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Figure 1. The Jeffersonian Precinct
McGUFFEY COTTAGE

FOREWORD

The University of Virginia may be one of the landscapes that most clearly evokes the unresolved conflict between the architecture of democracy in the new nation and the landscape of slavery upon which that nation was built. Thomas Jefferson’s remarkable vision for a university dedicated to graduating the citizen leaders of the new nation took the form of classical architecture adopted from ancient models that he, James Madison, and others used to design our own democracy. But our founding fathers’ failure to grapple with and resolve the nation’s economic dependence on slavery meant that the academical village included also kitchens and slave quarters, the site of everyday work of the nearly 100 to 150 people living and working at the University of Virginia who would know no democracy.

McGuffey Cottage is one of the most important material survivals of the university’s landscape of slavery. This historic structure report draws together the scant threads of information that come from the historical, archaeological, and architectural records. The archaeological investigations completed by Rivanna Archaeology revealed important observations about the structuring of the landscape through fences, drains, and other landscape features. As the university continues a program of careful archaeology these features will slowly begin to fit into a more comprehensive understanding of these marginal spaces occupied by African Americans in the antebellum and postbellum eras.

Built sometime between 1831 and 1856, McGuffey Cottage was the site of the everyday life and labor of the small community of enslaved Africans and/or African Americans owned by the professors resident in Pavilion IX. Census records suggest that in 1840 this included one adult woman, a teenage girl, and two adult men. We will likely never know their names nor their relationships to one another which is why the documentation and preservation of this building as an unnamed testament to their lives is so very important. We should, in fact, no longer call this building McGuffey’s Cottage.

This historic structure report is also an important first step towards the university’s commitment to repurpose this former kitchen and quarter as a space for the interpretation of slavery at the University of Virginia. This is an important commitment outlined in the Spring 2018 final report of the President’s Commission on Slavery at the University. As the university continues to grapple with its own legacy of disenfranchisement, telling the truth about its
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history in this physical space is an important step toward honesty and reconciliation. This building’s future should be directed towards telling its own history for generations to come.

Louis P. Nelson, PhD
Vice Provost for Academic Outreach
Professor, Architectural History
Member, President’s Commission on Slavery and the University 2013-2018
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INTRODUCTION

This history, it’s hidden in plain sight all across the grounds. The entire university was a site of enslavement. Our goal has been to re-inscribe that history and the lives of the enslaved back onto the landscape in as many ways as possible.¹

After Thomas Jefferson completed his second term as President of the United States in 1809, his principal effort, until his death in 1826, was the creation and construction of what became the University of Virginia. Jefferson envisioned a decentralized, idealistic university with parallel lines of buildings along a greensward or lawn. Work areas to support the university were behind the Jefferson-designed buildings. What are now beautifully landscaped gardens were, in the nineteenth century, filled with vegetable plots, privies, smokehouses, kitchens, small barns, animal pens and, soon after the university opened, living quarters for enslaved laborers.

This report, the latest in a series of historic structure reports for the buildings of Thomas Jefferson’s Academical Village, is the first to investigate one of these outbuildings. In 2013, the university established the President’s Commission on Slavery and the University, an outgrowth of student-led efforts to recognize the enslaved African Americans who lived and worked at the university. As one demonstration of the university’s commitment to uncover its undertold history, the university engaged John G. Waite Associates, Architects in 2017 to prepare a historic structure report for McGuffey Cottage, a dependency and former slaves’ quarters behind Pavilion IX.

The preparation of a historic structure report is the first step to develop a disciplined approach to the care of a historic building. A team of architects, architectural historians and building conservators reviewed archival information, examined the building fabric, and determined existing conditions and the scope of needed repairs, then recorded the findings. Archaeological excavations behind Pavilion IX conducted by Rivanna Archaeological Services in 2010-2011 contributed to the understanding of the building. This information provides a guide for immediate work and will furnish future generations with a clear picture of what was found in our time.
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Few archival records were found that dealt specifically with McGuffey Cottage. We do not know precisely when it was built; based on the archaeological findings and nineteenth-century images, it was constructed sometime between 1831 and 1856. We can guess at one or two of the names of the men and women who lived and worked there. We do not know how or if its use changed over the years. This lack of archival evidence places more emphasis on the interpretation of physical evidence. Access to that physical information has been limited by the twentieth-century interior finishes. A more thorough understanding of the original construction and functional aspects of the building will require the complete removal of the later modifications.

NOTE

1. Kirt von Daacke, Assistant Dean & Professor (History), College of Arts & Sciences; President’s Commission on Slavery and the University. From https://news.virginia.edu/content/video-uvas-slavery-history-no-longer-hidden-plain-sight.
THE JEFFERSONIAN PRECINCT

Originally called the Academical Village, the present Jeffersonian Precinct of the University of Virginia (Figure 1) occupies a twenty-eight-acre site in the rolling hills just east of the Shenandoah Valley. The original U-shaped complex of buildings is situated on an elevated site that slopes gently down toward the south. The Rotunda, which originally housed classrooms and the library, is located at the heart of the complex at the northern end of the central green space, called the Lawn. Two rows of five pavilions, each with connecting dormitory rooms, form the east and west sides of the Lawn and terminate at the foot of the Rotunda. Behind each row of pavilions is a row of three hotels built as eating facilities with connecting dormitory rooms. Between these inner and outer ranges are gardens bounded by serpentine walls.

The ten pavilions are numbered from I to X. Odd-numbered pavilions are on the west, and even numbered pavilions are on the east. Each of the pavilions originally housed one of the University’s ten separate schools. The professors lived on the upper floors and taught their classes on the main floors. The gardens behind the pavilions and hotels were the workplaces for enslaved men and women at the University, and included privies, kitchens, smokehouses, and other outbuildings. Later, more buildings were constructed in the gardens to accommodate work and living spaces for the enslaved laborers.

The pavilions are connected by a continuous colonnade, which offers shelter from the weather and partially screens the utilitarian dormitories from public view. Brick arcades, broken by paths leading to the pavilion gardens, provide the same shelter and screening to the ranges.

Each of the pavilions was designed by Thomas Jefferson with elements drawn from classical models as published by Palladio, Fréart de Chambray, and Charles Errard. Jefferson’s designs for the hotels were far simpler. The outbuildings followed local vernacular traditions.

The Lawn itself measures 740 feet in length and 192 feet in width. Lined with rows of trees, the Lawn is terraced in gradual steps from north to south. The Jeffersonian Precinct is separated from the newer sections of the University by roads on the west, north, and east sides and by a wide walkway on the south.
Figure 2. Engraving of University of Virginia (above) and detail of Pavilion IX (left) by J. Serz, published by C. Bohn, 1856. McGuffey Cottage is shown behind Pavilion IX; there is a shed-roofed addition on the south façade of the cottage.
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HISTORY

Pavilion IX was built circa 1819–1822 to the designs of Thomas Jefferson. It is the southernmost of the five pavilions on the west side of the Lawn. Its first occupant was George Tucker, who was the professor of moral philosophy. Documentary and archaeological evidence suggests that two outbuildings—the structure now called McGuffey Cottage and an earlier outbuilding to the north, since demolished—were constructed for use by enslaved African Americans between 1831 and 1856. For many years a large ash tree stood in the garden behind Pavilion IX, not far from McGuffey Cottage; it became widely known as the McGuffey Ash.

PROFESSOR GEORGE TUCKER AT PAVILION IX, 1825–1845

George Tucker was the university’s first professor of moral philosophy. Unlike other professors who had been recruited from Europe or New York, Tucker was born in Bermuda, in 1775, and educated there. At age 20 he came to Virginia to study law at the College of William and Mary and eventually settled in Richmond and later Lynchburg. In 1815 he won election to the Virginia General Assembly and between 1819 and 1825 served in the U.S. House of Representatives. Tucker accepted the post offered by the University of Virginia in February 1825. He was to teach what Jefferson “described as ‘mental sciences generally, including Ideology, general grammar, logic and Ethics.’”

Tucker was already a slaveholder when he arrived at the university in the spring of 1825, having purchased enslaved people for Deerwood, one of his estates in Virginia. After an auction of his father-in-law’s property, Tucker received, in trust, 12 enslaved field hands, which he then “mingled” with the slaves at Deerwood. Earlier, in 1809, he had traded land in Richmond for “a parcel of negroes.” In 1813, to settle debts, he arranged to rent out his enslaved people, “except three or four,” to white men. He was said to be “among the few Southerners who held more than twenty slaves.” In 1829, in a discussion about “proposed changes in the Virginia Constitution,” he “argued pseudonymously that slaveholders should have the right to cast votes for three-fifths of their slaves.”
When he moved to the university in 1825, Tucker was 50 years old, the most senior of the first faculty members. In his autobiography, written in 1858, Tucker recounted that when he “took possession” of Pavilion IX, his family “consisted of my son + three daughters,” along with his widowed sister, Eliza Jane Tucker, and “her daughter whom I had invited over from Bermuda, after the death of my wife” in 1823. Tucker’s three daughters were Maria, then about 19; Eliza, 17; and Lelia, 9. Tucker’s son, Daniel George, was then 22 (in 1829 he was placed in a facility for the insane in Philadelphia). Mary Byrd Farley Tucker, the daughter of Eliza Jane Tucker and Tucker’s niece, would later marry Professor John Patton Emmet, who occupied Pavilion I.4

In December 1828 Tucker, twice a widower, married Louisa Bowdoin Thompson, a widow.5 With her addition to the household, the private quarters in the pavilion allotted to the Tucker household may well have been growing cramped. According to the proctor’s financial records, Tucker paid rent to occupy at least one dormitory room beginning in July 1829.6 It was also at this same time, in July 1829, that the Board of Visitors instructed the proctor “to make an alteration in the Pavilion now occupied by Professor Tucker, by an addition to the west front, extending the whole length and elevation of the building, and about ten feet in width.” If the university did not have sufficient funds for this project, then Tucker was to pay for the work and be reimbursed with interest.7 An addition was built on the west elevation of Pavilion IX by 1832. Later, in November 1837, contractor G. W. Spooner was paid $36.66 for a “new porch, including brick work in rear of professor Tucker’s pavilion.”8 This entry, in the Visitors’ annual report for 1837–1838, may pertain to masonry work needed in conjunction with the porch.

Like those of other professors, George and Louisa Tucker’s household at the university included enslaved men and women. The U.S. census from 1840 indicated that the Tucker household included one enslaved male between the ages of 24 and 35 and another between the ages of 36 and 54, as well as one enslaved female between the ages of 10 and 23 and another between 36 and 54 (Figure 5).9

Tucker reportedly rented two of his enslaved workers to the university—Anthony in 1828 as a laborer and Isaac for a month in 1840 to assist a “stonemason while building walls surrounding the Academical Village.”10 The Visitors’ annual report for the year ending June 1847 contains an entry dated September 16, 1846, for $13.75 paid to George Tucker “for hire of Isaac, employed on wall.”11 Isaac, being owned by Tucker and possibly trained as a mason, perhaps had a role in constructing the outbuildings behind the pavilion.

In his 1858 autobiography, Tucker provided more information about his enslaved workers. The following excerpt described their situation after he left the university in 1845 and moved to Philadelphia:

My household servants, who had been reared & partly born in my family I emancipated—as they had been faithful and the attachment between us was mutual, the act was one of feeling & sentiment, but I subsequently had some doubts
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whether I might not to have divided them between my two married daughters, for the sake of all parties. The number thus set free was five—Two of them, men have since died without having abused their new privilege, & a third yet lives at the university, anxiously dreading the strict execution of the law which compels free negroes to leave the state, and which would separate him from his wife & children who are slaves—The two others a woman & her grandchild, we brought to Philadelphia, where I was to pay the woman wages. I had the child bound until she was 18, but forgetting what I had done, they secretly left me, incited by some black abolitionists to secure wages to themselves & betook themselves to New York, where I assume they now are.12

The enslaved man known as Isaac, who had passed away in 1857, was likely one of the two men whom Tucker identified in 1858 as “who have died without having abused their new privilege.” A reference in a letter from Tucker to the proctor indicates that Tucker trusted one of his enslaved workers with access to his valuable personal possessions; in the letter Tucker added this postscript to his daughter Mary Emmett: “You will oblige me, my dear Mary [B?], by getting my diamond pin & asking Mr. Brockenbrough to [enclose?] it to me in Newyork. The servant who cleans out my room can give it to you.”13

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR ENSLAVED PEOPLE AT THE UNIVERSITY

When describing residential accommodations to a prospective professor in 1819, Thomas Jefferson had written that the pavilion “besides a large lecturing room, has 4 good rooms for family accommodation, one of them below, large enough for your study & library, a drawing room and 2 bedrooms above. Kitchen & servant’s rooms below.”14 However, minutes of the Board of Visitors’ meetings suggest that the original plans for the university had not provided adequate accommodations for enslaved people. The professors had communicated their need for such facilities to the Visitors but at their October 1826 meeting the Visitors directed the executive committee to “inform the professors that the funds of the institution are in a condition which does not allow any application” of funds to their residences. On the other hand, the minutes also stated that “as soon as the funds will permit,” the board “will cause the necessary out houses to be erected, & will consider the propriety of making the proposed alterations in their attics & cellars.” Also included in the minutes of the same meeting, under a listing of construction work remaining to be done, is a reference to “Some small additions” being “also necessary for the better accommodation of the Professors in their Pavilions.”15 Several years would pass before such outbuildings were actually constructed behind the pavilions. In the minutes of the board’s meetings, enslaved African Americans were sometimes called “servants,” and the outbuildings referred to as “servants houses,” “offices,” or “accommodations for domestics.”
At its July 1828 meeting, the Board of Visitors directed that the proctor, “under the control of the executive committee, erect such building for the accommodation of Servants, in the tenement [pavilion] occupied by Doct. Dunglison, as may be deemed suitable; the cost whereof shall not exceed $150.” In addition, “a sum not exceeding $150” was to “be applied, under the direction of the executive committee, to provide accommodation for Servants in the tenement occupied by Doct. Emmet.” Professor Robley Dunglison then occupied Pavilion X, and Professor Emmet, Pavilion I. However, the additional facilities for Professor Emmet were probably not constructed for several years.

In October 1828, three months after their summer meeting, the Board of Visitors passed a resolution directing the proctor, under the supervision of the executive committee, “to cause to be erected additional offices for the accommodation of servants, in connection with the Pavilions and hotels of the University, where they may be desired.” No more than “two apartments to each hotel or pavilion” were to be built, and the cost of each was not to exceed $100; the work was to be done “as soon as the funds of the University will permit.”

At its meeting in July 1829, the Board of Visitors gave more specific instructions about the construction of four such outbuildings. At this meeting, the executive committee was authorized “to cause to be erected one office with two rooms, in the rear of each of the pavilions occupied by Professors Lomax & Patterson, and in the rear of each of the hotels.
occupied by Mrs. Gray & Mr. Conway." At this time Professor John Tayloe Lomax occupied Pavilion III, and Professor Robert M. Patterson occupied Pavilion V. There was also to be "one room in addition to the kitchen at the hotel to be occupied by Mr. Rose."

Another two years passed before construction of such outbuildings was authorized behind Pavilion IX and Pavilion VI: it was not until July 1831 that the Board of Visitors instructed the executive committee to "cause to be erected in the rear of Professor Tucker’s and professor Harrison’s pavilions, offices upon the plans indicated in their written applications submitted to the Visitors at the present meeting." Unfortunately, those documents have not been located, so it is not known whether their proposals may have differed from those authorized in 1829.

In any case, outbuildings or additions to three pavilions, including Pavilion IX, had been constructed by the time the Visitors met a year later, in July 1832. The minutes from that meeting state that the proctor was to have "in the rear of Professor Emmet’s Pavilion

Figure 4. George Tucker (left) and William McGuffey (right).
Figure 5. In the 1840 United States census, the Tucker household included one enslaved male between the ages of 24 and 35 and another between the ages of 36 and 54, as well as one enslaved female between the ages of 10 and 23 and another between 36 and 54.
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[Pavilion I] an addition to the basement story for the accommodation of Domestics similar to those already annexed to the Pavilions of Professors Tucker, Bonnycastle, and Harrison,” that is, similar to those already built at Pavilions IX, VIII, and VI. This language does not specifically refer to the new buildings as being separate structures (and the addition to Pavilion IX is believed to have been attached to the west elevation of the pavilion), but the estimates for “servants houses” discussed below do seem to be describing separate buildings rather than additions. The structures “already annexed” may have been intended to mean “associated with,” rather than physically attached.20

George Tucker’s colleague Henry St. George Tucker, who lived in Pavilion X from 1841 to 1845, also had a “servants house.” The proctor’s accounts show postings for “Planking window” of his outbuilding.21

FOUR PROPOSALS FROM CONTRACTORS
FOR CONSTRUCTING “SERVANTS HOUSES”

Four proposals for the construction of “Servants Houses” were found among the proctors papers in the Special Collections Library at the University of Virginia. While none of these estimates is specifically identified as being associated with an outbuilding behind Pavilion IX, the contractors’ descriptions are similar to the appearance of the extant outbuilding constructed behind Pavilion IX and perhaps to an earlier outbuilding to the north. The extant outbuilding is 13 feet 8 inches wide by 24 feet 4-1/2 inches long in plan, has an opening high up in each gable end, and consists of two rooms and a loft, or attic, with rough flooring.

One of the documents, perhaps the earliest, reads as follows (the original spellings and punctuation have been retained in all four proposals, except as noted) (Figure 6):

Estimate of the Carpenters worke and materials of a servants House intended for Doc Patterson agreeable to the plan furnished by Mr. Brockenbrough, to be finished in the following manner: There will be no plank floor in kitchen[,] It being determined to be Paved, the Door and Window frames to be plain reveald frames, Batton doors, Partitions of Inch plank [planed?] & grooved, stock locks on doors, the upper story to be seven ft high to the Collar beems, plain Stair Case, with a rail around head of Staires, Doores & Windows finished without architraves & no mantles or shelves over fireplaces but including 48 [in?] lineal of Shelving in Kitchen amts to $ 200.00

J. T. Lomax
McGUFFEY COTTAGE

Should it be determined to Plaister the Partitions
then will be a deduction in the above bill of [6? Workers?] 16.17
$ 183.83

The additional Plaistering will be 17.50
201.33

Making the Plaister Partition costing on the
whole more than the Plank 1.33

The strikethrough of Doctor Patterson’s name and the substitution of Professor Lomax’s name in this document suggest that it may date from about 1829, when “one office with two rooms” was authorized for construction “in the rear of each of the pavilions occupied by Professors Lomax & Patterson.” In 1829 Professor John Tayloe Lomax resided in Pavilion III; he left the university in 1830. Professor Robert Maskell Patterson resided in Pavilion V beginning in 1828. The document mentions “the plan furnished by Mr. Brockenbrough”; Brockenbrough had been dismissed from his position as proctor of the university by mid-August 1831, so he may have created the plan before that time.23

A second proposal (Figure 7) specifically mentions Professor Patterson’s pavilion. It may date from 1831, when two outbuildings, for Professor Tucker at Pavilion IX and for Professor Harrison at Pavilion VI, were authorized by the Visitors in July of that year, after the professors had submitted “written applications” to the Board of Visitors (these proposals may have been part of those applications). This second document, with the pencil date of 1831, reads as follows (the measurements of the floor plan of the larger building align quite closely with those of the extant outbuilding behind Pavilion IX):

Estimate of the Carpenters work
and Materials for two Servants
Houses building at Doc Pattersons [Pavilion V]
one of them 24 x 12 with twoo
doores and twoo windows also one
small window in gable end with
rough floor in Loft. The other House 15 x 12 one
door & one window[,] one small
window in gable end[,] rough
floor in Loft.24

This second proposal included the following additional work: “the present roof of smoke House to be take[n] down and new roof covering both Smoke & Wash House.” The total of the estimate was $156, which was proposed to be discounted 20 percent to $124.80; the
Figure 6. “Estimate of the Carpenter’s work and materials for servants House intended for J. T. Lomax,” circa 1831.
Estimate of the Carpenters work and materials for two Servants Houses building at Doct. Pattersons.

One of them 24 x 12 with three doors. Three windows also one small window in gable end with rough floor in loft.

The other House 16 x 12 one door four windows. One small window in gable end. Rough floor in loft. The present roof on the house to be taken down and new roof covering both smoke from house and 5. in all to 203.6.
Estimate of the cost of repairs and alterations on Pavilion to be occupied by Lieutt Carr Proctor of the University.

Partitioning off two small rooms in large room on first floor regaining three doors, three windows of the Casement is not required & be carried to Pavilion one above cut through partition communicating from passage to front room.

Plaining off the floors of large room below two rooms above stairs.

2 windows to be put in back wall of same room with 12 lights of 12x18 glass each. Varnish to complete.

Floor to large celler room of hard flooring & locate 100

Carpenters work & materials for a kitchen with two rooms say 20x16 out to out with 2 doors & three windows. Rough floor to be left and three small windows in gallery. The style of work to be similar to the servants house attached to Pavilion & occupied by cook Patterson.

$214.00

Figure 8. “Estimate of the cost of repairs and alterations on Pavilion to be occupied by Lieutt. Carr Proctor of the University.”
payment schedule called for an initial cash payment of $41.60, followed by a payment of the same amount after one year and another after two years.\textsuperscript{25}

A third proposal pertained to the “cost of repairs and alterations” to Pavilion VII, which was “to be occupied by Lieut. Carr[,] Proctor of the University” (Figure 8). Various changes were to be made to the Pavilion itself, but the estimate also included the following description of a proposed outbuilding:

Carpenters worke & materials for a Kitchen with two roomes  
say 24 x 16 out to out with 2 dooeres and twoo windows. Rough floor  
in loft and two small windows in Gables[.] The stile of worke to  
be similar to the servants Houses attached to Pavilion 5 occupied  
by Doct Patterson. $100

A fourth proposal in the same archival folder identifies the pavilion that was to be occupied by the proctor as Pavilion VII and the one occupied by Doctor Patterson as Pavilion V. Its wording “for a Kitchen” is very similar to that in the third proposal, except that a separate line was added at the end stating that “Brick work for Kitchen Estimating at” an additional charge of $78.00.\textsuperscript{26}
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**DATING THE OUTBUILDINGS BEHIND PAVILION IX**

The “annex” to Pavilion IX mentioned in the Visitors’ minutes of July 1832 may not be the outbuilding now known as McGuffey Cottage. Investigations by Rivanna Archaeological Services revealed a brick drain running under what is now the northeast corner of the extant outbuilding. This drain may date from circa 1831-1838; it appears to be associated with the work of “changes and additions now making in the rear of pavilion No. 9 by directions of the professor occupying the same,” George Tucker. This reference most likely pertained to the construction that had been authorized by the Visitors several years earlier, in 1829.\textsuperscript{27} Alternatively, the drain may have been associated with improvements made to the university’s water system in the 1830s.\textsuperscript{28} In any case, the outbuilding now behind Pavilion IX would necessarily have been constructed after, not before, the drain was installed.

Archaeological investigations revealed the foundations of another outbuilding behind Pavilion IX, located to the north of McGuffey Cottage.\textsuperscript{29} Based on the investigations’ findings, this outbuilding dates to the antebellum period (see the archaeological chapter in this report).

An 1856 view of the university (Figure 2) shows a small, one-story cottage, located just south of Pavilion IX, which is very similar to McGuffey Cottage; it has a gabled roof and a center chimney. If the drain were in fact constructed circa 1831-1837, then it would appear that the cottage was constructed sometime between 1831 and 1856.
George Tucker resigned from the university faculty in 1845, at age 70. He explained in his autobiography that after his colleague Henry St. George Tucker had resigned in 1845, he "had no intimate companions" at the university, the other professors being his juniors. In July 1845, as he prepared to leave the university, Tucker wrote to the next occupant of Pavilion IX, William H. McGuffey, that he planned to sell at auction "nearly all my household furniture," much of which was "of very good quality," and "some that are not easily obtained in this part of the country."

McGuffey, the second professor of moral philosophy, was born in 1800. He grew up on the Ohio frontier, studied the classics, was elected chair of ancient languages at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, in 1826, and was ordained a Presbyterian minister in 1829. In 1836 he became president of Cincinnati College, and three years later took over as head of Ohio University. After the university suffered financial reversals, he became a professor at Woodward College in Cincinnati. He accepted the professorship at the University of Virginia in 1845. His McGuffey’s Eclectic Reader became "the largest selling series of books in the United States in the nineteenth century."

McGuffey and his family occupied Pavilion IX for nearly three decades, until his death in 1873. The 1850 U.S. census indicates that their household then included three children: daughters Mary, 20, and Henrietta, 18, and a son, Charles, 18. McGuffey’s wife, Harriet Spining, died in 1850. In 1857 he married Laura Howard, the daughter of a professor at the medical school. The 1860 and 1870 U.S. censuses indicate that William and Laura McGuffey were the only family members then living in Pavilion IX.

One account states that McGuffey could not have afforded to own enslaved men and women and that he instead rented them for use as house servants. However, the 1850 U.S. census shows that McGuffey then owned two enslaved women, ages 28 and 44, and one enslaved man, age 30 (Figure 9). The 1860 census appears to show he owned only one enslaved woman, age 50. In another reference to a slave, McGuffey’s daughter Henrietta noted in 1853 that “Our servants (Mary Jane) child has been very sick.” Henrietta McGuffey also described her mother’s reticence about raising her daughters in the South, where enslaved people were responsible for many household duties: “My Mother was never very happy after she went to Virginia[,] she had been born and had lived in Ohio all her life and she could not become accustomed to the ways of society in Va. They were so entirely different from what she had be use[d] to and she disliked the idea of her daughters growing up and not being able to learn any thing about housework. We had plenty of good servants to do our work so there was no necessity for our working. Indeed no ladies at the University did any work I mean housework.”

William McGuffey was said not to be an abolitionist, but he helped both enslaved people and free black men “in many ways.” His daughter Mary taught William Gibbons, a rented...
Figure 9. Detail from the 1850 Slave Schedule from the United States census, showing the three slaves in McGuffey's household.

Figure 10. W. H. McGuffey to University of Virginia, invoice for "4 days work of George", January-December 1862, loose in Index to Proctor's Ledgers, 1858-1862.
enslaved man who worked as the McGuffey’s butler, to read and write (Gibbons lived at Pavilion III, not with the McGuffeys). Gibbons received further education and became a minister at a Presbyterian church in Washington, D.C. To the dismay of some, McGuffey entertained Gibbons in his front parlor when Gibbons returned to Charlottesville to visit friends. McGuffey preached to African American congregations and contributed to the construction of an African American church in Charlottesville.

A receipt in the collection of the proctors papers indicates that McGuffey rented out an enslaved man named George to the university in 1862, during the Civil War (Figure 10). The receipt shows that McGuffey received a payment of $3.00 for “4 days work of George” in January 1862, for 5.5 days of work in July and August, and for 10.5 days of work in November and December. In addition there were charges for 19 days of work in September 1862 and 11 days in October, but the receipt does not indicate who undertook that labor. The work done by George in January, July, and August was charged at $0.75 a day, while the work he did between September and December was charged at $1.00 a day. McGuffey’s total bill to the university was for $47.38, and he received payment from the proctor on January 7, 1863.

On Christmas Day 1865, many months after the South had surrendered, McGuffey wrote to Harriet Love, his half-sister, requesting that they “renew our correspondence with you all after so long a time of silence.” McGuffey reported that he and his wife “get along quite comfortably, since the war—and indeed during the whole four years, we did not suffer much, compared with others, in other parts of Va. and the South.”

McGuffey explained in the letter that there had been “no fighting very near us—and nothing was much injured in our immediate neighborhood.” However, he wrote, “Everything is greatly changed by the freeing of the Negroes.” He continued his commentary:

White people will be benefited by this change, after a little—But it is very uncertain what will become of the blacks. They do not know what to do with themselves now that they are free—and very many of them will, (I fear, must,) die for want of food and clothing and fuel, and medical attendance—There are former owners are for the most part trying to do for them all that they can—but that is but little—out of every hundred negroes, old and young, not more than twenty were working men and most of these twenty were taken away by the war—and have never returned.

Most of them probably died, or were killed—So now there is no body to raise bread and meat for those too young or too old to work—The white inhabitants, all thro’ the South have gone to work very heartily—But they have their own families to provide for—and this they can do only with great difficulty—The war swept away a great many of their able bodied men—and left thousands of widows and orphans, without money and without means—All over the country the fences were burnt—barns and farming tools and mills
destroyed—all the horses, mules and oxen carried away, or eaten up—and these people are without money!

Now, with the best intentions in the world, to help their late servants, they have little in their power—and while many of the white race must perish this winter, a much larger proportion of the black must disappear before spring—no matter who is in fault—or whether any body is to blame for this state of things—thousands will be in their graves before next Christmas—!—No power can help it—at least, none on earth!!—

Our university is doing well—very well, all things considered—It never stop[ed] during the war—but our numbers were greatly reduced towards its close—Now they begin to come back in good numbers.40

EARLY IMAGES OF PAVILION IX AND ITS OUTBUILDINGS

The early images of the university do not show any outbuildings behind Pavilion IX during Professor George Tucker’s occupancy. The engravings of the ground plan of the university issued between 1822 and 1828, for instance, all depict the rear of Pavilion IX with the same features: garden walls extending west from the north and south façades of the pavilion, with an opening midway along each garden wall; the garden walls then turn south and north, respectively, to form the east walls of the garden. These straight walls then adjoin serpentine walls to form the north, west, and south boundaries of the garden. The land on which the cottage now stands was outside the enclosed garden area of the pavilion. These ground plans do not show any outbuildings.41

Benjamin Tanner’s 1826 engraving of the Lawn shows Pavilion IX at the far left. However, the view is cropped tight to the rear wall of the pavilion, so it does not include any features in the garden behind the pavilion or any representation of other outbuildings at that time. Standing on the balcony on the second story of the south façade of Pavilion IX is an African American woman holding a white infant in a long dress, suggesting that she was caring for a child in the house (Figure 11). None of the Tucker children were infants in 1826, but at least three other professors living on the Lawn had young children.42

What may be the earliest images of the extant outbuilding behind Pavilion IX appear in two bird’s-eye views of the university, both published by Casimir Bohn and dated 1856. The view from the west was drawn and printed in color by E. Sachse and Co. of Baltimore, Maryland. The outbuilding is shown as a one-story, red brick structure, rectangular in plan, with the ridge of the gable roof running north-south. A leafy tree obscures any windows or doors. A smaller brick structure with a shed roof was apparently attached to the south wall of the building. Both roofs are colored gray, perhaps to indicate sheet-metal coverings. A serpentine garden wall forms a boundary on the south (Figure 2).43

Another view published by Bohn in 1856 depicts the university from the south, with Pavilion IX in the foreground at the left. It shows a small outbuilding standing quite close to the southwest corner of the pavilion. It has a gable roof with the ridge running north-south.
Figure 11. Engraving (above) and detail (left) showing Pavilion IX by Benjamin Tanner, 1826, based on an 1824 drawing. Note the African American woman holding a child on the terrace south of Pavilion IX.
Figure 12. "Western Aspect of the University of Virginia" from the May 1872 issue of Harper’s New Monthly Magazine. This view may have been based on the Bohn view from the west. Note the windows on the west façade of the dependency.
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and with the west side of the roof lower than the east side; there is no smaller structure on its south side.44

A wood engraving entitled “Western Aspect of the University of Virginia,” which was published in Harper’s New Monthly Magazine in May 1872, clearly includes the outbuilding behind Pavilion IX (Figure 12). It appears as a one-story, gabled-roofed structure, with two slightly oblong windows in the west façade. There is a small shed-roofed structure either attached to the south end of the outbuilding or built very close to it, much like what appeared in the Bohn view from the west. A vertical line at the north façade may indicate a small projecting entrance (but there is no physical evidence on the north façade for such a feature).45

MCGUFFEY COTTAGE IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

Maps published at the turn of the twentieth century include representations of the extant outbuilding with additional details. A fire-insurance map published in July 1891 (Figure 13) shows the outbuilding as having four adjoining sections, all rectangular in plan with solid walls between each section; except for the small, northernmost section, the longest dimension runs north-south.46 An 1896 fire-insurance map (Figure 14) again shows the cottage as a long, one-story structure. It also indicates that the north third of the building was narrower than the parts below. This map does not show any walls dividing the building into sections, unlike the 1891 map; however, the 1891 map generally depicts more details, so the lack of walls shown in the 1896 map may not be significant.47

A 1902 insurance map depicts the outbuilding as it appeared on the 1896 map. A 1907 map (Figure 15) shows it as a one-story building having two sections divided by solid walls. The larger section is at the south; the north section is narrower.48

A photograph, which is believed to date from the first decade of the twentieth century (Figure 16), shows the outbuilding having a standing-seam sheet-metal roof with its ridge running north to south; the northeast door is visible through a lattice fence.49

An entry in a ledger for the Department of Buildings and Grounds shows that some minor repairs were made to the “servants closet” at Pavilion IX in 1906. No further identification or details were provided.50

A topographical map of the university dating from 1909 (Figure 17) indicates that the addition at the southwest corner of Pavilion IX had been constructed by that time. It also shows that the footprint of the outbuilding had changed; the footprint no longer has a narrower addition at the north end of the building, and the north edge of the building no longer extends as far north as the original south wall of the pavilion; instead, the north edge stops short of the pavilion addition at the southwest corner of the pavilion. This change suggests that the north structure at the north end of the outbuilding was demolished by 1909, apparently at about the same time that the extension was constructed (otherwise, the
Figure 13. Detail of Sanborn map of the Lawn, 1891, showing McGuffey Cottage with one-story appendages to the south and north. In the color version of the map, the appendages are colored yellow, indicating that they were wood-framed structures.

Figure 14. Detail from a Sanborn map of the Lawn, 1896. In the color version of the map, the north appendage and the cottage are pink, indicating a brick structure.
north end of the cottage would have been very close to the southwest addition, perhaps uncomfortably so.\textsuperscript{51}

These removals may well have been related to the work done in the areas behind the West Lawn. An article published in the \textit{Alumni Bulletin} in 1913 described “the most important changes in our campus in the last few years”:

Previous to the session of ’08-’09, the space between West Lawn and West Range was a veritable junk-heap and dumping-ground. Here were lost in confusion piles of brick, a plumber’s shop, one or two other tumble-down buildings with broken windows, a long dilapidated shed under which reposed cast-off lumber, heaps of old iron, and all the other odds and end which should have been outside the campus. But when work was begun\textsuperscript{52} it was, indeed, well finished; the place was cleaned out in every way. The old buildings were razed, the ground leveled and graded, until what was once a spot offensive to the eye is now a place of grass and hedges—neat, trim and in every way attractive.
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Nonetheless, the 1913 fire-insurance map is like the 1907 map, except that the north section is not divided in two.

A photograph of the Lawn by Rufus Holsinger dating from about 1911 shows a three-quarter view of the outbuilding (Figure 19). The shed-roofed addition on the south has been removed, leaving a white paint ghost on the end elevation. A lattice fence runs from the stairs on the Lawn west along an east-west sidewalk, partially obscuring the outbuilding. However, it is clear that the south wall of the outbuilding has a doorway in the center and a small opening under the roof; there appear to be four openings in the east wall. There is a chimney located about one-third of the distance from the north wall.

Fire-insurance maps from 1920, 1929, and 1950 show the outbuilding as a broader rectangle; the extensions at the north have been demolished. The north end is depicted as being south of the extensions to the pavilion. The 1920 insurance map also shows this change to the footprint of the outbuilding and the addition to the pavilion. The 1929 and 1950 fire-insurance maps depict the same footprint and location as shown in the 1920 insurance map.

An October 1937 photograph of a storm sewer being installed behind Pavilion IX and in the yard to the north also shows part of the outbuilding, which had a light colored gabled roof and a central chimney. Similarly, an aerial view of the university dating from about 1946 shows the outbuilding with a gabled roof and part of its south façade painted white or a light color; there is an opening high in the south gable end (Figure 20).

Between 1948 and 1952, the Garden Club of Virginia undertook the restoration of the gardens with designs by landscape architect Alden Hopkins. In September 1952, during that work, a photograph was taken of the construction of a new serpentine wall southwest of Pavilion IX. That image includes the outbuilding, but it is largely obscured by trees or bushes; the photo does, however, show a white-painted opening high in the south gable end and what appears to be a gutter beneath the west edge of the roof. A second view, taken at about the same time, shows the outbuilding much more clearly, with two windows in the west façade, the gutter, the south gable end, and a central chimney at a point about one third of the length of the roof from the north wall (Figure 21).

Maps prepared for the university’s purposes prior to 1950 identify the outbuilding simply as a residence or dwelling. It is, however, identified on a 1971 garden plan as McGuffey Cottage; this may be the earliest use of that name on a document. The building is consistently identified as McGuffey Cottage in listings of faculty and staff residences dating from 1974 through 1979. A student report prepared in 1988 stated that the cottage was then “maintained as a professor’s residence.”

A September 1997 report prepared by University of Virginia Facilities Management stated that the cottage was then used for student housing. A stainless-steel roof had been installed in 1994, as were new gutters and downspouts; the roof was reported to be in good condition. According to the report, the exterior trim, windows, and doors were last painted in 1990, and were now in poor condition; it was hoped the paint could be renewed in 1997.
Figure 16. Pavilion IX, circa 1900-1910, by the Detroit Publishing Company. All that can be seen of McGuffey Cottage is the standing seam roof (above the lattice fence) and the northeast door (behind the fence).
Figure 17. Detail from topographical map of University of Virginia, 1909. Note that north is at the bottom of this map.

Figure 18. Detail from panoramic view of the Lawn by A.C. Brechin & Son, circa 1911.
Figure 19. Detail from panoramic view of the Lawn by Rufus Holsinger, circa 1911. The shed-roofed addition has been removed from the south façade of the cottage, leaving a white paint ghost on the brick and a doorway centered in the wall.
Figure 20. 1946 aerial view of the grounds. In the detail of Pavilion IX and its garden, McGuffey Cottage appears as it does today.
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Figure 21. A rare view of Pavilion IX and McGuffey Cottage from the southwest, taken in September 1951, when a new serpentine garden wall was constructed. There is no vent pipe on the west side of the roof (as there is now), indicating that the bathroom may not yet have been installed.

Other parts of the building were generally in good condition. A 1999 drawing showing fire-alarm installations proposed that a smoke and heat detector be installed in the cottage. A masonry condition assessment, dating from August 2013, identified areas of the exterior that had cracked brick and mortar, erosion, mold, and efflorescence. A facility inspection report prepared in 2016 and updated in 2017 stated that the “exterior brick and mortar are in fair condition” and that the interior brick paving and vinyl floors appeared “to be in good condition.” The plaster ceilings and walls were described as being “clean and in reasonably good condition.” The roof was covered with terne-coated stainless steel, and the exterior trim had been painted recently. The cottage was “heated by electric baseboard units,” and the bathroom “fixtures and hardware appeared to be clean, serviceable and well maintained.”
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Figure 22. Diagram of the excavation behind Pavilion IX.
SUMMARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDINGS

ANTEBELLUM PAVILION AND HOTEL DEPENDENCIES

As noted in the history section of this report, upon the opening of the University of Virginia in the Spring of 1825 there were few ancillary structures beyond smokehouses and privies supporting the pavilions and hotels within the Academical Village. Arriving at the University, faculty members housed enslaved African Americans in spaces appropriate to their living arrangements. Without separate purposefully-built servants’ quarters, records document that enslaved African Americans lived in the basement level rooms of hotels and pavilions, and, where possible, in the ground floor levels of adjacent dormitories.

From the beginning, basement level accommodations were found to be lacking and inadequate. In particular, hotel keepers complained of damp basement conditions that made kitchen duties impossible and created unhealthy living conditions. At Hotel D, George W. Spotswood’s family suffered from fever associated with a perpetually damp basement. Clearly, those living in the hotel’s basement also suffered, as in late 1825 he lamented the lack of a ‘cabin’ for his servants, a separate structure for housing the enslaved men and women who labored for him.1

By the summer of 1828, the first professors applied for and received permission to construct “such building[s] for the accommodation of servants.”2 Overall, between 1828 and 1832, one or more purposefully built structures for the accommodation of enslaved African Americans are documented as having been constructed in the tenements of at least seven of the ten pavilions (Pavilions I, III, V, VI, VIII, IX, and X), and five of the six hotels (A, B, D, E and F). These structures, characterized variously as ‘offices,’ ‘accommodations for servants,’ ‘accommodations for domestics,’ and ‘servants rooms’ were located to the rear of each pavilion, generally in a location convenient if not immediately adjacent to the primary structure itself.
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The carpenters’ estimates for some of these structures (see pages 23-25 of this report) document two types of accommodation for enslaved laborers at the University of Virginia. One of the residence types was a two-room structure measuring approximately 12 by 24 or 16 by 24 feet in dimension. This residence type contained two rooms most likely divided by a central wall containing a fire place. The rooms may have been connected via one or more doorways. The second residence type was significantly smaller measuring 12 by 15 feet in dimension. This residence type was likely a one room structure with a fireplace at one end. The presence of a loft or staircase in each of the three estimates suggests that these structures may have utilized the upper half story, or loft, or perhaps a full second story as a living space. The estimates acknowledge the presence of functional work spaces, such as a kitchen, that were built into or added onto the structures, reinforcing the understanding that living spaces for enslaved African Americans doubled as work spaces.

ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AT McGUFFEY COTTAGE

Between December 2010 and January 2011, archaeological investigations were undertaken north of and adjacent to McGuffey Cottage in advance of the installation of new chilled and hot and cold-water supply and return lines connecting the eastern end of Colonnade Alley with Pavilion IX. Investigations were composed of pre-construction large unit excavation in targeted areas as well as archaeological monitoring of construction activities throughout the project area.

Prior to the initiation of construction, it was determined that the project had the potential to impact sensitive cultural resources. In particular, historic maps of the University had identified that the area north of and adjacent to McGuffey Cottage once contained a north-south oriented rectangular building, standing until its demolition in the circa 1907-1909 period. The building is believed to represent the northern end of a long row of pre-Eman- cipation dependencies located off the southwest corner of Pavilion IX. Maps show that the dependency appeared to be appended to the north end of McGuffey Cottage.

A large 10 by 10-foot unit was placed in the location of a proposed construction access hole north of and adjacent to McGuffey Cottage and west of the circa 1900s addition to the southwest corner of Pavilion IX. During both pre-construction excavation and monitoring of construction activities a historic structure and other landscape and cultural features significant to understanding McGuffey Cottage were identified and documented.
Located north of and adjacent to McGuffey Cottage, the southern and eastern walls of a brick foundation, representing the partial architectural remains of a pre-Emancipation dependency, were identified just below existing grade. The brick foundation was found to lie approximately 5 feet north of the north façade of McGuffey Cottage, and approximately 9.5 feet west of the southwest addition to Pavilion IX. Based on the partial foundation exposed during pre-construction excavation, as well as information collected during monitoring of construction activities, the historic building is believed to have minimal dimensions of approximately 10.5 feet in a north-south direction and 7.0 feet in an east-west direction. Probing beneath the ground surface to the west of the archaeologically exposed foundation indicated that the brick footer continued further in this direction, extending at least to the adjacent extant garden wall (Figure 22 and Figure 23).

The brick foundation was approximately 0.7 feet (two bricks) wide, and held together by a gray-green sandy, lime-based mortar. Present only 2 inches below grade, the south brick foundation wall was found to be five courses tall. Impacted by a trench dug for a first half of the twentieth-century iron sewer line, the east brick wall was identified at between 6 and 8 inches below grade and ranged between two and five courses tall. The bricks composing the partial foundation all appeared to be soft and hand-made.

The east wall of the brick foundation was noted to be set back from and located approximately 2.5 feet west of the east façade of McGuffey Cottage. This appears to conform with late nineteenth to early twentieth-century fire insurance maps that show a narrower north-south oriented structure north of and adjacent to McGuffey Cottage. As previously noted however, the south wall of the brick foundation was located 5.0 feet north of the north façade of McGuffey Cottage. This contradicts historic maps that do not show any space between the structures composing the long row of dependencies southwest of Pavilion IX. University maps show the antebellum dependency north of McGuffey Cottage abutting the extant structure's north façade.

Material culture recovered from builder’s trenches associated with the construction of the brick foundations included domestic ceramics and glassware, pane glass, cut nails, and animal bone reflecting a second quarter of the nineteenth-century assemblage. Elsewhere, material culture recovered east of and adjacent to the dependency and associated with its occupation document a largely first half of the nineteenth-century assemblage including a preponderance of animal bone. While the artifacts, in and of themselves, do not point to any one particular function for the antebellum dependency, they do document a significant amount of continuous cultural activity in the area suggestive of occupations that supported the adjacent pavilion, as well as a potential residence for enslaved individuals.
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BRICK PIER

During excavation of a north-south oriented trench within the archaeologically identified antebellum dependency, three dry-laid bricks were identified sitting on a pedestal of undisturbed subsoil clay (Figure 22 and Figure 24). The pedestal stood approximately 0.4 to 0.5 feet higher than the bottom of the trench, suggesting that it was intentionally left in this location during the excavation of the trench. No full dimensions for the brick feature were obtained as it extended into soils outside of the large excavation unit. The clay pedestal, and associated single course of bricks, were interpreted as the base of a pier internal to the antebellum dependency.

GARDEN WALL

A second foundation, an east-west oriented mortared brick wall, was identified during monitoring of construction activities. The partial brick foundation was preserved only in several short segments and was located approximately 16.0 feet north of the north façade of McGuffey Cottage. The east-west brick foundation was found to be 0.7 feet (two bricks) wide, and possessed a yellow, sandy mortar. The foundation was found to lie only 0.25 feet below grade and possessed four courses, the bottom of which was a row of headers.

The east-west brick foundation was cut in several locations by 1) the western wall of the circa 1900 southwest addition to Pavilion IX; 2) by a deep north-south oriented circa 1937 trench associated with a 12-inch diameter terra cotta storm water line; 3) by a twentieth-century planting hole; 4) by the east foundation of the antebellum dependency; and 5) by the twentieth century north-south oriented iron sewer line extending from the north façade of McGuffey Cottage (Figure 22 and Figure 25).

The east-west brick foundation predates all of the features that cut it. As previously noted, the western wall of the circa 1900 southwest addition cut the archaeologically identified east-west brick foundation. If extended further in an easterly direction, the east-west brick foundation would align precisely with the southwest corner of the original west façade of Pavilion IX (Figure 26). The Maverick plan, produced in the early 1820s while the University was still under construction, shows that all of the pavilions possessed east-west garden walls that extended off the rear walls of the original Jeffersonian pavilions. These garden walls would have separated the rear of the pavilions from the adjoining functional yard space on both the north and south.

Stratigraphically, the east-west garden wall was founded on, and therefore post-dates, two soil horizons, one of which was a deep, red clay fill deposit with few artifacts. This fill deposit is believed to represent soils from an adjacent construction, possibly associated with the excavation of the basement level for Pavilion IX. The wedge-shaped nature of the fill deposit, thinner in the east towards Pavilion IX and thicker in the west towards the brick outbuilding, suggests that it was also used to level the rear yard. Due to the underlying fill
Figure 23. The archaeological investigation behind Pavilion IX uncovered the southern and eastern walls of a brick foundation for a pre-Emancipation dependency.

Figure 24. Within the location of the dependency, three dry-laid bricks sit on a pedestal of undisturbed subsoil clay.

deposit, its relative lack of material culture, and its alignment with the southwest corner of the original Pavilion IX, the east-west brick wall is believed to be an original (e.g. Jeffersonian) garden wall.

The eastern foundation of the archaeologically identified dependency was found to penetrate and sit on top of or straddle the east-west oriented garden wall. This condition necessarily dates the antebellum dependency as being constructed subsequent to and post-dating the east-west garden wall. It is not yet clear if the eastern wall of the antebellum dependency extended north beyond the east-west garden wall, or if the garden wall formed its northeast corner.
Figure 25. The east-west brick foundation was cut in several locations.

Figure 26. Site plan showing box drain and original garden wall foundation.
Figure 27. A significant concentration of quartzite cobbles was identified throughout the entire area north of McGuffey Cottage.

Figure 28. The cobbles underlies, and therefore predates, the antebellum dependency and the east-west garden wall.
**McGUFFEY COTTAGE**

**COBBLE SURFACING**

An extensive and unusual deposit, consisting of a significant concentration of quartzite cobbles within a surrounding soil matrix, was identified throughout the entire area north of McGuffey Cottage (Figure 27). The cobble deposit was found to underlie, and therefore predate, both the archaeologically identified antebellum dependency and the east-west garden wall. The cobbles and surrounding soil matrix were also found to lie directly on top of sterile subsoil and local greenstone bedrock, suggesting that it represents the earliest occupation deposit pre-dating or contemporaneous with the construction of Pavilion IX. The concentration of quartzite cobbles within the soil matrix is unusual for natural conditions within the Academical Village and instead likely represents an intentional effort to make a more functional working surface adjacent to the Pavilion IX construction site.

**POST-HOLES**

Several post-holes were identified east of and adjacent to the east façade of the archaeologically identified historic building. Two in particular appear to be of similar construction size and shape and are likely related to one another. Both post-holes, deep square-shaped features with near vertical sides and post-molds, were located approximately 2.5 feet east of the east façade of the antebellum dependency and 9.0 feet in a north-south direction from one another. Material culture recovered from the two post-holes represents a first half of the nineteenth-century assemblage.

The fact that the two post-holes parallel the east façade of the antebellum dependency suggests some kind of association or contemporaneity with it. While the post-holes could possibly represent a porch to the antebellum dependency, this is unlikely because of the narrow space separating the dependency and post-holes, as well as the fact that the southern post-hole is located on the southeast corner of the dependency but the northern post-hole is not located on the northeast corner of the same. The more likely interpretation is that the two post-holes represent a portion of a fence line that extended to both the north and south. A fence line in this location would most likely have been a palisade that visually separated residential space adjacent to Pavilion IX, from the functional garden space to its west. In the case of Pavilion IX, it is assumed that the garden space west of the fence would contain numerous dependencies. It might also have served to block the view of the dependencies supporting Pavilion IX from the Jeffersonian road corridor that passed just to the south.

**BRICK BOX DRAIN**

A mortared brick box drain was identified during monitoring of construction activities adjacent to and west of the circa 1900 southwest addition to Pavilion IX. The drain was oriented in a northeast-southwest direction and was constructed of re-used brick mortared
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together with a pargeted interior (Figure 29). The function of the utility was to drain an adjacent building or low-lying area. Because it underlies and is not connected to the circa 1900 southwestern addition to Pavilion IX, the brick box drain pre-dates this structural addition. Assuming that the drain was laid in a straight line, and extending it in a north-easterly direction, the orientation and course of the brick box drain suggests that it likely connected with the southwest corner of the original pavilion. Likewise, extending its course in a southwesterly direction, the orientation and course of the brick box drain would avoid the archaeologically identified antebellum dependency and intersect with north façade of McGuffey Cottage (Figure 26).

A circa 1872-1876 map of the Academical Village shows a box drain in the location and orientation of the archaeologically identified feature. The map shows the box drain connecting to the west façade of what would be the circa 1831-38 western addition to Pavilion IX and bisecting what is believed to be McGuffey Cottage (Figure 30). If the map represents the as-built and unaltered version of the brick drain, then the brick drain must necessarily date to after the circa 1831-38 period.

Given the fact that the brick box drain is found to be directed around the southeast corner of the archaeologically identified antebellum dependency, yet if extended in a southwesterly direction in a straight line it would directly underlie the northern end of McGuffey Cottage, the brick box drain may post-date the construction of the archaeologically identified antebellum dependency and pre-date the construction of McGuffey Cottage. The 1872-1876 map of the Academical Village appears to support this hypothesis.

RESEARCH SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the documented material and stratigraphic evidence, a preliminary chronological and spatial relationship can be established for the archaeologically identified features and their relationship to both Pavilion IX and its additions and McGuffey Cottage. As anticipated, an antebellum brick dependency was identified north of and adjacent to McGuffey Cottage. Although no full dimension for this building has yet been obtained, it measured at least 10.5 feet in a north-south direction and 7.0 feet in an east-west direction. Preliminary evidence suggests that the northern end of the eastern façade of the brick dependency rests upon, and is notched into, an east-west oriented brick garden wall. If this is accurate, then the northern and possibly western garden walls in this location may also have served as structural walls for the brick dependency. Below grade probing also suggested that the western end of the southern façade may have joined with a pre-existing north-south oriented garden wall. If this is assumed to be true, then a more accurate dimension of the brick dependency would be approximately 12.0 feet north-south, and 11.0 feet east-west.

Within an approximate structural footprint of 11.0 by 12.0 feet, the small brick pier takes on new meaning. Of unknown dimension, the single course of brick and underlying clay pedestal is found to be centrally located within the small antebellum dependency.
Due to the small size of the surrounding structure, the pier did not likely serve a structural function as the walls were close enough to be spanned. Because of its centrality, the brick pier feature may have supported a small stove, a hanging post, or other feature important to understanding the function of this small structure.

Fire insurance maps indicate that by the late nineteenth century the antebellum dependency was a one-story structure with fire proof roof, most likely with a chimney and north-south oriented gable roof. The same maps also document that the east façade of the brick dependency was found to be set back from the east façade of McGuffey Cottage. However, the fire insurance maps do not record the 5.0-foot space separating the two structures as identified during archaeological investigations.

The function of the antebellum dependency is unclear. University records document that many of the dependencies built for pavilion and hotel occupants had dual functions, serving as both residences and workplaces. The brick dependency therefore could have been
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built for a very specific primary function (e.g. kitchen), but also may have had a secondary function as housing for enslaved individuals.

The east-west oriented brick garden wall aligns with the southwest corner of the original pavilion and is therefore believed to be the base of an original, circa 1822, garden wall. The garden wall pre-dates the antebellum dependency but post-dates the construction of Pavilion IX. The garden wall is founded on a fill deposit believed to be related to the excavation of the Pavilion IX basement level. This fill deposit is believed to have been used to level the area immediately west of and adjacent to Pavilion IX.

The earliest occupation deposit within the area of investigation was a brown silty matrix with significant concentrations of quartzite cobbles. This deposit lies directly on sterile subsoil and pre-dates all other features in the area of investigations. The concentration of quartzite cobbles within the soil matrix is believed to be an intentional surfacing used to make a functional work space for the construction of Pavilion IX.

The two post-holes east of and adjacent to the east façade of the brick dependency are believed to be associated with a former north-south oriented fence-line, one that shielded the dependencies from both pavilion residents and visitors passing by on the adjacent Academical Village’s road to the south.

Given the difference in size between McGuffey Cottage and the adjacent brick dependency, as well as the space between them and the different setbacks of the two buildings, it is assumed that they were not built during the same construction episode. The course of a northeast-southwest oriented brick box drain believed to be associated with the circa 1831-38 western addition to Pavilion IX, appears to underlie McGuffey Cottage, and therefore pre-date the building’s construction. If so, this places the construction of McGuffey Cottage after the circa 1831-38 period. A circa 1870s map also shows that the brick box drain avoids the archaeologically identified antebellum dependency, appearing to reflect the structure’s presence, and suggesting that it may have been standing prior to circa 1831-38 (Figure 30). A tentative conclusion then is that McGuffey Cottage post-dates the antebellum dependency to its north (Figure 22).

BROADER PATTERNS AT OTHER ANTEBELLUM DEPENDENCIES WITHIN THE ACADEMICAL VILLAGE

Archaeological investigations have taken place at a number of map-projected locations of early nineteenth-century dependencies within the Academical Village. In addition, research in primary source maps, images and ledgers has focused on a greater understanding of pre-Emancipation dependencies. Based on this archaeological and archival research, a number of broad patterns regarding the location, materials, and purpose of these unique antebellum support structures can be outlined.

Pre-Emancipation dependencies were generally small structures, varying slightly in shape, size and orientation. Archival sources and archaeological research have documented that
these outbuildings were constructed exclusively of brick. Of the seven distinct outbuildings archaeologically examined, each one possessed a mortared brick foundation. Early aerial photographs and fire insurance maps also document that, at least by the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, these structures were predominantly one to one and a half stories tall.

Although no formal policy regarding their location was ever articulated by the Board of Visitors, nineteenth-century historic maps and images document that there was an overall order to the spatial arrangement of dependencies. Dependencies were always placed to the rear of pavilions and hotels, either north or south of them and never immediately east or west of their rear façade. With few exceptions, most dependencies were rectangular-shaped structures oriented in a north-south direction with axes perpendicular to their adjacent pavilions and hotels. Historic images also document that dependencies were often, but not always, built end to end forming long rows, particularly adjacent to the rear of pavilions.

The function of antebellum dependencies was invariably tied to the housing and/or labor of enslaved individuals. Requests for the construction of dependencies by pavilion residents and hotel keepers that were approved by the Board of Visitors document three primary functions. Dependencies were constructed as kitchens, washhouses, and buildings for the ‘accommodation of servants’. Kitchens and washhouses also frequently served a secondary function as housing, utilizing ground floor and attic space as living quarters.

The areas adjacent to antebellum dependencies were spaces that saw repeated activities related to both work and family life. Because of their adjacency to functional yard and garden spaces, dependencies are often found in association with cobble surfacing. Quartzite cobbles, harvested from local drainages, served to stabilize a poorly drained ground surface that could become muddy and cumbersome over time. Cobble surfacing was identified south of and adjacent to a circa 1830s kitchen in the northwest corner of the Pavilion VI garden (Figure 31). Cobble surfacing is also found in most alley termini adjacent to the north and south sides of each pavilion. At the Cracker Box, brick surfacing was identified both north and south of the extant kitchen structure (Figure 32).

Due to their locations north and south of the pavilions and hotels, antebellum dependencies had to integrate with the pre-existing brick walls that defined the garden and yard space. Historic maps document that antebellum dependencies were generally constructed adjacent to garden walls, often in the extreme corners of the pavilion and hotel gardens, so as to be convenient to but separated from the white residence. Archaeological investigations have documented that several antebellum dependencies incorporated pre-existing garden walls into their structures. At the Mews in the northeast corner of the Pavilion III garden, garden walls were found to form the eastern façade of the original circa 1830 kitchen. During a late nineteenth-century expansion of the Mews to the east, it incorporated an existing garden wall in a new south façade that included brick piers and a gate opening (Figure 33). In the northwest corner of the Pavilion IV garden, a small 12.0 by 12.0-foot structure containing a brick-lined well was found to utilize pre-existing garden walls in its eastern and southern
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Figure 31. Cobble surfacing near a circa 1830s kitchen in the northwest corner of the Pavilion VI garden.

Figure 32. At the Cracker Box, brick surfacing was found to the north and south of the extant kitchen structure.
façades. Likewise, Structure 1, a circa 1831 kitchen located in the northwest corner of the Pavilion VI garden, is believed to have utilized a pre-existing garden wall in its western façade.

It is not yet clear why the practice of incorporating pre-existing garden walls into new structures occurred at all, much less with repeated frequency at the Academical Village. One possible explanation could be that pre-Emancipation funding from the General Assembly and other private sources never entirely fulfilled the needs of operating an educational institution. The constant lack of funds could have led to a culture of economy administered by the Board of Visitors and enforced by the Proctor and faculty. Archival sources appear to corroborate the perpetual lack of funds, documenting numerous instances where requests for new buildings or needed renovations by faculty and hotel keepers were approved with the condition that the costs not exceed a specific amount, and that the applicant would have to fully fund the request until the University could reimburse them at a later date.

Other cultural features often found in association with antebellum dependencies are post-holes. Frequently found in pairs or linear alignments, and located adjacent to dependencies, these post-holes are generally interpreted as fence lines. Fences were constructed throughout the nineteenth century to hide or to restrict access to facilities, activities, and
people. Within the Academical Village, evidence for fences are found in courtyards and to the rear of pavilions and hotels.

Material culture assemblages found in association with antebellum dependencies generally reinforce their use throughout the pre-Emancipation period, and often extending well into the postbellum period. Artifact collections document the domestic nature of these structures in the form of tableware ceramics and glass, children’s toys, and personal items, as well as the labor of their inhabitants in the form of buttons, thimbles, scissors and animal bone. The presence of late nineteenth-century material culture also reflects the fact that these dependencies may still have been used as residences for domestic servants, butlers, nannies and other positions typically filled by African Americans in the post-Emancipation period.

Research suggests that the University undertook the first wholesale ‘beautification’ of the Academical Village in the first decade of the twentieth century under the direction of landscape architect Warren Manning and Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds William Lambeth. During the 1906-1909 period, the eastern and western gardens were targeted for a comprehensive improvement that included cleaning up “the unsightly parts of the grounds between the Lawn and the Ranges,” and “the area between the West Lawn and West Range, in large part a dumping ground for miscellaneous refuse, with dilapidated small buildings and piles of loose bricks.” Evidence documents the demolition of the majority of historic dependencies to the rear of the pavilions and hotels during the first quarter of the twentieth century.

NOTES

1. George W. Spotswood to James Madison, November 29, 1825. James Madison Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; John B. Richeson to Rector and Board of Visitors, October 2, 1826. MSS#11925. Special Collections Department, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia; George W. Spotswood to the Rector and Board of Visitors, July 4, 1829. MSS #11958. Special Collections Department, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia.

2. Minutes of the Board of Visitors, July 10, 1828.

3. This may represent artistic liberties when rendering small, and perhaps less important, details such as the size, location and spacing of nineteenth-century dependencies.

4. The western façade of the ca. 1837 addition to Pavilion IX is set back on both its northern and southern ends.

5. It is not yet clear how this fence line would relate to McGuffey Cottage to its south. Connecting the two post-holes and drawing a straight line in a southern direction, the fence line would have intersected with the northeast corner of McGuffey Cottage. This may suggest that the fence line predates the construction of McGuffey Cottage.

6. Archaeological investigations have taken place at the Hotel D kitchen (1) and wash house (2), the Cracker Box kitchen (3), Structure 1 in northwest corner of Pavilion VI garden (4), at the Mews (5), at a Well house adjacent to the northwest corner of Pavilion IV garden (6), and at the antebellum dependency north of McGuffey Cottage (7).
7. The Cracker Box, located northwest and to the rear of Hotel F, is the notable exception. At two stories tall, the second story of the Cracker Box provided access to the Pavilion X garden, and much later the second story of Hotel F.

8. Recent archaeological investigations have identified a small structure, approximately 12-foot square, northeast of and adjacent to Pavilion IV. The structure was found to contain a brick-lined well. The original footprint of the Mews too was an exception. Built as a small kitchen, the Mews was also square-shaped, approximately 19 by 19 feet in dimension.

McGUFFEY COTTAGE

Figure 34. Schematic drawing of McGuffey Cottage in the late nineteenth century, based on archaeological and photographic evidence. There was a shed-roofed wood structure to the south accessed through a door cut into the south wall of McGuffey Cottage. The brick structure discovered by the archaeological investigation was one of a series of outbuildings to the north of the cottage.

Figure 35. McGuffey Cottage, 2018.
Figure 36. Site plan showing chronological development of Pavilion IX and its associated dependencies.
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ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

EXTERIOR

The structure now known as McGuffey Cottage is a 24' 4-1/2" by 13'-8" rectangular brick dependency, just 2'-4" south and 6'-11" west of Pavilion IX. The building and its gabled roof extend north to south.

The original hand-made red brick (of variable quality) is laid in common bond. The placement of the header courses varies on each façade. Generations of repointing campaigns have resulted in a variety of joint profiles, including concave, flush, and struck. The brick walls extend down below grade. In the mid-twentieth century renovations, a concrete floor slab was poured on grade inside the walls.

Standing-seam, terne-coated, stainless-steel sheet metal now covers the gabled roof. The lightweight framing for the roof, as well as the many small nails protruding from the underside of the original roof sheathing, indicates that the roof was originally covered in wood shingles. The original brick chimney, north of center, rises approximately fourteen courses above the roof ridge (the lower course is covered in flashing) to a two-course-high corbeled chimney cap.

Access to the interior of the cottage in the nineteenth century was through two doorways in the east façade. Only the southeast door currently functions; the northeast door is walled over on the interior.

In the nineteenth century, this small building did not stand alone. It was flanked by structures to the north and south. The construction dates of these structures are undetermined, but the north structures and possibly the south appendage are shown on various views and maps until 1909. The south appendage is first shown in the 1856 Bohn view of the Lawn as seen from the south. The small, shed-roof structure is attached to the cottage and extends about two-thirds of the depth of that building. The 1891 Sanborn map records the appendage as a wood-framed structure. By the time that the 1896 Sanborn map was released, the appendage appears to have been removed.
Various maps show another structure to the north of the cottage. This addition is not seen in the 1856 Bohn and 1872 Harper’s New Monthly Magazine views, but is clearly recorded in the 1891 Sanborn map of the grounds. That map shows a one-story wood structure with what may be a narrow one-story wood addition to its north, clearly attached to the cottage. The 1896 Sanborn map and the later maps indicate that the north structure was constructed of brick.

The 2011 archaeological investigations revealed portions of the east and south foundations of a brick structure situated about five feet from the north face of the cottage. This finding conflicts with the Sanborn maps from 1891, 1902, and 1907 which show an attached structure. If those maps were drawn correctly, then further investigations may reveal that the separate brick structure was attached to the cottage by the roof structure with an open breeze-way separating the two brick buildings.
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EAST ELEVATION

The four-bay-wide east façade of the building includes original doorways in the outer bays and original window openings in the inner bays. The header courses are placed every seven to nine stretcher courses. The bricks on this façade average 7-3/4" long by 3-3/4" wide by 2-1/4" high, and are laid so that the height of ten courses, including joints, is approximately 2' 4". At the top of the façade, three courses of corbeled bricks support the edge of the roof framing.

The original doorways in the outer bays have later steel lintels that support the stretcher course above. The openings are framed by large, 2" wide wood beads and sit above square-edge sills, all installed in the mid-twentieth century. Both openings feature mid-twentieth-century board-and-batten doors (see interior description for detailed descriptions of the doors). The grade is lower at the south end of the building, and a freestanding sandstone step is used to bridge the distance to the south doorway.

Figure 38. McGuffey Cottage from the east.
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Figure 39. East elevation.

Figure 40. West elevation.
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Figure 41. North elevation.

Figure 42. South elevation. The outline of the bricked-up doorway is shown as a dotted line.
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The original window openings in the two inner bays are set below rowlock header bricks. Large 2" wide wood beads and square-edge sills trim the openings. The south opening holds a 6/6 wood sash, while the narrower north opening holds a 4/4 wood sash. The trim and sash all date to the mid-twentieth century renovations.

A hung sheet-metal gutter extends across the façade, with downspouts at the north and south ends. A twentieth-century lantern fixture is mounted above the south doorway. There is a modern mailbox between the south doorway and south window opening.

NORTH ELEVATION

The north gable end of McGuffey Cottage is a plain elevation with only one small gable window opening now filled with a wood louver.

The gable opening sits above a header course, with just three stretcher courses separating that header course from the one below. On the rest of the elevation, the header courses are placed every seven to nine stretcher courses; the brick sizes match those of the east elevation. A twentieth-century raking wood fascia board trims the gable. The 5'-8" high brick garden wall is built against the west end of the façade.

The opening in the gable has a wood louvered ventilation sash, framed with a large 2" wide outer bead and two inner fillets. The louvered sash has seven slats and is set above a
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Figure 45. McGuffey Cottage, looking north along the west elevation.

Figure 46. McGuffey Cottage, looking northwest along the south elevation.

square-edged sill. The sash and trim date to the mid-twentieth century renovations. Originally, the opening likely held an operable glazed casement sash.

WEST ELEVATION

The west elevation features two nineteenth-century low, horizontal window openings. As on the east façade, the three uppermost brick courses are corbeled out to support the roof framing. Near grade, the bricks project out to form a water table. This façade is largely built in stretcher bond set between single Flemish courses, with a single header course four courses below the corbeled brick. Below that header course, the bricks are approximately 7-3/4” to 8” long by 4” wide by 2-1/2” high, and are laid so that the height of three courses, including joints, is approximately 8-3/4” to 9” high. Above the header course, the bricks are narrower: 2-1/4” high, such that the height of three courses (with joints) is 8”. It is possible that the header course marks the top of an earlier garden wall incorporated into this elevation. At the south end of the façade, the bricks are keyed into the garden wall that extends to the south.
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The pair of horizontal window openings were added sometime before 1872, when they first appear in the *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* illustration. The openings have plain wood frames and square-edged sills. The north opening has a 3/3 double-hung wood sash; the south sash has been removed from its opening to accommodate an air-conditioning unit.

Anomalies in the brickwork suggest that foundation vents, centered beneath the window openings, have been filled with brick. This may have occurred when the slab on grade was poured within the building footprint.

A hung sheet-metal gutter extends across the elevation, with downspouts at the north and south ends.

SOUTH ELEVATION

Like the north façade, the south gable end of the structure is a plain façade, that now has only one small ventilation opening in the gable. There was, however, for some time a shed-roofed addition attached to this façade, and evidence remains for that structure. Faint remnants of whitewash, the interior finish of the addition, remain on the brickwork, and the outline of the doorway to the addition, now filled in with brick, can be clearly seen centered on the façade.

The header courses on the south elevation are placed every seven stretcher courses, with one header course immediately below the gable opening. The brick sizes are similar to those of the east elevation. A twentieth-century raking wood fascia board trims the gable. The 5'-6" high brick garden wall is keyed into the west end of the façade.

The top of the former door opening at the center of the elevation is aligned with the bottom of the corbel course on the east and west elevations. The opening was approximately 3'-2 1/4" wide.

The original opening in the gable has a wood louvered ventilation sash that matches the one on the north elevation, framed with a large 2" wide outer bead and two inner fillets, with a square-edged sill. The louver and trim date to the mid-twentieth century renovations.

A galvanized electrical conduit and PVC electrical conduit extend up approximately 1'-10" above grade and then enter the building near the center of the façade.

INTERIOR

As originally constructed, the interior of this small brick structure consisted of two rooms separated by a brick mass that incorporated two fireplaces. A large, square room was situated to the south while a much smaller rectangular room was to the north. Each room included an access doorway in the east wall and an adjacent window opening. The function of the two rooms is unknown, but it is likely that the larger space served for living, sleeping, and cooking. The functions likely varied over the years.
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Figure 47. First floor plan.
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Figure 48. Section looking north.

Figure 49. Section looking east.
Figure 50. Twentieth-century wood trims.
The finishes were basic: brick walls that were either whitewashed or plastered, and a wood floor or possibly brick pavers on soil. The ceiling may have been the exposed structure of the attic floor, although further probes may reveal a now missing lath and plaster finish. Any wood trim would have been simple, such as board trim. There was probably no baseboard. The two window openings would contain glazed sash and the doorways would include basic board-and-batten doors. The large south fireplace included an iron crane (still extant) and was used for both heating and cooking. Further probes may reveal a similar fireplace in the smaller north room.

An attic space extends fully above the two first floor rooms. The low space beneath the gable roof was apparently made to be occupied, probably for sleeping and storage. The space is completely floored and consists of two areas separated by the chimney mass. Each gable end wall included a small window opening that originally featured a glazed operable sash (probably a casement sash). There is no evidence for the use of whitewash or any other finishes in this austere area.

The access to the attic was through a large opening positioned in the ceiling directly in front of the south fireplace. A moveable ladder was used to reach the opening. There is no evidence for any kind of hatch cover. The placement of the hatch was probably to take advantage of heat from the fireplace to help warm the attic area during the winter.

Modifications were made to the interior and exterior of the cottage in the later nineteenth century. Sometime prior to 1872, two low, rectangular window openings were inserted in the west wall. At another undetermined date, an opening was inserted in the south wall, apparently a door opening to connect to a shed-roofed wood structure constructed against the south wall of the building. There remains evidence of whitewash and paint on the south elevation of the brick cottage for the interior treatment of this addition. The simple structure is seen in the 1856 Bohn view and the 1872 woodcut view published in Harper’s New Monthly Magazine. It is shown on the 1896 Sanborn maps, but by 1909 it no longer appears on the maps.

The twentieth century brought change to the interior of the cottage. By the mid-twentieth century (date undetermined) the interior received more refined finishes, similar to those in the pavilion, with molded trim at the door and window openings, and wood baseboards trimming the walls. A wood mantel shelf was added to the south fireplace, where it may have replaced an earlier shelf. A concrete floor slab was poured and the brick floor installed over this surface. At some point, the north room was divided into two spaces; these spaces are now a kitchen and bathroom. This work involved the closing of the north fireplace. The interior wall and ceiling surfaces were covered in expanded metal lath and plaster, concealing the original attic access hatch, and a much smaller opening was inserted in the northeast corner of the kitchen ceiling.

Most recently, the kitchen space received new cabinetry and a small pantry/closet was added along the south wall of that space. All of these modifications resulted in the creation of the small, efficient apartment that now exists.
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Figure 51. The living room, looking north (left) and southeast (right).

LIVING ROOM

This 13'-2 1/2" by 11'-11" space now functions as the living room and sleeping area for the current tenant. All of the exposed surfaces and finishes, with the exception of the brick fireplace, date to work carried out in the twentieth century. The openings in the east wall are original, but the window opening in the west wall was inserted sometime before 1872.

The room originally featured simple finishes: a brick or wood floor; brick walls either plastered or possibly simply whitewashed; plain board trim at the door and window openings; and a board-and-batten door much like the current door. The wood framing of the ceiling may have been exposed. A large opening in the ceiling in front of the fireplace provided access to the attic and allowed heat from the fireplace to warm the attic.

At an undetermined date in the nineteenth century, a door opening was inserted in the south brick wall (evidence visible from the exterior). This door opened to a shed roof addition attached to the south end of the brick cottage. This wood addition can be seen in the 1856 Bohn view and in the 1872 Harper’s New Monthly Magazine illustration. It was removed by 1909, when it is no longer shown on a 1909 topographical map of the grounds.

Floor:  Twenty-first-century brick pavers (3-5/8" wide by 7-3/4" to 8" long) are set in a two-brick basketweave pattern over a poured concrete surface. The work areas of the pavilions originally had floors composed of bricks laid on soil. If there were vents in the west wall, as the exterior brick anomalies suggest, then it is possible that this building had a wood floor. No brick paving was found in the north dependency uncovered in the archaeological investigation.

Walls:  The original brick walls are finished in twentieth-century plaster on expanded metal lath. On the east wall, the lath is nailed to 2" wide, 1-1/2" deep contemporary wood furring. Behind the furring, the brick wall is coated with a hard cement mortar covered with a thin coat of whitewash or plaster, finished with a beige paint. Together, the mortar and finish are approximately 1/4" to 3/8" thick. This finished surface is 2-1/2" behind the finished surface of the existing twentieth-century wall plaster. On the north wall, surrounding the projecting fireplace, the plaster is applied directly to the brick surface.

Ceiling:  The twentieth-century ceiling is finished in plaster on expanded metal lath, 8'-3" above the floor. A small access panel to the attic was cut into the ceiling in 2018, in the location of the original 3'-7" by 1'-6 1/2" opening that had been covered by the later ceiling finish. A probe in the ceiling surface is necessary to determine if the ceiling was...
Figure 52. Two sketches of the original brick fireplace mass that divides the cottage into two areas.
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Figure 53. A probe above the south end of the southeast window opening revealed a hard cement mortar applied to the brick wall.

Figure 54. The original pot crane survives in the fireplace.

Originally finished in plaster on wood lath, or if the wood structure was exposed.

Baseboard: The twentieth-century, 5-3/4" high wood baseboard is composed of a splash trimmed with a flush bead at the top and a quarter-round shoe at the floor.

Doors: The two doorways—one in the east wall, and one in the north wall—are each framed by a 3" wide single-fascia architrave.

East door: The twentieth-century board-and-batten exterior door (3'-0 5/8" wide by 6'-1 1/2" high) is made up of 4-1/2" wide by 1-1/8" thick tongue-and-groove beaded boards fastened to three horizontal rounded-edge battens. Hardware: The hardware, contemporary with the door, includes three 4" high half-surface iron butt hinges; a 3" by 5-1/4" rim lock with round knobs and an exterior keyhole escutcheon with a decorative drop cover (all brass); a Corbin surface-mounted deadbolt with a Cormax Best key cylinder; a polished brass slide-bolt; and a peephole set in a square bracket. A bronze sign on the exterior face of the door identifies the building as McGuffey Cottage.

A twentieth-century 2'-11 1/2" wide by 6'-2" high wood screen door on the exterior side of the opening has two screened panels. Hardware: The screen door hardware includes a pair of 3-1/2" high butt hinges; a spring closer; and a latch with a lever handle on the interior and a round knob on the exterior.

North door: The twentieth-century board-
and-batten door (2'-5 3/8" wide by 6'-7 3/8" high) is made up of 5" wide, 1-1/8" thick, tongue-and-groove beaded boards fastened to three horizontal, rounded-edge battens. Hardware: The hardware, contemporary with the door, includes two 3-1/2" high half-surface iron butt hinges; a 3" by 5-1/4" cast-iron rim lock with round polished brass knobs and an oval brass keyhole escutcheon.

Windows: There are two window openings in the room: an original opening in the east wall, and a later low, horizontal opening in the west wall. The condition of the exterior brickwork surrounding the west opening indicates that it and the opening to the north are later insertions. They were created sometime before 1872, when they appear in an illustration published in the May 1872 issue of Harper’s New Monthly Magazine.

The east opening is framed by a 3" wide single-fascia twentieth-century architrave, and sits above a 1-1/4" bullnosed sill and 3" high apron. The 6/6 double-hung sash include 10-1/2" by 1'-0" panes. In the lower sash, the muntins are 5/8" wide; the muntins in the upper sash are 3/4" wide. The sash fasten shut with a brass thumblatch. On the exterior of the opening, a wood-framed window screen includes two openings, each with a panel of hardware cloth lined with insect screen.

A February, 2018 probe at the south end of the lintel revealed the 1-1/2" thick flat wood lintel above the east opening. It may be nominal dimension lumber, dating to the mid-twentieth century. Two bricks immediately south of the window opening are stacked (not coursed), suggesting that there was a larger lintel, possibly 3-1/2" in height (measured from the bottom of the existing lintel to the top of the double-stacked brick. This lintel would have extended approximately 6" beyond the window opening. The existing lintel extends approximately 5" beyond the window opening.

The pre-1872 west opening has 2" wide twentieth-century trim and sits above a 1-1/8" bullnosed stool and a 3-3/4" high apron. The sash has been removed from the opening and replaced with plexiglass panels to accommodate a window air conditioner.

Fireplace: The original 6'-10 1/4" wide brick fireplace projects 8" from the finished plaster surface of the original brick north wall. The bricks average 2-1/4" high by 8' long by 3-1/2" thick. The 4'-0 1/2" wide segmental arched opening, made of rowlock bricks, is 2'-10 3/4" high at the outer edges, and 3'-2 3/4" high at the highest point. The exposed brick surrounding the opening is now painted. The original brick wall above and to the east of the projecting brick fireplace is finished in painted plaster.

An original iron pot crane survives in the northwest corner of the 1'-5 1/2" deep firebox. The twentieth-century, basketweave-patterned brick floor continues into the firebox.

The 1-1/4" high, 1'-1" deep wood mantel shelf trims the top of the projecting fireplace; the square-edged shelf is trimmed by a 2" bed molding of a fillet, cyma reversa, and bead. This twentieth-century surface may replace an original shelf. It is also possible that there was no shelf, and that the brick surface was exposed.

Heating: Electric baseboard heaters extend along the east and west walls, below the windows. Wire mold on the east wall connects that heater to a Robertshaw thermostat.

Lighting/electrical: A semi-flush mount ceiling fixture has a glass shade molded into concentric circles. Other electrical elements include flush and surface-mounted duplex receptacles in the east, south, and west walls, and a switch in the south wall (near the doorway). On the west wall, wire mold conduit connects the baseboard heater to a surface-mounted outlet for the air conditioner.

Equipment: On the south wall, there is a surface-mounted smoke detector, as well as a communications outlet and a surface-mounted wireless access point.

KITCHEN

This small 8'-6 1/2" by 6'-5" kitchen exists in what was originally a longer narrow room that included the bathroom to the east. The current arrangement dates to work carried out in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The original larger room was simply finished, with a door and window in the original east wall (now in the bathroom). A fireplace was probably centered in the brick mass of the south wall. The small window opening in the west wall was inserted sometime before 1872.

Floor: Twentieth or twenty-first-century 1'-0" square vinyl tiles, mimicking slate, are laid over a poured concrete surface.

Walls: The walls are finished in twentieth-century plaster on expanded-metal lath. On the east wall, plaster is applied to expanded metal lath, furred out from the brick masonry. The north wall
is furred out from the original brick masonry to accommodate the kitchen cabinetry and fittings. The east wall is a twentieth-century framed partition. The south wall is the original brick chimney mass. The twentieth-century partition extending out from the south wall to enclose the pantry closet is finished in gypsum board.

*Ceiling:* The ceiling is finished in twentieth-century plaster on expanded metal lath, 8'-2 1/2" above the floor. A small attic access panel, contemporary with the current ceiling finish, is located in the northeast corner.

*Baseboard:* A 7-1/4" high twentieth-century wood baseboard that trims the west wall is composed of a splash trimmed with a flush bead at the top and a quarter-round shoe at the floor. The pantry closet is trimmed both inside and outside with a 5-3/4" high base with a similar profile.

*Door:* The south and east doorways are framed by 3" wide twentieth-century single-fascia architraves. The more recent pantry closet doorway has a 2-1/2" wide single-fascia architrave with a shallow cyma molding.

*Closet door:* A recent louvered bi-fold door accesses the pantry. Each leaf is 1'-3 3/4" wide by 6'-5 3/4" high by 1" thick. Hardware: The hardware, contemporary with the door, includes an overhead track, a pivot hinge in the floor, three 3-leaf bifold hinges, and a round plastic knob.

*Window:* The pre-1872, low, horizontal window in the west wall, similar to the west window opening in the Living Room, has a 3" wide twentieth-century single-fascia architrave and sits above a 1-1/8" thick bullnosed stool and a 2-3/4" high apron. The 3/3 double-hung wood sash has 10" by 11" panes and 7/8" wide muntins. The sash fastens with a thumblatch on the meeting rails. On the exterior of the opening, a wood-framed window
screen includes one opening, screened with hardware cloth lined with insect screen.

**Fireplace:** In February of 2018, a 5" by 5" area of plaster was removed from the back wall of the pantry closet to verify the existence of a firebox opening on the north face of the chimney mass; the depth of the brick wall would allow for the existence of a fireplace in this location. The center line of the probe was approximately 2'-7" east of the west face of the chimney mass. A hard cement mortar facing, approximately 1" thick, was uncovered on the north face of the chimney mass. This mortar extends 3'-11" above the finished floor. By sounding, it appears that the hard mortar extends to the floor and east into the adjacent bathroom. It was not possible to determine how far west the cement mortar extends. It is likely that the hard surface covers an original fireplace opening. Diamond mesh expanded metal lath is attached directly to the brick above the hard mortar, with approximately a 1" cover of plaster.

**Cabinets:** Five bays of cabinets extend across the north wall. The lower set of cabinets, set below a faux grey granite solid surface counter, includes plain white laminate doors in the center and west bays; four tiers of plain white laminate drawers in the bay east of center; and an opening for a refrigerator in the far east bay. The doors have cabinet hinges and grips finished in nickel.

The upper tier of the recent cabinetry incorporates a shelf for a microwave at the west end, set below a shelf enclosed by two glazed stained-wood doors. Three white laminate shelves extend from that unit to the east wall.

**Heating:** An electric baseboard heater is located on the west wall, below the window opening.

**Lighting/electrical:** A flush-mounted ceiling fixture has a bell-shaped glass shade. Other electrical fittings include a switch on the west partition of the closet, and a flush duplex receptacle in the north wall, above the countertop. Wire mold conduit extends from the ceiling down along the west wall to the level of the window sill, then turns and extends down to the baseboard heater.

An electric panel board at the east end of the north wall is hidden behind a wood frame and door (1'-5 1/2" wide by 2'-0 1/2" high). The panelboard (Square D QOC24UF QO Load Center) has a 125-amp main. There is a 30-amp circuit breaker for the hot-water heater, and eleven 20-amp circuit breakers for lighting, receptacles, the microwave oven, the baseboard heaters, the cooktop, and the refrigerator.

**Plumbing:** A stainless steel sink with a Franke
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faucet is set in the countertop, west of center.

Furnishings/fitting: The kitchen is equipped with a Summit two-burner cooktop at the west end of the counter; an under-counter refrigerator at the east end of the lower cabinetry; and an LG microwave at the west end of the upper cabinetry.

BATHROOM

The small, 6'-9 1/2" by 4'-11 1/2" bathroom is at the east end of an originally larger narrow room that included what is now the kitchen. The original, simply finished room featured a doorway and window opening in the east wall, and possibly a fireplace in the projection of the south brick wall. The door opening, visible from the exterior, is now covered by the plaster and expanded metal lath that form the east wall surface.

Floor: Like the kitchen floor, this floor is finished with 1'-0" square vinyl tiles, mimicking slate, laid over a twentieth-century concrete slab.

Walls: The walls are finished in plaster on expanded metal lath. On the east wall, the lath is furred out from the brick masonry. The lath is applied directly to the brick chimney breast forming the south wall and to the brick north wall. The west wall is a twentieth-century framed partition.

In the north bathtub enclosure, 4-1/4" square white ceramic tiles are bordered by 2-1/4" by 6-1/2" black tiles with curved outer edges.

Ceiling: The twentieth-century ceiling is finished in plaster on expanded metal lath, 8'-2 1/2" above the floor.

Baseboard: The twentieth-century wood baseboard is composed of a splash trimmed with a flush bead at the top and a quarter-round shoe at the floor. On the east wall, the baseboard is 5-1/2" high; the trim on the other walls is 5-3/4" high.

Door: The twentieth-century doorway in the west wall has a 3" wide single-fascia architrave. An original doorway in the east wall is covered by the plaster and lath finish.

West door: The twentieth-century hollow-core wood door, contemporary with the opening, is 1'-11 5/8" wide by 6'-7 1/2" high by 1-3/8" thick.

Hardware: The hardware, contemporary with the door, includes a pair of 3-1/2" high butt hinges and a 2-1/4" high Schlage stainless steel mortise lockset with round knobs and roses. Two stainless steel hooks are mounted to the bathroom side of the door.

East door: From the exterior, the twentieth-century door matches the east door in the living room, but is only 2'-8" wide. Hardware: The door is fixed in place, and no hardware is visible from the exterior.

Window: The original window opening in the east wall is framed by a 3" wide fascia trimmed with a bead along the inside edge; the trim steps back to a 3/4" wide stop. The opening sits above a 1-1/4" bullnosed sill and 2-3/4" high apron. The 6/6 double-hung sash include 9-1/2" by 11-1/2" panes with 3/4" wide muntins. The sash fasten shut with a thumblatch. On the exterior of the opening, a wood-framed window screen includes two openings, each with a panel of large wire mesh lined with a fine screen.

Heating: An electric baseboard heater extends along the west end of the south wall.

Lighting/electrical: The flush-mount ceiling fixture has a ribbed glass shade. Additional light-
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Lighting is provided by a three-bulb fixture above the lavatory. Other electrical fittings include a switch and receptacle near the lavatory, and wire mold conduit that extends from the baseboard heater up into the ceiling.

Plumbing: The bathroom is equipped with an enameled cast-iron bathtub on the north wall, spray-painted in a textured finish, with a Moen shower head on the west wall. A porcelain pedestal lavatory on the west wall is positioned south of the doorway. An American Standard toilet on the east wall has “JUN 15 2005” and “MADE IN BRAZIL” stamped into the toilet lid.

A water heater in the southeast corner of the room, in the recess created by the projecting chimney mass, is concealed by a painted plywood box trimmed at the top with a small cyma molding. The enclosure is cut to fit over the window sill. A valve protrudes through the north face of the partition. Corrugated conduit runs from the enclosure into south wall. A valve protrudes through the north wall, immediately west of the enclosure.

Equipment: There is an exhaust fan in the ceiling.

Furnishings/Fittings: A mirrored metal medicine cabinet is mounted to the west wall, above the lavatory. There is a stainless steel toilet paper holder on the east wall, and a stainless steel towel ring on the south wall. The tile bath enclosure includes a black ceramic soap dish and a similar towel rod, and a more recent curved shower curtain rod.

ATTIC

The 22'-10 3/4" by 11'-8" attic space extends fully above the rooms below. It is divided, like those rooms, into two areas by the brick chimney. The low space includes a floor surface over the entire area. The boards are neatly cut to fit around the chimney and around the large access opening located south of the chimney (providing access from the room below).

There were originally single small windows in the north and south end gables that probably held glazed sash, but now feature more recent wood louvers. Although there are no other finishes, it is likely that this space was intended to be a sleeping loft. The large access opening is situated in front of the fireplace below to allow some heat to reach this area in the cold months. The windows would provide limited ventilation in the warmer months. There is no evidence at the opening for a stair; the loft must have been accessed by a moveable ladder. There is also no evidence for any sort of cover for the opening.

Conditions at the west side of the chimney indicate that something was positioned in that location (see the Chimney description below). Probes are needed to determine what may have occurred here.

Floor framing: Floor joists, 2-5/8" wide by 8-3/4" deep, extend east-west. Original floorboards, ranging from 9-1/2" wide to 1'-1" wide and 7/8" to 1-1/4" thick, are laid north-south on the joists and nailed in place with cut nails.

The original framed access opening (1'-6 1/4" wide by 3'-7 3/4" long) is positioned at the northwest quadrant of the ceiling in the south room below. Shouldered headers at the east and west ends of the framed opening are seated in mortises cut in the upper face of the attic floor joists. The flooring is cut to fit snugly around the access opening and the brick chimney.

Close inspection of the vertical faces of the joists framing the north and south sides of the opening revealed pairs of vertical scored lines, 3'-1/4" apart, in the wood surface at about 8-3/4" from the east end. These scored lines, which indicate the possible intended position of the header, suggest that the opening was planned to be shorter in length, but was made larger during construction.

Roof framing: The original 3-3/4" to 4-1/4" deep by 3" wide rafters forming the gable roof are spaced from 1'-6" to 2'-2 1/4" apart (on center). The rafters appear to bear on 11" wide floorboards that rest on the ends of the floor joists, along the east and west walls of the building, and butt together at the ridge of the roof; there is no ridgeboard. The height of the attic, measured from the top of the floorboards to the underside of the rafters at the ridge of the roof, is approximately 3'-9 3/4".

It appears that there was originally a wood shingle roof on the building. The roof framing is insubstantial, and the remaining board sheathing is discontinuous with many cut nails protruding from the reverse face of the sheathing. The early board sheathing is approximately 1" thick and ranges from 7-1/2" to 13" wide. The board sheathing ends 1-3/4" short of the brick wall at the south end of the building. Twentieth-century plywood has been laid over the board sheathing to support the current metal roof.

Windows: The existing twentieth-century louvered gable vents are constructed of wood with
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Figure 59. Attic plan.

Figure 60. Roof plan.
insect screen stapled to the inner face of the vents. The openings are set in plain twentieth-century wood frames. Pockets remain in the brick wall construction at the openings, where wood lintels, sills, and jambs were formerly set in the masonry, forming the frames for small windows. The original lintel pocket and sill pocket at the south gable both measure 2'-3" wide by 2-1/2" high by 4" deep. The original opening in the masonry measures 1'-7" wide by 1'-7" high (excluding the height of the lintel and sill).

Chimney: At the floor level of the attic, the original brick chimney measures 1'-10" (east and west faces) by 2'-6" (north and south faces). The chimney is supported by the larger brick mass housing the fireplace below. The adjacent floor structure also rests on this brick surface.

At the center of the lower portion of the west face of the chimney there is a vertical area of infill brick, with three bricks below the floorboards and four bricks above the level of the floor. The purpose of this former opening is unknown.

On the same side of the chimney mass is an unusual condition with the floor framing. The east-west joists, positioned at about 2'-11" apart (on center), extend along either side of the chimney. Between these joists is an intermediate joist approximately 1'-2 1/2" from the south joist. This intermediate joist is cut off at about two feet from the face of the chimney, possibly to allow some-thing to pass between the joist and the chimney. This area requires further probing to determine what was positioned here.

Heating: A flexible foil vent duct extends up from the bathroom vent, through the ceiling, and out to the north louvered attic opening.

Lighting/electrical: A junction box is surface-mounted to the north wall, west of the louvered opening. BX cables extend from the junction down through the ceiling to service the receptacles and switches below.

Plumbing: A vent pipe extends up through the floor planks, north of the chimney, connecting with another vent pipe from the north end of the building, and then continues up through the roof. A flexible foil vent duct from the bathroom extends to the north louvered opening.
After nearly two centuries of use and multiple generations of change, McGuffey Cottage retains many of its character-defining features and significant evidence of its original construction. Originally constructed to serve as living and working space for enslaved African Americans in service to the residents of Pavilion IX, it can be presumed that the building saw hard service. With well-documented accounts of distressed building conditions at the university during the middle and end of the nineteenth century, it seems likely that secondary service structures received less care than the primary residential and educational buildings. The simple, permanent nature of brick masonry construction has served the building well. Roofing, windows, doors and flooring have been replaced, yet the original brick load-bearing wall construction and chimney mass, along with the attic floor construction and roof framing, remain. In all likelihood, the modern interior finishes can be removed to expose significant evidence of the building’s original use.

While ongoing maintenance over the last several decades has been advantageous for the building’s survival, new finishes are obscuring the historic character of the structure. Some changes, such as the installation of the concrete floor slab, may be contributing to long term problems with rising damp in the porous brick wall and chimney construction. Evidence of this problem is seen on the interior of the building, along the base of the east and west walls, where friable plaster is visible. Furred-out interior finishes and recent paint coatings on the chimney mass may be masking other moisture related problems. A visual survey of interior and exterior conditions has identified the most readily apparent problems, and these have been outlined below.
Figure 63. The terne-coated stainless-steel sheet metal roofing developed an abnormal oxidation with a brown “rusted” appearance. The roof was painted between August and October 2017, obscuring this condition.

Figure 64. There is stepped cracking of the repointed mortar joints on the east elevation of the cottage, at the upper southeast corner. The mortar has been heavily applied and buttered over the edges of the bricks.

EXTERIOR

EAST ELEVATION

1. The terne-coated stainless steel standing-seam sheet metal roofing has streaked oxidation with a longitudinal (ridge to eave) orientation. The oxidation has the appearance of rust staining. This condition was observed in August 2017; however, by October 2017 the sheet metal roofing and chimney flashing had been painted, obscuring the underlying condition.

2. Steel rivets have been used to anchor the terne-coated stainless-steel leader straps to the downspouts. The rivets have rusted.

3. There are multiple generations of pointing with mortar buttered over the edges of brick and smeared on the surface of brick. The joint profile varies from concave to flat (struck) to eroded. Most of the repointing appears to utilize a hard Portland cement mortar that is not compatible with soft handmade brick.

4. The northeast downspout drains to grade at the base of the north elevation, with no splash block.

5. The lantern light fixture above the south door opening is not historically appropriate.

6. There are open mortar joints in the brickwork beneath the south door opening.

7. There is stepped, hairline cracking in the mortar joints above each of the window and door openings.

8. There is uneven paint build-up on the window and door frames. Much of the painted finishes are crazed. The hardware cloth covering the insect screens at the window openings is visually
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Figure 65. There is stepped cracking in the brick wall construction adjacent to the upper south corner of the northeast window opening. The cracking appears to be active; cracks have opened in repointed mortar joints (highlighted by the dotted line).

Figure 66. The pointing repairs made above the northeast door are muddled and irregular. The steel lintel above the door opening is rusted; the expanding rust may be jacking the masonry. Cracks have developed in the repair mortar at the north end of the lintel (highlighted by the dotted line).

SOUTH ELEVATION

1. The exposed brick is generally eroded. To the east and west of center, evidence remains of white-wash on the brick. There are open mortar joints in the brickwork near grade level.

2. At the southwest corner of the building a large gap between the cottage and the garden wall has been filled with mortar. The gap extends the entire height of the garden wall. The mortar was crudely applied and is cracked and missing, especially near grade level.

3. There are multiple generations of pointing, much of it poorly executed and battered over the edges of the brick. There are concave, flat (struck), and eroded profiles of pointing. The color of the mortar varies from grey to beige to tan. Most of the repointing appears to utilize a hard Portland mortar.
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Figure 67. The downspout at the northeast corner drains to grade against the north elevation of the building.

Figure 68. The brick masonry on the north elevation of the cottage, at the northwest corner, has eroded mortar joints and broken brick. Algae and lichen are growing on the brick.

cement mortar that is not compatible with soft handmade brick. There are cracked mortar joints and open joints across the face of the elevation.

4. PVC and galvanized conduit extend approximately 22" above grade, near the center of the elevation. Mortar has been smeared over broken brick where the galvanized conduit enters the building.

5. There is significant paint build-up on the louvered gable vent. The lower three wood slats are heavily eroded.

WEST ELEVATION

1. There are multiple generations of pointing. The mortar profiles are eroded, struck and flush. Mortar has been buttered over the edges of brick in localized areas.

2. The west wall of the cottage has been awkwardly toothed into the newer garden wall. The faces of the toothed brickwork at the southwest corner are offset near grade level, and the coursing does not align.

3. The air-conditioning unit in the southwest window opening is visually obtrusive. The sash has been altered to accommodate the air conditioner.

4. Steel rivets have been used to anchor the terne-coated stainless-steel leader straps to the downspouts. The rivets have rusted.

5. Algae is growing on the brick and on the concrete splash block at the northwest corner of the building at grade level.

6. The northwest terne-coated stainless steel downspout has rust-colored oxidation.

7. Mortar has been spread over the upper face of the brick water table ledge in isolated areas.

8. The repointing mortar is generally hard Portland cement mortar that is grey to beige to tan in
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Figure 69. There are open pockets in the mortar joints near the center of the north elevation.

color. The hard mortar is not compatible with the soft handmade brick.

9. There are remnants of vines attached to the brickwork.

10. There is irregular paint build-up on the wood window frames. The hardware cloth covering the insect screen at the northwest window opening is visually obtrusive.

11. Anomalies in the brickwork suggest that there may have previously been foundation vents centered beneath the window openings that have been filled with brick. This may have occurred when the slab-on-grade was poured within the building footprint.

12. There is stepped hairline cracking in the brickwork above the north window, beneath the gutter.

13. The brick chimney is soiled and algae is growing on the mortar.

14. Prior to painting, the standing-seam, terne-coated stainless-steel sheet metal roofing had longitudinal (ridge to eave) rust-colored oxidation patterns.

15. There is loose brick at the corbelled cornice near the north end of the gutter.

16. There is hairline stepped cracking in the brickwork of the corbelled cornice near the southwest corner of the building.

NORTH ELEVATION

1. There is algae and lichen growing on the surface of the brick at the base of the wall.

2. The northeast downspout from the east elevation drains to grade without a splash block at the base of the north elevation.

3. There is stepped hairline cracking in the
Figure 70. The mortar joints in the chimney construction above the roofline are deteriorated; the mortar is cracked and loose. Moss is growing in the mortar joints on the north elevation of the chimney, and the brick is soiled.

Figure 71. The painted wood slats of the louvered south gable vent are heavily eroded.

Figure 72. The hardware cloth covering the insect screens at the window openings is visually obtrusive.

Figure 73. The air-conditioning unit in the southwest window opening is visually obtrusive. The sash has been altered to accommodate the air conditioner.
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Figure 74. On the west elevation, the brickwork at the juncture of the garden wall and the southwest corner of the cottage is awkwardly resolved. The brick coursing is offset and does not align; there are open mortar joints near grade level.

Figure 75. Mortar is smeared on the face of the brickwork at the inside southwest corner, between the cottage and garden wall. The mortar is uneven, and the joint is open. Algae is growing on the brick. Near grade level the mortar is deteriorated and the brickwork is irregular, with open joints and cavities.

brickwork adjacent to the top of the garden wall.
4. The mortar joints are poorly pointed; the workmanship is variable. Hard Portland cement mortar has been used for repointing. The hard mortar is not compatible with the soft handmade brick. Mortar is buttered over the edges of brick. The mortar is generally eroded or struck. There are open pockets in the mortar joints near the center of the wall and at grade level.
5. There is excessive paint build-up on the wood gable vent.
6. There are paint drips on the brickwork.
7. There are damaged bricks that appear to have impact damage.
8. Lichen is growing on the brick at the northwest corner of the building, near the top of the garden wall.
9. The north elevation of the chimney is heavily soiled. The mortar is cracked and loose. Moss is growing in the mortar joints.

INTERIOR

LIVING ROOM

1. Baseboard electric radiators are mounted on the east and west walls with surface-mounted wiring and a surface-mounted thermostat on the east wall.
2. There is blistered paint and uneven painted
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plaster finishes on the east and west walls near floor level. There appears to be a moderate problem with rising damp. The existing brick floor appears to be laid on a concrete slab poured on grade. The concrete slab is likely directing moisture toward the more porous brick in the cottage walls.

3. There are surface-mounted receptacles on the east, west and south walls; as well as, recessed receptacles on each of these walls. There appears to be two generations of wiring in the building.

4. There is a recessed data outlet and a surface-mounted wireless access point on the south wall, above the baseboard.

5. There is a window air-conditioning unit in the west window opening. The window opening has been framed to accommodate the air-conditioning unit and glazed with acrylic glazing panels. This installation is visually obtrusive and historically inappropriate.

6. The northwest beaded-board door to the kitchen binds on the floor and cannot be closed.

7. The fireplace surround has a heavy build-up of paint that obscures the brick coursing. The mortar joints in the firebox are eroded.

8. The window on the east wall is painted closed. The center horizontal muntin in the upper sash sags.

KITCHEN

1. The attic access panel above the fixed kitchen shelving in the northeast corner of the space is inaccessible.

2. The plaster above the baseboard at the north end of the west wall is blistered. This appears to be a symptom of rising damp.

3. There is a baseboard electric radiator mounted on the west wall with surface-mounted wiring.

4. Paint obscures the cracks and uneven surfaces of the plaster ceiling.

5. The north wall has been furred out to accommodate the Pullman kitchen; the historic finishes and materials are obscured.

6. The electric panel board is located in the northeast corner of the kitchen, above the kitchen counter. The reverse door swings of the panel and panel enclosure make access difficult; this may be a non-compliant installation.

7. The window on the west wall has excessive paint build-up. The interior window sill is rotted; the form of the sill is maintained by the painted finish encapsulating the rot. The double-hung sash are painted closed. The window reveal between the sash and window screen is dirty and inaccessible.

8. The pantry closet in the southeast corner of the kitchen is constructed of modern materials and is in good condition.

BATHROOM

1. There is a baseboard electric radiator mounted on the south wall with surface-mounted wiring.

2. There appears to be an electric hot-water heater within a plywood enclosure located in a recess at the southeast corner of the L-shaped space, positioned immediately in front of the east window. The water service for the cottage appears to be stubbed up through the concrete slab adjacent to the hot-water heater enclosure. This awkward installation detracts from the character of the building.

3. The painted surface of the east wall is uneven, with irregular paint build-up.

4. There are horizontal hairline cracks in the ceramic tile on the east and north walls of the tub surround.

5. The painted plaster ceiling is cracked. Paint obscures the cracks and uneven surface of the ceiling.

6. The bathroom exhaust fan, located above the tub, vents to the exterior through the attic above.

7. The painted surface of the south wall is uneven, with irregular paint build-up.

8. The cast-iron bathtub has been coated with a textured finish.

ATTIC

1. The bathroom fan vents to the attic, adjacent to the north louvered gable vent. Without direct exhaust to the exterior, the existing ductwork introduces moisture into the attic.

2. There is little or no insulation above the existing ceiling, nor in the attic space.

3. The west roof rafter adjacent to the north gable wall is rotted at its base.

4. The mortar at the interior face of the gable walls was applied with little attention to detail; the mortar is smeared over the face of the brick. There are open joints; and much of the mortar appears to have lost its binder, leaving sand in the joints. Unsupported cavities remain in the brick wall construction, above and below the gable vents, where
Figure 76. The base of the west roof rafter adjacent to the north gable wall is rotted. The mortar at the interior face of the gable wall is deteriorated.

Figure 77. There are open joints in the brick chimney at the attic level. Mortar has been smeared on the face of the brick, and creosote appears to have migrated through the mortar joints.
the lintels and sills of the former gable windows have been removed.

5. There are open joints in the brick chimney at the attic level. Mortar has been smeared on the face of the brick, and creosote appears to have migrated through the mortar joints, leaving dark brown deposits on the face of the masonry.
McGUFFEY COTTAGE

RECOMMENDATIONS

The archival and physical investigations undertaken for the historic structure report have yielded a substantial amount of information about the original purpose and configuration of the nineteenth century dependencies supporting Jefferson’s academical village. These buildings were built as working and living spaces for the enslaved African Americans bound to the faculty and staff of the university. As one of the few remaining dependencies, McGuffey Cottage should be preserved to recognize the impact of slavery at the university and the contributions made by the enslaved African American community.

The building can be restored to illustrate the living and working conditions of nineteenth century slavery, or the exterior building envelope can be restored and the interior adaptively used to interpret slavery at the university. The remaining evidence will support either of these approaches.

Individual recommendations for the long-term preservation of the building are outlined below.

1. Remove all modern interior finishes to assess remaining physical evidence of the building’s original use.

2. Undertake extensive building probes to understand original ceiling, wall and floor finishes, and to better define the chronology of physical changes.

3. Consider the removal of the concrete floor slab. The relative density of the concrete, as compared with the porosity of the brick, generally directs ground moisture to the brick walls and chimney mass, resulting in problems with rising damp. The symptoms of this problem are visible within the cottage.

4. Develop a program for the building’s future use. Possible scenarios include a restoration interpreting the building’s original form and function, emphasizing the role of slavery at the university; or, an adaptive use of the building envelope to house a museum honoring the contributions of slaves to the university. Continued residential use, or possible office use, would be marginal assignments for this building. The finishes, fixtures and building systems will be largely dependent on the building’s intended use, however, more of an effort should be made to reduce the visual and physical impact of these systems on the building.
5. While the kitchen, pantry and bathroom are necessary support spaces for the residential use of the cottage, they detract from the historic character of the building. The bathroom physically blocks the northeast door and window openings of the cottage. Consideration should be given to removing these features.

6. Provide period appropriate window and door architraves and fireplace moldings. Investigate the lintel conditions and consider the removal of exposed steel lintels. If the steel lintels are to remain, they should be prepared and painted. Provide dutchman repairs and selective component replacement for rotted wood windows and frames.

7. Chemically clean the exterior brick masonry, removing general soiling and biological growth. Retain the white paint “ghost” evidence for the former appendage on the south elevation.

8. Repoint the exterior brick masonry with a lime-rich mortar matching the physical and aesthetic properties of the original mortar. Carefully remove later generations of poorly formulated and applied mortar repairs and rake out eroded joints. Reset loose brick and replace broken brick. Retain areas of historic mortar in good condition.

9. Repoint the brick chimney within the attic and above the roofline. Retain infill evidence on west face of chimney within the attic.

10. Improve the existing storm water drainage so that water is not routed to grade adjacent to the building.

11. If the decision is made to restore the building, consideration should be given to the re-introduction of wood shingle roofing.

12. Remove or replace the exterior light fixture with a contextually appropriate lighting solution, such as a light standard (pole) near the building.

13. Strip built-up, uneven paint coatings from the exterior woodwork. Prepare and paint all exterior wood surfaces.

14. Replace the eroded slats at the south gable vent. Consider replacing the vents with historically appropriate window sash, while maintaining some form of attic ventilation.

15. Consider reconstruction of period appropriate windows and doors, removing inappropriate moldings and architraves. Remove the window air conditioner from the southwest window opening, and reconstruct a period appropriate sash for this window opening.

16. Remove the surface-mounted electric radiators.

17. Remove surface-mounted wiring and receptacles.

18. Remove the hardware cloth covering the insect screens at the window openings.

19. Chemically strip the paint from the interior chimney mass and repoint the brickwork.
RECOMMENDATIONS

20. Probe the north face of the chimney mass near floor level to locate the firebox opening. Reconstruct the brick opening as needed.

21. Dependent on the intended use of the building, consider improvements to the thermal performance of the building envelope, including adding insulation in the attic.
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