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MATERIAL CULTURE AS EVIDENCE

Of all the examples of material culture, architecture proves to be the most complex and meaningful object, representing social status, place and lifestyle. Shelter, at its most basic is home for the human species, something without which humans would not survive. But buildings are more than shelter; it is building's ability to communicate that lifts it beyond most objects.

Within most cultures, architecture is built to last, sustaining the heritage of the culture. John Jakle, in his study of vernacular forms along the east coast of the United States stated this point clearly:

"Architecture, because of the natural tenacity of its fabric, the immobility and complexity of its examples, and the practical conservation of its builders and users, has maintained its regional integrity and is of greatest use in the drawing of regions."¹

By analyzing a small group of buildings it is possible to ascertain the local and cultural influences that went into their construction and derive potential meanings to them. It is this investigative process that is the purpose of this paper. A small group of regionally specific domestic buildings has been chosen for study in an attempt to understand the reasons for their design. The current literature on the subject has been studied and used as a basis for this analysis, which expands the efficacy of the previous research. Conclusions are made as to the identification of significant features and suggestions are given as to possible causes and to directions for further research. The goal is a concise understanding of the buildings under study, the motivations of their

building and the history of the structures that can serve as a template for future applications of architectural interpretation.

**HIGH ARCHITECTURE VERSUS VERNACULAR**

Within domestic architecture there are several variant streams, the most important being those houses designed by a trained professional and those more modest buildings constructed on a previously proven design. John Jakle quotes Mary Mix Foley, who further defines these two architectural strains in the domestic realm as formal and vernacular. She notes that whereas formal styles differed with each generation, the vernacular was "remarkably sturdy." When studying the social influences in house design both methods can prove enlightening. However, whereas professional design tended to be restricted serving the educated upper-class into the middle of the 19th century, vernacular architecture represented the larger percentage of the society. Because it is more widespread, vernacular architecture can tell us more about the settlement pattern and serve as a tool to identify their builders.

The houses cited in this study are all identified as vernacular. They are identified as such, because they were built without architects according to long-standing methods and plans. They also conform to the definition of vernacular found in the *Encyclopedia of Vernacular Architecture*:

"Vernacular architecture comprises the dwellings and all other buildings of the people. Related to their environmental contexts and available resources, they are customarily owner- or community-built, utilizing traditional technologies. All forms of vernacular architecture are built to meet specific needs, accommodating the values, economies and ways of living of the cultures that produce them." 

---


The group of houses that were selected for study were chosen largely based on their plan and size. The houses shown in this study are all one-room deep structures, possessing a gable end of no more than eighteen feet wide. In most cases, they are of a size that permits two distinct rooms, although some of a smaller size are studied with the suggestion that these smaller structures were intended to be enlarged to the standard two-room plan. The houses are largely built of brick, although later examples are studied that are built of timber. The houses all exist within the counties of Cumberland and Salem in New Jersey, which are along the eastern shore of the Delaware Bay. This area is part of the larger Quaker grant that was given to William Penn in 1676 and which also comprised Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Previous literature on this subject is comprised mostly of works by cultural historians and folklorists. Scholars such as Fred Kniffen, Henry Glassie and John Jakle have attempted to determine the regional character of vernacular architecture with uncertain success. Despite the effectiveness or lack thereof of these studies, it is important to review them so as to have a basis for the new research to be conducted. Buildings constructed according to vernacular motives are more conservative in their value system. To those studying material culture, this conservative nature proves useful for it sustains the historic values of the community through built heritage. Although heritage requires an acceptance by the individual or group which produces it, it can be reflective, produced even with comparative knowledge of popular culture or alternate
methods. Architect Doug Swaim identifies folk housing as a mental fact, "a symbol of 'Houseness.'" He writes, "The dwelling that results is located for good, or at least until man or decay removes it. The folk house is thus a record of mind in place . . . ."

Two fundamental issues when dealing with architecture are taxonomy and identification. Architectural identification is fundamentally determined by form - a building consists of built forms of specific sizes, materials, proportion, pattern of fenestration, and so are form in space. The construction and use of a structure are not necessarily determinate in establishing typology. For example, buildings originally designed in brick can be constructed later in frame. William Pierson, in describing high style architecture, defines form as represented by facade elements of organization, proportion, scale and ornament. John Jakle in his survey of domestic architecture, classifies buildings based solely on ground plan, "the ground plan or the pattern made by the exterior walls when viewed from directly above . . . ."

Jakle quotes geographer Terry Jordan, "The products of folk architecture are not derived from the drafting tables of professional architects, but instead from the collective memory of a people . . . based not on blueprints but on mental images that change little from one generation to the next . . . an architecture without architects." 

---

8 Ibid., p. 12.
9 Ibid., p. 3.
Due to the strong cultural inferences of vernacular architecture, many different disciplines consider it within their perview for study and interpretation. Cultural historians view domestic vernacular as folk dwellings, a material representation of traditions passed through heritage. As such, they conclude that it is localized and is influenced most by the passage of time. As John Jakle writes, "In general, folk material exhibits major variation over space and minor variation through time, . . ." As can be expected, the design profession and cultural historians perceive vernacular architecture quite differently. For the cultural historian, the study of architecture is a tool to understand more fundamental belief systems and attributes of a cultural or social cohort.

John Jakle distinguishes between cottages, those buildings without a full second story, and houses, those with a full second story. This distinction is not used in this study for several reasons. Although several of the early examples in this work are gambrel-roofed, lacking a full second story, they are still considered houses. In analyzing one-room deep domestic architecture, the significance of layout relies on the ground floor plan. Making a distinction between cottage and house would simply imply a difference in stature or use that may not be a part of the building system.

Iconology within the built form oftentimes indicates the social status given to particular structures; this is particularly true with residential buildings. John Jakle indicates such when he writes, "In a patently democratic society, social status, as
symbolized by fashion, remained an exceptional impulse.\textsuperscript{13} It is not the purpose of this study to delve into the intricacies of the class system or expression of status that exists in capitalist societies such as the United States. It may be taken for granted that one purpose of the built form is to portray the class status of the inhabitants. Although when analyzing single-room or other early variants of one-room deep domestic architecture this status indicator aspect may become arguable, when one observes the subsequent telescoping additions of such structures and one-room deep architecture built in the nineteenth century this aspect becomes more obvious. As Jakle indicates, "During the nineteenth century [one-room deep houses] symbolized affluence born of the land."\textsuperscript{14} This assertion is made due to the orientation of the structures to the road and the perception of size as one views the front facade. The structure's extension laterally, parallel to the road when the structure is specifically oriented to it, portrays a structure that is potentially very large; the front facade in such a case becomes indistinguishable from a much larger two-room deep plan. As Jakle surmises,

"The strength of the form as a class or status symbol was maximized when facades faced public roads thus projecting an impressive front elevation wider than that of any other early house type except for the full double-pile Georgian house. Its popularity reflected a newly emerging democratic agrarian society. The I house symbolizes prosperity and respectability both among farmers and among businessmen and professionals in the villages and towns."\textsuperscript{15}

Cultural historians rely on vernacular houses as markers to reflect regional social and cultural variations.\textsuperscript{16} In vernacular architecture, geographic variations are more

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 107.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 120.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 121.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 1.
evident than temporal change, which is the opposite of variations among formal architecture. This contrast makes it possible to interpret social and cultural lines because the influence of heritage or traditions passed through time remains strong.

**NAMING THE TYPE**

Many cultural historians refer to the type of domestic architecture discussed in this thesis as the "I" type house. Such structures were first termed "I" houses in the 1930s, when the cultural historian Fred Kniffen noted their recurrence in Illinois, Indiana and Iowa and in used the name to describe their narrow "I"-like profile. These cultural historians accurately identified the defining feature of this common building type, namely, its one-room deep plan. Fred Kniffen led the way in such research and taught many who would eventually follow in his footsteps. One of his students who actively continued his research was Henry Glassie. According to Henry Glassie, English immigrants often built "I houses," two-story, one room deep buildings usually with internal gable-end chimneys and blank gable walls. This assertion is supported by the findings of this study. Glassie continues by identifying a subtype with two front doors that was built in the Philadelphia region from 1830 to 1900. Such a subtype was not found in the region selected for this study; although houses with multiple front doors were documented, they were determined to be original single entrance structures with later additions. No multiple entrance structures specifically built as such were identified.

Glassie ends his discussion of one-room deep domestic architecture by stating that the housetype was replaced "about 1760" by the two-room Georgian type. This contradicts his earlier statement concerning the 19th century dates of the two door subtype, but he
does not spend the time to clarify. However, if the examples in this study are used even the most simple one-room plan continues to be constructed after 1760, and indeed is the prototypical house type of its era.

After Glassie's study of folk housing along the eastern coast of the United States, another cultural historian, John Jakle, took the torch by conducting a study on vernacular architecture in specific regions of the eastern half of the United States. In analyzing John Jakle's book some critical points need to be mentioned. First, despite Jakle's proposed reliance on plans he only inventoried habitable single-family dwellings visible from public rights-of-way. As a result, these dwellings were identified by visual determinants observed from a vehicle. Hence, mistakes regarding classification are possible, mistakes which could damage Jakle's conclusions. In the study for this paper, occupancy was not a determinant for inclusion - the only qualifying issue was the structure's one-room deep plan. Where Jakle relies solely on structures visible from the road, this study supplements visible structures with documentation from the Historic American Buildings Survey and earlier research. Several of the structures so documented are not visible from the street. One reason this supplemental research was necessitated was due to the average acreage of some of the properties involved. Within the study region it is not unheard of to have 300+ acres in a single property. Jakle also admits to not establishing a systematic photographic record. In this study, an attempt has been made to identify and photograph a large majority of the extant one-room deep domestic

---

19 Ibid., p. 21.
structures within the study region. Where Jakle chose a large geographic region and surveyed only small individual sites throughout, this study has chosen a limited geographic region and has attempted to survey it in its entirety.

**NEW JERSEY EXAMPLES**

In all of these previous studies, no examples were given for architecture within the state of New Jersey. Architectural historian, Alan Gowans, professional historian devoted to New Jersey architecture, includes formal and vernacular examples among the one-room deep house. Although adding several stylistic parameters, Gowans basically identifies the typology of the southern New Jersey one-room deep structure by its "narrow boxlike shape" and "blank side wall." Other criteria he includes as part of the typology are the use of one pent eave along the front facade, a cove cornice, a "front door approached by a small flight of steps" and a symmetrically fenestrated front facade. He stipulates that all these features are indicative of a house type introduced from Philadelphia, which, in turn, was a type developed in London after the Great Fire of 1666. He calls this type the "Philadelphia Colonial."  

"During the first century of its history, to be sure, several distinctive house-types developed in New Jersey - a "Dutch" type in the Hackensack Valley, a New England type in East Jersey, a Philadelphia type in the south."  

Although the criteria for Gowans' type may be the same for one-room deep domestic architecture in the study region, the settlement patterns and rural nature of the region do not lend credence to the notion that an urban architecture would be

---


21 Ibid., p. 2.
transformed into a rural type in Cumberland and Salem Counties. Rather, the similarities between the architecture of the two regions (particularly that architecture built in brick) can be traced back to the regions in England where the settlers originated. Clear comparisons can be made, but the influences involved are probably more direct - they are not disseminated from one to the other.

**Jakle's Criteria Applied to the Study Region**

In John Jakle’s analysis several criteria are established to ensure the accuracy of the built form's representation of the community in which it is located. These criteria provide a effective means to review the parameters used in this study and to explicate the reasons for the choice of region. First, Jakle only chooses sites that were founded during the initial occupancy of their area. This requirement ensures that the sites selected are not simply results of mimicry of surrounding neighborhoods. In our study area, Cumberland and Salem Counties comprise the area that was first settled by the colonists in western New Jersey. John Fenwick, the owner of the colony that encompassed the subject region, landed along the Salem River on October 4, 1675. These counties were founded during the initial occupancy of their area and the buildings selected date from that period as well.

The second criteria that Jakle established is that growth must have occurred in subsequent periods in order to show examples of successive construction eras. This subsequent growth provides comparative sources with time as the fluctuating component. In the case of the study region it is nearly impossible to find a community that has not

---

been altered over the years. However, Jakle stipulates that that change must be positive (relative term) growth, so that new influences can be effectively represented in new structures. Although economic delineation was not determined for this study, the built form in this region does exemplify economic growth. Besides the numerous examples of colonial structures, there are many buildings from the Victorian period, indicating economic abundance in the region during that time. More recently, especially in the suburban regions surrounding Salem, Bridgeton and Vineland, housing communities, strip malls and other examples of suburban sprawl have become increasingly evident, indicating that economic growth continues to this day.

Thirdly, John Jakle requires a diverse economic base for the study region. This criteria ensures no undue monopoly of influence from a single company or commercial endeavor. Although the economies of Salem and Cumberland Counties are largely based, now and historically, on agriculture (as a drive through the region's open expanses of fields would clearly indicate) there are several industrial influences that create some diversity. Due to the high quality and quantity of sand in the region, glassmaking has been a large industrial employer. Forests of old-growth trees are abundant and logging has been a strong facet of the local economy. The bay, ocean and rivers have also contributed heavily to the region's economy in the form of fishing, crabbing and especially oyster and clam dredging. Related to these enterprises was shipbuilding, which employed many local citizens. Although the productivity of these businesses fluctuate, diversity was a strength in the region's economy.

Fourth, Jakle stipulates that the study region must not be within the "immediate trade shadows" of cities. The houses selected should not be in relation to a city.
Geographic location and transportation routes, or lack thereof, have played a strong part in the continuity of Cumberland and Salem counties over time. The spatial mapping of cultures by their proximity to industrial cities identifies these two counties as a region of *petite culture*. Urban influence was minuscule and hence has not ever governed the development of the towns or their rural environs.²³

A fifth criteria is that the study area must be located in the interior of its culture region. This criteria requires that the study area does not encompass a peripheral and therefore difficult to define region. Peripheral or bordering regions are shaped by so many variant external influences that they are ineffective in portraying an accurate or definable iconology. Cumberland and Salem Counties, located along the southern end of New Jersey are at the core of an originally English Quaker culture region. With Philadelphia to the west, the Atlantic Ocean to the east and relatively large expanses of land separating them from the next closest urban cores of New York City and Baltimore, these counties are culturally secluded.

Finally, Jakle proposes that despite the requirement for a degree of cultural uniformity, the study region must also be located on or near paths of cultural diffusion. Being located as they are along navigable rivers opening to the Delaware Bay and almost exactly between New York and Baltimore geographically, the counties under study conform to this criteria. Hence, Cumberland and Salem Counties fit within all the parameters established by John Jakle and therefore the residential structures found within should effectively represent the cultural influences of the region. Beyond these criteria,

the region under study exhibits other aspects that makes it a good source of architectural study, due in part to its cohesive nature.

**GEOGRAPHY OF THE STUDY REGION**

After Cape May County, the region of Cumberland and Salem County is the southernmost in the state of New Jersey. Its geography is largely comprised of flat expanses of deposited clays and sands sloping gradually to the major waterways to be found within. Of these water features, the Maurice, Salem and Cohansey Rivers are the largest. The Maurice River rises in Gloucester County, travels through Salem County, providing a partial border between it and Cumberland before flowing through the eastern half of Cumberland to end in the Delaware Bay. Its entire length measures about forty-five miles. The Cohansey River begins in Salem County, follows a southerly route through Bridgeton on into the Delaware Bay, traveling a course of about thirty-one miles. The Salem River flows through Salem County, also terminating in the Delaware Bay. The rest of the region is pierced by numerous creeks, including Lower Alloways, Stow, West, Back, Cedar, Autuxit and Dividing Creeks. These waterways are listed due to their significance as transportation and communication routes prior to the establishment of overland routes. Among the waterways and running the length of the Delaware Bay are marshes, measuring in breadth from a half to two miles.

To its original settlers, the region was a place of great natural resources. The soil is very fertile and ever since the first colonies, large crops of wheat, oats, corn, fruit and vegetables have been produced. Expansive forests continue to exist including large

---

amounts of white, black and red oak, hickory, pine and cedar. Throughout the region is a specific type of sediment sandstone, referred to as Jersey sandstone, which consists of sand or fine gravel cemented by oxide of iron. This stone was quarried extensively for use in foundations and infrequently for entire structures.²⁶

The actual delineation of the region is a complex one. In the Quintipartite Deed of 1676 all that land to the west of a line running from Little Egg Harbor to the Delaware River was assigned to William Penn, Gauen Laurie and Nicholas Lucas by the Duke of York. In 1680, disputes between the Duke of York and the assignees caused this tract of land to be reassigned, this time with one-tenth of it being assigned to John Fenwick. Fenwick's tenth included what eventually would become Cumberland and Salem Counties. Fenwick, without any regular survey or allotment, claimed the land where he settled as his and granted to those who purchased from him deeds for specific numbers of acres.²⁷ Fenwick's colonists included men of many professions, from cheese monger to tailor, ship carpenter to gentleman.²⁸ As could be expected, agriculture quickly became the primary occupation in the region and much of the land was partitioned into large tracts of between 300 and 500 acres, with several tracts of considerably larger size.²⁹ The original settlers were almost exclusively Quaker. Although the region's population remained predominantly English through the Revolution, Quakers soon became a minority, representing only around 16% by 1745. These Quakers lost ground later to Protestants, largely Anglican, Presbyterian and Congregational, who took advantage of

²⁵ Ibid.
²⁶ Ibid.
²⁷ Ibid., p. 501.
William Penn's policy of open immigration. Salem County was incorporated on May 6, 1682 and by an act passed January 19, 1747, the county of Cumberland was separated from the southern parts of Salem County. This new county was named Cumberland for the Duke of Cumberland. Two years before he had won a significant victory at Culloden in Scotland, defeating Bonnie Prince Charles, thus ending any Stuart claims to the throne of England. He was a national hero at the time and his name appears in counties in many of the American colonies of the period.

**TERMINOLOGY**

Because of variations in terms, some explanation of terminology is necessary. Most of the terms used by the scholars previously mentioned are ineffective. Henry Glassie, for example, uses the term "Georgian" to designate the two-room deep plan houses that appear in the mid 18th century. This study avoids the use of "Georgian" to describe a plan type, reserving it for a design style that was applied to both vernacular and formal architecture. The same two-room deep plan is overlaid with Federal and Gothic details in the mid 19th century. In both the one-room and two-room plans, this study makes reference to the "hall/kitchen" and the "parlor." These terms should not be considered literal. the room identified as "hall/kitchen" refers to the utilitarian space of the house where tasks such as cooking are performed and where a more public atmosphere exists, since the entrance and stairs are usually located therein. The room that is identified as the "parlor" is that room which is specifically separated from the busier

---

29 Ibid., p. 9.
30 Ibid., p. 10.
31 Ibid., p. 322.
32 The Cumberland Story: A Brief History of Cumberland County, N.J. (Bridgeton: Cumberland County Historical Society), p. 3.
area of the house for whatever reason. It could be an actual parlor or it could be a first floor bedroom. The significance of this room lies in the fact that it has a purpose distinct from the kitchen space.

One-room deep domestic houses are defined by the depth of its plan; that is, the lateral dimension (usually the gable end) of the structure measures around fifteen to eighteen feet, providing depth for a single room. This is opposed by the two-room deep plan, or what Henry Glassie calls a "Georgian" plan, which measures about twice the depth of the previous and which is actually comprised of two distinct bays placed laterally front to back. The type is often called a hall and parlor plan, which confuses uses; it may be a kitchen, bedroom or other uses. A clearer nomenclature describes a one-room deep, two room plan and a one-room deep two room plan with a center hall.

The simplest house form recorded in Salem County is a square-walled structure with no partitioning, but two stories. Nine structures, known as "hall" houses were recorded in inventories in Salem between 1700 and 1774.33 These "one-room plan" structures take two forms: either a symmetrical front elevation with window-door-window on the first story and one or two interior gable-end chimneys with dimensions of between fifteen to seventeen feet by nineteen to twenty-four feet; or, a single window and door front facade with a single interior gable-end chimney measuring sixteen to seventeen feet by sixteen to twenty-one feet. In the inventories, residents of such houses had estates valued between £95 and £585, the wealthiest being Leonard Gibbon in 1744.34

33 Ibid.
Another slightly larger house type was the so called "hall/parlor" house, the "one room deep two room plan" house. Most of these buildings had symmetrical window-door-window facades and two internal gable-end chimneys, an example being the John Oakford house of 1764. As with the smaller "hall" house, some of these larger types had only one chimney, as is the case in the original section of the Beasley-Hancock house dating from around 1765. Dimensions for these houses usually ranged from sixteen to seventeen feet by twenty-five to thirty-five feet.35

Like the "one room plan" houses, these were quickly enlarged as circumstances permitted. Alterations and additions usually progressed in a predictable manner. The Smith-Weatherby house, for instance, was built with a one-room plan in 1752. At some later date, probably during the late 1760s or 1770s, it received a lateral addition of two rooms as well as a second story over the original section. The addition in the horizontal plane transformed it into a "center-passage" house that remained one-room deep.36

As several of the examples accompanied by plans show in this study, one-room structures are usually added to in a telescoping fashion. John Jakle asserts not only that the single room is the primary component from which room appendages form expansions, but also that the single-room unit was the first step from which linear plan dwellings originated.37 He makes this statement in an arbitrary manner, with no floor plans to support it and continues by stating that the "Georgian" influence turned linear plan forms more symmetrical and facades more balanced.38 When analyzing one-room deep

35 Ibid., p. 36.
36 Ibid., p. 45.
38 Ibid., p. 107.
structures this formal influence is only visible in the facades of nineteenth century examples, which portray a "Georgian" elevation on a one-room deep plan.

The weather experienced in Cumberland and Salem Counties varies from consistent freezing temperatures in the winter months to rather hot and humid conditions in the summer. With this in mind, it is no wonder why brick was extensively used in early construction. Brick is a natural insulator, keeping the heated air inside during the winter and resisting heat penetration in the summer. Also, fireplaces would prove a necessity in the winter months, and all the examples given herein seem to exhibit chimneys for fireplaces.

**FACTORS AFFECTING DESIGN**

Climate plays an important role in vernacular design. Where the house is oriented to the south, the gable ends, almost exclusively, exhibit windows only on the southern edge. This placement of windows is an attempt to take advantage of the southern sun during the winter months.

Chimney placement is another important factor. In New England, central chimneys conserve warmth in the core of the house. In the milder mid-Atlantic region chimneys are usually on the end walls. Thus, a central or interior chimney usually designates a bay addition.\(^{39}\) This is due to the fact that chimneys for this type of house were almost exclusively placed on one or both gable ends. A central chimney, therefore, usually indicates that the chimney was incorporated into an addition.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., p. 115.
Orientation is an important reaction to climate - where lot size permits, houses usually face south.\textsuperscript{40} Because most of the houses studied are located on farms, lot size is usually not an issue and most houses face south. In a town, it is common to face the street. Although due to the expansive nature of acreage and property size in this region, constrictive lot size is rarely an issue, it can be considered as a possible issue for those houses of extraordinarily low cost, which would be constrained by a small lot size.

Based on research of inventories and probates, Julie Riesenweber, who chose many of these houses for her own cultural history study, asserts that although historic brick houses of two and a half stories with at least two rooms remain extant, the majority of structures in Salem County during the eighteenth century were comprised of smaller frame structures.\textsuperscript{41}

By applying the ideas and conclusions made by previous research to examples within the study, new assertions can be made as to the influences on their construction. The examples given include variation in location, size, inhabitant wealth, construction method and material and other factors, providing a good foundation for conclusions.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 142.
FIGURE 1

Map of Cumberland County, New Jersey
FIGURE 2
Map of Salem County, New Jersey
THE GEORGE ABBOTT HOUSE

According to Cushing, the original hall/kitchen portion of the George Abbott house was built in 1704, with the western lateral extension being built in 1724. In the hall/kitchen portion of the house, the window on the southern wall would most likely have originally been a door. It is identified as a hall/kitchen plan by its single fireplace, corner stair and short gable wall. This plan is very similar to the Kiger house, with its placement of the fireplace in the northwest corner where is helps insulate the interior. The addition of 1724 exhibits a more formal plan, with a center hall and flanking rooms of equal size. With its central door and symmetrically positioned pairs of windows the south facade gives a more formal appearance. Because of the addition, the original kitchen fireplace chimney runs up through the center of the house. As well, the later addition has no chimneys, which suggests that the original chimney was modified to accommodate the added rooms of the extension.

The George Abbott house stands at a considerable distance from the nearest road, and would have been oriented to the south as is the norm for this type.

George Abbott, with his wife and his sister Mary, emigrated from England to New England, where they stayed for a short time before settling in the township of Elsinboro in 1690. In 1696, George purchased one hundred and thirty-six acres of land from Joseph Nicholson, located on the north side of Lower Alloways Creek. In the succeeding years George Abbott purchased several other parcels of ground from the Nicholson family, on which he built this brick structure. The Abbots were Quaker.

---

FIGURE 3

The George Abbott house (1704)

Elsinboro, Salem County

---

THE WILLIAM BRADWAY HOUSE

The William Bradway house was built of brick in 1700, with a one-room frame addition built sometime around 1810. The house is another derivation of the two-room subtype, with a room separated from the entrance and hall/kitchen area of the house by a wooden partition wall. This house is unique in the examples here given in that the partition does not run longitudinally from one exterior wall to the other, but rather encloses a room filling little more than a quadrant of the floor space. This design permits the corner stair to remain in the hall/kitchen room and may be a lateral alteration.

Another two-room plan with a single fireplace, the fireplace is constructed in such a way as to be wholly separated from the rest of the rest of the structure. It is most likely that the center window in the north facade was originally a door, making the north and south facades nearly identical.

Edward Bradway, his wife (Mary), their children (Mary, William and Susannah) and three servants came in the Kent from London in 1677. Edward had purchased a town lot of sixteen acres and one thousand acres in the country from John Fenwick prior to leaving England. William Bradway, Edward's only son, became a merchant and purchased nine hundred of his own acres later in life.⁴⁴

FIGURE 4

The William Bradway house (1700)
Salem County

THE KIGER HOUSE

The Kiger house is a hall/kitchen plan structure built around 1720. It is identified as such by its single fireplace along the western wall, its corner staircase and the lack of any partition creating a second room. In most of these one room plan houses the kitchen chimneys are usually placed on the west. Although partitions of this kind were often removed, it is unlikely one existed in this house due to the lack of a second fireplace and the small size of the overall structure, which would provide only the smallest possible space for a second room. The only window penetrations are on the front, or southern facade. These windows frame the front door, which is slightly larger than the only other entrance, being along the rear or northern facade. The corner stair is placed in such a position as to take advantage of the structural brickwork of the chimney for support. This stair also provides an added bit of insulation along the northern wall.

This house is located in Pilesgrove Township, near the historic town of Woodstown. Pilesgrove was one of the original townships of Salem County and was named after Thomas Piles, A Quaker, who purchased ten thousand acres there.  

46 Ibid., p. 447.
FIGURE 5¹
The Kiger house
Salem County

¹ Plan taken from HABS NJ-445.
The Daniel Smith-Weatherby house was built in 1752 in Quinton Township. It is comprised of a single room with a fireplace along the west wall. A single door provides entrance to the south. The plan does not show a staircase, which was probably removed when additions to the house were built. This house, slightly smaller than the Kiger house with only a single window on the entrance facade and with no staircase, would indicate the inhabitants to be of less wealth than the Kiger family at the time of construction. However, the family history does not correspond with this assessment.

John Smith, his wife and their children were of the company that came to Salem in the Griffen with John Fenwick in 1675. John purchased from Fenwick two thousand acres, extending from the head of Alemsbury Creek to Alloways Creek. His son, Daniel, bought one thousand acres on Alloways Creek, near Quinton, on which he built this house. Originally Quaker, as were all those who arrived with Fenwick, Daniel eventually became a Baptist, donating a quarter of an acre of his land for a site to build the Mill Hollow Baptist Church in 1743.47

---

47 Ibid., p. 394.
FIGURE 6

The Daniel Smith-Weatherby house (1752)

Quinton, Salem County

THE WILLIAM OAKFORD HOUSE

This is the first house shown with a clear two room plan. As with many of these two-room plan subtypes, the original plankboard partition creating the two rooms has been removed; it was most probably located just to the west of the entrance. The two-room subtype is identified by its elongated lateral plan and the existence of usually two fireplaces, one on each gable end. In most cases the fireplaces are of two types, a cooking fireplace associated with the kitchen and a parlor fireplace. The partition was placed to separate the parlor from the entrance, staircase and working area of the house (i.e. the hall/kitchen). The kitchen fireplace is located in the southeast corner, with the corner stair adjacent along the eastern wall. What can be called the parlor fireplace is located a bit off-center along the western wall, flanked by a closet to the north and a small window to the south. The facades on the north and the south are nearly identical with central entrances and symmetrical windows on either side. The photograph shows the gambrel roof and the brick patterning on the eastern gable end.

The Oakford family was one of the original families of Salem County. Two brothers, Wade and Charles, purchased a large tract of land along Alloways Creek. William Oakford, who built this house in 1736, was a grandson of Wade.48

---

FIGURE 7

The William Oakford house (1736)

Alloway, Salem County

---

THE JOHN OAKFORD HOUSE

Extremely similar to his brother William's house from the previous page, John Oakford's house is also a hall/kitchen-parlor plan. Here too, the kitchen fireplace is located along the eastern wall with the stair in the northeast corner. The parlor fireplace is more centrally located on the western wall, and although it too has a storage space to the north, it lacks any southern flanking window. The north and south facades are again nearly identical, although in this case, the doors are off-center to accommodate the partition of the larger parlor. This askew facade is important in that it portrays the lack of significance placed on symmetry in this period. The photograph shows similar brickwork, gambrel roofing and dormer configurations to the William Oakford house.

The principal village in Upper Alloways Creek township is Alloway. The first three houses in the village were built by the Oakford family and were all hip roofed brick structures. The Oakfords were Quaker and were prominent in the Alloways Creek Meeting. Charles and Wade Oakford, nephews of Edward Wade, came to Salem around 1695. Charles Oakford purchased three hundred acres from his uncle and Wade purchased five thousand acres. This house was built in 1764 by John Oakford and his wife, Hannah Colston Oakford, thirty-one years after their marriage in 1733.

---

50 Ibid., p. 476.
FIGURE 8

The John Oakford house (1764)

Lower Alloways Creek, Salem County

---

THE WARE-SHOURDS HOUSE

The original section of the Ware-Shourds house, built in 1730, is comprised of the two rooms to the east. The one-room addition to the west was made in 1758. The original section displays the typical attributes of the two-room plan. A parlor, with its own fireplace is separated from the hall/kitchen by a plankboard partition wall. The kitchen fireplace is along the western wall with what was once most likely a corner stair in the northwest corner. There are small storage closets adjacent to both fireplaces, with the one on the southeast corner containing a small window. As with several other of the examples shown the northern and southern facades are nearly identical (the diagonal lines in the plan indicate where a door once stood). The addition is very similar to the original in plan, with nearly identical north and south wall penetrations (assuming the picture window along the southern wall was expanded from an original door opening), and its large kitchen fireplace.

This house was built by Joseph Ware along the south bank of Alloways Creek. Joseph Ware was a servant of Edward Wade when they came in 1675, but soon became the purchaser of five hundred acres of land on Alloways Creek, which he acquired from Anthony Page for forty-seven pounds.\textsuperscript{52} He was a devout Quaker who gave the Friends a lot of ground for a meeting house in 1717.\textsuperscript{53} This house, along with the John Maddox Denn house and the John Oakford house, stands along the south bank of Lower Allways Creek between the Delaware Bay and Hancock's Bridge.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p. 425.
FIGURE 9

The Ware-Shourds house (1730)

Lower Alloways Creek, Salem County

---

THE BEASLY-HANCOCK HOUSE

The Beasly-Hancock house is a derivation of the two-room plan. As in other plans of this type, a partition creates a room separate from the entrance and hall/kitchen space. However, this house does not have a parlor fireplace, and rather than a corner stair adjacent to the kitchen fireplace, the stair is located along the partition wall in the parlor space. The kitchen fireplace is smaller than previous examples and is flanked by a single window. The entrance facade is symmetrical, with a central door and flanking windows.

Very little is known about the family who built this house. It is tentatively attributed to Morris Beasley, who lived during the period of the Revolutionary War. The name of Hancock is associated with the house, because it was owned by the Hancock family in the 19th century and was the home of a famous nurse, a Hancock, who participated in the Civil War battle at Gettysburg. An estimated construction date for this house would probably be sometime within the 1760's.
FIGURE 10

The Beasly-Hancock house (c. 1760)

Lower Alloways Creek, Salem County

SAMUEL NICHOLSON HOUSE

The Samuel Nicholson house was built in Elsinboro Township in 1752 and exhibits transitional features between the one-room deep plan and the two-room deep design. As in two-room deep plans, the parlor is separated from the hall/kitchen space and entry; however, in this case the partition wall is made of brick and the parlor itself is broken into two distinct rooms with corner fireplaces. As with other plans shown, the entry opens into the "hall/kitchen" with a large kitchen fireplace. Again, that fireplace is flanked by a corner stair. The northern and southern facades are nearly identical with centrally placed doors and flanking windows. The parlor section has a triangular chimney feature, flanked by windows, which provides a small parlor fireplace for each of the two rooms. A wood plank partition separates these two rooms, which have nearly the same square footage. Also notice in the photograph the suggestion of a missing pent eave, which would be an indicator to this house's date of construction.

Samuel Nicholson was one of the wealthiest of the colonists who arrived with John Fenwick and became a magistrate of the colony under Fenwick's governship. Samuel, with his wife Ann and five children purchased a sixteen acre lot on Wharf Street in Salem and a tract of two thousand acres in Elsinboro. It was at his house in Salem that the first Society of Friends was organized in the colony in 1676. In the same year Samuel was appointed the first justice of the peace in Fenwick's colony. He had been a farmer in Wiseton, Nottinghamshire, England prior to taking passage with Fenwick.

56 Ibid., p. 368.
FIGURE 11

The Samuel Nicholson house (1752)

Elsinboro, Salem County

---

THE JOHN MADDOX DENN HOUSE

The John Maddox Denn house is the only example of the brick farm houses which does not comply with the typical features of the one-room hall/kitchen plan, or the two-room hall/kitchen-parlor plan. This house is more typical of those to be found in New England. The centrally located front entrance opens directly to the stairwell. This stairwell utilizes the massive core chimney for support and warmth, which provides large fireplaces for each of the two rooms on the first floor. Neither the north or south facades are symmetrical and they are not similar in penetration placement or number. The photograph shows a single highly pitched shed dormer, which is another feature of typically New English architecture. Such houses as this are known as saddlebag houses, derived from the analogy of the two rooms, which straddle the central mass of the chimney, like saddlebags.\footnote{Holl, Steven, p. 12.}

John Maddox, a chandler from the parish of St. Sepulchre in London, with his wife, their daughters and three servants came from London on the ship \textit{Surrey} in 1678. In 1682, John purchased a half of William Hancock's manorial tract known as Hancock Hurst, equaling five thousand acres of land near Hancock's Bridge in Salem County.\footnote{Thomas Cushing, M.D. and Charles E. Sheppard, Esq., \textit{History of the Counties of Gloucester, Salem, and Cumberland New Jersey, with Biographical Sketches of Their Prominent Citizens}, (Philadelphia: Everts & Peck, 1883), p. 319.}

One of his daughters, Elizabeth, married James Denn, who lived in Salem. The grandson of the elder Maddox, John Maddox Denn, born in 1693, married Elizabeth Oakford in 1717, and built this house eight years later.\footnote{Ibid., p. 435.}
FIGURE 12\textsuperscript{1}

The John Maddox Denn house (1725)

Lower Alloways Creek, Salem County

CONCLUSIONS

These houses show several similarities that should be summarized. First of all, they are all one-room deep structures, with gable ends not in excess of eighteen feet wide. All of the homes have at least one fireplace, and in the case of two-room plans, typically have a kitchen fireplace and parlor fireplace in separate rooms. They are all constructed in brick and all have some form of patterning in their brickwork. All of the houses were constructed prior to the Revolutionary War. In order to test some of these consistencies, a windshield survey was conducted of other one-room deep domestic architecture in the region under study. It was interesting to discover that although some similarities were found, there were discrepancies in geographic location and time.

The largest change was the shift to timber construction in later one-room deep house construction. For instance, the Ananias Sayre house in figures 13 & 14 was built of wood frame sometime after Ananias purchased the ground in 1761. It shares numerous features with the earlier brick examples, with an off-center window on the gable end, a one-room deep plan, a corner stair and gable-end fireplaces. The major difference is that this house is built of wood, despite next door examples in brick and dating from the approximate same time.

Another example can be seen in the Dunn-Stratton house (figs. 15 & 16). This house is very similar to the ones previously shown, except that it too is built of wood. The Dunn-Stratton house was built in 1797 by Baracha Dunn originally with a single story, measuring approximately sixteen by twenty-three feet. As with other examples here given, the single fireplace was located in the northeast corner, with a corner stair
adjacent to it in the southeast corner. Doors were located centrally on the north and south walls and a plankboard partition existed at one time just to the west of the doors. The parlor had a single window looking out to the south and was otherwise empty. This house is located on the opposite end of the study region from the Sayre house. There is no documented statement that accounts for this shift from brick to wood construction, but some suggestions are possible. Perhaps, as is concluded by other scholars of the region, the pre-Revolutionary examples of timber construction are largely lost and only the brick examples survive to this day. Another suggestion is that the clay deposits used to make the bricks were used up, although this is unlikely due to the nature of the terrain and geology of the region. Another suggestion would be that the patterning of the bricks in the earlier examples indicates the employment of specific craftsmen, perhaps originally from England, who moved away or died during or after the Revolutionary period. Finally, cost could be a reason, with the brick craftsmanship proving too expensive for later construction.

After Salem, the town of Greenwich was the next to be established in the study region, being laid out in 1685. In this early village there are examples of both brick and timber one-room deep domestic architecture. Vauxhall Gardens (fig. 17) was built of brick by Thomas Maskell around 1725. Although very similar in profile to the gambrel structures built by the Oakfords, Vauxhall lacks the patterned brickwork of the Salem examples. Thomas Maskell was born in Simsbury, Connecticut which may explain the lack of patterning, if that patterning was a carry-over from England. Compare this one-room example with another in Greenwich, the Harding house (fig. 18). Built a little later

---

60 Cumberland County Register of Historic Structures and Sites.
than Vauzhall Gardens, this house is distinguished by its central chimney and timber construction. Just around the corner from the Harding house is the Daniel Harris house (figs. 19 & 20), again dating to the first half of the 18th century. Here again is a one-room deep domestic structure built of timber. In fact, timber is not the only disparate construction material used in one-room deep construction within Greenwich. The Samuel Ewing house (figs. 21 & 22) is a one-room deep domestic structure built in 1765 that is entirely constructed of Jersey sandstone. Samuel Ewing was the son of Thomas Ewing, who was born in Londonderry, Ireland before traveling to the colonies and settling in Greenwich. Perhaps because of this Irish background, brick was not the obvious choice in construction material, but a more substantial material than timber was sought, resulting in the choice of sandstone.

Other examples of timber construction of the one-room deep house, can be found in Mauricetown, along the Maurice River in Cumberland County. Mauricetown was not established until 1730 and it was not until the Compton brothers began developing the town in 1814 that it truly began to prosper. Most of the residents of Mauricetown were in the business of seafaring, and numerous captains resided here. Two obvious examples (figs. 23 & 24) of one-room deep construction were photographed in this town. The later date of the town's establishment and development would indicate timber construction based on the hypothesis that later construction was primarily in timber, and that is exactly what the examples show.

---

61 Letter from Carl Williams to Joseph Downs dated April 16, 1951, Lummis Library Collection.
62 HABS-NJ-635, p. 2.
David Hackett Fischer suggests in his book, *Albion's Seed*, that vernacular architecture in the colonies is related to the countries of origin of the colonists. In other words, patterns in the built form travel transcontinentally. As discussed earlier, this region was very homogenous, almost exclusively English and Quaker. Based on Fischer's supposition, it can be hypothesized that the one-room deep domestic architecture found in the study region relates to vernacular architecture to be found in the regions of England from which the settlers of Cumberland and Salem Counties originated.

One such connection can possibly be made through construction methodology. Of over eleven types of bonding patterns for brickwork used in England and across America, Flemish bond was almost exclusively the bond of choice in Salem and Cumberland Counties. The bond is recognized by its checkerboard pattern produced by using a vitrified or blue header brick. This vitrified glazing was produced by applying continued heat until the color changed. It is called Flemish bond, because it arrived in England via Flanders and was most popular in the southeastern corner of the country, chiefly in Kent, Essex, Surrey and Sussex Counties. There is one example of brickwork in England which exhibits all of the bond and diaper patterns found in Salem County and that is the Inner Gate House at Little Leez or Leigh's Priory in Essex, built around 1536. 

It is largely from these counties in England where the settlers of Cumberland and Salem Counties originated, and the continuation of the popular brickwork by the settlers is proof that the architecture was strongly influenced by standards and practices from the English homeland.

---

In addition to the elevations and materials, the plans of many of these structures indicates Old World origins. Rooms unequal in size, often indicated by the asymmetrical facades of early examples, relate directly to building typologies in the midlands of England.\footnote{John A. Jakle, Robert W. Bastion and Douglas K. Meyer, \textit{Common Houses in America's Small Towns: The Atlantic Seaboard to the Mississippi Valley}, (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1989), p. 114.}
FIGURE 13

Ananias Sayre house (c. 1761)
Roadstown-Greenwich Road
Stow Creek Township
View looking northwest

1 Photo taken October 1998 by author.
FIGURE 14\(^1\)

Ananias Sayre house (c. 1761)
Roadstown-Greenwich Road
Stow Creek Township
View looking southwest

\(^{1}\) Photo taken October 1998 by author.
FIGURE 15

The Dunn-Stratton house (1797)
Main Street
Millville
View looking northwest

\footnote{Photo taken February 1999 by author.}
FIGURE 16

The Dunn-Stratton house (1797)
Main Street
Millville
View looking northwest

1 Photo taken February 1999 by author.
FIGURE 17

Vauxhall Gardens (1725)
Mill Road
Greenwich Township
View looking northeast

1 Photo taken July 1998 by author.
FIGURE 18

The Harding house (c. 1735)
Ye Greate Street
Greenwich Township
View looking northeast

1 Photo taken July 1998 by author.
FIGURE 19

The Daniel Harris house (c. 1730)
Bacon's Neck Road
Greenwich Township
View looking south

1 Photo taken October 1998 by author.
FIGURE 20

The Daniel Harris house (c. 1730)
Bacon’s Neck Road
Greenwich Township
View looking east

1 Photo taken October 1998 by author.
FIGURE 21

The Samuel Ewing house (1765)
Ye Greate Street
Greenwich Township
View looking northwest

1 Photo taken October 1998 by author.
FIGURE 22\textsuperscript{1}

The Samuel Ewing house (1765)
Ye Greate Street
Greenwich Township
View looking northeast

\textsuperscript{1} Photo taken October 1998 by author.
FIGURE 23

Noble Street
Mauricetown, Commercial Township
View looking southeast

1 Photo taken February 1999 by author.
FIGURE 24^1

High Street
Mauricetown, Commercial Township
View looking northwest

^1 Photo taken February 1999 by author.
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