

Historic American Buildings Survey

Bur Coryell

D-3

AN ARCHITECTURAL STUDY

of

IN
STORAGE

FORT McHENRY



Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Eastern Office

Division of Design and Construction

B&W Scans

5-2-2005

Philadelphia 6, Pennsylvania

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

An
Architectural Study
of

F O R T M C H E N R Y

FORT MCHENRY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC SHRINE
Baltimore, Maryland

by

LEE H. NELSON
ARCHITECT

January, 1961

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Eastern Office, Division of Design and Construction
143 South Third Street
Philadelphia 6, Pennsylvania

FOREWORD

This architecturally-oriented study is limited to the physical history of the "star fort" and its successor, the pentagonal fort, on Whetstone Point, Baltimore, from 1776 to 1857. Later changes, though interesting, are not included since the fort and buildings have not undergone any structural change since that date.

This study does not deal with the outworks or outer buildings, nor is it concerned with general historic events, except as they affected the construction and the alteration of the fort. Those aspects are discussed at length by Dr. S. Sydney Bradford and Franklin R. Mullaly, National Park Service Historians, in their report, "Fort McHenry, Historical and Archeological Research Project, 1957-1958." The writer acknowledges their cooperation in undertaking the architectural evaluation of the documents, which they collected and arranged for the Fort McHenry research library. Credit is also due G. Hubert Smith, Archeologist, Missouri Basin Project, Smithsonian Institution, for his assistance during the summer of 1958, and for reading the text of this report.

The research and writing of this physical history was made possible by Historic American Buildings Survey funds, and was conducted during the summer of 1958 as a H.A.B.S. project at Fort McHenry. Four buildings were measured and land recorded (under the writer's direction) by an excellent team of student architects, as follows: Benjamin F. Barr II, University of Pennsylvania; Orville W. Carroll, University of Oregon; Harold A. Nelson, University of Michigan; Trevor R. Nelson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and George L. Wrenn III, Harvard University. Two other structures (Buildings "A" and "C") were not measured because of the time limitation.

The writer acknowledges the assistance of Fort McHenry Superintendent Robert H. Atkinson, for furnishing drafting space, and his successor, Walter T. Berrett, for his overall cooperation which simplified the completion of the H.A.B.S. project. Wilbur H. Hunter, Jr., Peale Museum, Baltimore, contributed to this report by facilitating the reproduction of old views in the museum collection. The writer is especially indebted to Charles E. Peterson, Supervising Architect, Historic Structures, Eastern Office, Division of Design and Construction, for his suggestions and direction of this architectural study.

The written data, the photographs, and the drawings comprising this study are in the Historic American Buildings Survey collection in the Library of Congress, from which copies are available.

Lee H. Nelson
Philadelphia
January, 1961

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I. FORT WHETSTONE AND FORT MCHENRY (including Sally Port, Casemates, and Guard-Rooms), 1776-1857	
PART A. HISTORICAL INFORMATION	
FORT WHETSTONE, 1776-1797.....	1
The Earthen Redoubt or "Star Fort"	
Felix Louis Massenbach, 1776	
Colonel Francis Ware, 1776	
James Alcock, 1776	
Plans for Rebuilding, 1793-1795	
John Jacob Ulrich Rivardi, 1794-1795	
Samuel Dodge, 1794	
Alexis De Leyritz, 1795-1798	
THE BUILDING OF FORT MCHENRY, 1798-1800.....	18
The Pentagonal Brick-Faced Fort with Five Bastions	
Major Louis Tousard, 1798	
John Foncin, 1799-1800	
THE WAR OF 1812.....	27
Colonel Decius Wadsworth, 1813	
Captain Samuel Babcock, 1813	
Fort McHenry in 1814	
Maximilian Godefroy, 1815	
LATER IMPROVEMENTS, 1829-1857.....	36
Lt. Henry A. Thompson, 1833-1839	
Lt. Thomas J. Lee, 1834-1835	
Captain Richard Delafield, 1836	
CONCLUSIONS.....	47
Appendix I Whetstone Point Lands.....	50
Appendix II Foncin's Estimate.....	54
Appendix III Foncin and Fort Independence, Boston, 1800-1802.....	55
Appendix IV Foncin and Fort Hamilton, Philadelphia, 1814.....	62
PART B. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION.....	67
ILLUSTRATIONS AND DRAWINGS.....(follow page)....	70

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER II. COMMANDING OFFICER'S OFFICE AND QUARTERS (Illustrations only)	
CHAPTER III. THE POWDER MAGAZINE	
PART A. HISTORICAL INFORMATION.....	71
PART B. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION.....	82
ILLUSTRATIONS AND DRAWINGS...(follow page).....	84
CHAPTER IV. OFFICERS' QUARTERS (Illustrations only)	
CHAPTER V. NO. 1 SOLDIERS' BARRACKS	
PART A. HISTORICAL INFORMATION.....	85
PART B. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION.....	97
ILLUSTRATIONS AND DRAWINGS...(follow page).....	99
CHAPTER VI. NO. 2 SOLDIERS' BARRACKS	
PART A. HISTORICAL INFORMATION.....	100
PART B. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION.....	111
ILLUSTRATIONS AND DRAWINGS...(follow page).....	113

CHAPTER I

PORT WHETSTONE, the Revolutionary War earthen "star fort"; its successor, FORT MCHENRY, a brick-faced, five-bastioned pentagonal fort; and the Fort McHenry SALLY PORT, CASEMATES, and GUARD-ROOMS.

H.A.B.S. No. MD-63

CHAPTER I. FORT WHETSTONE AND FORT McHENRY, 1776-1857

PART A. Historical Information

FORT WHETSTONE, WHETSTONE POINT, BALTIMORE, 1776-1797

The Earthen Redoubt or "Star Fort"

As early as January 20, 1776, the Maryland Congress of Deputies, or Convention as it was popularly called, resolved that "... the Town of Baltimore [should] be fortified if it be practicable."¹ On January 29, following this initial resolution, the Council of Safety, administrative body for the Convention, requested of Samuel Purviance, Chairman of the Committee of Observation in Baltimore Town that,

said Committee would furnish them with a Chart of the North East Branch of Patuxent River from Whetstone Point; also the Soundings & [sic] Depth of the Water between that Point and Gonsuch's Point also a plan of Fortification and Cheveaux [sic] de Frise or other Obstructions to be placed in the River together with an Estimate of the Expense."

That the Council lost no time in seeking some sort of engineering assistance is evident. For on January 21, they held a fortifications conference with two amateur Veterans in attendance. These

¹Maryland Council of Safety to the Deputies for Maryland in Congress, January 20, 1776, Archives of Maryland, XI, 101. Cited hereafter as Arch. Md.

²Journal of the Council of Safety, January 29, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 120. On the same day, the Baltimore County Committee of Observation unanimously resolved,

That Messrs. Samuel Purviance, John Child, Benjamin Griffith, William Buchanan, and George Harrison, be a Committee to devise and point out to the Council of Safety the best modes for fortifying and defending Baltimore Town, and to make out an Estimate of the expenses of each.

Resolution of the Baltimore County Committee, January 29, 1776, American Archives, Fourth Series, IV, 1723. Cited hereafter as Amer. Arch.

two gentlemen, James Alcock, Baltimore schoolmaster, and Felix Louis Massenbach, occupation unknown, were to play a significant role in designing the defenses at Whetstone Point.³

On February 2, only two days after the conference, the Council went to Whetstone Point, "to inform themselves of the situation thereof, and consider of the practicability of fortifying the same."⁴ It is very probable that the Baltimore Committee of Observation, together with Alcock and Massenbach, met the Council at Whetstone Point on that occasion and presented a proposal for land fortifications and channel obstructions. Such a proposal was submitted to the Council and approved February 3. The Baltimore Committee agreed to undertake the business and complete the same "with all convenient speed," for the sum of £ 6,200.⁵ The money was appropriated and work was begun in earnest on February 13, as recorded four days later.

We have ab[out] 50 hands at work on a battery since tuesday at Whetstone..⁶

³Journal of the Council of Safety, January 31, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 127. Alcock's name is sometimes spelled Allcock in the documents. The correct spelling is uncertain. In the 1790 Census, Alcock is used. Massenbach's name is variously listed as Maussenbaugh, Massenback, and Nassenbaugh. Upon resigning his commission, the name is listed as Mr. Felix Louis Baron Massenbach.

⁴Journal of the Council of Safety, February 2, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 133. The selection of Whetstone Point was based primarily on its strategic location. When the Council determined that Whetstone Point was the most advantageous site for Baltimore's defenses, the property was confiscated from the Principio Company, a British association of ironmasters, which had been engaged in the removal of iron-ore on along the Point. See Appendix I, "Whetstone Point Lands."

⁵Journal of the Council of Safety, February 3, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 136.

⁶Samuel Purviance to the Council, February 17, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 167.

On February 10, prior to this flurry of activity, Massenbach was commissioned 2^d Lt. of Captain Fulford's Artillery Company, and probably placed in charge of the works to be erected on Whetstone Point,⁷ Massenbach's usefulness in this capacity is amply demonstrated in a letter from Charles Carroll, the Barrister, to the Council, dated February 19, 1776,

...I understand that the gentlemen of the Committee of Balt^o Town find [Massenbach] very necessary to them in erecting their fortification...

In fact, his engineering talents (the extent of which are unknown) were also in demand at Annapolis for fortifications erecting there.⁸ Later he removed to Virginia to assist with the defenses in that colony.⁹

The fortification erected on Whetstone Point under the direction of Felix Louis Massenbach, during the month of February 1776, was almost certainly limited to a shore-line gun battery, as there is no evidence that a star fort existed when the British sloop, the Otter, appeared in Chesapeake Bay on March 5, 1776. The approach of

⁷In addition to his commission, Massenbach was paid twenty pounds, "for his Expenses in attending the late Convention and this Council and for his Services as an Engineer." Journal of the Council of Safety, February 10, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 148.

⁸Barrister Carroll to Council, February 19, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 172.

⁹Reference to Massenbach's design for the battery at Whetstone is found in William Lux's letter to the Council, March 21, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 274, as follows:

Genl. Lee got here last night and has been to view our Battery, he thinks it very well executed, and that it will answer the intention. He has taken Mr. Massenbaugh [sic] with him to Virga & says [Massenbach] understands his business & that he cant do without him.

the Otter not only caused obstructions to be placed in the channel between Whetstone and Gorsuch's Point,¹⁰ but motivated the hasty erection of another gun battery and a breastwork, or low-lying, earthen "star fort."¹¹ Though the British sloop turned tail and went "prowling" down the bay, the Baltimore defenders were determined to "push" the new works on the Point as a show of strength against the marauders' return. By March 16, the committee reported,

Our Fort at Whetstone is ready to mount 8 guns, and we shall use every exertion to expedite it.¹²

¹⁰The channel "obstructions" included the sinking of small vessels and the installation of a boom and iron chain between the two points. The vessels were raised 3 1/2 months later.

¹¹On March 7, only two days after the alarm caused by the Otter, the Council requested of the Baltimore Committee, "You will acquaint us as soon as you can with any Measures you may think necessary for your Defence that may be in our Power, and we will forward them with all expedition." Council to Baltimore Committee, March 7, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 203.

The same day, the Balt. Committee Resolved, "That a Breast-work be immediately thrown up at the Point..." Baltimore Committee, March 7, 1776, Amer. Arch., Fourth Series, V, 1808.

Following this decision, on March 8, the Council sent \$1000 to the Balt. Comm., to defray militia expenses occasioned by the alarm, and also asked for an accounting of "Monies expended on the fortifications at Whetstone Point." See Council to Baltimore Committee, June 5, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 485, Journal of the Council, March 28, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 294, Journal of the Council, September 12, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 266, Council to Baltimore Committee, September 28, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 308.

¹²Baltimore Committee to Council, March 16, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 255-56. The problem arises as to whether the term "Fort" is here used interchangeably with the batteries, or whether it actually alludes to the "star fort" as eventually completed. After mid-March, however, there are frequent references to the "Fort" on Whetstone Point, which seem to distinguish the batteries from the "star fort." See for example, Maryland Delegates to New-York Committee of Safety, March 19, 1776, Amer. Arch., Fourth Series, X, 414, "Fortifications and batteries are now erecting..."

Not only did they expedite completion of the fortifications, but there was talk of adding buildings at the Point. In a letter to the Council, Nathaniel Smith committed to writing, "...what would be necessary to have done about the fort." He proposed the addition of "...a Magazine, Hospital and Laboratory, which in my opinion no fort or garrison ought to be without..."¹³ Later, in May, Smith asked,

I should [sic] be glad to have Orders to git [sic] a Flagg [sic] for the Fort, & to know what Device you wou'd [sic] have on it (if aney) [sic],

and pressed for the erection of a magazine, "as we Cannot possibly do well without it."¹⁴

A plan, apparently for the magazine, was submitted by Colonel Francis Ware, then stationed at the fort. Though the Council hesitated to advance any sums for that purpose, they left the matter to the discretion of the Baltimore Committee, and that group determined to proceed with the magazine. When Colonel Ware left the fort, he left the erection of the magazine in the hands of Nathaniel Smith but the powder storage house was not actually built.¹⁵

¹³N. Smith to Council, March 30, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 300-301.

¹⁴Nathaniel Smith to Council, May 20, 1776, Arch. Md., XI, 434.

¹⁵For reference to Ware's plan, see Baltimore Committee to Council, July 7, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 6. For the Council's rejection of the request for funds, see Council to Baltimore Committee, July 7, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 7. Regarding the disposition of Ware's design, see Nathaniel Smith to Barrister Carroll, July 18, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 75. For other documents referring to the planned but unexecuted erection of the magazine, see Council to Baltimore Committee, December 5, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 508, Council to N. Smith, June 5, 1777, Arch. Md., XIII, 278, Nathaniel Smith to Gov. Johnson, June 3, 1777, Maryland State Papers, Brown Books, 62, V, 60. Geo. P. Keepports to Gov. Lee, July 12, 1780, Arch. Md., XLV, 11.

Design of the earthen "star fort," though not certain, is attributable to James Alcock. Alcock designed and erected a "fortification" at Whetstone, but what part of the works he designed is not clear. The relative chronological sequence of the supporting evidence bears out the assumption that while Massenbach designed the gun batteries, Alcock designed the earthen "star fort."

Alcock, together with Massenbach, had conferred with the Council in January 1776, on the subject of fortifications, but he does not seem to have had a hand in the earliest defenses (i.e., the gun battery) on Whetstone Point. Massenbach had left for Virginia shortly after the appearance of the Otter, and the subsequent erection of the "star fort" was probably put into the hands of Alcock.

On July 27, 1776, Charles Carroll wrote of Alcock,

He has been as I am Informed of great Help to the Gentⁿ of Balt. Town in Designing and Erecting their fortification at Whetstone.¹⁶

And on September 6, 1776, Alcock was paid forty-five pounds out of the Western Shore Treasury, "for thirty days' Engineering," but whether this payment was for services rendered at Baltimore or elsewhere is not stated.¹⁷

¹⁶Barrister Carroll to Council, July 27, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 130-131.

¹⁷Journal of the Council, September 6, 1776, Arch. Md., XII, 259.

In late August 1777, the British made another appearance near the mouth of the Patapsco, but Baltimoreans were somewhat better prepared on this occasion. Nathaniel Smith notified the Governor that he and the militia, "shant give up the Fort, without giving them some trouble," and that if the British should attempt the fort, he promised to give them a warm reception.¹⁸ The high state of preparedness evoked editorial comment from the Maryland Gazette:

The fort, batteries, and boom, at Whetstone Point are in excellent order; an air-furnace is erected on the Point, from which red thunderbolts of war will issue to meet our invading foes.¹⁹

The British war vessels left the Patapsco area without forcing such a demonstration and local attention turned to more domestic problems, especially the so-called Baltimore Insurrection which grew out of the distresses made under the "Militia Law."

In 1778, some temporary barracks, on the lower slopes of Whetstone Point, housed wounded soldiers but in one doctor's opinion,

"the Fort is a very unfit place for an hospital...because a Situation Surrounded with Water in itself sickly must in Consequence make it more Difficult for People allready [sic] Sick to recover..."²⁰

¹⁸N. Smith to Gov. Johnson, August 22, 23, 1777, Arch. Md., XVI, 340-42.

¹⁹Maryland Gazette (Baltimore), September 9, 1777.

²⁰Dr. Wiesenthal to Maj. Nathaniel Smith, October 22, 1778, Maryland State Papers, Brown Books, 168, V, 114. As to the "fitness" of the fort, see Brown Books, 169, V, 116, 172, V, 115, Red Books, 318, XXI, 66-1.

However, the fort was maintained during the winter of 1778, equipped with an armament of 38 cannon.²¹

In the spring of 1779, another British force appeared in the bay and the tempo of activity at Fort Whetstone once again increased, but the expected attack never materialized.²² With the concentration of the enemy's efforts in Virginia, much of the personnel, supplies, and effort that had gone to maintain Fort Whetstone was diverted for the use of the Continental Army in Virginia.

During the winter of 1779, the barracks on Whetstone Point were considered for hospital use of wounded French troops, then in Virginia, but the lack of facilities and local reluctance to quarter the wounded French conspired against the move, and thus saved "a good deal of trouble," in one unofficial view.²³

By November 1780, the active usefulness of the fort at Whetstone had passed, and its commander, Capt. George P. Keeports, was advised by the Council to remove all but four or five cannon "to some Place of security in the Country, together with the Arms, Ammunition,

²¹Inventory of Cannon, etc., November 2, 1778, Maryland State Papers, Red Books, 719, IX, 303.

²²For correspondence pertaining to this, the third threatened attack, see Maj. Nathaniel Smith to Gov. Thomas Johnson, May 16, 1779, Maryland State Papers, Red Books, 403, XXV, 64, Council to A. Buchanan, May 22, 1779, Executive Papers, Hall of Records, Annapolis. Council to A. Buchanan, May 19, 1779, Arch. Md., XXI, 403. Council to R. Dallam, May 16, 1779, Arch. Md., XXI, 394.

²³Jas. Calhoun to Gov. Thomas S. Lee, November 26, 1779, Arch. Md., XLIII, 272-73, Jas. Calhoun to Gov. Lee, November 30, December 6, 1779, Executive Papers, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

Accouttriments [sic] and public Stores...²⁴ Apparently, the execution of this order was delayed several months, for in January 1781, Keepports was instructed to repair and remove all except four cannon, to Elk Ridge Landing. The Council feared that the enemy, having taken Richmond, would "visit us as soon as they have accomplished their object in Virginia, which we are satisfied is to plunder, harass and distress our People..."²⁵

Once again, in April 1781, Baltimoreans believed themselves in danger because of enemy action in the Maryland end of the Chesapeake, and took appropriate steps. A warning system was established to prevent a surprise attack on the city, the militia was posted at Whetstone Point and in town, and gun carriages at the fort were strengthened to be serviceable.²⁶ The withdrawal of the British vessels from the bay relieved Baltimore of its concern for safety, and the militia was dismissed.²⁷

²⁴Council to Capt. Geo. P. Keepports, November 9, 1780, Arch. Md., XLIII, 356.

²⁵Council to Capt. Geo. Keepports, January 11, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 270, Council to Gen. Buchanan, January 11, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 271.

²⁶Andrew Buchanan to Gov. Lee, April 4, 1781, Executive Papers, Hall of Records, Annapolis, Council to the Inhabitants of Baltimore Town, April 6, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 380-81. W. Smith, et al., to Gov. and Council, April 4, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 160. Jeremiah Jordan, et al., to Col. Richard Barnes, April 3, 1781, Letters to the Governor and Council, Jan. 1 - Dec. 31, 1781, 160. Council to Andrew Buchanan, April 5, 1781, XLV, 378. Sam. Smith to Gov. Lee, April 12, 1781, Letters to the Governor and Council, Jan. 1 - Dec. 31, 1781, 183. Council to Capt. Keepports, April 14, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 400.

²⁷Council to Andrew Buchanan, April 26, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 417.

With the entrenchment of the British at Yorktown, the enemy's designs upon Baltimore were relaxed, and the center of attention shifted to Virginia. In short, "Maryland is relieved by the Enemy's establishing themselves in York river."²⁸

During the following two months of August and September 1781, much of the previously confiscated British-held land on the neck of Whetstone Point was sold at public auction, under the direction of Nathaniel Ramsey, one of the Commissioners for Confiscated British Property. The remainder of the land occupied by the "star fort" and batteries was not sold until the following year, on July 30, 1782.²⁹ Just before the September 1781 auction, other events transpired which occasioned the earliest known drawings of Fort Whetstone.

In the summer of 1781, British forces, under the command of Lt. General Earl Cornwallis, decided to concentrate their efforts in Virginia, hoping to divide the colonies, cut off their supply lines, and thus bring about a more decisive regional conquest. With the British well established at Yorktown by September 1781, and the expected attack on Baltimore apparently postponed, the importance of stoutly manned defenses on Whetstone Point became secondary to the impending crisis at Yorktown.

²⁸James McHenry to Gov. Lee, August 6, 1781, Letters to the Governor and Council, Jan. 1 - Dec. 31, 1781, 394.

²⁹See Appendix I, "Whetstone Point Lands."

Consolidation of the Allied forces in the Yorktown - Williamsburg area, necessitated the overland march of the French army from Newport, Rhode Island, in the summer of 1781. During this overland march, the French army under the leadership of Count de Rochambeau, passed through Baltimore. Assigned to the staff of Rochambeau for this march was one Captain Louis-Alexandre Berthier (1753-1815), who left a descriptive and graphic account of the march, in the form of journals and maps.³⁰ It is from the Berthier and Rochambeau papers that we have the earliest extant graphic documents pertaining to the defenses on Whetstone Point. The field measurements for the Berthier map (see illustration No. 1) were presumably taken during the Camp à Baltimore sojourn, September 12-15, 1781.³¹ Measurements for similar but more elaborate map in the Rochambeau Collection were probably made during the same encampment.³²

³⁰Papers of Louis-Alexandre Berthier, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey. The writer acknowledges the assistance and enthusiasm of Howard C. Rice, Jr., Chief, Dept. Rare Books & Special Collections, in making readily available his knowledge of the Berthier Papers.

³¹"Rade et port de Baltimore," 12-15 September, 1781, Papers of Louis-Alexandre Berthier, Group 16, map 8, Princeton University Library.

³²Map Number 13, Rochambeau Collection, 1779-1780 (?), Library of Congress. It seems probable that this map was actually drawn in September 1781, during Rochambeau's march from Newport to Yorktown, rather than the tentative 1779-1780 date ascribed to it. It is also conceivable that Berthier was the cartographer for the map in the Rochambeau Collection, the map being an improved second copy presented to Rochambeau by Berthier.

Another map, published a decade later (1792), of "BALTIMORE AND IT'S ENVIRONS," was drawn by a "French Geographer," A. P. Folie,³³ This particular map (see illustration No. 2) is obviously more detailed in its treatment of Baltimore than with the "environs," so that the portrayal of Fort Whetstone as a military installation leaves something to be desired.

However, the three drawings accredited to Berthier, Rochambeau, and Folie, are the only known extant eighteenth century plans of Fort Whetstone. With respect to the earthen "star fort," they are basically in agreement, that is, in plan, for none of them include sections, details or supplementary descriptive data.

Since this study does not deal with the outworks, the enclosed fortification shown on these three drawings may be described as an earthen embankment, conforming to a five-pointed star in plan, surrounded by a ditch, and built a short distance northwest of, and on higher ground than the two roughly parallel shoreline gun batteries on the lower tip of Whetstone Point. None of the plans show guns mounted on the "star fort," though there must have been some in that position prior to 1781. No buildings are shown within the enclosure.

Such a defensive work should be classed as a redoubt rather than a fort, since it was secondary to the more important "water batteries." The "star fort" was hastily thrown up and rudimentary in function, for none of the then available treatises on fortifications recommended the star-plan because of the indefensibility of the

³³"Plan of the Town of Baltimore and It's Environs," A. P. Folie, 1792, Cator Collection, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore.

ERRATA

- FOREWORD, line 23. "land" to read "and."
p. 3, line 18. "Otter" to read "Otter."
p. 5, line 7. "should" to read "shoud."
p. 12, line 23. "treatices" to read "treatises."
p. 27, line 9. "1815" to read "1814"
p. 44, line 17. "'star fort'" to read "fort."
p. 48, line 22. "only two months" to read "just."
p. 49, line 3. "for" to read "fort."
p. 49, fn. 112. "July 13, 1814" to read "13th 7ber 1814."
p. 62, line 18. "has" to read "was"
p. 62, fn. 135. "13 July 1814" to read "13th 7ber 1814."
p. 63, line 12. "names" to read "named."
p. 75, line 13. "Maximilien" to read "Maximilian."
p. 101, line 4. "star fort" to read "fort."

re-entrant angles between the star-points.³⁴

Following the capitulation of Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, the defenses at Baltimore lay in an unimproved, and indeed neglected, physical condition until the early 1790's, when interest in coastal fortifications was revived as a result of difficulties with France.

Plans for Rebuilding 1793-1795

The hostilities with revolutionary France motivated an elaborate system of coastal defenses along the Atlantic Coast states. The enabling Congressional legislation entitled "An Act to provide for the defence of certain ports and harbors in the United States," was approved March 20, 1794, and granted authority to the President to direct the task of building fortifications and to receive land from "any state" for that purpose.³⁵

Prior to this approval, a House committee reported on such harbors "...as require to be put in a state of defence, with an estimate of the expense thereof..." Baltimore's share of the fortification program was limited to \$4225.44, intended to cover all parapets, embrasures, battery platforms, redoubt, two magazines and barracks.³⁶ This sum was not intended to provide for structures of a permanent nature, but rather of earth, sod, and timber.

³⁴J. J. U. Rivardi, military engineer, later criticized the design as follows: "...that redoubt is of a very bad defense; all the fires being oblique and all the intrant [sic] angles indefensible," Rivardi to Gov. Thomas S. Lee, April 13, 1794, Maryland Historical Magazine, VIII (1913), 286-290.

³⁵U.S., Congress, The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States..., 3rd Cong., 1834, IV, pp. 1423-24. Cited hereafter as Annals of Congress, IV.

³⁶U.S., Congress, American State Papers, Documents, Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, 1832 [XVI], pp. 61, 63. Cited hereafter as American State Papers, XVI.

Selecting a site for the new fortifications at Baltimore was not a problem. The old fort at Whetstone Point was still the most strategically advantageous location for defense of the harbor. It may be recalled that the Revolutionary War fort had been built on land confiscated from British interests. By 1782, all that land had been sold by the Maryland Council. Although several private individuals owned that end of the Point occupied by the "star fort" and batteries, nothing had been done in the way of improving the site for speculative enterprises. In fact, the Point had been badly disturbed by people digging for "red ochre," i.e., iron ore.

To make this land available to the federal government involved not only an act of the Maryland Legislature, but consent of the property owners as well.³⁷ Title transfers did not take place until after construction had been started.

While the initial planning which predicated the general extent of Baltimore's defenses lay in the hands of General Samuel Smith of the Maryland Militia, the actual execution of those defenses was entrusted to John Jacob Ulrich Rivardi, a French artilleryist and military engineer, who was appointed by the President shortly after the enabling act was approved. Rivardi's commission included the design of fortifications for the cities of Baltimore, Alexandria and Norfolk.³⁸ His instructions from the Secretary of War, dated

³⁷See Appendix I, footnote 119.

³⁸Although Rivardi is usually regarded as a Frenchman, or a French speaking Swiss, it is interesting to note that Moreau de St. Méry, in his Norfolk sojourn, May, 1794, described the fortifications erecting there as being built "under direction of M. de Rivard [sic], an Italian engineer." Moreau de St. Méry's American Journey, [1793-1798], tr. and ed. by Kenneth and Anna M. Roberts (Garden City, N.Y.: 1947), 58.

March 28, 1794, cover the scope and intent of such defenses.³⁹ The instructions also provided for an agent or assistant to carry out the engineer's plans. Such a man was Samuel Dodge, selected by Major O. H. Williams (Md., 1st Cavalry) as a "very well informed, active, zealous Citizen."⁴⁰

Unfortunately, Rivardi's plans have disappeared, but the covering documents are extant, which reveal his professional criticism of the earthen "star fort" as originally designed, perhaps by schoolmaster Alcock.

The Star fort never was finish'd intirely [sic] & the ditches are partly filled with the Earth of the breast-works, that [Kind of] redoubt is of a very bad defence; all the fires being oblique and all the intrant [sic] angles indefensible...⁴¹

Rivardi proposed to correct these defects by constructing two formal bastions to replace points on the western side of the earthen "star fort." This was intended to accomplish two objectives: 1) help prevent an enemy landing on that side, and, 2) allow the important entrant angles to be covered by a fire at right angles.

³⁹"Instructions to John Jacob Ulrick [sic] Rivardi, acting as temporary Engineer in the service of the United States," from H. Knox, Sec. of War, March 28, 1794, American State Papers, XVI, 87-88.

⁴⁰O.H. Williams to Gov. Thos. S. Lee, April 7, 1794, Otho Holland Williams Papers, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. Cited hereafter as O.H. Williams Papers. Several other men were considered for the position of superintending the works and disbursing the money. One of these men was Louis Henry Bouteiller, Chief of Brigade of Artillery in the Army of France. Apparently he declined. Also considered was Francois Gardy, a "practical" French engineer, recommended by Rivardi; but Williams selected Dodge instead.

⁴¹supra, footnote 34.

Upon one of these bastions, he planned a battery to cover the land approaches, said battery to be complemented with a powder magazine on the terreplain of that bastion. He further intended to face the bastion with "1230 feet of strong timber at a shilling a foot."

The appropriation was not sufficient to allow for converting the other star points to bastions. To compensate for this, Rivardi suggested that the undefended flanks of the breastwork (star fort) be protected with chevaux-de-frise, which he estimated would require about 1200 palisades. The bulk of Rivardi's covering letter for his plans deals with improvements to the two lower gun batteries.

To get the work underway, Rivardi "drew...the lines on the ground, and prepared drawings and sections on a large scale," for the use of Superintendent Samuel Dodge. He directed Dodge to begin with the lower battery improvements, since that battery would be most important in the event of an attack.⁴²

After Rivardi's departure for Norfolk, Samuel Dodge pursued the work, but various delays prevented him from finishing the "lower work of the fortification" until the middle of September 1794.⁴³ By October 30, when Dodge's services ceased, he had used all the then available funds.

When Rivardi returned to Baltimore in January 1795, he was obviously disturbed that Samuel Dodge had spent all of the appropriation upon the lower works, and upon "additional barracks &c. which

⁴²J. J. U. Rivardi to Sec. of War, April 20, 1794, American State Papers, XVI, 89.

⁴³Samuel Dodge to Gen. Knox, Sec. of War, September 14, 1794, American State Papers, XVI, 92-93. See also S. Dodge to Otho H. Williams, May 19, 1794, O. H. Williams Papers. S. Dodge to Sec. of War, July 8, 10, 1794, American State Papers, XVI, 92.

were not in [Rivardi's] plan..." Furthermore the "star fort" improvements had not been started, thus requiring a "further Supply of 4000 Dollars to proceed in that business as soon as the Season will allow it."⁴⁴

It is clear that Rivardi did not intend to rebuild the old earthen "star fort," or breastwork as he called it, but merely to reshape two of the points into bastions, faced with wood, to be used for batteries. This was intended to protect the lower works from a land attack, since the fort could not be expected to contribute defensively in any other capacity. However there is no evidence that Rivardi's limited proposal was carried out, and the oft-stated assertion that Rivardi designed the brick-faced pentagonal fort, actually built later, is without basis in fact. The government did not even acquire the land occupied by the old "star fort" until 1798 and later.

Even though Rivardi's plans for developing the "star fort" were abandoned, the outer works were to be the objects of additional expense. Since Rivardi's obligations kept him busy elsewhere, another man was appointed to fill the position vacated by Samuel Dodge.⁴⁵

⁴⁴Rivardi to Gov. John Stone, January 15, 1795, Maryland Historical Magazine, V (1910), 291-292.

⁴⁵In addition to designing other fortifications, Rivardi was a field officer in the regiment of Artillerists and Engineers, a school established May 9, 1794, at West Point. James Ripley Jacobs, The Beginning of the U. S. Army, 1783-1812 (Princeton: 1947), 289.

Alexis De Leyritz was appointed as civilian assistant engineer on May 3, 1795, and continued in that capacity for three and one half years until his "services ceased," on November 15, 1798. The extent of De Leyritz's services (or his background) are not known. The small sums expended during the first three years of his appointment (less than \$3,000), were applied to improving the outer works rather than the "star fort."

THE BUILDING OF FORT McHENRY 1798-1800

The Pentagonal Brick-Faced Fort with Five Bastions

The last two years of the eighteenth century were most important, architecturally, at Whetstone Point, for it was during that short period that the first significant changes took place upon and within the "star fort."

The quasi-war with France stimulated the augmentation of all coastal fortifications, and from 1798 to 1800 over \$80,000 of federal funds were expended to bring the fort to an effective defensive status.⁴⁶ About five months prior to Alexis De Leyritz's termination, another engineer, Major Louis Tousard was appointed to furnish a new plan for improving the fortifications at Whetstone Point. On July 7, 1798, James McHenry, Secretary of War, ordered Tousard to repair to

⁴⁶Report of the Secretary of War, February 13, 1806, American State Papers, XVI, 199.

Baltimore for the purpose of viewing the existing works with De Leyritz, still temporary engineer, and to "lay down a plan."⁴⁷

The urgency of the order reflected the widespread criticism of Baltimore's defensive works, that is, they were not capable of resisting a land attack, hence the need for a more adequate enclosed fort to supplement the water batteries. Twenty thousand dollars was appropriated for this purpose.

Major Tousard repaired to Baltimore, viewed the existing works with resident engineer De Leyritz, and proceeded to lay down a plan for additions designed for the "protection of the City and Harbour, against any sudden attack from enemy's Ships of War, or Coup de main from a small land force..."⁴⁸

By August 8, 1798, Tousard had finished the plans, elevations, profiles and an estimate of costs for an enlarged fort already known as Fort MCHENRY. He then delivered them to James MCHENRY for approval and disposition. Tousard's estimate for the new works totaled \$30,963.44. Despite the fact that only \$20,000 of government funds were appropriated, the Baltimore City Naval Committee

⁴⁷James MCHENRY to Maj. Louis Tousard, July 7, 1798, MCHENRY Papers, Library of Congress. Cited hereafter as MCHENRY Papers. MCHENRY hired Tousard despite President Adams' objections and feelings regarding the use of a Frenchman, because "I could find no other person qualified..." MCHENRY to Alex. Hamilton, November 19, 1800. MCHENRY Papers. Prior to this, Tousard had been a field officer with Rivardi in the regiment of Artillerists and Engineers, West Point. Jacobs, *loc. cit.*

Tousard's remarkable career began with his admission to the School of Artillery at Strassburg, in 1765. Among his other accomplishments, he laid down a plan for the rebuilding of Fort Mifflin, near Philadelphia, 1798. See Tousard to Hamilton, August 7, 1798, The Intimate Life of Alexander Hamilton, Allan McLane Hamilton, ed. (New York: 1911), 326. See also the Tousard-Stocker Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania,

⁴⁸Ibid.

accepted the plan, thinking they could engage the "patriotism and cooperation" of the citizens to make up the difference, either in labor or cash.⁴⁹ Secretary of War McHenry therefore transferred the power to execute and complete the new defensive works, to the Baltimore Naval Committee, binding them to purchase the necessary additional land, and to follow Tousard's plan. McHenry subjected to their orders the \$20,000, until spent, after which time the balance should be raised by local subscription.

As of September 21, 1798, the Naval Committee adopted Major Tousard's plan.⁵⁰ One of its first acts was to obtain options for the property occupied by the old earthen "star fort." To build upon that site required the purchase of lots numbered 68-72. One of the proposed bastions projected into lot number 66, so part of that lot was also bought by the Committee.⁵¹

During property negotiations, construction was pushed on additional improvements to the lower battery under the supervision of Alexis De Leyritz, still retained as temporary engineer and compensated at the rate of two dollars per day. Work continued until the rigors of winter forced cessation, and De Leyritz was released on November 15.⁵²

⁴⁹McHenry to Jeremiah Zollett, et al, August 31, 1798, McHenry Papers.

⁵⁰Robert Gilmore et al to McHenry, September 21, 1798, McHenry Papers.

⁵¹A part of lot 66 was transferred from William Goodwin, owner, to the United States, on November 6, 1798. Title to lots 68-72 was not transferred from Wm. Goodwin, owner, to the United States, until August 26, 1800. The delay in transferring that all-important 11 acres has not yet been explained.

⁵²General Accounting Office, Register of Warrants, 1795 to 1799, Accountant's Office, Indian Tribal Claims Section, April 27, 1799. Cited hereafter as G. A. O.

In February 1799, the Committee reminded Secretary McHenry that the season was approaching when the work ought to be recommenced, but that nothing could be done until another engineer was appointed to carry out Tousard's plan. The Committee wisely thought it unsafe to permit any work unless an engineer was present lest the workmen "diviate from the plan adopted."⁵³

McHenry had some difficulty in locating another engineer, but on March 28, 1799, he appointed Messr. John (or Jean) Foncin, French artilleryist and military engineer, to the position of "temporary engineer," at two dollars per diem plus travel expenses.⁵⁴

Foncin's appraisal of the problem at Whetstone Point was quite different from that of Major Tousard. On April 12, Foncin dispatched to McHenry a letter critical of Tousard's plan, declaring it "insufficient," outlining certain "imperfections," together with suggestions for a "new plan." Foncin felt that he could not carry Tousard's plan into execution without "hazarding his [own] professional character." McHenry agreed in principle to Foncin's plan provided that, 1) it meet

⁵³Robt. Gilmore to McHenry, February 11, 1799, McHenry Papers.

⁵⁴McHenry to Gilmore, March 22, 1799, McHenry Papers. McHenry requested the Commanding Officer at the fort to furnish quarters for Foncin, McHenry to Capt. S. Morris, March 28, 1799, McHenry Papers. See also McHenry to Gilmore, McHenry to Foncin, March 28, 1799, McHenry Papers, regarding the appointment. Foncin was ordered to devote any spare time to giving lessons to officers of the garrison in "gunnery drawings and fortifications."

Foncin first came to the United States in 1797. Upon his arrival, Moreau de St. Méry noted in his journal for January 20, 1797, "I received M. Foncin, the engineer, arriving [in Philadelphia] from Cayenne," Moreau de St. Méry, *op.cit.*, 277.

with the Committee's approval, and 2) that no further appropriation be required.⁵⁵

The Baltimore Committee, having previously accepted Tousard as an officer of "great professional skill," was naturally embarrassed and confused at Foncin pronouncing Tousard's plan as "impracticable," "defective," and "insufficient." To aggravate the delicate situation, Foncin's "new plan" exceeded the cost estimate of Tousard's proposal.⁵⁶

Apparently Foncin's ability, together with his "modest" and "unassuming" character, was however, the decisive factor, for the Committee admitted to McHenry a willingness to change plans, as follows:

Mr. Foncin has submitted to us the plan of the works which he deems indispensable to our protection; we have great confidence in his judgment, and should with pleasure cooperate with him in the execution...⁵⁷

The Committee's willingness to "cooperate" with Foncin was contingent upon the government not obligating the citizens of Baltimore for a larger amount than originally pledged. Secretary of War McHenry resolved the difficulties by increasing the appropriation to \$30,000, and by thus yielding on the point, he urged the Baltimore Naval Committee to discard Tousard's plan and proceed with the work

⁵⁵McHenry to Foncin, April 17, 1799, McHenry Papers. See also extracts from Gilmore to McHenry, May 6, 1799, McHenry Papers.

⁵⁶Gilmore to McHenry, May 6, 1799, McHenry Papers. This important letter outlines the whole problem in great detail, with background material and an honest presentation of the Committee's awkward situation. Foncin's estimate for his plan totaled \$39,938.34. This estimate was enclosed to McHenry with the above letter. For the estimate in its entirety, see Appendix II. Unfortunately neither Tousard's or Foncin's plan have been located, if they are extant.

⁵⁷Ibid.

lest the "public good" sustain a loss by an inadequate defense.

I am strongly inclined to give the preference to Mr. Foncin's plan as more effective for defence...⁵⁸

By late July 1799, Foncin's plan for the brick-faced, five-bastioned pentagonal fort enclosing a powder magazine and barracks, was begun in earnest. The new masonry works were built over the crumbling remains of the Revolutionary War earthen "star fort." It was, therefore, John Foncin, rather than Rivardi, De Leyritz or Tousard, who designed the fort and its inner buildings, the architectural appearance of which remained substantially unchanged until after the fateful battle of September 13-14, 1814.

Commensurate with his new responsibility, Foncin was promoted from temporary to full engineer, with a corresponding increase in compensation for his services.⁵⁹ With considerable application to the task at hand, Foncin pushed the work during the balance of 1799 and throughout most of 1800, and thus completed the fort previous to his departure in the fall of 1800. Additional sums were needed in 1801

⁵⁸McHenry to Gilmore, May 10, 1799, McHenry Papers. For other letters dealing with this temporary impasse, see, Gilmore to McHenry, May 18, 1799, McHenry to Foncin, May 25, 1799, and for McHenry's approval, McHenry to Gilmore, July 15, 1799, McHenry Papers. Even after the settlement, Samuel Smith wrote to John Adams, complaining that inadequate funds had been allotted for defending a "City Known to be of the Commercial Consequence of Baltimore." Adams transmitted Smith's request to McHenry on August 5, 1799, adding that "I wish that Justice may be done to that City, and that it may have its proportion of Aid in the fortification of it," Bernard C. Steiner, ed., The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry...(Cleveland: 1907), 406-407.

⁵⁹G.A.O., 1800 to 1802, January 6, 1800.

to complete the buildings, bringing the total government expenditures (since 1794) to \$93,664.36.⁶⁰

The earliest surviving graphic document to show the completed brick-faced, pentagonal fort with bastions, is the plan of Fort McHenry (see Illustration No. 3) dated "9th November, 1803."⁶¹ The draftsman has not been identified. However, it was drawn using a scale of toises, a French measure in common use at that time by French cartographers. It seems likely that the draftsman probably copied Foncin's plan, otherwise the measured plan would probably have used feet or yards as a scale. By conversion of toises to feet, the accuracy of the map can be demonstrated.⁶²

The exterior sloping walls between the bastions are shown on this map to be 120 feet in length, the side walls of the bastions 40 feet long, and the front or leading edges of the bastions scale 75 feet. While it is not possible to accurately measure the base of the fort today, because the ditch has been filled in, field measurements indicate that the plan is accurate to plus or minus three feet.

⁶⁰For Foncin's appointment and termination as Engineer, see G. A. O., 1800-1802, March 1, 1800, October 16, 1800. After leaving Baltimore, Foncin went to Boston to work on Fort Independence (See Appendix III). For a yearly listing of expenditures for Fort McHenry, see Report of the Secretary of War, February 13, 1806, American State Papers, XVI, 194.

⁶¹National Archives, Cartographic Section, Drawer 51, Sheet 1 [H.A.R.P. map no. 1]. Later endorsed and reused by Richard Delafield, Capt. of Engineers, and Gen. Charles Gratiot, Chief Engineer of the Army, September 27, 1836.

⁶²Like many early measures, a toise does not have a fixed equivalent in English measures. It is variously equal to six feet, or sometimes 6.4 feet. By comparing certain physical features on the 1803 plan with existing conditions, a toise in this case is known to have been equal to six feet. This plan was carefully measured with a rule divided into 64 parts per inch, each 64th being converted to a decimal fraction of a foot, thus making it possible to convert the scaled features to feet and inches.

The 1803 plan shows a well-defined ditch around the land sides of the fort, but none along the southeast side, facing the harbor. This defect was later corrected. The width of the ditch varied from 35 feet at the bastions to 55 feet, from the brickfaced walls midway between bastions. The ditch was also drained at two points by "water conduits," which have since been obscured or obliterated. A conduit also opened through the rampart, centered along the southeast wall. The fort as originally built, probably had a master drainage system, similar to but less extensive than the one at Fort Washington, Maryland, but the evidence of such a system is not yet available.

The 1803 map is interesting also in that it shows trees planted upon bastions, terreplein, and the parade ground level. The plan shows 36 trees upon the terreplein level, 30 on the bastions (6 on each), and 38 around the parade ground. The function of such extensive planting is not clear, but it probably served several functions; as camouflage and as a ready supply of otherwise expensive firewood in the event of a siege. Old views of Fort McHenry seem to show Lombardy poplars, a tree widely planted in America and noted for its high absorption of ground water, a desirable feature in the earthen and sodded fort.

Since the fort seems to have been designed primarily to defend against a land attack, it is interesting to note that the only gun embrasures shown on the plan of 1803 were located in the bastions, two on each side, but none along the leading edges, since that area was occupied with six trees. The embrasures, therefore were not designed to fire against ships, but to cover the curtain walls and entrant angles of the fort against a scaling-ladder operation. It is obvious that the shore batteries were regarded as the main line of defense,

and the fort as a defense against a land attack from the rear, and as a protective enclosure for the needs of the garrison.

Buildings for the garrison included five structures arranged around the periphery of the parade ground. The functions of these five buildings were as follows (listed by location, right to left upon entering the sally port): 1) Commanding Officer's Office and Quarters, 2) Powder Magazine, 3) Officers' Quarters, 4) No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks, and 5) No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks. No.

The sally port or entrance to the fort, furnished access at a point midway on the escarpment wall facing the harbor branch of the Patapsco River. The possible exposure of the gateway to enemy fire from the harbor, later led to the building of a ravelin. The sally port was at first approached by a fixed bridge across the ditch, with a short, removable span at the gateway. As originally built, the sally port was not roofed, but was only an opening through the ramparts.⁶³ The inside faces of the sally port were vertical, probably brick faced, about 13 feet apart, while the length through the opening was about 33 feet. It thus only approximates its size as rebuilt in 1814 (nine feet wide and 35 feet long). Otherwise, there are no architectural features on the 1803 map which indicate anything but a simple opening in the ramparts.

The 1803 map is the only early graphic document to show the flag pole location. It was situated along one side of the parade

⁶³The sally port opening must have looked very similar to that at Fort Pitt, Pennsylvania, erected 1759-61, according to a drawing by Charles M. Stotz. Alfred Procter James and Charles Morse Stotz, Drums in the Forest (Pittsburg: 1958), 171.

ground, and would have been encountered to the near right upon entering the parade ground from the sally port.⁶⁴

Another map of Fort McHenry, drawn ca. 1806 by Captain John B. Walbach, is similar in most respects to the 1803 map except for certain discrepancies, such as the number of trees indicated. Other differences reflect improvements and changes to the buildings within and outside the fort.

The fort remained virtually unchanged, in fact became somewhat neglected, until the defensive preparations preceding the 181¹¹ bombardment.

THE WAR OF 1812

Although the fortifications at Whetstone Point had never been the objective of enemy action, its presence and strategic location had been an important deterrent to hostile designs upon the Baltimore harbor since Revolutionary War times. With the War of 1812, the fortifications once again became the object of improvements calculated to deter the British navy.

Beginning in March 1813, preparations were many months in the making. Certain defects were corrected and several modifications were intended to up-date the defensive preparedness of Fort McHenry.

⁶⁴Two hewn-oak braces for this flagpole were found during the 1958 archeological explorations, by G. Hubert Smith, archeologist. Since the flagpole was replaced and moved on several occasions, its exact location during the writing of the "Star-Spangled Banner," in 1814, is not certain. However, most of the evidence seems to substantiate the 1814 location as unchanged from its position as shown on the 1803 map.

The indefensibility of the gate doors was emphasized by General Samuel Smith in a letter to the Secretary of War,

The gate [door] is of Pine, and I think might be knocked down by a very few strokes of an axe.⁶⁵

Smith also requested that an engineer be sent to "complete the fortifications." Major Lloyd Beall, Acting Agent of Fortifications at Fort McHenry, was ordered to carry out some minor improvements, until an engineer could be dispatched to that place. Beall filled the embrasures in the bastions, and "platformed" the bastions sufficiently high to allow the cannon to be fired en barbette. He was also instructed to protect the sally-port gateway with a brick wall "...in front of the Gateway to be 6 feet high..."⁶⁶ This brick wall, or "traverse," was not built, however, since any such protective device obviously called for the talents of a military engineer. Once again Samuel Smith complained to the Secretary of War that construction before the sally port could not commence until an engineer be sent to "lay off the work."⁶⁷

The situation seemed to be desperate, and pressure was exerted from several quarters. Captain John Montgomery, Maryland artillery officer, wrote Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, outlining the need for an engineer's presence at Fort McHenry, and recommended

⁶⁵Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Samuel Smith Papers, S. Smith to Gen. John Armstrong (Sec. of War), March 18, 1813. Cited hereafter as S. Smith Papers. See also Smith to Armstrong, March 16, 1813, S. Smith Papers.

⁶⁶U. S. Military Academy, J. G. Swift Papers, Col. Swift to Maj. Lloyd Beall, March 27, 1813.

⁶⁷S. Smith to Gen. Armstrong, March 29, 1813. S. Smith Papers.

Maximilian Godefroy as a "Man [of] Science, abilities, & an able engineer who might [be] most usefully [sic] at this place,"⁶⁸

The War Department finally ordered Captain Samuel Babcock of the U. S. Engineers, to Fort McHenry, but not until April 26, 1813. In the meantime, Colonel Decius Wadsworth (formerly of the Artillerists and Engineers) visited the fort, described its defects, and suggested at least one important change for the defense of the unprotected sally port entrance. For this Wadsworth planned a brick-faced ravelin, and its completion was apparently left in the hands of Captain Babcock, upon his arrival in early May.⁶⁹

Babcock's orders also included completion of those changes begun under the direction of Major Beall.⁷⁰ On December 1, 1813, engineer

⁶⁸J. Montgomery to A. Gallatin, April 1, 1813. Albert Gallatin Papers, New York Historical Society. Godefroy's services as military engineer were utilized in the defense of Baltimore, but not at Fort McHenry until after the battle, when he designed two powder magazines for the outworks (see note 76 for biographical reference to Godefroy).

⁶⁹Decius Wadsworth to John Armstrong, April 13, 1813. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 156, Office of the Chief of Ordnance, Selected Pages, Letters and Endorsements Sent to the Secretary of War, 1812-1817. Wadsworth described Fort McHenry as a "...regular Pentagon, without Ditch or Covertway, too reduced in its Dimensions to be Capable of a long Defence against a regular attack, but abundantly Secure against an assault & well enough adopted to protect & cover the detached Water Battery in which the principal Defence against shipping must rest." See also Wadsworth to Armstrong, April 26, May 3, 1813, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 107, Secretary of War, Letters Received. Wadsworth believed that a ravelin probably constituted a part of the original design for the fort.

⁷⁰Col. J. G. Swift to Capt. S. Babcock, May 26, 1813, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Selected Pages from Letters to Officers of Engineers, July 4, 1812 - February 20, 1869. Cited hereafter as NA RG 77 OCE SPLOE 1812-69.

Babcock wrote General John Armstrong that his work at Fort McHenry was complete, including not only the mounting of 21 cannon on the fort, but apparently the construction of the ravelin as well.⁷¹

Similar in design to eighteenth century French ravelins, it was triangular in plan, erected in front of, but not connected to the entrance which it protected. The ravelin was brick faced, about eight feet high with battered walls, and measured about 132 feet along each of the leading edges. A ditch 28 feet wide, complete with banquette, flanked the two leading edges, and was made a part of the main ditch around the fort. Since the ravelin blocked access to the sally port bridge, an opening was left in the north wall of the ravelin, and a bridge across the ditch at that point completed the passageway.⁷²

The fort did not undergo any further modification until after the historic bombardment of September 13-14, 1814. The physical appearance during that dramatic episode of the war, while not very different from that shown on the 1803 and ca. 1806 maps, can thus be briefly described as follows:

FORT McHENRY in 1814

At the time of the bombardment (see Illustration No. 4), Fort McHenry was a regular pentagonal fortification, faced with masonry walls of brick about 12 feet high, battered, capped with dressed coping stones and quoining at the salient points. The fort was surrounded by a well-defined, dry ditch varying in width (between the bastions and curtain walls) and about five feet deep.

⁷¹Capt. Babcock to Sec. of War, December 1, 1813. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 107, Office of the Secretary of War, Selected pages from Registers of Letters Received, January 1813 - August, 1821.

⁷²Access through the side wall of the ravelin was not a unique feature of Fort McHenry. A similar arrangement was used at Fort Pitt, Pennsylvania, built 1759-61. See James and Stotz, *op.cit.*, 171.

The parapets were sodded earth, planted with trees, and designed to accommodate cannon fired en barbette. The terreplein level was separated from the parade ground level by another sloped earthen bank, also sodded, with an open drainage line at that junction. The five bastions were platformed with wood; the embrasures had been filled. The ravelin was an earthen mound, faced with brick, with stone quoins at the three corners of its triangular plan. It also was platformed behind the front corner. The ditch serving the ravelin was crossed with a wooden trestle bridge, giving access to an opening in the ravelin wall. Having passed through the ravelin, one approached the protected bridge over the main ditch before the sally port entrance. That bridge was also wooden, resting on brick piers, with a wooden railing. Just before gaining entrance to the main doors, was a short, removable span, apparently not a draw bridge.

The sally port was an unroofed passageway cut through the ramparts. Passing through the sally port, the parade ground was immediately at hand, on the same level. Access to the terreplein was by earthen ramps situated to the right and left of the inner sally port opening.

Seven buildings were distributed around the parade ground, listed by function, beginning just north of the sally port 1) a small Guard-House, about 18' by 20', apparently one story high, 2) Commanding Officer's Quarters and Office, 18' by 48', one and a half stories high, with gable roof and dormers, servants' garrets in the attic space, a cellar kitchen below, 3) Powder Magazine, 20' by 31', 4) Officers' Quarters, 18' by 51', one and a half stories, with a small cellar kitchen, 5) No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks, 22' by 91', one and a half stories, gable roof with three dormer windows, and a cellar kitchen under the north room, 6) a small cistern house 17' by 30', one story, hip roof, with a small porch, 7) No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks 22' by 98', one and a half stories, gable roof, with three dormer windows, and cellar kitchen under the east room.

The all-important flagpole was apparently situated between the Guard-House and Sally Port, on the parade ground. There was also a well in the courtyard, and trees in front of the buildings.

After the September 13-14 bombardment, Lt. Colonel George Armistead Commanding Officer of the fort, estimated that between 1500 and 1800 bombs were fired by the enemy, and that about 400 of these landed within the works. It has been commonly believed that he meant within the enclosed fort, but he probably meant within the precincts of the fort and outlying gun batteries. At 2:00 a.m., Wednesday morning, September 14, a 24-pounder on the southwest bastion of

the fort, was blown asunder by a shell, which killed one officer and wounded several men in Captain Jos. Nicholson's company of volunteers.

Armistead's report mentions that two of the buildings were materially damaged, but does not state which buildings.⁷³ The powder magazine is known to have sustained a direct hit. The walls of the fort apparently suffered extensive damage from bomb fragments, and one observer, visiting the fort in 1818, commented at that date, that "the old walls still exhibit the scars of the attack."⁷⁴

There was not a single bombproof building in the garrison, nor were there any casemates for the protection of the men. During the attack, men were forced to withdraw from the fort for lack of bombproof shelter. After the bombardment, this defect was the object of a vigorous program to render the fort safe in the event of renewed hostilities. The prevailing belief that the British would return motivated extensive additions and improvements to the fort, its buildings, and outer works.

Following the assault, the Baltimore City Committee of Vigilance and Safety, together with the militia, cooperated in an attempt to prepare the fort for the possibility of another bombardment. The Committee requisitioned the necessary materials, and the militia released its "mechanics" from military duty for the work of "bombproofing" the powder magazine, the well, and the sally port. The attack had also pointed out the need for "bombproof barracks" or casemates.

⁷³Report of attack on Fort M'Henry, by Lt. Col. George Armistead, September 24, 1814. John Brannan, Official Letters of the Military and Naval Officers of the United States, during the war with Great Britain, in the Years 1812, 13, 14, and 15 (Washington: 1823), 439-441.

⁷⁴John M. Duncan, Travels Through Part of the United States and Canada in 1818 and 1819 (New York: 1823), vol. 1, 225-26.

Almost immediately a great force of laborers and carpenters began work on underground casemates, to be located under the ramparts, on each side of the sally port. However, the obvious haste and poor supervision of the project forced the cessation of activity. As a result, on September 29, 1814, General Smith reported to James Monroe, Secretary of War, as follows:

The Bombproof for the preservation of the Men within the fort had been completed under the direction of Captain Babcock, and timber had been prepared at a great expense. He has changed his plan & the digging & timber is an expense lost to the public.⁷⁵

Smith further stated that both Captain Babcock and Colonel Armistead were too ill to properly superintend the work, and that he, Smith, knew nothing about military engineering, "...nor have I any person that even pretends to knowledge. I therefore pray you to send me an Engineer." Smith complained that work was being done with such purposeless haste, that much of it would have to be redone.

Apparently as a result of this plea, General Smith received the necessary professional assistance in the person of Maximilian Godefroy, a French architect and engineer, then residing in Baltimore.⁷⁶ Godefroy planned improvements for the outer works including two small powder magazines, and also designed bomb-proofs for the fort. There is no evidence that the bomb-proofs or casemates as built, are the result of Godefroy's plan and supervision, but one

⁷⁵S. Smith to James Monroe, September 29, 1814, S. Smith Papers.

⁷⁶For a brief biographical account, see Fiske Kimball, "Godefroy, Maximilian," Dictionary of American Biography, ed. by Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (New York: 1931), vol. 7, 343.

document mentions the forthcoming return of Godefroy after an absence "...when he will finish the design of the bomb-proofs for this place."⁷⁷

The bomb-proofs which were previously designed for timber construction to be covered with earth, were thus changed (probably by Godefroy) to underground rooms with thick walls and vaults of brick. This addition to the existing defenses was begun about a month after the British bombardment of September 1814.

These underground casemates (each measuring about 18 by 50 feet), one on each side of the gateway, were built with ventilators through the terreplein, but not lighted. The sally port with its brick vaulting and adjoining casemates as we see them today are substantially a product of the post-bombardment repair and construction work, although some changes were made in 1835 and 1857.

The 1819 Plan of Fort MCHENRY (see Illustrations Nos. 5-7) is the first graphic representation of the fort in its improved post-bombardment condition. Drawn by William Tell Poussin, Captain of Topographical Engineers, it is the first accurate measured drawing of the fort.⁷⁸ In most instances the limit of error is less than one foot. As such, this plan is a vitally important document. From it can be deduced the physical changes to the fort following the attack.

⁷⁷Capt. Frederick Evans to S. Smith, October 10 (?) 1814, S. Smith Papers.

⁷⁸National Archives, Cartographic Section, Washington, Drawer 51, Sheet 2, "Reconnoitring of Chesapeake Bay, STATE OF MARYLAND, Plan and Profiles of Fort MCHENRY, 1819," drawn by William Tell Poussin, Captain Topographical Engineers [H.A.R.P. map no. 4]. Poussin (a Frenchman) wrote and published extensively on his impressions and experiences in the United States. For an important autobiographical work, see Guillaume Tell Poussin [1794-1876], Les Etats-Unis D'Amérique... (Paris: 1874).

The major changes that took place were the "bombproofing" of the sally port with a brick-vaulted roof, the addition of casemates under the ramparts on each side of the sally port, the strengthening of the main powder magazine, the "bombproofing" of the well (with a brick vault), the addition of a boundary wall and sea wall, the addition of two powder magazines in the outworks,⁷⁹ extension of the lower gun battery, and the addition of a postern through the ramparts. Strangely, the 1819 plan does not indicate the existence of trees on the fort, though they were not removed until the 1830's.

The war had drawn to a close in December 1814, without producing any further attacks upon the defenses of Baltimore. With the fort thus improved, the garrison took on a more peaceful aspect. An 1822 inspection report commented that,

...One half the Parade [ground was] taken up in a flower garden. A considerable number of shot instead of being piled, form the borders of walks.⁸⁰

⁷⁹These two powder magazines were designed by Godefroy, and were mentioned in an advertisement. See Federal Gazette (Baltimore), September 25, 1815. They are shown in the outworks of the 1819 Poussin map.

⁸⁰Unsigned Inspection Report of Fort McHenry, September 22, 1822, National Archives, Records Group 159, Office of the Inspector General, Selected pages from Inspection Reports, 1814-1842.

A foreign visitor to the dormant fort, ca. 1825, described it rather disdainfully, as follows:

The fort itself is very small, and ill-shaped; a pentagon with five little bastions, where at most but three large guns can be mounted; in front of the entrance is a little ravelin which defends nothing. There is no counterscarp; the ramparts are sodded. The fort is separated from the land by a [boundary] wall, which might rather prove injurious than advantageous. The fort is in a decayed condition, and is to be abandoned on account of its unimportant situation. The engineers intend to construct new fortifications several miles farther off in the Chesapeake Bay. Moreover, the situation of this fort is so unhealthy that the garrison leave it during the summer.⁸¹

Fort McHenry was not abandoned, but retained as a second barrier or accessory to the system of coastal fortifications contemplated in the 1820's by the Board of Engineers.

LATER IMPROVEMENTS 1829-1857

In 1821, the U.S. House of Representatives had requested the Secretary of War to report to the House on the progress made toward determining new sites and plans of fortifications for the eastern coast of the United States, with an eye toward possible reduction in the expense of defending the "Atlantic frontier." The Board of Engineers submitted a report which in part, mentioned the projected sites for works farther out in the harbor approaches to Baltimore. These new sites were intended to turn the enemy

⁸¹Karl Bernhard, Duke of Saxe-Weimar Eisenach, Travels Through North America during the years 1825 and 1826 (Philadelphia: 1828), 164. In later years, a new fort was built several miles farther out in the Patapsco River. That defensive work, designed by Lt. Robert E. Lee, was named Fort Carroll, after Charles Carroll, distinguished Marylander and signer of the Declaration of Independence.

before gaining such close proximity to the harbor, since Fort McHenry, they claimed, "has no influence whatever over an attack by land, and cannot even secure the city and harbor from bombardment."⁸² That report was modified in 1826, when the engineers decided to retain Fort McHenry as a "second barrier" to the proposed outlying defenses.⁸³

From an artilleryman's point of view, Fort McHenry by the 1820's was essentially obsolete in every respect, being neither strategically situated nor equipped to match the improved naval armament of that period. However, the decision to keep the fort forced a program of up-dating to compensate for its defects. The years of neglect created a maintenance problem and it was necessary to stabilize and repair the post before new works could be started.

While "preservation of the men" had been the primary purpose behind much of the post-attack improvements, especially the sally-port vaulting and the vaulted bomb-proof casemates, the brick vaulting remained exposed to the weather. It was soon apparent that "preservation of the masonry" from the elements would entail counter-protective measures. An 1829 examination of the fort revealed that,

The bombproofs under the rampart, on each side of the gateway, leak very much, in consequence...of there being no roofs over them. The repairs necessary

⁸²"Fortifications," Department of War, February 12, 1821, U.S. Congress, American State Papers, Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States (Washington: 1834), vol. XVII, 304, 306.

⁸³"Revised Report of the Board of Engineers on the Defense of the Seaboard," March 24, 1826, U.S., Congress, American State Papers, Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States (Washington: 1860), vol. XVIII, 283, 291.

for them would be a thin coat of plaster or water cement on the outside of the arches and a wash of cement on the walls of the interior.⁸⁴

The brick vaulting over the sally port also leaked, and it was proposed to cover it with a wooden roof. This same report noted that much of the scarp walls of the fort needed repointing, and that to protect the brick masonry from water and frost damage would necessitate a "thick wash of water cement...on the face of the scarp..." The materials and labor to preserve the masonry were listed as follows:

30 Barrels Water cement	-- at \$3 $\frac{1}{2}$	--	\$105
15 do lime	-- " 2	--	30
Masons hire 30 days	-- " 2	--	60
Soldiers " 200 "	-- " 15 cents		30
Washbrushes for contingencies		--	25
			<u>\$250</u>

This work of repointing and coating the scarp wall was accomplished under the direction of Captain James W. Ripley, 4th Artillery at Fort Mifflin, during the summer of 1829. Additional coats were also applied at later dates. The bricks over the casemates were found to be so saturated with water that a coating of "water cement" would be ineffective. Captain Ripley then recommended a covering of wood as being the "cheapest and most effectual means of preserving [the bombproof casemates]."⁸⁵ General Gratiot,

⁸⁴Capt. John Lind Smith, Engineers, to Gen. Gratiot, April 17, 1829, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Selected Correspondence Relating to Fort Mifflin, Maryland, 1811-37. Cited hereafter as NA RG 107 OCE SC FT-MS 1811-37.

⁸⁵Capt. J. W. Ripley to Gen. Gratiot, July 25, 1829, NA RG 107 OCE SC FT-MS 1811-37.

Chief Engineer of the Army, then proposed that Ripley use sheet-lead instead of wood, and authorized him to procure the lead.⁸⁶ The cost of this repair was estimated at about \$500, but it is not known whether the lead was actually installed.

During the years 1829-30, all the officers' quarters and soldiers' barracks within the fort were raised in height to two full stories. These buildings were also equipped with two-story, full-length piazzas along the front of each building. Other buildings outside the fort were also improved and enlarged at that time.

On December 17, 1830, Major M. M. Payne, Commanding Officer at Fort McHenry 1829-31, reported to Gratiot that both bridges (gateway and ravelin) needed new flooring and that the gateway doors were so decayed and broken as to require to be made anew, the work to be done as usual, "by the artificers of the garrison."⁸⁷

His estimate of the work includes yellow pine joists and planking for the bridges with three inch oak planks for the gateway doors. The materials estimate totaled \$208.08. General Gratiot requisitioned three hundred dollars for the purpose.⁸⁸

Another defect received consideration in 1833. The sloped earthen bank which separated the terreplein from the parade ground level, had been a constant source of irritation with respect to the

⁸⁶Gen. Gratiot to Capt. Ripley, July 27, 1829, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Miscellaneous Letters Sent, Volumes 1-25, 1812-1872. Cited hereafter as NA RG77 OCE LS 1812-72.

⁸⁷Maj. Payne to Gen. Gratiot, December 17, 1830, NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1831-37.

⁸⁸Gen. Gratiot to Maj. Payne, December 18, 1830, 1812-72, NA RG77 OCE LS 1812-72.

health of the garrison. The sloped bank discharged rainwater around the foundations and into the cellars of the barracks buildings, contributing to the dampness of the cellars, and consequently to rotting of the wooden floors above.

Brevet Colonel John B. Walbach (author of the map of ca. 1806), Commanding Officer at Fort McHenry 1832-33, proposed to replace the sodded slope with a brick wall, "to ensure a better circulation of air around the quarters."⁸⁹ Though the idea was approved, stone was substituted for brick. On September 30, 1833, General Gratiot charged his nephew, Lt. Henry A. Thompson with the direction of the work. Gratiot believed the stone to be "cheaper for a wall of this magnitude," and he suggested that Port Deposit (Maryland) stone be secured for the job.⁹⁰

The 519 feet of stone wall, 7'-6" high, to be laid without batter, complete with foundation and coping, was estimated to cost \$4,219.44.⁹¹ It was subsequently built under the supervision of Lt. Thompson, and has been an important factor in eliminating the water runoff into the fort.

In 1835, guard-rooms were added to each side of the sally port, but the story of those additions goes back to 1831, when various officers at the post agitated for removal of the temporary guard-house (built ca. 1815), which was hidden behind the bombproof

⁸⁹Col. Walbach to Col. Jones, September 21, 1833, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Letters Received, 1826-1837. Cited hereafter as NA RG77 OCE LR 1826-37.

⁹⁰Gen. Gratiot to Lt. Thompson, September 30, 1833, NA RG77 OCE LS 1812-72.

⁹¹See drawing and detailed estimate for this wall, National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 4, n.d.

well, into the sally port area to improve the functional use of that station.⁹² While this was a logical position for the guard-house, the suggestion was countered with inertia and parsimony from the Chief Engineer of the Army. Several proposals to build new guard-rooms adjacent to or in front of the sally port were denied.⁹³

In an 1834 report by Lt. Thomas J. Lee, Artillery, to General Thomas S. Jesup, Quartermaster General, the guard-house was described as a "source of great inconvenience," being located between the Men's Barracks and behind the well. This fact, together with the poor condition of its roof and floor, brought some action upon the matter.⁹⁴

On July 9, 1835, Lt. Lee prepared an estimate for adapting the sally port vicinity to accommodate guard-house and prison facilities. He proposed to build a room on each side of the sally port and over the bomb-proofs. These rooms were to be accessible only from the courtyard. A major concern was that the new guard-house should not appear from the exterior of the fort. To work within this limitation, Lt. Lee proposed cutting away fifteen feet (in length) of the bomb-proof rooms on each side of the sally port. A smaller bomb-proof room could then be built in its place, thus reducing the one large bomb-proof casemate (approximately 18' by 50') to two rooms of dif-

⁹²Maj. Payne to Gen. Jesup; April 20, 1831. National Archives, Record Group 92, Records of the War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General, Selected Pages from Registers of Letters Received, 1818-57. Cf. Capt. Ripley to Gen. Gratiot, April 22, 1831. NA RG107 OCE SC FT-Mc 1811-37.

⁹³Gen. Gratiot to Capt. Ripley, April 30, 1831. NA RG77 OCE LS 1812-72.

⁹⁴Lt. Lee to Gen. Jesup, November 19, 1834. National Archives, Record Group 92, Records of the War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General, Consolidated Correspondence File, 1794-1915, Fort McHenry. Cited hereafter as NA RG92 OQM CCF 1794-1915.

ferent size, connected by a doorway. The entrance arches to the bomb-proofs from the sally port were to be preserved. This alteration accounts for the present constricted passageway into the casemates. Lee planned to cut away about 1700 cubic feet of brick on each side, and build a new arch 15 feet long, eight feet wide, seven feet high and 18 inches thick.⁹⁵ This work, as executed, followed his proposal quite closely. His estimate for labor and materials totaled \$2034.00. The plans, which he submitted with the estimate, show that the top of the sally port at that time was surrounded by a railing with flanking staircases on each side giving access from the ramparts to the roof. There was also a railing along the top of the parapet of the ramparts. While these elements no longer exist, they were used as an observation platform for guard purposes, since the roof of the sally port was a good vantage point for a tour of guard-duty.

The two new guard-rooms (with a prison in the rear of each) were begun about August 15, 1835 and finished that same year.⁹⁶

On November 25, 1835, Lt. Henry A. Thompson, who had stayed on at the fort to direct other improvements, notified General Gratiot that he had commenced cutting down the trees growing in the fort (planted ca. 1800) and on the ravelin. He promised that this military logging operation would be dispatched in short order.⁹⁷

During the following September 1836, General Gratiot and Captain Richard Delafield of the Engineers, inspected Fort McHenry

⁹⁵Lt. Thomas Lee's "Estimate [and Plans] of Materials and Cost of Building a Guard House &c. at Fort McHenry, Md.," July 9, 1835, NA RG92 OQG CCF 1794-1915.

⁹⁶Report on the Condition of Public Quarters at Fort McHenry, by Lt. Thomas Lee, September 30, 1835, NA RG92 OQG CCF 1794-1915.

⁹⁷H.A. Thompson to Gen. Gratiot, November 25, 1835, NA RG77 OCE LR 1826-37.

with an eye to improving its artillery emplacements.⁹⁸ As a result of this meeting, Captain Delafield prepared elaborate plans for an extensive outer gun battery to replace the abandoned shore-line batteries. He also proposed that the bastions of the fort be "restored" with its gun embrasures as per the 1803 plan.⁹⁹ Both Delafield and Gratiot endorsed the 1803 plan on September 27, 1836, with that purpose in mind. There is no evidence however that the embrasures were "restored."

Delafield also detailed a breast-height wall of brick to separate the earthen parapets from the terreplein, thus replacing the short, sloped bank which had formerly served that purpose. This three foot high brick revetment wall was built by Thompson and finished by the end of October 1837.¹⁰⁰ Its appearance is practically unchanged to the present time. Thompson also repaired the scarp wall, by replacing defective bricks and repointing the entire wall. He removed all the coping stone and replaced it with Patapsco granite, a local stone. During this same period 1836-40, Thompson supervised the erection of a new outer battery, and a new sea wall; and he acquired additional property for the government. Some of Thompson's improvements are shown on a plan drawn by him in 1837.¹⁰¹ This plan shows the intended

⁹⁸Gen. Gratiot to Capt. Delafield, September 12, 1836, NA RG77 OCE SPLOE 1812-69.

⁹⁹National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 8, drawn by Richard Delafield, Captain of Engineers, September 27, 1836, endorsed by Gen. Gratiot [H.A.R.P. map no. 6].

¹⁰⁰H.A. Thompson, agent of fortifications, to Gen. Gratiot, October 24, 1837, NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

¹⁰¹Fort McHenry, Md., 1837, by H. A. Thompson, Superintendent, National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 9 [H.A.R.P. map no. 24].

inclusion of two gun platforms in each bastion, but apparently they were not installed.

Thompson also directed the closing of the gateway through the ravelin and the elimination of the bridges, in 1838. Access to the sally port was effected by means of a ramp from the ditch, much as we see it today.

Thompson's Annual Report submitted October 17, 1839, noted that the breast-height wall had been raised 18 inches, covered with zinc and coped with sandstone, the scarp wall coated with a thick cement wash (traces of which are still visible), a breast-height wall built on the ravelin and traverses laid for seven guns on the ravelin.¹⁰²

On December 4, 1839, after a three year period of extensive additions and alterations, the U. S. Engineers pronounced the work complete and turned the fort back to the Army. The appropriations, expenditures, and compensation of agents at Fort McHenry for the years 1836-1839 totaled \$136,062.06. Although various minor alterations and repairs to the "star fort" have been made since 1840, no significant changes are evident.¹⁰³

The last major change in the sally port vicinity was the result of the proceedings of a board of officers which convened at Fort

¹⁰²H. A. Thompson to Col. Totten, Chief Engineer, October 17, 1839, National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Letters Received, 1838-1866. Cited hereafter as NA RG77 OCE LR 1838-66.

¹⁰³For a full narrative of work done during those years, see "An account of such Repairs to Fort McHenry as appears on the books of the Engineer Department," by Capt. Frederick A. Smith, Engineers, May 5, 1840, NA RG77 OCE LR 1838-66. See also a map of Fort McHenry, drawn by Capt. Frederick A. Smith, May, 1840, National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 14 [H.A.R.P. map no. 8].

McHenry on May 21, 1857.¹⁰⁴ The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the crowded prison conditions and to seek a remedy. The proceedings outlined the problem as follows:

The prisoners from this post and from other stations are from twelve to thirty men and are so crowded and deprived of proper breathing air or sleeping space as to be detrimental to health.

The report further mentioned that "casual" prisoners were forced to be confined with "confirmed delinquents," resulting in a "constant deterioration of morals."

The board concluded that the prison rooms located in the guard-rooms over the bomb-proofs to be not only contracted but unsafe, and "entirely inadequate to maintaining the discipline of a post exposed as is this to the temptations of a large city..."

This report, plus the fact that four prisoners had dug their way through the walls, was responsible for the construction of new prison facilities. This was to be accomplished by building an additional room on each end of the existing guard-rooms, to be placed over the bomb-proofs as before, but without any alteration to the arch below. The room to be added to the north end would simply serve as a guard-room, whereas the southern addition would be divided into a passageway with three small prison cells, "ventilated by iron doors," the whole to cost about \$1400.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴"Proceedings of a Board of Officers convened at Fort McHenry, Md.," May 21, 1857, NA RG77 OCE LR 1838-66.

¹⁰⁵"Estimate of cost of building Guard House at Fort McHenry, Md.," by Maj. I. L. Donaldson, June 13, 1857, NA RG77 OCE LR 1838-66.

Plans and covering letters for these extensions were transmitted July 27, 1857, and included details for hollow walls to render the space more habitable "...by freeing it from damp."¹⁰⁶ Approval for the work was issued August 10, 1857, and work began almost immediately.¹⁰⁷ These additions were completed in October, and represent the last substantial changes to the sally port complex. Small windows and vent holes were bricked up but no structural changes have taken place since 1857. The three small prison cells added at that time were used during the Civil War, and one Confederate officer has left a vivid account of his experiences in the smallest of the three cells, describing the dampness and filth in that place.¹⁰⁸

In the late nineteenth century, such damp places were subject to medical criticism. This criticism was especially aimed at the

¹⁰⁶"Fort McHenry, Sketch of proposed changes in prisons..." received with Maj. Brewerton's letter of July 27, 1857 [H.A.R.P. Map no. 21]. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Map File.

Cf. Maj. Brewerton to Gen. Totten, Chief of Engineers, July 27, 1857. NA RWD RG77 OCE LR 1838-66.

¹⁰⁷Gen. Totten to Maj. Brewerton, August 10, 1857. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Selected Pages from Letters to Officers of Engineers, July 4, 1812-February 20, 1869.

¹⁰⁸"Henry Hall Brogden -- An Account of His Experiences During the [Civil] War." A personal narrative written by H. H. Brogden which includes his imprisonment at Fort McHenry, 1863-64. Original MS owned by Mrs. Charles K. Lennig, Jr., 45 Woodale Rd., Philadelphia 18, Pennsylvania (copy at Fort McHenry).

unhealthy use of casemates or "bombproofs" for habitation. Since the Engineers were being taken to task for designing such uninhabitable spaces, Lt. Colonel W. P. Craighill of the Engineers, felt constrained to state that the criticism was unjust, as follows:

The casemates were never intended by the Engineers to be occupied except in time of war, and it is probable that ...the medical officers would not be unwilling to shelter themselves in them when shells do, from a fleet were flying.¹⁰⁹

CONCLUSION:

An evaluation of the available documents makes it obvious that Fort McHenry is not the design of any one engineer or architect. Felix Louis Muesenbach and James Alcock designed the Revolutionary War fortifications on Whetstone Point, but by 1814 those defences had been so completely altered that their influence upon the design of Fort McHenry itself was negligible. John Jacob Ulrich Rivardi, French artilleryist and military engineer, is usually credited with the architecture of Fort McHenry, but this is a gross error and stems from the widely known publication of his letters pertaining to the 1794-95 improvements at Whetstone Point. Samuel Dodge, fortifications agent, and Alexis De Leyritz, temporary engineer, were successively responsible for continuing some of Rivardi's designs, but neither of them made any contribution to the fort itself, but rather to the lower gun batteries.

¹⁰⁹Lt.-Col. Craighill to Gen. Fry; Baltimore, April 30, 1865. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Letters Sent Baltimore District Office, February 4, 1878 - February 26, 1880.

Major Louis Tousard, French artilleryist and military engineer, was commissioned in 1798 to design a fort which could afford defense against a land attack from the rear.¹¹⁰ Although his plan was approved, no work in that direction was accomplished. Only with the appointment of John (or Jean) Foncin, another French gunnery officer and military engineer, did a plan for the masonry-faced, pentagonal fort materialize from a crumbling earthen star redoubt. Furthermore, Foncin personally carried his plan into reality. Except for the later addition of a ravelin (which may have been in his original design) and changes in the embrasures, his design of the fort and inner buildings remained unchanged until after the Battle of Baltimore in 1814. Foncin, "a French Gentleman," was praised by James McHenry for demonstrating

that evidence of ability in his profession by correcting errors of much consequence, in the original plan of the works, as well as assiduity in Superintending and directing their progress...

McHenry considered him "worthy of trust, competent to what he has undertaken, upright and unassuming in his conduct."¹¹¹

Foncin's own views concerning the two years, 1799-1800, which he spent laying out and directing the erection of Fort McHenry, are ably expressed in a letter to McHenry, written only two months previous to the bombardment:

¹¹⁰For Tousard's theoretical writings on fortification, see Louis De Tousard [1749-1821], American Artillerist's Companion or Elements of Artillery... (Philadelphia: 1808), vol. 1, chap. 25, "On Fortification;" chap. 26, "Summary Essay on Fortification;" chap. 27, "Of Practical Fortification."

¹¹¹James McHenry to Samuel Dexter, Sec. of War, May 29, 1800. McHenry Papers.

...and I still keep alive the flattering remembrance of the Satisfaction of the citizens of Baltimore, while I was building for McHenry... It is a painful idea to me, that the beautiful city of Baltimore [should] be exposed to the disasters of War; but my mind will be a little solaced, if Fort McHenry does answer the purpose for which it was established, and affords me the Satisfaction of having contributed to your defence.¹¹²

¹¹²"Col. John Foncier [sic] to James McHenry," July 13, 1814, Maryland Historical Magazine, V (1910), 182-83.

APPENDIX I

Whetstone Point Lands

The land comprised by Whetstone Point was apparently first patented by one Charles Gorsuch, on February 24, 1661,¹¹³ but if so, he abandoned it, for on June 2, 1702, a patent for the land was granted to James Carroll, who named it "Whetstone," perhaps because of its shape or its mineral deposits.

The Point was considered a favorable location for a town, and an Act of April 19, 1706, made it a Port of Entry. Any such commercial favor was not forthcoming, and in 1725 Carroll sold it to John Giles, who relinquished control of the land to the Principio Company, in 1727. That company, an association of British ironmasters and merchants, purchased of Giles all the iron ore upon or under his property. This colonial commercial enterprise intended to mine the iron deposits for the manufacture of pig and bar iron.¹¹⁴

When the Maryland Convention ordered defenses built on the site in 1776, all the property was confiscated from the Principio Company.

In 1780, while the fort continued to serve the defense of

¹¹³Gorsuch's name was later applied to the Point across the channel from Whetstone. Gorsuch's Point was the site of the Lazaretto gun battery which played a minor role in the defense of September 13-14, 1814. Whether or not Gorsuch actually patented the peninsula of land later known as Whetstone, is a problem requiring additional research. In fact, the entire history of title transfers for Whetstone Point needs more precise study from primary sources. This appendix should be considered a brief preliminary attempt.

¹¹⁴Henry Whitely, "The Principio Company," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Bibliography, XI (1887).

Baltimore, the land was surveyed¹¹⁵ and platted into 76 lots, with the intention of auctioning it off to raise badly needed money for the Continental Army.¹¹⁶ The first such auction took place on August 14-15, 1781, at which time about 16 lots were sold, mostly those on the upper end of the peninsula. Twenty-six additional lots were sold at the second auction held September 24-25, 1781.¹¹⁷ The lots which were occupied by the "star fort," gun batteries, and out-buildings were not sold until July 30, 1782.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵Samuel Chase's instruction re sale of Whetstone Point, n.d., Executive Papers, Nov.-Dec., 1780, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

¹¹⁶The Council insisted that the lots on Whetstone Point be sold for specie, that is, hard money, for the "Purposes of the Officers and Soldiers of our Line in the Southern Army..." Council to Nathaniel Ramsey, August 6, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 547.

¹¹⁷"Acco. Sales of Sundry Lotts [sic] situated on Whetstone Point sold at Public Auction Septem. 24th & 25th, 1781, by Order & Direction of Nath'. Ramsey Esqr. One of the Commissioners for Confiscated British Property," September 26, 1781, signed by T[homas] Yates, Auctioneer, Maryland State Papers, Red Books, 1767, XX, 3. See also N. Ramsey to Gov. Lee, October 7, 1781, Red Books, 1768, XX, 2. M. Gist to Gov. Lee, October 2, 1781, Brown Books, 532, III, 64. T. Yates to Gov. Lee, October 8, 1781, Letters to the Governor and Council, Arch. Md., XLVII, 517, Council to Thomas Yates, October 8, 1781, Arch. Md., XLV, 636, Nathaniel Ramsey to Gov. Lee, [August 31?, 1781], Letters to the Governor and Council, Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1781, Arch. Md., XLVII, 464.

¹¹⁸Map of Whetstone Point showing boundaries of lots 60-76 superimposed on Fort McHenry, August 1907, in Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore [H.A.R.P. map no. 292]. See also 2 maps of platted lots adjoining Fort McHenry Lands, December 29, 1817, National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 1½. See also list of title transfers for lots 1-76, Maryland Land Office, filed in H.A.R.P. archives, Fort McHenry in August, 1781 chronological notebooks. These consist of brief abstracts, without adequate documentation to determine the ultimate disposition of each lot, especially those lots which were deeded to the United States government from 1795 to 1800. See also B. Dickeson to Nath' Ramsey, July 31, 1782, Executive Papers, Commissioners of Confiscated Property, 1781 - 1784, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

After that date, the entire ownership of Whetstone Point was vested privately with a number of individuals. In the early 1790's when the federal government planned an overall system of coastal fortifications, the interest in Fort Whetstone was revived. The Maryland Legislature in December, 1793, granted permission to the War Department, upon application to the Governor of Maryland, to build additional fortifications upon Whetstone Point, "with the consent of the owner of the soil."¹¹⁹ Whether this consent was granted willingly or by condemnation with recompense, is not clear.¹²⁰ At any rate, those lots numbered 73 through 76, which comprised the outer works, were not deeded to the U.S. until July 20, 1795. The lots (numbered 66, 68-72) which had been occupied by the old earthen "star fort" did not pass into government hands until November 6, 1798 and August 26, 1800.¹²¹

¹¹⁹"Whereas the United States may think it necessary to erect a fort, arsenal, or other military works or buildings on Whitestone [sic] Point, for the public defence: Therefore, Resolved, That, upon the application of the President of the United States to the Governor, for permission to erect a fort, arsenal, or other military works on the said point, for the purpose aforesaid, the Governor shall, and may, grant the same, with the consent of the owner of the soil," By the House of Delegates, December 25, 1793, American State Papers, XVI, 71.

James McHenry "voted in favor of the resolution to grant the federal government, with consent of the owner of the land, permission to build a fort or arsenal on Whetstone Point..." Bernard C. Steiner, The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry... (Cleveland: 1907), 144.

¹²⁰"The collector at Baltimore has been directed to take measures for ascertaining the value of the land at Whetstone Point, near Baltimore, whereon the fortifications are erecting," December 17, 1794, American State Papers, XVI, 106.

¹²¹See unsigned, undated manuscript history of Fort McHenry, ca. 1887, sheet 15, H.A.R.P. chronological notebook for 1887. July 20, 1795, from Alex. Furnival, 7 acres plus, under Act of Congress, June 9, 1794. November 6, 1798, from Wm. Goodwin, 2 acres, same act. August 26, 1800, from Wm. Goodwin, 11 acres plus, same act.

Additional property (24 acres) was acquired in 1836.¹²²

¹²²"An account of such Repairs to Fort McHenry as appear on the books of the Engineer Department," Sheet 7, submitted by Capt. Fred. A. Smith, May 5, 1840. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office Chief of Engineers, Letters Received, S1028.

See also "PLAT of THE LOTS [sic] OF LAND Belonging to the GENERAL GOVERNMENT on which Fort McHenry is Erected," surveyed June, 1840 by A. J. Bouldin. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 13 [H.A.R.P. map no. 109]. This plat also has a list of title conveyances for all the lots involved.

APPENDIX II

Foncin's Estimate¹²³

An Estimate of the Expense for the construction of a
Port to be erected at Whetstone Point near Baltimore.

Stone	Perches	
for the foundations.	800	
for the Wall of the Ramparts	2300	3700
for the counterforts or buttresses .	600	
at 20 shill p. perch		9866.67
7400....bushels of lime @ 2/b.		2466.67
Sand		925. -
Masons work at the rate of \$1 p. perch		3700. -
Bricks		
600,000 Bricks for the wall @ \$6 ½		3900. -
1,800 bushels of lime.		600. -
Sand		300. -
Masons work at the rate of \$3 pr. thousand bricks.		1800. -
Earth by the cubical toise		
Solid of the Parapet	560	
Solid under the Parapet.	1600	
Solid of the Banquette	120	4140
Solid of the Terreplein.	1560	
from the foundations	300	
at \$2 per cubic toise		8280. -
Powder Magazine.		1600. -
Cistern.		500. -
All the buildings for the avenue, off. sold. & [rest unreadable]		6000. -
		<u>\$ 39938.34</u>

¹²³Enclosed in a letter from Robert Gilmore to James McHenry,
May 6, 1799, McHenry Papers.

APPENDIX III

Foncin and Fort Independence,¹²⁴ Boston, 1800-1802

During May of 1800, James McHenry resigned as Secretary of War. The fortifications at Baltimore were as yet incomplete. Foncin was still in charge of the works but being a McHenry appointee, his position was certainly less than secure. McHenry was well aware of the delay and waste that might result should the fortifications be subject to yet another engineer's ideas and opinions. To assist a smooth change of administration, McHenry prepared a lengthy report (for his successor) which outlined the state of affairs in the War Department. In that report McHenry not only identified Foncin with the works at Baltimore, but gave him an unreserved professional and personal recommendation that may have assisted in retaining Foncin and furthering his career as military engineer, as follows

will it be permitted to mention, that I have employed on the Fortifications erecting at Baltimore, in the capacity of Engineer, a French Gentleman of the name of Foncin, and that evidence of ability in his profession by correcting errors of much consequence, in the original plan of the works, as well as of assiduity in Superintending and directing their progress, induced me to raise the compensation he was first engaged at--This Gentleman I would recommend to be continued in employ as heretofore--being much mistaken, if he will not be found, worthy of trust, competent to what he has undertaken, upright and unassuming in his conduct.¹²⁵

¹²⁴This material on Fort Independence is not intended to be a physical history. It is a preliminary effort to collate two separate works of fortification which are related chronologically and architecturally. Fort Independence further interests us because it shares a common authorship with Fort McHenry.

¹²⁵A report from McHenry to his successor as Sec. of War, Article 12, May 29, 1800, McHenry Papers, Clements Library.

McHenry's vote of confidence was probably responsible for the continued employment of Foncin by the War Department, despite the anti-French feelings so prevalent at the time. At any rate, Foncin stayed on at Baltimore until his work was substantially completed. He was then transferred to Boston where he was charged with laying down a plan for strengthening the old defenses on Castle Island. The exact date of Foncin's removal to Boston is not known, but he was probably on the site by October 1, 1800.¹²⁶

By November 24, 1800, Foncin had 1) appraised the existing fortification as an "old and useless inclosure," and 2) laid down a plan for a completely new fort to be erected over the old works (See Illustration No. 9). This plan, fortunately preserved,¹²⁷ is interesting for its marginal comments by a Frenchman experienced in military engineering. Foncin's notations interest us not only for the reference to Fort McHenry, but also because they include his justification for the new plan.

¹²⁶On October 16, 1800, John Foncin, was paid \$287.72 as engineer for August and September, 1800, including his travel expenses from Baltimore to Boston. Register of Warrants, 1800-1802, October 16, 1800, General Accounting Office. This could mean that Foncin remained in Baltimore through the month of September and then moved to Boston, or was already in Boston during the two months mentioned in the warrant.

¹²⁷Plan of Old Fort Independence and a new Fort Independence, "to be erected," (Superimposed in two colors), November 24, 1800, signed by Foncin, National Archives, Record Group No. 77, drawer 20, sheet 1.

The fort of Boston having been drawn on the Same Scale as that of Baltimore,¹²⁸ their respective Size may be compared together, it will appear from this examen that the irregular pentagone of Boston is somewhat larger. But the Site of castle island has not permitted it to be smaller, and considering the length, narrowness, and irregularities of this island, there is no possibility to have a good work occupying only the top of the hill, as does the old inclosure. Such work would have no capacity, no defense; and the carrying of earth to form so high a rampart, would become too expensive. Thus considering the public utility, The money of the Government Shall not be employed in building a very defective and impotent fortification. Besides the port of Boston is to be attacked by large Squadrons of men of war, and fort independence is used as a strong place for prisoners of war. Those considerations give to the last an unquestionable importance, and rank it with the positions which ought to be strongly fortified. Therefore great care has been used to have the whole inclosure well flanked. When the ground will be disposed, there Shall be no landing place without being discovered from the works.

According to this plan, many works have been ascertained as indispensable. But the honorable Secretary of war will consider that an engineer who is desirous to discharge the duties of his Station, must always recall in his mind, This fundamental rule, Viz, That fortifications works being the Security of the nations, ought to be not only Strong, but created on Solid and permanent Basis.

In 1801, Foncin prepared and submitted a more detailed plan of the proposed fortifications (See Illustration No. 10). This plan, also preserved, included elevations, sections, cannon size and placement, building locations, etc.¹²⁹ For the latter he offered two schemes.

¹²⁸Foncin's plan of Fort McHenry herein alluded to, has not been located, which makes his Fort Independence drawings of special interest to our study of the Baltimore harbor defenses.

¹²⁹"Fort Independence," 1801, signed by Foncin, National Archives, Record Group No. 77, drawer 20, sheet 2. The similarity to Fort McHenry (designed by Foncin in 1799) is conspicuous, that is, a brick-faced, five bastioned, pentagonal fort, laid out in the classical French tradition. Owing to site problems, Foncin used an irregular pentagon on Castle Island. Physically, Fort Independence was designed to be about twenty five per cent larger (in area) than Fort McHenry. The escarpment walls of Fort Independence were to be 22 feet high compared to about 12 feet at Fort McHenry.

Architecturally, Foncin's designs for Fort Independence (note the main-gateway) are singularly undistinguished. Perhaps he was attempting to avoid any show of "extravagance" which might defeat his proposal.

The first called for grouping the buildings in a quadrangle. Of this plan, Foncin noted that

The distribution of the Buildings...is simmetrical and agreeable. But the Place d'armes is smaller than in the 2^d Fig. Besides the houses of the commandant and of the officers, are confined on each Side by The Barracks.¹³⁰

The alternate plan called for placing the buildings against the inner periphery of the irregular pentagon, similar to the arrangement at Fort McHenry. Foncin apparently favored this plan for he commented as follows:

The distribution of the buildings...is plain and convenient. The place d'armes is larger than in the 1st Fig. the houses of the Commandant and of the officers are less confined. Besides the ground will be earlier ready to admit those buildings.¹³¹

From other notations on this 1801 drawing, it would seem that work had not begun on Foncin's plan, for he indicated existing buildings upon the grounds "to be successively pulled down."

As yet we do not know the precise extent to which Foncin's plans were carried out, except that he remained in Boston until the fort was completed. Apparently his commission not only included the design of Fort Independence, but also a layout for the general defense of the city and port of Boston. A misunderstanding over this latter area of responsibility developed between Foncin and the War Department. An 1803 letter from Foncin to President Jefferson brings this misunderstanding into sharper focus. The letter, included here in its entirety, requires a prefatory resume.

¹³⁰Ibid.

¹³¹Ibid.

As resident engineer at Fort Independence, Foncin completed his work in December, 1802. At that time he asked permission to remove to Philadelphia (as a personal convenience), there intending to finish his drawings of the Boston defenses. The Secretary of War granted the request, possibly thinking that Foncin wanted leave without pay. Unknown to Foncin, his pay was terminated when he moved to Philadelphia, where he continued to devote his attention to the problems of Boston. On February 12, 1803, Foncin was amazed to learn that he had been laboring without recompense.

Earnestly, but naively, he appealed for his "back" pay, but without success. Finally he laid the problem before President Jefferson with the hope that the President would rectify the error. Perhaps thinking he could take advantage of the pressing need for engineers, he announced his departure for France. What follows is a translation of the letter to Jefferson.¹³²

Philadelphia
14 April, 1803

Sir:

The President of the United States having honored me with the commission, enclosed herein, to erect the fortifications necessary for the defense of the port of Boston, I have built Fort Independence to the satisfaction of the citizens of that city. This work having been achieved, and after four years of steady labor, as much

¹³²Foncin to Jefferson, Philadelphia, 14 April 1803, Jefferson Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

The writer is indebted to Meir and Ruth Sofair, Philadelphia, for the translation of this letter from the French to English. Although proficient in English, Foncin wrote in his native language to avoid any "improper expressions," knowing that Jefferson was competent to understand his plight. The efficacy of the letter is not presently known.

in Baltimore [two years] as in Boston [two years]. I had requested permission to come to Philadelphia, and this favor has been granted me according to the enclosed letter from the Secretary of War dated August 5th [1802].

Having thus continued in the Service, I achieved during the winter the plans for the defense of the port of Boston, I sent to the Secretary of War various observations relative to the Service, and I have been paid without any difficulty. But while I was using in good faith the results of my experience in the art of fortifications in order to be more and more useful to a country which I would have wanted to serve all my life, how surprised I was, when without any prior notice I have been deprived of my salary since the first of December [1802] pursuant to Mr. Simmons' letter enclosed herein. I have since stopped my duties as engineer in the Service of the United States. I have claimed in vain what was due me from the first of December [1802] to the twelfth of February [1803], this last day being the one when I received, even though indirectly, the first notice of the will of the Secretary of War. Would it be possible that I, who worked with such constant energy to build without intermission the forts of Baltimore and Boston, I who have received the highest testimony from the citizens of those two cities, as our can see from the article of the Independent Chronicle enclosed herein, and from the members of the Congress who have visited my work, would it be possible, I wonder, that I would be deprived of the salary of 2 months and 12 days?

Truly, I have no objection to make when the Secretary of War wishes to annul my commission from the President of the United States, but I should at least be informed, in positive terms, that I was no longer employed and consequently I would have returned to my native land.

Besides, one cannot claim that I have finished the entire work assigned to my care. The commission with which I have been honored consists of the general defense of the port and the city of Boston and Fort Independence is only a part of the plans. According to the opinion of the generals and other officers who have visited this place, it is considered indispensable to build a fort, or at least a battery, like the plan of the Secretary of War for Governors Island [New York].

The enclosed letter dated the 16th of March [1803] by which the Secretary of War wishes to re-employ me, but in considering me out of the Service since my arrival in Philadelphia, would appear to void the permission which

he had given me. But, alas, one should suppose that it has a retroactive effect, which is not possible. I could not imagine without intense feeling this severe interruption of my services, at a moment when I had reason to expect a recompense.

Therefore, sir, by entrusting myself entirely to your impartial justice, I take liberty to write you, requesting that you return to me the original documents on which I base my claims, so that you do not doubt my good faith, and if your decision is favorable, I would like very much to receive what is due me before my departure for France, having booked my passage on the S.S. "New Jersey" (belonging to M. Plumestade) which will leave for Anvers in 15 days.

Forgive me, sir, if I use my native language. It is a respect I must observe towards you, to avoid the use of any improper expressions.

I am,

Sir,

with the most profound
respect,
Your very humble
and very obedient
servant,

J. An Foncin

the sum that I claim is
258 dollars $\frac{89}{100}$

P.S. As it would be very flattering to my spirit that my services having been recognized by the President of the United States, from whom I have had the honor of receiving two commissions, I enclose the last letter dated 27th of July which I received in Boston, to say nothing of the several others by which the Secretary of War gave me testimony of his most genuine satisfaction.

Since it is not our purpose to enter the physical history of Fort Independence, this material is appended here because it sheds further light on the otherwise obscure career of John (or Jean) Foncin.

APPENDIX IV

Foncin and Fort Hamilton, Philadelphia, 1814

With the completion of Fort Independence, Foncin was apparently discharged from the service of the War Department. It appears that he moved to Philadelphia shortly after his Boston sojourn,¹³³ and perhaps he remained in Philadelphia until 1814, when he returned to France. However, his name does not appear in Philadelphia directories until 1811.¹³⁴ Foncin's activities for the period 1803-1814 are still unknown. It seems that he was idle much of that time, for in 1814 he wrote of his "displeasure of not being employed since many years..." but he went on to say that he was currently assisting in the design and erection of fortifications for the defense of Philadelphia.¹³⁵

The system of defenses around Philadelphia during the War of 1812 was bolstered and supplemented under the aegis of the Philadelphia Committee of Defence. The Committee's efforts were primarily directed toward developing the defenses along the Delaware River, but it has also deemed advisable to provide some measure of

¹³³See letter from Foncin to Pres. Jefferson, 14 April 1803, translated from the French and included in Appendix III.

¹³⁴"Foncin, John O., 191 south Second," The Philadelphia Directory for 1811, 121, no occupation given.

¹³⁵"Col. John Foncier [sic] to James McHenry," Phila., 13 July 1814, Maryland Historical Magazine, V (1910), 182-183. The full text is given later in this appendix.

During this period, Foncin's name often appears with the rank "Colonel." He is not listed in Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army...Washington, 1903. Perhaps he earned the rank in France.

protection along the Schuylkill River.¹³⁶

On August 29, 1814, the Sub-Committee reported their immediate intention to erect field fortifications on the heights and most important entrances to the city, to wit,

from the west side of Schuylkill, commencing at such places as General Williams, and the United States engineers under his command, shall deem proper...¹³⁷

The Sub-Committee was authorized to call to their assistance such "topographical engineers and men of science" necessary for the design and layout of the field defenses.¹³⁸

Two days later, the volunteer "appointees" were names as follows:

Military Engineers
Chief - General Williams
Second - Colonel Foncin

For the Topographical Department
Dr. Patterson
Mr. [William] Strickland
Mr. John Biddle¹³⁹

Under the leadership of this group, a corps of volunteer laborers constructed a redoubt on a hill above the Schuylkill, (see Illustration No. 11) near "Woodlands," the country house of William Hamilton. It is difficult to particularize on the division of responsibility for constructing this minor defensive work. However,

¹³⁶For a more complete discussion of Philadelphia's participation in the War of 1812, see Scharf and Westcott, History of Philadelphia, 1884, I, 573-75.

¹³⁷"Minutes of the Committee of Defence of Philadelphia, 1814-1815," Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1867, VIII, 35.

¹³⁸Ibid.

¹³⁹Ibid., 49.

Foncin's response to this special resolution was read into the committee minutes on September 22, 1814. His letter acknowledged that

The testimony of satisfaction which the General Committee of Defence have been pleased to give him, is, to his mind, the most flattering recompense for his services, and feeling himself happy in finding an opportunity of showing to the citizens of Philadelphia how grateful he is for the kind protection and friendship that this city hath afforded him during so many years.¹⁴³

Fort Hamilton was Foncin's last work as military engineer in America, and he shortly thereafter departed for his native France.

Several months prior to his departure, Foncin in a letter to James McHenry, summarized his American career in eloquent terms which are especially appropriate to the main subject of this study - Fort McHenry.

Philadelphia 13th 7ber 1814.

Sir¹⁴⁴

The gratitude which I constantly preserve of your kindness towards me, permit me not to go to France, without letting you know my feelings on this account. You not only have supported me while you was secretary of war; but your satisfaction towards my conduct, has been a great encouragement for the exerting of all my faculties in the service of the United States; and I still keep alive the flattering remembrance of the Satisfaction of the citizens of Baltimore, while I was building fort McHenry. I always have done all that was in my power to show my zeal; and in this very moment notwithstanding my displeasure of not being employed since many years, I am happy to answer the desire of the Citizens of Philadelphia, who have applyed to me, in order to help them in the projecting and erecting some fortifications for the defence of their city. I do it with the greatest pleasure,

¹⁴³"Minutes of the Committee..." op.cit., 172.

¹⁴⁴supra, note 135.

being extremely thankful for the protection I have enjoyed there during many years. But our French Government being returned to our old beloved sovereigns, it is my duty to go back to my country, and I request from you Sir, the favor of an answer, which might be wondered as an evidence of the approbation of the U. S. for my services, while you was secretary of war. Your letter will be a record which may be some day useful to my son; and I must not neglect to procure him such an honorable title. Besides I wish to retire from the United States in the most convenient manner. I shall be very thankful for your kindness, and beg your pardon for the trouble I give you.

I am with great respect
 Sir
 Your most humble and
 obedient Servant

John Foncier [sic]

P.S.-It is a painful idea to me, that the beautiful city of Baltimore be exposed to the disasters of War; but my mind will be a little solaced, if Fort McHenry does answer the purpose for which it was established, and affords me the Satisfaction of having contributed to your defence.

Col. John Foncier [sic] at Francis Breuil's Esq^r
 Philadelphia

The Honorable James McHenry Esq.^r

PART B. Architectural Information

A. General Statement. The brick-faced fort is a unique, surviving American example of a late eighteenth century pentagonal fortification. The sally port is typical of early nineteenth century gateways built to control access to the inner garrison. As such it can be compared to the sally ports at Fort Mifflin, Pennsylvania, and Fort Washington, Maryland.

1. Architectural Character. The massive expanse of brickwork in the scarp walls, bastions and ravelin of the fort, architecturally expresses the protective function of a military installation such as Fort McHenry. Although the brick walls give the impression of solid masonry, they are only a facing for the earth and sod ramparts. The sally port which functions as the gateway through those ramparts, is a block of masonry, penetrated by a vaulted passageway. The top surface of the vault is concealed by brick parapet walls. The underground casemates, on each side of the sally port were installed in 1814 as an integral part of the sally port, and their architectural character is limited to the brick vaulted ceiling, since these rooms cannot be seen from the outside. The guard rooms were built later, and their inclusion in the sally port vicinity was for convenient control of the gateway. They are quite ordinary architecturally, small in size, and do not reveal another important function, i.e., that of confining prisoners. Architectural embellishments on the sally port are limited to the two arched openings with their keystones and impost blocks, executed in sandstone. There are no carvings or inscriptions. The only relief in the brick wall surfaces is provided by 3 recessed panels, framed with wood trim, which are situated over the arched openings of the sally port.

2. Condition of Fabric. Good.

B. Exterior.

1. Overall dimensions. Fort: Overall circumference approximately 1755 feet, height averages 12 feet. Ravelin: The two leading faces of the ravelin are about 132 feet long. The two back faces of the ravelin are about 67'-8" long. The maximum present height is about 11'-6". Sally port: 18 feet wide, 18 feet high, 35 feet deep. Guard rooms: first rooms north and south of sally port, 16'-1" wide, 13 feet high, 26'-6" deep. Outer rooms north and south of sally port, 14'-5" wide, 13 feet high, 16'-0" deep.

2. Foundations, not known.

3. Wall construction. Fort: Sloped brick masonry walls, laid up in English bond, that is, alternate rows of headers, with a stone coping, and stone quoining at all three outer corners of each bastion. Ravelin: Sloped brick masonry, laid in common bond with headers every fourth course, with stone coping and stone quoining at the three main corners. Sally port: Brick masonry, throughout, Flemish bond on the

exterior face, common bond on inner face and sides. Guard rooms: first room north and south of sally port, are brick masonry, laid up in common bond. Outer rooms north and south of sally port, brick masonry with air space (hollow wall construction).

4. Chimneys. A chimney projects 4'-6" through the terreplein from each of the outer casemates. Apparently they were built to serve fireplaces on the end walls of the outer casemates. The fireplaces have been removed, but the chimneys remain. They measure 2'-11" each way, are capped with a dressed block of granite. Smoke passage is provided by small rectangular vent holes on each face of the chimney. Each of the outer guard rooms were also built with a small chimney to accommodate iron stoves for heating the cells. Chimney on southernmost guard room has been removed above roof line, but chimney on northernmost guard room remains and is capped with sheet metal.

5. Openings.

a. Doorways and doors. Sally port: Sally port openings are 9'0" wide and 10'5" high. Each sally port doorway is arched with especially moulded, tapered voussoir bricks, black in color. The projecting keystones and impost blocks are of cut sandstone. Sally port doors are 4½" thick, divided doors, separately hinged, heavily constructed with three layers of planks riveted together. Doors are shaped to fit arched openings. Each door is about 4'-6" wide and 10'-4" high, hinged from the sides. One of the double doors at each end of the sally port is fitted with an inner door so that individual entrance can be gained without opening the main doors. Construction date of these elaborate doors is not known, but they pre-date the 1930 restoration by the War Department, under the direction of L. M. Leisenring. Casemates: Similar but smaller doors control access to the underground casemates. They are 2 5/8" thick, triple thickness of wood, riveted construction, divided at the middle, curved to fit the arched opening, and supported from the sides by long strap hinges. Doors leading to the northern casemates are 1930 replacements, and patterned after the opposite set of doors, date unknown. Guard rooms: Guard room door openings are distinguished from all other doorway openings in the fort by their arched brick lintels. Openings and doors seem to be original, that is, pre-Civil War, except for the northernmost door which is a 1930 replacement. The dressed granite steps leading to the 3 guard room doors are apparently original with the construction of these rooms. On the courtyard elevation of the southernmost room is a recessed panel, treated like a door opening with an arched lintel, but filled with brick. This is an original construction, deliberately introduced to balance the symmetry of the overall design.

b. Window openings and windows. The adjacent guard rooms flanking the sally port also have arched lintels of brick similar to the door openings. Those windows are double-hung, four over four in their arrangement of panes. The frames, including sash bars, muntins, etc. seem to be original, that is 1835, in their details. The dressed granite sills are also original. The single window on the north end

of the guard rooms is a replacement, apparently dating from the 1930 restoration. That window opening was originally furnished with iron bars. A small casement window located on the parade ground elevation of the southernmost guard room, lights a narrow corridor leading to the three prison cells. This window is divided into three panes, and appears to be original in its details, that is, 1857. The opening is near the roofline and guarded by iron bars. Below the window is a narrow, rectangular air-vent which serves to ventilate the hollow walls. On the end wall of the cell block are evidences of 3 small vent holes, one for each cell, but these have been bricked up. On the front wall (facing outside the fort) of the two inner guard rooms are evidences of larger windows, but those too, have been bricked up.

6. Roof.

a. Shape, covering. Sally port: flat, covered with sheet metal, wrapped over edge of roof, with lapped soldered joints. Application date of present roof not known, but probably 1930 or later. Guard rooms: shed-roofs, covered with sheet metal, wrapped over edge of roof, similar to sally port.

b. Cornice, eaves. Cornice around sally port and guard rooms, moulded wood cornice, painted white, date unknown. Wood cornice on south guard room replaced in 1930. Cornice applied to brick walls, joint protected by overlapping roof covering. Gutters and downspouts date from 1930 restoration.

C. Interiors.

1. Floor Plans. Casemates: small casemate rooms adjacent to sally port measure about 9'-0" by 15'-0". Access is by temporary wooden stairs from the sally port passageway. At the ends of the small casemates are open doorways leading into the outer casemates, each measuring about 18'-0" by 33'-0". Guard rooms adjacent to sally port measure about 14'-6" by 22'-0". Southernmost room or cell block: consists of a passage 2'-10" by 13'-5", whose only access is gained by two steps up from inside the guard room. The passage itself steps up twice to accommodate the rise of the underground casemate vaulting. Off the passage are three prison cells, each measuring about four feet by nine feet. Northernmost guard room: measures 11'-9" by 13'-0", and presently serves as an electric transformer room, but was originally a guard room and prison cell, access from either the adjacent guard room or from its own exterior door.

2. Flooring. Casemates: asphaltic concrete of recent origin, brick gutters around edges, with drain holes in the outside corners. Original floor surface unknown, probably wood. Sally port: asphaltic concrete, original surface probably graveled. Guard rooms adjacent to sally port: wood, narrow, tongue and groove, recently installed, exact date not known. Outer guard rooms and cells: brick floors. Cells have thin asphaltic concrete surface over brick, gutters around edges.

3. Wall and ceiling finish. Casemates: whitewashed brick. Sally port: exposed brick, evidences of previous white washing or thin coating of cement wash. Guard room immediately south of sally port: whitewashed brick walls, exposed wooden rafters in ceiling, unpainted. Guard room immediately north of sally port: exposed brick, evidence that bricks are reused, some with whitewashing, exposed rafters in ceiling, unpainted. North guard and cell room: exposed brick walls, exposed rafters in ceiling, unpainted. Cell block: whitewashed brick walls, brick vaulted ceiling also whitewashed.

4. Doorways and doors. Casemates: door openings between casemate rooms are unframed, square-headed, with rectangular iron bar lintels supporting masonry above. South guard room and cell block: door opening between guard room and cell passage has no door, is unframed, has flat-arch brick lintel. Cell rooms: arched brick openings, heavy iron doors, made up of 1" by 2½" and 1" by 2" rectangular iron bar frames, with ¼" diameter vertical bars on approximately 2½" spacing, complete with pintle type hinges set in masonry, and iron hasps, with keepers set in masonry. North guard rooms: doorway between two northern guard rooms is framed with wood. Frame and door apparently date from the 1930 restoration. Door opening includes one wooden step into northernmost guard room. Opening has brick flat arch lintel.


5. Trim. Very little trim used in any of these rooms. Guard room south of sally port is the only room with baseboards, which appears to be original since they are notched into the door frame.

6. Hardware, is limited to that found on sally port doors, casemate doors, and guard room doors.

7. Lighting, electric, installed 1930 and later.

8. Heating. Casemates: apparently had fireplaces at one time, but if so, have been removed at some undetermined time. Guard rooms: north and south guard rooms originally had stoves, now gone, and stovepipe holes in chimneys have been plugged.

D. Site. Sally port, casemates and guard rooms are built into the earthen ramparts of the fort, protected from the outside by the brick walls. The roofs, however, project above the ramparts, and thus are visible from the front. The outside face of the sally port faces northeast.



RADE . ET . POR

Illustration No. 1

Portion of "Rade et port de Baltimore," 12-15 September 1781, Papers of Louis-Alexandre Berthier, group 16, map 8, Princeton University Library. Map of Whetstone Point showing "star fort," shore-line batteries, and buildings.




Illustration No. 2

Copied from a portion of a "Plan of the Town of Baltimore and its Environs," by A. P. Folie, French Geographer, 1792. Peale Museum, Baltimore. Map of Whetstone Point showing "star fort" and shore-line batteries.




Illustration No. 3

Copy of plan of Fort M'Henry, November 9, 1803, author-
 ship unknown. National Archives, Records of the War
 Department, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77,
 drawer 51, sheet 1.



Illustration No. 4

Portion of an anonymous watercolor painting of the Fort
McHenry bombardment of 1814. Peale Museum, Baltimore.
View of southeast bastion and sally port.




Illustration No. 5

Plan of Fort McHenry, by William Tell Poussin, 1819.
National Archives, Records of the War Department,
Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51,
sheet 2.




Illustration No. 6

Portion of a plan of Port McHenry, by William Tell
Poussin, 1819, National Archives, Records of the War
Department, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77,
drawer 51, sheet 2. Plan of fort and enclosed build-
ings.




Illustration No. 7

Portion of a plan of Fort McHenry, by William Tell
Poussin, 1819. National Archives, Records of the War
Department, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77,
drawer 51, sheet 2. Sections through ramparts (top),
sally port and ravelin (middle), and postern (bottom).




Illustration No. 8

Portion of a lithograph of Fort M'Henry, by E. Sachse,
1862. Peale Museum, Baltimore.




Illustration No. 9

"Fort Independence to be erected," November 24, 1800, by John Foncin, National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group No. 27, drawer 20, sheet 1. Marginal notes on this plan refer to the fortifications at Baltimore, see Appendix III.

Plan of the Parapet of Fort Hamilton




Illustration No. 11

Plan of the Parapet of Fort Hamilton,
1814. Drawing in the William Strick-
land account book, State Records Office,
Harrisburg, Pa.




Illustration No. 12

Southwest bastion from south bastion. Rear of No. 1
Soldiers' Barracks (Building D) at right. Photographer:
Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.




Illustration No. 13

Detail of typical stone quoining at
an outside corner of a bastion.
Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July
1958.



Illustration No. 14

Entrance to postern. Photographer:
Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.



Illustration No. 15

View of sally port and guard rooms from parade ground.
Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 16

Interior elevation of sally port,
with doors closed. Photographer:
Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 17

Arched entrance to small casemate room looking south
from inside sally port. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher,
July 1958.






Illustration No. 18

View from southernmost casemate looking into adjoining casemate. Note brick vaulting, and ventilator holes (at left). Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.



WEST ELEVATION
SCALES 1/4" = 1'-0"



EAST ELEVATION
SCALES 1/4" = 1'-0"


NOTE: ALL ELEVATIONS DETERMINED BY FIELD SURVEY. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET AND INCHES. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

DATE: 10.15.18


BY: [Signature]

GEORGE W. NELSON, CONSULTING ARCHITECT, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

UNDER DIRECTION OF UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, BRANCH OF PLANS AND DESIGN	NAME OF STRUCTURE THE SALLY PORTY PORT ANNE, MARYLAND	HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY MAY 2, 1938
--	--	--



SECTION D-D - LOOKING WEST
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




SECTION A-A - LOOKING NORTH
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




DAVID B. NELSON - CIVIL ENGINEER - REG. NO. 100

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C.	NAME OF STRUCTURE '141' SALLY DORT	SURVEY NO. AD-63	HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY SHEET 3 OF 10 NORTH
TOWN OF BETHANY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC SQUARE - MONTGOMERY COUNTY - MARYLAND			


SOUTH ELEVATION WITH SECTION
THROUGH CASSETTE NO. 2
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



NORTH ELEVATION WITH SECTION
THROUGH CASSETTE NO. 1
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



SECTION AND THROUGH
CASSETTE NO. 3
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




EXTERIOR EXISTING
FOR SECTION CASSETTE
AND AIR SHUTT
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

SECTION THROUGH CASSETTE NO. 3
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

DATE OF DRAWING: FEBRUARY 1962
DRAWN BY: J. H. HARRIS
CHECKED BY: J. H. HARRIS
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

NAME OF STRUCTURE: ...
SURVEY NO: ...
HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY SITE # 61-3 SILVER

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND



WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL

WOOD

CORRIDOR

REAR PORT

SALLY PORT

TOP CORNER WALL






WOOD

WEST BATTERY BRUSHING TERNARY BLOCK OF SALLY PORT COMPLEX SECTION 1/2

1/2" = 1' - 0" (VERTICAL SCALE)

SECTION A-A


ORVILLE W. CARROLL - LEE H. NELSON - DEC. 1950



1/2" PINE SALLY PORTAGE PIGMENT FOR DOOR HINGE



STRAP HINGE SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"



DOOR HINGE SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"



DOOR HINGE SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"




DOOR HINGE SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"

INTROD. ADDRESS - 1001 N. 10th St. - PHOENIX, ARIZ. SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"


NAME OF STRUCTURE: 1001 SALLY PORTAGE PIGMENT FOR DOOR HINGE
DRAWN BY: [Name] CHECKED BY: [Name] DATE: [Date]

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEETS


UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY



DOOR PLAN - DUNGLON N°1
(CASEWELL)
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



ELEVATION
DUNGLON N°1 (CASEWELL)
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"





WINDOW PLAN - DUNGLON N°1 (CASEWELL)
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




SECTION THROUGH WALL AND WINDOW
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

LEWIS E. NELSON - JULY 1938



DOOR FRAME
DOOR PANELS
DOOR PANELS TO BE ORDERED FROM THE MANUFACTURER OF THE DOOR FRAME TO BE USED IN THIS PROJECT.

NAME OF STRUCTURE: [illegible]
 ADDRESS: [illegible]
 CITY: [illegible]
 STATE: [illegible]
 ZIP: [illegible]



DIVISION OF UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE - BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	PROJECT: [illegible]	SHEET NO. 12 OF 12 SHEETS
	NAME OF STRUCTURE: THE CALUM FORT	SURVEY NO. AD-65
DATE: [illegible]	DRAWN BY: [illegible]	CHECKED BY: [illegible]

CHAPTER II

COMMANDING OFFICER'S OFFICE AND QUARTERS

(now known as Building A)

H.A.B.S. No. MD-196

Illustrations Only




Illustration No. 19

Commanding Officer's Office and Quarters (Building A).
Facade and northeast end-wall, Powder Magazine at left.
In 1814, this was two separate buildings, i.e., a Guard
House (at the right) and Commanding Officer's Quarters
(at the left). They were joined together sometime after
1819 and before 1829. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher,
July 1958.



Illustration No. 20

Commanding Officer's Office and Quarters (Building A).
Rear wall and west end-wall. Photographer: Jack E.
Boucher, October 1958.



Illustration No. 21

Commanding Officer's Office and Quarters (Building A). Fireplace in eastern-most room. This fireplace was sealed off sometime in the nineteenth century, and reopened during the War Department restoration of 1929-30. At that time, the old cooking crane was discovered. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.



Illustration No. 22

Commanding Officer's Office and Quarters (Building A).
View of excavation of bricked-up cellar window on front
wall. Cellar was filled with earth and openings were
filled with brick ca. 1837. Photographer: Jack E.
Boucher, October 1958.

CHAPTER III

THE POWDER MAGAZINE

H.A.B.S. No. MD-197

CHAPTER III, THE POWDER MAGAZINEPART A. Historical Information

The powder magazine is one of the buildings within Fort McHenry, built 1799-1800, from a plan by John (or Jean) Foncin, French artilleryist and military engineer. The first graphic document that in any way indicates a magazine inside the fort is a plan of November 9, 1803.¹ This plan, curious in several respects, is drawn to a scale of toises, a French measure, in this case equivalent to six feet. At any rate, a magazine was shown and it occupied its present position. It was a rectangular structure, drawn only in outline, and (by converting toises to feet) measured 20'-0" by 31'-6". There is no interior arrangement shown. This is the earliest measurable plan of that building and is corroborated by a similar plan of the fort which was drawn ca. 1806, by Captain John B. Walbach of the Artillery for the U. S. Military Philosophical Society.² This plan is also drawn to a scale of toises, and the magazine similarly scales about 20'-0" by 31'-6". The ca. 1806 plan shows a wall around the magazine, which might have served either as a low retaining wall to provide better drainage, or more likely, as a means of isolating the magazine from the garrison, a common military device. Excavation of

¹"Fort McHenry, 9th November, 1803" [H.A.R.P. map no. 1], National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 1. Original authorship of this plan is unknown. It was later endorsed by Capt. Richard Delafield, Engineers, and Gen. Charles Gratiot, Chief Engineer of the Army, September 27, 1836.

The writer acknowledges the assistance extended by Dr. S. Sydney Bradford and Franklin R. Mullaly, National Park Service Historians, during the architectural evaluation of the historical documents, which they collected and arranged for the Fort McHenry research library.

²"Plan of Fort McHenry by Captain Walbach of the Artillery for the U.S. Mil: Philo: Soc: No. 1" [H.A.R.P. map no. 2], ca. 1806, New York Historical Society, United States Military Philosophical Papers. See H.A.R.P. index card for reference to documents that establish the approximate date of this map.

the magazine foundations during the 1958 archeological program has revealed the original building size to be 20'-0" by 31'-6", and thus confirms the accuracy of the 1803 and 1806 plans. The existence of the powder house was first officially recognized in a report of the Secretary of War, dated February 13, 1806.³ Not until 1809 is there a document which refers to the structure as a brick magazine.⁴ Finally in 1811, a War Department report on coastal defenses, describes Fort McHenry in more precise terms, noting that there was a "...Brick Magazine that will contain 300 Barrels of Powder..."⁵

With the mounting tension between England and America, the necessity of improving fortifications commanded considerable attention. By 1811, repairs were necessary at Fort McHenry; and the buildings were generally refurbished. By spring of 1813, the tempo of improvements had increased. General Samuel Smith, Maryland Militia, in March 1813, asked the Secretary of War for "...An Engineer to compleat [sic] the fortifications..."⁶ As a result, on March 27, 1813, J. C. Swift, Colonel of the U. S. Engineers directed Major Lloyd Beall (U.S. Artillery, at Fort McHenry, March and April 1813) to carry out certain improvements at Fort McHenry.

³Report of the Secretary of War, February 13, 1806, U. S. Congress, American State Papers, Documents, Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, 1832 [XVI], 194. Cited hereafter as American State Papers, XVI.

⁴Report of the Secretary of War, December 19, 1809, American State Papers, XVI, 246.

⁵Report of the Secretary of War, December 10, 1811, American State Papers, XVI, 310.

⁶Sam. Smith to Gen. John Armstrong, Sec. of War; March 16, 18, 1813. Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Samuel Smith Papers. Cited hereafter as S. Smith Papers.

Among other things he was ordered to:

Erect a Traverse inside the Fort...of Brick...in front of the Magazine Door, 12 feet long & 8 feet thick at the Base, sloping two inches to each foot in height...as high as the top of the window over the Door.⁷

However, nothing was done immediately. Smith again asked for an Engineer. A month later Colonel Swift ordered Captain Babcock to erect the traverse which had not yet been built.⁸ Another month passed and the order was repeated. In spite of the urgent need for improving the magazine, there is no evidence that the work was executed until after the bombardment.

The vulnerability of the structure was dramatically emphasized during the bombardment September 13-14, 1814:

While men were outside [the] star fort...a shell struck the powder magazine where there were many barrels of this explosive. When the shell struck it was deemed necessary to roll out the barrels of powder as the magazine was not bomb-proof.⁹

Another account relates that, "A shell struck the corner of the

⁷Col. Swift to Maj. Beall; March 27, 1813. U. S. Military Academy, J. G. Swift Papers. A traverse for a magazine of this period, is a block of brick masonry placed in front of the magazine door. Its function was to protect the entrance from cannonfire. Such a traverse was usually incorporated into the fabric of the building above the door level, and contained a separate entrance or entrances, leading into the powder storage room. While the traverse served as a protective device, it had the disadvantage of blocking light from the interior. Typical extant examples are the traverses at Fort Washington, Maryland, built 1815-24.

⁸Col. Swift to Capt. Babcock; April 26, 1813. National Archives, Record Group 77, War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Buell's Collection, Engineer Historical Papers, 1800-1819.

⁹Baroway, Aaron, "The Cohens of Maryland," Maryland Historical Magazine, XVIII (1923), 373 "Reminiscences of the Bombardment of Fort Mchenry, 'The Star Fort,' in Sept., 1814." Narrated by Col. M. I. Cohen.

magazine in a slanting direction, and shattered the wall; had it penetrated, the capture of the fort would have been inevitable."¹⁰ The fact that there were no bomb-proof buildings within Fort McHenry and the apprehension that the British would shortly return, prompted immediate efforts to put the fort in a better defensive condition. Within four days after the attack, Brig. General Winder directed Major General Samuel Smith's attention to the work as follows:

There will be required to render the magazine [at Fort McHenry] bombproof, [with] 192000 Bricks & 40 Brick layers [thick].¹¹

From the above quantity of brick,¹² and from the existing architectural evidence, it appears that "to render the magazine bombproof," three improvements were made immediately after the attack of September 13-14, 1814. 1) The walls of the magazine were thickened to their present dimensions; 2) a massive brick vault was built over the powder storage room, and; 3) a traverse was erected in front of the newly thickened walls, thus protecting the entrance.

The foundation of the traverse, as excavated during the 1958 archeological work, agrees quite closely with 1813 directive; that is, the traverse is 12'-2" long and nearly eight feet wide (the full width being disturbed by a later utility line). However, the location

¹⁰Duncan, John M., Travels Through Part of the United States and Canada in 1818 and 1819 (New York: 1823), v. 1, Letter VIII, 225-26.

¹¹Gen. Winder to Gen. S. Smith; September 18, 1814. Baltimore City Archives, Baltimore City Hall, 1814, Box 23, no. 496.

¹²The writer has calculated that approximately 90,000 of the bricks were used in the construction of the "bombproof" vault, with the balance being employed in the thickening of the walls, etc. The term "40 brick layers" refers to the vault. 40 layers of brick at 2 1/4" per brick gives a vault thickness of 7'-6". The actual thickness varies from 7'-0" to 7'-4", remarkably close to Gen. Winder's order.

of the traverse, together with visible evidence in the brick masonry, tend to support the writer's opinion that the traverse was added to the newly thickened front walls after the bombardment, rather than to the smaller pre-bombardment magazine.

The haste with which the magazine was strengthened is impressive. By September 29, 1814, two weeks after the bombardment, Samuel Smith reported that "The Bombproof for the magazine at Fort McHenry will be compleat [sic] this day."¹³

While the powder house was now adequate from a military point of view, it still lacked a roof to protect the exposed brick vault from the elements. With respect to this problem, some of the post-attack improvements at Fort McHenry were carried out from plans by Maximilien Godefroy, Baltimore architect and professor of civil and military architecture at St. Mary's College. Shortly after completion of the magazine vault, Godefroy intended to cover the vault with earth and sod roof. The earth was intended to act both as a roof and as further protection against concussion. Godefroy's scheme, however, met considerable opposition from Captain Frederick Evans, Commanding Officer of regular artillery at Fort McHenry. Evans feared that an earthen roof would prevent the freshly-laid masonry from curing, as follows:

Should [covering the magazine with earth] take place, I believe it will not be possible to save our powder, as the arch when put up was done in a rainy time & the absorbent qualities of the brick destroyed...[It] now requires all the air that can be had both within & without to dry the walls.¹⁴

¹³S. Smith to James Monroe, Sec. of War; September 29, 1814. S. Smith Papers.

¹⁴Capt. Evans to Gen. S. Smith; October 9, 1814. S. Smith Papers.

Apparently the matter was settled by merely plastering the vault,¹⁵ but the problem was not resolved. The following year, in November 1815, an estimate for rafters, plank, nails and shingles, totaling \$592.60, was transmitted to Lt. Colonel Bomford with the statement that construction of a roof should be expedited due to the impossibility of keeping ammunition dry during the winter, and that "Slates tho' preferable to shingles are not to be procured."¹⁶ Apparently the slates were located however, since the appropriation was increased to allow for installation of a slate roof instead of shingles, and the repair work included several lightning rods.¹⁷

The first professionally competent plan of Fort McHenry is that done in 1819 by William Tell Poussin, Captain of the Topographical Engineers. This plan shows the fort in its improved post-war condition, is accurately drawn and includes some rather significant details and sections.¹⁸ The powder magazine, as shown on this plan, had reached

¹⁵The heavy coat of plaster is still intact on the upper surface of the brick vault, although there is no documentary evidence as to the date of its application.

¹⁶Lt. Bache to Lt. Col. Bomford; November 24, 1815. National Archives, Records of the War Department, [Record Group 156], Office of the Chief of Ordnance, Selected Letters Received 1801, 1806 and 1812-20. Cited hereafter as NA RWD RG156 OCO SLR 1801-20.

¹⁷Lt. Baden to Capt. Morton; November 4, 1817. NA RWD RG156 OCO SLR 1801-20.

¹⁸"Reconnoitring of Chesapeake Bay, STATE OF MARYLAND, Plan and Profiles of Fort McHenry, 1819." Drawn by William Tell Poussin, Captain Topographical Engineers, H.A.R.P., Map no. 4. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Washington, Drawer 51, Sheet 2.

its present physical size. Most helpful is the fact that the traverse is also shown projecting from the front end of the structure. So accurately is the magazine drawn that it agrees in dimensions with the present measured building.

Although the magazine at this time was protected by a brick traverse, a "bombproof" brick vault, and a slate roof to shed rain, apparently it fell into disuse after the cessation of hostilities. An inspection report of 1822 notes that the "Magazine contains only boxes of fixed ammunition and Cartridges."¹⁹

During an active renovation period of Fort McHenry in 1829, the magazine underwent some changes. Captain J. W. Ripley, in charge of repairs, reported to General Gratiot, Chief Engineer of the Army, as follows:

The Magazine (within the Fort) is entirely useless as such, having two others that are perfectly dry, and in good repair. I request permission to remove a small Traverse from the door...in order to admit the light, as I wish to occupy it as an office or Store Room. The T[raverse] is quite small, but so situated as to exclude the light from the door and a window once in use if necessary could be readily replaced.²⁰

Permission for this change was granted two days later by Gratiot, on July 27, 1829. The traverse of course was not as small as Ripley represented it to be. It was a block of brick masonry 12 feet wide, 8 feet deep and 18 feet high. Though the traverse was removed, its location was determined in the 1958 Archeological program. The

¹⁹Unsigned Inspection Report, dated September 22, 1822. National Archives, Record Group 159, Office of the Inspector General, Selected Pages from Inspection Reports 1814-1842.

²⁰Capt. Ripley to Gen. Gratiot; July 25, 1829. National Archives, [Record Group 107], Office of the Chief of Engineers, Selected Correspondence Relating to Fort McHenry, Maryland, 1811-1837. Cited hereafter as NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

existence of the traverse was short-lived, only 15 years, but that was sufficient time to indicate its outline on the frontwall of the magazine, due to the lime action in the brickwork around the traverse.²¹

When Maj. General Gratiot inspected the fort in 1835, the magazine was still not a fit receptacle for powder. He noted:

as the present magazine is too damp for the preservation of powder, as well as unsafe from its projecting several feet above the ramparts, a new one is required.²²

During the last half of the 1830's, considerable repair of the fort was carried out under the direction of H. A. Thompson, nephew of Gen. Gratiot. Thompson seems to have had a free hand in determining the extent and execution of this work.

Among the many repairs and additions made by Captain Thompson was a new floor in the magazine, as well as a lining to the interior walls.²³ The main concern was to once again make the magazine dry enough to store powder, and put an end to the irritating problem of continual dampness. Thompson's proposed changes were approved by Gratiot January 8, 1836. From the excavations conducted under the magazine floor during the 1958 Historical and Archeological Research Program (MISSION 66), it would appear that the magazine had a cellar space for circulation of air under a wooden floor. The interior side

²¹See photograph by L. M. Leisenring, O.Q.M.G. Photo of powder magazine and building A, taken February 2, 1927, H.A.R.P. Photo no. 1358.

²²Gen. Gratiot to Sec. of War, November 20, 1835. National Archives, Record Group 77, War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Letters Received 1826-1837. Cited hereafter as NA RWD RG77 OCE LR 1826-37.

²³Capt. Thompson to Gen. Gratiot, January 9, 1836. NA RWD RG77 OCE LR 1826-37.

foundation walls have a ledge suitable for accommodating wooden joists and floor planking. These interior footings extend below the ledge for a distance of 5'-8", more than ample for ventilation, but also so deep as to be constantly damp due to ground water. A similar floor construction was used in the powder magazines at Fort Washington, Maryland, constructed 1815-1824. In fact, all the remaining service magazines outside the walls of Fort McHenry have wooden floors over a cellar space.

Apparently Thompson filled the magazine cellar with earth, and laid a brick floor over the fill, just as he had filled the cellars of the barracks to eliminate decaying of joists and flooring due to ground water. The barracks cellars were filled about the same time (1836-37).

Special order No. 70 was issued on August 29, 1836, which caused the evacuation of troops so as to continue repairs on a larger scale. Not only were buildings repaired during the period 1836-1840, but outer works, a seawall, boundary wall, etc., were constructed. During this interval, Captain Thompson was agent for the Engineer Department, and among his frequent transmittals is a report which includes the condition of the magazine.

The magazine is large, in good order, drier than those I have generally seen, & has a lightning rod, the only one at the Fort. [The magazine] requires a protection in front of the door...²⁴

The "protection" to which Thompson alludes, is a traverse to replace the one which had been removed in 1829. Nothing was done however about rebuilding the traverse.

²⁴Capt. Thompson to Capt. Smith, March 21, 1839. NA RWD RG77
OCE IR 1838-66.

The magazine was the subject of further interest, however. On June 24, 1839, Thompson sent a plan and section of the magazine to Captain F. A. Smith, Engineer Department. The letter which accompanies the drawings describes the building as follows:

The Building is of Brick, with a Slate Roof & a lightning Rod...there is no cellar or space under the floor...there is but one Ventilator or window in the rear...two doors which are good & strong... a new window shutter will be required...it appears to me that the roof might be lowered considerably, & thus prevent its being so conspicuous an object...²⁵

The "window" was in the rear wall and has since been bricked up. While Thompson's plan was generally correct, some details were based upon assumption rather than fact. This is especially true of the vent holes and roof structure.

Apparently he was aware of the shortcomings of his drawings, and in a follow-up letter admits to errors. In an effort to determine the extent of the space under the roof, Thompson sent a "small man" into the space, but it was too "dark and gloomy" to learn anything, and he finally concluded that it "...can only be seen with the roof off..."²⁶

The purpose of Thompson's effort was to determine if the roof structure could be lowered. That the roof projected above the ramparts had been noticed by others. In 1836 Colonel Fenwick had brought the matter to the attention of General Gratiot:

...may I not observe that from its height, it presents too conspicuous an object to the Enemy for a direction of its Fire?²⁷

²⁵Ibid., June 24, 1839.

²⁶Ibid., June 27, 1839.

²⁷Col. Fenwick to Gen. Gratiot, January 9, 1836. NA RG107
OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

However, the matter, though revived occasionally, was dropped, and the roof remained unchanged.

On October 22, 1839, Captain Thompson was ordered to repair the rear window of the magazine with a shutter on the outside and a row of 7/8 inch diameter iron bars, set in the opening one foot inside the walls, with a "wire gauze" screen installed on the inside.²⁸

With repairs at the fort substantially complete, the garrison was turned back to the artillery as per Special Orders No. 94, December 4, 1839.

While other minor repairs have been made at various times, such as bricking up the rear window, reworking the doors, and raising the ground level to provide better drainage, the powder magazine has not undergone any significant changes. It was used as a coal shed in the 1880's, and generally has never been entirely useful or satisfactory as to its original function. It was never adequate as to size, nor was it conveniently located with respect to the guns in the fort. Altogether, the magazine never served its function efficiently, and ultimately it was discovered that to render the outer batteries effective, several service magazines, contiguous with the battery, were a more satisfactory solution.

²⁸An Account of such Repairs to Fort Mchenry as appear on the books of the Engineer Department," by Capt. Frederick A. Smith, May 5, 1840. NA RWD RG77 OCE LR 1836-66.

PART B. Architectural Information

A. General Statement. This powder magazine represents two stages of construction. As originally built, ca. 1800, it was the main powder storage facility for Fort McHenry, and as such played an important role in the defence of the fort during the British bombardment of September 13-14, 1814. It is said to have sustained a direct hit during that engagement, and its present appearance is primarily a product of extensive alterations following that military action.

1. Architectural Character. Architecturally, the powder magazine is similar to other magazines of the late 18th and early 19th century, and should be compared with the brick arsenal at Fort Mifflin, Pennsylvania, built 1798-1800 and the two magazines at Fort Washington, Maryland, built 1815-24. The massive, block-like appearance expresses its function as a protective enclosure for powder storage. The lack of fenestration, the narrow doorway, and the unusually thick brick walls adjacent to the entrance, contribute to the severely plain architectural character. Exterior architectural detail is limited to the eight-sided, gambrel-type roof and the corbeled brick cornice along the sides. The original design of this powder magazine is unknown, since in 1814 it was completely enveloped by five feet of brick walls, and the roof replaced with a brick barrel vault. Originally, it was a rectangular structure of brick, 20' by 31'-6" in size. The interior powder chamber is little changed and measures 10' by 26'. The side walls were originally five feet thick, while the front and rear walls were originally three feet thick. The original door opening still exists, but a window over the door which once daylighted the interior has been bricked up. The magazine once had a wooden floor, supported by joists over a cellar space. The cellar has since been filled with earth, and the wooden floor replaced with brick paving.

2. Condition of Fabric. Very good.

B. Exterior.

1. Overall dimensions. 30'-5" by 40'-2".

2. Foundations. The sidewall foundations of the original magazine are of random sized quarry stone, about 5'-4" thick, and extend below the joist ledge line to a depth of 5'-8". When the brick walls were thickened around the exterior of the building (in September, 1814), the additional required footings were constructed of brick and extend below grade about four feet.

3. Wall Construction. Brick throughout; the side walls are now 10'-3" thick, front wall 8'-3" thick, and rear wall 6'-1" thick. Brick is laid up in common bond with headers inserted at irregular spacing, varying from two to eight courses. A portion of the original front wall is visible above the doorway and brickwork in that area is laid in English bond.

4. Openings.

a. Doorways and Doors. This structure is typical of other early nineteenth century powder magazines in that it is equipped with inner and outer wooden doors. The door opening penetrates the original front wall which is three feet thick, and the doors are flush mounted on the inner and outer surfaces of that opening. The outer door, of 2" stock, is supported by wrought iron strap hinges. The infilled panels are composed of beaded boards. The inner door is 2" thick, is supported with iron strap hinges which embrace both sides of the door. The inner door is more like a cell-door. It has four rectangular openings with iron bars. This door is similar to those in the powder magazines at Fort Washington, Maryland. These doors probably date from the mid-1830's.

b. Windows and vent holes. Originally, the magazine contained two windows, one over the door and one in the rear wall. The front window was bricked up at an early date when the outer walls were thickened, but the rear window opening served at least until the late 1830's when it was fitted with iron bars and a "wire gauze" screen. At some undetermined time after that, the rear opening was reduced in size to a rectangular vent slot.

There are also small vent holes along the exterior walls, but the ultimate destination of these holes is not known because they change direction inside the wall and the inner surface of the powder storage room is plastered over their original inlet.

5. Roof.

a. Shape, covering. The inner storage chamber is covered with a brick "bomb-proof" barrel vault approximately seven feet thick which is plastered on both surfaces. Above this is a wooden superstructure or outer roof which carries a slate roof. This superstructure follows the general semi-circular shape of the vaulting, but is composed of eight straight-line segments. Posts, which rest on the upper surface of vault, carry the roof beams. The beams are decked, with one inch boarding or subroof to which is attached the slating.

b. Cornice and fascia. There is no cornice as such, except a corbelling of brick along the sides of the magazine, which supports the lower roof supporting beams. A 1" x 8" beaded fascia board on the front and rear walls, follows the broken roofline and serves to flash the joint between the brick walls and slate roof.

C. Interiors.

1. Floor Plan. There is only one interior room which measures 9'-11" by 26'-0".

2. Flooring. Brick, two layers thick, laid in mortar without any consistent pattern, except for cross bands of brick laid end to end, on approximately two foot centers. The original surface was probably of wooden floor boarding supported by floor joists which rested upon the stone foundation ledge. There was probably a shallow cellar space for circulation of air, but that was filled about 1837.

3. Wall and Ceiling finish. Plaster, probably modern.

D. Site. Behind the magazine is a granite and brick revetment wall spaced two feet from the rear magazine wall, and which serves to separate the sodded earth terreplein from the magazine and thus keeps it dry.

The ground surface all around the magazine is paved with brick laid in a herringbone pattern. Adjacent to the northeast side wall of the magazine is a group of unmounted cannon lying upon the brick paving.




Illustration No. 23

The Powder Magazine, facade and west side. Photographer:
Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 24

The Powder Magazine, rear view. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 25

The Powder Magazine, interior view.
Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July
1958.




Illustration No. 26

The Powder Magazine. View of attic, toward rear wall,
showing top of brick barrel vault and roof framing.
Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.

SECTION 1 - EAST ELEVATION



SECTION 2 - WEST ELEVATION




SECTION 3 - NORTH ELEVATION




SECTION 4 - SOUTH ELEVATION




SECTION 5 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)




SECTION 6 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 7 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 8 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 9 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 10 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 11 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 12 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 13 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 14 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 15 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 16 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 17 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 18 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 19 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 20 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 21 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 22 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 23 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 24 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 25 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 26 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 27 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 28 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 29 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 30 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 31 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 32 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 33 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 34 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 35 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 36 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 37 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 38 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 39 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 40 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 41 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 42 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 43 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 44 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 45 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 46 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 47 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 48 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 49 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 50 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 51 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 52 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 53 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 54 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 55 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 56 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 57 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 58 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 59 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 60 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 61 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 62 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 63 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 64 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 65 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 66 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 67 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 68 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 69 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 70 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 71 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 72 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 73 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 74 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 75 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 76 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 77 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 78 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 79 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 80 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 81 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 82 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 83 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 84 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 85 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 86 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 87 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 88 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 89 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 90 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 91 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 92 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 93 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)




SECTION 94 - WEST ELEVATION (Detailed)



SECTION 95 - EAST ELEVATION (Detailed)





1. THE BUILDING WAS CONSTRUCTED IN 1783
 2. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A POWDER MAGAZINE
 3. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1861
 4. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1862
 5. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 6. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1901
 7. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1902
 8. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 9. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1941
 10. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1942
 11. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 12. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1961
 13. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1962
 14. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 15. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1981
 16. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1982
 17. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 18. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 2001
 19. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 2002
 20. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE

1. THE BUILDING WAS CONSTRUCTED IN 1783
 2. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A POWDER MAGAZINE
 3. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1861
 4. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1862
 5. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 6. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1901
 7. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1902
 8. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 9. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1941
 10. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1942
 11. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 12. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1961
 13. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1962
 14. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 15. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1981
 16. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1982
 17. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 18. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 2001
 19. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 2002
 20. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE



1. THE BUILDING WAS CONSTRUCTED IN 1783
 2. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A POWDER MAGAZINE
 3. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1861
 4. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1862
 5. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 6. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1901
 7. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1902
 8. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 9. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1941
 10. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1942
 11. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 12. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1961
 13. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1962
 14. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 15. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1981
 16. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1982
 17. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 18. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 2001
 19. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 2002
 20. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE

1. THE BUILDING WAS CONSTRUCTED IN 1783
 2. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A POWDER MAGAZINE
 3. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1861
 4. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1862
 5. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 6. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1901
 7. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1902
 8. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 9. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1941
 10. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1942
 11. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 12. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1961
 13. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1962
 14. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 15. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 1981
 16. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 1982
 17. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE
 18. THE BUILDING WAS DESTROYED IN 2001
 19. THE BUILDING WAS RECONSTRUCTED IN 2002
 20. THE BUILDING WAS USED AS A STOREHOUSE

TREVOZ 3. NELSON - BRM - F. BAKER II - DCU
 NAME OF STRUCTURE: THE POWDER MAGAZINE
 PROJECT NUMBER: NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC SITE, BALTIMORE COUNTY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
 DISTRICT NO: MD-197
 SHEET NO: 4 OF 4 SHEETS
 HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
 SCALE: 1" = 10'-0" FEET

FACIA BOARD FULL SIZE

WOOD PLATE FULL SIZE



ATTIC PLAN, SHOWN WITH ROOF REMOVED
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SECTION A-A
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

DESIGNED BY: WILSON - LITTLE ARCHITECTS, INC. - BALTIMORE, MARYLAND


DATE: FEBRUARY 1958

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF WILSON - LITTLE ARCHITECTS, INC. AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN ANY MANNER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILSON - LITTLE ARCHITECTS, INC.


WILSON - LITTLE ARCHITECTS, INC.
1100 PONDOR AVENUE
FOR MARYLAND NATIONAL ANTIQUITY AND HISTORIC SHIRE - BALTIMORE COUNTY - BALTIMORE - MARYLAND

SHEET NO. 10-197
HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
SHEET 7 OF 8 SHEETS

1/2" CHARLIT HEAD PROJECTS 1/4"




HINGE FOR INNER DOOR SCALE 1/4\"/>



INNER DOOR SCALE 1/4\"/>

HINGE FOR OUTER DOOR SCALE 1/4\"/>



SECTION 3-6 - OUTER DOOR SCALE 1/4\"/>

SEE PLAN FOR DOOR SWELL



CHAPTER IV

OFFICERS' QUARTERS
(now known as Building C)

H.A.B.S. No. MD-198

Illustrations Only



Illustration No. 27

Officers' Quarters (Building C). Facade and north end-wall. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.



Illustration No. 28

Officers' Quarters (Building C). Bricked-up cellar window and remnant of brick light-well, on front wall.
Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.



Illustration No. 29

Officers' Quarters (Building C). View of excavation at cellar stairwell below north end-wall. This feature was largely damaged by installation of water pipe. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.

CHAPTER V

NO. 1 SOLDIERS' BARRACKS
(now known as Building D)

H.A.B.S. No. MD-199

CHAPTER V. NO. 1 SOLDIERS' BARRACKS (Building D)

PART A. Historical Information

Although temporary barracks were erected at Whetstone Point as a part of the Revolutionary War fortifications for Baltimore, they did not survive to become a part of later defensive works at that place.

During the more extensive 1794-95 improvements at Fort Whetstone, a frame barracks building was constructed from plans by John Jacob Ulrich Rivardi, French artilleryist and military engineer, who was appointed by President Washington to lay out the works at Baltimore, as a part of the coastal system of fortifications.¹ Although Rivardi designed but one barracks for Fort Whetstone, additional barracks were built by Samuel Dodge, agent and assistant to Rivardi. These barracks were located within the precinct of the upper water battery, but are no longer extant.²

The most significant period of building on that strategic peninsula, resulted from the quasi-war with France in 1798-1800.

¹"An Act to provide for the defence of certain ports and harbors in the United States," Approved March 20, 1794. U.S. Congress, The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States..., 3d Cong., 1849, 1423-24.

Cf. Henry Knox, Secretary of War to Gov. Thomas Sim Lee, March 28, 1794. Maryland Hall of Records, Annapolis, The Brown Books, 716, IV, 27.

The writer acknowledges the assistance extended by Dr. S. Sydney Bradford and Franklin R. Mullaly, National Park Historians, during the architectural evaluation of the historical documents, which they collected and arranged for the Fort McHenry research library.

²J. J. U. Rivardi to Secretary of War, American State Papers, XVI, p. 89, April 20, 1794. Rivardi planned a frame structure 16' by 40'.

Cf. Maryland Historical Magazine, V (1910), 291-92. Rivardi to Gov. John Stone, January 15, 1795. Rivardi complained that funds had been spent "...for the building of additional barracks &c. which were not in the plan [furnished by Rivardi]." These buildings were also situated within the upper gun battery.

At that time, the gun batteries were supplemented with a regular brick-enclosed fort, designed by John Foncin, French artilleryist and military engineer. The defenses were renamed in honor of James McHenry, Secretary of War and a Baltimorean. Within the compound created by the pentagonal fort, quarters were built to accommodate the garrison, and it is one of the enlisted men's barracks (now known as Building D) that concerns us here. None of the buildings within Fort McHenry can be accurately dated, but this barracks was erected sometime between 1799 and 1802, after which time it is known to have been occupied.³

The earliest known plan to show the 1799-1802 improvements, is the plan of Fort McHenry dated "9th November, 1803."⁴ With respect to the buildings, this document is architecturally important for it shows their relative positions inside the fort, and at least indicates their overall dimensions by a scaled plan.⁵

Building D, on that drawing, is represented to be 22 by 91 feet, which closely conforms to its present dimensions, not including a 14 foot addition in length which will be mentioned later.

³Lt. Samuel T. Dyson to William Linnard, Military Agent, July 23, 1802. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 92, Office of the Quartermaster General, Consolidated Correspondence File, 1794-1915, Fort McHenry. Cited hereafter as NA RG 92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

⁴"Fort McHenry, 9th November, 1803." [H.A.R.P. map no. 1]. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 1. Authorship of this map is unknown.

⁵The map is drawn to a scale of toises, a French measure of length. One toise in this case is equivalent to 6 feet. The plan was carefully measured (by the architect) on a rule divided into 64 parts per inch, each 64th being converted to a decimal fraction of a foot, thus making it possible to interpret the dimensions of the building.

Another plan, drawn ca. 1806 by Captain Walbach of the Artillery, corroborates the 1803 map with respect to the overall dimensions of Building D.⁶

Although Building D has not undergone any basic changes in plan, its original outward appearance, especially for the 1814 period, is not certain, but by evaluating the physical and documentary evidence, the 1814 condition of the building can be determined with some degree of accuracy.

Architecturally, Building D at the time of the 1814 bombardment, was a one and one-half story brick barracks building, which measured the aforementioned 22 by 91 feet in plan, and was divided into three rooms, each 19'-8" wide and about 28'-6" in length.⁷ Each room was heated by a single fireplace centered on the brick crosswalls. Clear ceiling heights in the three rooms were slightly over eight feet. The exterior structural brick walls were 14 inches thick and rested upon shallow footings composed of random quarry stone. The brick work in the front wall, or facade, was laid up in a Flemish bond, while the side and rear walls are common bond with headers every sixth course.

⁶"Plan of Fort McHenry by Capt. Walbach of the Artillery for the U.S. Mil: Philo: Soc:, No. 1" [H.A.R.P. map no. 2], ca. 1806. New York Historical Society, United States Military Philosophical Papers. See H.A.R.P. index card for reference to documents that establish the approximate date of this map. This plan was also drawn using a scale of toises.

⁷Col. Jacob Hindman to Col. W. K. Armistead, Engineers, March 17, 1819. "The present quarters...are...of one story only with three small rooms on one range and two on the second [range]." National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 107, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Selected Correspondence Relating to Fort McHenry, Maryland, 1811-37. Cited hereafter as NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

The existence of a kitchen cellar under the northwest end of Building D, was established in October, 1958, by limited architectural explorations under the supervision of the writer. The cellar occupies the entire space under the northernmost room of the building (excluding the later additions) and was an integral part of the original structure, with stone walls extending nearly 8 feet below grade level. The kitchen cellar was lighted by four window wells, two along the front wall and two along the back wall. Entrance to the cellar was undoubtedly from the north end of the building, but that feature is obscured by an 1829 addition to that end of the building.

Unfortunately, the type of roof structure on the original one and one-half story barracks has not been clearly established. It was probably a gabled structure flanked with three dormer windows. While there are several views of the "bombardment," only one, a watercolor painting, is apparently contemporary.⁸ Though the view centers about the naval action, Fort McHenry is depicted with several buildings within, none of which correspond with Building D. Another barracks which appears to be Building E, also a soldiers' barracks, is shown with a gable roof and three dormer windows. It is very likely that the roof of Building D was similar. In turn, these barracks were probably similar to the enlisted men's barracks at Fort Mifflin, located below Philadelphia on the Delaware River, built in 1798-1800 from plans by Major Louis Tousard, also a French artilleryist and military engineer. Those barracks display similar disposition of exterior architectural elements, i.e., one and one-half stories, three exterior doors, flanked by windows and three dormer windows lighting

⁸Anonymous watercolor painting of the Fort McHenry bombardment. Peale Museum, Baltimore. [H.A.R.P. map no. 336].

the attic space. Nor are the overall dimensions of the buildings too dissimilar, i.e., Building D, 22' by 91'; and Fort Mifflin 28' by 117'.⁹ The similarities suggest the possible existence of a "standard" barracks plan for the period ca. 1800.

The gable roof was probably shingled and the rafters rested upon a wood plate atop the brick walls at a point two feet above the attic floor line. The attic rooms under the gable roof were called "garrets," but apparently they were seldom occupied by soldiers because of the limited head room and poor ventilation.¹⁰

The 1819 "Plan and Profiles of Fort McHenry," drawn by William Tell Poussin, is the first known graphic document to show the fort with its post-war improvements.¹¹ This plan or map of the fort indicates an addition to the northwest end of Building D. Such an addition at that early date has not been identified as to function, but perhaps it was a rudimentary kitchen to replace the one in the cellar since it appears that the cellar was abandoned at an early date because of ground water. This extension, must have been of a temporary nature, since a permanent (brick) kitchen facility was added in 1829, to be discussed later.

⁹"Buildings of Fort Mifflin," measured drawings, ca. 1835. National Archives, Cartographic Section, drawer 47, sheet 10.

¹⁰Capt. F. Belton to Gen. Jesup, July 5, 1822. Belton described the officers quarters, which were similar to the soldiers barracks as "...containing three rooms, with garrets above, scarcely allowing one to stand upright in them." NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

Cf. Col. Jacob Hindman to Col. W. K. Armistead, March 17, 1819. "The Garret rooms can not be occupied in summer on account of the intense heat." NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

¹¹"Reconnoitring of Chesapeake Bay, STATE OF MARYLAND, Plan and Profiles of Fort McHenry, 1819." Drawn by William [Guillaume] Tell Poussin, Captain Topographical Engineers [H.A.R.P. map no. 4]. National Archives, Cartographic Section, drawer 51, sheet 2.

By 1823, the barracks roof required a replacement. One interesting piece of correspondence for that year renders a contemporary opinion regarding permanent roof coverings. A letter from Lieut. J. M. Porter, 6th Infantry, to the Secretary of War, expresses his views as follows:

I have long since been of [the] opinion that zinc roofs should never be put upon buildings, firstly from the cost & secondly because they corrode or give way in a few years. If the roof in question is very flat, it of course will have to be covered with a metallic roof. If...there is a sufficient pitch to carry off the water it should be covered with slate.¹²

Before this problem was solved, Lt. Henry W. Fitzhugh, Acting Assistant Quartermaster at the fort, brought another defect to the attention of the Quartermaster General. Fitzhugh's "examination" of the barracks at the fort revealed that the floors required some important repairs. "...the floors of all the buildings have sunk in consequence of the decay of the joists, and the floors in many places are literally [sic] worn out..."¹³

Repairs to the roof, though "only in a tolerable condition," was postponed in favor of the badly decayed and worn floors.

In the mid-1820's abandonment of Fort McHenry was considered because of its "decayed condition," its "unimportant situation," and

¹²Lt. J. M. Porter to Secretary of War, September 16, 1823. NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

¹³Lt. Henry W. Fitzhugh to the Quartermaster General, July 8, 1824. NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

its "unhealthy" environment.¹⁴ However, the fort was retained as a "second barrier," or as an accessory to the coastal defense system.

A major renovation program was necessary if the post was to continue as an effective military installation. To accommodate a larger garrison, the barracks obviously required enlargement and refurbishing, but the means of accomplishing this enlargement was not so certain. Several proposals were in the offing.

One proposal allowed for merely widening the barracks,¹⁵ The scheme was opposed on the premise that widening the barracks would only intensify the "unhealthy" living conditions at the fort,¹⁶ since the widened rooms would then be adjacent to the earthen slope below the terreplein. The argument was drawn as follows:

...the ill Health of the Garrison...occupying the Fort, proceeded not from the Position [of the fort] but from the construction of the Quarters. It is evident the close, confined Air, connected with Damp...generates the sickness, the prevention will be found in a free Circulation of Air thru [sic] the Buildings; this can easily be effected by raising the story...¹⁷

The argument against widening the barracks was sustained in favor of raising them to two stories, thus gaining better ventilation.

¹⁴Bernhard, Karl. Travels through North America during the years 1825 and 1826 (Philadelphia: 1828), 164. While Bernhard's comments represent personal rather than official opinion, he does allude to the intended construction of "new fortifications several miles farther off in the Chesapeake Bay," as a first line of defence to replace Fort McHenry. The subsequent erection of Fort Carroll in the Patapsco Harbor was intended to fulfill that function.

¹⁵Maj. T. Cross to Gen. Jesup, April 22, 1829. NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

¹⁶Every summer during the so-called "sickly season," the entire garrison at Fort McHenry was evacuated to the Baltimore hinterland in an attempt to escape the humid and confining atmosphere at the fort.

¹⁷Gen. J.R. Fenwick to Gen. Jesup, May 23, 1829. National Archives Records of the War Department, Record Group 92, Office of the Quartermaster General, Selected Pages from Registers of Letters Received, 1818-57.

In June of 1829, the brick walls of the barracks were examined for their structural ability to support the addition of a second story.¹⁸ This having been established in the affirmative, construction commenced and was rapidly pushed to completion. In anticipation of this change, an estimate of proposed repairs had been prepared in February 1829, and submitted to the Quartermaster General in Washington.¹⁹ This lengthy and detailed estimate is an important document for it reveals not only the intention to raise the building in height, but also contains information as to existing conditions. With respect to Building D, the estimate contemplated the removal of the existing roof, raising the building to two full stories with a shingled hip-roof, and the addition of a two story porch or "piazza" along the entire front of the barracks. The proposal also included a 14 foot addition at the northwest end of the building, to be used as a kitchen.

The "probable costs" for the alterations and additions to Building D totaled \$3102.76, but the final cost is not known. The chief carpenter employed for this work was Howell Downing, a Baltimore carpenter, hired at the rate of two dollars per day.²⁰ The work seems to have been completed in 1830.

¹⁸Maj. M.M. Payne to Gen. Jesup, June 1, 1829. NA RG92 RWD QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

¹⁹Lt. S. B. Dusenbury to General Jesup, February 24, 1829. NA RG92 RWD QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

²⁰Lt. S. B. Dusenbury to Gen. Jesup, August 4, 1829. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 92, Office of the Quartermaster General, Selected Letters received Relating to Fort McHenry, Maryland.

Cf. Capt. James W. Ripley to Col. Bomford, October 7, 1829. NA RWD RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915.

Cf. Matchett's Baltimore Director, 1833, 58, "Howell Downing, carpenter, 9 W Lexington St."

The earliest extant drawings of the newly enlarged barracks were drawn in November, 1834, by Lt. Thomas J. Lee, 4th Artillery, Acting Assistant Quartermaster at the fort.²¹ Lt. Lee's drawings are architecturally important for they are the first to show the buildings not only in elevation, but also with their interior room arrangement. The plans show door and window openings, fireplaces, stairways and porches. They also reveal the reason for the angular end, in plan, of the southeast end of the porch. Located between Buildings D and E was a large, bombproof brick vault over the water-well. The height of the vaulting was such that the porch ends of both buildings were built on an angle, in plan, to accommodate the nearby brick vault. Though the well is now gone, the porches retain the original and once functional angular ends.

Lt. Lee's drawing also shows the newly heightened brick barracks with hip-roof. This roof was subsequently altered to its present sloping or shed-roof, protected by raised, brick parapet walls. In a recent examination of the attic space in Building D, the writer observed the structural joist framing of the 1829 hip-roof still in place. When the hip-roof was replaced by the present shed-roof, the tapered joists were left in place, and the shed-roof rafters supported on newly raised brick parapet walls. The older hip-joists have tapered ends along the front and back walls. Along the side walls are short joists placed at 90 degrees to the others and supported at one end by brick beam pockets and at the other end by a mortise and pegged

²¹"Fort Mchenry, Drawn in obedience to a Circular from the Qr. Master Genls. Office, dated Nov. 13th, 1834, by Thos. J. Lee, Lt., 4th Arty. & Acting A.Q.M." [H.A.R.P. map no. 206]. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Map file.

joint to the first cross joist. The precise date for the change in roof shapes is not certain, but probably took place in 1837 when the roof was newly covered.²²

In 1833, the earthen and sodded slope behind the barracks was replaced by a stone revetment wall, a substitution which was intended to eliminate the water runoff into the barracks.²³ In addition to providing better drainage, the stone wall allowed for more circulation of air behind the buildings.

During the extensive improvements at the fort in the late 1830's, the barracks floors were removed. The cellar kitchen, apparently abandoned due to ground water, was filled with earth, and a new floor was to be laid upon scantling over a grouted brick

²²During the 1958 H.A.B.S. measuring project at Fort McHenry Mr. Orville W. Carroll, Architect, National Park Service, brought the existence of the hip-roof framing (hidden in the attic) to the writer's attention.

A front elevation of Building D, drawn in 1840, leaves no doubt that the roof change had taken place prior to that time. See "Plans and Elevations of the Soldiers Barracks at Fort McHenry," drawn from actual measurements by Lt. R. Butler, Engineers [May, 1840]. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 17. This is an important drawing for it shows window and shutter arrangements, fireplace dimensions, crosswall locations, etc.

²³Gen. Gratiot to Lt. Thompson, September 30, 1833. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Miscellaneous Letters Sent, Volumes 1-25, 1812-1872.

Cf. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 4. Undated drawing, contains plan, section, and estimate for stone revetment wall, also slope of existing earthen bank [H.A.R.P. map no. 20].

floor.²⁴ The date of the present first level brick floors is not known to the writer.

Though no major fire has ever been recorded inside the fort, the potential threat and the difficulty of saving such closely related barracks in such an event, caused enough concern to finally replace the shingle roofs with a zinc covering.²⁵ An estimate for the work was transmitted April 5, 1837, by Captain Henry A. Thompson, agent for the improvements of the late 1830's, to General Gratiot, Chief Engineer of the Army:

For covering the four [barracks] buildings at this Post with tin [sic] at \$475 each — \$1800.00²⁶

The estimate was approved the following day, and the work of re-roofing was undertaken immediately. Whether the hip-roof structure was replaced with a shed-roof at that time is not known.

While the other barracks within the fort suffered numerous alterations in the post-Civil War period, Building D underwent comparatively little change. When Fort McHenry was restored in the late

²⁴Lt. Thomas J. Lee to Gen. John Fenwick, January 7, 1836. NA RWD RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM. This document includes an estimate and suggestion for ramming earth into the cellars as a base for the new floor.

Cf. Lt. T. J. Lee to Gen. Jesup, April 12, 1836, complains of "...the impossibility of obtaining earth sufficiently dry to fill up the cellars." NA RWD RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

Cf. Capt. Thompson to Gen. Gratiot, March 14, 1837, noted that cellars were not yet completely filled. National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 77, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Letters Received, 1826-1837.

²⁵Agent Henry A. Thompson observed that the close proximity of the buildings would render it "...impossible to save them in case of a fire." He recommended slate as a substitute for the shingle roof, or if not slate, some other type of roof "impervious to fire."

²⁶Capt. Thompson to Gen. Gratiot, April 5, 1837. NA RG107, OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

1920's by the War Department under the direction of Colonel L. M. Lelsenring, Building D served as a model, since it alone retained its porches. While it was generally believed that the restoration represented the 1814 condition of the buildings, it actually approximates the 1829-30 period when the second stories and porches were added.

PART B. Architectural Information

A. General Statement. This building in its present appearance, is typical of permanent U. S. Army barracks for the period ca. 1830. As such it is much changed from its original appearance as built ca. 1800. Since its restoration in 1927-30 by the War Department (under the direction of Colonel L. M. Leisenring), it has been maintained as part of the historic group of structures within Fort McHenry, birthplace of the Star-Spangled Banner.

1. Architectural Character. The present restored appearance does not depict the original architectural character, but rather that of 1830, when the second story and piazza was added. The severity of the plain, brick wall surfaces is relieved only by the door and window openings. Except for the piazza with its supporting columns, the exterior is practically devoid of architectural embellishment.

2. Condition of Fabric. Good.

B. Exterior.

1. Overall dimensions. 22'-0" by 105'-3" (Originally 22'-0" by 91'-0").

2. Foundations. Random size quarry stone laid in lime mortar, extending about 3½ feet below grade, except at the northern end of the building where the foundation extends about 7½ feet below grade to accommodate a cellar kitchen, which was filled with earth about 1837.

3. Wall construction. Brick masonry throughout, Flemish bond in front; common bond on the rear and end walls, with headers at varying intervals.

4. Porches. Building originally had no porches. The existing two story piazza is apparently unchanged from the time of its installation in 1830. When the piazzas for the other buildings (within Fort McHenry) were reconstructed in 1930, this piazza served as the model. Turned wooden Doric columns are spaced at approximately 9'-6" centers, and rest upon dressed and tooled stone plinths. The second story columns are similar, but scaled down, except for the lower three feet which are square in cross-section. The roof of the piazza was originally shingled, but is now covered with sheet metal joined with stand-seams. The shingles are still in place under the metal roof. The gutter and downspouts are 1930 replacements.

5. Chimneys. Reconstructed, capped with sheet metal.

6. Openings. Openings are limited to doors and windows without any pediments, architraves, etc. Exterior lintels are flat, brick arches.

a. Doors, are all replacements, original design unknown. Door sills may be the original dressed, granite-like stones.

b. Windows and shutters, are all replacements. First floor windows are double hung, 15 panes over 10, and this arrangement follows the original design. The details, such as muntin and sash-bar sections, are 1930 in design and construction techniques. The slatted shutters are similar to the original shutters, but are replacements, including hinges and shutter stops (original design unknown). Second floor windows are arranged in a 12 over 8 design, as compared to the original 6 over 6 design for the double-hung sash.

7. Roof. Shed-type, surrounded by raised, brick parapet walls. Original building had a gable roof with dormer windows. When raised to two stories in 1829, a hip-roof was installed. The hip roof was replaced with the shed-roof about 1837. However, the hip-roof ceiling joists are still in place under the shed-roof. Present shed-roof is covered with sheet-metal joined with standing seams, installed in 1930. The side parapet walls step down to accommodate the change of level. A continuous brick corbel supports the rear parapet wall, the other parapet walls being flush with the main walls, and capped with projecting coping bricks moulded with 2 drip grooves.

C. Interiors.

1. Floor plans (1st floor). Plan of original building consists of three rooms, each measuring about 28'-6" long and 19'-8" wide. In 1829-30, a kitchen addition to the northwest end of the building created a fourth room 13'-3" by 19'-8". Access to each of the three original rooms is by a door centered along the front of each room. A window flanks each door making three doors and six windows along the front wall. There are three windows along the rear wall of each room. The 1829 addition in length does not have right angle outside corners, in plan, but rather they are cut off on 45 degree angles. This kitchen addition has one exterior door on the front wall, and a window in each of the angular corners.

(2nd floor) is similarly arranged into three rooms, with the same disposition of doors and windows except that there are 2 windows in the rear wall of each room. (cellar). The original barracks building was 22'-0" by 91'-0" in size, and the space under the northwest room of that building (excluding the 1829 addition) was occupied by a cellar kitchen. Entrance to the cellar was by an outside stairwell, centered along the original end wall. The cellar was lighted by four windows, two in front and two in rear. The cellar was filled in 1837, and its existence and location was discovered during the 1958 Architectural Explorations at Fort McHenry, but it was not excavated.

2. Stairways, are replacements, original details unknown, but they are located in their original position. There is one stairway in the middle room and one in the northernmost room; in each case they are situated at the juncture of the front wall and the crosswall, rising into the corner, and turning back 180 degrees to the second floor.

3. Flooring (1st floor). Brick, laid in a lengthwise pattern, laid in 1930. Original floors were wooden, type unknown. (2nd floor), a 1930 replacement of the original 5/4 white pine flooring. Present flooring is 5/4 random width, probably yellow pine.

4. Wall and ceiling finish, plaster over metal lath, installed 1930, throughout both floors. Originally, the walls were exposed brick, whitewashed, and the ceilings were exposed wooden joists.

5. Doorways and doors, 1930 replacements, original design unknown.

6. Trim, all dates from 1930, including door frames, window frames, baseboards, etc.

7. Hardware, dates from 1930, including double hung window mechanism, all hinges, and lock mechanisms. Lock sets are brass reproductions of an old design, but not necessary like those originally installed at Fort McHenry.

8. Lighting, all modern, original provision for lighting unknown.

9. Heating, presently by modern steam radiators. Fireplaces, one in each room, were restored in 1930, as were the cooking ranges and mantels. Each room contains a fireplace and chimney, located at the center of the crosswalls; two of the fireplaces being back to back. The first floor fireplace openings have no shelves or trim. The lintels are arched with header bricks, supported by iron bars with a rectangular cross-section. Second floor fireplaces are smaller in size and have flat arch brick lintels. The mantel shelf and pilaster boards are 1930 replacements, similar to those used on the 1829 fireplaces in this building.

D. Site. The building is located between the Officers' Quarters (Building C) and No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (Building E), on the opposite side of the parade ground from the sally port. The front of the building faces northeast. Brick paving surrounds the building and extends under the piazza. About eight feet behind the building is a granite revetment wall which runs parallel to the rear building wall. The stone revetment wall separates the courtyard level from the terreplein level of the ramparts.



Illustration No. 30

No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks (Building D). Facade and southeast end-wall. This was the only building which retained its ca. 1829 "piazza," when the fort was restored by the War Department in 1929-30. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 31

No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks (Building D). Rear wall and southeast end-wall. Brick patchwork on end wall indicates a nineteenth century (not original) window opening. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.



Illustration No. 32

No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks (Building D).
View of stairway in center room, first
floor, restored 1929-30 by the War
Department. Photographer: Jack E.
Boucher, October 1958.





Illustration No. 33

No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks (Building D). View of bricked-up cellar window, and altered brick light-well on front wall. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.




Illustration No. 34

No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks (Building D). View of bricked-up cellar window, brick light-well and stone foundation at rear wall. End of stone foundation (at left) denotes juncture of ca. 1829 addition to building. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.



REAR (SOUTHWEST) ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = ONE FOOT




FRONT (NORTHEAST) ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = ONE FOOT

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES
1000 UNIVERSITY DRIVE
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742


ORVILLE W. CARROLL, DEL. 1958

UNION BRANCH OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS	NAME OF STRUCTURE	PROJECT NO.	DATE
NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION	EXISTED AEN'S BARRACKS - BUILDING 2	AD-09	1958
1000 UNIVERSITY DRIVE COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND 20742	"FORT ACHERY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC SHRINE - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA - MARYLAND		
	HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY		
	SHEET 2 OF 2 SHEETS		



SECTION ELEVATION

SECTION ELEVATION




SECTION
SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

SECTION
SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



OFFICE OF ARCHITECTS 1000 ... WASHINGTON, D. C.	NAME OF STRUCTURE	SURVEY NO. ...
	HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY SHEET 2 OF 8 SHEETS



COL. NO. 1 FIRST FLOOR
 WOODEN COLUMNS FULL SIZE

COL. NO. 2 SECOND FLOOR
 WOODEN COLUMN FULL SIZE

SECTION OF HOUSE
 WOODEN COLUMN

SECTION A
 SECTION B
 SECTION C

FULL SCALE

FULL SCALE

FULL SCALE

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MICH.

DRAWN BY: [Name]










CHECKED BY: [Name]

SURVEY NO. HD-99

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

SHEET 6 OF 6 SHEETS

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR



SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"

UNION BUREAU OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING

NAME OF STRUCTURE

UNION BUREAU OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING

DATE

10-19-19

UNION BUREAU OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

UNION BUREAU OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING

CHAPTER VI

NO. 2 SOLDIERS' BARRACKS
(now known as Building E)

H.A.B.S. No. MD-200

CHAPTER VI. NO. 2 SOLDIERS' BARRACKS (Building E)

PART A. Historical Information

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (the earliest known precise designation), is one of two such buildings within Fort McHenry. It was built ca. 1800, but apparently was not finished in every detail until about 1802.

The plan of Fort McHenry dated November 9, 1803, is the earliest extant graphic document to show this soldiers' barracks building. Though the plan is drawn to a scale of toises, it is only necessary to reduce the building plans to feet by mathematical conversion.¹ The building is represented to be 22 feet wide (which conforms to its present width), and 88 feet long. Today the barracks occupies a length of 98'5" in plan. Unfortunately the 1803 plan does not show any interior room arrangements.

Chronologically, the next map of Fort McHenry is that drawn ca. 1806 by Captain John B. Walbach, for the U. S. Military Philosophical Society.² This map is quite similar to the 1803 map in

¹"Fort McHenry, 9th November, 1803" [H.A.R.P. map no. 1]. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 1. Authorship of this map is unknown. Toises, an old French and Swiss measure, is variously equivalent to 6 or 6.4 feet, 6 feet in this case. The plans were carefully measured on a rule divided into 64 parts per inch, each 64th being converted to a decimal fraction of a foot, thus making it possible to accurately interpret the dimensions of each building.

The writer acknowledges the assistance extended by Dr. S. Sydney Bradford and Franklin R. Mullaly, National Park Service Historians, during the architectural evaluation of the historical documents, which they collected and arranged for the Fort McHenry research library.

²"Plan of Fort McHenry by Capt. Walbach of the Artillery for the U. S. Mil: Philo: Soc: , No. 1" [H.A.R.P. map no. 2], ca. 1806. New York Historical Society, United States Military Philosophical Papers. See H.A.R.P. index card for reference to documents that establish the approximate date of this map; this plan is also drawn using a scale of toises. Walbach was earlier a Lt. in the Artillerists and Engineers.

most respects, but it seems to have been more accurately executed. This is borne out by checking the map against measurable features of Fort McHenry. The accuracy of the drawing is especially confirmable with respect to the buildings within the star fort. No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks, for example, scales 22 by 95 feet which is quite close to its present size 22' by 98'5". This is well within the tolerable limits of accuracy for such a map. Thus, it is fairly certain that the building has not been changed in length or width since its erection ca. 1800. In fact, it is likely that its ground plan remains as it was when built. Unfortunately, we cannot be so certain as to the appearance of the building above ground, and since the ca. 1806 map by Captain Waibach is the last representation of the fort prior to the bombardment, the appearance of the building at that time is equally uncertain. However, it is now possible to obtain a reasonably good picture as to the 1814 state of the building by on-the-site architectural exploration and by an architectural evaluation of historical documents pertaining to additions and alterations as follows:

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks, a one and one-half story enlisted men's barracks, was arranged into three rooms on the ground floor, and each measured about 18'8" wide and 31'8" long.³ Each room had

³Colonel Jacob Hindman to Colonel W. K. Armistead, Engineers, March 17, 1815. "The present quarters...are...of one story only with three small rooms on one range & two in the second [range]." National Archives, Record Group 107, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Selected Correspondence Relating to Fort McHenry, Maryland, 1811-37. Cited hereafter as NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

a fireplace, with two of them back to back. The floor to ceiling heights on the ground floor were slightly over eight feet. The exterior brick walls averaged 14 inches in thickness and extended above the ceiling joists for a height of two feet. There was a cellar (probably used as a kitchen) under the easternmost room, though it appears to have been abandoned at an early date because of ground water problems. The cellar was filled with earth ca. 1837. 1958 archeological work (MISSION 66), under the direction of G. Hubert Smith, revealed an exterior brick-lined stairwell centered along the eastern end wall. Four cellar windows, with brick-lined light wells, provided the cellar with daylight. Those windows were removed and bricked up when the cellar was filled, that is, ca. 1837. A cellar fireplace was excavated by the writer during the 1958 architectural series of explorations. This fireplace is located under the existing ground floor fireplace, is of the same general design, with a brick hearth, and contains the accommodating hardware for cooking cranes.

As to the roof structure for this one and one-half story barracks, it was probably very similar to the soldiers' barracks at Fort Mifflin, located below Philadelphia and built coeval with Fort McHenry, that is, 1798-1800. The barracks at that place are similar, not only in plan, but in the general disposition of such architectural features as doors, windows, etc. It is very possible that a "standard" plan existed for barracks of that period.

Unfortunately, there are very few reliable views of Fort McHenry for the all important 1814 period. Of the many "bombardment" scenes, only one, a watercolor painting, has been evaluated as a contemporary and accurate portrayal of the September 13-14, 1814

British bombardment.⁴ One of the buildings depicted in that painting, corresponds by its position to No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks, and was represented as having a gable roof with dormer windows. As a result of the October, 1958, architectural investigation behind the plaster of the easternmost, second story plastered end wall, the outline of the original gable roof is discernible from the filled-in two story addition of 1829. The original roof was probably shingled.

The height of the main brick walls, as mentioned previously, extended above the ceiling joists two feet. This fact was determined in September 1958, when the writer opened the plastered side-walls just above the second floor line and revealed the top of the old brick walls. When the building was later raised to two stories, an eight inch brick wall was added to the existing walls and this juncture is now evident. The identification of this architectural detail is further corroborated by an 1829 inspection report of the structure.⁵

The original gable roof enclosed a space frequently referred to as "garrets," though these attic rooms were never adequate for occupancy, due to their limited head room.⁶ Apparently, the building

⁴Anonymous watercolor painting of the Fort McHenry bombardment H.A.R.P. map no. 336. Peale Museum, Baltimore.

⁵Maj. M. M. Payne to Gen. Jesup, June 1, 1829. "The present walls of the buildings are fourteen inches thick, and they run up two feet above the upper floor, consequently [sic] a wall nine inches thick and seven feet high would give the upper rooms a sufficient pitch to render them airy [sic] and comfortable." National Archives, Records of the War Department, Record Group 92, Office of the Quartermaster General, Consolidated Correspondence File, 1794-1915, Fort McHenry. Cited hereafter as NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

⁶Col. Jacob Hindman to Col. W. K. Armistead, March 17, 1819. "The Garret rooms can not be occupied in summer on account of the intense heat." NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

Cf. Capt. F. Belton to Gen. Jesup, July 5, 1822. Belton described the officers' quarters, which were similar to the soldier's barracks, as "...containing three rooms, with garrets above, scarcely allowing one to stand upright in them." NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37.

did not have a full length porch or "piazza."

The 1819 "Plan and Profiles of Fort McHenry," drawn by William Tell Poussin of the Topographical Engineers, is the first plan to show the fort in its improved condition.⁷ No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks is shown (by a scale plan) as being 22 by 127 feet, but the apparent increased length is misleading, since the addition is not really a part of Building E, but rather a guard house which nearly abutted the west end of the barracks, with only passage room between the two buildings. The guard house was never actually attached, and the structure was later removed.

By 1823, the barracks roof needed repairs. An interesting letter from Lt. J. M. Porter, 6th Infantry, to the Secretary of War, "In relation to the repairs to roofs of Quarters &c at Fort McHenry," attempted to discuss the relative merits of zinc and slate roofs as follows:

I have long since been [of] [the] opinion that zinc roofs should never be put upon buildings, firstly from the cost & secondly because they corrode or give way in a few years. If the roof in question is very flat, it of course will have to be covered with a metallic roof. If...there is sufficient pitch to carry off the water it should be covered with slate...⁸

However, other defects, such as decayed floor joists and worn floors, commanded more immediate attention; and repair of the roofs, though

⁷"Reconnoitring of Chesapeake Bay, STATE OF MARYLAND, Plan and Profiles of Fort McHenry, 1819." Drawn by William Tell Poussin, Captain, Topographical Engineers [H.A.R.P. map no. 4]. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 2.

⁸Lt. J. M. Porter to Secretary of War, September 16, 1823. NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

"only in a tolerable condition," was postponed.⁹ By the late 1820's, the barracks at Fort McHenry had been so neglected that a major renovation program was necessary if the post were to continue even as a secondary installation in the coastal defensive system.

Enlargement and refurbishing of the buildings was mandatory to handle a larger garrison. On February 24, 1829, a comprehensive estimate of "proposed repairs" was transmitted to General Thomas S. Jesup, Quartermaster General, in Washington.¹⁰ This detailed document is particularly important for it contains clues not only to new work, but to existing conditions. With respect to No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (first designated as such in this document), the estimate contemplated removal of the existing roof, raising the building to two full stories, capping the structure with a shingled hip-roof, and adding a two story porch or "piazza" along the entire front of the building.

The estimated costs for these alterations totaled \$2590.45. The estimates for this major architectural change reveal not only quantities, but quality, unit prices and labor costs. An addendum to the specifications denotes where qualitative substitutions may take place. Where the estimate calls for the "best Suffolk shingles," for example, at \$14/M, the addendum allows "bundle shingles," at \$3 to \$5/M.

⁹Lt. Henry W. Fitzhugh to the Quartermaster General, July 8, 1824. NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

¹⁰Lt. S. B. Dusenbury to Gen. Thomas S. Jesup, February 24, 1829. NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

Before this work was executed, other proposals were in the offing. One such scheme provided for merely widening the existing barracks, instead of raising them to two stories.¹¹ This was an attempt to reduce the contemplated expenditure. However, this idea was attacked on the premise that widening the building would only increase the health problems at the fort, since the barracks rooms would then be adjacent to the damp earthen slopes below the terre-plein. A chronic problem at Fort McHenry during the summer months was the so-called "sickly season." Every July or August, the entire garrison was evacuated to a summer bivouac in the Baltimore hinterlands. The argument was pressed as follows:

...the ill Health of the Garrison...occupying the Fort, proceeded not from the Position [of the fort], but from the construction of the Quarters. It is evident the close, confined Air, connected with Damp...generates the sickness, the prevention will be found in a free Circulation of Air thru [sic] the Buildings; this can easily be effected by raising the story...¹²

The argument against encroachment upon the ramparts was sustained; and the brick walls of the barracks were examined in June of 1829, for their structural ability to support the addition of another story. This having been established in the affirmative, construction commenced and was rapidly pushed to completion. The Chief Carpenter employed for the second story additions (all the barracks buildings were raised to two stories) was one Howell Downing,

¹¹Maj. T. Cross to Gen. Jesup, April 22, 1829. NA RG92 QMG, CCF 1794-1915 FM.

¹²Gen. J. R. Fenwick to Gen. Jesup, May 23, 1829. National Archives, Record Group 92, Records of the War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General, Selected Pages from Registers of Letters Received, 1818-57.

hired out of Baltimore at two dollars per day.¹³ The work seems to have been completed early in 1830.

The oldest extant plan of the newly enlarged barracks buildings was drawn in November, 1834, by Lt. Thomas J. Lee, 4th Artillery and Acting Assistant Quartermaster. Lt. Lee's drawings are architecturally important since they are the earliest plans to show the interior room arrangement of all the buildings.¹⁴ These plans indicate door and window openings, fireplaces, stairways, and porches. They explain, for instance, that the west end of the porch on Building E had to be built on an angle to accommodate the nearby bombproof well structure. The well, with its protective brick vault, is now gone, but the porch, in plan, retains its angular end.

Lt. Lee's drawing also depicted the barracks building with a hip-roof. Today, the barracks has a sloping or shed roof protected by raised brick parapet walls. In a recent examination of the attic space of Building E, the writer observed the structural joist framing of the 1829 hip-roof, still in place.¹⁵ When the hip-roof was replaced by the present shed-roof, the tapered joists were left in place, and the shed roof rafters supported on raised brick parapet

¹³Lt. S. B. Dusenbury to Gen. T. S. Jesup, August 4, 1829. National Archives, Record Group 92, Records of the War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General, Selected Letters Received Relating to Fort McHenry, Maryland.

Cf. Capt. James W. Ripley to Col. Bomford, October 7, 1829. NA RG92 RWD QMG CCF 1794-1915.

Cf. Matchett's Baltimore Director, 1833, 58, "Howell Downing, carpenter, 9 W. Lexington St."

¹⁴"Fort McHenry, Drawn in obedience to a Circular from the Qr. Master Genls. Office, dated Nov. 13th, 1834, by Thos. J. Lee, Lt. 4th Arty. & Acting A.Q.M." [H.A.R.P. map no. 206]. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Map File.

¹⁵During the 1958 H. A. B. S. measuring project at Fort McHenry, Mr. Orville W. Carroll, Architect, National Park Service, brought the existence of this detail to the writer's attention.

walls. The older hip-joists have tapered ends along the front and back walls. Along the side walls are short joists placed at 90 degrees to the others and supported on one end by brick beam pockets and on the other by a mortise and tenon doveled joint to the first cross joist. The writer has not yet learned when the shingled hip-roof was replaced by the metal covered shed roof, but it was probably in 1837, when the roof was newly covered.

In 1833, the earthen and sodded slope behind the barracks was replaced by a stone revetment wall.¹⁶ Substitution of the stone wall for the grassy slope practically eliminated the water runoff into the barracks. It also allowed for better circulation of air behind the buildings.

During the extensive construction period of the late 1830's at Fort McHenry, the barracks floor and roof was renewed. The kitchen cellar was filled with earth, and a new floor was to be laid upon scantling.¹⁷ The date of the present first level brick

¹⁶Gen. Gratiot to Lt. Thompson, September 30, 1833. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Miscellaneous Letters Sent, Volumes 1-25, 1812-1872.

Cf. Undated Drawing, contains plan, section, and estimate for stone revetment wall, also slope of existing earthen bank [H.A.R.P. map no. 20]. National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 4.

¹⁷Lt. Thomas J. Lee to Gen. John Fenwick, January 7, 1836. NA RG92 RWD QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM. This includes an estimate and a suggestion for ramming earth into the cellars as a base for the new floor.

Cf. Lt. T. J. Lee to Gen. Jesup, April 12, 1836, complains of "...the impossibility of obtaining earth sufficiently dry to fill up the cellars." NA RG92 QMG CCF 1794-1915 FM.

Cf. Capt. Thompson to Gen. Gratiot, March 14, 1837, notes that cellars were not yet completely filled. National Archives, Record Group 77, Records of the War Department, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Letters Received, 1826-1837.

floors is not known to the writer.

Surprising enough, no major fire has ever been recorded among the barracks buildings, but the potential threat of fire, caused the shingle roofs to be replaced with new zinc roofs.¹⁸ An estimate for doing this work was transmitted April 5, 1837, by Captain Henry A. Thompson, agent for the improvements of the late 1830's, to General Gratiot, Chief Engineer of the Army:

For covering the four [barracks] buildings at this Post with tin at \$475 each - \$1800.00.¹⁹

The estimate was approved the following day, and work was undertaken immediately. In May 1840, following completion of the renovation program, the soldiers' barracks were merely described as being in "excellent condition."

Much later, prior to World War I, the two-story porch was removed from Building E, window and door openings were altered, and Victorian window and door lintels were applied, apparently in an attempt to update the building.

When Fort McHenry was "restored" by the War Department in the late 1920's, under the earnest direction of Colonel L. M. Leisenring, No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks (Building D), served as a

¹⁸Ibid., Thompson observed that the close proximity of the buildings would render it "...impossible to save them in case of fire." He recommended slate as a substitute for the shingle roof, or if not slate, some other type of roof "impervious to fire."

¹⁹Capt. Thompson to Gen. Gratiot, April 5, 1837. NA RG107 OCE SC FT-MC 1811-37. An 1840 drawing of the barracks also shows the brick parapet walls, indicating that the roof structure had been changed in 1837 from a hip-type to a shed-roof, its present form. See Plans and Elevations of the Soldier's Barracks at Fort McHenry, drawn from actual measurements by Lt. R. Butler, [1840], National Archives, Cartographic Section, Record Group 77, drawer 51, sheet 17.

model, since it alone retained its porches. While it was generally believed that the restoration represented the 1814 condition of the buildings, it actually approximates the 1829 period when the upper stories and porches were added. With the documentary material made available by the recent Historical and Archeological Research Program at Fort McHenry, it is now evident that the "restored" buildings substantially represent the 1814 period in ground plan only. Everything from a point two feet above the second floor line, including porches, represents an architectural additive process, the biggest change occurring in 1829.

PART B. Architectural Information

A. General Statement. Present appearance of this building depicts a typical permanent U. S. Army barracks of the period ca. 1830. It is much changed from its original condition as built ca. 1800. It was restored in 1927-30 by the War Department, under the direction of Colonel L. M. Leisenring, and has been maintained as part of a historic group of structures.

1. Architectural Character. The present restored appearance does not portray the original architectural character, but rather the building as it looked in 1830, after the second story and full length piazza was added. Although many of the exterior and interior details are restored, the first floor structure is original, and the ground floor room arrangement is substantially unchanged. Entire building is very plain, and except for the porch, devoid of any architectural refinements. The severity of the brick wall surfaces is broken only by the simple unframed openings for doors and windows.

B. Exterior.

1. Overall dimensions. 22'-0" by 98'-5".

2. Foundations. Random quarry stone foundation walls, which extend about three feet below grade, except at easternmost end of building, where stone walls extend nearly eight feet below grade to accommodate a cellar kitchen that was filled with earth about 1837.

3. Wall Construction. Brick masonry, throughout, common bond with headers every sixth course.

4. Porches. Building originally had no porches. The present piazza is a reconstruction of the 1830 piazza, which had been removed sometime before World War I. Restored piazza is of wooden construction, supported at 9'-4" intervals by turned, freely interpreted Doric columns resting on dressed and tooled stone plinths. Second story piazza is supported at same spacing by smaller turned columns except that lower three feet of column is square in section. Reconstructed piazza follows its predecessor in general disposition but the details such as mouldings on columns, railing, etc., do not closely conform to those on No. 1. Soldiers' Barracks (Building D), which retains its original 1830 piazza. The roof of the second story piazza is a shed-roof. The rafters are supported on one end by the wooden columns and on the other end by beam pockets in the brick wall. Roof was originally shingled, but is now covered with sheet metal joined with standing seams. Porch roof, gutter and downspouts also are replacements dating from 1930. The eastern end of the porch is cut off on an angle, in plan, and was originally built thus to make room for the nearby bombproof well, now gone. When the porch was reconstructed in 1930, the angular end design was retained.

5. Chimneys. Reconstructed, presently capped with sheet metal.

6. Openings. All openings are unframed without any architraves, pediments, etc. All exterior lintels are flat arches of brick.

a. Doors. Are all replacements, original design unknown. Millwork details are all 1930 as to design and construction. Door sills are probably original, being of a dressed, granite-like stone.

b. Windows and shutters. Are all replacements. First floor windows are double hung, and similar to the original windows, that is 15 over 10, with respect to the arrangement of panes. Second story windows, also double hung, are arranged 12 over 8, instead of the 6 over 6 arrangement of the windows as built in 1830. All details such as muntins, sash bars, etc., are modern as to design and construction. All shutters and shutter stops are replacements, original design unknown.

7. Roof. Sloping, shed-type, covered with sheet metal, joined with standing seams. Present covering was applied in 1930. Original roof was lower, gabled with dormer windows. In 1829-30, when the building was raised to two stories, a hip-roof was constructed, which was replaced with a shed-roof about 1837. Underneath the present shed-roof, the hip-roof ceiling joists are still in place. Surrounding the shed-roof are raised, brick parapet walls, which step down on the ends to accommodate the change of height between the front and rear parapet walls. Parapet walls are capped with projecting coping bricks, moulded with two drip grooves. All gutters and downspouts date from 1930, original design unknown.

C. Interiors.

1. Floor Plans (1st floor). Plan is similar to original as built ca. 1800, that is, three rooms, each measuring about 19'-8" deep and 31'-8" long. Brick crosswalls had been removed, but were reconstructed by the War Department to their original location. Access to each room is by an exterior door centered along the front of each room. A window flanks each door so that there are three doors and six windows along the front wall. There are two windows in the rear wall of each room, except the easternmost room, which has three. (2nd floor) is similarly arranged into three rooms, corresponding in size to the rooms below. Three exterior doors, located over those below, open into the second floor piazza. Window locations correspond to those below, except the easternmost room which has two windows in the rear wall. (cellar) Located under the easternmost room of the 1st floor is a cellar room built as an original part of the building, ca. 1800. The cellar room, probably a kitchen, was entered from an exterior cellar stairwell, centered along the end wall. There were four windows which daylighted the room, two in front and two in back, all of them located below the first floor windows. The brick walls above the cellar windows are supported by flat arch brick lintels. The cellar windows were protected by brick light wells. About 1837, the cellar was filled with earth, the windows removed and the openings bricked up, and the brick light wells destroyed.

2. Stairways, as they exist are replacements. They occupy the location as shown in the Lt. Thomas J. Lee plan of 1834. No earlier arrangement has been discovered. There are three stairs, one in each room, and each occupies the corner created by the meeting of the front wall and the crosswall.

3. Flooring (1st floor). Brick, laid in a herringbone pattern, installed 1930. Original floors were floored with wood, type unknown. (2nd floor) Original floor as installed in 1829-30 was 5/4 white pine flooring, but the present floor is a 1930 replacement of 5/4 pine, 5 1/2" wide. (cellar) Remnants of a brick floor remain, one course thick, laid without mortar.

4. Wall and ceiling finish. (1st floor) Whitewashed brick walls, exposed second floor joists above. (2nd floor) Plaster over metal lath on walls and ceiling, applied 1930.

5. Trim, all dates from 1930, including door frames, window frames, baseboards, fireplace mantels, etc.

6. Hardware, all installed 1930, original designs unknown. Lock sets are brass reproductions, but not necessarily like original lock sets.

7. Lighting, electric, installed in 1930 and later.

8. Heating, modern steam radiators. Originally, heat was furnished by fireplace, one in each room. Fireplaces, and chimneys, restored in 1930, are located at the center of the crosswalls, two of the fireplaces being back to back. First floor fireplaces have no shelves or mantel pieces, openings are arched with header bricks, supported by iron lintel bars, rectangular in cross section. The cellar fireplace is similar to those on first floor, except that it is whitewashed. Second floor fireplaces are smaller, with flat arch brick lintels. The mantel shelf and pilaster boards are 1930 replacements, similar in design to those shown on the 1834 drawing by Lt. Thomas J. Lee.

D. Site. This building is located between No. 1 Soldiers' Barracks and the Guard Rooms, on the parade ground. The front of the building faces northwest. About eight feet behind the building, and parallel with it, is a stone revetment wall which serves to separate the upper terreplein level from the parade ground level.



Illustration No. 35

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (Building E). Facade and southwest end-wall. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 36

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (Building E). Rear wall and southwest end wall. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.




Illustration No. 37

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (Building E). Second floor level of "piazza," reconstructed in 1929-30 by the War Department, using Building D as a prototype. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, July 1958.




Illustration No. 38

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (Building E). Partial excavation of cellar fireplace under northeast room, first floor. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.






Illustration No. 39

No. 2 Soldiers' Barracks (Building E). View of bricked-up cellar window and remnant of brick light-well under rear wall of northeast room. Photographer: Jack E. Boucher, October 1958.



SECOND FLOOR PLAN
Scale 1/8" = 1'-0"



FIRST FLOOR PLAN Scale 1/8" = 1'-0"

GEORGE W. MENN, JR. - ARCHITECT


PREPARED FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ARCHIVES
400 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720-5080


NAME OF STRUCTURE
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
SARGENT'S BUILDING
1000 G STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540

DRAWN BY
NO. 100

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
SHEET NO. 100



REAR (SOUTHEAST) ELEVATION
SCALE 1/8" = ONE FOOT




FRONT (NORTHERN) ELEVATION
SCALE 1/8" = ONE FOOT




GEORGE L. VERNER, INC. - BALTIMORE, MARYLAND



DRAWING NO. ND-7201	HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY SHEET 2 OF 8
NAME OF STRUCTURE THURSTON MEN'S BARBERS BUILDING ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTING FIRM INC. - BALTIMORE, MARYLAND	
UNITED STATES NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY - BALTIMORE, MARYLAND	



SOUTH ELEVATION
SCALE 1/8" = ONE FOOT



NORTH ELEVATION
SCALE 1/8" = ONE FOOT



SECTION A-A
SCALE 1/4" = ONE FOOT




JOSEPH L. WRIGHT, ARCHT. & ENGR. 1940


UNDER DIRECTION OF UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

FORT MARY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS
BARRACKS - BUILDING 2
BALTIMORE COUNTY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

HISTORIC AMERICAN
BUILDINGS SURVEY
SHEET 5 OF 5 SHEETS



FOUNDATION PLAN SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




CELLAR FIREPROOF SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

20754, G. DARR II - DEL. 1950


UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM ARCHITECTURAL RECORDS

FORT MCHENRY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC SITE - BALTIMORE COUNTY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND


HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY sheet 4 of 6 sheets



BALUSTRADE DETAIL
FULL SCALE




SECOND FLOOR PORCH COLUMN
FULL SCALE



FIRST FLOOR PORCH COLUMN
FULL SCALE


ARCHITECT: L. W. BISHOP, JR. - MEMPHIS, TENN.
 DRAWING NO.: 100-200
 PROJECT: NATIONAL MONUMENTS AND HISTORIC SITES - BALDWIN COUNTY, GEORGIA - PARTRIDGE
 NAME OF STRUCTURE: UNKLETON AND PARTRIDGE BUILDING
 HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY - SHEET 9 OF 5 SHEETS

FEDERAL BUREAU OF SURVEYING
 DIVISION OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
 WASHINGTON, D. C.



TYPICAL DOOR SILL AND HEAD
FULL SCALE

TOTAL: 1000 AND 1000 SILL FOR FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR DOORS.
 NOTE: FIRST FLOOR DOORS ARE 20" WIDE EXCEPT BY 1/2" IN ALL OTHER INSTANCES. SECOND FLOOR DOORS ARE 20" WIDE EXCEPT BY 1/2" IN ALL OTHER INSTANCES. ALSO, 1/2" OF THE SECOND FLOOR DOORS.



GEORGE L. WATSON & BENJAMIN B. BARRIS • DEPT. OF ARCHT. • 1928

