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CHAPTER ONE

In his cultural geography of the post-Civil War years, American Space, J. B. Jackson wrote that

the coffee-table book—large, handsomely bound and illustrated, with a modicum of text—has long been a familiar feature of the American home . . . . a hundred years ago, popular taste preferred familiar subjects. Book after enormous book was published to show what a remarkable people we were, and what a remarkable country we lived in.

For rural and small-town Americans of that period, the subscription county atlas was a localized, sometimes personalized "coffee-table book," analogous to those discussed by Jackson on the national level, which showed how historic, progressive and productive an individual county and its people were within the "remarkable country" as a whole.

Illustrated county atlases furnish the student of late nineteenth century America with an unusual source that provides several types of evidence of the material environment: lithographic views, property maps, and lists of the atlas' subscribers. These features, useful in
themselves, also allow linkage with tax and census records which help identify the subscribers' socioeconomic status. Atlases with some or all of these features were produced for the vast majority of counties in the Northeastern and Midwestern states between the close of the Civil War and the last decade of the nineteenth century.

The value of lithographs in county atlases, and in their counterparts, county histories, was recognized over twenty years ago by geographers. Historical geographer Norman Thrower, in an article reviewing the history of county atlas publishing, stated that "views of this kind, although of little artistic merit, provide valuable information on the contemporary rural landscape." Fred B. Kniffen, in the landmark article, "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion," noted that county histories, "with their engravings of individual farmstead scenes, precise dating, and biographical data," are "invaluable sources" for the study of American rural settlement geography; these comments are also applicable to illustrated county atlases, which were often produced by publishers also involved in the county history business.

Despite recognition of the value of atlases, little work has appeared that makes use of them in any systematic way. Furthermore, no research has addressed the claim,
dating from the 1870s, that atlas lithographs "looked no more like the originals that Chinese letters look like English print." Nor have the atlas subscriber directories been used in conjunction with census records, tax records or other contemporary materials to provide a picture of who bought the atlases and whose material environment was depicted in their pages.

This study aims to resolve these concerns. After a brief introduction to the phenomenon of the late nineteenth century county atlas, the bulk of the work will be devoted to a model study involving three representative atlases. These cover Genesee County, New York; Salem and Gloucester counties, New Jersey; and Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. It explores one common lithographic subject, farmsteads. This study could be followed by similar treatments of other county atlases and other lithographic subjects.

The atlases analyzed were chosen because, while they were produced by the same firm during a two-year period, they covered areas that were relatively different historically. All three were published in Philadelphia during 1875 and 1876 by a firm headed by Louis H. Everts, who also published county histories. Although this firm operated under two different names in the three states, the atlases were otherwise similar in organization. Each
consisted of brief histories of the county and its
townships, followed by state, county, township and village
maps, interspersed with lithographs paid for by
subscribers, with a "business directory" of subscribers at
the back.6

The counties covered by these atlases differ
significantly in their periods of settlement, the ethnic
background and places of origin of the original and
subsequent settlers, and in the development of agriculture,
trade and industry. These differences allow an assessment
of the atlas company's sensitivity to local conditions, in
particular whether Evert's artists accurately depicted
regional architectural styles or cultural preferences. The
survival of many farmsteads in the four counties
facilitated assessment of the accuracy of the atlas
illustrations.

New Jersey's Salem and Gloucester counties were
settled in the late 17th century, primarily by English
Quakers. Because this area of southern New Jersey rapidly
became subordinate to Philadelphia, the population remained
low. The two counties reported a total of 45,502 residents
in the 1870 federal census, of whom 83.6 percent were born
in New Jersey and 6.1 percent were foreign-born, with Irish
and Germans constituting the largest groups. Agriculture
remained an important part of the economy after the Civil War, with an increase in truck farming for the markets of Philadelphia and other eastern cities and a decline in grain and stock farming. Manufacturing, particularly glassmaking, had begun to gain a foothold in these counties by the 1870s, but most of the area was still rural in character.7

Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, was settled beginning in the early 18th century, by German, English, Welsh and Scots-Irish immigrants. Geographically larger than the other counties considered here, Lancaster's agricultural resources made it an important trading partner of Philadelphia and Baltimore. In the 1870s, Lancaster was still one of the most productive farming counties in the nation. Manufacturing had also become important by the middle of the nineteenth century, particularly in Lancaster City, the site of several cotton mills. The county's population in 1870 was 121,340, 91.9 percent of which was Pennsylvania-born. Foreign-born residents accounted for only 6.2 percent of the total, and German immigrants made up over two-thirds of the foreign-born.8

Genesee County, New York, much younger than the other counties studied, was settled during the first post- Revolutionary westward movement, beginning in the 1790s.
The original settlers of the region were primarily of New England stock, some by way of more easterly sections of New York. The pioneer agriculture of the Genesee was followed in the 1820s, 1830s and 1840s by grain-dominated farming. As disease and insect damage struck the grain crop in the 1840s, the wheat belt moved further west, and Genesee County agriculture became more diversified, with considerable dairy farming. The county's political boundaries, set in the 1840s, enclosed no major population centers; the county seat, Batavia, reported a population of just under 6500 in the 1870 federal census. The county's population reached 31,606 in that year, of which 5833 residents (18.5 percent) were foreign-born. These immigrants were primarily from Ireland, Great Britain, and the German states. By the 1870s, the county was served by three major rail lines and, indirectly, by the nearby Erie Canal. Some manufacturing enterprises were located in Batavia and LeRoy, but the county remained primarily rural and agricultural in nature well beyond this period.9

Farmsteads were the most common subject illustrated among over three hundred views published in these three atlases.10 Concentration on farmstead views, and
consequently on the farmers who paid for them, allowed a determination of the range of socioeconomic levels represented within a group of comparable subscribers.

Before discussing this three-atlas study, a brief introduction of the phenomenon of the subscription county atlas is necessary. As an American cartographic form, the county atlas developed logically from earlier, single-sheet maps of cities, towns and counties. Hand-drawn maps of small civil units appeared with the first settlements, but the earliest such maps engraved in America were produced in the 18th century. Production of single-sheet city, town and county maps grew slowly over the first half of the nineteenth century. Demand for such maps increased with geographic expansion and population growth in the thirty years preceding the Civil War. The contemporaneous development of the rotary steam press, lightweight zinc lithographic plates and cheap paper made production of these maps more feasible.

County maps of the period just before the Civil War often included two features that later became part of county atlases and form the basic data for this study: lithographic views of local buildings, which were placed around the margins of single-sheet maps, and business listings, or lists of subscribers. Drawn on a large scale,
often one inch to one mile, these maps provided considerable detail. However, their large dimensions made them awkward to handle, and subject to wear and damage.\textsuperscript{13}

Since many surveyors and cartographers served in the military during the Civil War, commercial map production declined during the war years.\textsuperscript{14} At the war's end, the county map publishers shifted their focus from single-sheet maps to atlases. Atlases had three advantages over single-sheet maps at the time: they were easier to handle, store and use because they were bound; they were relatively cheap to produce, since they could be based on existing single-sheet maps or, in the Midwest, on federal survey maps; and as a new product, perhaps they were more saleable to persons who had already paid for a single-sheet county map.\textsuperscript{15} The earliest known American county atlas was published at Philadelphia in 1861. This atlas of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, illustrates the experimentation which led to the discovery of these advantages: it is simply an 1860 wall map cut up into townships and bound, convenient to use and inexpensively done.\textsuperscript{16}

Map and atlas publishers chose their territory for maximum profit: counties that were well-populated and relatively prosperous, such as most counties in the
Northeast and Midwest, were virtually all mapped, while few atlases or single-sheet maps were made of counties in the defeated Confederacy.\textsuperscript{17}

Between 1864 and 1890, cartographers produced 123 atlases covering 114 of the 150 counties in New England, New York and New Jersey; about 45 percent of these featured some lithographic views. New York was the most completely worked state in the region, with the vast majority of its counties atlased, and almost 60 percent of these illustrated.\textsuperscript{18} The counties of the Midwest were, if anything, more completely covered and more fully illustrated than their Eastern counterparts.\textsuperscript{19}

The most prolific atlas publishers employed canvassers to sell their product by subscription before publication, thus guaranteeing themselves a profitable market before incurring major costs. In using the canvassing system, atlas publishers helped make the post-Civil War era "the heyday of the [subscription book] industry."\textsuperscript{20}

The extensive marketing programs employed by these firms are described at length in How 'tis Done. A Thorough Ventilation of the Numerous Schemes Conducted by Wandering Canvassers, Together with the Various Advertising Dodges
for the Swindling of the Public, published in 1879 and attributed to an otherwise unknown author, Bates Harrington. Harrington claimed to have inside information on the atlas business, as an "intimate acquaintance" of Alfred T. Andreas, a leading publisher of maps, atlases and histories of midwestern counties. Since the author of How 'tis Done states his aim to be exposing "the many rascalities which are practiced daily," so that "the agents and frauds of every description, like the jealous Moor, find at last their occupation gone," it is clear that the book is a strongly biased source.

Fortunately, it is possible to check Harrington's descriptions and claims. Surviving prospectus material and newspaper accounts tend to corroborate his basic outline of the atlas canvassing campaign.

According to Harrington, a representative of the atlas company first tried to interest county newspapers and prominent citizens in the project, arranging for articles to be published on the subject. The firm of Everts, Ensign & Everts did just this in the late fall of 1875, in preparation for their atlas of Genesee County, New York. The publishers of the LeRoy Gazette, located in the county's second largest town, noted the visit of the Everts firm's "advance courier" in the issue of November 17, 1875;
they reported that the county Board of Supervisors had
given the atlas project their endorsement. The article
applied superlatives to the proposed atlas: the work would
"excell (sic) all others," be "the most complete and
exhaustive of any . . . ever seen," and the surveyors,
draftsmen and artists involved were to be "the most
talented and gifted." Two weeks later, the Gazette
published another article describing the proposed product
at length, proclaiming it to be "far in advance" of other
"so-called atlases." According to the Gazette, the Everts
work was to be "Perfectly Reliable." The leading newspaper
of the county seat, Batavia, also advised its readers to
give "hearty co-operation" to the atlas firm.

Once the support of the county's press had been
secured, several waves of canvassers covered the county,
according to Harrington. The first group persuaded
residents to subscribe to the atlas, which cost about ten
dollars. Another corps of canvassers followed, taking
orders for lithographic portraits and views of homes,
farms, stores, livestock and factories, which cost anywhere
from $25 to $250, depending on the size and subject. A
third group of canvassers offered to place biographical
sketches of residents in the atlas, at a charge of two-
and-a-half cents per word. All sales were secured by
contract, with payment deferred until completion, several months after the orders were taken. Other company representatives travelled the county to add details to the United States Land Office maps, and staff artists produced the sketches on which the contracted lithographs would be based. 27

A surviving prospectus for the Genesee County atlas tends to corroborate Harrington's description of the campaign. 28 The prospectus appealed to property owners, with a claim that the atlas would prove valuable to "every permanent resident" of the county. It emphasized the endorsement of "a number of [the] most enterprising citizens," the long experience of the company, the "intrinsic value and practical utility" of the work, the need for lithographic views to "indicate the improvements . . . the wealth and enterprise of the community," and the inclusion of historical and statistical material. The prospectus appealed to local pride, encouraging "a local interest in a work which is bound to give a truthful representation of your county." The atlas would, furthermore, be "at once ornamental and entertaining," and a "souvenir for the parlor or library." 29
Discussing the price, the prospectus made the atlas sound more like a public service than a commercial venture: "All must have equal rights to the privilege of [seeing their home or business illustrated], ... but such drawings MUST BE SELF-SUSTAINING."\textsuperscript{30}

Harrington's explanation of the success of county atlases should be kept in mind throughout the study that follows. He felt that the atlases were useful only to a small group of real estate agents, bankers and government officials. The key to large sales of atlases, according to Harrington, was "a natural desire in men and women to do as their neighbors do." Thus, the subscription list was self-perpetuating, for as Harrington said, when "the canvasser comes along and shows the name of this or that person, who, perhaps, has ample wealth to afford [an atlas], the poorer man at once feels that it will make a good impression if his name goes along with the rest."\textsuperscript{31} The canvassing system thus made subscription to the atlas a matter of conspicuous consumption that appealed to both the well-to-do and the poor, according to Harrington. The atlas on the parlor table was thus a minor status symbol, which also happened to be "exceedingly valuable to some and wholly worthless to others" as a collection of maps.\textsuperscript{32} The
remainder of the present work discusses the ways in which historians may fall into the former category and not the latter.
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The usefulness of the county atlas lithograph as an historical source depends on the degree of accuracy with which it portrays its subject. If the scholar studying the built environment of the 1870s, or farmstead layouts, or house types popular in the given area cannot rely on the accuracy of an atlas lithograph, then such evidence must be viewed with skepticism. If the extent to which lithographs accurately depicted their subjects can be determined, then this source of information can be used with confidence in future research. If the atlases were accurate in many respects, the evidence would be useful in one way; if systematic inaccuracies were uncovered, then this information might be useful in other ways—for example, in a study of commercial lithographic practices of the period, or in a study of the self-image of rural Americans.

The need for an assessment of the accuracy of these lithographs flows from contemporary accounts of their production and sale, as well as from modern studies of
related kinds of prints. Ironically the primary source of information on atlas publishers of this period is also the primary critic of their accuracy. Bates Harrington complained of the atlas views that "many . . . looked no more like the places they were said to represent than they did like the capital at Washington." According to Harrington, this was sometimes encouraged by the "viewer," or lithograph salesman. In an imagined conversation with a farmer, Harrington's viewer says,

. . . any changes or improvements you may contemplate making in the future can be made in the sketch just as you dictate. . . . for instance, you would want that pile of wood near your house left out of the sketch, and the rubbish about the backyard, which you are about to cart off, should not appear.²

It seems natural that minor tidying-up such as that described would have occurred, but Harrington felt that greater inaccuracies were involved. When the farmer subscribed for a lithograph, Harrington wrote, "He beholds a magnificent villa rising from the shadows of his old, dilapidated house and barn, and mentally resolves on just what orders he will give the artist who is thus placed under his control."³
Harrington cites two specific cases of major inaccuracy. One, which was entirely the mistake of the atlas firm, concerned a well-to-do Midwestern banker, whose two-and-a-half story, vine-covered house was portrayed as a "two-story stone house" without the vines. Presumably this meant that the windows in the upper half-story were omitted.4

An even more extreme example of "building castles in the air" occurred in Iowa, according to Harrington:

A man living in Maquoketa, Iowa, a prominent man and large grain and stock dealer had a desirable lot, on which he intended, someday, to erect a fine mansion. He contracted for a view of his residence to be printed on the map of Jackson County. Between himself and the artist, a fine exterior was drawn. Mr. E. was going to fill in from this design, to suit the convenience of his family, before the map would be published. When the map did come, the citizens flocked to the spot where the 'palace' was reported to be located, but to see only a few piles of stone and an excavation for a cellar. Mr. E.'s finances had failed to connect . . . . the only thing for him to do was to visit some distant relatives until the people got through making sport of his 'visions of a home.'5

Although he did not claim that fabrication on this scale was frequent, Harrington did assert that "the atlases were filled with views of farms and towns that looked no more like the originals than Chinese letters look like English print."6
Modern scholars have also cautioned against accepting lithographic evidence too readily. Peter Marzio and Milton Kaplan, in an analysis of several lithographs of nineteenth century public monuments, warned that "too often lithography has been mistaken for a rudimentary stage of photography. It is, rather, a sophisticated, popular art form, which communicates facts and ideas in a curious and biased style."\(^7\)

John Reps, the foremost authority on American city views, has written that "artists also erred or practiced deliberate deception in drawing some of the vignettes that can be found around the borders of many views."\(^8\) Reps found, nevertheless, that confidence in the accuracy of [city] views is not misplaced in general.\(^9\)

Fortunately, a plausible fieldwork procedure exists which allows an historical assessment of lithographic accuracy in the atlases and, hence, of Harrington's claims. This procedure is made easier by the existence of the lithographs and contemporary local property maps together in the atlases. The procedure, the goal of which was to identify surviving illustrated farmsteads and determine the degree of accuracy of the lithographs, is described below.
First, photographs were taken of all illustrations of farmsteads in the atlases, and prints were made for use in the field. Farmstead locations were ascertained by matching names on the appropriate township and village maps with the names on the lithograph captions. These locations were marked on modern maps of the counties studied. The basic road structure has not changed much since the 1870s in the four counties studied, making this process relatively easy. A few owners' names could not be located definitively on the atlas maps, but such problems were extremely rare. In some cases, owners of illustrated farmsteads owned two or more parcels of land, yielding several potential locations for these farms.

Once the likely locations for the illustrated farms were marked on the contemporary county maps, a field search was undertaken. Identification of an atlas farmstead through such a search is in itself a statement of at least minimal accuracy on the part of the atlas publishers: they must have located the house correctly on the map, and/or correctly portrayed the basic form, siting, or other aspects of the structure at that location.
On the other hand, failure to locate a farmstead through the field survey does not necessarily imply inaccuracy in the lithographs, although this is one possibility. Other possible reasons for failure to locate a farmstead include destruction of the farmhouse and/or farm buildings since the 1870s, and alterations over time which render the farmstead unidentifiable. In areas that have undergone considerable residential, industrial or commercial development in the intervening century, destruction of illustrated farms is more likely to have occurred. The area around Batavia, Genesee County, and the area bordering the Delaware River in Salem County are particularly problematic in this respect. Since the chosen counties remain partly rural in character, however, the chances that many farmsteads had survived seemed good.

The degree to which the illustrations were correct also affects their usefulness. Systematic comparison of the lithographs with the actual farms yielded a more sophisticated assessment of accuracy. Categories of detail which might affect the degree of accuracy in a lithograph include: siting, or how the buildings fit into the landscape; construction materials; number of stories; fenestration details; location and types of wings and porches; roof types and chimney location; related
buildings; barn size, type, and materials; relationship between house and barn; and possibly details peculiar to a particular farmstead.

Of course, the absence of correlation is not proof of inaccuracy, since loss of structures and details over time contributes to statistical variation. However, the presence of such details certainly indicates a greater degree of accuracy on the part of the atlas companies.

One-hundred-seven farmsteads were illustrated in the 1876 Genesee County atlas. All but one were located on the atlas maps. Four others with known sites were found to have been destroyed, though others may also have been razed over the years. Thus, the maximum number of farmsteads which could have been found (i.e., no other farmsteads destroyed) was one-hundred-two. Sixty-two, or 60.8 percent, of the illustrated farmsteads were located. Table 1 shows the identification of illustrated farmsteads, town-by-town, in Genesee County. As noted above, Batavia has undergone a considerable amount of development in the twentieth century, which may explain the lower identification rate in that town.
Table 1
Town by Town Farmstead Identification
Genesee County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Illustrated Farms</th>
<th>Farms Poss. Identifiable</th>
<th>Farms Located (% of poss. identifiable farms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elba</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeRoy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62 (60.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***includes all farmsteads located on the atlas maps and not known to have been destroyed.
Twenty-six farmsteads were illustrated in the 1876 atlas of Salem and Gloucester counties. One farm could not be located on the atlas maps. Fifteen, or 57.7 percent, were found through fieldwork. Table 2 illustrates the town-by-town farmstead identification rates for these counties. Of the thirty farms located in the 1875 Lancaster County atlas, twenty-seven, or 90 percent, were found during fieldwork. Table 3 shows the township-by-township identification rate for the Lancaster County farms shown. For the three atlases combined, 104 of 158 (65.8 percent) of the illustrated farmsteads were found.

The initial identifications made in the field were subsequently refined through comparative analysis of the lithographs and photographs taken during fieldwork. This analysis checked twenty points of comparison between the 1876 and 1983 images, which are listed in Table 4. These points include general, and perhaps more permanent, criteria such as style and building relationships, as well as more specific, and in some cases, more ephemeral, details such as construction materials, fenestration details, and fence types.
Table 2
Farmstead Identification
Salem and Gloucester Counties\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Farms Sought</th>
<th>Farms Located (Percent Success)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsinboro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Penn's Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(now Pennsville)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilesgrove</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Alloways Creek</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(now Alloway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Penn's Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Pittsgrove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, Gloucester County</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Includes all farms located on 1876 atlas maps and not known to have been destroyed. List includes only towns with at least one farmstead illustrated in atlas. All towns in Salem County unless otherwise noted.

\textsuperscript{b}Three of these farms appeared in one lithograph.

Sources: Everts & Stewart, Salem & Gloucester Atlas; Fieldwork, 1983-84.
Table 3
Farmstead Identification
Lancaster County\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township or Borough</th>
<th>Farms Sought</th>
<th>Farms Located (Percent Success)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christiana Boro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colerain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Donegal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hempfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manheim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Joy Boro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadsbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Hempfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Iampeter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>27 (90%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Includes all farms located on 1875 atlas maps. List includes only towns and boroughs with at least one farmstead illustrated in atlas.

Sources: Everts & Stewart, Lancaster Atlas, 1875; Fieldwork, 1983-85.
Table 4

Farm Details: Frequency of Accurate Depiction

(104 farmsteads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail Type</th>
<th>Accurate Depictions (% of farmsteads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House roof type</td>
<td>88 (84.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stories</td>
<td>87 (83.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House style</td>
<td>85 (81.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bays, front</td>
<td>74 (71.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors, number &amp; placement, front</td>
<td>71 (68.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/barnyard relation</td>
<td>59 (56.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House addition types</td>
<td>55 (52.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House porch types</td>
<td>55 (52.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House construction materials</td>
<td>48 (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House addition, roof types</td>
<td>47 (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimneys, no. &amp; location, main section</td>
<td>39 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of bays, side</td>
<td>29 (27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn size (no. of levels)</td>
<td>22 (21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main barn, roof type</td>
<td>20 (19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main barn, location of main opening</td>
<td>14 (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main barn, construction materials</td>
<td>12 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House dependent outbuildings</td>
<td>6 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main barn, attached outbuildings</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence type, houseyard</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence type, barnyard/field</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this analysis, summarized in Table 4, show that the details most often confirmed to be accurate were associated with the farm house. Details of outbuildings, the barn and farmyard were confirmed less often. Again, such failures do not necessarily imply lithographic inaccuracy; in some cases, changes in agricultural practice may have rendered some outbuildings obsolete, leading to their absence on the modern landscape. In such cases, no statement on the accuracy of the specific lithographs involved with regard to these details can be made. Many farms had clearly modern outbuildings, making direct comparison with the lithographs impossible (Fig. 1). Nevertheless, the spatial relationship between the farmhouse and the barnyard could be confirmed on 48.1 percent of the farmsteads, including some on which new barns have been built.

The details most likely to be accurately depicted included both specific details, such as roof type and number of stories, and general characteristics, such as style. None of the farmsteads had all twenty characteristics correctly portrayed, partly because the orientation of the artist toward the house varied, making it impossible to see all of these details in each lithograph; for example, many did not show the side of a
Figure 1a. Lithograph of W. H. Slater farm, 1876.

Figure 1b. Photograph of Slater farm, 1983. Note placement of modern outbuildings in same location as old barns.
house clearly enough for a comparison of the number of bays on the side, and other details, such as chimneys, were sometimes obscured by trees.

The details least likely to be confirmed were fences. Again, this can be attributed largely to changes in agricultural and domestic use of fences over the past century. In the 1870s, farmers were only beginning to use barbed wire fencing. During the following century, more traditional fencing was replaced by barbed wire, which was, in many cases, itself replaced by electric wire fencing later. Houseyard fences have also experienced change. In the late nineteenth century, fencing the yard went out of fashion, and many fences were removed at that time.\(^{10}\)

Construction materials were confirmed as accurate in almost half of the cases. This figure is significant, for in many other cases, confirmation was impossible, because the lithograph simply did not include such detail. There were no confirmed inaccuracies in this respect, as Harrington might lead one to expect. When the artists and lithographers depicted a construction material, they were apt to be correct. Most cases in which no material was specified involved houses which turned out to be frame structures with clapboard siding.
Overall, Table 4 suggests a relatively high degree of accuracy in these details. Of the twenty characteristics tested, ten were found to be accurate in 45 percent or more of the cases, despite the likelihood of change over time in many of these details.

Another way of analysing this information is to calculate the number of farmsteads with specific numbers of lithographic characteristics confirmed as accurate. As the graph in Figure 2 shows, most identifiable farmsteads were accurate in at least nine of the details tested. This suggests that Everts' sketchers paid close attention to details of the farms they drew, and that the lithographers in Philadelphia were competent in translating these sketches onto zinc plates or stone. These results suggest that one can look at a given lithograph as substantially correct, rather than simply as evidence of certain types of detail.

Detailed examination of several farmsteads reveals the extent to which this is true in individual cases. Many elements shown in the lithograph of the William B. Carpenter farm in the Salem and Gloucester atlas were confirmed in the 1984 photographs of the Elsinboro, New Jersey, site. (Figs. 3, 4) The yard is now overgrown, but
Figure 2

Number of Farmsteads by Number of Accurate Details

Sources: See Table 4.
Figure 3. Wm. Carpenter farm, Elsinboro, Salem County, New Jersey. Lithograph, Everts & Stewart, 1876.

Figure 4. Wm. Carpenter farm. Photograph by the author, 1984. Note ruins of barn through trees at right.
several surviving buildings were illustrated accurately in their form, details, and relationship to other structures. The house, a two-and-a-half story, five-bay Italianate dwelling with four chimneys, a partial front porch and a low-pitched hip roof topped with a 'widow's walk,' appears today substantially as it was shown in the atlas. The wide shed or carriage barn to the right of the house has survived. The smaller section of a shed in the foreground also appears in the modern photograph. Only the portion of the main barn closest to the house remains standing, but even this fragment confirms the correctness of the atlas illustration in its profile and location. The small shed between the carriage shed and the house also remains standing.

The Carpenter farmstead was depicted faithfully in the atlas. As an illustration of an ensemble of related buildings, this lithograph can be trusted. Fence types and landscaping can not be confirmed, but given the otherwise faithful rendering, the picture may be considered substantially correct.

The farmstead of Abial Gardner of Stafford, New York, was shown in the Genesee County atlas. (Figs. 5, 6) The five-bay Georgian farmhouse with a one-story ell is
Figure 5. A. Gardner farm, Stafford, New York. Lithograph, Everts, Ensign & Everts, 1875.

Figure 6. Gardner farm. Photograph by the author, 1983.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
correctly shown set back slightly from the road, with a
cluster of farm buildings behind it and to the left,
forming a long, rectangular yard. Several of the
outbuildings which faced this yard in the 1876 lithograph
have survived. The first structure along the yard on the
left is a small one-story frame building with two windows
facing the road and one in the end gable. The modern
photograph confirms the accuracy of the artist in the
location, form, construction materials and fenestration of
this building. Several small buildings fill the space
between this structure and the main barn in the lithograph.
Similar buildings are sited in this area today, though the
visual evidence does not permit confirmation that they are
the same buildings there in 1876. A large barn with its
long axis parallel to the road is visible in both pictures
behind the smaller outbuildings. If the artist drew the
building correctly for the atlas, major changes have
occurred. A lean-to on one side of the barn in the
lithograph is not visible in the photograph, and the
current building has a gambrel roof in contrast with the
gable roof shown in the atlas. Gambrel-roofed barns did
not become popular until after the atlas was published, so
the current configuration may be a result of reconstruction
or even replacement of the barn shown in the atlas.
Finally, another barn, with its gable-end facing the road, appears at the back of the yard in both pictures. The building in the photograph seems somewhat larger, though this is difficult to determine.

On the whole, the Everts view of the Gardner farmstead is accurate. The house and farm buildings were located and detailed correctly, insofar as can be determined.

The house on the A. D. Mills farm in Elba, New York, shows signs of modernization in the 1983 photograph: new picture windows and shingled walls. However, the general outline of the house is identical to that shown in the 1876 view: a one-and-a-half story, gable-roofed house with a one-story linear addition and a one-story ell. (Figs. 7, 8)

On the Mills farm, the main barn, barn year, and the lay of the land are of greatest interest. The location, size and fenestration of the barn matches almost exactly in the two pictures, as do the construction materials. The barnyard is correctly shown in the lithograph between the barn and the junction of two roads in the foreground. A major difference is in the roof type. Since everything else about the barn in the photo matches the lithograph,
Figure 7. Ancil D. Mills farm, Elba, New York. Lithograph, Everts, Ensign & Everts, 1876.

Figure 8. Mills farm. Photograph by the author, 1983.
one can assume that the present gambrel roof replaced the gable roof with Victorian cupola in renovations subsequent to the atlas publication. The gradual slope of the road from the house down to the intersection is also clear in the lithograph; the wide meeting of the roads depicted in 1876 has also survived to the present day.

The Orlando T. Hoyt farmstead, also in Elba, was drawn quite correctly. (Figs. 9, 10) The upright-and-wing house, with a rear ell, was placed correctly in front of the three barn buildings. The details, including pilasters on the corners of the house, and a round window on a barn gable, are visible in both pictures. Again, the gambrel roof in the photograph probably represents a post-1876 renovation, and the silo in the photograph would have been a later addition. Even the fences on the far left of the photo seem to follow the lines of the fence in the lithograph, though the modern fencing is a different type.

In sketching the Charles B. Moore farm in Sadsbury, Lancaster County, the atlas sketcher produced a work of great accuracy. (Figs. 11, 12) Comparing the lithograph with a modern photograph in this case yields few differences that are not clearly modern features. The sloping drive, the house sitting atop a terrace, and the
Figure 9. Orlando T. Hoyt farm, Elba, New York. Lithograph, Everts, Ensign & Everts, 1876.

Figure 10. Hoyt farm. Photograph by the author, 1983.
Figure 11. Charles B. Moore farm, Sadsbury, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Lithograph, Everts, Ensign & Everts, 1875.

Figure 12. Moore farm. Photograph by the author, 1984.
large barn complex across the drive are immediately identifiable. The low barn in the front of the barn complex in the photo appears to be fairly new, but it was located in exactly the same way as a barn in the lithograph. Otherwise the only differences in this area are minor: a slightly different roof line and the appearance of silos. The fenestration of the house was illustrated correctly, as was the arrangement of porches.

In the lithograph, a small creek can be seen running across the drive; this is Williams Run, from which the road past the farm takes its name, and it is also visible in the photograph, running through a pasture and under the drive.

At the left of the photo is a small outbuilding constructed during 1983 and 1984. When I first visited this farm in 1983, the foundations of the small outbuilding shown at the far left of the 1875 view were still visible. In the lithograph, an apparently separate house is partially visible behind the main house. This does not appear in the modern view. In the 1870 census, the three families enumerated immediately following the Moores were headed by landless farm laborers, two white and one black. Combining the evidence of the census with the visual evidence of the lithograph, one concludes that Moore may well have housed the laborers in this building just behind his own house.
Overall, the Moore farm, now in the hands of an Amish family, is a remarkable testimony not only to the accuracy of county atlas lithographs, but also to the survival of the rural nineteenth-century landscape in Lancaster County.

The residence of Dr. David Mellinger in Manor Township, Lancaster County, illustrates the shortcomings of a purely visual assessment of accuracy in atlas lithographs. (Figs. 13, 14, 15) Comparing modern photographs with the atlas vignette, the barn seems to have been accurately drawn and placed in the picture, but the clutter of small buildings to the right of the barn today do not appear in the lithograph. More disconcerting is the difference in roof lines between the two views. The photograph shows a two-and-a-half story house with a long, two story ell, while the atlas depicted a house typical of the Lancaster County landscape: apparently two stories in front, with a steeply-pitched roof, but three stories with a flat roof behind this. Fortunately, a descendant of Dr. Mellinger still lives next door. She was able to describe changes to the property in this century which explain these major differences in the two views. Miss Mellinger also produced a sheaf of ten off-prints of the lithograph, confirming that the subscriber received several loose copies in addition to the view bound into the atlas.12
Figure 13. Dr. David Mellinger property, Manor Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Lithograph, Everts, Ensign & Everts, 1875.
Figure 14. Mellinger house. Photograph by the author, 1985.

Figure 15. Mellinger barn, house in background. Photograph by the author, 1985.
Some atlas views did contain distortions of reality, many of which seem to be the result of trying to fit as many buildings as possible into a small space. It was frequently necessary to use a wide-angle lens to get the same elements of a farmstead that appeared in an atlas view into a modern photograph (See Figs. 8, 10, 12). Another apparent distortion occurred in the vignette of Rena Spickler's farm in Penn Township, Lancaster County (Figs. 16, 17). Mrs. Spickler paid for only one-quarter of a page, and the sketcher was forced to squeeze the house and a small attached building into the space. The small wing and the porch that connected it to the main house were drawn accurately, but the house itself looks smaller than it actually was. Despite the pine trees blocking the facade in the print, I believe that the lithograph does show a seven-bay house with a centered door, but with dimensions altered to suit the available space.

The results of this search for surviving farmsteads illustrated in county atlases clearly refute Bates Harrington's claims of widespread inaccuracy in county atlas lithographs. Harrington may have cited actual examples of incompetence in his book, but this study found a high degree of accuracy among a large number of atlas views. Based on the evidence discussed here, one can say
Figure 16. Rena Spickler residence, Penn Township, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Lithograph, Everts & Stewart, 1875.

Figure 17. Spickler residence. Photograph by the author, 1985.
that Harrington faithfully described the sales campaign of
the atlas publishers, but that he was not right in
dismissing the products of that campaign as inaccurate.

In casting doubt on the reliability of several
lithographs of public monuments of the mid-nineteenth
century, Marzio and Kaplan wrote

In order to assess the objectivity of any
print, its social purpose must be carefully
determined. Similarly, it is instructive to
learn whether it was commissioned by an
interested party or whether it was
produced by the lithographer directly . . . .

I have assessed the objectivity of county atlas lithographs
by another means, first-hand inspection of the artifacts
involved: the lithographs and the landscapes portrayed in
them. Considered from Marzio's and Kaplan's viewpoint,
county atlas vignettes were clearly commissioned by
interested parties. The results for the county atlas genre
were quite different than those from the Marzio and Kaplan
study. The latter found that the involvement of interested
parties caused lithographs to be published of subjects that
did not exist. The farmers who subscribed for county atlas
lithographs seem to have wanted views that, to be sure,
showed their property favorably, but that were also
accurate. In this respect, the atlas views are more akin
to bird's-eye views of cities and towns than to views of
famous structures or civic sculpture. Reps' description of urban views as "flattering, carefully posed, and retouched portraits rather than completely candid records of reality" applies to county atlas views as well.\textsuperscript{14}

What might these biases mean for the scholar using county atlas lithographs as historical sources? One should not expect atlas vignettes to show the clutter of everyday life or evidence that a structure was poorly maintained. If these qualifications are kept in mind, then the atlas views can be relied upon by the researcher.
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CHAPTER THREE

The atlas subscribers depicted in How 'tis Done shared one important trait: a susceptibility to the canvasser's pitch. Beyond this, Harrington described a cross-section of the population as likely customers: bankers, attorneys, real estate agents, small businessmen, well-to-do, middling, and poor farmers. He suggested that among the gullible were persons who would find the atlas useful in their businesses, some for whom the book was an ornament for the parlor, and some who could not rationally justify paying the price of an atlas. The evidence presented earlier showed that Harrington was incorrect in his assessment of the accuracy of the atlas views. In this chapter, the subscribers to the atlas views will be studied in an effort to place the artifacts in context, and to determine whose environment was shown in the vignettes. In the process, it will be possible to see whether the subscribers were drawn from as broad a socioeconomic spectrum as claimed by Harrington.
The format of the atlases allows the modern historian to link the visual evidence of the atlas maps and views with census, tax, and other records. The subscribers can be located spatially on the maps; their socioeconomic condition can be determined from manuscript census and tax material. Further information can be obtained from biographical works and from the atlas subscriber directories. A combination of these sources clearly illuminates the circumstances of view subscribers.

Several of these sources have been used to describe the farmers who subscribed for vignettes in the atlases analyzed above. While each of the linkages shed light on the audience for the atlas views, they are intended to be suggestive, rather than comprehensive.

An investigation of the occupations of vignette subscribers was undertaken to determine whether most, or all, of these persons were full-time farmers. The subscriber directories, titled "Business Directory" in these atlases, listed the occupation of each subscriber, presumably as provided by the customer.
In Salem and Gloucester counties, all twenty-four subscribers studied were listed as farmers in the atlas directory. Nineteen were listed only in this way, while two were also listed as millers; three described themselves additionally as "stock raiser" or "stock dealer."  

In Genesee County, 99 of the 103 subscribers to farm views had their occupations listed in the directory. Sixty-one were listed simply as farmers. Eighty-four were either active in, or retired from, exclusively agricultural pursuits, and this total jumped to 90 when those whose additional listings were for local governmental positions, such as constable or overseer of the poor, were included. Several others combined farming with milling, canning, shoemaking, or the manufacture of cider. A minister at Byron and the postmaster at Oakfield were also farmers. Only three were not linked directly to tillage or stock raising. 

In contrast with these findings, examination of the Lancaster County atlas directory revealed fewer farmers living on the apparent farmsteads illustrated, and even fewer who were farmers to the exclusion of other work. For Lancaster County, the occupations listed in
the atlas were compared, when possible, with the subscriber's occupation listed in the 1870 federal census. The resulting list showed that over one-quarter of the subscribers for "farm views" in this atlas had no direct agricultural occupation. These included the following occupations: capitalist, merchant miller, rifle manufacturer, hotelkeeper, agricultural implement manufacturer, retail lumber merchant, physician, and iron works proprietor.\textsuperscript{4}

Only 12 (40 percent) of the subscribers to farm views in Lancaster County were listed exclusively in agricultural pursuits. Others combined farming with a variety of other occupations, including capitalist, land speculator, coal dealer, bank president, brickyard operator, tobacco dealer, and drover. While the significance of this distribution is uncertain, it is clear that one can not automatically assume that a farm-like landscape in an atlas vignette was owned by a full-time farmer. Manufacturing developments in Lancaster City and County during the mid-19th century may have produced a group of industrialists who purchased farms as summer homes, or who retained a family farm after farming ceased to be the family's primary occupation.\textsuperscript{5}
Comparison of 1870 and 1880 federal census averages with acreages held by farm view subscribers in Lancaster County showed that Lancaster farm views in the 1875 atlas were paid for by property owners, most (60.8 percent) of whom owned farms larger than the state and Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) averages of 103 acres, 32 percent owned farms of less than 103 acres. These proportions were reversed when the Lancaster acreages were compared with the 1870 national average of 153 acres for farms, with thirty-two percent above the mean acreage.6

By 1880, the federal census showed declines in the average acreage of farms in Pennsylvania to 93 acres, in the Middle Atlantic region to 95 acres, and nationally to 134 acres. The 1875 acreages of the atlas lithograph subscribers in Lancaster County placed 76 percent above the 1880 state and regional averages, 24 percent below. Forty percent owned farms in 1875 which were larger than the 1880 national average, while 60 percent were below this figure.7

Comparisons were made between the tax records of Genesee County towns for the atlas publication year, 1876, and the average farm values and acreages from the
1880 United States Census. The majority of farmers who paid for lithographs had farms that were both larger and more valuable than the averages for New York state, the Middle Atlantic region, and the nation. The national average value of $2,544 per farm was exceeded by over four-fifths of the Genesee lithograph subscribers, despite the fact that 45.6 percent of the farms were smaller than the national average size of 134 acres. Sixty-one percent of the lithograph subscribers' farms were more valuable than the average New York state farm, and almost as many, 56 percent, exceeded the average size for the three-state region. These figures also indicate that a significant minority of the lithograph subscribers owned farms of less-than-average value within the state and region.  

Many factors affected the price of a farm view. According to Harrington, the most important was size, though specialized subjects, such as portraits, also had an impact. A larger lithograph allowed more features, greater detail, better perspective and greater accuracy. However, no correlation was found between the relative prosperity of individual subscribers and the size of views.
At a time when farm sizes in the Northeast had begun to shrink, over three-fourths of the subscribing Genesee County farmers owned farms larger than either the state or Middle Atlantic regional average.\textsuperscript{10}

These comparisons indicate that a majority of the farmers who paid to have their farms illustrated in the Genesee County atlas would have been considered prosperous and substantial at that time. The evidence of the Lancaster County view subscribers' occupational listings suggest that, in at least some cases, the farms illustrated were owned by non-farmers, including manufacturers and professionals. Although a significant group of less prosperous individuals also paid for such illustrations, it seems unlikely that many purchasers were poor, as Harrington implied. All whose farms were shown owned land, but within the group varying degrees of prosperity were represented. The county atlas illustration can not be characterized as a "democratic art form."\textsuperscript{11} The "victims," as Harrington would have characterized them, of the view salesmen were all property owners, albeit a somewhat diverse group of property owners.
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5 Ibid. See Thomas Winnpenny, Industrial Progress and Human Welfare.


7 Ibid.


9 Harrington, How 'tis Done, 38, 53-54.

10 Ibid.

11 This is Marzio's designation for popular chromolithography in the nineteenth century. See "The Democratic Art of Chromolithography in America: an Overview," in Art & Commerce: American Prints of the
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Nineteenth Century (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1978). Reps, Views and Viewmakers, 4, also uses the term "democratic art form in reference to city views because "they reflected conditions in urban places of all types throughout the country." By this standard, too, the atlas views were not "democratic," since they showed only the farms of property owners. Also, purchase of one atlas, together with subscription for a small view cost about $32, or at least six times more than one city view, based on figures in Harrington and Reps.
CHAPTER FOUR

AFTERWORD

Any artifact that can be provided with association in space and time, either by being accompanied by a document or better— as with gravestones or buildings— by being set into the land, is a valuable source of a great quantity of information.  
Henry Glassie

This study has assessed a potentially powerful but little-used source of information on the landscape of a large part of North America in the latter half of the nineteenth century. County atlas lithographs appear to be artifacts firmly anchored in space and time, linked closely to the buildings and landscapes they depicted, as well as to the subscribers who paid for them. But before the vast number of lithographs within county atlases could be used systematically as historical sources, it was necessary to establish whether, and to what degree, the prints actually related to the scenes they purported to depict. It was necessary to prove or disprove the
claims of carelessness and deception levelled against the atlas companies by the major period source on county atlases, Bates Harrington.

It was shown that the lithographs are basically reliable as depictions of middle-class farm environments of the late nineteenth century. This reliability depends upon the researcher's recognition of the special qualities of the views, notably their tendency to squeeze as many buildings as possible into the space available, and the imperative for the sketchers to draw their subjects in a manner approved by the customers.

What value is there in the knowledge that county atlas publishers produced accurate vignettes of rural landscapes and townscapes? The answer lies in the ways in which the atlas prints can now be used in other studies.

Reliable atlas views should be useful to researchers in a number of disciplines. Historians who venture into the subject of the material environment in studies of community, agriculture, or the family might find the views a good source of information. However, those who are already attuned to studying the landscape—here I would include cultural geographers, landscape
historians, folklorists, historical archaeologists, and students of academic and vernacular architecture—are the most likely to integrate the evidence of the county atlases into their research. Indeed, some of these scholars recognized the potential of the atlases long ago. The apparent failure to follow up this recognition with serious work was a major motivation for the present thesis.

How could students of the settlement landscape—a general term which I would apply to researchers in all of the fields mentioned above—make use of the atlas views? Of forty-five research areas listed by geographer Allen G. Noble as requiring significant study by such scholars, at least eight could make good use of the evidence available in county atlases. They are listed in Table 5, together with suggestions for how county atlases might contribute to the studies.

The atlases' unit of organization, the county, lends itself to regional studies of the settlement landscape, yet provides a basis for comparison of results with other regions throughout eastern North America. Questions which might be asked in such county studies include: how typical were atlas subscribers' homes,
### Table 5
Research Projects Using County Atlas Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Use of Atlases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relation between Dutch-derived buildings in New York/New Jersey hearth and southwestern Michigan</td>
<td>Atlas views could provide visual links; census data on subscribers could also provide ties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Study of the common &quot;Cornbelt Cube&quot; house type.</td>
<td>Survey of midwestern atlas views a first step in search for type's origins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A study of the upright-and-wing house, one of the most important dwellings of the eastern Midwest.</td>
<td>Same as 2. Detailed analysis of subscribers who owned such houses. They were very common in the Genesee County atlas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot;A series of regional studies of academic architectural style&quot; to &quot;broaden our understanding of the geographical distribution and local impact of nineteenth century architecture.&quot;</td>
<td>Atlas data should be ideal for such studies of influence, because of the large numbers of views and the precise location of the sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Study of the geographical distribution of hay hoods and hanging gables.</td>
<td>This and the four following topics could benefit from use of the atlases because such features are frequently shown in atlas farmstead views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A study of the &quot;hitherto-ignored&quot; subject of barn types in the Midwest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Full-study of the origins of the gable-entry banked barn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Studies of secondary or outbuildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Noble, Wood, Brick & Stone, pp. 168-70; atlases cited earlier in the thesis.
farms and other structures of the county's architecture as a whole? does the evidence of the vignettes change our knowledge of a region's architecture? is the architecture of the upper-middle/middle-class milieu of the atlas views distinctive when compared to the buildings of the county as a whole?

Another use of the views would be a study of changes in architectural ornament over time. In many cases, ornamentation was confirmed to have been accurately depicted, as illustrated by the porch posts on the Col. H. B. Olmsted house in Genesee County (Figs. 18, 19). But in many cases, ornamentation shown in the vignettes was no longer present. Using the atlas views and photographs over a period of time to the present, one could document and analyze changing approaches to ornamenting the home and other structures. Similar studies could be undertaken of changes in fencing methods and outbuildings, and of persistence of barn and outbuilding location over time.

A large project that would make the evidence of the atlas lithographs more accessible for scholars wishing to compare a large number of views would be a compilation of a checklist of atlas views like that
Figure 18. H. B. Olmsted farm, Batavia, New York. Lithograph, Everts, Ensign & Everts, 1876.

Figure 19. Olmsted farm. Photograph by the author, 1983.
produced by John Reps for urban views. Such a project would be much more difficult than the list of urban views and their makers, because there were many more atlas vignettes published than urban views. However, their detail and specificity would make them as valuable as urban views, were they as fully known.

It is to be hoped that county atlas views will become an accepted resource for scholars of the historical settlement landscape. They are valuable as data as well as illustration, and will reveal much information on the environment of rural and small-town America of the nineteenth century, if they are asked.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1Henry Glassie, Folk Housing in Middle Virginia (Knoxville: University of Tenessee Press, 1975), 12.
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