

# On Dwelling: The Colonial Experience

AMIR H. AMERI  
Parsons School of Design

Most of the early settlers in the New England and the Chesapeake Bay colonies came from the ranks of a growing English middle-class in the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> They came to the different parts of the new world from a similar cultural and socioeconomic background and a shared architectural heritage. In spite of all that the early settlers had in common, however, the settlement patterns and the architecture of the New England and Chesapeake colonies followed two significantly different paths.

Scholars generally attribute the distinctive material and formal character of the domestic architecture of the two colonies to ecological and climatic differences between the two regions. In this paper, my aim is to explore the factual inconsistencies that render the ecological and climatic explanations implausible. What I focus on instead are the ideological roots of these architectural differences. The specific formal and material preferences in the domestic architecture of each colony were not, I believe, so much pragmatic responses to ecological and climatic conditions in New England and Chesapeake Bay regions, as they were attempts to give tangible physical expression to two very different world views: the Puritan and the Anglican.

Although the domestic architecture of New England and Chesapeake colonies were to follow separate paths of development, it is important to note that each, in its developed form, was a variation on the post-medieval three cell English house.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore an English precedent can be found for virtually every domestic architectural expression we encounter in either New England or the Chesapeake colonies. In the period from 1650 to 1700, after much experimentation, the preferred house form in the New England colonies was a two room rectangular plan house with a double back to back fire-place forming a single mass in the center of the house.<sup>3</sup> This house type was one or two stories high, plus an attic, with steep roofs and gable ends, accompanied occasionally by a lean-to, either added to the original mass or built as part of the original plan. Parson Capen House, Topsfield, Mass., 1683, and Whipple House, Ipswich, Mass., 1683 are good examples. An important feature of these houses is that they are of wood frame construction, covered on the exterior by

weather-boards. In fact an overwhelming majority of New England dwellings were weather-boarded, wood frame construction~.~

The preferred house form in the Chesapeake colonies was similar to the New England house form, with one major exception. Whereas in New England the chimneys were placed back to back in the center of the house, in Chesapeake colonies they were placed at the opposite ends of the preferred house form. These chimney stacks were either engaged in the end walls or projected out from them.

The preponderance of this house form in the Chesapeake colonies from the last quarter of the seventeenth century on, should not imply that examples of the central chimney house were not to be found before or even after this date. Archeological and documentary evidence suggest that not only was the central chimney house **type** quite prevalent in the first half of the seventeenth century, but that the early settlers experimented with virtually every known English house type before settling on the peripheral chimney house **type**.<sup>5</sup> In time, we are told, "the dozens of house types characteristic of the English inheritance were pared down to a few well-considered options" and "by the second half of the seventeenth century - the central chimney was eliminated in most new buildings" until it "disappeared from the architectural repertoire" of the Virginia gentry "in the eighteenth century."<sup>6</sup>

Bacon's Castle, Surry County, VA, c. 1665, exemplifies this type of house. It is, however, a misleading example in that throughout the seventeenth century, as much of recent scholarship on the subject documents, an overwhelming majority of domestic structures in the Chesapeake colonies were wood frame or plank structures.<sup>7</sup> There were altogether, Rasmussen optimistically surmises, "roughly two dozen brick houses" built in the Chesapeake colonies during the second half of the seventeenth century.<sup>8</sup> The remaining houses were of wood construction.

Although the percentage of brick houses built in the Chesapeake colonies before the eighteenth century is quite negligible, the Chesapeake colonists appear to have had a decided preference for brick as a building material.<sup>9</sup> Camille

Wells points out that advertisers in the Virginia Gazette made a point of specifying in their sales advertisements every brick structure on the property. They were far less diligent, on the other hand, in reporting or specifying wood frame construction.<sup>10</sup> This is in part, Wells argues, "because brick and stone were exceptional materials worthy of emphasis while framed, plank, and log structures were so commonplace that their constitution hardly invited comment." Another reason may well be the common belief around the turn of the eighteenth century that brick structures are better with respect to "uniformity and substance," and an "improvement" over wood frame structures.<sup>12</sup> This sentiment was perhaps best expressed by Robert Beverley, who noted in 1705 that "The private buildings are also in time very much improved, several gentlemen there having built themselves large brick houses of many rooms on a floor."<sup>13</sup> As Dell Upton tells us:

Virginians maintained a clear hierarchy of preferences. Some choices were better than others for reasons other than cost: they served as distinguishing markers. Certain of these preferences are not surprising. We are not startled to learn, on the whole, brick was thought more dignified than frame building.<sup>14</sup>

It may not, indeed, be startling to learn that brick was thought more dignified and an "improvement" over wood frame buildings in the Chesapeake colonies. It is, however, quite surprising to find no indication of a similar sentiment in the New England colonies, particularly if we consider that the New England settlers had the same architectural heritage and knew the same architectural vocabulary as their southern counterpart. We find, for instance, no Northern equivalent for the Governor John Harvey bustling about to collect money from "the ablest planters" and "masters of ships" for a "brick church or an equivalent for the Lynnhaven congregation taking pride in building a "good, substantial brick church," in 1691, with a brick porch, and "good and sufficient lights of brick, well glazed, with good glass".<sup>15</sup>

The small number of brick houses built before the eighteenth century by a few wealthy merchants and land speculators in Boston and Medford do not appear to have excited the imagination of the New England colonist as particularly dignified, nor do they appear to have denoted an "improvement" over wood frame construction, worthy of diligent pursuit. It is, nevertheless, important to note that when we encounter brick houses in New England colonies, (Peter Sergeant House, Boston, MA, 1676, or Peter Tufts house, Medford, MA, 1675) they display characteristics that are close or identical to the Chesapeake house, e.g., the peripheral placement of chimneys. They are, in other words, well unlike the typical wood frame house in New England with its central chimney. At the same time, when we find descriptions of the wood frame houses in the Chesapeake colonies, for none has survived, most appear to have the same formal features as the remaining brick houses in the Chesapeake colonies. In short, as Fiske Kimball noted: "it was charac-

teristic of the brick house with gables, whether North or South, to have them terminate in tall chimney-stacks."<sup>16</sup> Generally speaking, wood frame houses had central chimneys in New England and peripheral chimneys in the Chesapeake colonies."

The preference for wood frame construction in New England as opposed to a preference for brick in the Chesapeake colonies, and the preference for double, back to back fireplaces at the center of the house in New England as opposed to the prevalent practice of placing protruding fireplaces at the opposite ends of the house in the Chesapeake colonies have been variously attributed by many scholars to differences in the English regional origins of the early settlers in each colony and/or ecological differences between the two regions of the new world.

Kostof, summing up the opinion of a majority of scholars on the subject, tells us that the seventeenth century houses in the American colonies

... were based on the late medieval vernacular of the homeland, but took on different forms in the North and South depending on the point of origin of the settlers and local conditions ... In the west of England where Virginia and Maryland colonists had their origin external gable-end chimneys were the rule. And the arrangement also made good sense in the hot humid weather of the Chesapeake tidewater, since end chimneys can dissipate the heat generated by summer cooking. The central chimney, on the other hand, was characteristic of the east of England, and so it seemed natural to the homesteaders of Massachusetts and Connecticut who originated there.<sup>18</sup>

Insofar as the employment of different building materials in each colony is concerned, Pierson, comparing Parson Capen House and Bacon's Castle, tells us that "they are different because conditions of climate and available materials dictated that one should be made of wood and the other of brick."<sup>19</sup> Echoing this environmental determinist point of view, Morrison attributes the relative absence of masonry construction in New England to the scarcity of lime for mortar in this region, while Whiffen portrays the adoption of a specific type in each colony as being "no doubt, a matter of the survival of the fittest, with climate as the chief determinant."<sup>20</sup>

Although these explanations appear empirically factual, there are numerous anomalies that render them implausible. They more accurately reflect the world view of the scholars that offer them, than the world view of those who constructed the edifices in question, or for that matter the actual environmental conditions in each colony.

To begin with, the adoption of each house type in the New England and the Chesapeake colonies could not betray the regional origins of the early settlers, as the various regions in England were well represented in each colony. The original settlers of each colony came from many different regions in England, and within each region, both from rural as well as

urban areas. For instance:

Of intense interest is the fact that the early Sudbury leaders (Massachusetts) represented the three types of English local background, seven of them having lived in open-field villages, six having lived in five English boroughs, and several others having been inhabitants of East Anglican villages."

Therefore, regional variations could not have played a significant role in the selection of one mode of spatial arrangement over others. Also, as noted earlier, archeological evidence suggests that the early the Chesapeake colonists initially re-constructed virtually every known English house type before collectively settling on the central corridor, peripheral chimney type. We find the same initial diversity and eventual consensus in building technology. For instance, Reiff notes that the brickwork in Virginia does not "reflect any one area of England... since Virginia settlers, and probably the bricklayers too, came from a variety of English counties" and "the type and the generally consistent method of bricklaying became standardized in the colony and established its own traditions.""

It is as problematic to account for the adoption of a different house type in the New England and the Chesapeake colonies in terms of climatic differences between the two regions, as it is to attribute the selection to the regional backgrounds of the early settlers. Both the New England and the Chesapeake dwelling types are preceded by regional practices in England. Both types were imported. The formation and development of each type in England cannot be traced, however, to ecological or climatic conditions similar to those in the New England and the Chesapeake regions. In origin, the types do not betray any particular adaptation to climatic differences, and certainly not to any climatic variations similar to those in the New England and the Chesapeake Bay regions.

The prevalent view of the preference for peripheral chimneys in the Chesapeake colonies as a direct and determined response to the hot and humid summer climate of the Tidewater region - given that end chimneys effectively "dissipate the heat generated by summer cooking" - is also and fundamentally problematic. The Virginia gentry who adopted the type, had relegated cooking to outbuildings as early as the 1620's.<sup>23</sup> In the New England Colonies, the move was less dramatic, as cooking was often relegated to the lean-to addition, and generally given a separate fire-place. Considering that in the Chesapeake colonies the fireplace would have been used only when needed to generate heat, any design serving to dissipate that heat to the outside makes little sense. The added expense that peripheral chimneys may have incurred in the Chesapeake colonies is also hard to justify or account for in climatic terms, since the separation offered no climatic relief from any heat that might have been generated by cooking in summer, or for that matter, the other

Whiffen argues that "the key" to the success of the

peripheral chimney house type in the Chesapeake colonies was "central cooling," since the cross current in the central "passage" created "an air-draft in summer."<sup>25</sup> However, the central passage did not appear in Virginia before the first quarter of the eighteenth century.<sup>26</sup> Consequently, it could not have played a role in the adoption of the peripheral chimney house type in the second half of seventeenth century. Also it is not clear what relief the air-draft in the passage, when it was added, may have afforded the two rooms that were placed, cross axial to the air current, on the opposite sides of the passage and separated from it by walls and doors. Considering that both rooms had ample cross ventilation provided by casement windows on opposite sides, the desire for an air-draft in the passage, as Mark Wenger points out, had as much to do with the social courtship practices of Virginia planters as climatic determinants, should they exist.

Of course climatic factors and ecological conditions are influential factors in the design process. They do not, however, always adequately account for the formal and material choices of the builders. The preference for peripheral chimneys in the Chesapeake colonies and the preference for central chimneys in the New England colonies cannot be adequately explained and simply attributed to climatic differences between the two regions. The reason must be sought elsewhere, considering that insofar as climatic adaptation is concerned there are numerous anomalies in the selections made. One might argue, for instance, that brick would have been a more suitable building material for the relatively cold winter climate of New England and wood a more suitable material for the hot and humid summer climate of the Chesapeake Bay. The practice, however, did not in time accord with this argument, and others that may well be advanced in the cause of climatic adaptation.

Since bricklayers and bricks were available in New England from the very early days, the relative absence of brick houses in the New England colonies is often attributed to lack of lime in that region." Lime was indeed scarce in New England. Yet it could have been obtained, as it was in Connecticut, by burning oyster shells.

Lime was available very early in New London and New Haven, but it was used principally for plastering ... An examination of the mortar in early work, particularly in houses along the Sound, indicates that oyster shells were a common source of the lime used in it.<sup>28</sup>

Also we know that Rhode Island was well supplied with deposits of lime near Providence, worked from 1662.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, if the New England settlers of the coastal regions wanted to build brick buildings, it was not wholly beyond their reach. They did not! This is particularly significant considering that in the Chesapeake colonies lime was also scarce and what was available was obtained by burning oyster shells as it was in Connecticut. As late as 1751, we find Carter Burwell having to advertise in the Virginia Gazette for "any quantity" of "Oyster shells" that "can be delivered at his

landing by the last of March for the construction of Carter's Grove, James City County, VA, 1745-55.

In short, the difficulty of obtaining lime translated into an economic challenge for anyone wishing to build a brick structure in New England as well as the Chesapeake colonies. For instance, the attempt to build a brick church in Jamestown in the 1630's appears to have strained the resources of the colony according to a report of Governor John Harvey to the Privy Council, and consequently the church was not completed before 1647.<sup>30</sup>

The expense of a brick house in the seventeenth century may well account for the small number of brick houses built in the Chesapeake colonies during this time period. In fact, the rise in the number of brick houses in the Chesapeake colonies appears to be in direct proportion to the rise in the purchase power of the colonial gentry. Neiman argues that "when [Virginia] gentlemen became interested in displaying their social eminence before the world at large, brick became a handy tool to that end.") It did, in part because of the expense, and in part because brick in the architectural vocabulary of the early settlers denoted not only "improvement," but also social status.

Masonry, it is important to note, was the construction material of choice for the English gentry whose manor houses in the seventeenth century were rendered in brick by the growing English middle-class that aspired to their social status and wealth, and re-rendered in the colonies by those who crossed the ocean in order to realize the aspiration.<sup>32</sup>

A prominent feature of the masonry manor houses of the English gentry in the seventeenth century was a conspicuous display of chimneys in multitudes, rising eminently above the roof-line as the barometers of the wealth and the social status of the owner. With this in mind, it is indeed not surprising to learn that Virginians thought brick was "more dignified than frame building" or that "in the second half of the seventeenth century, more and more successful planters chose to build brick chimneys" and "it was during this period that chimney placement became standardized."<sup>33</sup> The choice of brick as construction material, when it could be afforded, and the standardized use of two peripheral chimneys as opposed to a central chimney may well have been part and parcel of gathering up the known architectural expressions of gentility that would allow a William Hugh Grove to readily denote the message in 1732, when he wrote that a traveler was more likely to find "spare bed and lodging and welcome" at houses where "brick chimbles shew."<sup>34</sup> The brick chimneys, separated, pushed to, and beyond the outer envelope of the house, were not unlike coats of arms that in this instance were prominently displayed on both ends of the house to announce the polite hospitality of a gentrified household within.

Insofar as the status of the peripheral chimneys are concerned, it is also important to note the amusing, though often neglected fact that in the Chesapeake colonies, contrary to common practice in gentrified dwellings, "most poorhouses took the two-room, central chimney form com-

monly used for slave houses, kitchen-laundries, and other agricultural outbuildings."<sup>35</sup> The central chimney, so prevalent in New England, had, in other words, not only a place in the architectural repertoire of the Chesapeake colonies, but also a clear association and significance.

Thus, if the Anglican planters of the Chesapeake colonies preferred to have more than one chimney prominently surrounding their house, it was not simply because the multiplication made good climatic sense, or if they wanted brick buildings and built them when and if they could, it was not because lime was readily available, but because these tangible forms and materials had an intangible reward. They allowed these otherwise typical English middle-class men and women to reproduce the signs and live through them the dreams and aspirations that compelled them to take the arduous journey across the ocean and into the wilderness. Furthermore, if the peripheral placement of chimneys coincided - when economically feasible - with the use of brick as a construction material, it was because the two were parts of a known syntax in the architectural vocabulary of the early settlers, conveying wealth and social status by associations that have their root in the English middle-class emulations of the manor houses of the seventeenth century English gentry.

This latter point is best illustrated by the architectural practices of the Northern colonists, where the economic challenge of a brick house was only met in time by a few wealthy Anglican merchants and land speculators. Although initially the cost of a brick house may well have been forbidding to many in the New England region, we do not find, contrary to the Southern example, a rise in the number of brick houses, proportionate to the rise in the purchase power of the Puritan settlers of the North in the second half of the seventeenth century.<sup>36</sup>

This is not to say that the Puritan houses of the New England colonies remained, by and large, modest and inexpensive. On the contrary, a good number of wood frame buildings in New England compare well or even surpass many Chesapeake brick houses in terms of size, elaboration, and expense. For instance, the simple one-room house of John Whipple, Sr., c. 1655, who was well-to-do and served as deputy to the general court, was considerably enlarged by his son sometime before 1683, and it is one of the larger surviving seventeenth century houses in America.)'

If the Puritans of New England wanted to build brick houses, they could have built, if not all, at least a good number of brick buildings, and if not throughout New England, at least in the coastal regions. The cost was well within the means of the wealthier selectmen around the coast and in most inland settlements. They chose not to. The reason may well have been circumscribed by Jefferson who recorded in "Notes on Virginia" (1784) "The unhappy prejudice that houses of brick and stone are less healthy than those of wood."<sup>38</sup> This "unhappy prejudice" from a Southern gentleman's point of view was not shared, of course, by those wealthy Anglicans in the New England colonies who built stately houses like the Chesapeake examples not only in

brick, but also with prominent peripheral chimneys that stood out as voiceful oddities in a landscape dominated by wood frame, central chimney houses. The syntactical connection between peripheral chimneys and brick construction as denotators of gentility and wealth was as apparent to these New England gentlemen as it was to their Chesapeake counterparts. It was equally apparent to the appointed English governor of Massachusetts who purchased and moved into the Peter Sergeant House (a brick building with peripheral chimneys) as the only house fit for the position in Boston.<sup>39</sup>

Considering that the significance of the peripheral chimneys and brick construction were not established independently in the Chesapeake colonies, but a part of the English architectural vocabulary that the settlers brought with them to the new world, as evidenced by the contextual peculiarities of brick houses in New England, as well as the poorhouses, slave quarters, and utilitarian buildings of the Chesapeake colonies, we may well conclude that the particular significance of brick and peripheral chimneys was equally apparent to those Puritans who held brick, in prejudice, as "less healthy" compared to wood. The prejudice may well have had everything to do with this significance. In other words, if the Puritans of New England chose not to build in brick or place their chimneys peripherally, it was not because lime was scarce, or because brick was less healthy - though one may gauge the motive as such - or even because central chimneys were simply more suitable to the climate of New England, but because both the material and the form were directly associated with the very social and religious institutions that drove these otherwise typical English men and women across the ocean in search of that "Zion in wilderness."

The Puritan and the Anglican colonist both came to the new world with a clear vision of the way the world ought to be. It was, however, precisely this vision that set the two groups worlds as well as miles apart. If there are differences between the spatial artifacts of the two colonial societies, the reason may be rooted as much in their distinct visions of a perfect world as in the ecological and climatic differences between the New England and the Chesapeake Bay regions. If the Puritans of the North emulated the rural folk architectural idiom of seventeenth century England, including such rural folk traditional elements as jetties and pendants, and their Anglican counterparts chose as their model the middle-class rendition of the manor houses of the English gentry, it was by way of giving tangible expression to their distinct visions of a perfect world.

If, as Edmund Pendleton put it in late 1760's, to build a building "of wood" meant to "be humble" in the architectural vocabulary of the colonists, and brick meant a dignified "improvement," then the Puritans' selection of wood as the building material of choice was well in keeping with the Puritan views and practices and their emphasis on the "plain" and the simple in all conduct.<sup>40</sup> Brick, given its significance, would have been indeed "less healthy" to them, though only

insofar as the health of the puritan spirit was concerned, i.e., the health of a spirit that could not suffer formal and material association with all that it rejected and left behind.

Although it is my contention that there was an element of choice in the selection of a specific building form and the preference for a particular building material in each colony, and as such these selections are significant and meaningful, it is not my contention that central or peripheral chimneys, brick or wood, are inherently meaningful, i.e., inherently simple or complex, aristocratic or plebeian, humble or exalted. These material and formal differences are only potentially and contextually meaningful. They present differences in terms of which and with recourse to which we can conceive and express other, less tangible differences. If the Puritans chose wood instead of brick, and central instead of peripheral chimneys, it was to give tangible expression to a conception of the world whose vision was as opposed to the Anglican vision as wood is to brick, and the central is to the peripheral.

If the selection of one house type and building material over the other are significant, as I have tried to contend throughout this work, it may well be because wood and brick, central and peripheral chimneys formed linguistic paradigms in the shared architectural vocabulary of the early settlers. As such, they allowed the colonists to think, express, and live their differences in material form through the selection of one house form or material instead and in opposition to the other.

This is all to say that architecture is as much a means for protection and shelter as it is a means for conception and signification. This latter did not escape the attention of the early settlers. The spatial artifacts of the two colonies served as much to protect and shelter the colonists, as they served to project and reinforce their distinct values, beliefs, and ideals.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> See David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed*, (Oxford, 1989), 27-31; 226-232. Also David Grayson Allen, *In English Ways*, (Chapel Hill, 1981), 19-30
- <sup>2</sup> For a description of the post-medieval three cell English house see: J. T. Smith, *English Houses 1200-1800* (London: 1992), 31-111, and Oliver Cook, *The English House Through Seven Centuries*, (Woodstock: 1983), 137-190.
- <sup>3</sup> For archeological evidence on early houses in New England see James Deetz, *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life* (Garden City, 1977)
- <sup>4</sup> See Abbott Lowell Cummings, *The Framed Houses of Massachusetts Bay, 1625-1725* (Cambridge: 1979) and Hugh Morrison, *Early American Architecture* (New York: 1952) 49-95.
- <sup>5</sup> See Fraser D. Neiman, "Domestic architecture at the Clifts Plantation: the Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, ed. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach (Athens: 1986): 292-314, and Cary Carson, "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," *Winterthur Portfolio* 16 (1981): 135-196. For archeological evidence on early houses in Chesapeake colonies see Ivor Noel Hume, *Martin's Hundred* (Charlottesville: 1979).

- <sup>6</sup> Carl R. Lounsbury, ed., *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape* (New York: 1994) x; William Rasmussen, "Drafting the Plans, Pride and Practicality in Virginia's Colonial Architecture 1643-1770," in *The Making of Virginia Architecture*, ed. Charles E. Brownell (Richmond, 1992) 3; Fraser D. Neiman, "Domestic architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: the Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, ed. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, (Athens: 1986) 311.
- <sup>7</sup> See Cary Carson, "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," *Winterthur Portfolio* 16 (1981): 135-196; Fraser D. Neiman, "Domestic architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: the Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, ed. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach (Athens: 1986): 292-314, Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (1993): 1-31, Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane, Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1986).
- <sup>8</sup> William Rasmussen, "Drafting the Plans, Pride and Practicality in Virginia's Colonial Architecture 1643-1770," in *The Making of Virginia Architecture*, ed. Charles E. Brownell (Richmond, 1992) 1-33.
- <sup>9</sup> See Hugh Morrison, *Early American Architecture* (New York: 1952), 134-175.
- <sup>10</sup> Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (1993): 7.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>12</sup> We read, for instance, that:  
The house of Secretary Richard Kemp, erected in 1639, ... and described as "the fairest that ever was known in this country for substance and uniformity" was perhaps the first house in Virginia to be built entirely of brick. Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Old South* (New York: 1942)
- <sup>13</sup> Parke Rouse, *Planters and Pioneers* (New York: 1968), 81.
- <sup>14</sup> Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane, Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1986), 110.
- <sup>15</sup> Noted by Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Old South* (New York: 1942), 87; 89.
- <sup>16</sup> Fiske Kimball, *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (New York: 1922), 47.
- <sup>17</sup> The Virginians' preference for peripheral chimneys is perhaps best demonstrated by accounts of original central chimneys being dismantled in time and replaced with peripheral chimneys. Please see Fraser D. Neiman, "Domestic architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: the Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, ed. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, (Athens: 1986), 311.
- <sup>18</sup> Spiro Kostof, *A History of Architecture, Settings and Rituals* (New York: 1985), 609.
- <sup>19</sup> William F. Pierson, Jr., *American Buildings and Their Architects*, 4 vols. (Garden City: 1976), 1:54.
- <sup>20</sup> Hugh Morrison, *Early American Architecture* (New York: 1952), 69; Marcus Whiffen, *American Architecture, Volume I: 1607-1860*, (Cambridge, 1981), 6. Also see: Abbott Lowell Cummings, *The Framed Houses of Massachusetts Bay, 1625-1725* (Cambridge: 1979), 118-125 and Fiske Kimball, *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (New York: 1922), 35-52.
- <sup>21</sup> Summer C. Powell, *Puritan Village* (Middletown: 1963), xix.
- <sup>22</sup> Daniel D. Reiff, *Small Georgian Houses in England and Virginia* (Cranbury: 1986), 215.
- <sup>23</sup> See: Donald W. Linebaugh, "All the Annoyances and Inconveniences of the Country," *Winterthur Portfolio* 29 (1994): 1-18.
- <sup>24</sup> Lounsbury tells us that "By the beginning of the 18th century, Southerners had completely rethought the configuration of the English house, consigning many service spaces such as kitchen, pantry, and buttery to detached structures or outhouses," Carl R. Lounsbury, ed., *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape* (New York: 1994). See also Cary Carson, "Impermanent Architecture in the Southern American Colonies," *Winterthur Portfolio* 16, (1981): 57; Fraser D. Neiman, "Domestic architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: the Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, ed. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, (Athens: 1986), 314; Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (1993): 15-16.
- <sup>25</sup> Marcus Whiffen, *American Architecture, Volume I: 1607-1860*, (Cambridge, 1981), 7.
- <sup>26</sup> Mark R. Wenger, "The Central Passage in Virginia: Evolution of an Eighteenth-Century Living Space," in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, II*, ed. Camille Wells (Columbia, 1986): 137-49.
- <sup>27</sup> See Frederick J. Kelly, *Early Domestic Architecture of Connecticut*, (New Haven, 1933), 20.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 18
- <sup>29</sup> Fiske Kimball, *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (New York: 1922), 36
- <sup>30</sup> Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Old South* (New York: 1942), 87. Also noted by Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane, Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1986), 60.
- <sup>31</sup> Fraser D. Neiman, "Domestic architecture at the Cliffs Plantation: the Social Context of Early Virginia Building," in *Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*, ed. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach, (Athens: 1986), 307.
- <sup>32</sup> For a complete formal genealogy of the Virginia brick house and its origins in the manor houses of Elizabethan and Jacobian periods see Daniel D. Reiff, *Small Georgian Houses in England and Virginia* (Cranbury: 1986).  
Also, it is important to note that the emulation of the English gentry by the Anglican middle-class, in England or in the Chesapeake colonies, was not merely a question of wealth. The gentry, as Talpalar explains it, embodied a social ideal: The landed proprietor was aristocracy: he was of a different order of being - a gentleman, or what the ancients described as "beautiful and good;" he became the symbol of quality, of what was considered the *best* among men ...; he was associated *per se* with the universal desiderata - family, culture, virtue, freedom, talent, wealth, wisdom. ... he was the personification of the life to be emulated - of the ideal to be achieved, if not exactly of the real. M. Talpalar, *The Sociology of Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1968), 247.
- <sup>33</sup> Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane, Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1986), 110; Carl R. Lounsbury, ed., *An Illustrated Glossary of Early Southern Architecture and Landscape* (New York: 1994), 74.
- <sup>34</sup> Noted by Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect," *Winterthur Portfolio* 28 (1993): 9.
- <sup>35</sup> Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane, Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1986), 221.
- <sup>36</sup> Signs of Change in the dwelling type, the Meeting House, and the settlement pattern of the New England colony, it is important to note, begin to appear not as soon as the economic lot of the settlers improves, but as soon as the Puritan religious fervor lost its intensity of the earlier years in the first half of the 18th century.
- <sup>37</sup> See David Larkin, June Sprigg and James Johnson, *Colonial Design in the New World* (New York: 1988), 48
- <sup>38</sup> Noted by Fiske Kimball, *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (New York: 1922), 36
- <sup>39</sup> See Hugh Morrison, *Early American Architecture* (New York: 1952), 74.
- <sup>40</sup> Noted by Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane, Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New York: 1986), 110.