

AN ARCHITECTURAL AND SOCIAL ANALYSIS
OF BEVERLEY MANOR, VIRGINIA
(1745-1770)

MASTER'S THESIS

MASTER OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

School of Architecture
University of Virginia

Donna Rachal Mills
30 April 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	iv
CHAPTER ONE Origins and Settlement of the Manor Irish	1
CHAPTER TWO Architecture of Beverley Manor: Direct Evidence	19
CHAPTER THREE Architecture of Beverley Manor: Indirect Evidence	47
CONCLUSION	85
APPENDIX	90
SOURCES CONSULTED	93

LIST OF TABLES IN TEXT

TABLE ONE:	
Occupations Practiced by Original Settlers	14
TABLE TWO:	
Social Ranks Indicated for Original Settlers	16
TABLE THREE:	
Early Manor Settlers with Inventoried Estates	50
TABLE FOUR:	
Comparison of Inventoried Furniture (Excluding Beds)	
First and Third Decades of Settlement	52

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are extended to the following individuals for their time, assistance, and invaluable advice: Professors Charles Brownell, James Cox, and Edward Lay of the University of Virginia, my committee members; Dr. Jerry Oldshue, University Archivist, University of Alabama; and especially my parents, who instilled within me a deep appreciation and love of our cultural and architectural heritage.

INTRODUCTION

More than a century after the British founding of Jamestown, Virginia's holdings beyond the Blue Ridge were still a vast and largely unexplored wilderness. Few attempts had been made by the English to breach the great mountain range, and eventual settlement of present Augusta County fell to a non-English group--the Irish. Squatters drifted to the frontier by the 1730s; and, in 1736, William Beverley of Essex County secured a patent from the General Assembly for 118,491 acres surrounding the modern city of Staunton. He named it Beverley Manor.

Little research has been conducted on the earliest structures erected in the Manor during its founding years, and documentation is scarce. Existing studies tend to concentrate on extant buildings, most of which date to the end of either the Colonial or post-Revolutionary periods.¹

¹ For prior works on Augusta County see Joseph A. Waddell, Annals of Augusta County, Virginia, from 1726-1871 (Bridgewater, Va.: C. J. Company, 1902); J. Lewis Peyton, History of Augusta County, Virginia (Bridgewater, Va.: Privately printed, 1953); Robert D. Mitchell, "The Upper Shenandoah Valley During the Eighteenth Century: A Study of Historical Geography" (diss., U of Wisconsin, 1969); Edward Chappell, "Cultural Change in the Shenandoah Valley," (M.A. thesis, U of Virginia, 1977).

INTRODUCTION

The dual goals of this study are to determine the types of structures produced in Beverley Manor before 1770 by the first known Irish settlers and to demonstrate how this information can be obtained through a cultural, rather than a purely architectural, approach.

A significant obstacle makes mandatory the second goal. Architectural historians rely heavily upon meticulous scrutiny of actual buildings to answer questions. In the case of Beverley Manor, this method of study is not possible. Few extant structures can be dated with any certainty to the pre-Revolutionary era, and even fewer (if any) to the first decades of settlement. Therefore, this project must rely upon other means and resources--namely, records created by and for the first-generation settlers. Efforts have concentrated on the thorough examination of original records: deeds and other land transactions, court orders and judgements, and probate documents (especially inventories)--all housed in the county courthouses of Orange (pre-1745) and Augusta (post-1745)--supplemented by private papers.

The group chosen for this study were those individuals listed prior to the year 1740 in Beverley's account book. (See Appendix 1.) This writer theorizes that those persons who first purchased land from Beverley, after he received

INTRODUCTION

his 1736 patent, were the first settlers. Of the ninety-two listed individuals, sixty-three were entered for the year 1737, nineteen for 1738, and eight for 1739.² The tracts they initially claimed amounted to 46,227.5 acres, or 39 percent of the entire Manor. Beverley allowed each claimant to take possession of his tract and begin improvements thereon; and he collected rent and interest from each until the purchase price was paid in full. At that time an official deed was recorded, and the title was transferred to the new owner. The settlers were also required by the patent stipulations to cultivate or improve three acres for every fifty they received from Beverley, lest they lose title.³

The account book of the patent-holder, William Beverley--unused or underused by prior writers--has proved invaluable. It provides the earliest known reference to many of the settlers living in the Manor, and it places them there significantly earlier than previously thought. Past researchers have typically relied on Orange County

² Entries for the remaining two individuals were not dated, but were included in this study, since the men to whom they refer are known to be in the Manor in the 1730s.

³ For a published copy of Beverley's patent see Peyton, 62-64. The Manor Account Book is housed in the library of the Virginia State Historical Society.

INTRODUCTION

deeds and importation records to estimate the time that each family or individual arrived. However, Beverley did not begin transferring title to his renters until 1738/39; and many did not receive titles until the 1740s. For most of the early immigrants, these deeds are the first public record of their existence in the area. Yet, the account book reveals that 93 percent of the families or single men had already moved into the Manor several years prior to their first appearance in Orange records.⁴

This pattern is also evident in the Orange County transportation records. Of the fifty-one heads of households in the study group who proved their importations, only eight did so before 1740, and all of these were in 1739--two years after Beverley's account book begins to record land transactions. From the standpoint of architectural history, it is very important to determine the earliest approximate date these families arrived in order to calculate when they began erecting their frontier structures. A loss of even a few years can alter the span of time in which a building form appears to have been used.

It is also critical for this study to define the types of people who lived in the structures that extant records

⁴ Of the ninety-two, only six received title to their land the same year they appear in the account book.

INTRODUCTION

do describe. Past studies have generalized the building forms used in Augusta County and the Valley, on the premise that one typical "frontier type" probably represented most of the population within this vast area. Yet, few studies have attempted a microcosmic analysis that might answer several important questions: Exactly what documentary evidence does exist to identify specific structures in specific years? Who was building each type of structure, and what was his social standing? What means--funds, craftsmanship, and labor--were available to these settlers? Answers to all these questions should permit an inquirer to place these structures into context with the personalities of the people who built them and who were satisfied to live in them.

As this thesis will show, there clearly were different building forms, representing different social levels, being erected simultaneously in the first several decades. But this fact raises questions of its own. What kinds of variances existed between members of a small wilderness community that prompted them to live differently, whether better or worse, than their neighbors? Or, did they live differently at all? Was it simply a case of the wealthy and prominent leaders building substantial structures earlier than the subordinate classes? Was there even a

INTRODUCTION

lower class large enough to contribute to such a social stratification during these early years? Or can it be said that everyone lived under the same frontier conditions and in the same types of dwellings regardless of wealth and position, until the area stabilized enough to allow for architectural growth and diversity? If so, how long did it take for such stability to emerge?

These are all questions that will be addressed in the present study. By using the original resources (public and private) available prior to 1770, in conjunction with basic secondary sources, the dwellings and the lives of this group of Irishmen can be adequately reconstructed to show the forms that their frontier dwellings assumed, how long they persisted, what kinds of people and standards of living these forms supported, and how these elements might reflect the unique cultural traits of their builders.

CHAPTER ONE

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

The pioneers who settled the Valley of Virginia have commonly been referred to as "Scotch-Irish," a term causing endless confusion and generating heated debates among both scholars and laymen. This phrase was popularized in the latter part of the nineteenth century by descendants of colonial Irish immigrants who wished to distinguish themselves from the Potato-Famine Irish who began swarming to America in the 1840s. In an effort to elevate the early settlers above the largely poor and uneducated Catholic Irish of the Famine era, it was argued that the colonial Irish emigrated from one particular area--that is, Ulster (northern Ireland), which had been seeded with English and Scottish settlers in the early 1600s.

Nineteenth-century scholars further asserted that the effects of the Irish plantation system inaugurated by the English Crown were so great that Ulster was no longer "Irish" a century later when large-scale emigration to America began. The main factor cited to support their claims has been religion. Northern Ireland became largely Protestant during the seventeenth century, while the rest

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

of the island remained predominantly Catholic. Therefore, it followed that the Presbyterian leanings of so many of the Valley's Irish proved their Ulster origins and Scottish descent. Similarly, all the Catholic Irish who found their way to America during the colonial period were said to be from areas outside Ulster, a region where Catholics supposedly did not exist in sufficient numbers to contribute to the overall social fabric.¹

The idea that Ulster alone supplied the Irish immigrants of the Virginia Valley has become widely accepted; however, this assumption has not gone unchallenged. Some modern Irish-American historians, such as Michael J. O'Brien and Grady McWhiney, argue that religion alone does not determine nationality; that more than a century of residence in Ireland had diluted the intruding Scottish strain by the time of the American exodus; that the other provinces of Ireland suffered as much, indeed more, from the factors leading to emigration as did Ulster; and that the Scots and Irish were historically the same cultural

¹ See William W. Henry, "The Scotch-Irish of the South," Proceedings of the Scotch-Irish Congress at Columbia, Tennessee, 1889 (Nashville, Tn, 1889): 110-31; Henry Ford, The Scotch-Irish in America (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1915); Esmond Wright, "Ulster and the United States," The Ulster American Connection (N.p.: New U of Ulster, 1981): 1-9; Maldwyn A. Jones, "The Scotch-Irish and Colonial America," The Ulster American Connection, 10-18.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

group; therefore, differences between the two, although existing, were not as great as many have believed. They have contended that the majority of ships involved in transporting goods and immigrants between American colonies and Ireland actually hailed from non-Ulster ports and would logically have transported more non-Ulster immigrants. Finally, they point out that Catholics (native Irishmen) who emigrated to Virginia, where Catholicism was practically nonexistent, would have attended the only churches available to them; on the frontier these were often Presbyterian.²

Several instances within the Manor support the latter theory of ambivalence between conflicting denominations. The Reverend John Hindman, an ordained Presbyterian minister, "turned his coat" and became the first Anglican minister in Augusta. The prominent Patrick Cook left a bequest in his will for "the Meeting House," which would indicate that he had definite Presbyterian leanings; yet, his daughter was married by an *Anglican* minister. Finally, the

² See Humphrey Desmond, "The Colonial Irish," Journal of the American Irish Historical Society (1922): 165-71; Grady McWhiney, Cracker Culture (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: U of Alabama P, 1988); Michael J. O'Brien, "Shipping Statistics of the Philadelphia Custom House, 1733 to 1774, Refute of the Scotch-Irish Theory," Irish Settlers in America (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1969) 558-67.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

Presbyterian minister John Craig baptized in his church the infant of a *Catholic* servant of John Pickens in the 1740s.³

This project has clearly established Irish origins for most of the original Manor settlers, and a large number were found to have entered the colonies via Philadelphia. Modern authorities believe that the majority of eighteenth-century immigrants from Ireland who settled Pennsylvania were "Scotch-Irish" rather than native Irishmen. However, almost no evidence was found in this study to more precisely define the ethnicity of the Manor "Irish." (Although direct evidence was found suggesting that a Scottish strain in the community was unusual rather than the norm). Therefore, for want of concrete documentary evidence and to avoid generalizations that might be presumptuous, this paper will refer to the studied population by the only term their contemporaries used--Irish. Until the ancestry of

³ For Rev. Hindman, see Howard M. Wilson, The Tinkling Spring: Headwater of Freedom (Fisherville, Va.: Tinkling Spring & Heritage Presbyterian Churches, 1954) 115; and "Craig Baptisms, 1740-1749" (ms., Virginia State Library, Richmond) 34. For Cook, see Augusta Will Book 1:123 and Lyman Chalkley, Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlement in Virginia, Extracted from the Original Court Records of Augusta County, 1745-1800, 3 vols. (1912; Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1980) 1:340. Because of the fragility of the records and conditions of storage, access could not be gained to all of the original court judgements of Augusta County; for those records that could not be personally examined, Chalkley's published abstracts have been used and will be cited.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

each of these particular ninety-two families is traced to determine exactly where they originated, allusions to a more remote ancestral heritage cannot be reasonably made.⁴

EMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT

Very little emigration from Ireland took place during the reign of the Stuart monarchs in the seventeenth century. However, the flood of Irish immigrants to the American colonies that began in the early 1700s prompted Bostonians of 1718 to complain, "the confounded Irish will eat us all up."⁵ Five great waves of emigration occurred during this period, those of 1717-18, 1725-29, 1740-41, 1754-55, and 1771-75. The exact number of Irish carried on these waves is uncertain, but authorities agree upon a rough estimate: 500,000 landed on American soil from 1730-70, with an estimated 5,000 arriving between 1725 and 1727 and no less than 30,000 in 1772 and 1773.

⁴ The Irish flavor of the early community was apparently so overwhelming that it was commonly referred to in the eighteenth century as "the Irish Tract." Only one case was found in which Scottish origins can be attached to a Manor family. In 1747, the two sisters of George Hutchison required a translator for their nuncupative will; the translator reported they spoke in "Scottish." See Augusta Will Book 1:70.

⁵ Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742 (New York: Knopf, 1966) 250.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

Both contemporary sources and modern study reveal that the dominant factors leading to such large-scale emigration after 1700 were first and foremost economic. The degree to which religious discontent resulted in emigrant movement has been greatly exaggerated, and Ireland is no exception. The real source of discontent was the land system--a jere-miad of absentee landlords, rack rents, and short-term leases, coupled with bad harvests, famine, disease, and suppression of Irish manufacturing and trade by the English Crown. By the time of the first emigrant wave, Ireland's economy was so crippled that Archbishop William King charged the English Parliament with "destroying the little Trade that is left to us. These & other Discouragments are driving away the few Protestants that are amongst us." The "other Discouragments" of which King wrote were surely the successive years of drought, dramatic increases in rent, and proportional rises in tithes.⁶

⁶ James G. Leyburn, The Scotch-Irish: A Social History (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1961) 169; Desmond, 166-67; Hugh Dickson, An Introduction to Ulster Architecture (Belfast: Ulster Architectural Heritage Soc., 1975) 53. For King see Charles K. Bolton, Scotch-Irish Pioneers in Ulster and America (Boston: Bacon and Brown, 1910) 57. While King's anxiety over the loss of the Presbyterian population would seem to confirm the theory of Ulster-Protestant emigration, it must be considered that a Presbyterian cleric such as he would be preoccupied with the activities of his own flock rather than with that of the non-Protestant population.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

The second wave of out-migration was even greater, and again, unbearably high rents and tithes were the major factors--this time aggravated by several seasons of bad harvests. Good crops of 1729 and 1730 brought temporary relief to the suffering Irish, but prices fell and remained low throughout the 1730s. Successive years of famine in the 1740s and 1750s pushed the third and fourth waves to America. Credit for the final migration is generally given to a depression in the linen trade, the industry upon which Ulster's economy relied. However, Ireland's agricultural economy had continued to plummet; and by 1770 the people were prostrate, barely able to feed themselves on farms divided so many times that no family had acreage sufficient to its needs.⁷

What type of people were induced to participate in the Irish emigration? Such contemporaries as Archbishop Boulter noted that the majority of individuals leaving Ireland could not pay their own passage--fewer than one in ten according to some reports. It has also been asserted that the greatest number of servants and redemptioners arriving in America during the colonial period were from Ireland.⁸

⁷ Leyburn, 172-73.

⁸ M. Jones, 13.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

However, an analysis of the pre-1740 Manor group reveals a different picture. Of the ninety-two families or individuals in this study, fifty-one men (slightly more than half) swore to the Orange County Court that they had imported themselves, family members, and even servants, from Ireland to Virginia *at their own expense*. The number of persons for whom they underwrote the cost of transportation, food, and care upon arrival totaled 265. It is clear that these men--who constituted 55 percent of the legal land owners in Beverley Manor--were not of the indentured class. Moreover, these men were proving their importations to qualify for more land under the headright system. It is reasonable to conclude that there were men among this group who imported themselves and others but did not want additional land, and therefore did not need to prove that they had paid their own passage. If so, this would further increase the percentage of self-paying immigrants.

Another question remains to be addressed: how did these Irish immigrants find their way to the wilderness borderland of Virginia? The first of the great migrant waves entered America by way of New England, a region that the Presbyterians at least believed to be sympathetic to their Dissenter cause. At best, they received there a cold welcome by a population that exhibited a deep-rooted dis-

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

like and mistrust of the "wild Irish," Protestant and Catholic alike. Thus, when roughly six hundred immigrants landed in Boston in 1718, they were immediately packed off to the frontier by unsympathetic officials. Eleven years later, amid rising tension, angry mobs in the same city actually prevented the landing of Irish-laden ships from Belfast and Londonderry.

The cultural differences between Englishmen and native Irishmen, cultivated by centuries of outright hatred in the British Isles, were too great to be overcome by trans-Atlantic migrations. The many negative reports of contemporary English colonists reflect the disdain felt by a society "accustomed to the ordered life of law-abiding villages and urban centers" toward a people they considered "barbaric" and prone to uncontrollable violence, excessive drink, and an infuriating derision of laws and social restrictions.⁹ While some Irish communities persevered in New England despite the seemingly unreconcilable differences they faced, the vast majority of Celtic settlers pushed farther south and west--into the inviting freedom and isolation of the frontier.

⁹ M. Jones, 14; Audrey Lockhart, Some Aspects of Emigration from Ireland to the North American Colonies between 1660 and 1775 (New York: Arno Press, 1976) 72.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

The economic possibilities offered by the Penn Colony, coupled with the cold reception of New England, turned the mainstream of Irish migration toward Pennsylvania as early as 1725. Meccas of Irish society sprang up in present Lancaster and Chester counties, and then the overflow began pushing into the Cumberland Valley. By the 1730s, due as much to the restless nature of the Irish as to the changes in policy enacted by Penn's successors, multitudes began leaving Pennsylvania--settling the Valley of Virginia, then moving on to the lower South. McWhiney and his colleague Forrest McDonald have shown that the farther south and west one moved from Philadelphia, the more Celtic the population became. By the 1790s, Anglo and Celt were evenly distributed in the upper South, each comprising roughly two-fifths of the population; moving into the Carolinas, more than half were Celtic, outnumbering Anglos five to three. Moreover, the Irish are said to have dominated the frontier regions from Pennsylvania southward, ranging from two-thirds to all of the population in specific areas.¹⁰

¹⁰ McWhiney, 18; see also McWhiney and Forrest McDonald, "Celtic Names in the Antebellum South," Names: Journal of the American Name Society 31 (1983): 89-102. Throughout this paper, the term Anglo will be used to denote colonists of English descent, while Celt will refer to those of Irish, Scottish, or Scotch-Irish heritage.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

Into Virginia itself, Irishmen swarmed. The colonial Anglophile William Byrd III wrote in alarm in 1736, "they flock over thither in such numbers, that there is not even elbow room for them. They swarm like the Goths and Vandals of old and will overspread our Continent soon."¹¹ Although small-scale Irish settlements could be found in the early eighteenth century within the area that became the modern counties of Albemarle, Campbell, Charlotte, Nelson, and Prince Edward, conditions favoring large-scale migration did not emerge until 1730. By that time, the Pennsylvania Valley had already been largely settled and the frontier was expanding; Irish immigrants arriving in Pennsylvania after 1727 found the best lands taken or too costly, and they were forced to look elsewhere.¹²

Virginia's backcountry Irish had established themselves so well by 1775, only forty years after initial settlement, that the population of the entire Shenandoah Valley has been estimated as 37.9 percent "Scotch-Irish," with the Germans accounting for 31.5 percent and the English only 26.6 percent. These Irish and/or Scotch-Irish

¹¹ William Byrd, "Letters of the Byrd Family," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 36 (1928): 353-55. Byrd referred to them as "Irish."

¹² Henry, 117.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

settlers, along with their German counterparts, for a time held out against the seemingly inescapable Anglo influence, rejecting the latter's agricultural systems, settlement patterns, religion, and customs. Nevertheless, the Anglo-Americans eventually made a cultural impression upon Valley life. Increasing in numbers with the beginning of the nineteenth century, they would affect a change in Valley architecture as well as in Irish and Germanic society. It is the time period before this onslaught of Anglo influence with which this study is concerned.¹³

COMMUNITY LIFE AND SOCIAL PATTERNS OF THE MANOR

An architectural study is more shadow than substance if it does not examine the individuals who created and lived in the buildings. Thus, the ninety-one men and one woman appearing within Beverley's account book before 1740 have been sought in all available records. Who were the people who bore the names recorded by Beverley? More importantly, what occupations did they hold? What positions in society did they enjoy? What was their economic

¹³ Thomas J. Wertenbaker, The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942) 210. For population figures, see W. Stitt Robinson, The Southern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763 (Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1979) 148.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

state? All of these questions should figure prominently in any attempt to reconstruct Manor architecture. The technical detail of the structures would be virtually meaningless if the builders were not known by name and character.

As stated earlier, of the ninety-two single immigrants or heads of households included in this study, more than half paid passage from Ireland for themselves--and for 265 other immigrants. Therefore, the known, self-supporting population of the early Manor represented a significant portion of the area's settlers. Since the approximate charge for transporting one person during this era was £20, an individual obviously had to have considerable funds in order to emigrate.¹⁴ The average six persons transported by each head of household burdened their families with an average expense of £120. Together, these fifty-one men invested well over £6,000 in transportation costs alone. In addition, each had sufficient money to begin renting or buying land from Beverley soon after arrival in Virginia, increasing still more the total capital he was obliged to have. Therefore, the Manor's first settlers, as a rule were not members of the poor and laboring classes.

¹⁴ For the £20 figure, see William M. S. Rasmussen, "Designers, Builders, and Architectural Traditions in Colonial Virginia," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 90 (1982): 204-05.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

Further study reveals that most of the menfolk possessed a learned skill or trade to support themselves and their families in the new land. Of the ninety-two pre-1740 settlers, at least thirty-seven (or 40 percent) were identified as practitioners of a trained skill, excluding farming; even an "architectus" or master builder was discovered.¹⁵ At least thirteen different trades are found among the initial Manor claimants, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Occupations Practiced by Original Settlers

Occupation	Number of Practitioners
Farmer/Planter	62
Miller	12
Ordinary keeper	6
Weaver	5
Surveyor	3
Blacksmith	3
Shoemaker	2
Taylor	2
Mason	1
Distiller	1
Master Builder	1
Carpenter	1
Cordwainer	1

¹⁵ For James Lynn, the "architectus," see Augusta Deed Book 3:505. The information concerning occupations was assembled from the deed, order, judgement, and probate records of Orange and Augusta.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

A number of these men practiced more than one calling, and estate inventories of several of the first-generation immigrants mentioned specialty tools not included in the above tabulation. As extant records very often do not indicate a person's trade or occupation, the number of skilled artisans in the Manor is undoubtedly higher. It was these same millers, weavers, and ordinary keepers whom this study identifies as the "elite" class--those who were referred to as "gentlemen," who filled the county offices, and were members of the vestry. The ninety-one men under study filled at least fourteen different social and governmental positions within the community before 1770. The office or titles of respect attributed to them are shown in Table 2.¹⁶ Others are identified as agents or representatives for Beverley and as land speculators. In aggregate, these first-generation Irish settlers of Beverley Manor held no fewer than 131 positions of community leadership.

Yet, the social stature of Augusta's Irish "elite" did not curb the cultural traits most often attributed to Irish immigrants: i.e., a propensity for violence and

¹⁶ This information was drawn from the deed, order, judgement, and probate records of Orange and Augusta.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

Table 2
Social Ranks Indicated for Original Settlers

Position	Number Holding Title or Office
Constable	30
Justice	18
Gentleman	16
Captain	15
Collector of Tithes	14
Commissioner	10
Sheriff	6
Undersheriff	5
Vestry member	5
Coroner	2
Colonel	2
Lieutenant Colonel	2
Lieutenant	2
Major	1

excessive drink, and an infuriating derision of "law and order." For example, Robert McClenachan, a justice, gentleman, and sometime sheriff of Augusta County, was brought before the court at various times for assault and battery "in the courthouse," (1753), for being drunk (1758), for selling liquor without a license (1761), and for failure to pay rent (1763). Robert Cunningham, another justice, was also fined for drunkenness (1745)--as was William Smith, constable and captain (1745). Assault and battery charges

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

were also filed against Samuel Gay, another justice (1747).

More seriously, Thomas Turk was arrested and charged with attempted rape, and his father was arrested until he promised to "keep the peace" toward the victim (1743). Gibbon Jennings, one of the wealthiest of the original settlers, also was cited for abusive behavior toward a female (1741). Murder allegations were attached to two families, the Buchannans (1747) and Trimbles (1755). At least one man turned his wife "out of doors." Sixteen or so of the Manor men were sued for debt, two for failure to pay workers they had contracted with, five for not returning their tithable lists, one for slander, one for breach of promise, and one for nonpayment of back rent (1745-1768).¹⁷

The literacy rate appears to have been high for these first-generation settlers. Only six were found to have left their marks in legal records rather than signing their names: Francis McCown, William Ledgerwood, Robert Crockett, James Davis, Thomas Kirkpatrick, and Daniel Monahan. Information concerning the social positions of these six men was meager; records found to date for them indicate only that all were farmers or planters; Crockett was a

¹⁷ This information was gathered from the order books and judgements of Orange and Augusta.

ORIGINS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE MANOR IRISH

militia captain, and Ledgerwood served once as overseer of a road. From the evidence, it can be concluded that a significant majority of the first Manor settlers received at least some education before reaching Virginia.

Prior writers have attributed Pennsylvania origins to most (if not all) of the Valley's "Scotch-Irish," portraying them as part of a flow of migration down the Great Wagon Road. Of the fifty-one men in this study group who proved their importations, all but two stated that they came to Virginia by way of *Philadelphia* (which cannot be taken to mean that they lingered for any length of time in Pennsylvania); The two exceptions stated that they brought their families "directly" to Virginia from Ireland. Of the remaining forty families in the study group, a Pennsylvania residency of some type is either known or indicated for only eighteen. Therefore, if the vanguard named in the account book is any indication of the rest of the Manor population, few of the immigrants spent any significant amount of time in Pennsylvania before pushing on to Virginia; and their classification as part of the "Scotch-Irish" cultural group of Pennsylvania--with its influences on architecture--must be questioned.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

Architectural documents created during the decades spanned by this study are scarce. As will be shown, substantial building activity was not undertaken during the earliest years of the Manor's growth; and the types of buildings for which detailed architectural records are typically created were themselves scarce during this period. The records that revealed the most useful information concerning architecture were Augusta's court orders and judgements and the minutes of the parish vestry--with deeds and private papers playing a lesser, but still useful role.

These sources contained a surprising number of documents related to both public and private structures erected from the 1740s to the 1760s. The majority concerned buildings that were funded publicly and those with which prominent individuals were involved; therefore, the housing and secondary structures of the lower societal levels could not be as adequately reconstructed as that of the elite. Still, the extant records provide invaluable insight into the architectural activities of immigrant landowners during the first decades of the Manor's settlement. The informa-

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

tion gathered from these records is organized into discussions of public buildings, private residences, and miscellaneous structures. Within each section, focus is placed upon the materials used (e.g., log, framed wood, or stone); size and quality of the structure; purpose of building and for whom intended; and characteristics that the buildings reveal about their creators and the community.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The Courthouse

In 1738 the Virginia Assembly ordered the creation of Augusta County, but a mechanism and facility for governing the new district was not established until 1745. In October of the latter year, Beverley wrote to the newly appointed justices instructing them to make a deed for the courthouse that stood on his Mill Place--thereby revealing that a structure had already been built by that time for court business.¹

The care with which this governmental building was erected is questionable, for it would undergo immediate and continual repair and would soon be judged unfit for use. At the first court held in the county two months later, the

¹ Augusta Deed Book 1:3.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

justices ordered repairs on the building, but did not describe the work that was to be done. A year later they again ordered repairs; but the clerk still deemed it unfit to hold the winter sessions. Again the next May, the grand jury complained of:

cracks between the logs . . . four or five inches wide and four or five feet long . . . some stopped with chunks of clay, but not close . . . no glass or shutters to [the windows]; the inside not furnished nor fitting for his Majesty's Judicatory to sit.

At least one more attempt--but probably not the only one--was made to upgrade the building; in October 1748, William Murray sued Colonel John Lewis (a sometime agent of Beverley) for £20 owed Murray for "sawing the Scathing" for the courthouse. The size of the overdue payment gives some indication of the extent of the repairs that were necessary; it was equivalent to the contemporary cost of building a substantial residence.²

It seems that the Court entertained thoughts of erecting a more adequate facility as early as 1746, when it ordered an inspection of the twenty-five acres specifically set aside by Beverley for the courthouse and grounds. However, the land was found "unsuitable and useless" and

² Augusta Deed Book 1:3; Order Book 1:3; Order Book 2:634; Judgements, March 1758, Drawer 401.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

the court was advised not to accept it unless it was laid out so that the courthouse stood in the center. Still, decisive action was slow in coming. In 1750 the court took bids for construction of a building on Augusta Street in Staunton, but the project was apparently shelved.

In May 1751 the sheriff was ordered to give notice that the August court session would authorize the building of a new courthouse, to be 40' x 26' in size. Problems materialized in its construction also. Two years later Henry Murray was awarded a contract for the *finishing* of the building; possibly this referred to the finer points of interior work--or (to use another connotation of this word) it might suggest that the original contractor did not complete his task. Delays and dissension continued. A year later, the court ordered that no money should be paid to any person building the new courthouse without official consent. Whatever problems prompted these orders, they evidently prolonged completion of the facility, and in May 1757 it still was not ready for use. A commission appointed to inspect the structure returned its opinion that all was done according to agreement except:

the steps to the Two outward Doors[,] Glazing three Upper Windows[,] the post of all the stairs to be Capt [capped] and the two Upper Windows to be finished According to

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

bargain And a Stayle [stile] Post of the Sheriffs Box.³

The good description that exists for the first courthouse cannot be found for the second; nonetheless, some comparison of the two can be made. Dimensions of the first were 38' 3" x 18' 3"; the second was substantially larger, 40' x 36'. The first was of log, hewn on both sides, and probably had dovetail notching. The material of the second is not stated in extant records. However, the man who completed it, William Murray, was a carpenter and joiner; thus it was undoubtedly of log or wood frame rather than stone.

Prior writers have presumed that the first two court buildings were both one-story log structures.⁴ Evidence contradicts that opinion. There is no indication that the first had more than one level, but the second clearly did. The commissioners' report of May 1757 plainly states that there were two "*Upper Rooms*," three "*Upper Windows*," and stairs. Also, a report filed in August 1758 concerns one of the doors to the "*upper Room*." The surveyor's plat of Staunton made by Thomas Lewis in 1749 depicts the new courthouse, the only structure on the plat, being a story

³ Augusta Order Book 1:102; Order Book 3:257, 322; Order Book 4:106; Judgements, May 1757, Drawer 401.

⁴ See Brenda L. Morris, "The Courthouses of Augusta County," Augusta Historical Bulletin 25 (1989): 15-17.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

and a half, with one front door on the ground floor and two front windows on a second level. It is not possible to discern from the drawing whether the structure was of log, as was the first court house, or whether it was framed.⁵

The second facility also boasted more architectural elements than the first. It had significantly more windows--with at least three (and probably four) on the upper level and an undetermined number on the ground floor. Its predecessor had only two small holes to serve as windows, and they were neither glassed nor shuttered. Also, the commissioners reported two outward doors on the 1757 structure, while there is nothing to indicate that the first courthouse had more than one. Finally, it is said that the first building had no fireplace; the present study shows that the second definitely did. In May 1757, John Cunningham was ordered to keep fires in the courthouse, as well as to clean it and provide candles; and Lewis's plat depicts an end chimney.⁶

⁵ For a published copy of Lewis's plat see Edward Aull, Early History of Staunton and Beverley Manor in Augusta County, Virginia (Birmingham, Ala.: Privately printed, 1963).

⁶ Augusta Order Book 5:76; Murray v. Lewis, Judgments, Drawer 401. Morris, in preparing "The Courthouses of Augusta County," apparently did not locate these documents relating to the second courthouse; thus, her conjectural sketch does not conform to the evidence.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

The Manor inhabitants had entered their third decade of settlement before they began to erect a sound structure for their foremost public edifice. This passage of time could be interpreted as a decided lack of concern or regard for public architecture. If so, it would also reflect the community's attitude toward domestic structures. Moreover, despite its unsatisfactory condition, the first courthouse continued to be used for at least twenty years after it was abandoned as the court's seat. As late as 1771 it was a dwelling; at some point it was divided into more rooms, a floor laid, and shutters installed. In this modified state, it survived for three more decades and was considered a suitable dwelling for the daughter and son-in-law of the prominent (but rambunctious) Robert McClenachan.⁷

The Jail

A second public structure often referred to in the county records was the jail, which the justices ordered to be built on 10 December 1745. While more romantic chroniclers of Augusta's history have portrayed an idyllic community free of crime,⁸ the urgency of the Manor's need to confine miscreants is clear from court orders of May 1746,

⁷ Morris, 16.

⁸ See Peyton, 32-35.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

which commanded the Sheriff to "get a house" for the jail, until the building was completed. The 21 May 1748 report of the commissioners appointed to view the finished structure describes it as "twenty two feet three Inches long and seventeen foot three Inches wide from outside to outside[,] built with Square Loggs." As with the first courthouse, this important auxiliary building appears to have been shabbily constructed, for it, too, was immediately condemned by the commissioners as inadequate. According to their complaints, there were

near one foot thick holes at y^e Corners and else where two or three Inches wide and so poorly duftailed at the Corners that it would be a very easy Matter to pull it all Down, The Chimney that was formerly built in a very poor Manner[,] now part roof which a Man Might easely break with his foot or hands.⁹

It appears improbable that this poorly constructed jail was long used. In August 1751 one David Kingkade was ordered to make any necessary alterations to the jail that were not included in his contract--an apparent reference to a new structure that had also failed to meet the court's satisfaction. Similiar evidence that the first jail was soon replaced is to be found in a local deed by which Robert McClenachan, the former sheriff (now a "gentleman" keeper

⁹ Augusta Order Book 2:634.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

of the town's ordinary) leased to the court Lots Nos. 1 and 2 in Staunton. Excluded from the lease were the old court house, *old prison*, and another house. The justices were instructed not to build or permit anyone else to build any structure on the land in question, but McClenachan reserved the right to add chimneys to the existing buildings. Apparently the three structures mentioned, including the old prison, had no fireplaces--and therefore no heat--as late as 1759.¹⁰

Architectural details of the second jail, erected sometime between 1745 and 1751, are meager. That it was of stone is evident by a bond of November 1771, by which Joseph Kinkhead, contractor for the county's third jail, guaranteed his performance. That document gave him the right to use the building materials from the *old jail*--stone, a quantity of iron, and iron doors--in the construction of the new facility, thereby accounting for the demise of the county's second prison. The fate of the first one, still standing in 1759, is yet unknown. It might be speculated that, like the first courthouse, it was leased for other purposes--perhaps even a dwelling. It is revealing that the second jail, constructed concurrently

¹⁰ Augusta Order Book 1:3, 46; Order Book 2:634; Order Book 4:47; Deed Book 8:185; Will Book 5:36.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

with the second court building, was of stone while the courthouse was of wood. Stone obviously had greater security value; but it cannot be said that it had more esthetic appeal or was considered more befitting to public edifices than was log or wood.

PRIVATE RESIDENCES

Stone

The earliest direct reference to a *residential* stone structure in the Manor dates to October 1746, when Alexander Douglass, a mason, sued Beverley's principal agent, Colonel James Patton, for nonpayment on a house Patton had ordered. Terms of the contract specified that Douglass should build on Patton's plantation "a stone House" with cellar--employing the following specifications:

a Cellar . . . Three square under a hill . . . the height of the Cellar and the house from the foundation is fifteen feet square in the clear, from the floor of the Cellar to y^e upper side of the under floor to be seven feet, and from the upper side of the under floor to y^e under side of the ceiling seven feet, the Chimney to be built on y^e outside of one of the squares three feet in the clear at y^e back. The door jam's two feet deep & four feet wide, the Chimney at the front to be raised Ten or twelve inches at Y^e least above the roof of the house---Two small windows according to y^e directions of the Pltf. and further the said Defend. did agree to Quarry & haul all of Stone. To Lime[,] plaster & white wash the said house and to finish the same by the last of May.¹¹

¹¹ Patton v. Douglass, Augusta Judgements, Drawer 387.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

For his work Douglass was to receive £10.

The details of the contract are significant. Patton, the foremost individual of importance in the Manor, erected a residence supplementary to (and undoubtedly smaller than) his own, but one of a form not generally attributed to this society. Fifteen feet square, of plastered and whitewashed stone, it represents the first reference to a square structure within the Manor--both the courthouse and prison were rectangular. More importantly, perhaps, is the evidence of naked stone being covered and whitewashed--an element suggesting parallels between the housing that these Irish immigrants constructed in the New World and those that they left behind. It was general practice in Ireland to plaster and whitewash stone buildings.¹²

The next evidence of a stone house in the area appears in a deed of 28 February 1749, by which mention is made of Daniel Harrison's "Stonehouse" on Cook's Creek. Harrison, like Patton, was referred to as "Gentleman," and it is apparently significant that the first two stone residences known in the community belonged to members of the social

¹² For Irish building practices, see Maurice Craig, The Architecture of Ireland from the Earliest Times to 1880 (London: B. T. Batsford, 1982); and Niall McCullough and Valerie Mulvin, A Lost Tradition: The Nature of Architecture in Ireland (Dublin: Gandon Editions Dublin, 1987).

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

and economic elite. Again in 1763, the court ordered a road to be viewed from "*the Stone House to James McAfee's, or James McCown's, on Catapo.*" While it offers no detail about the house, this road order does suggest that as late as the third decade a stone house was uncommon enough to be specified as such. (Road orders typically refer to a landowner's name rather than to a structure on the property.) The name of the homeowner was not given, so his social standing cannot be tested against the pattern suggested above.

A fourth stone dwelling is mentioned in 1768, when the road overseer from the "*Stone House to Tinker Creek*" was to alter the route. In the next year, Israel Christian deeded to his son William, 1,095 acres on Buffalo Creek, "*commonly called the Stone House Lands.*" Colonel John Lewis, in-law of Beverley's agent Patton, is also said to have used stone construction for Fort Lewis, a structure that road orders first mention in the 1760s. These records identify at least three more immigrant landowners (Lewis and the Christians) who built and/or lived in stone residences.¹³

It seems probable that there were many more stone or part-stone structures in the Manor. At least four stone

¹³ Augusta Deed Book 2:586; Order Book 7:486; Order Book 12:92; Deed Book 15:355.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

masons lived there contemporaneously--John Moffett, Silas Hart, Alexander Douglass (of the Patton contract) and William Edmondson--first referred to as masons in 1746, 1748, 1749 and 1752, respectively. With such a large number of masons operating concurrently, it does follow that there was enough of a demand to support their service. (Perhaps even to support them well, since Silas Hart owned at least two servants and served several times as county justice.) However, it must be recognized that a mason's work was not limited to the construction of all-stone residences. Even wooden structures very often used stone for foundations and chimneys; and at least one house in the Manor was known to have had a ground floor of stone, with a second story of logs. There was also an unusually large number of mills, and some stonework was typically required for them.¹⁴

Log or Frame

The first wooden buildings for which a contract exists were constructed in the mid-to-late 1740s by Colonel Lewis. Sometime in 1745, Lewis contracted with Henry Murray (the carpenter who had finished the second court house) to build

¹⁴ For stone masons see Patton v. Douglass, Augusta Judgements, Drawer 387; Deed Book 2:89; Order Book 3:297; Deed Book 1:161.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

two houses and rebuild a sawmill. Murray completed the work by 1748, according to a suit that he very tardily filed (in 1758) against Lewis for nonpayment of the £57 he claimed to have earned. Included in the file is the 1748 account of Murray's work and fees, as follows:¹⁵

To Building a House 31 x 21	£ 24
To an after agreement for 2 dorment [sic] windows .	£ 2
To Building a house on the Glebe by agreement	£ 24
To an after agreement for the difference of	
2 end windows for 2 dorment windows	£ 2
To rebuilding the saw mill	£ 5
	£ 57

It is evident that Lewis had two different houses built sometime between 1745 and 1748, one for the Augusta Parish parsonage and one for an unknown purpose, both of the same value. As other records identify two mills for Lewis, it can be speculated that the mentioned sawmill was his. But was the 31'x 21' house for him also--a more substantial structure to replace his original dwelling? This one of the mid-1740s was almost as large as the first courthouse and apparently of a better type; its dormer windows are the earliest to which a reference has been found. There is nothing in the case file to indicate whether the buildings were log or stone; but since Murray sawed the "scathing" for the courthouse, it appears that he was a carpenter,

¹⁵ Augusta Judgements, Drawer 401, March 1758.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

not a stonemason; and it is reasonable to assume that if Lewis desired stone structures he would have contracted with one of the four identified masons, as Patton did in 1746. Therefore, the Lewis house of the 1740s is treated as wood in the present study.

The values of the buildings that Murray erected for Lewis bear indirect testimony to their nature. The Anglican glebe house would certainly not be of the poorer sort; rather, it should be a comparatively substantial structure, as befitted its function and position as a seat of the Commonwealth's official religion. The other house for which Lewis contracted is of identical value and should be as substantial. It is also noteworthy that two years earlier Patton paid only £10 for a stone residence that was to be plastered and whitewashed; and the stones first had to be quarried. Lewis's wooden structure, which would have been easier to assemble than stone, cost twice as much to build.

The glebe house is encountered again in 1747, when the Anglican vestry agreed to purchase land for the glebe "convenient to the lands of Col. Patton" and "near Leeper's old Plantation," on which a church was to be built. Patton agreed to supply the timber and stone, as well as the five acres of land. A house was subsequently ordered, 32' x

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

18', floored above and below, with a "partition staircase," and a brick or stone chimney at each end. Also included was a 14' x 18' square-log stable, and a framed dairy 10' square--all to be completed by October 1748. The following May, a barn was ordered, 40' x 20' with a 9' x 20' shed on each end, and a 14' x 20' threshing floor. During the construction of the buildings the vestry authorized that Mr. Hindman (the Presbyterian minister turned Anglican cleric) be given a living allowance based at £20 yearly--a court order that reveals something more of the relative value of housing in this society. The cost of Reverend Hindman's dwelling, stable, and barn exceeded his annual living allowance by only 20 percent.¹⁶

Some confusion exists over these glebe structures. As previously shown, Lewis had contracted for several buildings in 1745 and Murray's suit claimed to have completed a glebe house by 1748. However, the vestry did not authorize the purchase of glebe land or the construction of a parsonage until 1747. One of two possibilities seem to exist here. Either Lewis prematurely had a glebe house erected on his land in 1745, anticipating that it would be the site chosen by the vestry, or else Murray erred in recalling the

¹⁶ Augusta Parish Vestry Book, 3:27.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

date of the original contract. The latter possibility seems more probable. Not only was the alleged 1745 contract not introduced as evidence but the alleged date of completion (1748) agrees with the date specified for the Rev. Hindman's glebe. Court minutes also show that in 1750 Lewis was ordered to do further work on these buildings, to make them acceptable, and it might reasonably be proposed that his failure to pay for the construction work might be due to the unacceptability of his product.¹⁷

In May 1753, Joseph Teas (a planter and former county commissioner) contracted with one Archibald Stewart for improvements on a tract of land that Teas had bought from Beverley. Stewart agreed to build a log house, maul and lay 6,700 rails (apparently for fencing), and clear and plow 20 acres. No architectural details were supplied for the house. However, this deed confirms that new log houses were still being constructed by the well-to-do, even as the community matured and stabilized. Teas first entered land with Beverley in 1737, almost fifteen years before he contracted for this structure; and by frontier standards, he had acquired a small fortune before his death in 1756--including over 2,000 acres, 98 head of livestock, and

¹⁷ Augusta Parish Vestry Book, 29.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

at least two slaves and one servant. It might be argued that Stewart executed the contract as a tenant for Teas and that the log dwelling was suitable quarters for a tenant. However, Teas's will, which left this tract to his two minor sons, indicated that it was the very land on which he then lived; and Stewart, the builder, was himself a substantial landowner by 1749, with tracts that either adjoined Teas or lay near to him.¹⁸

Patton appears again in housing records in 1753, contracting with Benjamin Harris to build on Patton's Springfield plantation two round-log houses, described as:

twenty one Feet Long and fifteen feet side in the Clear and to be Eight Feet high under the Joists which is to be square and three Logs high above the Joists beside the Wallplate; and [with] a shade of twenty Feet Long between the houses as wide as they are, and a Chimney to be cut out and built up with Logg at each end, and the s^d Houses[,] Shade and Chiminies are all to be under one Roof covered with Clapboards. . . and the Houses and Chiminies to be Junked and Daubed both out side and Inside, and _____ or Squared both outside and inside and Two Doors to be cut out and Hung in the Gable ends of both Houses and the Gable ends from the Logs up to the Clapboard.¹⁹

Harris was to be paid eleven *pistoles* upon finishing the work. The two identical structures, which offer the second

¹⁸ Augusta Will Book 3:143; Deed Book 3:464.

¹⁹ Agreement between Harris and Patton, 12 February 1753, Preston Papers, Va. State Historical Society Library, Richmond.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

and third extant examples of architectural construction on Patton's land, are interesting for both their degree of variance from the first and for their inherent characteristics. As identical pens, separated by a "shade" or walkway with a single roof covering the whole, this might be considered a forerunner or early example of the popular Southern dogtrot. It is also reminiscent of the Irish dwelling type in which a covered walkway separated the family quarters from those of the animals, all under the same roof.

These 1753 structures are clearly a different type of housing than the 1746 dwelling Patton built, raising the questions of occupancy and social quality of their residents. The later structures were larger than the 15' square stone house of 1746, but had a lower ceiling. They were much smaller than the 31'x 21' structure Lewis had erected by 1748; and the value of the 1753 pair is considerably less than those of both Patton's and Lewis's earlier buildings. The *round-log* construction indicates a reluctance to underwrite the added time and expense of hewing logs; and the log chimneys, lack of windows, and single door in each pen all suggest that Patton was throwing up inexpensive housing--possibly for his servants or slaves.

Again in 1754, Patton contracted for another house, which Frederick and Henry Shore were to build as follows:

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

twenty Feet Square in the Clear with good Square Logs dufftailed and [a] Sleeper Squared with a Beam of a foot square under the middle of the s^d Sleeper[,] also to put in Joysts of eight Inches by five square with Large Beam under the middle of them[,] the Joysts to be nine feet from the Lower floor and the Logs to be Raised five feet high above the Joysts, with a Shingle Roof as good as the Roof of the House wherein Mr. Wm Thompson now lives and as much of the said Roof over the end of the House as in Mr. Thomson, also a paint house on both sides and one end of the same, the Gable Ends to be Done up with Clapboards[,] two Doors & two Windows to be cut out.²⁰

Patton agreed to pay twelve pounds and twelve shillings.

This third Patton contract reflects another building style and suggests still another class division on his plantation. It is the largest dwelling of record for him, but there is no evidence to warrant a conclusion that its space or construction was adequate to qualify as his personal residence. This structure was to have a sleeping loft, with ceilings nine feet high; and Patton was concerned that it be as good a quality as that of Mr. Thompson's house. (The title *Mr.*, like *Gentleman*, was then one of respect for men of social standing.) The squared logs with clapboards on the gable ends, as well as the two doors and two windows, added to the expense of the structure. This house, of deliberately superior quality, was likely for a married child or valued employee.

²⁰ Agreement between Patton and Shore, 1 February 1754, Preston Papers.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

The "paint houses" that were to be attached to three sides of Patton's latest house deserve comment. These hood-like coverings for doors and windows were commonly referred to as *pent* roofs. As an architectural feature, it is variously said to of German or Quaker origins.²¹ The appearance of a Quaker element in a predominantly Irish (and supposedly Presbyterian) community would be striking. Several Quaker families have been identified in the area; and it might be said that Patton, a man of extensive travels, had been introduced to this architectural element in Pennsylvania. However, given the strength of the German culture that shared the Valley with the Manor Irish, a German attribution appears more probable. In either case, this is the only instance yet documented of this building form at Beverley Manor.

In November 1760 the Augusta Parish vestry agreed to build yet another house on the glebe, this one to be of square logs, 24' x 18', "Duftailed", with one and a half

²¹ David Hackett Fischer, Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America (New York: Oxford UP, 1989) 478-79; Allen G. Noble, Wood, Brick, and Stone: The North American Landscape (2 vols.; Amherst: U of Mass Press, 1984), I:46; K. Edward Lay, "European Antecedents of Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Germanic and Scots-Irish Architecture in America," Pennsylvania Folklife 32 (1982): 17.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

stories, and a partition across the house. The sum of £300 was levied to pay for its construction. By January of the following year, William Ward had undertaken the building, promising to construct it of logs that were six inches thick and squared on two sides. The sleeper or lower joists were to be framed in the ground-log, and the latter was to be nine inches thick. All joists were to be planed and squared, or ornamented with moulding, and to be eight by five inches square. The whole was to be covered with shingles "free of the sap" and fourteen inches "to the weather." Gable ends were also to be clapboarded. Upper floors were to be laid of plank; and the partition across the house was to be of "punch and fennel work, with a wainscotted door in the same." The staircase was to be raised with facing and provided with a door. The outside door was also to be wainscotted; and all doors were to have iron hinges. One sash window of six panes was ordered for "the room," with one of the same type opposite the front door--both well glazed. Spaces between the logs were to be filled with good mortar or daubed and a stone chimney built.²²

This last parsonage was by far the most ornate house

²² Augusta Parish Vestry Book, 19.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

documentable in the extant records of Beverley's pioneer settlers, and it adds importantly to our knowledge of building types on the colonial frontier. It introduces ornamental decoration, sash windows, and iron fittings. Although the completed building used only £64 of the appropriated £300, it was definitely of better quality than the glebe house Lewis contracted for in 1745. It also evidences that log structures were ornamented with wainscoting and mouldings.

For almost thirty years after initial settlement, log clearly remained a favored material for the dwellings of substantial citizens. The last reference to log structures in the time period covered is dated 1763, when Mr. Robert Hambleton (again note the title of respect) acknowledged a debt to one John Biggs for four days of "getting house logs and covering cabin." This document provided no architectural detail. Neither this record nor any other created by the parties suggested a usage or occupancy; and there has been found no evidence that Hambleton owned servants or slaves who might have occupied the dwelling. For want of such evidence, this might stand as another example of a log house erected by a man of social position in the Manor.²³

²³ Chalkley 1:462.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

OTHER RESIDENCES

Numerous other records were created in early Augusta that mention dwellings, without accompanying details. Beverley's account book offers one sole mention of a structure. On 7 July 1739, Robert Poage paid Beverley £14.3.4, as principle and interest, on Poage's bond for "building a cabin." Nothing more was said about this dwelling. On 27 November 1750, John Cunningham and John Davis, both immigrant settlers, executed a deed for Lot No. 7 in Staunton; a house was noted as being on the property. The same occurred again in November 1751, when Beverley conveyed Lot No. 12 in Staunton, with a house on the premises, to Gent. Alexander Wright, who assisted Murray in completing the second courthouse. In August 1752, "John Brown, Gent.," an initial settler, conveyed a house and Lot No. 4 to Samuel Wilson; in August 1753, John Kerr sold to Francis Beaty (both first-generation immigrants) a "*Mansion House*" on 336 acres, adjoining property already owned by Beaty. Several days later, settler William Christian purchased a home on Staunton's Lot No. 8 from Thomas Paxton. Another "*Mansion house*" was sold in 1755, this one by settler Robert Young, Sr., to his son Robert. More town houses in Staunton were conveyed by or to initial settlers in 1761, 1762 and 1764: Patrick McDonald sold to one S. Heard a dwelling house and

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

two "office houses," again on Lot No. 12; James McDowell bought from M. Bowyer a house 18 feet in length facing a street; and John Stewart sold to Israel Christian a house on Lot No. 3. While no detailed information is provided, these transactions help to identify members of the initial settler families who were living in town or owned town dwellings during the studied period.²⁴

MISCELLANEOUS STRUCTURES

Several references were found to structures other than public or residential buildings. Of these, mills were by far the most frequently mentioned. In 1735, the Orange County court issued two road orders for the area from *Beverley's Mill* to Piney Mountain Run and on to the James River Mountains, revealing that there was at least one mill already in the area before Beverley secured his patent in 1736. In the early 1740s, road orders were issued to and from Colonel Patton's Mill (1744 and later), Finley's Mill (1744), and Picken's Mill (1744 and later). As previously stated, John Lewis contracted with Henry Murray in 1745 to rebuild Lewis's sawmill; how long the mill stood prior to

²⁴ Manor Account Book, 19; Augusta Deed Books 3:7; 4:179, 489; 5:381, 443, 462; 6:503, 518; 10:72, 75; 11:568.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

that year is uncertain. A large number of other mills followed during the 1740s, including those of John Davis, Benjamin Allen, John Wilson, William and Robert King, William Long, John Hutchison, Henry Guy, George Lewis, and John Trimble; John Lewis also built a second mill in this decade. In the 1750s, mills were built for Joseph Love (son-in-law of immigrant Joseph Teas), William Wilson, John Buchanan, Joseph Long, and Patrick Young. Sometime before 1768, John Scewright erected his mill.

While these are by no means all of the area mills that were accessible to Manor inhabitants, they do indicate the number owned by early settlers or their offspring. Totaled, at least forty mills are *known* to have been erected before 1770 by the ninety-two individuals or families under study--or by their immediate neighbors. Of these, twenty-one were referred to only as mills, six were identified as water mills, eight as water grist mills, three as grist mills, and three as fulling mills.²⁵

Other buildings referred to in the court records included a variety of structures of more or less social

²⁵ Orange Order Book 1:52, 36; Order Book 3:192; Order Book 4:108, 177. Augusta Order Book 2:8, 49, 51, 134, 140, 151-54, 239, 258-60, 322, 344, 574, 585-86; Order Book 3:184, 208, 251, 328, 368, 392, 414-15; Deed Book 5:525; Deed Book 6:416; Will Book 3:221.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

value. A school house was erected around 1747 on James McClure's land. In 1754, a road was to be viewed from Campbell's Schoolhouse to Renix's road; it is not known if this was the same facility previously attributed to McClure. In 1759, Robert McClenachan had a structure on Lot. No. 1 or 2 in Staunton, standing with the courthouse and prison, that was variously called a house and "McClenachan's Tent." The purpose of the tent might be inferred from the license issued to McClenachan, throughout the 1750s, to operate an ordinary at the courthouse. In 1760, William Lapsley had a smith shop built on the lands of William Johnston; and in 1767, Israel Christian owned a building in Staunton in which one William Bowyer lived and kept store.²⁶

CONCLUSION

The material relating to public, private, and miscellaneous structures in the court and vestry records has proved informative, establishing a variety of building types erected and used by the first-generation families during the Manor's formative years. It has been established that log was not replaced by frame during the three

²⁶ Augusta Order Book 2:181; Executions, April 1801; Order Book 4:126; Deed Books 8:185; 13:505. Augusta Parish Vestry Book, 368. Chalkley 1:328.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: DIRECT EVIDENCE

decades of this study; rather, log construction continued to be used by members of the economic elite, and in "substantial" public buildings, until the end of the 1760s. Stone and wood construction appears to have been used interchangeably, even in governmental buildings and dwellings of community leaders. The inherent quality of one over the other appears to have played a role only when defense was desired. Finally, these records have yielded a clear indication of architectural diversity in the early Manor, although not always along class lines.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Any student of early American architecture prefers records that explicitly describe house types and the occupants of specific buildings. In reality, building contracts, personal letters, and descriptive court records are scarce. The resulting void can often be filled by wills and estate inventories for the subject population. A few such records are created at midlife by random people, usually in times of debt or illness. They are more commonly created when a settler's life comes to an abrupt halt.

As record sources, these two categories have both strengths and weaknesses. More than any other type of probate record, inventories contain detailed information about the number and types of things an individual owned and how much they were worth. Using these data, in conjunction with other information already uncovered about a family, its social status and standard of living can often be deduced. More importantly from the standpoint of architectural history, these records can permit one to hypothesize the type of structure an individual occupied by the number and nature of household furnishings and kitchen

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

items that are listed.

Inventories and wills do have limitations that must be factored into any extrapolations made from the available body of records. A significant portion of males in any study group will have died intestate. Few females left wills. Some individuals will have left no property worth inventorying. In colonial Virginia, real estate was inherited by the laws of primogeniture; therefore, buildings were almost invariably excluded from inventories and wills. There also exists evidence that certain types of personal property--particularly clothes--were omitted by custom if the deceased had heirs-at-law who could use them. Also important is the fact that females who died intestate were seldom considered to have any personal property at all. If married, the property was deemed that of her husband--even her clothes might be inventoried in his estate. If widowed, her property had generally been "lent" to her by her late spouse, and as such it tended to go to his or their heirs according to guidelines previously specified by him or the law. Few single adult females seemed to have existed at all on the Virginia frontier. Finally, a number of the pioneers of Beverley Manor moved to other counties or colonies before their deaths. Since this study focuses upon their experiences in the Manor, the outmigrating

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

subjects were not followed.

Given the above limitations, this study has gleaned much from the wills and personal property inventories (but particularly the latter) of those nineteen early settlers who left recorded estates. Table 3 identifies the individuals included in this will-and-inventory study.

An analysis of the information contained in the inventories of these individuals yields certain patterns for the three decades covered. Most striking is the extent to which livestock comprised an overwhelming (albeit declining) percentage of the individual estates: 70 percent in the 1740s, 67 percent in the 1750s, and 43 percent in the 1760s. Conversely the value of household items (including "luxuries") owned by the decedents did rise (more slightly) over the three decades: from 5 percent in the 1740s, to 10 percent in the 1750s, to less than 15 percent in the 1760s.

Although these data were obtained from only 22 percent of the study group, they nonetheless reveal that the maturation of the frontier had minimal effect on the composition and character of the estates left by the first-generation settlers. Livestock was the dominant investment, and comforts were of negligible importance. More directly, since the amount and value of interior items indirectly imply the type of building that housed them, it can be

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Table 3
Early Manor Settlers with Inventoried Estates

Year	Name	Value of estate* (£.s.p)
1742	Gibbon Jennings	240.10.00
1743	John Hart	34.11.06
1744	Alexander Brackenridge	62.15.03
1744	Daniel Monahan	97.01.01
1747	William Skillern	54.12.04
1749	John Moffett	152.00.03
1749	Robert King	25.07.06
1749	Patrick Cook	242.05.00

	Average for the decade	(110.22.11)
1751	James Crawford	82.19.06
1751	James Bell	206.16.06
1752	Nathan Patterson	236.14.10
1753	James Fulton	109.10.00
1756	Joseph Teas	233.00.00
1759	Martha Mitchell	22.19.00

	Average for the decade	(98.21.09)
1761	Francis McCown	55.00.02
1763	George Robinson	197.01.02
1763	John Lewis	32.12.00
1765	Randall McDonall	29.06.09
1769	James Gillespy	180.18.01

	Average for the decade	(54.19.09)

*These are approximate values. Many of the inventories are difficult to read, and the totals provided on the recorded copies are not always accurate.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

proposed that an aesthetic interest in housing did not increase significantly from the time of initial settlement to the dawn of the American Revolution.

The number of beds owned by families is one of the most revealing clues to dwelling size, and an increased occurrence of beds in estate inventories should suggest that larger structures were evolving. However, this does not appear to be the case for the Manor. Of the nine individuals who died in the 1740s, the ratio of beds to household members (including known servants) was 10:43--or 4.3 persons for every identified bed; without servants, this figure becomes 4.1 persons per bed. This ratio was maintained even through the 1760s. In the third and last decade of this study, when servants are counted, the ratio was 9:38, or 4.2 people per bed; and without servants, 4 per bed. The only individual in all those thirty years who died in possession of a cradle was Patrick Cook--who, at his death in 1749, was by far the wealthiest of any Manor people of his time and family size.

Not only was the bed-to-people ratio consistent throughout the three decades, but so was the number of other large furniture items requiring floor space. A comparison of the approximate number of these items for the two decades appears in Table 4.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Table 4
Comparison of Inventoried Furniture (Excluding Beds):
First and Third Decades of Settlement

Item	1740s (9 inventories)	1760s (5 inventories)
Chests/trunks	5	5
Tables	4+	3
Chairs	8+	16
Dressers	1	
Cupboards		1
Estate values	£1010.07.0	£491.12.02
Household members represented	43	38

The information gathered from the nineteen inventories found for the subject population during the first three decades of Manor settlement suggests that, while family sizes expanded over the years, there was not a corresponding increase in the amount of furniture. Nor was there a noticeable rise in the number of such nonessentials as gold and silver items, books, looking glasses, and washing and powdering tubs that some Manor people possessed. If interior furnishings are any indication of the type or size of family dwellings, it can be proposed that houses did not enlarge proportionally during the studied period.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

CASE STUDIES

Composite data and averages are useful for defining overall patterns within a society. However, the range of diversity and the extent of similarity within a study group are best understood by examining individual experiences. The following nineteen case studies, extracted from the data forms compiled for each individual listed on Table 3 and presented in chronological order, demonstrate two important points: the manner in which appraisments can sometimes be used to hypothesize the nature of dwellings; and the degree of housing development that occurred within the studied period.

GIBBON JENNINGS (1743)

Personal Data:

Jennings first appeared in the Manor Account Book in 1738 paying down on two pieces of land; a third bought by 1740 raised his holdings to 1,535 acres. He built a mill on one of the original tracts before September 1740 and had small improvements (nature unspecified) on the other. By early 1742, he was in serious financial straits; within a year his entire estate was seized for debt. A deed of 1756 related that he had "absconded" within four months of the seizure. His fate is not known.¹

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Inventory Data:

From the given value of his estate (£240.10.00), it would appear that Jennings stood at the top of the Manor's economic ladder--his total worth being second only to Patrick Cook's £242 estate. However, Jennings' property was valued seven years earlier than Cook--only five years after he first claimed his Manor land; thus Jennings had built his estate more quickly. Insofar as architecture and living conditions are concerned, Jennings' relative wealth is deceiving; his lifestyle was still primitive. The several farm tools that were seized imply that he did some farming, in addition to owning a mill; but there is nothing to show that the improvements he had made on his three tracts were substantial. At least two other individuals were living on his properties--William Nutt on the mill tract (to whom Jennings supposedly conveyed property in 1740) and Mark Jones on the James River land. These men could have made the improvements referred to in the writs of attachment.

Conclusion:

The meager list of household items seized to satisfy

¹ Beverley Account Book, 24. Orange Deed Book 4:350-54; Judgement Reel 46, February-March 1742; Order Book 3:360-63; Order Book 4:182. Augusta Deed Books 1:319; 7:375.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

the judgement against Jennings suggests one of two possibilities: either he lived somewhere on his own land in housing so primitive that it accommodated only one old wooden box, one iron pot, and pot hooks (his entire household collection) or else he lived in someone else's home. The latter appears to be a typical arrangement for many of the early Manor men. The only other household item he owned was a chest and its contents, which were in the hands of Colonel Lewis. Apparently his only moveable property of value was locked therein; whether he had deposited it with Lewis for safekeeping or whether he lived at Lewis's house is unstated. Whichever the case, it is clear that this single male who owned considerable livestock and land was not concerned with his domestic surroundings.

JOHN HART (1743)

Personal Data:

Hart entered 491 acres with Beverley in 1737 at a price of £16, and he had completed payments four years later when he purchased a 400-acre tract for an additional £12. He served as undersheriff in the early 1740s and as surveyor for the adjacent Borden's Tract. Hart died a bachelor or widower, without children, before August 1743;

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

his brother Silas (the mason) filed for administration as his next-of-kin. It does appear that John sold his original Manor land. However, the appraisers of his estate were all Manor men, and so it is assumed that he died in Beverley's tract. His origins are not known; he did not prove his importation, and no other records suggested an earlier residence.²

Inventory Data:

The 1743 appraisal of Hart's estate valued his personal property at £34.11.06, considerably less than that of Jennings; but Hart clearly lived in much greater comfort. He owned only two horses, a paltry number for the Manor men, but his wardrobe was outstanding: fifty-five pieces of clothing, including four wigs and a pair of satin breeches. He also possessed a large number of luxury items, including more than seventeen books, a silver watch and snuff box, and gold stone buttons. His basic clothing, valued at over £5, comprised 15 percent of his estate; his luxury items, 21 percent--while his household items, amounting to less than four shillings, made up only 1 percent.

² Manor Account Book, 48. Orange Deed Books 4:4,110-11; Order Book 3:24; Will Book 1:280, 294; Augusta Deed Book 7:102.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Conclusion

Like Jennings, Hart could have shared a dwelling with someone else; but Hart does not appear to have been farmed. As an undersheriff he was likely a townsperson (perhaps at Waynesborough, which his land was near), although this cannot be automatically assumed. He owned neither bed nor mattress, and the only furniture mentioned was one chest and one box. He had one knife and fork, and no tools other than a broken auger and a chisel.

Although Hart and Jennings were both bachelors, their estate listings imply quite different lifestyles. Neither had families to support, both had considerable acreage, and neither burdened himself with household furnishings. In the case of Jennings it might be presumed that his sparse comforts were due to an investment of all his capital in his lands and mill, but not with Hart. The latter owned an exceptional amount of comfort items, was obviously much concerned with his public appearance, but clearly did not view housing as a status symbol.

ALEXANDER BRACKENRIDGE (1744)

Personal Data:

Brackenridge proved his importation from Ireland on 22 May 1740, claiming passage for himself and seven family

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

members. However, he appears in the Manor book three years earlier--charged for three tracts totalling 896 acres. He died intestate before 24 May 1744, A farmer and commissioner of the Tinkling Springs congregation, Brackenridge left an estate valued at £62.15.03.³

Inventory Data:

As did most Manor probates, Brackenridge's inventory began with a listing of livestock (valued at £43), followed by farm tools. From there the reader can follow his appraisers into his home, where various kitchen items were listed--pots and pans; pewter; eleven dishes; twenty-three knives, forks, and spoons; seven noggins; two tables; a chest and box; and wash tub. Mixed with these "interior" items are one scyth, tacking [plow], three hoes, and four bells. Immediately following these are his bed and its furniture, two coats, a side saddle, and five baggs--after which an oversight was apparently remedied, for next is listed 5 acres of rye and 4.5 of wheat. The household list then resumes with such sundry items as a churn, coolers, a crock, looking glass, tumbler and butter plates--intermixed, again, with nonhousehold items.

³ Manor Account Book, 28. Orange Order Book 2:155; Deed Book 4:88-89; Will Books 1:322; 2:506.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Conclusion:

From the Brackenridge inventory it appears that the houses of the most influential members of the community stored possessions indiscriminately--or else the clerk who copied this lengthy appraisal into the official record books of the county shuffled pages of the inventory. It is also doubtful that Brackenridge's house was anything more than a two-room, and perhaps only one-room, dwelling. The single bed raises questions about sleeping accommodations. Brackenridge was married, with four minor children and one servant at the time of his death--a total of no less than seven persons living in the house. Moreover, as he had several older children whose marital status is yet unknown, the number could be even higher. No chairs are mentioned, although he does have four tables. There is no cupboard for the many dishes and pieces of flatware; they should have been stored in the chest or box. Still, Alexander enjoyed some degree of affluence, as is attested by the existence of a servant and a washing tub, and the prominent social standing of his grown children.

This first inventory for a householder does not suggest that the early community leaders were living in anything but primitive housing, or that dwellings were furnished with even the bare necessities during the first

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

decade of Manor settlement. As seems to be the rule, the bulk of the estate was invested in land and livestock--with very little importance attached to the family home.

DANIEL MONAHAN (1744)

Personal Data:

Monahan entered 900 acres with Beverley in 1738; purchased it a year later; and sold it to Joseph Teas in 1743. His origins are not known, but his estate settlement mentions Pennsylvania money. Called a yeoman in 1743, he died in 1744 leaving no wife but one infant daughter. Some carpenter's and cooper's tools appear in his inventory, along with a plantation worth £20 (the latter is listed because he had no sons to inherit); but the small number of farming tools would have been adequate for only very limited tillage. Monahan was illiterate or else ill when he "marked" his will.⁴

Inventory Data:

This £97 inventory begins with a listing of wearing apparel, money due, and tools. A looking glass and a few

⁴ Manor Account Book, 16. Orange Deed Books 3:105-08; 9:36-37; Order Book 2:30-31; Will Book 2:64-65. Augusta Will Book 1:87.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

other interior items are followed by a hoe; a few froes; and weaver, carpenter, and cooper ware. The inventory then mattresses and seven items of bed furnishings (blankets, pillows, rugs, etc.) Besides pots and pans, a powdering tub, dishes and flatware, a case (undescribed), and a spinning wheel, he owned no other furniture. Household and kitchen items represent only 3 percent of his estate. Like Hart, he had an extensive wardrobe, comprising 6 percent of the total. As typical, livestock was his largest investment, accounting for 40 percent of his personal goods.

Conclusion:

From the sparse furnishings attributed to Monahan, it does not appear that the dwelling of this single father would be anything more than a one-room structure. Possibly he and his daughter lived in another home, or he may have lived alone while his motherless child was cared for by someone else. In any case, despite his considerable landholdings and comparatively large number of personal-comfort items, Monahan was equipped for very modest housing and was seemingly unconcerned about the furnishings that surrounded him.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

WILLIAM SKILLERN (1744)

Personal Data:

Skillern was in Augusta before 1737, when Beverley began charging him quit rent on 597 acres. He proved importation three years later, July 1740, for himself, his wife, and four children whom he had brought from Ireland at his own expense. The following year, he purchased 635 acres on a draught of the Long Meadow, near the patent line. He was apparently well-connected in society, not only in Augusta County, but east of the Blue Ridge as well. His will mentions Colonel William Randle of "Tookaho;" and, as executors of his estate, he named Peter Jefferson, Colonel Thomas Meriwether, and Colonel James Patton of the Manor. When he died in 1744, he left a widow and five minors.⁵

Inventory Data:

Skillern's personal estate was valued at £54.12.04, a sum that does not include the 900 or more acres he still owned at his death. The inventory does list his crops. His household of seven identified members had only one bed, complete with furniture, worth £5. He had an unspecified number of chairs and a table, worth twelve shillings--less

⁵ Manor Account Book, 15. Orange Deed Books 2:209; 4:266; Will Books 1:303-05; 2:63, 102. Augusta Will Book 1:33; Order Book 1:347, 361.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

than his saddle. Some £3 of pewter ware was his only "luxury" item. With several pots and pans, candlesticks, pails, tubs, knives and forks, four "baggs," and a flesh fork, the Skillerns eked out their existence. The £7 value of his household goods was even less than that of his clothing. Again, the bulk of his moveable property was livestock, comprising 52 percent of his personal estate.

Conclusion:

Despite his seemingly intimate connections with the Jeffersons, Meriwethers, and Pattons, Skillern lived a sparse existence. To assume that his inventoried items furnished anything more than a one-room house would be unrealistic. Again, here is a man who values his personal appearance (clothing) more than he does his living environment. Like Brackenridge, the only other family man who died this early, Skillern paid to transport a sizeable family from Ireland--thereby depleting his finances--and it took him four years to pay off the land he entered with Beverley in 1737. That debt would have consumed the majority of his earnings during his first years in Virginia. Like Brackenridge, Skillern died before he had time to rebuild his capital or his living quarters. Yet, his early death has provided a glimpse into the modest circumstances of influential individuals on the Virginia frontier.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

JOHN MOFFETT (1749)

Personal Data:

Moffett, a mason, was entered in the account book in 1737 with 396 acres, worth slightly more than £11. Two years later he proved importation for himself, his wife [Mary Christian, of the Manor Christians] and four children, whom he brought from Ireland at his own expense. Several more children were baptized in the 1740s by the Rev. John Craig. He was commissioned a militia lieutenant in 1741; sold his manor land in 1746 to Mathew Robertson of Pennsylvania; and died by May 1749, leaving a wife and seven minor children. The widow Mary remarried by 1752; in 1755, her son George Moffett accused his stepfather, John Trimble, also of the Manor, of beating Mary to death.⁶

Inventory Data

Although Moffett was called a mason in 1746, his inventory included no tools of that trade. In fact, very little was found other than the forty horses and fourteen cows that made up 97 percent of his estate! For his household of nine he provided two mattresses and two

⁶ Manor Account Book, 45. Orange Order Books 2:109; 3:160, 392; Deed Book 4:425. Augusta Deed Books 1:161; 2:785; Will Book 1:142, 221; Order Book 3:361, 467; Will Book 3:231.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

sets of bedclothes, a frying pan, two pots with hooks, iron tongs, old pails, a cooler, half a dozen knives and forks, a washing tub, two saddles, three runletts [small barrels], a churn, a gun, and four books (one a bible). Not even chairs to sit on or a table to eat on are mentioned.

While cows and horses dominated most estates, Moffett's stock was exceptional. His nine pacing horses suggest that he raised horses to sell or race. The Irish were extremely fond of horse racing and gaming (as convictions in the court orders amply attest). It is not surprising that someone in the Manor would supply the sport.

Conclusion:

Moffett, whose estate is by far the smallest yet found for his family size, clearly did not own enough interior items to support life in anything larger than one room.

ROBERT KING (1749)

Personal Data:

King was in the Manor by 1737, and received title to 750 acres in 1742. He proved importation in 1740 for himself, his wife, and three young children from Ireland at his own expense. He had at least one slave, built a mill, and sold a portion of his tract in 1748. When he died the following year, two of his four children were minors. He

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

bequeathed thirty shillings to "the Meeting House" (indicating Protestant leanings); and a plantation on Falling Spring (not part of his original Manor tract) was left to his widow in trust for their only son John.⁷

Inventory Data:

On 29 November 1749, an inventory was made of the goods belonging to "Widow King," totaling slightly more than £25. Almost 90 percent of the estate her husband left was in the form of livestock. Household items included only two pots, three pewter dishes, a candlestick, and a lantern; no bed, table, or chairs were listed.

Conclusion

The meager list of household furnishings King left to his widow indicates that his housing was modest. The record offers nothing deviant from the emerging pattern.

PATRICK COOK (1749)

Personal Data:

Cook, a farmer, commissioner, and constable, received

⁷ Manor Account Book, 39. Orange Order Books 2:156; 3:237, 487; Deed Book 5:82-86; Augusta Deed Books 1:161, 375; 2:41, 535; Order Book 1:151; Will Book 1:187, 194, 401, 519.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

title in 1740 to 590 acres on which he began paying in 1737. No importation was found for him; it is possible that he came to Virginia from the Newcastle, Delaware, area as he left a bequest to the presbytery there. He and Samuel Gay were indebted to the Crown for £10 in 1741, and their property was seized to cover the debt. But he apparently recovered from the loss, for his estate was appraised at over £242 (£185, if real estate is not included)--a considerable estate for a man with a young family. His widow Elizabeth (sister of Hugh Young) remarried by 1752 and was accused of leaving in ruin the plantation Patrick had left her as guardian of their two small children.⁸

Inventory Data:

Of Cook's estate, livestock accounted for 57 percent, with cash and notes at hand totaling 17 percent, and furnishings 6 percent. Cook, by far, had the most interior furniture. He, his wife, and two infants enjoyed the use of four beds and bedsteads, seven chairs, one table, one chest press (the first mention of such an "extravagant" item), one regular chest, two trunks, a stool, and a cradle

⁸ Manor Account Book, 52. Orange Deed Book 4:117-19; Order Book 2:358, 362. Augusta Order Books 1:73; 3:371; Will Book 1:123, 109; Deed Books 2:686; 3:55; 18:101. See also Chalkley I:340.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

(the first mention of these last two items), numerous pieces of flatware, both wooden and pewter dishes, several spinning wheels, and various other articles. Among his nonessentials were numerous books and glass bottles, a sugar box, two tablecloths, and seven napkins (also new to Manor estates).

Conclusion:

The Cook family presents the only one thus far that might have lived in something more than a one-room or very small two-room dwelling. The items inventoried also suggest storage arrangements and room functions. After listing livestock and farm implements (which should have been stored in an outdoor shed or barn because of their number), the appraisers appear to have moved into the main room of the home--a common area for living and entertaining. Here they found seven chairs, a chest press with all of Cook's clothes, his saddle bags and riding whip, a sugar box and teaspoon, a set of money weights, a small trunk, a table with two cloths and seven napkins, a chest, eight glass bottles and various other items. At this point the inventory becomes confused, as if the clerk miscopied the order of the appraisal, for a plow and harness are intermixed with these household items; in an estate of this size it might be argued that he should not have a plow in the

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

middle of his living quarters, especially as it appears that he did have some sort of storage for such things. The appraisement of interior furnishings then resumes with furnishings that could be in the main room, but more probably in a second one, and includes three beds and a looking glass. Immediately following this is an itemization of kitchen supplies, grouped with a fourth bed. It is possible that the kitchen comprised a third living area.

JAMES CRAWFORD (1751)

Personal Data:

Crawford, named in his brother Patrick's importation of 1740, entered 311 acres with Beverley in 1737 and bought another 401 acres ten years later. No mention of an occupation was found for him; presumably he farmed. He had several children baptized by Rev. Craig in the 1740s; but when he died in 1751 he left only two infants, Jane and James, by his wife Elizabeth Robertson, sister of William Robertson.⁹

⁹ Manor Account Book, 48; Craig Baptisms; Orange Order Book 4:50; Augusta Will Book 1:76.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Inventory Data:

Crawford's personal estate totaled some £83, with livestock representing 87 percent, furnishings 5 percent, luxuries 4 percent, and tools another 4 percent. His interior items are more balanced than those of family men in the previous decade. His small family had two mattresses, each complete with sheets, quilts, blankets, and bolsters; six chairs; and one chest. Still, the number of kitchen items was small; and no luxuries other than pewter dishes were listed. His clothes were not inventoried, which is unusual for a man without sons.

Conclusion:

While the Crawfords had more furniture than did the households of the previous decade (excepting that of Patrick Cook), their belongings still could have been accommodated easily within a one-room structure.

JAMES BELL (1751)

Personal Data:

Bell proved importation in 1740 for himself, three other family members (believed to be siblings rather than children), and five apparent servants. He was in the area at least three years earlier, for his first entry in Beverley's account book is dated 1737. He laid claim to

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

500 acres, but apparently had trouble making his payment; Beverley sued him for debt in 1743 and 1744. His financial and legal problems did not prevent him from being named a county justice in 1748. By trade, he was a weaver. During his lifetime he acquired over 2,200 acres and at least five servants. At his death he left a wife and six minors.¹⁰

Inventory Data:

The inventory returned on 1 August 1751 included only livestock, worth about £80. A second appraisement was recorded on 18 June 1752, listing only cash, notes, and bonds, totaling £127, and fifteen yards of linen; it also mentions an action pending against Mr. Borden.

Conclusion:

Neither estate document mentions household items. No conclusions can be drawn about Bell's type of dwelling.

NATHAN PATTERSON (1752)

Personal Data:

Patterson appears in the account book in 1739, paying for 201 acres that had been previously surveyed for Moses

¹⁰ Manor Account Book, 26, 66. Orange Order Book 2:156; Order Book 3:385. Augusta Order Book 1:1; Deed Book 1:217, 263; Deed Book 2:486; Will Book 6:361.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Thompson, another of the first Manor settlers. The tract was deeded to Patterson the following year. His son Robert proved his importation in May 1740, saying that he entered through the port of Philadelphia; it might be assumed that Nathan followed the same route. Little else is known about the father. He called himself a freeholder in his 1752 will, and died before 21 May of that year, leaving a widow, six children, and at least three grandchildren.¹¹

Inventory Data:

Patterson's estate was valued in 1752 at over £236, not including land. As was the pattern in the 1740s, his livestock (including several racing horses) accounted for the largest single category on his estate inventory, although the percentage was significantly less (45 percent). As with the first inventory of the 1750s, his total estate is more balanced than those of the previous decade. His household furnishings and kitchen items totaled almost £39, or 16 percent, and included six walnut chairs and one walnut dresser (the first instance of a furniture item being described by wood type), three beds (one chaff, one feather, one unspecified), three spinning wheels, a chest,

¹¹ Manor Account Book, 25; Orange Deed Book 4:128-29; Augusta Will Book 1:418, 452.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

two trunks, tablecloths, napkins, and six books. His kitchen items included twenty-one dishes and thirty-one pieces of flatware--the largest collection thus far.

Conclusion:

By the second decade of settlement the original land-owners were living in greater comfort. The mention of "one bed on the *loft* and furniture," also provides a valuable clue to his housing; and the reference to "a parcel of wooden lumber in the house," indicates that non-interior items were being stored in the family dwelling. The number of beds and chairs suggests that this may have been a two-room structure.

JAMES FULTON (1753)

Personal Data:

Fulton began paying for 637.5 acres of land in the Manor in 1737, and received official title to it in February 1742. Ten years later he made out his will, mentioning two horses from *New England*. This is the only reference found to suggest that an early Manor settler migrated through that region. Fulton was a distiller, although he evidently farmed as well. At his death he had a wife and

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

eight children, of whom five were minors.¹²

Inventory Data:

It does not appear the Fultons were living as comfortably as the previous two families of the 1750s. Although this farmer's estate was valued at over £100, 73 percent was livestock and 23 percent was in guns and tools of trade. (His most valuable possession was his still; with utensils it was appraised at £20--as much as the glebe house five years earlier.) The remaining 4 percent of Fulton's estate was invested in two old beds, two old chests, eighteen dishes, an old pewter tankard, four pots with hooks and racks, and tongs--serving a family of seven to nine people.

Conclusion:

Evidently in the early 1750s there were still first-generation Manor families living under the same primitive conditions prevailing in the 1740s. Fulton had been in the Manor for at least sixteen years, undoubtedly longer; yet his furnishings are scanty at best, and his dwelling cannot be conceived as anything larger than one room.

¹² Manor Account Book, 46; Orange Deed Book 5:107-12; Augusta Will Book 1:511.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

JOSEPH TEAS (1756)

Personal Data:

Teas (var. Tays) was in the Manor by 1737; two years later he received title to 465 acres from Beverley. He purchased additional land in 1743 and 1752, bringing his total acreage to 2,279. He was called a farmer in 1739, served as commissioner of Tinkling Springs Church during the 1740s, and owned at least two slaves and one servant at the time of his death. In 1751, he contracted with Archibald Stewart to build a log house, to maul and ax 6,700 fence rails, and to clear and plow 20 acres--part of Teas's original tract. His will of 1753 mentions his wife and four children (one a known minor; and one married with children). His will was proved in March 1756.¹³

Inventory Data:

Teas's personal inventory was appraised at £233, excluding land but including slaves and crops. Yet he assumes the pattern that emerged in the 1740s. His ninety-eight head of livestock accounted for 60 percent of his estate, and the slaves and servant an additional 21 percent; his household items (5 percent) were valued at less

¹³ Account Book, 44. Orange Deed Book 3:217-23; Order Book 3:36. Augusta Will Book 2:143, 148; Deed Books 3:464; 12:461. Chalkley 2:4.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

than £9, £5 of which was bedding. (Inventories of the 1740s placed the latter value upon a single, furnished bed.) If Teas had more than one bed, which he should have for his family size, they were not complete with bedstead, but were merely mattresses. Other than this, the house was stocked with only one chest, some pots and a frying pan, some candlesticks and "other things," some pewter, earthenware, some "vessels," and a dough trough.

Conclusion:

It is important to discover that a man who had been living in the same area for twenty years, owned over 2,200 acres of land, enjoyed the services of at least two slaves and one servant, and raised almost one hundred animals, had such a small amount of household furnishings. The house he built in 1751 is puzzling. If it were for personal use, it does not appear that it improved his family's living conditions substantially, judging by the sparsity of his furnishings five years later.

MARTHA MITCHELL (1759)

Personal Data:

Martha was a widow at the time of her first appearance in Manor records--the only female among the initial set-

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

tlers who comprise this study. In 1737 she claimed 279 acres with Beverley, on which David Mitchell paid £8 in 1739; a few months later she purchased the tract. She died in 1759, leaving two identified sons. One apparently lived with her, for her will included a provision that he live with his brother James, saying "through the necessity of the times, [David] hath been forced to leave his own habitation."¹⁴

Inventory Data:

This is the only estate of a female dating to the 1750s. She owned three head of cattle, two horses, and eight sheep. Her furnishings consisted of one pot with hangings, three types of spinning wheels, half a dozen chairs, and a black-walnut chest. Other than this, she owned only seven articles of clothing (inventoried because there were no female heirs-at-law to automatically inherit them), several pieces of fabric, and one rug. Her appraisal came to roughly £23.

Conclusion:

The home of this widow, who apparently gained her livelihood by spinning rather than farming (and raised

¹⁴ Manor Account Book, 46; Orange Deed Book 4:361; Augusta Will Book 2:305, 323.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

livestock for food and wool), was surely nothing more than a cottage. To spin, she needed chairs. Since the wheels were of different types and functions (i.e., of different sizes), it is likely that the chairs were of varied height. Did the rug serve as her bed?

FRANCIS McCOWN (1761)

Personal Data:

McCown proved importation in July 1740 for himself and a family of three. He first appears in the account book in 1737, buying the 195 acres deeded to him two years later. Called a yeoman several times during the 1740s, he could not read or write. In the ensuing decade he acquired over 1,600 acres; then sold all but 500 before his death. His will cites a wife and nine children, most minors.¹⁵

Inventory Data

Although McCown's estate was valued at £55, lower than those of the other males of the 1760s, he lived in relative comfort. His household accounted for 11 percent of the estate and included an unusually large collection of dishes

¹⁵ Manor Account Book, 32. Orange Deed Book 3:261-62; Order Book 2:207. Augusta Deed Book 1:48, 52, 55, 90; Deed Book 2:321; Deed Book 3:105; Deed Book 4:3, 264; Deed Book 5:554; Will Book 3:94, 116.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

and flatware, two beds complete with furniture, one mattress and bedstead, one table, a chest, and a box. His livestock comprised 80 percent of the remaining property.

Conclusion

The home furnishings of this illiterate farmer were more extensive than those of prior decades. Obviously, the number of beds and their trappings owned by large families (but not particularly wealthy ones) was increasing; and bedding, more than any other household item, points to the relative size of dwellings, as they are the largest and most costly furniture. Yet McCown's beds were valued at less than £4, suggesting that they were not very large (and would therefore not require much floor space) or else were of poor material. If the former is true, it would be possible for all three to be accommodated by one large room, and still provide space for the few other items.

GEORGE ROBINSON (1763)

Personal Data:

Several George Robinsons appear simultaneously in the Augusta County records, but it is probable that the one whose inventory was appraised in 1763 was the original Manor settler. This George purchased 892 acres from Bever-

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

ley in 1738; he and wife Martha later sold it. During the the course of his life he was referred to as a farmer, commissioner, justice, and militia captain. He was survived by his wife (identified then as Martha) and eight children, at least five of whom were minors.¹⁶

Inventory Data:

Robinson's estate totaled £197, with livestock comprising 47 percent and household items a surprising 19 percent. His dwelling was stocked with one bed and its furnishings, two old chaff beds with blankets, one table (but no chairs), one old chest, a flax wheel, two old trunks, trenchers (wooden platters), a cooler, pails, and other kitchen utensils. Pewter and books are also found.

Conclusion:

Robinson's only table, theoretically in his eating area, is grouped with the completely furnished bed, then followed by the chaff beds, trunks, and kitchen utensils--suggesting that all were in one room. A separate structure may have existed for the farm tools and animals. If so, the lifestyle of this court justice and militia

¹⁶ Manor Account book, 22. Orange Deed Book 3:110-11; Order Book 3:197, 386. Augusta Deed Books 1:77; 283, 310; 4:450; Order Books 1:4, 68; 4:1, 118; Will Book 3:307.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

captain was not far removed from those of the 1740s.

JOHN LEWIS (1763)

Personal Data:

Lewis, one of the most celebrated Manor settlers, was called a gentleman in 1739 when he acquired 2,071 acres from Beverley. Over the course of his life he variously served as justice, constable, and militia colonel; held an ordinary's license; owned several mills; and kept several servants. He was also responsible, at one point, for overseeing the construction of one of the glebe buildings, and had at least one substantial house built for his own purposes. In addition, he was extensively involved with James Patton, in land speculations and other ventures.¹⁷

Inventory Data:

The inventory of Lewis's property is surprising for a man of his social position. His estate amounted to less than £26, excluding real property. The only luxury items he possessed were fifteen pewter plates and one washing tub. His household furnishings comprised 37 percent of the estate, however, and included one cupboard, one table and

¹⁷ Manor Account Book 4, 10. Orange Deed Book 2:47; 9:28; Order Book 3:83; Augusta Order Books 1:1, 344; 2:160; Deed Book 1:35; Will Book 3:221, 307.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

four chairs, two coolers, one bed with furniture, several more dishes, and kitchen utensils. Livestock consisted of only four cows and fifteen hogs--not even a horse.

Conclusion:

Lewis was married at the time of his death; but he was allegedly well advanced in years, and his children were married with offspring of their own. It is probable that he had given some personal belongings to these children before his death, resulting in the scanty inventory. If this is not the case, then this extremely prominent individual was living a surprisingly modest existence.

RANDALL McDONALL (1765)

Personal Data:

McDonall/McDonald began making payments toward 141 acres on Christee's [Christian's] Creek in 1738, and completed them in July 1740. He is called a planter in the 1742/43 suit Beverley initiated against him, and he subsequently purchased another 200 acres. He died by 1756, when John Ramsey posted bond as guardian of McDonall's orphaned son Randall. The following year his widow Jannet filed her bond as administratrix of Randall's estate, which was not settled until 1765. In addition to the widow and

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

minor son, he left at least four other children.¹⁸

Inventory Data:

Randall's inventory was not taken until 1765 at which time it was appraised at £29. No household items were listed, only clothes (valued at some £6), livestock (£5), cash and notes due, a bible, a gun, and a few farm implements. This estate hardly warrants his title as a planter --by modern connotations--nor does it seem to support a family of seven.

Conclusion:

Obviously McDonall's property was distributed in the nine years between his death and the date of the inventory, preventing any conclusions about his housing.

JAMES GILLESPIE (1769)

Personal Data:

James Gillespie, farmer, constable, and commissioner, entered land with Beverley in 1737, and received title to those 208 acres three years later. In 1740 he also proved importation for seven individuals from Ireland, at his expense. He bought an additional 410 acres from Beverley

¹⁸ Manor Account Book, 52. Orange Deed Books 4:158; 3:350. Augusta Will Books 3:153, 203; 3:391; 20:448.

ARCHITECTURE OF BEVERLEY MANOR: INDIRECT EVIDENCE

and had several children baptized during the 1740s by the Presbyterian minister, Craig.¹⁹

Inventory Data:

Gillespy's estate was appraised at slightly less than £200. Listed amid his farming implements is a servant, a bed, and kitchen items. Another grouping of items included wearing apparel (valued £5.7.0), one bed with bedstead and furniture, one bedstead without furniture, 2 jars, a chair, another feather bed and quilt, a dozen chairs, a "doe" chest, a table, shoemaker's tools, and a flesh fork--then more farm implements appear with livestock and crops.

Conclusion:

Gillespy's estate is considerable, and it is conceivable that his housing would have been better than average. The listing of a bed and a servant among farm tools suggests that he had provided living quarters for this servant in some type of barn, shed, or storage area. Obviously, the family had progressed to a more private existence. With at least two full beds, a dozen chairs, and a table, his home was probably more than a one-room structure.

¹⁹ Manor Account Book, 55. Orange Deed Book 4:121-23; Order Book 2:208. Augusta Order Book 1:198; Deed Books 2:427; 5:128; Will Book 4:263, 268.

CONCLUSION

The reconstructed lives of the ninety-two "first settlers" of Beverley Manor has yielded patterns that reflect both directly and indirectly upon the early architecture of the Irish in Augusta County, Virginia. Given the paucity of extant records and their inherent limitations, the assembled detail on architectural forms and types is surprisingly informative; and the degree to which the lives of settlers can be reconstructed offers valuable insight into the personalities and character of the builders.

The Manor settlers belie some stereotypes, but live up to others. More than half of them, before leaving Ireland, had sufficient means to pay for their families' transportation to the New World. Considering the substantial cost of this undertaking, and the large number of individuals they transported, these first settlers of the Manor were clearly not of the lower classes. The fact that their labor, over the first half-dozen years, paid for over 46,000 acres of Manor land also contradicts the stereotypical assertions that Irish-American frontiersmen lacked industry or eschewed labor.

.

CONCLUSION

The majority of Augusta's earliest Irish settlers have proven to be artisans--possessors of a developed or apprenticed skill or trade--although a large percentage farmed as well. With little respect for occupational lines, these men filled the ranks of the frontier elite, serving the community in thirteen different governmental, military, religious, and social capacities--a total of 131 positions being held among them. Literacy was more pronounced than commonly assumed; those who could not at least sign their names constituted less than five percent of the adult male population.

In one respect, the Manor Irish were guilty of the stereotypical Irish behavior that early Augusta County historians have glossed over. The Manor settlers were not always pious and law-abiding citizens. Collectively, these ninety-one "wild Irish" males could boast of no fewer than forty court charges, arrests, and legal actions--and their number included the two most-celebrated residents, James Patton and John Lewis.

The speculation of prior writers--that the early community had little time to preoccupy itself with building--holds true to a point. The first public structures were rude ones at best. The repeated reports of unfit conditions at the courthouse and jail does suggest that the

CONCLUSION

frontier community was singularly indifferent toward their public edifices--or singularly indifferent toward institutions of "law and order."

Stone, a familiar building material to the Irish, was clearly not deemed necessary for those buildings in which the business of the Crown was conducted--except, perhaps reluctantly, to secure the community's jail. Stone was used, however, on a number of private dwellings. In at least one of the latter cases (representing 10 percent of the extant building contracts) that stone was covered with plaster and whitewashed, offering a direct parallel with building practices in Ireland.

By far the most favored building material was log, an unsurprising fact in a wilderness community. What is perhaps more revealing is that log construction continued to be used by the social elite for new dwellings throughout the period. And it was clearly not reserved for plainer dwellings, since such architectural adornments as mouldings and wainscotting were coupled with logs in the third glebe house.

Hierarchies of architectural form did exist on this wilderness frontier. As early as the second decade of settlement, structures assuming some degree of superiority emerged, such as the glebe house and the private dwelling

CONCLUSION

for which Lewis contracted in the 1740s. Moreover, the three buildings ordered by Patton in the 1740s and 1750s clearly represent three different building levels: 1) a "dog-trot" type of round logs, with relatively low ceilings, without laid floors or windows, and apparently meant for servants; 2) a 20' square house with sleeping loft, higher ceilings, pent roofs, squared logs, and clapboarded gables, possibly meant for a family member or a valued employee; and 3) a 15' square stone dwelling, with exceptionally high ceilings, which was to be plastered and painted. One might expect the stone house--a more substantial and costly building form--to appear in later stages in the community's development; but it was the earliest to be erected. Conversely, the third parsonage for Augusta Parish, built in the 1760s, was of square logs, not stone; only its ornamental wainscotting and moldings, not its dominant building material, bespoke an advancement in building forms.

An analysis of estate inventories extant for 22 percent of the study group suggests several other characteristics of early Manor buildings. Significantly, it does not appear that dwelling sizes increased proportionally with family size from the 1740s to the 1760s, although sleeping lofts were being added. Similarly, very few differences

CONCLUSION

were found in the number or quality of interior furniture; improvements were more likely to be items of comfort or convenience--bedclothes and kitchen wares for example. Arguing that household furniture reflects the quality and size of housing, it appears that most immigrants, at death, lived in structures that were not significantly larger or more substantial than those prevailing in the first decade of settlement.

This study of ninety-two individuals who pioneered Beverley Manor in the 1730s, has revealed much useful data on the earliest frontier structures of Virginia's Great Valley. While direct documentation of building activities during the first several decades of settlement is scarce, clues have been found in a variety of records created publicly and privately for other purposes. As demonstrated in this thesis, deeds, road orders, judgements, probate records, and vestry minutes all serve vital functions in an architectural study or social analysis of a community--especially when building-specific documents are in short supply.

APPENDIX 1

The Pre-1740 Manor Families

Extracted from William Beverley's Manor Account Book

<u>Name¹</u>	<u>Earliest Entry Date</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
ALEXANDER, James	1737	423.5
ANDERSON, George	1737	411
ANDERSON, John	1737	747
BELL, James	1737	243
BELL, James	no date	500
BETTY, Francis	1737	276
BLACK, Thomas	1737	569
BRAKENRIDGE, Alexander	1737	896
BRECKINRIDGE, Robert	1737	300
BROWN, John	1737	420
BUCHANAN, John for John BLACK	1737	784
CALDWALL, James	1738	600
CALDWALL, George	1737	405
CAMPBELL, David	1738	466
CAMPBELL, Patrick	1738	1546
CAMPBELL, Robert	1737	350
CATHEY, James ²	1739	
CHRISTIAN, John, Robert and William	1737	1614
COOK, Patrick	1737	590
CRAWFORD, James	1737	311
CROCKETT, Robert	1737	322
CULTON, Joseph	1737	334
CUNNINGHAM, Robert	1739	482
DANISTON, Daniel	1738	300
DAVIS, James	1737	570
DAVISON, John	1737	785
DAVISON, Samuel	1738	353
EDMISTON, David	1737	350
FULTON, James	1737	637.5
GILLESPIE, James	1737	208
GUY, Samuel	1737	323
HAMILTON, Archibald ³	1737	

HAMILTON, Arthur	1739	435
HART, John	1737	491
HAYS, Patrick	1739	600
HUTCHISON, George	1738	1577
HUTCHISON, John	1737	292
HUTCHISON, William	1737	522
JENNINGS, Gibbon	1738	1160
KERR, John	1737	175
KING, Robert	1737	750
KING, William	1737	251
KIRKPATRICK, Thomas	1737	390
LEDGERWOOD, William	1737	387
LEEPER, James	1737	526
LESLEY, James	1737	226
LEWIS, Col. John	1738	2071
LONG, William ⁴	1737	219, 409 400, 433
LYNN, James	1737	538
McCULLOCK, Issac	1737	230
McCUNE, Francis	1737	196.5
McCLANAHAN, Robert	no date	331 & Lot. 12
McCLURE, Andrew	1738	370
McCLURE, James		
father of Andrew	1738	408
McCUTCHIN, John	1737	920
McDONALL, Randall	1738	141
MARTIN, Patrick	1737	321
MAXWELL, Adley	1738	220
MAXWELL, John	1738	439
MITCHELL, David ⁵	1738	
MITCHELL, Jno for		
Samuel DOACK	1739	388
MITCHELL, Martha	1737	279
MOODY, Robert, and		
John FRAZER	1737	945
MOFFETT, John	1737	396
MONAHAN, Daniel	1738	900
OFFRIEL, Morris	1737	40
PALMER, William	1737	388
PATTERSON, Nathan	1739	201
PATTERSON, Robert	1737	331
PATTON, Col. James	1737	1971
PICKONS, John	1737	469
POAGE, Robert	1739	900
POAGE, Seth	1738	300
RISK, John	1737	300
ROBINSON, George	1738	292

ROBINSON, James	1737	395
RUSSELL, Andrew	1737	496
SEARIGHT, John	1737	526
SKILLERN, William	1737	597
SMITH, William	1738	135
TEAS, Joseph	1737	465
THOMSON, Moses	1738	896
TRIMBLE, John	1737	449
TURK, Robert	1737	1313
VANCE, William	1737	400
WILSON, John	1737	348
YOUNG, John	1737	763

¹ There are variant spellings for these individuals. The ones listed here are the forms entered in the Account Book.

² This is an entry for two bonds of 5 and 6 June 1739 for £2.13.10 and £4.0.0

³ Hamilton is being charged in 1745 for quit rent (for the years 1737, 1738, 1739) and interest on 30 acres (for 1743 and 1744).

⁴ Long is surety for [John] Preston on the 219 acre tract; payment on 409.5 acres was charged to James Alexander.

⁵ David was entered on 20 April 1738 for cash he paid on Martha Mitchell's tract; she can be identified as his mother.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Primary Records

Orange County, Virginia, 1734-1745:

Probate records (wills, inventories, sales); conveyance records (deeds); marriage licenses and returns; circuit court orders and judgements.

Augusta County, Virginia, 1745-1769:

Probate records (wills, inventories, sales); conveyance records (deeds); marriage licenses and returns; circuit court orders and judgements; vestry records; guardian bonds.

Manuscript Collections

Beverley Manor Account Book, Virginia State Historical Society

The Douglass-Hall-McCue Papers, Virginia State Historical Society

The Preston Papers, Virginia State Historical Society

The Trimble-Wilson-Love Papers, Virginia State Historical Society

SOURCES CONSULTED

Secondary Sources

- Abernathy, T. Three Virginia Frontiers. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1940.
- Anderson, John L. "The Presbyterians and Augusta County, 1738-1757: A Political and Social Analysis." M.A. thesis, U of Virginia, 1985.
- Aull, Edward. Early History of Staunton and Beverley Manor in Augusta County, Virginia. Birmingham, Ala.: Privately published, 1963.
- Barrick, Mac E. "The Log House as a Cultural Symbol." Material Culture 18 (1986): 1-19.
- Bealer, Alex. W. The Log Cabin. Barre, Mass.: Barre Publishing, 1978.
- Billings, Warren, et al. Colonial Virginia. White Plains, New York: KTO, 1986.
- Blake, J. W., ed. The Ulster American Connection. N.p. The New University of Ulster, 1981.
- Bolton, Charles K. Scotch-Irish Pioneers in Ulster and America. Boston: Bacon and Brown, 1910.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1952.
- Byrd, William, comp. "Letters of the Byrd Family." Vir-

SOURCES CONSULTED

- ginia Magazine of History and Biography 36 (1928):
353-62.
- Chappell, Edward. "Cultural Change in the Shenandoah Valley: North Augusta County Houses." M.A. thesis, U of Virginia, 1977.
- Chalkley, Lyman. Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlement in Virginia, Extracted from the Original Court Records of Augusta County, Virginia, 1745-1800. 3 vols. Reprinted, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1980.
- Clark, Dennis. Hibernia America. New York: Greenwood P, 1986.
- Clark, Thomas D., comp. Travels in the Old South, a Bibliography. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1956.
- Coyle, John G. "The Scot, The Ulster Scot and the Irish." The Journal of the American Irish Society X (1911): 103-10.
- Craig, Maurice. The Architecture of Ireland from the Earliest Times to 1880. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd, 1982.
- Dickson, Hugh. An Introduction to Ulster Architecture. Belfast: Ulster Architectural Heritage Society, 1975.
- Dunlap, Boutwell. Augusta County, Virginia, in the History of the United States. Frankfort: U of Kentucky P,

SOURCES CONSULTED

1918.

Evans, E. Estyn. Irish Folkways. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.

---. The Irish World: The History and Cultural Achievements of the Irish People. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

Fischer, David Hackett. Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America. New York: Oxford UP, 1989.

Ford, Henry J. The Scotch-Irish in America. Princeton, Princeton UP, 1915.

Frazier, Irvin. "John Lewis, Founder and Patriarch." Augusta County Historical Bulletin 3 (1967): 5-24.

Glassie, Henry. Patterns in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States. Philadelphia: UP, 1968.

Henry, William Wirt. "The Scotch-Irish of the South." The Scotch-Irish in America (Nashville: The Scotch-Irish Society of America, 1889): 110-31.

Johnson, Patricia. James Patton and the Appalachian Colonists. Verona, Va: McClure P, 1973.

Johnston, W. P. "The Scotch-Irish of Western Virginia." The Scotch-Irish in America. Nashville: Scotch-Irish Society of America, 1899.

Kercheval, Samuel. History of the Valley of Virginia. Woodstock, Va: W. N. Brabill, 1902.

SOURCES CONSULTED

- Kniffen, Fred. "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 55 (1965): 549-77.
- Lay, K. Edward. "European Antecedents of Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Germanic and Scotch-Irish Architecture in America." Pennsylvania Folklife 32 (1982): 2-43.
- Leyburn, James G. The Scotch-Irish: a Social History. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1962.
- Lockhart, Audrey. Some Aspects of Emigration from Ireland to the North American Colonies between 1660 and 1775. New York: Arno P, 1976.
- McCullough, Niall and Valerie Mulvin. A Lost Tradition: The Nature of Architecture in Ireland. Dublin: Gandon Editions Dublin, 1987.
- McDonald, Forrest and Ellen S. "Ethnic Origins of the American People, 1790." William and Mary Quarterly 37 (1980): 179-99.
- MacLysaght, Edward. The Surnames of Ireland. Shannon, Ire: Irish UP, 1969.
- McWhiney, Grady. Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South. Tuscaloosa, Ala: The U of Alabama P, 1988.
- and Forrest McDonald. "Celtic Names in the Antebellum Southern United States." Names: Journal of the Ameri-

SOURCES CONSULTED

- can Name Society 31 (1983): 89-102.
- Mitchell, Robert Davis. "The Upper Shenandoah Valley of Virginia During the Eighteenth Century: A Study of Historical Geography." Diss. U of Wisconsin, 1969.
- Morris, Brenda L. "The Courthouses of Augusta County." Augusta Historical Bulletin 25 (1989): 14-20.
- Morton, Richard L. Colonial Virginia: Westward Expansion and Prelude to Revolution, 1710-1763. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1960.
- Myers, Albert C. Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1968.
- Noble, Allen G. Wood, Brick, and Stone: The North American Landscape. Amherst, Mass: U of Mass P, 1984.
- O'Brien, Michael J. Irish Settlers in America. 2 vols. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1979.
- O Danachair, C. "Materials and Methods in Irish Traditional Building". Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland 87 (1957): 61-74.
- Orem, A. R. Ireland. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1970.
- Peyton, J. Lewis. History of Augusta County, Virginia. Bridgewater, Va: 1953.
- Rasmussen, William M. S. "Designers, Builders, and Architectural Traditions in Colonial Virginia." Virginia

SOURCES CONSULTED

- Magazine of History and Biography 90 (1982): 198-212.
- Robinson, W. Stitt. The Southern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1979.
- Shurtleff, Harold R. The Log Cabin Myth. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1967.
- Slatten, Richard. "Interpreting Headrights in Colonial-Virginia Patents: Uses and Abuses." National Genealogical Society Quarterly 75 (1987): 169-79.
- Upton, Dell. "New Views of the Virginia Landscape." Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 96 (1988): 403-70.
- Van Devanter, J. N. History of the Augusta Church from 1737 to 1900. Staunton, Va.: Ross Printing Company, 1900.
- Waddell, Joseph A. "Scotch-Irish of the Valley of Virginia. (Nashville: Scotch-Irish Society of America, 1895): 79-100.
- . Annals of Augusta County, Virginia, from 1726-1871. Bridgewater, Va.: C. J. Company, 1902.
- Wertenbaker, Thomas J. The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942.
- Weslager, C. A. The Log Cabin in America. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1969.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Wilhelm, E. J. "Folk Geography of the Blue Ridge Mountains". Pioneer America II (1970): 29-40.

Wilson, Howard M. The Tinkling Spring: Headwater of Freedom. Fishersville, Va.: Tinkling Spring and Heritage Presbyterian Churches, 1954.