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Preface

In the years following the Great Depression and preceding the Second World War, a newspaper editor, named Henry Charleton Beck traveled the back roads of New Jersey. Beck recorded the places he saw and the tales he heard and published them, first as newspaper articles and then later as a highly successful series of books.

"...many towns, too tiny and uncertain for placement on present day maps, have been found to be villages of importance long before the first flares of the Revolution. Others which have vanished entirely were called to mind by those who lived near their sites, remembering the strange fireside tales of their forebears. Still other hamlets and less, mere clusters of dwellings at foresaken crossroads, have hidden their past in brooding silence and decay. While the world outside has been growing up, this world inside has been growing down."

Today, over half a century later, the once distant "outside world" has grown to encroach upon that which Beck defined as the "inside." Under the twin pressures of growth and change, many of these same crossroads, towns and hamlets, those which survived "growing down," are now once again faced with a crisis of existance. As suburbanization reconfigures the landscape of rural and small town New Jersey, the threat exists that centuries old communities may lose their sense of identity in the resulting sprawl. Traditional place names, in many cases, will soon be less

---

relevant to local residents than their zip codes. Once the center both physically and symbolically of many New Jersey towns, Quaker meeting houses are tangible and conspicuous reminders of their communities' past and as such symbols important to their present and future. The goal of this thesis is to create an historical framework for the understanding of these buildings; a context, hopefully, of aid to those persons who are intrusted with the care of these buildings and the future of the communities in which they stand. This thesis includes both a typological examination of Quaker meeting house form as it developed in New Jersey and an anotated, illustrated inventory of every meeting house known to have been constructed within what is today the State of New Jersey, once the Provinces of East and West New Jersey.

The process by which the information related here has been assembled has taken the better part of a year. Every surviving New Jersey Quaker meeting house was visited as well as many in Pennsylvania, Maryland and Delaware. In addition to the resources available in the library system of the University of Pennsylvania, the Collections of the Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College have been invaluable in the preparation of this paper. Swarthmore's Quaker Collection, as one of the two joint repositories for the papers of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, represents in manuscript form, a large portion of the Delaware Valley's
seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century history. And finally, as far as sources go, I would like to call to attention the work of an early twentieth century Quaker Historian, T. Chalkey Matlack of Moorestown, N.J. Without Mr. Matlack's research, copiously recorded in numerous small notebooks preserved at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, this thesis, especially its second part, could not possibly have been completed in the time period it was and, in fact, much of the information contained in it would have been lost to history entirely. I would like to thank my thesis advisor, the Director of the Graduate Program of Historic Preservation at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. David De Long and my thesis reader, Dr. Michael Chiarappa without whose guidance this thesis could not have become a reality. And finally, I wish to thank my fiancee, Helen Rupp who gave me her seemingly limitless support and patience.
A Note On Dates

One of the most confusing problems faced by the historian is the question of Calendars. A primary source, letter, journal entry, newspaper article, will, deed, legal document, or inscription may clearly bear a date, but unless one understands the Calendar system which that (most likely) long dead author has referenced, it is impossible to correlate the date given on the document with the Gregorian Calendar in use today. The problem, in regards to this work, primarily involves the 1751 act of the English Parliament, which, beginning in 1752, replaced the flawed Julian Calendar with the more accurate Gregorian. Previous to this Act, and in keeping with a twelfth century decree of the Anglican Church, the year began on the day of the Annunciation, better known as the 25th of March or the vernal equinox. The year, thus beginning on the 25th of March was known as the Ecclesiastical, Legal or Civil Year. Since the Norman Conquest (1066), the practice of beginning the year with the first of January was common for English subjects when defining a "Historical Year." The resulting confusion was often mitigated through the use of a double form of date in the first months of a new year. Therefore, a date which we with our present Calendar would recognize as February 15, 1701, might have been written February 15, 1700/01. Quakers, before 1752, used the Ecclesiastical year for letters and meeting minutes but for legal instruments
the double date reference system was customarily used. After 1752, in compliance with the act of Parliament, Friends began their year on January first. Quakers added one further complication. Both before and after the date of 1752, Friends refused to use "Pagan" names for the days of the week and months like Monday (Moon day), Thursday (Thor's day) and Sunday (Sun day) or July (named for Julius Caesar), June (named for Juno) and August (named for Augustus Caesar). Instead, they substituted a numerical system which before 1752 termed March the first month, and after called it the third. Therefore, the example of February 15, 1700 previously given, would in "Quaker" appear as the 15th day of the 12th mo. 1700. The same day of the month, fifty two years later, and after the Calendar change, would have been written, the 15th day of the 2nd mo. 1753.2

A basic understanding of both the Calendar change and Quaker idiosyncracies is necessary as this thesis relies on both primary and secondary sources for its dates. When dates are given, every effort has been made to include the verbatim text of the original source and when appropriate the modern Calendar translation. Inevitably, however, some dates within this work are derived from secondary sources, and therefore the possibility of error exists.

---

Chapter I: A Quaker Background

Quakers and the Settlement of New Jersey

Every day in schools across the United States, children are taught the story of William Penn’s colony; a Quaker settlement that offered religious freedom to all those who chose to live there. Few realize that the road for the establishment of Pennsylvania was paved first in New Jersey (Fig. 1). Under the influence of Penn and the Society of Friends, Quakers began, in 1675, colonization of the Province of West New Jersey seven years before Pennsylvania.³ Successes and failures in New Jersey taught the lessons that were to make Penn’s more famous colony successful. The town of Burlington, N.J. served as the prime staging area for the settlement of Philadelphia and the Jersey hinterlands provided the raw materials for building the new city while its recently established farms provided the food to feed Philadelphia in its fledgling days. As late as 1742, Governor Morris of New Jersey stated proudly that, "Pensilvania cannot build a ship, or even a tolerable House, nor ship a Hogshead or a pine stave," without wood from New

³ While small populations of Quakers, immigrants from New York and New England, were present in the colony of East Jersey several years before the settlement of West Jersey, they were small unorganized groups among larger populations, many converted to Anglicanism and the rest were soon absorbed by the dominant West Jersey and Philadelphia Quaker culture. Peter O. Wacker, Land and People, A Cultural Geography of Preindustrial New Jersey and Settlement Patterns (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1975), 180.
Fig. 1, A Map of East and West Jersey Being an Exact Survey taken by Mr. John Worlidge. Mr. John Thorton, London c. 1690-1700, Library of Congress
Little of this history is popular knowledge. Today the chief remaining signs of Quaker influence in the region are the meeting houses. Although more common in south western New Jersey, they are scattered across the entire state at rural crossroads, in towns, and in urban Camden and the New Jersey portion of Philadelphia's suburban sprawl (Fig. 2). These buildings remain, testimony to the Society that shaped the area's culture.

Quaker settlement in the Delaware Valley began in Salem, New Jersey in 1675. Founded by John Fenwick (1635-1683) and initially known as Fenwick's Colony, Salem is located on the Delaware River in the extreme south westerly portion of what is today the State of New Jersey. Less than two years later a second Quaker settlement was in place, much further up the river at Burlington. The founding of Salem and Burlington were not the first Quaker


6 Pomfret, 102-104.
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Fig. 2 New Jersey Quaker Meeting Houses, 1672-1796, Taken from Wacker, Land and People....
forays into the Americas. Quakers had travelled the New World since 1655, but these first American Friends were missionaries, only a very small number immigrants.⁷ All things considered, the dates of these first Quaker footprints in the New World soil are extraordinarily early. Early not when compared with the first New World European settlements but remarkably early considering the date of the founding of Quakerism. The Society of Friends had its birth around 1650.⁸ Within five years Quaker missionaries were walking American shores and within twenty-five years colonies were being founded. The brief span of time between the founding of Quakerism and its introduction to the Delaware Valley is extremely important in understanding how the Society of Friends developed here and how it found architectural expression. Early Quakers reached the New World as the Society of Friends was in its very years of infancy. The defining social and religious attributes of the group were still much in the process of development.

The story behind the founding of their first two colonies is complex, one of intertwined economic and religious motivation. The main figure behind the enterprise was Edward Byllynge (d.1687). Byllynge was a wealthy English

⁷ Frederick B. Tolles, Quakers and The Atlantic Culture (New York: Macmillan Company, 1947), 9. Tolles states that between 1655 and 1662 at least 60 Quakers made the transatlantic crossing.

⁸ Ibid, 4.
Friend who, because of imprudent personal investments, was faced with bankruptcy; serious circumstances in seventeenth-century England. In 1674, when the opportunity to purchase the holdings of Lord Berkeley in New Jersey was given him, Byllynge saw the opportunity both to aid his Quaker brethren and to redeem himself financially.

Because of his excessive debts, Byllynge could not purchase the property in his name. Instead he enlisted the aid of John Fenwick. In return for fronting the venture, Fenwick received a ten percent interest and turned the remaining shares in the property over to William Penn, Gawen Laurie and Nicholas Lucas, prominent and influential Quakers, who would manage Byllynge’s share in trust. Contrary to the wishes of Byllynge, Penn, Laurie and Lucas, Fenwick sold portions of his New Jersey lands and sailed to New Jersey claiming the region that became Salem as his. Byllynge believed Fenwick’s share to be an undivided interest and thought the financial success of the enterprise

---

9 Pomfret, 65. Edward Byllynge was a convinced Quaker, converted while serving as a calvary officer in Scotland. An acquaintance of George Fox, Byllynge moved to London in 1659 and took up the occupation of Brewer. There, while often the subject of intense persecution himself, he became influential in efforts to relieve other Quakers so troubled. Despite his initial prominence among Quakers, his financial situation deteriorated to the point his reputation suffered greatly. In 1673, a pamphlet was published titled, "A Serious Exposition with B.E., An Eminent Quaker, About His Late Breaking Neer Forty Thousand Pounds, A Great Part Whereof Was Moneys Of The Quakers Publique Stock."

to be linked to a unified settlement effort. Penn, Laurie and Lucas also saw advantage in unifying settlement. It would enable the trustees to wield the kind of control that would ensure the colony became everything they wished, a haven for economically and legally beleaguered Quakers. Shortly, after battles with both the Governor of New York and with Fenwick, they were able to bring Salem under their control and even more importantly, by 1681, won the right of self government answerable only to the Crown, creating the world's first Quaker colony. It was to be a short lived experiment.\(^\text{11}\) Purchase of West Jersey property was not restricted to Quakers; it was open to anyone with a modest amount of capital.\(^\text{12}\) The majority of purchasers, however, were Quakers; only one purchaser of the initial shares was a non-Quaker.\(^\text{13}\) The Society of Friends, at least in the early years of Delaware Valley settlement, encouraged migration among certain populations of its members. The areas in which Quakerism grew with the most strength were also among the most economically challenged in the British Isles. Primarily an agrarian group, Quakers in these areas worked marginally productive but expensive lands, lands they could at best

\(^{11}\) Ibid, 65-85.

\(^{12}\) The trustees formed a joint stock company composed of 100 equal shares valued at £350 each. Partial shares were sold. Some purchasers held portions as small as 1/20 of a share, the cost therefore being as low as £17.5. Ibid, 86.

only afford to lease. The Society of Friends played an active role in the lives of its members. Young Quaker men with limited financial parental support, young Quaker women without dowries, widowed mothers and poor families were encouraged to gather together what meager capital they had and purchase the cheap and fertile New World lands. The New World, and specifically the settlements in New Jersey, offered not only financial opportunities but the added advantage of living primarily among other Friends. Quakers, while hoping to set an example for the rest of the world, believed that excessive contact with non-Quakers was polluting. It was a point of stumbling on the long arduous road to salvation. In addition, the New Jersey settlements offered freedom from "sufferings," Quaker terminology for governmental and social persecutions.14

For those who are not otherwise familiar with Quakerism in practice it is necessary to provide some background. Quakers trace their heritage to a loose group of worshippers known as the "Seekers of the Truth," Seekers for short. These were the outcasts of the English Puritan Revolution, people of extraordinary conviction in search of a Christian faith that could successfully wed puritanical spirituality with life's realities. Their first leaders were wandering preachers who, supported by Oliver Cromwell and the Rump

Parliament, attempted to bring the more resistant outer fringes of Britain and Wales into the Puritan fold. While accommodating themselves to the local population a form of ostensibly anti-institutional Puritanism was developed. Denying the value of the university-trained minister, they gradually codified the belief of "the inner spirit." Every person was capable of holy communion because each person contained a portion of the holy spirit within themselves. The spirit either expired or thrived depending upon whether one carefully nurtured it. Groups met in sessions of silent prayer punctuated with the short exhalations of those moved to speak by God or by the sermons of those well accepted as being divinely inspired. With the organizational work of a group of influential prophets, most notably, George Fox, at the end of the 1650's, this new Christian sect was codified. Due to the spasmatic fervor to which they were often moved during religious experiences, the group acquired the popular name of Quakers, but knew themselves as the Society of Friends.

The Society of Friends, as it developed in the seventeenth-century and existed in the eighteenth and

15 Ibid, 48.
16 Ibid, 49.
17 Ibid, 70-71. The process by which precise doctrine was developed was in many cases simply that of Fox spreading his own religious and organizational ideas through a great body of apostolic letters addressed to individual groups of Quakers.
nineteenth-centuries, was extraordinarily structured and organized. Thus, contrary to the individualistic nature of its beliefs, it was itself institutional. As stated before, the Society played an intimate role in most facets of a member’s life. Each member belonged to a meeting composed of his Quaker neighbors. Geography was important as the distance one could be expected to travel to meeting was limited, generally fewer than fifteen miles. This distance shrunk in winter and could also be affected by major geographic boundaries such as rivers. The Society of Friends functioned on a system of geographically related hierarchical meetings. A single yearly meeting oversaw all Friends that lived within the territory overseen by its subordinate quarterly meetings. The geographic domain of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting is clearly shown in Figure 3, an 1838 map of the Philadelphia Orthodox Yearly Meeting. The number of New Jersey meetings (Fig. 4) belonging to it has fluxuated across the years. The yearly meeting oversaw several quarterly meetings each of which was responsible for Quakers living under the care of any of the several monthly meetings over which each quarterly had oversight. Each monthly meeting, likewise, had oversight of the preparative meetings which were held with in the region of which the monthly had care.
Fig. 3, "A Map of The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1838" Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.
Fig. 4, "Map of Friends Meetings," 1936, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College
All meetings for worship were under the care of a preparative meeting. The preparative meeting was the lowest unit in the Quaker system that provided for the conducting of the Society's business. The local meeting monitored the Quaker's life, correcting his missteps as they became apparent. This, along with the everyday business of property and school oversight were the basic responsibilities of the preparative meeting. The title "preparative" derives from the responsibility of the meeting to bring forward its serious problems and concerns to a monthly meeting of Friends.\textsuperscript{18} In New Jersey, the monthly meeting oversaw four or five preparative meetings. Although in practice it is the preparative meeting that has the most direct impact on the lives of its members, it was the monthly meeting which assumed official responsibility for the care of its members. It was the monthly that authorized marriages, that granted permission for removals, and maintained discipline. Except in special circumstances only the monthly meeting could disown an errant Friend.\textsuperscript{19} Two or three monthlies were overseen by a quarterly meeting which was in turn overseen by the yearly meeting of Friends. The quarterly meeting was attended by appointed representatives of all of its member monthlies. It was responsible for establishing or dissolving

\textsuperscript{18} Salem Quarter, iv.

any of the meetings under its care.\textsuperscript{20} The yearly meeting was the ultimate source of all doctrinal determinations and was in the hierarchy the highest of the meetings. Each of the many yearly meetings of Friends was independent. It was part of their duty to communicate with other yearly meetings. Although each was completely autonomous, they usually, at least nominally, acknowledged the greater influence of the London Yearly.\textsuperscript{21}

Several things should be noted regarding the mechanics of the Society. The process of the organization of the Society of Friends was still in progress during the earliest portions of the time frame which this paper covers. Every meeting cannot be assumed to have conducted its business in exactly the same fashion. In particular this refers to the women's meeting. The practice of holding separate monthly men's and women's meetings was actively encouraged by George Fox but had only just become common at the date of the settlement of Quaker New Jersey.\textsuperscript{22} Their universal acceptance should not be assumed at an early date. There are also several other types of meetings that have not heretofore been discussed. For example, before the establishment of a yearly meeting for the New Jersey/Pennsylvania area, there were "general meetings" and

\textsuperscript{20} Salem Quarter, iii.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid, iii.

\textsuperscript{22} Pomfret, 217-218.
biennial meetings at both Salem and Burlington. Little Egg Harbor is also said to have been the site of another short lived "general" meeting. Essentially these were the precursors of the yearly although Salem's meeting continued even after the date of the yearly's establishment.

Meeting House Design, American and English

Usually, groups celebrate their houses of worship. The great mosques of Islam, the Gothic cathedrals of Europe, and the temples of the Ancients are all fitting examples. The Greeks, if only mythologically, asserted that the immortals periodically were resident in their edifices. The imposing windswept ruins at Bassae, Delphi and Paestum can almost convince one that the myths were fact. As much monuments to the rulers and peoples that built them as to the Gods they honor, religious buildings were normally a civilization's grandest buildings. The Quaker, however, had no Church.

"Dare not use, much less adore, a piece of wood or stone, an image of silver of gold; nor yet allow of that Jewish, or rather Pagan pomp in worship, practiced by others, as if Christ's worship were of this world, though his kingdom be of the other."23

These were the words of William Penn. The meeting house was simply a building. To the Quaker the word Church referred to a religion, to a faith. George Fox and other

members of Protestant sects called Anglican and Catholic houses of worship steeplehouses. No building of this earth was a Church.  

Quakers despised the religious establishment. John Talbot, the first rector of St. Mary’s Church in Burlington, New Jersey, used to make missionary visits out into the countryside, that is, until his horse died. "Ye Quakers recorded that this was judgement upon me." Plainness, an aversion to ostentation, was also a part of Quaker doctrine. Abstinence from excess silenced undue pride.

Jesus "came not to consecrate a way to the eternal rest through gold, silver, ribbons, laces, paints, perfumes, costly clothes, curious trims, exact dresses, rich jewels, pleasant recreations, plays, treats, balls, masques, revels, romances, love-songs, and the past times of the world: no, no, but by forsaking all such entertainments, yea, and sometimes more lawful enjoyments too; and cheerfully undergoing the loss of all on one hand, and the reproach, ignominy, and cruel persecution of ungodly men on the other." But the issue of plainness is one that is often overstated. The Quaker was no ascetic. While they avoided vanity, they did not deny the few comforts that the

---


26 Penn, 63.
eighteenth-century could provide.\textsuperscript{27} They also did not always deny the wealthy more luxury; provided that the wealth had been achieved in an honorable fashion, it represented the fruits of a man's labor and, provided that he did not display it in an ostentatious manner, he was entitled to the rewards of his work. In keeping, most meeting houses were simple but well built. Superfluous architectural adornment was avoided in meeting house design but basic decorative details that were often part and parcel of the carpenter's and mason's craft, like carved moldings and brick string courses, are commonplace. The Quaker's adherence to plainness demanded that he abstain from ostentation, but in spite of his famed buttonless clothing, it did not require him to participate in affected austerity.

During the first twenty-five years of Quakerism, the quarter century which directly preceded the founding of Salem and Burlington, only a small handful of English meeting houses were constructed as such from the ground up. With the single anomaly of the larger urban meeting house at Hertford (1670), they were all rural, cottage-like buildings. Quakerism was still very much an illegal practice

\textsuperscript{27} Jack D. Marietta, "The Growth of Quaker Self Consciousness in Pennsylvania, 1720-48," essay in Seeking the Light, Essays in Quaker History in Honor of Edwin B. Bronner, eds. J. William Frost and John M. Moore (Haverford: Pendle Hill Publications, 1986), 98-99. This statement should be somewhat tempered by stating that by the end of the eighteenth-century excessive wealth was looked upon with considerable suspicion by many Quakers. Plainness became both the symbol and tool of Quaker group unity.
in England at the time the first settlers left Britain for West Jersey. Most English meetings were either held in private homes or in second hand structures reconfigured for Quaker use. English Quakers would not be legally free to construct their own meeting houses until the 1689 Act of Toleration. Before that date, meeting houses of any type were prone to forfeiture, a situation hardly conducive to an active building program. Another possible reason sometimes given for the failure of seventeenth-century Friends to build numerous and substantial meeting houses is that some still hoped for eventual "comprehension" within the national Church. Whatever the reason, English precedent was limited.

English buildings have highly individualistic exteriors. Their facades usually reflect the manner in which their interior components have been arranged. Commonly, there are three basic internal divisions, an entrance hall, a large meeting room and a small meeting room. Symmetry played no part in interior configuration. The typical English meeting house (see Figs. 5a and 5b) is entered through a single doorway. The entrance hall served to insulate the meeting rooms from noise and temperature

---


The Typical English Meeting House, Eighteenth Century

Fig. 5a, Photo Amersham Meeting House. Taken from Hubert Lidbetter, The Friends Meeting House.

Fig. 5b, Plan, Amersham, original portion, 1685, expanded for women's meetings, 1785. Taken from Hubert Lidbetter, The Friends Meeting House.
fluctuations. It also provided a gathering place for Quakers entering and leaving services. The large meeting room was used for worship. Women entered from the entrance hall by one doorway and men by another; each sat on their own side of the room, separated by a center aisle. Both sexes sat facing several rows of long benches mounted on risers against the opposite wall. On this seat sat the meetings leaders, its elders, clerk, ministers and visiting dignitaries. Some meeting houses also contained upper gallery seating, usually reserved for the youth. When worship concluded and the business meeting was to begin the women rose from their seats and left the room to reconvene for their business meeting in the small meeting room. The small meeting room could be located adjoining the main meeting room, in a loft space above all or part of the main meeting room or in entirely different part of the building. Often large shuttered partitions divided the meeting house space. The partition was placed between the small and large meeting rooms and would only be raised or opened to unify the space for large gatherings on special occasions. Seating on opposite sides of the partition was never oriented in the

30 In Quakerism's earliest days, seating within the meeting was not separated by gender. Men and women sat together. The move to separate them was undertaken as a means to spread the acceptance of the monthly women's business meeting. In England, seating men and women on opposite sides of the meeting room seems to have been adopted as the general rule by 1674, two years before the founding of Salem. Levy, 78.
same direction completely eliminating the possibility of uniting the meeting. As women were always expected to sit in the same space as the men during worship and then exit to their own room when business was to be conducted the ratio between the sizes of the large and small meeting rooms was usually close to two to one. Asymmetry was the universal rule in the design of early English Quaker meeting houses and these buildings, which set the future precedent for English meeting houses, are significantly different from nearly all New Jersey examples.

Today, if one examines the meeting houses that still stand in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, an opinion could quickly be drawn that with few exceptions Quakers followed a fairly homogenous architectural design program in the construction of these buildings. The majority of surviving Delaware Valley meeting houses are fairly similar (Figs. 6a and 6b). Rural Pennsylvania meetings often are built of stone while, typically, New Jersey and Philadelphia examples are constructed of brick. Normally, they have two levels of fenestration, representing the first level of meeting space and the loft or gallery. The main facade is not located on a gable end. Rather, twin doorways, each covered by a small pedimental roof, are found on at least one of the long sides of the building. In the most generic of the many subtle

The Typical Delaware Valley Meeting House, Eighteenth-Century

Fig. 6a, Chesterfield Meeting House, N.J. T. Chalkey Matlack Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Fig. 6b, Plan, Chesterfield Meeting House, redrawn from Historic American Building Survey by Chiarappa, "The first and the best sort...".
variants, the design of the main facade includes ten windows, one on both sides of each of the two doors and six on the upper level. The appearance is generally one of a double hall and parlor house. Each of the doors on the main facade leads into the meeting space. At the root of its design, the Delaware Valley meeting house is symmetrical.

Although over the years many have had utilitarian additions and alterations, essentially the New Jersey meeting house is a rectangular mass with a unified interior space. The interior is divided in half, from floor to ceiling, by a partition. To the left of the partition sit male Friends, to the right sit the women. The partition is only closed to separate the two business meetings, men’s and women’s. Its mechanism works in one of two ways. In some meetings, especially earlier ones, the wooden structure is composed of a group of shutters and doors mounted within a frame work. With all of the shutters and doors open the building’s entire interior is unified. In the second method the partition consists of two large panels which rest on top of one another, effectively creating a center wall. The upper half of the screen can, by means of a winch, be raised through a slit in the ceiling into the attic space while the lower half slips through the floor into the cellar.\textsuperscript{32} The

\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}This second type is most likely a nineteenth-century innovation. Several meeting houses have had their partition removed after separate women’s business meetings were abandoned in the twentieth-century.}
ratio between the two halves, unlike that demonstrated by English examples, is an equal one to one. The facing or minister’s bench is built along the rear wall opposite from the two main entrances, while seating for the main body consists of individual benches arranged in rows and separated by a single aisle leading to the door. Another aisle runs lengthwise down the building in between the minister’s bench and the main seating. Usually at each end of this aisle is another doorway. In some buildings doorways exist behind the minister’s bench; these will be discussed later. Buildings which once housed a meeting of monthly size or larger usually also contain a gallery. The gallery, in most instances, runs along front and side walls of the building. Contemporary accounts refer to the gallery as seating for youths. Gallery benches like the minister’s were mounted on stepped risers. For the most part the buildings are symmetrical around a center axis defined by the partition. A few lack galleries, a few have three levels of fenestration and a few are without even a second level, but overall it is apparent that nearly all followed a similar model in their design.

The "typical" attributes described above refer to a plan that became common in the 1760’s and which is expressed by the majority of existing New Jersey examples. There were

33 In some works, the minister’s or facing bench is also referred to as "the gallery." In this paper, to avoid confusion, the term will not be used in this manner.
earlier forms and there have been later. Although American meeting house design has not been static throughout its approximately three hundred year history, meeting house design does remain fairly uniform within definable periods of time. While the seventeenth-century was primarily a period of experimentation, a form was arrived at in its closing years that became dominant throughout the first half of the eighteenth-century. The doubled design that became universal in the second half of the eighteenth-century remained popular into the twentieth. The nineteenth-century also saw the introduction of modified and scaled down versions of this plan and the twentieth saw the introduction of the architect-designed meeting house. This paper will examine this evolution of form (Fig. 7) with the idea of providing an historical and morphological framework for the surviving New Jersey meeting houses.

Meeting house design, in the Delaware Valley, and in particular New Jersey as the oldest regional Quaker settlement, is the result of an evolution, a process that took place largely on American shores. The development of the large, prominent meeting house was a function of the economic and social success that immigrant English Quakers found in the Delaware Valley. It has been suggested that the programmatic differences in spatial configuration of American and English meeting houses has its roots in the overall acceptance of the importance of the women's
a. The Early or Primitive Meeting House, post 1676, dominant, 1676-1700

b. The Bank Meeting House Type, post 1702 dominant 1702-1770

c. A Doubled Meeting House Type, Single Story, post 1780

d. The Doubled Meeting House Type, post 1760, dominant 1770-1827
meeting. English Quakers, apparently, were slow to adopt the separate meeting in theory and even slower to actually implement it. George Fox himself was primarily responsible for the introduction of the women’s meeting. He believed that women, more effectively than men, could control household discipline. A separate meeting empowered the women to act in certain capacities outside of direct male control. It created a forum within which "modest" women could speak openly and ensured that feminine insight played an active role in policy. The responsibilities of the women’s meeting included visiting the sick, care of orphans, caring for indigent Friends, disciplining women and most importantly, nearly all control over marriage. It was this last power that brought resentment from men who were forced not only to submit themselves and their choice of a bride-to-be before the women’s meeting for investigation and approval, but were physically required to supplicate themselves before the meeting twice, once at the presentation of the intention to marry and once to hear the women’s decision. This resentment considerably slowed the adoption of the practice. As it was,

---

34 Butler, "Quaker Meeting Houses in America...," 100-104.


36 Bacon, 174.
even after the general adoption of the women's meeting, it was the males who made the primary policy decisions.\(^{37}\) As part of the process of introducing monthly meetings to the Quaker populous, George Fox travelled to the New World in 1671 and reported favorably that women's meetings were already established in Boston and elsewhere. In New Jersey, the date of the establishment of women's meetings at Salem and Burlington was only little later than contiguous to that of settlement. In England, the London Yearly Meeting was still debating the subject as late as 1744 and did not establish a women's yearly meeting until 1784 and only after considerable pressure was exerted by Americans.\(^{38}\)

Obviously, the variation in the accommodation of the women's meeting between English and American meetings can be pointed to as a factor behind the differences in internal proportioning and arrangement between British and American structures. It would seem that American meeting houses more clearly manifest the Foxian vision of sexual equality.\(^{39}\) The truth is probably somewhat more restrained. First, George Fox acknowledged the importance of female viewpoint, not equality. Second, in spite of later debate, women's meetings were generally established by 1675, the year of the

\(^{37}\) Levy, 77-79.

\(^{38}\) Bacon, 180.

\(^{39}\) Butler, "Quaker Meeting Houses in America...," 102-103.
Byllynge purchase, explaining why they were introduced at the conception of West Jersey meetings. American Quakers do seem to have more readily adopted the concept of the women’s meeting, but not radically so. Interior configuration was affected by the emergence of the women’s meeting but it was equally the result of a process of experimentation that will be shown to have had its origin in Philadelphia and Burlington in the 1680’s. The configuration of English meeting houses is uniquely suited to and obviously derived from worshipping in renovated and makeshift structures. While persecutions always made British Quakers feel they lived in someone else’s land, American Quakers developed a new building type to serve as the focal point of what they hoped would be, and for a short time were, Quaker towns, villages and communities. Delaware Valley Quakers had the opportunity to develop a practical, coherent solution to the problem of meeting house design, an opportunity that English Quakers did not have.  

40 Levy, 80.  
41 Lidbetter, 5.
Chapter II: The Establishment of Accepted Form

A Period of Experimentation and the Resulting Dominant Design Pattern

Settlers in Burlington and Salem faced similar conditions. They met in makeshift shelters and in the private homes of prominent settlers. While persecution had been the cause of similar situations in the homeland, unprejudicially rough circumstances were behind the primitive conditions in this portion of the New World. It has been stated that the first Quaker meetings at Burlington were held in tents formed out of the sails of the ship, Kent.\textsuperscript{42} While questionable in the specifics, this level of early accommodation is probably not far from the truth. Thomas Budd, one of the most prominent of the first Burlington settlers, described the circumstances as "many Exercises, tryalls and hardships, being forced with our weak wives and Children to Lodge under trees until we could raise up a few huttes together for shelter, being exposed to hard winter weather, savages, beasts and wild Natives."\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{42} Ellis L. Derry's \textit{Old and Historic Churches of New Jersey} (Union City: Wm. H. Wise & Co., 1979) is one work that relates this story (p. 144). Pomfret's scholarly and much more reliable work, \textit{The Province of West New Jersey 1609-1702}, states that a tent was erected to serve as a community center and place of worship but neither states the source of the tent's material nor his source for this information (p. 106, 217).

\textsuperscript{43} Pomfret, 106: Quoting "Samuel Jennings and Thomas Budd to London Friends, 1685," 103.
Burlington's monthly meeting was first held at John Woolston's house.\textsuperscript{44} The earliest recorded place of meeting at Salem was the log home of Samuel and Ann Nicholson.\textsuperscript{45} In 1681, the Nicholson's gave their home and sixteen surrounding acres to the Salem Meeting making the small building the first structure specifically designated as a Friend's meeting house in the Delaware Valley.\textsuperscript{46}

A few first hand accounts and a bevy of second-hand ones point to the extensive utilization of log architecture throughout southern New Jersey. Log architecture was a prominent form in the first growth of Delaware Valley building. It was simple to build, suited to available materials and was typically replaced as soon as wealth permitted. It is probable that the Nicholson's gift of their home to the Salem Monthly Meeting was based as much on their desire to move into a more hospitable and more prestigious brick structure as it was representative of their duty to God and generosity toward their neighbors. In either case, soon after the date of 1681 structures begin to be built specifically to function as meeting houses. Most references describe these first meeting houses as being of comparatively primitive construction, either crude frame

\textsuperscript{44} Pomfret, 218.

\textsuperscript{45} Pomfret, 218, and Derry, 97.

\textsuperscript{46} Salem Quarter, 212.
null
buildings sheathed in cedar shakes or log structures.\textsuperscript{47} The time lag between the first dates of settlement and the construction of meeting houses approached a decade. The meeting house was important to these early settlers, but less so than the dwelling house. The home meant survival and while the population was still minimal, most meetings could be accommodated in the house. Meetings in the home were, after all, to what English Quakers were accustomed. Consequently, and in spite of the role that the meeting played in the life of every Friend, homes were erected first and only considerably later, meeting houses. Eventually, as the meeting size grew past what could be accommodated in a seventeenth century home, the need for meeting houses was answered in one of two fashions. Small and isolated communities constructed modest structures completely utilitarian in nature and exceedingly basic in construction. The larger centers of the young settlements began to build more substantial and permanent structures to service the needs of their growing communities. 

No early examples of the small, primitive meetings

\textsuperscript{47} The only primary source account of a log meeting house structure is the late eighteenth-century journal reference of Ephraim Tomlinson, who notes such a building existing near the site of the present day Arny's Mount meeting house. "On the 20th day of 6th mo. 1771, I was at the marriage of my son-in-law, John Gardiner, at the log meeting-house, hard by Julytown." Quoted by T. Chalkey Matlack in his typescript "Notes on Quaker Meeting Houses," Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, vol. 1: 149. Other references, while numerous, all seem to date to the nineteenth-century and can not be confirmed.
survive. During the seventeenth century buildings of this type were erected at Newton (1687), Evesham (1698), Greenwich (1686) and Chesterfield (1693). No specific primary visual or written evidence of the design of these buildings survives. In all likelihood, they closely resembled several meeting houses which although slightly later in date, were built in similarly isolated and diminutive communities. Several images of this type of meeting house survive, including a photo of the Maurice River Meeting House (1800, Fig. 8) and a sketch of the Sommer’s Point Meeting House (1785, Fig. 9). Both were small frame structures, entered by central double doorway located symmetrically between two widows. These small buildings almost certainly contained only a single interior space. Simple and inexpensive, this most basic of designs persisted wherever small populations coincided with meager financial reserves.

The history of the small meeting house (Fig. 10) constructed in 1709 in what is today Tuckerton, Burlington County, New Jersey, then known as Little Egg Harbor, demonstrates well the factors which were behind their design and construction. The man who donated the land and saw to its erection was Edward Andrews, one of the first settlers of Little Egg Harbor and although wayward when young, none the less Quaker. The Tuckerton Meeting House, demolished in
Fig. 8
Maurice River Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection,
Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Fig. 9
Sommer’s Point Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection,
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
According to Matlack "this is a drawing made by J. Henry Bartlett of Tuckerton after a faint photo taken prior to 1862. Photo was taken at the request of Beulah Pharo." (Notebooks, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College).
1863, is one of the earliest Delaware Valley meeting houses for which a reliable image, in the form of a drawing, made from a now lost original photograph. It was a small crudely constructed shelter. The main body of the meeting house was a single, open space used for meetings for worship and the men's business meeting. The women's business meeting was held in a small addition attached to one end of the building. This arrangement paralleled typical English meeting house construction. The design of the building was not, however, the simple result of a newly immigrated English Quaker following the tradition of his home land. The similarity was, in fact, the direct result of the geographic location of Edward Andrews' farm.

Edward's father, Samuel Andrews and his wife, Mary, maintained a plantation in Mansfield Township, New Jersey. They were, however, not a part of the recent Quaker immigration. Samuel and Mary had first made their home in Oyster Bay, Long Island. Edward was born there and meeting records indicate that he frequently returned to visit. Quaker missionaries, long before settlers arrived in New Jersey, traveled from England to New England and made significant numbers of converts there. Samuel and Mary were a part of this Quaker community. Mary's father is known to have been a prominent Quaker and in fact donated the land on

---

which Samuel would build the Long Island meeting house at which both he and Mary would worship. Samuel moved his family to Mansfield Township, New Jersey sometime between 1677 and 1686. The obvious reasons for moving were both the rich farm land and the desire to be a part of the new, more strictly Quaker, Delaware Valley Community. They had eight children and Edward, in age, fell somewhere in the middle. As New England "convinced" Quakers, neither Edward nor his parents had likely ever seen an English meeting house.\(^\text{50}\)

When Edward came of age, he was forced to make a decision about his future. As a younger male child he would not inherit his father’s farm and by the time he was to set out on his own, all of the prime farm land in Burlington County and the surrounding region was long since claimed. Edward was also something of a black sheep, living a wild life for a Quaker, but somehow avoiding being disowned. He fiddled, danced and was married by a Monmouth County Justice of the Peace rather than in Quaker fashion, a disownable offense in itself.\(^\text{51}\) For all of the above reasons, in 1699, Edward purchased 500 acres in what was then a lonely wilderness, the Upper New Jersey outer coastal plain.\(^\text{52}\) Edward’s was choice land for the region. He cleared his farm

\(^{50}\) Ibid, 249-251.

\(^{51}\) Ibid, 251: extract from records in the Monmouth County Clerk's Office in Freehold.

\(^{52}\) Ibid, 256.
and settled down to become one of the area's first settlers. Edward's property, unlike his father's, had in the greater scale of time, only recently emerged from the ocean floor and as a result was both sandy and less fertile (Fig. 11).53 Compounded with this was his isolation. Edward could not easily bring his crops to market. The distance between Little Egg Harbor and the settled lands along the Delaware was a considerable barrier. There were no roads, except a few Indian paths, through the New Jersey Pine Barrens. So in all likelihood, Edward sold little and relied on his farm for nearly everything.

His life would soon change. His own description is most appropriate:

"Then the Lord was pleased to again call on me in the twenty seventh year of my life; and thus he began his great work in me. At first he tried me with a small thing. Being now removed into a remote place from friends, and no meetings of Friends within forty or fifty miles of my dwelling, and the people of the neighborhood being a vain and loose people in the 4th month, 1704, as I was working in my field alone, in a solitary condition, I saw a bone of a man's leg, which I had often handled before, and flung it to and fro; but now when I saw it, this arose in my mind; that if I was dead, I would not like to have my bones thrown up and down in the open field; and if so, I ought to do as I would be done by, in that case; I also thought it would be well of me to bury that bone, because it was my fellow-creature's bone. I had some reasoning in myself concerning it; but at length concluded it was not much labor to do it,

---

53 Roger Thomas Trindell, "Historical Geography of Southern New Jersey as Related to its Colonial Ports," (Dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1966), 15.
Fig. 11, Map of New Jersey showing Inner and Outer Coastal Plains Taken from Trindell, *Historical Geography of Southern New Jersey*...
and so went and buried it; after which I returned to my work again with the answer of peace in my mind."\textsuperscript{54}

Interpreting this as a calling from God, he gathered together all of his neighbors who would come and began holding meetings. He developed a following and on the second day of the fourth month of 1709, the Chesterfield Monthly Meeting of Friends was informed that Friends at Little Egg Harbor had raised a meeting house on Edward Andrews' land.\textsuperscript{55} It was a modest structure; the area's residents, like Edward, could afford nothing else. The building was constructed with a pine frame and sheathed with cedar shakes. The more preferable brick was too expensive. Clay was absent from the area's soil and would have had to have been purchased fifty miles away and then carted to the site. While it was an exceedingly simple structure it was probably as substantial as were any of the private homes in the area. By the third month of 1714/15, the meeting had grown in strength. The monthly fifty mile trek to Chesterfield was a burden. Edward applied to the Chesterfield Monthly to establish a monthly meeting at Little Egg Harbor.\textsuperscript{56} It was


\textsuperscript{55} Minutes of the Chesterfield Monthly Meeting, 2nd day, 4th month 1709. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, 3rd day, first month 1714/5.
for the monthly meeting, most likely, that the women's addition was added to the structure.

The design of the small meeting house was restricted by the dire economic circumstances and the evolution of the building's use. Edward Andrews built a meeting house in Little Egg Harbor, similar to English meeting houses perhaps because the conditions experienced in Little Egg Harbor were similar to those experienced by Quakers in the small, rural, English villages from which most came. Seventeenth-century English Quakers were both socially and economically distressed. Most English Quakers leased rather than owned their own farm land and most farmed land that was only marginally fertile. Their poverty was increased by the endless series of fines and imprisonments to which the English government submitted religious dissenters. English Friends had little money to dedicate to the construction of meeting houses, buildings could always be confiscated.

Two buildings which survive today are usually equated with this early and most primitive group of meeting houses. These are the Seaville (Fig. 12 and 13) and Barnegat (Fig. 14 and 15) Meeting Houses. They are not, however, what they at first appear. The Seaville Meeting House has been dated

---

57 Levy, 25-52.

58 Levy, 95, and 112-115, and Lidbetter, 5.
Fig. 12
Seaville Meeting House
Author's Photo

Fig. 13
Plan,
Seaville Meeting House
Fig. 14
Barnaget Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Fig. 15
Plan,
Barnaget
Meeting House
by some to as early as 1727. The building, a small, one story, one room, clapboard meeting house with exposed interior beams has an extremely primitive, almost seventeenth-century air about it. In fact, it is known to have been erected in 1763 and to be the surviving eastern half of a larger structure which in design belonged to an altogether later tradition. On the other hand, the Barnagat Meeting House, with the exception of a small frontal restroom addition and the covered porch, remains very much similar to its original appearance. The building, however, probably does not date to 1770. Meeting records indicate that a replacement for an original eighteenth-century building was constructed in the mid nineteenth-century.

Typically, in large towns, the construction of a substantial meeting house preceded even the erection of the court house or other civic buildings. The primary building campaigns were undertaken in Burlington and Philadelphia. Burlington seems to have been the first to begin both planning and construction. A most unique building, the

---

59 The meeting house at Seaville has sometimes been said to have been in use at an earlier date further up the coast and to have been moved in the eighteenth-century, Lidbetter, Friends Meeting, 31-32. The Salem quarterly meeting's history quotes the meeting records which state that the meeting house was constructed at its present site in 1763 and not 1727. Salem Quarter, 264.

60 Minutes of the Little Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting, 12th day, 10th month 1848. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.
Fig. 16
Burlington Meeting House
Print Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Fig. 17
Plan, Burlington Meeting House
Print Collection,
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
hexagonal Burlington Meeting House (Fig. 16) was begun in 1683. In Northern Europe, the octagonal centralized church plan was a well known alternative for Protestant Church designers who wished their buildings to remain as distinct as possible from plans based on Catholic liturgy. What it represented in the relative wilderness of seventeenth-century New Jersey was a new start. So unconventional a design choice was symbolic of a society that saw itself at an important juncture, a point of beginning. The New World offered an unprecedented religious freedom. Believing themselves on the verge of creating the heavenly society on earth that they sought, a young religion inherently if not conciously understood the need for a new building type and began experimenting with design.

Rational and democratic in its symmetry, the hexagonal plan theoretically would seem both symbolically and functionally suited to a faith without paid preachers and that believed in the importance of individual communion with God. Unfortunately, as constructed, it did not prove to be a practical design. The Burlington Meeting House apparently failed logistically on two counts; it was too cold and too small. The building's plan included both an extremely high ceiling and a hexagonal windowed cupola, two attributes which would have made the building more comfortable in

---

summer but unbearably cold in winter. Compounding the problem was the fact that the building apparently lacked any means of heating, and size, not initially a problem, soon became one. In addition to weekly, monthly and quarterly meetings, the Burlington Meeting House was soon also required to house the large general assembly which would grow to become the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. As a result of both problems, the building was extended in 1696 with what the Burlington Meeting called a "winter meeting house," in fact, a rectangular addition attached to the rear of the original structure. A plan (Fig. 17) of the meeting house in this later configuration exists and seems to indicate that at this time the interior arrangement of space was based on or paralleled English precedent. The plan shows both the original portion of the building and the rectangular addition separated from each other by a screen partition. The rectangular addition contained the hearth the hexagonal structure lacked. As the heavily attended meetings the building was required to house were, for ease of travel, held only in temperate months, the partition could remain closed during the winter season limiting the space the fireplace was required to heat.


63 Minutes of the Burlington Monthly Meeting, 4th day, third month 1696, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.
In Philadelphia, Burlington’s sister city, there were three early attempts at creating meeting houses as significant civic edifices. These were the Center Square Meeting House (1685, Fig. 18), the second Bank Meeting House (1702, Fig. 19) and the Great Meeting House at Second and High (Market) Streets (1695, rebuilt 1755, Fig. 20). William Penn’s influence had fast made the city the center of Quaker culture in the New World. Penn himself probably dictated the placement and definitely sponsored the construction of the Center Square Meeting House. Work on the structure began in 1685. The life span of the building was extremely short and the materials from it were reused in finishing the construction of the second Bank Meeting House. The location was probably the cause of the building’s early demise. The meeting house was centrally placed in terms of Penn’s long term plan for Philadelphia but was isolated from the city as it had developed to that point. Philadelphia was still very much a small town clustered along the banks of the Delaware. Little is known about the Center Square Meeting House’s design or

---


65 Ibid, 69.

66 Ibid, 72.
Fig. 18
Center Square Meeting House
Taken from Watson, *Annals*...

Fig. 19
Second Bank Meeting House
Taken from Watson, *Annals*...
appearance. The only reported image is one that appears in Watson's *Annals of Philadelphia*, a book first published in 1830 over a hundred years after the building's demolition. Its short life span and its less than enthusiastic reception make it unlikely that this building in any way functioned as a prototype for the buildings that followed it.

The Bank Meeting House was the city's second meeting house. Located on the Delaware, more proximal to the city's population, it was originally a frame structure (1685), but was soon rebuilt in brick (1702). In its masonry incarnation, this meeting house had an important design legacy. The overall exterior configuration is best described as being similar to that of a squat, gambrel roof center hall house. John Watson tells us that the Bank Meeting House, instead of the "board partition" common in meeting houses of Watson's time, used a simple curtain to separate men's and women's meetings. The first Delaware Valley reference to a "board partition" is regarding one

---

67 Ibid, 67-68. The first meeting house constructed in 1683 was a crude temporary building known as the boarded meeting house and located at what is today the west side of Front Street near Sansom.


69 Ibid, 335.
installed in the Salem Meeting House in 1685. Watson notes that the Bank Meeting House's entrances were segregated by sex as well. Men entered the building from the "front" (east) door while women entered a door on the southern facade. This practice of designating entrances by gender will later find a much stronger architectural expression. This building's legacy to Delaware Valley Meeting House design was a block like, rectangular form externally. If the hexagonal Burlington Meeting House represented a northern European Protestant conception, developed remotely from the Italian High Renaissance fixation with the theological and intellectual perfection of the centrally planned Church, then the Bank Meeting House represented the first phase of the general integration of classical High Renaissance symmetry, in the manner of Palladio and Indigo Jones, into the Anglo-colonial builder's art.

The third prominent Philadelphia structure, was the so-called Great Meeting House. Located at Second and High (Market) Street, it was the Pennsylvania home of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. The surviving images of the

---

70 Minutes of the Salem Monthly Meeting, 26th day 8th month, 1685. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.

71 Ibid.

72 In reality, the Great Meeting House was never large enough, in either its first or second incarnation, to house the entire yearly meeting. Up until 1760, when held in Philadelphia, one half of the gatherants, either the men's
Great Meeting House would seem to support the assumption that the design criteria exemplified by the Bank Meeting House were continued at High Street and then by means of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, disseminated to the entire region. The most famous images, however, depict the building as it existed after a 1755 rebuilding. John Watson described the building in its first incarnation as "surmounted on the centre of its four angled roof by a raised frame of glass work, so constructed as to pass light down into the meeting below, after the manner of the Burlington meeting house." It is not surprising that the twin homes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting both under near simultaneous construction less than 30 miles apart, would be erected to similar designs. Three views of the first Great Meeting House are known, all are rough early eighteenth century images found in river front views of Philadelphia and none of the three show anything more than the building's double pitched roof and cupola. (Fig. 21) Likely, the building resembled the

or the women's portion of the yearly meeting would retire to the Bank Street Meeting House. After 1760, the men held their portion of the yearly meeting at the Pine Street Meeting House. The Great meeting house was used by the women until 1804. Bacon, "A Widening Path...," 181.

73 Watson, 300.

Fig. 20
Great Meeting House,
Philadelphia
Taken from Watson, Annals...
Fig. 21, Meeting house at Second and High Streets from George Heap, "An East Prospect of the City of Philadelphia taken by George Heap under the Direction of Nicholas Skull, Surveyor General of the Province of Pennsylvania" engraving, 1754, Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Fig. 22
Wilmington Meeting House
Taken from Wilson, Philadelphia Quakers...
second Wilmington Meeting House (1748, Fig. 22) more than its Burlington counterpart.

The similarity of the Burlington and first Great Meeting Houses raises the question of whether or not the simultaneous construction of the two meeting houses was part of a programatic development plan sponsored by the colonies' proprietors. Penn, after all, had large stakes in both efforts. The Encyclopedia of Philadelphia, a twentieth-century publication, asserts that the Great Meeting House's master carpenter was Thomas Jaques, a native of Leicestershire, England, a Huguenot and a professional builder. Jaques arrived in Philadelphia the same year in which Penn donated the land to the meeting, 1683. The Encyclopedia states that "Quaker authorities agree that he brought with him the plans for the meeting house which was erected at the southwest corner of Second and Market streets." Was it possible that the plan for the Burlington Meeting House was also generated in England? The Burlington Meeting House was constructed by an English trained master builder. But Francis Collins, one of the initial purchasers of Burlington lands, was also one of their earliest and most respected settlers. He emigrated to this country considerably before he received the commission

---


from the Burlington Monthly Meeting. Collins had begun his career in England. He is known to have had rare experience in meeting house design as he was responsible for renovations made to the English Stepney Meeting House. In New Jersey, he was responsible for the construction of the first Burlington Court House, the Burlington Market and the Copany Meeting House as well as the hexagonal meeting house. While the two meeting houses are both undoubtedly the product of English trained craftsmen, its doubtful that there was any programmatic connection between the two efforts. The two designs were however both similar attempts to create a "Rationalized Protestant" centralized plan. Both were born of English/European ancestry and both were apparently more acceptable in theory than in practice.

The Bank Meeting House, however, represents a much more "American" solution to the problem, just as intellectually rational but in a straight forward way more practical and far less complex. It was simply the most basic way to inclose the interior program which had through practice evolved as the most amenable to the Quaker system of worship. It was both closer to the Quaker doctrines of plainness and in terms of ease of construction much more

---
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agreeable to the colonial mason whose primary experience was in domestic building.

Most New Jersey meeting houses constructed in the first three quarters of the eighteenth century generally reflect the Bank Meeting House in form. Some of the largest and most prestigious of New Jersey's structures were nearly identical in design. Perhaps the most similar was the large brick meeting house constructed in Haddonfield (1760, Fig. 23) but other examples were erected at Trenton (1739, Fig. 24), Upper Springfield (1727, Fig. 25), Copany or Old Springfield (1775, Fig. 26), East Branch (also known as Robin's Meeting, 1816, Fig. 27), Arny's Mount (1775, Fig. 28) and Greenwich (1779, Figs. 29 and 30). Meeting houses constructed at Woodbury (1715, Figs. 31 and 32), Bordentown (1740, Fig. 33 and 34) and Alloways Creek (1756, Fig. 35 and 36) also belong to the same design family, but have since been modified. Somewhat taller and narrower these last meeting houses were the result of the Bank Meeting House formula applied to buildings of a more modestly dimensioned footprint. The proportions of these last structures are such that it is unlikely that they were originally fitted with an upper seating gallery, a device which could only have been applied in an awkward fashion. These buildings may have instead contained an upper floor. While Delaware Valley meeting house design continues in a new direction during the second half of the eighteenth century, the Bank Meeting
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second half of the eighteenth century, the Bank Meeting House pattern does continue, as the 1816 East Branch Meeting House demonstrates, to be for quite some time, a much less popular but viable alternative to more current trends.

Double Meeting Houses and a Quaker Revival

The most significant development in the architecture of the Delaware Valley Friend's meeting house was the exterior expression of the meetings' gender based division. Twin
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hooded entries located on the main facade became common in meeting houses built after 1760 and dominant by the end of the eighteenth-century. The use of dual main entry ways is not limited solely to American Quakers but can be found associated with the meeting houses of several Protestant sects, most notably the Presbyterians. The earliest New Jersey Quaker structures known for certain to have had them incorporated into their original designs were the Hardwick (1763, demolished 1885 and known only from a crude sketch, Fig. 37), Quakertown (1754, Fig. 38) and Mount Laurel Meeting Houses (also known as Evesham, 1760, Fig. 39).

Conceptually, the Quakertown and Hardwick Meeting Houses were the simplest of these three buildings, primarily each was two, small, one room meeting houses built side by side, separated by a moveable interior partition. Both were probably also similar in configuration to the meeting house at Seaville (see Figs. 12 and 13) before its 19th century subtractive alterations. These two northern New Jersey meeting houses were the ancestors of a whole group of single story meeting houses, including Easton (1811, Fig. 40) Cropwell (1809, Figs. 41 and 42) and a doubled meeting house by addition, Rancocas (original portion 1772, date of addition unknown, see Figs. 111, 112 and 113). They also set a precedent for the more common two and three story, double meeting houses.
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The Mount Laurel or Evesham Meeting House was the earliest two story double meeting house known to have been built in New Jersey. While crude in the proportions of its interior woodwork and in its rough exterior stonework, in plan this fieldstone building demonstrates a well thought out and effective method by which the concept of dual main entries was incorporated into the uniformly accepted Bank Meeting House plan. While earlier and later "doubled forms" are, with the exception of Hardwick, in door and window placement exactly that, two meeting houses built side by side, the meeting at Mount Laurel alters the arrangement of the main facade providing a more architecturally unified and traditionally proportioned structure. The meeting house at Mount Laurel was conceived as a single structure with two main doorways rather than as two similarly orientated connected buildings each with its own entrance. The proof of this comes in the fenestration of the main facade. A "doubled plan" would call for redundant twin windows on the first level between the two doorways. Mount Laurel, instead, substitutes a single window. Similarly on the upper level of fenestration are three awkwardly placed windows, instead of the even four or six, common to most double plan meeting houses. Visually neither half of the building could stand alone as a symmetrical entity. It should be noted that although a much simpler building, the Hardwick Meeting House, with its three instead of four windows on its main
facade, was the product of similar design.

It was the true "doubled plan" and not the Mount Laurel configuration which would dominate late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Delaware Valley meeting house design. One of the earliest, preceeded only by the 1772 meeting house in Salem, surviving examples of a New Jersey meeting house that displayed the true two story culmination of the doubling of form, is that of the Chesterfield Meeting, otherwise known as Crosswicks (Fig. 6a). The town of Crosswicks was founded by Quakers in 1677 and fast became a local center and its Quaker meeting, one of the more influential.\footnote{Derry, 104.} Its first frame meeting house was constructed in 1693 and was soon replaced, in 1706, with a brick structure more congruous with the meeting's prominence.\footnote{Chesterfield Monthly, 4th day, 10th mo. 1692; 7th day, 11th mo. 1692, and 2nd day, third month 1706.} The Crosswicks Meeting continued to grow and, in 1753, the meeting was forced to enlarge the building.\footnote{Ibid., 7th day, 6th month 1753.} In 1773, Chesterfield, this time in order to accommodate the Quarterly Meeting, was faced again with the question of whether to enlarge or completely replace their meeting house. Undoubtedly a meeting house twice expanded would have in plan and appearance been an exceedingly awkward structure. Instead, the decision was made to construct an entirely new meeting house from the
ground up.  

The process by which the Chesterfield Meeting adopted the then newly introduced "doubled" plan is enlightening. The meeting sent a committee to study the Buckingham (P.A.) Meeting House, the earliest known Delaware Valley meeting house to have been constructed from the start as a true doubled plan meeting house.  

The Society of Friends may have been a conservative group but its very structure, its interconnected system of meetings, guaranteed the fast spread of those new ideas that were adopted. Through yearly meeting delegates, the eighteenth-century Quaker was annually in contact with every other member of his Society regardless of whether he left his home town or even if he had never even sent or received a letter. The group was bound even more tightly by the longstanding tradition of the travelling Quaker ministers. Regularly visited by Friends from both nearby and distant quarterly and yearly meetings, all Quakers were in regular contact with members of other meetings.

The committee appointed to study Buckingham's new Meeting House, composed of Stacy Potts, Benjamin Clark, James Odell and Abraham Skrim, responded positively, stating

---
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that such a meeting house could be constructed for £750.\textsuperscript{85} Soon after, Chesterfield's new meeting house was under construction.\textsuperscript{86} The building was one of the very largest and most impressive New Jersey meeting houses yet constructed. By implication, the Chesterfield minutes tell us that in 1773 Buckingham's plan was considered both advantageous as well as acceptable but not yet universal. This doubled meeting house design was basic, so simple that it would not have required a committee visitation to study it if it had already reached the point of commonplace acceptance. And yet it had reached a level of acceptance great enough for a committee to recommend its adoption as the chief architectural embodiment of an influential group of Friends.

The Chesterfield Meeting House would be followed by prominent examples at Salem (1772, Fig. 43), Upper Greenwich (Mickelton, 1789, Figs. 44 and 45), Pilesgrove (Woodstown, 1785, Fig. 46), Plainfield (1788, Fig. 47) and Burlington (1784, Fig. 48).

While it is doubtful that we will ever be able to point to one meeting house in particular and say that it was the original source of the "doubled" design, it is at least fairly certain that this form did not develop in

\textsuperscript{85} Chesterfield Monthly, 5th day, 8th month 1773.

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 7th day, 10th month 1773.
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Philadelphia. Good visual records, while lacking for many rural examples, survive for Philadelphia meeting houses. It seems that the "doubled" form in any of its incarnations was not introduced to Philadelphia's Quakers until after it had already achieved popularity in the surrounding Quaker communities. The doubled plan probably owed its popularity to its functionality as the most obvious and practical method of extending an already existing meeting house. As wealthy and prominent Philadelphia meetings more often than not replaced rather than enlarged their houses, it is the outlying rural communities in which we should expect and in fact find large numbers of meeting houses enlarged in such fashion. The very earliest of which may have been the Nicholson's log house in Salem, New Jersey, the building with which New Jersey meeting house history began.

"The 26th Day of the eight mo. 1685. It was agreed by the monthly meeting and by Benieme Acton that the said Benieme shall build a room twenty feet in length and in breadth equal with the meeting house in Salem Joyning and ranging equal in hithe-with the said meeting house joyned to ye east end of the old meeting house with two windows in the said roome where the said Benieme shall be directed and a pertition betwixt the new Room and the old with two long doors containing the breadth of the house with a chimney at ye east end of the house and the said Benimeme is to make it a good framed house and to lay sufficient joysts or beams for the floor of the upper room and Benieme is to make a little door in aforesaid pertition and too clapboard the walls and shingle the roofe, and the said Benimeme is to finish the house by the first of the second month next..."  

Salem Monthly, 26th day, eighth month 1685.
30th day of the ninth mo. 1685... it was thought fit by Friends that the partition in the east end of the old meetinghouse be made three foot high with shutters to run up and down according to the directions of John Thompson and Christopher White.88

The admittedly confusing quotations above describe a late seventeenth-century building which seems very much similar to a type of meeting house which does not become common until seventy-five years later. The Salem Meeting minutes describe a building with two long doors, and interiorly, with two chambers, "in length and breadth equal" separated by a shuttered partition. In spite of its importance as the seat of one of the New World’s most influential meetings and its role as the first meeting house in the Delaware Valley, its unlikely that the Salem structure played any direct role as a precedent for later design. No other similar building has been documented in the Delaware Valley earlier than 1760. A date by which the Salem building was little more than termite fodder. The solution to the question of meeting house design arrived at by the Salem Meeting was ignored in favor of the route taken by Philadelphia. Rather the doubled design was probably a syncronist but unrelated development, one that was already known in the meeting houses of other protestant sects and which allowed older, outgrown meeting houses to be expanded into buildings which reflected modern design rather than

88 Ibid., 30th day, ninth month 1685.
otherwise facing expensive total demolition or continued existence as agglutinated white elephants.

Aside from practicality of design, there were other factors working within the Society of Friends that may have sped the spread of the "double" plan. In the extreme southern portion of New Jersey, a few miles from the city of Salem, on the fringes of the town known today as Hancock's Bridge is the Alloway's Creek Meeting House. Originally constructed in 1756 and expanded in 1784 the building is a typical example of the Bank Street planned meeting house converted to doubled form (see Fig. 36).

"At a preparative meeting held 8 mo 26th 1784.... This meeting agrees, that in regard to a mode of addition of our meetinghouse that the managers pull down the west end and an addition sufficient to square each room and raise the new part as high as the old and as much higher as may be thought necessary and the old part likenwist."

The Salem Quarterly Meeting, that to which the Alloway's Creek Preparative Meeting belonged, was in a period of reorganization at the time of the Alloway's Creek Meeting House expansion. Several new preparative and monthly meetings were created, a few new meeting houses were constructed and a few were enlarged. The alterations at the site of the Alloway's Creek Meeting House were made to
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accommodate a new monthly meeting. The Salem Quarterly created the new meeting to service the two port towns of Greenwich and Alloway’s Creek. Greenwich, the larger settlement, was an official port of entry, complete with its own customs house and burgeoning trade. It had enlarged its meeting house (see Figs. 61 and 62) in advance of the quarterly’s decision and therefore was the lone site of the new monthly until Alloway’s Creek managed to complete their alterations.

What did the creation of the new monthly meeting mean? Obviously, it, artifactually, produced the alteration in size and form of both the Greenwich and Alloway’s Creek Meeting Houses. For members of the meeting at Alloway’s Creek, it also meant less cold winter hours spent traveling to monthly. But, more importantly, the new monthly gave Friends at Alloway’s Creek, and Greenwich as well, greater control self control. The monthly meeting, more so than any other meeting, and in fact more so than civic government, was the basic unit that governed the life of its members.

The tighter regionalization of control had a twofold effect. First, on the local level, Friends had more say in their Church and, consequently, in how they lived their own lives. Because they had their own monthly meeting they also had
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more influence in the quarterly and yearly meetings
themselves. But secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the
move also tightened the control of the Society of Friends
over the individual. By reducing the number of members in a
monthly meeting, it more easily allowed that body to keep
close tabs on its membership, increasing conformity. This
last fact suggests that the creation of the Greenwich
Monthly Meeting may be linked to a well researched and
documented Quaker revival movement, one that gripped the
Society at perhaps not so coincidentally the same time that
double plan meeting houses become dominant.  

During most of the eighteenth-century, the Philadelphia
Yearly Meeting believed itself under siege. Its problems
became openly apparent in the 1720's. For the first time
since settlement, Friends in Pennsylvania and New Jersey
found themselves numerically in the minority. Beginning in
1717, Pennsylvania was witness to a wave of immigration that
brought thousands of Palatine Germans and Scotch Irish to
the New Colony. The Quaker regions of New Jersey saw
immigration from many different directions, overflow from

---
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Pennsylvania and the northern colonies as well as migration from other regions within the colony. It is certainly an understatement to say that the Friends were not happy with their new found neighbors. In a broadside printed by the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting in 1732 their feelings were clear, "remarkable and grievous is the Depravity of Manners so observable in our streets; sorrowful enough is it to see the great Encrease of Profphaneness and Lewdness...much owing to the importation of great Numbers of the Vicious and scandalous refuse of Other countries."96

The Society, however, feared more than just immigrant immorality, they feared for their very survival. The threat was very real, forces were conspiring against them and, in Pennsylvania, they were led by Sir William Keith, deputy Governor of the Province from 1717 to 1726.97 Long a trusted friend of wealthy Quaker politicians, Keith took advantage of both a severe economic depression that struck in 1722 and the new immigrant masses to advance his career. With a minority of elite Quakers holding most of the wealth and much of the political power in the colony, Keith introduced a popular political insurrection and attempted to place himself as its head.98 In order to increase his own popularity, Keith fanned the flames of discontent among the

96 Ibid, 81.
97 Ibid.
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new immigrants and targeted their wrath against the upper class, a decidedly Quaker upper class. Keith was eventually driven from power by a populist Quaker, David Lloyd, but not before planting a sizable number of his supporters into political offices in both the Philadelphia city and county governments, and not before establishing substantial anti-Quaker sentiment among the immigrant populous.99 In New Jersey, these events had a profound influence all along the Philadelphia cultural watershed, and obviously throughout the entire dominion of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Anti-Quaker sentiment had an even longer history on the eastern side of the Delaware than it did in the colony of Pennsylvania. Quakerism in New Jersey had been, in the seventeenth-century, beleaguered by a union of Royalists apposed to West Jersey self rule and, in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries, by representatives of the Anglican Church, most notably, the Reverend John Talbot and George Kieth, a once powerful Quaker leader turned Anglican minister.

While Talbot and Kieth traveled up and down the Atlantic Seaboard and often spoke in Philadelphia, they paid special attention to New Jersey as its unusual religious diversity, compounded with its initial dearth of Anglicans, for them made it a true religious wasteland.100 Kieth and

99 Ibid, 83.
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Talbot would travel from one Quaker meeting to the next violentely sermonizing on the errors in the Quaker’s beliefs. In Burlington, Talbot even attempted to disrupt the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, a group he termed "ye great Synagogue of ye Quakers." The Quaker response was threefold. Groups of travelling Quaker ministers followed Talbot and Keith from meeting to meeting trying to counteract the dissention they were attempting to spread. Quaker presses throughout the New World attacked Kieth directly and finally on a much more localized approach individual meetings varied the dates and times at which they were held to prevent the attendance of unwanted interlopers.

The Anglican assault and populist politics were not the only forces threatening Delaware Valley Quaker Society. European turmoil spilled over to the New World and brought Quaker pacifism to the forefront of Delaware Valley politics. Their refusal to participate or aid in military actions, either offensive or defensive had been a point of conflict between the Society of Friends and the English government since Quakerism’s formative days. In America, the circumstances were no different. The Society of Friends, or at least those Quakers who belonged to meetings under the

101 Ibid, 268.
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Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, initially had no ideological objection to supporting a war through taxation.\(^{104}\) Justification for the policy was found in the famous Biblical quotation of Jesus in Matthew 22, verse 21: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." The predominantly Quaker Pennsylvania assembly had demonstrated this interpretation of Quaker pacifist doctrine in 1711. Queen Anne had requested that Pennsylvania assist in preparing and executing a Canadian campaign as part of her war with France. The Pennsylvania legislature refused to take part but readily agreed to make a financial appropriation for the Queen's use. Quaker legislatures would vote funds to support conflicts but would play no role in dictating their application.\(^{105}\) The policy, held fine for foreign engagements but collapsed for obvious reasons when world events dictated that Pennsylvania provide for her own defense. The Quaker legislature could vote money for defense but refused to spend it. This problem first came to a head in 1739 when the Assembly refused to support the governor's efforts to provide a militia to defend Pennsylvania from a perceived Spanish threat. Anti-Quaker politicians fanned the flames of discontent and attempted to demonstrate what they believed was the inappropriateness of Quakers in Government

\(^{104}\) Marietta, "The Growth of...," 91.
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and the hypocrisy they believed their policies represented. Anti-Quaker sentiment was pervasive.\textsuperscript{106} Powerful Pennsylvanian's, such as Benjamin Franklin, worked openly to undermine the Quaker control of Pennsylvania Government.\textsuperscript{107}

When hostile Spanish forces failed to materialize, the Philadelphia political scene slowly returned to status quo but with more widespread underlying anti-Quaker sentiment. The situation remained stable for another fifteen years. Then, in 1756 the New World rivalry between the French and the British became open hostilities. War in the colonies and in Pennsylvania itself put the Quaker members of the Pennsylvania assembly in a corner from which they could not escape. Forced into a difficult position between religion and politics, six Quaker assemblymen, followed soon by several others, resigned their seats. Suddenly for the first time since its creation, Quakers were in the minority on the Assembly.\textsuperscript{108} In fact, most of the remaining Quakers, numbering less than one third of the total assembly, would be reprimanded by their meetings.\textsuperscript{109} The popular negative opinion of Quakers fostered by the Seven Years War ran directly over into the Revolutionary War. Friends were considered traitors by rebel and tory alike.
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The effect of these turbulent years on the Society of Friends was dramatic. Politically, the result was unification. Quakers despite their religion were economically and socially a diverse group. Previous to the tumultuous events of the eighteenth-century they never presented a unified political voice. Under exterior forces Quakers, rich and poor, farmers and merchants, gradually became a single unified force which translated the viewpoints of the yearly meeting into political policy. This unified front was more or less forced on Quakers. All Quakers were assailed politically for the same reasons and therefore all were likely to respond in similar ways. But within the Society of Friends and specifically, within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting a deliberate unifying response developed that was designed to combat destructive exterior forces, but was conceived of and executed from the inside.

The Society attempted to draw together its members and to insulate them from the negative forces of the outside world, both by trying to combat the adverse effects of contact with outsiders, and by strengthening the sense of cohesion within the Friends. Since Quakerism no longer actively engaged in recruiting new members, its very existence depended upon keeping its own within the fold. Increasing worldliness made this increasingly difficult. One answer was simply to leave populated areas. This was a

choice often made in the south where increased immigration was augmented by the polluting aura of slavery. North Carolina, once a major center of Quakerism, saw nearly one quarter of its meetings dissolved. Quakers left for the frontier. Sometimes whole meetings moved en mass. Ohio and later, Indiana were the destinations of choice.\(^{111}\) The area overseen by the Philadelphia Yearly, witness to a smaller exodus, concentrated upon shoring up their communities. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, led by a few prominent Quakers, undertook the effort directly. The movement seems to have begun in 1755 and continued roughly until the end of the Revolutionary War, after which tensions between Quakers and the previously anti-Quaker factions relaxed.\(^{112}\) Doctrine outlined in the form of Queries and Disciplines, was to a point never before seen, more clearly codified and elaborated.\(^{113}\) Previously, on many moral issues, a variety of viewpoints were tolerated within the Society. Over the course of the last half of the eighteenth-century strict guidelines for Quaker beliefs and behaviors were adopted. Deviance was not tolerated.\(^{114}\) In 1755, the strongest official statements against military service were issued as
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well the firmest directives demanding the disownment of anyone marrying out of the Society. By 1776, all Friends were forbidden from owning or in any way being involved in the slave trade.115

Beyond simply introducing tight rules, the Society of Friends saw to it that the mechanisms for their enforcement were strengthened and made more effective. Meetings for Ministers and Elders, meetings made up of only the most influential Friends which very much controlled the direction of the Society, previously held at the yearly meeting were introduced as far down the meeting ladder as the monthly.116 Disownment numbers rose sharply.117 Disharmony with the Society was in no way tolerated and the great Quaker school system was increased to provide greater insulation against the outside world and to more thoroughly indoctrinate the young members of the Society.118

It is very likely that the introduction and proliferation of the doubled plan meeting house is directly tied into this eighteenth-century Quaker revival. As a functional part of the revival, the role of the women's meeting in both the yearly and the lesser meetings was increased. The men's meetings paid more interest in the
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women's meeting and the women's meeting began taking initiatives on its own.¹¹⁹ While women were not given an equal role in the functioning of the Society until the twentieth century, their role as the moral backbone of the family and the overseers of marriage was outlined directly by George Fox and renewed and appreciated by Revivalist Quakers.¹²⁰ It is a very short step to conceptualize the mutually important and separate roles of both sexes in the form of the dual main entries of a doubled meeting house. When combined with the date of the first known Delaware Valley "doubled" meeting house built from start as such, 1760, five years after the date usually given as the start of the revival, the argument that these meeting houses are architectural manifestations of the wider social movement is considerably strengthened. The revival's institutionalized methods of behavioral control would have favored the adoption and spread of a single meeting house plan.

Also corresponding to this period of revival is a noticable growth in the total numbers of New Jersey meeting houses. Considering that this is a period of political turmoil and warfare, it would seem an unlikely period to be making large capital investments in physical improvements.

The revival may have effected the rate of New Jersey meeting house construction, as well. Michael Chiarappa in
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his doctoral dissertation, "'The First and Best Sort:'
Quakerism, Brick Artisanry, and the Vernacular Aesthetics of
Eighteenth-century West Jersey Pattern Brickwork" argues
that the construction of both West Jersey Quaker meeting
houses and Quaker dwelling houses were part of a programatic
expression of Quaker control over the surrounding New Jersey
cultural and geographic landscape.  Chiarappa correlates
the number of meeting houses and dwelling houses constructed
and political and demographic stress exerted by an increase
in the regions non-Quaker population.  Another
correlating factor that can not be ignored is the continued
growth of Quaker population within this region, as is
demonstrated by approximate figures derived from
contemporary estimates and census data (Fig. 49).  Consequently, both the average size of New Jersey meeting
houses (Fig. 50) and thier total numbers (Fig. 51) continue
to increase during the closing years of the eighteenth-
century.

The "double" meeting house plan (see Fig. 7d) was
undeniably the most common choice during the closing years
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123 While the growth of the Pennsylvania Quaker
population slows to a halt after 1750, such was not the case
in New Jersey. Undeniably, the New Jersey Quaker population
was dwarfed by the increase that occurred amoung the rest of
the population, but in fact, based on contemporary
estimates, the New Jersey membership of Society of Friends
grew throughout the eighteenth-century (Fig. 49).
Fig. 49, The Population of New Jersey Quakers by Year, 1670-1810, compiled from historical estimates.  

Fig. 50, The estimated total square footage of meeting houses in New Jersey by year, from 1670-1810.
Fig. 51, The total number of *existing* meeting houses by year, from 1670—1810.
of the eighteenth-century, but it would be an overestimation to say that it was the only one. The Bank Meeting House plan (see Fig 7b), for meeting houses not required to house quarterly meetings or very large congregations, was an exceptable alternative, into the nineteenth-century. There were also "double" varients (see Fig. 7c). The most common of these were the one story, double meeting houses of the Hardwick, Quakertown type. This plan, because of its small size and traditional appearance, is popular even today, as was demonstrated by its selection for one of the youngest New Jersey Quaker meeting houses, the present Westfield Meeting House.
Chapter III: Conservatism and Change

Early Nineteenth-Century Conservatism

With the end of war and the establishment of the new nation, Quakerism's aggressive stance was somewhat relaxed. Many Quakers migrated westward to less growth pressured communities. Meeting house construction continued at a somewhat slowed rate. It is from this period that the most detailed account of meeting house design and construction survives.

So far, little has been said about the process by which individual meeting houses came to be built. This has primarily been due to the lack of regionally specific primary source information. Quaker meeting records are unusually thorough, but rarely totaly enlightening. The minutes of meetings often give the date at which new construction was first considered, what the decision was, who was to oversee the work, and what the expense was to be. They usually do not explain why a new meeting was necessary. How the design was arrived at, who did the arriving, or what the details of construction were, were rarely discussed in any detail. Nor was the relationship of the builder to the meeting or what his qualifications for employment were. For New Jersey Quakers, besides vague meeting records there are no known primary sources for this information; no diaries, no contracts and no architect's papers. For Wilmington, Delaware, a city located across the Delaware River, only a
few miles from Salem itself we are more fortunate.

On October 26, 1815, the Wilmington Preparative Meeting began discussion on what was to be done to ease the problem of overcrowding at their meeting house. The clerk of commission, appointed to examine and deal with the issue, was Benjamin Ferris (1780-1867). He was not only one of the more influential men belonging to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting but also Delaware's most eminent local historian. Ferris had the foresight to both visually record the old meeting house before its demolition, and to record in writing all the proceedings involved in deciding to construct an entirely new meeting house, as well as the primary events in determining its design and its construction.

"On the 26th of 10th mo. 1815 a concern was opened in the Preparative Meeting relative to the State of our present meetinghouse, and a number of Friends in the course of the discussion of the subject having freely expressed their views, it clearly appeared, that Friends of this meeting were not comfortably accommodated with a meeting place, that our meetings on first day morning were unsuitably crowded and that some of our religiously disposed neighbors were restrained from sitting with us when assembled for Divine Worship from a fear of incommoding our own members. It also appeared that when Friends who were travelling on a religious concern desired the company of our neighbors at meeting with us and proposed a general notification for this purpose, that friends who generally undertook to notify in such cases were much tried with the view of

inviting Persons to a house which was not sufficiently large to afford them a Seat."^126

The Wilmington Meeting responded in a most Quakerly fashion, they created a committee to examine the problem. Committees are called to deal with almost every problem that a Quaker meeting faces. While meetings are in the ultimate sense quite democratic, at least in theory, their means of arriving at decisions collectively is often less than effective for complicated decisions. The clerk of a meeting, the individual in charge of maintaining the minutes, monitors discussion. The inner light will lead the meeting toward the best decision, which becomes discernable enough during the course of debate that the clerk will be able to interpret it and set it down in the minutes.^127 Committees were more favorable as less voices made it easier to arrive at a course of action and limited the input from Quakers likely to have contrary view points to those within the circles of power.

Ferris' writings demonstrate the role committees played in the design and construction of meeting buildings. The Wilmington committee was composed of fifteen men, all prominent businessmen who held considerable "weight" within their meeting; none were directly connected to building

^126 Ibid, 71.

industries. The women's meeting had no apparent role. The committee's first task was to determine whether it was wiser to construct a new building or rather to simply enlarge the old. From the beginning, it seems the consensus was in favor of entirely new structure. It appeared,

"evident that to make it [the old meeting house] answer the purposes of the Society the cost will be nearly equal to the expense of a new one, besides subjecting Friends to the necessity of Procuring another meeting place while building and repairs were in hand."\(^{128}\)

Thomas Spackman, Moses Rea and Jesse Betts were appointed by the meeting to estimate the cost of a structure 75 feet long by 50 feet deep. The measurements were then changed to 76 feet by 48 feet, "to divide the house to greater advantage." The total bill would come to eleven thousand, three hundred and ninety-one dollars. The single greatest expense then, as now, was labor.\(^{129}\)

The ground plan and elevations were devised by William Poole, Jacob Alrichs and Benjamin Ferris, himself.\(^{130}\) Ferris supported himself in cotton manufactory, Alrichs was the owner of a machine factory, and William Poole a prominent businessman.\(^{131}\) Ferris described the layout as follows,

\(^{128}\) Ferris, 72.

\(^{129}\) Ibid, 71-73.

\(^{130}\) Ibid, 72.

\(^{131}\) Ibid, 69.
"the Friends appointed to make the Plans & Elevations produced one in which was laid down the usual outlines of Ground Plan being now produced and some time spent in considering its various parts the Committee agreed to adopt it, the outline being as follows. Minister's Gallery to extend across the whole long angle of the house west side. One door in each end contiguous to the Minister's Gallery. One small window in each end between the doors and the Westernmost corner of the house. Two other Windows in each end down stairs. Six windows in front up stairs, four in the rear and three in each end. Two doors and four windows in the front down stairs. Four windows in the rear down stairs, and two doors between the Minister's Galleries. A small building 9 by 15 behind the house to cover the platform which is intended to extend behind the Minister's Gallery. One Story high."\[132

The plan was changed before construction began,

"Minister's Gallery curtailed so as to extend to the line under the Youths Gallery it being 12 feet from the Northeast and Southwest ends of the house. The Benches which are to fill these vacancies are to front each other, those on the S.W. to front those on the N.E. and vice-versa."\[133

"The Doors in the ends of the house to be moved one foot to the Eastward and the two end windows nearest the East front are to be moved one foot toward the West to correspond with the alteration now made in the removal of the doors."\[134

The meeting house that Benjamin Ferris and his Wilmington neighbors designed and built was a double plan meeting house of exactly the type that had become so universal during the last half of the eighteenth-century (Fig. 52). As Ferris described the building's arrangement as

\[132 Ibid, 73.
\[133 Ibid.
\[134 Ibid, 77.
being of the "usual plan," he both recognized that there was a dominant code of design and consciously complied with it. The extent of the discussion outlined in Ferris's description demonstrates that while there was an accepted, "usual" plan, it was up to the committee to decide upon its appropriateness and to alter it to fit their meeting's specific needs. The general result of the Quaker building planning process across the Delaware Valley seems, in fact, to have led to an ever increasing conformity. The few variations in plan found in the late eighteenth-century become limited to slight differences in rear door and window placement by the early nineteenth.

New Jersey meeting houses of this time period, also quite typical examples, include those at Moorestown (1802, Figs. 53), Newton (Camden, 1801, Fig. 54), Mansfield (1812, Figs. 55 and 56), Mullica Hill (Woolwich Meeting, 1808, Figs. 57 and 58), and Medford (1814, Fig. 59). As a group these meeting houses were among the largest built to that date. Meeting houses seem to have become more massive during the early years of the nineteenth-century. As well as becoming longer and wider, meetings also expanded upward. While most meeting houses built circa 1760 or later have another level or large attic above the balcony, nineteenth-century examples saw an increased enlargement in the scale of this space. The room height was increased as well as the magnitude of its fenestration. While eighteenth-century
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buildings would occasionally contain a small light in the upper level of each gable end, nineteenth-century examples often had full six over six window openings. The total effect was to make the buildings seem more block-like and huge. But overall, the dominant theme in meeting house design during this period was continuity.

Schisms, Hicksite versus Orthodox and Gurneyite versus Wilburite

The closing years of the eighteenth-century and the first of the nineteenth-century were the eye of the storm for American Quakerism. While the trauma of the eighteenth-century had attacked Quakerism from the outside, the turmoil of the nineteenth-century was to come from within and consequently would be devastating. The Society of Friends believed in unity as both their justification and their salvation. As explained above they used conformity as a method of holding their society together in the face of adversity, but the concept went even deeper than that, it was a part of their theology. This is expressed clearly in the way Quaker meetings made decisions. They did not take votes or follow the direction of the majority but rather the clerk of the meeting "sensed" its direction. If the "inner light" or will of God guided each good Quaker, then how could they have a difference of opinion on important issues that faced their church. The only conclusion was that the
one group was not reading the voice of God correctly. One could not tell whether that group could be either the minority or the majority and in either case it meant that at least some Friends were misdirected.\textsuperscript{135} During the nineteenth-century, the Society of Friends in America was to come to not one, but several major doctrinal confrontations and each was to tear at the very psyche of the group.

The history of American Quakerism in the nineteenth-century seems to have largely hinged on the personality of one man, Elias Hicks (1748-1830), the respected Quaker minister from Long Island. Hicks was a fervent speaker distraught by the direction in which the Society of Friends seemed to be headed. Quakerism, in his view, had drifted away from the beliefs that were behind its founding. At the center of Hicks' doctrinal debate was the concept of Inner Light and its relative importance. Orthodox Quakers, as those opposed to Hicks came to be known, were moving Quakerism closer to a more conventional Christian standpoint. When Hicks claimed that the Inner Light was the true guide to salvation, Orthodox Quakers stressed the importance of the Bible. When Hicks stated that Jesus was only one, albeit very gifted, son of God among many, Orthodox Friends ridiculed him and branded him a heretic. The revival period of the late eighteenth-century had left the Philadelphia Quaker power structure unwilling to

\textsuperscript{135} Braithwaite, 306 and 329.
tolerate any divergent viewpoints. Those Friends who controlled most of the power in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting were vehemently opposed to Hicks. The disagreement became open conflict at the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of 1827. Unable to gain control of the meeting, Hicks, who was in attendance as a visiting Quaker, and his followers left the Arch Street Meeting House one night and convened their own yearly meeting the next morning. The rest of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting fell in line on one side or the other.

Underneath these issues were others that played just as important a role in the events that would eventually lead to the division of American Quakerism. These were the issues on the surface, underneath were many levels of strife. With anti-Quaker sentiment among the non-Quaker populous dying down after the American Revolution, Quakers were likely to identify themselves as a group a little less. Quakers with "weight" tended to be both wealthier and more urbane than those who championed the cause of Hicks. Part of the reason for Quakerism's drift toward the middle of the spectrum may have been caused by the desire of wealthier Friends to fit more easily into a Philadelphia upper class dominated more and more by men of different religious backgrounds. Orthodox Friends were often newly rich men who had found their fortunes in booming American commercialism. The old monied

---

136 Hamm, 15-16.
families, socially threatened by the new bourgeois, often formed Hicksite sympathies in response. Still another primary cause of the conflict was the exclusionary structure of the Quaker power system. Positions of power and the resulting "weight" they brought were unofficially passed on hereditarily. The son of a highly respected Quaker was automatically held in high regard himself. The wealthy Orthodox Quakers had controlled most positions of power within their meetings. The others were disenfranchised and knew it. Although most American Quakers and all British Friends sided with the Orthodox viewpoint, the situation within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was clearly different. When the separation occurred, most urban Friends became Orthodox Quakers, while in the more rural surrounding areas Hicksites held the numerical superiority. When news of the split reached each meeting, the usual result was that lines were drawn. The more numerous group would retain control of the meeting house and meeting funds and oust the others. The events at the Salem Meeting House, recorded by a neighbor Harriet Van Meter Cone, are typical. Elias Hicks visited the New Jersey

---


138 In the year 1845, there 71,600 Orthodox Quakers in America, there were only 23,000 Hicksite Friends. Hamm, 175.

139 Frost, 78.
meetings soon after the Separation in 1827. Mrs. Cone recalled the events after he spoke. After the excitement and opposition of a number of Quakers, the opposition locked the gates of the yard to prevent the Hicksite party from holding their meeting in the old meeting house. A Hicksite blacksmith came in and knocked off the locks, and the Hicksites drove in and held their meeting.\(^{140}\) Within New Jersey, it was usually, but not always, the Orthodox who received the short end of the stick. An 1834 count made by New Jersey Hicksites stated that there were 2100 Orthodox friends in New Jersey and 3896 members of "the other portion of the Society." Orthodox numbers were somewhat different, 2972 "Friends" and "3344" seceders. A probably more reliable count taken in 1830 showed that at least within Salem itself, there was a two to one ratio, 250 Hicksites to 150 Orthodox. Animosity between the groups became extreme.\(^{141}\)

To the Orthodox, the Hicksites were heretics. Orthodox Friends could be censured for even talking to a Hicksite Friend. After the London Yearly Meeting officially recognized the Orthodox Friends, the followers of Hicks set up their own parallel system of meetings including their own

---

\(^{140}\) Salem Quarter, 233. This history also contains the account of the eminent English Quaker Thomas Sillitoe, who travelled the Salem quarter in the aftermath of the separation and who was openly offended by the "violent" actions and "determination to worry Friends out of their property in their meeting houses."

\(^{141}\) Ibid, 114-116 and 120-121.
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.

The architectural outcome of the situation is easy to surmise. Meeting house numbers within southern New Jersey nearly doubled. New meeting houses had to be built to accommodate those evicted from the old ones. Nearly all of the meeting houses constructed in the first years following the split were comparatively modest structures, as the group that held the old meeting also held all of the funds. In the past, Quakers had relied on contributions from neighboring meetings to help fund new meeting houses, New Jersey Quakers were now faced with a constituency of only about half its former size, and consequently only half the wealth.

The Chesterfield Orthodox Meeting House is typical of many built in the wake of the separation (Fig. 50). Constructed of brick but relatively small in scale, this meeting house was raised in a prosperous community. Built in 1854, giving its meeting time with which to establish a building fund, its design draws from both early and late eighteenth-century meeting house precedents. In overall massing and arrangement, the building is very similar to small meeting houses of the early eighteenth-century. The Chesterfield Meeting includes in its design the double entry that became prevalent in the second half of the eighteenth-century. While the doubled form of these late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century meeting houses had grown from the expansion of smaller older meeting houses and from American
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Quaker meeting ritual, the continuation of the form in this smaller meeting is probably as much a function of tradition and a conservative nature as it was a practical solution to the smaller meetings' requirements. Meeting houses built in Greenwich (1857, Figs. 61 and 62) and Salem (1837, Figs. 63 and 64), share the same solution to the problem of the necessary smaller meeting house proportions. Yet, they are different from the one constructed at Chesterfield. These two meeting houses, like their larger cousins, include fenestration between the dual entries; Chesterfield, awkwardly, lacks it.

Meeting houses built in the wake of the schism did not automatically include dual entries in their design. Surviving meeting houses from Mansfield (1828, Fig. 65), Newton (also known as Camden, 1837, Fig. 66), and Woodstown (c.1828, Fig. 67), are examples of buildings designed with only one primary entry. Structures of this type were not uncommon. Usually of frame construction and a date very close to that of 1827, these buildings probably represent the first crop of post-Schism meeting houses, constructed with limited funds as quickly as possible. Most likely intended only as temporary measures, they lacked the more elaborate detailing of their brick counterparts.

Between 1830 and 1860, the majority of American Quakers moved closer and closer toward the dominant evangelical religious culture of the United States. The views of Joseph
Fig. 63
Salem Orthodox Meeting House
Author's Photo

Fig. 64
Plan,
Salem Orthodox Meeting House
Fig. 65
Mansfield Orthodox Meeting House,
Author's Photo

Fig. 66
Newton Hicksite Meeting House,
Pre-renovation Drawing,
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Fig. 67
Woodstown Orthodox Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
John Gurney (1788-1847), an extremely influential English Friend and traveling minister, were at the heart of the movement. Gurney basically took the prime tenants of Orthodox Quakerism a step further; increased faith and reliance on Christ and the Bible and a standpoint that almost denied the existence of "Inner Light." To this mix he added one other more radical belief, instant sanctification by true acceptance of God. Gurneyism was the first step in a reform movement that was to lure increasing numbers of converts to Quakerism.  

Relaxed discipline, both in the written set of rules and the application of them, and a new evangelical nature made Quakerism a growth religion in the middle years of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately for the pursuit of Quaker unity, instant salvation was the straw that, once again, broke the camel's back.

Quakerism had long held dear the belief that life was one long trial on the route to being saved. Conservative Quakers under the leadership of John Wilbur, a respected Friend from Rhode Island, rebelled against the Gurneyite belief in near instant salvation. Crusading followers of Gurney tried to force Wilbur's own meeting to disown him for his views. His meeting refused and the event fractured the

---

142 While the Wilbur/Gurney split caused a drop in "Orthodox"/Gurnyite Quaker numbers, from 71,600 members in 1845 to 55,764 in 1871, the attraction of Evangelical Quakerism had by 1908 swelled Gurnyite membership to 97,785. Hamm, 175.
whole New England Yearly Meeting. Each of the other yearly meetings were then forced to recognize either the vastly more numerous Gurnyite New England Yearly Meeting or the separatist faction composed of the followers of Wilbur.

Most of the yearlies fell firmly on the side of the Gurneyites but the more conservative Philadelphia Yearly Meeting made a unique response that is extraordinarily important to this paper. Unlike the other yearly meetings, the vast majority of the members of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting had strong Wilburite sympathies, but those favoring Gurney’s beliefs were some of the most influential and active members. The yearly waffled for some time but, in the end, the result was astounding. In the hopes of preventing a schism within the Philadelphia Yearly itself, it was determined to quiet the debate by cutting off all communication between Philadelphia Orthodox Friends and Orthodox Friends everywhere else...including England, effectively making the New England dispute irrelevant.143

The conservative Philadelphia Friends imposed a self isolation that was to have a pronounced effect on local meeting house architecture. Historians of Philadelphia architecture often point to Quaker tradition as the reason why Philadelphia remained a city of plain red brick and gray stone; a city of small, architecturally modest row houses, until well after the middle of the nineteenth-century. The

143 Frost, 83 and Hamm, 34.
architecture of both Philadelphia Yearly Meetings remained traditional. Interested in perpetuating the ways of the Quaker founders, Hicksite meetings naturally retained older architectural forms. Orthodox Friends retained traditional designs both because they generally were more conservative than Quakers in other regions and because they had isolated themselves from the modern architectural influences to which other Orthodox meetings were subjected. Philadelphia had been on the verge of architectural innovation with the construction of the less than conventional, architect designed Arch Street Meeting House (Fig. 68), in 1804. But self imposed isolation put an end to that. The most radical innovation in the following years would be the occasional variation of the orientation of urban meeting houses so that the building’s gable end faced the street as it does at the Race Street Hicksite Meeting House (Fig. 69), of 1856. It was simply a method of retaining traditional design when faced with the ever increasing expense of street front property in the growing metropolis of Philadelphia. The only other architectural innovation found in New Jersey meeting house design of the last three quarters of the nineteenth century was the addition of twin outhouses, usually attached to the two rear corners of the building (Fig. 70). Access to these structures was usually achieved from the exterior of the building, sometimes however, vestibules were provided at the meeting house’s two side doors, so that it would not be
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necessary to expose oneself to the weather. Out houses were sometimes constructed simultaneously to the meeting houses they serviced and in other cases attached to older buildings not previously supplied with such an amenity. This slight modification was perhaps the most radical deviation made by those responsible for Delaware Valley post-schism meeting house architecture.

The most effective way to point out how much the conservative nature of Philadelphia Quakerism and its self-imposed isolation froze their architecture is to demonstrate what happened elsewhere. Figure 71 shows the 1877 Richmond Meeting House, the site of the Indiana Yearly Meeting. How did medievalizing design and ornament, an indirect historical reference to a Catholic Europe, become a part of the design of the building which housed a Quaker yearly meeting? The reasons behind the building are at least twofold. The most important was that as the nineteenth-century progressed Orthodox Quakerism became more and more a part of the American Evangelical movement. Paid ministers were introduced, as were theatrical revival meetings. Quaker pastors associated and coordinated with ministers from other denominations. Feeling Quakerism was being "left behind," prominent revivalist Quakers sought to limit the differences between Quakerism and other evangelical religions. Their methods were not to bring Quaker doctrine to other groups or even to meet them half way but rather to drag the Society of
Friends out of the Dark Ages and into the American Evangelical fold. Along with popular religion came current ecclesiastical architectural design, i.e. the "gothic revival."

The spread of less conventional meeting house design was aided by the Quaker institution of traveling ministry. Quakers of a certain standing within their home meetings who "felt the call" often visited other meetings both to speak and listen. In America, the tradition goes back to the first English Quakers to set foot in the New World. In England, it goes all the way back to Quakerism's earliest roots, among the seventeenth-century's wandering religious dissatisfied, known as "The Seekers of the Truth." In fact, English travelling ministers exacerbated each of the primary breaks that occurred in American Quakerism. English Quakers were present at that fateful Philadelphia Yearly of 1827. They counseled Orthodox Friends to avoid compromise and helped push American Quakerism over the precipice from which it tumbled.English Quaker meeting houses never demonstrated the same conformity in exterior appearance that was found around Philadelphia and were more likely to be

\[144\] Tolles, Quakers and the Atlantic Culture, 9.

\[145\] A primary account of the 1827 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting is found in William Bacon Evans, Jonathan Evans and His Time, 1759-1839 (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1959). Although obviously biased, Thomas Evans' detailed description shows just how active the English visitors to the yearly meeting were.
exposed to the most modern of European architectural design. Walter Robson, an English Quaker touring America at the time of the construction of the Richmond Meeting House, described it as "a really handsome building, red brick, with towers at one end." He described the old meeting house (Fig. 72), one of the same plan that was still being built around Philadelphia, as "a poor, old, shabby place." American Quakerism always felt itself in the shadow of the London Yearly Meeting regardless of the fact that the American Quaker population was more numerous than the British. It has even been said that part of the reason for the break between Hicksite and Orthodox Quakers was because Orthodox American Quakers feared being branded heretics if they compromised with Hicks and his followers against the will of English advisors. The opinion of men like Robson undoubtedly meant much to the members of yearly meetings still maintaining official communication with their British counterparts.

The Indiana Meeting House was a radical design; much more so than anything found in New Jersey, but the influence of the revival movement was felt architecturally here as well. Meeting houses built in Tuckerton (1863, Fig. 73),
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Beach Haven (c.1880, Fig. 74) and Shrewsbury (1841, Fig. 75) may be evidence of the effect of this revival in New Jersey. These are three buildings which were in appearance far closer to the typical simple nineteenth century American ecclesiastical architecture than they were to historical Quaker tradition, varying in design both from the large double plan meeting houses that developed in the second half of the eighteenth century and from what the more aptly suited group of small meeting houses that developed out of the 1827 schism. It has been suggested, probably rightfully so, that differences developed between Orthodox and Hicksite meeting houses. Across the country, Orthodox meeting houses were likely to be both more ornate and oriented differently than those built by Hicksites. Orthodox meeting houses often were entered on the building’s gable end, much in the fashion of traditional nave oriented Churches and closer in style to other American ecclesiastical architecture.\textsuperscript{148} In New Jersey, this "chapel plan" is found at both Tuckerton and Beach Haven but otherwise rarely. Members of both Philadelphia Yearly Meetings were far more apt to favor conservative traditional meeting house design and this is most likely associated with the more conservative nature of

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
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the isolationist Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Just as the Philadelphia Orthodox Yearly Meeting was unable to endorse the evangelical movement which swept other American Orthodox Yearlies and the mid-nineteenth century American religious scene in general, it was also unwilling to abandon traditional meeting house forms in favor of ones more in line with mainstream American ecclesastical architecture. Consequently, under the aegises of the two Philadelphia Yearly Meetings, there was little difference between the architecture of a Hicksite meeting house and one of the Orthodox.

While New Jersey nineteenth century Quaker meeting houses were more conservative than those found in most other parts of the country, they in no way escaped all influence from the then current popular design. For example, the elongated window proportions on the rear facade of the Medford Hicksite Meeting House (1843, Fig. 76) and the large semi-lunar eve lights on the Haddonfield Orthodox Meeting House (1841, Fig. 77). Other popular additions to both old and new meeting houses during the second half of the nineteenth century were long porches which replaced the previously universal pedimented door hoods or porticos. These porches, in addition to being simply popular architectural features of the period, provided Friends with
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a sheltered place to gather before and after meeting.\textsuperscript{149}

Overall, mid to late nineteenth century modifications in the designs of New Jersey meeting houses were superficial. The most telling example and one most informative when contrasted against the Richmond Indiana Meeting House, without a doubt, must be the 1898 Moorestown Orthodox Meeting House (Fig. 78). In 1802, Moorestown Friends decided that it was time to replace their old stone meeting house, one that had stood at the center of the town since 1720. A committee was convened and proposed a sixty-six foot long by forty foot wide building, built of brick. The structure, although actually about two foot shorter, was erected in the same year. While built in the nineteenth-century, the building’s design was very much a product of eighteenth century tradition. Given its very early nineteenth century date, only two years after the turn of the century, it is not surprising that the meeting house would share much in design with ones built in the late eighteenth century, but the importance of the building’s more archaic form becomes clear when it is compared to the building erected by the Moorestown Orthodox Meeting after the schism.

With the division of the Moorestown Quaker Meeting, the Hicksites remained in control of the meeting house. The

\textsuperscript{149} Francis J. Puig, The Porches of Quaker Meeting Houses in Chester and Delaware Counties 21-30.
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Orthodox, instead held their meetings in the frame school house that stood in the meeting house yard (Fig. 79). The Orthodox were to be close neighbors to the Hicksite Quakers, a situation that surely caused friction. It took the Moorestown Orthodox Friends seventy one years to construct a meeting house of their own and when they did, it was erected on the very site of that school house, a distance considerably less than a stone’s throw from their old home.

The meeting house the Orthodox Friends chose to erect is the primary physical evidence of an architectural movement among Quakers in New Jersey that left little other physical evidence of its own. The Orthodox Friends constructed a colonial revival megalith. The building outdid the 1802 structure in every detail, size, proportion, ornament. The old meeting house was, to use a Quaker word, plain. It was typical of meeting houses of its type, but lacked all of the "Georgian" and "Federal" embellishments that were so beloved by the colonial revival. While the older meeting house lacks any extraneous architectural embellishments, the 1898 meeting house contains not only all

150 The original status of the first structure in which the Moorestown Orthodox Friends met is disputed. The version related here is that found in Derry's Old and Historic Churches of New Jersey. James C. Purdy's Moorestown, Old and New, A Local Sketch (Moorestown, W.J. Lovell, 1886), a book written before erection of the 1898 meeting house states that the wooden structure was erected in 1829 and never served any purpose but that of a Hicksite Quaker meeting house (p. 131).
of the most elaborate affections of the bricklayers art, watertable, stringcourse and flat arch brick lintels over the window openings, but also a massive cornice that wraps around the gable ends of the building, elaborate circular eve vents, cast iron snow fencing on the roof and to top it all off, four massive false chimney stacks. On one level, we could simply dismiss the Moorestown Orthodox Meeting House as a colonial revival structure, a design generated by practical requirements, traditional meeting house design and on a revival style that was becoming increasingly popular. But there are deeper reasons for the building's design. The issue of authenticity is such a reason. The Hicksite and Orthodox factions squabbled, from 1827 to the date of their amelioration in 1955, about which group was the true descendants of original Society of Friends. By retaining possession of an older meeting house, the Moorestown Hicksite Quakers held a meaningful symbol. When the Orthodox Quakers raised their structure, it became an issue of competing meeting houses. One original, more modest eighteenth century structure confronted by an elaborate nineteenth century imposter.

Even the issue of the influence of the Colonial Revival is not as simple as it might seem. Quakerism was tied to social position. Even today the highest levels of Philadelphia society are populated by many of Quaker ancestry. The mid nineteenth-century saw the genesis of
serious interest in American history. The first interest in historical buildings and sites centered around those associated with the Revolution, Washington’s Headquarters in Cambridge, Carpenter’s and Independence Hall in Philadelphia and, of course, Mount Vernon. It is no coincidence that the early historical descriptions of New Jersey meeting houses always centered on their role in the Revolution. The Crosswicks Meeting House had a cannonball imbedded in its facade as the result of a Revolutionary skirmish. Woodbury was a hospital, Evesham, a bivouac area and commissary, Burlington, a barracks. Hessians used the Mount Holly Meeting as a slaughter house and the British maintained their headquarters in the Salem Meeting House yard. These, at least, are the stories that have been handed down, some may be true, others not, but each was frequently repeated in the numerous works of local history that the nineteenth-century turned out. By belonging to a meeting that met in an old meeting house or at least one that looked old, the Quaker garnered a certain social position. Town residents knew that Quakers had founded their communities and belonged to its oldest families. These were years of patriotism fanned by the fear of the ever increasing flow of immigrants and the coming of the centennial and even though they refused to fight in it, Quakers profited socially in image by the ties to the Revolution their meeting houses held. This historical pedigree for both Quakers and their
structures is a part of the equation that explains why in the Delaware Valley with its strong colonial history, traditional meeting house forms were maintained while in the more recently settled midwest they were dropped.

The Twentieth Century

Existing meeting houses became important to the Quaker. Traditionally, the Quaker placed no special meaning in buildings, the meeting house as an artifact held no religious importance to them. The concept that a place of worship was a "House of God" was revolting to the seventeenth or eighteenth-century Friend, it was far too Papist. There was no hesitation in demolishing or selling an outdated or outgrown building. But by the mid nineteenth-century the meeting house had become important to the Quaker in its own right. It was now a cultural and social asset and as such no early New Jersey meeting house was deliberately replaced during the last half of the nineteenth-century. Old meeting houses have seen much change. In many, dwindling meeting size and rising fuel costs has mandated that the gallery be completely floored over to prevent heat from rising up and into that large and usually unoccupied space. The other often encountered modification has been the removal of the central partition. With the twentieth-century demise of the women's meeting, these devices were obsolete. They survive in active meetings usually only in situations
where the meeting size is small enough not to warrant the expense of heating the extra space. The Salem and Woolwich (Mullica Hill) Meeting Houses are two examples of large meetings that removed their partitions.

The twentieth-century has seen the construction of only four entirely new meeting houses (Atlantic City, Atlantic City Area, Merchantville and Westfield) probably for the simple reason that there is a great excess of available meeting space. This excess of meeting house space is perhaps the longest lasting effect of the Orthodox/Hicksite schism and one of the primary issues of importance concerning the continued preservation of these important structures. The start of the twentieth-century saw a substantial drop in membership at many New Jersey meetings and events which led, for the most part, to the reconciliation the divergent groups of Friends. The result, in terms of the schism swelled body of meeting houses, was that many meeting houses fell into disuse. Some have simply been lost. Others have been sold and converted to other purposes. The Salem Orthodox Meeting House is now home to legal offices. Trenton's Orthodox Meeting House has been refitted as a Quaker community center. The Mooresville Orthodox Meeting House serves as a school gymnasium and the Westfield Meeting House is now a Quaker preschool. Both the Old and Upper Springfield Meeting Houses have become residences. The same fate has befallen the Orthodox meeting house at Mansfield.
The Bordentown Meeting House is now bank office space and the Haddonfield Orthodox Meeting House is a supermarket (Fig. 80).

Usually, the meeting houses constructed before the schism, valued as more historic, have managed to remain in continuous use and in the hands of Quaker Meetings. Unfortunately, many architecturally important meeting houses, such as Arny's Mountain, Mansfield, Alloway's Creek and Mount Laurel, although still under the care of Quaker meetings, now, most of the time stand empty. While the meetings which oversee these buildings most often understand their worth, the maintenance of these buildings is none-the-less a financial burden. Consequently, some have undergone long dormant periods without much repair. These are some of the most valuable and most threatened of all surviving meeting houses.
Fig. 80
Haddonfield Hicksite Meeting House
Author's Photo
Part II. An Annotated, Illustrated Inventory of Quaker Meeting Houses Constructed in New Jersey

Introduction

There were five Quarterly Meetings (not counting the twin meetings spawned by the Separation of 1827) that have had oversight of New Jersey Monthly Meetings. Four of these, Burlington, Haddonfield, Salem and Shrewsbury and Rahway Quarterly Meetings, can truly be said to have been New Jersey Quarterly Meetings. The fifth, the Bucks Quarterly, was a Pennsylvania Quarterly which, after 1859, had oversight of the Kingwood Monthly Meeting. The oldest of these quarterly meetings is the Shrewsbury and Rahway. This meeting was a part of the New York Yearly Meeting until 1682 at which point it transferred to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. After the Separation of 1827, in 1833 to be precise, the Hicksite Meetings of this Quarter transferred back to the New York Yearly. The other meetings have, since its start in 1682, always been members of the Philadelphia Yearly. The following is a short building history of all of the meeting houses of the four New Jersey Quarterly Meetings. Quarterly meetings are arranged alphabetically as are the individual meetings within each quarterly. In the event a meeting was divided by the schism of 1827 and a second meeting house erected to house the dispossessed group, the meeting which retained the original meeting house is listed first regardless of alphabetical order.
Meeting Houses of The Burlington Quarterly Meeting

Arny’s Mount (Mount, Shreve’s Mount, Julytown)

The Arny’s Mount Meeting was organized about 1743. Meetings from 1743 to 1775 were held in a log structure.\(^{151}\) Several inconsistencies exist in primary source material which has caused dispute among local historians as to whether this building was, in fact, a designated meeting house or a school house that doubled for the purpose. The first minute reference to the building reads as thus.

"...sundry Friends belonging to the upper part of Mount Holly Meeting made application in writing to Burlington Monthly Meeting for liberty to hold a meeting for worship on the first day of each week during the winter season at the meeting house now standing near Caleb Shreve’s Mount."\(^{152}\)

That the building was actually constructed of logs is indicated by a passage in the journal of Ephraim Tomlinson, "On the 20th day 6th mo., 1771, I was at the marriage of my son-in-law John Gardiner at the log meeting house hard by Julytown."\(^{153}\)

Which ever the case, the building was replaced in 1774,

"To the monthly meeting of Friends of Burlington: We the subscribers with others having obtained the liberty of holding a meeting for religious worship

\(^{151}\) Burlington Monthly, 3rd day, 8th month, 1743.

\(^{152}\) Ibid.

near Shreve's Mount have hither to met in a school house which we find very inconvenient for that purpose and therefore are desirous of building a small comfortable house..."\(^{154}\)

Land was obtained in 1775,

"Jonathan Hough Jr. conveyed to Daniel Smith, Samuel Shinn, Samuel Allison, John Comfort, Peter Ellis, Edward Black and John Hilliard, the survivor or survivors of them, in trust one acre, two rods of land and twenty five perches of land to and for the purpose of building a meeting house there on, for the use of the people called Quakers and for a place to bury their dead"\(^{155}\)

The meeting house (Figs. 81 and 82) was constructed of stone and is the same structure that survives today. The building has endured two fires, one in 1800 which consumed most of the wooden portions of the building and another in 1809.\(^{156}\) The Arny's Mount Meeting House is located on the south west intersection of Juliustown Road (Burlington County 669) and Arny's Mount Road (Burlington County 668).

Barnaget

Matlack believes that this Quaker meeting was first formed about 1767 and that the small frame meeting house located at Barnaget, N.J. was constructed very soon

\(^{154}\) Burlington Monthly, 5th day 12th Month, 1774.

\(^{155}\) Mount Holly Monthly Meeting Miscellaneous Papers, Friends Historic Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

\(^{156}\) Mount Preparative Minutes. (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 2d month, 17800 and Mount Preparative Meeting account book 1797-1882. (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 12th mo. 12th 1809.
Figure 81
Amy's Mount Meeting House, main facade,
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society Of Pennsylvania

Figure 82
Amy's Mount Meeting House
street facade,
author's photo
after. Salter's *History of Monmouth and Ocean Counties* quotes a deed dated June 11, 1770. The deed was from Timothy Ridgeway and Levi Cramer of Stafford Township, Monmouth County and was to Stephen Burdsel and Job Ridgeway, the son of the said Timothy, Daniel Shrouds and Joseph Gauntt. The property concerned was "one piece or parcell of land containing one acre and a half quarter," and specifically mentioned an already existing meeting house. Contrary to general belief, this meeting house is probably not the one standing in Barnaget today on the north side of Bay Ave. (Ocean County 609), between Walnut Lane and Water St.

"At Little Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting held the 12th day of the 10th month 1848..... John Collins, Willits Fawkes, Timothy Pharo, Robert Pharo and John Collins Jr. is appointed a committee to raise money by subscription for the purpose of Building a meeting house on Friends old meeting house lot at Barnaget..."

The phrase "Friends old meeting house lot" may very well suggest that the original Barnaget Meeting House had already, by 1848, met its demise. In any case, the new Barnaget Meeting House (Fig. 83) was finished by 1851.

---

157 Matlack, 151.


159 Minutes of the Little Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 12th day, 10th month 1848.
Figure 83
Barnaget Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 84
Beach Haven Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
"At Little Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting held the 10th day of the 4th month, 1851... The committee appointed to superintend the building of the meeting house at Barnaget now makes a full report and say the house is built, the cost of which is 755 dollars and 46 cents..."

Beach Haven

The Beach Haven Quaker Meeting was first organized in 1878 and the meeting house (Fig. 84) constructed two years later. Matlack quotes correspondence, dated 1929, between Robert F. Engle of Beach Haven and himself.

"This meeting house was built by Dr. Asshurst, Archelaus Pharo, and Philip Duane. It stood on Third Street next to Archelaus Pharo’s Cottage, later Dr. Asshurst’s. As Walter Pharo was the son and legatee of the donor it was his to dispose of when the meeting was discontinued (1907). He presented it to the Beach Haven Public Library for library and entertainment purposes and it was moved to a lot on Beach Avenue adjoining and belonging to the methodist church... Later Mrs. Pharo, now a widow, presented the town with a wonderful new library building in memory of her husband and his father... There being no further use for the building for such purposes as the donor intended, and as it occupied ground belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, by consent of all concerned, it was turned over to the said church for Sunday school use."\(^{161}\)

The Kynette Methodist Church, that which is spoken of above, was later destroyed by a fire from which the old meeting house survived.\(^{162}\)

\(^{160}\) Little Egg Harbor Monthly, 10th day, 4th month, 1851.

\(^{161}\) Matlack, 153-4.

\(^{162}\) Matlack, 156.
Bordentown

"At a Monthly Meeting of Friends held in their Meeting house in Chesterfield the 4th of the 9th mo. 1736, Friends appoint Isaac Horner, Richard French, William Morris, Joshua Wright & Marmaduke Watson to treat with Joseph Borden about land to build a meeting house on & for a graveyard he having made an offer to some friends concerning it."  

163

Friends apparently changed thier minds about the proposed location for the new meeting house,

"At a Monthly Meeting of Friends held at their meeting house in Chesterfield the 3 of the 2 mo., 1740... Thomas Potts, Jun., Preserve Brone Jun. to get a deed from Joseph Borden for a piece of Ground on the other side of the street for a meeting house & to deliver up the old deed for the other piece of ground."  

164

The second plot of land was purchased on 10 mon. 1, 1737 and the meeting house (Figs. 85 and 86) was completed in 1740. This second plot discused above is located in the center of modern Bordentown, close to the southeast corner of Walnut Street and Farnsworth Avenue. The Bordentown Preparative Meeting was discontinued in 1878 and all usage of the building ceased soon after that.  

165

For many years the building was used for the storage of wallpaper by Mrs. D. H. Clevenger who maintained a buisness next door.  

166

By

---

163 Minutes of the Chesterfield Monthly Meeting Minutes (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 4th of 9th month 1736.

164 Chesterfield Monthly, 3, 2nd Mo. 1740.

165 Matlack, 158.

166 Ibid., 156.
Figure 85
Bordentown Meeting House
Author’s Photo

Figure 86
Bordentown Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
1929, the building had come into the possession of the bank neighboring it on the corner of Walnut and Farnsworth. In the summer of 1929, the building was remodeled to serve as office space for that institution, which still occupies it.\(^{167}\)

**Burlington**

Meetings for worship were first held at Burlington in 1677. The earliest surviving minute of the Burlington Monthly Meeting is dated 15th of ye 5th mo. 1678. By 1683, the Burlington Quarterly Meeting, held alternately in Burlington and Chesterfield, was established. In 1681, it was deemed necessary to build a meeting house for Burlington Friends.\(^{168}\)

In the next year, 1682, the Burlington Monthly Meeting commissioned a hexagonal meeting house to be built by Francis Collings, "according to the draught of a six-square building of forty feet square from out to out..."\(^{169}\)

The building apparently took some time to complete. During a monthly meeting held in 1685,

"George Hutchinson + James Budd are willing to take ye trouble upon them to endevour to cause Francis Collings to perform his covenants in

\(^{167}\) *Ibid.*, 158.

\(^{168}\) Burlington Monthly, 6th of 12th mo. 1681.

\(^{169}\) Burlington Monthly, 5th of 12th mo. 1682.
building ye meeting house & Court House to ye finishing of what he undertook."\textsuperscript{170}

7th of ye 10th mo. 1696—"Ordered by this meeting that ye month meeting be Kept at the new meeting house..."\textsuperscript{171}

"This meeting having taken into their consideration ye coldness of ye season for this winter have thought it convenient to remove ye meting to Geo. Hutchinson’s house both first days & fifth days & to return it again when the weather is more Favorable."\textsuperscript{172}

"It was proposed at this meeting the building of a winter meeting house. It was agreed that it should be done as followeth, viz: a Brick house a Brick and half thick after it is raised a foot and a half from the ground, which is to be done with good sound stone and the wall to be built of equal height with the old meeting-house and the roof to be covered with cedar and join the awther roof, the breadth to be equal with one of the old house and the length 30 feet. To be plastered with lime and hair, and to be lined below with ?slit dale? 4ft high from the seats – with 2 good pine floors, one of them to be grooved"\textsuperscript{173}

Several images of the first Burlington Meeting House (Fig. 87) survive in the collections of the Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College and at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. These all appear to be based on one original painting or drawing. The earliest mention of any artistic rendition of the meeting house was

\textsuperscript{170} Burlington Monthly, 7th of ye 5th Mo. 1685.


\textsuperscript{172} Burlington Monthly, 11th month, 2nd, 1687.

\textsuperscript{173} Burlington Monthly, 3mo. 4th, 1696.
Figure 87
Hexagonal Burlington Meeting House wash drawing,
Graphics Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 88
Plan,
Hexagonal Burlington Meeting House Graphics Collection,
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
made by Amelia Gummere who stated that the said image was
given to her by a native of Burlington, Samuel Emlen dating
the image to at least as early as 1884.\textsuperscript{174} A surviving
floor plan (Fig. 88), showing both the original structure
and the "winter addition" can be found in the Historical
Society of Pennsylvania's Manuscript Department, but there
is no indication as to its date.

On February 13, 1740, The Pennsylvania Gazette reported
the following: "From Burlington, we hear that the Meeting
House on High Street there, was last week burnt down by
accidental fire."\textsuperscript{175} A confirming minute dated 2nd day of
ye 4th Mo. 1740 stated that "A minute came from our last
Quarterly Meeting, to this purpose, that the considerable
progress is made toward the reparation of the meeting-house
that was burned in Burlington"\textsuperscript{176}

The building was altered in 1781 to increase its
capacity.

"Friends having been put to some inconvenience at
times for want of room in the meeting House at
Burlington and as it is thought there may be an
alteration made to advantage to this meeting in
that respect which will be attended with but a
small expense the following friends are appointed
to consider the proposal and if they think it may
be advantageous to get the work completed against

\textsuperscript{174} Amelia Mott Gummere. \textit{Friends in Burlington}
(Philadelphia: Collins, 1884), 25.

\textsuperscript{175} DeCou, \textit{Provincial Capitol}, 62.

\textsuperscript{176} Burlington Monthly, 2nd day of ye 4th mo. 1740.
the next Quarterly Meeting to be held in this place.\textsuperscript{177}

The work was completed much later than anticipated, by 26th 11, 1781.\textsuperscript{178}

Amelia Mott Gummere in her essay "Friends in Burlington," quoted a record of the Burlington Friends School dated 7 mo. 28, 1792 for the date of this building's final destruction. "Laborers were employed to take down the old building back of the new meeting house, some time since purchased of the Quarterly."\textsuperscript{179} The "new meeting house" (Figs. 89, 90, 91 and 92) mentioned in the above quote was built in 1783 on the same lot of ground as the first meeting house, between it and High street.

"Burlington Monthly meeting had under consideration the erection of a new meeting house in Burlington on the ground belonging to the Quarter, in order to accommodate the Quarterly meeting; and it appearing the sense of the monthly meeting to be best to put the matter forward by proposing it to this meeting; and it was concluded that friends of Burlington Monthly Meeting have liberty to build as they propose."\textsuperscript{180}

"We of the committee appointed by the Quarterly Meeting to consider of the building a New meeting house in Burlington to accommodate the Quarterly Meeting have after considering the matter agreed

\textsuperscript{177} Minutes of the Burlington Quarterly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 26th 2mo. 1781.

\textsuperscript{178} Burlington Quarterly, 26th 11 1781.

\textsuperscript{179} Minutes of the Burlington Friends School, 7th mo. 28, 1792, as quoted in Gummere, 68.

\textsuperscript{180} Burlington Quarterly, 26th 5mo, 1783.
to propose that the size of the House be about the same as that at Crosswicks."\textsuperscript{181}

The reasons why the Crosswicks Meeting House (see Fig. 95) was chosen as the model for the proposed building in Burlington are both obvious and less than obvious. Crosswicks was the other site of the Quarterly Meeting. If the 1773 meeting house had been found satisfactory to both the Chesterfield Monthly Meeting and Burlington Quarterly Meeting, which was also held there, then it is logical that the Quarterly might propose its plan for the new Burlington Meeting House. There was also another reason. In 1773, when Friends of the Chesterfield Meeting first proposed building a new meeting house to accommodate holding the quarterly meeting in Crosswicks, an agreement was made and was noted in the Monthly and Quarterly Meeting minutes. Burlington Friends, in order to provide two sufficient buildings in which to hold the quarterly meeting, would support the construction of the new Crosswicks Meeting House if the Chesterfield Meeting would reciprocate when Burlington decided to replace their meeting house. It is natural that the two plans would therefore be similar, in design as well as in expense.\textsuperscript{182}

The meeting house constructed in Burlington was nearly identical in size and plan to that in Crosswicks and like

\textsuperscript{181} \textit{Ibid.}, 24th 11th 1783.

\textsuperscript{182} \textit{Ibid.}, 30th Of the eighth month 1773.
The page contains a paragraph of text, but the content is not legible due to the quality of the image.
Figure 89
Burlington Meeting House
Author’s Photo

Figure 90
Burlington Meeting House, rear, author’s photo
Figure 91,
Burlington Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 92
interior,
Burlington Meeting House
author's photo
its Chesterfield prototype it survives today and is actively used for worship. It is located on the south side of High Street, Burlington City, N.J.

Burlington (Yearly)

The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was born out of a General Meeting held in Burlington in 1681. That meeting was held in Burlington until 1685 and then between 1685 and 1760 the site alternated annually between Burlington and Philadelphia. In Burlington, general and yearly meetings were first housed in the hexagonal meeting house and after 1715, in a meeting house of its own.

"At a Quarterly Meeting of Ffrds held at our meeting hous in Burlington ye 27th, of ye 12 mo. 1715. It is agreed at this meeting that a Brick hous be built in Burlington for ye servis of ye yearly meeting. According to the dementions here after mentioned, viz: 40 foot long, and 30 foot wide and ten foot of wall above the floor, at the discretion of the Ffrds mentioned for the servis and that subscription be forthwith made in order to enable the said to procure the said work to be ready as they can for ye servis of ye Next Yearly Meeting."\(^{184}\)

Twenty five men were appointed to oversee the selection of a plan. To accommodate the new meeting house, Samuel Bunting, Peter Fretwell, Daniel Smith and Samuel Smith purchased from one, Thomas Wetherall,

\(^{183}\) Ibid., 28th Of 6th month, 1681.

\(^{184}\) Ibid., 27 12 mo. 1715.
"one certain lott of land situate lying and being in the town of Burlington, on ye North Side of ye Broade Street neare ye mid way betweene High Street and York Street and fronteth on ye said Broade street in length sixty foot and also runeth backwards north & west according to ye course of High Street sixty foot so that ye front line & back line & side lines are all of equal length sixty foot."\textsuperscript{185}

Matlack describes this plot of land as "on the northern side of Broad Street, east of High Street, adjoining the lot on which the Baptist Church now stands."\textsuperscript{186}

It is most likely that this building served the yearly meeting until its permanent withdrawal to Philadelphia in 1760. A Quarterly minute dated ye 25th of 12th mo. 1722 may however give evidence otherwise. "This meeting agrees that Burlington friends may have the use of the new meeting house to teach scool in provided that they can have a scool master that is in unity with Friends and when it shall be so imploied ye said Burlington Friends to keep it in repairs as to windows."\textsuperscript{187} There is no reason to believe that the building could not have served both as a school and its function as the site of the Yearly Meeting but it seems strange that the Burlington Friends would have to assume responsibility for the windows in such case unless it was no longer being used by the yearly meeting. In either case the

\textsuperscript{185} DeCou, \textit{Provincial Capitol}, 64, quoting Deed, dated sixteenth of the third month, called May, 1716.

\textsuperscript{186} Matlack, 163.

\textsuperscript{187} Burlington Quarterly, ye 25th of 12th mo. 1722.
building was permenantly remodeled as a school house in 1779.\textsuperscript{188}

"The meeting was informed that in pursuance of encouragement received from committee which has the care of the meeting house situate on Broad Street in Burlington friends of that town had proceeded to make to the house considerable repairs in order to Accomodate it for a school which they are about to open."\textsuperscript{189}

Some of the details of the remodeling were recorded in a Burlington Quarterly Meeting minute dated the 29th of the fifth month, 1780,.. 

"The meeting taking under consideration the request from Friends of the preparative meeting of Burlington to make two lodging rooms in the meeting house in broad street for the better accomadation of Friends shool kept there, it is agreed that the liberty sp desired is allowed."\textsuperscript{190}

The building has long since been demolished.

\textbf{Burlington (Hicksite)}

Immediately after the separation, Burlington Hicksite Quakers rented a building that was located on East Union Street known by Matlack as "the old Cocoonery."\textsuperscript{191} In 1845, they erected a meeting house (Fig. 93) on the western side

\textsuperscript{188} Ibid., 30th 8th month 1779.

\textsuperscript{189} Ibid., 30th 8th month 1779.

\textsuperscript{190} Burlington Quarterly Minutes, 29th day of the 5th month, 1780.

\textsuperscript{191} Matlack, 161.
of High Street south of Federal back from the street.\textsuperscript{192}

The lot was obtained in 1844.\textsuperscript{193}

Fourth Month, 7th, 1845

"Burlington Monthly Meeting Held at Ancocas... The committee would suggest for the consideration of the meeting that the dimensions of the house should be 25 by 40 feet with 15 feet storrie and built of brick..."\textsuperscript{194}

The plan was changed before the building's construction.

"Proposed to alter the plan for the meeting house in Burlington as follows... to wit... on South side to have two doors instead of one and four windows instead of two. On North Side two windows instead of three. The size of the glass to be 10 x 16 instead of 9 by 11 and twelve in number. Doors + window shutters to be pannelled instead of lined. The doors on South side to be double and one foot more of foundation of brick except the centre wall which will be of stone to be a cellar door 3ft wide in the cellar. - to make the alterations above specified Peter Keene will charge seventy two dollars in addition to the original contract with which the Building Committee agree."\textsuperscript{195}

The total cost of the meeting house, horse sheds and fence was $1834.86.\textsuperscript{196}

\textsuperscript{192} DeCou, Provincial Capitol, 70.

\textsuperscript{193} Minutes of the Burlington Orthodox Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 3rd day, 3rd month, 1844 and 11th day, 4th mo. 1844.

\textsuperscript{194} Minutes of the Burlington Hicksite Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), fourth monrth, 7th 1845.


\textsuperscript{196} Burlington Monthly, 7 mo. 5th, 1847.
Figure 93,
Burlington Hicksite Meeting House,
before 1929 alterations
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 94
Burlington Hicksite Meeting House
post 1929 alterations
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
In 1910, the building was first leased, and then later in the same year, sold to a Polish/Lithuanian Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{197} The price was $1700 in cash and another $1200 in a mortgage at five percent interest.\textsuperscript{198} The structure was remodeled at this time (Fig. 94). Its orientation was changed to create a nave and a porch was added to its new front facade. The 1845 date stone was retained. This building was demolished in 1936.\textsuperscript{199}

Chesterfield (Crosswicks)

The first Chesterfield Meeting House, located in Crosswicks, was completed sometime just after 10th mo. 4, 1692.\textsuperscript{200} On the 11th mo., 7th, 1691 a committee was established to choose a carpenter to construct the building, strong evidence that this first Chesterfield Meeting House was a frame structure.\textsuperscript{201} The job was given to one, John Greene.\textsuperscript{202}

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{197}] DeCou, \textit{Provincial Capitol}, 71, Quoting Burlington County Deed Book 458, 398 in the County Clerks Office Mount Holly.
\item[\textsuperscript{199}] Matlack, 211.
\item[\textsuperscript{200}] Chesterfield Monthly, 10th mo. 4, 1692.
\item[\textsuperscript{201}] \textit{Ibid.}, 7th 12th mo. 1691.
\item[\textsuperscript{202}] \textit{Ibid.}, 10th mo 4, 1692.
\end{itemize}
A second meeting house replaced the first, in 1706. This time the choice of building material was brick.

"At a Monthly Meeting of friends held at their meeting house in Chesterfield ye 2nd day of ye 3d month 1706, William Wood and Francis Davenport acquaints this meeting that they have agreed with William Mott for 40000 Thousand of Good Bricks to be made for 40 pounds with which the meeting is satisfied and desires yt they will take care to make articles of their agreement."^{203}

Alterations were made to the building in 1752 for the purpose of accommodating the women's meeting.^{204} "The Friends appointed concerning the repairs and enlargement of the meeting house report that it is their opinion that a leanto added to the Northside of the house sixteen foot wide will be the most convenient."^{205}

In 1773, this structure was, in turn, replaced by a third building (Fig. 95), also of brick, in order to accommodate the holding of the Burlington Quarterly Meeting in Crosswicks.^{206} Building a new meeting house was first proposed to the Quarterly Meeting on the 22nd of 2mo. 1773.^{207} A committee was sent to visit the Friends Meeting at Buckingham, P.A., to examine their new meeting house and make recommendations for the construction of the new one in

^{203} Ibid., 2nd, 3rd Mo. 1706.
^{204} Ibid., 5th 4th mo 1752.
^{205} Ibid., 3 of 5th mo 1753.
^{206} Ibid., 4th 3rd mo, 1773.
^{207} Burlington Quarterly, 22nd of 2mo. 1773.
Chesterfield. "This meeting appoints Stacy Potts, Abraham Skirm, James Oldel & Benjamin Clark to view the Buckingham Meeting House and also to know the expense thereof to out next meeting." The committee responded that,

"We have considered of the size of the house and plan, and are of the opinion that Buckingham meeting house is nearest to what we would recommend with such improvements as may be made there on to advantage."

Construction of the new meeting house was approved the 7th of the 10th month 1773. This meeting house survives and located in the center of the town of Crosswicks. It is located North East of the corner of Front and Church Streets.

Chesterfield (Orthodox)

Burlington Orthodox Friends first held their meetings in the home of Joseph Hendrickson on Buttonwood Street. In 1831, they constructed, on a plot of land bought from Samuel Bunting, a small frame meeting house. This structure would later be moved to another portion of the lot and refitted as a school. In 1854, they constructed a small

---

208 Chesterfield Monthly, 1st of 7mo 1773.
209 Burlington Quarterly, 30th of the 8th month, 1773.
210 Burlington Monthly, 7th of the 10th mo. 1773.
211 Minutes of the Chesterfield Orthodox Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8th day, 4th Month 1828, and Chesterfield Tercentenary Committee. Chesterfield Township Heritage (Crosswicks, NJ: Chesterfield Tercentenary Committee, 1964), 146.
Figure 95
Chesterfield Meeting House
Author’s Photo

Figure 96
Chesterfield Orthodox Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
brick meeting house (Fig. 96) which still stands today on Bordentown Rd. (Burlington County 672).\textsuperscript{212} It is presently occupied by the Chesterfield Historical Society.

East Branch (Robin's Meeting)

This meeting was first organized in 1739 and by 26th of 3m, 1740 was housed in its own building.\textsuperscript{213} The most recent building (Fig. 97) was, according to its date stone, constructed in 1816. The last recorded minute of the East Branch Preparative Meeting is dated 21 of 3d mo. 1833.\textsuperscript{214} The building survived well into the twentieth century but has since been demolished sometime after Feb. 1930.\textsuperscript{215} It was located approximately 7 miles east of Allentown on the north side of New Canton–Stone Tavern Rd. (Monmouth County 524), between Imlaystown–Hightstown Rd. and East Branch Rd.

Little Egg Harbor (Tuckerton)

The old Little Egg Harbor Meeting House (Fig. 98) was erected by Edward Andrews in 1709.\textsuperscript{216} In the 1868, "History

\textsuperscript{212} Chesterfield Orthodox Monthly, 9th month, 7, 1853 and 4th month, 5th 1853.

\textsuperscript{213} Matlack, 168, and Chesterfield Monthly, 26th of 3mo, 1740.

\textsuperscript{214} Minutes of the East Branch Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 21 of 3d mo. 1833.

\textsuperscript{215} Matlack, 170.

\textsuperscript{216} Blackman, 194.
Figure 97
East Branch Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
of Little Egg Harbor Township," Mrs. Leah Blackman wrote,

"The old meeting house was a one story edifice, built in the plainest style of architecture. There was a smaller structure attached to the west end of the principal building, where in the females transacted the buisness pertaining to their portion of the society. The roof of the meeting house was a hip-roof, as was the fashion of that primitive age, and the four sides were covered with cedar shingles, and the inside of the house was ceiled with boards, and what they called the gallery was a raised plateform; and seats for the audience were long benches with two rows of slats for backs: most of the seats had movable cushions covered with brown Holland on the north side of the church there were large wooden shutters, which, in warm weather, were opened for the purpose of admitting air. The builders had been sparing of glass, and there were but four windows in the church, and they were about four feet square, with nine panes of seven by nine glass. These were the windows it contained when demolished. The first windows of the meeting house were imported from Old England, and the panes were small diamond-shaped, and the sash formed of lead: and during the Revolutionary War, the windows were taken out and concealed behind the wooden ceiling, in order to keep them out of the hands of those who would have been likely to have appropriated the leaden sash to the formation of musket balls."²¹⁷

In the year 1863, this building was taken down and replaced with a new frame meeting house (Fig. 99) which still stands on the west side of Route 9 south of Tuckerton.²¹⁸

Little Egg Harbor (Bridgeport, Wading River)

There is very little evidence of this meeting house.

"At a monthly meeting held at Little Egg Harbor

²¹⁷ Ibid., 194.
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13th day 1 mo. 1825 one of the committee appointed to attend the indulged meeting at Bass River report in behalf of the Committee that all the meeting allow'd to be held there has been kept up and attended to general satisfaction and reported there is a new meeting house built at Bridgeport this meeting think best to discontinue the indulged meeting at Bass River but that it be held at Bridgeport for six month..."219

On visiting the site of this meeting house in 1929, T. Chalkey Matlack had this to say,

"there is little left to recall the meeting house at Bridgeport. The village is small and has long since changed its name to Wading River deriving the present appellation from the stream of water flowing past the place. At the branching of the road at the end of the long bridge spanning the river, is an old house by some termed "The Bridge House." It stands by the edge of a ragged and unkept woodland, where, only a few rods within, on a slightly rising elevation of ground, is the "lonely" little graveyard marking the location of the Friends' meeting house of earlier days...A few feet eastward of this "lonely" graveyard are the ruins of the old meeting house, a frame structure, by disuse fell into decay and at length crumbled to ruins. Later a forest fire completed the destruction, and, in 1929, there only remains the foundation of the house, over which the plaster of the inner walls lies flat and while on the surface of the floor space, while a few pieces of charred timbers lie around to testify to its former existence."220

Lower Mansfield (Mansfield Neck)

This is another meeting house about which little information survives. E. M. Woodward's 1883 History of Burlington County, N.J., referring to the year 1783, stated that

219 Ibid., 13th day, 1 mo 1825.

220 Matlack, 176.
"it appears there were at that time two principal meetings in the township, under the titles of Mansfield and Lower Mansfield, the latter, being returned as a subordinate branch of Burlington Monthly Meeting, was located at or near what is now the village of "Bustleton" where the public school house now stands."\textsuperscript{221}

Michner states that "A meeting was allowed to be held at William Folwell's on First days once in three weeks, during the winter season...In 1783, it was established with the privilege of a preparative meeting, it has since been discontinued."\textsuperscript{222}

The Burlington Monthly Meeting minutes record that "Friends of Mansfield Neck" requested permission to construct a meeting house and advice in its siting in 1781.\textsuperscript{223} Matlack's 1930 description of the location of the site of the Lower Mansfield Meeting house is, "in the hamlet of Bustleton at the forks of the road where the church now stands."\textsuperscript{224}

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{Mansfield}
\end{flushleft}

The first Mansfield Meeting House is said by both Matlack, quoting Samuel Smith, and Woodward to have been a

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{221} Woodward, 356.
\textsuperscript{222} Ezra Michner. \textit{A Retrospective of Early Quakerism}, (Philadelphia: T. Ellwood Zell, 1860), 37.
\textsuperscript{223} Burlington Monthly, 1st of 1st mo, 1781.
\textsuperscript{224} Matlack, 168.
\end{flushright}
"long, narrow frame building" erected in 1731 on land purchased of Francis Gibbs. The History of Burlington County, stated that one half of this structure (Fig. 100) was moved to another part of the property, reconfigured and was tenanted by the teacher of the neighboring Quaker school. Matlack repeats this account and included a picture of the structure in one of his scrap books. Thomas Woody in his book, Quaker Education in New Jersey, included a picture of what appears to be the same building and captioned it "The Master's Dwelling, A Part of Old Springfield School Property." The same account of the moving of a portion of the old meeting house was once again retold in a pamphlet entitled "Friends in South-Central New Jersey for over 300 years observe the Tricentennial." This work was dated 1964 and stated that the relocated portion of the old meeting house still stood at that date, although this author has not been able to determine if this is still the case. The newer structure (Figures 101 and 102), built in 1812 as indicated by its date stone, is a large and


226 Woodward, 356.

227 Matlack, 180-181.

228 Thomas Woody. Quaker Education in New Jersey (1923), 77.
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Figure 102
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prominent brick structure located about one mile north of Columbus on Route 206.\textsuperscript{229}

Mansfield (Orthodox)

Mansfield Orthodox Friends constructed a meeting house (Fig. 103) directly next to the building in which they had previously worshiped. The date of this meeting house is generally given as that of the schism, but this is probably little more than a guess. This structure has since been converted into a dwelling (Fig. 104).

Mount Holly (Bridgetown)

The Mount Holly Meeting was organized in 1687 but did not receive the benefits of a meeting house until 1716.\textsuperscript{230}

"Whereas there was one little meeting kept at two places, one at Restore Lippincotts, and one at Daniel Wills, which hath been held for a considerable time, but now there is a meeting-house built at Mount Holly for to accommodate those two meetings, and those belonging to those meetings desire to be removed to the said meeting house, which is approved and allowed of by said meeting."\textsuperscript{231}

This structure was apparently located on the north side of Wood Lane at the western end of the surviving Quaker

\textsuperscript{229} "Friends in South Central New Jersey," pamphlet.

\textsuperscript{230} Michner, 41.

\textsuperscript{231} Burlington Monthly, first month, fifth, 1716 see also 2nd day, 11th mo. 1715.
burial ground.\textsuperscript{232} Although Woodward's \textit{History of Burlington County} claimed the meeting house to have been a frame structure, it is more likely that George DeCou's belief that it was brick, enunciated, in \textit{Historical Sketches of Mount Holly and Vicinity} (1936), was correct.\textsuperscript{233}

In 1762, Mount Holly Friends requested the liberty of building a meeting house in "the said town."\textsuperscript{234} In other words more proximal than the old meeting house to the center of the rising population of the town of Mount Holly itself. The issue of building another meeting house in Mount Holly proper was brought before the Burlington Monthly Meeting 6th day of 12th month 1763. On the 4th day of the forth month, in that same year, Mount Holly Friends were given permission to "build a meeting house in town."\textsuperscript{235} The meeting house was constructed by 1763.\textsuperscript{236} Known as the "little meeting house," this building was located "seventy-seven feet north of Mill Street'" and was reached by a "line" called Meeting House Alley on the western side of the brick house formerly numbered 47 and then later part of a lot on which an Acme

\begin{footnotes}
\item[233] Woodward, 188, and George DeCou, \textit{Historical Sketches of Mount Holly and Vicinity} (Mount Holly: DeCou, reprint from Mount Holly Herald), 87.
\item[234] Burlington Monthly, 3rd of 5th mo. 1762.
\item[235] \textit{Ibid.}, 6th day of 12th month 1763 and 4th day of 4th 1763.
\item[236] \textit{Ibid.}, 4th of 4th mo. 1763.
\end{footnotes}
was constructed.\textsuperscript{237} The new meeting house seems to have been better located to the point of view of town residents, but less so to others. DeCou spoke about the advantages of the siting of the older meeting house. It was, "near the junction of the old roads leading to Burlington and to Jacksonville and directly on Woodpecker Lane Road leading westerly to the Friends' Meeting House near Rancocas which at that time stood at the northern end of the cemetery on the Centerton Road."\textsuperscript{238} The Burlington Monthly Meeting required that the older meeting house be retained. One of the reasons given was that it sat on the site of the burial ground and was therefore advantageous for holding services in after burials.\textsuperscript{239} Another reason is that its location was more advantageous to travelers and to rural Friends.

At a Burlington Monthly Meeting held 7th 5th mo. 1770, "the request of friends at Mount Holly to hold their Week day meeting in the town in future was now taken under consideration and after deliberating thereon, it was concluded most of the benefit of friends there in General, that said request is granted, only at such times when strangers visit them it is understood that the meeting shall be held at the meeting house out of town when first day notice of such a visit is given."\textsuperscript{240}

In 1775, in anticipation of the establishment of the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{237} DeCou, \textit{Historic Rancocas}, 98-99.
\smallskip
\textsuperscript{238} \textit{Ibid.}
\smallskip
\textsuperscript{239} Burlington Monthly, Fourth of fourth, 1762.
\smallskip
\textsuperscript{240} \textit{Ibid.}, 7th, 5 mo. 1770.
\end{flushleft}
Mount Holly Monthly Meeting, Friends of that town constructed a third, larger brick meeting house (Figs. 105 and 106). This building was erected on a lot of land located at the south east corner of High and Garden Streets.\(^\text{241}\)

Then there was the question of what was to be done with the two older buildings. The following minutes reveal the fate of the 1716 meeting house.

"At Mount Holly Monthly Meeting the 8th of 7th month, 1778. Requests from the Mount Holly Preparative, this meeting appoints Henry Burr, John Ridgeway, Edward Black, Job Stockton, Joseph Lamb, Aaron Barton and Samuel Shinn to consider that had best be done with the old meeting house out of town and report their judgement to next meeting."\(^\text{242}\)

Mount Holly Monthly Meeting, 4th mo 11th, 1778,

"One of the friends who had the old meeting house under care reported that they had met and that it seemed best to them that for the present the house should remain as it now is excepting that the Doors and Windows ought to be done up with rough boards, to which the meeting concents..."\(^\text{243}\)

Permission was given by the Burlington Monthly Meeting in 1780 for the Mount Holly Friends to use the materials of one of the two meeting houses as their portion of a

\(^{241}\) Deed, John Brainard and Elizabeth Brainard to John Comfort, Daniel Doughty Smith, Samuel Shinn, Samuel Allisson, Peter Ellis, Edward Black and John Hilter, first day of January, 1775 (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

\(^{242}\) Minutes of the Mount Holly Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8th of 7th mo. 1778.

\(^{243}\) Ibid., 4th mo. 11th, 1778.
Figure 105
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Figure 106,
Mount Holly Meeting House
rear
author's photo
quota.\textsuperscript{244} Eventually the other meeting house was transferred into the possession of Peter Shiras who, on May 26th, 1804, sold it to Joseph Cooper.\textsuperscript{245}

The 1775 meeting house is that structure which, although greatly altered, survives today. The greatest alterations were made in 1850 and are documented in a letter from Mount Holly Friends directed to the Burlington Quarterly Meeting.

"The committees appointed by Burlington Quarterly and Mount Holly Preparative Meetings to take into consideration the propriety of making some alterations in Friends Meeting House at Mount Holly - for the better accommodation of the quarterly meeting - having all met (except one from each committee) and conferred together on the subject agree to report- That the probable expense of raising the walls six feet higher and putting in galleries on the south side of the building sufficient to contain about 250 persons would be from $1400 to $1600."\textsuperscript{246}

An article in the Burlington County Herald dated May 8, 1975, stated that Friends established a Friends' school in the western end of the building in 1893. The west end of the building was remodeled in 1919 and that at a later date the galleries in the eastern portion of the building were

\textsuperscript{244} Ibid., sixth Month, 1780.


\textsuperscript{246} Letter, Israel Stokes, George Ford, Nathan W. Black and Samuel Ellis to Burlington Quarterly Meeting of Friends, 4mo, 26th, 1850. Misc. papers, Burlington Hicksite Monthly Meeting, 1842-1871 (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).
leveled and floored over.\textsuperscript{247}

Mount Holly (Orthodox)

The small wooden Orthodox Meeting House (Fig. 107) was erected in 1832. It was located on Buttonwood Street, between Brainard and Garden Streets. The building, constructed by Stacey Atkinson, was converted several times to new uses, in one case a school (Fig. 108), but has since been demolished.\textsuperscript{248}

Old Springfield (Copany)

The first Old Springfield Meeting House was constructed by Francis Collings on the "hither side of the Mattacopany bridge." Permission for the construction of the building at that site was given in 1694.\textsuperscript{249} A Burlington Monthly minute dated "Ye 8th of ye 3d mo. 1699" suggests that the brick building was completed in the summer of 1699.\textsuperscript{250} An earlier minute, 3d of ye 11th month 1697, gives the building's measurements as 20 foot long by 20 foot wide.\textsuperscript{251}

\textsuperscript{247} (Untitled Article) Burlington County Herald, May 8, 1975, Pamphlet Group 1, Mount Holly Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

\textsuperscript{248} Woodward, 189.

\textsuperscript{249} Burlington Monthly, 4th of 12th mo. 1691 and 8th of 3rd mo. 1699.

\textsuperscript{250} Ibid., 8th 3rd mo. 1699.

\textsuperscript{251} Ibid., 3rd of ye 11 mo 1697.
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In 1775,

"A Friend from Old Springfield informed the Meeting (Burlington Monthly) that they had thoughts of Rebuilding their meeting house if this meeting has no objections which being considered they are left at liberty to perform the work in a becoming manner."  

The result, constructed on an enlarged lot, was the substantial brick structure (Fig. 109) which survives today.\(^{253}\) This meeting house passed out of the ownership of Friends in the 1950’s and is now a private residence (Fig. 110) located at 1832 Jacksonville-Jobstown Rd., about one half mile east of Jacksonville.

**Rancocas (Ancocas)**

The Rancocas Friends Meeting was established in 1681.\(^{254}\) The work on the first Rancocas Meeting House began in 1702 and was completed in 1703.

"Ye 6th of Ye 5th mo. 1702, John Wills in behalf of ye major part of ye frds belonging to Rancocas Meeting made a proposal before this meeting of ye building of a meeting house for themselves by their burying ground, desiring ye councel of this meeting and this meeting leaves them to their liberty to proceede."\(^{255}\)

"Ye 4th of 11th mo. 1702, John Wills proposed to this meeting concerning ye ordering and letting of ye meeting house to workmen of Ancocas, this
Figure 109
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meeting leaving it to ye neighboring Friends that live near ye place the dementions being spoken to at this meeting to be 30 feet long oute to oute and 22 feet wide from oute to oute and 12 foot in hight on ye wall."^{256}

"7th of ye 12th mo., 1703... Jon. Wills reports to this meeting house at Northampton is fit to meet in."

DeCou, in *Historical Sketches of Rancocos and Neighborhood*, quoted a statement by Samuel Wills of Rancocos preserved in the "Wills family records."

"Samuel Wills born in 1765, has left a record that he could distinctly remember going to the old building when a small boy. He also recalled that there was a large fireplace in the southwest corner near which the mothers sat with their children in extreme weather."^{258}

In 1772, as proposal was made by Friends of Ancocos, to the Burlington Monthly Meeting to build a new meeting house, as their old meeting house, located at the northern end of the cemetery on Bridge Street, had "grown old and they think not convieniently situate."^{259} The Burlington Monthly agreed finding the 1703 meeting house "old and unsafe."^{260}

The present meeting house (Figs. 111, 112 and 113) was then

---


^{257} *Ibid.*, 7th of ye 12th mo. 1703.


^{260} Burlington Monthly, 6mo. 1, 1772.
erected on the north side of Main Street, east of Bridge Street. The date 1772 is displayed prominently in ornamental brickwork on the southern wall of the building. At some later date, this building, like the Greenwich Orthodox Meeting House, was enlarged without the creation of paper evidence. The most logical date of the addition would have been that of the holding of the first monthly meetings at Rancocas, which occurred after the Hicksite separation when the Orthodox Burlington Quakers held their monthly meeting here. This date, however, would seem to be slightly late for the composition which is of a type one would expect in the late eighteenth century.

Stony Brook

From John F. Hageman's "History of Mercer County, N.J." in Woodward and Hageman's History of Burlington and Mercer Counties,

"June 1, 1709, Benjamin Clark conveyed by deed nine acres and sixty hundreths of an acre of land, on the northeasterly side of Stony Brook to Richard Stockton and others in trust to build a meeting-house on it, and for a burying-ground for the Society of Friends..."\(^{261}\)

Hageman stated that the 1709 meeting house was a small frame building that remained in use until the year 1760.\(^{262}\)


\(^{262}\) Ibid., 610.
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The Chesterfield Monthly Meeting records dispute this as they state that the meeting, in 1724, gave permission for a meeting house to, "be built of stone, thirty four feet long and thirty feet wide, and finished, so as to render it useful..."²⁶³

The present meeting house (Figs. 114 and 115) is believed to have been constructed at a cost of £238 and 5 shillings in 1760 on the foundation of the 1724 structure which had burned in 1759.²⁶⁴ It is located at the Corner of Quaker Road and Mercer Street a short distance west of the town of Princeton.

Trenton

"At a Monthly Meeting of Friends held at their meeting house in Chesterfield the 2nd of the 1 mo. 1737/8. This meeting appoints Joseph Reckless to draw a Deed for land for a meeting house and graveyard at Trenton to be conveyed to Benjamin Smith, Stacy Beakes, William Plasket, Joseph Decou, Nathan Beakes and Isaac Watson, this meeting appoints John Tantum & Benja' Smith to have the oversight of the affair."²⁶⁵

An important history of of the Trenton Friend's Meeting House (Figs. 116 and 117) was given by Isaac Stephens (1810-1891) in an untitled article he wrote for the Friends Intelligencer in 1872.

²⁶³ Chesterfield Monthly, 3rd second Month 1725.
²⁶⁵ Chesterfield Monthly, 2nd of the 1 mo. 1737/8.
"The Meeting House of Friends at Hanover and Montgomery Street in the City of Trenton, N.J. having lately been rebuilt and greatly improved, a few facts connected with its history, are by the writer deemed worthy of notice in the Intelligencer: In Doctor Michener's Retrospective of Early Quakerism from the records of Burlington Quarterly and Chesterfield Monthly Meetings, it appears that the meeting at Trenton was "settled in the year, 1740." This agrees with the date (1739) placed with blue glazed bricks in one end of the house, and well remembered by some of us who were school boys here from 1820-1830. About the year 1840 the house was considerably changed and rough-cast on the outside. The recent improvements have been very thorough, and we think the house has some features worthy the attention of Friends who may wish to make their Meeting Houses more comfortable. We have now a roomy vestibule entrance, where Friends can exchange salutations, dry their feet before meeting, or find their company to leave for home, and a stairway leading from this vestibule to a well arranged monthly meeting room above, which by sliding shutters can be thrown in connection with the house below...The traditional open back benches have been discarded for close back seats, which are together with the wood work of the house, painted and the floor carpeted. Altogether, it is a meeting house neat and plain, but not so widely different from our own homes as to show an unpleasant contrast. There is also a peculiar satisfaction in knowing that within these same walls we have heard a Thomas Weatherall, a Richard Burdsall, and a Maria Imlay, give forth the most attentive listeners words of wisdom, and truth. These other beautiful spirits from amongst us, have passed on to the 'better land.'"

Isaac Stephens
Trenton, N.J. 8th mo. 13th 1872

Figure 116
Trenton Meeting House,
before remodelling,
Collection of Trenton Friends Meeting

Figure 117
Trenton Meeting House
main facade
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Trenton (Orthodox)

Trenton Orthodox Friends first held meetings in a former Methodist Church that was located on the northeast corner of Greene and Hadmey Streets. In 1855 as marked by the building's date stone, the Trenton Orthodox Meeting erected the small brick meeting house (Fig. 118) at 155 Mercer Street. The building is now the Mercer Street Friend's Center.

Upper Freehold (Woodward's Meeting, Arney Town, Ellisdale)

Matlack states that this meeting was first established in 1740. "The meeting house, a frame structure on a stone foundation, disappeared upwards of fifty years or more." He visited the site of the meeting on the 3rd of May in 1931 with Asa M. Smith of Moorestown, N.J. and reported that at that time the foundation and some brick and stone rubble remained. He stated that the wood along with slate from the meeting house roof had been scavenged for reuse in the construction of nearby farm buildings.

According to Matlack, a school house (Fig. 119), now moved to a location about a mile east of Ellisdale on Ellisdale Rd., and reconfigured as a residence, was also used for Quaker meetings. This building was said to have been erected

---

267 Matlack, 198.
268 Matlack, 200.
269 Ibid., 201.
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in 1812.\textsuperscript{270}

Upper Springfield

Permission was given by the Burlington Quarterly Meeting in 1726 for Friends in the "Upper part of Springfield, Mansfield and Chesterfield" to have liberty "to proceed in building a new meeting house near William Earle."\textsuperscript{271}

No alterations are known to have been made until 1782 when permission was given by the Burlington Quarterly Meeting to enlarge the Upper Springfield Meeting House (Figs. 120 and 121); work was nearly completed by 2nd mo. 1783.\textsuperscript{272}

The fate of this building is best given in a plea found in the \textit{Friends Intelligencer} in 1910,

"This is a picture of Upper Springfield Meeting House, built in 1727, enlarged in 1823 (incorrect see above), and burned down in Eighth month, 1909, through the carelessness of a man in burning brush and weeds in the adjoining graveyard, when owing to a high wind, the flames caught on the horse sheds, thence to the Meeting House.

We have been unable so far to secure any assistance from the "Jeanes Fund for Meeting House Purposes," but this has not deterred us from

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{270} Matlack, 200, and Franklin Ellis, \textit{History of Monmouth County} (Philadelpia: R.T. Peck & Co., 1885), 632. and Thomas Gordon. \textit{A Gazetteer of New Jersey} (Trenton: Fenton, 1834) . Gordon states that at Arneystown there was a "Large Meeting House pertaining to Friends."
\item \textsuperscript{271} Burlington Quarterly, 20th 12th mo 1726.
\item \textsuperscript{272} Ibid., 27th 5th mo 1782 and 24th 2nd mo. 1783.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
trying to do what we could for ourselves. There are only a few Friends in that locality, but the old meeting house has ever been held in high regard by the people of the neighborhood, and as the meeting is unable to rebuild without assistance, a number of generous people (most of them not Friends, but who wish to see the house rebuilt) have given us valuable help and the building is partly completed, but not sufficient money has yet been contributed for the payment of it. So we send this brief notice to the intelligencer, hoping some generous Friends may read it and help us. Contributions may be sent to

Martha E. Gibbs
Clerk of Upper Springfield Monthly Meeting, Columbus, N.J.273

A follow up notice dated eighth month, 12, 1911 noted that, "We have news of interest from Upper Springfield, N.J. where a new meeting house was built this year to replace the old house built in 1727 and burnt in 1909."274

On the subject of the rebuilding DeCou states, in his Historical Sketches of Mount Holly and The Vicinity, that

"The present building measures a little over forty feet in length, and, as already stated, is not so long as the meeting house was prior to the fire, the western end not having been rebuilt. The house as it now stands is undoubtably the oldest part which was erected in 1727. A careful comparison of the illustrations of the meeting house past and present shows that the date stone is in exactly the same position as it was in the old building. It fell out at the time of the fire but was carefully preserved by Herman Croshaw, of Wrightstown, who personally saw it restored to its original position. The present building is not as high as it was before the fire and without

273 (Untitled Article) Friend's Intelligencer, Volume LXVII Number 53, Twelfth Month 31, 1910, 805.

274 Ibid., 8th month 12 1911.
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Figure 121
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question more closely resembling the building erected in 1727... The house now standing, with
the exception of the roof, doorway, windows, etc. is literally the original building, as the eastern
wall was intact after the fire and the northern and southern walls were repaired with the original
bricks. The western end of the present building, although of course a new wall, was also built from
the old bricks."

The building (Fig. 122), located at the intersection of Springfield Meeting House Road and Highland Rd. in
Springfield Township, has since been converted into a private residence and as such is presently in use.

Figure 122
Upper Springfield Meeting House
author's photo

\[^{272}\]

DeCou, Historical Sketches of Mount Holly..., 5.
Vincentown

5th mo. 8th, 1782,

"The Friends of Vincentown Meeting request Liberty of holding their meetings as usual the ensuing year, which this meeting unites with, and the same friends request leave to build a meeting house on a lot of land near Vincentown which was given for that purpose, as soon as they conveniently can which this meeting agrees to."\textsuperscript{276}

George DeCou states that this structure was a frame building.\textsuperscript{277} Woodward's \textit{History of Burlington County, N.J.} states that the building was constructed of logs.\textsuperscript{278} In either case, this building was replaced in 1813 with a brick building (Fig. 123). At the date of the publication of Woodward's \textit{History of Burlington County}, (1883) the meeting house was occupied as a dwelling.\textsuperscript{279} The building was renovated in 1910 with much modification (Fig. 124). Its walls were buttressed and incorporated into a larger two story structure built by Vincentown Grange No. 67. This building is located on the east side of Main St just south of Grange St. The 1812 date stone is still visible.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{276} Burlington Monthly, 5th mo. 8th, 1782. The deed to this lot dated 12th day, Seventh Month 1781, Anna Leeds, executor of Vincent Leeds to Samuel Hilter, William Bisher, Hudson Burr, John White and Isaac Barton is preserved in Mount Holly Monthly Meeting Papers Misc (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

\textsuperscript{277} DeCou, \textit{Historic Rancocas}, 98.

\textsuperscript{278} Woodward, 426.

\textsuperscript{279} Ibid.
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Figure 124
Vincentown Grange Building
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Meeting Houses of the Haddonfield Quarterly Meeting

Atlantic City (Orthodox)

This meeting was established relatively recently, in 1872. Its first home, located at the intersection of Pacific and South Carolina Avenues, was a frame building (Fig. 125) demolished in 1926 and replaced with a large brick structure on the same site (Fig. 126). This large building contained both a school and meeting space. The meeting space was located in that part of the building that faced Pacific Avenue.280

Bakersville

This meeting house was located north of that at Sommer’s Point in Linwood. The structure stood, off Roue 586 (Shore Road), across from the Central Methodist Church in a lot of ground presently a cemetery.281 The building is believed to have been constructed about 1730 and was in use after the meeting house at Sommer’s Point was sold.282 Richard Sommer’s place is no longer listed as one of the alternating sites of the Great Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting

---

280 Matlack, 403.
281 Salem Quarter, 340.
282 Ibid., 340.
Figure 125
Atlantic City Orthodox Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 126
Atlantic City Orthodox Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
after 5th day of ye 9th mo 1739.

Cropwell

The meeting at Cropwell was probably founded in 1786; its first meetings were held in a Friend’s school house administrated by the Evesham Preparative Meeting. The Cropwell Preparative Meeting was established in 1794 and Cropwell Friends announced their intention to build a meeting house to the Evesham Monthly Meeting in 1800. Members of the Cropwell Meeting disagreed about the siting of the meeting and work was delayed until that issue was resolved. Finally, in 1805 building plans were fixed.

"The Committee appointed to take the matter into view and digest a suitable plan for a house also reported that we do give it as our opinion that in order to have a suitable accommodation it will be necessary to build a house about thirty-six feet wide and fifty feet long and extend the story about thirteen feet high with a sliding petition through the centre thereof but without upper galleries which will give sufficient room on the floor for thirteen benches ten feet long on one side of a gang way three and a half feet wide through the long way of the house, opposite windows in the front of the house, four windows in the back and one in each end to contain twenty

---

283 Minutes of the Great Egg Harbor Monthly (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 5th day of ye 9th mo. 1739.
284 Michner, 22.
285 Minutes of the Evesham Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8th day, 3mo, 1794 and 6 day 12 month 1800.
286 Ibid., 6th day 12 month 1800.
Figure 127
Cropwell Meeting House
author's photo
four lights each, agreeable to a draft thereof which we have prepared and from the best information we can obtain we apprehend such a house will cost about eight hundred pounds, all of which we submit to the meeting."\textsuperscript{287}

The meeting house (Fig. 127) was completed in 1809.\textsuperscript{288}

An account of the building expenses was recorded and is recited here.

"An account of the expenses of Cropwell Meeting House, 36 feet by 50, story 14 feet high, sealed with half inch cedar boards, wainscotted with white pine about 5 feet from the floor and the remainder of the wall plastered, a double pannel sliding partition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48350 Bricks at the Kiln at 4 Dol. per hun.</td>
<td>193.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 acres of land</td>
<td>106.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 perch of stone in the ground</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9760 feet scantling at 16 dol.</td>
<td>142.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood to burn the brick</td>
<td>57.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White pine boards</td>
<td>79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter work</td>
<td>422.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason work</td>
<td>137.64 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance on mason charged</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry bills</td>
<td>97.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plank for benches</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar &amp; pine boards and 1/2 inch oak under the</td>
<td>175.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{288} Ibid., quoting Cropwell Preparative Meeting, 31st 1st 1809.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shingles</td>
<td>115.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scaffold poles, etc.</td>
<td>5.12 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halling water and provision at raising</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lime at 3 dollars 7 cents at landing</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint and oil</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sundry of labour</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halling 42 load of sand</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pine scantiling for window frames, etc.</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flooring</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoves and pipes</td>
<td>50.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1767.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.—The raising stone, halling the same, brick from J. L. Lippincott’s to Meeting House, halling lime and some of the sand, all the boards, digging out foundation, all the attention & superintendence done without charge. The floor was laid double, the under 1/2 inch chestnut oak, the upper heart pine square edged, a true account taken from the clerk of the meeting of the manager’s book.

By John Evans

3. mo. 26. 1835

---

Easton

In 1803, a Quaker Meeting was formed in Easton that met in a school house. A preparative meeting was established in the year 1810 and according to its date stone, the Easton Meeting House was constructed the following year. The

---


290 Matlack, 410.
meeting house (Fig. 128) is located one and one half miles southeast of Masonville, on Fostertown Road, in Luberton Township and is presently used by the Easton Union Church.291

Evesham

The Evesham Friend's meeting was in existence at least as early as 1694 and held in the house of William Evans.292 Permission to construct a meeting house was not granted by the Burlington Monthly Meeting until 1698. Haddonfield Monthly minutes mention a meeting house as being in existence in 1718.293 It is said that this earliest of Evesham Meeting Houses was a log structure.

The minutes noting the decision to build the present meeting house makes mention of an earlier structure.

"...after fully said confrence + spirit of brotherly love + consideration prevailing it was unanimously agreed that as our meeting house is in a shattered condition, it will be best to rebuild it, in or near the same place where it now stands, in a more convenient manner..."294

291 Ibid., 409-410.

292 Derry, 48.

293 Haddonfield Monthly, 2nd month 14th day 1718; Derry, 48, and Matlack, 411.

294 Minutes of the Evesham Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 6th day of 3 month 1760.
Figure 128
Easton Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
In 1760, both a preparative and a monthly meeting were established at Evesham and to house them a new stone meeting house was built (Fig. 129, 130 and 131). This building was completed about 1762. It survives as the eastern end of the present meeting house. The meeting house was enlarged in 1798. With the Hicksite separation, the two groups shared this meeting house holding meeting on opposite sides of the partition, Orthodox Friends occupied the eastern section of the building.

Galloway (Leeds Point)

Meetings were first held in the vicinity of Leed's Point in 1683. The date of the construction of the first Galloway Meeting House is uncertain. The graveyard of the present day Emmaus Methodist Church (corner of Moss Hill Road and Route 9, across from the village of Smithville) was the site of a meeting house. A second meeting house (Figs. 132 and 133) may have been located further down Moss Mill Road, "nearly across from the house of Mr. Fred Higbee

\textsuperscript{295} Ibid., 9th mo. 2nd, 1762.
\textsuperscript{296} Derry, 48-49, and Matlack, 411.
\textsuperscript{297} Matlack, 411.
\textsuperscript{298} Derry, 51.
\textsuperscript{299} Salem Quarter, 340.
\textsuperscript{300} Matlack, 414.
Figure 129
Evesham Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Figure 130
Evesham Meeting House
West Wall
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 131
Evesham Meeting House
rear
author's photo
"I will do my best to tell you what I can about the friends meeting house. I myself cannot remember anything of it but I have heard the old folks speak of it. I have inquired of the old folks around here what they could remember of it or knew. I find two old ladies who said they had attended meetings there when they were young girls and as near as I could find out there had been no meetings in the meeting house for around 60 years, as it has been made a dwelling for around 55 years. The back part of the house was the meeting house and the front part built later."\(^{302}\)

The meeting house was converted to a store and dwelling house, the rear portion of the building being the original meeting house and the front an addition added in 1874 three years after meetings ceased,"\(^{303}\) then, in 1929, the home of Absolom Higbee.\(^{304}\) Matlack gives the date of this building as 1744 "in accordance with meeting records."\(^{305}\)

There is no proof that notation found in the meeting records refers to this building and not the one that stood further west in the graveyard of the Methodist Church. On visiting the residence of Mr. Absolom Higbee in 1929 T. Chalkey Matlack stated that,

---

\(^{301}\) Matlack, 414.

\(^{302}\) Fred Higbee to T. Chalkey Matlack, May 27, 1929. (T. Chalkey Matlack Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

\(^{303}\) Matlack, 415.

\(^{304}\) Ibid.

\(^{305}\) Salem Quarter, 340, quoting a Little Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting Minute dated fourth day, ninth month, 1744.
Figure 132
possible meeting house, Leed's Point
street facade
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 133
possible meeting house, Leed's Point
rear section
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
"the weather boarding attests to the uncertain age of the structure, for the boards are irregular in their width and all are wider than those used during the last fifty years or more of the eighteenth century." 306

This building burned to the ground on May 10, 1932. 307

Haddonfield

The first meeting house in Haddonfield was constructed in 1721 on land given by John Estaugh.

"At said meeting report is made by the persons appointed to gett subscriptions for the erecting the new meeting house that there is subscribed In order to gett the sum of one hund & one pounds + ten shillings, and that said persons are desired to gather the money and that John Hains, Thomas Sharp & Joseph Cooper Jun is appointed to agree with a workman for building the same forty foot long + twenty foot wide twelve foot post, shingled on ye outside a gallery at each end ten foot one twelve foot ye other to accommodate the women's meeting to be lined back high with bord lathed & plastered the other part and the house if possible be finished by the last end of the seventh month next." 308

Construction on the building apparently lasted a considerable period of time as Haddonfield Monthly minutes dated 12 day 9th mo. 1725 recorded that Constantine Wood made a payment of three pounds on behalf of Friends of Woodbury Creek towards the finishing of the Haddonfield

306 Matlack, 415.


308 Minutes of the Newton and Haddonfield Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8th day, 3rd month, 1721.
Meeting House.\textsuperscript{309} The building was located on Haddon Avenue near King’s Highway on land today occupied by a firehouse.\textsuperscript{310} This building served until 1760 when a large brick meeting house was erected on the site of the old meeting house (Fig. 134).\textsuperscript{311} The old meeting house was then moved across the street and used as a horse shed for the new meeting house.\textsuperscript{312} The brick meeting house was demolished in 1851, the old bricks were supposedly reused in a wall that surrounded the Quaker cemetery.\textsuperscript{313}

Haddonfield (Orthodox)

Haddonfield Quakers both Hicksite and Orthodox worshipped on opposite sides of the Old Haddonfield Meeting

\textsuperscript{309} Haddonfield Monthly, 12 day, 9th mo. 1725.

\textsuperscript{310} Derry, 320. Derry is probably quoting, "This is Haddonfield." Matlack does not recognize this incarnation of the Haddonfield Meeting House, believing the following brick structure to be the elder.

\textsuperscript{311} Derry states that new meeting house was constructed across the street from the old. Monthly meeting records dated the 18th of the third month, 1760, give the Haddonfield meeting permission to move the old house so they could build the new one on the old lot.

\textsuperscript{312} Derry, 321.

\textsuperscript{313} Derry states that the old meeting house was demolished by fire one suspected to be arson. In fact the meeting records state clearly that the Orthodox Friends tore down the old building after constructing a new structure. Minutes of the Haddonfield Orthodox Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 5mo, 29, 1851, and Derry, 322.
Figure 134
Haddonfield Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
House until its demise in 1851. At that time, the Orthodox Quakers constructed a new meeting house (Figs. 135 and 136) at the corner of what is today Friends Avenue and Lake Street. Haddonfield Quakers, Orthodox and Hicksite, reunited in 1952 and chose to retain this meeting house. In 1956, additions were added to house a day school and first day school.

Haddonfield (Hicksite)

In 1851, Haddonfield Hicksite Quakers purchased land at Ellis and Walnut Street. There, they constructed a meeting house, one traditional in form and very similar to that of their Orthodox counterparts (Figs. 137 and 138). The building had

"two windows in the rear, back of the facing benches or minister’s Galleries, and plenty of others at the front and ends, two small covered porches in the front and one at either end. Closing shutters divide the assembly-room in two equal parts, one side being for women friends in the days of the past, the other for the male members until the congregation in later years so reduced in numbers as to warrant only half the house being heated and used for the usual First day meetings for worship. With that change it was customary to use the eastern end of the house

---


315 Derry, 322, and Memo from Chairman of Building Committee, First month, 15, 1956, Haddonfield Monthly Meeting, Pamphlet Group 1 (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

316 Derry, 322.
Figure 135
Haddonfield Orthodox Meeting House
author's photo

Figure 136
Haddonfield Orthodox Meeting House
rear
T. Chalkey Matlack
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Figure 137
Haddonfield Hicksite Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 138
Haddonfield Hicksite Meeting House rear
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
during the winter season and the western end during the remainder of the year."

In 1952 Haddonfield Hicksite and Orthodox Quakers reunited and adopted the Orthodox Meeting House as their home. The old meeting house was sold to the American Stores Company with the stipulation that the old building be retained as part of the construction of a new Acme Supermarket (Fig. 139), a function that it still serves.

Hopewell (New Hopewell)

"On 10 mo. 6, 1798," the Friends Meeting at New Hopewell, informed the Meeting at Upper Evesham that they had a "prospect of Securing a lot of land for a meeting house and Burying ground." Two months later they reported that "a deed for the lot had been executed and proposed a meetinghouse 24 feet square."

A Haddonfield Quarterly minute dated 3 mo. 26, 1802 stated that "A new Meeting house has been built at New Hopewell..." The life span of this meeting house was very short lived, as by 5 mo, 12, 1827, an Upper Evesham Monthly minute states that,

317 Matlack, 420.
318 Derry, 322.
319 Minutes of the Upper Evesham Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 10 mo. 6, 1798, and 12th mo. 6 1798.
320 Haddonfield Quarterly, 3 mo. 26, 1802.
Figure 139
Haddonfield Hicksite Meeting House
author's photo
"The above committee reported that the meeting house was in very bad condition—windows broken—shutters on ground—roof leaking etc. We disposed of the Said meeting house to Job Norcross for the sum of forty dollars and gave him liberty to remove the same from the said lot and apply it to his own use."\[321\]

Prowell's History of Camden County (1886) records that after 1820 the old meeting house was moved by Job Norcross, and "rebuilt as a two-story dwelling, on the Blue Anchor Road, not quite a mile from its old site, where it is now occupied as the home of William Norcross."\[322\] The meeting house was originally located near, "the railroad station called Florence, in Winslow Township of Camden County, near Tansboro."\[323\]

**Medford**

The first Friends meetings held in Medford were conducted in the "School house near Robert Braddocks."\[324\] A paper commemorating the Centenary of the Medford Meeting House (1914) stated that "the first meeting house in Medford was a frame structure located about fifty yards southwest of the present meeting house (Orthodox)."\[325\] The year 1762 is

\[321\] Upper Evesham Monthly, 5 mo. 12, 1827.

\[322\] Prowell, 700-701.

\[323\] Matlack, 422.

\[324\] Woody, 200.

\[325\] Medford Monthly Meeting Pamphlet file (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 5.
the date usually given as that of its construction and it is believed that it may have been an addition to the already existing school house, and faced the road leading down to Landing Bridge.\textsuperscript{326}

At an Evesham Monthly Meeting held in 1774, Friends belonging to the School House meeting requested "some advice and assistance with respect to building or enlarging their meetingplace."\textsuperscript{327} The Friends appointed reported that they had "attended ye schoolhouse meeting and that they apprehended an enlargement of their meeting place was necessary, therefore ye members there of, are at liberty to make an addition or build a new meeting house..."\textsuperscript{328} Whether or not work occurred at this date is unknown but the question resurfaced again in 1812 and at that time an entirely new building was deemed necessary, one seventy-six by thirty-eight feet in length, the estimated cost of which was 3600 dollars. The measurements were altered to seventy-four by forty-two feet. Construction commenced and was completed in 1815.\textsuperscript{329} This meeting house (Figs. 140 and 141) is located on the south side of Union Street, a short distance from its intersection with Main Street. Between

\textsuperscript{326} Matlack, 429.

\textsuperscript{327} Evesham Monthly, 10th of 3rd mo. 1774.

\textsuperscript{328} Ibid., 7th of 4mo, 1774.

\textsuperscript{329} Upper Evesham Preparative, Nineth Month, 3 1812; Nineth Month, 30, 1813, and 2 month, 15th 1815.
Figure 140
Medford Orthodox Meeting House
author's photo

Figure 141
Medford Orthodox Meeting House
rear
T. Chalkey Matlack
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
1845 and 1847 substantial renovations were undertaken. Both the existing lobbies and porch were added at this time.\textsuperscript{330}

**Medford (Hicksite)**

Until approximately April of 1842, both groups of Medford Friends, Hicksite and Orthodox, shared the large 1812 meeting house.\textsuperscript{331} It would not, however, be until 1846 that Hicksite Friends would construct a brick meeting house of their own (Figs. 142 and 143).\textsuperscript{332}

"The Committee of Men and Women Friends verbally appointed at last meeting to confer together to see if any way should open in the clearness to hold our meetings on first days in the morning instead of the afternoon report that we have twice met and deliberated on the subject and no way appeared to open for it in the clearness to be in peace and Quietness other than by building a New meeting house which on consideration we were united in proposing to the meeting provided sufficient means can be procurred. A house about thirty seven or eight by sixty four or six we think will be sufficient to accommodate the Quarterly Meeting and if a house is built propose that it be built on the lot where the school house stands on south street in Medford unless some lot more suitable is procurred previously to commencing the building the plan of the house to be nearly similar to the present meeting house—The estimated cost of such a house with the

---

\textsuperscript{330} 150th Anniversary of the Union Street Friends Meeting House 1814–1964, held Seventh Month eleventh, 1964, Medford N.J. Medford Monthly Meeting, Pamphlet Group 1, (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

\textsuperscript{331} Upper Evesham Preparative, (Hicksite) 11 mo. 4th, 1842.

\textsuperscript{332} Derry, 264, and Matlack, 428.
Figure 142
Medford Hicksite Meeting House
author's photo

Figure 143
Medford Hicksite Meeting House
rear
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
necessary fixtures round it and the yard is about thirty five hundred dollars."\textsuperscript{333}

The structure, located set back on the east side of Main Street, south of its intersection with Union, in Medford, was largely financed by one man, Benjamin Davis. Davis’ story as it has been related is melodramatic. As the meeting house was nearing completion, he surveyed it inorder to assess what hardware he was going to need to purchase on an upcoming trip to Philadelphia. While still inside the building, he had a heart attack and fell dead on the meeting house floor.\textsuperscript{334} In 1955, Medford Friends rejoined, service is held in summer months in the Hicksite structure and in the Orthodox building during the winter.\textsuperscript{335}

Merchantville

The Merchantville Friends Meeting was born out of dissention within the Moorestown Hicksite Friends Meeting. Two influential ministers, Edwin L. Pierce and Franklin T. Haines left that meeting and opened a meeting of their own, neither officially affiliated with either Arch Street or Race Street Friends. The Meeting was established in 1901 and a brick structure was built to house it in the same year (Fig. 144). The meeting’s strength was largely based on the

\textsuperscript{333} Upper Evesham Preparative (Hicksite). 10 mo. 2 1846.

\textsuperscript{334} Matlack, 428, quoting History of Burlington County, 1883.

\textsuperscript{335} Derry, 267.
Figure 144
Merchantville Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
large following of its leaders and when ill health struck them both the meeting foundered. The property came into the hands of the Bell Telephone Company who demolished the meeting house in the process of constructing a central office. The building was located on East Maple, a short distance from Center Street.\(^{336}\)

**Mooresstown (Chester)**

The Meeting of Friends at Mooresstown was first organized in 1685.\(^{337}\) Its first home was named the Adams Meeting House after James and Esther Adams who gave the plot of land on which it was built. "All that Acre of land adjoining to the King's Highway on the west and is lying & being on the western most parts of the moity of Four hundred Seventy five acres of land heretofore conveyed..."\(^{338}\) The building is said to have stood on the north-west corner of

\(^{336}\) Matlack, 431.


\(^{338}\) Deed, James and Esther Adams to John Hollinghead, Matthew Allin, John Adams, William Hollinghead, Thomas Frouth, Joseph Heritage, Thomas Willis, John Cooperthwaite, William Marklocke, Sarah Roberts, Richard Heritage, Thomas Hutton and Timothy Hamok, 9th day of second month April 1700 recorded in Secretary Office in Burlington Book G H Folio 373 5/3 (original at Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).
the present Main and Chester Avenues. A Chesterfield Monthly minute of 6th 8mo. 1720 states that, "The friends of Chester, being the lower part of this county, acquainted friends of this meeting sometime past that by an accident of fire their meeting house was burnt."^340

Moorestown, Old and New by James C. Purdy, a local history published in 1886, recorded that a plan of the meeting house lot and cemetery had survived to that date and showed the meeting house located in the southeastern corner of the lot, next to Chester Avenue facing Main Street. ^341

This work also states that the Adams Meeting House was fashioned from logs. ^342 The meeting house constructed after the fire, was said by Purdy to have been constructed of stone. ^343

On December 27, 1781, land was purchased on the south side of Main Street at the head of Chester Avenue, nearly across the street from the old meeting house and

---

^339 Burlington Monthly, second month 9th, 1700; George DeCou. Moorestown and Her Neighbors; Historical Sketches (Philadelphia: Harris and Partridge, 1929), 57, and Matlack, 432-433.

^340 Chesterfield Monthly, 6th 8mo. 1720, and Matlack, 432-433.

^341 Purdy, 128.

^342 Ibid., 128.

^343 Ibid., 128-129.
Figure 145
Moorestown Hicksite Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 146
Moorestown Hicksite Meeting House
Author's photo
Figure 147
Moorestown Orthodox and Hicksite Meeting Houses
and School House
Woodward’s History of Burlington County
graveyard.\textsuperscript{344} On this lot a stone school house was constructed. T. Chalkey Matlack states that a portion of the stone wall of this school house survives in the west wall of the brick meeting house constructed on that site and completed in 1802 (Figs. 145 and 146).\textsuperscript{345} This is probably not the case as a photograph depicted in Woodward’s \textit{History of Burlington County} (Fig. 147) shows the two Quaker Meeting Houses, Orthodox and Hicksite, standing simultaneously but structurally separate with the school building in between.\textsuperscript{346} Purdy states that this school house was constructed of stone taken from the meeting house across the street.\textsuperscript{347} The minutes of the Chester Meeting clarify the events.

"We the committee appointed to take into consideration what may be best to build a new meeting house with & having generally met agree to report that the said house be built with brick. The calculated expense not less than a 1000 and we propose Robert French, and John Collins be appointed managers of the same, and Samuel Roberts Sr., Edmund Hollinshead, Joseph Roberts, and Rueban Mattack be appointed as assistant committee. We likenwist propose that the little meeting house be taken down and such parts of the

\textsuperscript{344} Deed, Ephraim Haines and Hannah, his wife to Joshua Roberts, Jacob Hollinshead, James Cattle, "Elders and Overseers of the Society or Congregation of Friends" 12th month 27 day 1781 (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

\textsuperscript{345} Matlack, 432.

\textsuperscript{346} Woodward, 258.

\textsuperscript{347} Purdy, 130.
other as may be convenient to take out and leave the walls standing, so as it may accommodate us while the new one is a building..." The Committee appointed last month in order to consider what might be best to do with the old meeting house, they now report that they were generally united that it would be best to pull down and make sale of the stone ye except such part as is wanted for building sheds, and fence in the ground... and the committee that was appointed to have care of the building is appointed to have it performed..."349

In 1803, the Evesham Monthly Meeting recorded, "One new Meeting house erected for the accommodation of Chester Particular Meeting, in Lieu and near the place of the old one."350 The large rear addition and its accompanying interior modifications appear, based on photographic evidence, to date to just before 1927.351

Mooresstown (Orthodox)

James C. Purdy records in Mooresstown, Old and New, that, in 1829, Mooresstown Orthodox Friends constructed a frame meeting house on the western end of the 1803 meeting house lot.352 Ellis Derry in Old and Historic Churches of

348 Minutes of the Chester Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 10th mo 7th day 1800.

349 Ibid., 2nd month 8th day 1801.

350 Matlack, 433.

351 Mooresstown, Hicksite Meeting House, Meeting House Photo Collection (Friends Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

352 Purdy, 131.
New Jersey, maintains that the Orthodox retained control of the old stone school house and met there until 1839 when a new frame building (Fig. 148) was erected. The wooden building served until 1897 when the present large brick structure was erected (Figs. 149, 150 and 151). This building, in the wake of Orthodox/Hicksite repatriation, has been renovated to serve as the gymnasium for the large Quaker school erected behind it.

Newton (Camden)

George R. Prowell's *History of Camden County, N.J.* (1886) states,

"In the spring of 1682, a few Irish Friends, who had spent the winter in Salem, moved up to and settled about Newton Creek. Thomas Sharp, (1660-1729) one of these Irish Friends, one of their number, in his account of their early settlement, says 'In 1684 the Friends in the vicinity of Newton, desirous of erecting a house of worship, selected a lot of land on the bank of the middle branch of Newton Creek, containing about two acres, it being on the bounds of land of Mark Newby and Thomas Thackera, which was laid out for a burial ground, and at the West end a log meeting-house was erected.'"\(^{354}\)

Matlack states that the work was executed by William.\(^{355}\) Matlack also quotes the journal of Joseph Hinchman that states that on the 22nd of December 1817, this


\(^{354}\) Prowell, 650.

\(^{355}\) Matlack, 440.
Figure 148
Moorestown Orthodox Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Figure 149
Moorestown Orthodox Meeting House
front
author’s photo

Figure 150
Moorestown Orthodox Meeting House
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meeting house was destroyed by fire. The meeting house was located in West Collingswood, between Lynne Street and the railroad. Matlack also states that, "Close by is an old building dating from 1753 (Fig. 152), remodeled or rebuilt in 1821, having the later date on its gable wall. This locally is said to have been a Friends' Meeting House."\(^{357}\)

In 1801, a large brick edifice was constructed (Fig. 153) on what is today Mount Vernon Street, near its intersection with Haddon Avenue. A date stone marked 1801 was set in the building's western gable.\(^{358}\) Orthodox Quakers met in that house until the meeting was laid down in 1924.\(^{359}\) As of 1928 the meeting house was being used as the headquarters of Boy Scout Troop 21.\(^{360}\) Beginning in 1934, the city of Camden took to the continued maintenance of the structure as it was realized to be the city's oldest house of worship.\(^{361}\) The building has since been demolished.

Newton (Hicksite)

In the days immediately following the separation, Hicksite Quakers held their meetings in the school house of

\(^{356}\) Ibid., 440.

\(^{357}\) Ibid.

\(^{358}\) Ibid., 436.

\(^{359}\) Ibid., 435.

\(^{360}\) Ibid., 438.

\(^{361}\) Ibid., 437.
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the Camden Academy.\textsuperscript{362} Less than three weeks later a lot of land for a new meeting house was located and donated to the Friends by Joseph W. Cooper.\textsuperscript{363} The meeting house erected on it was known disparagingly by the Orthodox Friends as, "the Hicksite Cabin" or "the nine days' wonder."\textsuperscript{364} It seems to have generally been nicknamed, "the little cabin in the woods."\textsuperscript{365} In 1885, the Newton Hicksite Meeting House was considerably renovated, enlarged and architecturally embellished in the manner of the time. The architect responsible for the alterations is tentatively believed to have been Wilson Eyre Jr. This attribution is based primarily on the word of Mrs. Emily Cooper Johnson who quoted statements to that effect made by her father, Howard Cooper, a prominent Camden citizen and a trustee of the meeting house at the time of its renovation.\textsuperscript{366} The Wilson Eyre Jr./Howard Cooper connection is confirmed by the fact that Eyre later designed Cooper's own home.\textsuperscript{367} At the time of the meeting house renovations, Eyre was working in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{362} Prowell, 467.
\item \textsuperscript{363} Minutes of the Newton Hicksite Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), seventh Month 6, 1828; Prowell, 467, and Matlack, 437.
\item \textsuperscript{365} Matlack, 437, quoting the notes of Amos J. Peasley.
\item \textsuperscript{366} Teitelman, 109.
\item \textsuperscript{367} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
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Camden, on the Dr. Henry Genet Taylor House. Whomever the architect, this meeting house (Fig. 154, 155 and 156), is located on the south side of Cooper Street, east of Seventh Street and is still in use.

Sommer's Meeting

On the 3rd day of the tenth month of 1785, members of this meeting obtained approval from the Great Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting to purchase a site for the purpose of constructing a meeting house. An old resident of the area recalled in 1918 that as a child she had known this building (Fig. 157).

"It was a one and a half story affair, the one half story being the attic. It had a central door with windows each side. At one end, towards the west, was a large brick chimney from the ground to the peak of the roof. At the eastern end of the building was a window. It had cedar shingles and weatherboard sides and ends. It faced Ocean City and stood at what is now the Southwest corner of New York Avenue and Main Street. It was inherited by her uncle, Jesse Sommers, who cut it in half. He used half as a tennent dwelling and moved the other half to the hollow next to Captain Sooy's house, north side, and used it as a blacksmith shop."

---

368 Ibid.
369 Prowell, 467.
370 Great Egg Harbor Monthly, 3rd day tenth month of 1785.
371 Matlack, 416, quoting Frank H. Stewart, then President of the Gloucester County Historical Society who interviewed, "a certain Mrs. Anderson," on July 31, 1918.
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Westfield

The meeting at Westfield was first organized in 1794. The earliest meeting house is said to have been constructed in 1800 and the first meeting held in it 12th month, 21, 1800. That building apparently succumbed to fire.

"At a Meeting of the members of Westfield Preparative Meeting held in the School house the 23rd day of 3mo. 1859 to take into consideration measures for rebuilding the meeting house, in the place of the old one burned on first day afternoon last (the 20th instant), Asa Lippincott & Nathan H. Conrow were appointed to collect information and suggest plans for the construction of a new house."  

Westfield, 3rd mo 30th 1859

"Near the time adjourned to, the members again met and the committee appointed at last mtg to propose plans for the construction of a new meeting house exhibited several, which being carefully examined, the following was agreed upon (viz.) The Building to be Brick or Stone 36 by 40 feet, all the seats upon the same floor, and to have large Partitions or shutters to lower down so as to divide the room into two appartments for meetings of buisness."  

The following is an extract from "An Historical Sketch of Westfield Meeting and School" being a portion of a personal recollection entitled "The Meeting House and Grounds As they were in 1871."

"There was one small committee room at the back,  

---


373 Matlack, 444.

374 Ibid., 444.
where the men’s preparative Meeting was held and where the adult Bible Class met during the Firstday School hour. This annex was only one story high and contained four or five benches seating about thirty people and was heated by a wood stove. This little room also contained the Firstday school library with its shelves of books against the North West wall. This room was a very busy place after meeting on Firstdays. Then we children bought back our library books and exchanged them for others to read during the week. Swiss Family Robinson, The Rollo books, and Boys of Other Countries were some of the books I remember. We looked forward each month to the Scattered Seeds which were distributed to us through first day school. On Preparative Meeting days the Women Friends held their Preparative Meetings in the large room of the Meeting house and the men withdrew to the small room; each group to transact its own Monthly meeting at Moorestown." (Figs. 158 and 159)³⁷⁵

Recently, a new Westfield Meeting House has been erected (Fig. 160) on the east side of Route 206 in Cinnaminson, and the nineteenth century building is now used as a preschool.

Westfield (Orthodox)

Hicksite Quakers retained the new meeting house at the time of the split. Orthodox Quakers met until 1848 in a school house on Marmaduke Lippincott’s farm.³⁷⁶ After the above date, a frame meeting house (Fig. 161), 38 by 44 feet was constructed in the town of Pamona, half a mile from Westfield.³⁷⁷ This building either has not survived or remains unidentified by the author.

³⁷⁵ Conrow, 13.

³⁷⁶ Woodward, 300.

³⁷⁷ Matlack, 444.
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Meeting Houses of the Salem Quarterly Meeting

Allowaystown (Thompson’s Bridge, Head of Alloway’s Creek)

The Meeting at Allowaystown was established early, in 1683, and discontinued early, in 1810. The meeting house was a frame structure, erected in 1756.

"At Our Monthly Meeting held at Salem 26th day of 4th month 1756 the Friends at the head of Alloway's Creek made Application to have a new Meeting house built to accommodate friends in that part to which proposal this meeting agrees and Benjamin Thompson, Isaac Oakford and Isaac Thompson are appointed managers to see and get and build between this and next fall, and bring the account there of to this meeting."

The meeting house site and what remains of the burial ground are located just west of the start of Alloway’s Creek on Route 540. The fate of the structure is best related in a minute from a Salem Monthly Meeting held the 27th day of the eleventh month, 1809:

"The meeting house at the head of Alloways Creek belonging to this meeting having become unnecessary and useless in consequence of the decrease of Friends in that neighborhood by deaths, removals, etc., and Friends of Upper Pennsneck informing they were desirrous of enlarging their meetinghouse, and that they apprehend the frame, etc., of said house at Alloways Creek would be useful to them, on considering the subject it appeared the united sense of the meeting that Friends of Upper Pennsneck be at liberty to remove all or such

---

378 Ibid., 557.

379 Salem Monthly, 26th day, forth month, 1756.
Figure 162
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Head of Alloway's Creek Meeting House
Friend's Historical Library
Swarthmore College
A True Survey of the Mettunthouse Lot, Situate at the Head of Allarvick, in the County of Salem, Province of West New-Jersey; it being Bounded as followeth.

Beginning at a Stake for a Corner set in John Hudspeth's Line, Standing near an Apple tree, Running from thence South Seventy four Deg. West three Chains to Twenty five Links to a Stake for a Corner Standing by the Side of the Kings Road, from thence Running South Twenty two Deg. East Down the 8th Read one Grain to Sixty Links to a Stake for a Corner Standing by the Side thereof from thence Running North, Seventy four Deg. East, three Chains to fifteen Links to a Stake for a Corner Standing in the 8th John Adams's Line, from thence Running North Sixteen Deg. West from Chain to Sixty Links along up the Said John Adams's Line bounding thence to the Place of beginning, Containing half an acre of Land.

Surveyed and Drawn the Twenty Ninth Eighth Day of the Ninth Month Called September Anno Domini one thousand seven hundred fifty six.

By George Abbott Esq.
parts as they may think useful to them, with the stove, benches, etc., belonging thereto.\textsuperscript{380}

Matlack suggests that "the Allowaystown meeting house was reproduced, probably quite similar to its original self, in the frame structure erected in Pedricktown in 1812. But the appearance, of course, was changed when a second story was added in 1859 (see Fig. 192).\textsuperscript{381} About 1950, the lot and graveyard was bulldozed destroying the surviving stone foundation.\textsuperscript{382}

Alloway's Creek (Hancock's Bridge)

The Alloway's Creek Meeting was organized in 1679 and first accommodated in the home of John Denn.\textsuperscript{383} In 1684, the General Meeting held in Salem ordered,

"that ye meeting be kept once in two weeks in that part of Alloway's Creek as Elsinboro friends shall think most convenient and ordered ye Jos Thompson, Andrew Thompson, Jos White, Tho Woodrofe, Isaac Smart, George Deacon, Edward Bradway doe view ye ground where ye meeting shall be upon sixth day next and purchase the ground..."\textsuperscript{384}

The meeting house was constructed on land on the north

\textsuperscript{380} Ibid., 27th day of the eleventh month, 1809.

\textsuperscript{381} Matlack, 582.

\textsuperscript{382} Salem Quarter, 352.


\textsuperscript{384} Salem Monthly, 15 2nd month, 1684.
side of the river.385

"Dito the meeting agreed with Christ. White that he shall build a meeting house upon ground lately bought of Edward Champney, the house to be 20 feet long and 16 foot wide, to be finished in 3 months time with two windows and two doors, with boards for a loft, ? ye lofs? 8 foote high, the walls lathed and daubed on both sides the roof proportional to the width and length of ye house and he the said Christ. to have twelve pounds for the work."386

Later, changes in population made it more convenient to hold meetings on the south side of the river. 25th day of the 11th Mo. 1702, "It was proposed by friends of Alloways Creek that they might remove so much of their meeting house as may be permissible to a more convenient place."

In 1718, a new meeting house was constructed on land donated by Joseph Ware.387 In 1753, John Hancock deeded land for the construction of a larger brick meeting house that was completed in 1756 (Figs. 163 and 164).388 Alloway’s Creek was made a preparative meeting in 1783 and after 1784 was in alternation with the meeting house in Greenwich, the site of the Greenwich Monthly Meeting. The building was expanded, doubled to make room for the monthly.

"At a Preparative Meeting held 8 mo 26th 1784...

385 Salem Quarter, 315.
386 Salem Monthly, 28th day second month 1684.
387 Ibid., 25th day of 11th mo. 1702.
388 Salem Quarter, 316, and Salem Monthly, 26th of ye 4th 1756.
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This meeting agrees, that in regard to a mode of addition of our meetinghouse that the managers pull down the west end and an addition sufficient to square each room and raise the new part as high as the old and as much higher as may be thought necessary and the old part likenwist.\footnote{389}

The Alloway's Creek Meeting was laid down in 1930 for lack of membership and its property was transferred to the care of the Salem Monthly Meeting. Between 1940 and 1951, the meeting house housed the Salem County Historical Society but it has since been returned to the care of the Salem Monthly Meeting which currently maintains it and uses it for special meetings at least once yearly. The meeting house is located on Buttonwood Road at the eastern fringe of the village of Hancock's Bridge.\footnote{390}

Cape May (Beesley's Point)

This meeting seems to have had its start at some unspecified date in the late seventeenth century. The first meeting house in the region seems to have been constructed in 1727 at Beesley's Point.

"29th of 3rd month 1727 at a Monthly meeting held at Rebeckah Garretson's House...At s'd meeting it is concluded to build a meeting house by Jacob Garretson and Jacob Garretson agrees to give one acre of land for the servis of s'd meeting which

\footnote{389} Minutes of the Alloway's Creek Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore P.A.), 26th day, 8th month, 1784.

\footnote{390} Salem Quarter, 321.
house is to be built this fall. ³³⁹¹

Cape May had just recently, in 1726, obtained permission to hold a monthly meeting.³³⁹² The first monthly meeting held in that house occurred in 1729 probably indicating the approximate date of the building's completion.³³⁹³ In 1763, members of "the upper precinct of Cape May" requested permission to construct their own meeting house which was completed by the nineth month.³³⁹⁴ This is the meeting house known today at Seaville. At least until 1772, both meeting houses, upper and lower (Seaville and Beesley's Point respectively), were both in use, alternating as the site of the monthly meeting.³³⁹⁵ The fate of the meeting house at Beesley's Point is not known. The Cape May Monthly Meeting ceased to exist in 1804 when the Cape May Preparative Meeting was transferred from the Haddonfield Quarter to the Salem Quarter and became a part


³³⁹² Minutes of the Haddonfield Quarterly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 16 of 7th 1726, and Salem Quarter, 341-342.


³³⁹⁴ Great Egg Harbor Monthly, 5th day 9 mo 1763, and Salem Quarter, 264.

³³⁹⁵ Salem Quarter, 264.
of the newly founded Maurice River Monthly Meeting.396

Greenwich

The Greenwich Meeting was first held in the home of Joseph Browne beginning in 1686.397 In 1687, the same Joseph Browne sold to Charles Bagley, "a lot 50 feet on the street and 55 feet deep, for the only use, service, & purpose of a meeting-house & graveyard for those people in scorn called Quakers; between ye dwelling-house of ye Joseph Browne & his new Barne."398 This was a portion of a parcell of land originally purchased from John Fenwick by Mark Reeve on August 9, 1686.399 A Salem Monthly Minute dated the 26th day of the 3d month of 1690, records the request of Cohansey Friends to erect a meeting house of their own.400 The request was not acted on until at least 1693 when the Salem Monthly granted Cohansey Friends money to assist in the

396 Minutes of the Woodbury Quarterly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 20th of 2nd month, 1804, and Salem Quarter, 265.

397 Salem Monthly, 29th day, 9th mo. 1686.

398 Matlack, 565, quoting Deed Book 5, Salem County Records.

399 W.S. Bacon "Search of the Title of Friends Property in Greenwich, 8-8-12." Deeds, Greenwich Monthly Meeting Misc, Papers (Friend's Historic Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), quoting "Trenton Records, Greenwich Town lots."

400 Salem Monthly, 26th, 3rd mo. 1690.
construction of a meeting house. Nineteenth century works have held that the meetinghouse first erected here was a log structure.

A Salem Monthly minute of 1725, may indicate that Greenwich Friends erected a second meeting house sometime about that date. "This Meeting orders Andrew Thompson to pay Jon Goodwin six pounds for building ye brick works of the Cohansey Meeting house."402

In 1765, the Salem Monthly minutes record that the Greenwich Meeting was, "under the necessity of building a larger house for better accommodating their meeting and have proposed to build one forty feet in width which they concluded will cost two hundred and fifty pounds."403

This building (Figs. 165, 166, 167, 168 and 169), as indicated by a date stone, is apparently that which survives today. At some time since its date of construction, unspecified in either the surviving meeting records or the local histories, this building has been enlarged and a second doorway added to the main facade. This is clear from the prominent joint in the building's brick work just to the north of the southern door on the street facade. This addition was most likely added in anticipation of the

401 Ibid., 25th day of 10th month, 1693.
402 Ibid., 21st, 2d 1725.
403 Ibid., fifth day, thirty-first, 1765.
creation of the Greenwich Monthly Meeting in 1783.404 The Monthly minutes record that a fire took place in the meeting house in 1793, there is no record as to what the extent of the damage was.405 The meeting house is located near the terminus of "Ye Greate" otherwise known as Greenwich Street (Fig. 170). The meeting itself dwindled to only one member during the 1920's, but has now regained considerable strength. The meeting house, unheated, is used for summer meetings.406

Greenwich (Hicksite)

With the advent of the Hicksite separation, Orthodox Quakers in Greenwich retained use of the old Greenwich Meeting House. Hicksite Quakers worshiped in private residences at first. In 1831, the Hicksite Quakers purchased an old Methodist meeting house, previously located on the southern side of Mount Gibbon, and moved it to Ye Greate Street.407 Approximately a quarter century later, it was decided to build a new meeting house (Figs. 171, 172 and

---

404 Salem Quarterly, 18th Of 11th month 1783.

405 Minutes of the Greenwich Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 27th 11 month 1793.

406 Salem Quarter, 162.

407 (Untitled Article) Upper Main Line News, (N.D.) "Interesting + Historical" Swarthmore Pamphlet Collection, Greenwich Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), and Salem Quarter, 163 and 165.
"The subject of building a new-house for the accommodation of this meeting being called up, Benjamin L. Tyler report, he had been informed of twelve-hundred dollars being subscribed. The meeting approve of William Test, John Tyler, Reube Hyliard and Benjamin L. Tyler going on and building a house..."\textsuperscript{408}

"This meeting appoint William Test and James Dare to act with John Tyler to take a deed of trust for lot of ground for the meeting house and yard..."\textsuperscript{409}

12mo 23rd 1857, "William Test as one of the commity to build a house report they have built the house and find it cost 2010.95."\textsuperscript{410}

Thus as its date stone states, the present small brick meeting house was completed in 1857. Now centrally heated, it is used by Greenwich Friends for worship during the winter. It is located on Ye Greate Street just west of the village of Greenwich.\textsuperscript{411}

Maurice River (Port Elizabeth)

"At a Monthly Meeting held at Greenwich the 2nd day of the fifth month 1798, the friends appointed to attend to Meetings at Maurice River informed they have attended the most of them & believe them to be held to satisfaction and also informed they

\textsuperscript{408} Minutes of the Greenwich Hicksite Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 6 mo. 24th 1857.

\textsuperscript{409} Ibid., 8 mo 26th 1857.

\textsuperscript{410} Ibid., 12 month 3rd 1857.

\textsuperscript{411} Salem Quarter, 163-165, and Matlack, 566.
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were building a meetinghouse with which this meeting unites and leave them at liberty to hold them as usual for six months."³⁴¹²

A monthly meeting was established at Maurice River in 1804. The last recorded meeting of any type was held in 1881.³⁴¹³ "It is generally assumed that the meeting house was built by Stephen Murphy, a carpenter and member of the meeting."³⁴¹⁴ It was a timber framed and wood sided, one story structure, approximately 30 x 20 feet built on the east side of Delsea Drive, Route 47, approximately 1000 feet north of the bridge over the Manumuskin Creek in the Friends Burial Ground.³⁴¹⁵ In 1884 the meeting house (Fig. 174) was sold to Capt. Thomas M. Reeves who used much of the building for firewood. In 1888, the remaining timbers and stone foundation were removed by J. W. B. Vanaman and used in the construction of a barn on Ferry Lane in Port Elizabeth. The barn was blown down in a hurricane during the 1960's.³⁴¹⁶

Pilesgrove (Woodstown)

Initially, Friends in the Pilesgrove area travelled to Salem for meeting. In 1720, they were given permission to

³⁴¹² Greenwich Monthly, 2nd day, fifth month, 1798.
³⁴¹³ Salem Quarter, 358, and Woodbury Monthly, 10mo 23rd 1881.
³⁴¹⁴ Salem Quarter, 356.
³⁴¹⁵ Ibid., 355.
³⁴¹⁶ Matlack, 567, and Salem Quarter, 358.
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hold their own winter meetings in the house of Roger Huggins. 417 Pilesgrove Friends almost immediately began to consider building their own meeting house. In that same year, Roger Huggins, Aquilla Barber, Joseph White Jr. and Edward Hews purchased from Joseph White, Sr. one half acre of land on North Main Street (Route 45). 418 A frame meeting house was constructed on this property and meetings were held from 1725 until 1785. 419 In that year the large brick meeting house (Figs. 175, 176 and 177), presently standing, was erected on an adjoining half acre lot purchased in 1771. 420 After 1837, Salem Quarterly Meetings were held twice a year in Woodstown. 421 In 1849, the building was enlarged by tearing down the rear, (west) wall and adding a fifteen foot addition, "In order that the house be so enlarged as to accommodate all with seats who may attend the Quarterly meeting held there." 422 In 1873, the two pedimental door coverings were removed and replaced with the long "portico" around the street facade and west end of the

417 Salem Monthly, 30th day, 3rd month 1720.
418 Salem Quarter, 294.
419 Ibid., 295.
420 Salem Monthly, 25th day 7mo 1785, and Salem Quarter, 296.
421 Salem Quarter, 300.
422 Ibid., 301–302.
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building and which survives today. In 1907, a frame annex was added to the rear of the building and in 1927 the partition was removed from the main meeting space and the balcony was floored over for classroom space. The removal of the partition was apparently motivated by the installation of a new steam heating system, replacing the four stoves that had sufficed up until that date and making it efficient to heat the entire space instead of half as had become the practice after separate women’s meetings were discontinued. The building was further enlarged in separate efforts made in 1955, 1966 and 1974, the last two both being additions made to the kitchen.

Pilesgrove (Orthodox)

In 1828, Woodstown Orthodox Friends erected a small, frame building (Fig. 178) on Union Street near Elm, now 355 North Main Street. In 1969, the meeting house was sold to the Historic Village of Smithville and moved to the other side of the state. In 1987, ownership was again transferred

---

423 Minutes of the Pilesgrove Hicksite Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 6mo. 26th day, 1873.

424 Minutes of the Woodstown Monthly Meeting, 10 mo 29 1907; Minutes of the Woodstown Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8–7–1927, and Salem Quarter, 303–304.


426 Salem Quarter, 310, and Matlack, 574.
and the building was relocated behind the Atlantic City Area Friends Meeting House at 437-A South Pitney Road, Galloway Township.427

Salem

The Friends Meeting at Salem was organized in 1676. The first meeting house at Salem was a renovated dwelling house sold, along with 16 acres, to the Quakers by Samuel and Ann Nicholson for twelve pounds in 1681.428 This tract of land is located on West Broadway, a portion of which still remains in the ownership of the Society of Friends and comprises the Salem Friend's grave yard.429

Immediate modifications were made to the Nicholson house.

"It is articled and agreed betwixt Robert Zane, John Thomson and Thomas Pierce for ye repaire of ye said meeting house viz to cover it with clapboard and put wind beames to every couple of rafters and braces to ye ruff: ye doore on ye south side to be removed & a doore with a shutter on ye north side of ye house and ye northside to be lathed and daubed & ye doore to be placed in ye south next to ye shedd, ye work to be done in three months after ye date here of.430

Several months later, the building was enlarged, possibly in response to a minute of a General Meeting held

427 Salem Quarter, 312.
428 Salem Quarter, 211; Deed, 6th day of 4th month, called June, 1681; Jaquette, 1, and Derry, 98.
429 Salem Quarter, 212.
430 Salem Monthly, 4th day of the 5th mo. 1681.
in Burlington that required Salem to hold a separate women’s meeting.\footnote{Burlington Monthly, last day sixth Mo. 1681.}

"Ordered by the meeting that the meeting house shall be enlarged fifteen foote in length and in the highte equal with the old frame with a chimney and pair of stairs, and Jo Thompson and Robert Zane to have the ordering and oversight of the work."\footnote{Salem Monthly, 26th, 10th, 1681.}

As Salem quickly became the site of monthly, quarterly and general meetings, the house was soon outgrown.

"The 26th day of the eighth month., 1685, it was agreed by the monthly meeting and Benjamin Acton that the said Benjamin shall build a room twenty feet in length and in breadth equal in heighth with the said meetinghouse, joyned to ye edge and of ye old meetinghouse, with two windows in said room where ye said Benjamin shall be directed, and a partition betwixt the new room and the old with two doors containing the breadth of the house with a chimney at the east end of the house, and the said Benjamin is to have twelve pounds for his labor and Friends to find all materials, and to bring all things to the place the house must stand and the said Benjamin is to make it a good frame house and to lay sufficient joists or beams for the floor of the upper room, and Benjamin is to make a little door the aforesaid pertition and to clapboard the walls and to shingle the roof, and the said Benjamin is to finish the house by the first of the second month next."\footnote{Ibid., 26th day 8th Month 1685.}

An addendum was made to these instructions the next month,

"It was thought fit by Friends that the partition in the east end of the old meeting house be made three foot high with shutters to use up and down according to the direction of John Thompson and
Christopher White."\(^{434}\)

And another on 27th of 2nd Month 1686,

"It was ordered by the said meeting that Christopher White and John Thompson make an agreement with Benjamin Acton to make and lie the upper floore and lower floore of the new end of the meeting house and also to clapboard the wall on the inside and fill it with ? morter."\(^{435}\)

Further alterations were called for on in 1688,

"It was ordered that Christopher White and John Thompson take care to see the new end of the meeting house floored overhead with boards and to make it convenient for the people to sit in and to seat round about as they may see it most convenient with a pair of stairs and to have it done before the yearly meeting."\(^{436}\)

The house still proved to be too small. Planning to enlarge or replace the meeting house began again.\(^{437}\) It was decided to replace it entirely. 30th of the 11th month, 1698/9,

"At this meeting John Thompson, Isaac Smart, Rotherah Morris and Richard Darkin brought in their report that they had put out the meeting house to be built, brick work to Richard Woodnutt and the woodwork to Robert Gillam."\(^{438}\)

The new meeting house would be forty feet long by thirty feet wide.\(^{439}\) A final accounting of the expenses was

\(^{434}\) Ibid., 30th day of the 9th month of 1685.

\(^{435}\) Ibid., 27 2nd mo. 1686.

\(^{436}\) Ibid., 26 day of the first mo. 1688.

\(^{437}\) Ibid., 29th of the 6th month 1698.

\(^{438}\) Ibid., 30th of the 11th month, 1698/9.

\(^{439}\) Ibid., 29th day of the 2 mo. 1699. This minute is a transcription of an action made by the Salem Quarterly Meeting, on the last day of the Salem General meeting, 1699.
recorded in a monthly minute dated 30th day of the first month, 1702,

Paid out for bricks, stone, lime and workmanship for the same £ S d
188 - 00 - 11

for timber, boards, shingles and carpenter work
194 - 15 - 3 1/2

laid out for iron work and nails, priming the house, glaising, drawing of articles of agreement and sundry expenses to the workmen
037 - 17 - 0

to John Thompson for his trouble in overseeing the work
05 - 00 -

The whole charge is 425 - 13 - 2 1/2

Not surprisingly, in light of the past, this building was enlarged as well, once, in 1717. Two surviving but undated accounts of building expenses survive in the records of the Salem Monthly Meeting and probably relate to this addition. The first receipt, referred to in the last line of the second, gives the size of the addition in its heading. 441

"Ye acount of ye Brick work for ye adicon of ye meten hous at Salem 25 by 20 by 12 ft hie." (Fig. 179)

£ S d

Bricks 15000 -- -- -- -- -- -- 15 - 0 - 0

Lime - 60 bushels -- -- -- -- 05 - 0 - 0

440 Salem Monthly, 30th day of the first month, 1702.

Sand - 12 Sd from ye River 02 - 8 - 0
Laying Brick & ? find tenders? 09 - 12 - 0

\[ \vphantom{\text{Laying Brick & ? find tenders? 09 - 12 - 0}} \]
\[ \vphantom{\text{This Computation made by me Robt Raines}} \]

\[ \text{This Computation made by me Robt Raines} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scantling for 3 dore cases 75 foot</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scantling for 6 window cases 144 foot</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 joice 20 feet long each 260 foot</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 plaits 25 foot long each 50 foot</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pare of rafters &amp; color beams 433 feet</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scantling for Rafter feet &amp; other uses 150 foot</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 laths 25 foot each 875 foot</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 of Shingles at 45 Shillings each 1000</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 pound of nails at 10 pence per pound</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 foot of bord at 3£ - 5s - per 1000</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brick work 33£ refered to in another paper</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This house was in use until 1772 when the present meeting house (Fig 182) was constructed.\(^{443}\) 25th of the 5th

\(^{442}\) Ibid.

\(^{443}\) Salem Monthly Minutes, 29th day of the fifth mo. 1717; 24th day 12th month, 1717, and Salem Quarter, 212.
Figure 179
Receipt for Brickwork
Salem Meeting House
c. 1717
Friends Historical Library
Swarthmore College
A Computation of the Brick work and
of the Scantlin Timber boards Shingles nails
for the Addition to the Meeting House at Salem.

Scantlin for 3 doors 6 cases 7 1/2 foot
- - - 00-00-0
Scantlin for 6 window cases 144 foot
- - 00-12-0
13 Joyce 20 foot long each 200 foot
- - - 00-01-5
15 Prices 24 foot long each 50 foot
- - 00-04-7
9 Parc of hafster Cedar beams 483 foot
- - 00-16-0
Scantlin for hafster foot other times 150 foot
- - - 00-10-5
35 Stalls 25 foot each 875 foot
- - - 03-12-11
2000 of Shingles at 45 Shillings each 1000
- - - 04-10-0
60 pound of nails at 10 Pence per pound
- - 02-10-0
2000 foot of board at 3 1/2 per 1000
- - 06-10-0
The Brick work 38 Kep. to in another paper
- - - 38-00-0

$4=19=7$

Figure 180
Building receipt
Salem Meeting House
c. 1717
Friends Historical Library
Swarthmore College
mo, 1772, ". . . The meeting adjorns to the usual time, to be held in the Court House in Salem if this house should be taken down as expected". 444

William Ellis, a professional builder, was responsible for the present structure as is stated in a letter from him addressed to John Redman, the clerk of the Salem Monthly Meeting in 1796.

"I also wish to shew the enclosed and enquire of Thomas Goodwin if Living, as he perhaps can inform thee something about this matter, as I boarded with him at the time I was building the meeting house of Friends..."445

Many of a group of building receipts for this structure, surviving in the collection of the Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College also bear his name. 446

Included as Figure 181a and 181b is an accounting of the expenses for erecting this building. This last meeting house is located on East Broadway, at the head of Walnut Street, in Salem, New Jersey. The original partition has since been

444 Salem Monthly, 25th of the 5th mo. 1772.

445 William Ellis to John Redman, May 12th 1796, Salem Monthly Meeting Miscellaneous papers 1685-1929, Salem Monthly Meeting Financial Records, Building of the Meeting House receipts, 1772-1796 (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA). Salem Quarter, 212 states that William Ellis was a Philadelphia builder. There is no evidence in either Moss and Tatum, Carpenter Company Records or Philadelphia directories that this was the case.

Figure 181a and 181b
"Meeting House Debt to Charles Ellis,
11 month 23 1772"
Salem County Historical Society
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to half hall bricker</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Bryan for 3 days work</td>
<td>7 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Daniel  Mahone for 1 day</td>
<td>8 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Lawrence for 1 day setting bricks</td>
<td>7 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Bryan 2 days</td>
<td>7 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to turning up bricks</td>
<td>5 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to the leshman to half the hall</td>
<td>5 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to George of Mowbray to half hall</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Thomas Graham</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Thomas Graham</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Thomas Graham</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid for 500 feet pine &amp; cedar boards</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Josua Evans for laying the foundations of the front wall</td>
<td>14 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 7 Gallons of Rum for raising</td>
<td>1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cutting and setting poles</td>
<td>2 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 55 of Shingles</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Thomas Graham</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to William Elles</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Josua Evans</td>
<td>2 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sundries paid to William Elles</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash for join work done at Hatfield</td>
<td>3 1 14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Joseph Venmon on account of clay 1792 to William Elles</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Joshua Evans</td>
<td>11 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 12 Bushels of flour</td>
<td>0 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to thore of Moore</td>
<td>0 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 71 barrels of horse</td>
<td>0 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid for 10 bushels of horse to Richard Brock</td>
<td>0 12 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to John Town for land for pins</td>
<td>0 1 1 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cash paid to Robert Nelson for land for building</td>
<td>0 1 61 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By my subscription</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash received of William Goodwin</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash from Judah Abell, for sundries</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash from Samuel Richardson</td>
<td>12 5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash from Samuel Richardson</td>
<td>59 1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash from Samuel Richardson</td>
<td>21 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash from Aaron Raymond</td>
<td>41 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge to Joshua Smith for bricks</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big 816 feet of board that Bezalel Handley had</td>
<td>3 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash for bricks, from Joseph Handley</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By my last subscription</td>
<td>88 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash from Joshua Thomson at Andover</td>
<td>5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash received from Robert Johnston</td>
<td>10 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cash received from John Mason</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88 11 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Sometime house for 500 hands 2 days, with John Mason.
- Brought over from other side.
- M. Brought down.
- To Cash paid to Joseph Vanaman. 16 1 0
- 1 10 0 to Cash paid to the body of the messengers.
- To Cash paid to William Ellis 6 5 5.
- To Cash paid to Ellis at John Pompeao 9 1 6.
Figure 182
Salem Meeting House  
author's photo

Figure 183
Salem Orthodox Meeting House  
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection  
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
removed and the balcony altered to create rooms for the display of meeting relics and a small library.

Salem (Orthodox)

"Our meeting house having been thus violently taken possession of, and threatenings made by some of the seperatists to break whatever fastenings Friends should put on; this commitee with other concerned Friends, met on the third day following to concider whether it would be proper under these circumstances to try to attempt to occupy our meeting house; and after endevoring wieghtily to feel after the mind of truth on this on this very sorrowful and trying occasion believed it would tend most to the wealfare of the society and maintaniance of our peacable principles to withdraw from those sceens of disorder and hold our meetings in Friends school house."  

The school house mentioned above was located on Margrets Lane, now Walnut Street. In the first month of 1828, 55 men, 87 women and 108 children were listed as seperatists by the Salem Orthodox Friends and disowned. As their own numbers were only 23, 48, and 59 respectively, for all intensive purposes it was they who were out in the cold. In 1837, Orthodox Friends purchased a lot of ground on the south side of West Broadway across from the old Salem Oak. In that same year, they constructed on that lot a small brick meeting house (Figs. 183, 184 and 185). It was regularly used by

447 Salem Monthly (Orthodox), 7m 2, 1828.

448 Salem Quarter, 235.

449 Salem Monthly, 1st, 2m, 1837. A large number of building receipts survive in the collection of the Friends Historical Library Swarthmore College, Salem Quarter Meeting Papers Misc. Documents.
Salem Orthodox Quakers until 1941 when the building was finally sold.\footnote{450} Since that date a greatly remodelled 107 West Broadway has been home to buisness and legal offices.

Seaville

The Seaville Friends Meeting House (Figs. 186, 187, 188 and 189) was erected in 1763. "One new Meeting house built in the Upper Precinct of Cape May."\footnote{451} This date is confirmed by the first deed to the property held by Friends which is dated 7th of 3rd, 1764.\footnote{452} It has sometimes been assumed that this primitive meeting house was in fact older in date. The date usually given, 1727, was probably based on a minute of the Great Egg Harbor and Cape May Monthly Meeting, Dated 3rd mo. 29th, 1727, "...it is concluded to build a Meeting House by Jacob Garretson's and Jacob Garretson to give one acre of land for the servis of s'd meeting..."\footnote{453} That citation most certainly referred to the meeting house at Beesley's Point. Matlack reported that he had heard that the Meeting House at Beesley's Point had been removed to Seaville. This is also unlikely.

\footnote{450}{Salem Quarter, 235, and "Summary of Deeds on 107 W. Broadway, Salem N.J.," Typescript, Prepared 1941.}

\footnote{451}{Minutes of the Great Egg Harbor and Cape May Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 5th day 9th mo, 1763.}

\footnote{452}{Salem Quarter, 266.}

\footnote{453}{Great Egg Harbor and Cape May Monthly, 3rd mo. 29th, 1727.}
Figure 184
rear,
Salem Orthodox Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 185
rear,
Salem Orthodox Meeting House
author's photo
Figure 186
Seaville Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Figure 187
Seaville Meeting House
author's photo

Figure 188
rear,
Seaville Meeting House
author's photo
Figure 189
interior,
Seaville Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Meeting houses at Beesley's Point and Seaville were used alternatingly by the Great Egg Harbor and Cape May Monthly Meeting for several years.\textsuperscript{454} The Cape May (Seaville) Preparative Meeting was discontinued on 12mo, 2nd, 1818.\textsuperscript{455} Between 1860 and 1954 the meeting house was rarely used. By 1871 it had fallen into such disrepair that major alterations were required. George Ward "of Salem" had the women's portion of the meeting house demolished and the men's portion repaired.\textsuperscript{456} The surviving portion of the original Seaville Meeting House, now attached to a large twentieth-century addition, is located on the west side of Route 9 in Seaville, N.J.

Upper Greenwich (Mickelton)

As early as 1736, permission was given for Friends to hold meetings at the house of Gracie Faucit.\textsuperscript{457} A minute of the Haddonfield Monthly Meeting, the 8th day of the first month of 1759, states that approval was given for the construction of a meeting house, "near Samuel Lippincott's."\textsuperscript{458}

This meeting house was said to have been a one story

\textsuperscript{454} Salem Quarter, 264.

\textsuperscript{455} Salem Quarterly, 21st day of 8th month, 1817.

\textsuperscript{456} Salem Quarter, 267.

\textsuperscript{457} Haddonfield Monthly, 11 8th mo 1736.

\textsuperscript{458} Ibid., 8th day 1 month 1759.
cedar structure near the corner of Quaker Road and Wolfert Station Road in Mickelton.\textsuperscript{459} In 1798, a new brick meeting house (Figs. 190 and 191) was completed on a two acre lot at the corner of King's Highway and Democrat Street.\textsuperscript{460} The date of construction is announced by a date stone located in the center of the main facade. The old meeting house was disassembled at that time and its timber used in the construction of horse sheds to service the new building.\textsuperscript{461} A sounding board above the minister's bench is said to have been a unique but now missing part of the original construction.\textsuperscript{462} Additions to the building have been made repeatedly, once in 1815, and a second forty foot by 30 foot cement block addition in 1919.\textsuperscript{463} In 1929, the gallery floor was leveled to make four classrooms.\textsuperscript{464} Major renovations were undertaken to both the exterior and the interior of this meeting house in 1942. "Knotty pine" panelling was added to the building's interior. New windows were added to the meeting space, and the porch, a later addition, was further extended. A plywood floor and wall to

\textsuperscript{459} Cushing and Sheppard, 209.
\textsuperscript{460} Matlack, 579.
\textsuperscript{461} Salem Quarter, 176.
\textsuperscript{462} Ibid., 176.
\textsuperscript{463} Ibid., 177 and 181.
\textsuperscript{464} Ibid., 181.
Upper Penn's Neck (Pedricktown)

The first Upper Penn's Neck Meeting House was constructed in 1796, the same year the meeting achieved preparative meeting status. It was a frame structure located on land given to the meeting by Isaac and Hannah Pedrick and which stood near the cross roads of Mill Street and Railroad Avenue. At a Salem Monthly Meeting in November 1809, permission was granted to Upper Penn's Neck Meeting to remove the small Allowaystown meeting house and its benches and stoves, and make use of them in Pedricktown. It is not known to whether the surviving photo of the Upper Penn's Neck Meeting House (Fig. 192) represents either the older Upper Penn's Neck Meeting House expanded or the Allowaystown Meeting House moved intact to a new location, or a totally new meeting house built of old materials. In either case the building was again altered. Michner stated it was "rebuilt" in 1857. The History of Gloucester, Salem and Cumberland Counties, states that an

465 Ibid., 181-182.

466 Minutes of the Upper Penn's Neck Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 14th day of the 12th Month, 1797, and Ezra Michner, 48.

467 Salem Quarter, 370, quoting deed of July 12, 1796.

468 Salem Monthly, 27th of 11th mo. 1809.

469 Michner, 48.
Figure 190
Upper Greenwich Meeting House
author's photo

Figure 191
Upper Greenwich Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
upper floor was added circa 1859.\textsuperscript{470} Upper Penn's Neck Preparative minutes confirm that on the 27th day of the ninth month of 1857 a committee estimated the cost of "repairing the meeting house at four hundred dollars."\textsuperscript{471} In 1867, the Upper Penn's Neck Preparative Meeting was discontinued by consent of the Pilesgrove Monthly.\textsuperscript{472} In 1900, the Philadelphia Hicksite Yearly Meeting reported that the Pedricktown Meeting had been laid down.\textsuperscript{473} The property was sold in 1901 and the meeting house torn down. As of 1929, the location of the old meeting house was occupied by an automotive repair shop owned by Lloyd W. Thorn. An out building (Fig. 193) was said to contain one of the meeting house's original doors.\textsuperscript{474}

Woodbury (Redbank, Woodbury Creek)

The first Woodbury Meeting House seems to have been erected sometime soon after May 26, 1696 when John Wood deeded a 100 x 70 foot lot for use as a graveyard and for the construction thereon of a meeting house.\textsuperscript{475}

\textsuperscript{470} Cushing and Sheppard, 445.

\textsuperscript{471} Upper Penn's Neck Preparative, 9th mo. 24th 1857.

\textsuperscript{472} Ibid., 11th mo. 26th, 1867.

\textsuperscript{473} Matlack, 583.

\textsuperscript{474} Matlack, 581, and Salem Quarter, 371.

\textsuperscript{475} Boedeker, 3, and Salem Quarter, 275.
Figure 192
Pedricktown Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Figure 193
garage out building,
Pedricktown
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
On the ninth month, 15th, 1715,

"John Swanson of Philadelphia conveyed to John Ladd, Henry Wood and John Cooper, Yeoman, all of the county of Gloucester, western province of New Jersey, trustees, one acre of ground...lying on the west side of Woodbury Creek...in trust to erect a Meetinghouse upon."\(^{476}\)

John Cooper, an influential local Quaker, is said to have been the builder.\(^{477}\) This meeting house is believed to survive, altered, as the south west section of the present meeting house (Fig. 194) located on the northern side of Broad Street, then King's Highway, just south of Woodbury Creek in the town of Woodbury itself.\(^{478}\)

In 1783, it was proposed to the Salem Quarterly Meeting that it should establish a new monthly meeting to be held at Woodbury.\(^{479}\) Woodbury Friends, in anticipation of the new meeting, were planning to enlarge their meeting house.\(^{480}\)

\(^{476}\) Recorded in the Extracts of the Minutes of the Woodbury Preparative Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA). Deed dated 21st of Sept. 1715 and recorded in Records of Gloster County Book 5 Fol. 145:146.

\(^{477}\) Dawes Watson. "Historical Sketch of Woodbury Meeting," 1915 Typescript Pamphlet Group 1, Woodbury Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA).

\(^{478}\) Salem Quarter, 281.

\(^{479}\) Salem Quarterly, 19th day of 5th mo. 1783.

\(^{480}\) Minutes of the Woodbury Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 4 mo. 11th 1783.
Figure 194
Woodbury Meeting House
T. Chalkey Matlack Collection
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
4 mo. 1st, 1783,

"At a meeting of the committee of eighteen friends of Woodbury Meeting to consider what may be the most eligible way of enlarging our meeting house; are unanimously of opinion, that an addition of 26 feet back, the length of the present house with two more galleries will be the most convenient way of enlarging the same; the walls to be carried the height of the present walls."481

The orientation of the building is believed to have been changed with the enlargement.482 After the time of the 1827 separation, both Hicksites and Orthodox Quakers shared the building, holding meetings on opposite sides of the wooden partition, the Orthodox Meeting in the building's older half.483

In 1950 and 1951, the meeting house was remodeled. The west end was divided to create four rooms, one for a furnace, two restrooms and a kitchen. The gallery was floored over and converted into classroom space and plumbing was installed.484

Woolwich (Mullica Hill)

The Woolwich Meeting was established, on a trial basis, in 1797. The meeting was at first housed in a school house

---

481 Ibid., 4mo. 1st, 1783.
482 Salem Quarter, 281.
483 Salem Quarter, 284-285.
constructed in 1788.\textsuperscript{485}

"Where as Jacob Spicer late of Woolwich, by his last will, dated 10th of 7th Mo 1779, gave to the people call'd Quakers, one and a half acre of land at Mullica's Hill for a burying ground and to build a meeting house upon it, it being before this meeting was divided from Haddonfield; and that the meeting nominated Benjamin Hooton, David Brown, James Whitall Junr., Amos Cooper, Samuel Mickle and Josuha Paul, (the better to secure the said lot) to take deed from Abigal Rudrow the heir of the said Jacob Spicer: which was done and the said deed lodged in the hands of said David Brown, And the Friends of Greenwich (Upper) Preparative meeting having applied to this meeting, for liberty to construct a school-house on said lot—It was now considered."\textsuperscript{486}

This request was approved by the Woodbury Monthly Meeting on the 15th day of the 7th mo. 1788.\textsuperscript{487} It would not be until 1800 that a full preparative meeting would be created.\textsuperscript{488} And the monthly meeting would not be born until the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{489} The meeting house (Fig. 195) is located in the southern portion of the town of Mullica Hill and is situated on a large triangular plot of ground at the corner of South Main Street and Route 45. The building was constructed in 1808. A fact confirmed by the building's date

\begin{footnotes}
\item[485] Woodbury Monthly, 15th Of 8th mo 1797, and 12th day 9th mo. 1797.
\item[486] Ibid., 15th 4th mo. 1788.
\item[487] Ibid., 15th day of the 7th mo. 1788.
\item[488] Salem Quarterly, 11 mo 17 1800.
\item[489] Salem Quarter, 189, and Matlack, 567.
\end{footnotes}
stone. In a 1897 paper, delivered by Hope L. Moore, it was reported that soon after the building was completed, "there arose a great wind and leveled one gable end to the ground."\(^{339}\) The building's interior partition was removed in 1897 and sometime afterwards the gallery was covered over so that a second floor could be created to house the Quaker Sunday school.\(^{340}\)

---

\(^{339}\) Quoted in *Salem Quarter*, 190.

Meeting Houses Of the Shrewsbury and Rahway Quarterly

Meetings

Amboy

The first mention of the meeting place of the Amboy meeting is vague as to in what situation it was housed.

"At the M.M. held in Amboy the 8th of the 10th mo. 1686...Friends agreed to pay three pounds money of this province for the yearly rent of the meeting room: & the year to begin this day likewise finds it necessary that there be fix formes for seats in the meeting-room, the making of which John Laing takes into consideration..." 492

A following minute makes it more apparent that the meeting room was actually an independent structure.

"At monthly meeting held in Amboy the 11th day of the 11th month 1687...It being proposed to bring Contributions toward the Rent of the Meeting-house John Barclay informed the yearly rent was 3L (pounds)." 493

This meeting fell under the control of George Kieth in 1702 and after such date are no longer considered Quakers. The meeting became part of a larger body of Anglicans and no other information concerning their seventeenth century meeting place is known to survive. 494

492 Minutes of the Woodbridge Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8th of the 10th mo. 1686.

493 Ibid., 11th day of the 11th month 1687.

494 Matlack, 598.
Hardwick (Great Meadows)

Matlack places the date of the Hardwick Meeting House at 1752. It is definite that in 1749, "Friends at the Meadows" requested that the Kingwood Monthly meeting appoint a committee to help them choose a place to site their meeting house. 495

The second meeting house was constructed in 1763,

"Agreeable to the direction of Last Quarterly meeting, we have appointed Peter Schmuck and Jacob Lundy to attend the committee who are to consider the rebuilding of Hardwick Meeting House in order to inform of our agreement concerning the plan of the said house which is as followeth viz. 40 feet long and 25 feet wide in the clear and one story high." 496

Kingwood Monthly Meeting 10 mo 13 1763, "Friends have concluded to build their meeting house at Hardwick 40 feet long and 20 feet wide in the clear with one chimney and coal hearth." 497

The last meeting held at the Hardwick Meeting House was in 1855. 498 Thaddeus S. Kenderdine described the site of the meeting house in 1906.

"From here we went on foot to where we at length found the remains of Hardwick meeting. This was on the North side of the Pequest, here spanned by an

495 Minutes of the Kingwood Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 8th mo. 12 1749. This meeting house stood until 1763.

496 Ibid., 10 mo. 2 1763.

497 Ibid., 10 mo, 13 1763.

498 Matlack, 603.
iron bridge. On one side of this, in the modest ways of such officials, the Freeholders (as they are called here), have had their names carved in enduring cast-iron tablets riveted to a girder for that purpose. Of the meeting house we found nothing but the foundation walls, now in alien ownership, and the graveyard in care of Plainfield Friends, forty miles away...The more recently built meeting house stood on the higher part of the grounds and facing the yard from 50 yards to the north, and amid a group of trees, some of them seemingly old enough to have shaded the first log structure built in 1752, and torn down 12 years afterward to give place of one of stone...It was 30 feet by 40 and built of limestone cemented with old fashioned mortar.\(^{499}\)

In 1865 the house and graveyard, were sold to Jesse Adams. The building was raised and a school house was erected on the same foundation preserving the older building's chimney and its date stone.\(^{500}\) A photograph of a primitive drawing of the Hardwick Meeting House survives (Fig. 196). The site of this meeting house is located near Allamuchy.

Plainfield

The first Plainfield meeting house was erected in 1731.

Woodbridge Monthly Meeting 17th 4th 1731,

"this meeting appoints Abraham Shotwell and Benjamin Smith to manigth building of the meeting house near John Laing...demensions the said house


\(^{500}\) Matlack, 604.
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not to exceed 24 foot square 14 foot betweine joynts.\textsuperscript{501}

In 1731 the Monthly Meeting at Woodbridge granted permission to build a meeting house on lands given by John Laing, which was afterwards known as "Plainfield Meeting House in the woods."

This building was replaced in 1788,

"The Friends appointed to endevor to find out a suitable place to build a meeting house at Plainfield report, they all agreed that a lott of land containing three acres near the house of John Webster the third would be a suitable place for said house to be built on and they propose that the size of the house should be about thirty four by forty eight feet."\textsuperscript{502}

The fate of the 1731 meeting house is clearly spelled out in the Monthly Meeting minutes,

"The committee appointed to build the meeting house at Plainfield are at liberty to make use of the Timber or such part of it as there is occasion for, on the lot on which the old meeting house stands for the use of the new house intended to be built."\textsuperscript{503}

"Partitions were removed in 1906, glass vestibules have been lately introduced for warmth in the winter and to deaden the noise at all times made by the almost ceaseless roar and clang of steam and trolley cars rushing by."\textsuperscript{504}

\textsuperscript{501} Woodbridge Monthly, 17th 4th 1731.

\textsuperscript{502} Woodbridge Monthly, 15th of 11th 1787.

\textsuperscript{503} Ibid., 12th month 19 1787.

\textsuperscript{504} Thaddeus S. Kenderdine. "Plainfield Meeting," \textit{Friends Intelligencer}, Volume LXIII, Number 14, Fourth Month 7, 1906, 209-211.
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Figure 198
Plainfield Orthodox Meeting House
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This meeting house (Fig. 197) is located in Plainfield on the north side of Watchung Avenue.

Plainfield (Orthodox)

Plainfield Orthodox Friends first met after the separation at the house of Eliza Shotwell.505

"The orthodox branch of our society which formerly had a holding in Plainfield is now extinct. Some twenty five years ago the meeting house built after the "separation" was replaced by a large and substantial two story brick structure surrounded by a tall-columned portico, probably costing $10,000. This is a matter of comment as the meeting was laid down five years ago."506

The Plainfield Orthodox Meeting House (Fig. 198) was sold sometime just after 16th of 7th 1908 after all meetings in Plainfield had been laid down when an offer of $5000 was tendered.507

In 1929, when Matlack visited Plainfield, it had become "the 'Recreation Rooms' of the 'Franklin Council No. 41 Junior order of United American Mecanics.' There has been a large addition joined to the house at the rear for a bowling alley...It is located at No. 311 east Front Street."508

505 Minutes of the Rahway and Plainfield Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 6mo, 19th 1828.


507 Rahway and Plainfield Monthly, 16th of 7th mo. 1908.

508 Matlack, 608.
Quakertown (Kingwood, Fairview, Bethlehem)

Matlack quotes a deed dated March 20, 1733 which conveyed four acres of land from Jacob Doughty to Samuel Laige, Samuel Willson, Edward Rockhill, John Stevenson and Joseph King, "for the use of the meeting" as a probable indication of the date of the construction of the first meeting house in Quakertown, N.J.\textsuperscript{509}

Kingwood Monthly Meeting, 11, 12mo, 1744,

"This meeting taking into consideration the necessity of Building a new meeting house in this place have unanimously agreed to at the necessity thereof before the next Quarterly meeting."\textsuperscript{510}

Burlington Quarterly Meeting, 25th day, 12th mo. 1744,

"The monthly Meeting of Friends at Bethlehem having made application for liberty to build a meetinghouse there, that they already have not being large enough, this meeting consents to their proposal, And that the said be built according to the directions of the monthly meeting, to wit, about thirty six feet long and twenty six feet wide."\textsuperscript{511}

Burlington Quarterly Meeting, 11 day, 1 mo. 1744/5,

"Kingwood with this meeting agrees that the said meeting house shall be built according to the above dementions in the clear, and that it shall be built of stone."\textsuperscript{512}

Kingwood Monthly Meeting, 14th day, 3 mo. 1747,

"We are building our new meeting house here thirty

\textsuperscript{509} Ibid., 124.

\textsuperscript{510} Kingwood Monthly, 11, 12mo, 1744.

\textsuperscript{511} Burlington Quarterly, 25th of the 12th month 1744.

\textsuperscript{512} Ibid., 11 1mo 1744/5.
nine feet long & twenty seven feet wide and we expect by computation that the cost will amount to one hundred pounds subscribed towards discharging the same..."\[513\]

Soon after the meeting house caught fire and required wholesale repair, Kingwood Monthly Meeting, 17th day, 2nd mo. 1752,

"This Meeting appoints Jeremiah Williams to agree with suitable workmen to Repair the meeting house of Friends in Kingwood (Known by the name of Bethlehem Meetinghouse) in such manner and form as they think best."\[514\]

Burlington Quarterly Meeting, 31st day, 8th mo. 1752,

"This meeting observing something slender in the report from Bethlehem and being dissatisfied with that was informed by some Friends not of that meeting that a difference was among them relating to the building of the roof of their meeting house, this meeting therefor thought it necessary to consider the convieniency and inconvieniency of both proposals and upon the whole is of opinion that the form of the roof of said meeting house as before built is much the best both as in regards to the convieniency of women Friends and convieniency of galleries..."\[515\]

Kingwood Monthly Meeting, 9th day 5th mo. 1754.

"We have to general satisfaction finished rebuilding our meeting house according to the former mode as we were advised by the Quarterly meeting so far that we hold our meetings there it being about as near completion as it was before it was burnt the whole cost of rebuilding amounts to upwards of one hundred and seven pounds..."\[516\]

Quakertown was transferred from two different

\[513\] Kingwood Monthly, 14, 3, 1747.

\[514\] Kingwood Monthly, 17th 2nd mo 1752.

\[515\] Burlington Quarterly, 31st of 8th mo 1752.

\[516\] Kingwood Monthly, 9th 5th 1754.
quarterlies at different times in its existence. It began as part of the Shrewsbury Quarterly, became a part of the Burlington Quarter in 1786 and was finally transferred to Bucks Quarter in 1859. It was reported to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting at Race Street in the Spring of 1906 by the Bucks Quarter that "Quakertown, N.J. Monthly and Particular meeting have been laid down and the few remaining members thereof joined to Buckingham Monthly Meeting." This meeting house survives (Fig. 199 and 200) and is located in the village of Quakertown, Hunderton County, approximately four miles west of Flemington, New Jersey.

Rahway

The first Rahway Meeting House was built in 1757.

Woodbridge Monthly Meeting, 20th 1st Month, 1757,

"Friends at Rahway have repeatedly made application to the monthly meeting for leave to build a meeting house at that place...it is referred to the Quarterly meeting..."

Woodbridge Monthly Meeting, 17th of 2nd, 1757,

"The Friends appointed to attend the Quarterly meeting of Shrewsbury have brought a paper from thence signed by the clerk which declare it to be the solid sence of that meeting that a meeting house aught to be built at Rahway...."

---

517 Matlack, 125.
518 Ibid., 126.
519 Woodbridge Monthly, 20th 1st month 1757.
520 Ibid., 17th of 2nd 1757.
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Figure 200
Quakertown Meeting House
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Woodbridge Monthly Meeting, 17th 3mo, 1757,

"The Friends appointed to size the meeting house at Rahway reporte they have considered it agreed that it shall be 34 foot long & 30 foot wide."\textsuperscript{521}

The Rahway Meeting House was expanded in order to accommodate the new Rahway and Plainfield Monthly Meeting and the Woodbridge Monthly Meeting.\textsuperscript{522} It was located on Main Street.\textsuperscript{523} W. Woodford Clayton stated that this first Rahway Meeting House was still standing at the time of the writing of his \textit{History of Union County N.J.} in 1882. He stated that the original building was abandoned in 1804 when the present meeting house was constructed. It was loaned to the First Methodist Society to hold services in before the erection of their Church. Afterwards it was home to George W. Hall's hardware store and it was afterwards the place of business of a Rahway Tea Merchant (1882).\textsuperscript{524}

The second Rahway Meeting House (Fig. 201) was located on Irving Street at the Head of Poplar and was a 50' x 35' two story frame structure built in 1804.\textsuperscript{525} Both meeting houses have since been demolished; the 1804 structure sold

\textsuperscript{521} \textit{Ibid.}, 17th 3mo 1757.

\textsuperscript{522} Woodbury Monthly, 16th 8mo 1769.

\textsuperscript{523} W. Woodford Clayton. \textit{History of Middlesex and Union Counties, New Jersey} (1882), 270-272.

\textsuperscript{524} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{525} Matlack, 609-610, and Clayton, 272.
in 1893 and demolished at that time.\textsuperscript{526}

\textbf{Rahway (Orthodox)}

The Rahway Orthodox Meeting of the Society of Friends first met in the local Friend’s school house. Then in private homes due to disturbances caused by the Hicksite faction.\textsuperscript{527} This changed in 1855.

"We of the committee appointed in 9mo 1853 to procure a lot and erect a suitable meeting house for the use of friends of Rahway and also to purchase a lot for a burial ground there now report that we purchased a lot on the east side of second street and between New Street and Milton Avenue in Lower Rahway in the 8th mo 1854 which cost one thousand + forty nine 35/100 dollars and erected a brick meeting house there on thirty two feet front by thirty eight feet deep, at a cost of two thousand eight hundred + thirty eight 17/100 Dollars including fencing, filling up lot, grading, paving, painting etc making the whole cost of ground and building Three thousand eight hundred & eighty seven 52/100 dollars. This house has been used by the meeting since first month 1855."\textsuperscript{528}

The meeting house (Fig. 202) was located on Irving between Lewis and Milton Avenues. Its upper story was occupied at the time of Clayton’s work by a school. It was demolished in 1922 and its bricks were reused in the construction of the Rahway Trust Company Building erected on

\textsuperscript{526} Matlack, 610.

\textsuperscript{527} Rahway and Plainfield Preparative, 17th 9th mo 1828.

\textsuperscript{528} Minutes of the Rahway Orthodox Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 15th of 10th mo. 1857.
the same site.\textsuperscript{529}

Randolph (Mendam)

16th 6mo, 1758,

"The Friends appointed to size the meetinghouse at Mendam and compute the cost reported that they think it proper it should be 26 foot wide + 25 long and that it will cost L 73 or something over that...James Brotherland & Jacob Laing appointed to take a deed for the land where the meeting house is to be built and to have the oversight of the building said house"\textsuperscript{530}

Matlack, quoted the date of this deed as 8mo, 5th 1758.\textsuperscript{531}

Thaddeus S. Kenderdine described the building’s interior in 1906,

"But the inside of the meeting house was a revelation to one curious of ancient architecture in its line, and suggestive of primitive ways of worship and of sacrifices to its accomplishment as well as a source of speculation to those interested in the claim that the society of Friends was the first to recognize the mutual rights of the sexes in meeting affairs, in view of the inequalities shown in the arrangements of the men’s and women’s ends of the building. the interior is 24 by 25 feet, the men’s part of the building, the greater portion, with its usual gallery, while on the other side of the partition the seats are all on one level, perhaps the only example of its kind. So despite George Fox’s promulgation of equal rights of the sexes in meeting affairs, the women of Randolf were placed in a lower plane than the men in the ways of worship and in the transaction of buisness. Every thing is of the simplest and rudest construction in the inside fittings. What are known as shutters

\textsuperscript{529} Matlack, 610-611, and Clayton, 272.

\textsuperscript{530} Woodbridge Monthly, 16th 6mo. 1758.

\textsuperscript{531} Matlack, 612.
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consist of two battered, horizontal doors, ten feet long and three feet high, each side of the middle doorway, and held in place with wooden buttons, while hanging from the overhead cross-beam are corresponding traps which swing down to meet the lower division. Between is a rude door with wooden latch and the conventional latch-string of our ancestral log house hanging from it...Underneath the floor at the east end was an excavation two feet deep and four by eight in area, in which we were told was once a flag stone, under which a fire from charcoal burned in winter weather. This was during the ten years after the meeting house was built; after this an iron furnace was introduced, made at the Hibernia foundry, five miles north of Dover... In 1845 a more modern stove was installed and in its covering of rust is there still...The men’s door was fronting the gallery while the women came through the doorway shown in the right side of the picture (a side entrance)."\(^{532}\)

This meeting house (Fig. 203) survives and has recently been renovated. It is located less than two miles south of Dover in Randolph Township, Morris County.

Shrewsbury

Shrewsbury is generally held to be the oldest Friends Meeting in New Jersey. It was established by a small number of Quakers who had migrated south from New England, especially Connecticut.\(^{533}\) The first mention of a meeting house erected here comes from none other than George Fox himself. Shrewsbury was the only New Jersey meeting in existence when George Fox travelled through this area in

\(^{532}\) Kenderdine, "Lundy’s Birthplace," 5-7.

\(^{533}\) Benjamin Olds. Historical Collections of the State of New Jersey (New Haven: John W. Barber and Henry Howe, 1861), 358.
1672.

"We got at length to Shrewsbury in East Jersey and on the First day of the Week had a precious meeting there; to which Friends and other People came far; and the Blessed presence of the Lord was with us. The Same week we had a men's and women's meeting out of most parts of New Jersey. They are building a meeting-place in the midst of them; and there is a monthly and general meeting set up which will be of great servis in those parts in keeping up the gospel..."\(^534\)

On the subject of the Shrewsbury Meeting House, The History of the New Jersey Coast in Three Centuries by William Nelson stated,

"At Shrewsbury the Trustees of the Friends Meeting purchased land in 1695, and erected a brick meeting-house which was occupied until 1816, and in 1817 another edifice was erected on an adjoining lot. The sect divided in 1827-8, the Hicksites came into possession of the meeting-house and lot and the branch survives. The orthodox became practically extinct..."\(^535\)

The minutes of the New Garden Monthly Meeting record the erection of a meeting house in Shrewsbury about 1721,

"It is recommended from ye last quarterly meeting that a free contribution be made towards defraying ye charge of building Friends meeting house at Shrewsbury it being a Large meeting house for to accommodate Friends at ye Yearly Meeting & other occasion all meetings so this meeting recommends
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it to each preparative meeting & other occasional meetings."\(^5\)

The surviving building (Fig. 204) is that same one erected in 1816 and is located on the north east corner of the intersection of Sycamore Ave. and Broad St. (Rt. 35).

Shrewsbury (Orthodox)

Sometime soon following the 1827 Separation, Shrewsbury Orthodox Quakers bought an old house, one formerly owned by George Lippincott who had previously used the building as a Tavern. In 1841, this house and its accompanying lot were sold in order to purchase a new lot and build a meeting house (Fig. 205).\(^5\) In 1848 the building was sold to Edward Vanuyem and later to Thaddeus Wilson. A new meeting house was then built on the west side of Broadway on a lot of ground "formerly owned by Benjamin Parker, Robert Parker, Seth Lippincott and Abigail Townsend and now quit claimed by Benjamin Parker."\(^5\) The lot containing a dwelling was divided in half, the dwelling house sold as such by Benjamin Parker and the other half of the lot sold to the Friends

\(^5\) Minutes of the New Garden Monthly Meeting (Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA), 9th, 10th mo. 1721.


\(^5\) Shrewsbury Orthodox Monthly, 5th mo 4th 1842.
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Meeting on which a new meeting house was erected.\textsuperscript{539}

The building was afterwards used as a school and later as the town library. About 1880 the building was moved to a site on Broad St. north of Sycamore Ave., and used as a library and dramatic hall and called Library Hall. Between 1908 and 1909 it served as the fire house. It was still later used as a garage by Mrs. Martin Marx. The building has been much modified, the front door boarded up and a door has been added on the south side of the building.\textsuperscript{540} This building does not survive.

Squan

Because of their remoteness from other Friends, Quakers living in the vicinity of Manasquan, N.J. were given liberty in 1706 of holding their own monthly meeting.\textsuperscript{541} Matlack believes that the first Squan Meeting House was erected in that same year. Quoting a caption found on a photograph in the assembly room of the 1884 Squan Meeting House (Fig. 206), he stated that the building as it was erected in 1706 was a large two story frame meeting house and that the original was blown down in a gale that occurred 9 mo. 1809 or 12. The building was reconstructed from the original

\begin{footnotes}
\item[539] Shrewsbury Orthodox Monthly, 2nd mo 8th 1843.
\item[540] Anderson and Newbury, 7, and Matlack, 619.
\item[541] Shrewsbury and Rahway Quarterly, 29th 8mo 1706.
\end{footnotes}
timbers but on a modified smaller one story plan.\footnote{542 Matlack, 621.}

A new building was constructed in 1886 (Fig. 207).

Friends Intelligencer, Seventh Mo. 31, 1886

"The Friends living in Squan, New Jersey, having completed their new meeting-house, invited their friends to join them in holding the first meeting in it on the 21 instant... the meeting at Squan, which is a branch of Shrewsbury Monthly Meeting, is one of our older meetings. The ancient building, which has been moved into an adjoining field was used as a meeting house for more than one hundred and fifty years. The worn and decrepit shingles that cover its sides and roof present a marked contrast to the neat and attractive building that takes its place. This contrast between the old and the new is emphasized when we compare the stiff benches and tiny windows of the one with the cheery and comfortable interior of the other.\footnote{543 (Untitled Article), Friends Intelligencer, Volume XLIII, Seventh Mo. 31, 1886, 485.}

The old building has since been removed. The rear annex to the present building was added about 1934.\footnote{544 Matlack, 621.} The house is located on Metting House Rd., bordering the Atlantic Ave. and Rt. 35 traffic circle.

Squankum

Franklin Ellis in History of Monmouth County 1885 states

"The Friends meeting house was built on lot of three fourths of an acre of land, sold for that purpose February 21, 1778, by Patterson Cook to George Parker, Obadiah Tilton, Britton White,
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Benjamin Corlies, trustees of Friends' Meeting. The old building stood on the opposite side of the Stream from the mill. The old burial place still remains. The meeting has long since gone down. A school-house was built there in 1839.\textsuperscript{545}

The location of the meeting house and its accompanying graveyard became the village graveyard.\textsuperscript{546}

The following deed, from the records of the New York Yearly Meeting, disputes the date given by Ellis.

"Nov. 20, 1785 Hugh Jackson to George Parker, Obadiah Tilton and Benjamin Corlies for 40 shillings 3/4 acre at a place called Squancome on North side of Manasquan River, east side of the road from Squancome bridge to Colt's neck. for a plat to erect a meeting house + burial ground."\textsuperscript{547}

Topanemus

Little is known about the Quaker Meeting of Topanemus. The following quotes are taken from Edwin Salter and George Beekman's work, "Old Times in Old Monmouth",

"Topanemus graveyard is about a mile west of the village of Marlborough. The lands of Hendrick E. Conover, of Freehold bound it on the north, east and south, and the Barricklo Farm on the west. It is on a high Knoll overlooking the surrounding country on every side. The Quaker meeting house stood on the northeast end. After the Quakers were

\textsuperscript{545} Ellis, 648.

\textsuperscript{546} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{547} John Cox, Jr, Compiler. Inventory of the Church Archives in New York City, Religious Society of Friends, A Catalogue of Records in Possession or relating to, the two New York Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends and Their subordinate meetings (The Historical Records Survey W.P.A., NYC, 1940), 60.
converted to Episcopacy by the renegade George Keith, it became the place of meeting for that sect, until the present church edifice in Freehold town was built. This was some time before the Revolution."548

Salter's work included the following extract from George Kieth's Journal,

"October 10, 1702- We went to the meeting of the Quakers at Toponemes in Freehold in East Jersey, who used to Keep a separate meeting from the other Quakers for their gross errors and joined with me and my friends in the separation about 1692."549

Woodbridge

The Woodbridge Meeting was first organized in 1686 and became a monthly meeting by 1689. The monthly meeting was discontinued in 1769 and the meeting was discontinued entirely in 1769.550

Land for the meeting house was obtained on the 14th day of the 2nd month, 1707. "On the north by a highway on ye west by land now in the possesion of Benjamin Dunham, on ye South and east by land of the said John Allen"551 "Building was commenced, twenty feet by thirty feet between ye cill and plate"552 A minute dated 15 10 mo 1709 called for

548 Salter, 238.
549 Ibid.
550 Matlack, 628.
551 Clayton, 575.
552 Ibid., 574.
William Robinson to get boards for the floor of the meeting house and to arrange for bricks for the chimney it also ordered Nathaniel Fitz Randolf to get Shingling nails, clapboards and nails. The meeting house was completed by the 16th of the 10th mo, 1713. The meeting property was sold, in 1784, after its 1769 discontinuance.

553 Woodbridge Monthly, 15 1o mo 1709.
554 Clayton, 575.
555 Matlack, 628.
Glossary

Taken in an abridged form from the "Guide to Geneological Research at Friends Historical Library," Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College.

Acknowledgement - A formal, written statement of apology by an offending member to the meeting for having acted in a manner contrary to the rules of discipline.

Birthright member - A person whose parents are both members of the Society of Friends, thus making the person a Friend from birth.

Convinced Friend - A person who is not a birthright Friend but who joins the Society.

Discipline - A book compiling rules of behavior for Friends bearing on all matters of church government such as qualification, description and transfer of membership; duties of ministers; methods of filing appeals; and attitudes toward marriage. Also refers in a more general way to the entire body of rules and tenants established by the various meetings which over the course of time have defined what it means to be a member of the Society of Friends.
Disownment – The involuntary termination of membership in a meeting when a member of a meeting acts contrary to established discipline. Reasons for disownment have changed over time, often reflecting contemporary societal mores.

Elders – A small group of men and women appointed to assist and also oversee the ministers.

Gurneyite Friends (also called "Evangelical Friends") – Following the teachings of English Quaker minister and reformer, John Joseph Gurney (1788 – 1847), Gurneyites were evangelical Quakers believing in the direct and immediate work of the Holy Spirit based on systematic study of the Scriptures and in the centrality to Christianity of the doctrine of atonement.

Half-Yearly Meeting – A meeting held twice a year, composed of monthly meetings within a geographical area, and with the responsibilities of a quarterly meeting.

Hicksite Friends – The Friends called "Hicksite," resulting from the Separation of 1827, placed special emphasis on the Inward Light, a divine spark within each person. They objected to creedal tests. Originally inspired by New York minister Elias Hicks (1748 – 1830), these Friends became increasingly liberal over the decades.
Indulged Meeting — A newly formed meeting for worship which requests and is granted the care and oversight of a local monthly meeting.

Monthly Meeting — The basic unit of Quaker administration, which holds regular monthly business meetings. Only Quakers could participate. It has responsibility for care of members, authorizes removals and marriages, maintains discipline, considers the queries, manages meeting property, fosters social concerns, and reports regularly to the Quarterly Meeting. Business meetings in theory are held in spirit of worship, and are so in effect meetings for worship for conducting business.

Orthodox Friends — Members of a branch of Quakers resulting from the Separation of 1827 who were evangelical and stressed the Jesus Christ of history and reliance on the Bible as the authoritative source of religious truth.

Overseer — A member of committee of overseers responsible for the welfare and discipline of members of the monthly meeting.

Particular Meeting — A formally-established meeting for worship under the care of the monthly meeting.
Preparative Meeting – A regularly-organized business meeting of a single congregation which prepared business to be presented to the monthly meeting. The cope of business as recorded in its minutes was normally limited to responses to queries and matters of property and school oversight. Most preparative meetings within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting have become monthly meetings or have been discontinued.

Quarterly Meeting – Meetings for business held four times per year, attended by representatives of all monthly meetings in a county or region. It is an intermediary between the monthly and yearly meeting, serves as an appellate body for disciplinary matters, and considers problems too large for a local meeting to solve. A quarterly meeting hold the authority to establish or discontinue a monthly, preparative, or particular meeting for worship. It collects financial assessments from each monthly meeting in accordance with the quota established by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.

Queries – A formal set of questions, first adopted by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1743 and revised periodically since then, which were to be answered in writing by preparative, monthly and quarterly meetings and reported to the yearly meeting. The queries concern conduct of individuals and practices of the meetings and provide one
means of assuring uniformity in discipline. Meetings of ministers and elders also responded to queries.

Removal - A certificate of removal is a document given to persons who are transferring their membership from one meeting to another. Their removal testifies that they are members in good standing with the meetings they leave.

Separation of 1827 - As a result of a schism among Quakers in 1827 in Philadelphia, two Philadelphia Yearly Meetings were formed which were called informally Hicksite or "Race Street" and Orthodox or "Arch Street."

Testimonies - Traditionally, Quakers developed a series of specific practices, often called testimonies which expressed ethical conduct of truthfulness, simplicity, equality, and peace. Testimonies include rejection of oaths, use of "thee" and "thou" in speech, plain dress, refusal to take off hats to social superiors, equality of men and women, opposition to slavery, and refusal to bear arms. Testimonies also can refer to official documents, frequently disownments and memorials, prepared by Quaker business meetings as part of what they considered witnessing to truth.

Traveling certificate or minute - A document issued by a meeting to a member in good standing (normally a recorded
...
minister), allowing him or her to travel to other meetings to visit or preach.

Wilburite Friends - Orthodox Quakers who identified with the prominent Rhode Island Quaker minister John Wilbur (1774 - 1856). Wilburites, sometimes called Conservative Friends, emphasized the plain life, separation from the world, strict enforcement of the discipline, guidance by the Inward Light, and close adherence to the writings of early Quakers. A major schism developed among Orthodox Quakers in the Midwest in the 1850's, but the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (Orthodox) maintained a fragile unity, despite tensions between a Wilburite majority and a Gurneyite minority.

Women's Meeting - Separate business meetings for women alongside the men's meetings were held by preparative, monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings. Women appointed representatives, communicated with other women's meetings, granted or received certificates of removal, approved marriages for women members. The men's meeting rarely overruled the women's meeting on removals, marriages or questions regarding matters of discipline. Women usually had to work with much smaller funds than men's meetings. Gradually, beginning late in the nineteenth century, men and women met jointly to conduct business.
Yearly Meeting - a large autonomous body of Quakers, which meets for several days once a year. In theory, its decisions are binding on the monthly and quarterly meetings within its jurisdiction and on the committees and staff which carry out the work of the yearly meeting. It meets annually to conduct business, formulate the discipline, receive reports and concerns from its constituent meetings, review the state of the society, and communicate with other yearly meetings and non-Quaker organizations.
Bibliography


Bacon, W. S. "Search of the Title of Friends Property in Greenwich, 8-8-12." Deeds, Greenwich Monthly Meeting Misc. Papers, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Bicentennial Anniversary of Friends Meeting House" *Woodbury Times,* Sept. 27, 1915, Pamphlet Group 1, Woodbury Monthly Meeting, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Burlington Friends Meeting House, The Old and the New High Street, Burlington. N.J." newspaper clipping, Pamphlet Group 1, Burlington Monthly Meeting, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Census of West Jersey, 1699" reprinted in New Jersey Archives, First Series, Vol 2, 305.


Conrow, Nathan H. Historical Sketches of Westfield Meeting and School.


--- "Sketch of Burlington Friends Meeting House." Typescript, Pamlet Group 1, Burlington Monthly Meeting, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

--- "The Story of Stony Brook Meeting House" Typescript, Pamlet Group 1, Burlington Monthly Meeting, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Deed from John Brainard and Elizabeth Brainard to John Comfort, Daniel Doughty Smith, Samuel Shenn, Samuel Allisson, Peter Ellis, Edward Black and John Hilter, Jan. 1, 1775." Mount Holly Deeds, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Deed from Ephraim Haines and Hannah his wilfe to Joshua Roberts, Jacob Hollingeade, James Cattle, 'Elders and Overseers of the Society or Congregation of Friends,' 12th mo 27, 1781." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Extracts of the Minutes of the Woodbury Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Friends in South Central New Jersey." Pamphlet.


--- "Notes on Quaker Meeting Houses." Typescript Manuscript. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

Medford Monthly Meeting Pamphlet File. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Minutes of the Alloways Creek Preparative Meeting, 1783-1841." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Burlington Hicksite Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.
"Minutes of the Burlington Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Burlington Orthodox Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Burlington Quarterly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Chester Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Chesterfield Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Chesterfield Orthodox Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the East Branch Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Evesham Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Evesham Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Great Egg Harbor and Cape May Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Great Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Greenwich Hicksite Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Greenwich Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Haddonfield Orthodox Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Haddonfield Quarterly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Kingwood Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.
"Minutes of the Little Egg Harbor Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Mount Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Mount Holly Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the New Garden Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Newton and Haddonfield Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Newton Hicksite Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Pilesgrove Hicksite Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Rahway and Plainfield Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Rahway and Plainfield Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Rahway Orthodox Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Salem Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Salem Orthodox Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Salem Quarterly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Shrewsbury and Rahway Quarterly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Shrewsbury Orthodox Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.
"Minutes of the Upper Evesham Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Upper Evesham Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Upper Penn's Neck Preparative Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Woodbridge Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Woodbury Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Minutes of the Woodstown Monthly Meeting." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Mooresetown, Hicksite Meeting House." Meeting House Photograph Collection, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Mount Holly Monthly Miscellaneous Meeting Records." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

"Mount Preparative Meeting Account Book, 1797-1882." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


Olds, Benjamin. Historical Collections of the State of New Jersey. New Haven: John W. Barber and Henry Howe, 1861.
null
"One Hundred Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union Street Friends Meeting House, 1814-1964, held Seventh Month eleventh, 1964, Medford N.J." Pamphlet Group 1, Medford Monthly Meeting, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Summary of Deeds on 107 W. Broadway, Salem N.J."
Typescript, prepared 1941.


Thomas, George E. "Disoriented and Contrary: Observations on Quaker Meeting Houses In the Eighteenth Century, March 15, 1985."


Trindell, Roger Thomas, "Historical Geography of Southern New Jersey As Related to its Colonial Ports," Dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1966.


(Untitled Article). Friends Intelligencer, Vol. XXIX, No. 20, 8mo 24, 1872.

(Untitled Article). Friends Intelligencer, 7th mo 31, 1886.


(Untitled Article). Upper Main Line News (N.D.), Swarthmore Pamphlet Collection, Greenwich Monthly Meeting, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


"Woodbury Preparative Meeting Account Book." Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.


Woody, Thomas. Quaker Education in New Jersey. 1923.
