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I began this project with a series of assumptions. Believing New Jersey's early eighteenth-century dwellings to reflect the diverse cultures of its first settlers, changes in these buildings, I surmised, would reflect cultural shifts as the disparate population merged to form a uniquely American society. My initial search sought evidence in framing details, building materials, and room arrangements. To my surprise, the dwellings I examined not only lacked the structural features I was looking for, but were actually late eighteenth-century buildings or additions to early nineteenth-century structures.

I shifted my efforts to analyze why these houses survived only from the late eighteenth century and to understand what forces caused them to change over time. Using the buildings as my primary evidence, the answers challenged my notions of what constituted an eighteenth-century dwelling in Hopewell Township and revealed an architectural reorganization of domestic space that occurred at the turn of the nineteenth century as farmers entered the modern era.
My initial research relied on the work of others. A 1984-85 architectural survey of Hopewell Township prepared by Heritage Studies, Inc., provided the starting point. This resource included all the information necessary to begin a study of the region's architectural and social history and to establish a sample of eighteenth-century dwellings. With access to the research on Hopewell's early deeds compiled by Betsy Errickson and Pam Caine, I was able to complete a number of title searches and house histories. The New Jersey State Archives also proved an invaluable resource for early deeds, maps, probate records, and mortgages. Finally, a review of newspaper advertisements and room-by-room probate inventories from Hopewell and adjacent townships helped corroborate dates, personal wealth, and family relationships while placing the buildings in their historical context.

The story to emerge chronicled a period of unprecedented building; but it is a story of people as much as it is of dwellings. Tax records helped to link farmers, wealth, and houses into a coherent order. Since tax lists enumerating building materials were unavailable, I reached into the adjoining township in Pennsylvania, where a tax list for Upper Makefield Township, Bucks County, recorded invaluable information on houses, barns, and tenements.
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ABSTRACT

Beginning in the 1750s, folk builders and farmers in Hopewell Township, Mercer County, New Jersey began to construct durable housing of four distinct traditional types of one, two, three, and four rooms. Issues of land ownership, agricultural production, and the rise of a market economy permitted their construction, and, not surprisingly, the first to build durable farmhouses possessed considerable political, economic, and agricultural power. These dwellings helped landowners define the world around them by meeting their traditional economic, social, and cultural priorities. In the post-revolutionary period, these houses underwent a spatial and functional transformation as owners used a local module of construction equal to the traditional one-room house to create buildings consisting of a large main block with separate entry and an attached service wing. Ultimately, the transformation signaled changing social and economic attitudes about public and private space, form and function.
INTRODUCTION

Vinson Runyon knew the necessity of the task before him. First elected Hopewell's constable in 1742 and reelected six years running, he understood the importance of wealth and property, as did his assistant, Andrew Smith. Perhaps no one in Hopewell grasped the meaning of wealth and property more readily than Andrew Smith, who possessed considerable amounts of each. He served at various times as a freeholder for the district and, with his extended family, dominated political life in the township. Smith's holdings exceeded even those of the man whose estate he and Runyon were about to inventory.

The decedent, John Hunt, passed away in September of 1748, but it was now the first of October—harvest time. Cattle were fat. Hay still sat stacked in the dead farmer's fields. Both the rye and wheat crops were safely away, but the oats remained only partially stored in the barn. Plenty of work remained undone.

The two men began their task by inventorying John Hunt's personal effects. His wearing apparel, purse, beds and bedding,
three chests, warming pan, twenty-eight cheese wheels, nine chairs, Bible, cane, and nine pounds sterling worth of linen and woolen cloth made a handsome tally. After noting a slave named Dinah, and valuing her at sixty pounds, the two court-appointed appraisers moved outdoors to the detached kitchen. Here they found the usual cooking utensils, pewter and earthenware, together with a few fineries, including a brass kettle and glassware. The slave Dinah slept on a mat in the kitchen chamber, which they duly noted along with sheets, an old table, woolen yarn, a side saddle, spare bed curtains, deerskins, a hatchel, and quantities of bran and rye.

But Runyon and Smith had neglected to check the chamber of the master's own dwelling. Returning, they climbed the stairs and noted two woolen and one linen spinning wheel, buckwheat, flax seed, wool cards, old scythes, casks, and lumber. They listed each item and, before leaving for the cellar, carefully labeled these goods as "in the Great House chamber."¹

John Hunt's mid-eighteenth-century "Great House" amounted to little more than a one room dwelling with a cellar and chamber above. The farm also enjoyed a complement of barns, hay barracks, and a full kitchen removed from the main dwelling. Yet, like most of his prosperous contemporaries, Hunt's modest dwelling signified something distinct and superior over others in the region. It
constituted nothing less than a mansion house. But between 1750 and 1820, this type of traditional rural New Jersey farmstead underwent a spatial and functional transformation. New kitchen wings, attached to the gable ends of houses, coupled with the widespread acceptance of the Georgian house-type, were perhaps the two most visible results of this change. The combination won such speedy and widespread acceptance that by 1817 William Cobbett on a journey through Lancaster, Pennsylvania, noted:

The houses consist without exception, of a considerably large and very neat house, with sash windows, and of a small house, which seems to have been tacked on to the large one; and, the proportion they bear to each other,...is as nearly as possible, the proportion in size between a cow and her calf.

Today a familiar sight on the landscape, the combination of a little wing attached to a larger dwelling became the house-type of choice in rural central New Jersey during the nineteenth century and was both the product of tradition and a symbol of change.

The surviving dwellings in Hopewell Township, Mercer County, New Jersey, record not only architectural changes, but the patterns of choice people make in creating their dwellings. The historian Henry Glassie demonstrates that a building's form--its arrangement of rooms--reveals much about the way people occupy, use, and alter living space. By examining the forms of eighteenth-century dwellings in Hopewell, we can learn how folk builders confronted and adapted to changes in the world around
them. The traditional house-types in Hopewell responded in
traditional ways to patterns of life and work. What were these
traditional house-types, such as John Hunt's "Great House," really
like? What forces led to their creation? More importantly,
alterations to these buildings were the result of fundamental
changes in society. What were these changes, and how were they
reflected in the dwellings? What forces in the eighteenth century
led people to re-think their traditional way of building and
occupying space?
EARLY SETTLEMENT

Colonial settlement patterns and geography help put people and buildings in context. Through much of its early history, New Jersey existed as a divided province. Shareholders known as proprietors originally governed their respective Eastern and Western provinces until New Jersey became a crown colony in 1702. One proprietor named Daniel Coxe of London owned huge parcels of land in both Jerseys, including the tract of about 31,000 acres in West Jersey known as "Hopewell" and purchased on 20 October 1685 from Thomas Sadler and Edward Billings.5

The modern boundaries of Hopewell closely follow those originally surveyed for Coxe by Daniel Leeds in 1688 and include the Delaware River to the west and the division line between East and West Jersey to the east. The northern boundary follows the distinctively stepped survey line dividing Hopewell and Amwell Townships first laid out for Coxe in 1688 (figure 1). To the south, Hopewell borders Jacob's Creek and parts of Lawrenceville (formerly Maidenhead), Princeton, and Ewing Townships.6
Hopewell straddles the area known as the Piedmont Plateau. New Jersey contains five distinct topographical regions. These include the Outer Coastal Plain, the Inner Coastal Plain, the Piedmont Plateau, the Highlands, and the Ridge and Valley Section. The Piedmont region accounts for about one-fifth of New Jersey's total area and lies between the Highlands to the north and the Inner Coastal Plain to the south. This fertile, agriculturally productive area accounts for Hopewell's combination of flatlands in the southern half of the township, and the gently rolling hills and valleys in the north.

The Piedmont region stretches diagonally across the state from the Hudson River to the Upper Falls of the Delaware River and on into Bucks and Chester Counties, Pennsylvania. The Delaware and Raritan rivers provided semi-navigable routes up into the region, and the original Indian trails running between these two rivers crossed New Jersey through the Piedmont. The trails in turn became major roads linking the European settlements of Philadelphia and New York and were significant conduits for settlement in the region.

Hopewell's lands first opened for settlement early in the 1690s, and though a mixture of English, Dutch, Scots-Irish and German immigrants settled New Jersey along the Delaware River, the settlers of Hopewell came originally from Long Island, Middletown,
New Jersey, and the Hudson River Valley and were often first- or second- generation American-born descendants of immigrants to the New Netherlands. Although located hard on the Delaware River, apparently very little Germanic influence reached Hopewell from Pennsylvania during this early period of settlement. However, of the settlers entering the New Netherlands, almost 50 percent originated outside the Netherlands with German, French, and Spanish Netherlands heritages. Many Germans, therefore, emigrated with the Dutch and settled in the New Netherlands before moving into Bergen and Morris Counties and up the Raritan River into Central New Jersey. This might explain the differences between contemporary dwellings constructed on both sides of the Delaware and suggests that even though Hopewell and adjacent Upper Makefield, Pennsylvania, shared common typographies, building materials, and architectural developments, the house forms in each township derived from distinctly different ethnic and cultural traditions. At the very least, it demonstrates how formidable natural and political barriers like the Delaware River could be during early settlement and shows how, by first constructing tight local studies such as this, we can better assess regional cultural processes.

While some early settlers, therefore, possessed German roots, families of Anglo origin, like the Hunts, Harts, Smiths, and Stillwells, accounted for the bulk of Hopewell's first
farmers. Indeed, estimates of the origins of all of New Jersey's eighteenth-century inhabitants suggests that by 1790 almost three-quarters of the population originated from the British Isles. Only about 20 percent were of Dutch extraction with the remaining 11 percent made up of German, French, and Swedish immigrants. In Hunterdon County, where Hopewell was located during the eighteenth century, the distributions ranked similarly. English, Welsh, Scots, Scots-Irish, and Irish settlers accounted for 60 percent of the total population there, while the Dutch represented just 19 percent and the Germans only 16 percent. The remaining 5 percent included the French and Swedish.

This diverse population brought a number of different churches to the area. The Stouts founded the Baptist Church in Hopewell in 1715 at the home of Jonathan Stout, one of the original settlers. Presbyterian congregations were formed in Maidenhead (now Lawrenceville) and Pennington in the early 1720s. The nearest Dutch Reformed Churches were established in Belle Mead in 1727 and in Harlingen in 1751.

Hopewell's record of ethnic traditions, however, survives unblemished in just a few remaining dwellings. Sections of the Baker house, John Bainbridge house, Edmound Burroughs house, Benjamin Merrell house, John Wallace house, and John Welling house contain anchor-bent framing characteristic of Dutch construction,
but often with modifications that suggest hybrid forms.\textsuperscript{14} The majority of buildings examined lacked distinctive framing systems, room arrangements, or other features that could be positively identified as the product of a single ethnic group. Considering the high number of Anglo settlers in Hunterdon County, the evidence suggests that either the English framing tradition quickly dominated and subsumed other building technologies or that any blending of ethnic building traditions occurred elsewhere long before the creation of Hopewell's surviving housing.\textsuperscript{15}

According to the written record, by the 1720s a large population of farmers was well established in the Hopewell area. In 1722, 62 percent of the taxable population of Hunterdon County were landowners and 38 percent worked as singlemen or tenants.\textsuperscript{16} A full three-quarters of the 105 farms totaled 100 acres or more. Farmers generally required about seventy five acres to grow enough food for themselves and a family of five; the remaining acreage probably produced surplus grain for market.\textsuperscript{17} But while 76 percent of the farms covered over 100 acres, by far the largest tracts--almost two-thirds of all the land in the county--were controlled by only a third of the taxable population.\textsuperscript{18} Thus, in a time when the amount of workable acreage determined family income, the majority of wealth generated from Hunterdon County's farmland was concentrated in the hands of a small number of large landholders.
The records also suggest a substantial number of buildings were present in Hopewell by the second quarter of the eighteenth century. For example, a series of lawsuits between Daniel Coxe and various settlers of the township disclosed that fifty farmers were ejected from their premises in Hopewell for invalid land titles. The suits also detailed information about the buildings and appurtenances then in existence. In the complaint of trespass between James Vanhorn and Thomas Smith, for example, the judgment noted that on the sixth day of May 1732, Daniel Coxe sold to Vanhorn a property that included:

one Messuage, one barn, one orchard, one garden, one thousand acres of arable land, five hundred acres of pasture land, five hundred acres of meadowland, and five hundred acres of woodland...now or late the tenure and occupation of the said Thomas Smith.

While these documents and others such as probate records suggest the existence of dwellings in Hopewell at an early date, few, if any, survive. Fifteen of the fifty dwellings thought to date from the eighteenth century, or roughly 30 percent, were built either in the second half of the eighteenth century or in the first quarter of the nineteenth century (see appendix A). The dearth of physical evidence for Hopewell's earliest buildings might point to the impermanent nature of their construction. Gawen Lawrie, one of the proprietors of East Jersey, described several buildings in 1684 as:
...built very cheap...[with] two or three rooms...the walls...of cloven timber, about eight or ten inches broad, like planks, set one end to the ground and the other nailed to the raising which they plaister within.

Lawrie describes a structure that has at least some of its members set in the ground. If Hopewell's earliest buildings were indeed earthfast, then time and the elements have erased all trace of their existence. The first substantial, durable housing did not appear in Hopewell until the 1750s, and it took traditional forms.

Contrary to the popular frontier myth of settlers scratching out an existence on subsistence farms, the surviving eighteenth-century dwellings in Hopewell Township belonged instead to a class of prosperous landowners. These men bought and sold real estate, rented and leased property to workers who tilled the land for them, loaned money at interest to debtors, and controlled much of the fertile valley land in the township.
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"The value of land and houses is the best estimate of the wealth of a nation," argued the Reverend John Witherspoon of Princeton, while debating the issue of taxation during the second Continental Congress in 1776; "This is the true barometer of wealth." In his speech, Witherspoon acknowledged an unspoken truth: eighteenth-century men invested in their lands and buildings. Colonial tax lists often reflect this premise. The tax lists for Hopewell Township help link the names of inhabitants with their relative wealth through categories, called ratables, that include: acres of improved and unimproved land; number of horses, cattle, hogs, and slaves; and amount of tax paid. Unfortunately only an occasional reference to a saw mill, grist mill, or tannery actually associate Hopewell landowners with specific buildings.

However, a surviving tax list of c. 1796 from the adjacent township of Upper Makefield, Pennsylvania, identifies the landowners with their dwellings and describes the materials used in their construction. This list, together with similarly detailed ratables from other parts of New Jersey, Pennsylvania,
and Delaware, help place the property and wealth of Hopewell's inhabitants into an architectural context. The surviving dwellings of Hopewell's eighteenth-century inhabitants reflect traditional arrangements of interior space found in England and parts of Europe and also resemble much of the durable building stock found along the Coastal Plain and Piedmont regions of New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania and the Chesapeake Bay region. Of the fifteen dwellings examined in this study, nine exhibit the characteristics of four distinct traditional house forms (figures 2 & 3).

The smallest form consists of one-room dwellings measuring approximately sixteen to twenty feet square, similar to John Hunt's "Great House" mentioned earlier. Four of the buildings examined are of this type, with two dating from the pre-revolutionary period and two from shortly thereafter. An example is the late eighteenth- or early-nineteenth century log dwelling illustrated in figures 4 & 5. This modest dwelling built by Friday True, a free black, included a fireplace (now removed) in the eastern gable-end and a closeted staircase in the adjacent corner leading to an open loft. This building and similar surviving eighteenth-century structures, together with evidence gleaned from tax records and inventories, suggest that most people lived in homes of a similar size. For example, while Israel
Putnam was traveling through nearby Somerville, New Jersey, in 1794, he noted that the houses were all about twelve feet square.  

But not all of the region's one-room houses were constructed in log. According to the Upper Makefield tax list, only a third of the dwellings in that township were of log construction (figure 6). The material found wider use in secondary dwellings and outbuildings, like William Allen's farm in nearby Amwell Township which contained, in addition to a two-story stone dwelling house and stone barn, "a good log Kitchen." Log also served as a suitable material for tenant and laborer housing. John Stevens, a cordwainer and tanner living in New York, advertised a farm also in Amwell Township consisting of three-hundred and fifty acres with "four good new log houses with shingle roofs," probably for tenants or workers. They measured twenty-five feet by twenty, twenty-two by seventeen, eighteen by twelve, and sixteen by eleven respectively. Laborers in the iron foundries of Hunterdon County were also quartered in log houses.  

Whether for dwellings, outbuildings, or workers' housing, buildings constructed in log were not just temporary shelters. The Friday True log house in Hopewell, for example, rests on a durable stone foundation over a full cellar. Similarly, in 1751
William Pidgeon advertised for sale a well-cultivated plantation of six-hundred acres in Hunterdon County that included, in addition to cleared wheat fields, meadow and timber stands, "a good fram'd Barn, a Log-House of two Rooms, and a Stream running before the Door sufficient to turn a Small Mill..." and all within close proximity to the markets of Philadelphia, New Brunswick, and Trenton. 34

A much larger percentage of timber-frame dwellings were constructed elsewhere in the mid-Atlantic region than in the area around Upper Makefield and Hopewell. Throughout southern New Jersey and along the Inner Coastal Plain in Delaware, houses of log or frame construction accounted for over three-quarters of all the dwellings. According to the 1798 Federal Direct Tax, 81 percent of the dwellings in Mannington Township, Salem County, were built of log or frame. 35 In Lower Alloways Creek, Salem County, a similar figure of 82 percent of the dwellings were of wood construction, making log and timber the preferred material for most of that area's taxable population. 36 This is in marked contrast to dwellings of log and frame construction in the Piedmont Plateau around Upper Makefield and Hopewell, which totaled just 47 percent of all the structures on Upper Makefield's tax list. Instead, most of the region's dwellings were built of stone.
Differences in wealth helped distinguish owners of stone houses from owners of log dwellings. About half of Upper Makefield's population did not own houses, working instead as laborers, singlemen, and tenants. These represented the poorest of the poor. An owner of a house, therefore—even one made of log—was economically better off, but generally he still ranked in the poorer wealth deciles. Over half of all the log dwellings in Upper Makefield, for example, were inhabited by men possessing between one and twenty-nine acres of land and some of the lowest land valuations (figure 7). In contrast, those men ranking in the top two wealth deciles occupied stone dwellings. But when charted graphically, landowners of medium wealth (5th, 6th, 7th, & 8th deciles) chose to build their houses equally of stone or wood, suggesting that as they grew more prosperous, inhabitants actually used both building materials interchangeably. Apparently the choice of log or stone as a building material did not necessarily involve ethnic preference or carry social status among the inhabitants of the region. Instead, important distinctions in wealth, status, and birth occurred not just in the building's material, but in its appearance, durability, and overall form.

The 1764 one-room stone house of Job Phillips measured eighteen feet by twenty-two, and was probably typical in size and form of many durable one-room stone houses in Hopewell (figures 8 & 9). Generally, these structures included a large cooking
fireplace located on the interior gable-end, next to a closeted stair leading to the loft. The original interior finish of the Phillips house included paneled doors, plastered walls, a chair rail, and exposed, beaded joists (figures 10 & 11). When Phillips died in 1822, his furniture included two beds, bedding and bedsteads, a desk and bookcase, several chests, a candle stand, tables, Windsor chairs, crockery, teaware, and a corner cupboard. 39 Refined foodstuffs, including wheat, rye, buckwheat, and corn were stored in the chamber.

Phillips' dwelling, like others of its size, included a cellar. A masonry foundation supported the chimney above, and the entire cellar provided additional storage space especially for perishable foods; Phillips' cellar contained such temperature-sensitive items as pickled and smoked meats. He occupied a substantial, well-constructed dwelling. The farm also included a separate barn (now destroyed) that housed horses, cattle, hogs, and sheep, as well as harnesses, farming equipment, and some of the rough produce of the farm. 40 But all the tasks associated with the preparation of farm produce and the routines of domestic life took place within the context of this one-room house.

Similar one-room dwellings included the John Van Cleve house (figures 12 & 13), and the much altered early nineteenth-century home of Henry Phillips, Jr. (figures 14 & 15). The latter
contained a full basement, while the former differed only in its absence of a cellar. Instead, wooden joists lay only several inches above an earthen floor. Other than that, both buildings contained similar masonry construction and roofing systems of common rafters with half-dovetailed collar ties typical of most buildings in the Delaware River Valley.

The second traditional house-type found in Hopewell contained two rooms arranged side-to-side, consisting of a hall for cooking and day-to-day living, and a parlor for more formal functions. The original section of the Wilson Hunt house of c. 1750 (figures 16, 17, & 18) measured twenty feet by forty feet and included this two-room plan. The Hunt house, like that of Job Phillips, was a well-crafted and substantial building of similar masonry construction and finish, except for the addition of a fully paneled fireplace wall in the hall (figure 19). A house divided into two distinct spaces helped separate and codify the activities of everyday life that would have normally taken place in a single room. Similarly arranged houses of two rooms were also constructed in southern New Jersey about twenty years before and, while built largely of brick, differed little in form and function from those in Hopewell. The Samuel Stout, Jr. house of 1756 (figures 20 & 21), the Benjamin Pelton house (now destroyed), and the Andrew Smith house all originated as hall-parlor dwellings. In addition, the early nineteenth-century frame
dwellings of Theophilus Bainbridge (see figure 35) also contained a hall and parlor.

While the first four of these houses contained the traditional two-room plan on the main level, they were also built into the sides of hills, allowing for a third inhabitable room in the downhill end of the basement level. This did not apply to the Theophilus Bainbridge house. While the two rooms helped to separate the house into specialized spaces on the main floor, a basement room allowed for even greater flexibility of use. The lower rooms possessed exterior doors and windows, and were equipped with cooking fireplaces. For all intents and purposes, these hall/parlor dwellings actually functioned as three-room buildings. Since the basement rooms served as kitchens, their isolated location removed the tasks associated with cooking from the main living quarters, and represented an early solution to the later large-scale process of relegating the kitchen to a subordinate space, dealt with at length in a later chapter. But in the case of the Wilson Hunt house, the basement kitchen permitted the upstairs hall to function as an entry, thus accounting for its fashionable paneling and elevated appearance.

The third principal house-type in Hopewell also contained two rooms, but this time with the spaces positioned front-to-back rather than side-to-side. The framed house of Benjamin Merrell of
c. 1765 (figures 22 & 23) utilized this two-room plan, and the
original stone section of the Abraham La Rowe/Adam Ege house of c.
1765 (figures 24 & 25) also followed this plan on the main floor.
Like some of its neighbors, this banked house also contained a
working kitchen in the basement level. Interestingly, while these
two dwellings utilized the same form, the La Rowe/Ege house did so
with stone and the Merrell house with wooden anchor-bent construc-
tion characteristic of Dutch building practices. In these two
cases, materials and building technology were incidental to
overall form.

The fourth traditional house-type found in eighteenth-
century Hopewell contained four rooms arranged two wide and two
deep. The brick home of Jeremiah Woolsey of 1765 measures forty
feet by thirty-two and utilizes this plan (figures 26, 27, & 28).
Unlike numerous surviving brick buildings in southern New Jersey,
the Woolsey house represents the only recorded eighteenth-century
brick dwelling in Hopewell. Brick or combinations of brick and
other materials accounted for less than 5 percent of the dwellings
recorded in the tax list for nearby Upper Makefield. An expensive
and labor-intensive material, brick was used infrequently in the
region and only by the wealthiest inhabitants. The brick home of
the President of the College of New Jersey (Princeton University)
built in 1756, and the brick-fronted home of the prosperous
Princeton tanner Job Stockton built in 1766, are two good regional
examples. Similarly, in Salem County, New Jersey, the brick dwellings decorated with patterned gable-ends were built only by a small number of the wealthy elite.\textsuperscript{43}

The Woolsey house offered interesting solutions to the problems of linking four rooms together. The two original front doors provided access to the principal rooms and helped establish symmetry on the facade. One door opened into the hall, the other into the formal parlor. The two rooms in the back were linked through interior doors and consisted of the original kitchen and a small back chamber. In all these respects, the house resembled the so called John Welling house (see figure 63). The arrangement of upstairs chambers in the Woolsey house corresponded to the rooms on the ground floor, and an inventory of the house listed beds and stored goods in these spaces. Some of the items listed downstairs included such luxury goods as a teastand, chest, case of drawers, cupboard, tables, fourteen chairs, silver spoons, looking glass, fireplace furniture, and textiles.\textsuperscript{44}

Patterns of living in the Woolsey house, however, even with a number of specialized rooms, continued to work in traditional ways. Though the inventory does not specify the precise location of things in the house, one can infer from the order in which the list was made that many of the objects were kept only in the hall and parlor, suggesting that most of the living took place within
these front rooms. By the early nineteenth century when most families had long-ago moved their sleeping quarters to the second floor, the Woolsey's, in behavior characteristic of an earlier time, still furnished the parlor-- their most lavish public room-- with the best bed, bedding, and furniture.\(^4\)

Only by the 1750s did farmers and folk builders begin to construct substantial, durable housing in Hopewell Township of one, two, three, and four rooms. These dwellings helped landowners define the world around them by meeting their economic, social, and cultural priorities. The work necessary for subsistence could take place within these houses, different spaces could accommodate different needs, and outwardly they helped distinguish social and economic classes. The kitchens, especially, were an integral part of each dwelling. All the buildings included in this study originally contained cooking fireplaces or entire rooms devoted to the preparation of food within the main body of the house. Thus, in every example, all the activities associated with domestic life took place within the main dwelling's four walls, and reflected an order of domestic space modeled on age-old traditions.
Figure 2. Map of Primary Surveyed Buildings, Hopewell Township, New Jersey. (1) Theophilus Bainbridge House; (2) Edmound Bainbridge House; (3) John G. Hunt House; (4) Wilson Hunt House; (5) Abraham La Rowe/Adam Ege House; (6) Benjamin Merrell House; (7) Henry Phillips, Sr. House; (8) Henry Phillips, Jr. House; (9) Job Phillips House; (10) John Stillwell House; (11) Colonel Joseph Stout House; (12) Samuel Stout, Jr. House; (13) Friday True House; (14) John Van Cleve House; (15) Jeremiah Woolsey House. (Drawing, author)
Figure 3. Map of Stoutsburg, 1829. The map illustrates one room, hall/parlor, hall/parlor/kitchen, and Georgian houses in Hopewell Township. "Map of a section of the Franklin and Georgetown Turnpike, laid out by Andrew Howel Esquarand [sic] for General John Frelinghuyson, October 23, 1829." Drawn by William Lythe. (Courtesy, Hopewell Museum)
Figure 4. Exterior, Friday True House, c. 1805 with additions. The log section is the earliest part of the house. (Photo, author)
Figure 5. Plan, Friday True House. Plan of the first floor. The original cooking fireplace stood on the east gable end, now removed. (Drawing, author)
Figure 6. Frequency of Materials in Dwelling Houses for Upper Makefield Township, Pennsylvania, c. 1796. Figures are derived from the Upper Makefield Township tax ratable for c. 1796.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Tax Range</th>
<th>No Dwellings</th>
<th>Log</th>
<th>Stone</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No Dwellings</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1-$13</td>
<td>No Dwellings</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$14-$72</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$73-$132</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$133-392</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$393-$912</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$913-$1,655</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,656-$2,021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,022-$2,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,702-$2,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Percentage and Distribution of Building Materials by Decile for Upper Makefield Township, Pennsylvania, c. 1796. Figures are derived from the Upper Makefield Township tax ratable for c. 1796. Deciles are based on the total value of taxable property.
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Figure 8. Exterior, Job Phillips House. The original stone house, left, dates to 1764. The frame section, partly visible on the right, is c. 1830 and replaces an earlier addition. (Photo, author)
Figure 9. Plan, Job Phillips House. Plan of the first floor. (Drawing, author)
Figure 10. Interior, Job Phillips House. View of the fireplace wall and closeted stairs. (Photo, courtesy Richard W. Hunter)
Figure 11. Interior, Job Phillips House. View of the eastern wall showing the dimensions of the original opening that once led into an earlier building, and its present size, reduced to accommodate the existing addition. (Photo, courtesy Richard W. Hunter)
Figure 13. Plan, John Van Cleve House. Reconstructed plan of the first floor showing the original house, left, and the three-sided kitchen wing (partly destroyed) on right. The stairs and fireplace are extensively rebuilt. (Drawing, author)
Figure 14. Exterior, Henry Phillips, Jr. House, c. 1810, with additions. The left three bays are stone, c. 1810; the right three bays are frame c. 1830. (Photo, author)
Figure 15. Plan, Henry Phillips. Jr. House. Plan of the first floor. The fireplace and stairs in the Period One section are rebuilt. (Drawing, author)
Figure 16. Exterior, Wilson Hunt House, c. 1735, with additions. Period Two addition is obscured behind the c. 1870 frame wing. Period Three kitchen wing on right. The original house is banked into the side of the hill. (Photo, author)
Figure 17. Detail, Wilson Hunt House. The right four central bays mark the Period One section. Entrance to the basement kitchen is through the door at lower right. (Drawing, author)
Figure 18. Plan, Wilson Hunt House. Plan of the ground (top) and first floors. After the first addition, c. 1760, the hall became an entrance passage. The ground floor kitchen was converted into a dining room following construction of the new kitchen (right), and a straight flight of stairs was built to the new dining room. Not drawn are the oven shed, far right, and the nineteenth-century frame addition, far left. (Drawing, author).
Figure 19. Hall, Wilson Hunt house. View of the first floor hall. Visitors entered directly into this space. With the working kitchen in the basement, the raised paneling in the hall symbolically infused this room with elevated status. (Drawing, author)
Figure 20. Exterior, Samuel Stout, Jr. House, 1756, with additions. The central bay was the original entrance (now blocked). The entrance to the basement kitchen is at lower right. (Photo, courtesy Percy Preston)
Figure 21. Plan, Samuel Stout, Jr. House. Plan of the ground (top) and first floors. The original hall/parlor house is right. Following the addition of the dining wing, left, a small interior entrance porch was built around the front door. (Drawing, author after Walker Sander Ford and Kerr, Architects, 1970)
Figure 22. Exterior, Benjamin Merrell House, c. 1755, with additions. Period One section, right, originally two rooms deep and one story high. Period Two kitchen wing at left. Both sections enlarged vertically in 1805. (Photo, author)
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Figure 23. Plan, Benjamin Merrell House. Plan of the first floor. Period One section consisted of a hall and parlor positioned front to back. Both sections are framed with anchor beams in the Dutch style. Anchor beams in the Period One section rest atop a horizontal timber in the interior bearing wall. (Drawing, author)
Figure 24. Exterior, Abraham La Rowe/Adam Ege House, c. 1765, with additions as it appeared in the 1890s. Right two bays of the main section denote the original house. The left two bays and lean-to shed are c. 1700. The original ground floor door was relocated from the right bay to the left bay, bringing it closer to the center of the facade. (Photo courtesy of Mrs. Richard Potts).
Figure 25. Plan, La Rowe/Ege House. Plan of the ground (top) and first floors. The Period Two section, now destroyed stood in the shaded patch at left. The original closeted stairs were removed and a new flight constructed at center, opposite a new doorway. (Drawing, author after Richard Potts)
Figure 28. Plan, Jeremiah Woolsey House. Plan of the first floor. The kitchen fireplace (northeast room) was truncated to allow for a passageway and door to the new kitchen wing. (Drawing, author after HABS, NJ-201)
LAND, AGRICULTURE, AND WEALTH: REASONS FOR THE FIRST DURABLE HOUSING

Ralph Ege, a late nineteenth-century historian of Hopewell Township, offered a romantic yet insightful analysis of the economic development of eighteenth-century Hopewell. He identified a period between about 1735 and 1760 that the older residents called the "golden years."

During this prosperous era, good dwellings and large, substantial barns were substituted for the log cabins and stables of the emigrants, and in some portions of the State these old house and farm buildings are still to be found in good repair, reminding us of an age when our colonial ancestors built for durability rather than for display.

Ege recounted a period of exceptional agricultural productivity in which profits from farming produced the wealth necessary to build new, durable housing.

Not surprisingly, issues involving land ownership, agricultural production, and the rise of a market economy led to the creation of the first durable housing in Hopewell. Deeds, probate records, and the accounts of a complicated suit involving disputed land claims in the township reveal that property owners...
invested in durable housing only after they held clear title to their lands, which began only in the 1750s.

The land disputes centered around the claim of Daniel Coxe as original owner of the 31,000-acre Hopewell tract. In 1731 Coxe ejected fifty landholders and their families who had unwittingly purchased bogus property titles from Thomas Revell, a land agent working for the Proprietors of West Jersey, rather than from Coxe, the lawful owner. When Coxe advertised the reclaimed land for sale in 1735, violence ensued. In July, a mob, presumably of evicted farmers, attacked the residences of Duncan Oguillon and John Collier. Coxe recently had put into their possession the dwelling houses and plantations formerly belonging to evictees John Parke and Thomas Smith. According to a newspaper account of the incident, the mob:

...being all disguised, having their faces besmear'd with Blacking, and Armed with Clubs, and Sticks in their Hands, Did in an Insolent, Violent, and Riotous Manner, break into and enter the said respective Dwelling Houses, and did assault, Beat, and wound the said Duncan Oguillon and John Collier, and other Persons then in the said several Dwelling Houses, and then did with force & Arms, violently amove [sic] and turn out of Possession, Cursing, Swearing, and threatening in a most outrageous Manner, that they would kill and Murder the said Daniel Coxe, Esq.; in Defiance of all Law and Government.

After a lengthy court battle tried in Burlington, Coxe won his claim. An appeal kept the matter undecided until the early 1750s, when the courts again ruled in favor of Coxe's heirs. To
end the matter, the heirs wrote new deeds for the tracts of land already settled and improved by the vanquished defendants, in effect forcing them to repurchase the land they had settled and improved, or forfeit their title to the Coxe heirs.

The entire affair helped generate a period of social instability as families, uncertain of their futures, refrained from making substantial investments in housing. Entire households were evicted, fathers could not guarantee an inheritance for their sons, and lands quickly changed hands. The problem was not unique to Hopewell. As late as 1765 one traveler noted that the chief obstacle to New Jersey's growth was the uncertainty of land titles. 49

During the ensuing shuffle for land, several of the wealthier families in Hopewell, possessed of the necessary resources to settle the Coxe claims, snatched up valuable bottom lands from their less fortunate neighbors or kinfolk. As early as 1738, for example, Samuel Stout Sr. (1709-1781) entered into discussions with Daniel Coxe for the purchase of part of a plantation that was formerly in the possession of Stout's brother-in-law Nehemiah Bonham. 50 Stout eventually secured the land and an adjoining parcel from the Coxe heirs in the 1750s, and this tract became the site of the stone dwelling house of his son Samuel Jr. (1730-1803) illustrated in figure 20. With clear
titles to the land, wealthy landowners began to build durable stone, frame, and brick dwellings.

In an agricultural society, landownership constitutes wealth, and the surviving tax ratables show that property owners whose dwellings were included in this study belonged almost universally to the economic elite—that is, those individuals in the top two wealth deciles assessed for $2.33 or more in the 1802 Hopewell tax. The family names to appear most frequently in this wealth bracket include: Hunt (10); Stout (7); Hart (7); Blackwell (5); Moore (5); Titus (5); Phillips (4); and Smith (4). These families possessed 46 percent of the livestock, controlled a third of the total value of land, and owned over half of the township (table 1). The same men to hold economic power maintained a firm grasp on political power. They were freeholders, constables, tax collectors, and sheriffs—the officers and rulers of the town.

Marriage and kinship helped the leading families consolidate and maintain their control over Hopewell and enabled their grasp on valuable land to tighten over the course of the eighteenth century. Again, Hopewell was not alone in this respect. "The pride of being considered a large land-owner is the only thing that rouses them," noted Theophile Cazenove of the smaller landowners in New Jersey in 1794, "except for a few inland
Table 1. Percent of Slaves, Livestock, Acres, and Land Value by Decile, Hopewell Township, New Jersey, 1802. Figures are derived from the Hopewell Township tax rate for 1802 (NJSA). Deciles are based on the total tax paid by each taxable inhabitant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total Tax</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value all Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>$$ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$0-$0.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$0.31-$0.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$0.50-$0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$0.53-$0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$0.83-$1.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1.13-$1.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$1.48-$1.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1.87-$2.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$2.33-$3.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>7,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$3.25-$9.09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>10,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>35,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inhabitants, who have lived for a long time, from father to son, on their farms. Even the Reverend John Witherspoon of nearby Princeton acknowledged the importance of land ownership when he tried to establish a national tax on property and dwellings in 1776.

Between 1780 and 1802, the total number of taxable properties in Hopewell increased from 262 to 328 as larger tracts of land were subdivided. The number of landless inhabitants decreased from 52 percent of the taxable population to 29 percent. The number of farms over 200 acres was reduced by half and the number under 99 acres increased by 60 percent. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, only 3 percent of Hopewell's available acreage remained "unimproved," and 44 percent of the farms were within the 100-200 acre range (table 2). While the total number of farm units increased over the course of the eighteenth century, farm sizes decreased and came under the ownership of a few wealthy property owners. As a result, by 1802 over 60 percent of the township's taxable population lived on less than seventy-five acres, and of these almost half owned no land at all. Conversely, the top two wealth deciles in Hopewell together controlled over one-half of all the land in the township. Men like Samuel Stout, Sr. assembled parcels of fertile bottom land and valuable pasture and...
Table 2. Change in Frequency and Acreage of Farm Units Between 1780 and 1802, Hopewell Township, New Jersey. Figures are derived from the Hopewell Township tax ratables for 1780 and 1802 (NJSA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Size (in Acres)</th>
<th>1780 Hopewell Township Tax Ratable</th>
<th>1802 Hopewell Township Tax Ratable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent of Taxable Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-99</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Farm Units = 262

Total Farm Units = 328
timber land into estates covering hundreds of acres and invested
his wealth in buildings like the long, low-eved stone house
described by Ralph Ege but now destroyed.  

The primary crops produced on these large agricultural
estates included grains like corn, wheat, rye, oats, and barley. Flax and hay also accounted for a share of the produce, and
distilled cider from the apple crop was sold in hogs heads for
export to the urban markets.

Cities and ports like Trenton, Philadelphia, New Brunswick,
and New York provided the necessary markets for these products.
In 1764 John Lamburt's mill, within 2 miles of Pennington,
operated two stones: one for local flour production and the other
specifically to handle the merchant trade for these markets. The mills and plantation of Nathaniel Ware, Esq., located six
miles above Trenton in 1750, included:

[a] Mill-house... of stone, 60 feet in Length, 24 in
Breadth, with an Overshot, two pair of stones; and a
Bolting Mill, well accustomed, and known to make as good
work as the best Mills in the Jerseys; it may always
command wheat enough, and is conveniently situate for
New York or Philadelphia Markets being less than 30
miles of good Wagon Road from Brunswick, and Boats
carrying fifty or sixty casks may load at the Mill Door
for Philadelphia.

By the 1770s, Philadelphia had become the biggest exporter of
grain in the colonies. "Wheat is the grand article of the...
province," exclaimed the anonymous author of American Husbandry in 1775: "They sow immense quantities..."\textsuperscript{61}

By 1765, skilled artisans were also producing luxury goods for wealthy patrons in the Trenton, Hopewell, and Princeton areas. Imported goods were also available at local stores to complement items produced at home or locally. Several inventories in the area listed such mass-produced products as imported Queensware, and when Constantine Dougherty sold his store on the main road in Pennington, "where the Principle of the Produce of the Country, for sixty Miles back, comes to Market," the contents of his store was a treasure trove of local products, luxurious imported textiles, clothing, and consumer goods.\textsuperscript{62} By the mid-eighteenth century, Hopewell's major landowners participated fully in an active market economy with close links to the major urban centers of the middle colonies.

Finally, probate records and estate inventories confirm the prosperity of these planters, who partially invested in material goods as tokens of their success. Job Phillips, John Van Cleve, Samuel Stout, Jr., Wilson Hunt, and others owned such luxury items as silver teaspoons, ceramic tea cups, and the other equipage for genteel tea drinking, as well as looking glasses, desks and bookcases, and eight-day clocks. These objects were all powerful symbols of wealth and prosperity.\textsuperscript{63} For example, according to
inventories recorded in nearby Chester County, Pennsylvania, just 4 percent of the 1,565 inventories made between 1820 and 1829 listed a desk and bookcase. They appeared so infrequently in probate records that between 1680 and 1849, the number of desks and bookcases in any given year never exceeded 5 percent. Similarly, eight-day clocks appeared in less than 10 percent of the estates inventoried in Chester County between 1810 and 1819.64

Simply possessing large tracts of land, however, was not enough for owners to participate in Hopewell's market economy. Crops needed to be planted, cared for, and harvested. The labor required to operate sizable farms was such that property owners depended on a combination of slaves, hired-hands, and tenants to work the land profitably. In addition to controlling over half the land, the top two wealth deciles owned 87 percent of all the slaves in Hopewell Township by 1802 (see table 1).65 Indentured or bound white servants also accounted for a small but important part of the work force. Philip Titus of Hopewell gave notice of the disappearance of his bondsman, "a high-Dutch servant man named Jacob Rubb, about 5 feet 3 inches high...of a swarthy complexion, straight black hair, and about 28 years of Age."66 As early as 1749 the traveler Peter Kalm reported a large number of servants in New Jersey, and Theophile Cazenove often commented on the numbers of Scottish, Irish, and German servants he found during his travels through New Jersey in 1794.67 Between 1704 and 1779
newspaper advertisements reported 673 runaway servants; there were only 189 runaway black slaves reported during the same period.\(^{68}\)

One step above bound laborers were inmates and black freemen: non-landowners who included laborers, farmers, artisans, and widows. They often owned small house lots of ten acres or less, and subsisted on a combination of farming and household trades. Tenancy also played an important and necessary role in the agricultural cycle and permitted market farming to occur in the prosperous regions of Hopewell. The Hopewell tax lists identified "householders" as non-landowners in possession of someone else's property.\(^{69}\) By 1802 these householders included over a third of the taxable population.\(^{70}\)

Large landowners rented property to householders in order to generate capital while ensuring the maintenance of their land. Henry Baker, a Yeoman farmer from Hopewell, leased a plantation of one hundred and three acres in Upper Wakefield Township, Pennsylvania, to William Davis for the term of one year in exchange for half the grain and one forth of the produce from the orchard. By the terms of the lease, Baker reserved for his own use the parlor, chamber, and part of the cellar in the dwelling house as well as one third of the garden. In addition, Davis agreed to take care of the orchard, keep all fences in repair, make new ones (Baker to
provide the posts and rails), pay all taxes, consume all the hay and straw and not to sell any of it, nor to cut firewood without permission. Davis was to sow the winter grain, plant clover and grass, till fourteen acres for oats and generally to "leave the place in as good repair as it now is reasonable ware, tear, and casualties which may happen by fire or otherwise only excepted."⁷¹

Just across the Hopewell line in neighboring Blawenburg, Montgomery Township, New Jersey, Bernardus Van Zant let a two hundred and twenty six acre farm to Aaron Updike for one year beginning the first of April, 1812. In exchange for the profits on the crops, Updike agreed to pay Van Zant two hundred dollars and the property taxes on the farm as well as to sow a ton of "plaster," keep two cows, three sheep, and collect all the necessary firewood for Van Zant's mother, who lived on the east side of the dwelling house. Updike received the use of the two west rooms and part of the chamber, kitchen, and milk room privileges together with full use of the outbuildings, barns, and stables. The lease also specified a precise program of field plantings to be followed by Updike in order to ensure proper crop rotation. In this case, the agreement not only ensured the welfare of Van Zant's elderly mother, but also helped safeguard the productivity of the farm over the term of the lease.⁷²

Tenant farming was an important and widely used tool
throughout New Jersey. Absentee landlords like John and Richard Smith of Burlington leased a property along the Delaware River in Hopewell to Daniel Severns in 1762. By 1764 Severns had been replaced by a Joseph Morrell. When Cazenove made his journey through New Jersey in 1794, he discovered that Philadelphia residents Lewis Forman and John P. Durand owned absentee farms as far north as Hanover in Morris County, New Jersey, which they leased "for one half of the produce" provided they "furnish half of the expenses; horses, cattle, implements, etc." In the Black River area, Cazenove confirmed that many large landowners depended on extra labor to realize the full productivity of their land. For example, he noted that:

Mr. Wells, a farmer near here, has 400 acres contiguous to his residence, and more than 1000 acres in the neighborhood. Here you easily find farmers [who will farm] for half the produce of the land, and the farmer furnishes the cattle, etc.

Ironically, while large numbers of tenants gave wealthy planters the means by which to build the first durable housing in Hopewell, tenancy by definition created transience and social instability. This state may have contributed to the slow pace of durable building that marked Hopewell in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Equally important to large landowners were the number of sons who could help maintain and till the land profitably. While
in their youth, sons assisted their fathers as family members in common. But once sons matured, married, and started families of their own, fathers were forced to seek new sources of labor for their own farms. The maturing generation, however, without money or inherited land, was usually forced to settle and build houses on part of the father's estate. But rather then deed the property over, fathers continued to exercise a degree of control by postponing gifts of farmland to their male children.

This practice resulted in part from the unprecedented increase in life expectancy which colonists enjoyed in Hopewell and other northern colonies during the eighteenth century. Long life created not only a stable social order, but also a generation of fathers who lived to see their sons mature, marry, and begin families. A century before, sons might have postponed marriage until they received their inheritance, or simply settled on parts of their family farm knowing that they would soon inherit the property. When Jonathan Stout (1660-1723), one of the first settlers, died at the relatively advanced age of sixty-three, his will divided the estate according to the old system. He "allowed" his son Benjamin Stout (age 32) and his wife of nine years the tract of land, "which he now Dwells on containing two Hundred and fifty acres." He also "allowed" to his son Jonathan Stout (age 22) and his wife another two parcels of land totaling four hundred acres. For his youngest sons, David (age 17) and Samuel (age 14),
the patriarch left "the plantation I now dwell on" to be divided among them equally. The female children received personal effects and the bulk of the movable estate, as was customary. 77

The equal distribution of land among male heirs, called partible inheritance or gavelkind, existed in England prior to the Norman conquest. It remained customary in a few regions, especially in Kent, England, and gradually took root in the New World as the traditional and legal means of distributing property. It stood in marked contrast to the system throughout the rest of England, which left all real property to the eldest male. The latter system, called primogeniture, was originally established to help support military service, but it also prevented the dissolution of productive landed estates by channeling the inheritance through a single heir. Patrick M’Robert noted the problems that partible inheritance created as early as 1775, when he commented that New Jersey farms had become so small by the practice of dividing and sub-dividing them among descendants of the original owners that they were no longer profitable, and many farmers were selling and moving away. 78

Beginning in the 1750s and coinciding with the building of the first substantial, durable housing in Hopewell, second- and third-generation sons like Samuel Stout, Sr. (1709-1781), who enjoyed an extended life, continued to wait until death to make
gifts of property to sons who had already married and settled on family land. Stout Sr. began to assemble tracts of fertile lowlands and valuable pasture and timber lands across the township, until by 1774 he controlled over 1166 acres. One son, Jonathan (1752-1818), married in 1775 and settled on his father's tract of 500 acres known as the Belmont Farm near the Delaware River. The other son, Samuel, Jr. (1730-1803), married Anna Van Dyke (1733-1810) in 1754 and built his own stone hall-parlor house (see figure 20) in 1756 on another tract of his father's land. Jonathan lived on the Belmont Farm for six years before inheriting it from his father. His older brother, Samuel, Jr., lived and farmed his tract for twenty-five years before receiving clear title to it at the age of fifty-one. Samuel, Jr., in turn withheld title of the property from his two sons Ira and Andrew until Samuel's death in 1803 at the age of seventy-three.

Without farmland to call their own, sons remained dependent on their fathers. The practice of withholding legal title to the land underscored the degree to which patriarchs protected their own interests in old age while exercising a degree of economic and familial control over their children. Sons worked the land to their father's advantage and remained, in effect, tenants on their estates. Such a practice also had the desired effect of delaying the break-up of large plantations which patriarchs had taken a lifetime to create. As early as 1698, Gabriel Thomas explained
much when he wrote that at Burlington, New Jersey "There are many Fair and Great Brick Houses on the outside of Town which the Gentry have built there for their Countrie [sic] Houses." Hopewell's gentry were building country houses too. The formation of large landed estates loosely based on the model of the English country house, coupled with increased social stability, economic prosperity, and a new confidence in the future, may have inspired the builders of the first durable housing in Hopewell to create handsome estates to be passed down from one generation to the next.

Colonel Joseph Stout (1686-1767) created perhaps the best example of this kind of "generational estate." The eldest son of pioneer Jonathan Stout and brother of Samuel Stout, Sr., Joseph built an imposing two-and-a-half-story double-pile stone dwelling with a central passage in 1752 (figures 29 & 30). Its construction also corresponded with the general introduction of the Georgian house-type into Hopewell. This form, based on fashionable English designs and characterized by a central or side stair passage flanked by a series of explicitly differentiated domestic spaces all under a single unifying roof, symbolized a new world view which embraced greater self-awareness and confidence in rational thought. Common vernacular variations of the form included a stair passage only one room deep and those located to one side of the building.
Only a few homes of the Georgian form existed in Hopewell prior to the Revolution. Stephen Burrows' Pennington home contained four rooms to a floor and a passage running through the whole. The John Stillwell house of c. 1765, although extensively restored in this century, originally consisted of a double-pile side-passage plan. Both the Edmund Burroughs house and the Henry Phillips house are side passage-plan dwellings, but date from the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Most pre-revolutionary planters continued to occupy traditional house forms. But Colonel Stout's house was one of the first of its kind in the northeastern quarter of the Township, and it exhibited all the elements of a fully-developed gentleman's country house.

The farm included a stone dwelling two stories high, containing nine well-finished rooms, a cellar, a cellar kitchen, six fireplaces, and a large entry through the center. The grounds were dotted with a stone barn, an assortment of out-buildings, and an orchard of grafted fruit trees, including peaches, pears, and cherries. Stout could easily afford his new dwelling. When he completed the house in 1752 he was the fifth wealthiest man in Hopewell. He perhaps best captured the image of the advanced agrarian farmer touched by the influences of Philadelphia. His house represented one of those fashionable mansions in the constellation of great country seats orbiting around the fringes.
of Penn's city. A map of Philadelphia and its environs produced by Scull and Heap in 1752 plainly documents the distribution of similar farms around Philadelphia.

Yet, even while the house was a model of the gentleman's fashionable country seat, complete with its own series of specialized rooms and ordered domestic spaces, the family continued to occupy it in traditional ways. For example, at the time of the widow Ruth Stout's death in 1769, her inventory listed such furnishings as were commonly found in inventories of a half-century before, including "11 high back chairs" and "1 Great Chair." The family behaved like the Woolseys in this respect. While Colonel Stout's house outwardly projected prosperity, inwardly it remained comfortably the same.87

In a four-page will drafted in 1764, Colonel Stout carefully planned for the final disposition of his estate. He intended to divide the vast holdings between his three grandsons (his eldest son Johnathan having predeceased him), leaving the homestead plantation and dwelling house to the eldest grandchild, Joseph Stout. When the Colonel died unexpectedly in 1767, however, the executors were forced to apply for a court-appointed guardian for the heirs, who were all still minors. Wilson Hunt, maternal grandfather of the children, took control, renting the homestead plantation first to William Chamberlain between 1768 and
1771 at $50 per annum, and then to his own son, John P. Hunt for at least six-and-one-half years until 1782, when young Joseph Stout reached his majority. When he finally took possession of the house and farm, Joseph tried to sell it, describing the plantation as "very healthy and pleasant [that] would suit a gentleman or a farmer...".

Other prosperous men chose to be identified with the Georgian idiom. Job Stockton, a tanner in Princeton, built a modest Georgian house of brick and frame in 1766. It was almost an exact copy of the house built for the president of the College of New Jersey (Princeton University) ten years earlier. The wealthy planter George Morgan created a similar estate nearby. In 1779 he began improving the outbuildings and grounds according to the latest scientific principles. These improvements included the apparent Georgianization of the house in the early 1780s as suggested in Morgan's account book when he paid Philip Hartman for one-hundred and ten new sash lights to remodel the windows (figure 31).

But a Georgian house like Colonel Joseph Stout's marked the exception, not the rule in Hopewell. Most of his neighbors in the top two wealth deciles chose to occupy more traditional one-, two-, or three-room homes. The farm of Wilson Hunt epitomized the majority of prosperous landowners in Hopewell. His substantial
stone hall/parlor dwelling (see figure 17) stood in the center of a large tract of land near present-day Marshall's Corner. In 1753, when the County levied a special tax "for repairing the Gaol and Court House and Killing wolves and panthers, Etc.", the collectors assessed Wilson Hunt for ten shillings and nine pence: the highest in the township. By 1778 he was the fourth largest landholder in Hopewell with 400 acres of improved land, three slaves, and 400 pounds Sterling on loan to debtors at interest.

Wealth placed Wilson Hunt in a small but extremely powerful segment of Hopewell's population with important political and familial ties to the other major landholders in the region. At various times he served as overseer of the roads, town surveyor, and freeholder. Through marriage of his sons and daughters to families of similar wealth, Hunt established important business and blood ties with other powerful families like the Stouts.

At the time of his death in 1782, Hunt's inventoried estate totaled nearly 3,300 pounds. Some of the items not specifically willed to members of the family included a horse valued at 200 pounds and bonds totaling over 900 pounds. Even when taking into account wartime inflation, the valuations demonstrated an impressive level of accumulated wealth. The number of animals Hunt owned at the time of his death made him one of the largest livestock holders in the township and also helped distinguish him
as a member of the rural elite (see table 1). His holdings included seven cows, three heifers, two steer, a bull, nineteen horses, ten hogs, two working oxen, eight calves, and thirty-five sheep.93

Like many of the large growers, Hunt relied on tenants to realize the full potential of his acreage. At the time he drafted his will in March 1781, two of his properties were under tenure: a house and lot (less than ten acres) by Edmond Palmer, and a farm tract lying "above the road" by Israel Burrows (or Burroughs). Burrows, who first appeared in the 1778 tax list as a tenant householder with two horses and a cow, was assessed in 1780 for one cow and one four-horse team which he hired out for plowing.94 Not just a self-sufficient homestead, the Hunt farmhouse stood at the center of a thriving agricultural operation producing surplus grains and livestock for regional markets. Its two rooms and cellar kitchen afforded all the space necessary for the family's formal living and dirty work.

Contrary to the long-held belief that farmers tilled their own land, evidence suggests that wealthy landowners used a variety of available labor, including slaves, indentured servants, hired-hands, and tenant farmers, to cultivate their fields. The more affluent planters leased property to landless renters, usually with formal written agreements and often in exchange for cash or
typically in exchange for a share of the produce. The first
durable farmhouses covered in this study belonged to men with
considerable political, economic, and agricultural power who,
through leases and retention of land titles, exercised a form of
control over the community that must have been unmistakable to
others in the area. The dwellings that planter's built were
traditional in form and material expressions of power and social
position.
Figure 30. Plan, Colonel Joseph Stout House. Conjectural plan of the first floor based on newspaper advertisements and HABS drawings of the nineteenth-century replacement structure. Fireplace positions are based on the painting of the house. (Drawing, author after HABS NJ-289)
A period of architectural reorganization took place in Hopewell Township largely after the Revolution. Folk builders began to create newly differentiated spaces by altering, adding, or completely re-building the dwellings of planters, largely in response to changing economic and social needs. The result signalled a fundamental shift in the traditional spatial hierarchy. In a majority of cases these alterations occurred in the way of lateral additions made to the original structure, and they took several forms. Lean-to sheds or entire rooms like those added to the Wilson Hunt house (figure 32) were the most typical of these accretions. The sheds were perhaps the simplest, and were easily created by appending a lean-to onto either the gable end or side of the house. They were constructed by resting rafters onto a ridgepole anchored into the wall with iron brackets. Typically these sheds functioned as store rooms or protective coverings for vulnerable bake ovens.

Additions were also made by appending whole rooms onto the original dwelling, and these spaces generally corresponded in size and finish to the traditional one-room house type. For example,
the first addition to the Wilson Hunt house included a single unheated bedroom measuring twenty feet square attached to the western gable-end of the house and featured a separate staircase and exterior door (figure 33). Save for the absence of a fireplace, this addition resembled the one-room stone dwellings of Job Phillips and John Van Cleve. It also relied on the hall to function as an entrance passage, socially isolating the parlor, kitchen, and bed chamber from visitors.

The second addition to the Wilson Hunt house consisted of a new kitchen wing measuring twenty-one by twenty feet attached to the eastern end of the house, and it also contained a separate stair and exterior door. The original basement kitchen was upgraded into a new dining room, and a new staircase was built to the entrance passage above. These two lateral additions transformed the Wilson Hunt house from a hall/parlor dwelling with a basement kitchen into a five-room house stretching over eighty feet in length. Eighteenth-century builders in Hopewell adopted the traditional twenty by twenty foot one-room plan house as the spacial unit of choice in new construction.97

In other words, both builders and occupants conceived of and organized their domestic space in terms of discrete rooms, and rather than divide their houses into smaller units with partitions, owners chose to expand outwardly. The John Bainbridge
house, now destroyed, perhaps most graphically illustrates how builders strung together the one-room unit, even well into the nineteenth century (figure 34). More importantly, while traditional hall and hall/parlor plan houses continued to be built in Hopewell through the revolution, the act of expanding them meant that they no longer symbolized the ideal type. Most owners found more specialized rooms desirable, and enlarged their homes accordingly, when circumstances and resources permitted. As John Witherspoon observed, Hopewell's farmers tended to invest their surplus wealth and display their status in more outwardly visible things like buildings and land.

While a few of these later additions created new spaces for sleeping, as in the case of the first addition to the Wilson Hunt house, the vast majority were built expressly for cooking or dining, or for servant housing. Indeed, the process of accretion successfully set off the kitchen or dining room in every house surveyed. Clearly it reflected a priority among eighteenth-century planters. By separating cooking activities, owners removed the dirty work and smells from the undifferentiated spaces of the original dwelling into smaller dependencies. Other activities associated with the household kitchen, including food storage, fiber processing, and especially dining also were removed or set apart from their traditional setting in the all-purpose hall. The widespread introduction of the socially elevated dining room into
homes during the third quarter of the eighteenth century, coincided with the general introduction of the kitchen wing. Not only were separate dining and kitchen facilities derived from new attitudes toward the preparation, service, and consumption of food, but they also helped build greater distinctions between servant and master.\textsuperscript{99} Inventories and probate records from the Henry Phillips, Sr. house, Wilson Hunt house, George Woolsey house, and Edmound Burroughs house indicate that slaves lived in the kitchen garret or chamber.

Traditionally, kitchens served as the places where the raw materials of the farm were processed either for consumption or sale. Owners of one-room plan dwellings took care of kitchen related activities in the all-purpose hall. Those living in two-, three-, or four-room plan houses usually organized their space in such a way as to keep kitchen activities away from the more formal spaces reserved either for dining, socializing, or sleeping. Newspaper advertisements and travelers' accounts reinforce the notion that both owners and builders conceived of the kitchen as a separate and distinct unit, even when it was an integral part of the house. These sources describe kitchens variously as free-standing structures, dependencies attached to the main dwelling, or rooms fashioned in a material different from the rest of the house.
For example, Andrew Smith of Hopewell owned "a good stone dwelling-house...and a large kitchen adjoining one end said house." Isaac Henen's Hopewell farm included "a good two story dwelling-house, kitchen, barn, tanyard, and out-house." When Henry Margerum sold a part of the late Garret Johnson's tract it contained a frame house, "lately repaired, with a cellar, a lean-to, with two rooms on a floor, a kitchen and draw-well near." William Allen sold at public vendue two tracts in 1771, the first containing "one stone dwelling-house 2 stories high, with a cellar under the whole, and a good log kitchen." Even Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts noted that the houses in New Jersey were built partly of stone, partly of wood, sometimes of logs, but always "perfectly neat." In every example, the kitchen is referred to as a desirable and distinct unit.

As Gerry noted, eighteenth-century folk builders constructed their kitchen wings from a variety of materials and with differing methods, but in Hopewell stone was a preferred material. The Theophilus Bainbridge house (figures 35 & 36), the Wilson Hunt house, the Samuel Stout, Jr. house, the John Van Cleve house, the John Stillwell house (figures 37 & 38), the Henry Phillips, Sr. house (figures 39, 40, & 41), the La Rowe/Ege house, and the Johannahs Opdyke/Daniel Hunt house (figures 42 & 43) all possessed stone dining or kitchen wings by the turn of the nineteenth century.
The frequency with which these appendages were constructed in stone, sometimes next to frame dwellings, as in the case of the Theophilus Bainbridge house, John Stillwell house, Henry Phillips, Sr. house, and the Opdyke/Hunt house, suggests that builders viewed the material as particularly well-suited for a space that received the lion's share of use. For example, the busy tavern belonging to Rut Johnson of Hopewell had a large frame house with five rooms on a floor, with a cellar underneath and a "large stone kitchen."\(^{103}\) Not surprisingly, stone was also used as a durable material for several out-buildings. When John Price advertised his estate in 1772, he owned not only a stone dwelling house and stone kitchen, but also a distillery, "over which a new stone house is erected."\(^{104}\) Similarly, John Lambert maintained a sizable plantation and milling operation, but only his weaving shop was made of stone.\(^{105}\)

While 82 percent of the top wealth decile in nearby Upper Makefield, Pennsylvania resided in stone dwellings, we have seen that masonry homes were not exclusively the domain of the rich. Stone possessed insulating properties which made buildings constructed of the material ideal for cold storage, and its durable and fire-resistant qualities, which found wide application in mills, shops, and distilleries, were equally ideal for the wear and tear expected of any busy kitchen. Moreover, as the
commercialization of agriculture became increasingly important, kitchens took on new significance as the centers of production. \textsuperscript{106} Hopewell's new kitchen wings included substantial cooking fireplaces and bake ovens set either in the back of the hearth or in line with it. Both the Woolsey house and Van Cleve house kitchens had built-in sinks and drains. Henry Phillips Sr.'s kitchen contained a plethora of pots, dough trays, bake irons, and cooking equipment as well as reels, wheels, and hatchels, quantities of woolen yarn, flax, whitening pots, cider-making equipment, spinning wheels, casks of pickled pork and hog's lard, lumber, tools, a grindstone, and smoked meat. \textsuperscript{107} As a space designed for heavy use, the stone kitchen wing functioned as a dependency to the larger dwelling, helped in farm production, and served utilitarian needs.

After 1783, Hopewell's folk builders gradually isolated the kitchen from the rest of the house in three ways. First, builders would simply attach a new kitchen onto an original dwelling. For example, when John Van Cleve expanded his one-room house in the late eighteenth century, the masons merely butted a new three-sided room of about the same size to the gable-end of the original structure and knocked out a new connecting door (figure 44). This strategy was the easiest and most frequently adopted in Hopewell, occurring in six of the fifteen houses included in this study. \textsuperscript{108} In the case of the Samuel Stout, Jr. house, builders constructed a
new stone dining room onto the west gable and built a new interior entrance porch (figure 45). The former hall became a kitchen, and the whole house functioned as a two-room house with a socially neutral kitchen in the center (see figure 21).

Second, folk builders would isolate the kitchen by building a new house, usually larger in size, adjacent to the original dwelling, as in the case of the frame addition to Henry Phillips, Jr.'s original stone house (figure 46). Families then typically downgraded the original building into the kitchen and shifted their formal living into the new "big house." In these cases, the new dwelling also almost invariably included a separate entrance passage in the Georgian form. The Job Phillips house followed a similar pattern, and when builders added a new framed addition onto the gable end of the log dwelling of Friday True, they disguised its one-room plan behind a balanced "Georgian" exterior (figure 47). In the latter case, while the new exterior nodded to the increasing acceptance of the Georgian plan in Hopewell, the interior space retained the familiar one-room plan. In all these cases, the final form of the dwelling resembled that of a big house attached to a less important service wing.

Third, and in a variation of the first two options, builders first attached a new kitchen wing onto an original house, then sometime later demolished the original building leaving the
kitchen wing intact, and built a new Georgian-style house in place of the old. The final result outwardly resembled the second strategy except that, rather than being the original house, the stone kitchen wing was itself an earlier addition. Conclusive evidence of this process of building, demolition, and rebuilding is often difficult to find and vague at best in the houses examined for this study, but it nevertheless exists. Today the Henry Phillips, Sr., house (see figures 40 & 41), for example, consists of a small two-story stone kitchen wing attached to a larger frame block built in the Georgian form. The kitchen wing, however, is comprised of only three walls butted against the main building. One might assume that the stone kitchen was added to the frame building, but where the two sections meet, the frame portion is constructed to fit against the stone kitchen, not the other way around. This would suggest that the kitchen was an addition onto a building that preceded the present frame block. There is no conclusive proof, and the flooring nails used in both sections suggest that the kitchen and main house were actually built at the same time.

However, evidence gathered at other buildings tends to support the first theory. At the Edmound Burroughs farm, in 1789 Burroughs surveyed off a parcel of land from his father's estate and built the two story Anglo-American framed Georgian block next to an earlier and much smaller Dutch-framed kitchen wing, which
was apparently moved to the site (figures 48 & 49). The Theophilus Bainbridge house consists of an early nineteenth-century frame hall/parlor house attached to a three-sided stone kitchen wing that may be of an earlier date. The same holds true for the John Stillwell house, where the three-sided stone kitchen wing was added onto an earlier house, or built at the same time as the frame block, or appended sometime later. In addition to these buildings, the later Georigan block of the Job Phillips house apparently replaced an earlier addition, demolished to make way for the new wing.

The clearest and earliest evidence of this metamorphosis actually appears outside Hopewell in the Opdyke/Hunt house just over the Township border in Lawrenceville, and in the John Wallace House in Somerville (figure 50 & 51). The Opdyke/Hunt house, known as Glencairn (see figures 42 & 43), includes a kitchen wing of three walls that once attached to an earlier Dutch-framed dwelling. This building was replaced in the early 1760s with the present frame block, and timbers from the original structure were reused in the floor of the kitchen wing. At the Wallace house, builders added a Dutch-framed kitchen wing onto the first building, then reused the dressed and decorated joists from the original structure to build the new Dutch-framed Georgian block next to the kitchen between 1775 and 1777 (figure 52). Evidence of the door that once led from the kitchen into the original
structure survives in the form of a fragment of a threshold that marks the location of the opening, now blocked by the frame of the newer building (figure 53). The process of rebuilding usually left the service wing intact, but it also created a larger and socially superior main block for the farmer and his family. Furthermore, the fact that owners chose to save their kitchens when replacing their main dwellings demonstrates the relative importance these rooms enjoyed, even when dominated by newer construction.

The Abraham La Rowe/Adam Ege House of c. 1768 best illustrates the pattern of building, demolition, and rebuilding, especially in the Georgian idiom. The dwelling stands in the side of a hill, giving the northern elevation the appearance of a one-story house and the southern elevation that of a two-story building (see figure 24). Sometime in the 1780s, builders attached a small frame wing onto the western gable. Archaeological evidence found on the site suggests that this new wing served as a kitchen or place for preparing food and produce (figure 54). This room then permitted the old hall to become more of a dining area. Around the turn of the nineteenth century the owners demolished the frame wing and replaced it with a new stone addition effectively doubling the size of the original house. It also created a neatly balanced southern elevation, similar in appearance to the increasingly popular Georgian form
(see figure 24). To bring the old hall more into keeping with its new status, the owners removed the original closeted stairs and built a new flight on the other side of the room nearer the center of the house and directly in front of a new main entry (figure 55). They then built a new stone kitchen shed onto the eastern gable end.

Through a process of building and rebuilding with the traditional one-room module, the Eges experimented with, then successfully transformed their traditional eighteenth-century home, first into a combination big house/little house, then into a full-blown Georgian building. In this final form it possesses a nearly balanced facade, central staircase, and several differentiated spaces. The old hall continues to function as the main entry through which visitors pass, but it is now socially neutral. As Henry Glassie noted in his landmark study of folk housing, the skins of houses are something people are willing to change as long as the spaces they must utilize and occupy remain the same within. The traditional system of housing worked for most Hopewell farmers, but their underlying conservativism, while it did not keep these homeowners from experimentation and gradual change, served to regulate the process within a traditional, local framework.

An emerging mindset—one that created distinctions and
separations often attributed to the Georgian world view—gently nudged homeowners and folk builders to enlarge structures through a local process of accretion, and to create dwellings with distinctly articulated spaces that included prominent service wings. The resulting form of a big house attached to a little house was the product of fundamental shifts in the traditional spatial hierarchy of these dwellings. By first removing the kitchen from the heart of the house and into attached dependencies, owners achieved two things: they freed space for the introduction of a dining room and isolated the smells, dirt, and servant's activities associated with the processing of food produce. By investing time and resources in the creation of kitchen wings, owners also demonstrated the degree to which they used the preparation and service of food as a symbol of status.

Kitchen appendages gave both physical and symbolic expression to the increased spatial stratification of Hopewell's farmhouses. They functioned as the actual and figurative link between the raw, untamed world of the barnyard and fields, and the refined, cultured world of the parlor and chamber. Not only did the kitchen wing meet utilitarian needs, but it worked like a fence gate: an elaborate barrier that set off and isolated the farm family in the socially superior inner rooms of the big house, while at the same time linking them to the fields that were their source of wealth. In this sense, some of the earliest versions of
the new kitchen possessed the attributes of the hall, by taking over the functions of the all-purpose room and allowing wealthy planters to assign new importance to old spaces. Eventually owners rearranged their homes to create formal entrance passages, or demolished them completely—all except the kitchen—to build new Georgian dwellings with an intergal entrance and passage.

Not surprisingly, the wealthiest families with the most productive farms were the first to expand their homes in this fashion, though they did so only late in the eighteenth century and by using a module of building equal to the traditional one-room house. Like his vast acres, herds of livestock, and expensive furnishings, kitchen wings helped distinguish the prosperous farmer from his neighbor. Thus the one-room plan house, through a series of adaptations and novel applications, was made to serve new and more specialized purposes. The results generally resembled the ordered massing, symmetrical facades, and spatial hierarchy of the Georgian idiom. But the evolution of Hopewell's buildings owed continued allegiance to local systems of spatial order based on the one-room form. As the domestic spaces of post-revolutionary Hopewell's traditional dwellings were redefined, the buildings underwent a profound physical transformation.
Figure 32. Exterior, Wilson Hunt House as it appeared c. 1880. Note the frame lean-to shed constructed onto the gable-end of the kitchen wing sometime prior to 1828. (Photo, courtesy Hopewell Valley Historical Society)
Figure 33. Wilson Hunt House construction phases. Period One, c. 1735-40; Period Two, c. 1780; Period Three, c. 1795. (Drawing, author)
Figure 34. Exterior, John Bainbridge House, c. 1750, with additions (now destroyed). The central section is the oldest and utilizes Dutch anchor-beam framing. (Photo, courtesy Karl Neiderer)
Figure 35. Exterior, Theophilus Bainbridge House, c. 1810, with additions. The three-sided stone kitchen wing abuts the early nineteenth-century frame block and may be contemporaneous or part of an earlier dwelling. (Photo, author)
Figure 36. Plan, Theophilus Bainbridge House. Plan for the first floor. The early nineteenth-century frame block was constructed using the hall/parlor form. (Drawing, author)
Figure 37. Exterior, John Stillwell House, c. 1865. Period One section is right and stone kitchen wing, partially obscured beneath later frame additions, is left. The three-sided kitchen wing is either contemporaneous with the main block or a later addition. The kitchen was raised vertically in the nineteenth-century. (Photo, author)
Figure 38. Plan and framing detail, John Stillwell House. Substantially rebuilt, the current floor plan is believed to replicate the original. The detail of the corner framing (top) resembles typical shoulder post and rafter construction of Anglo-American origin. (Drawing, author after John Grant)
Figure 39. Exterior, Henry Phillips, Sr. House, c. 1790 or earlier. The three-sided stone kitchen wing (left) is either an addition to an earlier house, or contemporary with the frame block, right. (Photo, author)
Figure 40. Exterior, Henry Phillips, Sr. House as it appeared c. 1890. Note only one chimney on the frame block. (Photo, courtesy Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Birum)
Figure 41. Plan, Henry Phillips, Sr. House. Plan of the first floor. The three-walled kitchen wing is butted against the frame block. (Drawing, author)
Figure 43. Plan, "Glencairn." Plan of the first floor. The Georgian block is built against the three-sided stone kitchen wing. (Drawing, author after HABS NJ-296)
Figure 44. Detail, John Van Cleve House. Detail of the original south gable showing the first roof line of the kitchen addition, later enlarged vertically. (Photo, author)
Figure 45. Exterior of dining room addition, Samuel Stout, Jr. House. View of the dining room wing added c. 1803. The original roof line of this addition was lower than the main roof, later enlarged vertically. (Photo, courtesy Percy Preston)
Figure 46. Exterior, Job Phillips House. The frame section, right, of c. 1830 replaced an earlier addition. The original stone house was downgraded into the service wing. (Photo, author)
Figure 47. Exterior, Friday True House. After completing the frame section, right, the original log structure was covered in weatherboard and used as the kitchen wing. The balanced facade of the frame section suggests multiple rooms, but conceals a one-room space. (Photo, author)
Figure 48. Exterior, Edmound Burroughs House, c. 1790. The Dutch-framed kitchen wing, right, was an addition to another structure moved to this site and incorporated into the new dwelling. (Photo, author)
Figure 49. Plan, Burroughs House. Plan of the first floor. Both the main block and kitchen wing are constructed on a mutual foundation, though they are built of two distinct framing systems. (Drawing, author after the New Jersey Barn Company)
Figure 50. Exterior, John Wallace House, c. 1776. Wallace demolished the original structure, leaving the kitchen wing intact, and built the existing center-passage block adjacent to the kitchen. (Photo, author)
Figure 51. Plan, John Wallace House. (Drawing, author after HABS NJ-50)
Figure 52. Detail, reused joists in the Wallace House basement. The quarter-round beading and sizable dimensions suggest this and other timbers like it came from an earlier structure, perhaps the original building. (Photo, author)
Figure 53. Detail, fragment of a door threshold in the Wallace House. This marked the location of a door that once led into the original structure, now replaced by the present Georgian block. (Photo, author)
Figure 54. Garret, La Rowe/Ege House. View of the west gable end of the Period One section, showing evidence of the abutment of the now demolished Period Two wing. (Photo, author)
Figure 55. Basement kitchen and stair, La Rowe/Ege House. View of the original basement kitchen looking west to the new central stair. The Period Three addition is visible through doorway. (Photo, author)
TOWARD A COMMON BUILDING STOCK

During the next few decades, the "cow and calf" of William Cobbett's description became the locally preferred building-type among the elite. Usually consisting of a big house in the Georgian idiom attached to a small kitchen wing, it emerged as the area's formal expression of an efficient, modern farmhouse and as part of a general reorganization of domestic space that took different forms in different regions across the nation. Spawned from traditional eighteenth-century folk house forms, and gradually adapted to changing social and economic norms, by the beginning of the nineteenth century builders erected the combination big house/little house at the same time and as an integral unit. Such was the case when John G. Hunt rejected the home of his father with its many accretions to build a new dwelling in 1817 (figures 56 & 57) using the "cow and calf" form. By the 1820s other major landholders like the Stouts even abandoned their former hall-parlor houses in preference for the new idiom, erecting new dwellings between 1810 and 1830.

The big house/little house won especially widespread acceptance at a time when farmers began re-consolidating lands.
into larger, more productive plantations. By the early decades of the nineteenth century, most of Hopewell's large tracts of land had been subdivided into small and largely unproductive parcels. Beginning in the 1830s, however, new farmers like Benjamin S. Hill combined the shrunken homesteads of Wilson Hunt and several others to create a single economically productive peach farm. Rising prices and increasingly frenzied land transactions such as Hill's characterized much of the early nineteenth century as planters created new farms large enough to produce surplus crops again. Some of these new farms were in turn purchased by even greater landowners like Michael Vreeland of nearby Rocky Hill, who operated three sizable farms simultaneously. By 1860 Vreeland controlled over three hundred acres, and possessed a combined appraised value of $35,000. His personal estate was estimated at an additional $24,000, making him one of the wealthiest planters in adjacent Montgomery Township, New Jersey. In Hopewell and all over the mid-Atlantic region, newly prosperous farmers began remodeling or reconstructing their farmhouses in the big house/little house form; another major rebuilding of the architectural landscape began to take place.

New agricultural magazines and architectural pattern books encouraged a more scientific approach to farming that included a call for efficient houses. These journals advocated dwellings covered in elaborate architectural detailing that were in fact
thinly veiled versions of the now ubiquitous Georgian dwelling. The Georgian plan swiftly became the most widely published house form in nineteenth-century architectural publications. As late as 1852 William Brown illustrated a Georgian house with attached kitchen wing in *The Carpenter's Assistant* (figure 58). It is no wonder, then, that in 1862 James Anderson, a powerful landholder in nearby Hamilton Township, Mercer County, drafted a set of specifications for a new dwelling house to be constructed by Charles Nutt that fully embraced the new house form. The contract noted:

The house is to consist of three parts, the Main house, the Kitchen, and a lean-to attached to the Kitchen. The Main house is to be 36 ft front by 18 ft deep and 20 ft high. The first story is to be 9 ft. high, the second story 7 ft. 9 in. and the Remainder in the attic. The Kitchen part is to be 18 X 18 ft. and two stories high. The first story to be seven and one half feet high and the second seven feet, all in the clear. The lean-to is to be in the rear of the Kitchen. It is to be one story high and eleven feet out by eighteen wide.

The document goes on to specify all aspects of construction, including details on moldings and windows. In every matter of finish, the kitchen wing was deliberately downgraded as a symbolic indication of its lesser status.

In the 1870s, some of the most progressive farmers, like David Voorhees in nearby Blawenburg, who was a member of the Princeton Agricultural Association, ardent supporter of the county fairs, and advocate of advanced agricultural techniques, continued
to maintain formal Georgian-type houses as powerful symbols of efficiency and prosperity (figure 59). 121

During the eighteenth century a few distinct traditional house forms introduced by settlers in the region underwent a gradual change as folk builders and owners experimented with architectural hybrids to meet their changing social and economic needs. Eventually these local evolutionary forces combined to create a new set of house forms that successfully blended Hopewell's original building stock into a single dominant rural architectural design. The little diversity that existed in the eighteenth century all but disappeared, leaving a landscape dominated by a single major building form consisting of a large main block and attached kitchen wing. The Georgian plan house with its separate entrance passage and stair, once the domain of the few, successfully satisfied planter's evolving attitudes about public and private space, form and function, and, together with the attached kitchen wing, came to symbolize the power of the agrarian elite.
Figure 56. Exterior, John G. Hunt House, c. 1817. A big house/little house combination constructed at the same time. (Photo, author)
Figure 57. Plan, John G. Hunt House. Plan of the first floor. The entrance stair passage provides controlled access to the dining room, left, parlor, top, and service wing, right. The kitchen wing includes specialized closets, and direct access to basement storage rooms. (Drawing, author)
Figure 58. Facade and plan, Seth Sweeter House, Worcester, Massachusetts. Nineteenth-century agricultural treatises and builders' journals advocated the big house/little house form. (Photos, Brown, The Carpenter's Assistant)
Figure 59. David C. Voorhees Farm, c. 1880. "Residence of David C. Voorhees, Blawenburg, Somerset Co., N.J." The Voorhees farm, located just across the Hopewell border in neighboring Montgomery Township, represented the best of the area farms. Voorhees practiced advanced farming techniques and was active in local agricultural societies. (Photo, Snell, History of Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, New Jersey)
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APPENDIX A: INVENTORY OF PRIMARY BUILDINGS

The following inventory of primary buildings examined for this study includes notes on title information, architectural descriptions, and general comments explaining how the buildings are dated and offering other interpretive findings. Dwellings are listed in alphabetical order by the builder/owner's name.

1. THEOPHILUS BAINBRIDGE HOUSE, c. 1810, with additions

Block 92 Lot 10
Pennington-Washington Crossing Road

This house dates almost entirely to the nineteenth-century with the possible exception of the stone kitchen wing, which may have been an addition to an earlier structure (see figures 35 & 36). The history of the house is confused by the presence of another structure which once stood on the same tract of land (see John Bainbridge House).

When the original owner, John Bainbridge, Sr., died in 1765 he left the homestead farm, including the site of the present
building, to his second eldest son Theophilus and an abutting 110 acres, lying on the western side of Jacob's Creek then in the possession of his son John, to his third son William. Both tracts were described as inhabited. The house on the western parcel was destroyed several years ago, but surviving photographs clearly identify it as an eighteenth-century Dutch-framed dwelling with later additions.

Theophilus, owner of the eastern tract, died intestate in 1773 and the property apparently passed to his wife, Mary. She passed away in 1788, leaving her estate to her son William and his wife Hannah Hunt. They had been married in 1777. In 1802 William was assessed a modest $1.75, placing him in the seventh decile. William and Hannah Hunt Bainbridge sold the homestead farm to another Theophilus Bainbridge in 1810. When this Theophilus died intestate in 1824, the property was ordered sold by the Orphan's Court and advertised in the Trenton Federalist as containing "on the premises a good 2 story Dwelling-house, English Barn, Cow-house, Wagonhouse, and Corncrib, all nearly new." The main dwelling clearly dates from the first quarter of the nineteenth century and probably coincides with Theophilus's purchase of the property. It also matches the description in the newspaper. It is a two-story frame building with a hall/parlor plan. The hall contains a non-cooking fireplace in the right
corner and a closeted staircase in the left. The parlor contains
a single fireplace centered in the gable end with a built-in
cupboard to the right and a chair rail throughout. The interior
wood work, mantels, doors, and finish all date to the early
Federal period, including fielded panelling with quirked edges
characteristic of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth
century; the whole is constructed with cut nails. The roofing
system consists of sawn common rafters without collar ties
bridled at the apex and birdmouthed over a sawn false plate. In
general, false plate construction appears in buildings from the
late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Hopewell. The
western addition dates from the 1870s, when the property was sold
to William Anderson in 1875.

The stone kitchen wing, on the other hand, may date from an
earlier time and is either a remnant of the original dwelling or
an addition to an earlier building that was later replaced by the
existing frame structure. The 1765 will of John Bainbridge
indicates that a dwelling stood on this property, and the masonry
construction and plan of the kitchen wing are consistent with late
eighteenth century kitchen additions. It consists of three stone
walls butted against the frame building. Many of the exposed
joists are replacements or reused, especially the joist nearest
the frame section, which contains exposed mortises and butts for
studs. It should be noted that the frame block includes no
facilities for cooking and suggests that the stone kitchen served that function at least by 1810. Nevertheless, the same quirked panelling found in the frame block also appears in the kitchen, and cut nails are used throughout. Furthermore, the original access to the basement of the frame section was made by way of a flight of stairs, now blocked, that originated in the kitchen. This would have afforded access to the storage spaces in the basement, and is another indication that the frame section and stone wing may be of the same period. It should be noted, however, that the frame of the English cow barn mentioned in the advertisement is of eighteenth-century construction.6

NOTES:

1. Will of John Bainbridge, 1765 (640), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

2. Probate of Theophilus Bainbridge, 1773 (866), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

3. Will of Mary Bainbridge, 1787 (1367), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

4. William and Hannah Bainbridge to Theophilus Bainbridge, 1810 (17:92), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

5. "Sale of Real Estate," Trenton Federalist (20 November 1824), Microfilm Collection, Alexander Library, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

2. EDMOUND BURROUGHS HOUSE, 1789

Block 22 Lot 7

Jacob's Creek Road

John Burroughs (1684-1772) moved to Ewing Township around 1705 and purchased a farm there. His son Joseph Burroughs (1725-1798) married Martha Willets (1732-1808) and purchased an estate of 236 acres from Powell Hoff on 3 July 1750. Powell received a confirmation deed from the heirs of Daniel Coxe on 6 November 1749. In 1764 Burroughs expanded his estate with the purchased of an adjacent 320 acres from William Lester and Anna Rodinan.

On 7 October 1789, Burroughs instructed surveyor George Pharo to mark off 200 acres from the first tract for Burrough's son, Edmound, who built this house sometime shortly thereafter (see figures 48 & 49). Like other fathers, Joseph withheld title to the property until his death in 1798, when he finally bequeathed the land to Edmound. The property descended through members of the Burroughs family well into the nineteenth century. In 1802, Edmound was assessed $3.90 in taxes, placing him squarely in the wealthiest ten percent of the population.

The building consists of a Dutch-framed kitchen wing of seven anchor bents butted against an Anglo-American framed
Georgian block. Both rest on what appears to be a foundation constructed at one time. The kitchen wing includes a cooking fireplace tucked against one corner and a closeted staircase, now removed, next to it. All the exposed joists in the Dutch frame are dressed and chamfered, with the exception of the one nearest the fireplace, which lacks chamfering on both sides, and the one next to the Georgian block, which lacks chamfering only on the abutting edge. The outer corner posts are anchored to both the roof plate and the end anchor beam with arch braces and down braces, but the inner corner posts are anchored only to the plate with arch braces. No evidence of mortises or notches appears for either braces or studs anywhere along the inside anchor beam. This would suggest that the Dutch frame was intended to be braced transversely against the larger wing from the outset and was not an older dwelling. Yet the Dutch frame is in no other way integrated or connected to the larger block, and this implies that the frame is older and perhaps moved to the site. Frames like this were also easily reworked for new purposes. A few wrought nails appear in the frame, but these were used interchangeably with cut nails around this time, and can not be relied on.

The Georgian block consists of hewn framing and rafters with half-dovetailed collar ties (now removed) resting on a false plate. Some original split lath remains. The surviving architectural details in this portion of the house include broken
architraves around the main parlor doorways, slender columnar balusters, and raised paneling with quirked edges indicative of the last quarter of the eighteenth century and almost identical to that found in the Theophilus Bainbridge house and the Henry Phillips, Sr. house.

At the very least, the presence of two distinct framing systems used side-by-side suggests they were built at different times and underscores the rapidity with which the Anglo-culture dominated in Hopewell. Whether the Dutch frame is an earlier structure moved to the site or contemporary with the other block, it suggests that while Dutch framing technology was not easily adapted to suit the Georgian house form, it continued to function well in smaller one-room plan buildings and kitchen wings. This preference for the Dutch system in smaller buildings might explain the apparent increase in its use during the nineteenth century in Hopewell, especially among the town's poorer inhabitants.

NOTES:

1. Hoff to Burroughs, 1750 (CC W:3), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

2. Coxe to Hoff, 1749 (CC W:1), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

3. Luster and others to Burroughs, 1764 (CC U:192), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

4. Will of Joseph Burroughs, 1797 (1825), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.
5. Edmond Burroughs to John Burroughs, 1816 (26:104), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA; Probate of John Burroughs, 1817 (2860), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA; Naomi Burroughs and others to Horatio Burroughs and others, 1836 (65:91), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA; Horatio Burroughs to Mary S. Burroughs, 1844 (F:409) Mercer County Registry, NJSA. Mary Burroughs married William Farley sometime between 1844 and 1846; William Farley to Joseph Burroughs, 1851, (U:32) Mercer County Registry, NJSA.

6. 1802 Hopewell Township Tax Ratable.

3. JOHN G. HUNT HOUSE, 1817
Block 31 Lot 43
Marshall's Corner - Woodsville Road

John Guild Hunt (1786-1852) was the son of John Price Hunt and grandson of Wilson Hunt (see Wilson Hunt House).\(^1\) In 1817 John G. Hunt built this stone dwelling on land belonging to his father (see figures 56 & 57). The datestone, marked with the initials "JGH" and the year, is still visible in the top of the eastern gable. The bounds of the farm were clearly mentioned when the executors of John Price Hunt sold the old Wilson Hunt house to Benjamin S. Hill in 1832.\(^2\) John G. Hunt married Rebecca Titus c. 1810. His property passed to his son John S. Hunt in 1852.

The two story stone dwelling and adjoining service wing were constructed at one time and as an integral unit. The foundation and walls are structurally integrated and its framing systems of hewn and sawn timber are consistent throughout. The interior finish, mantels, doors, and chair rails are typical of early Federal design, and are constructed with a combination of wrought and cut nails. The roofing system consists of vertically sawn rafters bridled at the apex and birdmouthed over the plate with plank collar ties nailed into place. Only the central truss employs hewn rafters made from a harder wood and offers greater strength just where the roofing system is weakest. Each roof
truss is further strengthened with a plank king post nailed to the collar tie and the rafter apex. The design is similar in detail to the roofing system employed at the Henry Phillips, Sr. house of c. 1790 (see Henry Phillips, Sr. House).

John Hunt's large Georgian block and smaller kitchen wing demonstrate that the form achieved widespread acceptance by 1817. It is the earliest example of a fully integrated structure, and its service wing includes a variety of convenient closets and cupboards carefully laid out to maximize efficiency. The closet nearest the door is equipped with pegs for hanging things. The door under the stairs originally led directly to the storage rooms in the cellar. Another closet next to the cooking fireplace afforded additional storage, and the small cupboard built into the wall near the parlor door allowed a convenient place for serving things and dining equipment. Instead of one door, the service wing had two: one for the parlor and one for the entrance passage. The kitchen stairs, now extensively rebuilt, led to the second floor chamber.

The entrance passage originally contained a walled-in staircase with a door, which helped to isolate the private rooms on the second floor. The passage afforded access to the dining room (right), kitchen (left), and parlor (straight ahead).
NOTES:

1. Lewis, 95. For additional geneological information see Cooley, 144-145.

2. John G. Hunt and James Stevenson, executors of John P. Hunt to Benjamin S. Hill, 1832 (53:154), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.
Wilson Hunt (1715-1782) was the fourth generation American born to a family of English descent who first settled in Newtown, Long Island. Wilson's father, John Hunt (1685-1748), purchased two 500 acre tracts from Alexander Lockhart in 1714 and built a one room dwelling and detached kitchen described in his inventory.\(^1\) By 1722 John Hunt was taxed for 200 acres, 13 cattle and horses, and 11 sheep.\(^2\) When Hunt bequeathed the homestead farm and other possessions to his children in his will written in 1740, Wilson was already established on a part of his father's plantation. Wilson married Susanna Price (1715-1783) in 1735 and, according to tradition, built this substantial stone house on his father's property.\(^3\) Wilson Hunt certainly lived on the property in 1753 when he was the largest taxpayer in the township. At his death in 1782, he left the building and farm to his son John Price Hunt. John P. Hunt died in 1828 and instructed that the estate be sold by his executors, John G. Hunt and James Stevenson.\(^4\) The property was purchased by Benjamin S. Hill in 1832 and consolidated into a larger and more productive farm.\(^5\) The chain of title continues from here to the present owner.

The architectural design and construction details clearly
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date this house to c. 1735-1750. Its plan and construction follow the standards of the period. It consisted of a hall/parlor plan house on the first floor and a working kitchen and store room in the basement (see figures 17 & 18). A wooden plank partition divided the kitchen from the rougher cellar. A full fireplace, now partially enclosed and modernized, stood against the the northeast corner of the east gable of the kitchen, while the western chimney stack rested on a masonry arch butted into the northwest corner of the store room. Dressed and chamfered joists run north to south in the kitchen while roughly hewn timbers carried the ceiling in the adjacent cellar area. A door in the south wall led directly from the basement kitchen to the outdoors. Two joists mortised into a short bridging beam in the southwest corner of the kitchen identifies the location of the original winding stair, probably enclosed within a vertical plank partition. This stair provided interior access to the floor above and to its principal public rooms.

Much of the masonry work resembles that found in the Job Phillips house of 1764. Stone relieving arches cap all the openings on the exterior. The joists are let directly into the masonry walls and probably rest on top of a plank plate embedded into the masonry. Each set of rafters is bridled together and held in place with a half-dovetail collar tie. In an uncommon detail, the rafters of the Hunt house originally extended through
the wall to support a small overhang. While these extensions disappeared long ago, the sawn ends of the rafters are plainly visible protruding through the wall.

The first addition to the Hunt house, built off the western gable on the uphill side of the building, stood on a watertable constructed to match the original, and included a single unheated room (now partitioned) and garret over a full basement (see figures 18 & 33). A new door knocked through the wall under the hall stairs connected the new room with the older building, but a window and door pierced the addition’s south facade and provided direct access to the outdoors. A closeted stair in the southwest corner of the addition led to the garret. The new wing maintained the roofline of the original, thus avoiding troublesome and potentially leaky, roof joints. Following this addition, the former hall functioned more as an entry passage, regulating access to the bed chamber (right), parlor (left), and kitchen in the basement.

The second addition consisted of a new kitchen built off the eastern, downhill side of the original structure and included an enormous cooking fireplace and bake oven. It also boasted its own exterior door and a small stair (now removed) which provided access to the garret above. The old kitchen was upgraded into a dining room, and the original winding stairs removed and replaced.
with a more elaborate straight flight of steps leading up to the hall. Clearly the unit of construction favored by local builders amounted to little more than a one-room dwelling house. Shortly thereafter, and certainly by 1828, the owners added a shed to protect the baking oven, which protruded out the back wall of the kitchen (see figure 32). 6

Wilson Hunt's will left to his wife, Susanna, a life interest in one-half of the dwelling house "together with the use of one half the Barn, Garden, Orchard, Out House, & Cellars." 7 Perhaps one or more of the additions were constructed around that time.

NOTES:

1. Lockhart to Hunt, 1714 (CC BBB:154), Burlington County Registry, NJSA. The deed describes Hunt as from Newtown, Long Island. See also Coxe to Lockhart, 1713 (CC M:381), Burlington County Registry, NJSA.

2. 1722 Hunterdon County tax, in Hale, 15.

3. Cooley, 141-142; Lewis, 89-90.

4. Inventory of John Hunt, 1748 (215), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA; Will of Wilson Hunt, 1782 (1170), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA; Will of John P. Hunt, 1828 (3629), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

5. John G. Hunt and James Stevenson, executors of John P. Hunt to Benjamin S. Hill, 1832 (53:154), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

6. John P. Hunt's will of 1828 refers to an "oven shed." Ege remembers these oven sheds as general storage areas; Hunt's inventory supports that assertion.

5. ABRAHAM LA ROWE/ ADAM EGE HOUSE, c. 1765, with additions

Block 27 Lot 9
Trenton-Harborton Road

The original section of this dwelling has often been compared in style and construction to the neighboring Harbourton Store, which was built in 1768. The dwelling dates almost certainly from the mid-eighteenth century and was built on a tract of 100 acres originally granted to Abraham La Rowe, Sr., in 1725. Little is known of the La Rowe family in Hopewell, but Abraham appears in the 1722 tax ratable as the owner of 50 acres with 8 cattle and horses and 6 sheep. He also appears as the overseer of the River Road in 1728. His son, Abraham, Jr., appears in the 1753 tax list and as the overseer of highways in 1758. The land in question descended from the senior La Rowe to his widow and two sons in 1750. By 1756 Abraham, Jr. held controlling interest in the property, and he sold it in turn to Adam Ege (1725-1803) of nearby Woodsville in 1771. Adam Ege was born in Germany and emigrated around 1738. He married Margaret Hunt about 1748 and settled first on a farm given him by the Hobbs family of Hopewell. While it is possible that the La Rowe family may have built part of the present dwelling, it is also conceivable that the Ege's are entirely responsible for its construction.

Both the original dwelling and subsequent alterations are
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carefully outlined in the main text (see figures 24 & 25). All joists run front to back and are neatly dressed on the first floor, suggesting they were always exposed. Like most other houses built in this period, the roofing system utilized hewn common rafters bridled at the apex and secured with half-dovetailed collar ties. The interior finish originally included plaster and horse hair applied directly to the masonry. Nailing blocks embedded into the front of the first floor chimney breast suggest the presence of panelling or a mantel shelf at one time. A molded chair rail survives in the northern room. Wrought nails appear throughout the Period One section and cut nails in the Period Three portion. The existing staircase is also constructed using cut nails. When it was installed, the builders converted the original ground floor door into a window and opened a new entry in the left bay more in line with the new stairs (see figure 55). Much of the Period Two addition (see figure 54) was obliterated when the Period Three section was constructed, but the present owners, when repairing the floor in the Period Three section, discovered reused timbers that probably date to the earlier wing.

When Adam Ege died in 1803 his estate was valued at 533 pounds. Among his inventoried possessions were a desk valued at 2 pounds and a clock valued at 7 pounds. He also possessed bonds and notes against debters valued at 271 pounds. A year before
his death he was assessed for $3.32, placing him among Hopewell's wealthiest ten percent.

NOTES:

1. A summary of the title prepared by Betsy Errickson is in the possession of the present owner.

2. Ege, 3-4.

3. Inventory of Adam Ege, 1803 (2055), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

4. 1802 Hopewell Township Tax Ratable, NJSA.
6. BENJAMIN MERRELL HOUSE, c. 1755, with additions

Block 8 Lot 4(A)

Amwell Road

An older resident of the township remembered the Benjamin Merrell House as a "long, low building" before it underwent extensive renovations in 1865. During that year, the owners added a second floor to the original one-and-a-half story frame dwelling and installed a new, slightly higher roof over the original kitchen wing (see figure 22). Fortunately, exposed joists on the first floor and basement help reveal the building's original dimensions.

The property was originally a 127 acre tract deeded from the executors of the Coxe estate to Samuel Stout, Sr., in 1751. Just when it came into the hands of Benjamin Merrell is not clear, but it was certainly in his possession by 1764, when a description of an adjoining property described Merrell as living on the tract. The present owners discovered a spurious datestone reused in the hall chimney stack and bearing the year 1713. The date was found facing in to the flue, and the numbers do not possess serifs as one might expect for that age. Therefore, the date on this stone almost certainly can be discounted as the date of the house and is probably reused from some other building. The framing system and the presence of wrought nails help to date this
house to sometime between 1751, when Merrell purchased the property, and 1764 when he is identified as living there.

Between 1778 and 1785, Benjamin consistently ranked in the top wealth deciles according to his taxes and number of livestock. He also maintained close business and family ties with the other elite, including Samuel Stout, Jr. who conducted the inventory and proved it in court. This inventory listed such goods as beds, a tea service, and queensware plates. It clearly delineates three distinct rooms, including the kitchen wing; a front room which contained "1 bed, Curtains, Beding, and bedstead" valued at 14 pounds as well as a looking glass, dressing table and chest of drawers; and a "back room." Merrell died in 1786 and left the property to his son John. John Merrell sold the property to Lucas Wearts in 1803 from whom the property descended to the present owners.

The original building consisted of two rooms positioned back to back over a full basement (see figure 23). A chimney foundation against the western gable provided footings for the large cooking fireplace in the front room, or hall, and for the corner fireplace in the back parlor. A heavy bridging member running from the chimney foundation to the eastern gable, supports the joists and partition wall above. These joists are mortised into the bridging timber, and a diagonal member in the back room...
laps over two joists to support the hearth for the corner fireplace above.

The rest of the building probably consists of Dutch anchor bent construction in some Dutch-American hybrid form. The exposed joists in the hall are dressed and include chamfered edges with small lamb's tongue details terminating at the exterior wall and interior partition respectively. These timbers apparently continue uninterrupted through the partition and on to the north wall and ride overtop a bridging member concealed within the partition. All doors and windows fit snugly between joists and suggest that the joists are mortised and tenoned into posts that stand on either side of these openings. Interestingly, while the framing of the basement uses a bridging summer beam, the main structure utilizes elements of the anchor bent framing system and suggests that Merrell's carpenters combined two framing traditions into a Dutch-American hybrid.

Benjamin Merrell's inventory suggests that the kitchen wing was in place by 1786. This addition is erected on a low foundation over a dirt crawlspace and several inches below the floor level of the original house. The frame of this new addition also consists of anchor beam construction. The new room includes a cooking fireplace and closeted staircase on the gable end and an exterior entrance door and window in the north and south walls.
The builders cut through the sill of the original house and created a new passage under the original stairs into the new wing. Still later a frame oven shed was extended over the bake oven, but was replaced sometime in the nineteenth century with the present structure.

NOTES:


2. Daniel Coxe to Samuel Stout, 1751, (CC M:471), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

3. Will of Joseph Stout, 1764 (721), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

4. Will and Inventory of Benjamin Merrell, 1786 (1353), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

5. John Merrell to Lucas Wearts, 1803 (L:725), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

6. When they opened the wall for repairs several years ago, the present owners discovered that the joists continue uninterrupted through the partition. Conover, interview.
7. HENRY PHILLIPS, Sr. HOUSE, c. 1790

Block 54 Lot 7
Pleasant Valley Road

John Phillips, Sr. purchased the 125 acre tract in 1737 from his brother Joseph, who originally acquired it from the estate of William Bryant in 1733. By 1775, John Phillips, Sr. had acquired an additional 20 acre tract and his son, Henry, possessed 50 acres adjacent to his father's farm below the present Pleasant Valley Road. According to tax ratables, in 1779 Henry operated a grist mill and was listed as a householder on his father's property. By May 1780 John Phillips let 96 acres above Pleasant Valley Road to his son, Henry, and kept 49 acres below the road, including the mill site, for himself. From this point until his death in 1789 John was listed in the tax ratables as a householder, presumably with his son Henry in the homestead located above the road. When John Phillips prepared his will in 1780 he left to his son Henry, "the plantation on which I now dwell" and reserved for his unwed daughter Polly, "the use of the two Back Rooms in my dwelling house as long as she remains in a single state." This description of the dwelling does not correspond to the existing structure, and probably refers to another house no longer extant.

The building was certainly there by 1805, when Henry's
inventory clearly documents the existing house. It consists of a stone kitchen wing of three walls butted against a frame, side-passage block (see figures 39 & 41). A combination of architectural details, sawn framing members, and the presence of machine cut nails with applied heads, place the construction date of the existing building squarely in the fourth quarter of the eighteenth century, probably after 1789 when Henry Phillips inherited the land. The building resembles in every respect the Edmound Burroughs house of c. 1790 (see figures 48 & 49) and apparently dates from the same period. While the first inclination is to assume that the kitchen wing is an addition, the structural evidence suggests that the entire house was built either at one time or that the kitchen wing predates the Georgian block. The doorway leading from the frame section into the kitchen wing is clearly original to the frame section of the house, and the staircase and joists in the smaller wing also appear to date from the same general era. And yet the frame of the larger block was designed to fit against the kitchen wing, not the other way around.

The framing system employed in the main block is all of late eighteenth-century construction. The principal timbers are hewn while all of the secondary members, including rafters, are of vertically sawn lumber. In an interesting variation, the builders nailed sawn planks to the apex and collar tie of each pair of
rafters to form a king post; a similar feature was employed in the John G. Hunt House. Cut nails with hand-applied heads are used almost exclusively throughout the house. The outside facing of the frame block that abuts the stone kitchen shows no evidence of siding or nailholes for exterior sheathing. In addition, the original nogging in this portion of the wall, unlike other sections, is carefully positioned flush with both the inside and outside face of the framing in order to provide a suitable surface for plastering. The original plaster still remains on the inside surface. The roofing system used in the kitchen wing utilizes a hewn false plate and mechanically sawn rafters similar to those used in the main house, with the exception of two hewn rafters possibly reused from another structure. Overall, it seems likely that the stone kitchen wing was added to a previous structure, which was later replaced with the present wing, as in the case of both the Opdyke/Hunt House and the Wallace House.

NOTES:

1. Joseph Phillips to John Phillips, 1737 (CC E:284), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA. The various parcels of land are recorded in the deed from Stevenson and Hoppock to William, Henry, Ralph, and John H. Phillips, 1803 (12:45), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

2. Henry purchased 17.5 acres of his 50 acre tract from Samuel Stout, Sr. sometime between 1774 and 1778 when he was taxed for part of it. See: Peter Phillips to Samuel Stout, 1774 (CC A-I:228) Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA. Henry Phillips acquired an additional 11.25 acre tract from Stout or his heirs sometime between 1781 and 1785. See Coxe to Stout, 1773, (CC A-I:225), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.
8. HENRY PHILLIPS, Jr. HOUSE, c. 1810, with additions

Block 55 Lot 1(A)
Hunter Road

Today the Howell Living Historical Farm, this early nineteenth-century stone dwelling was long assumed to be of eighteenth-century origin (see figures 14 & 15). It originally consisted of a banked, one-room dwelling with a fireplace and closeted staircase. The land was originally part of the 125 acre tract John Phillips, Sr., purchased in 1737 from his brother Joseph, who originally acquired it from the estate of William Bryant in 1733. When John Phillips, Sr., prepared his will in 1780 he left to his son Henry, "the plantation on which I now dwell" (see Henry Phillips, Sr House). Phillips died in 1789 and his son Henry inherited the property. Henry died intestate in 1805, and when his lands were divided among his sons, Henry Jr., (b. 1786) received the tract of 79.75 acres were the present house stands. According to one deed, the farm was already divided into tracts by 1805. Henry, Jr. married Catherine Quick in 1811 and probably settled permanently on this part of his deceased father's estate at that time.

The frame addition on the eastern end now obscures the original basement entrance. This new addition uses corner posts hewn to form two-story high L-beams of solid wood and a false
plate system of roof construction. Riven lath is also used throughout (riven lath was used as late as 1835 in the area). At the same time the stone section was raised to a full two stories. In the late nineteenth century the roof system was largely replaced, but a few original rafters serve as nailers for barge boards on the gable ends.

NOTES:

1. Joseph Phillips to John Phillips, 1737 (CC E:284), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

2. Will of John Phillips, 1789 (1476), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.


4. Stevenson and Hoppock to William, Henry, Ralph, and John H. Phillips, 1805 (12:45), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.
9. JOB PHILLIPS HOUSE, 1764, with additions

Block 121 Lot 27
Church Road

This is one of the best preserved eighteenth-century dwellings examined. Today part of the Washington Crossing State Park, the original farmstead included a 190 acre tract of improved land stretching from the banks of the Delaware River east to the valley ridge. The dwelling stands near the back of the lot on the edge of a plateau some 140 feet above the river.

The original eighteen by twenty foot stone dwelling contains a datestone marked "Octr 4 1764" with the initials "JPP," presumably for Job (1735-1822) and Phebe Howell Phillips. They received a license to be married on 13 April 1764 and were wed in May.\(^1\) A 1783 road return for the new way "leading to the Delaware River" notes Job Phillips as living on the property. Phillips died in 1822 and the property passed to his son Joseph. Joseph died intestate in 1831 and the property was divided among his heirs.\(^2\) His son, Joseph R. Phillips, however, continued to farm the property and eventually consolidated it again from the various heirs.\(^3\) In 1838 he sold it to Alfred Holcombe from whom the title descends.\(^4\)

Throughout the eighteenth century, Hopewell tax ratables

---

\(^1\) 1783 road return for the new way "leading to the Delaware River" notes Job Phillips as living on the property.
\(^2\) Joseph Phillips died intestate in 1831.
\(^3\) Joseph R. Phillips sold the property to Alfred Holcombe in 1838.
\(^4\) The title later passed to Alfred Holcombe.
listed Job Phillips with 161 acres of improved land and 40 acres of woodlot. By 1802 Job had given his son Joseph 61 acres on which he probably constructed the frame dwelling formerly on the parcel and now destroyed. With his farm now reduced to 100 acres, Job still paid $2.07 in taxes, placing him in the third highest decile.\(^5\)

The original stone section (see figures 9 & 10) rose on a high watertable over a full basement of roughly coursed fieldstone. A substantial masonry arch shaped over a wooden form springs from the floor and butts against the northwestern corner of the foundation to support the masonry fireplace and chimney above. The grain of the wooden form is still visible in the mortar. Heavy wooden lintels set over the doors and windows carry the masonry loads above (see figure 11). On the exterior, however, elaborate decorative stone relieving arches cap both the basement and first floor openings. Just above these lintels, a one inch thick wooden plate inserted into the north and south walls carries decoratively beaded ceiling joists. The masonry envelops the ends of these joists and continues up to the roof plate. Here another wooden plate caps these walls and a simple roofing system of bridled rafters with half-dovetailed collar ties is birdmouthing over the plate.

The interior retains an original raised-panel door, with HL

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
hinges, and nailing blocks for a chair rail set into the masonry. Structural evidence also indicates that an earlier addition existed next to the eastern gable on the site of the current framed block. The doorway between the two sections may have been a window originally. Disturbed masonry around the lower edges suggests that it was enlarged into a doorway, presumably to provide access into the earlier addition. The opening was then reduced in width when the present wing was added in the early nineteenth century, perhaps after 1831 when Joseph R. Phillips took over the farm.

NOTES:


2. Will of Job Phillips, 1822, (3211), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA. Probate of Joseph Phillips, 1831, (3909), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.


4. Joseph R. Phillips to Alfred Holcombe, 1838 (A:51), Mercer County Registry, NJSA.

5. This frame dwelling (Block 121 Lot 28), now destroyed, stood near Phillips' stone house on what became the southern parcel. See Hunterdon County deeds 53:362, 68:416, 69:188, & 69:189, and Hunterdon County Road Returns (1:123), NJSA.
10. JOHN STILLWELL HOUSE, c. 1765, with additions

Block 25 Lot 14
Lambertville-Hopewell Road [Route 518]

Frame dwellings are perhaps the most expressive of ethnic construction because of their particular framing details. The John Stillwell house in the northern part of the township is one of only two original pre-Revolutionary Georgian buildings examined in this study (see figure 37). Its framing is especially interesting, consisting of shouldered corner posts that carry the front plate and the end girt with the end rafter firmly seated in the end girt, and its collar tie, which is under tension, mortised into the rafter (see figure 38). The rest of the rafters are simply birdmouthed over the plate, bridled at the apex, and, because these rafters are under compression, are half-dovetailed in. The system bears a remarkable resemblance to the roof of the Peak house in Medford, Massachusetts.¹

John Stillwell married Sarah Stevenson about 1760 and purchased the property in an unrecorded deed in 1765. While there is no certainty he built the house at that time, in 1778 he appeared on the tax rolls with 130 acres of surrounding land. At that time he owned four horses, six cattle, and three pigs, and had 365 pounds on loan at interest. In a further indication of the strong ties between the major families, no less than three of
Stillwell's daughters married into the family of John Van Cleve. By 1825 he had given over the farm to his son-in-law Samuel Van Cleve and was himself living in Amwell. At the time of his death two years later, Stillwell's extensive estate totaled $5,9317.13. Like his neighbors, Stillwell retained title to the properties divided between his sons and son-in-law until after his death. This house, however, he required be sold at auction out from under his son-in-law.

A one-story stone kitchen wing extends out the western side of the building and is either contemporaneous with the frame section, or an addition attached to the main dwelling sometime shortly after its construction. The position of the kitchen fireplace and the use of iron lintels over the doors and windows suggest the former. The wing was later raised to two stories, then enveloped in frame additions, leaving the stone portion buried in the center of the wing.

NOTES:

1. Abbott Lowell Cummings argues that the roof frame used in the Peak house is a distinctly American solution to the problems of framing a roof. See Cummings, 115-116.

2. See note 1 in the entry for John Van Cleve House in this appendix.

3. In his will, Stillwell explains this to us. See Will of John Stillwell, 1827 (3416), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA. Samuel Van Cleve married Phebe Stillwell in 1811.
The present building is a mid-nineteenth century reconstruction following a devastating fire that consumed all but the foundation of the original structure. However, its eighteenth-century appearance is well documented in a newspaper advertisement and in an early nineteenth-century painting (see figures 29 & 30). The original stone structure was built in 1752 for Colonel Joseph Stout (1686-1767), according to a surviving datestone which also appears in the painting; it represents the earliest Georgian-plan dwelling examined in this survey.

Stout's father, Jonathan Stout, divided the tract from his larger farm and deeded it to Joseph in 1710. ¹ Joseph died in 1767 and the property was placed in the guardianship of his dead son's father-in-law, Wilson Hunt, for the benefit of the Colonel's grandson. The accounts of Wilson Hunt tell a fascinating tale of one man's control of the vast resources of this important and profitable farm, and document complicated barter transactions, payments, and leases of the land to various tenants. ² The house was considered suitable enough for Washington to use for his headquarters prior to the battle of Monmouth. After Joseph, Jr.
came of age, he sold the property to his brother Wilson in 1789, who sold it in turn to John Weart the following year. The farm remained in the Weart family well into the twentieth century.

NOTES:

1. Jonathan Stout to Joseph Stout, 1710 (CC E:407), Hunterdon County Registry, NJS.

2. Will and Account of Colonel Joseph Stout, 1764 (721), Hunterdon County Probate, NJS; Account of Wilson Hunt, Guardian of Joseph, Wilson, Ruth, and Daniel Stout, 1780 (741), Hunterdon County Probate, NJS.

3. Ege, 158.
12. SAMUEL STOUT, Jr. HOUSE, 1756, with additions

Block 8 Lot 14(A)

Dunwald Road

The early history of the land is unclear, but a datestone on the south facade located next to the original door reads "SAS" and the year "1756," presumably for Samuel Stout, Jr., (1730-1803) and Anne Van Dyke Stout (1733-1810), who were married in 1753. Together with his father Samuel Sr., (1709-1831), both men farmed much of the land in the area, but the records often fail to distinguish between the two. Nevertheless, we know they participated in political life. Both served as justices and judges to the Court of Common Pleas. Samuel, Jr. was elected to the state Legislature in 1793 and served one term. One served as a freeholder, and as surveyors and overseer of the roads. One or both served as the tax assessor between 1766 and 1770 and as constable. Another served as moderator and judge of elections for the town, and served as a deacon, an elder, and a trustee in the Hopewell Baptist Meeting House. They also witnessed and appraised estates on a regular basis. Each maintained respectable and powerful positions in both the civic and religious life of their community.

Samuel, Sr. purchased the property of 255 acres in two parcels. His son, Samuel, Jr., apparently built the house on his
father's property while the father continued to live on the homestead farm located south of present Route 518. Sometime after his father's death in 1781, Samuel, Jr., moved to the homestead farm and let his son, Andrew, run the old farm. Just before his death in 1803, Samuel, Jr., divided the tract of land with the stone house between his two sons Ira and Andrew; Andrew received the eastern half including the dwelling. When Samuel, Jr., died in October of 1803 he still resided on the homestead plantation south of the Hopewell-Rocky Hill road with his son, Ira. His inventory totaled $3,285.41 and his personal land holdings included 310 acres of prime valley land and woodlots, 2,600 acres of land in Ohio, and such luxury goods as a $40.00 silver tankard, an eight day clock valued at $40.00, and a library of books totaling $80.00. He was not only an extremely wealthy individual but literate on a number of subjects.

Though extensively remodeled in 1970 by the architectural firm of Walker Sander Ford and Kerr, of Princeton, New Jersey, the dwelling's original appearance and layout are preserved in architectural drawings and family snapshots (see figures 20, 21 & 45). The original symmetrically planned facade concealed a traditional hall/parlor plan. Around 1800 a dining wing was added to the western gable of the house and a small interior entry constructed around the front door. Visitors entered this
vestibule first, then proceeded into the former hall. From here they could pass into the dining room (left), or parlor (right).

Following his father's death, Andrew Stout and his wife sold the stone house and plantation to Abraham Stryker of Amwell Township on 20 September 1804 and moved to the Ohio lands. The addition certainly existed by 1805, when Stryker's inventory mentioned "books & Sundries on the Mantle Shelf" and "Crockery & Sundries in the Closet"—features found only in the dining wing. The wing resembled other one-room additions constructed around the same time; it contained an independent exterior door, fireplace, and stairs to the garret above. It also had no basement. Originally its roof was lower than the main house, but was raised to the same height as the other shortly after completion. Unlike its counterparts in other dwellings which contained cooking fireplaces, this wing possessed a standard heating fireplace, modestly trimmed with early nineteenth-century molding and a mantel shelf, together with a small built-in cupboard for holding crockery and dining equipment. Cut nails appear throughout this part of the structure, and its roofing system consists of sawn rafters bridled at the apex, birdmouthed over the plate, and secured with half-dovetailed collar ties.

Stryker's inventory provides us with our earliest description of the house. It also builds a picture of Stryker's
economic status. His estate totaled $3,300.80 and included four
slaves and $1,879.19 in outstanding bonds and book accounts. The
descriptions of these book accounts suggest that Stryker
supplemented his farming income with other businesses. For
example, the inventory listed two desks, three spinning wheels,
chairs, two breakfast tables, and an eight day clock valued at
$50.00. It also included "Walnut Boards & Applewood" and a "Grind
Stone & Sundaries In The Shop," suggesting that Stryker may have
worked as a cabinetmaker in addition to his farming. Regardless,
while Stryker's wealth almost certainly equalled that of Stout's,
the bulk of Stryker's money was invested in bonds and book
accounts.

NOTES:

1. For genealogical information on the Stout family see
   Stout.


3. Daniel Coxe to Samuel Stout, 1740 (CC M:474), Hunterdon
   County Registry, NJSA; Daniel Coxe to Samuel Stout, 1750 (CC
   M:468), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

4. The homestead farm is described in a deed from the
   estate of Samuel Stout to Nathaniel Burrows, 1611 (18:393),
   Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA. A part of this estate is also
   described in two other deeds: James Hide to Samuel Stout, 1733 (CC
   M:463), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA, and Daniel Coxe to Samuel
   Stout, 1755 (CC M:477), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

5. The conveyance was made on 8 August 1803 and is referred
   to in the deed from Andrew Stout to Abraham Stryker, 1804
   (10:181), Hunterdon County registry, NJSA.
6. Inventory of Samuel Stout, 1803, (2079), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

7. Andrew Stout to Abraham Stryker, 1804. See also Stout to Burrows, 1811. Andrew Stout is described as living in Ohio.

8. Inventory of Abraham Stryker, 1805, (2168), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

9. Inventory of Abraham Stryker.
13. FRIDAY TRUE HOUSE, c. 1805, with additions

Block 3 Lot 3
Mountain Church Road

Found recently under later circular sawn clapboarding, the Friday True House, built by a free black, stands in the upper regions of the Sourland mountains near the northeastern boarder of East Amwell Township. The original log section measures sixteen by twenty feet and stands on a rubble foundation with a half‐cellar approximately five feet deep (see figures 4 & 5). The remains of a partially demolished chimney foundation along the dwelling’s eastern gable is the last remaining remnant of the original cooking fireplace, though floor patches secured with wire nails are clearly visible in both the first and second floors. The original closeted stair and floorboards are built using cut nails, further suggesting that this section of the house dates from the early nineteenth century. The logs are joined with V‐notch construction with a combination of mud and stone fill for the especially large interstices.

The one room, two‐story frame addition is constructed of hewn timbers and cut nails, and is built on a stone foundation over a low crawlspace. The frame is butted against the original log section, and has a second story accessible only through the older house. A single brick stove flue replaces a larger
fireplace which once rose against the outside eastern gable of the log house. Patches in the floors and plaster walls preserve its original dimensions.

Though the precise date of construction is not known, Friday True appears in the 1802 Hopewell Township tax ratables as a householder with one head of cattle. While he may have occupied the original house by that time, True was the former slave of Oliver Hart, minister of the Hopewell Baptist Church, and he did not gain his freedom until sometime in the early nineteenth century. In 1817 he and his wife, Judd, mortgaged the house and property of 20.57 acres to Andrew Weart for $442.69. They paid it off in 1839. Just when True acquired full title to the land is not known, but his son Aaron owned the property in the mid-nineteenth century. As a building material, clearly log enjoyed a prolonged period of use.

NOTES:

1. 1802 Hopewell Township Tax Ratable, NJSA.

2. Mortgage from Friday True to Andrew Weart, 1817 (Mort. 8:240), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.
14. JOHN VAN CLEVE HOUSE, c. 1777, with additions

Block 31 Lot 83
Poor Farm Road

Colonel John Van Cleve (1757-1814) was the fourth generation American-born descendant of Dutch ancestors who originally settled in New Utrecht, Long Island in 1653. The Colonel married Elizabeth Moore (b. 1758) in 1777 and they had nine children. The family developed close ties with John Stillwell, whose three daughters, Charity, Sarah, and Phebe married into the Van Cleve family.

When Van Cleve died intestate in 1814, his house consisted of two rooms: the original block and a new kitchen wing attached to the southern gable. That year his inventoried property totaled $1,760.91 and included such genteel items as china cups, tea spoons, a looking glass, and an eight day clock. When the farm was sold to the Township in 1821 for use as the new poor farm, the newspaper advertisement referred to the building as the "old house by the road."

When Van Cleve added the one-room kitchen wing to his house, he truncated the original fireplace and knocked through a connecting door under the closeted staircase. At the same time he inserted a new window on the south side of the main door. This
had the effect of symmetrically balancing the facade of the original block; the new wing retained its own front door and flanking window. The general effect was to create a new house that resembled the hall/parlor homes of Hopewell's landed elite.

In 1830, after the house became the dormitory for the township poor farm, a committee purchased materials for "repairing or rebuilding the poorhouse." At this time the roof was raised to the height of the original block. Regardless of when these changes took place, the additions to the Van Cleve house record a complex evolution of building and rebuilding that characterized Hopewell valley dwellings.

NOTES:

1. Ege, 173-4. The children of John and Elizabeth Van Cleve included: Chryonce (b. 1778); Christiana (b. 1780); Elizabeth (b. 1782); Joseph (b. 1784), who married first Charity Stillwell and second, Sarah Stillwell Brown; Penelope (b. 1786); Samuel (b. 1788), who married Phebe Stillwell; Ann (b. 1793); Charles (b. 1793); and Patty (b. 1800).

2. Cooley, 293.

3. Inventory of John Van Cleve, 1814 (2706), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA. The inventory makes special reference to "Kitchen plates" and Kitchen furniture."

4. A public sale notice for the property of "the late Colonel John Van Cleve" appears in the Trenton Federalist, (26 March 1821) Microfilm Collection, Alexander Library, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
15. JEREMIAH WOOLSEY HOUSE, 1765, with additions

Block 92 Lot 26
Pennington-Washington Crossing Road
HABS NJ-201

The only pre-revolutionary brick dwelling examined in this study, the Woolsey House was built near Pennington by Jeremiah Woolsey in 1765 when he was serving on the building committee for the new Presbyterian meeting house in Pennington (see figures 26, 27, & 28).¹

Men of similar wealth made decorative use of brick in Salem and Gloucester Counties prior to and during the same period. The Woolsey house, however, is devoid of these distinctive patterns, but its south and two side elevations are constructed in Flemish bond with an occasional glazed header inserted for decoration. The north elevation, by contrast, consists of common bond. The hall and parlor were originally divided by a conventional vertical plank wall, now removed; the division between the front and back rooms consists of a substantial, load-bearing brick wall at least two courses thick, dividing the house vertically from cellar to garret.² The two main front rooms still retain their own doors to the outside. The resulting fenestration creates a balanced facade. The surviving paneling and woodwork all date to the mid-eighteenth century and wrought
nails are used throughout the house. The roofing system consists of hewn rafters bridled at the apex and birdmouthed over the plate. The system also uses a principal purlin on each slope with half-dovetailed collar ties resting immediately above each purlin.

Jeremiah Woolsey possessed more than moderate wealth. His inventory of 1801 totaled $3,189.90. Unlike his agriculturally oriented neighbors, though, much of Woolsey's wealth lay in interest-bearing certificates and bonds. In addition, Woolsey possessed four shares in the "Patterson Factory," a New Jersey manufacturing establishment begun in 1791, and still under construction on the Passaic River when Woolsey wrote his will. Though the Patterson Factory failed, Woolsey invested his wealth in more than the local economy, spreading his purse as far as Patterson and the New York region.

By 1802 his son and heir, Ephraim, possessed 218 acres of improved land and paid $3.92 in taxes, ranking him among the wealthiest ten percent of the population (see table 1). He also possessed the material symbols of wealth, including a clock, valued at $30.00, and a male and female slave valued at $110 and $70 respectively. The kitchen wing was added shortly after Ephraim inherited the property; His son, George, scratched his name and the year 1802 into one of the window panes.
NOTES:

1. Hale, 59. For genealogical information on the Woolsey family see Cooley, 315-316 and Hale, 26-27.

2. There is no evidence to suggest that this brick wall was once an original exterior wall.

3. Will and Inventory of Jeremiah Woolsey, 1801 (1993), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA. See also: Will and Inventory of George Woolsey, 1762 (583), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA; Will and Inventory of Mary Woolsey, 1809 (2394) Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA; and Will and Inventory of Ephraim Woolsey, 1817 (2919), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

4. The intent of the Patterson Factory was to produce cotton cloth. See John W. Barber and Henry Howe, Historical Collections of the State of New Jersey (Newark, NJ: Published by Benjamin Olds for Justus H. Bradley, 1844), 408.

5. Inventory of Jeremiah Woolsey.
APPENDIX B: INVENTORY OF ANCILLARY BUILDINGS

These buildings were not examined in detail but contribute to the overall understanding of this study. Dwellings are listed alphabetically by the builder/owner's name. Unless otherwise specified, all houses are located in Hopewell Township. Note that block and lot numbers are provided only for buildings in Hopewell; all others are identified by street name only.

1. JOHN BAINBRIDGE HOUSE (destroyed), c. 1750, with additions

    Block 92 Lot 11

    Formerly Pennington-Washington Crossing Road

    Though destroyed, photographs of this building show an excellent example of building additions organized in a linear fashion (see figure 3). This structure consisted of three distinct frame sections, with the oldest of Dutch construction. Perhaps this was the original homestead referred to in John Bainbridge's will and described as "now in the possession of my eldest son, John."¹ In 1774 a John Bainbridge mortgaged the 46-acre property to Robert Taylor.² He paid taxes on the farm in
1780, then sold it to William Bainbridge in 1793. By 1849 the property belonged to Sarah Bainbridge.

Folk builders in Hopewell used the one room house as the unit of choice in new construction. By appending these units onto existing dwellings, they redefined the spatial organization of homes, allowing Hopewell's farmhouses to function like Georgian-plan buildings, with specialized rooms and a socially neutral entrance passage.

NOTES:

1. Will of John Bainbridge, 1765 (640), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

2. Mortgage, John Bainbridge to Robert Taylor, 1774 (Mort L:30), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

3. 1780 Hopewell Township tax ratable, NJSA. See also John Bainbridge To William Bainbridge, 1793 (20:305), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

4. See J. W. Otley and J. Kelly, Map of Mercer County, 1849, NJSA.
2. BAKER HOUSE, c. 1800, with additions

Block 50 Lot 16

Pennington-Harbortun Road

Built in two stages beginning near the turn-of-the-nineteenth century, the earliest section consisted of an Anglo-American framed Georgian side-passage block with an attached Dutch-framed kitchen wing (figure 60). The kitchen wing, like that of the Burroughs house, consisted of an earlier building moved to the site and incorporated into the new structure. The evidence for this appears in the framing. The outer posts of the wing are tied and braced to the anchor beam and plate respectively, while the inner posts are secured only with arch braces to the plate. The kitchen wing, therefore, was built in a separate framing system from the main house but was not constructed as a free-standing unit. This configuration supports the notion that, like the Burroughs house, the Baker kitchen wing was originally an addition onto another structure.

Around 1870 builders added the western two bays and unified the main facade beneath common weather boarding and a new roof. They also constructed a long porch running the full length of the main block. On the inside, the builders expanded the basement by removing the old western foundation wall to create one large cellar. To simplify construction, the builders positioned the
joists of the new addition on top of the girt in the old frame, instead of mortising them in. The result was a pronounced step-up into the new rooms on the first and second floors: simple solutions that tied the two sections together.
Figure 60. Exterior, Baker House, c. 1800, with additions. The original building comprised the kitchen wing and the right three bays of the main block. The left two bays were added c. 1870 and the entire facade unified under a new roof and siding. (Photo, author)
4. McPHERSON HOUSE, c. 1800

Block 5 Lot 6
Van Dike Road

Probably built in the early nineteenth century, this one-room frame structure (figure 61) had a kitchen wing attached to the western gable sometime after the first dwelling was complete. Later, builders added another bay to the eastern gable end. The kitchen wing originally stood on top of a shallow crawl space (now excavated) and contained a full cooking fireplace against the western wall. This fireplace and stack were subsequently removed, probably in the 1940s, and the back side of the original chimney utilized for a new, smaller fireplace that took advantage of the existing chimney stack. Stairs to the second level were located against the outside gable end where the removed stack once stood. Modest in scale and prominence, the house helps confirm the continuing process of adding kitchens to the dwellings.
Figure 61. Exterior, McPherson House, c. 1790, with additions. The kitchen wing (partially obscured at left) is an early nineteenth-century addition onto an earlier dwelling. (Photo, author)
When Johannes Opdyke purchased the original tract of 250 acres from Thomas Green in 1697, the deed mentioned a dwelling house on the property.\(^1\) Though it is not clear whether this or another tract of 200 acres Opdyke bought later that year incorporated the present site of the farmhouse, a house was clearly on the Opdyke farm by 1745.\(^2\) A map from that year identifies the dwelling house in the general location of the present building (see figures 42 & 43). Johannes' son, Laurence, is shown occupying it. When he died three years later, the inventory of his estate referred to a cellar, which does not exist under the stone kitchen.\(^3\) Since the larger frame block is clearly from a later time, it can be assumed that the inventory referred to a part of the dwelling that no longer exists. At the time of Laurence's death, his inventoried estate totaled 434 pounds and he owned such luxury items as walnut tables, looking glasses, two slaves, and 224 pounds on loan at interest. Like his prosperous Hopewell neighbors, Opdyke clearly possessed considerable wealth.

The property passed to Nicholas Veghte of Somerset, who
sold it to Daniel Hunt in 1762. Hunt probably built the Georgian block adjacent to the stone kitchen wing shortly after his purchase. The architectural details inside the main block closely resemble the details of the Job Stockton house, another dwelling built in Princeton in 1766. Nathaniel Hunt purchased the property in 1782. Shortly after his death in 1811 his inventory referred to the kitchen garret, suggesting that the stone wing was still only one and a half stories. Hunt's inventory also includes such symbols of wealth as five slaves, a riding chair, two feather beds valued at $62 and a "best" looking glass. The inventory also refers to many of the rooms in the frame portion, confirming its existence at that time.

The stone kitchen wing consists of three walls and was originally built as a one-story addition to an earlier structure. Reused timbers found under the current kitchen floor were characteristic of Dutch anchor-beam construction and may have been reused from the original structure built by Johannes or Laurence Opdyke. The house is generally referred to today as "Glencairn."

NOTES:

1. Green to Opdyke, 1697 (CC B:585) Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA.

2. Dixon to Opdyke, 1697 (CC B600) Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA. See John Dailey, Map of the Road from Trenton to New Brunswick, 1745, Archives and Manuscripts Collection, Princeton University Libraries, Princeton, New Jersey.
3. Inventory of Laurence Updike, 1743 (236), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.


5. Inventory of Nathaniel Hunt, 1811 (2475), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.
5. HEZAKIAH STOUT HOUSE, c. 1800

Block 8 Lot 2(A)

Amwell Road

This banked stone structure includes a central stair hall, flanked by a dining room and parlor (figure 62). A former kitchen wing, once attached to the eastern gable off the dining room, was replaced by the modern kitchen wing in 1967. The house bears a spurious datestone marked 1765 above the initials "HS," presumably for the owner Hezakiah Stout. The current owners moved the date stone from its original location near the bottom of the western gable to its present position next to the rear door.

Hezakiah Stout received a confirmation deed for the 120 acre property from the Coxe heirs in 1756, but he does not appear on the township tax records until 1785, when he was assessed for 150 acres of improved land, four horses, eight cattle, and one slave.\(^1\) In the 1802 tax ratable, Stout was assessed $328, placing him in the top decile in terms of wealth. He also possessed a desk, dining room table, looking glass, and an eight day clock: all symbols of his wealth. Besides a well appointed kitchen, dining room, and parlor, Stout's entrance passage contained numerous windsor chairs, and the main chamber contained a new cast iron Franklin stove.\(^2\)
Though he owned the land, Stout may have been leasing the property, as suggested by the will of Colonel Joseph Stout, who owned the adjacent parcel. The Colonel's will, dated 1764, refers to Benjamin Stout on the property. Hezakiah Stout was appointed one of the overseers of the highways in 1759 and was received by baptism into the Baptist Church of Hopewell in 1765, the same year as the datestone. This coincidence raises the question of whether the stone might be nothing more than a grand record of Stout's baptism. He is mentioned again in the town records in 1769, when he reported a runaway bull. In 1796 he was elected trustee of the church, and he baptised his slaves Off and Dinah in 1812 and 1813, respectively. According to manumission records, Stout owned three other slaves named Levi and Phoebe, daughter of Betty.

Though Stout was active in town and church affairs throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, his house clearly dates from the early nineteenth century. Its roofing system of common rafters suggests a later date, cut nails are used throughout, and its architectural details are all neo-classical in form. The kitchen wing, now demolished, may have been part of an earlier structure, but there is no evidence to support this. The extensively remodeled nature of this building and the uncertainty of its original date make it a poor example for analysis.
Nevertheless, it demonstrates the growing preference for the Georgian plan in Hopewell Township.

NOTES:

1. The deed from Coxe to Stout is referred to in Sorter to Voorhees, 1848 (N:283), Hunterdon County Registry, NJSA. See also 1785 Hopewell Tax ratable, NJSA and 1802 Hopewell Tax Ratable, NJSA.

2. Inventory of Hezakiah Stout, 1814 (2699), Hunterdon County Probate, NJSA.

3. Will of Colonel Joseph Stout.

Figure 62. Exterior, Hezakiah Stout House, c. 1800, with additions. A stone kitchen wing once stood attached to the right of the main house. (Photo, author)
6. JOHN WALLACE HOUSE, 1777

Washington Road
Somerville, New Jersey
HABS NJ-20

In 1734 Cornelius Middaugh sold the undeveloped tract of 95 acres to his brother George. George probably erected the first dwelling on the property at this time. He may also have been the one to add the Dutch-frame kitchen wing to the original building sometime prior to its sale in 1765 to Reverend Jacob Hardenbergh, minister of the local Dutch Reformed Church. Hardenbergh also may have built the kitchen wing after his purchase of the property.

Hardenbergh sold the house and property in 1775 to John Wallace (c. 1717-1783), a Philadelphia fabric importer and merchant. Between 1775 and 1777, Wallace demolished all but the kitchen and built a new eight-room mansion adjoining it for his country seat and place of retirement (see figures 50 & 51). Interestingly, this two-story Georgian house with interior chimneys, utilizes a hybrid form of Dutch-American anchor-bent framing.

Wallace lived in the house less than a year when the continental army made arrangements to use part of the dwelling for
General Washington's headquarters. The house was one of the largest in the area. Washington lived there from December 1778 to June 1779. At Wallace's death in 1783, the house passed to his son William (1763-1796). The farm was eventually sold out of the family to Dickenson Miller in 1801, and it is now owned by the State of New Jersey and open as a museum.

The Wallace house contains the best evidence of eighteenth-century builders demolishing a pre-existing dwelling to make way for a new Georgian block, while retaining the kitchen wing for re-use. First, in the basement of the main block, builders reused massive anchor-beams, probably from the original building. These timbers were planed smooth and dressed with quarter-round moldings typical of early exposed framing (see figure 52). Second, a fragment of a threshold in the kitchen wing marks the location of the original door from the kitchen to the first building, now blocked by the framing of the Georgian-style replacement (see figure 53). Finally, the framing of the kitchen wing indicates that it was constructed as an addition to another building and could not have been an independent structure.

NOTES:

1. Middaugh to Middaugh, 1734 (CC B-3:146), Somerset County Registry, NJSA. The author wishes to thank Jim Kurzenberger, curator of the Wallace House, who generously shared his research and knowledge, and whose work the author relies on heavily in this section.
2. Middaugh to Hardenbergh, 1765 (CC B: 607), Somerset County Registry, NJSA.

3. Hardenbergh to Wallace, 1775 (CC AL:10), Somerset County Registry, NJSA.
Commonly referred to as the John Welling House, recent research casts doubt on this traditional attribution. The structure is a complex building and is chiefly noteworthy here for its hybrid system of Anglo-Dutch framing (figure 63).¹ The complexity of the land title, and the difficulties of dating this building make it a poor candidate for this survey, but it serves as another indication that the process of acculturation was already well under way by the time this and the other buildings were constructed.

NOTES:

Figure 63. Exterior, John Welling House. The building is framed with Dutch-style anchor beams and consists of a hall and parlor with a rear aisle. (Photo, author)