tower does not appear to be keyed in to the east wall of the central portion, at least at the second floor level. In Figure C.5, which shows the junction of the stair tower and the east wall, the brick courses do not line up with each other. Also, the east wall of the central portion is laid in three-course American bond while the stair tower, as previously mentioned, is laid in five-course American bond. A close-up view of this area, shown in Figure C.6, reveals that the east wall was covered with stucco prior to the addition of the stair tower.

The bricks below the shed roof line on the stair tower do not appear to have been exposed to the same stucco as the adjacent bricks. This area was covered with stucco to match the rest of the building after the Legendre’s changed the roof form from a shed to its present peaked roof; however it appears to be disparate enough from the surrounding bricks to presume that it was not stuccoed when originally built. That the east wall was clearly stuccoed before the stair tower was added (Figure C.6 is evidence) and the area below the shed roofline was not stuccoed is further evidence linking the addition of the stair tower and the one-story wings to the same construction phase, following raising the building to two stories.
Figure C.5. Junction of the stair tower and the east wall. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.

Figure C.6. Close-up of Figure 5, showing stucco on the east wall. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
Stoney may have built the stair tower on an earlier foundation for a small covered stoop. A photograph taken from the crawl space of the south one-story wing of the east wall near where the stair tower joins shows very soft, early bricks that appear to match the original foundation in character as well as in bond pattern, which is English (Figure C.7). As the vast majority of houses in the Lowcountry had outdoor living spaces, it is very likely that Medway, too, had a covered porch on the east side. When he raised the building to two stories around 1835, Stoney may have expanded the porch to gain more outdoor space before finally adding the stair tower and wings. At that point, as the Harper’s engraving shows, he probably bumped out the porch, and may well have added a porch to the west side of Medway. Adding a covered space on the west would have certainly been probable if it became the primary entrance for guests to Medway while the east entrance was primarily for servants and business associates.

Figure C.7. Foundation of the stair tower. Photo by Richard Marks Restorations.
When the stair tower and the flanking wings were finally added, the stair tower only reached two stories. As discussed in Chapter four, a rowlock course that wraps the stair tower at the same level where the shed roofs meet the central portion’s east wall indicates the tower’s earlier height. Because the tower terminated after the second floor, it probably did not serve the third level which means the attic was unfinished when Stoney raised the level of Medway’s original building.

Changes in 1855

As Samuel Stoney wrote in *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country*, his great-uncle Peter Gaillard Stoney added the west wing to Medway in 1855. As it is today, Stoney never covered his west wing with stucco; rather, he painted its walls to match the rest of the building. Also at the time of the west wing’s construction, Peter Stoney probably at least partially finished the garret level and increased the height of the stair tower to accommodate access to the third floor. Once again, evidence of this change is the rowlock course on the stair tower. At this point he may have added a small window to the north side of the stair tower at the second floor for ventilation and light. On the west wing, Stoney added stairs to access the second floor. It is likely that the westernmost room became the formal living room and the rooms above it bedrooms. Figure C.8 is a view of Medway from the north. The small window on the stair tower

---

95 Stoney, Samuel G., *Plantations of the Carolina Low Country*, 47
and Stoney’s west wing addition are visible. The photo’s date is unknown, but it is believed to have been taken in the early twentieth century.

![Image of Medway](image)

Figure C.8. Undated view of Medway from the north, from the Medway Collection.

_Sunnyside: A Northern Precedent_

American author Washington Irving, who penned classics such as “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” and “Rip Van Winkle,” purchased a modest cottage in the Hudson Valley of New York in 1835. The cottage, which he bought from the Van Tassel family, was originally built in the seventeenth century by a Dutch-American named Wolfert Acker. Irving hired an architect from Boston to design modifications to the cottage, and
he came up with a Gothic revival building of two-and-a-half stories with crow-stepped gables and a projecting tower off the central of the north wall. The inspiration for his romantic renovation may have stemmed from the building’s original tenant, Acker, as it is reminiscent of Dutch architecture. According to the Irvington Historical Society, Sunnyside may have drawn inspiration from Gothic and Tudor revival architecture in Scotland as well, as Irving’s career was incubated with the help of Scotsman Sir Walter Scott. Figures C.9 and C.10 are of Irving’s house in the 1930s, taken by National Parks Service employees for the Historic American Building Survey (HABS). Figure C.11 is a HABS drawing of the South Elevation of the house completed the same year.

Figure C.9. Sunnyside, Tarrytown, New York. Photo courtesy of HABS, Library of Congress.

Figure C.10. Sunnyside, Tarrytown, New York. Photo courtesy of HABS, Library of Congress.
Figure C.11. HABS South Elevation of Sunnyside. Photo courtesy of HABS, Library of Congress.

Sunnyside is a great example of romantic Dutch or Scottish architecture’s proliferation in the United States in the 1830s. The similarities between Sunnyside and Medway are undeniable. Irving’s romantic fascination was probably contagious, and may very well have spread to Charlestonians visiting the north to escape the southern summer heat and humidity. Was Stoney a guest of Sunnyside? Perhaps, but even if not, Sunnyside highlights an architectural style that swept through America in the nineteenth century, one which Stoney most likely was inspired by for his renovations of Medway.
Conclusion

To summarize, in this evolution scenario, Peter Gaillard Stoney began around 1835 by raising the building from one and a half stories to a full two stories and adding the stepped gables which adorn Medway today, though as we know, the current gables were rebuilt in the early-twentieth century. He may have added a covered porch on the east side where the footprint of the stair tower is now. He must have planned to add a two-story stair tower with a stepped gable and two one-story wings that flank the tower because he intentionally left out windows on the second story of the original building’s east side. For consistency as much as to protect the faces of the bricks, Stoney stuccoed the entire building. Between 1835 and 1855, but probably closer to the former, Stoney added a two-story stair tower with a stepped gable end and two one-story wings with shed roofs coming off the east wall of the original building. He also relocated the porch to cover the entrance to the stair tower, which was a four-paneled Greek revival door with a transom and sidelights, a popular style in the 1830s. Stoney probably stuccoed his additions to match the rest of the building. Then in 1855 Stoney completed his romantic transformation of Medway by adding a west wing, also with a stepped gable, and raising the east stair tower to a full three stories and adding access via the stair tower to the garret.

There is substantial material evidence to suggest the preceding construction sequence; however, it should remain clear that this is only one possible scenario. The site investigation also turned up evidence supporting the conjectural interpretation presented in chapters four and five. Exactly how and when Medway evolved is not absolutely
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certain at this time. Further researchers are encouraged to dig deeper and draw their own conclusions. The research presented in this thesis represents the most thorough assembly of material evidence available to date but the findings should not be considered definitive.
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Appendix D

Architectural Description by Room:

A room key is included at the beginning of the general description of each floor at Medway. Pictures that correspond to each room are included at the end of each section by floor.
First Floor

The first floor serves as the main entertaining space of Medway. It contains a living room, library, dining room and parlor, kitchen and pantry.
Room 100: West Wing Entry Foyer

The west wing entry foyer is accessed from the patio on the southwest side of the house. Entering from the south one faces curving stairs leading to the second floor. A tri-partite window in the stairwell between the second and first floors lights the stairs. The pine flooring in this foyer is laid in an east-west orientation. The walls are finished with paneled wainscot and a walnut chair rail. Above the wainscot is a plaster wall with a simple cornice. A coat closet is located to the left upon entering the foyer, just beyond the door to the living room.

Room 101: Living Room

Through a door to the west of the entry foyer is Medway’s living room. Six 9/9 windows bring light into this room: two on each of the north, west and south walls. The flooring is pine laid east to west. Paneled wainscot, though simpler than the entry foyer, clads the first few feet of the wall, topped with a painted chair rail with plaster on the wall above it. The cornice is moderately ornate, signaling the use of the room as a place to entertain guests. On the north wall is found an elegant, yet simple, fireplace with a marble and wood surround.

Room 102: Parlor

The parlor is located in the original portion of the house on the south side. It is used as both the dining room and as a sitting area. It can be accessed from the outside by
French doors leading to the patio, or on its east and west sides from the library and the west wing entry foyer, respectively. Flanking the fireplace on the south wall are two 9/9 windows which are smaller than the windows on the west wing. The walls are completely paneled in cypress with built-in shelving for books and a semi-circular display shelf centered on the north wall. In contrast to the west wing, the pine flooring in the parlor is laid with a north-south orientation. The chimney breast has a cypress surround, mantel and overmantel to match the wall paneling.

**Room 103: Gun Room/Library**

The library, dubbed the gun room by the Legendres in the 1930’s, is in the one story portion of the east wing on the south side of the stair tower. The most striking feature of this room is the pecky cypress paneling and beams in the ceiling. The worm-eaten dark cypress gives a rustic appearance. The beams, which are non-structural, are hewn for a rustic effect. The west and north walls have built-in book and display shelving. The brick fireplace on the south wall is trimmed with pecky cypress. A 9/9 window pierces the wall between the fireplace and the east wall, and two 9/9 windows light the room from the east wall. In the northwest corner of the room is an inconspicuous door concealing a bar for servants’ use, called Room 103A on the floorplan, also accessed in the east wing entry hall. A door in the northeast corner provides access from the principal entry foyer to the library.
Room 104: East Wing Entry Foyer

The east entrance to Medway opens into the foyer at the ground floor of the stair tower. A stoop leads to the entry door, which is flanked by sidelights and a fanlight transom. A narrow set of stairs against the south wall of the foyer leads to the upper floors. The remaining walls house closets and built-in cupboards. Under the stairs in the southwest corner of the room is a door connecting to the servants’ bar, which is also accessible from the library. The pine flooring in this room is laid east to west. A door on the north wall leads to the kitchen area.

Although the east side is often referenced as the formal entrance to Medway today, it is less used by guests. The drive takes them to a walkway leading to the patio and the west wing entry foyer. Guests entering from this doorway may be led either to the living room or the parlor, whereas guests entering from the east side are led to the gun room/library. An elegant, formal door on the east side indicates an earlier layout of the building where guests may have entered a foyer and a more formal, arrangement of rooms. The stair tower was probably constructed before the addition of the west wing.97

---

97 During the 2012 restoration a section of roofing was exposed in the space behind a knee wall in one of the third floor bedrooms. This area was covered up by the 1855 west wing addition which preserved the wooden shakes still on their original purlins and battons. The presence of the shingles indicates certainly that the building was raised to three levels prior to the addition of the west wing. It is then likely that the stair tower was added at the same time, as was the formal entry door at the base of the stair tower. It is unlikely that the tower was added at the same time as the west wing because the formal entry door on the east side would have been unnecessary. The main entrance to Medway probably shifted to the entrance off the patio on the west wing during its construction in 1855, corresponding to the landscaping work including the creation of the double oak allee on the west side by Anna Maria Porcher. This impressive landscaped drive would have been used by guests arriving at Medway and surely they would have exited their carriages on the west side and entered through the doorway on the west wing as opposed to being led around the house to the east entrance.
Room 105: Kitchen

The kitchen is floored with 8” by 8” clay tile. A large 5’ square island is in the center of the room. Heart pine cabinets are hung on the walls. A large cooler is located on the south wall and a commercial double range and vent hood is on the north wall. To the east of the range on the north wall is a 9/9 window. Two more 9/9 windows are located on the east wall. The walls and ceiling are covered with gypsum wallboard and trimmed with a simple, manufactured wood cornice.

Room 106: Pantry

The pantry is accessed through either the kitchen, a hallway leading from the secondary foyer, or a door on the north wall leading to a stoop on the exterior. Its floor is covered by the same 8” by 8” tile found in the kitchen. Similarly it has heart pine cabinets.

Room 107: Powder Room

The powder room is located in the northwest corner of the original portion of Medway, and is accessed by stepping up approximately 12” from the floor in the west wing entry foyer. The heart pine floor was laid during the 2012 restoration. Its wall is plaster covered by wallpaper. A simple cornice was also added during the restoration, as was a painted white baseboard.
Room 100
Room 101
Room 102
Room 103
Room 104
Room 105
Room 107
Second Floor

The second floor is primarily used for the family or as private space at Medway. It has three large bedrooms connected by two stair halls and a long narrow hallway.
**Room 200: Second Floor Landing**

The second floor landing, at the top of the spiral staircase leading from the west wing entry foyer, is wainscoted identically to the foyer at the first level. Paneled wainscot is capped with a walnut chair rail. The semi-circular north wall follows the curve of the spiral stair. Midway between floors one and two on the north wall is a tripartite window with a central 9/9 window flanked by six-pane sidelights, also mentioned in the description of Room 100. The walls are plastered, as is the ceiling. A simple cornice painted white joins the walls and the ceiling. The stairs leading to the landing are carpeted and the carpet continues on the landing. On the south wall of the landing is a 9/9 window.

**Room 201: Master Bedroom**

The master bedroom is above the living room and occupies most of the west wing. It is entered from the landing through a vestibule which includes a closet. The cypress walls are paneled from floor to ceiling. A cypress cornice divides the wood walls and a plaster ceiling. Two 9/9 windows are on each of the south, west and north walls. The north wall has a fireplace with shelving on either side.

Room 201A, the master bathroom, is entered through a door in the northeast corner of the room. Its floor and wainscot are identical marble tile. A 9/9 window lights the bathroom from the north wall.
Room 202: Bedroom

This modest bedroom is located on the south side of the house above the first floor parlor, in the original portion of the house. It is accessed via a hallway that runs from the second floor landing to the east wing stair tower. The bedroom is carpeted and has plaster walls with a simple cornice and baseboard. There is one 6/6 window on the west wall and one 6/6 window on the south wall, to the west of the fireplace. The fireplace has a brick firebox and a wood surround. A closet just to the east of the door to this bedroom is paneled with cedar. The bathroom serving this room is accessed through a door at the southeast corner of the room. Its floor is covered with hexagonal tile. Tile surrounds the bathtub, and a combination of plaster and drywall make up the rest of the walls and ceilings. A 6/6 window lights the room from the south wall.

Room 203: Bedroom

The bedroom is located on the north side of the building, spanning the east to west length of the earliest portion of Medway. Its walls are plaster with a chair rail painted white. This room has a simple cornice and baseboard trim. Unlike the other rooms on this floor, the study’s floor is pine laid north to south. A brick fireplace divides the north wall. It is trimmed with painted wood pilasters and a wood mantel. Tri-partite windows with window seats are on either side of the fireplace on the north wall. The windows are 9/9 with six-light sidelights. A long, narrow bathroom serves the study. It is located on the east side of the room, and its north wall is the north wall of the stair tower on the east
wing. It has a stand-up shower, a toilet, and a tile floor. One 6/6 window is located on the north wall towards the east side, above the toilet.

Room 204: Hallway

The hallway provides access to the rooms on the second floor and runs between the east wing stair tower to the second floor landing on the west wing. The hallway is carpeted and has plaster walls and ceiling. A very simple, small cornice joins the walls and ceiling. Throughout the hall on the walls are small closets and shelves. At the end of the hall on the east wall is one 9/9 window. The stairs leading to the third floor are on the south side of the east stair tower.
Room 200
Room 202
Room 203
Room 204
Third Floor

The third floor is accessed only by the stairs in the east wing. Its rooms are much smaller because of the pitch of the roof. This floor contains three bedrooms and two bathrooms. The bedrooms are intended to be used by infrequent guests or children.
Room 300: Hallway

Because of the orientation of the early portion of the house and of the east and west wings, the hallway has two hard turns, first to the north and then again to the west, making the flow somewhat awkward. The floor is carpeted and the walls are either plaster or drywall with simple baseboard and cornice elements. The only window directly lighting the hall is on the east wall; it is a small 6/6 window.

Room 301: South Bedroom

The south bedroom is carpeted and its plaster walls are covered with wallpaper. Two 6/6 windows light the room from the south side, flanking the chimney. There is no fireplace in this room. Five-foot high knee walls meet the pitch of the roof on the east and west walls. A small closet provides storage in the northeast corner of the room.

Room 302: North Bedroom

The north bedroom is carpeted and its plaster walls are wallpapered. Two 6/6 windows light the room from the north side, flanking the chimney. There is no fireplace in this room. Five-foot high knee walls meet the pitch of the roof on the east and west walls. A small closet is locate on the west wall of the room, toward the southwest corner.

Room 303: Bathroom

This bathroom serves the north and south bedrooms. It has a shower, toilet, sink, and carpeted floors. A 6/6 window is on the north wall.
Room 304: West Bedroom

A carpeted entry vestibule separates the hallway from the west bedroom, and contains a closet and a bathroom. The bedroom has pine flooring, running east to west. The nearly five-foot high knee walls on the north and south side of the room are covered with beaded paneling. A large 6/6 window on the west wall overlooks the double allee of oaks. The walls also have built in shelving and a fold-down writing desk.
Room 300
Room 301
Room 302
Room 303
Room 304
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