UNITED BY WATER:
CABINETMAKING TRADITIONS IN THE DELAWARE RIVER VALLEY,
1670–1740

by

Jacquelann Grace Killian

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts in American Material Culture

Summer 2015

© 2015 Jacquelann Grace Killian
All Rights Reserved
UNITED BY WATER:
CABINETMAKING TRADITIONS IN THE DELAWARE RIVER VALLEY,
1670–1740

by

Jacquelann Grace Killian

Approved:

J. Ritchie Garrison, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of thesis on behalf of the Advisory Committee

Approved:

J. Ritchie Garrison, Ph.D.
Chair of the Winterthur Program in American Material Culture

Approved:

George H. Watson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved:

James G. Richards, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The spirit of research is enthusiastic, sharing, collaborative. At a Winterthur Furniture Forum in 2011, Linda Robertson presented me her spare copy of *Worldly Goods*, catalogue to the eponymous exhibition at the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1999. This gesture is exemplary of the generosity I found in all corners of Winterthur.

My interest in this subject began as a student at Pennsylvania State University working with Professor Emeritus Richard W. Pencek. For decades Dick introduced classes of undergraduates to decorative arts and historic preservation practice through his “Pennsylvania Decorative Arts” and “Pennsylvania Building Technologies” courses. With patient guidance and lively conversation, my thesis advisor Dr. J. Ritchie Garrison, Professor and Director of the Winterthur Program at the University of Delaware, thoughtfully engaged my questions and observations. He genially and steadfastly read numerous drafts as I struggled to articulate the implications of my findings. Thanks to Ritchie, I ask “so what?” He created an environment that fostered supportive interrogation of objects and theories. Our conversations frequently ended with the adage, “it’s complicated.” I am grateful for keeping that in my toolkit.

A number of individuals and organizations facilitated this research through their generous financial support. A Dewey Lee Curtis Summer Travel Research Grant given by the Decorative Arts Trust enabled my early travel research visits. I remain
grateful to the Trust’s Board and supporters for underwriting this research, and that of other young scholars. Continued financial support came from the Morrison & Fenella Heckscher Travel Fund, and Coco Kim Travel and Research Fund from the Academic Programs Department at Winterthur Museum. The continued generosity of Mrs. George M. Kaufman and the Kaufman Book Fund created a robust reference library, while WPEAC alumna Judith Livingston Loto enabled my purchasing with her shop’s student-friendly pricing.

I received limitless support from faculty, as well as current and former Museum staff and Program lecturers. I am indebted to Rosemary T. Krill, Wendy Cooper, Lisa Minardi, Mark Anderson, Stephanie Auffret, Gregory Landrey, Linda Eaton, Ann Wagner, Leslie Grigsby, Joshua Lane, Brock Jobe, Emily Guthrie, Jeanne Solensky, Lauri Perkins, Laura Parrish, Linda Martin-Schaff, and Richard McKinstry, Sarah Parks, Onie Rollins, Catharine Dann Roeber, Julia Hofer, Jim Schneck, Susan Newton, Charles Hummel, and Donald Fennimore. Independent historians Robert F. Trent and Philip Zimmerman shared their knowledge and observations, wisely and often humorously challenging my assumptions and those of our field generally. Furniture scholar Adam Bowett’s thoughtful conversations, swift, informative correspondence, and encouragement were (and remain) a great resource.

The specific evidence of this study will be of greatest interest to local scholars and collectors who are equally responsible for making this research possible. H. L. "Skip" Chalfant allowed me to impose on him and his family, and furthered that kindness by introducing me to pivotal people who opened their doors. Similar debts
of gratitude are owed to William K. du Pont, Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones, Thomas Musselman, Judy Doherty, Jay R. Stiefel, Esq., William and Susan Black, and Keith Adams. Each offered their knowledge, patience, and gracious hospitality at all times.

Curators and staff repeatedly made themselves, their collections, and files available to me. I’m especially grateful to Deborah Rebuck, Curator, and Christopher Storb, Project Conservator, of the Dietrich American Foundation. I am also grateful to the following professionals for their generosity: Patricia Kane, Jennifer Johnson and Eric Litke, Yale University Art Gallery; Peter Kenny, Co-President of the Classical American Homes Preservation Trust; Nicholas Vincent, The American Wing, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Alexandra Alevizatos Kirtley and Lucy Peterson, Philadelphia Museum of Art; Tara Gleason Chicirda, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; Ulysses G. Dietz, Dr. William Peniston, and Andrea Hagy, Newark Museum; Rebecca Wilson and John Haddock, Trinity Episcopal Parish and Old Swedes Foundation of DE, Inc., Wilmington; Stephen Ferguson, Princeton University Library; Anthony Shahan, Newlin Grist Mill; Todd Galle, Pennsbury Manor; Kelli Lucas Stewart, Skinner Auctions, Inc.; Maggie Brown Domont and Andrew Holter, Christie’s; Pat O’Donnell and Christopher Densmore, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College; Jeff Macechak and Lisa Fox-Pfeiffer, Burlington County Historical Society; Calvin Stevenson and other members of the Burlington Meeting of Friends; Nina Wallace and Dianne Snodgrass, Historical Society of Haddonfield; Gloucester County Historical Society; Allison Munsell, Albany Institute of History and Art; Bernadette Rogoff, Monmouth County Historical Association; Nicholas
Ciotola, The New Jersey State Museum; Laura Keim, Stenton and Wyck of Germantown; Amy Finkel, M. Finkel & Daughter, Philadelphia; Ron and Mimi Miller, Historic Natchez Foundation.

My WUDPAC and WPAMC classmates and alumni were my support network throughout the two years at Winterthur. Their quiet observation, occasional interventions, generosity, humor, and constant commiseration enriched what was already a transformative experience. I am humbled and grateful to be your colleague. You will always part of the fabric of my favorite experiences here, and I hope we reunite regularly to reminisce about life at the Ranch.

Finally, I dedicate this work to my parents and my brother with my gratitude for their trust that this bend in the road was the right one to take, and for supporting that wholeheartedly. Your patience and many sacrifices made this possible. Thank you.
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

LIST OF TABLES .................................................................................................................. viii
LIST OF FIGURES ................................................................................................................ ix
ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................ xix

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................... 1
2 ETHNICITY AND TRADITION .................................................................................. 39
3 MATERIALS ............................................................................................................... 85
4 APPLICATION ............................................................................................................ 122
5 CONCLUSION ............................................................................................................. 189

REFERENCES .................................................................................................................. 202

Appendix

A CRAFTSMEN ACTIVE IN NEW JERSEY PRIOR TO 1730 .......................... 219
B WILLS AND INVENTORIES .................................................................................... 259
C EXCERPTS FROM THE ACCOUNT BOOK OF JOHN TANTUM, 1701–08 ............... 278
D PATTERN BRICK HOUSES OF SALEM CO., NEW JERSEY ......................... 288
E SOCIETY OF FRIENDS MEETINGS IN NEW JERSEY ESTABLISHED PRIOR TO 1740 .............................................................. 290
F LOCATIONS OF SAWMILLS IN NEW JERSEY PRIOR TO 1750 ............... 294
G PERMISSIONS ............................................................................................................ 299
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1</td>
<td>Inventory of timber material itemized in the estate of William Till, joiner, 1711.</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2</td>
<td>Inventory of timber material itemized in the estate of Joseph Hibberd, 1737.</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.3</td>
<td>Inventory of timber material in the estate of Stacy Beaks, 1746.</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1</td>
<td>Common features of construction in casework examples attributed to John Head.</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2</td>
<td>Common features of construction in casework examples by William Beakes III.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3</td>
<td>Common features of construction in casework examples by unknown Delaware River Valley chest on chest maker.</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.1</td>
<td>Transcription of shop contents, will and inventory of Stacy Beaks.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 View of the Lower Trenton Bridge from U.S. Route 1, 2014 ....................... 1

Figure 1.2 Historical marker for the farmlands known as “Vriessendael”, Bergen County, established by David Pietersz DeVries ca. 1640 ..................................... 3

Figure 1.3 Map of the Delaware River Valley, with Delaware River and other major waterways delineated ................................................................. 5

Figure 1.4 Chest on chest, Delaware River Valley, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum 2009.0024. .......................................................... 9

Figure 1.5 Map illustrating geographic boundaries within the Delaware River Valley .................................................................................. 13

Figure 1.6 Map of New Jersey Statewide Rivers of the 3rd Order or Higher ............. 16

Figure 1.7 Diminutive chest of drawers with ‘Spanish’ feet, possibly Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1725–40. Winterthur Museum, 1960.0094. ............................................. 26

Figure 1.8 A Map of Maryland with the Delaware Counties and the Southern Part of New Jersey &c by T. Kitchin Geogr, London, 1757. Published in The London Magazine; or, The Gentleman’s monthly intelligencer (London: Printed for R. Baldwin, 1747–1783). Winterthur Museum, 1982.0309. .................................................. 36

Figure 2.1 Nova Belgica et Anglia Nova. Drawn by Willem Janszoon Blaeu (1596–1673) Lionel Pincus and Princess Firyal Map Division, The New York Public Library. .................................................... 45

Figure 2.2 A Mapp / of / New JARSEY / by / John Seller. Engraved by James Clerk, Published 1675(?). Winterthur Museum, 1964.0740. 47

Figure 2.2a Detail, Figure 2.2. “Modus muniendi / The manner of the Indian Fortifications / Town Houses and Dwelling places,” 1675. Winterthur Museum, 1964.740. ............................................. 48

Figure 2.3 Creeks and rivers of southeastern Pennsylvania, ca. 1693 ....................... 49
Figure 2.4  Kas. New York or vicinity, 1650–1700. Winterthur Museum, 1957.0087.001. ........................................................................................................52

Figure 2.5  Mench-Reall Log Cabin (demolished), Friesburg, Salem County, NJ, exterior view from the north. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS.................................................................54

Figure 2.5a  Detail, Figure 2.5. Corner joinery from Mench-Reall Log Cabin (demolished), Friesburg, Salem County, NJ. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS...............................................54

Figure 2.6  Map, Distribution of log houses in New Jersey, 1742–82 .......................55

Figure 2.7  Strong box, likely New Castle County, Delaware, before 1713. Possibly by Christian Joransson (Finnish, born New Castle County, DE). Old Swedes Foundation, Wilmington, Del.................................58

Figure 2.8  Sea chest. Dutch, 17th century. Albany Institute of History and Art, 1941.41. ..........................................................................................................................61

Figure 2.9  Jonathan Fairbanks House, 511 East Street, Dedham, Norfolk County, MA, ca. 1636 and later, view from southeast. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, HABS........................................................................62

Figure 2.9a  Detail, Figure 2.9. Beam ends and joists, west room north elevation, second floor, Jonathan Fairbanks House, 511 East Street, Dedham, Norfolk County, MA, ca. 1636 and later. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, HABS.........................................................63

Figure 2.10  South elevation facing Alloways Creek, Abel Nicholson House, Hancock’s Bridge, Salem County, NJ, ca. 1722 and later .........................64

Figure 2.11  View of pulpit and sounding board, Holy Trinity Church, Wilmington, DE.........................................................................................................................68

Figure 2.12  Details of pew and pulpit from northwest, Gloria Dei Church, 929 South Water Street, Philadelphia, PA. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, HABS........................................................................69

Figure 2.13  Sampler worked by Rebeccah Claypoole, Philadelphia, 1739. Miller Worley Collection. .................................................................70

Figure 2.14  Map of settlements of the New Jersey colony prior to 1680................73

Figure 2.15  Map of Friends’ Meetings established in New Jersey before 1740......77
Figure 3.1a  Map illustrating geographic boundaries within the Delaware River Valley. ................................................................. 88

Figure 3.1b  Detail, Figure 1.8. Cartouche from *A Map of / Maryland / with the / Delaware / Counties / and the / Southern Part of / New Jersey / &c / by T. Kitchin Geog*†,(published London, 1757). Winterthur Museum, 1983.0309. .............................................................................................. 94

Figure 3.2  USDA Species Distribution Map. Black walnut (*Juglans nigra*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 97

Figure 3.3  USDA Species Distribution Map. Southern yellow pine (*Pinus rigida* Mill.). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 98

Figure 3.4  USDA Species Distribution Map. Atlantic white cedar (*C. thyoides*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 98

Figure 3.5  USDA Species Distribution Map. Tulip poplar (tree) (*L. tulipfera* L.). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 99

Figure 3.6  USDA Species Distribution Map. Eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 99

Figure 3.7  USDA Species Distribution Map. Sweet gum or red gum (*L. styraciflua*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................. 100

Figure 3.8  USDA Species Distribution Map. Chestnut (*C. dentata*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 100

Figure 3.9  USDA Species Distribution Map. Red pine (*Pinus resinosa*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 101

Figure 3.10  USDA Species Distribution Map. Eastern redcedar (*Juniperus virginiana*). U. S. Department of Agriculture ................................................................. 101

Figure 3.11  Major rivers of New Jersey identified with geographic boundaries and saw mill locations active prior to 1750................................. 103

Figure 3.12  Stand of Atlantic white cedar trees in a New Jersey swamp. ............... 104

Figure 3.13  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of a cedar drawer bottom from chest on chest, Delaware River Valley, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. 105

Figure 3.14  Thomas Revell House, Burlington, New Jersey, ca. 1691 and later. .... 106
Figure 3.15  Detail, Figure 3.14. Roofing shingles, (likely replaced), 2014. .......... 106

Figure 4.1  High chest and dressing table, workshop of John Head (English, 1688–1754). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1726. Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1928-7-12, 1928-7-13. .................................................................................. 130

Figure 4.2  Dressing table, attributed to workshop of John Head (English, 1688–1754). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1719–37. Winterthur Museum, 1956.0038.143. ................................................................. 131

Figure 4.3  Chest of drawers, attributed to workshop of John Head (English, 1688–1754). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones. .................................................. 133

Figure 4.4  Chest of drawers, attributed to workshop of John Head (English, 1688–1754). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones. .................................................. 133

Figure 4.5  Detail, Figure 4.3. View of chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head, upper small drawer front dovetail joint with rabbeted bottom board visible. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones. .................................................. 134

Figure 4.6  Detail, Figure 4.4. View of chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head, upper small drawer front dovetail joint with rabbeted bottom board visible. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones. .................................................. 134

Figure 4.7  Detail, Figure 4.3. View of upper short drawer bottom from chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones.135

Figure 4.8  Detail, Figure 4.4. View of upper short drawer bottom from chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones.135

Figure 4.9  Detail, Figure 4.3. Upper short drawer at rear, seen in profile. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones 136

Figure 4.10  Detail, Figure 4.4 Upper short drawer at rear, seen in profile. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones 136
Figure 4.11  Detail, Figure 4.2. Dressing table attributed to workshop of John Head. Central drawer, view from rear. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1719–37. Winterthur Museum, 1956.0038.143. ................................................. 137

Figure 4.12 Detail, Figure 4.3. Upper short drawer, view of drawer interior with kerfing of drawer front. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones ............................................................ 138

Figure 4.13 Detail, Figure 4.4. Upper short drawer, view of drawer interior with kerfing of drawer front. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones ............................................................ 138

Figure 4.14 Detail, Figure 4.2. Proper right drawer, view of drawer interior with kerfing of drawer front on either side. Dressing table attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1719–37. Winterthur Museum, 1956.0038.143 ..................................................... 139

Figure 4.15 Detail, Figure 4.3. Upper short drawer, view of chalk mark on drawer back. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones ............................................................ 139

Figure 4.16 Detail, Figure 4.4. Upper short drawer, view of chalk mark on drawer back. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones ............................................................ 140

Figure 4.17 Detail, Figure 4.2. Dressing table attributed to workshop of John Head, proper left drawer, view of chalk mark on drawer back. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1719–37. Winterthur Museum, 1956.0038.143 ................................................................. 140

Figure 4.18 Detail, Figure 1.4. “Wedged pin”, a half-blind dovetail joint with small walnut splints hammered through pins (indicated here by red arrows). Drawer taken from chest on chest dated 1738, Delaware River Valley. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024 ..................................................... 142

Figure 4.19 Detail, Figure 4.22. Drawer interior, rear corner surface with red crayon numeral ‘4’ in the corners, noted by red arrows. Chest of drawers, ca. 1715. Made by William Beake III. Private collection ...... 144
Figure 4.20  Chest of drawers, signed by William Beake, also known as William Beakes III. Philadelphia or Burlington Co., NJ. 171[?]. Rocky Hill Collection  ................................................................. 147

Figure 4.21  Detail, Figure 4.20. Signature on chest of drawers in Rocky Hill Collection. Winterthur Library: Decorative Arts Photographic Collection, File #1971.147. ................................................................. 148

Figure 4.22  Chest of drawers, signed by William Beake, also known as William Beakes III. Philadelphia or Burlington Co., NJ, ca. 1715. Private collection ................................................................. 149

Figure 4.23  Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers in private collection, rear of case-width drawer with signature of William Beake: William / Beake in red crayon. Winterthur Library: Decorative Arts Photographic Collection, File #1978.877. ................................................................. 150

Figure 4.24  Chest of drawers, made by William Beake, also known as William Beakes III. Likely Burlington Co., NJ, ca. 1720. Dietrich American Foundation, 8.2.3.HRD.1811. ................................................................. 151

Figure 4.25  Detail, Figure 4.24. View of smaller drawer, bottom board exterior with graphite inscription (later strengthened with ink): Sarah Thorn her Draws / made by Wm Beakes this 14th of 12/mo 1720. Dietrich American Foundation, 8.2.3.HRD.1811 ................................................................. 152

Figure 4.26  Detail, Figure 4.20. View of smaller drawer interior, rear corner with inscribed ‘4’. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. Rocky Hill Collection ................................................................. 157

Figure 4.27  Detail, Figure 4.22. View of smaller drawer interior, rear corner with inscribed ‘4’. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. Private collection ................................................................. 157

Figure 4.28  Detail, Figure 4.24. View of smaller drawer interior, rear corner with inscribed ‘4’. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. Dietrich American Foundation, 8.2.3.HRD.1811 ................................................................. 158

Figure 4.29  Detail, Figure 4.20. Rear lower case rail interior surface with inscription in red crayon: Botom [sic]. Rocky Hill Collection ................................................................. 158

Figure 4.30  Detail, Figure 4.20. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III., view of half-blind dovetail joint, front of drawer, with wedges in pins where indicated with red arrows. Rocky Hill Collection ................................................................. 160
Figure 4.31  Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III., view of half-blind dovetail joint, front of drawer, with wedges in pins where indicated with red arrows. Private collection. ......................... 160

Figure 4.32  Detail, Figure 4.24. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III., view of half-blind dovetail joint, front of drawer, with wedges in pins where indicated with red arrows. Dietrich American Foundation ....... 160

Figures 4.33  Detail, Figure 4.20. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III. View of saw kerfs, front of smaller drawer seen from interior. Rocky Hill Collection. ................................................................. 161

Figure 4.34  Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III. View of saw kerfs, front of smaller drawer seen from interior. Private collection. ................................................................. 162

Figure 4.35  Detail, Figure 4.24. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III. View of saw kerfs, front of smaller drawer seen from interior. Dietrich American Foundation. ................................................................. 162

Figure 4.36  Detail, Figure 4.20. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. View of smaller drawers, underside of drawer bottom. Rocky Hill Collection. ................................................................. 163

Figure 4.37  Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. View of smaller drawers, underside of drawer bottom. Private collection. ................................................................. 163

Figure 4.38  Detail, Figure 4.24. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. View of smaller drawers, underside of drawer bottom. Dietrich American Foundation. ................................................................. 163

Figure 4.39  Detail, Figure 1.4. Board used for bottom of upper case of chest on chest, inscribed: 1738 x 3rd Mo (May 1738). Winterthur Musum, 2009.0024. ................................................................. 167

Figure 4.40  Chest on chest. Delaware River Valley, dated: 12th mo 1738/9 (February 1739). Private collection................................................................. 168

Figure 4.41  Detail, Figure 4.40. Inscription on drawer bottom. Chest on chest. Delaware River Valley, ca. 1739. Private collection............................ 169

Figure 4.42  Chest on chest. Delaware River Valley, ca. 1738. Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329................................................................. 170
Figure 4.43  Detail, Figure 1.4. Right rear foot, chest on chest dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. ............................................................ 171

Figure 4.44  Detail, Figure 4.42. Underside of chest on chest. Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329. .................................................. 171

Figure 4.45  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of drawer joinery with wedged pins. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024......................... 171

Figure 4.46  Detail, Figure 4.40. View of drawer joinery with wedged pins. Chest on chest, ca. 1739. Private collection. ...................................................... 172

Figure 4.47  Detail, Figure 4.42 View of drawer joinery with wedged pins. Chest on chest, ca. 1738. Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329.172

Figure 4.48  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of drawer interior with scribed lines and saw kerfs from cutting pins of dovetail joint. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024......................................................... 172

Figure 4.49  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of rear dovetail drawer joint. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. ..................................... 172

Figure 4.50  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of drawer bottom. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024..................................................... 172

Figure 4.51  Detail, Figure 4.40. View of drawer underside illustrating regular nailing patterns. Chest on chest, ca. 1739. Private collection. .............. 177

Figure 4.52  Detail, Figure 4.42. View of drawer underside illustrating regular nailing patterns. Chest on chest, ca. 1738. Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329...................................................... 177

Figure 4.53  Detail, Figure 1.4. Drawer bottom with scribe line used for laying out nails. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024.... 178

Figure 4.54  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of long drawer interior face with red crayon mark. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. ... 179

Figure 4.55  Detail, Figure 1.4. Interior proper right case surface with inscription in white chalk twice: Lower. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. ................................................................. 180

Figure 4.56  Detail, Figure 4.40. Red crayon inscription on interior of upper case to board: Inside. Chest on chest, dated: 12\textsuperscript{mo} 1738/9. Private collection... 180
Figure 4.57 Detail, Figure 1.4. Chalk mark in the form of the letter ‘E’ on exterior of case-width drawer. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. .......................................................... 181

Figure 4.58 Detail, Figure 1.4. View of underside of case-width drawer bottom, at rear edge, with intersection lines in red crayon. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. .......................................................... 181

Figure 4.59 High chest of drawers, Maidenhead (Lawrenceville), New Jersey, ca. 1740. Newark Museum, 63.27a, b ......................................................... 183

Figure 4.60 Detail, Figure 4.60. Chalk inscription and markings on rear of drawer back: x / End. High chest of drawers, New Jersey, ca. 1740. Newark Museum, 63.27a, b ......................................................... 183

Figure 4.61 Detail, Figure 1.4. Dated inscription on board with gouged channels made from tool. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. .......................................................... 185

Figure 4.62 Line drawing of a timber scribe or race knife dated 1774. ............... 185

Figure 5.1 Title page, mathematical notebook (1721–1722) belonging to Stacy Beaks (1705/6–1746). Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. ............... 198

Figure 5.2 “Plain Sailing”, from mathematical notebook (1721–1722) belonging to Stacy Beaks (1705/6–1746). Ink on laid paper (laid down), bound. Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. ........................................ 198

Figure C.1 Page 1, “The First of the 5th Month 1701.” Account book of John Tantum. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. ......................... 279


Figure C.3 Page ?, “Fransses Davenport work.” Account book of John Tantum. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. ......................... 282

Figure C.4 Page ?, “House building 15-00-00 / Work done for William Shatterthwaite.” Account book of John Tantum. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. ........................................ 284
Figure C.5  Page ?, “Worke for Thomas Folks.” Account book of John Tantum.
Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. ................................. 285
ABSTRACT

This thesis is a geographic and temporal case study of the carpentry and joinery trades present in the Delaware River Valley from the period of Anglo-European settlements in the 1660s to about 1740. This study closely examined the construction of and materials used in case furniture to ascertain shared characteristics that define work produced in New Jersey or Pennsylvania individually, or in the larger Delaware River Valley region as a whole. Within the sample, no characteristics were found to be distinct or determining features of furniture made in either colony in this time period, revealing the persistence of Anglo-European craft traditions in colonial America, and a relative stasis in internal casework construction, a result of the apprenticeship system. Deviations from typical construction or wood preference and placement speak to the hand of the individual and his culture of working unique to his ethnicity or that of his master.

The similarity of construction and material found in these objects indicates the shared cultural expectations of craftsmen and their patrons; they are illustrative of the craft tradition of a whole region, not of any one colony. This further suggests that extant furniture defined as made within Philadelphia or Pennsylvania without any further details of maker and place of manufacture could have been produced in New Jersey, or Chester and the Lower Counties (Delaware). Over two hundred and fifty members of New Jersey’s woodworking trades are identified by this study, illustrative
of that colony’s thriving craft culture that utilized material and interpersonal resources for success.

This examination of the region’s craft traditions emphasizes what its colonies share: patterns of settlement, ethnicity, kinship, religion, material richness, and commercial interdependence. Through cabinetmaking, the histories of New Jersey and Pennsylvania become that of two colonies—one region—united by water.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1910, the publicity committee of the Trenton, New Jersey Chamber of Commerce held a contest asking participants to devise a slogan that captured the city’s industrious nature. S. Roy Heath, a Trentonian and lumber merchant, crafted the winning slogan that has been visible to commuters by rail and automobile since its installation in 1911. The sign’s emphatic message has shimmered with sequins that adorned its block letters, later flashed at viewers with 2,400 electric light bulbs, and now glows in neon: ‘TRENTON MAKES, THE WORLD TAKES.’

(Figure 1.1)

Figure 1.1 View of the Lower Trenton Bridge from U.S. Route 1, 2014. By Famartin, Courtesy Wikimedia Commons.

---

1 Heath’s original slogan “The World Takes—Trenton Makes” was first installed by the R. C. Maxwell Sign Co. in 1911. The revised slogan was installed in 1917 when the sign was electrified, and a large, electrified American flag was incorporated into the sign. See Jon Blackwell/The Trentonian, “1911: ‘Trenton Makes’ History,” http://www.capitalcentury.com/1911.html, accessed 4/2/2014.
Trenton and central New Jersey are no longer hubs of industrial manufacturing as they once were in the nineteenth & twentieth centuries. Today’s viewers of the sign might be unaware of Trenton’s–and New Jersey’s–contribution to America’s industrial prowess since vestiges of its early infrastructure are rapidly disappearing.

Similarly, only isolated pockets of the material culture of New Jersey’s earliest inhabitants and their enterprising use of wood exist for historians to consider today. From these timber resources, New Jerseyans built ships for trade, constructed and heated homes and houses for worship, fueled furnaces, kilns and glassworks, and fashioned objects that held things used in daily life. To maintain the public’s awareness of its illustrious past (and to inspire preservation of what little remains), New Jersey towns like Bergen use historical markers as reminders of significant places in state history. (Figure 1.2) My goal for this thesis is similar: to remind present and future scholars to consider New Jersey’s early woodworking industry, its participants, and the role the colony and its people played in the regional economics and culture of the Delaware Valley.
In this thesis I argue that, prior to 1740, colonial New Jersey had an active woodworking population that adequately satisfied the demands of its residents for structures and goods. Over two hundred and fifty men have been identified as members of New Jersey’s woodworking trades in this period. (Appendix A.) Their occupations include sawyers, coopers, joiners, turners, millwrights, and carpenters, some who further specialized in shipbuilding or forge carpentry, two significant industries in early New Jersey. Individuals in southwestern New Jersey, makers and consumers, were also part of a region encompassing Philadelphia and southeastern Pennsylvania, and the three Lower Counties (Delaware) now known as the Delaware River Valley. (Figure 1.3) As early as 1680, an estimated 3,500 people lived in East Jersey (consisting of Shrewsbury, Middletown, Woodbridge, Elizabeth, Piscataway,
Twenty years later, a census of freeholders in the West Jersey province counted approximately 3,300 free, white, landowning males. Finally, by 1745, a census of the Eastern and Western Divisions of the colony counted over 61,000 inhabitants, including men, women, children under the age of 16, and enslaved peoples. At least 15,000 were white men over the age of 16.

---


3 Wacker, 1975, 131, quoting *New Jersey Archives*, 1st series, II, 305.

4 Wacker, 1975, 415. The Eastern Division consisted of Bergen, Essex, Middlesex, Monmouth and Somerset Counties; the Western Division: Morris, Hunterdon, Burlington, Gloucester, Salem, and Cape May.
Topographical permeability characterized the colony, allowing goods, people, and ideas to move freely via creeks and rivers that penetrated the hinterland. Those places that were spatially distant by land were efficiently navigable. Water-borne transit was often not linear, and the “urban-to-rural”, “hub-and-spoke” or “core-periphery” models scholars invoke to discuss movement of ideas and goods are ineffectual for understanding New Jersey’s early culture. Instead, hundreds of

---

waterways that branched off the Delaware River or Atlantic Ocean penetrated the hinterland deeply, connecting geographically remote communities to an intercoastal and transatlantic network. Waterways kept agriculturally and heavily forested areas of the colony linked to the market towns of Salem, Gloucester, Burlington, and Philadelphia in the early eighteenth century, while faith-based networks straddling the Delaware River promoted the exchange of goods, people, and ideas.

Carpenters lived in every town. To satisfy their clientele, many mastered a variety of carpentry forms from interior woodwork to making furniture and coffins. As Philip Zea succinctly stated, “fashion rode easily on the back of commerce.”6 Like makers in any region, carpenters, joiners, and other craftsmen worked in desirable styles with competitive prices; otherwise, they did not work at all. New Jerseyans who sought goods or craftsmen outside of their communities, particularly in Philadelphia or a market center with greater economic competition (and potential expense), made a conscious choice based on a discrete combination of social, cultural and commercial factors. Rather than considering such activity as a trend of the elite, scholars should closely examine the motives that drove those choices, and the networks of people and resources that made them possible.

Topographical and ecological advantages gave New Jersey craftsmen a diverse range of timber at their disposal. It was obtained locally through land clearance for plantations, or by way of trade with colonies on the lower rim of the Atlantic world.7


River transport and an early logging trade with Philadelphia brought New Jersey’s timber to that thriving commercial community, where it was milled and used within the market town or, for select species, re-exported further west to Chester County.

Craftsmen in Pennsylvania not only shared common materials with New Jerseyans, they emigrated from the same Anglo-European regions or cities, and many (but not all) were members of the radical Christian sect, the Quakers.8 Quakers were among the first landholders in the provinces of West Jersey and Pennsylvania, and consequently dictated the initial development and governance of both colonies. Within their faith was an internal hierarchy that spanned boundaries of town, county, and colony to reinforce social and commercial faith-based networks, including the system of apprenticeship. With a rigorous apprenticeship system, their native Anglo-European craft traditions persisted in the colonial Delaware River Valley, and often match the progression and timing of similar work in England.

Those first emigrants who established permanent settlements in New Jersey were demographically similar to those who later settled across the river in Penn’s

colony. Many were of lower or middling economic means, and survived as yeomen or artisans in trades. In each colony, these settlers joined Dutch, Swedes, Finns, and native populations who had already left their architectural and material imprint upon the landscape. Their interactions created a specifically regional hybridized European culture that differed from that of New York, New England, the Virginia Tidewater, and other Atlantic Rim colonies. In this frontier, they acculturated their craft traditions, augmenting them by using indigenous materials or adopting foreign techniques or technologies, like saw mills. Each group had enslaved labor, as well as indentured men and women who also came from all parts of the British colonies.

Given the relative homogeneity of populations across the Delaware River Valley, and the access of craftsmen to similar materials with comparable levels of training through apprenticeship, I argue that their material output was nearly identical across the region. A large body of unidentified and unattributed objects whose location of manufacture is unknown has been defined in public collections or in the marketplace as the product of Philadelphia artisans based on material and external characteristics. Without knowing an object’s maker or initial owner, one cannot confidently place an object’s manufacture within the boundaries of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or present-day Delaware. Wood use is an unreliable indicator of urban, localized cabinetmaking practices. Objects ascribed to Philadelphia manufacture that have no such distinct provenance could have been made in any of the three colonies. They are more accurately defined as products of the Delaware River Valley.

To understand the characteristics of objects made in the Delaware River Valley (a region defined by this study as south of the falls near Trenton, New Jersey to Cape May, New Jersey at the mouth of the Delaware Bay), this research examined over one
hundred objects likely made before 1750 that could be attributed to production in the region. The sample focused on casework only, like this representative example. (Figure 1.4)

Figure 1.4 Chest on chest, Delaware River Valley, 1738. Walnut, white oak, Atlantic white cedar, hard pine, brass. Dimensions: 69 ¼” x 41 ½” x 22 ¾”. Museum purchase with funds drawn from the Centenary Fund and acquired through the gift of Mrs. Waldron Phoenix Belknap, Winterthur Museum 2009.0024. Photo by author.

9 Origin in the Delaware River Valley means that the object’s owners lived in the region when it was made, or that the maker was living in the region at the time of its creation. In cases where no provenance or maker is known, regional production is ascribed when objects match all the following criteria: has a multi-generational family history of being made and used in the region before entering a public collection or marketplace; uses similar construction methods and dimensions as objects with known makers or confirmed origin in the region. As previously defined, “early” for the purpose of this study is prior to 1750, a decade in which Philadelphia gained a foothold on its title as most populous and prosperous city in the British colonies in the eighteenth century.

10 The survival of objects is so vast that a longer and more detailed survey should be made of all major national museum collections, and a systematic inquiry made to the Pennsylvania State Museum collections, and regional or local house museums and historical societies that could not be visited in the time frame for this study.
This object type was selected for the following reasons:

- Casework has specific construction requirements that allows for limited variation, namely in type of construction, choice of materials, their means of processing, orientation for use, and level of finish.
- Casework bears many marks of handwork that, when evaluated collectively, can be considered traits specific to a shop or maker. For example: length of dovetail overcuts and width of blade used to cut them, use of wedges or “keepers” in pins of joinery, refinement of dovetails, and so forth.
- Inscribed on many of these objects are systems of symbols or numerals (face marks) that track case and drawer components in sequences of assembly.
- Casework can provide a surface area large enough for inscriptions to be written by makers or owners.

A fraction of the objects studied retain such inscriptions with dates or initials of owners or makers that affirm their regional production. Corroborating documentary evidence affirms their manufacture to the geographic area that now constitutes the Delaware River Valley region.

The bulk of the objects surveyed, however, have no known maker or precise location of origin. The group can be defined, however, by similarity in case construction, drawer configuration and methods of joinery, wood usage and location of particular materials. These are characteristics of the region’s English-oriented craft
tradition, but there is sufficient variation in execution to identify many distinct cabinet shops at work. In this study, only five percent of the objects examined were clearly made in New Jersey based on supporting archival evidence. It is archival evidence, however, that testifies to the large presence of carpenters, joiners, and turners in New Jersey, whose work has been lost to time, or misidentified. From craftsmen’s inventories, we can regain an understanding of their position in their local and regional economy, assess the kinds of woodworking in which they engaged, and its scale. Wills and inventories re-establish the religious and social ties of kinship that linked craftsmen within their local communities, and to those across the river.

To assess the woodworking culture of the Delaware River Valley, we must define the region’s boundaries, and establish what geographical, topographical, and ecological features made it desirable as a land of new settlement in the seventeenth century. (refer to Figure 1.3) Writing about Quaker culture of the mid-Atlantic, historian Frederick B. Tolles said this of the Delaware River: “[it] united West Jersey, Philadelphia, and the Lower Counties (which eventually became the state of Delaware) into a single economic province, and linked it with the rest of the Atlantic community.”11 The river unified the lower valley, according to Tolles, yielding a “single ‘culture area.’” Peter O. Wacker’s Land and People: a Cultural Geography of Preindustrial New Jersey: Origins and Settlement (1975) stands as the best synthesis of state history and settlement dictated by New Jersey’s unique topography. His more recent collaborative effort with Maxine N. Lurie as editor of Mapping New Jersey: An Evolving Landscape (2009) illustrates the state’s geography, topography, ecology and

subsequent land use, all of which helped determine the timing, location, and sequence of New Jersey’s settlement.\textsuperscript{12}

The Delaware River flows south 419 miles from its source in the Catskill Mountains of New York State to the Delaware Bay near Cape May, New Jersey. (Figure 1.5) On this meandering journey, the river drops 880 feet in elevation before reaching sea level. An area known as “The Falls” adjacent to Trenton, New Jersey, has an eight-foot drop as the river traverses a geological meeting point, known as a “fall line”. There, the rolling, rich soil of the Piedmont Plateau to the west meets the flat, sandier soil of the Atlantic Coastal Plain to the east. The height of this drop, and that of other tributaries, was a source of power harnessed by early grist- and sawmill builders in the region.\textsuperscript{13} Ships could not navigate the river north of the falls, so it also created the northernmost boundary of English, river-based settlements in the seventeenth century. Overland or riverine routes that began at the Atlantic Coast or New York Harbor made settlement to the north of the falls possible, and groups of Dutch and Scottish settlers migrated south and west from New Amsterdam, Essex, and Middlesex Counties where they established farms in the fertile northern Delaware River Valley. Because of the falls, the upper and lower sections of the River were separated geographically as well as culturally, and land to the north of the falls was inhabited more sparsely than that below them.


\textsuperscript{13} Harry B Weiss, \textit{Early Sawmills of New Jersey} (Trenton, NJ: The New Jersey State Agricultural Society), 1968.
The presence of the Delaware River to the west and the Atlantic Ocean to the east creates the unique physiography of New Jersey and southeastern Pennsylvania in which farming and timber-based industries thrived. The Atlantic Coastal Plain covers nearly three-fifths of the landmass of the state, and roughly bisects it into western and eastern halves.\(^{14}\) This plain divides further into outer and inner sections, each with

topographical properties that facilitated the development of early agriculture and industries in the colony.

The Outer Plain is characterized by porous, sandy soils punctuated by large areas of marshes, bogs, and swampland where certain species of shrubs and conifers proliferate. These sandier soils were compositionally ideal for the glassmaker’s frit of silica sand, soda, and ground lime, and many glassworks were established in this geographic region. Notably in 1738 Caspar Wistar founded the United Glass Works in Alloways Creek, Salem County, where production of window plate- and table glassware flourished in the mid-eighteenth century.

Cranberry and blueberry harvesting is a contemporary industry in this southern region of New Jersey, where wetlands cover a good portion of the state’s interior. The headwaters of rivers and creeks contained vast acres of cedar and pine swamps. These dense forests of timber were harvested for use in shipbuilding, to fuel iron forges and blast furnaces, and to export for timber-frame structures. Cedar shingles, made by the tens of thousands, populate inventories of eighteenth-century New Jersey and


Philadelphia, attesting to the rapid growth of the trees, and an adequate industry present to cut and process them.17

The narrower Inner Coastal Plain’s soils contain a greater amount of clay near the surface, and proved to be excellent land for farming. This strip on the colony’s western border with the Delaware River was the site of settlements made first by Swedes, then Dutch, then later by English and Irish emigrants from the 1670s onward. Early promotional literature written about New Jersey and Pennsylvania meant for Irish and English immigrants from the Midlands and Northern Counties in that period emphasized the quantity of arable land and the variety of crops and tree species that grew plentifully.18 Rivers and creeks punctuate the western coast of New Jersey and were the “highways” by which timber, crops, and other goods were shipped to Philadelphia, and to points south in coast-wise trade.19 These rivers conditioned the development of early woodworking trades. (Figure 1.6)

17 The extensive inventory of Joseph Brown, Cohansey (later Greenwich), Salem County who died in 1711 includes two separate entries for shingles. The first, “a parcill (sic) of shingills (sic)” was valued at £32-16s; the second, at £27-10s. Winterthur Museum Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Ephemera, Col. 61, MS 55.21.2. See Appendix B. for transcription.


Scholarship about carpentry and joinery in colonial New Jersey (or the broader Delaware River Valley) intersects with various historical approaches. No one source exists that addresses New Jersey’s early material culture, so scholars must consult many sources to synthesize an understanding of social, political, and religious histories; material culture and cultural geography; industrial history; commercial and commodity history; forestry and ecological history; and object connoisseurship. Because few material culture historians have written about the colonial culture of the region as a whole, research included the work of scholars who addressed the history
and material culture of early Philadelphia, southeastern Pennsylvania, and Delaware.\textsuperscript{20} Objects produced and used by inhabitants in those areas are essential for understanding the regional material culture of which New Jersey was a part.

The earliest histories of New Jersey and Pennsylvania aimed for chronological accuracy, and their chronicles included the periods of seventeenth-century European contact and settlement. Thomas F. Gordon’s 1834 political and military history of New Jersey was more ambitious, starting with the first North American contact made by Europeans in the modern era, concluded at the signing of the federal Constitution. At roughly the same time, New Jersey native and antiquarian John Fanning Watson (1779–1860) wrote the \textit{Annals of Philadelphia} (1830) that recited stories taken from living residents who recalled the eighteenth-century past. Robert Vaux, vice-president of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (to which the publication was dedicated), endorsed Watson’s effort with the following: “…it is recommended to the patronage of those who feel an attachment to our city, and take an interest in its \textit{primitive} character.”\textsuperscript{21} Later scholars shared Vaux’s naïve characterization of early


Philadelphia’s colonial heritage. This perspective obscured historians’ understanding of the commercially advanced and complex city Philadelphia was, particularly as it related to the rest of the Delaware River Valley.\textsuperscript{22}

New Jersey historians, as represented by the New Jersey Historical Society (founded 1845), eagerly gathered all colonial records from New Jersey’s disparate founding towns to collate and reproduce them. In 1872, the forty-seven volume series \textit{New Jersey Archives: Documents Relating to the Colonial, Revolutionary, and post-Revolutionary History of the State of New Jersey} began publication.\textsuperscript{23} These transcribed volumes contain vital records, court cases, legislation, deeds, and probate records consulted extensively for this study. The initial publications chronicled the colony’s proprietary and legislative history, and were most valuable to political and legal historians. The New Jersey Historical Society abstracted wills and inventories from all counties in the state and published them beginning in 1901, encompassing a ninety-year period of New Jersey’s colonial and early republican history.

Commemorative events like centenaries drove further awareness of and appreciation for Philadelphia’s later colonial heritage, but marginalized the earlier period. With the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876, historians focused on Revolutionary War-era Philadelphia, mythologizing its prominent citizens and their artifacts. Through their writing and patronage, collectors, amateur scholars, and

\textsuperscript{22} Watson’s publication continued to influence other scholars and historians throughout the nineteenth century: it was expanded and republished twice in the next forty years.

\textsuperscript{23} An 1846 petition to the New Jersey State Legislature seeking help to that effect went unanswered until 1872 when publication began. The series’ formal title is: \textit{Documents Relating to the Colonial, Revolutionary and Post-Revolutionary History of the State of New Jersey} [Title varies]. \textit{Archives of the State of New Jersey}, 1st-2nd series. 47 vols. Newark, NJ, 1880–1949. Many of them are now digitized and searchable through the website Internet Archive (https://www.archive.org).
professional historians promoted prosperous Philadelphians that lived during the second half of the eighteenth century while unknowingly obscuring the objects and makers of the first seventy-five years of the colony’s history.

By contrast, Quaker historians like Albert Cook Myers (1874–1960), who dedicated his life to developing a greater understanding of the period of William Penn and his contemporaries, focused on primary sources. Like the New Jersey Archives series, Myers published edited transcriptions of primary source documents including journals and meeting records of the Society of Friends. Between 1902 and 1912, Myers published four books—three of which specifically addressed Pennsylvania and New Jersey prior to 1730: *Quaker Arrivals at Philadelphia, 1682–1750*, *Hannah Logan's Courtship* (from the diary of her future spouse, John Smith), *Sally Wister's Journal: a True Narrative; Being a Quaker Maiden's Account of Her Experiences with Officers of the Continental Army, 1777–1778*, and *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey and Delaware, 1630–1707*. These books remain essential to study of early English settlements in the Delaware River Valley.

Collectors and antiquarians were among the first to pass judgment on objects that would form a canon of American furniture worthy of scholarship and purchase. ²⁴

---

Books by Dr. Irving Lyon (*Colonial Furniture in New England*, 1889), Luke Vincent Lockwood (*Colonial Furniture*, first published 1901), and Wallace Nutting (*Furniture Treasury*, 1928) created an orientation toward early furniture that was New England-made. One notable exception to this was Lockwood’s publication, which illustrated a carved mahogany dressing table that bears the label for Philadelphia cabinet- and chair-maker William Savery (ca. 1722–1807).\(^{25}\) Labeled or signed objects were (and still are) the foundation for further comparison and attribution. One astonishing example of this occurred in 1919. Metropolitan Museum of Art curator R. T. H. Halsey proclaimed that cabinet-and chairmaker William Savery made all of the Chippendale-style Philadelphia furniture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s collections.\(^{26}\) An 1935 exhibit sponsored by the Philadelphia Museum of Art: the “Loan Exhibition of Authenticated Furniture of the Great Philadelphia Cabinetmakers” reinforced the significance placed by scholars and curators on marked and pedigreed objects was This Philadelphia-centered scholarship that began in the early twentieth century has persisted, distorting the significance of that city’s place within the region. These scholars’ comparisons and attributions relied mainly on superficial qualities (similarities in feet, finials, legs, or carved elements), favoring analysis of surface over construction. This skin-deep approach to object comparison has endured for the first half of the twentieth century.

---

\(^{25}\) This object is in the collection of Van Cortlandt House, a property of the Colonial Dames of America, located in Bronx, New York.

Through their acquisitions and exhibitions, museum curators, galleries, and collectors assessed objects through an art historical lens based on aesthetics, technical merit, as well as rarity and association with prominent figures in local and national histories.27 Their selections—and omissions—formed the basis of many major decorative arts collections, both public and private, in the first quarter of the twentieth century, and their verdicts dictated the trajectory of furniture scholarship. In 1924, the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art opened. In 1929, the New Jersey State Museum held a “Loan Exhibition of Early Domestic Furnishings” in honor of the 250th anniversary of the settlement of Trenton.28 R. T. H. Halsey’s proclamation, and those of others in the 1920s, sculpted a bias against those objects that were not labeled or marked, or lacked pedigree.

Early New Jersey-made furniture is not known because it has largely been removed from its original context, and very few marked or labeled pieces exist.29 A

27 Collectors include Howard Reifsnyder, Henry Francis du Pont, Mrs. J. Insley Blair, Miss Ima Hogg, Francis T. and Mabel Brady Garvan, Henry Ford, and John D. Rockefeller. Early dealers like Israel Sack, Bernard Ginsberg and John Levy, and Joseph Kindig, Jr. were among those quoted by Marion Carson as part of a “Twenties Dynasty” that funneled furniture onto the marketplace, or museum gallery platform. Carson in Blue Book, 1977: xxxv. Anderson Galleries in New York was also a source of furniture, including objects purportedly New Jersey-made. See Anderson Galleries, sale 1531, November 12–13, 1920, and sale 2300, part 3, December 7–8, 1928.

28 The New Jersey State Museum was founded in 1895 and their collections first encompassed archaeological, natural history and industrial history specimens found during a field study program they initiated. In 1929, they physically and thematically expanded their collecting focus to include decorative arts because of a desire to chronicle the state’s manufacture of ceramics. Furniture followed suit. See “History of the New Jersey State Museum, New Jersey State Museum website (http://www.state.nj.us/state/museum/dos_museum_history.html, accessed 4/1/2014).

29 It is important to note that furniture made in New Jersey after 1750 has not received adequate attention compared to Philadelphia or southeastern Pennsylvania furniture of the same period, but it is documented. Foremost among known makers are the Ware family of chair-makers, active from the late eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, and the Egerton family of the New Brunswick area, active in a comparable period. For additional makers across all furniture forms, see Margaret White, Early Furniture Made in New Jersey, 1690-1870 (Newark, NJ: The Newark Museum Association,
change in New Jersey’s cultural and demographic landscape in the nineteenth and
twentieth century has removed evidence from which we could understand the work of
early colonial craftsmen. With notable exceptions of elite housing in Burlington and
Salem Counties, as well as heavy timber frame houses in Cape May County, much of
the work of early carpenters and bricklayers in provincial West Jersey and colonial
New Jersey has been concealed by renovation or lost to demolition.30 Residents left
the region seeking land and greater economic prosperity in other parts of the United
States. At the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, Loyalists New Jerseyans obtained
land grants in the British territories of West Florida, or areas of the Louisiana
Territory, and likely took with them their heirlooms, or abandoned these artifacts
locally, dissociating them from family histories in the process.31 Such activities have

1958), and Thomas Smith Hopkins and Walter Scott Cox, Colonial Furniture of West New Jersey

30 A clutch of brick structures with patterned end walls or gables still stand in Burlington and Salem
Counties, and are part of a vernacular unique to the Quaker communities that thrived there. These
structures were expensive dwellings and not typical of vernacular housing in either area. For a
discussion of the meaning of these houses see: Michael J. Chiarappa, “The Social Context of
31-43; for documentation of surviving houses, see: Dr. George Walter Johnson, 27 in 76: Patterned-
Brick Houses of Salem County (Penssville, NJ: George Walter Johnson & Associated Printers Inc.,
1977), and Joseph S. Sickler, The Old Houses of Salem County, 2nd ed. (Salem, NJ: Sunbeam Publishing
Company, 1949); on the reasons for survival of these structures, see: “Mapping the Ancestral
Landscape,” in Gabrielle Lanier, The Delaware Valley in the Early Republic: Architecture, Landscape,
and Regional Identity (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004). On heavy timber frame
construction, a post-medieval English method used by early settlers to New England, and subsequently
to Flushing, LI and Salem County, see Joan Berkey, Early Architecture of Cape May County New
Jersey: The Heavy Timber Frame Legacy (Cape May County Courthouse, NJ: Cape May County
Historical and Genealogical Society, 2008).

31 Public vendues to resolve the debts of an estate were common in the eighteenth and nineteenth
centuries. The Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera contains a record of
such a vendue of Jonathan Hann (d. 1826), a farmer who lived in Bridgeton, NJ. See Doc. 328, Vendue
Jerseyans to North Carolina, see Ethel Stroupe, “Origins of the Jersey Settlement of Rowan County,
North Carolina: First Families of Jersey Settlement.” Reprinted from Rowan County Register 11, no. 1
left a void in the record of early New Jersey-made furniture. And those objects that persisted failed to pass connoisseurial benchmarks of finish, execution, or style and were relegated by early scholars to “the cruder sort,” neither worthy of collection nor scholarship.32 This scholarly myopia towards the early material culture of New Jersey has masked the reality that New Jersey craftsmen and their patrons were able to live and work effectively within their own local contexts.33 A few scholars have addressed the role of New Jersey-born cabinetmakers active in Philadelphia in their working careers, but unlike this study, their contributions focus on the later eighteenth century. And the perspective of urban modes of production again positions New Jerseyans’ efforts in the familiar philosophical bias towards cores and peripheries.34

William Macpherson Horner, Jr.’s *Blue Book of Philadelphia Furniture, 1682–1807* (1935) chronologically addresses 125 years of furniture production, and makes extensive use of primary source documents (void of citation, to the ire of decades of scholars). Horner scoured wills and inventories, and produced names and tantalizing bits of biographical information for over one hundred makers active in Philadelphia

---

32 “The cruder sort” was a phrase used by William Macpherson Horner.

33 Conversation with Dr. J. Ritchie Garrison, March 25, 2014.

prior to 1730. From those same documents, Horner extracted essential data about the contents of cabinetmakers’ and joiners’ shops, which is foundational for understanding the variety of woods used by urban craftsmen discussed in the materials chapter. Horner’s work proves that no single wood type was a hallmark of Philadelphia manufacture, as twentieth-century scholarship has often proclaimed. How different our understanding of furniture made in the Delaware River Valley would be if documentary evidence in New Jersey and Delaware had also received Horner’s systematic treatment.

Despite the Blue Book’s value, Horner’s work illustrated the binary views of chronologically labeled “vernacular” furniture and culture versus urbane furniture and polite sociability. The opening chapter (unfortunately titled) “Until Queen Anne” discusses furniture made roughly from the founding of the colony in 1682 to about 1740, while the balance of the text is devoted to furniture made from 1740 to 1807. This 1:10 ratio of pre-1740 : post-1740 period scholarship is an accurate reflection of the relative scholarly disinterest in earlier periods.

In a discussion of the Spanish foot as an example of hybridization between the “Until Queen Anne” and “Queen Anne” styles, Horner stated that the foot “is generally credited to South Jersey simply because it has been found there most frequently. That all were made in the one locality is, of course, an exaggeration.” To explain its presence in that locality (and exhibit an enduring bias), Horner noted “most of the prosperous districts, especially along the waterways…obtained their furniture

35 As I use it here, “vernacular” means “rural-made” or “of the cruder sort” (quoting Horner).

Horner further situates the presence of Philadelphia merchant Caspar Wistar’s Spanish-footed furniture in Salem County as an example of this migration and its potential influence on local cabinetmakers who produced a “cruder sort”.38 (Figure 1.7)

37 Horner, 1935, 39.

Horner’s treatment of work made prior to 1740 shaped twentieth century scholarship, and contributed to the relative disinterest among furniture historians in study of early furniture made in Philadelphia or elsewhere in the Delaware River Valley. Joe Kindig, Jr. in his introduction to the 1977 edition of *The Blue Book* noted

39 This diminutive chest of drawers with unusual, blocky Spanish feet is possibly related to a chest on chest with similar feet and attachment documented in Winterthur Museum Library’s Decorative Arts Photographic Collection (DAPC). See file 1969.3048. Local Delaware dealer David Hunt Stockwell owned that chest on chest when catalogued in DAPC in 1969. According to Stockwell, the chest on chest was made for the Wistar family of Grumblethorpe, owners of that Germantown villa in 1745. Stockwell believed Winterthur’s chest of drawers to be its mate, and thought the pair predated the building of Grumblethorpe. The chest on chest descended in the Baird-Wistar families, but its current whereabouts are not known. See also DAPC file 1964.1691.
that Horner’s work was beyond reproach: “… I questioned the thought that one could be so presumptuous as to believe they had the right to tamper in any small way with what I had come to know as the bible of Philadelphia furniture.” Kindig’s statement emphasized the prominent influence of this book twentieth-century scholars and its potential to influence future scholars, curators, dealers, and collectors. Horner’s preferences narrowed the furniture canon. Furniture made in New Jersey would not be a part of it.

Despite Horner’s influence, New Jerseyans at the local and state level promoted their history and culture, and generated publications about New Jersey-made (or New Jersey-used) artifacts. Centenaries like the commemoration of the settlement of Trenton and tercentenary of the naming of the colony yielded new historical texts and exhibition catalogues. The Historical Society of Haddonfield published the first standalone book on furniture (used and) made in colonial New Jersey: Colonial Furniture of West Jersey (1936). This exhibition was composed almost exclusively of furniture in identified collections, and mainly from families who were among the

40 Kindig, Jr. in Horner, Blue Book..., 1977: iii. While Horner’s imbalance in scholarly treatment of all Philadelphia furniture is striking and his work has frustrated innumerable scholars with his lack of footnote references to the abundant documentation he uncovered, the work is nonetheless significant. In many cases, Horner’s list of cabinetmakers, joiners, and carpenters active in this period is still exhaustive, and realiable. Horner can be used, but should be corroborated whenever possible by obtaining the original evidence Horner quotes. I am indebted to Alexandra Aleviatos Kirtley, Associate Curator of Decorative Arts at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, for our discussion of the finer points of this work.

earliest to settle in Haddonfield, like the Haddons, Estaughgs, and Hopkynses.\textsuperscript{42} Only three objects illustrated—a veneered chest on stand, double gateleg table, and joint stool—were likely made prior to 1740.\textsuperscript{43}

Later exhibitions that examined “the early arts” of New Jersey included glass and ceramics as well as furniture made in the state. Margaret White, curator of decorative arts at the Newark Museum in the 1950s, was responsible for “Early Furniture Made in New Jersey, 1690–1870” and wrote the companion catalogue illustrating furniture made and used throughout the state.\textsuperscript{44} This impressive endeavor remains the best survey of New Jersey cabinetmaking and furniture industry published to date. The catalogue includes an appendix of an astonishing one thousand furniture-makers in New Jersey, with those active after about 1770 present in greatest number.\textsuperscript{45} Finally in 1970, James R. Mitchell of The New Jersey State Museum curated

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Thomas Smith Hopkins and Walter Scott Cox, \textit{Colonial Furniture of West New Jersey} (Haddonfield, NJ: The Historical Society of Haddonfield, 1936; privately reprinted by C. Richard Becker, Shawnee Mission, KS: Inter-Collegiate Press, 1986). Haddonfield was part of the “London Tenth” settlement, established mainly by proprietors who were from London, and thus many emigrants to modern-day Haddonfield came from London, or lived there immediately prior to emigration in the 1680s. Families include: the Estaughgs,Hopkynses, Fostergs, Gillgs, Coopers, Satterthwaites, Woods, and Carpenters.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Unfortunately the current location of these objects is not known, and they have not been analyzed in person.
\item \textsuperscript{44} The Newark Museum, \textit{Early Furniture Made in New Jersey, 1690–1870} (Newark, NJ: The Newark Museum, 1959).
\item \textsuperscript{45} This likely reflects a bias toward surviving records and objects, since better recordkeeping and availability of those records likely enhanced the research White was able to complete in 1959 at the time of the exhibit.
\end{itemize}
“Furniture and Furnishings” from its collections and illustrated them in a thin volume published in conjunction with exhibit in 1970.46

Complementing object-based analysis by museums and historical societies, in the 1960s, husband-and-wife historians Harry and Grace Weiss published a valuable series of small texts about early New Jersey industries and craftsmanship based on documentary references. *Early Promotional Literature* identifies early texts advertising the colony’s benefits. Three books about brickmaking, saw mills, and timber industries illustrate the early and enduring role of New Jersey as a colony and state integral to regional and Atlantic World commerce through trade of abundant natural resources. *The Personal Estates of Farmers and Early Tradesmen*... illustrates the variety of trades active in early New Jersey’s commercial world, from upholsterers and tailors to brickmakers and carpenters. This 1971 survey of tradesmen’s estates in New Jersey prior to 1750 identified twenty-three carpenters and joiners active in Burlington. Thanks to digitization and indexing of documentary sources beyond vital records, this study has identified over forty carpenters and joiners operating in Burlington County prior to 1730 alone.

46 The majority of objects included are chairs, including rush-seated and Windsor varieties, as well as clocks and children’s seating. *Furniture and Furnishings from the Collection of the New Jersey State Museum*, (Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Museum, 1970). While furniture installations still exist at museums and historical societies around the state, this was the last exhibit that addressed New Jersey-made furniture exclusively, and for which an accompanying scholarly publication was produced that I could find to date. Other decorative arts exhibit catalogues which include furniture are: *Early Arts of New Jersey: Furniture, Pewter, Samplers, 1695–1840*, Organized by Carl M. Williams, New Jersey State Museum, 1952; *New Jersey Arts and Crafts: the Colonial Expression*, Monmouth Museum and Monmouth County Historical Association, 1972 (notable for often indicating region of origin as “Delaware Valley” vs. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or New Jersey when not known); *The Pulse of a People: A Royal Province, New Jersey: 1738–1776* organized by Suzanne Corlette, New Jersey State Museum, 1973. Also useful for illustrations of casework that housed New Jersey-made clocks is William E. Drost’s *Clocks and Watches of New Jersey* (Elizabeth, NJ: Engineering Publishers, 1966).
Isolated investigations of the material culture of greater Philadelphia and the Lower Counties of Delaware, particularly Chester County to the south and west of the city, have informed our understanding of craftsmen and their social and commercial networks in this same early colonial period. Margaret Schiffer and Dr. Lee Ellen Griffith published important contributions to the study of the material culture of this broad geographical area that serves as a counterpoint for other early studies of the region. In recent scholarship, curators at Winterthur Museum continued the regional conversation begun by Schiffer and Griffith decades earlier when they addressed furniture traditions and production in “Paint, Pattern and People: Furniture of Southeastern Pennsylvania, 1725–1850” (2011). This exhibition and catalogue focused localities of design and construction, and on the social networks that bound its residents. This work highlighted the diversity of people and decorative traditions that flourished beyond the “line and berry” floral inlay that most scholars associate with the area.


The material culture of the Delaware River Valley has been tightly focused on Philadelphia’s craft culture in the second half of the eighteenth century. Three unpublished theses by students in the Winterthur Program in Early American Culture, and contributions by some of their professors, ameliorate this imbalance by examining work and craftsmen prior to 1740. Essential for study of Delaware Valley furniture are theses by Ruth Matzkin (1959), Arthur W. Leibundguth (1964), and Cathryn J. McElroy (1970).\(^49\) Matzkin’s and McElroy’s work centers around documents and makers. Matzkin’s work employs statistical analysis to quantify furniture types found in Philadelphia inventories. It lacks analysis but is important for making available (since Horner’s publication) information extracted directly from primary source documents that inform us about the presence and use of furnishings in early Philadelphia. McElroy’s thesis, by comparison, is an exhaustive search into what was a fledgling area of study. McElroy took a typological approach in her analysis to identify characteristics of furniture unique to Philadelphia “and the surrounding area”. Like Horner, she isolated inventory and account records of carpenters, joiners, and

cabinetmakers to show the variety and breadth of their work at an early date.\textsuperscript{50} Her scholarship identified makers not previously known, and added a great deal of biographical information that illustrated the social and kinship connections between members of these trades. Further, McElroy identified stylistic and construction features she regularly observed in the objects examined that she felt indicated Philadelphia manufacture in this period. She cautioned scholars, too, that because the study of early regional furniture was in its infancy, “regional distinctions cannot yet be positively defined, or recounted in terms of exclusive absolutes.”\textsuperscript{51}

Winterthur Museum staff member and scholar Benno Forman devoted the later years of his career to study of furniture made prior to 1730, emphasizing the enduring presence of Anglo-European cabinetmaking and joinery traditions in the diaspora of colonial America. His scholarship was preoccupied with the identification and causes of regional variation in furniture forms created by the persistence of certain European traditions. His articles on the use of the chest of drawers in America focuses on those made in New England, but the conversations about typology, nomenclature, and construction are invaluable for studying any region’s early casework.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{50} McElroy, 1970, 113–121. See also Appendix II for a list of Philadelphia craftsmen McElroy identified.

\textsuperscript{51} McElroy, 1970, 103.

Many of Forman’s students perpetuated his exacting methodological approach to understanding early furniture manufacture and its regionalisms (or lack thereof). Foremost among them as it relates to scholarship of the Delaware Valley is Dr. Philip Zimmerman, whose articles in Winterthur Portfolio and The Magazine Antiques have presented some of most thorough scholarship about early furniture made in Philadelphia, and in the broader Delaware River Valley. Zimmerman’s study of the Wright’s Ferry mansion collection, and the collections of furniture at the New Castle Historical Society, Monmouth County Historical Association, and James Logan’s Germantown villa, Stenton, stand out for addressing locally made objects that survived in the region.53

More recent analyses of this region’s material culture continue to treat Pennsylvania or Philadelphia discrete from New Jersey and the Delaware River Valley region. They are valuable to this study, however, because they address this early period in the region’s craft history, and have yielded scholarship that will inform and provide a counterpoint to future research about New Jersey makers. Philadelphia Museum of Art’s Worldly Goods exhibition and catalogue (1999) was the most recent scholarship of early material culture made and used in greater Philadelphia since that institution’s publication Three Centuries of American Art (1976). Developing from his


research assistance with the *Worldly Goods* exhibition, Andrew Brunk published a family study of Philadelphia joiners Joseph, Josiah, and George Claypoole, a significant addition to Horner’s and McElroy’s work.\(^{54}\) In 1999, scholar Jay Robert Stiefel discovered the account book of John Head, an English joiner who immigrated to Philadelphia in 1717. Head’s account book is arguably the greatest contribution to our understanding of joinery and cabinetmaking culture in this early period in the Delaware River Valley as it documents thirty years of Head’s career in that growing town. Stiefel’s meticulous digestion and analysis of the record of this prolific urban shop resulted in the online publication “Philadelphia Cabinetmaking and Commerce, 1718–1753: The Account Book of John Head, Joiner” (2001). Stiefel published a subsequent article with two furniture conservators, Alan Andersen and Christopher Storb, who continue this research, contextualizing Head’s work with his Pennsylvania contemporaries.\(^{55}\) Current discourse about Delaware River Valley joinery and cabinetmaking continues to be made Philadelphians: Christopher Storb maintains the digital blog “In Proportion to the Trouble”.\(^{56}\) Philadelphia Museum of Art curator Alexandra Kirtley (with independent scholar James Gergat) published articles about


the possible origin and makers of a high chest and dressing table in that museum’s collections, to which Jay Stiefel authored a response that has continued the dialogue about research of these objects.57

To many furniture historians, the Delaware River is a boundary that bisects the region geographically, segregating it culturally. They have given little consideration to Philadelphia’s relationship with the colonial New Jersey market towns of Salem (1675), Burlington (1677), and Gloucester (1677), all of which were settled by
Quakers prior to Penn’s great experiment west of the Delaware. Many of these families intermarried with immigrants to Philadelphia in subsequent decades, enmeshing the region’s culture through kinship. (Figure 1.8) A map by Thomas Kitchin from the mid-1750s should remind scholars of Philadelphia’s proximity to and participation in early intercoastal colonial trade with New Jersey (and other colonies on the Atlantic rim), and those intricate commercial, social, and religious networks that spanned the river to make such trade possible.

This thesis aims to reunite the cultural and craft traditions of colonies on both sides of the Delaware River demonstrating that artisans existed in New Jersey, they supplied their local communities, and thrived parallel to and operated independent of their Philadelphia contemporaries. The chapter “Ethnicity and Tradition” addresses the ethnic diversity of the colony exhibited by architectural traditions in surviving structures or representations; the role of Quaker administration and politics to the success of carpenters and joiners in the colony’s early history; the significance of timing and sequence to the work of carpenters’ and joiners’, from seasonality to establishment of settlements and availability of work. The “Materials” chapter examines the historical ecology of New Jersey, arguing for its singularity compared to other colonies in the region. English philosophies of land clearance and timber’s material value, as well as discussion of methods of processing timber will reconnect the materials found in period inventories and furniture to their origins. This will underscore the ubiquity of certain cabinet woods in shops throughout the region due to the central role of New Jersey’s timber trade in regional furniture production. The

58 The dates provided are of Quaker settlement, not the formal founding dates of each location.
final chapter “Application” analyzes chests of drawers by three makers whose shops operated within and outside Philadelphia: John Head (1688–1754, active until 1747; born Suffolk, England, died Philadelphia, PA); William Beakes III. (1691–1761; born Falls, Bucks Co., died Upper Freehold, Monmouth Co., NJ), and an as-yet identified cabinetmaker in the region active in the 1730s. Detailed examination of construction techniques employed by each maker illustrates the high levels of consistency exhibited by a single maker or shop. These preferences or habits of construction provide further insight to a maker’s relative speed in their work or assembly, and allows for speculation about the possible pace of and demand upon a shop, as well as the maker or makers involved: his age and relative experience, and the tradition of training he received (English, Continental, etc.). It is also possible to speculate in such instances when economic forces of demand or seasonal rhythms of other work might be at play, which also informs us about the region or environment in which the craftsman works—urban or rural. Each maker’s advantages of training, origin, religious, and kinship networks explain their movement throughout the region and rates of success in particular locales. Concluding this study are appendices of select, transcribed regional wills and inventories of carpenters and joiners, locations and chronology of saw mills, a chronology of Quaker meetings established in New Jersey, and short biographies of identified craftsmen working in New Jersey prior to 1730.
Chapter 2
ETHNICITY AND TRADITION

Many factors encouraged the settlement and subsequent success of artisans in New Jersey. Enticing economic inducements advertised in promotional pamphlets and newly available land encouraged migration to the English provinces of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Favorable rates of pay and abundant need for tradespeople were motivating factors for immigration to the British colonies. Impoverished Quaker farmers and artisans from the Midlands, Yorkshire, and West Counties of England experienced economic sanctions and prison confinement for open practice of their religion in England in the 1660s and 1670s. With the necessities of labor and life attainable—and new rights to religious toleration established—carpenters and joiners from England, Ireland, and Scotland joined other Western European tradesmen destined for opportunity in the Delaware Valley. Upon arrival, they participated in ethnically diverse communities of Lenni Lenape peoples, Swedes, Finns, Dutch, Walloons, and German-speakers.59 Thanks in part to their faith’s organizational hierarchy, Quakers were especially adept at navigating the Delaware River Valley, finding that their faith-based networks gave them the ability to move and conduct business throughout the region. By 1700, Quaker carpenters and joiners were a dominant force in the West Jersey Province.

59 See Wacker, 1975, 57–119, Ch. 2 The Lenape and their Significance.
Woodworking needs in the region were abundant, and promotional literature identified both labor needs and economic benefits to settlement. Settlers needed skilled artisans to construct houses and furniture, ploughs, casks, crates, wagons, and ships that contained the tobacco, furs, and other goods produced by colonists for trade. An anonymous letter entitled “The Present State of the Colony of West-Jersey” (published 1681) enticed settlers to New Jersey, noting the improvements over the four short years since the first landings of English Quakers: “many persons… who have built some towns apt for trade, with convenient ports, where large ships of considerable burthen have already unloaded, especially at Burlington, situate about one hundred and fifty miles from the sea…” The letter apprised readers of the colony’s industrial potential, noting the woodworking trades active at that date: coopers, carpenters, wheelwrights, plow-wrights, millwrights, and ship-carpenters. Demand for members of these trades continued throughout the eighteenth century as the colonial population increased beyond the bounds of initial settlement.

Rates of pay as presented in promotional literature published before 1700 likely held the greatest promise of economic opportunity for immigrant woodworkers. Gabriel Thomas’s 1698 tract quantified laborers’ expected wages in Pennsylvania.62

60 This document is in the collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and has been reproduced in the Pennsylvania Museum Association Bulletin. The distance of Burlington on the Delaware River to the mouth of the Delaware Bay is actually only one hundred miles, not 150 as the letter states. See Albert Cook Myers, ed. Original Narratives of Early American History: Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, West New Jersey, and Delaware, 1630-1707 (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 191.

61 Myers, ed., 1912, 192.

62 Thomas’s account does not specifically identify Philadelphia as the location whose rates he quotes, but it seems logical to assume that rates in the city would be comparable to those in the immediate area, including across the river in Burlington. Thomas, a birthright Quaker from Monmouthshire in Wales, immigrated to Philadelphia in 1681. He lived in the Pennsylvania colony for fifteen years then returned
In his account, Thomas wrote “and for Carpenters, both house and ship, brick-layers, masons, either of these tradesmen, will get between five and six shillings every day constantly… Sawyers get between six and seven shillings the hundred for cutting of pine boards.” He further noted that the “gains and wages” of wheelwrights, millwrights, and joiners “are about the same proportion as the aforementioned trades in their advancements, as to what they have in England.” A 1683 account noted that ‘workmanship’ (hand-sawing) of boards in Amboy, New Jersey commanded “London price, or near upon, or sometimes more.”

Thomas also advertised benefits to settlement in the town of Burlington. Although he did not enumerate the specific wages of craftsmen, he noted “most sort of Trades-men whose wages are on the same foot with the Pennsilvanians (sic), and that ‘’Tis far cheaper living there for Eatables than here in England; and either Men or

to London in 1697 where he wrote and published accounts of his adopted colony and that of West Jersey. He was close to Penn but ended their friendship when he was passed over for the position of quit-rent collector of New Castle County. He returned to Philadelphia in 1706, and later died there in 1714. See Myers, 327–28. Penn noted in his 1681 promotional account of Pennsylvania that the labor of many craftsmen - including carpenters, masons, and shipwrights - was worth more in the new colony than in London at that time. Myers, 209.

63 This was also the rate of pay in Wilmington, as documented in a verbal contract made between Reverend Minister Erik Björk with Philadelphia sawyer Edward Smouth, who cut the boards for the Old Swedes’ Church at six shillings for each one hundred feet. Although the sawyers were from Philadelphia and were likely not receiving less than they would have by working in Wilmington, the author did not note the rate was higher than average, which implies parallel rates in these towns. For additional information about Björk, see Hans Ling, The Faces of New Sweden: Erik Björk, Christina Stalcop & America’s Frist Portrait Painter (Philadelphia, PA: Swedish Colonial Society, 2004). Björk and his wife were painted in the 1710s by fellow Swede Gustavus Hesselius, whose brother, Andreas Hesselius, was sent to Wilmington to replace Björk as the new minister of Holy Trinity Church.

64 Ibid., 327–28.

Women that have a trade, or are Labourers, can, if industrious, get three times the wages they commonly earn in England.” At approximately this same time, it seems that in the countryside of Burlington County, carpenters were paid less, though their work was steady. John Tantum, a carpenter active in the Chesterfield and Springfield (Nottingham) Townships, maintained an account book from 1701–07. (See Appendix C.) Entries for work in his day book range between 2 ½ to 4 shillings per day, reflecting either the variable intensity or complexity of the work, or the work of various skill levels—apprentice to journeyman to master. Entries for the most extensive jobs did not specify the type of carpentry completed, but most jobs averaged at least one hundred days. Local Quaker Thomas Lambert’s account was billed for approximately 180 days of work.

Agricultural commodities were important in the earliest years of settlement. Gristmills—the “necessary appendage” to any settlement—were erected immediately; millers and millwrights contributed essential knowledge to any newly established community. Flour and cornmeal were principal commodities in the Delaware Valley, 

66 This quote is contained in Thomas’s 1698 tract, “An Historical and Geographical Account of the Province and Country of West-New-Jersey in America,” reprinted in Myers, pp. 346–50.

67 Friends Historical Library, Records of Chesterfield Monthly Meeting (Crosswicks, NJ), Account Book, 1701-1708. RG2/Ph/C47 5.1. Tantum’s name is inscribed two different places on the cover of this account book, and in 1706 he was given the contract for the carpentry of the Chesterfield/Crosswicks meetinghouse. See Joseph S. Middleton, “Friends and Their Meeting-Houses at Crosswicks, New Jersey,” in The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 27: 3 (1903): 340–345. Most of the clients named in the account book can be identified as members of the Crosswicks/Chesterfield Meeting.

68 John Leander Bishop & William Troxell, A History of American Manufactures, from 1608 to 1860..., vol. 1. (Philadelphia, PA: Edward Young & Co., 1866), 104. Bishop and Troxell’s reference discusses the early presence of saw milling in colonial America. “The saw and grist mill is so necessary an appendage to new towns, and the employment for them so limited in sparse populations, that it was customary for the towns to make grants of peculiar or exclusive privileges, and donations of land, to persons willing to risk the expense of their erection."
and almost every town had at least one mill for processing the acres of wheat and corn found in the inventories of many plantation owners in New Jersey. As the economies of these colonies stabilized and agricultural production thrived, surplus foodstuffs were brought to urban markets. They were shipped via intercoastal trade to colonies to the south, including the Caribbean, incorporating the whole of the Atlantic World into a region of commerce and communication.

Like millwrights, carpenters and joiners also served an immediate need. Houses, barns, outbuildings, and places of worship, were initially—and continued—to be timber-framed or, if built of brick, had their interiors fit with woodwork. After gristmills were erected, sawmills quickly followed. New settlers in West Jersey needed carpenters as well as joiners to provide them with furniture for beds, chests to hold textiles, boxes for valuables, tables and chairs for working and dining.

Quaker immigrants arriving in the 1670s and 1680s immediately experienced a sparsely settled but culturally diverse landscape produced by successive settlement attempts by Scandinavian and Dutch predecessors. Swedes, Finns, Dutch, Walloons, Saxons, and native populations were still actively engaged in farming, trade, and craft in the region. In addition to native Anglo migrants, English Congregationalists from the New Haven and Massachusetts colonies further diversified local culture by

69 Inventories frequently specified both foodstuffs stored in the garret or cellar, and further delineated and valued the crops planted.

70 Many Finns whose homes were destroyed in the Thirty Years’ War relocated to Sweden, and emigrated from there to the Fort Cristina, built in 1638 by the efforts of Peter Minuit. Craig’s important genealogical work reveals the names of many Finns still living in the area in 1671 and 1693 captured during regional censuses.
contribute their construction and material traditions while “planting” the land. While many groups—English and non-English—desired homogenous communities of their own design, for many immigrants it was simpler to establish themselves in existing settlements. English and European settlers utilized land clearance and trails established by native populations a century earlier. No architectural evidence survives to help us understand their dwellings or fortifications, but early maps locate their settlements and prompt speculation about their village structure and dwellings.

The account of Quaker minister George Fox’s travel through America in 1671–73 chronicles his journey across the future West Jersey Province. Beginning in New Castle (which he characterized as a “Dutch town”), Fox and his party traveled to the fledgling English community Middletown (later Monmouth Co., New Jersey) on the Atlantic Coast. The group followed native paths, and on more than one occasion
native leaders hosted them overnight. Fox defined the Indian settlements “towns”.

72 (Figure 2.1) Willem Janszoon Blaeu’s *Nova Belgica et Nova Anglia* map (Amsterdam, 1635) illustrates the Delaware River Valley with various Lenni Lenape tribes noted. The upper right corner of the map illustrates representative, temporary dwellings of native Mohicans (*modus muniendi apud Mahikanenses*) made of twigs or branches, central in plan without visible window openings, and an oculus or opening in the center of an arched roof.

John Seller’s and James Clerk’s map of New Jersey repeats Blaue’s illustration of native dwellings and a settlement. (Figure 2.2) The map’s upper section illustrates the Delaware River and its affiliated creeks and rivers with round-arched dwellings symbolizing native settlements. These areas populated by native settlement were located along the Prince Maurice River (Maurice River), Kahansirk (Cohansey) River, Timber Creek, and Mantua Creek in southern New Jersey. Dutch, Swedish, and later English immigrants to the region also chose land adjacent to these creeks for their initial settlement attempts as well. The lower section of the map also illustrates *Indian canoos* [sic], demonstrating the hollowed out tree trunks used as vessels by native tribes. Immigrant settlers quickly adopted these and constructed flat-bottom ferries for their travel across the Delaware and through New Jersey’s waterways.

Figure 2.2  *A Mapp of New JARSEY* by John Seller. Engraved by James Clerk, Published 1675(?). Engraving with brush and watercolor on laid paper. 452 mm x 552 mm (overall). Winterthur Museum, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont 1964.0740.
Most work by Dutch and Swedish carpenters and joiners has been lost over time, and it is not possible to confidently identify how craftsmen from Dutch, Swedo-Finn, or English settlements may have interacted. Each community’s traditions embodied by extant examples of their architectural traditions illustrate the region’s ethnic complexity. The cases presented in this section illustrate aspects of blending and mobility that characterized the region prior to 1730.
In 1626, Dutch traders established Fort Nassau (present-day Gloucester, NJ) along with smaller settlements in Salem County, NJ on the east side of the river and at the Schuylkill River extending from the west bank of the Delaware River (known by the Dutch as the South River). Hewn, timber-frame farmhouses that survive in the Hudson River Valley and in the Netherlandish provinces were likely also built in the lower parts of New Netherlands in present day Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New
Jersey. Although Swedes, and then English, thwarted their settlement attempts in the lower Delaware River Valley, the Dutch continued trading and occupying the region to the end of the eighteenth century. Intermarriage between English and Dutch immigrants yielded ethnically blended households, as attested by an inventory of the estate of Englishman Captain Andrew Carr taken at his home in Tinaconk (Tinicum Island) in 1673. In 1666, Carr married a Dutch widow, and this inventory taken by English-speakers identifies the ethnically diverse material landscape in which he lived:

“1 Dutch plow with 2 Coulters, and one plow chain…2 Sweed’s plow Irons… 2 Old Sweeds axes…1 Dutch scythe… 1 Sweeds Jack with spit…1 great press stand in the Chamber… 1 little hanging Cupboard in the Chamber.”

The large case piece in the chamber itemized in Carr’s inventory—“1 great press stand in the chamber”—is possibly a kas, a large, architectonic, joined wardrobe or cupboard commonly used in Dutch households.


74 Carr married Margaretha Persijn, widow of Joost de la Grange. The inventory was taken by four men, at least one of whom was Dutch, while the other three seem to be English, and the estate valuation was made in guilders (2145 Gl.), and also in sterling (£214-10s.). Joost de la Grange and his family immigrated to New Sweden in 1662. That same year, de la Grange purchased Tinicum Island for 6,000 guilders. See Craig & Williams, eds., 2006, 37, 40–43, 61–63.

75 Margaretha Persijn Carr had died by the time the inventory was made, and it is possible that her furniture was bequeathed to children or descendants. Her will was not examined. On kasten see: Peter M. Kenny, American Kasten: the Dutch-style Cupboards of New York and New Jersey, 1650-1800 (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1991); Roderic H. Blackburn and Ruth Piwonka, Remembrance of Patria: Dutch Arts and Culture in Colonial America, 1609–1776 (New York:
these forms was similar to the joinery used for paneled interior woodwork, and carpenters or joiners could have made objects like these. These forms were sometimes simply paneled, elaborately adorned with applied moldings and bosses, or painted with trompe l’oeil decoration, many examples of these objects (as well as other examples of Dutch colonial culture) survive from New Netherlands’ settlements in the lower Hudson River Valley and New Amsterdam. Although they were common forms in Dutch households and might have been made and used in settlements in western New Jersey and Delaware, there are no surviving examples known whose production or history of ownership can be attributed to the lower Delaware River Valley in this time period.76

Produced by the Publishing Center for Cultural Resources for the Albany Institute of History and Art, 1988). I am grateful to Dr. Garrison for pointing out the nuance of language between the inventory taker (who was likely English-speaking) and the original user of the items inventoried (whose native language was Dutch).

76 The Monmouth County Historical Association collection in Freehold, NJ owns a kas signed by New Brunswick, NJ maker Matthew Egerton, Jr. made in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. See Kenny, American Kasten, p. 20, fig. 19. Egerton’s ethnicity is typical of Anglo-Dutch blending found in New Jersey’s northern and central counties: Egerton’s father was English while his mother was of Dutch descent, and the family attended the Dutch Reformed Church. This is Egerton’s only known example of a kas.
The New Sweden colony (1638–55) covered roughly the same region as the Lower Delaware River Valley identified by this study. Over eleven successful voyages nearly 600 people arrived in the colony. By 1693 when the Swedish Lutheran church canvassed the former colony, they found over one thousand congregants living on both sides of the Delaware. The Swedes erected a variety of structures: forts for military protection, as well as churches, mills, and dwellings that accommodated the housing and worship needs of those working in tobacco cultivation, or administering

---

77 The lower section of the case below the moulding is a restoration completed by Winterthur Museum conservation staff not long after the Museum purchased the kas, therefore dimensions are not accurate to the original height of the kas.

78 Craig, 1993, 18. The census was conducted so Swedes in Fort Christina (Wilmington) could levy their petition to Sweden for a new minister and religious texts to be sent to the congregations. An answer came in about 1697 in the form of Pastor Erik Björk.
the colony. Swedes were experienced timber harvesters and forestry managers: their log structures populated the east and west sides of the river, and this form persisted well into the eighteenth century.

Log construction, a building tradition common to Scandinavia, was used throughout the Delaware Valley. Dutchman Jasper Danckaerts defined the ‘Swedish mode’ in his 1678 description of a house he saw near “Borlington” (Burlington, NJ): “being nothing else than entire trees, split through the middle or squared out of the rough, and placed in the form of a square, upon each other… the ends of these timbers are let into each other, about a foot from the ends, half of one into the other.”

Danckaerts’ description notes the dovetailed ends of the logs that extended out from the corner, typical of Swedish vernacular construction seen in the Mench-Reall House, Salem County, NJ, now demolished. (Figures 2.5 and 2.5a)

---


80 Danckaerts’ words.


82 Although this building was possibly constructed in the eighteenth century according to architectural historians of the Historic American Buildings Survey who surveyed it, the open-ended timbers of the corners are consistent with earlier construction noted by Danckaerts. The house was located near the intersections of State Routes 672, 635 and Beal Road in Salem County, NJ, likely in or near the present town of Elmer, near Friesburg. See records for HABS-NJ-262C, Mench-Reall House, surveyed ca. 1938.
Figure 2.5  Mench-Reall Log Cabin (demolished), Friesburg, Salem County, NJ, exterior view from the north. Photograph by Nathaniel R. Ewan, May 9, 1936. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS, reproduction number NJ, 17-FRIBU.V,1—1.

Figure 2.5a  Detail, corner joinery from Mench-Reall Log Cabin (demolished), Friesburg, Salem County, NJ. Photograph by Nathaniel R. Ewan, May 9, 1936. Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS, reproduction number HABS NJ, 17-FRIBU.V,1—2.
Figure 2.6  Map, Distribution of log houses in New Jersey, 1742–82. After Peter Wacker & Roger Trindell, “The Log House in New Jersey: Its Origins and Diffusions,” *Keystone Folklore Quarterly* 13: 4 (Winter, 1969), 249. Illustration by author.\(^{83}\)

\(^{83}\) Trindell and Wacker obtained their data from the New Jersey State Archives.
Swedo-Finn and Germanic populations in New Jersey existed in higher concentration in towns along the Delaware River, particularly in Salem and Hunterdon Counties, where they continued to use log construction well into the late eighteenth century. Despite the presence of other traditions—timber framing and brick masonry—used in the region in the early eighteenth century, log construction was specified for two Swedish Lutheran churches built in Salem County. In 1714, the construction of the church at Penn’s Neck was entrusted to carpenter Regner von Aist, while in 1720, the congregation engaged carpenters Henric von Numan and Abraham Savoj to “form or fit the logs which had been cut the preceding May” for a parsonage. These buildings recalled earlier log churches built in the seventeenth century in the New Sweden colony at Crane Hook (Wilmington) and Wicaco.


85 Wacker and Trindell theorize that German Lutherans who emigrated from Pennsylvania were attracted to the Swedish Lutheran community and its openness to German congregants, as a German burial ground at the Penn’s Neck Church existed in 1714. Wacker & Trindell, 252.

86 Wacker & Trindell, 252, FN 14-15. The authors note that von Aist is a German, and speculate von Numan was also German, while Savoj was a Swedo-Finn. Abraham Savoy died at Penn’s Neck in 1727 and the contents of his estate contained “a Swed Bbl & salm Book 12 s”, lending credibility that if this is the same man as Abraham Savoj, he was of Swedish or Finnish descent. See Nelson, NJCW I., 403. Regner von Aist might be Ranier van Hist (Rennere van Hyst or Ranier Vanhist), called a yeoman of Salem County when he died testate in 1747. See Nelson, NJCW II., 499. See also Appendix A.
(Philadelphia). Each of these congregations had members that spanned the Delaware River at the time of English settlement in the 1680s.\(^{87}\)

Governmental records for the Swedish colony identify carpenters present in the colony.\(^{88}\) In his 1644 report to the Noble West India Company in Sweden, Governor Johan Printz enumerated the colony’s occupants, including three carpenters living at Fort Christina (present-day Wilmington): Anders the Carpenter, Claas Claasonn, and Tommas the Carpenter.\(^{89}\) In a 1671 census of the Delaware conducted on behalf of James, Duke of York, Dutchman Jan Harmansen (d. 1693), a carpenter by trade, was recorded living in New Castle along with several other Swedish craftsmen.\(^{90}\) Given the ease of mobility via waterways in the southernmost section of the Delaware River, and reach of the New Sweden colony, it is possible any of these men worked at settlements across the Delaware. With further scrutiny of period documents, like land

\(^{87}\) The Wicaco church was built in 1677, and stood where the Gloria Dei Church now stands. The Crane Hook congregation began worship in 1664, although their log structure was not completed until 1667. See Craig, 1993, 25, 90, and Watson, 147–48.

\(^{88}\) Thomas Paschall writing in 1683 noted the sawing prowess of Swedes in the Kingsessing area southwest of Philadelphia adjacent to his plantation.

\(^{89}\) “Anders the Carpenter” was noted not for his carpentry, but for laboring to plant tobacco for the colony on the plantation at Christina. Claasonn and “Tommas the Carpenter” were noted as “carpenters on the island”, and thus we should assume they were specifically engaged in carpentry. Bartlett and Jameson, eds., (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1913): 110–11. Also specified were two cooperers, presumably, who made tobacco casks and other cooperage articles: Lauriss the Cooper and Lukass Personn. None of these men are noted in the 1671 census. See Craig, 1999, 2.

\(^{90}\) The census was taken to determine inhabitants of the Delaware who were eligible to pay quit rents (property taxes) due to the Duke, who had demanded in 1664 that all holders of Dutch patents renew them with English authorities, or apply for a new patent for their land. Resistance to this caused another decree to be issued in 1669 specifying the registration applied to all inhabitants of the Delaware River. Craig, 1999, 2–3, 71. Dr. LuAnn deCunzo, Professor of Anthropology and Early American Culture at the University of Delaware, is currently researching craftsmen active in the Fort Casimir (New Amstel/New Castle) settlement between 1651-early 1680s, and a publication is forthcoming. I am grateful to her for sharing this information with me.
records, it will be possible to identify greater numbers of woodworkers active in the area during the times of Swedish and Dutch occupation.

Figure 2.7  Strong box, likely New Castle County, Delaware, before 1713. Possibly by Christian Joransson (Finnish, born New Castle County, DE). Walnut, tulip poplar, iron. 24 ½” x 48” x 20”. Courtesy Old Swedes Foundation, Wilmington, Del., photo by author.

Few examples of case furniture by Swedish makers survive, however, a dovetailed and lap-joined walnut (*Juglans nigra*) strong box donated by Christian
Joransson to Old Swedes Church in Wilmington in 1713 is a notable example.\textsuperscript{91} (Figure 2.7) Joranssen (or Joriansen) was born in New Castle County of Finnish descent, had been a member of the Crane Hook congregation since 1697, and was a carpenter by trade.\textsuperscript{92} While not credited by the church’s records as the chest’s maker, Joranssen is a strong candidate for this role. The Swedish colony experienced a labor shortage; carpenters could have employed their skills in smaller scale work, like furniture-making, so there is no reason to discount Joranssen’s ability to work in joinery, carpentry, and cabinetmaking.

The case is made of thick walnut boards butted and glued, then dovetailed at the front and sides, with tulip poplar backboards that have been lapped to the sides and nailed through. This combination of joinery types is unusual in Anglo-American

\textsuperscript{91} Burr, 181–182. Christopher Storb identified the wood during a visit in November 2013. I thank him for sharing his photos of this chest. According to church records as written and contained on the chest, the chest was given by Christian (Christiern) Jöransson (Juriasson) in or prior to 1713. Jöransson was the eldest of five sons of Anders Jöransson in what became New Castle County. Joransson was a member of the Crane Hook congregation and was a carpenter by trade. In 1714, his daughter Joranssen’s daughter Christina was baptized at the church on August 29 and was sponsored by congregants Matz Petersson, Peter Canpony, Brita Stalcop, and Kustin Constantine (Burr, 220). In that entry Joransson’s name is spelled Christiern. He is listed by that name in a compilation of Swedish families in New Sweden in 1693 published in Samuel Hazard, ed. Hazard’s Register of Pennsylvania 16:10 no. 34 (September 6, 1835): 145 (at that time Joransson was not married). See also Craig, 1999.

\textsuperscript{92} He pledged £1-10s. in 1697 toward construction of Holy Trinity Church in Christina and was employed in the fall of 1698 to work on the church roof. He worked at this task and other carpentry jobs at the church for 33½ days. He agreed to be the carpenter for the glebe house to be built next to the church, and began that work on 16 October 1701. He remained active in church affairs. On 24 June 1714 he was elected church warden. About 1712, at the age of 48, Christiern married Elisabeth Petersson. They had three children (Sophia, Christiern and Margareta), born between 1713 and 1716, all of whom died in childhood. The will of Christian Urinson,"formerly of Christina Creek but now of Fish Point," was dated 16 October 1716 and proved 6 November 1716. See Peter Stebbins Craig, “Samuel Petersson of Christina and His Descendants,” originally published in Swedish Colonial News 3:6 (Spring 2007); accessible online (http://colonialsuedes.net/Forefathers/SamuelPetersson.html reference 9). See also, Craig, “The 1693 Census of the Swedes on the Delaware,” in Studies in Swedish American Genealogy 3 (Winter Park, FL: SAG Publications, 1993), 107.
colonial examples of a similar period made in Philadelphia, and may be a trait of
Scandinavian construction or training.93 The dovetailed construction uniting the front
and side boards was used concurrently in large scale in log construction like that of the
Mench-Reall house, and had been known to Continental and English craftsmen for use
in furniture-making.94 Dovetailed joinery became a common method for making cases
then veneered with more exotic and visually appealing woods. This technique gained
popularity in Europe and England in the seventeenth century. Dovetails are
mechanically strong joints, and could be strengthened by the addition of glue or small
wedges inserted within the joint’s pin. Here, in what might be described as a post-
medieval tradition, the case is reinforced on all sides by large but simple iron straps,
with similar wrought straps girding the case bottom, and large wrought bale pulls
nailed through the case sides. The lid with a thumbnail-molded edge is reinforced at
either end by battens, and two large locks are nailed to the interior of the case front. It
is similar to dovetailed sea chests made in the Continental tradition, like this Dutch
example brought to New Amsterdam by Domine Bogardus, now at the Albany
Institute of History and Art. (Figure 2.8) The woods of the strong box, however, place
its manufacture firmly within the lower Delaware Valley region, and possibly not far
from the church itself.

93 See objects referenced in Chapter 4.

94 Fine English cabinetmakers worked with dovetail construction in furniture as early as the sixteenth
century, and facility with it was expected of London joiners in the seventeenth century. See Forman,
1632 lists those activities that were the province of joiners, not carpenters, and among them the
implementation of joints “dufftaled (dovetailed) pynned or glewed (sic.” See Chinnery, 42–43.
This was the cultural landscape into which English, Scots-Irish, and Scottish immigrants entered in the seventeenth century. English incursions into the Lower Delaware River Valley began in 1634 with failed attempts to settle at the Dutch settlement at Fort Nassau. Subsequently, English settlers who relocated from the New Haven Colony as early as 1642 established a village in the area later known as Salem in southern New Jersey. Many of those relocated from New England and Long Island settlements built in heavy timber frame construction like that found in the Jonathan Fairbanks House in Dedham, Massachusetts. (Figures 2.9 and 2.9a) Examples of this post-medieval construction method survive in surprising numbers in Cape May County and later Cumberland County, where a high concentration of whalers from the
Massachusetts Bay Colony (via Long Island) relocated and built communities beginning in the 1680s.95

Figure 2.9  Jonathan Fairbanks House, 511 East Street, Dedham, Norfolk County, MA, ca. 1636 and later, view from southeast. Photo by Thomas T. Waterman, June 1936. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, HABS, reproduction number: HABS MASS,11-DED,1—6

95 See Joan Berkey, *Early Architecture of Cape May County New Jersey: The Heavy Timber Frame Legacy* (Cape May County Courthouse, NJ: Cape May County Historical and Genealogical Society, 2008).
In addition to heavy timber framing, English immigrants constructed timber framed and brick buildings, and appropriated log construction for their needs. Carpenters and bricklayers, like London native Francis Collins who settled in Burlington, were among the earliest English Quaker settlers in the region, and they resumed their trades upon arrival.96 Because of its durability, brick townhouses survive in large numbers in the ports of Philadelphia and Burlington, but larger freestanding houses were also the focal point of rural “plantations” built by prominent

and wealthy Quakers in Salem, Gloucester, and Burlington Counties. The Abel Nicholson House in Elsinboro built in 1722 (with later additions) is one of many houses of this type surviving in Salem County. (Figure 2.10) (See Appendix D.)

Figure 2.10  South elevation facing Alloways Creek, Abel Nicholson House, Hancock’s Bridge, Salem County, NJ, ca. 1722 and later. Photo by author.

In this early period of English immigration to the Delaware Valley, need trumped any ethnicity’s strict adherence to a particular architectural idiom. Although it was not a native building style, Quaker settlers adopted log construction, an

97 Chiarappa, 31–32. Michael Chiarappa identified forty-four per cent of NJ brickmasons were members of the Society of Friends (or Quakers) in good standing, or were affiliated with that sect. Chiarappa clarifies that “Quaker affiliates” were artisans with Quaker spouses, or were disowned Quakers. Quoting Dr. J. Ritchie Garrison.

98 Like contemporaneous houses, the front façade faces Alloways Creek and is further demarcated by a large sycamore tree. Houses were built adjacent to these large trees to possibly facilitate navigation or identification from the water.
effective and rapid architectural solution that could be deployed for its communities’ initial dwellings, administrative buildings, and houses of worship after landing in provincial New Jersey in the 1670s and 1680s. In 1682, the Burlington Court decreed that Quakers Samuel Jennings and Thomas Gardner supervise construction of a log building to be used as a prison.\(^9\) The same year in his promotional tract about Pennsylvania, Thomas Paschall noted that some arriving Englishmen bought plantations from the Swedes (and likely used extant dwellings before building new ones). Similarly, there is record of Friends’ meetinghouses using log construction in early houses of worship in the region prior to 1730. Open practice of the Quaker religion was prohibited in England prior to the 1689 Act of Toleration, and participants often congregated in a member’s house for worship. This both accommodated the small numbers of initial worshippers, and maintained secrecy for the meetings’ gatherings and congregants. With its unprogrammed worship, the faith community could freely adapt a single-room log structure for meetings upon arrival in New Jersey.\(^10\) More substantial timber frame and brick buildings replaced these initial houses of worship as congregations expanded and raised necessary funds for permanent and more commodious accommodation.\(^11\)

---

99 Described as a house. Read and Miller, 1944, 11.


101 See Thomas Chalkley Matlack, “‘Friends Meeting localities belonging to Philadelphia Yearly Meeting both in the past and present time’ located in Burlington Quarter.” Manuscript Collection 1106, Box 1, Notebook 20. Haverford College Quaker Collection. Those meetings that began as log structures include Arney’s Mount (Shreve’s Mount).
Conversely, when Swedish Lutheran communities in Wilmington and Philadelphia erected new churches, they sought English builders and tradesmen who specialized in an architectural style suitable to the liturgy’s sophistication. In 1697, members of the Crane Hook congregation (near present-day New Castle, Del.) selected Wilmington as the location of their new church.102 Pastor Erik Björk and members of the congregation chose English masons and carpenters from Philadelphia almost exclusively: the Yard family for the masonry; John Smart and John Britt, carpenters; Edward Smouth (Smout?), sawyer; and James Lownes (a Quaker of Upland), who provided some lime for plaster.103 When one of the Philadelphians deserted the job, the church hastily secured a local Swede, Christian Anderson, to assist.104 Shortly thereafter, Philadelphians John Davis (a Quaker), and John Harrison (a joiner and member of Christ Church in Philadelphia) and his two sons were engaged to assist Smart with the completion of the roof and interior joinery.105 The pulpit and sounding board of Holy Trinity (Old Swedes) Church is an example of Harrison’s knowledge of contemporary English interpretation of Baroque liturgical

102 Pastor Erik Björk, a missionary-priest sent from Sweden to the Crane Hook congregation entered into the contracts for the church’s construction, and kept records of the work. These were translated from Swedish by Horace Burr and published as part of The Records of Holy Trinity (Old Swedes) Church, 1697-1773 (Wilmington, DE: Historical Society of Delaware, 1890), 21–40. See also George Fletcher Bennett with Joseph L. Copeland, Early Architecture of Delaware (Wilmington, De. & New York: Historical Press Inc., Carl T. Waugh & Co., 1932), 19–25. I am very grateful to Christopher Storb for bringing Harrison’s surviving work to my attention.

103 Burr, 35–37.

104 Björk notes Anderson as “one of our folk.” Burr, 33.

105 Björk praised the industrious and capable Harrison, advocating for his fair pay in dealings with John Smart.
design. This refinement can also be seen at the near concurrent commission the Harrison family completed for the Wicaco congregation at Gloria Dei Church in Philadelphia in 1700. (Figures 2.11 and 2.12) Other than Anderson, whose assistance was only sought to keep the project on track, Matthias de Foss, a local smith, and Lenard Osterson, a “Hollander” and glazier from Philadelphia, were the only non-English craftsmen with documented participation in the Old Swedes commission.

106 The pulpit and sounding board have been moved from their original location.

Figure 2.11  View of pulpit and sounding board, Holy Trinity Church (Old Swedes), Wilmington, DE. Photo by author.
Figure 2.12 Details of pew and pulpit from northwest, Gloria Dei Church, 929 South Water Street, Philadelphia, PA. Photo by Ian McLaughlin, January 21, 1937. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, HABS, reproduction number: HABS PA,51-PHILA,174--6
In 1739, Philadelphian Rebecca Claypoole wrought the following verses in a complex and elaborately patterned needlework sampler: "Rebecca Claypoole / is my
name / And England is my nation / Philadelphia is my Dwelling Place / and Christ is my salvation…” 108 (Figure 2.13) This couplet is a common one found adorning objects created during colonial childhood education, but these verses exemplify colonial settlers’ continued identification with their native culture after immigration. In their earliest years of settlement, Quaker immigrants recreated many of the cultural traditions from their English origins as they strove to perfect an earthly life consonant with their faith. Quakers founded—and culturally dominated—both the province of West Jersey and colony of Pennsylvania in the period before the 1720s. Their principles defined the region’s governance, and their networks of members united the Delaware River Valley into a cohesive cultural unit. To understand the area’s emerging craft culture in this period, it is essential to define how this religion guided the personal and public lives of Quakers—particularly those of Burlington County—including their business and commercial interests with one another, and with those outside their faith.

Quaker religious discipline was grounded in kinship and community. Delaware Valley Friends were part of a larger religious network that spanned the Atlantic World. This far-reaching organization of Friends facilitated the mobility, and success, of its members. When land in West Jersey and Pennsylvania became available for speculative settlement, Quakers in Jamaica and Barbados, as well as New England, London, the Midlands, Yorkshire, Ireland, and Scotland quickly obtained patents. After settling a land dispute between proprietors John Fenwick and Edward Byllynge, three members of the Society of Friends—including William Penn—

108 This sampler was owned by M. Finkel & Daughter, Inc., Philadelphia, PA, and was illustrated in Magazine ANTIQUES (March/April 2014): 35.
became majority landholders of the province.109 New Jersey was the first truly “Quaker colony”: West Jersey’s 114 first landowners all had associations with the Society of Friends as fully participating members, were in business with Friends, were married to Friends, or were sympathizers.110 At least five of the first proprietors of the province were also members in the building trades. By 1745, Quakers accounted for approximately 1/6th of the colony’s total population; in Burlington and Monmouth County, however, they made up nearly half the residents, with similarly high proportions found in adjacent Gloucester County.111

109 The three men were Gavin Lawrie and Nicholas Lucas, Scottish Quakers, and William Penn, the English founder of Pennsylvania.

110 Pomfret, 1951, 145.

111 Wacker, 1975, 415.
Figure 2.14 Map of settlements of the New Jersey colony prior to 1680, adapted from Peter O. Wacker, *Land and People: A Cultural Geography of Preindustrial New Jersey: Origins and Settlement Patterns* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1975), 122, Map 3.1, drawn by author.
Burlington (briefly known as Bridlington) was the seat of administration for the Quaker faith, as well as for the colony. The three counties that made up the West Jersey province—Burlington, Gloucester, and Salem—were each dominated by Quaker landholders when founded in the 1670s, and this dominance continued well into the eighteenth century. (Figure 2.14) Quaker meetings were the only houses of worship in Burlington County except for St. Mary’s Church (Episcopal), and that church’s mission in Mount Holly. Friends from the Midlands and Yorkshire controlled and sold lands in northern Burlington County to the boundary of the Falls, this being the region known as the “First Tenth” or “Yorkshire Tenth”. Friends from London were majority landowners in the administrative region in the lower half of Burlington proper, and south to the boundary with Gloucester (the “Second” or “London Tenth”). Quakers of Irish and Scots-Irish descent controlled the “Third” or “Irish Tenth”, now part of Gloucester County. The “Fourth Tenth” did not participate in the government of West Jersey until 1685, and consisted of land between Big Timber and Oldmans Creek. The “Salem Tenth” or “Fenwick’s Colony”, the oldest of the three Quaker settlements, also remained the most ethnically diverse with a healthy population of Swedo-Finns, Dutch, German, and native tribes surviving into the mid-eighteenth century.

112 Five of the first proprietors who bought shares that belonged to Edward Byllynge were carpenters, bricklayers, or joiners: John Dennis, joiner of County Cork, Ireland (1/14th of a share), Thomas Mathews, carpenter of London (3/8ths of a share), William Bate, carpenter of County Wicklow, Ireland, Francis Collins, bricklayer of Stepney (4/7ths of a share), and Thomas Hester, bricklayer of St. Martin’s in the Fields, County Middlesex (1/6th of a share). A share was £350. See: John Pomfret, “The Proprietors of the Province of West New Jersey, 1674-1702,” *PMHB* 75: 2 (Jan. 1951): 117–146.

As majority landholders, Quakers had the right to secular governance, and created the first laws of the province at a meeting of the General Assembly in 1681. Many of these laws were based on Quaker principles. The provincial court was held in Burlington at the Friends’ Meeting House until at least 1691 when Quakers who lamented this use of their house of worship hired and paid Quaker builder Francis Collins for the construction of the province’s first courthouse.114

The Society of Friends had a hierarchical organizational structure, but was largely decentralized in that the regular governance of its members occurred at the local level of “monthly meetings”. These meetings addressed outward matters of personal and commercial comportment, issues of youth education, processed new and departing members, and were a clearinghouse for marriages. Monthly meetings appointed a group of overseers who in essence were town administrators.115 Yearly meetings addressed the internal business of its membership, including the creation or review of epistles regarding conduct, appointments of overseers, and dealt with issues of organization and policy. “Weighty” Quakers, the most prominent members of the faith (often the wealthiest) attended the larger yearly meetings.116 These meetings alternated between Burlington and Philadelphia (beginning in 1684 or 1685 and

114 See DeCou, 41. The court was still using the meetinghouse as late as 1691.

115 Overseers monitored the membership and brought forward those who were not acting in Quaker ways so they could be acknowledged, and their actions formally discouraged or sanctioned. Other overseers were appointed to handle business like the construction of meetinghouses, establishment of schools, construction of roads and bridges, and tending to the poor.

lasting until 1764), and were a means for reuniting Quakers across the region for the purposes of group worship, and business.117

The system of oversight that governed Quakers maintained the faith’s hegemony in the region. Quakerism was the cohesive force in West Jersey society from the province’s inception with Burlington as its administrative center.118 The earliest meetings were established on the Delaware, or at the mouth of its tributaries. (Figure 2.15) Over time, members removed to new land, following rivers and creeks to areas of fewer inhabitants. New settlements branched eastward from the Delaware as Friends traveled along its tributaries deeper into the colony. These Friends requested permission from the Burlington Monthly and Quarterly Meetings to establish new meetings of worship, which created towns largely governed by Quaker citizenry. Meetings established new nodes of commerce and communication that provided local services yet allowed residents to maintain close contact with neighbors and commercial interests in Burlington, Salem, and Philadelphia. In this way, the system of Quaker faith organized and dispersed settlement of its members across the province, and initially maintained a group cohesion, deference, and discipline among followers.

117 Initially these meetings were attended by large groups of Quakers, perhaps like a family homecoming. Pomfret quotes that in 1695, the Yearly Meeting in Philadelphia was attended by 2,000 participants. Pomfret, 1956, 224.

118 Pomfret, 1956, 216, 284.
London became a locus of Quaker doctrine in the seventeenth century. The London Yearly Meeting drafted codified rules of decorum known as epistles, and sent
them to other meetings (in North American and Europe) to discuss and disseminate them via quarterly and monthly meetings. These epistles dictated the expected comportment of Friends in spiritual, familial, secular, and commercial realms. Early epistles also reveal the Friends’ great concern for treatment of one another, particularly fair business dealings, and the wellbeing and education of children and teenagers in the Quaker faith. This period was looked upon as a crucial one for developing “righteous character” of men and women.\footnote{119 \cite{Pomfret1956}} Early in Quaker settlement, young people were apprenticed or indentured piecemeal from English, Scottish, or Scots Irish families who could not afford the transatlantic journey as a family, or who were attempting to provide new opportunities to their children.

The Society of Friends’ members were a literate group, and remained in regular communication with kin and Friends across the Atlantic. In response to the rising numbers of Friends’ children bound out to non-Friends to obtain passage to the British colony, the Burlington Monthly Meeting issued a cautionary epistle in 1687 to their London counterparts, urging them to avoid this practice. The proper training and upbringing of young Friends weighed heavily on Quaker minds, and it continued to be a topic of conversation seven years later at the Burlington Yearly Meeting. Quaker minister and founder George Fox stated, “Thus, being placed out with Friends, they may be trained up in the truth; and by this means in the wisdom of God, you may preserve Friends’ children in the truth, and enable them to be strength and help to their families…”\footnote{120 \cite{Chiarappa1991}: 7, FN 26, quoting Fox, \textit{Journal} 2:76; quoted in Woody, \textit{Early Quaker Education}, 9–10.}

\footnote{119 Pomfret, 1956, 240.}
righteousness; instead, schooling was viewed as supplementary to the process of apprenticeship and binding out children, a habit on which the greatest importance was placed by faithful Friends.\textsuperscript{121} Apprenticeships in colonial New Jersey and Pennsylvania for Quaker children were often negotiated within existing religious networks.

Apprentices to Quaker masters learned through their trade to be clear and fair in their business practices, and to seek internal arbitration through the monthly or quarterly meeting to settle commercial disputes before resorting to general court. Their apprenticeship taught them their craft and groomed their business skills for working with or for other Friends. Since Friends dominated the region well into the early eighteenth century, apprenticeship with Quaker carpenters and joiners incorporated young tradesmen into local commercial networks connected by faith. Their faith provided credentials of trust in the form of certificates of removal issued by the meeting of departure. These certificates allowed newcomers to travel through the network to a new settlement that welcomed them into a religious and commercial sphere, and introduced them to potential customers. Certificates vetted newcomers, accelerating their integration into a new community, fostering their success.

Timing and sequence were equally important contributors as kinship networks to the success of early Quaker carpenters and joiners. The first waves of English craftsmen in the 1670s and 1680s increased the colony’s ethnic diversity, and Dutch, Swedish, and German traditions thrived in localized areas. Over the next sixty years, however, Anglicized versions of Western European traditions dominated the colony’s

politics, economics, and culture. Initial settlement in the colony was dictated by the
geography of the landscape, as well as the ethnicity and origin of its first proprietors
who sold or leased land in various areas. The proliferation of Friends across West
Jersey determined the density and sequence of settlement in various parts of the
province, and prioritized the work needed, from building houses and furniture to
constructing meetinghouses. After initial settlement, there was a lag in the
construction of formal meetinghouses as worship continued in individual homes until
larger quarters were necessary.¹²²

The timing of certain jobs coincided with particular seasons depending on the
climate and nature of the work. Carpenters and joiners in agricultural settings often
farmed in one part of the year while making furniture or building houses in the other.
Depending on the period in a rural craftsman’s life, he might have informally retired
from his craft and farmed instead.¹²³ Life span was also factor for carpenters and

¹²² This is attested to by the minutes of many early meetings that note the homes in which worship
took place. In Bucks County at the Falls Meeting, worship occurred in the home of William Biles, while
in Burlington, the men’s meeting first worshipped in at John Woolston’s house in 1678. This meeting
alternated houses, moving to that of Thomas Gardiner until a formal meetinghouse was planned in
1682, and completed in 1693. Thomas Lambert’s home was a place of worship for the members of what
became the Crosswicks (or Chesterfield) Meeting. The Salem Meeting began with a men’s meeting that
worshipped in the home of Samuel Nicholson. The quarterly meeting of Burlington and the Falls was
held at the home of William Biddle in Mansfield, Burlington Co., until his death in 1711. See Pomfret,

¹²³ Life cycles of craftsmen are often caught by vital documents, like wills, but earlier craft
occupations are often missed. The aspect of seasonality can sometimes be captured in inventories or
deeds, so cross-referencing is essential to this study. See Weiss, 1971. Weiss’s extremely useful
publication suffers from using vital records only, and thus misses a great quantity of tradesmen whose
presence is recorded through land transactions. See Nelson, ed., Documents Relating to the Colonial
History of the State of New Jersey Vol. 21, Calendar of Records in the Archives of the Secretary of
State, 1664–1703. (Paterson, N.J.: The Press Printing and Publishing Co., 1890), and Crestview
Lawyers Service, Colonial Conveyances: the Provinces of East and West Jersey, 1664–1794. (Summit,
joiners. First settlers seemed to have shorter life spans than their successors, since many carpenters and joiners who emigrated did so as mature adults. As this first generation of craftsmen died, their absence left a place in the craft community for younger artisans. This was especially valuable in urban areas with a higher competition for work.

Members of the woodworking trades other than first settlers in the region faced issues of mobility as the province of New Jersey grew into an economically vibrant, labor-competitive colony. The woodworking trades swelled between 1690 and 1730, with over two hundred carpenters and joiners recorded as active in New Jersey as the area absorbed new immigrants, and first- or second-generation apprentices came of age. Port towns had a higher density of craftsmen and artisans than surrounding areas dominated by agricultural commerce. In these port towns, ship carpenters and coopers were close to abundant but increasingly competitive work, causing some to remove to the surrounding hinterland. Conversely, those in agricultural settings moved to port towns when their local labor force was saturated and work scarce, or if they desired to be close to a high concentration of potential patrons, while others moved deeper inland for agricultural pursuits. Craftsmen established themselves where and when work was available. They were just as likely in this period to move away from urban areas as they were to join them.

Various factors have obscured modern-day scholars’ ability to identify members of woodworking and carpentry trades in New Jersey in the early colonial period. First, seasonality or age has concealed craftsmen’s occupations. Time of day and available light governed their daily work, while seasonality governed their work
annually, especially those craftsmen who lived in agricultural settings. The time of year determined when farms had to be planted and houses could be built, leaving other tasks, like furniture-construction, for colder or inclement seasons. A will or inventory taken late in a craftsman’s life might be made after retirement from a trade, and note “a parcel of carpenter’s” or “joiner’s tools.” The reference alluded to a prior trade although the decedent might self-identify as a yeoman in the will. Cross-referencing multiple archival sources yields a more accurate picture of the lifespan of craftsmen in their trade, and overall craft activity in New Jersey in this period.

Scholars have also overlooked the flexibility of certain kinds of joinery and carpentry skills, and the role of marketplace and seasonality to affect different demands on the skills of urban and rural craftsmen. Carpenters and joiners shared some basic skill sets despite their differences in occupational titles, and the reality was that they were very flexible in securing work. Urban craftsmen likely found it easier to specialize in joinery if carpenters were present and readily available, and may have supplemented their business by maintaining small shops. Rural carpenters, by comparison, might have been one of only a few craftsmen in their immediate area. To satisfy the demands of their clientele, they expanded their skill sets, took a wider

__________________________

124 Wills and inventories confirm those who owned plantations, as do records of land transfers, court records, and ear marks used for identifying livestock ownership.

125 Scholars noted in the introduction who have paid greatest attention to early joinery ameliorated this problem in their work on New England carpenters and joiners, but no such change has happened in the early mid-Atlantic. See the work of Robert Trent, Robert Blair St. George, Philip Zea, Benno Forman, and Joshua Lane.

126 Isaac Marriott, was identified as both a joiner and a merchant in separate documents. In 1696 when he was a bondsman in the estate of Thomas Bowman, he was called a merchant, alluding to the possibility that he maintained a shop as well as his joinery business. Honeyman, NJCW I., 49.
variety of jobs, and had to incorporate their work into the seasonal rhythms of planting and harvesting, or whaling.127

In summary, the Delaware River Valley in the period of the 1670s to 1740s was an ethnically plural region but with a rapidly expanding population of English and Irish Quakers, including those of Scots-Irish descent. Each group—Dutch, Swedo-Finn, English, Irish, Scots Irish, and Scottish—had visibly distinct carpentry traditions, and by extension, construction traditions in furniture. Minimal furniture survives to understand that diversity, but we can know of these distinctions through extant domestic and ecclesiastic architecture. Documentary evidence in the Swedish and English-speaking communities also informs us about the activity of many more craftsmen, and their relationships to one another and their patrons, than has been previously known.

Despite a desire for each group to maintain homogeneity, cultural norms were crossed in certain instances of necessity, as evidenced by examples of Quaker adaptation of local Swedish log construction traditions for their first meetinghouses and dwellings. Swedish congregations conversely used English contractors for their churches in Wilmington and Philadelphia when a particular architectural style and specialized level of expertise was required. Each Swedish Lutheran congregation desired a Baroque church with a high level of liturgical sophistication. London-trained

127 Joan Berkey has identified a carpentry community in Cape May made up of emigrants from the Massachusetts colony, as well as the Quaker communities of Flushing, Oyster Bay, and Jamaica on Long Island. Carpenters and coopers made up almost one tenth of the freeholding population in Cape May County in 1699, but these men were also all farmers or whalers, depending on the season. A number of these men were Quakers or defectors from Puritan communities in New England, and nearly all had purchased their lands from the London-based West New Jersey Society. See Berkey, Ch. 1 “The County’s Seventeenth-Century Settlers,” 1-9.
Craftsmen hired by the congregations—the Yards and the Harrisons of Philadelphia for both commissions—were the most capable artisans in the area to build small, austere Baroque parish churches with specialized interior features like the pulpits and sounding boards of Holy Trinity (Old Swedes) and Gloria Dei.

Craftsmen who were members of the Society of Friends proliferated in the region despite entering into an area with capable craftsmen, in part because of their critical mass by the 1720s. Their construction traditions came to dominate, however, because they successfully utilized their religious networks for training, mobility, and introduction in new settlements. In this way, their religious affiliation was occupational currency, giving them access to new clients by way of certificates of introduction at other meetings. The decentralized nature of the Friends’ religion with multiple areas of governance in Burlington and Salem also contributed to the increase of settlement and commerce throughout the West Jersey province. The growth of Quakerism’s adherents and their movements outward from administrative centers on or adjacent to the Delaware River dictated to some extent the timing and sequence of the availability of kinds of work for certain trades. These considerations, as well as the seasonality and location of work, would help shape how and when craftsmen were able to be successful in the region’s cabinetmaking trades.
Chapter 3

MATERIALS

“A Short Description of Pennsilvania [sic], by Richard Frame, 1692128

“Although I have a good intent, Yet hardly can express,
How we, through Mercy were content, in such a Wilderness.
When we began to clear the Land, for room to sow our Seed,
And that our corn might grow and stand, For food in time of 
Need,
Then with the Ax, with might and strength, the trees so thick 
and strong,
Yet on each side, such strokes at length, We laid them all along.
So when the trees, that grew so high, were fallen to the ground,
Which we with fire, most furiously to Ashes did Confound.
Then presently we sought for wood, I mean (not wood to burn) 
(but for) such timber, choice and good, as fitted well our turn.
A city, and towns were raised then, wherein we might abide,
Planters also, and Husband-men, had land enough beside.
The best of houses then was known, to be of wood and clay,
But now we build of brick and stone, which is a better way.”

As early connoisseurs attempted to make sense out of the artifacts they 
encountered, they frequently focused on materials. In their publications, early 
connoisseurs and scholars Irving Lyon, R. T. H. Halsey, and William McPherson

128 This poem was printed and sold by William Bradford in Philadelphia, 1692. Reprinted in Albert 
Cook Myers, ed. Original Narratives of Early American History: Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, 
West New Jersey, and Delaware, 1630–1707 (Charles Scribner’s Sons, 912), 303-4. Little is known of 
Richard Frame, who may have spelled his surname Freame in the seventeenth century. A Richard 
Freame is known to have been the grandfather of Thomas Freame, who married William Penn’s 
daughter Margaret in 1727. See Albert Cook Myers, “Notes and Queries,” Journal of the Society of 
Horner pointedly referred not only to the material from which a piece of furniture was made, but used that to assess its relative merits and rarity. Subsequently, Charles Montgomery defined the term “connoisseurship” as an assessment consisting of fourteen criteria: overall appearance, form, ornament, color, analysis of materials, technique, trade practices, function, style, date, attribution, provenance, condition, and evaluation. These criteria help scholars to analyze and contextualize any object, and through their evaluations, they can group objects into regions of production based partially on their material components. Materials became a limiting factor in defining place of origin, and remain important to scholars for that purpose.

In this study of objects, I have identified the nearly uniform presence of certain wood species, notably walnut (Juglans nigra), hard pine (Pinus rigida and other species of the subgenus pinus) and Atlantic white cedar (C. thyoides). This reinforces three important points: first, carpenters and joiners repeatedly selected certain species for structural or aesthetic reasons; second, these selections are partially a function of the availability of particular species in abundant quantities and at affordable prices in a particular moment in the region; third, the homogeneity of these materials is reflective of a larger English craft training and tradition of woodworking present in the Delaware Valley. As this section will discuss, an artisan’s choice of material was based on the ecology of the Delaware River Valley, and the unique topography of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the Lower Counties. It was also dependent upon land management


practices, legislation, milling technology, adequate transportation, and craft knowledge.

Wood was the essential raw material for fuel and construction, and inter-coastal timber commerce between New Jersey and Pennsylvania towns flanking the Delaware River existed at a very early date. The poem written by Philadelphia inhabitant Richard Frame (Freame?) at this chapter’s opening notes one of the first and principal reasons timber was harvested: as part of land clearing efforts to create pasturage for plantations. A good quantity of that wood was likely used in West Jersey to fuel early iron forging, glass manufacturing, and brick-making endeavors like those discussed in the previous chapter. Tall, straight species of pine, oak, and chestnut were employed in shipbuilding, a primary industry in the coastal regions of the Jersey provinces. Writers emphasized this ecological bounty and its potential economic benefit in promotional literature. George Scot’s 1685 tract to encourage settlement of his Scottish brethren in East Jersey noted the presence of oak “fit for shipping and masts…” and the advantageous yield of clearing forests for the planting of farms.131

Because of its physiographic divisions, New Jersey’s topography, ecology, soils, drainage, and even climate separate it from the rest of the Delaware River Valley.132 (refer to Figure 3.1a)


Four major physiographic regions cross through New Jersey’s borders: Coastal Plain, Piedmont, Highland, and Valley & Ridge, which yield dramatic differences in
soil composition that vary over short distances. For this reason, certain species of timber grew preferentially in New Jersey soils compared to Pennsylvania. Most important to this discussion of wood species is the soil found in the Atlantic Coastal Plain region.

The plain covers nearly three-fifths of the state’s landmass, and roughly bisects it into northwestern and southeastern halves. Throughout the Coastal Plain are numerous waterways that receive tidal flow. In the period of first settlement, these creeks and rivers would have been easily navigable by shallower draft vessels, or by dugout canoe. The rest of New Jersey’s landmass consists of the Ridgelands and the Piedmont that begins in the northwest portion of the state and drops in elevation to meet the Atlantic Coastal Plain. This meeting point is known as the fall line, located at present-day Trenton, and is delineated by the rocky falls of the Delaware River. Settlers who navigated the River northward found they could not sail beyond this point, which created a geographic (and cultural) boundary to river-borne settlement on the Delaware River’s eastern shores.

The Atlantic Coastal Plain can be further divided into inner and outer sections whose soils differ enough so as to be preferential to growth of particular species. The lower elevation Outer Coastal Plain has areas with poor drainage that have given over to swamp land. It is here that conifers like pine and cedar thrive in porous, sandy soils.

134 Wacker, 1975, 2.
135 Ibid.
By contrast, the interior or Inner Coastal Plain’s soils contain a greater amount of clay near the surface. Many early English planters who came to the colony of West Jersey settled their farms in the interior coastal region with these drier, clay soils conducive to growing grains and wheat.

Within the boundaries of each plain are two unique forest types which are more common to southern climes: the oak-pine type, which extends from the Outer Coastal Plain northward to Long Island, and the oak-chestnut type, which occupies most of central and northern New Jersey in the Inner Coastal Plain, Piedmont, and Ridgelands. The latter is more typical of forests of the eastern Appalachian Mountains.

In the oak-pine forest type located in coastal and southern New Jersey, pitch pines are prevalent, while in central and northwestern New Jersey they are scarce. Atlantic white cedars were also dense in the Outer Coastal Plain region but due to the intensive logging from the period of first settlement, the forest composition changed

136 These sandier soils were ideal raw material for glass production, which became a major industry in southern New Jersey, beginning with Philadelphian Caspar Wistar’s Wistarburgh Glass Works, founded in 1738, through the early twentieth century.

137 The planting tendency was to clear forests directly to the water’s edge; the banks of creeks and rivers in New Jersey bear the geographic remains of their agricultural use even today. The lack of ecological barriers from trees and tree root systems to prevent soil erosion allowed silting of the waterways. By the late 1800s, many rivers in southern New Jersey had silted to the extent that large ships could no longer navigate them, effectively ending the shipbuilding industry that had existed for two centuries.

dramatically.\textsuperscript{139} This primary species difference is very important to understanding which tree sources were readily accessible to first settlers in the West Jersey province, why certain species are present in the region’s early joinery, and how the presence of these species in Philadelphia cabinet shops reveals New Jersey’s role in interregional commerce and cabinetmaking.

Philadelphia naturalist John Bartram’s firsthand account of the difference in terrain of the Delaware Valley region is recorded in his writings at the end of May 1736. At that time, Bartram traveled from his home in Kingsessing near Philadelphia to the head of the Egg Harbor River in southeastern New Jersey with a guide who was part owner of a cedar swamp. Bartram, part of a larger international network of naturalists, journeyed to West Jersey to investigate the presence of cedar trees and their varieties to report those findings to a London colleague.\textsuperscript{140} Penetrating the Interior Coastal Plain deeply, Bartram observed the change in terrain from sandy to swampy, and navigation became difficult. At the head of the Egg Harbor River, Bartram noted the cedar swamp contained “many acres chiefly producing White Cedar, but in some dryer places, Silver Laurell [sic], or Bay, Maple, Holley [sic], &

\textsuperscript{139} In swampy areas where it has been logged, it is replaced easily by red maple, sweet and sour gum, magnolia, tulip, swamp white oak, willow oak, and holly. Muntz, 1959, 23.

\textsuperscript{140} John Bartram. Letter to Peter Collinson of London, in Winifred Notman Price, ed., “John Bartram in the Cedar Swamps,” \textit{Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography}, 81: 1 (1957), 87–88. The document transcribed in Price’s article is quoted by London naturalist Peter Collinson in a letter to Dr. Dillenius at Holy Well in Oxford from correspondence Collinson received from Bartram. In his letter to Collinson, Bartram indicated he’d sent a sample of white cedar seeds, and that the “red cedar” previously observed was actually a juniper or “savin.” Junipers are conifers, members of the Cupressaceae family and related to cypresses. The specific species to which Bartram might’ve referred is \textit{Juniperus sabina} or the Savin Juniper. This species is native to mountainous regions of southern and central Europe, not North America, so Bartram might have referenced it as a comparison for Collinson, rather than meaning it was the actual species he observed in the swamplands (p. 88).
Sassifras [sic] & about the ridges some pines, but I observed no Red Cedar.” Bartram further noted that white cedar demanded a wet climate, and was often found growing in water a foot high or more, with satisfactory conditions yielding trees as much as two feet in diameter.141

Firsthand accounts like Bartram’s and early promotional literature written by William Penn and others to encourage settlement on speculative lands inform us more fully about the observed biodiversity present in all parts of the lower Delaware River Valley. In a letter written to the Free Society of Traders in London, William Penn listed these noteworthy trees growing in his colony: “… the black walnut, Cedar, Cyprus [sic], chestnut, poplar, gumwood, hickory, sassafrax [sic], ash, beech; and oak of divers sorts, as red, white, and black, Spanish, chestnut, and swamp, the most durable of all…”142

Thomas Paskell (or Paschall) who lived adjacent to Cobbs Creek in present-day southwest Philadelphia wrote an account the same year as Penn’s letter to the Free Society of Traders.143 Penn’s letter was an inducement to settle in his colony, and was appropriately thorough in defining the presence of certain species of commercial

141 Bartram to Peter Collinson, PMHB 81: 1 (1957): 88.

142 Myers, 1912, 227. By 1683, William Penn had sold 300,000 acres of land in his colony to about 250 purchasers who bought acreage in amounts ranging from 10,000–250,000 acres. Penn also had seeds from his English gardens, including walnut trees, sent to James Harrison, the steward of his rural villa, Pennsbury, to be planted. Hubertis Cummings, “An Account of Goods at Pennsbury Manor, 1687,” PMHB 86, no. 4 (Oct., 1962): 399.

143 Paschall was actively cultivating his plantation at the time of the letter, noting that he cleared six acres. His statement that he lived in “Skoolkill Creek” could be more accurate. Thomas Holme’s map shows Paschall occupying property between Mill or Cobb Creek and the Schuylkill River. He was likely writing in the summer or fall, noting he’d built a house for his servants, and had hired a house for his family for the winter. Myers, 1912, 250–54.
interest to tradesmen and merchants, whereas Paschall, in a letter to fellow member of the Society of Friends J. J. of Chippenham in England, focused instead on the quality of timber and the nationality of the sawyers: “The woods are full of Oakes, many very high and straight, many of them about two foot through, and some bigger, but very many less; a Swede will fell twelve of the bigger in a day…” In his account, Paschall noted pointedly, “here is but few Pine-trees and Cedar.”144

It is not surprising that, as a promotional tract, Penn’s account leverages species diversity in his sales pitch. It is somewhat surprising, however, that Paschall, who wrote from an area adjacent to Philadelphia in the same year, stated that pine and cedar were not plentiful.145 Both of these woods are present as secondary cabinet woods in furniture ascribed to the Delaware Valley region (and Philadelphia specifically) prior to 1750. No doubt pine and cedar were present in the region, but Paschall’s letter makes a point that contradicts contemporary notions that species were available uniformly throughout it.146

This idea is supported by maps, promotional literature and firsthand accounts of West Jersey that note similar woods as those listed in the accounts of Pennsylvania made by William Penn and Thomas Paschall, including pine and cedar. John Worlidge’s 1690 map, A New Map of East And West Jersey identifies a cedar swamp

144 Myers, 1912, 4.

145 Kingsessing is now within the city of Philadelphia, but it was a distinct settlement well away from the original core of Penn’s city.

146 See Charles van Ravenswaay, Winterthur Portfolio 7 (1972): 175–215. Charles van Ravenswaay wrote about the growing region of Eastern white pine, which underscores the issue of assumption with wood material: “The uninitiated… may assume the eastern white pine (Pinus strobes L.) was limited in its growth to New England… it grew far into the South along the Alleghenies. Some of its greatest stands were in the forests of western New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin.”
on New Jersey’s southeastern coast near Cape May. A detail shown below of the cartouche from a map published in 1757 for *The London Magazine* (Figure 3.1b, and refer to Figure 1.8), illustrates prominent natural resources characteristic of forests in New Jersey, and the larger Atlantic Coastal Plain: tall, spindly pines and wind-whipped oaks.

Figure 3.1b  Detail, Figure 1.8. Cartouche, *A Map of / Maryland / with the / Delaware / Counties / and the / Southern Part of / New Jersey / &c / by T. Kitchin Geogr.* (published London, 1757). Engraving on white laid paper. Winterthur Museum purchase, 1983.0309. Photo by: Jim Schneck.

One of the earliest accounts of New Jersey made in the seventeenth century was that of Dutch navigator Cornelis Hendricksen in a report to the Lords States
General of Holland in 1616. Hendricksen sailed along the New Jersey coast, rounded Cape May, and sailed into the Delaware Bay. He found the country full of trees, most numerous were oak, hickory, and pine. An anonymous letter “The Present State of the Colony of West-Jersey, 1681” stated “there is a variety of trees in the country, and many of them; as oak, chestnut, walnut, mulberry, etc., and several sorts that are not in England.”

Gabriel Thomas wrote in 1698 about the species diversity and the economic value of certain timbers, particularly conifers, present in West Jersey: “There is a great plenty of working timber, as oaks, ash, chestnuts, pine, cedar, walnut, poplar, fir, and masts for ships, with pitch and pine resin, of great use and much benefit to the country.” Thomas Budd, the son of a Quaker clergyman who lived in Burlington around 1678, published an account of the region, treating Pennsylvania and West Jersey as a single colonial unit. His account was published thirteen years earlier than Thomas’s but corroborates it, noting the pitch, tar, rosin [sic], and turpentine made from native Jersey pines.

The woods enumerated in the accounts of Penn, Paschall, and others match the materials found in the case pieces examined in Chapter 4. Joiners overwhelmingly


148 Myers, 1912, 158–162.

149 Myers, 1912, 349.

preferred black walnut (*Juglans nigra*) as the case or show wood, and in those examples examined, it was used nearly exclusively in the solid. Other case woods include figured maple (a member of the genus *Acer*, particularly *Acer saccharum*), cherry (genus *Prunus*), and hard pine (also known in the furniture field as Southern yellow pine, genus *Pinus*).\(^{151}\)

Woods used in secondary or structural functions within case pieces were even more indicative of the lower Delaware River Valley’s ecological specificity. Listed in order of greatest quantity present, the secondary woods visually identified in this study include: hard pine, Atlantic white cedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*, also known as Whitecedar Falsecypress), tulip or yellow poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), white oak (genus *Quercus*, likely *Quercus alba*), Eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*), chestnut (genus *Castenea*), cherry, and red gum (also called sweet gum, *Liquidambar styraciflua*).\(^{152}\) These trees do not grow uniformly throughout the region now, nor did they in the periods of first European settlement.\(^{153}\) Chestnut, cherry, and tulip poplar specifically struggled to grow in the wet, sandy soils of southeastern New Jersey, as

\(^{151}\) There are ten species that can be defined as “Southern yellow pine”, a member of the hard pine group. Given that these species cannot be differentiated with the naked eye, the author elected to use this accurate but more generic descriptor “hard pine”.

\(^{152}\) Microscopic analysis of wood specimens was not completed for this research. Identifications are based on the author’s knowledge of wood, unless otherwise noted, which is why genus is presented but species is not. The author is grateful to Christopher Storb, conservator at the Dietrich American Foundation, Philadelphia, and to Gregory Landrey and Mark Anderson, Winterthur Museum, for their assistance with various material identifications.

\(^{153}\) Historians, collectors, and connoisseurs have frequently neglected to assess, however, whether their material assumptions are appropriate for the region or location of origin ascribed, and for the time in which an object was made. Writing in 1972, Charles van Ravenswaay, then director of the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, noted “that because a tree grows in a particular area does not mean it always has, nor does it mean that its use has been static over time.” Charles van Ravenswaay, 1972, 175.
documented by the United States Department of Agriculture’s species distribution maps. These maps approximate the indigenous growth areas of various species. Bright green notes documented native species; lighter green notes native species lacking specific county data; white indicates there is no county or state data available; darker blue indicates the species was introduced; while lighter blue notes the species was introduced but county data is not available. (Figures 3.2 to 3.10)

Figure 3.2 USDA Species Distribution Map. Black walnut (*Juglans nigra*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture\textsuperscript{154}

Figure 3.3  USDA Species Distribution Map. Southern yellow pine (*Pinus rigida* Mill.). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture155

Figure 3.4  USDA Species Distribution Map. Atlantic white cedar (*C. thyoides*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture156

Figure 3.5 USDA Species Distribution Map. Tulip poplar (tree) (*L. tulipfera* L.). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture\textsuperscript{157}

Figure 3.6 USDA Species Distribution Map. Eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{156} This species’ full scientific name is Chamaecyparis thyoides (L.) Britton, Sterns & Poggenb. See \url{http://plants.usda.gov/core/profile?symbol=CHTH2}, accessed 3/3/2014.

Figure 3.7  USDA Species Distribution Map. Sweet gum or red gum (*L. styraciflua*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture\textsuperscript{159}

Figure 3.8  USDA Species Distribution Map. Chestnut (*C. dentata*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture\textsuperscript{160}


Figure 3.9 USDA Species Distribution Map. Red pine (*Pinus resinosa*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture

Figure 3.10 USDA Species Distribution Map. Eastern redcedar (*Juniperus virginiana*). Courtesy U. S. Department of Agriculture

160 This species *Castanea dentata* (Marshall) Borkh., or American chestnut, was decimated in the twentieth century due to an Asian fungus first observed in the US in 1904. See http://plants.usda.gov/core/profile?symbol=CADE12, accessed 3/3/2014.

These woods were available across the region, however, because of early inter-coastal timber commerce spanning the Delaware River. Gabriel Thomas’s 1698 account is important for scholars because he records the use of creeks and rivers for timber transport, underscoring the early and healthy logging industry present in West Jersey, and role of Philadelphia as a consumer and re-exporter of this commodity. He stated: “Timber River, alias Glocester River, which hath its name (also) from the great quantity of curious Timber, which they send in great float to Philadelphia, a city in Pennsylvania, as Oakes, Pines, Chestnut, Ash and Cedars. This river runs down by Gloucester-Town, which is the shire town.”¹⁶² The river empties into the Delaware near present-day Camden, directly across from Philadelphia. (Figure 3.11)

¹⁶² Italics are the addition of the author. Myers, 1912, 350.
Figure 3.11  Major rivers of New Jersey identified with geographic boundaries and saw mill locations active prior to 1750. Illustration after Wacker and Lurie, *Mapping New Jersey: an Evolving Landscape*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rivergate Books, an imprint of Rutgers University Press, 2009). Drawn by author.\(^{163}\)

\(^{163}\) The map does not illustrate saw mills that could only be identified as active in a particular county. See Appendix F. for a table of all saw mills identified.
The practical and economic value of pine and its byproducts made it a valuable export commodity in the British colonies, which continued to focus on shipbuilding, trade and ensuring safe passage of cargoes to the Caribbean. Atlantic white cedar was an equally valuable, stable species used as a secondary cabinet wood.¹⁶⁴ (Figure 3.12)

Figure 3.12  Stand of Atlantic white cedar trees in a New Jersey swamp. Photo by Famartin. Courtesy Wikimedia Commons.

It is so often identified as a drawer bottom or used as dustboards in casework that scholars during the twentieth century (and today) still consider the presence of cedar a

hallmark of eighteenth-century furniture made in Philadelphia. Despite its ubiquity in identified Philadelphia casework, it was clearly available and used in New Jersey and the Lower Counties, and even in parts of Long Island, New York. (Figure 3.13)

Figure 3.13  View of a cedar drawer bottom from chest on chest made in the Delaware River Valley, (see Figure 1.4), dated 1738. Museum purchase with funds drawn from the Centenary Fund and acquired through the gift of Mrs. Waldron Phoenix Belknap, Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. Photo by author.
Figure 3.14  Thomas Revell House, Burlington, New Jersey, ca. 1691 and later. Photo by author.

Figure 3.15  Roofing shingles, detail of Figure 3.14 (likely replaced), 2014. Photo by author.
Cedar was widely used—and valued—for splitting and processing into roofing shingles. Cedar shingles roofed many structures in the Delaware River Valley region, like the Thomas Revell House that stands in Burlington begun in 1685. (Figure 3.14 and 3.15) Houses in other parts of the rapidly expanding English colonial empire also required shingles, which became an important export commodity to the southernmost colonies of the Atlantic. In 1700, a single English merchant in Philadelphia purchased almost 20,000 shingles from two other local merchants for the purpose of exporting them to Jamaica.

Despite the continued presence of handwork to process wood in small scale in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, sawmilling technology was present in the Delaware River Valley prior to English settlement. The Dutch introduced sawmills in

---

165 This method of cedar processing produced boards six to eight inches wide, approximately the same width as boards glued together to produce drawer bottoms in larger case pieces.

166 The Thomas Revell House, the oldest structure in Burlington, was first built on the waterfront in 1685 for George Hutchinson, a distiller and First Proprietor of the Province. Hutchinson sold it to Thomas Revell, a scrivener and appointed member of Queen Anne’s Governor’s Council in 1702. There is no evidence Revell lived in the house. He sold it in approximately 1699 to Isaac De Cou. The gable roof was converted to a gambrel during De Cou’s ownership, and it was moved to its present address at 213 Wood Street in 1966. See Historic American Buildings Survey, Record for the Hutchinson-Revell House, 8 East Pearl Street, Burlington, Burlington County, NJ (HABS NJ,3-BURL,5-).

167 Theodore Maisch, “Episodes in Lumber Industry,” in Southern Lumberman 136, no.1760 (July 15, 1929): 65. Maisch regrettably does not provide his source for these transactions. The buyer was not identified in the article, but Daniell England and Isaac Merriott (Marriott) are stated as the sellers. A Daniel England owned a sawmill on Buckshutem Creek, adjacent to the Maurice River in present-day Cumberland Co., NJ, operational as early as 1705 (Weiss, 1968, 49). It is likely that the Merriott mentioned was the son of Isaac Marriott of Burlington discussed in the previous section. Shingles in that quantity do not seem to be unusual. An inventory of Joseph Brown’s estate in Greenwich, Salem, NJ taken in 1711 lists “a parcel of shingles” valued at £32-0-0. It is possible Brown was a merchant who retired from carpentry. His estate listed a “parcel of old carpenters tools.” The total value of the estate was £1315-19-5 ½, and a sloop with its rigging and sails was valued at £180. See Inventory of Joseph Brown, Cohansey (Greenwich), Salem Co., NJ, 1711, Winterthur Museum Library, Joseph Downs Collection. Col. 61, Box 10, 55.21.2.
London, and may also have might introduced the technology to the Delaware River Valley, under their control (until the 1630s) and influence until the late-seventeenth century. Sawmills were present early in the province of East Jersey. The earliest known sawmill built in the colony of New Jersey was likely erected in 1664 in the town of Bergen, settled and largely inhabited by Dutch as part of the New Netherlands colony. Mill construction flourished in East Jersey with mills erected in Elizabeth (Town), Woodbridge, and Monmouth County in the early 1680s, where immigrants from New England colonies settled, possibly bringing mill technology that had been established there decades earlier. That same year, but in the far southwestern corner of the West Jersey province, William Hampton

168 Sawmilling history is not a linear and codified one. There are accounts that sawmills were taken to Madeira in the fifteenth century, and that a mill had been erected in Breslau (or Wrocław, capital of Silesia) in 1427. Mills followed in Norway, and in the Schleswig-Holstein and Prussian states in the sixteenth century. The first mill in the Netherlands was erected in 1596 at Saardam (present-day Zaandam, outside of Amsterdam). See the entry for ‘saw’ in Thomas Mortimer, A General Dictionary of Commerce, Trade and Manufactures…, (London: Printed for Richard Phillips, Bridge-Street, Blackfriars, 1810), n. p.; Bolling Arthur Johnson, et al., “In the Realm of the Lumber Manufacturer,” Lumber World Review 31 (January 10, 1920), 27–30. Bishop, 1866, 105. A sawmill was leased on Nutten (Governors) Island in 1639. Documented sawmill owners identified in this study do not seem to be of Dutch or Swedish descent, but it seems quite likely that they may have controlled saw mills during their governance of the lower Delaware Valley region.


Statistics for the late seventeenth century have not been found, but a 1714 statistic written in “Lord Sheffield’s Tables from the Customs-House books” indicated that New York exported 10,700 feet of boards and lumber that year. See Bishop, 1866, 108.

Writing from Amboy, East Jersey in May 1683, Thomas Rudyard, then Deputy-Governor of the New Jersey Province, noted “There is five or six mills going up here this Spring, two at work already.”

New Sweden’s settlements on both sides of the Delaware had wind- or water-driven grist- and sawmills, but due to shortages of materials and labor, settlers still relied heavily upon the work of sawyers well into the 1680s as Thomas Paschall’s letter recorded. Johan Printz, Governor of New Sweden, drafted reports in 1644 and 1647 about the territories under his governance that provide valuable information about technological developments, material scarcity, and labor needs in the region. In one example, Printz noted that a water-powered mill was built to replace an existing wind-driven one at Möndal (“place of the mill”), near Kingsessing, on a water source


171 Statistics for the late seventeenth century have not been found, but a 1714 statistic written in “Lord Sheffield’s Tables from the Customs-House books” indicated that New York exported 10,700 feet of boards and lumber that year. See Bishop, 1866, 108.


that had been dammed.\textsuperscript{174} Printz conjectured that a sawmill would be built below the dam, but lack of manpower and materials might have prevented its construction when, in a subsequent report to the government of Sweden he requested: “a man who can superintend the sawmill; also, windlasses and blades for saws.”\textsuperscript{175}

Inventories of New Jersey estates and land transactions prior to 1740 provide data about the presence of sawmills and their ownership. From these documents, in addition to period accounts, we know that mills were privately erected and owned, but that more frequently they were co-owned, as multiple instances of mill co-ownership are found. Mills were located in counties with the greatest concentration of waterways: prior to 1740 Gloucester and Burlington Counties with seven each, and Essex County with at least four. In Gloucester County, most mills were on Timber Creek or one of its tributaries, while in Burlington County, they were spread more diffusely in the western part of the county on rivers that flowed into the Delaware River. (Refer to Figure 3.18) Many references indicated construction or presence of a mill prior to 1725, with the earliest mills occurring in Elizabeth Town, Essex County, and Burlington and Salem Counties. Advertisements for the sale of mills in this period often included large parcels of acreage (from a few hundred to a few thousand acres), noted the timber species present (typically oak, pine and cedar), as well as the improvements of the mill (whether it had one or two saws, with two being more frequently noted after the 1730s), and the presence of wharves.\textsuperscript{176} Finally, in at least

\textsuperscript{174} Myers, 1912, 122.

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{176} Weiss and Weiss, 1968, 48–52.
one instance, a mill owner was also active in woodworking trades: shingle-maker William Ware owned a mill on Timber Creek before 1733. This evidence of milling throughout New Jersey and the Delaware River Valley broadly considered illustrates the relative ease with which this material could be harvested and exported regionally and as part of a larger network of intercolonial or transatlantic commerce.

Philadelphian Richard Frame’s (or Freame?) poem written in 1692 further enriches our understanding of how English immigrants valued, used, and managed timber resources in the Delaware River Valley. Frame notes a distinction in the period usage of the words “wood” and “timber” that alludes to its real value, and the ways in which it was managed or harvested. West Jersey settlers also regulated timber use via legislation passed locally by the General Assembly to further protect the timber on private lands. Court records illustrate that such timber was regularly poached. As early as 1681, provincial settlers enacted legislation to protect timbers expressly for their industrial use and economic value. Among other essential acts proclaiming the province’s currency, settling of lands, and establishing a system of roads, Act XXIII

177 Ibid, 53.

178 See Bowett, 2012, xii-xiii. Bowett discusses the differences in these commodities, indicating that timber “came from large trees grown to maturity and used for… house or ship-building, or conversion to planks, boards, etc.,” while wood “came from small trees; it was a crop, grown from coppice stools or pollards on a rotation of five, seven, ten or more years, to provide firewood, poles and other small stock useful… for everyday purposes. In effect, timber was capital and wood was income.” I am grateful to Mr. Bowett for our early conversations that informed my knowledge about wood use in England.

179 Sometime before 1729, Parliament established the post of Surveyor General of His Majesty’s Woods in North America, which seems to have been occupied by members of the New Hampshire colony throughout the eighteenth century. As early as 1691, the Crown sought to obtain all useful timbers for shipbuilding, and included a clause to that effect in the Massachusetts Bay Company charter. In 1729, further laws were enacted specifically to protect white pines. See Harvey Green, *Wood: Craft, Culture, History* (New York: Penguin Books, 2007, 2006), 166.
passed by the General Free Assembly of West Jersey stated “no person or persons, henceforth shall presume to fell and carry away timber from any land surveyed within this Province, without leave first had from the owner or owners thereof, upon pain of triple damage.” Additional legislation passed in the first half of the eighteenth century further protected standing timber: it forbade cutting of trees for poles as well as for pipe and barrel staves, and boring for turpentine without an owner’s consent.

Timber and timber products were frequently contested in early court cases, further reinforcing our understanding of their value in the colonial economy of the Delaware Valley region. Between 1682 and 1698, as many as eight cases appeared before the court of Burlington, all dealing with incorrect surveys of swampland, refusal to pay bills on boards and logs, rights to logging, and trespassing and illegal cutting from private lands. In nearly half of those cases or proclamations, the plaintiffs, accused, or participants can be identified (as of this publication) as carpenters or joiners active in Burlington County prior to 1707. Species are not


181 Timber’s byproducts—tar, pitch, rosin (resin) and turpentine—were useful commodities: resin was used as a binder in pigments; tar used for lubricant in axels, as a sealant for vessels, and as a component in remedies. Weiss and Weiss, 1965, chapters 2 and 3: Tar and Pitch; Turpentine.

182 H. Clay Reed and George J. Miller, eds. *The Burlington Court Book: A Record of Quaker Jurisprudence in West Jersey, 1680–1709. American Legal Records Series, 5* (Washington, D. C.: The American Historical Association, 1944). Timber species are not usually named in the court cases, rather the references include “timber”, “logs”, and “boards.” Only in a 1696 case regarding an inaccurate survey of cedar swamp was that delineation of species recorded; ibid., 186.

183 Ibid. Those mentioned are: John Cornish, plaintiff (November 3, 1691), 130; Eleazar Fenton, defendant (November 7, 1698), 93; Thomas Mathews, who called upon the Court to issue a proclamation as follows: “requests that the Court will take order against the spoyle of Timber upon Lands not taken up: The Court thereupon order that a Proclamation be issued forth from Governour and Commissioners that noe person etc. fell or cut down any timber Trees upon Lands untaken up, or take
identified in the cases, except in one instance contesting two fifty- and sixty-acre surveys of cedar swamp. The earliest record of a court transaction related to lumber found in the Burlington court records occurred in 1682 when the servant to Pennsylvania’s acting governor William Markham produced a receipt for 3,625 boards delivered "on the accompt of Joseph Stubbs, etc., amounting to £16-18s-4d with the boards at a cost of 9s-4d to the hundred.” In 1681, Markham, the first cousin of William Penn, arrived in Upland (now Chester), Pennsylvania and began ruling the future colony in his cousin’s stead. It is not clear what relationship Markham had to Stubbs other than that of client to supplier, and it is possible the boards in question were to be used at William Penn’s suburban plantation, Pennsbury, across the river and then under construction.

Private individuals in the Delaware River Valley were not alone in their protective attitudes toward local timber: England sought ways to utilize the region’s or carry away the same etc. under the penalty of being Fyned, and punished according to the nature of the offense…” (1684), 34.

184 Ibid., 186.

185 Ibid, 9-10. The date refers to the month of August, according to the calendar used by the Society of Friends, which was the same as the English civil and legal year that began on March 25. This day is known as Conception Day in England and the Feast of the Annunciation in Southern Europe. This calendar format was in use until 1752 when an Act of Parliament ended it in 1751. (http://www.erblandbrown.org/before_1850/documents/QuakerDates.pdf, accessed 3/19/2014).

186 The presence of this case in the Burlington court records is also confusing. As early as 1677 there were minor courts at Upland, Salem, and Burlington with a main court at New Castle. Burlington was no closer to Markham’s location of duty than Upland, so the decision to hold the case in Burlington is not known. The use of the boards is not known either, but in conversations with William Penn scholar Dr. Catharine Dann Roeber, it seems possible that the boards may have been procured for early alterations to an existing building at Pennsbury, just to the north of Burlington, where William Penn’s estate, Pennsbury would be located. It is possible that Markham was acting on behalf of Penn’s interests to procure the materials for the renovations (Dr. Catharine Dann Roeber in phone message to author, 10/9/2014).
prodigious forests and timber by-products for imperial shipbuilding activities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Through acts of Parliament, the Crown protected its rights to such material by legislating and punishing colonial activities that diverted the use of timber and its by-products. Parliamentary acts passed in 1704, 1713, and 1721 underscore how these timber resources played an active part in English efforts at naval expansion. In 1704, “An Act for Encouraging the Importation of Naval-Stores from Her Majesty’s *Plantations in America* was passed. Resinous pitch and tar, as well as the various species of pine trees from which it was extracted, were valuable regional products. Parliament passed additional protectionist legislation nearly four years later to “preserve White and other Pine Trees growing in Her Majesty’s Colonies…for the Masting of Her Majesty’s Navy.” The prohibited activities enumerated in these Parliamentary acts speak to the perceived value of the colonial timber supply to English naval growth, and underscore its anticipated role in an early intercolonial and transatlantic shipping industry.

---

187 See Bowett, 2012, xii-xiii, 299. England sought new forest resources that were not located in the Baltic or Holland. Bowett notes the beginning of earnest English interest in American timber resources commencing with the first Anglo-Dutch War (1652–54). Bounties of as much as £1 per ton “on ‘Masts, Yards and Bowsprits’ were offered, but high freight costs of transatlantic shipments prohibited this export from competing with exports from Norway, or the Baltic. Despite this, England invested £10,000 in men and tools to work in the American lumber trade.

188 Printed in a broadside bound in after the Boston News-Letter, August 4 to August 11, 1707. Quoted from Nelson, ed., (1894), 24–25: “No persons within Her Majesties Colonies…do or shall presume to Cut, Fell, or Destroy and Pitch-Pine Trees, or Tar-Trees, not being within any Fence or actual Inclosure, (sic) under the Growth of Twelve Inches Diameter, at three Foot from the Earth…”


190 Carl Woodward, “Agricultural Legislation in Colonial New Jersey,” *Agricultural History* 3:1 (Jan. 1929), 23. Barrel staves exported to other colonies were also subject to heavy taxation as a way to protect New Jersey’s commercial endeavors in shipping and transportation of goods.
The real values of wood in boards, planks, or scantling can be best understood by analyzing estate inventories of woodworkers who died while still active in their trade. Over a span of fifty years, specific woods are enumerated repeatedly in shop inventories across the Delaware Valley region. This homogeneity and continuity of species craftsmen preferred implies that many joiners and carpenters of the region participated in a specific Anglo-oriented craft tradition that was relatively stable prior to 1730. The English training of first settlers in woodworking trades continued to be handed down over the course of the next three generations so that choice of primary and secondary wood was largely static over time. These craftsmen mastered their material and understood that, in their particular region, the behavior of certain local woods was a reliable and relatively predictable factor in their cabinetmaking. Shop inventories across the region from the early eighteenth century to about 1745 continue to list woods in specific ratios. This finding implies that consumer demands in parts of the Delaware Valley did not change markedly because cabinetmakers were not forced to fully restock their shops with exotic species, though tropical woods do appear in inventories of craftsmen’s shops, and in inventories of personal property.

William Till, an immigrant from the Friends’ stronghold of Staffordshire, England, immigrated to Philadelphia where he practiced a thriving joinery trade illustrated by the contents of his shop inventoried upon his death in 1711.191 The

191 See Donald L. Fennimore and Frank M. Hohmann III, *Stretch: America’s First Family of Clockmakers* (Winterthur, DE: Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, 2013), ch. 2 & 3 (pp. 103–105). The links between the Society of Friends in Philadelphia and Staffordshire are very strong. Till was from Leek, Staffordshire, as was the Armitt family that also immigrated to Philadelphia in 1700. Stephen Armitt, b. 1701, also became a joiner in that city. He was among the fifteen cabinetmakers granted freedom to practice their trade by the Common Council of Pennsylvania in 1717. The noted Stretch family of clockmakers also immigrated to Philadelphia (and others to Salem, New Jersey). They were from the town Horton, located only four miles from Leek. It is quite likely that the Tills, Armitts, and Stretches knew one another, worshipped together as members of a local meeting in Leek,
inventory-takers Francis Cooke and John Goodson (?) listed the following woods present, with amounts in £: S: d:

Table 3.1  Inventory of timber material itemized in the estate of William Till, joiner, 1711.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Footage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine Boards…</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>4:18:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Seder [sic] Bou(lts?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0:15:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Board…</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4:7:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany Board…</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5:4:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany [sic] Scantling…</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0:17:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Seder [sic] Board…</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0:9:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Tree Board…</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0:2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear Tree Board…</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0:8:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Scantling 4 by 5…</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1:10:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moving upstairs to the garret, the inventory-takers found £1:10 of “Sundry Sort of Lumber Omitted,” and a large cache of furniture hardware identified as “locks, drops, scuttchoons (escutcheons), coffin handles, hinges &c” valued at the princely sum of £20:0:0. Given the value of the cabinet hardware alone, it seems that Till’s operation must have been quite large, and case furniture his specialty. He may have even

192 William Till. Inventory. 1711. Philadelphia County Wills, #216. Microfilm, Joseph Downs Collection, Winterthur Museum. Witnesses to William Till’s will include Thomas Story, apprentice William Beakes (III.), Joshua Cart (sic?), and Matthew Pope. Beakes became a joiner upon completing his apprenticeship with Till in 1711. It is possible that the other witnesses were also members of Till’s shop or his craft.

193 Till’s estate, including his home and personal apparel, was valued at £486:16:6. The home was valued at £300. Till’s various “working tools of all sorts” were valued at £30, yielding a combined total
supplied the hardware needs of other craftsmen. Not surprisingly, Till’s primary cabinet woods include walnut, cherry, and pear, all of which could have been obtained locally. The presence of mahogany in a large quantity of boards and scantling indicates that Till was making furniture in this wood for his clients, and illustrates the availability of this exotic material in the region thanks to trade networks that existed at a very early date.194

By comparison, the inventory of Chester County, PA resident and cabinetmaker Joseph Hibberd taken in 1737 shows less primary wood diversity than Till’s inventory of twenty years earlier. Hibberd’s particular clientele in Chester County may have favored solid walnut over more expensive woods that appear in Till’s inventory. Significantly, however, Hibberd’s inventory presents the same secondary woods as that of Till’s inventory—pine and cedar—with the addition of poplar.195 Hibberd’s inventory of shop woods is as follows, with amounts in £: S: d:

of nearly £70 between tools and lumber. This is nearly one half the value of his estate when excluding his house.


195 I am grateful to Lisa Minardi, Assistant Curator at Winterthur Museum, for showing me this inventory contained within the research files of the exhibition Paint, Pattern, and People. The original version of Hibberd’s inventory may be found in West Chester, Pa., Chester County Archives, will and inventory #609.
Table 3.2  Inventory of timber material itemized in the estate of Joseph Hibberd, 1737.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118 foot walnut bord [sic]</td>
<td>0:17:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about 50 foot ditto scantling</td>
<td>0: 6: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 foot pine and poplar bord [sic] and 1 piece of</td>
<td>0: 5: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 foot walnut planke [sic]</td>
<td>0: 6: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken bord [sic] of walnut about hund$^d$ foot</td>
<td>0: 9: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 foot of walnut bord [sic] and scantling</td>
<td>0: 5: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 foot of long black walnut bord [sic]</td>
<td>0:12:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some split ceder [sic] for drayor [sic] bottomes [sic]</td>
<td>0: 8: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presence of these woods again shows their availability regionally twenty years later, whether due to local harvesting or timber trade that no doubt expanded in the region as the century advanced. It further suggests that furniture-makers could work successfully in a variety of woods outside of Philadelphia, albeit possibly on a reduced scale compared to Till and his Philadelphia contemporaries. Hibberd lived in Darby Township, now Delaware County, adjacent to Darby Creek, Cobbs Creek, and the Delaware River. Given his location, he may have obtained his materials from across the river, or elsewhere on the west bank of the Delaware without ever needing to travel to Philadelphia’s wharves a few miles north.

Hibberd’s inventory also provides invaluable evidence that contradicts furniture historians’ assumptions that presence of certain woods identifies urban Philadelphia production. Hibberd’s inventory notes specifically the presence of cedar, likely the species of Atlantic white cedar that so frequently roofed the houses of the Delaware Valley and other parts British colonies. Here, Hibberd used cedar as furniture historians would expect: “split for drayor (drawer) bottomes.” Presence of cedar in Delaware River Valley-made furniture has been a cornerstone of historian’s
evidence that affirmed a narrower location of origin—Philadelphia.196 This wood was available on either shore of the Delaware River and should not be to indicate urban (or urbane) craftsmanship in this region, or to define Philadelphia production specifically.

Cedar was used as a cabinet wood well into the mid-eighteenth century as the inventory of Stacy Beaks’ large Trenton shop attests. Upon his death in Trenton in 1745, Burlington County native Stacy Beaks (b. 1706) left a thriving carpentry and cabinetmaking business that made furniture and likely completed complex interior woodwork projects with multiple apprentices and journeymen based on the quantity of tools present in his inventory.197 (Appendix B) Trenton was a small but growing town without roughly one hundred families, and an important transportation center as the northernmost port on the Delaware River that connected to Princeton, Somerset and Hunterdon Counties, New Brunswick, Amboy, and beyond to New York. Trenton grew slowly in this period, consisting of no more than a hundred residents, so it is likely that Beaks’ clients were within Trenton, and beyond it to the north and east in Hopewell and Maidenhead (now Lawrenceville) Townships. It is possible that Beaks was responsible for woodwork in some of the early brick townhouses in Trenton, and may have had a role in the woodwork of the first stone Presbyterian Church constructed 1726.

---

196 The earliest dated example of furniture made in the region that contains Atlantic white cedar as a secondary wood is a large walnut escritoire (or ‘scrutoire’) made by joiner Edward Evans, and bears his brand with the date 1707 on a drawer interior. This object is in the collection of Colonial Williamsburg, 1958-468.

197 See transcription of Beaks’ inventory, Appendix 5. The original inventory can be found in Winterthur Museum Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Ephemera, col. 61, box 10, 55.21.1.
A transcribed list of materials inventoried ‘In the Shop’ allows speculation at the shop’s production.

Table 3.3 Inventory of timber material in the estate of Stacy Beaks, 1746.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ : S : d</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7: 0: 0</td>
<td>1000 Foot Black Walnut [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: 0: 0</td>
<td>4000 Foot Pine, Cedar &amp; Gumm [sic] Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the shops of William Till in Philadelphia, and Joseph Hibberd in Chester County, Stacy Beaks used pine and cedar as secondary cabinet woods. The addition of gum boards here likely refers to sweet gum, and its presence in Beaks’ shop is an indicator of the terrain changes that began in the area immediately adjacent to his shop’s location in Trenton. At this point in the Delaware River, the Inner Coastal Plain and the Piedmont meet, yielding a change of terrain and soils. (See Figure 3.12) The precise 4:1 ratio of secondary woods to cabinet woods (here, black walnut) seems to also indicate a highly regulated and practiced shop. Till’s shop has a nearly perfect 2:1 ratio of pine to walnut that implies a refined knowledge of material use and investment as a result of skilled and regimented work. Beaks’ inventory of tools consisted of 110 planes, chisels and gouges, eight handsaws, two drawknives, a lathe with turning tools, two glue pots and five hammers. These tools could have constructed any kind of furniture from casework to chairs. Furthermore, the quantity of planes, chisels, and gouges points to a larger shop of journeymen and apprentices who could create interior architectural woodwork with complex curves that became fashionable by the middle of the eighteenth century.
Since the colony of West Jersey predated the settlement of Pennsylvania in 1682, Jerseyans would have sought the work of their immediate neighbors or townspeople, and such skilled craftsmen were present in the colony from the very first ship landing in 1677.198 With the knowledge of English joinery practice, available timber resources, and access to processed materials throughout the region, craftsmen working across the West Jersey settlement had the means to produce furniture that satisfied their local clientele. At the province’s inception, riverine transportation allowed movement of goods and people between West Jersey and Pennsylvania, which created expanded opportunities for apprenticeship, commerce, and migration. People continued to move via rivers and in unexpected ways that challenge historians’ assessment of the relationship between these settlements as one of “core vs. periphery” or “urban vs. rural”. New Jerseyans plied their trade adequately within their own colony. Philadelphia trades, however, soon experienced saturation and found the local marketplace very competitive. For many of those craftsmen, New Jersey was a land of opportunity, a place where they could work and acquire property. For Quakers in this period, their religion and kin networks made their transitions to West Jersey settlements fruitful ones.

198 Samuel Smith's 1765 "History of Nova-Cesaria, or New Jersey," printed in Burlington indicated that a carpenter was one of the passengers on the first or second ship to land in Burlington. He "was one Marshall… particularly serviceable in fitting up habitations for the new comers…" See George Morgan Hills, Church in Burlington, New Jersey (Trenton, NJ: William Sharp, Printer, 1876), 9. Search of period documents has not identified the ‘Marshall’ noted in this account.
Multiple generations of people arrived in the Delaware River Valley in the period analyzed in this study. Many would have had an immediate need for a chest or chest of drawers in which to store personal belongings, no matter how limited their means. Storage became an imperative as the region’s economy stabilized, a large part of the population thrived, and there was a sharp increase in the acquisition and production of textiles, valuables, and other goods that required security and organization. Carpenters who built first built forts and houses also constructed chests and chests of drawers to satisfy this need, until a class of joiners and cabinetmakers emerged who made more specialized forms. Chests and chests of drawers made in these regions survive in high quantities on the open market and in museum collections. These illustrate only a percentage of those pieces actually made and used in the region, but are indicative of that larger body of furniture produced by craftsmen which has not survived. Even without joinery and carpentry guilds in colonial America to regulate work, the apprenticeship system standardized these trades so that casework met mutual expectations of construction, material, and function between maker and consumer. Chests of drawers are tangible evidence of an English and Continental craft tradition that persisted in the Delaware River Valley. The hand of a cabinetmaker and his preferences can be seen in surviving furniture.
This section analyzes surviving chests of drawers by two identified shops that operated inside and outside Philadelphia, that of John Head (1688–1754, active until 1747) and William Beakes III. (1691–1761).\textsuperscript{199} Traits of construction identified in examples of their signed or dated furniture supports our knowledge of their life and training, and offers hypotheses about the working conditions each experienced in their respective areas. Using the characteristics identified in these urban and non-urban shop examples, the study considers a third group of furniture by an as-yet identified maker to project a profile of the possible craftsman. Of greater significance, this discussion will illustrate that craftsmen responded to economic pressures in ways that suited their specific circumstances, utilizing their advantages—networks of people, mobility, or stylistic knowledge—and revising scholars’ generalizations about the movement of craftsmen in this period.

Fashionable English and Continental furniture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was made of joined wainscot oak or dovetailed deal cases veneered with thin layers of more exotic or expensive woods. English-trained joiner John Head arrived in Philadelphia from Suffolk in 1717, and one year later made his first known piece of case furniture, a veneered chest of drawers. This expensive example sold by Head to James Poults for £8-0-0 may have served as a calling card for the newly arrived joiner: veneered furniture, while not uncommon in the Delaware River Valley, was not a popular choice among the region’s inhabitants based on surviving, documented artifacts.\textsuperscript{200} Compared to other chests of drawers Head made in

\textsuperscript{199} On John Head, see Stiefel, 2001.

\textsuperscript{200} On veneered furniture and casework in this period see Benno Forman, \textit{Continental Furniture Craftsman in London, 1511–1625} (London: The Furniture Society, [1971?]), and \textit{The Origin of the Joined Chest of Drawers} (Haarlem, The Netherlands: Fibula-Van Dishoeck, 1981); Adam Bowett,
this period for which he only charged £3-0-0, this technically ambitious and expensive commission showed potential clients Head’s cognizance of and facility with current tastes in London and Bristol, where many of Philadelphia’s prosperous merchants originated. In this successful display of his ability, Head established a reputation for fashionable work. Despite this advertisement of his cabinetmaking skills, however, this is the only example of a veneered chest in the account book that documented Head’s three-decade career, reinforcing our understanding that Head’s Philadelphia clients did not prefer veneered furniture.

Veneered furniture uses show woods frugally. Despite its popularity in England, veneered furniture made in the region survives in small numbers, and there are few references to it in archival documents. Veneering requires cabinetmakers to use boards of figured wood sliced into narrow (sometimes only one millimeter) thicknesses, a strategy useful in economies where such material is expensive or scarce.201 Although tools like glue pots and hammers for applying veneers appear in the region’s shop inventories, it is possible that obtaining material of appropriate thickness was difficult, as veneering saws are rarely listed among a shop’s hand tools.202 In this region, the favored show wood—walnut—abounded, and walnut in

---

201 Mitigating material cost, however, was the need for specialty tools—namely veneering saws, hammers, and glue pots—as well as the cabinetmaker’s ability knowledge to make a dovetailed case, and to properly adhere veneers, so veneering was economical to the cabinetmaker, but these additional costs were passed along to the consumer. Glue pots and hammers can be found in cabinetmaker inventories in this period, but not in large quantities.

202 It is possible that boards for veneering could be cut at local saw mills, precluding the need for smaller saws in individual shops. If this were true for most of the region, veneering would be more likely in areas where cabinetmakers had easy access to a mill that could supply those boards. This hypothesis requires further investigation. Adam Bowett noted that professional sawyers trained in
‘plank’ or ‘board’ is found in nearly every joiner’s inventory surveyed in this period regardless of urban or rural location. The region’s material richness allowed for work in the solid, which was economical for the cabinetmaker and his clients: it eliminated labor-intensive gluing and finishing and was quicker; solid boards were plentiful and competitively priced; solid joinery could be done by a less skilled worker than the cabinetmaking required for veneering.

Scholars’ analyses of material life in the Delaware River Valley attest to the near ubiquity of walnut chests of drawers, whether within Philadelphia or outside the port city. For the period 1718–44, 118 chests of drawers were debited in Philadelphian John Head’s account book, each made for the price of £3-0-0.203 Of that group, twenty-two were made in pairs. Ruth Matzkin’s 1959 study of Philadelphians who died before 1710 identified 250 chests of drawers present in the homes of deceased citizens as valued in their inventories.204 Only ten percent of those are identified further as ‘walnut’, although whenever a wood designation was given, walnut was most prevalent. A few early arrivals to Philadelphia may have traveled with a sea chest for carrying scant belongings, but most of the chests of drawers documented by Matzkin’s analysis must have been made in Philadelphia, or in the area immediately surrounding it. Among those estates documented, Matzkin identified at least eight cutting veneers existed in England, and it is possible that such specialized laborers did not find it economically beneficial to move to the colonies.

203 Stiefel, 2001. Although no wood was specified, given that walnut was most plentiful in his shop, I agree with Stiefel’s analysis that these chests of drawers had walnut cases.

204 Matzkin, 1959.
joiners active in Philadelphia who could have produced that quantity of furniture.\textsuperscript{205} This furniture was the product of a rapidly swelling population of craftsmen who were trained in or immigrated to that city in the period. These joiners could make many kinds of household furniture, though some joiners may have developed subspecialties like casework. The large quantity of boards present in the inventory of William Till dated 1711 suggests that he supplied a variety of casework or interior paneling to his clients.\textsuperscript{206}

Chests of drawers were essential to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century daily life, regardless of location. This storage form is found in large quantities in estate inventories of inhabitants outside Philadelphia. The quantity of joiners and carpenters active in New Jersey alone underscores that local craftsmen could make chests of drawers, and that Philadelphia craftsmen were not relied upon to supply the needs of that province’s inhabitants. Inventories of houses in the port town of Burlington sometimes contained two chests of drawers, often positioned in the lower hall or front chamber where a bed and furniture were kept. In wealthier homes in Philadelphia and New Jersey, pairs of chests could be found in ancillary rooms as well. In her survey of inventories of Chester County residents before 1740, scholar Margaret Schiffer recorded over 140 chests of drawers owned there, again indicating the necessity for

\textsuperscript{205} Matzkin identified 20 craftsmen who died before 1710: one sawyer, eight confirmed joiners, one house carpenter, seven carpenters, and three craftsmen whose inventories alluded to membership in the carpentry or joinery trades, but were inconclusive. See also Brunk, \textit{American Furniture}, 2002 regarding Joseph Claypoole’s early competitors in Philadelphia.

\textsuperscript{206} See Ch. 3 Materials, FN 62-63
In chests of drawers and other types of casework, analysis of construction details and level of finish can provide insight to a maker’s relative speed in their work or assembly, and allows for speculation about the possible pace of and demand upon a shop, as well as the maker or makers involved: his age and relative experience, and the tradition of training he received (English, Continental, etc.). It is also possible to speculate in such instances when economic forces of demand or seasonal rhythms of other work might be at play, which also informs scholars about the region or environment in which the craftsman works—urban or rural.

Prefacing a discussion of the working relationship of Peter Stretch and John Head, Jay Stiefel astutely noted that furniture attributions are “a hazardous undertaking. It can still be attempted, especially where a combination of identical features are present: appearance, construction, woods (primary and secondary), and the profiles of mouldings and turnings.” Of these features, habits of construction surpass all other criteria in terms of significance. This section discusses patterns of work and tendencies of three Delaware River Valley makers, all who trained in English methods of joinery, who often use the same primary and secondary woods (and in similar locations in their casework), and even work in identical object types. Despite these similarities, their work is unique and specific to their individual training, the location of their shops, their shop’s size, the seasons, and the pace of their work.

207 Schiffer, 1974, 271. In this section identifying the presence of certain materials, Schiffer counted 34 instances of oak chests of drawers, 19 instances of pine, 34 instances of poplar, and 57 instances of walnut.

For many years, scholars of American furniture have interpreted certain features of construction in ways that are now contradicted by a body of evidence—notably from the shop of John Head, the immigrant English joiner of Philadelphia who arrived in 1717. Head is an ideal craftsman to study: scholars continue to identify his shop’s *oeuvre* and Head’s surviving account book records a prodigious output that can be identified. Stiefel’s valuable analysis addresses the shop’s work by object type. In addition to the 118 chests of drawers made 1718–44 previously noted, the shop produced twenty-six high chests and dressing tables (fifteen of those were made 1723–26), fifty-five oval tables (1720–37), fifty-two bedsteads, ninety-one clock cases, forty-five desks, and seventy-three coffins over the course of his career.209

Scholars Jay Stiefel, Christopher Storb, and Alan Andersen united intense study of Head’s surviving work with his account book, and it is now possible to see the rapid pace and prodigious output of a single, urban Philadelphia shop run by an English-trained immigrant in the early colonial period.210 Further, these examples—particularly chests of drawers—exhibit standard features of construction that may be interpreted as characteristics of the fast-paced production of a larger, urban Philadelphia shop.

---

209 Ibid.

210 In addition to Stiefel’s publication, John Head’s work was the subject of remarks delivered in a lecture by Alan Andersen and Christopher Storb at the Winterthur Museum Furniture Forum on the subject of Philadelphia furniture, titled “Making It in Philadelphia: John Head and the Joyners Craft” (March 6, 2014). In the lecture, Andersen noted particular details for attributing Head’s work, among these characteristics are circular chalk patterns drawn to denote the backs or sides of boards used for drawers. See also, remarks of Christopher Storb, "Arts of Baroque Pennsylvania," November 12, 1999; Lita Solis-Cohen, "Seminar Sheds New Light on Early Philadelphia Decorative Arts," *Maine Antique Digest* (January 2000); Jay Robert Stiefel, Alan Andersen, and Christopher Storb, “The John Head Project, Part 1: Documenting His Work,” *Antiques and Fine Arts Magazine*. N.p., n.d. (http://www.antiquesandfineart.com/articles/article.cfm?request=910, Feb. 16, 2015). In this article, the authors note further details of construction characteristic of Head’s shop, including the splayed-leg profile in dressing tables combined with stretchers that are slightly wider than the width of the case.
John Head’s signature has not yet been found on any surviving pieces of furniture. Instead, work is attributed to Head’s shop based on physical and stylistic characteristics (including construction) found in casework purchased from Head and corroborated by his account book. Head’s shop maintained consistency in wood preference and joinery construction over a long period, making it possible to recognize these features across types of casework—from chests of drawers to dressing tables—and attribute a significant group of objects to his shop. Foremost among his shop’s work is a dressing table and high chest in the Philadelphia Museum of Art given by Lydia Thompson Morris, a direct descendant of German émigré Caspar Wistar, and his wife, Catherine Jansen Wistar, who received the furniture as a partial gift from Jansen’s father.211 (Figure 4.1)


The dressing table from this set is very similar to a dressing table (1956.0038.143) in Winterthur Museum’s collections in its configuration, style, and construction. (Figure 4.2)

This example and two chests in private collections with identical drawer configurations illustrate those tendencies for standardization across furniture forms as well. The table below charts the presence of those details in each of the three pieces.
Table 4.1 Common features of construction in casework examples attributed to John Head.

Head, an English-trained joiner and cabinetmaker, worked in ways that conform to our expectations of English-trained makers in the region in this period. Like many of his contemporaries, Head relied upon walnut for the case wood, and a blend of either hard pine or white cedar for the secondary woods. The chests examined in this survey feature a configuration of two short drawers oriented above three case-width drawers below. (Figures 4.3 & 4.4)

Figure 4.4  Chest of drawers, attributed to workshop of John Head (English, 1688–1754). Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Walnut, hard pine, Atlantic white cedar; brass. 32 11/16” x 39 ½” x 21 1/8” (measured at top). Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones. Photo by author.
The cases and drawers are all dovetailed (half-blind for the drawer fronts, full dovetails for the drawer backs). (Figures 4.5, 4.6)

![Image of chest of drawers with dovetail joint](image)

Figure 4.5 (left), detail Figure 4.3, and Figure 4.6 (right), detail Figure 4.4. View of chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head, upper small drawer front dovetail joint with rabbeted bottom board visible. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones. Photo by author.

The drawer bottoms are let into a rabbet in the drawer front and nailed entirely around the perimeter with the grain of the wood oriented from front to rear. (Figures 4.7, 4.8)
The drawers are all set into the case; their fronts flush. The tops of the drawer fronts, sides, and rear are flat and rectilinear. The pins of the dovetails contain no splines or wedges to spread them into a more secure joint. There are no numerical cabinetmaker’s marks on the interiors of the drawers to facilitate assembly.

There are also aspects of Head’s workshop which are anomalous compared to other examples of furniture surveyed in this study: in shorter width case drawers, the drawers’ bottom boards often extend beyond the drawer sides at the rear, and the outer sides of the board’s end are sometimes shaped, while the tails of the rear drawer joints frequently extend beyond the drawer back. (Figures 4.9, 4.10, 4.11)

212 The exception is the drawer backs of the dressing table, which have a shouldered or rounded profile. The tops of the drawer sides are flat, however.
Figure 4.9  (left), Detail, Figure 4.3. Upper short drawer at rear, seen in profile. Extended dovetails and bottom board denoted by red arrows. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones, photo by author.

Figure 4.10  (right), Detail, Figure 4.4 Upper short drawer seen from rear. Dovetails and bottom board extending beyond backboard denoted by red arrows. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones, photo by author.
Large, deep cuts or kerfs are visible in interior faces of the drawer fronts made from long, fast sawing strokes for cutting the pins of the dovetails; these kerfs can be as much as two inches wide. (Figures 4.12, 4.13, 4.14) Finally, almost uniformly placed on the exterior faces of the drawer backs and occasionally of the drawer sides are circular chalk marks. (Figures 4.15, 4.16, 4.17) These can be half-rounds with a central slash, or multiple circular rotations of the chalk with a central slash, made in one motion. While some cabinetmakers use similar marks, this mark is unique to casework produced in Head’s shop.
Figure 4.12  (upper left), detail Figure 4.3. Upper short drawer, view of drawer interior with kerfing of drawer front. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones, photo by author.

Figure 4.13   (upper right), detail Figure 4.4. Upper short drawer, view of drawer interior with kerfing of drawer front. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones, photo by author.
Figure 4.14  DETAIL, Figure 4.2. Proper right drawer, view of drawer interior with kerfing of drawer front on either side. Dressing table attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1719–37. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 1956.0038.143. Photo by author.

Figure 4.15  Detail, Figure 4.3. Upper short drawer, view of chalk mark on drawer back. Chest of drawers attributed to workshop of John Head. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1718–44. Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones, photo by author.
Many of these characteristics unique to Head can also be interpreted as features that would hasten processing, assembly, and finishing of casework for a busy, proficient shop. The long, deep saw kerfs allowed for quicker cutting of the pins in the
drawer fronts. Saw strokes in the drawer sides for cutting the dovetails are also slightly overcut, leaving a small gap on one or both sides of the pin as it meets the tail. Leaving the drawer bottom and drawer side dovetails longer meant less time is wasted in precision cutting, and provide an allowance for keeping the drawers flush with the case front.\textsuperscript{213} The drawer bottoms and interior case surfaces—not visible to users—lack a finely planed and sanded surface. The circular chalk mark defined both the board to be used for the drawer back, as well as its orientation in construction. These internal accommodations for lower levels of finish and speed aided production without diminishing the final product for the consumer.

Also absent from the established and proficient work of Head’s busy shop are other details of construction I associate with a slower pace of work. None of the examples of work by John Head discussed here exhibit the practice of wedging the pins of the dovetailed drawer joints. Scholars of Pennsylvania-made furniture identify this construction practice known as “wedging dovetails”, or more correctly stated, “wedging pins,” as exclusive to Germanic makers. While favored more in Germanic contexts, this technique can be found in the Delaware Valley region in casework made in both Anglo and Germanic cultures.\textsuperscript{214} (Figure 4.18)

\begin{flushleft}

213 Glue blocks used as drawer stops for the shorter drawers in the chests are still found on the interior rear of the cases, although there is only one for the vertical and horizontal faces. It was easier to glue the blocks to the case than to cut the blocks to fit on the extension of the drawer bottom board or adjacent to the extensions of the drawer sides as is frequently found on English casework.

214 Cooper and Minardi, 2011, 169, Figure 4.26; Jurgen Huber, “Expect the Unexpected. Constructional Details Revealed During the Conservation Treatment of a Commode by Johann Gottlieb Fiedler at the Wallace Collection.” \textit{Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Wood and Furniture Conservation}, (Amsterdam: Stichting Ebenist, 2010). Huber’s article discusses the presence of wedged pins in full Rococo casework made by German cabinetmakers in the eighteenth century. I am grateful to Christopher Storb and Adam Bowett for sharing this article with me.

\end{flushleft}
In this technique, the pins are sawn through to relieve a channel to receive small splints later driven into the pin of the dovetail joint. When inserted, these splits or wedges spread the wood of the pin to yield a tighter fit between the dovetails of the drawer sides and the pins of the drawer fronts. The technique is advantageous because
it creates a very strong mechanical fit without the aid of glue. Gerrit Jensen (d. 1715), cabinetmaker to the English monarch, built a dovetailed strong box for Colonel James Grahme in 1688.\textsuperscript{215} The dovetailed joints of the front and sides of the case are concealed by walnut veneer, but are exposed at the rear, revealing continuous use of wedges through the pins on both sides. The strong box was created to withstand attempts at theft and destruction while the household was mobile. The complete use of wedges through the rear case joinery here increased the case’s structural integrity.

In most early colonial American contexts, however, the presence of wedges is sporadic—used infrequently, and not continuously throughout all joints—and John Head’s shop does not rely upon them for strength or reinforcement. Wedging pins also requires a higher time investment for the maker, with at least three steps required. It is slower and, when used sporadically, could have multiple intentions: when cutting the dovetails, he may have left too much room and the joints need to be spread, or the craftsman has calculated that a few wedges will markedly increase the joint’s strength, and relied on wedging to accomplish this. Head or his craftsmen must not have felt that their joinery required this additional step to shore up the joints, and despite their occasional ragged appearance almost three centuries later, the joints have moved little. Use of wedges or splines, it seems, is an indicator of more conservative and laborious workmanship.

\textsuperscript{215} See Bowett, 2002, 192, (ill.195, Plate 6.29). The strong box now resides in the collections of the Grahme family estate Levens Hall, Cumbria. Adam Bowett to author, March 21, 2015, MESDA Furniture Seminar (Winston Salem, NC). I am grateful to Adam Bowett and cabinetmaker Larry Damico for their conversation with me about the merits of wedging pins in which Mr. Damico noted the strength added by the wedge to “double-lock” the joint. Adam Bowett shared images of and information about the Jensen strong box, which is the only known example of English-made casework with wedged joinery identified in this period.
Further evidence of the proficiency of Head and his workshop is the sheer volume of furniture made during the period documented by Head’s surviving account book. Head’s account book proves his shop capable of supplying seemingly any request from a client, from bedsteads and chests to hat blocks and boxes. As an urban shop (possibly with a hearth or heat source), Head likely had multiple benches at which apprentices and journeymen engaged in sawing and planing, as well as assembling and finishing furniture year-round. Without knowing more about the shop’s structure, we can only speculate how work was subdivided among them.

Figure 4.19 Detail, Figure 4.22. Drawer interior, rear corner surface with red crayon numeral ‘4’ in the corners, noted by red arrows. Chest of drawers, ca. 1715. Made by William Beake III. (1691–1761, born Bucks County, died Burlington, NJ). Walnut, hard pine, Atlantic white cedar; brass. Courtesy of private collection. Photo by author.

Curiously, work from Head’s shop also lacks a system of numerical marks to keep drawer components organized and to facilitate their assembly as is sometimes found on casework made by some of his contemporaries. (Figure 4.19). When present,
the marks often appear consistently on the interior faces of all the drawers in a case. Head’s shop did use the circular chalk mark previously illustrated, an ingenious shorthand that simultaneously defined both the board’s location and its orientation in a drawer. For a practiced, proficient craftsman, or one who only assembled casework, this paucity of marking is understandable. Scholars still do not understand the implications of these numerical markings beyond their utility, but what do they tell us about the skill of a craftsman who relies on them? Given the volume of Head’s work and lack of numerical marking system, I deduce that Head’s shop did not find them necessary for keeping material organized in preparation for assembly, or found that the shorthand mark was more efficient. By extension, a less experienced craftsman might find the time necessary to keep the boards in their correct orientation via numerical markings to prevent errors. It is also possible that the marks were useful to a craftsman who had to set down his work and resume it, perhaps after he executed other tasks—within the shop or outside it. In this way, the marks act as placeholders across time, potentially utilized by craftsmen who also subsisted as yeomen working in a rural environment dealing with the rhythms of their seasonal work. A craftsman processing boards into drawer components to store them for seasoning could also use the numerical markings to track various pieces. Rather than cutting down a board each time a drawer needed to be made, he could make multiple components with the numerical system to identify back and side boards.216

Joiner William Beakes III. differed in many ways from his contemporary, John Head, from his origin and training to how and where he practiced his livelihood.

216 I am grateful to Greg Landrey, Ritchie Garrison, and Tom Musselman for their thoughts about this aspect of material processing.
Given these environmental differences, it is to be expected that Beakes’ craftsmanship differed from Head’s, although they both worked in an English idiom. To understand Beakes’ work, this section analyses the craftsmanship of three nearly identical walnut chests of drawers signed or attributed to Beakes. Two of the chests with drawers that bear his signature survive in private collections, while a third bears an inscription crediting Beakes’ work. (Figures 4.21, 4.23, 4.25)

---

217 This is arguably one of the most published examples of early furniture made in the region. The Rocky Hill Collection owns this chest of drawers. The other chest is in a private collection. A third chest bears an inscription made by its first owner that indicates Beakes made it in 1720. Sarah (Foulke) Thorn (1702–1774), for whom Beakes made the chest, lived in Chesterfield, New Jersey. This chest is now in the Dietrich American Foundation.
Figure 4.20  Chest of drawers, signed by William Beake, also known as William Beakes III. (1691–1761; born Bucks County, Pennsylvania, died Upper Freehold, New Jersey). Philadelphia or Burlington Co., NJ. 171[?] Wallnut, hard pine, Atlantic white cedar; brass. Dimensions: 36 ¾ x 40 1/8 x 22 1/8 inches. Courtesy of Rocky Hill Collection, photo by author.

218 When catalogued in Winterthur Museum’s DAPC, this chest of drawers was owned by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph McFalls, Jr., Malvern, PA. Joseph McFalls purchased it from the Samuel J. England family (Oxford, PA) at a public auction. See Winterthur Museum, DAPC, file 1971.147.
Figure 4.21  Signature on chest of drawers Figure 4.20 in Rocky Hill Collection. Inscription written on proper left case board interior surface: W(i)llia(m) / (B)eak(e?) 171(1?). Drawer runners obscure parts of the inscription as transcribed. In photo, top of case is on the right side. Courtesy The Winterthur Library: Decorative Arts Photographic Collection, File #1971.147.
Figure 4.22  Chest of drawers, signed by William Beake, also known as William Beakes III. (1691–1761; born Bucks County, Pennsylvania, died Upper Freehold, New Jersey). Philadelphia or Burlington Co., NJ, ca. 1715 Walnut, hard pine, Atlantic white cedar; brass. Dimensions: 38 7/8 x 40 3/8 x 22 5/8 inches.219 Courtesy of private collection, photo by author.

219 The feet of this chest have been replaced. The replacements were modeled on the feet of the chest Figure 4.20.
Figure 4.23 Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers in private collection, rear of case-width drawer with signature of William Beake: William / Beake in red crayon. Courtesy The Winterthur Library: Decorative Arts Photographic Collection, File #1978.877.
Figure 4.24 Chest of drawers, made by William Beake, also known as William Beakes III. (1691–1761; born Bucks County, Pennsylvania, died Upper Freehold, New Jersey). Likely Burlington Co., NJ, ca. 1720 Walnut, hard pine, Atlantic white cedar; brass. Dimensions: 34 5/8 x 40 ¼ x 22 ¾ inches.220 Courtesy The Dietrich American Foundation, 8.2.3.HRD.1811, photo by Christopher Storb.

220The feet of this chest of drawers are later replacements, and the rear stiles have also lost some height that accounts for this shorter dimension compared to the other two chests.
Unlike John Head, William Beakes III. was born in Pennsylvania to a Bucks County family in 1691. William’s grandfather and namesake purchased land from William Penn and immigrated from Backwell, near Bristol in County Somerset, and with other Quakers founded the first meeting of the Society of Friends in Pennsylvania at Falls Township.221 William’s father married Elizabeth Worrilow at the Philadelphia

221 Beakes, 1997, 2–3. Beakes’ property was about fifteen parcels to the west of William Penn’s own plantation, Pennsbury. The purchase also included rights in the Liberty Lands, a communal territory to the west of the patents, and a lot in the city of Philadelphia. The Beakes family traveled on the ship the Bristol Merchant, and carried with them “3 cwt. Wrought iron; 2 cwt. Cheese; cwt. Brass manufactured.” The iron and cheese speak to the Beakes’ need to survive in what was very much a frontier upon their arrival, while the “brass manufactured” might include items that could be sold or traded to other immigrants or local native populations. It is also tempting to speculate that this reference alludes to cabinet hardware. William II., Stephen, and Samuel Beakes were old enough upon
Meeting of Friends, and William was born the subsequent year.\textsuperscript{222} Although scholars have identified his work as typical of Philadelphia craftsmanship, Beakes lived the majority of his adult working life in New Jersey. In 1694, William’s father purchased land in Nottingham Township, Burlington County, and the family relocated. Young William Beakes lived in Burlington County for possibly as much as a decade before being sent to Philadelphia to apprentice with a recently arrived Staffordshire joiner and distant relative, William Till.\textsuperscript{223} This apprenticeship kept with Quaker practice to bind out a child to a member of the community, frequently a relative.\textsuperscript{224}

---

\textsuperscript{222} Worrilow (sometimes spelled Worrilaw or Worriloe) came from a Staffordshire family. Of five children, only William III. and his younger brother, Edmund, survived to full adulthood. Birth and death dates for the Beakes children as follows: Walter (Jan. 25, 1693–Dec. 8, 1702); Elizabeth (b. 1696, d. 1696); Alice (b. 1698, d. 1698). See Beakes, 1997, 9; Hinshaw, vol. II, 1991, 335, 461, 954, 978–79.

\textsuperscript{223} Regarding Till’s biography, see Hinshaw, II., 1991, 427, 668. Till arrived to Philadelphia in 1700 from the small community of Leek, County Staffordshire, England, which was home to a number of other Philadelphia artisans in the woodworking and clockmaking communities: the Stretch family, as well as Stephen Armitt and his family. Beakes likely obtained his apprenticeship through his mother’s side of the family. There has long been some confusion as to the relationship between Till and Beakes III. In her thesis, Cathryn McElroy published Beakes’ relationship to Till as one of apprentice to master (McElroy, 164). In an internal memo from Benno Forman to Deborah Waters at Winterthur Museum, Forman stressed that McElroy was incorrect about this relationship, and that Beakes only witnessed Till’s will in 1711 (Forman to Waters, Oct. 17, 1975; Benno M. Forman Papers, 1969–82. Col. 72. The Winterthur Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera). McElroy was, in fact correct: Beakes’s mother’s aunt, Susannah Worrilow, remembered her great-nephew William, then apprenticed to Till, as a beneficiary in her will dated 1709/10, stating: “Item I give unto William Beaks Jun. who is now an apprentice with William Till of Philadelphia aforesaid Joyner the Sum of five Pounds money aforesaid.” See Philadelphia Wills. Susannah Worrilaw, 1710 (172-B). Microfilm. The Winterthur Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera. I am grateful to Chris Storb for bringing Worrilow’s will and this reference to Beakes III. to my attention. See also Donald L. Fennimore and Frank L. Hohmann III., \textit{Stretch: America’s First Family of Clockmakers}, (Winterthur, DE: Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Inc., 2013), 37–41.

\textsuperscript{224} Till likely operated a profitable shop although nothing is known of his shop’s structure, nor has his work been identified.
The year Beakes completed his apprenticeship—1711—was a tumultuous one for the newly-trained joiner: his master died, followed shortly thereafter by his father’s death. Till left nothing to his young apprentice but after his father’s death, Beakes inherited a house and lot in Philadelphia where he may have briefly resided. Only two years later, however, Beakes sold this property.225 As a fully trained joiner, Beakes had a desirable skill set at his advantage, but this may not have been enough to survive in Philadelphia’s increasingly competitive and specialized marketplace. It is possible that he used the capital from the sale of the Philadelphia house to move east to Burlington County, where his immediate and extended family had established themselves in a prosperous Quaker community.226 Between 1705 and 1730, William’s stepmother, brother, and many half-siblings had married in the Chesterfield (Crosswicks) Meeting, located about thirteen miles north of Burlington along Crosswicks Creek. This meeting had strong connections to the Falls Meeting in Bucks

225 No record of Beakes’ activity in Philadelphia and New Jersey from 1713 until 1724 has been found. In 1713, Beakes sold a house and lot to George Paynter. It was likely the house left to him in his father’s will in 1711. Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Manuscripts. Deed William Beaks to George Paynter, May 11, 1713. In 1740, Beakes purchased land from Anthony Woodward Jr. in Freehold, Monmouth Co. See Colonial Conveyances, 1977, 30. The Woodwards, Foulkes, and Beakes families likely first came in contact with one another in the 1680s. Anthony Woodward (Sr.) and Hannah Foulke married in the Burlington Meeting, and settled in Nottingham Township, where the Beakes family developed familial ties when William Beake II. married Ruth Stacy.

226 William’s mother, Elizabeth Worrilow Beakes died in about 1704, and his father married Ruth Stacy, daughter of Mahlon Stacy, a Yorkshire tanner, first purchaser of provincial West Jersey property in 1677, and one of the largest landholders. When William Beakes II. died in 1711, Ruth Stacy married Bucks County native and Beakes’ family neighbor Samuel Atkinson in 1714. Ruth Stacy purchased 100 acres of land from her stepson, Edmund, and established her home with Samuel Atkinson there. That residence was short-lived, however. In 1719 Atkinson and his wife removed to Chester Township in the southern part of the county now near present-day Moorestown, where they became active members of the Gloucester (later Haddonfield) Meeting. See ‘The Pennocks of Primitive Hall’ website, Rash’s surname index, entry for ‘Atkinson’: http://www.pennock.ws/surnames/nti/nti50320.html, accessed 10/15/2014.
County where the Beakes family had originally worshipped, and many marital unions brought together members of these two meetings. In his move east, Beakes entered a prosperous community where he would have been immediately welcomed because of his family’s active participation in the Friends’ meetings and larger community of believers. Beakes’ only identified commission utilized his religious network: in 1721, he made a chest of drawers for Chesterfield resident Sarah (Foulke) Thorn, as documented by her inscription on the underside of a cedar drawer bottom: “Sarah Thorn her Draws / made by Wm. Beakes this 14th 12/mo 1720.”227 (Figure 4.25) The Foulkes and Thorns were both active members of the Chesterfield Meeting where Beakes likely first met or was introduced to them.

The methods Beakes learned may have been characteristic to the region of Staffordshire where Till trained, and could account for many visible differences in

227 Sarah Foulke married Joseph Thorn (1701–1774) at Chesterfield (Crosswicks) Meeting in 1723. The date in the inscription uses the Julian calendar, in which the first month of the New Year was March, and the last month of the year was February. This is, however, equivalent to February 14, 1721. Sarah Thorn was born February 2, 1702. Without any documentation of Beakes’ work, it is tempting to speculate the chest of drawers was a gift to Sarah from a family member or in commemoration of her eighteenth birthday. The inscription is written after Sarah’s marriage to Joseph Thorn Jr. in 1723, however, and likely accounts for her desire to document and claim the chest as her property upon entering her marriage. Thorn’s graphite inscription was later heightened with pen and black ink. Later graphite inscriptions on the drawer below her inscription are now badly abraded. The other short drawer also has graphite inscriptions that are largely illegible with dates and family names. At least one name identified in the nineteenth century was Townsend. In her will of 1769, Sarah bequeathed a chest of drawers, possibly this one, to her ‘cousin’ Rachel Glover (1764–1842). Rachel was the daughter of her sister-in-law Mary Thorne and Mary’s husband, John Glover. The Glovers were a prominent family of early settlers to the Newton/Haddonfield region of Gloucester County. Their other children are named as beneficiaries in Sarah’s will as well. Rachel Glover married Isaac Stiles and lived in Gloucester Co., NJ. See Thorne Family File, Genealogical Files, Burlington County Historical Society. This chest of drawers was later owned by Richard Dietrich, and is now part of the collection of the Dietrich American Foundation. Although not illustrated in Winterthur’s DAPC, Joseph McFalls (then owner of the Rocky Hill Collection’s chest of drawers) noted that the Dietrich chest was found in New Jersey. See note in DAPC record 1971.147. I’m grateful to Wendy Cooper for bringing the Dietrich American Foundation chest of drawers to my attention, and to Chris Storb, conservator, and Deborah Rebuck, curator, for their time and assistance examining this chest.
construction seen between the work of John Head and William Beakes, although their respective chests of drawers might have been made only ten to fifteen years apart.\textsuperscript{228}

The table below illustrates the common features of the three chests signed by or attributed to William Beakes III.

Table 4.2 Common features of construction in casework examples by William Beakes III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>2/3 Configuration</th>
<th>case dovetailed or joined</th>
<th>1/2 blind dovetail joinery</th>
<th>front panel drawer</th>
<th>back panel drawer</th>
<th>back panel dovetail buttom</th>
<th>bottom board set into rabbited drawer</th>
<th>wedges in joints of stile drawers</th>
<th>wedges in joints of long drawers</th>
<th>kerf in drawer front</th>
<th>small overcuts where dovetail sides are cut</th>
<th>tops of drawer sides and backs that</th>
<th>Numbering on drawer interiors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.20</td>
<td>joined</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>chalk</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.21</td>
<td>joined</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>red crayon</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.24</td>
<td>joined</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>graphs</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{228} Inventory of William Till, 1711. Will 216-B. Philadelphia County Wills. Microfilm. Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Winterthur Library. In addition to Beakes III., Matthew Pope and Joshua Cart also witnessed Till’s will. It is possible they were also employed in Till’s shop, although that has not yet been investigated. Nothing is known of Till’s apprenticeship and work prior to immigration. It seems likely he was apprenticed locally within or near his town, as opposed to London or another larger city.
as guides. To facilitate drawer assembly, each case of drawers contains matching numerical markings on the interior faces of the side, rear, and front boards written in graphite, red crayon or chalk. (Figures 4.26, 4.27, 4.28)

Figure 4.26  Detail, Figure 4.20. View of smaller drawer interior, rear corner with inscribed ‘4’. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. Courtesy Rocky Hill Collection. Photo by author.

Figure 4.27  Detail, Figure 4.22. View of smaller drawer interior, rear corner with inscribed ‘4’. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. Courtesy private collection. Photo by author.
Figure 4.28  Detail, Figure 4.24. View of smaller drawer interior, rear corner with inscribed ‘4’. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. Courtesy The Dietrich American Foundation, 8.2.3.HRD.1811. Photo by author.

Figure 4.29  Detail, Figure 4.20. Rear lower case rail interior surface with inscription in red crayon: Botom [sic]. Courtesy Rocky Hill Collection. Photo by author.
On the hard pine lower case rail of the Rocky Hill Collection, Beakes wrote ‘Botom’ [sic] in red crayon to identify this component’s final position. Beakes signed and dated his work in chalk on the case interior: William Beaks / 171?. (Refer Figure 4.21) A hard pine drawer runner nailed over the inscription obscures the year’s final digit, but it likely reads ‘1711’, the year Beakes completed his apprenticeship. The consistent component numbering for each drawer—and fully written notation about the bottom board’s placement in this chest—seem consistent with a new craftsman who may not yet have the confidence of sight and memory to assemble components without these aids. The presence of numbering on all three chests implies that these examples were made in an early period of Beakes’ career. Such notation might be more prevalent in the work of less experienced craftsmen, an indicator of a methodical, laborious pace. This notation system would have also been useful to Beakes during his later life when he was a yeoman and a joiner living on a three hundred acre farm in Upper Freehold, Monmouth County. Due to the temporal and seasonal obligations of agricultural life, Beakes would have had to set his joinery work down regularly to see to these activities, but such ‘placeholders’ in his work would have allowed him to recover his activity without confusion and loss of time.


230 These notations might have also been made when boards were processed into drawer components, and stored. Rather than only cutting the parts for a single drawer when commissioned to make a chest, Beakes likely cut down an entire board into the necessary sides and backs for multiple chests. The seasoned stock would be numbered and stored for future assembly, increasing the speed at which future chests could be made. I am grateful to Tom Musselman for his thoughts about this question.
Beakes’ training, for whatever vernacular characteristics it might have had, adhered to standardized English joinery practiced regionally using local materials. Like John Head, Beakes consistently selected the same material and used it in identical configurations: solid walnut used for the case; half-blind dovetailed drawers made of hard pine sides and backs with cedar bottom boards. (Figures 4.30, 4.31, 4.32)

Figure 4.30 (left), Detail Figure 4.20; Figure 4.31, (center) Detail, Figure 4.22; Figure 4.32 (right), Detail, Figure 4.24. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III., view of half-blind dovetail joint, front of drawer, with wedges in pins where indicated with red arrows (from left to right): Rocky Hill Collection; Private Collection; The Dietrich American Foundation. Drawers illustrated in Figures 4.30-4.32 do not all exhibit wedges in these photos, although wedges are found in other drawers of these chests. Photos by author.
Beakes also consistently used hard pine for the rear upper and lower rails of the cases, and in all three examples, he extended the rear case stiles all the way to the floor without adding a turned foot.

Although Beakes and Head adhered to a shared expectations and traditions of English joinery, their execution of work is completely different, reflecting each craftsman’s individual training. Beakes’ work is arguably neater than John Head’s: the kerfs visible in the interior surfaces of the drawer fronts are very short, rarely extending beyond the joint, the product of a more precise, controlled movement (Figures 4.33, 4.34, 4.35); there is usually a small overcut in the drawer sides when the tails were cut; the drawer bottoms and sides are cleanly cut and all parts meet flush without unevenness (Figures 4.36, 4.37, 4.38). Beakes also used nearly identical quantities and positions of fasteners to nail the bottom board of all his drawers.

Figures 4.33 Detail, Figure 4.20. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III. View of saw kerfs, front of smaller drawer seen from interior. Courtesy Rocky Hill Collection. Photo by author.
Figure 4.34  Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III. View of saw kerfs, front of smaller drawer seen from interior. Courtesy private collection. Photo by author.

Figure 4.35  Detail, Figure 4.24. Chest of drawers made by William Beakes III. View of saw kerfs, front of smaller drawer seen from interior. Courtesy The Dietrich American Foundation. Photo by author.
Figure 4.36  Detail, Figure 4.20. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. View of smaller drawers, underside of drawer bottom. Courtesy Rocky Hill Collection. Photo by author.

Figure 4.37  Detail, Figure 4.22. Chest of drawers made by William Beake III. View of smaller drawers, underside of drawer bottom. Courtesy private collection. Photo by author.
In terms of pace, the greater precision found in Beakes’ work suggests methodical—and laborious—work habits. Reinforcing that possibility is Beakes’ sporadic but consistent use of wedges in the pins of his drawer joinery. Wedged pins are present in all three of his chests, but the wedges are not used uniformly in each joint, or each drawer. The chest of drawers in the Rocky Hill Collection uses wedges in the joints of the larger drawers, but they were not required in the joints of the small drawers, illustrating Beakes’ application of wedges only where he felt reinforcement was needed. Beakes likely made all three chests of drawers within the first decade after completion of his apprenticeship, and the use of wedges in all three of his chests may indicate a variety of circumstances: his relative inexperience as a new joiner; as a response to his concern over the strength of the joints (possibly also reflective of his inexperience); and the possibility that, if itinerant, he used mechanical fasteners in lieu
of glue. This would be slow work: the splints for the pins would have to be cut or chiseled from a block of wood, and a chisel or gouge used to create the small channel in which the spline or wedge would be tapped, and then planed flush to the surface of the drawer side.\footnote{Formal, scholarly discussion of wedged pins in joinery is relatively recent. Some scholars suggest that use of wedges allowed dovetails to be cut more quickly (and with less precision), and then secured with the inserted wedge, which allowed wood to be used before it was fully seasoned. It is possible that using wedges on wood not fully seasoned cut down on the time it took to produce a chest in a shop, but the act of creating, inserting, and finishing the wedges would have been laborious, and required some slow, cautious movements as the wedges were inserted. See Cooper & Minardi, 2011, 169.} These additional steps added time (and decreased profit) when completing a chest.

William Beakes III. died in Monmouth County, New Jersey in 1761. In his will dated earlier that year, Beakes identified himself as a member of his trade—a joiner—and it is possible he was physically able to maintain a shop until that time. \[Appendix B\] Since Beakes identified as a joiner, not a ‘cabinetmaker’, dovetail joinery may have remained a limited part of his carpentry repertoire. During part of his early career, Beakes may have been itinerant, since there is no evidence of his committed membership in a particular Friends meeting in New Jersey in that period although other members of his family were active in the Chesterfield Meeting. If he was itinerant, Beakes may have used splints to mechanically secure joints as an alternative strategy to gluing, which would have required the unnecessary baggage of pots, materials, brush, and a heat source. Wedges could have also facilitated assembly, acting like clamps. We do not have examples of Beakes’ work executed later in life to know if use of wedges or splints in the pins was a tactic conditioned by necessity, was a feature only employed early in itinerant years of his career, or if it was an integral
part of his approach to construction, a habit of workmanship he carried throughout his life.

In 1738, another craftsman active within the Delaware River Valley used walnut, white oak, cedar, and hard pine to create the double chest, or chest on chest, a furniture form new to the region, but found in England. Three examples by this unidentified maker have been identified: one in Winterthur Museum’s collections (2009.0024), one in the Dietrich American Foundation, and a third in a private collection. (Figures 1.4, 4.40, 4.42) Winterthur’s example and the one in a private collection.

232 There examples of chests made in the region earlier than these which have two very short joined cases stacked atop one another, and attach via tenons in the case sides of the lower section that slide into mortises in the case sides of the upper section. They usually stand approximately 36-40” in height. These are often walnut with pine or chestnut secondary woods, and were possibly made in Philadelphia and Chester County. English versions of chests on chests may have been made as early as the 1690s (three examples are in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London). These are also dovetailed cases, and over 60” high. A fourth chest on chest, similar though unrelated to this group, was sold by Willis Henry Auctions, Inc. (Lot 40, March 29, 2015). That example had hard pine drawer sides and back, and cedar drawer bottoms. Its half-blind dovetails were different than the joinery of this unidentified group, however. The release for the wooden spring lock in the upper drawers of the Willis Henry chest on chest was a circular hole cut into the drawer blade (vs. square or rectangular relieved into the dustboard, preferred in the Delaware River Valley). I am grateful to Mark Anderson, Head of Furniture Conservation, and Joshua Lane, Curator of Furniture at Winterthur Museum, for bringing this new example to my attention.

233 Only one of the three chests on chest in this group has any known eighteenth or nineteenth-century history. Philip Bradley, Downington, PA sold the chest on chest to its current owner in 1995. Bradley purchased it from the estate of Mary Merrick Williams Brinton (d. 1992). Below the date inscribed on a drawer bottom is a later inscription: “Nov 1844 this case of drawers / was repaired by order of Owen and Mary Jones.” Given the date, owners named in the inscription, and style of chest, the couple is likely Owen and Mary (Roberts) Jones, occupants of Wynnewood, Lower Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pa. Owen Jones died in 1878 and came from the Owen and Jones families of Wales who immigrated to the area in the early 1680s. The inventory of his ancestor Jonathan Jones’ estate taken in 1770 reveals two separate entries for a “walnut high case of drawers”, valued at £6 and £7 each. That Jones, born in 1680, could have been the chest on chest’s first owner. See Jonathan Jones, Last Will & Testament, Philadelphia County Will Book O, page 546, will # 410. Microfilm. Winterthur Museum Library, Joseph Downs Collection. It is further possible that the maker was local to the Merion area. Another example of a “paire of hight (sic) black walnut Chest of Draws” is listed in the inventory of Philadelphia innholder John Knowles, who died in 1745. See McElroy, 1970, 67, FN 220 referencing Philadelphia County Will #151, filed in 1745. McElroy also captured the will of a Philadelphia carpenter, also named John Knowles, whose will (#67) was filed in 1744. It is not known if these men were related.
collection were both made in 1738 according to dates found in their cases.234 (Figures 4.39, 4.41) The third chest on chest does not have an inscribed date, but was likely made about the same time as the matching examples. This craftsman worked at the same time as John Head and William Beakes III. but differs from them both in his approach to joinery, and likely differed from most of his peers in the trade because of the highly sophisticated and refined levels of finish found in his work.

Figure 4.39 Detail, Figure 1.4. Board used for bottom of upper case of Winterthur Museum chest on chest (2009.0024), inscribed: 1738 x 3rd Mo (May 1738). Photo by author.

234 The date on Winterthur’s example is incised in the bottom board of the upper case, possibly made with a timber scribe, and states: “1738 x 3rd Mo”. The example in a private collection is simply dated “1738/9” in red crayon on the underside of a drawer bottom. The example owned by the estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr. is not dated.
Figure 4.40  Chest on chest. Delaware River Valley, dated: 12\textsuperscript{th} mo 1738/9 (February 1739). Walnut, white oak, Atlantic white cedar; brass. 65 ½ x 39 x 22 inches.\textsuperscript{235} Courtesy private collection. Photo by author.

\textsuperscript{235} The width and depth dimensions were taken at the lower case. I thank Debbie Rebuck for sharing this information with me.
Figure 4.41  Detail, Figure 4.40. Inscription on drawer bottom, chest on chest. In red crayon (above): 1738/9 ¹²ⁿᵒ / Nov. 1844 this case of drawers / was repaired by order of Owen and Mary Jones. (below): ¹²ⁿᵒ 1738/9. The notation dated Nov 1844 is in a different hand. Courtesy private collection. Photo by author.
The examples owned by Winterthur and the Dietrich American Foundation are nearly identical: each is made of two walnut dovetailed cases atop one another separated visually by a waist molding; their arrangement of flush-set drawers is the
same; both have canted, fluted corners; and the feet are blocked and fastened in the
same way (Figures 4.43, 4.44) The private collection example differs noticeably from
these two: the cases do not have canted corners; the drawer configuration differs; and
the drawers themselves have a thumbnail-molded front and not set flush within the
case; the feet are blocked with a square board beneath the foot.236 Despite these
external differences, the interior of the case reveals precisely wedged dovetail drawer
joinery made of white oak drawer sides and backs with cedar bottoms in all three. This
wood configuration used in such precise joinery is a trait unique to this craftsman, and
a hallmark of his work. (Figures 4.45, 4.46, 4.47)

Figure 4.43  (left) Detail, Figure 1.4. Right rear foot, chest on chest dated 1738.
Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. Photo by author; (right)
Figure 4.44 (right) Detail, Figure 4.42. Underside of chest on chest.
Courtesy of the Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329. Photo
by author.

236 The high correlations of external features in the Dietrich and Winterthur examples suggest a
possible family connection between the chest’s owners, and possibly a personal or family relationship
with the chest’s owners and the cabinetmaker. The Dietrich example is marked at the center of the
upper case’s back boards “N° 2”. The Winterthur example has no such marking to identify it as “N° 1”
of a pair. This is only the author’s conjecture; no supporting documentary evidence has been found.
Figures 4.45 (above left) Detail, Figure 1.4. View of drawer joinery with wedged pins. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024.

Figure 4.46 (above center) Detail, Figure 4.40. View of drawer joinery with wedged pins. Chest on chest, dated 12 mo 1738/9. Courtesy private collection.

Figure 4.47 (above right) Detail, Figure 4.42 View of drawer joinery with wedged pins. Chest on chest, ca. 1738. Courtesy of the Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329, photos by author.

This cabinetmaker, like William Beakes III. and John Head, is highly consistent in his habits as demonstrated by these three chests on chests. The chart below illustrates similar characteristics found in all three examples:
Table 4.3 Common features of construction in casework examples by unknown Delaware River Valley chest on chest maker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovetailed or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case dovetailed or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-blind dovetail joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawer sides &amp; backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar drawer bottoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom board original box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining drawer back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening drawer sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovetails in pin collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovetail wedge in pin collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovetail wedge in other dovetail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open dovetail joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open dovetail cut to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear joint not mitre dovetail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of dovetail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of wedge in pin collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of dovetail in other dovetail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0= data not captured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O= observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X= not present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This cabinetmaker uses the same half-blind dovetail joints to unite the drawer fronts and sides, and uses full dovetails to join the sides to the drawer backs. The major difference is in the level of precision in this work, and of the high degree of finish found throughout the case. The pins of the front drawer joinery are nearly perfect isosceles triangles, likely laid out with a bevel gauge. Many of these have been struck through with a walnut wedge to expand the pin in a seemingly random fashion, though such secondary mechanical measures to secure such finely made joinery seem unnecessary. The interior faces of the drawer fronts bear small kerfs 1/4” or less. Extending beyond the kerfs, however, is a very shallow scribe line that guided the saw blade in the stroke, a highly methodical and likely slow habit of workmanship. (Figure 4.48) The drawer sides are finished with a shallow, rounded top edge, and these meet the drawer back in a mitre corner. (Figure 4.49)

---

237 I thank Ritchie Garrison for noting this technique.

238 The rear joint is not a mitre dovetail, but simply a full dovetail where the uppermost pin has been cut to meet at a 45-degree angle.
Figure 4.48  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of drawer interior with scribed lines and saw kerfs from cutting pins of dovetail joint. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024, photo by author.

Figure 4.49  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of rear dovetail drawer joint. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024, photo by author.
Other details of construction allude to the training and apprenticeship of this maker.239 (Refer to Figures 4.45, 4.46, 4.47) The drawers have lapped dovetails to join the fronts to the sides, and the fronts have been relieved with a large space to receive the drawer bottom and drawer runners that are nailed through the drawer’s perimeter. The characteristics of the drawer joinery exhibited here correspond to London cabinetmaking from about 1700–30, indicating that the cabinetmaker likely apprenticed with someone who was not yet familiar with an improvement on drawer construction that had emerged in London in the 1720s. His master was likely a cabinetmaker or joiner already working in the region who had also been trained in an Anglo craft culture. The rabbet of the case-width drawers is greater than that of the shorter drawers to accommodate the drawer bottom and the addition of drawer runners—thin splints glued to the length of the drawer bottom to cover the wrought nails and protect the interior drawer runners.240 This, like the wedges in the pins, seems unnecessary: smaller, wrought nails are used, often countersunk. (Figures 4.50, 4.51, 4.52) To insure precise nailing through the board to the edge of the drawer front


240 Runners are often replaced on casework due to their regular use, and subsequent wear. The walnut runners on Winterthur’s example show high levels of wear, but could be original. Walnut, an uncommon wood choice for drawer runners, is a hardwood that could withstand the friction and pressure of this action, and was an educated selection by this cabinetmaker. The author has not previously seen walnut used for runners (original or replaced) on any other casework of this period and region of manufacture. White oak runners were observed on the dated 1738/9 example in a private collection; these also looked original. Runners on the drawers of the Dietrich estate chest on chest had been reinforced with additional, later runners. It was not possible for the author to visually identify the wood present based solely on the end grain, though Table 4.3 notes that runners were original to the drawers (identified as “observed”).
or back boards, this maker laid a scribe line across the drawer bottom, and the fasteners are nailed within this boundary.²⁴¹ (Figure 4.53)

Figure 4.50 Detail, Figure 1.4. View of drawer bottom illustrating regular nail patterns. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024, photo by author.

²⁴¹ The scribe line is defined by the edge of the drawer front, so the cabinetmaker knew that nailing on the inside of the line meant nailing into the drawer front or back boards. I thank Joshua Lane for pointing out the logic of this strategy.
Figure 4.51  Detail, Figure 4.40. View of drawer underside illustrating regular nailing patterns. Chest on chest, dated 12mo 1738/9. Courtesy private collection. Photo by author.

Figure 4.52  Detail, Figure 4.42. View of drawer underside illustrating regular nailing patterns. Courtesy the Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr., 8.2.3.HRD.2329. Photo by author.
Based on a comparison of characteristics of workmanship exhibited by this maker to those of William Beakes and John Head, this cabinetmaker is precision-driven, methodical, possibly a slower worker who was highly skilled but new to his craft. His work exhibits a conservatism of habit, but not a lack of confidence. It is possible that he expended a great quantity of labor (and time) on these three chests on chests. Each illustrates far greater care in workmanship and a very high level of interior finish. This may reflect a change in consumer expectations and allowances for quality in workmanship that evolved in the region at this time.\textsuperscript{242} This craftsman may

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{242} My thanks to Ritchie Garrison for engaging me in this line of thinking about changing consumer allowances and expectations of workmanship.}
have also worked to a more refined standard of production due to a personal connection to the clients that may have been family members given the nearly identical double chests owned by Winterthur and the Dietrich estate.

Figure 4.54  Detail, Figure 1.4. View of long drawer interior face with red crayon mark. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. Photo by author.
Figure 4.55  Detail, Figure 1.4. Interior proper right case surface with inscription in white chalk twice: Lower. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. Photo by author.

Figure 4.56  Detail, Figure 4.40. Red crayon inscription on interior of upper case to board: Inside. Chest on chest, dated: 12 mo 1738/9. Courtesy private collection. Photo by Wendy Cooper.
Another example of this craftsman’s methodical, precise habits is the numerous numerical and graphic clues to facilitate assembly of the drawers and the cases. Like William Beakes III., the drawers sometimes exhibit numbering in the rear interior corners, though more frequently a simple red crayon line—sometimes wavy, or a squiggle—on all of the interior drawer surfaces identifies each component and its
proper interior or exterior face. Unlike Beakes, however, this craftsman also numbered the interiors of the case components to identify drawer locations when assembled. Red crayon numerals are found on the underside of the dustboards and the interior sides of the cases. This cabinetmaker also noted the boards for the lower case in the Dietrich and Winterthur examples with the word ‘Lower’ written in cursive, white chalk on the interior faces. (Figure 4.55) Similarly, a red crayon inscription on an interior board surface of the chest on chest in the private collection reads ‘Inside’ to denote the interior face of the board. (Figure 4.56) The function—if any—of additional markings in white chalk and red crayon on the case and its components has yet to be determined. (Figures 4.54, 4.57, 4.58). Markings in white chalk on the rear of a drawer are similar to those found on the rear drawers of a high chest in Newark Museum, possibly from a comparable date, and made in Maidenhead (Lawrenceville) section of Hunterdon County, NJ. I’m very grateful to Newark Museum Chief Curator and Curator of Decorative Arts Ulysses G. Dietz for his time with me to review this unusual high chest in his collection. The capital E in white chalk is also found on a drawer back of a miniature chest of drawers in a private collection illustrated in Stiefel, APS Bulletin 1, no. 1 (see Section 1, Fig. 3). The chest’s drawer is inscribed: E[d] Evans. Cabinetmaker Edward Evans was active in the Philadelphia area in 1707 when he made an escritoire or cabinet with fall front that is now in Colonial Williamsburg Foundation’s collection (1958-468). The miniature chest or valuables box does not seem to be the work of that Evans.

243 Numbers and graphic notation are found on the interior of Winterthur’s example.

244 I’m very grateful to Newark Museum Chief Curator and Curator of Decorative Arts Ulysses G. Dietz for his time with me to review this unusual high chest in his collection. The capital E in white chalk is also found on a drawer back of a miniature chest of drawers in a private collection illustrated in Stiefel, APS Bulletin 1, no. 1 (see Section 1, Fig. 3). The chest’s drawer is inscribed: E[d] Evans. Cabinetmaker Edward Evans was active in the Philadelphia area in 1707 when he made an escritoire or cabinet with fall front that is now in Colonial Williamsburg Foundation’s collection (1958-468). The miniature chest or valuables box does not seem to be the work of that Evans.
Figure 4.59 (above left) High chest of drawers, Maidenhead (Lawrenceville), New Jersey, ca. 1740. Walnut, gum, pine with inlaid banding, brass. Dimensions: 70 3/4 x 40 x 20 inches. Newark Museum Purchase 1963 The Members’ Fund, 63.27a, b

Figure 4.60 (above right) Detail, Figure 4.60. High chest of drawers, Maidenhead (Lawrenceville), New Jersey, ca. 1740. Chalk inscription and markings on rear of drawer back: x / End. Newark Museum Purchase 1963 The Members’ Fund, 63.27a, b. Photo by author.

The identity of this highly skilled craftsman is not known, but an inscription on Winterthur Museum’s chest of drawers may provide some insight about his ethnicity, religion, and his occupation. Two chests bear dates of manufacture written in the Julian forma. The private collection example is inscribed on one of its drawers twice in red crayon variously “1738/9 12th mo” and “12th mo 1738/9”. (refer Figure 4.41) Winterthur Museum’s example is dated “1738 x 3d Mo”, the inscription incised in a cedar board that functions as the case bottom of the upper section (refer to Figure
4.39) In the Julian calendar, the inscription denotes May of 1738 as the month of manufacture for Winterthur’s chest of drawers, and February of 1739 for the other chest of drawers. The joinery style follows recognizable English patterns of training found throughout the Delaware Valley, and the format of the inscription adheres to British colonial practice of using this dating style.\(^{245}\) The inscription itself is possibly also telling of the maker’s relationship to the woodworking trades. A detail photo illustrates that the inscription was scribed into the board’s surface via a tool that excavated a channel from the wood to create the numerals and letters. (Figure 4.61) This tool was likely a timber scribe, also known as a race knife, and was used by certain parts of the woodworking trades for the purpose of marking boards in a way that would not abrade or be washed away during water-borne transport.\(^{246}\) According to R. A. Salaman, various members of the woodworking industry, including timber merchants, shipwrights, cooperers, carpenters, and foresters, used this tool that may resemble illustration Figure 4.62. It is possible that the maker of these chests had a dual role in the woodworking trades as a millwright or shipwright, and thus had this tool at his disposal for marking boards.

---

\(^{245}\) Quakers consistently use this dating format for documents, a habit that persisted well into the 1760s even after the change to the Gregorian calendar in 1752. Although Quakers preferred this dating method, that should not exclude a non-Quaker craftsman from consideration.

\(^{246}\) Also known as a scribe; scorer; scrieve or scrive hook; scriving knife; skiven iron; and raze knife. The tool likely had a central spike and secondary cutter allowing the maker to create a circular groove, as if laid by a compass. The mark is completely unique to this piece, and the author has not encountered this method of inscribing or signing a piece of furniture in any other example examined in this study. See R. A. Salaman, *Dictionary of Woodworking Tools, c. 1700-1900*. Rev. ed. (Newton, CT: The Taunton Press, 1997), 483-484.
Figure 4.61  Detail, Figure 1.4. Dated inscription on board with gouged channels made from tool. Chest on chest, dated 1738. Courtesy Winterthur Museum, 2009.0024. Photo by author.

Figure 4.62  Line drawing of a timber scribe or race knife dated 1774. Illustration after Saloman, see entry for “timber scribe”, Figure 708c. *Dictionary of Woodworking Tools, c. 1700–1900*. Rev. ed. (Newton, CT: The Taunton Press, 1997), 483. Drawn by author.

Cabinetmakers and joiners had an abundance of materials, craft knowledge, and patronage at their disposal, a favorable set of conditions that allowed them to work successfully in town settings like Burlington and Trenton, or in farm-based economies, like Crosswicks nearby. Craftsmen like William Beakes III. utilized other resources—
his kinship, ethnicity, and religious network—to aid his eastward migration through New Jersey after leaving Philadelphia. Equipped with training and tools, he survived successfully in a largely rural area—where he, too, maintained a plantation—but one in which a steadily increasing population required his goods. The details of his case construction—use of wedges in the drawer joinery, finely planed surfaces, and extensive marking of case and drawer components—exhibit a slower pace of work, and possibly work that was interrupted by daily obligations beyond his craft.

John Head, conversely, established his shop in Philadelphia and utilized his imported cabinetmaking ability and training to promote himself among Philadelphia’s merchant elite. His account book documents his shop’s fast pace of production of fashionable domestic goods, while numerous identified examples of furniture illustrate hallmarks of speed: large saw kerfs, efficiencies of time and material for creating drawer stops, irregular nailing patterns, rough surfaces, and lack of additional strengthening details like wedges in the joinery. His shop was among those that clearly thrived in the competitive cabinetmaking industry that established itself along the Delaware.

The maker of the chests on chests remains a mystery. With limited ownership history for only one of the three examples, it is not possible to determine precisely where this maker was active. His meticulous workmanship and construction tendencies that increased overall manufacturing time allude to a pace that may not have been financially viable in Philadelphia’s competitive environment by 1740. These same characteristics of his joinery also indicate that a craftsman established in the region since the 1710s or 1720s likely trained him.
Scholars have assumed the furniture examined in this study was made in Philadelphia on account of their materials, refined workmanship, and “neat and plain” character. As John Head’s work makes clear, an urban production environment is not a guarantee of internal refinement, and highly finished interior construction may not be an accurate predictor of urban production. The work of William Beakes III. illustrates the uncertainties of attribution for a canonical “Philadelphia” maker, and the genuine complexity of movement and itinerancy possible in a craftsman’s early career. The chest on chest group’s laborious interior refinement raises questions of pace and where habits of workmanship were viable. These examples all illustrate that furniture cannot be accurately and objectively assessed for its origins based on its external features alone, and new dimensions of craftsmanship and history are possible when internal construction features are at the heart of object analysis.

These three makers are part of a larger Anglo craft tradition that continued uninterrupted in a colonial context with local materials in the early eighteenth century; their work has many similarities, and those similarities are as informative as their differences in shaping our knowledge of the region’s cultural fabric. In this case study, however, investigation of internal, craftsman-dictated construction characteristics reveals the habitus of each: three individuals with lineages of knowledge given by their master but inflected with their individual character and circumstances governed by unknown pressures of locale, season, and demand. Our responsibility as

scholars is to rescue their individual stories, and with them, restore diversity and complexity to the region’s craft history.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

Craftsman Stacy Beaks died in 1745 and left behind a thriving shop in Trenton, then a prospering town of brick townhouses that echoed those lining the streets of Burlington and Philadelphia down river. By this time, nodes of seventeenth century settlement in the region had increased in population, and expanded beyond their initial bounds. New nodes of commerce developed upstream and along turnpikes as the colony’s transportation network strengthened. The artisan community swelled in New Jersey towns, although not at the same pace or with the same density compared to Philadelphia. By 1710, at least fifteen men who self-identified in legal documents as carpenters or joiners died in Burlington County; in that same period, sixteen carpenters and joiners died in Philadelphia alone.248

Despite Philadelphia’s rapid growth, it is clear based on documentary evidence that New Jersey had its own craft population that supplied residents’ furniture, carpentry, shipbuilding, crating, and cooperage needs. At no time in this early colonial period did Philadelphia craftsmen supplant the production of local woodworkers in those New Jersey towns, nor in smaller rural settlements beyond. Philadelphia

248 Statistics are abstracted from Ruth Matzkin’s thesis. Matzkin, 1959. Matzkin’s tally included three men whose occupations she could not confirm: John Baker, d. 1684 (possibly a carpenter); William Hunt, d. 1694 (possibly a carpenter); and Samuel Taylor, d. 1710 (possibly a carpenter or joiner). She also included Joseph Carter, a sawyer. They have been excluded from the 16 noted here. The author’s count of craftsmen includes identified makers—carpenters, joiners, shipwrights, and forge carpenters—so sawyers are excluded from the Burlington County figure. See Appendix A.
craftsmen had clients outside the town, but those clients experienced additional expenses for crating and transport of their Philadelphia-made goods. New Jerseyans who chose the work of Philadelphia craftsmen made that choice out of circumstance and desire, not necessity. We have only to look at the example of Stacy Beaks’ shop to see the scale and variety of work he provided for Trenton’s inhabitants (Table 5.1). Tools “in the shop” include over 110 molding planes used in making interior woodwork with complex profiles in vogue at this time; “a parcel of chisels & gouges” and “lathe and turning tools” for making turned chairs, bedposts, or balusters; and “2 glue potts, 5 hammers, & sundreis” that could have been used for joining casework, or applying veneers to it.249

Table 5.1. Transcription of shop contents, will and inventory of Stacy Beaks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Molding Plains</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plains of Divers Sorts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Chisels &amp; Gouges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hand Saws</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crosscut Saw</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drawing Knives, 7 Augors, 1 Adze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lathe and Turning Tools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Axes, 1 Grubing Howe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Mall, 4 Higges [Wigges?] 1 Grindstone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glue Potts, 5 Hammers, &amp; Sundreis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Bedstead for Sacking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Old Iron</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Bedstead for Cord</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Gun &amp; Some Files</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

249 Another reference in the inventory below this notes “12 sett of bedstid stuff” valued at £2-10, indicating bedsteads might have been made cost-effective forms that could be made speculatively for local sale or export.
Stacy Beaks was one of many craftsmen in Trenton (and elsewhere) who supplied the diverse woodworking needs of a local clientele.\textsuperscript{250} The appendix of craftsmen at the conclusion of this thesis captures the activity of these men like Beaks whose work in the woodworking trades was not previously known, and whose skilled presence has been hitherto missing from scholarly study of craftsmanship in the Delaware Valley.\textsuperscript{251}

For nearly one hundred years, furniture historians have equated the culture and history of the entire Delaware River Valley with that of Philadelphia. Scholars deployed connoisseurial and “core-periphery” models to explain the perceived relationships between “city” and “country” furniture, made in Philadelphia or New York, and New Jersey, respectively. These models simplify a far more complex reality of economic, commercial and material interdependence between region’s colonies, with social, cultural, religious, and kinship ties uniting their inhabitants. Rivers and creeks dispersed timber from New Jersey to Philadelphia, where it was used in furniture, house construction, cooperage, and shipbuilding, and exported to settlements beyond the Schuylkill River. New Jersey’s geography contributed unique material resources to Philadelphia’s furniture production, materials that were also employed by

\textsuperscript{250} Winterthur Museum Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Collection 61, 55.21.1.

\textsuperscript{251} See also Appendix I Craftsmen Active in the Delaware Valley, 1680-1758 published in \textit{Worldly Goods}, 1999, 247-52. The author has not checked the location of activity for all craftsmen in that list but, with the exception of William Beakes III. (listed as William Beake Jr.), the list seems to be composed largely—if not entirely—of Philadelphia or Pennsylvania-based craftsmen. This underscores that scholars have not included craftsmen across the river, or to the counties south of Philadelphia as part of this region’s craft community. Craftsmen are also listed in Leibundguth (University of Delaware, 1964), McElroy (University of Delaware, 1970), and Matzkin (University of Delaware, 1959).
local craftsmen. A shared ethnic history of Dutch, Swedish, and English migration undergirded the region’s evolving craft culture in the seventeenth century. Localisms of style or construction evolved as cultural preferences remained relevant in particular communities, but English forms, construction, and joinery subsumed Dutch and Swedish traditions as a result of rapid, dense, and widespread Anglo settlement. The casework construction evolved into an English-dominated practice reinforced by the apprenticeship system and sustained immigration of English-trained craftsmen. This is true of Philadelphia-made furniture, as well as furniture produced throughout the Delaware River Valley where a similar Anglo-oriented cultural identity existed. Historians’ continued preoccupation with furniture “possibly made in Philadelphia” denies the shared construction traditions among the region’s craftsmen and stylistic preferences of its inhabitants. And with it, precludes opportunities to define the work of hundreds of craftsmen who capably operated throughout the region.

Historians and antiquaries of Philadelphia’s colonial past like John Fanning Watson chronicled historically significant individuals and first families of Philadelphia with their scholarship. Early collectors and curators R. T. H. Halsey and Joseph Downs embraced artifacts associated with these families. In turn, their connoisseurship identified makers like William Savery, who became canonical of—if not singlehandedly responsible—for early furniture made in Philadelphia. Scholars described the craft landscape of the region as barren, arcane, and backward. Early connoisseurship of Philadelphia furniture, its subsequent study, and enduring strength in the marketplace has reinforced scholars’ biases limiting study of goods made beyond its borders. Because of a gap in the artifact record of identified objects made in the province and colony of New Jersey, scholars have—by choice or by
circumstance—marginalized the colony’s significant contributions of raw materials, craftsmen, and furniture.

Historical models of “core and periphery”, or “hub and spoke” have consistently been engaged to explain the cultural and artistic output of New Jersey’s inhabitants, “influenced” by either Philadelphia’s or New York’s tastes or makers. The approach of Atlantic World historians by contrast embraces the regions layers of settlement, a palimpsest of Anglo-European conquest. It further provides an interpretation of the Delaware Valley as a region that was commercially (and culturally) unique but one that acted in concert with the rest of the Atlantic Coast, and the European world. This model integrates Philadelphia as one node in a complex system of exchange that includes New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware as part of the economic system of the British North Atlantic. More diverse but integrated methodologies are needed to explain New Jersey’s role in this commercial and cultural world.

This is not, however, a thesis devoted to exclusively to New Jersey’s furniture and furniture makers. Instead, this is a study of the cabinetmaking traditions of Delaware River Valley inhabitants writ large, from early English colonial contact until 1740. By tracing the periods of settlement and conquest by Dutch, Swedes, and English across the Delaware Valley, a contour of the region’s shared cultural past takes shape. Exploring the concentrated migration of English artisans, yeoman, and members of the trades to western Jersey in the 1670s–90s establishes the foundation for the commercial, social, political, and cultural networks that spanned the Delaware River to coastal settlements in Pennsylvania for the next hundred years. Initial decades of the founding of the Society of Friends coincide with English colonial settlement.
Ownership of the West Jersey territory was held among a group of five Quakers in the 1670s, and land purchases and rents initially favored fellow Quakers, increasing their immigration to the West Jersey province.

Quakers were a literate group that closely monitored the movements of its membership because of the religion’s hierarchical nature. Quaker habits of recordkeeping for groups, or meetings, in the Delaware Valley document the high mobility of its members who frequently traveled within and between colonies, regions, and across the Atlantic to visit family or conduct spiritual and financial business. This movement underscores the constant motion of people here, and in the broader Atlantic World. These people with a shared culture and faith regularly engaged their human networks for marriage, resource use and management, land settlement, employment, and apprenticeships. Given the high density of Quaker settlement in West Jersey, it was truly a “Quaker colony” whose faith-based administration spread web-like across the initial “tenths” of the colony’s settlement.

New Jersey’s unique placement at the intersection of the Atlantic Coastal Plain and the Piedmont created large areas of fertile land and timber forest, making it an advantageous place of settlement and a significant contributor to the region’s timber-based industries. The Coastal Plain’s dual areas of sandy or swampy soil fostered the growth of two species in large quantities—hard pine and white cedar. These woods were immediately utilized, fueling forges, constructing ships and buildings, and making furniture. Mill technology and abundant water sources facilitated New Jersey’s fledgling timber industry, and by the 1740s, towns on the colony’s oceanic and river coasts were major contributors to colonial shipbuilding. By-products harvested from pine were utilized for tar and turpentine, while cedar forests
contributed to New Jersey’s shingle industry. The woods low density also made it suitable for export; New Jersey’s cedar shingles sheathed the roofs of houses from Philadelphia to Jamaica.

Waterways were essential components for New Jersey’s colonial success; they connected settlements and carried materials, people, and ideas through the region. Waterways penetrate the New Jersey by as much as 30 miles inland from the Atlantic Coast or the Delaware River, and in early colonial settlement, were deep enough for shallow draft vessels used for transportation of people or goods. Dugouts or canoes made from wide dimension trees skirted the coasts, and were significant but simple tools for communication. The earliest settlements established by native people and subsequently used by the Dutch, Swedes, and English, were located on the Delaware River coast, and the mouths of its tributaries, providing easy migration along the coastline and to settlements across the river. This ease of transit facilitated settlement deeper east into the Jersey colony while preserving lines of communication and access to growing commercial and administrative centers like Burlington, and Philadelphia. In this way, the growth of the New Jersey colony was branched, originating from the Delaware River, flowing eastward. For craftsmen, directional migration from the early Jersey settlements westward to Philadelphia was not the dominant model, nor was it the only model, for establishing a successful livelihood.

This study illustrates that timing of settlement, location, age, knowledge, and networks were all determining variables that contributed to a craftsman’s success. Men like William Beakes III. and John Tantum who learned the carpentry or joinery trades yet settled in rural areas might have engaged in compatible occupations—yeomanry and carpentry, or as millwrights and joiners—in order to make a successful
living in more thinly populated areas. Those located in port towns, like immigrant joiners John Head (of Bury St Edmunds) who settled in Philadelphia, or London-trained Isaac Marriott who settled in Burlington, succeeded because of specialized knowledge, productivity, and a density of available consumers.

Competition in Philadelphia’s craft community steadily increased and caused some craftsmen to seek their fortunes in more accommodating areas. William Beakes III. began his career in the early 1710s in Philadelphia, and he may have left that town and settled in neighboring Burlington County for any number of reasons unrelated to his occupation. His skill as town-trained joiner may not have influenced his ability to establish a clientele in Burlington County as much as his kinship and religious networks did. Beakes ultimately settled even further east on a three-hundred acre plantation in Upper Freehold Township whose land he purchased from Anthony Woodward, Jr. in 1740—another Quaker whose family he had known in Nottingham Township.252 It was land—not his trade—that ultimately provided financial stability for his disabled son, daughters, and grandsons upon his passing.

New Jersey presented economic promise for other craftsmen, like Stacy Beaks, whose apprenticeship and employment opportunities may not have required relocation. Stacy Beaks was born into very positive financial circumstances in 1705/6, the first child of William Beaks II. and Ruth Stacy. (Figures 5.1 and 5.2) His elaborately inscribed mathematical exercise book dated 1721–2 illustrates the benefit of that financial position. Exercises ranging from the rules of three, bartering, interest calculations, geometry, and transverse sailing rendered in precise calligraphy signpost

252 See Colonial Conveyances.
what may have been familial expectations for commercial entrepreneurship. The exercise book may have been completed just before he commenced his apprenticeship, and he could have worked under a number of carpenters or cabinetmakers in Burlington, Nottingham, or Chesterfield. It is possible, too, that he apprenticed under his older half-brother, William (III.), who had completed his apprenticeship nearly a decade earlier. It seems likely that Stacy began his business sometime around 1736 or 1737, and he likely established himself in Trenton from the outset. His shop’s large tool supply indicates that within seven or eight years he managed a large operation. It seems quite likely that the Stacy family’s powerful position in the immediate area contributed to his ability to develop a clientele, while a location in Trenton positioned Stacy to provide a variety of woodwork for the interiors of the growing town.

253 The exercise book seems dissonant for someone who later became a carpenter or cabinetmaker, albeit one with a large shop. It is not known if the plan for Stacy was to always enter a trade and if this level of learning was typical for a young man of his family’s financial and social position.
In this study, cabinetmaking and joinery are lenses for understanding the Delaware River Valley’s environmental, commercial, cultural, and social relationships in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Cabinetmaking was a relatively stable craft tradition with certain embedded expectations of construction, training, form, and style. European guilds for joiners and carpenters enforced expectations for hundreds of years. In the absence of such guilds in colonial North America, the apprenticeship
system perpetuated those standards by passing one maker’s knowledge and habits to another.

Cabinetmaking, carpentry and joinery in the Delaware River Valley in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries conformed to expectations of a craftsman’s respective communities—whether Dutch, Swedish, or British. Those traditions not only demonstrate a persistence of their culture’s expectations, but also hybridity as people interacted.

Chests of drawers are particularly advantageous for examining the individual habits of handwork for particular makers because they illuminate the broader cultural norms shared by craftsman and customer. Tool marks, face marks, methods of joinery, and location of woods help identify the maker’s pace of production, to the relative pace of his shop, whether he was subject to seasonal rhythms of combination occupations, or if he worked in a specialized environment. These aspects speak further to the maker’s working habits in an urban or rural location where consumer demands differ.

The account book of John Head and a body of attributed casework grounds the discussion of urban production. Characteristics of Head’s casework show economies of material—and time—that would be expected for a shop operating at a rapid pace. His shops levels of internal finish are less refined where they would not be seen or noticed. These are not slights to the client; they are necessities of speed and profitability. Furniture historians have evolved a notion that operating in an “urban” center—Philadelphia—implies levels of refinement and finish not executed by “rural” counterparts. Instead, at this early period, speed was a method of survival, so these economics of time and mediocre level of interior finish may be much more prevalent
in work of urban craftsmen than historians suspect. Characteristics of interior casework have not been systematically studied to interpret pace of work, so a further analysis is not yet possible.

By contrast, an unidentified cabinetmaker of three chests on chest illustrates levels of interior finish and systemization that can only be described as laborious, his working pace was likely methodical, if not slow. This group illustrates total uniformity in drawer construction from wedged dovetailing and face marks to layout lines for marking saw cuts and nailing of drawer bottoms. This capable cabinetmaker expended a great deal of labor to make these chests, losing time that could have been devoted to other commissions. His economic and environmental situation is not known, but it seems unlikely that at the close of the 1730s, despite the beauty of his work, he could have survived in Philadelphia with competition from the likes of John Head, and scores of other craftsmen. Instead, it seems more likely his home was in an area of lower population density, and less competition.

William Beakes III. provides a final opportunity for reflection about the complexities of a craftsman’s condition and work environment. Beakes’ casework exhibits similar levels of uniformity as Head and the unknown cabinetmaker. Three chests examined in this study were likely made within the same decade, a period of transition and possible itinerancy in Beakes’ life. The earliest dated example, likely made in 1711, would have been completed the same year that Beakes concluded his apprenticeship. The other example, dated to 1720/1, was likely made after Beakes had left Philadelphia and moved to Burlington County, NJ. Three years later, he observed the wedding of his half-sister to Thomas Potts. Was he renting from a family member or local acquaintance in Burlington, Nottingham, or Chesterfield Townships? Was he
working as a yeoman and joiner at this time? Acting as a shop journeyman? Beakes’
drawer construction employs irregular but consistent use of wedges through the pins
of the dovetail joints. Lacking other physical and documentary evidence of Beakes’
life, material culture scholars are forced to generalize from the patterns they can see.
The findings here complicate the existing assumptions of furniture scholars.

Despite obvious external differences in the work of each maker reflecting the
desires of their clients and demands of the marketplace, the internal construction of
their casework illustrates a broadly shared, transplanted English craft tradition. Each
object was an artifact made at the convergence of the makers’ and buyers’ unique
circumstances: their locations, life courses, skills, training, ages, and prosperity. We
cannot reconstitute most of the details from objects alone. Instead, these artifacts
illustrate the constant circulation of people, ideas, resources, and things typical of this
period but little recognized by historians. Embedded within them are networks of
commerce, kinship, ethnicity, and religion. Each one can be unpacked to illustrate the
shared culture—the ways of doing—unique to the Delaware River Valley and its early
craftsmen.
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APPENDIX A.

CRAFTSMEN ACTIVE IN NEW JERSEY PRIOR TO 1730

This appendix is a list of identified members of the woodworking trades active in provincial and colonial New Jersey prior to 1730, organized by county of activity. When known, towns and villages are specified, i.e., Burlington County, Chesterfield Twsp. Occupations listed here are those provided by the craftsman in period documents: wills, inventories, marriage certificates, and legal contracts. Biographical information has been compiled from primary and secondary documentary sources, both manuscript and digital, accessed to date. Major sources of data about these artisans originate in the publications below. Spellings reflect the transcriptions of primary documents by van Doren Honeyman and Nelson and have not been altered. In references to land transactions, the abbreviation “Do.” is short for “ditto”, replacing to the word “deed” which has been omitted.

The State of New Jersey’s transcription of records from the Secretary of State includes many transactions of land in which the occupation of the parties entering into the transaction are listed. William Nelson’s text extracted these land records, and an index at the rear of the text is organized by occupation. When included as part of the bibliographic reference for a particular craftsman, the NJA-D&P listed the craftsman by his trade in this index. The sources below have been digitized and for this project were accessed through Internet Archive, and searched for the following terms: carpenter, joiner, turner, millwright, shipwright. The author has taken pains to assure the references are accurate, but cannot account for inaccuracies of translation from the
original documents that are referenced here. Due to the constraints of time and quantity of craftsmen identified, primary documents were not consulted.

Hereafter abbreviated *NJA-D&P*

Hereafter abbreviated *NJCW 1*.

Hereafter abbreviated *NJCW 2*.

Hereafter abbreviated *NJCW 4*.
Allen, Matthew (d. 1701; will dated Sept. 7, 1701)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chester Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £743.7.8
Estate appraisers: John Pain, Thos. Eves, Abraham Heuling
Notes: possibly a Quaker; will was witnessed by known Quaker Thomas Scattergood.
His daughter, Alinor, married Isaac Connorow.
References: NJCW/11.

Antram, James (dates unknown)
Carpenter (but noted as a planter in some land transaction records)
Active Burlington Co., Mansfield Twsp.
References: NJA-D&P, pages as noted above.

Austin (Oosten?), Francis (will dated July 30, 1723)
Carpenter  
Active Burlington Co., Evesham Twsp.  
Estate value upon death: £280.0.0  
Estate appraisers: John Sharp, Thomas Wilkins  
Notes: wife, Mary. Austin defined himself as a yeoman in his will.  
References: NJCW1, 19, 347.

Bainbridge, John (will dated May 10, 1686)  
Carpenter and joiner  
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.  
Estate value upon death: £88.13.11  
Estate appraisers: Francis Davenpoort, John Snowson (?), John Hooten, William Beard  
Notes: Bainbridge actively bought and sold property in West Jersey: deed to John Bainbridge from Thomas Wright, yeoman of Burlington, for a water or wharf lot there, being part of 1/8th of a share, which is one half of the water lot belonging to 1/4 of a share, bought of Thomas Hutcheson et. al. May 10, 1677. Another deed of land to Bainbridge, same year: William Wood of Burlington Co., yeoman, to John Bainbridge of Burlington, joiner, for a town and water lot there, part of 1-32 of a share, bought of George Hutcheson.  
References: NJCW1, 123; NJA-D&P, 432

Bainbridge, Jr., John (dates unknown)  
Carpenter  
Active Burlington Co., possibly Chesterfield Twsp.  
Estate value upon death: not known  
Notes: Inventoried estate of Bonaventure Dominicee Feb. 13, 1691-2 (NJCW1, p. 140); inventoried estate of Samuel Hunt, Maidenhead, Hunterdon Co. (1719, Dec. 26; NJCW1, p. 249); with Malhollon Stacy & Joshua Wright, Bainbridge inventoried the estate of John Lambert Sr. (1696, July 13; NJCW1, 280); along w/ John Brearly, he inventoried the estate of Rebekah Stacy (Malhollon's wife) (dated 1711, Aug. 20; NJCW1, p. 437). Land purchases: 1691 7th d. 10th m. (Dec). “Do. Thomas Wood of Burlington Co., husbandman, to John Bainbridge of Burlington, joiner, for all his lots and lands on the Island of Burlington, belonging to 1-32 of a share, bought of Geo. Hutcheson Jan. 29, 1677-8.” “1691-2 26th d. 12th m (Feb.), John Calow of Burlington Co., wheelwright, to John Bainbridge, for a house lot on the Island of Burlington and 13 1/3d acres in townbounds, part of 1-30 of a share, bought of Thomas Ffarnsworth (Farnsworth) Dec. 10, 1687; also a lot on said island, N. W. Broad St., S. W. Benjamin Scott, E. and W. Thomas Ollive and partners, in quantity 1-32 of 9 acres, bought with other land of Mathew Allen May 30, 1689.” Bainbridge also listed as living in Middlesex Co. in 1690s: “1693 May 12. Do. John Biinbridge (Bainbridge) of Assunpinck, Middlesex Co., East Jersey, joiner, to Benjamin Ffield (Field), for 250 acres, lately occupied by John Calow and bought of George Hutcheson
January 20, 1685-6.” Further land purchases: May 6, 1696 “Do. Thomas Revell to
John Bainbridge of East Jersey, joiner, for 200 acres of the W. J. Society's land above
the Falls of Delaware, part of the 15,000 acre tract.”
References: *NJCW1*, pages as noted above; *NJA-D&P*, p. 432

**Bunting, Sr., John** (d. 1715; will dated Mar. 8, 1714/5)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £209.13.0. Inventory of estate included 2 bibles and other
books worth £2.2.0.
Estate appraisers: John Tantum, John Bunting, Jr., John Middleton
Notes: Quaker, based on appraisers (Tantum built the Crosswicks Meetinghouse). His
will lists his wife Sarah, children: John, William, and Sarah (Murfin). It also included
his home, 250 acres & a lot 70 acres near the meeting house. Witnesses to the will
include: Jacob Doughty, Thomas Foulkes, John Bunting, Jr. According to
*NJA-D&P*, p. 363: July 1685, Bunting is mentioned in a patent of 320 acres to Thomas Ffolke by
Daniel Leeds, quoted as one property boundary "adjacent to John Bunting (Sr.)” (see
Revel's *Book of Surveys*); March 1, 1691, mentioned in return of surveys to Francis
Davenport of 77 acres adjoining his former settlement, along south side of Crosswicks
Creek between Samuel Wright, John Bunting, George Nicholson & Thomas Ffolke
(see p. 90 of Revel's *Book of Surveys*)
References: *NJCW1*, p. 77

**Bunting, John, Jr.** (d. 1729; will dated Sept. 19, 1729)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £52.12.3
Estate appraisers: John Chesshire (Cheshire) & Isaac Horner
Notes: His will mentions his brother William and brother-in-law William Murfin
(husband of his sister, Sarah). He owned land in Chesterfield amounting to 360 acres,
of which 260 came from father, 100 was bought of his brother William. Separately he
also had 20 acres adjoining George Douglas in Chesterfield, and 4 acres of meadow on
Crosswicks Creek in Nottingham Twsp., “156 a. not taken up.”
References: *NJCW1*, p. 74

**Burt, Richard** (d. 1707; will dated Aug. 6, 1707)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Maidenhead (now Lawrenceville)
Estate value upon death (not known)
Estate appraisers: William Morrell, Philip ?, John Bainbridge, (Sr.)
Notes: possibly Presbyterian
References: *NJCW1*, p. 76
**Bustill, William** (d. 1721; will dated Dec. 21, 1721)
Burlington Co.
Carpenter (though he defines himself as “merchant” in his will)
Estate value upon death: £588.12.13
Estate appraisers: Isaac Marriott, Jr. and Isaac de Cow (DeCou)
Notes: likely a Quaker, based on association with Marriott and De Cow. His will included his wife Elizabeth, children Samuel & Unity, as well as a farm in Springfield, house in Burlington, and other personal property. Isaac Marriott (Jr.), John Dawson, and Christopher Snoden witnessed the will.
References: *NJCWI*, p. 77

**Carter, John** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Possibly a Quaker based on affiliation with Edmund Beaks in settling estate of Thomas Baker (inventory dated March 25, 1728 of Nottingham; Carter appraised estate along w/ Joseph King). This estate was affirmed by Edmund Beaks, the administrator of the estate, p. 24. Appraised estate of Thomas Tindall, Sr., yeoman, Nottingham, Burlington along w/ William Budd, Oct. 13, 1714, p.465. Witnessed will of John Bacon, Chesterfield Township, Burlington, will dated May 19, 1711.
References: *NJCWI*, pages as stated in notes above.

**Chapman, Robert** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Witnessed will of John Bacon, Chesterfield Township, May 19, 1711, p. 20; Appraised inventory of Ann Beck, Chesterfield Township, Sept. 28, 1716, p. 32; witnessed will of Henry Beck, also of Chesterfield (husband of Ann Beck), also dated Sept. 1, 1716, p. 32; purchased at auction some goods belonging to Francis Davenport, list of goods remains from auction Nov. 14-15, 1720 (Davenport lived in Chesterfield), p. 129; inventoried estate of Francis Parot (Parrott), June 8, 1702, also Chesterfield, p. 354; Owed debt by estate of Joseph Stons, also Chesterfield, inventory dated. Oct. 4, 1688, 444.
References: *NJCWI*, pages as listed in notes above.

**Clark, Thomas** (d. 1708; will dated Apr. 9, 1708)
Burlington Co.
Carpenter
Estate value upon death: £48.1.0
Estate appraisers: Thomas Tindall, Isaac de Cow (DeCou)
Notes: Likely Quaker because his estate’s appraisers were Quakers; “Mary and Elizabeth Clarke” are listed as arrivals to Philadelphia. It is not known if they are related to Thomas Clark.
References: NJCW1, 94

Collins (or Collings), Francis (b. 1635, Oxfordshire, England, d. 1720?)
Bricklayer (possibly also a carpenter?)
Active Northampton Twsp., Burlington Co., and Newton, Gloucester Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Collins is credited with constructing the Burlington Court House (ca. 1691), as well as 1st Burlington Meetinghouse (ca. 1685–93), and Springfield (Copenny/Matacopenny Bridge) Meetinghouse (1699). See DeCou, p. 60–61. DeCou calls him a bricklayer and builder. He was the son of Edward and Mary Clement Collins. In 1663 he married Sarah Mahan at the Bull and Mouth Meeting in London (at which time Collins lived at Ratcliff Cross, Stepney, County Middlesex). There he rebuilt the Stepney Meetinghouse in 1675 (according to a surviving account book, quoted by Clement). Collins first settled in Gloucester Co., then removed to Burlington, living in Northampton Township at the time of his death.
References: Clement, 1877, 71–84.

Cornish, John (d. 1694; will dated Aug. 11, 1694)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
References: The Burlington Court Book, 130; NJCW1, p. 110

Emley, Thomas (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: According to a case dated 1705 presented to the court at Burlington, William Alcot was bound to Thomas Emley, a carpenter.

Evens (Evans?), William (d. 1728/9; Feb. 21, 1728/9)
Carpenter (he calls himself a yeoman in his will)
Active Burlington Co., Evesham Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £901.7.7. The inventory included: book debts totaling £166.11.3; a clock & case at £10; a silver tankard and 6 silver spoons valued at £16; and “8 negro slaves” valued at £270.
Estate appraisers: Josiah Foster and Samuel Lippincott
Notes: He inventoried the estate of Joseph Bouton, a Quaker, so it is possible he was, too. His will mentions his wife, Elizabeth, sons Thomas & John (under age), daughter Jane, son-in-law William Hudson, and grandson William Evens. He gave legacies to
Jane Stow, Joseph Hedges, and Sarah Harv(e)y. He owned a home, farm, and other parcels of land including 50 acres adjoining his son Thomas's farm, and 50 acres between Henry Ballinger and John Sharp. The will was witnessed by Jonathan Eldridge, John Turner, and Samuel Atkinson (possibly the second husband of Ruth Stacy). He was executor of will of his mother, Jane Evans.

References: *NJCW1*, p. 157

**Fenton, Eleazar** (d. 1728; will dated Mar. 28, 1728)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Springfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: over £300 (farm, personal property, and debts owed)
Estate appraisers: John Bullock and William Emley
Notes: Quaker. *The Burlington Court Book*: “1684 24th of 4th month at a meeting of Proprietors and Freeholders of the First tenth. Among the names of Proprietors and Freeholders was Eleazar Fenton, assessed with 200 acres.” (p. 30)
References: *NJCW1*, p. 161

**Forsyth(e), Mathew** (or Matthew) (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: A Quaker whose marriage is recorded in the minutes of the Chesterfield Meeting in 1696 to Rebecca Oddling. According to *NJCW1*, Forsyth was active in administrating the estates of friends and colleagues as follows: p. 357, bond owed to him by estate of Robert Pearson, mentioned in account of estate made April 25, 1704; p. 41, inventoried estate of William Black of Chesterfield, April 22, 1702, along with John Bacon and Edward Rockhill; p. 74, his children are named as heirs to Joseph Burch of Chesterfield, Burlington Co., in Burch's will d. Nov. 27, 1703. Forsyth also witnessed Burch's will, and inventoried his estate with Edward Rockhill and Henry Beck on 10th month 10th day 1703; p. 193, inventoried estate of John Greene, Mansfield Township, along with Eliakim Higgins and John Joyner Oct. 20, 1694. Greene and Eliakim Higgins were both carpenters.
References: *NJCW1* as above, and *PMHB* 9, no. 3 (Oct. 1885): 347

**Francis, Richard** (d. 1720; will dated June 27, 1720)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: £86.15.15
Estate appraisers: W. Pattison; (James Verree & Isaac de Cow joined him in witnessing Francis’s will)
References: *NJCW1*, p. 172

**Gardner (Gardener), John** (d. 1694; will dated Nov. 9, 1694)
Carpenter and Joiner
Active Burlington Co., Burlington
Estate value upon death: £359.16.0. The inventory included: a silver dram cup, bonds of Lawrence Morice, Mathew Allen, book debts due by John Labert (Lambert?), John Parres (Pears?), James Saterthay (Satterthwait?), Thomas Kendall, Walter Oumpherys (Humphreys?), James Wills, Thomas Glading, and a house and lot on High St., valued at £150.
Estate appraisers: Isaac Marriott, Samuel Fornis and Benjamin Wheate.
Notes: “Deed of William Embley (Emley) to John Gardner for lot in Burlington, W. High St., S. Samuel Ffurnis (Furniss, Furness, Fornis?), E. Percival Towle, N. Thomas Raper.”
Reference: NJCW1, p. 178; NJA-D&P, p. 537

Greene, John (d. 1694; will dated Sept. 30, 1694)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Mansfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £35.4.11
Estate appraisers: Matthew Forsyth, Eliakim Higgins, and John Joyner
Notes: Greene built the first meetinghouse used by the Crosswicks (Chesterfield) members. The first recorded meeting took place in October 1693. The meeting settled their debt with Greene for his work during the 11th month 1693 (approximately February 1694), at which time they paid him £40, and gave "£1.0.2" shillings over and above for their pleasure with his work.

Hands, John (d. 1694/5; will dated Dec. 14, 1694/5)
Joiner
Active Burlington Co., Burlington
Estate value upon death: £12.3.2
Estate appraisers: William Loujoy and John Pears
Notes: Noted as a "sojourner, late of Burlington, joyner." Mostly tools recorded in inventory. Abraham Senior is main creditor of estate.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 209

Harding, Thomas (d. 1708)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Wellingborough Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £62.6.10 ½
Estate appraisers: John Woolman and Joshua Humphris (Humphreys?)
Notes: Home farm on Northampton River. Quaker, based on associates. No wife or occupation mentioned in his will, p. 210. Children: Mary, wife of Henry Ballinger, Hope & Rebecca. Leaves legacy to John Wills for fencing burying ground in
References: *NJCW1*, pages as referenced in notes above.

**Higgins, Eliakim** (d. 1698/9)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co. and Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: £8
Estate appraisers: John Langstaffe and Reni Papal (alias Laflower)
Notes: Lived in Burlington before death in Woodbridge. Was likely Quaker during his life, but possibly disowned later in life. p. 226: Administration of estate of Eliakim Higgins granted to Jedediah Higgins of Piscataway (June 23, 1698); Feb. 22 1698–9, inventory of estate made; p. 193: along with Matthew Forsyth and John Joyner, inventoried estate of John Greene, carpenter, Mansfield Township, Burlington Co. (Oct. 20, 1694); p. 335: witnessed will of James Newbold, yeoman of Mansfield, Burlington Co., along w/ Thomas Revell, and John Powell April 11, 1697 and was among those paid in 1697 by Michael Newbold, brother of James, during his illness before death.
References: *NJCW1*, pages as referenced in notes above.

**Hudson, John** (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Son of Burlington carpenter Robert Hudson; mentioned in the will of his mother, Mary Hudson (will dated Mar. 29, 1698).
References: *NJCW1*, p. 244

**Hudson, Robert** (d. 1695/6; will dated Jan. 24, 1695/6)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: £75.17.0
Estate appraisers: Benjamin Wheate & John Hollinshead
Notes: Quaker. Listed as arriving to Philadelphia with his family: William, Timothy, Mary, Hannah.

**Jennings, Peter** (d. 1690; will dated Aug. 31, 1690)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: £105.2.7
Estate appraisers: John Hollinshead & Thomas Kendall
Notes: Inventory of estate included £74 in book debts
References: NJCW1, p. 258

**Lambert, John** (dates not known)
Joiner
Active Burlington, Nottingham Twsp.?; originally from Southwingfield, Derbyshire
Notes: “Jan 11, 1681/2, deed of John Lambert of Nottingham, W. J., joiner, to William Barnes of Mansfield, W. J., turner, for 100 acres to be surveyed in the First Tenth.”

**Marriott, Isaac** (born London 1660, died Burlington 1712; will dated May 3, 1712)
Active Burlington Co., Burlington
Listed in period documents as both joiner and carpenter. See notes.
Estate value upon death: £213.17.10. Inventory included: “51 5/8 oz. of silver plate, £20.13; a silver watch, £6; a Bible and several books, £1; a negro woman and her husband, £50.”
Estate appraisers: Thomas Raper, John Borradaill, and Isaac Decow
Notes: Quaker, member of Burlington Meeting. Father, Richard, mother Margaret (Wilde). Family from Wappenham, Northamptonshire, but relocated to London before Isaac’s birth. His parents married in 1655 at Saint Clement Danes Church in Westminster, very near Holborn (a meeting of London Friends in Westminster was active since 1655). Apprenticed in London. Converted to Quakerism, and received a certificate of removal dated 12th mo. 7 1680 from the London Men's Meeting to travel to Burlington. Wed Joyce Olive (or Ollive), also of Burlington, at the Burlington Meeting in 1681. He maintained his activity in the meeting until his death, representing the meeting at quarterly sessions, and as an overseer. In 1698 the Burlington Meeting requested that he and fellow member Benjamin Wheate make a pine table for the meetinghouse. In later years, Marriott was responsible for mending the floors of the meetinghouse. He possibly also made seating and a gallery for the “great meetinghouse” in 1706 (likely referring to the brick addition to the original hexagonal building). Isaac’s will names “Wife Susannah, children: Isaac, Samuel, Anna, Richard, Joseph, Benjamin, Thomas. Granddaughter Sarah Marriott, Kinsman Abraham Marriott. Property is all devised in ounces of silver.” (?). Executors: wife, son Thomas, with Samuel Carpenter and Tomas Raper as assistants. Witnesses to will:
John Borradail, John Carlisle, and Samuel Lovett. According to *NJCW1*, he was also involved in the administration of the following vital records: p. 37: June 23, 1711 witnessed will of William Biddle, Mount Hope, Burlington Co., along w/ Thomas Raper and Cullum Macquire; p. 49: 1692, bondsman along w/ Hugh Huddy for administration of estate left unadministered by Edward Hunloke, deceased, in which he is mentioned as "merchant" in will of Thomas Bowman" of the Fawles (Falls) of the Dellewere (Delaware); p. 77: 1710, along w/ John Dawson & Christopher Snoden witnessed will of William Bustill (merchant of Burlington), and inventoried estate w/ Isaac Decow; p. 85: 1696, along w/ Henry Grubb ("innholder") inventoried estate of John Chaffon, gentleman of Burlington Co. His son Isaac was likely also in the woodworking trades, but living in Philadelphia: in 1715, his wife, Jane, applied for a certificate from the Philadelphia Meeting to return to Co. Middlesex to visit her mother. Based on various land purchases, Marriott’s shop and home may have had water frontage in Burlington: “Deed from Thomas Budd, merchant, to Isaac Marriot, for 1-32 of a share in the London Tenth and 18 acres in the Second Tenth, also a lot on Burlington Island, 5/8ths of the water lot.” Other land purchases: “1692 May 14. Do. Thomas Gardiner junior of Red Bank, Co. of Gloucester, W. J., yeoman, to Isaac Marriott of Burlington, joiner, for a corner wharf lot in Burlington, fronting Second and High St., N. Benjamin Wheat, E. George Hutcheson's garden.” “1692 Oct. 5. Ditto. George Hutcheson to Isaac Marriott, for 3 ft. 2 3/4 in. of a wharf lot, part of a corner fronting on Second St., N. Benjamin Wheat, E. grantor.” References: Minutes of the Burlington Monthly Meeting (microfilm. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College); W. J. Buck, "Certificates of Removal to Burlington" (undated) Records of Burlington and Mt. Holly Monthly Meeting, 1678-1872. Historical Society of Pennsylvania; *NJCW1*, p. 304 (as well as references noted above); *NJA-D&P*, p. 443

**Martineau, Nicholas** (dates not known)
Joiner
Active Burlington Co., possibly Burlington
Notes: Deed dated 1701-2, Feb. 16 of John Gilbert to Nicholas Martinaux (Martineau) for 200 acres (Gilbert purchased of the West Jersey Society), that was part of 30,000 acres above the Falls of the Delaware. Martineau's land was on the south side of Stony Brook adjacent to Jonathan Davis. A [?] Martineau inventoried the estate of Samuel Ogborne of Burlington (along w/ Benjamin Wheate and George Hutcheson) (1694, Nov. 21, *NJCW1*, p. 344). Martineau was the principal creditor of estate of William Griffith, Burlington and was designated administrator of the estate on Dec. 22, 1715 (*NJCW1*, p. 195). Martineau witnessed will of Hugh Huddy, along w/ William Norcross, Joseph Welsh (dated Dec. 15, 1716, *NJCW1*, p. 243); Martineau was named sole heir executor of the estate of Samuel Territt, smith of Burlington (dated Nov. 24, 1714, *NJCW1*, p. 456). Given these many references to Burlington (town), it seems likely that Martineau lived and worked in the town of Burlington.
Reference: *NJA-D&P*, p. 535; *NJCW1* references as noted above.
Miller, Thomas (d. 1717/8; will dated Mar. 22, 1717/8)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £80.4.0
Estate appraisers: Benjamin Wright, John Bullack (Bullock?), Richard Harrison, Jonas Ingham
References: NJCW1, p. 321

Monckhouse, William (d. 1690/1; will dated Mar. 10, 1690/1)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: bondsmen for his estate: Josh Newbould and Joseph Burgin, yeoman
References: NJCW1, p. 322

Moone, Jesper (d. 1728; will dated Apr. 29, 1728)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: £45.15.6
Estate appraisers: Thomas Scattergood & Titian Leeds
References: NJCW1, p. 322

Newbold, Joshua (dates unknown)
Millwright and/or carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Notes: listed twice in the index of NJA-D&P: as carpenter and millwright.
More research needed

Pancoast, Joseph (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Listed as a carpenter in the index of NJA-D&P
More research needed

Pears, John (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Bondsman in estate of Thurlas (Turlogh) Sullivan whose will was dated Mar. 28, 1700.
References: NJCW1, p. 488–9.
Philips, William (d. 1688; will dated Aug. 22, 1688)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: £8.18.6
Estate appraisers: George Gofforth (?), William Smith, Jonathan West, Christopher Snoden
Reference: NJCW1, p. 264

Resniere, Peter (dates unknown)
Ship carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: bondman for the estate of John Brigs (will dated Mar. 14, 1690/1). Quaker.
References: NJCW1, p. 60

Scattergood, Joseph (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Listed as a carpenter in the index of NJA-D&P
More research needed

Scattergood, Thomas (d. 1696/7; will dated Mar. 5, 1696/7)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Likely a Quaker. Related to Pancoast family, also of Burlington. Bondsman for estate of Arthur Borradell
References: NJCW1, p. 46

Scott, Joseph (d. 1726; will d. Oct. 13, 1726)
Forge carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.
Estate value upon death: £16.2.0
Estate appraisers: David Rockhill, Isaac Horner
Notes: Possibly built the structure that housed the forge at Black’s Creek, Bordentown, ca. 1722–26.254

_____________________________________________________

254 The forge’s proprietors were Isaac Horner, Joseph Borden and Samuel Farnsworth.
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**Stevenson, Jonathan** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Notes: was not a Quaker; is recorded as marrying in open court. Was administrator of the estate of Thomas Allen whose will was dated July 16, 1684.
References: *NJCW1*, p. 12.

**Tantum, John** (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp.
Notes: A Quaker whose marriage to Martha Newberry is recorded in the minutes of the Chesterfield Meeting in 1708. Tantum completed interior carpentry of the second Crosswicks/Chesterfield meetinghouse (see Middleton in *PMHB*). He was part of a committee from Chesterfield meeting to consult on the construction of Stony Brook meetinghouse in 1724. Tantum and French collected donations from Chesterfield for the new meetinghouse. In 1725, Tantum along with Joseph Worth & Benjamin Clarke were instructed to proceed with building the new meetinghouse. See Howard Barclay French, *Genealogy of the Descendants of Thomas French...* v. 2 (Philadelphia, PA, privately published, 1913): 313-4. Tantum also made a coffin for Nathaniel Pope, a local tailor, and was paid by Pope’s wife, Anne. His wife was Elizabeth (Bacon) Tantum. Tantum’s account book of 1701–08 is in the Friends’ Historical Library, Swarthmore College. See Appendix C.
References: *NJCW1*, p. 370; *PMHB* 9, no. 3 (Oct. 1885): 348

**West, Jonathan** (d. 1701; will dated Aug. 11, 1701)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co.
Estate value upon death: £168.6.0
Estate appraisers: Henry Grubb, Joseph Cross
References: *NJCW1* p. 499.

**Woodward, Anthony** (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Burlington Co., Chesterfield Twsp., possibly also Freehold, Monmouth Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Additional research necessary
References: *PMHB* 9, no. 3 (Oct. 1885): 347; *Colonial Conveyances*, 1977, 30
CAPE MAY COUNTY

Townsend, John (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Cape May Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
References: See Joan Berkey, *Early Architecture of Cape May County New Jersey: The Heavy Timber Frame Legacy*. (Cape May County Courthouse, NJ: Cape May County Historical and Genealogical Society, 2008).

Crowell, Yelverton (date of death unknown; will dated Jan. 10, 1723/4)
Carpenter
Active Cape May Co.
Estate value upon death: £116.15.6; account of estate made May 20, 1726
Notes: *NJCWI*, p. 121

ESSEX COUNTY

Allan, George (d. 1684/5; will dated Feb. 15, 1685/6)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., Elizabeth Town or Middlesex Co., Perth Amboy
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: 1685-6, Feb. 15, Agreement of William Cottar and wife Elenor of Woodbridge to Geo. Allan of Elizabethtown; 1688, Apr. 9: patent of 1 acre lot on E. High St. to W. Back St. to Geo. Allan of Perth Amboy; 1692 3 March 22. Recorded May 5, 1693. Ditto. Peter Dassigney of Woodbridge, surgeon, to George Allan of Elizabeth Town, carpenter, for ? of 132 acres, S. W. the West Brook, as mentioned in a deed of June 24, 1686, from Robert Moss to present grantor, Jonas Wood and Samuel Wood.
References: *NJA-D&P*, p. 90, 192.

Cramer, Thomas (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., likely Elizabeth Town
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Executor of father William Cramer's estate, of Elizabeth Town, Dec. 4, 1689.
Reference: *NJCWI*, p. 115

Crane, John (d. 1722/3; will dated Feb. 7, 1722/3)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., Elizabeth Town
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Owned mills on Rahweh River, Elizabeth Town.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 116

**Decent, John** (dates unknown)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., Elizabeth Town?
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: p. 345: On May 30, 1682, John Decent and Humphrey Speving appraised the estate of John Ogden, Elizabeth Town.
Reference: NJCW1, as noted above

**Gardner, John** (d. 1720; will dated Feb. 12 1719/20)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., New Barbadoes
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Will names Wife Hanah, sons Gershum and Thomas, & daughter Sarah. Proved March 9 1719-20; with Azariah Crane, Gardner appraised the estate of Isaac Kingsland (New Barbados, Essex Co.) on March 22, 1697-8; was bondsman for estate of Richard Berry, Nov. 16, 1703, of New Barbados, Essex Co., where he is noted as "John Gardiner of Newark" and "yeoman".
References: NJCW1, p. 36, 179; and other references above.

**Little (Littell), John** (d. 1713; will dated Apr. 8, 1713)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., Elizabeth Town
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Defined in will as yeoman. Wife Mary, sons John, Robert, Jonathan, Anthony. His home and farm consisted of 20 acres in Elizabeth Town. He also had 100 acres of woodland, 4.5 acres in the Elizabeth Town Rahway meadows, and misc. other land. Witnesses to his will: William Darly, Thomas Husk, Samuel Whitehead; p. 295 Separate entry for will of Mary Little (widow of John), dated April 9, 1715, with daughters Martha, Comfort, and Constants. Witnesses Mehitable Little, Robert Little, Will Oliver. p. 465: along with George Ross, inventoried estate of widow Lydia (Lydeah) Toe Jan. 25, 1689–90 (her husband, John Toe, Elizabeth Town, died 1689). References: NJCW1, as quoted in notes above.

**Pierson, Samuel** (d. 1729/30; will d. Mar. 3, 1729/30)
Carpenter
Active Essex Co., Newark
Estate value upon death: not known
Needs further research
GLOUCESTER COUNTY

Acton, Benjamin (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Estate of Thomas Bull owed debt to Acton (inventory made 1686/7 Mar. 2). It is possible that this is the same Benjamin Acton, carpenter, who was active in Salem in 1685.
See also Acton, Benjamin under Salem County.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 73

Bate(s), William (d. 1700; will dated Nov. 6, 1700)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co., Newton
Estate value upon death: £66.2.0
Estate appraisers: John Kay & Thomas Sharp
Notes: Bates was a 1st purchaser in the province, and owned 1/20th of 1 share. Listed as a carpenter from Wickloe Co., Ire., resided in West Jersey. Split share w/ Robert Turner, linendraper (Dublin, Ire., resided in W. Jersey & Pa.); Joseph Sleigh, tanner (Dublin); Robert Zane, sergemaker (Dublin, Ire., resided in W. Jersey—possibly father of the Robert Zane, carpenter, d. 1694/5?); Thomas Thackary(a), stuffweaver (Dublin, resided in W. Jersey), see Budd's True Account, reprinted in Pomfret's The Province of New Jersey (p. 285). In 1683, Bates served as a representative to the Legislature from the Irish Tenth, and was appointed constable. He had several children: Jeremiah (m. Mary Spicer); Joseph (m. Mercy Clement, 1701); Abigail (m. Joshua Frame, 1687); Sarah (m. Simeon Ellis, 1692); William (m. a native woman, name not known). Mercy Clement was the daughter of James and Jane Clement (Flushing, New York). Mercy’s brother was Samuel Clement, a known carpenter and joiner active in the Flushing community.255
References: NJCW1, p. 30, 285; Clement, 1877, 47-56; and others as noted above.

Braman, Joseph (d. 1701/2; will dated Mar. 5, 1701/2)

255 A high chest signed by Samuel Clement and dated 1726 resides in Winterthur Museum’s collections. See 1957.0512. Mercy and Joseph were married at the Newton home of another Long Island immigrant, John Hinchman. Clement, 1877, 52.
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co., Great Mantua Creek
Estate value upon death: £25.6.6
Estate appraisers: Robert Parker, Philip Paul
Notes: Possibly a Quaker. Had a brother, Benjamin Braman. Joseph died testate. No
mention of his tools or occupation.
References: NJCW1, p. 57

Heritage, John (d. 1716; will dated Nov. 19, 1716; inventory made Nov. 20, 1716)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co., New Garden
Estate value upon death: £41.14.10
Estate appraisers: Thomas French & John Chambers
Notes: Father was Richard Heritage. Will mentions his wife Sarah, brother Joseph.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 222

Herritage (Heritage), Richard (d. 1702; inventory dated Aug. 24, 1702)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co., New Garden
Estate value upon death: £137.10.4; inventory includes "liberary" of books worth 26s
Estate appraisers: John Kay & Thomas Shakle
Notes: Quaker. Son is John Heritage. Upon Richard's death in 1702, John's location is
given as Sutton New Garden. In Swarthmore College Friends Library, document
(handwritten copy made of the Yearly Meeting held at Burlington, 5th day 7th mo.
1688) indicates that Herritage represented Gloucester Meeting.
(http://tripod.brynmawr.edu/find/Record/cdm-HC_QuakSlav-11726, p. 18) p. 249:
listed as bondsmen in will of William Hunt, yeoman of Gloucester Co. (June 1, 1689);
p. 359: along w/ Francis Collins, inventoried estate of Thomas Penston of Gloucester
Co. dated Dec. 2, 1697.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 224, and references above.

Kaighin, John (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co., Newton
Estate value upon death: not known.
Notes: Witnessed will of William Cooper, yeoman, Newton Township, Gloucester
(will dated 1709-10 7 Mar.) NJCW1, p. 108; witnessed will of John Dole, Newton,
Gloucester. States Kaighin was brother-in-law of Dole, witnessed will & appraised
estate. Dole's wife, Mary (Kaighin?). Dole's farm adjacent to Kaighin's on Delaware
R. (will dated 1714 27 Nov.), pp. 139-40; NJCW1: appraised estate of Margaret
Erwin, Newton Township, Gloucester (will dated 1708 21 June), p. 156; NJCW1:
appraised estate of Mathew Medcalf (Midcalf) of Gloucester Town (1710 28 Aug.), p.
314; NJCW1, Trustee for disposal of real property of Archibald Mickle (a Quaker)
along w/ Abraham Carlile, cooper of Phila., and John Dole of Newton Township.
Kaighin also stated as from Newton Township (will d. 1706 Mar. 25), p. 317; *NJCW1*:
witnessed and appraised estate of Daniel Mickle of Newton, Gloucester Co. (will d.
1712 5 Apr.), p. 317; *NJCW1*: appraised inventory of Sarah Mickle, Newton,
Gloucester Co., widow of Archibald Mickle (inv. dated 1718 4 Nov.), p. 317-8;
*NJCW1*: witnessed will of Benjamin Thackera of Newton, Gloucester Co. Co-witness
is Joseph Kaighin (will d. 1727 4 Apr.), p. 357; *NJCW1*: assisted with execution of
will of Thomas Whitall (Whiteall) of Newton, Gloucester Co., witnessed by Jos.
Kaighin, both Joseph & John appraised estate (will d. 1728 24 Dec., appraisal 1728-8
References: *NJCW1* as noted above.

**Lord, Joshua** (d. 1713; will d. 5th day 8th mo. 1713)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co.
Estate value upon death: £153.17.7
Estate appraisers: Henry Wood & Constantine Wood
Notes: Quaker, based on dating of will. Will names his children James, Joshua,
Edmund (last two under age), Elizabeth, Alse. Lord had a home and farm of 280 acres
and land on Raccoon Creek. Son Joshua to live with brothers and sisters two years,
then with his uncles until he is of age. Witnesses: Alice Lord, Robert Lord, William
Warner. Inventory made Oct. 17, 1713; in1727/28 11th month (Feb.) 13th, witnessed
will of Mosas Lycon, Glo(uc)ster Co., along w/ Peter Cox, Ann Cox; witnessed will of
James Smith, 1726-27.
Reference: *NJCW1*, p. 297, 300, 426

**Moore, John** (d. 1727; will dated 1727)
Ship carpenter
Active Gloucester Co.
Estate value upon death: £22.11.10
Estate appraisers: Abraham Alberson & Enoch Ellison
Reference: *NJCW1*, p. 324

**Walker, John** (dates not known)
Joiner
Active Gloucester Co.,
Notes: Deed dated June 20, 1689: “Ditto (deed). Robert Turner of Philadelphia,
merchant, to John Walker of Old Markett, Gloucester Co., joiner, for 100 acres, part of
1/4 of a share bought of James Graham of New York, April 12, 1684.” Other land
Philadelphia, merchant, to John Walker of Glo(u)ester Co., joiner, for 210 acres on
the Westside of Pounshoakin Creek, surveyed by Thomas Sharp for Thomas Jones
June 17, 1687, adjoining John Taylor.” Unfortunately there are many entries in the
wills and inventories of the state for men with the name John Walker: John Walker of Elsinborough, Salem Co., died 1704/05 (will dated Feb. 26, 1705/05, p. 487), also w/ a son John, underage at time of death. A John Walker was paid by the estate of Jacob Babcock, Gloucester (Dec. 14, 1717, p. 22); A John Walker witnessed the will of Thomas Buckman, Gloucester Co. (will dated June 28, 1708, p. 70).
Reference: *NJA-D&F*, p. 655; *NJCW* references as noted above.

**Zane, Robert** (d. 1694/5, will d. Jan. 27, 1694/5)
Carpenter
Active Gloucester Co., Newton
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: With John Thomson and Thomas Pierce, Zane is credited with repairing the Salem Meetinghouse (Tvaryanas thesis, p. 282); Robert Zane also had a son, Robert, who appears to have stayed in Gloucester, witnessing wills or completing estate appraisals. His will names his wife and children Nathaniel, Robert, Elkanah, Simmeon, Mary, Easter, and another child (unborn). Zane owned land on Newton Creek. Witnesses to the will include Thomas Thacker, James Atkinson and William Bate.
Reference: *NJCW*, p. 530

**HUNTERDON COUNTY**

**Beaks (Beakes), Stacy** (b. 1705/6, d. 1745/6)
Carpenter and joiner
Active Hunterdon Co., Trenton (possibly also Falls Township, Bucks Co. and Haddonfield or Chesterfield Townships, Burlington Co?)
Estate value upon death: £383.6.2
Estate appraisers: W. Morris, William Plaskett, Charles Axford
Notes: Quaker. Wife, Mary (Bickerdike) Beakes, also Quaker. In February 1731, Stacy is granted a certificate of removal from Haddonfield MM to Falls Meeting in Bucks County. His future wife, Mary, arrived in September 1731 from Richmond Monthly Meeting, Yorkshire. They married at Falls Meeting, Bucks County February, 1733. Their first child, Ruth, was born in January 1734, and May of that year the young family was granted a certificate of removal from Falls Meeting to Chesterfield Meeting.
References: Inventory, dated 1746. Winterthur Museum Library, Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Ephemera, col. 61, box 10, 55.21.1; *NJCW* 2, 41; Hinshaw vol. II.

**Ford, John** (d. 1721; will dated Oct. 20, 1721)
Carpenter
Active Hunterdon Co., Hannover Twsp.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: executors of his estate are his wife (name not given), and Josiah Ogden
Reference: NJCW1, p. 169

**Harrison, Thomas** (d. 1721; will dated Dec. 22, 1721)
Carpenter
Active Hunterdon Co.
Estate value upon death: £176.13.0
Estate appraisers: Samuel Green & Jacob Godowne
Reference: NJCW1, p. 214

**Howell, Obadiah** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Hunterdon Co., Trenton
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: apprentice to Wm. Plaskett during construction of 1st Friends' Meetinghouse in Trenton, 1739 (see: Raum's *History of Trenton*).
Reference: as noted above.

**Plaskett, William** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Hunterdon Co., Trenton
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Likely a Quaker. Carpenter credited for building 1st Friends' Meetinghouse in Trenton, 1739. His apprentice at that time was Obadiah Howell (see: Raum's *History of Trenton*). Along with W. Morris and Charles Axford, William Plaskett appraised the estate of Stacy Beakes.
Reference: as noted above.

---

**MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

**Ashmore (Ashmoer), Anthony** (d. 1700; will d. Nov. 28, 1700)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Perth Amboy? (and later, Monmouth Co.?)
Estate value upon death: £29.6.0
Estate appraisers: Nathaniel FitzRandol(ph?) & Thomas Warne
Notes: Ashmore’s will indicates he is living in Monmouth County when he died. His apprenticeship (concluded?) 7 Feb. 1688/9. He was previously apprenticed to Thomas Warne, Perth Amboy (who appraised his estate). The NJA-D&P indicated a new apprenticeship to John Kaighin. Statement reads "like apprentice"; note, in will:
Warne appraised estate. A John Kaighin was a carpenter in Gloucester in the early 1700s (see Kaighin, John under Gloucester County).
References: NJA-D&P, p. 166; NJCW1, p. 17

**Barron, Elizeus** (d. 1715; will dated July 22, 1715)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Although a value was not provided, estate appraisers listed as Thomas Johnston, Samuel Dennis, Moses Ralph (Rolph?). Presbyterian. Family had a coat of arms.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 27

**Bloomfield (Blomfeild?), Ezekial** (d. 1702/3; will dated Jan. 12, 1702/3)
Carpenter and wheelwright
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Mentioned in the will is his wife, Hope. The will witnessed by Samuel Hale, William Ellison, Joseph Fitz Randolph. Proved Feb. 26 1702–3.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 42.

**Bollen, Capt. James** (d. 1682; will d. Mar. 27, 1682)
Carpenter (?)
Active Middlesex Co.
Estate value upon death: £63.0.0; real property £85.9.11 ½
Estate appraisers: John Pike, Samuel Dennes, John Blomefild (or Blomfield), Samuel Moore
Notes: Bollen was named Secretary of the Province. It is not certain whether there was another Bollen who was a carpenter.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 44

**Dennes (Dennis?), Sr., John** (d. 1695; will dated June 1, 1695)
Carpenter (and joiner?)
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not given
Notes: administrator of his estate is John Dennis (Jr.).
Reference: NJCW1, p. 135

**Dennis, John** (d. 1702/3; will dated Jan. 3, 1702/3)
Carpenter (and joiner?)
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: £29.11.0
Estate appraisers: John Langstaff and Benjamin Martin
Reference: *NJCW1*, p. 134

**Dennis, John** (dates not known)
**possibly John Dennis, Sr., above**
Joiner, native of Cork, Ireland
Resident of West Jersey (precise location unknown; possibly Gloucester area in the Gloucester Tenth, where many Irish purchased.)
Notes: John Dennis was a first purchaser of the West Jersey province, buying 1/14th of 1 share that he purchased in conjunction with: Samuel Norris, occ. not given (London); Abraham Godowne, broadweaver (Stepney); Thomas Davis, merchant (Ratcliffe, London); William Steel, merchant (Cork, Ire.); Samuel Dennis, merchant (Cork, Ire.); Apollo Morris (occ. not given). John Dennis is the only one listed as having a residence in West Jersey. A deed dated Apr. 23, 1688 of Dennis and his brother, Samuel is listed in the *NJA-D&P*: “Deed John Dennis, late of Cork, Ireland, now of W. J., joiner, for himself and as attorney of his brother Samuel Dennis, to Christopher Sibthorpe of Philadelphia, brasier, for 250 acres in Gloucester Co., on Delaware R. ‘Greenwich lots.’”
Reference: Pomfret’s *The Province of New Jersey*, 287; *NJA-D&P*, 651

**Donham, John, Jr.** (d. 1706)
Carpenter and millwright
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: £237.11.10 ½. Inventory of personal estate incl."2 negro slaves 75 #, and two silverspoons, 18 s."
Estate appraisers: John Bishop, Elisha Parker, and Joseph Rolph
Notes: *NJA-D&P* lists his occupation in the index under as both carpenter and millwright. The estate was appraised on Oct. 17, 1706. Donham was very active in his community and is mentioned numerous occasions as an appraiser for local estates or a witness to wills: p. 431: witness to will of Richard Smith, senior, along with Thomas Hokan on July 17, 1692.; p. 181: along with John Loofbourrow, William Frost & Benjamin Griffith, witnessed the will of Thomas Carhart of Woodbridge, March 16, 1695-6; p. 104, along w/ Samuell Ayres, inventoried estate of William Compton, likely of Woodbridge (though not specified), Dec. 6, 1694. Donham Jr. received a bequest from the estate of John Rolph, along with Rolph's brothers & sisters: Benjamin, Joseph, Moses & Henry, as well as Benjamin Cromwell. Each received a portion of £24.4.51/2 from the administrator of estate, Joseph Rolph, in 1697.
References: *NJCW1*, p. 141 and other pages as referenced above.

**Fitzrandolph (Fitz Randolph), Benjamin** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: mentioned as son (under age) in will of father Nathaniel, planter. Made account of estate of John Rivers, Middlesex Co. Further granted administration of said estate on April 5, 1718; p. 228: witnessed will of Jedidiah Higgins, yeoman, Somerset Co., dated Apr. 23, 1715.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 167, 385

Fitzrandolph (Fitzrendolph), John (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Administration on his estate granted to son, John Fitz Randolph, June 19, 1727.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 166

Frost, William (d. 1720?, will dated April 10, 1713)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Amboy
Estate value upon death: not known
References: NJCW1, p. 175 and other pages as noted above.

Gauge, Thomas (d. 1708; will dated Mar. 28, 1708)
Ship carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: £71.6.0. Inventory of estate included “half a ship” worth £30.0 (indicating a ship half completed, or half ownership of a vessel)
Estate appraisers: Thomas and John Pike
Reference: NJCW1, p. 182

Geddes (Geddis?), John (d. 1705; will dated July 26, 1705)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Piscataway
Estate value upon death: not known
References: NJCW1, p. 182

Greer, James (d. not known; will dated Sept. 6, 1697)
Joiner
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Deed of land in Woodbridge from Greer to George Browne, also of Woodbridge, a tailor. Land purchased by Greer in 1696 from previous owners, George and Margaret Willocks. Previously owned by Samuel Bacon. Reference: NJA-D&P, p. 273

**Kaighin, John** (d. 1688/9;)
Carpenter
Middlesex Co., Perth Amboy (?)
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Listed as a carpenter in a deed with William Ellisone (Ellison?), tanner of Elizabeth Town (deed dated Jan. 2, 1688/9). Kaighin laid out 30 acres of land to Ellisone in Monmouth County. He was noted as being “late of Amboy Perth.”
Reference: NJA-D&P, p. 166

**Mathews, John** (d. not known; will dated June 16, 1698)
Joiner
Active Middlesex Co., Perth Amboy
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Many John Mathews were found during a search of vital records and land transactions in this period. A John Mathews was granted a patent for a lot in Perth Amboy; the New Jersey State Archives contains the will of a John Mathew, Cape May Co., yeoman, dated 1714-5, Jan. 25 (NJCW1, p. 310). Inventory of the personal estate (£82.12.2) made by John Paige and John Taylor; a John Mathews named in will of William Oldden (Ouldden), Middlesex Co., Piscataway, yeoman (dated 1719/20, Jan. 1). Oldden had bought land of John Mathews (NJCW1, p. 344); a John Mathews was owed by estate of Isaac Record of Northampton, Burlington Co. (will dated 1728, May 10). (NJCW1, p. 378).
Reference: NJA-D&P, p. 285; NJCW1 pages as noted in parentheses above

**Newman, William** (d. 1692; will dated Nov. 29, 1692)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co.
Estate value upon death: not given
Reference: NJCW1, p. 339

**Peirce (Pierce?), Joshua** (died 1670/1?)
Joiner
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Notes: Administration on estate of Joshua Pierce granted to his widow, Dorothy.
Reference: NJCW1, p. 365.

**Presgrove, Thomas** (d. 1730; will dated June 9, 1730)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: not given
Reference: *NJCWI*, p. 374

**Roignon (Ronyon), Vincent** (d. 1713)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., New Piscataway?
Estate value upon death: not given
Notes: Administrator of John Terry’s estate (Terry’s will dated Oct. 8, 1678).
Reference: *NJCWI*, p. 457

**Rolph, Joseph** (d. 1708; will dated May 18, 1708)
Carpenter
Active Middlesex Co., Woodbridge
Estate value upon death: £700.0.0
Estate appraisers: Jonathan Bishop, Adam Hude, John Ewr(?)
Reference: *NJCWI*, p. 394

**MONMOUTH COUNTY**

**Beakes, William III.** (1691–1761)
Joiner
Active Monmouth Co., Upper Freehold (possibly also Burlington Co. in Chesterfield or Nottingham Twsp.s.)
Estate value upon death: £268-2-4
Notes: Quaker, but possibly not a member later in life.
Reference: William Beakes will and inventory. Will 2581-2588M. Book 11, p. 63. New Jersey State Archives; see also references in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

**Canaan, Patrick** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., poss. Freehold
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Appraised inventory of William Naughty, planter, of Freehold Feb. 14, 1702-3, along w/ Robert Ray (Rhea possibly?) and William Ronald.
Reference: *NJCWI*, p. 334

**Combs, Thomas** (d. 1723; will d. Oct. 12, 1723)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., Freehold
Estate value upon death: £92.12.6
Estate appraisers: Thomas Williams, George Walker, John Campbell
Reference: *NJCW1*, p. 103

**Davidson (Davison), William** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., Freehold
Estate value upon death: £157.19.0
Estate appraisers: Alexander Dove, Henry Perine, and Jacob Jemison
Notes: Davidson is called a yeoman in his will.
Reference: *NJCW1*, p. 130

**Jackson, Francis** (d. 1697; will d. May 25, 1697)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., Shrewsbury
Estate value upon death: £72.7.6
Estate appraisers: Peter White, William Shattock, George Corleis (Corlies?), William West
Reference: *NJCW1*, p. 256

**Rea (Rhea), Robert** (d. 1718)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., Freehold
Estate value upon death: £206.10.11
Notes: executed a chair dated 1695 in collections of Monmouth County Historical Association, Freehold, NJ. Defines himself as ‘yeoman’ in will. Will notes wife, Jennit (also Jannett), and children: David, Elisabeth, Catherine, Margaret, Isabel, Mary. Witnesses to will: Richard Clarke, George Walker, John Campbell. Appraisers: Richard Clarke, Thomas Combs, John Campbell.
Reference: *NJCW1*, 382.

**Tilton, John** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., Freehold
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Son of Peter Tilton, born 1669. In 1705 he and wife Elizabeth gave land to his brothers, Henry and Samuel.
Reference: *Colonial Conveyances*, 479.

**Whyte (White), Samuel** (d. 1698)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Estate appraisers: Gav Drummond, John Williams, Thomas Hillborn
Notes: date of death found in index of Wills, section on "unrecorded wills", p. 433 (NJCWI)
Reference: as noted above

**White, Thomas** (d. 1684/5; will dated Jan. 21, 1684/5)
Carpenter
Active Monmouth Co., Shrewsbury
Estate value upon death: £140.2.0
Estate appraisers: Thomas Potter, Samuel Dennis, Symon Charles
Reference: NJCW1, p. 506

**SALEM COUNTY**

**Acton, Benjamin** (died 1730?)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Acton is credited with building an addition to the Salem Meetinghouse in 1685 (see Tvaryanas thesis, p. 281). He was a Quaker, and active within his community as an appraiser of estates and witness to making of wills. He appraised the estate of William Champneys, Millbrooke, Salem (made Sept. 22, 1701), p. 88; executor of estate of Alexander Deuerox (Deverox?), Salem Co., husbandman (will d. May 24, 1711), p. 137; witnessed will of George Garritt (d. Sept. 13, 1714), p. 181; witnessed the will of Thomas Graves, Salem Co., yeoman (d. Sept. 12, 1714), p. 193; inventoried estate of Richard Hancock, Chohanzick (Cohansey), Salem Co., w/ John Watts, Edward Champneys (inv. or will d. May 20, 1689), p. 206; Acton received payment from estate of Nathaniel Jeanes (Janes?) of Penn's Neck, Salem Co., yeoman (date 1703), p. 257; appraised estate of Thomas Johnson, Manneton Creek, Salem Co. w/ Danell (Daniel?) Rumsey (inv. made Oct. 15, 1696), p. 265; with Johnathan Beere witnessed will of Thomas Kent of Salem, planter (will d. 14 Apr., 1691), p. 272; appraised estate of John Sirredge, Cohanzey or Cesariae River. In 1686 he is recorded as having married Christina England at the Philadelphia Meeting (see William Montgomery Clemens, American Marriage Records before 1699, Pompton Lakes, NJ: 1926. Reprint, Baltimore, MD: Clearfield Company, 1998, 2004: p. 84). He has been confused with his son, Benjamin Acton Jr., a currier and tanner who died in Gloucester in 1749 with a prodigious estate valued over £1700.
References: NJCW1, as noted above

**Aist (Hyst, Hist), Renier van** (b. before 1689)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Penn’s Neck
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Son of Dutchman Reynier van Hist, a sergeant who arrived with Governor Jacob Alrichs at New Amstel in 1657. Father's will dated Feb. 1, 1697-8. His mother, Gertruyd, remarried Machial Barron (d. ca. 1689), deputy sheriff of the New Castle court. The family lived on land Reynier van Hist the Elder had purchased from Lucas Dircksen van Berg for 900 gilders. Dircksen’s widow remarried Jacob Fabritius, and when she was not paid for the land, Governor Lovelace foreclosed on the property in 1670. Capt. John Carr received a patent for the land in 1671, but later left the area. After subsequent transfers of the property, Barron, his wife, and stepsons removed to Salem County. Trindell & Wacker (p. 252) note that a carpenter in Penn's Neck, Regner van Aist, was hired to build the Swedish Lutheran church out of logs. Given that van Hyst’s father was a sergeant, it is unlikely (though not impossible) that he was a carpenter. It seems reasonable that the younger van Aist apprenticed in the region. This carpenter’s name also appears in records as Rainier, Reyner, or Regnier van Hist/van Aist/Vanhist.

References: Those noted above, and Craig, 1999, 60, FN 154.

**Alewell (Elwell), Sr., Thomas** (d. 1706; will dated Apr. 25, 1706)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Pilesgrove precinct
Estate value upon death: £70.13.6
Estate appraisers: Joseph White, William Hall
Notes: Possibly Baptist?
Reference: NJCW I, p. 6

**Barratt, Sr., James** (d. 1717; will dated Aug. 12, 1717)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Manington Precinct
Estate value upon death: £129.18.8
Estate appraisers: Richard Woodnutt and John Pledger
Notes: Barratt’s will states he is a "carpinture", and had a son, James, noted in will.

**Bowen, Jr., Samuel** (d. 1727; will dated Dec. 19, 1727)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Cohansey
Estate value upon death: £105.18.0
Estate appraisers: Hugh McKnight & Dan Bowen
Notes: Possibly a Quaker.
Reference: NJCW I, p. 48

**Champneys, Edward** (d. 1707; will dated Jan. 19, 1685/6)
Joiner and carpenter
Active Salem Co., Salem Town
Estate value upon death: £38.15.7
Estate appraisers: John Mason and Samuel Hedge, Junior
Notes: Arrived with John Fenwick, proprietor of the Salem Tenth in 1675. Patent by
executors of John Fenwick to Edward Champneys for 10 acres in "New Salem" lately
occupied by John Maddocks on Neuill's (Nevill's?) Street and Ten Acre Creek.
Champneys was married to Priscilla Fenwick, youngest daughter of John Fenwick. He
was a joiner from London, but had previously lived in Thornbury, Gloucestershire.
An earlier patent indicates his origin was Almondsbury, Gloucestershire (where his
father, Edward Champness, was from). In 1675, not long after their arrival, his wife
Priscilla died, and he remarried Elizabeth (?) by 1679. From late 1670s through early
1700s, Champneys is recorded making frequent land transactions, and was investing
and reselling land speculatively in the lower Tenths. By 1680 he was no longer a
member of the Salem Meeting.
References: NJA-D&P, 561; The Genealogies of New Jersey Families (New Jersey:

**Chanders, James** (d. 1709; will dated Dec. 20, 1709)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Ann’s Grove
Estate value upon death: £138.12.5
Estate appraisers: Thomas Thompson, John Thompson
Notes: Possibly a Quaker. Albert Cook Myers’ *Quaker Arrivals* notes Chanders
family, Frances, Edward and Paul, arriving in Philadelphia.
Reference: NJCW1, 88

**Ellewell (Alewell?), Jr., Thomas** (d. 1722; will dated Aug. 14, 1722)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Piles Grove precinct
Estate value upon death: £137.0.0
Estate appraisers: John Loyd and Roger Huckings
Notes: Son of Thomas Alewell (Ellwell)? p. 154: will mentions wife Susannah, sons
Thomas and Josiah - no occupation listed. Inventory of estate made 7th month (sept?)
10th day 1722. Includes bible, two testaments, parcel of old books valued at £0.18.0.
Reference: NJCW1, 154

**Furbush, Thomas** (d. 1702; will dated Apr. 20, 1702)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Fairfield
Estate value upon death: £5.10.0 (inventory incomplete)
Estate appraisers: not given
Reference: NJCW1, 177

**Gibson, Simon** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.?
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: mentioned in deed of Sarah Pile (dated March 4, 1683-4) to descendants, including daughter Sarah Gibson and son-in-law Simon Gibson. Pile's estate owed debts to many in Salem Co., and Salem proper.
Reference: *NJCWI*, 366–7

**Gilham (Gilliam?), Robert** (d. 1705/6; will dated Feb. 17, 1705/6)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Salem Town
Estate value upon death: £62.0.3
Estate appraisers: Richard Johnson & William Folwell
Reference: *NJCWI*, 185

**Gill, Benjamin** (d. 1695/6; will dated July 15, 1695)
Ship carpenter
Active New Castle, Pennsylvania (Delaware); died in Munmouth River (Salem Co.), NJ
Estate value upon death: £271.18.0; died with half a constructed brigantine worth £70.0
Estate appraisers: Samuel Curtiss & Samuel Hedge
Notes: wife, Ann, executrix of will. According to will, Gill owned land in America and England.
Reference: *NJCWI*, 185

**Hall, William** (d. 1728; will dated Apr. 28, 1728)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Cohansey
Estate value upon death: not known
Estate appraisers: J. Vining, William Perdue, Robert Johnson
Notes: Quaker. Mentioned in the will of Susanna Bradway, d. 1696. His wife, Sarah (d. 1726), was Susannah’s sister. Should not be confused with William Hall, merchant of Salem, who was married to Sarah Plumstead, d. 1713 (see *NJCWI*, p. 202). Master to John Williams (mentioned in Williams' 1718 will).
Reference: *NJCWI*, 56, 510, and as above.

**Haslewood, George** (d. 1693; will dated Apr. 11, 1693)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Salem Town?
Estate value upon death: not given
Notes: At Burlington Meeting on the 9th mo. 10th 1681 (Dec. 9, 1681), Haslewood, a carpenter of Salem, married Margaret Butcher (a widow) living in Burlington (see W.

Reference: *NJCWI*, 216, and other pages as noted above

**Hide (Hyde), Thomas** (d. 1688/9; will dated Feb. 5, 1688/9)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Munmouth River
Estate value upon death: £87.14.0
Estate appraisers: John Pledger, John Forrest
Notes: According to inventory of the estate of John Harding, Salem Co., a freeholder & laborer, made Feb. 11, 1687–8, Hyde was owed 19s. "for coffin".

**Huestis, Moses** (d. 1694; will dated Nov. 16, 1694)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Amwellbury
Estate value upon death: £34.15.2
Estate appraisers: John Paine & Jonothan Walker
Notes: Father lived in Westchester, NY.
Reference: *NJCWI*, 245

**Hyst (Hist), Renier (Regner, Rennere) van**
See also Van Aist, Renier

**Jequat (Jaquet), Peter** (d. 1721; will dated Dec. 27, 1721)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.
Estate value upon death: not given
Notes: Has a son, Joseph.
Reference: *NJCWI*, 259

**Johnson, Richard** (d. 1719/20; will dated 1719/20)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Salem Town
Estate value upon death: £240.18.3
Estate appraisers: William Grifin & Jonathan Goodwin
Notes: Johnson named carpenter of Salem in administration of will of George Haslewood (will dated Apr. 11, 1693); named "Esquire" in his will dated 1719/20. p. 216: Johnson and Margrett Haslewood were executors of George Haslewood’s estate (died 1693). Named in Johnson’s will are his children: Robert, Elizabeth Pearson, granddaughters Elizabeth Pearson & Mary Johnson. He owned a lot of 250 acres in Manington, and gave legacies to cousins Thomas Johnson & Sarah Ivins. Johnson’s will was witnessed by William Grifin, Jonathan Goodwin, Joseph Elly.
References: NJCW1, 216, 264

Johnson, Thomas (d. 1696)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Manneton Creek
This is one of multiple Thomas Johnson’s listed in the NJCW1. This individual requires more research.
References: NJCW1, as noted above.

Kenton, William (d. 1693; will dated Dec. 8, 1693)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co. (formerly of MD)
Estate value upon death: £37.6.0 (adjusted from £139.3.6)
Estate appraisers: Edward & Samuel Wade
Notes: Named carpenter in his will; a note indicates that another inventory was taken, and the corrected amount of the inventory is £37.6.0. Named in his will are his wife Mary, sons William and John, both under age. Kenton owned property in Md. to be sold. He also owned farm bought from John Worlidge. Executors of Kenton’s will were Richard Darkin of Salem and John Pitts of MD. Kenton’s will was witnessed by
Edward Wade, Isaac Pearson, Samuel Hedge. Appraisal of his estate made 2nd month 6th, 1694. Wife, Mary Kenton, daughter of Edward Bradway, Munmouth River, Salem Co., mentioned in codicil (dated March 16, 1693-4) to will of Edward Bradway dated Dec. 6, 1693. Witnesses to will of Bradway include Samuel Wade and Samuel Hedge. Bradway's inventory was made by Samuel & Edward Wade, who were possibly also in the woodworking trades. Reference: *NJCWI*, 272, p. 56,

**Pierce, Thomas** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Pierce was one of three carpenters (including Robert Zane and John Thomson), hired to repair the repair the Salem Friends’ meetinghouse.
Reference: See Tvaryanas, 1993, 282

**Powell, Jeremiah** (d. 1700; will dated 14th day 10th mo. 1700)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Munmouth River
Estate value upon death: £109.5.0
Estate appraisers: Joseph Ware, John Maddocks
Reference: *NJCWI*, 373

**Savoy (Savoj), Abraham** (d. 1727; will dated June 20, 1727)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Penn’s Neck
Estate value upon death: £17.17.0
Estate appraisers: William Beld & John Raen
Notes: Swedish Lutheran? The inventory conducted Aug. 14, 1727 includes: "a Swed Bibl & salm Book 12 s., and a debt "due from Weliam Bedl, £4.15.0." (p. 402). Savoj was hired in 1720 by the Lutheran congregation at Penn's Neck to "form or fit the logs which had been cut the preceding May for a parsonage." (Wacker & Trindell, 252, FN 15).
Reference: *NJCWI*, 403; those noted above.

**Seele (Seely, Seeley), Benjamin** (d. 1721; will dated March 20, 1721/2)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Cohansey
Estate value upon death: not known
References: *NJCWI*, 411

**Thompson (Thomson), John** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.
Estate value upon death: not known
References: As noted above; NJCW1, 158

**Vance, James** (d. 1726; will dated Apr. 26, 1726)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.
Estate value upon death: not given
Notes: administrator of Prudence Barrat
Reference: NJCW1, 27

**Walling, Thomas** (d. 1724; will dated May 19, 1724)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co.
Estate value upon death: £108.5.0
Estate appraisers: Abraham Nealson and Samuel Elwell
References: NJCW1, 488

**White, Christopher** (dates not known)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Alloways Creek
Estate value upon death: not known
Notes: Quaker. Credited with constructing Hancock's Bridge Friends’ Meeting ca. 1686 (see Tvaryanas, 259). In Swarthmore College Friends Historical Library, a handwritten copy made of the minutes of the Yearly Meeting held at Burlington, 5th day 7th mo. 1688 indicates that White (and Benjamin Wyatt) represented the Gloucester Meeting. (p. 18): http://tripod.brynmawr.edu/find/Record/cdm-HC_QuakSlav-11726.
References: As noted above.

**Wood, Jonathan** (d. 1727; will dated Aug. 2, 1727)
Carpenter
Active Salem Co., Cohansey
Estate value upon death: £150.2.1
Estate appraisers: Thomas Maskell, Ebenezar Smith
Reference: NJCW1, 519
WEST JERSEY (UNDEFINED)

Mathews, Thomas (dates not known)
Carpenter
Settled in West Jersey; dates of activity not known
Notes: Mathews was a 1st purchaser in the Province of West Jersey. Mathews purchased 3/8ths of a share with the following men: Richard Lawrence, gentleman (London, resided in W. Jersey); Thomas Cary, silkman (London); Samuel Groom, Jr., mariner (London, resided in W. Jersey); Joseph Webster, weaver/citizen (London); Edward Peare, shipwright (London); Samuel Cradock, fishmonger/citizen (London); Gilbert Mace, weaver/citizen (London). The London Tenth (current southern Burlington County) may have been the area where Mathews settled, but his location of settlement is not known. See Budd's True Account, reprinted in Pomfret's The Province of New Jersey.

EAST JERSEY

Gray, Henry (date of importation Feb. 10, 1684/5)
Joiner
Active East Jersey (precise location not known)
Notes: Gray was imported to East Jersey by William Dockwra, along with a number of other craftsmen including a glasier, painter, blacksmiths and bricklayer in 1684-85. Dockwra was a merchant in London. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Dockwra. Dockwra purchased land "lying on the S. side of Raraton R. and called Ahandewamock" in East Jersey, according to a deed made between him and Richard Jones, also a London merchant. Gray might have rented a 100 acre farm from Rennere (Renier?) van Hyst, and is noted as such in van Hyst's will (dated 1697/8, Feb. 1). The location of farm is not specified, but was possibly in Salem Co.
Reference: NJA-D&P, 65, 71; NJCW1, 479
CRAFTSMEN LISTED IN NJA-D&P INDEX BY OCCUPATION
NOT PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED

Carpenters
Bacon, Samuel
Barnes, William
Braman, Joseph
Brookfield, ?
Canaan, Patrick
Carhart, Thomas
Carter, John
Chapman, Robert
Chawkley, John
Daniell, Richard
Foulshame, Nathaniel
Friley, William
Heesom, John
Hunt, William
Jackson, Francis
Kylett, John
Lee, William
Leet, Isaac
Long, Peter
Lovejoy, William
Meickle, Alexander
Mitchell, James
Moore, Joseph
Mores, Mathew
Mosse, Peter (possibly Burlington or Salem Co.)
Mosse, Thomas (possibly Burlington or Salem Co.)
Newman, John
Newman, Walter
Ogborne, John (possibly Burlington Co., Chesterfield or Nottingham Twsp.)
Ogborne, Samuel (possibly Burlington Co., Chesterfield or Nottingham Twsp.)
Parsons, John
Pumphary, Walter
Rowell, ?
Salsbury, William
Sharp, John
Sherman, Thomas
Shippey, John
Shotwell, Abraham
Statham, Zebulon
Stevens, Thomas
Taylor, George
Thomson, William
Thornell, Israel
Tompson, Urbanus
Tonkan, Edward
Vaughan, ??
Wade, Robert
Warne, Thomas
West, Joseph
West, William
Whitlock, John
Williams, Thomas

Joiners
Green, James (possibly Burlington Co.)
Walker, John
Webb, Samuel

Millwrights
Bishop, Jonathan
Crosby, John
Dickman, Hugh
Gabitas, William
Smith, John
Vance, John

Ploughwright
Calow, John

Sawyers
Coeyman, B. P.
Durborrow, Hugh
Morris, Lawrence
Nichols, Samuel
Radley, Daniel
Satherwait, James (possibly Burlington Co.)
Smith, Edward
Smith, William
Smout, Edward (Sawyer active at Old Swedes Church, Wilmington, Del.?)
Taylor, Samuel
Young, Nicholas


**Shipwrights**
Edwards, Abadiah  
Fisher, Dennis  
Graisberry, Benjamin  
Graisberry, James  
Graisberry, Joseph  
Linch, Dennis  
Linck, John  
Mason, Thomas  
Meecum, Edward  
Pledger, John (Salem Co.)  
Russell, Richard  
Tatem (Tatum?), John  
Van Hyst, Abraham (possibly Salem Co.)  
West, James  
Willis, John  
Wood, James

**Turners**
Barnes, William  
Denn, John (possibly Salem Co.)  
Godwin (Goodwin), Edward (Salem Co.)  
Vance, John  
Vance Samuel  
Ward, John  
Ward, Samuel

**Wheelwrights**
Abbett, John  
Blanch, William  
Burling, Elias (likely Burlington Co.)  
Burling, John (likely Burlington Co.)  
Crosse, Thomas  
Gleave, George  
Lillies, David  
Shinn, John  
Smith, Isaac
APPENDIX B.

WILLS AND INVENTORIES

NJ State Archives, B. 5 / p. 264, Will 187 J

*Will of Stacy Beak(e)s, Trenton, Hunterdon County, 1746*

I Stacy Beakes of Trenton in ye County of Hunterdon and Province of New-Jersey being weak of body but of perfect sound mind and memory, thanks to Almighty God for the same, and calling to mind ye mortality of my Body and knowing that it is appointed for all me to Die, ye do make Constitute and ordain this my last will and Testament in the Maner and form following

First, I order that my Body be Decently inter'd according to the Decent order used among Friends. by my Executors hereafter named ------

Imprimis, I order that all my just Debts be carefully pays, and to my well Beloved wife Mary Beakes I give and Bequeath the sum of One Hundred Pounds, and ye use of all my House and Lott where I now live during her natural life. --------

Item I give and Bequeath to my only and well Beloved Son Stacy Beakes a certain Lott of Land Bought of David Martain ye Sheriff, and all the Land that ye purchased of Mahlon Kirkbride to him his Heirs & Assigns together with one Hundred Pounds in money, and that he shall be in absolute possession of the above named lands and money at the age of twenty one, and also the House and Lott where I now Live, after ye decease of his mother to him his heirs and assigns for ever.

Item I give and Bequeath unto my three Daughters Lidia, Ruth & Mary Beakes ye Sum of One Hundred Pounds to each of them, to be pay'd at the age of Twenty One, that is to say that my above named three daughters shall receive the above sum of One Hundred pound Each when Each of them arrives at ye age of twenty one years of age.

Item my will is that my Son Stacy Beakes, shall be brought up and Educated to read and write and sipher through Vulgar Arithmatick and at the age of fourteen years to be put an apprentice to Learn some good trade as he may Chuse, and also my three Daughters to be brought up and Educated to read, write and sipher through the rule of
Three, and that the charge of bringing (sic) and educating as above sd (stated) shall be Defray'd with the profits arising from the Legacies above std (stated).

Item my will is that the Land formerly Belonging to my Uncle Mahlon Stacy and which my Father Atkinson and my mother has promised to give me, shall be sold, and the money shall go to pay Mahlon Kirkbride for the Land purchased of him, and in case ye above land should not Decend into my Family, that then the above sd (stated) debt due to Mahlon Kirkbride shall be paid out of the reversion of my Estate if sufficient and if not, that then the remainder be it more or Less, to be pay'd out of the Legacies before given, Each Legasee (Legacy) paying an Equal part, and in case there should be any Revertions of my Estate after the Debts and Legacies are pay'd, that then all such Revertions shall be Equally divided between my wife and my four children, and if it should please Got that any of my children should depart this life before they arrive at the age of twenty one years, that then their Legacies to be Equally Divided among my surviving children.

And Lastly I appoint my well Beloved wife, and my Brother Gideon Bickerdike Executors of this my last will and Testament, as witnesses my hand and seal this Thirtyeth day of the Ninth month in the year of our Lord one Thousand Seven Hundred and Forty Five ---------------------- 1745.

Stacy Beakes

Signed sealed and acknowledged/in the presence of us

Edmd Beakes / Nathan Beakes / William Robinson

-----------(Affirmation)

Nathan Beakes and William Robinson two of the Witnesses to the within Will and being of the People Called Quakers, on their solemn Affirmation did Severally Depose that they Saw Stacey Beakes the Testator Within Named Sign and Seal the Same and hear him publish pronounce and Declare the Within Instrument to be his Last Wills and Testament and at the doing thereof the Said Testator was of sound and disposing Mind & Memory, as far as these Deponents know and as they (?) believe and that Edmond Beakes the other Subscribing Evidence was present and Signed his Name as a Witness to the Said Wills together with these Deponents in the (?) of Said Testator. Affirmations taken at Trenton the Eleventh Day of Aug 1746.

Nathan Beakes
William Robinson

(Further Affirmation by Mary Beakes and Gideon Bickerdike)
The Account of Gideon Bickerdike Executor of the Last Will & Testament of Stacy Beakes late of the County of Hunterdon Deceased as well of and for such and so much of the Goods Chattels and Credits of the said deceased which came to his hands to be Administered as of and for his payments and Disbursements out of the Same etc. ------

This accomptant chargeth himself Do

This Accomptant Chargeth himself with all and Singular the Goods Chattels and credits of the said deceased mentioned and specified in an Inventory and Appraisement thereof made and Exhibited into the Surrogative (?) Office at Burlington amounting (?) by the said inventory appears to be the sum of…… 383:6:2

To Sundry Book Debts not in the appraisement…… 38:18:10

To the Rent of a Meadow for (?) Year @ (?) # an…… 21:0:0

To Interest on 136: 8 (?) years and six months ..... 80:6:6

To Interest on 92: 7 Years & 6 Month ...... 48:5:7

(total) 571:17:1

I Exhibit this as a True account Witness / my hand this eleventh day of March 1755 / Gideon Bickerdike.

(? Contra this acceptant prays Allowance 6:00 (?)

This Accomptant prays Allowance for Moneys Extended in Bringing up and Educating the Children of the Deceased as (?) the account appears and allowed out of the rents & profits of the Estate as far as it will pay amounts to…… 149:12:3 (?)

By Money Paid Mahlon Kirkbride for the Interest of his Bond for Eight years & Six Months...... 63:12:10

By Money Paid to Ditto in par of the Principal of this Bond............. 57:6:9

By Money P'd to Ditto for the Interest of his Bond.............3:16:0

By Moneys Paid Sundry persons due from the Estate of the Deceased Amounting in the whole to the sum of ..... 21:16:8
This Accomptant prays allowance for Sundry Debts Appraised to the Estate and the persons proving Insolvent were not to be Recovered as follows to wit  
Cornelius Ferril's Bill ........ 4:18:5
John Smith Ditto ............. 2:10:0
Archibald McCarty ............ 1:10:0
Richard Howell Judgmt ...... 13:7:2
Also for one Cow that died in a few days after the Appraismt .... 2:10:0
This Accomptant prays Allowance for his Trouble in Transacting Negotiating and Settling the Deceased's Affairs at 7% on the sum of 547:1:6 ........ 38:5:10
The Accomptant prays Allowance for the Charge of Paying his Accompt & obtaining a (?) Lot .... 1:4:0

(Total) 360:9:9
By money paid Mary Beakes in part of the (?) 22:15:2
(Total) 443:4:2(?)
Balt (?) in the (?) hands 128:12:?
(Total) 577:1?:?
Inventory of Stacy Beak(e)s, Trenton, Hunterdon County, 1746
[transcribed by author]

An Inventory of the Estate of Stacy Beaks departed/
Taken by us the Under Subscribers This 14\textsuperscript{th} of 11\textsuperscript{mo} 1745/6/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Desk and book-case</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Walnutt Tables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Walnutt Tea Table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small Bed with Feathers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rush Chairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Mapps……2.. 2/6 [or 216?]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small Looking Glasses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pair Iron Doggs, Tongs, &amp; Shufle [Shuttle?]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell Earthen In the Clositt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Rooms on the Right Hand &c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chests of Drawers &amp; 2 Tables</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bed, Blanket, 2 Quilts, 1 Pair Sheets, Bolster &amp;Pillow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rush Chairs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case with Some Bottles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Glass Dare [Daro?]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Table Cloths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Napkins</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pair of Sheets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pair of Pillow Cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gunn and 2 Horse-whipps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Wearing Apparel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Setts of Calicoe Curtains &amp; 3 Remnants of Stuff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{256}256\] Winterthur Museum Library: Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Collection 61, 55.21.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bed &amp; Bedstead with Curtains</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trundle [?] Bed, &amp; Bedstead, Quilt &amp; Sutes [?]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small Sett of Drawers &amp; Stand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Parlor Rooms &c [continued]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Silver Watch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Clock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Joyners Furniture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Kitchen &c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Earthen Ware</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Porstor [?] &amp; Tinn Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doz. Knives &amp; Forks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tables, 1 Dow-Troff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old Chairs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Old Candlesticks, old Doggs, &amp; Tongs &amp;c</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Warming Pan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tea Kettle, 1 Chafing Dish, 1 Skillet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Iron Potts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turn over</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bro't over & Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Rooms up Stairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Bed, Coverlid &amp; Sates [?]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Chist with Some Thred &amp; Worsit [?]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pine Desk</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Books</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Bed, Bedstead &amp;c</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Shoomakers Tools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Third Room &c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of old stuff with 3 Sickles 2 Horse Bells [?], 2 Colls [?]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spinning Wheels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pine Stool</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mens, 2 Womans old Sadles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In the Shop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Molding Plains</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plains of Divers Sorts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Chisels &amp; Gouges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hand Saws</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crosscut Saw</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drawing Knives, 7 Augors, 1 Adze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lathe and Turning Tools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Axes, 1 Grubing Howe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Mall, 4 Higges [Wigges?], 1 Grindstone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glue Potts, 5 Hammers, &amp; Sundreis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Bedstead for Sacking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Old Iron</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Bedstead for Cord</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Gun &amp; Some Files</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brass Kettle, 3 Hackles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [Qty] [Description] £  S  D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Foot Black Walnut</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Foot Pine, Cedar &amp; Gumm Boards</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sett of Bedstead Stuff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mair &amp; 2 Colts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cows &amp; 3 Hoggs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Servant Girls Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Apprentiss Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Negro Girl</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frying Panns, 1 Gridiron, 2 Box Irons</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bro't over & Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Sundry Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Farguson, &amp; Samuell Dop[?] Bill With Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Jonns Junior Bill with Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Best [?] Bill with Interest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Howell Judgement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Silver &amp; Gold</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Paper &amp; Pence</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danial Cox Bond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Johnston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew Rowley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelios Ferrill Bill &amp; Interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smiths Bill for Boards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archabel McCarty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>382</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL THE ABOVE AND WITHIN MEN HAVE ? / ASTUTE GOODS AND CHATTELS AN VALUED AND / APPRAISED AT THE SUM OF THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THREE POUNDS SIX SHILLINGS / AND TWO PENCE, THIS 14TH OF 11TH MO 1745/46

BY US

W MORRIS
WM PLASKETT
CHARLES AXFORD

Gideon Bickerdike lead of the Last Will & Testament of the within / Named Stacy Beaks being one of the people called Quaker on his / Solemn affirmation according to Law did declare the within writing / Contains a True and perfect inventory of all and Singular the Goods, Chattels & Credits of the said Deceased so far forth as have / Come to his knowledge or possession or to the possession of any other / person or person for his [??]

Affirmed at Burlington
March the 11th 1765 before Gideon Bickerdike
Saml Pearhiing [??]
I William Beakes of the Countie of Munmoth in the Eastern Division of New Jersey Joyner being in health of body & of sound & perfect mind & memory, but calling to mind the uncertainty of this Life and knowing all men must die when it shall please Ye Lord in his wisdom to call was minded to settle & Dispose of those temporal things wch the Lord in his mercy have bestowed upon me. First I recommend my soul to God who gave it & my body to be Decently buried at the Descretion of my Executors & friends. As touching my Reall and Personall Estate, I do Will & Devise as followeth, first I will that all my Just'd Debts & funerall charges be justly paid……………

Imprimus I give & bequeath unto my Dear & Loveing wife Anne Beakes the sum of one hundred & fourty pounds Lawfull money of New Jarsey as soon as after my Decease as the same can be made of my Estate also my mind and will is that my wife shall have the best bed & furniture in my house also I give to my dear wife one acre of meadow in the long meadow adjoining ye Causeway or Highway & also one acre of upland in the field adjoining to said meadow to be & remains to my said wife during her widowhood. …. (?) Lott of upland & meadow is bounded as followeth Beginning at a stake on the Ditch bank thence South fifty six degrees east twelve perch to a Stake on the Ditch bank by ye Road which goes to Thomases Mill then North thirty six degrees East Sixteen perch to a stake by the road side then north four degrees west twelve perch to a stake then (?) twenty one degrees west Ninteen & one half Perch to place of Ye beginning containing two acres of land & meadow, be the same more or less, and that Roome with a Small chimney in it & its privileges of the outward room for Cooking washing or baking with use of ye oven to bake in & also ye privilege of what part of the cellar she shall want in that dwelling house my son David has built on ye said Lott together with privilege in any other Room of ye said house so long as she shall be & remain my widow. And my mind is that my son David Beakes shall fence ye meadow separate from ye upland with a good post en rails fence five rayls ugh also ye upland with the like fence and as there is room Enough in ye said house my mind is that my son David should live in ye said house with his mother so long as his mother shall live my widow. For all which Charge if complied with. I give & bequeath the reversion of this house & Lott with every of their appurtenances unto my Son David & his heirs Lawfully begot to them their heirs & assigns forever. And for want of such heirs to my son Edmund Beakes & his heirs and assigns forever……………

Item my mind & will is for ye better Enabling my dear wife to bring up & Educate my two grandsons William & John Morford I give her the further sum of twenty pounds money as above said to be levey'd out of my estate.
I give & bequeath to my daughter Elizabeth Thomas the Sum of forty five pounds one year after ye sale of my plantation.

I give & bequeath unto my Daughter Anne Beakes the sum of forty five pounds to be paid one year after the sale of my plantation.

I give & bequeath unto my grandsons William & John Morford the sum of ten pounds to each of them to be & remain in my wives…(?) they shall arrive to the age of twenty one the use of the said forty pounds their bringing up, but if either of my said Grandsons should die before he shall arrive to age the Survivor of them shall Enjoy such ..(?).. Legacies….

I nominate constitute and appoint my dear loving wife Anne Beakes & my son Edmund Beakes my Executrix and Executor of this my last will & Testament to whom I give full…(?)… bargain & sell all and singular my plantation whereon I live & thence to convey & confirm …(?) Single Deed or otherwise as fully & largely as I could have …(?) my life to me Exce[pting the within lott of Land given to my dear wife …(?)… Lott of fifty six perches & …(?).. Ye South side of …(?)… adjoining to the lott with on Described & is bounded as thus on (?) of both ye said lotts further she with under the hand of my brother Edmd. Beakes who surveyed the same (?) But if either of my Executors should Dye before the sale of my said plantation, that then & in that case the Survivor shall have full power to Grant bargain & sell Convey & confirm the same as fully as I could have done in my lifetimes……..

I give & bequeath to my son David the said Lott of fifty six perches of Land & to his heirs lawfully begot & to them their heirs and assigns for ever & for want of such heirs to be & remained unto my son Edumund Beakes & to his heirs & assigns forever………..

And lastly I give & bequeath all the remainder of my Estate not before bequeathed to my five sons David Edmund Stephen Abraham and Samuel Beakes to be Equally Divided amongst my said sons share & share alike, and for as much as it has pleased God to visset my son David with fits which has in a great measure rendered him incapable of doing his own business so that my mind & will is his share or part above bequeathed shall be put out to Interest by my Executors & the Interest (?) thereon shall be paid yearly to such person as shall have the Care of him, and if the fits should altogether disable him from doing anything for his support, that then my mind & will is there shall be as much of the (?)orin) shall be applied to make out what ye Interest cannot (???) like manner till the whole is spent But if it should please God to (???) himm so that the Neighbours Judges he may have the same in his own management. & will there the same may be paid him what remains to be due. But if it should so happen my said son David should be removed by death before this my last will shall take place that then his share or part (?) from the sale of my plantation shall be
equally divided amongst my surviving sons share & share alike. In Testimony where
of I have here unto set my hand and seal the twenty seventh day of February (?) in the
year of our Lord -- one thousand seven hundred & sixty one 1761......... William
Beakes

Signed sealed & delivered in the presence of us -- and published the above said
Instrument to be his last will & testament…. (?? further text, illegible in photocopy).

William Lawrie Jesse Woodward / Edm.d Beakes

------ (Testament)

William Lawrie and Edmond Beaks Two of the Witnesses to the within Will and of
the people called Quakers on their Solem Affirmations did affirm that they saw
William Beakes the (?) therein named Sign and Seal the Same and heard him publish
pronounce and Declare the Within Instrument to be his Last Will & Testament and
that at the doing thereof the said Testation was of Sound and disposing mind & …. (rest illegible in photocopy).

Signed Wm Lawrie / Edm'd Beakes
Inventory

A true and Perfect Inventory of all and Singular the good chattels and credits of William Beakes of Upper Freehold in the Countie of Mumouth in the Eastern Division of New Jersey Deceased, as the same was appraised by John Steward and Thomas Miller the 25th (?) of June 1761.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description of Goods</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in his lodging room</td>
<td>Imprimus his purse and apparel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Sundrie furneture in said room amounting too</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye other Lodging room</td>
<td>To Bed &amp; furniture &amp; stand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye parlor</td>
<td>To 1 Clock oval table &amp; other things</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye front little chamber</td>
<td>To 1 Bed &amp; Furniture &amp; other things</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye large front chamber</td>
<td>To 1 Bed &amp; Furniture &amp; large walnut table</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North little chamber</td>
<td>To a parcel of Chester drawe, Joyners tools &amp; other things</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Garret</td>
<td>To 2 Beds &amp; bedstead &amp; 1 Cott (?) &amp; bed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye Kitchen</td>
<td>To pewter potts, tubs Churns and other things adj to</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Chamber (above?)</td>
<td>To sundries in ye Kitchen chamber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out a doors</td>
<td>To 8 cows (?) yearlings &amp; a bull &amp; 1 young Stallion &amp; 4 working horses</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To (?)eriefs &amp; weesles &amp; sundry other things</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye shop</td>
<td>To Sundries in ye shop amounting to</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out a doors</td>
<td>To 1 waggan Stack of hay &amp; other things</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ye fields</td>
<td>To Weat on ye ground Indian Corn &amp; Rye a mtg to 26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To grass in ye meadow 16 sheep 2 calves 18 Geese (?) 15 swine &amp; some peggs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To grubbing hoes &amp; other small things</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given under our hands the day and year above written.
John Steward
Thos Miller
Inventory of Joseph Brown, Cohansey (Greenwich), Salem County, 1711

The Will and Inventory / of Joseph Browne / of Cohansey Deceased / The Will proved the 8th [?] day / of September anno 1711 / Isaac Sharp Esq / Surrog[.] / N: 4:

[interior p. 1]
Inventory of the Goods Chattills of Joseph Browens [? Alternate spelling?] / Laite of Greenwich in the County of Salem in the Province of West New Jersey Deceased. Takin by us Bartholomew Wiatt / Joseph Eastland & Nataniel Brading Apprazors This / 7th & 10th Dayes of May in the Year of Our Lord 1711

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To his Waring Apparill</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To 142 ounces &amp; 4 Penny wt of Silver Plaite at [??]</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sloop with her Sailes Rigin &amp; Other Attier</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negro Man Named Peter &amp; his wife a Negro / woman &amp; one small Negro child</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negro Man Named Pattrick</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indian Boy Named Peter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negro Man Named Quach [?]</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young Negro Boy &amp; Girl both</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fether Beeds with Blankitts Sheatts &amp; other Furniture all</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pair of Sheatts att 30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundry Tabill Cloaths Napkins &amp; Towills all att</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174 Pound of Pewter Dishes Plaitts &amp; Potts &amp;c at</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Brass Kettels &amp; 7 Brass Candillsticks with other old Brass Ware all att</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Parcell of Tinn Ware att 12/</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Iron Potts &amp; Iron Kittells: all att 122/</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iron Boxes with hotters [??] att 2/ps</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Warming Panns at 30/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iron Pott Hucks: &amp; Trammills att</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clock &amp; watch: both att</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Luckin Glass at 40/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Qty] [Description]  £  S  D
<p>| | | | | |
|     |                                                  |    |   |   |
| 6   | Lether choars &amp; 1 Lether Couch                    | 3  | 4 |   |
| 6   | Walnut choars att 6 /ps                           | 1  | 16|   |
| 2   | Ovill Tabills att 50 /pss                         | 5  |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caine Choars att 20/pss</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small Luckin Glasses att</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chist of Drawers &amp; 1 small box</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seall Skin Trunck &amp; 4 Small Truncks att</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caise of Bottells &amp; 3 Doz of Small Bottels at</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small Japan Boxes att</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wooden Cup &amp; 3 Small Brusshes at</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prospickt Glass &amp; 1 Small Box</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large Copper att 100/</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A Parcell of Earthin Waer &amp; Glasses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Woodin Cears att 2/6 ps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Woodin Tabills at 12/all</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Chists &amp; 1 Old Cradill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wooden Caise at 2/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Saddills &amp; 2 Bridills &amp; 1 Port Mantill all /</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carried Over</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brought Over</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pair of Large Bellusses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tunn of Sider att 80/</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cheas Tubbs &amp; a Parcill of Old Cask att</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large &amp; 1 Small Spinnin Wheills both att</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcill of Shingills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcill of Furrs att</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcill of Bacon att</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lise [?] hoges att 6/pss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grinn Stone with an Iron Handill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crose Cutt Saw &amp; 2 Whip Sawes 1 Being A Steall Plaite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Bead Stids: with Sackin Botturns att 30/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Parcell of Old Carpenters Tools &amp; 4 Shep Shearas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hay Kniff: 4 old Hoes &amp; 2 old Axes &amp; 2 old Spaid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barrill of Porck at 50/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barrills of Beaff att 30/pss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hundred foot of Boards att 6/ft [?] hundred</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plowes &amp; Thaer Tacklin [?] att</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Cart att</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Acres of Weitt &amp; Rye att</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Qty] [Description]</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundry Kniffs and Forks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large Bibill &amp; Joseph Hissses History in Follio &amp; Sundry Books all att</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Walkin Caines att 12/both</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small Skren att 6/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iron Chimne Backs att 20/ both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[15 lines of inventory containing remnants of cloth, not transcribed]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Packs of Pinns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Remnants of Stuff's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doz Iron Hoes att 30/ doz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fryin Panns att 26/ att</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doz of Fyer Panns at 2/pss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carryed over</td>
<td><strong>981</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 ½</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brought over</td>
<td><strong>981</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 ½</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trowills 3 Squares 3 Cross Garnitts &amp; 1 Sith all att</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doz &amp; 3 Chissells &amp; 7 Brass Cocks [?]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Lock at 6/ &amp; a parcel of Allspice att</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pound of Shott</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pound of Powder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pair of Iron Trasses at 10 att</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dear Skins [?] haer &amp; 3 small Drest Dearskins</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Pound of Nailes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gunns at 70 /all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pailes att 12 pss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pr of Scales with Waites &amp; 2 pr of Still Yards [?]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mens Hatts att</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Small Parcell of Habedashery Waer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pound of Flaxe &amp; a Parcell of Linnen&amp; Woolen Yeanr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bridill att 6/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Horse &amp; 1 Maer boath att</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sheap &amp; 20 Lames att 14/ pss</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Caves &amp; 1 Caiff att 65/ pss with [?] Caiff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hoffers &amp; Stears 3 year Old at 40 /pss</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yearlin Caiffes at 20/pss</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paer of oxen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large pr of Stears att</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old Oxen &amp; 1 Cove [?]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current cash amounting to</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Bushels of wheat</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6840</td>
<td>Of Stares [?] &amp; 26000 of cedar Shingles</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coper [?]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Young cattle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Came before me Isaac Sharp: /
Esq appointed for ye pro[?g? of?hs]
Inventory of Edward Godwin (Goodwin?), Salem County, turner, 1708

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Qty]</th>
<th>[Description]</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[?] and apparel hay bride and saddle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In cash</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the dwelling house 2 beds and furniture</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case of drawers &amp; carpet 1 small box &amp; a table</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Pewter and brass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Iron Pots a [??] and a frying pan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A funnel and other tinn ware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White earthen ware and 2 wood pestels [?] and morters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 pairs of sheets and other small linen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 chairs and 2 small forms and a stool</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 small gunn and ascover [?]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dozen and a half of trenshers [?] one par of bess[..?]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Iron boarns [?] and seales [?] one box iron [?] the other irons Belonging to the fire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bible with some other books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Looking glass 2 small brushes and other small things / unmentioned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Loft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Qty]</th>
<th>[Description]</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[?] bed and 1 ordinary chaf bed with bedding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A quantity of clean wheat [?] about 3 bushels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A small quantity of salt and about 3 bushels of peat [?]</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pare of old wool cards &amp; a parcel of wool and abed [?] cord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old chests 3 old boxes one cow bell [?] cellar a small /</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

257 Nelson, 1899, 581. In articles of agreement for land tenancy dated 1686, Godwin (Goodwin) is identified as a turner living in Middle Neck (now Elsinboro Township). See also Place Names of Salem County, NJ 2, no. 4 (1964): 36.
### In the seller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Butter and cheese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Empty (?) cask and 2 rondol (?)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tubs and 2 pails (?)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A cask of tallow a few candles and a dozen (?) of glass bottles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forms one old box with other lumber</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In the work house

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woolf trap with one other small trap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adds 2 falling axes with the working tools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pot rack and one spit 2 spades one shovel / 2 hoes a mall with 4 wedges 1 sith geard [guard?] / with other lumber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plow 1 harrow 2 Irish carts [carls?] with tackling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Set of pine boards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stocks of Bees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Head of meat [veal?] cattle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A horse a mare and 3 colts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hed of hogs young and old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fodder (?) at home and a broad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corn upon the ground</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of (?) a bond</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £294 6 2

[signed]
John Chompton [?]
Richard Darkin
APPENDIX C.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ACCOUNT BOOK OF JOHN TANTUM, 1701–08

Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College
Chesterfield Monthly Meeting Records, RG2/PH/C47

The pages have been transcribed to the best of the author’s ability. Not every page or entry has been transcribed.
Figure C.1  Page 1, “The First of the 5th Month 1701.” Account book of John Tantum. Courtesy Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. Photo by author.

[page 1]
The 1st of the 5 month 1701 / work for Thomas Lambert
**list of work by “Ro” or “Jo” by days and half days with totals
**page total: £23-06-06

[page 2]
The 20th of ? month 1702 / began to work for Tho’s Tindall
**list of work by “Ro” or “Jo” by days and half days with totals
**page total: £15-15-0

[page 3]
The 11 of the 4 month 1702 / began to work for Tho Lambert
**list of work by “Jo” by days and half days with totals
**work total: £9-19-6
Thomas Lambert worke
the 6 of the 5 month 1703
Fransses Davenporte / work and what he had / for lether and na?? and / mending the
pumpe buckit / carrying salte from W Farnsworth /
49 foot of 3 inch plank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount (shillings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For making a plane and a saw / handle an ordering 2 planes more</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mending the pumpe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing a pare of hinges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>various days work for “Jo”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Rucke on bedstid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C.3 Page ?, “Fransses Davenport work.” Account book of John Tantum. Courtesy Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. Photo by author.
Mending a wheel and wings (?) / and a wharfe (?)
Figure C.4  Page ?, “House building 15-00-00 / Work done for William Shatterthwaite.” Account book of John Tantum. Courtesy Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. Photo by author.

[page ?]
house building £15-00-00
Worke done for William Shattarthaite
The 25th of the 12 month 1704
****list of work by “Ri” or “Jo” by days and half days with totals

Worke for Thomas Folks
**list of work, unidentified
Payed upon sistars acounte to / John Farnsworth
Payed at Burlington
5 hogs and salt
one pare of shears
Sam Geese 2 days [work]
**list of days of work, unidentified
one bushel of wheat
[Total of list] £02-18-00
----
one bushel of wheat
one dove (?)
payed to him beef
2 pound of nails
work for Jaos (?) about his house
Roof and scantling
One bushel an half of wheat
Sam Goos 4 pounds of nales

**other pages not translated.
APPENDIX D.

PATTERN BRICK HOUSES OF SALEM CO., NEW JERSEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>William Bradway</td>
<td>Salem 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Joseph Darkin(^{259})</td>
<td>Elsinborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1720</td>
<td>Richard Robinson (?)</td>
<td>Mannington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kiger/Geiger House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Alexander Grant</td>
<td>Salem (Town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Abel Nicholson(^{260})</td>
<td>Elsinborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>John Maddox Denn(^{261})</td>
<td>Lower Alloways Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>John Worlidge</td>
<td>Salem (Town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>John Pledger (?)</td>
<td>Mannington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Richard Smith</td>
<td>Moore’s Corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Nathaniel Chambless III</td>
<td>Lower Alloways Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Joseph Ware(^{262})</td>
<td>Lower Alloways Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1730</td>
<td>William Tyler</td>
<td>Quinton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>William Hancock</td>
<td>Hancock’s Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>William Chandler (Kent-Keasbey House)</td>
<td>Quinton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1735</td>
<td>James Evans (?)</td>
<td>Lower Alloway Creek Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Ephraim Padgett</td>
<td>Lower Alloways Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{258}\) Nelson, ed., 1890, 597.

\(^{259}\) Joseph Darkin’s brother, John, had a similar brick house built ca. 1720 that is no longer extant. Nelson, ed., 1890, 581. He is defined as a yeoman in a deed executed in 1686.

\(^{260}\) Nelson, ed., 1890, 602–04. Nicholson entered into a deed in 1690 (?) and was named yeoman as his occupation.

\(^{261}\) Nelson, ed., 1890, 575. Denn entered into a deed in the 1690s and his occupation was turner.

\(^{262}\) This house was later owned by Thomas Shourds, Salem historian
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>William Oakford</td>
<td>Alloway Township&lt;sup&gt;263&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>William Mecum</td>
<td>Lower Penns Neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Cornelius Copner</td>
<td>Pennsville Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>263</sup> Monmouth River, named in early maps of the region, was renamed Alloways Creek.
## APPENDIX E.

### SOCIETY OF FRIENDS MEETINGS IN NEW JERSEY

### ESTABLISHED PRIOR TO 1740

Information compiled from Tvaryanas, 1993 (hereafter DT, page number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year Meeting-house built</th>
<th>Year Meeting-house planned</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Note Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1672 (or earlier)</td>
<td>Shrewsbury Meeting</td>
<td>Sycamore Ave. / Broad St. (1814 Bldg.), Monmouth Co.</td>
<td>1672, 1695</td>
<td>DT, 325. George Fox noted &quot;they are building a meetingsplace among them,&quot; when he passed through in 1672.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Salem Meeting</td>
<td>Salem Co.</td>
<td>1681, 1685</td>
<td>DT, 281. 1st met in house of Samuel &amp; Ann Nicholson donated for this purpose. Benjamin Acton commissioned in 1685 to build new meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Burlington Meeting</td>
<td>340 High Street, Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Francis Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additions made to accommodate poor structure. Sits directly in front of original hexagonal meetinghouse property. Seats 559 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Hancock's Bridge Meeting</td>
<td>Allaways Creek, Salem Co.</td>
<td>1686+</td>
<td>Christopher White</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st met in house of John Denn. Ca. 1686 Christopher White was severed for building meetinghouse (on land donated by Edward Champneys).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Springfield / Copenny</td>
<td>Mattapenny Bridges, Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Francis Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Rarocas</td>
<td>Northampton Twp., Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1702-3</td>
<td>Also known as Ancocas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682 (?)</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Camden Co. (formerly Gloucester Co.)</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>DT, 239. Possibly built by William (surname?), per Prowell’s History of Camden County (1887)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Land’s Point</td>
<td>Atlantic Co. (formerly Burlington Co.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Allowaystown</td>
<td>Salem Co.</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>John Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also known as Thompson’s Bridge Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Crosswicks</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>John Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also known as Chesterfield Meeting. DT, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Mauricestown Meeting</td>
<td>Chester, Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1700+</td>
<td>Discrepancy b/t DT &amp; Pomfret on founding date. DT, 1685. Pomfret, 1700. Deed to land received 1780 or later.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686 (or earlier)</td>
<td>Amboy Meeting</td>
<td>Middlesex Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 309.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Established</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year Meeting-house built</td>
<td>Year Meeting-house planned</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Note Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Greenwich Meeting</td>
<td>Cohariey, Cumberland Co. (formerly Salem Co.)</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 264</td>
<td>Notes that 19th c. refs. Indicate this was a log house (doesn't enumerate refs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Mt. Holly Meeting</td>
<td>Rancocas Creek, Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Woodbridge Meeting</td>
<td>Middlesex Co.</td>
<td>1709–13</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 333-334.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsauken Meeting</td>
<td>Camden Co. (formerly Gloucester Co.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Lower Evesham Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Evesham Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as Lower Evesham?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Haddonfield Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td>1722 absorbs Newtown Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Woodbury Creek Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>1715</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Cooper? Also known as Red Bank Meeting. DT, 394.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Stony Brook Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Cape May Meeting</td>
<td>alternated (later mansehouse in Seaville; Beasley's Point, 1727); Cape May Co.</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1700</td>
<td>Leeds's Point Meeting</td>
<td>later Smithville, Atlantic Co. (formerly Burlington Co.)</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1700</td>
<td>Absecon Meeting</td>
<td>later Smithville, joins Leeds's Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Established</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year Meeting-house built</td>
<td>Year Meeting-house planned</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Note Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 (or earlier)</td>
<td>Topanemus Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also known as (Topanemes, Freehold Meeting). DT, 333. Quotes George Keith's journal, that he visited this meeting in 1702. Keith notes they joined him in separation in 1692... so meeting active even earlier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Little Egg Harbor Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>1709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting erected on land of Edward Andrews. Timber frame w/ cedar shakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Squan Meeting</td>
<td>Manasquan, Monmouth Co.</td>
<td>17067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 329. Quoting Mastick's belief that this is the date the meetinghouse erected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad Street Meeting</td>
<td>East Broad St., Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeCou, 65. Site of the Yearly meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Piscataway Meeting</td>
<td>Woodstown, Salem Co.</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Mansfield Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Upper Springfield Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Amwell Meeting</td>
<td>Hunterdon Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Woodbridge Monthly Meeting</td>
<td>Plainfield, Union Co.</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Kingwood Meeting</td>
<td>Quakertown, Hunterdon Co.</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 316. Deed for land to erect meetinghouse 1733.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Trenton Meeting</td>
<td>142 East Hanover St., Trenton, Mercer Co.</td>
<td>1738-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 194 - Stacy &amp; Nathan Beales mentioned in conveyance of land, Hanover St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Bordentown Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 150. Discrepancy b/t DT &amp; Pomfret. DT says 1736, Pomfret said 1740.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Established</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year Meeting-house built</td>
<td>Year Meeting-house planned</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Note Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Bordentown Meeting</td>
<td>Burlington Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT, 150. Discrepency b'tw DT &amp; Pontfret. DT says 1736, Pontfret said 1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Allamuchy Meeting</td>
<td>Warren Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Upper Freehold</td>
<td>Monmouth Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also known as (Woodward’s, Army Town, Elisdale Meeting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F.
#### LOCATIONS OF SAWMILLS IN NEW JERSEY PRIOR TO 1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>ca. 1704</td>
<td>Tuckerton</td>
<td>Edward Andrews erects saw- and grist-mills on Tuckerton's or Andrews' Mill Creek&lt;sup&gt;265&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>By 1664</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>A sawmill present when Stuyvesant surrendered to English&lt;sup&gt;266&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>By 1724</td>
<td>Hackensack</td>
<td>Sawmill mentioned in will of David Ackerman&lt;sup&gt;267&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1679 or 80</td>
<td>Delran Twsp.</td>
<td>Thomas Olive erected a mill on Olives' Mill Creek that empties into Rancocas, 1 mile above Bridgeboro.&lt;sup&gt;268&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>By 1679</td>
<td>Falls of the Delaware</td>
<td>A sawmill at this location (Assunpink Creek?) is mentioned by Jaesper Danckaert's journal&lt;sup&gt;269&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>ca. 1704</td>
<td>Coopers Creek</td>
<td>Sawmill erected by William Matlack&lt;sup&gt;271&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>264</sup> Included in Burlington County.

<sup>265</sup> Bishop, 1866, 109.

<sup>266</sup> New Jersey State Museum, 1971, 13.

<sup>267</sup> Weiss, 1968, 51.

<sup>268</sup> DeCou, 1973, 44–45.

<sup>269</sup> DeCou, 1973, 44–45.

<sup>270</sup> Included in former Gloucester County.

<sup>271</sup> Weiss, 1968, 50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Ca. 1706</td>
<td>Timber Creek</td>
<td>William Thorne built a saw mill on northern branch of Timber Creek, known as Thorne's Mill Branch(^{272})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>By 1710</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>Abraham Porter &amp; Co. assessed for a mill. Near Chew's Landing(^{273})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>By 1730</td>
<td>Timber Creek/Gloucester River</td>
<td>Sawmill noted on property of Abraham Porter(^{274})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>By 1733</td>
<td>Timber Creek</td>
<td>Cheesman saw mill referenced(^{275})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumber.(^{276})</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>Hancock's Sawmill built on Mill Creek (Indian Fields Run)(^{277})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumber.</td>
<td>By 1702</td>
<td>Fairfield Twsp.</td>
<td>Part of a saw- and grist-mill complex in will of Samuel Fithian (Ogden's Mills)(^{278})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Before 1695</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Thomas Davis granted liberty to construct a saw mill, according to Newark Town Records. (^{280})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{272}\) Weiss, 1968, 49.

\(^{273}\) Weiss, 1968, 49.

\(^{274}\) Weiss, 1968, 52.

\(^{275}\) Weiss, 1968, 53.

\(^{276}\) Originally part of Salem County.

\(^{277}\) Sebold and Leach, 1991, 96.

\(^{278}\) Weiss, 1968, 49.

\(^{279}\) Weiss, 1968, 49.

\(^{280}\) Weiss, 1968, 49.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>By 1711</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Sawmill on Elizabeth River mentioned in will of Thos. Brown, Sr.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>By 1740</td>
<td>Loc. not specified</td>
<td>Joseph Coles owned half share of a sawmill.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1682?</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>Jonathan Bishop constructs a sawmill on the Rahawack River (Rahway River?)283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>By 1740</td>
<td>Raritan River</td>
<td>Land six miles from a sawmill upon Black River advertised for sale284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Loc. not specified</td>
<td>Leonard's sawmill referenced in land transaction285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth286</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Sonman's Patent (now Ocean Co.)</td>
<td>Edmund Beakes purchases land in Sonman's Patent, erects a mill (this is on the North Branch of Tom's River?)287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

281 Weiss, 1968, 49.
283 Bishop, 1866, 108.
284 Weiss, 1968, 53.
286 Present-day Ocean County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>By 1750</td>
<td>Freehold area</td>
<td>A sawmill at this location (10 miles from Freehold on north bank of Manasquan River). Monmouth Furnace later built on site of the saw mill. Likely erected by Isaac Palmer²⁸⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>Ca. 1682</td>
<td>Salem Town</td>
<td>Sawmill built in Salem by William Hampton²⁸⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>1712/3</td>
<td>No defined loc.</td>
<td>Nathaniel Brading's estate notes 1/3 part of a sawmill valued at £160, no loc. given, but he dies in Salem Town²⁹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>By 1713</td>
<td>Salem Town</td>
<td>William Hall, a merchant, owned a sawmill--among assets named in estate appraisal²⁹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>By 1666</td>
<td>Elizabeth Town</td>
<td>A working sawmill present²⁹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Elizabeth Town (Elizabeth)</td>
<td>Sawmill existed on Thomson's Creek; Samuel Marsh was 1/3rd owner²⁹³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁸⁹ Bishop, 1866, 109.
²⁹⁰ Brading’s inventory is located in the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Ephemera, Winterthur Library. See Nathaniel Brading Inventory, Col. 61, 55.17.2.
²⁹¹ Weiss, 1968, 50.
²⁹² Weiss, 1968, 23.
## Elsewhere in the Delaware River Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1658       | Near New Amstel (now New Castle), DE       | Joost Andriessen proposed to build a sawmill and grist-mill below the Turtle Falls here  
294 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

| 1662       | New Sweden Colony (west side of Delaware River) | Ironwork for a saw mill was sent over from Sweden, purchased for 450 florins  
295 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

| Before 1678 | Carcoon Creek (now Delaware Co.?), PA        | A sawmill here was referenced in a trial at the Upland court.  
296 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

| Before 1682 | Frankford, Philadelphia, PA                 | A sawmill supposedly stood near the house of William Kinsey, built by Swedes (on Tacony Creek?)  
297 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

| After 1682  | Chester Creek (now Delaware Co.), PA        | Richard Townsend established a corn- and sawmill here. Supposedly received framed up from London. A joint venture between he, Caleb Pusey, Penn, Samuel Carpenter and others. A weathervane survives from the mill with their initials.  
298 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

| Before 1723 | Chester Creek (now Delaware Co.), PA        | "Chester Mills", part owned by estate of Jonathan Dickinson advertised for sale  
299 Bishop, 1866, 111.  

---

294 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

295 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

296 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

297 Bishop, 1866, 110.  

298 Bishop, 1866, 110. The whereabouts of the weathervane are not known to the author.  

299 Bishop, 1866, 111.
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All the best with your thesis.

With kind regards,
Digital Collections and Services
Philadelphia Museum of Art
Email: rightsandrepro@philamuseum.org
Office: 215-684-7902
FAX: 215-235-0034

---

From: Jackie Killian []
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 10:17 PM
To: RightsandRepro
Subject: Request to reproduce 1928-7-12 & -13

Dear Manager of Rights & Reproductions,

Attached is a form requesting permission to reproduce a digital image on your website illustrating your museum's objects referenced above. No digital file is required as I was able to download one of adequate quality from your website.

The illustration will appear in a chapter of my MA thesis to be completed at the University of Delaware this spring. Details of the publication are as follows:
Title: United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1740
Author: Jacquelann G. Killian
Publisher: University of Delaware
Date of publication: May 2015
Print run: 1 copy (will be available in the rare book collection of Winterthur Museum, Garden & Library
Publication: printed and bound with a digital version of the thesis available via Proquest, an online, subscription dissertation delivery service.

Thank you very much for considering my interest in promoting your collections in my scholarly work. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,
Jackie Killian
April 24, 2015

Jacqueline Killian
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture
Winterthur Museum
Winterthur, DE 19735

Subject to the conditions of the Photographic Use Contract for Winterthur Collection printed on the reverse side, permission is hereby granted to reproduce the photographs below only in article:

United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1740
Jacqueline Grace Killian
UMI/University of Delaware
May 1, 2015

This permission will be null and void unless the application fees are paid per Invoice number: GRATIS and one complete gratis copy of the publication in which the images are reproduced is provided to Winterthur Photographic Services

1. 1956.38.143 Dressing Table Digital Images: Overall
   Detail: Drawer Interior
   Detail: Drawer back
   Detail: Chalk mark


2. 1960.94 Chest of Drawers Digital Images: Overall
   Detail: foot


3. 1964.740 Map Digital Images: Overall
   Detail: Native settlements
   Detail: Native canoes

4. 1982.309  Map  Digital images: Overall
Detail: Cartouche
Courtesy, Winterthur Museum, Map, A MAP of/ MARYLAND/ with the/DELAWARE/ COUNTIES/ and the/
Southern Part of/ NEW JERSEY/ &c/ By T. Kitchin Geog \r, 1757, London, England, Ink, Laid paper,
Museum purchase, 1982.309

5. 2009.24 Chest on Chest  Digital images: Overall
Detail: Drawer bottom
Detail: Drawer Joinery (interior)
Detail: Drawer Joinery (exterior)
Detail: Inscription

Courtesy, Winterthur Museum, Chest on chest, Museum purchase with funds drawn from the Centenary
Fund and acquired through the gift of Mrs. Waldron Phoenix Belknap, 2009.24

[Signature]

Photographic Services Coordinator
Marketing & Communications Division
Claypoole sampler_Permission

From: Jackie Killian
Sent: Sun 7/19/15 8:43 PM
To: Jackie Killian

From: On Behalf Of Amy Finkel
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 5:06 PM

To: Jacquelann Killian
Subject: Re: Rebeccah Claypoole sampler?

I heard back just as quickly (good because we’ll be tied up with the Delaware Antiques Show for a week) and yes, you have permission to use it. "Miller Worley Collection, Photo Courtesy M. Finkel & Daughter, Philadelphia"

Amy
Jacqueline Killian  
Lois F. McNell Fellow  
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture  
Academic Programs Department  
Winterthur Museum, Library, & Garden  
Winterthur, DE 19735

Permission is granted to reproduce the images listed below in United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1750, by Jacqueline G. Killian to be submitted to the University of Delaware as a 2015 thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession or Call Number</th>
<th>Book or Object</th>
<th>Reproduction to be made from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1) Detail of drawer  
2) Detail of signature on drawer | Images taken by author  
Order#15L143 |
1) Detail of signature on drawer | Images taken by author  
Order#15L144 |

The credit line to be used with each picture is:

"Courtesy, The Winterthur Library: Decorative Arts Photographic Collection"

Please provide a complimentary copy of the publication. It is understood that this thesis will be submitted to UMI, and that UMI may sell, on demand, for scholarly purposes, single copies of your dissertation, which includes the images described above. Permission is hereby granted for that purpose. Please note use restrictions below.

Lauri Perkins  
Rights and Reproductions  
Library and Academic Programs
Dietrich permission

From: Jackie Killian
Sent: Sun 7/19/15 8:27 PM
To: Jackie Killian

Date: Wed, 22 Apr 2015 15:14:14 -0400
From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: A further image question

Hi, Jackie,

I finally heard back from Chris Dietrich about the chest on chest and he is thrilled for you to include illustrations of the Dietrich chest on chest in your thesis. He would like it credited still to the Estate of H. Richard Dietrich, Jr. Hopefully Chris Storb has now sent you images of it (I spoke to him about it earlier today). Our catalog number for is is 8.2.3.HRD.2329.

The Beakes chest should be credited for ownership to The Dietrich American Foundation. Our catalog number for it is 8.2.3.HRD.1811.

I hope we can put a date on the calendar soon to get up to see Tom’s collection and maybe even Peachfield (which despite it being 20 minutes from my home, I have never seen!).

Lots of luck tying up all the little last details on your thesis! Let me know if there is anything else I can do to help.

Best,
Debbie
Permissions for Trenton Makes

From: Jackie Killian
Sent: Tue 11/11/14 8:01 AM
To: Jackie Killian

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
(c) 2005 Flickr user Bearclau / Creative Commons
No alterations were made to this image

Jackie Killian
Lois F. McNeil Fellow, Class of 2014
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture
Re: permission request

From: Christopher Densmore (cdensmo1@swarthmore.edu)
Sent: Mon 11/10/14 8:39 AM
To: Jackie Killian

Dear Jackie Killian:

You have permission to reproduce the images in your MA thesis without charge, requiring only that the images be clearly credited to Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College. Any other use of these images requires written permission of Friends Historical Library.

Christopher Densmore, Curator
Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Jackie Killian"  <br>
To: cdensmo1@swarthmore.edu
Sent: Sunday, November 9, 2014 4:51:06 PM
Subject: Re: permission request

Dear Chris,
I'm writing to confirm that you received an emailed request for permission to reproduce some of my personal photos of a manuscript in the Friends Historical Library collections. This is for use in my MA thesis.
Thank you for letting me know it was received when you have a moment.
With sincere thanks,
Jackie Killian
Winterthur Museum
Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record/Historic American Landscape Survey Collection

Rights and Restrictions Information

Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., 20540-4730

Material in these collections is generally considered to be in the public domain.

Access: Permitted, subject to P&P's policy on serving originals. This policy requires that copies of the drawings are served in lieu of the full-size originals. Field records are served by appointment only.

Reproduction (photocopying, hand-held camera copying, photoduplication and other forms of copying allowed by "fair use"): Permitted.

Publication and other forms of distribution: The original measured drawings and most of the photographs and data pages in HABS/HAER/HALS were created for the U.S. Government and are considered to be in the public domain. However, occasionally material from a historical society or other source is included in the photographs or data pages. These materials are noted by the presence of a line crediting the original source, and it may be necessary to receive permission from the owner of such material before it can be published. In all cases the courtesy of an acknowledgment is requested if material is used in a publication. Privacy and publicity rights may also apply.

Credit Line: Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, HABS [or HAER or HALS], Reproduction number [e.g., "HABS ILL, 16-CHIG, 33-2"]

For more information, please read: Copyright and Other Restrictions: ... Sources for Information

Prepared by: Prints and Photographs Division staff. Last revised: October 6, 2005
05 November 2014

Jackie Killian
University of Delaware

Dear Ms. Killian,

Your request for permission to include an image from Stacy Beakes' “Mathematical Notebook” (C0199, no. 101) in your forthcoming thesis entitled United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1750, has been forwarded to me.

The University hereby grants permission for the use of this image. Please accept this letter as permission for one-time, non-exclusive use and insofar as our rights extend as the owner of the physical property.

When publishing, the picture credits should read: “Princeton University Library.”

The preferred reference citation is:


With all best wishes for the success of your project, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Stephen Ferguson
Acting Associate University Librarian
for Rare Books and Special Collections
- Curator of Rare Books
Princeton University Library
One Washington Road, Princeton, NJ 08544
609.258.3165 | 609.258.2324 fax
ferguson@princeton.edu
www.princeton.edu/radc
blogs.princeton.edu/notabilia
Jacquelann Killian  
Lois F. McNeil Fellow  
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture  
Academic Programs Department  
Winterthur Museum, Library, & Garden  
Winterthur, DE 19735

Permission is granted to reproduce the images listed below in United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1750, by Jacquelann G. Killian to be submitted to the University of Delaware as a 2014 thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession or Call Number</th>
<th>Book or Object</th>
<th>Reproduction to be made from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Col. 61, 55 x 21.1       | Will of Stacy Beaks. *Wills, inventories, and administration papers, 1636-1952.*  
1) Header of Will and Inventory  
2) Contents of shop | Images taken by author  
Order# 14L.189 |

The credit line to be used with each picture is:


Please provide a complimentary copy of the publication. It is understood that this thesis will be submitted to UMI, and that UMI may sell, on demand, for scholarly purposes, single copies of your dissertation, which includes the images described above. Permission is hereby granted for that purpose. Please note use restrictions below.

Lauri Perkins  
Rights and Reproductions  
Library and Academic Programs
Policies and Links

Privacy Policy

Our privacy policy is clear: We will collect no personal information about you when you visit our website, (including our social media sites) unless you choose to provide that information to us.
For more information, please visit:

- USDA Privacy Policy

Accessibility Statement

USDA.gov maintains the Accessibility Statement page which can be accessed at:

- USDA Accessibility Statement

Freedom of Information Act

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), which can be found in Title 5 of the United States Code, section 552, was enacted in 1966 and provides that any person has the right to request access to federal agency records or information. All agencies of the United States government are required to disclose records upon receiving a written request for them, except for those records that are protected from disclosure by the nine exemptions and three exclusions of the FOIA. This right of access is enforceable in court. The federal FOIA does not, however, provide access to records held by state or local government agencies, or by private businesses or individuals. All states have their own statutes governing public access to state and local records; state agencies should be consulted for further information about them.

USDA maintains a FOIA home page which can be accessed at:

- Freedom of Information Act

USDA's Significant Guidance Documents

On January 18, 2007, the President issued Executive Order 13422, "Amendment to Executive Order 12866 for Regulatory Planning and Review." On that same day, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued a final Bulletin entitled, "Agency Good Guidance Practices." The primary focus of the Executive Order and Bulletin is to increase the quality and transparency of agency guidance practices and the significant documents produced through them.

- USDA’s Significant Guidance Documents

Digital Rights and Copyright

Most information presented on the USDA Web site is considered public domain information. Public domain information may be freely distributed or copied, but use of appropriate byline/photo/image credits is requested. Attribution may be cited as follows: "U.S. Department of Agriculture."

Some materials on the USDA Web site are protected by copyright, trademark, or patent, and/or are provided for personal use only. Such materials are used by USDA with permission, and USDA has made every attempt to identify and clearly label them. You may need to obtain permission from the copyright, trademark, or patent holder to acquire, use, reproduce, or distribute these materials.

Trademark

Congress has not granted the Department a trademark. Use of the USDA symbol is stated below:

"USDA Symbols or logos are intended for the official use of the United States Department of Agriculture only. They are expressly excluded from use to imply endorsement of a commercial product or service. The symbol or logo may not be used by anyone outside of USDA without permission."

Links to Other Sites

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) official web site is www.usda.gov. The USDA website provides links to other websites to provide additional information that may be useful or interesting, and is being provided in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the content you are viewing on the USDA website. USDA is providing these links for your reference. Once you access another site through a link that we provide, you are subject to the copyright and licensing restrictions of the new site.

It is the sole responsibility of you, the user of this site, to carefully examine the content of the site and all linked pages for privacy, copyright and licensing restrictions and to secure all necessary permissions if
FW: request for permission to reproduce image of chest of drawers by William Beake III

From: Jacquelann Killian
Sent: Mon 11/10/14 10:37 AM
To: 'jackiekillian@hotmail.com'

From: Janice Rudden
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 10:48 AM
To: Jacquelann Killian
Subject: Re: request for permission to reproduce image of chest of drawers by William Beake III

Dear Jackie,

Please be advised that Mr. William K. duPont read your email dated Nov. 3, 2014, requesting permission to reproduce the photographs you listed of the chest of drawers by William Beake III (on loan at Winterthur Museum). By way of this email to you, Mr. duPont grants you that permission to reproduce the images for your thesis entitled, United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1740.

Mr. duPont also would like the credit line to read: Courtesy Rocky Hill Collection.

If possible, a copy sent to Mr. duPont of your entire thesis would be greatly appreciated and thoroughly enjoyed by him. Please send to the following post office address and I will make sure he receives it.
Re: Quaker chest w/ drawers?

Sent: Wed 4/16/14 9:11 PM
To: Jackie Killian

Yes private coll. is fine.

On Apr 16, 2014, at 8:22 PM, Jackie Killian wrote:

I can postpone my visit to the shop to see the chest if it won't be back by Friday. Still excited to see it though!

Also, "private collection" is ok for images of objects in your collection I illustrate in my thesis? Just wanted to confirm w/ you.

Thanks,
Jackie

From: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: Quaker chest w/ drawers?
Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2014 17:32:10 -0400
To: [Redacted]

Jackie,

Not sure I will be around, but maybe. The chest is not going to the show. It is having the brasses put on.

best to you,

[Redacted]

On Apr 16, 2014, at 4:15 PM, Jackie Killian <jackiekillian@hotmail.com> wrote:
Rick Mones_permission

From: Jackie Killian
Sent: Sun 7/19/15 8:38 PM
To: Jackie Killian

> From: Richard []
> Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2015 7:43 AM
> To: Jacquelann Killian
> Subject: RE: Chests
>
> Dear Jackie
> Thank you for the update. I am pleased that you will be staying on at Winterthur and that you will continue to research, write, and teach. I look forward to being of help in your efforts.
>
> When you come down, we can settle the paperwork you have enclosed. I think I would like it to be: (Collection of Dr. Richard and Pamela Mones). I always liked that Joe McFalls listed himself as the owner in a number of publications where his objects were shown.
>
> I will let you know details of our trip to Winterthur and will hope to say hello then.
>
> Sincerely,
> Rick
Please complete all requested information as it pertains to your request, provide a signature, and return to the Albany Institute of History & Art.

Jackie Killian
Lois F. McNeil Fellow, Class of 2014
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture

Hereby applies for permission to reproduce, one time use only, the following image(s):

Sea Chest
Dutch, 17th Century
Walnut or Javanese mahogany, H 21 ¾" x W 36" x D 23"
Albany Institute of History & Art Purchase, 1941.41

For publication in (please provide title of book/article/journal, author, publisher, expected date of publication, volume, and year if applicable):

Title: United by Water: Cabinetmaking Traditions in the Delaware River Valley, 1670-1750
Author(s): Jackie Killian
Publisher: [Univ. of Delaware]
Date of Publication: 2014
Volume:
Print Run:
Language(s): English

Electronic Edition? □ Yes □ No
Check the type of publication: X Non-Commercial (Scholarly) □ Commercial □ Other

Other uses (if applicable):
MA Thesis

Permission to reproduce, if granted, is contingent upon acceptance of the Regulations for Reproduction Included with this form. Any breach of these terms and conditions will automatically result, at the sole discretion of the Albany Institute of History & Art, in revocation of permission to reproduce.

This is to certify that, on behalf of— have reviewed the Regulations for Reproduction and agree to them:

Signature of Applicant:
Date of Agreement:

Permission for the reproduction of the listed image(s) for the purpose(s) specifically indicated within this application is granted, premised and contingent upon payment of the fees involved.

AIHA Signature of Authorization:
Date of Agreement:

125 Washington Avenue Albany, New York 12210 P: (518) 463-4478
F: (518) 462-1522 www.albanyinstitute.org
FW: Photo credit

From: Jackie Killian
Sent: Sun 7/19/15 8:39 PM
To: Jackie Killian

> From: To
> Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 1:39 PM
> To: Jacquellie Killian
> Subject: pictures I
>
> Hi Jackie,
>
> First of all congratulations on your new job. It must be a relief to know that you have a permanent job and being able to stay at Winterthur must be a dream come true.
>
> I'm sending you four (two in this e-mail, two in a secondary e-mail) pictures showing the date X. Please feel free to let me know if none of them are satisfactory.
>
> You may consider this my formal approval for you to use as many photos as you wish in your thesis. When I bought my property, it was locally known as X. Maybe I should follow Bill's lead and credit the loan to that :) Seriously, "Private Collection" will be fine.