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Chapter One: Introduction

Defining the Type

The goal of this research is to describe the architectural character and social status of a house form that was likely imported from England and became extremely common in Bucks County in the latter part of the 18th century and into the middle of the 19th century. The subject house type seems to represent a house that was very popular amongst the middle class. The basic house type can be defined as a one-room deep, two-story, gable end, two room plan house. There are variations and sub-types within this type, but I have chosen to focus on the house with a single hall/kitchen entrance and cross-passage because of its predominance in the landscape. Due to the large numbers of this house type, extant in the landscape, a great deal can be learned about the history of the area through the study of the distribution and variations of this cultural artifact.

One of the sub-types that could have been included in a more expansive study on this type is the two-room wide, single room deep plan with a single front entrance into a separate, usually central stair corridor, as opposed to a single entrance directly into the kitchen or hall (hall/kitchen). The other sub-type that is very common is the one-room deep, hall/kitchen and parlor type with separate front entrances into each of these two rooms, which appears as the pattern of window, door, door, window (W D D W) across

---

1 The term “hall” is an English term that is used to describe “the principal ground floor living-room that is open to the roof.” R. W. Brunskill, Illustrated Handbook of Vernacular Architecture (London: Faber and Faber, 1971): 102. It is commonly used in the study of American vernacular architecture to describe the kitchen or common living space of a house, which is not open to the roof. The modern use of the term typically describes a passage or corridor within the house off of which are entrances to private spaces. As a way of recognizing the historic term and the commonly recognized modern term for this room, as well as preventing confusion throughout the paper I will refer to it as the hall/kitchen. This will additionally prevent confusion with the modern use of the term hall to describe corridor.
the first floor front facade. There are also examples in which the first floor front facade presents a pattern of two windows, then a door and then a window across the front, or W W D W. This is similar to the double entrance type, but in the place of the parlor entrance is a window. On a few examples of this house type there is very clear evidence that a door was filled in. On others, however, the evidence is not so clear and it would seem that this is an original configuration.

Despite the obvious relationship between these sub-types, I have chosen to concentrate on just one sub-type, which will hereafter be referred to as a type or the subject type. This type consists of two rooms side by side on the first floor with, typically, a series of three rooms on the second floor. Even within this single type there is great variety in the placement of doors, windows, fireplaces, stairs and other architectural features. In a majority of the houses that were surveyed for this research, the first floor partition, dividing the two rooms has been removed, creating a single large room on the first floor. This was done because central heating made it unnecessary to heat just one room. The common practice of building additions onto these houses, which often moved the hall/kitchen or work-space out of the central part of the house, also made it unnecessary to separate these two spaces. Additionally, in later years the small rooms created by the first floor partition became unfashionable. In most cases there is some evidence of where this partition had been. Most of the second floor partitions in the surveyed houses have also been altered to one degree or another.

Access to the first floor of this house type is gained through a door located along the front facade of the house. Prior to the removal of the first floor partition, this door
typically opened into the hall/kitchen or principal living area. From this room there was access through a door to the parlor, which was the other room on the first floor. The front and rear doors were often not centered along the front and rear façades of the house. In order to allow for appropriately sized rooms, the first floor partition had to be located in a position that prevented the front door from being centered along this wall. The two rooms on the first floor either may be of similar dimensions or the hall/kitchen may be larger, but the prominent cooking fireplace, which is significantly larger than the parlor fireplace located in the other room, makes it clear which is the hall/kitchen and which is the parlor. Access to the second floor was commonly gained via a boxed-winder stair, typically, though not always located in the corner of the main room (Fig. 1).

Figure 1. Wustholz Residence, Penns Park, Wrightstown Township.
Though many second floor room arrangements had been significantly altered and some were not accessible, there does appear to exist a typical arrangement of second floor rooms (Fig. 2). This consists of a small room that is entered from the stair in the corner of the building. This room is rectangular and, in all but one case, the long dimension is parallel to the long dimension of the house. Next to this room, either to the front or rear of the house is another room that is the same length but generally a little deeper. The rest of the second floor was taken up with a chamber above the parlor at the other gable end of the house. There is usually a small fireplace within this chamber, along the gable end.

This one-room deep, two-room wide house type commonly stands as a separate cell that is sometimes a part of a larger house. On first glance it seemed that these small

---

2 The floor plans presented in this paper are all oriented so that the front façade is at the bottom.
houses were expanded as the needs and means of the family grew. After further research and upon further examination of the houses, it became increasingly evident that what first appeared to be an addition was in fact an earlier structure onto which the subject type had been added, representing a separate masonry cell.\(^3\) In a number of the houses there is still a question as to the construction chronology of the house. In most cases the house was expanded by extending its longest dimensions, resulting in a telescoping form. In the examples, which contain a very distinct hall/kitchen and parlor, the addition was always on the end of the hall/kitchen, or main living area. Additions to the rear of these houses tend to be later 20\(^{th}\) century additions, which could be added without consideration being given to natural heat and light sources.

Except for some of the houses located in Washington Crossing State Historic Park, only one house was not expanded in some fashion on one of the gable ends. The Mathews Residence (p. 73) has not been expanded in this manner and the only addition is an enclosed porch addition on the rear facade. One of the major questions in the examination of the growth of these houses has been the manner in which communication with a gable end addition was accomplished. It has been difficult to determine whether existing doors or windows were adapted to allow for access to gable end additions.

\(^3\) Throughout this paper I will often refer to the “cells” of the houses. A “cell” refers to a masonry section of the house representing a single construction phase.
The “I-house” Problem

This research represents the study of a house type that has come to be known or defined as an “I-house” type. I first encountered the term “I-house” in a brief article in Old House Journal, which described a certain type of stone house located in Wabaunsee County, Kansas. The article described the “I-house” as “a pre-railroad folk form”, which is “two rooms deep and one room wide that were built nationally, usually of wood.” In fact, the author was describing a building that is two rooms wide and one room deep, but there was no discussion of the reason these houses were being described as “I-houses.” A survey of the literature finds it to be a relatively common term. However, the name that was being used to define this house type is not at all descriptive of the house.

There is some question as to the origin of this term. Fred Kniffen used this term to describe a certain house form that was commonly found in the mid-western states of Iowa, Indiana and Illinois—three states that begin with the letter ‘I’. Vernacular historians used it to describe a narrow two-story house of two or more rooms, on the first floor, arranged in a row, under a single roof. One of the problems with the term is that its origins are very uncertain and so it is currently used with considerable uncertainty in describing a wide range of houses. Additionally, it is impossible to justify the use of the term in describing houses that can be found in many states that do not begin with the letter ‘I’.

---

5 Comment by Professor Robert Blair St. George referring to conversation with Fred Kniffen in which the origin of the term is discussed and it is determined to be based on the location of houses in Iowa, Illinois and Indiana.
Kniffen’s use of the term spread so that it began to be used to describe any houses that are one room deep and two rooms wide. The idea was that the footprint of this house form, being wide and shallow, or long and narrow, somehow resembled an uppercase “I”, or that the gable end of this type of house, being tall and narrow, might resemble an uppercase “I”. In his article “Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion,” Kniffen uses the term to define a frame house found in Alabama, a stone house in central Kentucky, and a log house in Arkansas. This contradicts the above definition, which bases the I-house term on their frequency in the mid-western states that begin with the letter “I”. The common characteristics of these houses are two stories, one room deep and at least two rooms wide with gables located to the side. Kniffen acknowledged that beyond these consistent characteristics the houses varied greatly. They were built in a large variety of materials, possessed various porches and appendages and were finished in different styles. The other mechanism by which Kniffen grouped these different houses together as a type was through geographical and cultural diffusion. In conducting the research for this thesis it will be apparent that there can indeed be great variety within a single building type, but it is also clear that Kniffen’s examples of “I-houses” do represent a type. The problem, however, arises when such a non-descriptive term is used in identifying such a broadly defined house type.

Henry Glassie used “I-house” in “Eighteenth-Century Cultural Process in Delaware Valley Folk Building”, demonstrating that it has become a commonly used

---

term, to describe a vernacular house type that is widespread in his study area. By including a Pennsylvania house, the term further removed it from its original meanings, which were questionable to begin with, and had little use in describing the cultural place and function of the type. More useful is Glassie’s methodology. Instead of relying on exterior form alone, Glassie links the exterior to the floor plans and façade openings of the house. Glassie states that “The form, primly symmetrical, was employed in America as early as 1700 and was accepted for the home of the affluent gentlemen the length of the Atlantic seaboard for the last three quarters of the eighteenth century, although its impact was not was not great until after the publication of handbooks advocating the Georgian style in the 1740s and 1750s.” It is clear that this plan survived changes in style that the type underwent with the increased influence of the Georgian form. This is illustrated in the subject houses that were examined, however the use of Georgian symmetry does not appear widespread in the subject houses until much later. Despite the author’s use of buildings as cultural markers, Glassie wrote little about the function and cultural place of the houses. In order to more fully understand this very dominant house type, important questions need to be addressed, such as: Who lived in the houses? What is the typical arrangement and function of the rooms? Where and when were the houses built? How were they oriented in their landscape?

In the early stages of choosing a research topic, I had planned on investigating houses in the Delaware Valley that fit in to Henry Glassie’s categories of one-third, two-third or full-Georgian plans. In conducting a general survey for this research however,

---

8 Glassie, p. 400.
9 Ibid., p. 400.
10 Glassie, p. 401-403.
it became very apparent that the one-room deep, two-story, gable end hall/kitchen and parlor house is the dominant house form in the study area. Once I became aware of the frequency of these houses, I began to see how common they are. They appear everywhere, in large towns, small hamlets and rural areas. It seemed that more could be learned from this far more prevalent house type. In addition, because the house form is very consistent, the features, which define the house, (one-room deep, two-story, gable end, two-room plan) should be used to define the type. I propose to substitute “one-room deep, two-room plan”, rather than the vague “I-house”, which only describes the shape of the footprint of the house, or possibly the gable end.

In conducting this research there is much to be learned beyond the four walls of these houses. One of the goals behind the study of the cultural artifact or the vernacular building type, is to learn about the cultural meaning of the place in which an object or house can be found. To study a greater wealth of objects (the more dominant house type) will result in a more extensive knowledge of an area.

**Defining Vernacular**

Among the questions that must be asked about “common” buildings is whether they should be considered a vernacular type. Recently the term vernacular has become a very loaded term, which requires some investigation before it can be used to describe any house type. In *English Vernacular Houses: A Study of Traditional Farmhouses and Cottages*, Eric Mercer describes vernacular buildings as follows: “…vernacular buildings are those which belong to a type that is common in a given area at a given time… no building is or is not vernacular for its own qualities but is so by virtue of those
which it shares with many others."\textsuperscript{11} Because the subject house type is very common throughout the area of study and shares patterns and characteristics, the house type clearly represents a vernacular type.

R. W. Brunskill further contributes to a definition in describing the vernacular building as, "that which is traditional rather than academic in its inspiration, which provides for the simple activities of ordinary people, their farms and their simple industrial enterprises, which is strongly related to place, especially through the use of local building materials, but which represents design and building with thought and feeling rather than in a base or strictly utilitarian manner."\textsuperscript{12} Brunskill’s definition acknowledges that in the vernacular building type thought may well be given to design, but, unlike academic design, greater consideration is given to the function and economy of the building.

The subject house type represents a group of buildings that reflect each of the characteristics stated in the above two definitions of 'vernacular.' The question of degree may be raised as some houses seem to adapt formal or academic conventions to the design of these houses, such as the idea of Georgian symmetry, or detailed trim work. These 'academic' architectural values, however, are added onto a form that makes use of local building materials, traditional crafts, the advantages of local topography and the traditional arrangement of functional spaces within the structure.


In order to use the above two definitions it is necessary to establish that the houses that were surveyed for the purposes of this research do indeed represent a type. In “The Types of the Southern Mountain Cabin,” Henry Glassie presents an example of how folk architecture may be classified. In this article he describes two types of southern mountain cabin: the rectangular and the square. The single element used to distinguish the two types of cabin is the form of the building, including the floor plan and the number of stories.\textsuperscript{13} The cabin type is further defined based on construction technique, construction material, ethnic origin, geographic location, and placement of features, such as the doors and fireplaces. In Glassie’s work, other elements such as construction material represent sub-types or variations in the type.\textsuperscript{14}

In the manner of Glassie and many others who have studied vernacular types, I have based my definition of this type predominantly on the floor plans of these houses. Though the subject houses were identified first through only a very superficial examination of any visible facades, upon further investigation the floor plans and arrangement of interior spaces proved to be extremely predictable and consistent, demonstrating shared characteristics that appear to represent social status.

The Subject Type as an English House Type

The one-room deep, two-story, gable roof hall/kitchen and parlor houses of the Delaware Valley represent a house type that was introduced to the area by the English early in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. It became extremely common in the later part of the 18\textsuperscript{th}


\textsuperscript{14} Glassie, 1978, p. 394-404.
century and into the middle of the 19th century. It is well established that the study area was settled predominantly by the English, who transported their building traditions to their new home. In *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*, David Hackett Fischer provides extensive information on the settlement patterns of English Quakers in specific early settled areas along the eastern seaboard of the new colonies. One of the folkways is represented by a migration of Quakers from the North Midlands of England to the Delaware between 1675 and 1725. According to Fischer, a majority of these settlers came from the counties of Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, and Staffordshire, representing the North Midlands.


Figure 3. Two-unit family floor plans. (Brunskill 1971, p. 105)
A survey of literature of English vernacular house types demonstrates that a common English house type influenced the design of the subject house type in Bucks

15 It is well established by Bucks County Historians that the area of study was largely settled by the English and English Quakers. A list of Bucks County history references can be found in the bibliography at the back of this paper.
17 Ibid., p. 438-441.
County. The most convincing evidence that I have thus far encountered is in two books by R. W. Brunskill. In Brunskill’s *Illustrated Handbook of Vernacular Architecture*, two of his categories of vernacular house types include a number of sub-types that are very similar to the subject house type of this paper.

The first is a sub-type of a type he describes as the Two-Unit family (Fig. 3).\(^{18}\) Many of the examples of this type shown in the figure above illustrate similarities to the subject house, such as the placement of fireplaces, and the scale and arrangement of the rooms. Example “ii” seems to be the most similar to the subject type. Even more similar to the subject type is a sub-type that Brunskill describes as the Inside Cross-Passage Family (Fig. 4).\(^ {19}\) Within this type there is one example that is extremely similar to the subject type, which is identified in figure below with the letter ‘e’.

![Figure 4. Inside Cross-Passage Family floor plans (Brunskill 1971, p. 109)](image)


\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 109.
In this example the opposing front and rear doors create a cross passage. This is typical in the subject type, though there is variety in the location of the doors. The placement and scale of the fireplaces and the scale of the rooms in the example above are also very similar to the subject type. In example 'e' of the cross-passage type there is an important distinction between the two fireplaces that differentiates the hall/kitchen from the parlor that is not present in other examples of the Two-Unit Family, nor in any examples of the cross-passage type. In addition, in only one of the cross-passage examples, are the fireplaces internal within the volume as they are in the subject houses. All of the other examples have protruding or external chimneys as is common in more southerly climates of the United States. This may suggest a regional variation of this one example of the sub-type represented in Brunskill’s work. Unfortunately Brunskill does not take this examination of the type very far and we cannot determine the full form of this sub-type, nor is it possible to determine its frequency or general geographic location. He does state that the Inside Cross Passage Family “is not as common as some others, though many examples are to be seen in North Wales.”

In English Cottages and Farmhouses, Olive Cook presents an example of a house that appears to be very similar to the house shown in the isometric view in Figure 4. In the photograph below, one can see that the house is similar in proportion to the house presented in Figure 4, as well as the subject type, particularly a house like the Fredendall residence (Photo. 10) with its asymmetrical facade. Some significant differences are the protruding chimney, the size of the windows and the lack of a window above the door. Perhaps this is again a result of this type occurring infrequently in the English landscape.

---


At this point in my research I have been unable to definitively link the subject house type to a specific English region. In the course of researching different English vernacular house types, however, one thing that has become very clear is that the one-room deep house is extremely common, if the most common cottage type in the English vernacular landscape. Throughout English Vernacular Houses: A Study of Traditional Farmhouses and Cottages\(^1\) by Eric Mercer there are examples of houses in which the rooms of the first floor are arranged in a row with additions or attached farm buildings being located at either end of the building.

---

\(^1\) Eric Mercer, English Vernacular Houses: A Study of Traditional Farmhouses and Cottages, 1975. Mercer's book is an extensive source on English vernacular houses, which includes many floor plans of houses from different regions.
Methodology

As mentioned earlier, for the purposes of focusing this research it was necessary to focus on a single house type. My eye was continually drawn to the single front entrance, one room deep, hall/kitchen and parlor type. It is the most common and it seems to be an early type that could hold information with regard to early settlement and development of the area. In “The Study of Folk Architecture: Geographic Expressions” Fred Kniffen writes, “The selection of folk housing from among the several constituents of the cultural landscape as the opening wedge was based on the fact that housing is surely the most obvious feature of man’s occupation of the earth, and the humble house is still by far the most abundant.” The house type that I have chosen to study also represents the most abundant of the common house types. What is additionally useful about this type is that the form has been used, or adapted, in houses that do not represent “humble” houses, but those of fairly wealthy farmers.

Once this subject type was established I began to conduct a more thorough, though by no means exhaustive, survey of my area of study. That proscribed study area became Solebury, Buckingham, Upper Makefield and Wrightstown Townships, which were chosen for two reasons. First, I needed to limit the study area simply for the sake of keeping the project manageable. Secondly, these four townships were settled predominantly by English settlers and, as mentioned earlier, the one room deep hall/kitchen and parlor house represents an English form. Before I had established a geographic boundary for my survey I had surveyed three houses (the Mathews. Weinberg

and Nuegent residences) which are included in this paper. and are not located within the
proscribed study area.

My survey started with a very cursory windshield survey of this house type in the
four- township study area. This was conducted in order to get a general idea
of the frequency of these houses, but also to get some quick information regarding the
location, construction material, orientation, and location of windows and doors.23

Whether a house was surveyed depended upon someone being at home on the
occasions that I knocked. It also depended upon the response of the resident when
presented with a stranger who was interested in gaining access to their house in order to
measure it, take photographs, and generally poke around. Fortunately I received very few
negative responses when I approached the residents of potential subject houses. My
general technique for approaching the owner was to attempt to find a commonly used, yet
formal entrance. I then knocked, introduced myself and stated the reason for my visit and
interest in their house. I produced a letter of introduction, printed on University
letterhead, which supported what I had already told them. I did this sooner if the owner
seemed hesitant, but if they seemed receptive I gave them a copy of the letter later in this
initial introduction. One thing I found to be particularly helpful in creating a level of
comfort between the owner and myself was that I had grown up in the area. This brought
the project to a more personal level. It was also useful to compare their house to other
houses I had previously investigated. Another important key for the return visit was to
get the owners’ telephone number and not expect them to call me. Getting the telephone

23 The results of this survey can be found in the Appendix: General Survey.
number and calling the owner also reiterated my interest in the project and precluded the necessity of returning to the house and reintroducing myself.

The survey of the subject houses usually consisted of two, or occasionally, three visits to each house. The initial survey consisted of measuring for floor plans and exterior photography, which could be accomplished in about two and one-half hours. Additional visits were used to double check uncertain or unusual measurements and to revisit any features or details that seemed to present atypical characteristics of a house. Additional photography and detail measurement was also done during subsequent visits. Only when it was possible to gain access to the second floor and the original partitions were still largely unaltered did I survey the second floor of the houses. It became very evident after gaining access to the first few houses that I was going to be looking at houses that had many similarities.

Archival research was conducted at Bucks County Historical Society, Spruance Library, located in the Mercer Museum in Doylestown, Pennsylvania and the Bucks County Courthouse, also in Doylestown. These are excellent repositories for documents of the history of Bucks County. The sources that were accessed at the Spruance Library consisted of historic deeds, tax records, wills and estate records, orphans court records, historic newspaper advertisements for the sale of real estate, and historic maps. The Courthouse was used predominantly to access later deeds that are not kept at Spruance Library, as well as certain estate records that are not kept at the library.
Chapter Two: Catalogue of Subject Houses

The subject house type continued to be used from a time early in the settlement of the area, as represented by the Plough residence on the following page, to a later period when the Georgian style began to influence even modest houses, as represented by the development of Taylorsville. In order to illustrate this continuation of its use and the changes that took place under the Georgian influence, the catalogue of subject houses is arranged chronologically, beginning with the earliest houses. As the dates of several of the houses are not definitive, I have placed them in the chronology according to my best estimate of when they were built. The houses in Taylorsville represent a concentrated period of development and have been placed as a group according to this time period; they have not been arranged chronologically within the group. Within the Penns Park group, the McMenamin residence does not represent a late 18th century construction date as do the Fulmor and Wustholz residences, by which the group has been placed in the chronology, but I wanted to keep the Penns Park houses together as a group. The Mathews residence is placed at the end of the catalogue because a construction period could not be determined for this house as a result of it being moved at some point in its history.
Figure 5. Plough residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 2. Plough residence, south facade.
The Plough Residence is the final subject house that is located in Wrightstown Township. It is situated along Brownsburg Road West. The house sits back from the road and is oriented towards the south. The authors of *Wrightstown Township: A Tricentennial History* suggest that the Plough residence may be dated through a comparison of features to the same period as another Wrightstown house, located on Worthington Mill Road, that has a datestone that reads "1751." If this is an accurate comparison, the Plough residence is most likely the oldest of the subject houses.

There are a number of features that set the Plough residence apart from the other subject houses. The first is the coursed ashlar stonework of the front façade. This type of stone work was not found in any other subject houses, which were more commonly built of 'fieldstone' and it caused the Plough residence to stand out from many of the other houses that were surveyed. The masonry openings of the first floor are also significantly more narrow, by about six inches, than is typical for these houses. The window openings of the first floor front façade also have segmented stone arches, which I have seen on only a small number of the houses that were included in the general survey and none of the other subject houses. These features are evidence of an earlier date of construction than the other subject types.

Another feature is the presence of the remains of a stone drip course on the west gable end of the house. This indicates that a pent eave had extended across this gable at some point in the history of the house and again suggests a significantly earlier date than the other subject houses.

---

Unfortunately when the addition was constructed at the eastern end of the house the masonry wall at that end of the original cell of the house was completely removed. The only evidence that remains of the fireplace at this end of the house is the foundation for it that still remains in the basement. Uncharacteristically, this foundation is the same size as the one along the other end wall of the house, which is 8 feet wide by 42 inches deep. The fireplace along the western end of the house is another feature that exhibits characteristics that are unique to this house. The upper left side of the chimney on the first floor extends to the south to allow for the small chamber fireplace above to be moved to the side. This permitted the flue of the fireplace below to pass freely by the fireplace above. The character of the two fireplace foundations suggests that the use of these rooms may not have been defined as in the other subject houses. As mentioned in the description on the following page, the Plough residence at one time had a stone kitchen attached. so perhaps the fireplace in the western room of the house was not a cooking fireplace, but a large parlor fireplace. The same may have been true for the fireplace in the other room, which no longer exists. The section of the house that adjoined the stone kitchen may have consisted of a parlor and dining room. This illustrates that even at this early date the basic subject house form was used, which further supports the likelihood that this house type was brought over from England.

As with the Richards residence, the Plough residence is an example of the subject type that seems to represent a property of higher social status than most of those that have been surveyed. If the house was built in the middle of the 18th century as is suggested by the authors of *Wrightstown Township: A Tricentennial History*, it was built as the
residence on a 289 acre parcel of land. This suggests that a fairly wealthy farmer owned this house. By 1836, the size of the property had been reduced to 63 acres and 5 perches. dimensions that it retained until the middle of the 20th century. An advertisement for the sale of the property in 1856 describes the farm as follows:

"The improvements are a good two-story Stone House, with stone Kitchen adjoining; a frame Barn, stone stable high, a good frame wagon house, wood house, corn crib, hog pen; a milk house with a spring therein, from which water is conveyed through pipes to the barn; a cistern of water near the door with a pump therein; an apple orchard of selected fruit and other fruit trees; about 5 acres of woodland and 4 of meadow, with a stream of water running through it, the remainder is divided into convenient sized fields, under good fence, and in a good state of cultivation."26

The owner of the property prior to this sale was Jonathan Worthington who, in a deed dated 26 March 1850, is described a yeoman.27 In deeds prior to this the property is described as 'a certain messuage plantation or tract of land.'28 Clearly this is the property of a fairly wealthy yeoman.

---

27 Deed Book 78, p. 557. 26 March 1850. BCHS, Spruance Library.
28 Deed Book 61, p. 330, 1 April 1836. BCHS, Spruance Library.
Richards Residence

Figure 6. Richards residence, first floor plan showing western and central cells.

The Richards residence is the final subject house that is located in Upper Makefield Township. It is situated along Pineville Road and is oriented towards the road, in a southerly direction. The Richards residence is built in three sections, all three of which are of a rubble-stone construction with the central section, containing fine cut quoins. The feature that first drew my attention to this house is the fact that there appeared to be two of the subject types attached end to end; one being an addition to the other. The western most cell of the house most resembles the dimensions and floor plan of the other subject house and is the section of the house with which I am primarily concerned.

Unlike the houses of Taylorsville, none of the sections of the Richards residence has a stucco finish. The westward section of the house has a datestone of 1787 with the initials “BSW”, for Benjamin S. Wiggins. The western cell of the house contained two
parlors instead of the parlor and hall/kitchen arrangement that is common in the subject houses. This section of the house does not present a symmetrical façade. The front door is pushed about 1'-6" off center into the eastern room of this section. The first floor windows of the south façade contain nine over six light sash and those of the rear façade contain six over six light sash. This is the only example of a subject type in which the windows on the first floor of one façade are different from those on the opposite façade.

The double parlor arrangement is possible because of the presence of the large cooking fireplace that is located in the cell that is attached to the east of this section (referred to as the central cell). The third section of the house is an early 20th century addition to the east of the cell that contains the cooking fireplace. There are certain features of the masonry of the two earliest sections of the house that need to be examined. The first is the character of the junction of the two masonry cells along the north side of the house. At this junction the masonry from the central cell appears to project beyond the masonry of the other section, which would indicate that the western cell was built first. On the other hand, a horizontal seam in the masonry just above the second story windows, along the north and south façades indicates that the roof line of the central cell had been raised to meet the roof line of the western cell of the house. This may indicate that the central cell was constructed first and then after the western cell was built, or at the same time. the roof of the central cell was raised to match it. Based on this masonry evidence it is unclear which section was built first.

When the character and the function of the fireplaces is introduced it seems clear that the central cell must have existed in some form prior to construction of the western cell. It was not likely that a house would have been constructed with two small parlor
fireplaces without having a cooking fireplace as well. There is no evidence that either of the fireplaces in the western cell was altered at any time in the past, which may have indicated that a large cooking fireplace was reduced in size to be used as a parlor fireplace. The Richards residence is similar to the Plough residence in that it appears as if the subject house section of the building was added on to an earlier building, which most likely represented a fairly simple settlement house. Further evidence that the central cell may have been constructed earlier is the fact that the first floor south facing windows on the central cell contain six over six light sash and those of the western cell contain nine over six light sash.

The Richards residence represents a wealthier example of the subject type. Several factors contribute to this classification. The first, discussed above, is the presence of the double parlor cell in the house and simply the large size of the entire house. Additionally, the house was historically located on a large farm. In 1763 Bezaleel Wiggins purchased 90 acres and 124 perches in Upper Makefield from the London Company and by 1795 Benjamin Wiggins, a farmer was taxed on 278 acres of land, a stone house, a frame house and two frame barns that he owned in Upper Makefield. There is currently a large stone barn on property adjacent to the Richards property that had been associated with the Richards residence. Thus, this house does not represent the property of a middle class mechanic, but rather a successful farmer.

---

30 Ibid., p. 86.
Photograph 3. Richards residence, south facade.

Photograph 4. Richards residence, western end of the south facade.
The Penns Park Houses

There are three subject houses located within Penns Park, which is located in the center of Wrightstown Township. Penns Park was developed along the road from Philadelphia to New Hope, this section of which is now Route 232 or Second Street Pike. It is so named because it is situated on land that William Penn originally intended to remain open land commonly owned by the original land purchasers of Wrightstown Township.\(^{31}\) It was the first village in the township, and was originally known as Logtown. The first settler to this place was John Chapman who arrived in the autumn of 1684.\(^{32}\)

As with the houses in Taylorsville the houses in Penns Park were developed in a town setting. As a result they are all oriented towards the road and they all present symmetrical façades to the road. These houses do not, however, represent the conscious effort at developing a town, as do the houses in Taylorsville. There is also no evidence that the Penns Park houses were developed on speculation, which suggests that each was built for a specific owner.

The Fulmor and Wustholz residences likely date to the late 18\(^{th}\) or earlier 19\(^{th}\) centuries, whereas the McMenamin residence dates to around 1837. I have included the McMenamin residence at this point in the paper so as to present the Penns Park houses as a unit within this paper. It does help to illustrate that the house type was used over an extended period of time.


\(^{32}\) Ibid., p. 8.
Fulmor Residence

Figure 7. Fulmor residence, first floor plan.

The Fulmor residence is situated along the north side of Penns Park Road. It faces the road and is oriented towards the south. Prior to the construction of an addition to the east gable end, the original section of the house, which represents the subject type, presented a symmetrical façade. Unlike many of the other houses that were looked at, the windows of the first floor contain six over six light sash and not nine over six light. This is a common feature of the three subject houses that are located in Penns Park.

The three windows of the second floor front façade are centered over the openings of the first floor. Unlike many of the subject houses, there were at one time three windows on the second floor of the rear façade, but the central window has since been filled in and the window to the west was made into a door onto a patio above the one story rear addition. The windows of the parlor have a splayed or angled masonry opening and those of the hall/kitchen are square. This is a feature that I have seen on other
houses. The reason that the windows of the hall/kitchen are square is that they are pushed up against the fireplace or the stair and there is not sufficient space to angle the opening. On some occasions the side of the opening away from the obstruction was splayed and the other side of the opening is square.

The two entrances into the original section of the house open into the hall/kitchen, which was located at the eastern end of the house. The cooking fireplace is located in the northeast corner of the room and the boxed winder stair in the south east corner. The opening of the cooking fireplace is 5'-6" wide and there is very clear evidence of the location of the original bake oven. Evidence for the location of the partition was found in the form of vertical marks on the north and south masonry walls, breaks in the baseboard, and nailing patterns on the floor. The location of the partition here created a hall/kitchen that was approximately 11'-11" wide, when measured to the plane of the fireplace opening and a parlor that was approximately 10'-9" wide when measured to the interior of the gable wall. Because of the removal of the partition, the location of the door from the hall/kitchen into the parlor is unknown.

There is an unusual opening in the southern end of the east gable wall that I have been unable to identify. It penetrates through the masonry wall and would have opened into the back of the stair if a board barrier did not separate the two. This opening suggests a number of possibilities. The first is that the stair was not in this location originally and the opening was a door or window. The second is that it had been a door or window in the masonry wall of an earlier building and when the larger section of the house was built to the west they covered over the opening in order to put the stair in this location. If this were the case, the ceiling height of this small section would have been raised in order for
the second floors of the two sections to meet. The height to the bottom of the joists in this room varies between about 8'-6" and 8'-7". Perhaps at this time a second story was added to the small section of the house.

Additional evidence to support this possibility is the character of the second floor joists in the small section of the house. They are finished with a plain chamfer on the edges and have very irregular dimensions from around 2 3/4" to 3 1/4" by 6 1/2" to 7 1/2". This suggests that these joists may be from an earlier date than those in the other section of the house, which are of a consistent dimension of 2 3/4" by 7 3/4" and are finished with a 3/8" half round bead on the side of the bottom edge. Evidence to the contrary of this construction sequence scenario is the lack of any evidence of a fireplace having been located in this small section of the house. Without conducting a very thorough analysis of the structure, it is difficult to determine the true nature of these changes.

Photograph 5. Fulmor residence, south facade. Door on left enters into the main section of the house.
Wustholz Residence

Figure 8. Wustholz residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 6. Wustholz residence, southwest facade.
The Wustholz residence is also situated on the north side of Penns Park Road. It is oriented towards the southwest and faces the road. Both the north and south facades of the house are symmetrical. It is built of rubble stone, which has not been covered with stucco at any point in its history and still retains much of its original pointing. As is commonly the case with these houses, there is no second story center window on the rear façade. Like the Fulmor residence, the first and second floor windows contain six over six light sash.

The front entrance originally opened into the hall/kitchen, which was located on the western end of the house. The boxed winder stair is located in the northwest corner of the house. The cooking fireplace is located next to the stair in a somewhat unusual central position along the west gable wall. To the south of the fireplace there is an opening into a modern addition. This space might originally have been used for a closet. It is also possible that there was a door or window in this location. Without a more invasive analysis of this opening, the original use of this space cannot be determined. The centered location of the cooking fireplace instead of the corner of the house is atypical for the subject houses. The opening of the cooking fireplace is about five feet wide and the opening for the bake oven remains, along with the original iron door. Also present in the hall/kitchen are two opposing built-in cupboards along the north and south walls.

Evidence for the location of the original partition that divided the first floor into two rooms was found in vertical marks on the front and rear walls that indicated the location of an interruption in the plaster. There were also breaks in the baseboards along these walls that indicated where a piece of missing baseboard had been installed. In
addition the pattern of beads along the bottom edges of the floor joists of the second story is different along the edge of the joist to which partition boards would have been nailed.

![Figure 9. Joist profile, Wustholz residence.](image)

In Figure 9, shown above, joist B has only a partial bead on the left side of the joist. A complete bead would have been partially obscured by the partition boards; thus it was omitted when the bead was added to the joists. This joist was also fabricated from a piece of wood that left large hollows in the side of the finished joist. Again this was the side that would have been obscured by the partition if it were still in place. As was the case with most of the subject houses, the exact location of the door in the partition that connected the two rooms could not be determined.

The Wustholz residence was occupied for a period of at least 30 years by a series of wheelwrights. The first reference to this is when Ephraim Slack, a wheelwright, purchased the property from William Ely in March of 1831.\(^3\) The next three owners of the property were also wheelwrights. An advertisement for the sale of the property in 1860 again clearly describes the property of a successful wheelwright. In this description

\[3\] Deed Book 55, Page 215, 29 March 1831. BCHS, Spruance Library.
the location of the property is referred to as Pennsville, which was the name of the town before it became Penns Park.

"Containing TEN ACRES of prime land, situated in the immediate vicinity of Pennsville; bounded by the road leading from Pennsville to Wrightstown Meeting and lands of Chas. Thompson and B. M. Collins. The improvements are a 2-story STONE HOUSE, newly fitted up in good style, with piazza in front, shed back with cistern; well of lasting water at the door, with pump therein; a stone smoke house, a frame Wheelwright Shop, Frame Barn, wagon house, and other out-buildings; apple orchard and other fruit trees."34

The following floor plan illustrates the most likely configuration of the original partitions on the second floor of the Wustholz residence. This plan shows a fairly typical arrangement of two smaller parallel rooms (or a room and an entry) at one end of the house with a larger chamber, with fireplace at the other end. The dashed lines represent the most likely configuration of original partitions.

Figure 10. Wustholz residence, second floor plan.

34 Bucks County Intelligencer Real Estate Advertisement Files 1850-1860. Wrightstown Township 27 December 1859. BCHS, Spruance Library.
McMenamin Residence

Figure 11. McMenamin residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 7. McMenamin residence, west facade.
The McMenamin Residence is the third subject house that is located in Penns Park. It is situated along Second Street Pike, just north of the intersection with Penns Park Road, the road that goes to Wrightstown Meeting. The house faces the road and is oriented towards the west. It presents a symmetrical façade exclusive of the addition to the southern gable end. Prior to the construction of this addition the rear façade also presented a symmetrical façade. As with the Fulmor and Wustholz residences, the first floor windows contain six over six light sash, as do the second floor windows. The house is built of rubble filled frame and is unique amongst the subject houses in this regard. The house contains two parlor windows on the north wall to either side of the parlor fireplace.

According to deed research the house probably dates to around or just after 1837, when Abraham Reeder, a clock and watch maker, sold the property to Charles H. Reeder.35 This concurs with the date of around 1840, which was provided by the owner.

The overall dimensions of the original section of the McMenamin residence are 26'-3" by 16'-3", which is about two feet shorter on each side than the typical dimension of 28'-2" by 18'-2". The roof of the McMenamin residence has a 12/12 pitch, which is steeper than the typical 9/12 pitch typical in the other subject houses. The steeper roof may be a result of the difference in building material and technique.

Evidence for the location of the partition was a break in the baseboard and nailing patterns on the side of a joist. The location of the door was determined by the presence of two mortises in the floor, as well as a break in the nailing on the floor. As in the Wustholz residence, the cooking fireplace is not located in the corner of the room but set

---

35 Deed Book 228, p. 2, 2 April 1837. Bucks County Courthouse, Recorder of Deeds, Doylestown, PA. The cost of the property at this time was only $45.00.
out by a small closet that is located in the southeast corner of the room. This suggests that this space in the Wustholz residence might have been similarly used as a closet. The opening of the cooking fireplace is comparatively small, being only 4'-9" wide. There is no evidence of a bake oven in the back of this fireplace.

The following floor plan shows the likely original arrangement of the second floor of the McMenamin residence. Note the similarities to the second floor of the Wustholz residence (Fig. 10).

![McMenamin residence 2nd floor](image)

**Figure 12.** McMenamin residence, second floor plan.
Figure 13. Nuegent residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 8. Nuegent residence, southeast facade.
The Nuegent residence is located along Pipersville-Wismer Road in Plumstead Township. Based on deed evidence, the Nuegent residence dates to the first decade of the 19th century. As with the Fredendall residence, the Nuegent residence is situated perpendicular to the road and is oriented towards the southeast. The builders of the Nuegent residence also made no effort to create a symmetrical façade. Both the front and rear doors were pushed toward the eastern end of the house and into the hall/kitchen. They are fully 2'-4" from being centered along these walls, by far the largest distance by which any front doors of the subject houses are off center. Presumably the doors were pushed this far off center in order to place the partition at a location that allowed for a larger parlor. Still, it is unusual that the door was not located immediately adjacent to the partition as is the case in most of the other houses. In the Nuegent residence there is a space of twenty inches between the edge of the front door and the location of the original partition. The rear door had been in a similar location along the north wall, but it has since been converted into a window. As with the houses in Penns Park, the windows of the first and second floor contain six over six light sash, which may reflect the relatively early construction date.

The cooking fireplace is located in the southeast corner of the building and the original boxed winder stair was located next to it in the northeast corner of the hall/kitchen. The stair has since been converted so that the stair box contains only the stair to the basement and access to the second floor is gained through an addition that was added to the eastern end of the building. The second floor of the Nuegent residence was

---

36 Deed Books 34, p. 226, 16 October 1804, and Deed Book 40, p. 1, 15 March 1811. BCHS, Spruance Library. In the first deed no mention is made of a “messuage or tenement”, but one is mentioned in the following deed and there is a significant increase in the amount that is paid for the property.
not surveyed because the original configuration of the rooms had been significantly altered. Presumably there is a small fireplace located along the west wall of the parlor chamber. Also of note in the Nuegent residence are the windows located on each floor at the southwest corner of the building, along the west gable wall. The presence of windows in this location is unusual when comparing this house to those that have already been examined. In looking at this house and the following two, however, we see that each of these houses have windows in the same locations.
Weinberg Residence

Figure 14. Weinberg residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 9. Weinberg residence, south facade.
The Weinberg residence is also located along the Pipersville-Wismer Road, slightly further north and just across the boundary of Bedminster Township. The road crosses a bridge just east of the house and the road winds up and behind the house, which is oriented towards the south. If the south façade is considered to be the front façade of the house, then this house is oriented away from the road. The house faces Cabin Run Creek along which there had been a mill. There is also a small barn on the property. The earliest document that mentions a house on this property is a deed dated 1818. Based on the size of the cooking fireplace in the eastern section of the house, it is likely that this section of the house is earlier.

Neither the north nor the south façades of the house are exactly symmetrical, though an effort was made to create a façade that appears to be symmetrical. Both the front and rear doors are six inches from being centered along their respective walls. The windows of the front and rear walls are also not located equidistant from the gable ends of the house. The windows in the hall/kitchen are located 4'-5" from the end of the building and the north parlor window and the south parlor window are located 5'-9" and 6' from the west gable end respectively. The placement of the parlor windows in this location seems to have been done in order to situate them in centrally along the parlor wall and not according to a symmetrical location as viewed from the exterior. This suggests a fairly sophisticated client or builder and indicates that the arrangement of the interior space was of a greater priority than the creation of a symmetrical façade.

The Weinberg residence is another example in which there is some question as to the chronology of the construction of the house. Attached to the eastern end of the

---

37 Deed Book 46, p. 369 18 April 1818. BCHS, Spruance Library.
subject cell of the house is two-story frame addition or earlier cabin. The single room on the first floor of this section contains a large cooking fireplace in which there had been a bake oven. The common room of the subject cell of the house contains a fireplace that appears large enough to have accommodated cooking activities, however there is no evidence of a bake oven in this fireplace. As with the Richards residence, the presence of this large cooking fireplace in the eastern section of the house suggests that it represents an earlier period of construction. The parlor at the western end of the house does not contain a fireplace and nor does the chamber above. There is a chimney at the west end, which suggests that these rooms may have contained stoves in order to heat the spaces.
The Fredendall Residence is located in a small hamlet that was historically known as Glendale. It is located in Buckingham Township along Street Road, which is one of the boundaries between Buckingham and Solebury Townships. The house is constructed of stucco covered stone, with a later frame addition off the west or hall/kitchen gable end.

The house is situated close to the road, but is oriented in a southerly direction so that the principal façade is perpendicular to the road. No effort was made in the construction of this house to create a symmetrical façade. This house is different from others that were built in town settings in that it has not been oriented towards the road, but is placed distinctly perpendicular to the road. The south entrance, which was presumably the front entrance, and the entrance along the north wall of the building are
opposite each other, and both are pushed quite far to the west. As is the case with every subject house (excluding those that consist of a double parlor arrangement), both entrances are into the hall/kitchen. Dean Gray, a blacksmith, owned the property from 1827 to 1847 and it is unlikely that he would have owned the property for this extended period of time without improving it. A likely date of construction is soon after 1827 when Dean Gray purchased the property.\textsuperscript{38} The house is clearly older than this, and based on the asymmetrical façade and its orientation away from the road, it likely dates to the first quarter of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century.

Another common characteristic that can be found in the Fredendall residence is the use of nine over six light sash on the first floor and six over six light sash on the second floor. The window openings of the second story are placed above each of the openings of the floor below, with the usual exception that there is no window above the rear entrance.

As is the case with most of the subject houses the partition that had divided the first floor of the Fredendall residence into two rooms was removed at some point in the building’s history. The dashed lines in the above drawing denotes the general location of this partition and the original boxed winder staircase. The location of the stair in this location is interesting because it takes up so much space in the parlor. Prior to its removal, the partition had created a hall/kitchen that was only eight inches wider than the parlor. The projection of the stair box into the parlor resulted in a rather small parlor. The location of the boxed winder stair in a position along the partition, rather than in a

\textsuperscript{38} Deed Book 52, p. 322 3 April 1827. BCHS, Spruance Library.
corner next to the cooking fireplace is a feature that was found in only two other subject houses, the Abdon Hibbs House in Taylorsville (Fig. 20) and Andrassy House (Fig. 18).

The cooking fireplace is located in the northwest corner of the house. The current opening is about 6'-9" wide. This has been reduced from about 7'-5" and evidence of a bake oven has been partially obscured. A small window is located along the west gable wall immediately to the south of the cooking fireplace. This may indicate the location of a pantry enclosure as can be found in the Abdon Hibbs House, which also has its stair located along the partition. This indicates that the pantry space was a higher priority to the builder of house than the additional space in the parlor.

As with the subject houses that are located in other town settings, the Fredendall residence seems also to have been associated with middle class owners. As early as 1847 the house is referred to as being situated on one acre of land. It has been difficult to determine, through early deed research, the size of the parcel on which the house was originally built. Associated with the house is a frame shop that is referred to as a storehouse in deeds between 1887 and 1947. In an advertisement for the sale of the property in the Bucks County Intelligencer dated 6 November 1860, the description of the property includes a carpenter shop. It is also interesting that this advertisement describes the house as a 'mansion house'. Some other owners of the house were Dean Grey, a blacksmith who purchased the property in 1827 and Wilson Pidcock, a butcher who sold the property in 1887.
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39 Deed Books 224, p. 408 17 February 1887, and Deed Book 832, p. 31 11 August 1947. BCHS, Spruance Library.
40 Bucks County Intelligencer Real Estate Advertisement files 1850-1860, Upper Makefield Township, 6 November 1860. BCHS, Spruance Library.
41 Deed Books 52, p. 322, 3 April 1827, and Deed Book 226, p. 298, 11 April 1887. BCHS, Spruance Library.
Photograph 10. Fredendall residence, south facade.

Photograph 11. Fredendall residence, north facade.
Figure 16. Whitemore residence, first floor plan.

The Whitemore residence is located in the village of Solebury in Solebury Township. Historically the village was known as Center Hill, as it is referred to in an 1876 map of Solebury Township. The house faces Sugan Road and is oriented towards the northeast. The earliest reference that places a house on this property with certainty is the will of Thomas Livezy in which he leaves to his wife Sarah the "house and lot he is currently living in situate in Solebury Township." An earlier deed dated 2 April 1811 for the sale of the property by Watson Fell (Yeoman) to John Paxson (Yeoman) mentions "hereditaments and appurtenances". A map from an Orphans Court record dated 29 April 1828 does not mention a house on this lot, which at this date includes 26 acres and

---

44 Deed Book 39, p. 530, 2 April 1811. BCHS, Spruance Library.
105 perches of land.\textsuperscript{45} Tax records, however, show that Thomas Livezy was assessed in 1828 for 26 acres of land and a house.\textsuperscript{46} Based on this evidence this house can be dated to the period between 1811 and around 1833.

Exclusive of later additions to the south end of the house, both the front and rear façades of the house are symmetrical. The windows of the house display the common distribution of nine over six light sash on the first floor and six over six light sash on the second floor. The north gable wall also contains two windows on the first floor to either side of the parlor fireplace, which is an uncommon characteristic amongst the subject houses (see also the McMenamin residence, page 36).

Prior to the removal of the partition, the front and rear doors entered into the hall/kitchen, which was located at the southern end of the building. The location of the original partition was determined through the presence of a break in the floor boards, which extended the entire depth of the house, and marks on the plaster that indicate an earlier interruption in the plaster. The partition in this location resulted in a parlor that was about 11'-8" wide and a hall/kitchen that was about 12'-1" wide. This measurement represents the open floor space of the rooms. When this measurement is used the result is a parlor that is fairly similar in size to the hall/kitchen. Of note in the hall/kitchen fireplace is the fact that there is no evidence of a bake oven.

\textsuperscript{45} Orphans Court Records Volume 7, p. 86, 29 April 1828. BCHS, Spruance Library.
\textsuperscript{46} Solebury Township Tax Records, 1828. BCHS, Spruance Library.
Figure 17. Whitemore residence, second floor plan.

Photograph 12. Whitemore residence, northeast facade.
Andrassy House

Figure 18. Andrassy House, first floor plan.

The Andrassy House is also located in Washington Crossing State Historic Park, however it is in the upper portion of the park about six miles north of Taylorsville. It is located very near the border of Upper Makefield and Solebury Townships. The house faces River Road and is oriented to the northeast. This House is the first of a number of the subject houses that represent a distinct break from the standard hall/kitchen and parlor configuration that we have thus far seen in the Taylorsville houses and that predominates the subject houses.

At the time that a topic for my research was decided upon, I recognized that the Andrassy House might fit into the subject house type. Upon gaining access to the house, it became clear that the cell of the house that drew my attention was indeed an addition to
an earlier cell and not the original section of the house.\textsuperscript{47} The original section of the house is not shown in the floor plan above. It is a one room stone cottage with a garret to the north of the addition. The small one room section dates to the late 18\textsuperscript{th}\textsuperscript{48} century and the larger addition most likely dates to the first quarter of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, though a firm construction date for this section is not known. The east façades of the two sections are flush but the earlier section is not as deep as the later addition. The door communicating between the two cells is indicated on the floor plan. There is a large cooking fireplace located in the northwest corner of the addition.

The additional cell of the house consists of a large parlor and a smaller room that really cannot be identified due to changes resulting from its current use as a modern kitchen. This section of the house is significantly larger than all of the other subject houses in that it is 22'-2" deep, whereas the standard depth of most of the other houses is around eighteen feet. The dimensions of the large parlor are 14'-3" wide by 19'-2" deep, significantly larger than any rooms in the other houses. One unusual feature of the small room to the south of the large parlor is the door opening in the south gable end of the house. The opening has been filled in and there is no way to determine the period or original character of the opening. If it is an original opening it is the only such opening in the subject houses.

The Andrassy House appears to present a symmetrical façade. however the front door is not centered but eight inches further to the north; to the side of the large parlor, into which the doors of the addition enter. This is a little surprising given that there do

\textsuperscript{47}Interview with Pat Patrizio, the educator at Washington Crossing State Historic Park and the current resident of the house. It is also apparent by the location of the cooking fireplace.
\textsuperscript{48} Interview with Pat Patrizio.
not seem to be any impediments, such as staircases or partitions preventing the creation of a symmetrical façade. The stair in this section of the house is a boxed winder stair that is located along the western end of the partition just south of the rear entrance. As this stair is located at the rear of the house and the partition is located fifteen inches to the south of the front entrance, there was plenty of room to locate the door four more inches to the south, which would have provided for a truly symmetrical façade. As is standard, the windows of the first floor contain nine over six light sash and those of the second floor are six over six light.

Figure 19. Todaro residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 14. Todaro residence, northeast facade.
The Todaro residence is located in Brownsburg, Upper Makefield Township and is another example of a subject house situated within a town setting. The principal section of Brownsburg was settled along the boundary of two London Company land parcels, near another section represented by Beaumont’s Ferry, the second ferry crossing in Upper Makefield. The Todaro residence was probably built during the first quarter of the 19th century at the time that Brownsburg underwent a significant building boom. Deed research supports a somewhat later date of around 1834. It is oriented in a northeasterly direction, facing the road, instead of towards the customary southerly compass orientation. The Todaro residence presents a nearly symmetrical façade, however the front door is pushed slightly to the north side, and enters facing a stair that divides the hall/kitchen and the parlor. The windows of the Todaro residence have been altered significantly and no longer contain the typical nine over six and six over six sash.

In the examination of this house, one must take into consideration the fact that it suffered a fire earlier in the 20th century. As a result much of the interior structure and finish of the house is very likely not original. The features that identify it as of the subject type are the overall dimensions of the house, the location of masonry openings and the location and character of the fireplaces.

Along with the Elmer Buckman House in Taylorsville, the Todaro residence is the only other subject house to have a central straight stair and not a boxed winder stair that we see in the other examples. Knowing that the house suffered a fire, one cannot assume
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49 Marshall, 1990, p. 74
50 Ibid. p. 75.
51 Deed Books 52, p. 381; 58, p. 536; and 64, p. 81. A comparison of the sale costs and lot sizes in these three deeds suggests a construction date between the transactions recorded in Book 58 and 64.
52 This information is based on historic photographs owned by Mr. Todaro.
that this is the original configuration of the stair. There is no evidence, however, for a stair being previously located in another location. Of course any such evidence may have been destroyed in the fire.

One argument for the central stair being an original configuration is the fact that in the northwest corner there is not enough space to accommodate a boxed winder stair, which typically require a space about 3 feet by 6 feet. The space in this corner allows enough room for the 6' dimension but there is only 2'-6" between the edge of the window and the north wall of the house. This suggests that either the current stair is an original configuration or there had been a winding stair along the partition between the two rooms, such as is the case in the Fredendall residence, which has very similar dimensions as the Todaro residence. If a fairly firm date of construction were not know, the strait stair might suggest a later date of construction than houses with winding stairs. As it is, it suggests that this stair was built after the fire and the house originally would have had a winding stair along the partition.
The Taylorsville Houses

Washington Crossing State Historic Park is located in Upper Makefield Township along the Delaware River. Contained within the park are remnants of the historic town of Taylorsville. There are five subject houses located in Taylorsville. Taylorsville was developed on a part of 850 acres that Henry Baker purchased from William Penn in 1684. In 1777, soon after General George Washington used this place as the launching point for his famous crossing of the Delaware in order to march on Trenton, Benjamin Taylor purchased a ferry that was located here along with 350 acres. The five subject houses are the Abdon Hibbs House, Amos Taylor House, Eliza Taylor House, Elmer Buckman House, and the John Frye House. These houses were all built in the late 1820s or 1830s and they represent a concerted effort by the Taylor family to develop the town.

As a group these houses help to demonstrate a number of interesting trends and characteristics of the subject type as a whole. They also represent a very conscious effort to create the image of a very neat and prosperous settlement. As such, the houses are all oriented towards the principal early roads of Taylorsville with disregard for the traditional southerly orientation. (The Abdon Hibbs House and the John Frye House are situated on a section of the old Lower River Road, which is roughly parallel to the river and is now a footpath in the park.) The houses also present very neat symmetrical façades with a slightly higher, if somewhat superficial level of finish than most of the other houses that I encountered. This was accomplished through the installation of

---


embellished door surrounds on the front façades. Beyond this feature though, the level of exterior finish is no greater on the front façades of these houses than it is on the rear façades, or on the front façades of other houses that were surveyed.

As a result of the research conducted by Martin J. Rosenblum, RA and Associates for Washington Crossing Historic Park, there is extensive information on the tenants and owners of these houses that has been very helpful in developing a picture of the social standing of this house type. It appears that the building of these houses in Taylorsville was undertaken with the intention of drawing certain mechanics into the area with the goal of spurring the growth of Taylorsville. The Abdon Hibbs House and the John Frye House were both built as tenant houses or on speculation.\(^{55}\) An advertisement in the Bucks County Intelligencer dated 6 January 1834 for the sale or rent of the Abdon Hibbs House and other buildings in Taylorsville listed “A dwelling house, Wheelwright and Blacksmith Shops worthy the attention of industrious and good mechanics.”\(^{56}\) Each of the subject houses were at some point either occupied by mechanics or were advertised for sale or rent as being ideal for the accommodation of a mechanic.

The floor plans presented in this chapter are all oriented so that the front façade is at the bottom. The floor plans of the five houses in Taylorsville were redrawn from floor plans that were produced by Martin Jay Rosenblum, RA and Associates and printed in the *Washington Crossing Historic Park Historic Structures Report: Lower Park Buildings*. They were reproduced for this paper in order to create a standard of consistency in style and media between these floor plans and those that were produced by myself.

\(^{55}\) Ibid., p 33.
The Abdon Hibbs House is situated along old Lower River Road in Taylorsville. It is oriented with its principal façade facing west, towards the road. It is constructed of rubble stone with an exterior plaster or stucco finish. This construction method and stucco finish is a constant with each of the subject houses located in Taylorsville and typical of the other houses that were surveyed.

The Hibbs House presents a symmetrical front façade, excluding the projection of the bake oven and the protective shed roof. Exclusive of the small pantry window on the southern end of the house, all the first floor windows contain nine over six light sash while the second floor windows contain six over six light sash. Unlike the symmetry of
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57 The floor plans of the five houses in Taylorsville were redrawn from floor plans that were produced by Martin Jay Rosenblum, RA and Associates and printed in the Washington Crossing Historic Structures Report: Lower Park Buildings. They were reproduced for this paper in order to create a standard of consistency in style and media between these floor plans and those that were produced by myself.
the front, the rear façade of the house is not symmetrical. As is typical both entrances open into the hall/kitchen. The rear entrance however, has been pushed to the south in order to accommodate the boxed winder staircase, which is located along the eastern end of the partition. This is one of only three examples of the subject houses in which the stair box can be found in this location. The cooking fireplace is located in the southwest corner of the hall/kitchen. The bake oven of this house has been restored in its original location. In the corner next to the cooking fireplace, the location in which one would have commonly found the stair, there is located a pantry that is lit by a small window along the gable end.

All of the ceilings in the Abdon Hibbs House are plastered, which is a feature that is common in the Taylorsville houses, but not in the other subject houses. This indicates that the builders of these houses were seeking a higher level of finish. It may also be a result of a later date of construction than a number of the other houses that were examined.

The Abdon Hibbs House first appeared on a map in 1830 and in 1834 it was advertised for sale or rent along with wheelwright and blacksmith shops. And in 1854 an advertisement for the sale of the house stated that “This property would suit either a carpenter or wheelwright: both are much wanted in the place.” Though built by the Taylors, the Hibbs House is named for Abdon Hibbs, a carpenter who rented the house from 1858 to 1859. That the house is still known as the Abdon Hibbs House is not based
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59 Bucks County Intelligencer Real Estate Advertisement files 1850-1860, Upper Makefield Township, 17 October 1854. BCHS, Spruance Library.
on the significance of his period of ownership, but rather simply the name that has been passed down through history.

Photograph 15. Abdon Hibbs House, west facade.

At one point nine people occupied the Abdon Hibbs House. Between 1845 and 1851 John Smith Phillips, a shoemaker, lived in the house with his wife and five daughters, along with Joseph and Charles Hough, who were journeyman or apprentice shoemakers. In order to accommodate this many people, the garret had been divided into two separate chambers. Other mechanics who lived in the house were Jacob Woolery, a wheelwright who occupied the house from 1852-53; Daniel Mahon, a carpenter who lived there from 1855-57; and Abdon Hibbs, another carpenter who rented the house from 1858-59.

---

60 Rosenblum and Associates. p. 34.
61 Ibid. p. 32.
62 Ibid. p. 34.
John Frye House

![Figure 21. John Frye House, first floor plan. (after Martin Jay Rosenblum, RA and Associates)](image)

The John Frye House is another example of the development by the Taylor family of Taylorsville. According to the report prepared by Martin Jay Rosenblum, RA and Associates, the John Frye House first appears on maps from 1828 and 1829 on land purchased from Benjamin Taylor by Bernard Taylor in 1821. An advertisement from 1832 described the house as "nearly new." The John Frye House is located across the street from the Abdon Hibbs House and slightly to the south. Excluding the shop addition on the northern end of the house, it too presents a symmetrical façade with very similar exterior details as those of the Abdon Hibbs House. The similarity of these exterior details suggests that the materials for the house were procured from a common source and perhaps applied by the same builder. It is oriented towards the east, facing the

---

63 Ibid., p. 27.
road. Again the windows of the first floor contain nine over six light sash with those of
the second floor contain six over six light sash.

The interior of the Frye house is finished in a finer manner than the Abdon Hibbs
House. This is evident in a number of interior details that can be compared between the
two houses. The doors in the hall/kitchen of the Frye house are raised panel doors,
whereas in the Hibbs House the doors in the hall/kitchen are all of beaded board and
batten construction. There is also a chair rail ornaments the parlor and hall/kitchen of the
Frye House but not in the Abdon Hibbs House. The John Frye House has a more typical
arrangement of the boxed winder stair located in the corner of the hall/kitchen next to the
cooking fireplace. The ceiling of the flight of stairs leading from the first floor to the
second is plastered, whereas in the Hibbs house the underside of the stairs of the next
flight are left exposed. In addition, the location of the stair in this corner location may
have allowed the builders to provide a slightly larger parlor than in the Abdon Hibbs
House. Both of these houses have similar parlor fireplace surrounds.

The cooking fireplace of the John Frye House is located in the northeast corner of
the room. The fireplace opening is approximately 5'-10" wide and though the bake oven
is no longer extant, the opening for the oven can still be found at the rear of the fireplace.
Also present in the Frye house are two built in cupboards located in the hall/kitchen along
the north and south walls between the door and window. This is a common feature in the
subject houses, one that was probably not necessary in the Abdon Hibbs House, given the
presence of a substantial pantry.

As with the Abdon Hibbs House, the John Frye House was at one time occupied
by a family and two mechanics. In 1852 Bernard Taylor sold the house to Samuel Search.
a prosperous blacksmith, who owned the house until 1873. In 1860 the household consisted of Search, his wife, their three daughters, a journeyman blacksmith and an apprentice. The garret of the Frye House was also divided into two chambers by a wood partition that is still in place. There is also evidence that the ceiling had been finished with boards to create a somewhat finished space. Though Search’s children may have occupied the garret, it may also have accommodated his workers. The worker also might have lived in the second floor of the shop addition.


---

64 Ibid., p. 29.
The Elmer Buckman House is located along General Washington Memorial Boulevard in Taylorsville. This road had originally led to Bakers Ferry, which was the first ferry across the Delaware in Upper Makefield and dates to around 1699. The current road name is a modern creation and the road was originally probably called Ferry Street. The Buckman House faces the road and is oriented towards the north. Although a definitive construction date of the Buckman House is not known, given its size and the Georgian characteristics of its façade, it likely dates a little later than the other subject houses in Taylorsville, though it was definitely built before 1838.

---

The front door of the Buckman house is slightly off center, but given the level of finish and size of the house, one has to believe that the intention of the builders and the owner was to create a symmetrical façade. The windows of the first floor contain nine over six light sash and those of the second floor contain six over six light sash. A northern orientation is traditionally very uncommon for these houses where the usual preference is a south or southeast orientation. This orientation toward the street is an indication that the priorities of the builders of these houses were more focused on the development of a neat and well-organized settlement.

The Elmer Buckman House is significantly larger than the other houses in Taylorsville, being 32'-2" wide and 18'-2" deep. It is also unusual in that it contains a central straight stair and not the typical boxed winder. This suggests that this house was intended to be somewhat finer than the Hibbs and Frye Houses. It is also interesting to look at the room dimensions of the Elmer Buckman House. Each of the downstairs rooms contains a depth (measurement between the north and south walls of the house) of 15'-3". A measurement of the hall/kitchen taken between the exterior masonry wall of the east gable end and the near edge of the stair and partition reveals a dimension of 13'-1". The same measurement in the parlor results in a dimension of 12'-2". This is consistent with what has been found in other houses, in that the hall/kitchen is the larger of the two rooms. In considering the amount of open floor space in each of these two rooms (essentially eliminating the space taken up by the hall/kitchen pantry) however, the result is a hall/kitchen that is two feet narrower than the parlor. This seems to indicate a greater emphasis on the more formal parlor space. A look at the arrangement of the front door and the stairs also shows that the builders created a situation that is very close to
being a separate foyer. There is a four-light transom over the front door. Additionally, the garret of the Buckman House contains two front-facing arched dormers, which indicate a higher level of finish than the other houses in Taylorsville.

The cooking fireplace of the Elmer Buckman House is located in the southeast corner of the room. The fireplace opening is about 6'-2" wide and unlike the Abdon Hibbs and John Frye Houses, the bake oven projected through the rear wall.

Though it is somewhat larger and finer than other subject houses in Taylorsville, the Elmer Buckman was also seen as being a suitable residence for a mechanic. The house was advertised for sale in the Bucks County Intelligencer dated 31 October 1838 and the advertisement stated that "This property would suit almost any mechanic."^67

Photograph 17. Elmer Buckman House, north facade.

The Amos Taylor House is also situated along the General Washington Memorial Boulevard. It was constructed in the middle or late 1830s and is built of stone with a stucco finish. It too faces the road and is therefore oriented towards the north. The house presents a symmetrical front façade as well as rear façade. The windows of the first floor contain nine over six light sash and those of the second floor contain six over six light sash.

The front door enters into the hall/kitchen, which is located at the western end of the house. The cooking fireplace is located in the southwest corner of the house and the stair is located in the northwest corner. The opening of the cooking fireplace is about six feet wide and, as in the case of the Elmer Buckman House, the bake oven was located.
outside the south wall of the house. The opening for the oven was in the side of the fireplace, not in the rear wall. The Amos Taylor House is also larger than the Frye or Hibbs Houses, being 30'-2" wide by 17'-8" deep.

The Amos Taylor House is also known as the Tailor’s House, named for the number of tailors that resided there. Amos Taylor and Mahlon Taylor, both of whom were tailors, resided in the house at some point. In addition, Charles W. Young who was also a tailor rented the house between 1846 and 1853. Attached to the original house is a shop addition. An advertisement for the sale of the property in the Bucks County Intelligencer dated 17 October 1854 stated that “The shop was built for the accommodation of a tailor.”


Rosenblum and Associates, p. 43.
The Eliza Taylor House is the last of the subject houses that is located in Taylorsville. Samuel Taylor’s brothers, Benjamin and Mahlon probably built it for his widow Eliza Taylor around 1834. It is oriented to the west facing the old Lower River Road south of the ferry road. There is a frame addition to the south gable end of the house.

Though it is located in the park, the house is rented and I have not been able to gain access to it in order to determine the nature of all of the changes that have taken place. Certain changes may be identified through the floor plan shown above. At some point the cooking fireplace was removed from the southern gable end and a straight staircase was introduced along this wall. The first floor partition was removed in order to create one large room on the first floor. It is suggested in the historic structures report for
the lower park building that prior to these changes the Eliza Taylor House and the John Frye House may have had very similar floor plans and finish details. Unfortunately I have been unable to survey the Eliza Taylor House in order to compare these two houses.

Photograph 19. Eliza Taylor House, west facade.

69 Rosenblum and Associates. p. 47.
70 Ibid., p. 295.
Mathews Residence

Figure 25. Mathews residence, first floor plan.

Photograph 20. Mathews residence, south facade.
The Mathews Residence is the most complete example of the subject house type that was surveyed for the purposes of this research. It is located in Tinicum Township along Dark Hollow Road. The house is oriented towards the south and faces the road. There have been no additions to the gable ends of the house and the partition, which divides the first floor into two rooms, is still in place, in its original location. According to the owner, the house was moved to this site near the road from the original site on a hill to the north.

In the above floor plan one can see that the door of the front façade of the building is about one foot from being centered along the wall. The windows of the first floor are about four inches from being in symmetrical positions. The openings of the second floor are placed directly above the openings of the first floor. The placement of these openings suggests a symmetrical façade yet the openings, particularly the front door, clearly reflect certain requirements of the interior spaces.

The absence of additions on either gable end allows the house to be viewed with its gable-end openings intact. Thus we can see the two original windows at the southwest corner of the house. This also shows us that there were no openings on the first or second story of the east-end of the building, which was largely devoted to the staircase and the large fireplace and its associated flue. This is important in that it shows that there was never an exterior door or a window on this end, whereas in a house like the Wustholz residence (p. 32) this could not be determined. This evidence suggests that in other examples where there have been additions to this gable end there may not have been a window or door that was altered to provide access to the new space. The unaltered condition of the east-end wall also allows for the examination of the original
configuration of the interior of the end wall of the hall/kitchen. We can see that the space that was used for a closet in the Mathews Residence was adopted as a short hall into the east-end addition of the Fulmor Residence (p. 29).

![Mathews Residence 2nd floor floor plan](image)

**Figure 26. Mathews residence, second floor plan.**

The above floor plan shows the unaltered arrangement of second story rooms in the Mathews residence. It illustrates the typical three-room arrangement with two small parallel rooms at one end and a large parlor chamber at the other end of the house. Notice the small fireplace in the parlor chamber, though there is no fireplace in the room below.
Chapter Three: Conclusions

The previous chapters have documented a house type that represents an English form, which was introduced in the study area early in the 18th century and became very popular as a middle class house of mechanics and yeoman. The subject type is two stories tall, sometimes with a finished garret, and contains two rooms on the first floor and two or three rooms on the second floor. The first floor was divided into two rooms by a partition that extended from the front wall to the back wall. Access to the house was gained through a door along the long wall of the house, which entered into the common living room, referred to as the hall/kitchen throughout this paper. Next to this room was a more formal parlor which was entered through a door off of the hall/kitchen. Another door, which also entered into the hall/kitchen, can be found along the rear wall of the house, often opposite the front entrance. In an analysis of this basic form a great deal can be learned about the priorities of the middle class and how these priorities were reflected in their choice of housing.

Orientation

Because of the importance of light and heat to the comfort of the inhabitants, the orientation and arrangement of interior spaces of the subject houses provide an opportunity to determine the priorities of those who were building the houses. When possible, early American houses were usually oriented in a generally southerly direction.
which provided more light and heat during the winter months.\textsuperscript{71} Despite this custom, nine of the seventeen subject houses are not oriented in a generally southerly direction. Four of the subject houses that are oriented towards the south also face the road. The nine houses that are not oriented in a southerly direction are all oriented towards the road along which they are situated. They also share the circumstance that each is located in an area that was at least moderately developed at the time that the house was built. In a town setting, road orientation was apparently more important to the builder than was the traditional southerly orientation.

A second design issue reflects the question of the importance of symmetry. It is often the case that the front door of a house which appears present a symmetrical façade may be placed off-center by a two or three inches. The small amount by which a door like this is off-center is probably the result of the inexact process of building with uncut stone. Houses like this will be considered symmetrical because that appears to have been the intention of the builder. The small amount by which the façades of some of these houses are asymmetrical is not visible to the casual observer.

The Amos Taylor House (p. 69) and the Elmer Buckman House (p.66) are two examples in which the subject house faces the road and are oriented almost due north. This raises an important issue with regard to the traditional southerly orientation of a one room deep house. The one major difference so far noted between the front and rear façades of the subject houses is that a second floor center window was often excluded.

\textsuperscript{71} To simplify the discussion of the orientation and arrangement of the subject houses they will be described in this paper as if they are oriented towards one of the principal compass headings. Thus, a house that is oriented in a south-southeasterly direction will be referred to as if it were oriented due south. Houses that are oriented in a clearly northeasterly or southeasterly direction will be referred to as such. True compass readings can be found accompanying the floor plans shown in the catalogue portion of this paper.
from the rear façade. The most common arrangement of windows and the door on the front and rear façades of the subject houses is depicted in the following illustration. The greatest difference between these two elevations is the exclusion of the center window from the second floor of the rear façade.

![Figure 27. Symmetrical façade configuration similar to the Amos Taylor House. (p. 70).](image)

In a one room deep house if the window openings of both the rear and front façades are consistent, the house could be oriented either towards the south or the north as either façade would allow the same amount of sunlight to enter the house. If the traditional southerly orientation is reversed, the only interior space that would suffer a decrease in light is the space that would have been lit by a second floor center rear window. If the second floor rooms were not used primarily as daytime work spaces, the lighting of these spaces would have been a lower priority. That the lighting of second floor rooms was a lower priority is indicated by the typical use of nine over six light sash on the first floor and six over six light sash on the second floor.
In the case of the Amos Taylor House and the Elmer Buckman House, mentioned above, southerly orientation was sacrificed in order to allow for the houses to face their entrances to the road. However, as noted above, the lighting of the interior spaces of the houses was only modestly affected as a result of this reverse of orientation. The remaining three subject houses in Taylorsville are oriented towards the east or west, again to face the road. As a result of this orientation, during the middle of the day, in the winter months very little direct light would enter though the windows of the front and rear façades. In this circumstance, lighting of the interior spaces would have suffered. Only during the early and later part of the day was more sunlight was able to enter the interior of the house.

Another consideration in the placement of windows in the second floor is the need for daylight in these rooms. The daytime function of these rooms determined the amount of light that was necessary. If the second floor rooms were used mostly as sleeping chambers, to light them during the day was not a high priority. This again is reflected in the common practice of using smaller windows on the second floor.

Symmetry

In addition to the issue of solar orientation, there is also the issue of architectural style as reflected in the issue of symmetry of the houses. We can presume that a house with a symmetrical façade demonstrates that the builder or owner was aware of issues of style. Symmetrical front façades are more commonly found in houses that are oriented towards the road, where the owner presumably was concerned with presenting a certain image to the public eye. The desire to present a symmetrical façade appears to have been
associated with a finer level of finish work and detail on the house, which required a
greater expense in the construction of the house. This relationship between symmetry
and finer finish work is particularly true of the subject houses that are located in
Taylorsville. The Taylorsville houses reflect strong Georgian influences due to their
generally late construction dates.

Prior to the construction of additions, every subject house located in Taylorsville
presented a symmetrical front façade. The Abdon Hibbs House, built around 1830, is
an example of a house built on speculation for the purpose of luring a mechanic to settle
in the town. The house was built within a developing town and fronts one of the streets in
Taylorsville. The house was not built by a mechanic, but by one of the sons of Benjamin
Taylor, the founder of Taylorsville. Again, in a town setting the builders or developers
of the house and the town likely wanted to present a neat, symmetrical and impressive
image to visitors to this new town.

The image of prosperity is also apparent in the advertisements for the sale or
rental of certain houses. As we have previously seen, many of the advertisements state
specifically that the house was ideal for a certain type of mechanic, whose residence
would have been necessary in a well-rounded and successful settlement.

The placement of bake ovens is also related to issues of orientation and symmetry.
The Elmer Buckman House and the Amos Taylor House are situated facing the main
east/west street in Taylorsville. The bake ovens of these two houses were located
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72 The Eliza Taylor House, John Frye House and the Amos Taylor House all have additions that were
constructed against the hall end of the house.
73 Rosenblum and Associates, p. 47.
outside the south or rear wall of the house with the opening located in the side of the cooking fireplace. In every other subject house, which still contains evidence of a bake oven, the oven was located outside the gable wall of the house with the opening to the bake oven being located in the rear wall of the fireplace. The removal of the bake oven to the rear of the house, as in the case of the Elmer Buckman and Amos Taylor Houses, provided for a completely symmetrical façade by removing a common object of daily chores from the eye of the public.

It is interesting to compare the front and rear façades of the subject houses to see how they relate to issues of symmetry and room arrangement. In the Abdon Hibbs House and the Elmer Buckman House symmetry is lost on the rear façade of the house where the rear entrance is placed according to the location of stairs rather than according to the interest of symmetry and style. The rear façades of the houses in Taylorsville were generally not visible to the casual observer and thus the builders were not concerned with issues of symmetry on this side.

In the Abdon Hibbs House the west façade is the symmetrical façade and faces the road. The east façade faces the Delaware River and one can see in the floor plan (Fig. 20. p. 60) that the east façade is distinctly asymmetrical. The rear door has been pushed far to the south in order to accommodate the stair that is placed along the partition between the hall/kitchen and the parlor. An interesting comparison can be made between the Abdon Hibbs House and the Fredendall residence, which is one of two other houses in which a winding stair was also placed along the partition between the hall/kitchen and the parlor. In the Fredendall residence, if we consider the south façade to be the principal façade, we can see that no adjustments were made in the arrangement of interior spaces in
order to accommodate a symmetrical façade. Instead, the south and north façade mirror each other, neither being symmetrical. In the case of the Abdon Hibbs House the rear door is offset to the south due to the location of the stairs. In the Elmer Buckman House (Fig. 22, p. 66 and photo below) there is a strait central stair that has also pushed the rear entrance to one side.


On the second floor of the Elmer Buckman House and the Abdon Hibbs House the location of this stair and associated hall have prevented the introduction of a second story window in this area along the rear wall. What makes this situation worth mentioning is that the rear façade of the Elmer Buckman House faces to the south a window in this location would have maximized the amount of light entering the second floor of the house. The priority was to include this central strait stair and a hallway on the second floor. A center window was included along the second story of the front
façade in order to provide a symmetrical façade and light the second floor hall. A comparison with the Wustholz residence (p. 32) shows that, if a second story rear window had been included, it would have provided additional light to the rear room on the second floor. This window would not have been impeded by a stair or partition, and indeed could have been constructed in a position that would have allowed for a symmetrical rear façade. In spite of this the central rear window on the second floor was excluded.

Other subject houses present very clearly asymmetrical door and window openings. Two examples of this type are the Fredendall residence, mentioned earlier, and the Nuegent residence. Both of these examples are oriented approximately south and have their principal façade perpendicular to the road. The Fredendall residence is situated in Glendale, which had been a small rural settlement of farmhouses, a mill and a store. Though located in a town, Glendale did not represent the extensive planned development of the type that can be found in Taylorsville. The Nuegent residence is located in a more rural setting. In both of these cases the priority of a southerly orientation was more important than that of road orientation and a symmetrical façade. In the Nuegent residence the front and rear entrance were not located directly adjacent to the intersection of the partition and the masonry walls as is common in the other subject houses. This would have provided for a façade that was much closer to being symmetrical. It also would have moved the hall/kitchen entrance far into the corner rather than the current location, which seems to present more of an interruption in the working space. Both the Fredendall and the Nuegent residences represent clear examples of the inside cross-passage floor plan as shown in Brunskill’s Illustrated Handbook of
Vernacular Architecture (Fig. 4). In his brief discussion of this type, the doors are not centered along the front and rear façades and are located opposite one another. In his example though, the doors are pushed to the side of the parlor rather than the principal 'living-room', as Brunskill refers to it. This is different from the subject houses in which the entrance is pushed to the side of the common room in order to allow for a larger parlor. This is the same configuration that can be found in the two front rooms of Brunskill's example of the small 'double-pile plan' (Fig. 28)

\[\text{Figure 28. Off-center door to allow for a sufficiently large parlor. (Brunskill, 1981, p. 55)}\]

In a discussion of double-pile plan houses in *Traditional Buildings of Britain*, Brunskill discusses the off-center placement of the front door as it relates to the size of the parlor. He suggests that "the front door is pushed rather to one side so as to give a reasonable width to the parlor on the front; this can rarely be detected at first glance except that in the very smallest examples the door is pushed considerably to one side." 

---

75 Ibid., p. 108.
77 Ibid., p. 54.
Houses such as the Fredendall and Nuegent residences are not necessarily smaller than the houses that possess symmetrical façades, but the reason for this off-center placement of the door is to provide for a sufficiently large parlor. In a comparison of the Nuegent residence, with an asymmetrical façade, and the Abdon Hibbs House, with a symmetrical façade, that the parlor of the Hibbs House is significantly smaller. Both houses are around 28'-2" wide yet the parlor of the Hibbs House is only 9'-11" wide and the parlor of the Nuegent residence is 11'-6" wide. This is a result of the front entrance of the Hibbs House being pushed significantly to the north or parlor side of the house in order to create a symmetrical façade. This also required the partition to be pushed to that side of the house, thus reducing the size of the parlor. It is interesting that the house that is intended to represent a higher level of finish and higher social status contains a smaller parlor as a result of the process of achieving this goal.

Another factor, which may have affected the orientation of the subject houses, is the date of construction. It may turn out to be that these issues of symmetry are related to date of construction as much as they are to the setting of the building. My inclination is to believe that symmetry is a matter of setting and wealth more than it is a matter of period of construction. The Richards residence for instance, which was built in 1787, is one in which there was very clearly an effort made towards approximate symmetry but it falls short by half the width of the front door opening. The owner was definitely familiar with symmetry in building but also had specific requirements for the interior spaces. It would seem they did not have an acceptable alternative for meeting the requirements for a fully symmetrical façade and interior space requirements. The Richards residence was built around 40 years before the houses in Taylorsville but it makes very strong gestures
towards symmetry. It cannot be simply that the later date of construction that has influenced the fully symmetrical façades of those houses. Rather, it seems as if the symmetrical façades of the houses in Taylorsville are due to the stronger influences of the Georgian style at this later date, as well as the town setting in which style was more important.

The most common configuration of gable end windows in the subject houses is an absence of any windows on the second or third floors and one or two small windows at either end of the attic. Not surprisingly the general survey revealed a much wider variety of window openings in the gable ends.

At this point in my research there is limited evidence that the pattern of window openings on the gable ends depend upon a compass orientation. There are only three subject houses that do present very similar configurations of gable end windows, which could be based on compass orientation. The Nuegent, Weinberg and Mathews residences, which are the three subject houses located outside of the principal area of study, each have two windows on the west gable end, exclusive of any attic windows. There is one window per floor and they are located at the southwest corner of the building, in the parlor and the parlor chamber. A window in this location allowed late afternoon sunlight to pass into the parlor. The McMenamin and Whitemore residences also have windows in the parlor end but they are arranged so that there is a window to either side of the parlor fireplace with no window on the second floor of the gable end.

The typical absence of windows in the gable parlor end of the subject houses may have been a result of the additional expense incurred in adding additional windows. It may also have been out of consideration of issues relating to the regulation of the
temperature of the interior of the buildings. Such consideration likely took precedent over the value of additional light that would have been introduced into the interior with the inclusion of additional windows.

The Andrassy House is the only clear example of a house in which there had been a door in one of the gable ends of the house. One can see in the floor plan (Fig. 18, p. 52) where a door in the southern gable end had been closed up at some point in the history of the house. There is no way to tell if this was an original opening. In other houses there could have been openings in the hall/kitchen gable end, but it is not possible to determine because it was to this end that most additions were added and all evidence of original openings has been obscured. The width of these gable end openings into additions indicates that these openings were most likely not original. The typical width of the masonry opening of an exterior door is around 43 inches and the door opening itself is typically 35 or 36 inches. The masonry opening into the addition of the Nuegent residence is only 2'-7 ½" wide, which would have allowed for a door opening of only around two feet. In the Whitemore residence the masonry opening in the southern gable end is 2'-10 ½" wide, which would have allowed for a door opening of only a little over two feet. This does not provide for enough space for an exterior door.

The Mathews residence provides additional evidence, which supports the idea that the gable end opening was not common. In this house, in which there are no gable end additions, there is no evidence of gable end openings on the hall/kitchen end through which access to an addition could be established. At the same time however, this space between the stairs and fireplace, which contains a closet in the Mathews residence is significantly wider in the Fulmor residence, where it was used as access the two sections
of the house. I have been unable to determine whether this space had contained a door or window, or simply a closet without a masonry opening. It raises the question as to whether some of these houses were built with the idea of expansion in mind. In every subject house to which additions were added, they were added to the side of the house on which the hall/kitchen was located.

Fireplace and Stair Arrangements

One of the clearest indicators of use and arrangement of the interior spaces of the subject houses is the placement and type of fireplaces.\(^\text{78}\) The most common arrangement of the fireplaces is to have a large cooking fireplace located in the hall/kitchen, usually in a corner along one gable wall, and a parlor fireplace, in a central location along the opposite gable wall. If we look at these houses according to simplified compass orientations, we see that there was a tendency to place the cooking fireplace in either the northwest or the northeast corner. This located the fireplace towards the colder areas of the house in the winter. If this was the most desirable location for the cooking fireplace, a question must be raised as to why the parlor and the parlor chamber fireplaces are not similarly located in the north corner of the room. One explanation for the central placement of the parlor fireplace and the chamber fireplace above is that to have placed them in the corner would have made it difficult for the chimney to pierce the roof at the ridge. A central location may have also heated the room more efficiently and completely than if it had been placed in a far corner of the room.

\(^\text{78}\) A discussion of the fireplace arrangement in the subject houses also necessitates that they be treated as if they are oriented towards one of the principal compass headings.
The exceptions to the common parlor and cooking fireplace arrangement described above are the cases in which the subject cell of the house was built after an earlier cell, which contained a large cooking fireplace and was retained after the subsequent construction phase. The Andrassy House and the Richards and Weinberg residences are examples of this type in which it was not necessary to include a large cooking fireplace in the later construction cell. The Plough residence is a question because the fireplace in the western room of the house represents a fairly small cooking fireplace, if indeed it had been a cooking fireplace. A description of this house in an advertisement for an orphan’s court sale of real estate states that the improvements are “a good two-story Stone House, with stone Kitchen adjoining.” As with the Richards residence there is some question as to the evolution of the house and its interior spaces. In the Mathews residence there is no parlor fireplace, but there is a small fireplace in the chamber above the parlor. I have been unable to determine if the absence of a parlor fireplace is an original configuration or if the parlor fireplace and the foundation were removed when the house was moved.

In buildings that are oriented toward the road at the sacrifice of a southerly orientation, we find exception to this general rule of placing the cooking fireplace in one of the northern corners of the house. In three of the houses that are located in Taylorsville, the cooking fireplace is located in one of the south corners. The Eliza Taylor House has lost its cooking fireplace as a result of a later alteration. Though I have not been able to survey this house we can assume that, given the location of the parlor

79 Wrightstown Township Real Estate Advertisement Files 1850-1858, Bucks County Intelligencer, 11 November 1856, BCHS, Spruance Library.
fireplace along the north gable, the cooking fireplace was located along the southern gable wall. This places it in a category with the Abdon Hibbs House, Elmer Buckman House and the Amos Taylor House, in which the cooking fireplaces are located in one of the southern corners. The John Frye house is the only one that has its cooking fireplace in a north corner.

In the Elmer Buckman and Amos Taylor Houses there is a clear reason as to why the cooking fireplace was situated in a southern corner of the house and not in one of the northern corners. If the priority of the builders was to create a symmetrical façade and this necessitated placing the bake oven to the rear of the house, then the cooking oven had to be placed in one of the southern corners.

In the Abdon Hibbs House there does not seem to be any reason why the parlor and hall/kitchen could not have been switched so that the hall/kitchen was placed on the north end of the house. Perhaps it was placed on the south end of the house so that the windows at the south end of the east and west façades lighted the space more efficiently.

An examination of the typical boxed winder stair that is found in the subject house reveals important information with regard to privacy in these small middle class houses. In the Whitemore residence the stair is located in the southeast corner of the house, next to the cooking fireplace. This location provides access to a small room or entry on the second floor, off of which are separate entrances to the other rooms. This location allows the smallest room on the second floor to be the more public space through which there is access to the other rooms. If a conjectural second floor plan (Fig. 30) places the stair in a location similar to the Fredendall residence, which no longer retains
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80 Entry seems to refer to a hall or small room at the top of the stairs.
its original second floor configuration, the result is a much larger entry. In this conjectural plan the entry has to be this deep in order to allow separate access to the two rooms. Another

Figure 29. Whitemore residence, second floor plan.

Figure 30. Conjectural second floor plan with central boxed-winder stair.
moved to the northeast so that the small entry is retained. In this configuration the privacy of the other small room would be lost because access to the large chamber must now be gained through this room. The corner location of the boxed winder stair creates a much more convenient room configuration on the second floor and thus, can be found more often amongst the subject houses. Additionally, on the first floor the location of the stair in the corner created by the cooking fireplace took up less of the valuable open floor space in these small houses.

The subject house type represents a form that was adaptable to a wide variety of needs. This is made clear in a number of ways. In examples like the Richards residence and the Andrassy House we find that the typical common room and parlor arrangement has been adapted to contain a double parlor situation in the Richards residence and what seems to have been a similar situation in the Andrassy House. The features contained within the house also vary in their location and in terms of what features are included. For example some houses contained pantry spaces within the hall/kitchen that were lit by a small window in the gable wall. Builders of these houses were also able to adapt the form so that the house presented a symmetrical façade when that was considered to be a high priority. As the form was adapted to meet a large variety of functional and aesthetic needs, so was it adapted to be used by people of different social status.

**Social Status**

In order to more fully understand this house type it is necessary to examine the social status of the residents of these houses. The primary vehicle in this process was deed research, which often revealed the occupations of the people involved in the
transactions. It also provided names to pursue in the research of other sources, such as historic tax records, real estate advertisements, wills and estate records, and historic maps. A great deal can also be determined through the examination of the house and its surrounding landscape.

As was mentioned earlier, the subject house type was adapted to satisfy a variety of different needs of different types of owners. A significant majority of the subject houses represent dwellings intended for occupation by families of a middle class. Skilled craftsmen, mechanics, tradesmen and yeomen represent the residents of this category. This is not, however, an absolute and often the subject type can be found on large farms that represented the properties of wealthier farmers.

The houses also tended to grow and evolve as the needs and the means of the owners changed. A farmer of limited means may have built a house that consisted of a hall/kitchen and a parlor downstairs with two rooms and an entry on the second floor. As the prosperity of that farm grew the farmer may have increased his land holdings and doubled the size of his house. In this circumstance, the subject house represents a dwelling of a higher social status.

The Richards Residence is an example of such a house, though there are very important distinctions. The first is the fact that the western most cell of the house had consisted of two parlors, as opposed to a parlor and hall/kitchen configuration. The partition is no longer extant and this cell now consists of a single large room with a parlor fireplace at either end. As mentioned previously, the masonry foundations of these fireplaces indicate that the size of these fireplaces has not been changed. The presence of two parlors indicates a higher level of wealth than most of the other houses that are being
considered. In addition, the overall size of the house, when the two pre-20\textsuperscript{th} century cells are considered is quite large. Other considerations like the large barn on the property and the size of the parcel of land on which the house was built also indicate a higher level of wealth than most of the other subject houses. 1795 tax records from Upper Makefield lists Benjamin Wiggins, one of the early owners of the Richards residence, as a farmer who owned 278 acres and obviously ran a fairly successful farm.\textsuperscript{81} The Todaro residence on the other hand was situated on about a quarter of an acre and was, at one time, occupied by a shoemaker.\textsuperscript{82} This shows us that as much as the house, the size and nature of the lot on which it is situated are also important indicators of the social status of the occupants of the subject house types.

Also at issue is the location of the house. The Richards residence is a rural residence in an area that was developed basically as large farms, which were occupied by men and their families who were wealthy enough to purchase larger parcels of land. It is noteworthy that many of the houses that were being built in rural areas were essentially of the same form as those that were built in towns on smaller parcels intended for merchants or mechanics, not wealthier landowners.

A comparison of the western cell of the Richards residence to a house like the Abdon Hibbs House in Washington Crossing State Historic Park, a house built specifically for a carpenter or wheelwright,\textsuperscript{83} reveals three distinct differences. The first is the width of the building; the western cell of the Richards residence is about four feet wider than the Abdon Hibbs House. The second is the fact that the western most cell of

\textsuperscript{81} Marshall, *Early History of Upper Makefield*, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{82} Upper Makefield Tax records, 1852. BCHS, Spruance Library.
\textsuperscript{83} Rosenblum and Associates, p. 31-32.
the Richards residence consisted of two parlors instead of a parlor and a hall/kitchen. The third is that the Hibbs house presents a symmetrical façade and the Richards residence does not. Aside from these three differences, which admittedly are not minor, these two houses are of essentially the same form. This illustrates that this form was being adapted to suit different needs. Other houses located in the same area as the Richards residence, also on large farms, have adopted this form. In most cases they have been enlarged, or are additions to earlier smaller houses, apparently according to the success of the farm on which they are situated.

Another example of the subject house type in which the subject cell does not contain a cooking fireplace is the Andrassy House, located in the northern section of Washington Crossing State Historic Park. The first building on this site consisted of a small one room stone cabin. In the 19th century a larger stone addition was added. The first floor of this addition consisted of two rooms, one of which contained a parlor fireplace. There does not appear to have been a fireplace in the other room though a chimney pierces the roof at this end. I was not able to survey the second floor of this house so the presence of a chamber fireplace on the second floor at this end could not be determined. It is possible that this second parlor and the chamber above were heated with stoves rather than fireplaces. In the case of the Andrassy House and possibly the Richards residence, the subject cells of the houses were added to existing structures.

Both of these houses, as well as the Weinberg residence, suggest that the subject house type
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84 Interview with the current resident Pat Patrizio who is the educator at Washington Crossing State Historic Park.
85 There is a question regarding the true nature and function of this room as it is quite narrow and contains unusual dimensions for a typical parlor of the subject house type.
86 The chronology of the Richards residence is discussed further in Chapter Two, p. 24.
type was being used as a means of expansion with increased prosperity of the owners. Evidence suggesting the presence of only a single parlor fireplace in the Andrassy House as well as the overall size of the houses indicates that the owner(s) of the house did not achieve the same level of wealth as did Benjamin Wiggins.

Another house that must have indicated a fairly high level of success of the owner is the Plough residence located along the northern boundary of Wrightstown Township, not far from the Richards residence. The first indication of the level of wealth of this owner is the size of the piece of land that the house was situated on. 63 acres and 5 perches. There is also a ruin of a large barn situated on the property. In two deeds dated 31 March 1842 and 1 April 1836 the property being transferred is described as "A certain messuage plantation or tract of land." This information informs us that this was indeed the property of a fairly successful owner. William B. Warner, who sold the property in 1842, was identified as a yeoman, as was William Rockafellow who purchased the property from Warner. A description of the property from 11 November 1856 describes the improvements to the property as follows:

"a frame Barn, stone stable high, a good wagon house, wood house, corn crib, hog pen; a milk house with a spring therein, from which water is conveyed through pipes to the barn; a cistern of water near the door with a pump therein; an apple orchard of selected fruit and other fruit trees; about 5 acres of woodland and 4 of meadow. with a stream of water running through it, the remainder is divided into convenient sized fields, under good fence and in a good state of cultivation." 
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87 Given a possible mid-18th century construction date, this house may have been constructed on a parcel of land containing around 289 acres. 1776 Map of property owners of Wrightstown Township. Drafted by Jeffery L. Marshall for the Wrightstown Historical Commission, 1991. BCHS, Spruance Library.
89 Bucks County Intelligencer Real Estate Advertisement files 1850-1860, Upper Makefield Township, 11 November 1856. BCHS, Spruance Library.
This description of the property with its many improvements indicates that the Plough residence was clearly the property of a fairly well off yeoman or farmer.

A closer look at the houses located in Taylorsville reveals a different social class of the people who lived in these houses. The houses that fall into the subject type category were all built in the 19th century. Only one of these houses, the Eliza Taylor House, built for the widow of Samuel Taylor around 1834, does not appear to have been built for the accommodation of some sort of mechanic. 90

Both the Abdon Hibbs House and the John Frye House were built on speculation in order to draw mechanics to live in Taylorsville. As mentioned in the discussion of the individual houses, both the Hibbs and Frye Houses accommodated a large number of people at one time. At one point nine people were living in the Abdon Hibbs House. 91 The fact that nine people were living in this relatively small house indicates that these houses were not meant for wealthier citizens who could afford a larger dwelling, but for middle class people who had to adapt according to more limited financial means. At the same time though this does represent a situation in which the shoemaker is successful enough to have two journeyman shoemakers working under him. In order to make this arrangement more acceptable the attic was divided into two separate rooms to accommodate the journeyman shoemakers. 92

---

90 Rosenblum and Associates, p. 47.
91 Ibid., p. 34
92 Ibid., p 32
In an advertisement in the *Bucks County Intelligencer* dated 31 October 1838, the Elmer Buckman House, another house in Taylorsville, states that “This property would suit almost any mechanic.”\(^3\) It is interesting that although the Elmer Buckman House is larger and represents a higher degree of finish than the other houses in Taylorsville it is still considered to be an appropriate residence for a mechanic.

Similar to this group of houses in Taylorsville is the Wustholz residence in Penns Park, Wrightstown Township. An advertisement for the sale of the Wustholz property, located in Penns Park, describes a 2-½ story stone house.\(^4\) Though it is impossible to determine at this point, the description of the garret as a half story suggests that it may also have been finished as one or more chambers as was the case in the John Frye House.

The Wustholz residence is another example of a house suited for a mechanic. An advertisement dated 19 October 1858 described the Wustholz property, then owned by Albanus L. Roberts, as, “that old and established WHEELWRIGHT STAND, owned by the subscriber.” The advertisement continued, “It contains 10 ACRES of Land, more of less, of the best quality, with a good Stone House, 2 ½ stories high; a good Wheelwright Ship: Barn, wagon house, and all necessary outbuildings.”\(^5\) Though this property was suited very well for a wheelwright, due to the presence of the wheelwright shop, other features of the property suggests that perhaps not every wheelwright could afford such a property. What really differentiates this property and house from those in Taylorsville is the fact that it stands on a significantly larger piece of ground. Not only do the houses in

\(^3\) Rosenblum and Associates, p. 37
\(^4\) Bucks County Intelligencer Real Estate Advertisement files 1850-1860, Upper Makefield Township, 19 October 1858. BCHS, Spruance Library.
\(^5\) Bucks County Intelligencer Real Estate Advertisement files 1850-1860, Upper Makefield Township, 19 October 1858. BCHS, Spruance Library.
Taylorsville stand on smaller lots, but also they were also initially rented by the mechanics that lived in them. The nature of the Wustholz property also suggests that the house may not have been built by a wheelwright or with the intention of bringing a wheelwright into the community. Whereas the examples in Taylorsville represent houses that were built with very specific tenants or owners in mind.

In addition to making note of the occupation of the people who lived in these houses it is also important to note that the occupants of the examples in Taylorsville were initially renting these houses. This indicates that the tenants were of a class that could not afford even this medium sized house. At least many of the mechanics that first settled in Taylorsville were not yet established enough in their trade, or in this area, to be able to afford such a house. In the historic structures report prepared for the Park, it is stated that Taylorsville went from being a town of renters to being a town of owners around the middle of the 19th century. This suggests that the occupation of being a mechanic did not set one beneath ownership of a house of this size, but it also required a certain amount of success in these occupations.

The subject house type clearly represents a type that was most commonly built for by people of a middle class status. This category of resident typically consisted of mechanics and skilled laborers, tradesmen and yeoman farmers. Although this is the group with which the subject houses can most commonly be associated, there are also many incidents in which the house type, or a variation of it, occurs in a situation that indicates a much higher level of social status. This is the case in houses such as the
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96 Rosenblum and Associates, p. 29.
97 For instance Samuel Search was a prosperous blacksmith who owned the John Frye House between 1852 and 1873. Rosenblum and Associates, p. 29.
Richards residence in which the basic two-room form was adapted to satisfy the needs of a wealthier farmer. The variety of owners and the differences in the characteristics of the properties with which the subject houses were associated, communicate that the subject house type was adapted to be adapted for use by people of different social classes. Architectural form alone is not then a clear indicator of social status, and must be considered in conjunction with other factors, such as property size, before one can begin to develop a more complete understanding of the role of the subject house type.

As a result of the adaptability, the subject house is far more common in the study area than the two-room deep house type. Despite this, very little has been written about these houses. Perhaps because it is small, and such a prevalent type, it goes unnoticed in the landscape in which it is so common. Rather than causing the house to go unrecognized, this should be all the more reason to study this house type thoroughly. Because of the large number of these houses extant in the landscape a great deal of information about the early history of the area stands to be gained from their study. At the same time, because the house is so small, it does not very well meet the needs of the modern homeowner and, thus, the integrity of the house is often threatened by alterations, such as the common practice of removing the partition on the first floor. It is important that these houses be studied and documented so that they may be interpreted and preserved before they are too changed to tell the story of their history. In order to further accomplish these goals, greater numbers of the subject houses need to be documented so that a more complete story of their meaning can be told, which will contribute to a more complete understanding of the history of the Delaware Valley. Documentation, after all, is a form of historic preservation.
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