

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
47 W. Coulter Street
Philadelphia
Philadelphia County
Pennsylvania

HABS No. PA-6654

HABS
PA - 6654

WRITTEN HISTORICAL & DESCRIPTIVE DATA
REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS
PHOTOGRAPHS

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of Interior
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE

HABS NO. PA-6654

Location: 47 West Coulter Street, Germantown neighborhood of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Owner: Trustees for the Germantown Meeting of the Society of Friends

Present Use: Meeting house for religious worship and general use by the Germantown Meeting of the Society of Friends; property includes Germantown Friends School complex

Significance: Germantown is a fine example of a mid-nineteenth century urban meeting house. It was built between 1868 and 1869 by master builder Hibberd Yarnall, and designed by Addison Hutton, one of Philadelphia's most accomplished Quaker architects. The commission was awarded to the firm of Sloan & Hutton just as Addison Hutton was in the process of dissolving his partnership with Samuel Sloan, under whom he had apprenticed. This structure may thus be one of Hutton's earliest independent works and it is likely the only Friends meeting house he designed. The meeting house maintains an austerity commensurate with the Quaker tenet of simplicity. However, it also exhibits elements of the high-style Italianate villas planned by well-known architects of the period, including Sloan & Hutton, for the city's rising class of businessmen and industrialists.

The construction of Germantown marks a significant shift in meeting house layout. Instead of erecting a partition in the center of the room to accommodate separate men's and women's business meetings as was typical of Friends meeting house design, the Germantown plan combined a main meeting room for worship and women's business with a rear "Committee Room" for the men's business meeting. The plan also deviated from the prototypical design by running the facing benches the width, and not the length, of the building. Void of a partition or gallery, the main meeting room is almost church-like in its spaciousness and orientation. The design reflects the tendency among some meetings that began in the late-nineteenth century to adopt mainstream ecclesiastical architecture.

By the late-nineteenth century, Germantown was a center of elite Quaker society, and, at a time when many meetings were in decline, it was growing significantly. Although the Society of Friends had maintained a meeting house in Germantown since 1690, the new members were part of a migration of affluent urbanites who fled the increasingly congested city of Philadelphia for developing suburban neighborhoods. The distinctive, architect-designed meeting house reflected the rising affluence of the Germantown Friends, just as its location foretold of the upcoming shift in Quaker demographics.

Historian: Catherine C. Lavoie, HABS, 1999

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of erection: 1867-69. The meeting house was erected in 1867-68, and the adjoining Committee Room was added in 1869.¹ In May 1867, the decision was made to construct a new meeting house, rather than to repair the 1812 structure currently in use.² On December 24, 1868, the building committee reported that the new meeting house was ready for occupancy. However finishing touches were made through the winter of 1868-69, and the meeting house could not be considered fully complete until the committee room was added the following year. It was begun in the spring of 1869, and finished by the end of October.³

Two date stones appear in the northeast gable end of the Committee Room section of the meeting house. The first was taken from the 1812 meeting house and reinserted. The 1812 date stone acknowledges the structure *it* replaced, giving both an “old” date of 1705 and “new” date of 1812. The intention may have been to convey the longevity of the meeting beyond that of the current structure. Below the first date stone is one for the current meeting house which, interestingly, reads: “Re-built 1869.”

2. Architects: Sloan & Hutton; Samuel Sloan and Addison Hutton, principals (meeting house); and Building Contractors, Yarnall & Cooper (committee room).

The meeting house was designed by the architectural firm of Sloan & Hutton, Samuel Sloan and Addison Hutton, principals.⁴ They were paid \$350 for the plans and specifications.

The design for Germantown Meeting House was probably solely the work of Hutton. As a birthright Quaker, Hutton was closely connected to the Society of Friends and through them he found a large portion of his commissions. At the time of this commission, his

¹ A similar “Committee Room” is found at the Arch Street Meeting House.

² Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes on the 23rd day of the 5th month 1867, located at the Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library.

³ The decision to begin the construction of the addition was recorded within the Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 25th day of the 3rd month 1869. The date of completion for the Committee Room was not noted, but by October 21st, the installation of heat in the “new room” was reported as accomplished.

⁴ The Treasurer’s Accounts for the Germantown Preparative Meeting of Friends, and the accompanying receipt book, record the transaction that took place on August 13, 1867. As stated on the stamped receipt: “From E.P. Morris, Treasurer of the Fund for building New Meeting House, Three Hundred & Fifty Dollars, architects charge for plans & specifications.... Sloan & Hutton.” Germantown Preparative Meeting, Treasurers Accounts, August 13, 1867, Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 3)

partnership with Sloan was dissolving. The firm was officially terminated in January 1868. At that time, Sloan left Philadelphia to try his luck in New York. After Sloan's departure, Hutton continued to present all the work that had come in during the term of their limited partnership under the name of "Sloan & Hutton." Much of the work Hutton accomplished on his own, however.⁵ An example is the design of the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society building, which he undertook about the same time as the Germantown Meeting House. He signed the drawings "Sloan & Hutton" although the drawings of the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society building were documented as the work of Hutton's alone.⁶

Hutton received virtually all of his architectural training from Samuel Sloan and his design for the Germantown Meeting House shows the strong influence of his teacher. Sloan's design philosophy referred to a triad of convenience, comfort, and fitness, which manifested itself in ways such as optimization of space, interior flexibility, as well as accommodations made for environmental concerns such as natural lighting and ventilation. These considerations are apparent in the design of Germantown Friends Meeting House. Examples are Hutton's use of over-sized windows and deep front porches at Germantown Meeting House. The window area of the building's facades were expanded to the maximum allowable within the constraints of structural stability and aesthetic proportions. Regard for natural light was very much in keeping with Quaker thinking as well. Deep front porches, as much as part of the eclecticism of the day as an element of comfort, allowed for social gathering before and after meeting. Hutton made use of Sloan's ideas concerning proper utilization of interior space by including high ceilings and eliminating unnecessary "partition walls" at Germantown.⁷ With regard to fitness, the design for Germantown Meeting House suited the functional needs of the meeting and also was in keeping with the social standing and affluence of the Germantown Friends. The meeting house is stylish yet understated and its large scale and elevated siting makes for an imposing presence.

⁵ Harold N. Cooledge, Jr., *Samuel Sloan, Architect of Philadelphia, 1815-1884* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 86.

⁶ Caleb I. Cope, *Annual Report of the President of the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society*, published by order of the Board of Managers (Philadelphia, 1868, 1870); as cited in Cooledge, 85.

⁷ Sloan's concern for "interior flexibility" were applied to his church designs as well, specifically for denominations such as the Baptist, Methodists, and Reformed Presbyterian, for whom space requirements were not determined by liturgy Cooledge, 31-32. In fact, Sloan designed the gable-fronted, First Baptist Church of Germantown in 1852, which provided the prototype for five more Baptist churches. In fact, Sloan had developed a design for schools that consisted of modular units divided by a system of partition walls, referred to as the "Philadelphia Plan."

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 4)

Addison Hutton (1834-1916)

Addison Hutton was born to Quaker parents in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, a rural area just outside Pittsburgh. Hutton learned the building trade from his father, who was a skilled carpenter and builder. He received rudimentary training in architectural delineation from a co-worker while employed for many months at French's Sash & Door Factory in Salem, Ohio. After returning home, Hutton was recommended for a position as an office assistant to Samuel Sloan, who was then area overseeing the construction of his design for the Greenburg County Courthouse.⁸ Anxious to try his hand at architectural design, Hutton left for Philadelphia in April of 1857 to become a draftsman for Sloan.

Sloan immediately put Hutton to work on a number of projects, including developing plates for his upcoming publication, *City Architect*. Hutton gained much practical and design experience from Sloan. However, their relationship was a somewhat tumultuous one, marked largely by periods of relative inactivity resulting from the financial panics of the 1850s. In spite of these circumstances, Hutton evidently demonstrated competence at his newly-chosen profession. In autumn of 1859, for example, he oversaw construction of one of Sloan's best known residential designs, "Longwood," in Natchez, Mississippi. He returned to Philadelphia in the winter of 1860 to find there was little work. By the fall of 1861, Sloan was forced to let Hutton go.

Meanwhile, his budding friendship with William Cowpers Cope, provided Hutton's entree into the elite circle of Quaker Society. Through the connections Hutton forged relationships that led to business opportunities. Hutton received his first independent commission in May of 1862. Henry Morris, among the influential Quakers he had made through Cope, hired Hutton to design a cottage for him in Newport, Rhode Island. Pleased with this work, Morris afterwards formed a contractual agreement with Hutton, employing him to work on several building projects. By December of 1862, Hutton also found work as a draftsman for George C. Howard. Hutton opened his own office the following year.⁹

Because of Hutton's success, Samuel Sloan approached him to form a partnership. After his previous experience with Sloan, Hutton initially thought better of it. Eventually, he agreed to a limited partnership of three years that started in January of 1864. Among their first joint commissions were designs for state hospitals in Connecticut and New Jersey, the Third Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, and St. Charles Borromeo Seminary

⁸ The recommendation came from Addison's cousin, B.F. McGrew, who happened to be one of the county commissioners with whom Sloan conferred.

⁹ Despite Hutton's ability to sustain an architectural practice of his own and then attract the attention of his former employer with the offer of a partnership, the cottage design for Morris is his only known work from this period. This may be due to the fact that Hutton had not yet begun to keep the yearly diaries that chronicle most of his career.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 5)

in nearby Overbrook, Pennsylvania. They also worked on a number of other schools and hospitals, and suburban villas. In September of 1865, Hutton hired his brothers Finley and Harmon as draftsmen, which evidently stressed the already-strained relationship with Sloan. Despite their personal troubles, the partnership was extended for another year. It was officially dissolved in January 1868, when Sloan left Philadelphia to open an office in New York. Hutton alone had to complete any work taken on during their tenure together.

On his own, Hutton became one of the most prolific architects in the Philadelphia region, designing a wide range of building types. From the beginning of his solo practice, he was entrenched in a number of important commissions, including designing and assisting in the construction of Parrish Hall, the first building at Swarthmore College in Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. He also received the commission to design the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society building at 7th & Walnut streets, in Center City Philadelphia, in 1868. Hutton's design was selected over those of accomplished Philadelphia architects James H. Windrim, Stephen D. Button, and the firm of Furness & Hewitt, and was quite a coup for the young architect. Again, his Quaker background may have influenced the Quaker members of the building committee at PSFS, who continued to make recommendations for him. A major residential commission, the design for "Glenloch," the residence of William Lockwood in Paoli, Pennsylvania, also came in 1868. His commissions in the coming years demonstrated his versatility. They included institutional buildings, such as an orphan's asylum and a hospital extension, West Chester Normal School, Ridgeway Library, and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania building. Urban commercial structures included the Provident Life & Trust Company and the Girard Life Insurance building. There were also designs for religious structures, such as the Arch Street Methodist Church. Architectural historians have characterized his style as somewhat staid.¹⁰ Like non-Quaker architects of his day, Hutton's designs included finely detailed elements of the eclectic styles. But, presumably influenced by Quaker tenets with regard to simplicity, Hutton appears to have concerned himself more with functionalism and sturdy construction rather than excessive architectural detail.

Samuel Sloan (1815-1884)

Samuel Sloan is one of Philadelphia's best known architects of the mid- to late-nineteenth century. His influential builder's guides, such as *The Model Architect* and *City and Suburban Architecture*, earned him a national reputation. A native of Chester County Pennsylvania, he made the transition from carpenter/joiner to architect about 1850. The latter career began when he came to Philadelphia to work on the construction of Eastern State Penitentiary, under the direction of supervising architect John Haviland. Next, Sloan took part in the construction of the Philadelphia Almshouse additions, and then

¹⁰ In his introduction to Elizabeth Biddle Yarnall's *Addison Hutton; Quaker Architect, 1843-1916*, George Tatum refers to Hutton's "quiet competence and sober restraint." Yarnall, 12.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 6)

acted as superintendent for a new building for “Department for the Insane of the Pennsylvania Hospital.” The Pennsylvania Hospital, established in 1752, was the first in America to receive mentally ill patients. Here Sloan met Dr. Thomas S. Kirkbride, whose progressive ideas for the treatment of the insane were manifested in a building layout known as the “Kirkbride Plan.” The two men formed a lasting relationship by collaborating on many mental hospital designs. This work earned Sloan a reputation as one of the nation’s foremost designers of this building type.

Other areas of Sloan’s expertise were suburban residences and villa designs. Among his clients were the rising class of businessmen and professionals who were profiting from increasing industrialization and the growing economy of the pre-Civil War era. His eclectic designs boldly mixed emerging European revival styles of the Classical, Renaissance, and Medieval periods with modern convenience and comfort appreciated by his wealthy patrons. Many were anxious to create a residence that was a statement of their financial success. Sloan capitalized upon their ambitions. Beginning with his first large residential commission, an Italianate Villa for Andrew M. Eastwick, Sloan gained a reputation as a designer of fashionable residences. Sloan also worked with speculative developers in an attempt to create upper-class suburban neighborhoods in areas of the city such as West Philadelphia, Germantown, and Chestnut Hill. In these areas he executed some of the designs that appeared in *City and Suburban Architecture* and in his other pattern books.

The Committee Room section added to the rear of the meeting house in 1869, was not designed by Sloan & Hutton. Instead, plans and specifications were provided by Yarnall & Cooper, Builders & Carpenters, the same firm responsible for the *construction* of the meeting house. The design and construction of both the new school building and the Committee Room, which was planned initially as an extension to the former, was bid as a package.¹¹ Evidence for Yarnall & Cooper’s involvement is found on the list of expenses, which includes \$300.00 to “Y & C for plans and specifications.” The receipt book, which records a payment of \$200 for plans on the 9th of September, with a balance of \$100 paid on the 19th, confirms their participation. Yarnall & Cooper were generally known as master builders, although their responsibilities often encompassed architectural design. Like many competent master builders of the era, Yarnall & Cooper appear to have made the transition from builder to architect, just as the architectural profession was coming of age. By 1880, they appear in the city directories as “Architect & Builder.”¹²

¹¹ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 26th day of the 5th month 1870.

¹² Sandra L. Tatman & Roger W. Moss. *Biographical Dictionary of Philadelphia Architects, 1700-1930* (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1985), 891. They are listed as Architect & Builder between 1880 and 1889 (Yarnall & Cooper died in 1882 and 1889 respectively).

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 7)

3. Builder, contractor, suppliers: The construction of the meeting house began with the formation of a building committee to determine proper form and to oversee the work of the contractor. After having rejected the possibility of repairing and making additions to the old house, the general specifications for the construction of a new house were outlined and an architect and builder selected. The building committee, appointed by the Germantown Preparative Meeting, consisted of Francis R. Cope, James R. Greeves, James E. Rhodes, Thomas P. Cope, Edward Comfort, Samuel Mason, John B. Garrett, Alfred Cope and Elliston P. Morris. All were influential or “weighty” male Friends of the meeting, and each made a substantial financial contribution to the construction of the meeting house.¹³

The Meeting House was erected by Yarnall & Cooper, Builders & Carpenters, Hibberd Yarnall, and Joseph Cooper, principals. According to the both the Treasurer’s account books and the accompanying receipts, the first of five installments was made to Yarnall & Cooper on August 16, 1867, three days after payment was made to the architects for their plans and specifications. The fifth and final payment, totaling \$4,324.50, was made in installments that began on December 13, 1868. Along with the final payment was \$833.21 for “extras.”¹⁴

Hibberd Yarnall (1830-1882) was an accomplished master builder, who appears to have been responsible for the architectural design, as well as the construction, of most of his commissions. In the last years of his practice (1880-82), he is listed in city directories as a builder *and* architect.¹⁵ Yarnall constructed, but did not design, the Germantown meeting house. On the other hand, he designed, but did not construct, the committee room and the school building.

Hibberd Yarnall was born February 15, 1830. He lived in Center City Philadelphia, and later in the adjoining borough of Germantown. As a young journeyman carpenter, he traveled throughout New York, and in New Haven, Connecticut, undertaking building construction. Returning to Philadelphia, he resided with his family at 17th and Chestnut streets, where he also had an office.¹⁶ The partnership of Yarnall & (Joseph) Cooper

¹³ Initial subscriptions ranged from \$1,000 to \$25, with the average subscription being \$100. The names and amount given by forty subscribers were listed in the Treasurer’s Accounts on the 27th day 4th month 1867. As the need for additional funds became necessary, subscriptions were recorded on three other occasions between the 3rd and 11th months 1867. Beyond the building committee members, others whose contributions were substantial include: R. Anna Cope, Anna Haines, John S. Haines, David Scull, Benjamin Shoemaker, members of the Garrett family including John B., Thomas, and Philip.

¹⁴ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Treasurers Accounts.

¹⁵ Tatman & Moss, 891.

¹⁶ Richard A. Yarnall, architect and grandson of Hibberd Yarnall, Interview with author, via telephone from his Doylestown, Pennsylvania office, January 10, 2000. Mr. Yarnall has much of his grandfather’s correspondence from his early years as a traveling journeyman. While the letters provide much insight into the profession, they were written while outside of

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 8)

(about whom little is known) first appear in the city directories in 1857. They were listed as “builders and carpenters” until 1879, after which time they made the transition to “builders & architects.”¹⁷ The firm undertook both residential and commercial design and construction. Yarnall relocated to Germantown and maintained a shop at the end of School House Lane, overlooking the Schuylkill River. He built numerous eclectic Victorian-era styled residences in Germantown, including a group of duplex houses on the 5300 block of Knox Street.¹⁸ Hibberd died in September of 1882, from injuries he received from falling from a building that he was constructing in Philadelphia. At that point, his nephew, Albert E. Yarnall assumed his share of the business. Joseph Cooper died in 1889, and in 1890, Albert Yarnall took on as partner trained architect William D. Goforth. The successor firm was known as Yarnall & Goforth.¹⁹

Suppliers and/or subcontractors individually listed in the account books for expenses incurred in the construction of the new meeting house include: Lewis Thompson for lumber, Robert Wood & Company for iron work, Levi Stokes for the construction of benches, H. Buchanan & Son for cushions (presumably for the benches), and C.S. Hale for twenty-six pairs of blinds.

According to the final report of the building committee, dated December 24, 1868, the entire project cost \$20,466.62. The price included \$14,745.75 for the structure, \$1,993.48 for the furniture, and \$3,727.39 for grading, erecting a front wall and other fencing, and the construction of horse sheds.²⁰

The Committee Room, although begun soon after the completion of the meeting house, was undertaken by a different architect and builder. Yarnall & Cooper produced the plans and specifications for the committee room and the school building, but the construction contract was awarded to John H. Hellensick.²¹ The contract, totaling \$12,480 for both the committee room and the new school, was entered into during May of 1869. Other

Philadelphia and, therefore, there is no discussion of his work in that area, including the Germantown Meeting House. Nothing is known of Cooper, who formed a partnership with Yarnall for part of his career.

¹⁷ Tatman & Moss, 891.

¹⁸ Richard A. Yarnall, Interview with author.

¹⁹ Tatman & Moss, 891.

²⁰ This sum does not quite match the funds paid out to the contractor, according to the account books, which total \$15,157.71

²¹ Although by today's standard it seems somewhat unusual to use one contractor's (or architect's) plans while employing another to execute them, it was not uncommon during this era. It was about this time that the field of architecture in particular was becoming organized profession (in part through the establishment of the American Institute of Architects), separate from that of contractor/ builder.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 9)

individuals on the construction project included carpenter Levi Stokes, along with laborer William Berry and stone mason Peter Smith.

4. Original and subsequent owners: The property is held by trustees for the Friends of the Germantown Meeting. The first parcel, consisting of only 3 perches of land fronting on the Germantown Road, was given to the Germantown Friends by Jacob Shoemaker in 1690. In 1693, some adjoining property was purchased, and, in 1705, an additional 50 acres was acquired. Much of the parcel was sold off by the mid-nineteenth century. An 1858 account of their real estate holdings referred to the consolidation of the property purchased prior to 1850 and stated that it consisted of only 2 acres and 10 perches.²²

In the 1850s, a number of small parcels adjoining the meeting house grounds were acquired to either accommodate additional buildings or to create a buffer around the property. In June of 1850, the minutes record the purchase of an adjoining 3/4 acre and 22 perches, formerly belonging to George Rose.²³ The parcel was acquired to provide ground upon which to extend the horse sheds. During March of 1856, 1 acre, 1 rood & 23-1/2 perches of land adjoining the meeting house to the southwest was purchased from Jesse Backius. This property was purchased with the intention of erecting a caretaker's residence, and to better accommodate the school, although exactly how that was to be done was not stated. A library and a committee room, with a "fireproof" safe for storage of records and papers, was also suggested at this time.²⁴ The remainder of the lot was to be used as a burying ground, with instructions that if it ceased to be used as a place of interment, that it be kept as an open green space planted with trees. In 1857, more property was purchased from the Rose family, including a "mansion house" in poor condition. While it was originally intended that the house be used by the school, it was altered and repaired the following year for the accommodation of "a large family," and presumably rented.²⁵

In 1871, the "Coulter Street lot" was acquired from Alfred Cope.²⁶ In October of 1898, the parcel situated on the northwest side of the meeting house property, referred to as the Mullen estate, was sold at public auction. It was purchased by "interested Friends" and

²² Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 18th day 2nd month 1858.

²³ Ibid., 25th day 4th month 1850 & 20th day 6th month 1850. Recorded in Phila. Deed Book TTC:173-75.

²⁴ Ibid., 27th day of the 3rd month 1856. Deed recorded in Phila Deed Book RDW 103:295.

²⁵ Ibid., 18th day of the 2nd month 1858.

²⁶ Reference dated 9th day 2nd month 1889, plat made of property, p. 290 of the preparative meeting minutes.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 10)

offered for sale to the meeting. Concerned that nothing “objectionable” be built in close proximity, the meeting agreed to its purchase.²⁷

5. Original plans and construction: The initial phase of construction consisted of the main block of the meeting house, including the large, wrap-around porch. Because the architect’s plans and specifications have not been found, there is little extant information to provide insight into the development of the design. It is simply stated in the Germantown Preparative Meeting minutes that the “new house” should be of “the *same general character* as the present house enlarged.”²⁸ The general specifications were left to the building committee, as indicated by statements like, the building should be “of such dimensions as the committee shall think requisite.” The resulting structure is a large, three-bay-by-five-bay, single-cell edifice. It rises two stories in height, but does not contain the “youth’s gallery” or balcony present in most two-story meeting houses, including the previous one at Germantown. As a result, the interior is open and spacious.

Although undertaken as a separate building project, and was designed and erected by individuals other than those responsible for the meeting house, the adjoining “Committee Room” was apparently planned from the beginning of the design and construction program. Its construction began only three months after the meeting house was ready for use. Moreover, deliberation over the general character of the new meeting house included the committee room. Economic concerns may have caused the Friends to eliminate it from the original plans. Regardless, the meeting house was not fully functional until the committee room was completed. The Friends had to use of the old meeting house for the men’s business meeting until it was built. The wood-frame hyphen that adjoins the two sections contained the men’s and women’s “cloak rooms” and restroom facilities.

6. Changes and additions: In 1902, a kitchen and dining room addition was made to the rear of the committee room. The work was undertaken by William C. Wright. The idea for the addition was introduced during a preparative meeting held on the 14th of August. The committee in charge of refreshments for the “Tea Meetings” expressed a need for better facilities in which to prepare their refreshments. The women were using their cloakroom, which was deemed inadequate for the purpose. A committee of women Friends, consisting of Sarah Emlen Moore, Sarah C.C. Reeve, and Jane Shoemaker Jones), in conference with the property committee, made their final recommendations on September 2, 1902. They stated:

²⁷ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 20th day of 2nd month 1898.

²⁸ An historic image that captured the old and new meeting house side-by-side, both with their gable ends to Coulter Street, suggests they were of the same general character, the interior differences were extreme.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 11)

It is the judgement of the committee of women Friends that there should be an addition made to the committee room of sufficient size to be divided into two rooms, one to be used as a kitchen and the other, furnished with tables such as have been used at our recent Tea Meetings, to be used as a dining room. After careful consideration of several plans it is believed that to build an addition, about 34' x 26' feet in size on the northwest corner of the Committee Room and communicating with the latter by a wide doorway, would be the more feasible place to accomplish this purpose. The cost of building and furnishing such as addition would be about two thousand dollars.²⁹

An award was made to the contractor in November of 1902.³⁰ The addition was completed by January 15, 1903.³¹

B. Historical Context:

Brief History of the Germantown Meeting & Its Early Meeting Houses

The Germantown Friends Meeting is among the oldest in the Delaware Valley. It began in 1683 by newly arrived Quakers from Germany and Holland. Their emigration was prompted by visits from George Fox, William Penn, and other prominent Quakers, who promised religious toleration in the new colony. The pronouncement was also heard by the Mennonites and others of Germanic decent persecuted for their unconventional religious beliefs. They joined with the Friends to settle this area which was aptly named "Germantown." As with the Welsh Friends who settled the region over the Schuylkill River during the same period, the land in Germantown was acquired through an agent. Francis Daniel Pastorius of the Frankfort Company made the purchase on behalf of thirteen families--thirty-three persons in all--of both Quaker and Mennonite persuasion. They arrived in Philadelphia in October of 1683. By 1690, twenty-eight Quaker families were living in Germantown along with sixteen others that included Mennonites, Dunkards, Lutherans, and Swenkfelders.³² Unlike the Welsh who established large farms, the Germans created a village, strung along a single main street. Germantown was officially laid out by Penn's surveyor, Thomas Fairman. Most inhabitants of Germantown took to industry, weaving wool and linen cloth. They also established tanneries and paper manufactories.

²⁹ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 2nd day of the 9th month 1902.

³⁰ Ibid., Treasurer's Accounts, 14th day of the 11th month 1902 through the 11th day of the 2nd month 1903.

³¹ Ibid., Minutes, January 15, 1902.

³² Jenkins, Charles F. *The Guide Book To Historic Germantown* (Philadelphia: Innes & Sons, 1902), 17-23. A list of the thirteen heads of household includes: Abraham Op den Graeff, Herman Op den Graeff, Lenart Arets, Jan Seimens, Willem Streypers, Jan Lensen, Dirck Op den Graeff, Thones Kunders, Reynier Tyson, Jan Lucken, Johannes Bleikers, Peter Keurlis and Abraham Tunes; Jenkins, 13.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 12)

The first meetings for worship of the Germantown Friends were held in 1683 in the home of Dennis Conrad.³³ By 1687, the meeting was under the care of the Abington Monthly Meeting, which at that time included Abington (formerly Cheltenham), Oxford (later Frankford) and Byberry meetings. In 1690, Jacob Shoemaker gave the Friends 3 perches of land along Germantown Avenue on which to establish a burying ground and a meeting house. A log meeting house was supposedly built. In 1693, and again in 1704, adjoining land was acquired. These acquisitions endowed the Germantown Friends with considerable property and possibly, income. On December 26, 1704, the Germantown Friends declared their intention to build a new meeting house in the coming summer. They also requested subscriptions from the Abington Monthly Meeting in order to finance its construction.³⁴ In the ensuing year, a new meeting house was erected along Germantown Avenue.³⁵ Little is known of this building other than it was made of stone and it sat close to the roadway. It was probably a single-celled structure, as was typical of the earliest meeting houses.³⁶

In February of 1812, the Germantown Preparative Meeting considered the construction of a new meeting house. The minutes reveal the communal nature of the design and construction process within Friends meetings. The meeting house, filled to capacity during meetings for worship, was deemed “inconvenient and often very uncomfortable for the accommodation of Friends.” A committee was appointed to “confer together on the subject” and to report to the meeting “their sence (sic.)” of the most efficient means of accommodating their growing population.³⁷ After “several conferences together and a free expression of sentiment on the subject,” the committee decided that a larger meeting house should be built, further back from the public road.³⁸ A building committee was appointed to “fix on a plan, and take such measures for carrying the above report into effect as shall seem to them advisable.”³⁹ By mid-April, they had agreed on a

³³The residence was located at 5109 Main Street or Germantown Pike; Pennsylvania Historical Survey, Works Progress Administration, *Inventory of Church Archives, Society of Friends in Pennsylvania* (Pennsylvania, 1941), 157. According to the Site and Relic Society of Germantown, *Guide Book to Historic Germantown* (Philadelphia, 1902), 57, this was the home of Thones Kunders. An article published in the Germantown Monthly Meeting’s *Meeting News*, 6th month 1956, claims that Thones Kunders was later known as Dennis Conrad.

³⁴ As cited in Pennsylvania Historical Survey, 158.

³⁵ The later site of a burying ground.

³⁶ A single-cell structure is also suggested by a reference to the date stone that was mounted over “*the* (singular) front door.” Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, “Memorandum,” 26th day of the 8th month 1814.

³⁷Germantown Preparative Meeting Minutes, 21st day of the 2nd month 1812.

³⁸ The committee consisted of Peter Robeson, William Tisher, Abraham Deaves, Joseph Paul, Joseph Jones & Samuel Johnson, reported the following week.

³⁹ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 27th day of the 3rd month, 1812. John Levezey, John Johnson, Peter Robeson, Joseph Jones, Joseph Paul, William Fisher and Samuel Johnson were appointed to a building committee.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 13)

plan for a house measuring 56 feet in length,⁴⁰ and had engaged workmen to carry it out. The funds were raised largely by the preparative meeting, with subscriptions from the Abington and Philadelphia monthly meetings. On the 23rd of October, the committee reported the project as nearly completed. Lacking the funds needed to finish the work, the ground rents for the adjoining property were applied to the remaining balance. On May 2, 1813, just over a year after construction began, the new meeting house was ready for meeting.⁴¹

The new meeting house was constructed of stone, and contained two apartments separated by a partition. It was two stories in height and contained a youth's gallery, which was partitioned in 1821.⁴² The old meeting house stood for approximately a year while the Friends debated its fate. It was eventually dismantled and the materials were used in the construction of a new set of horse sheds.⁴³ Its removal was marked by a short Memorandum, which stated, "The Old Meeting House was built in the year--1705, as appeared by a stone walled in over the front door, having stood 109 years."⁴⁴

Like the two previous meeting houses, the 1812 structure faced Germantown Avenue. Following an old Indian trail, Germantown Avenue became a major thoroughfare from the City of Philadelphia to the north-northwest. It became part of the Germantown and Perkiomen Pike between 1800 and 1801. Germantown had grown as a commercial and industrial village known for its linen production. In 1832, the village became the terminus for the first rail line in Philadelphia, the Reading Railroad to Germantown (later the Chestnut Hill & Germantown Branch of the Philadelphia & Reading RR). The rail line ran parallel and to the east of Germantown Avenue. The Philadelphia, Germantown & Chestnut Hill Railroad was built later, and ran to the west of Germantown Avenue. Eventually a trolley line provided transit from Philadelphia to Germantown and then on to Chestnut Hill.

Germantown Avenue had become noisy and congested by 1812 and so the new meeting house was built further back from the roadway. When the meeting house was erected between 1867 and 1869, it was built a block off the main street, on Coulter Street, which was laid out in 1860. The new meeting house was erected directly behind the 1812 meeting house. The gable-front orientation of the new house mimicked the neighboring gable end of the former house, and both included wrap-around verandas. These elements are where the similarities ended, however.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 17th day of the 4th month 1812. A tear in the page obscures the measurement for the depth.

⁴¹ Ibid., final report of the building committee was made on the 19th day of the 9th month 1814. The total cost for the construction of the new meeting house was \$5214.00.

⁴² In 1844, a cloak room and other accommodations for the women Friends was added.

⁴³ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 16th day of the 4th month 1813.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 26th day of the 8th month 1813.

Construction History of the Current Germantown Meeting House

In October 1866, the Germantown Preparative Meeting once again appointed a committee to investigate ways to improve upon their accommodations.⁴⁵ By 1863, the 1812 meeting house had undergone repairs and alterations. They included the construction of a “piazza” or porch built along the front facade, connecting it with a preexisting porch to the southeast. The grading of a new burying ground and of pathways between the meeting house and burying ground and the new Coulter Street entrance, and the erection of new carriage sheds were also completed. The property was deemed to be in “generally good condition” by the close of 1863. The Germantown Friends were quickly outgrowing their meeting house, however. It held only about 285 people, with room for sixty more in the “youth’s gallery” for a total capacity of 345.⁴⁶ The committee proposed an addition to the Green Street side of the building. A builder provided an estimate of the cost for an addition that would accommodate fifty-five more members. The committee submitted plans accordingly, and it was agreed to move forward with the construction of an addition.⁴⁷

Shortly thereafter, however, concern was raised over the need to vacate the meeting house during construction. After more careful consideration it was determined that a new meeting house could be built at a cost not far in excess of that required to alter the existing house. A new structure, built on the adjacent lot, would allow the Friends to continue to use the current meeting house, and would “ultimately give more satisfaction.” The new building was to be of the same “general character” as the old.⁴⁸ On August 16, 1867, contractors Yarnall & Cooper received their first installment for the nearly \$15,000 estimated construction cost. Their payment was issued three days after the architectural firm of Sloan & Hutton was paid for the plans and specifications.

The Germantown Meeting minutes do not mention hiring Sloan & Hutton. Discussion of such “worldly” matters as meeting house construction are conspicuously absent from Friends meeting minutes.⁴⁹ The Treasurer’s Accounts and receipts books for the Germantown Preparative Meeting, however, clearly indicate that the firm was paid for the plans and specifications of the

⁴⁵ Ibid., 25th day of the 10th month 1867.

⁴⁶ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, Report of the Building Committee, 18th day of the 3rd month 1867.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 19th day 3rd month 1867.

⁴⁸ Unlike the old meeting house, the new building was also to include “the committee room required for men’s business.” This reference to the Committee Room suggests that it was considered from the start to be part of the idealized plan for the new meeting house.

⁴⁹ The meeting house is not mentioned within the published biographies for either Samuel Sloan or Addison Hutton, both of which give listings of known works. Nor is mention made within Hutton’s papers. Although he kept yearly diaries throughout most of his career, they do not begin until 1870. Hutton’s entry for January 1, 1870 included the statement, “I have kept no diary of the last year’s events (and indeed but few notes for several years back).” Addison Hutton, Diaries, 1870 (HV 1122); & Letters (HV 1122, Box 2, file 1867-1879), Addison Hutton Papers, Quaker Collection, Haverford College.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 15)

new meeting house. The involvement of Sloan & Hutton also helps to explain the sophisticated and rather unusual design of the Germantown Meeting House. The design includes elements seen in Sloan & Hutton's Villa designs. And at the same time Hutton was designing the Orthodox Germantown Meeting House, he was working on plans for the Hicksite Friends Parrish Hall building, the first building of Swarthmore College.

As a birthright Friend, Hutton was well connected to the Quaker community. Hutton's dearest friend in Philadelphia-- through his young adulthood until his untimely death--was William C. Cope. Cope introduced Hutton to a number of prominent Quaker families including the Cope, Morris, and Savery clans, many of whom would later become clients. The Copes were among the most prominent members of Germantown Meeting, and Francis R., Thomas P. and Alfred Cope were on the building committee for the new meeting house, as was Elliston P. Morris, who served as the committee's treasurer. Hutton's letters from this period, written mostly to his sister Mary, frequently mentioned members of the Cope family-- including William's brother, Paschall--living in Germantown. His personal connections to the Germantown Friends remained strong. Hutton's only child, Mary, would later marry James Biddle at Germantown Meeting House and become a member of that meeting herself, raising their four daughters as Germantown Friends.

Construction of the Germantown Meeting House began in August of 1867, and evidently proceeded without incident. The Germantown Friends continued to meet in the old house. The minutes do not include any discussion of the construction process. The only record of its progress are the steady flow of payments to the contractor, and the occasional call for further building subscriptions. Based on the payment schedule, the framing was accomplished fairly quickly. By January of 1868, the bulk of the payments were made, and the work had moved to the interior of the building. On Christmas eve 1868, building committee representatives Edward Comfort and Francis R. Cope make their final report. Members and "attenders" of the meeting paid \$14,745.75 for the new meeting house. Other improvements included grading around the site, the construction of a wall along the front of the property, and the erection of horse sheds. These projects added another \$3,727.39 to the final cost of the building campaign.⁵⁰

After the new meeting house was occupied, the old meeting house continued to be used by the men for their business meeting. In February, the Friends discussed remodeling the old meeting house for use as a school, but still reserving the room used by men's meeting for business." A builder was consulted, and as before, it was discovered that the construction of a new building could be accomplished for little more than would be required to remodel the old meeting house. As plans got underway, however, it was decided that separate structures were needed. The minutes stated, "finding it difficult in the way of providing for both under one roof, and ascertaining that without any greater outlay an addition to the new meeting house for the latter purpose could be erected as well as a new school building separate there from and at a more

⁵⁰ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, report of the building committee, 22nd day of the 12th month 1868.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 16)

suitable distance.”⁵¹ Revised plans were submitted for the construction of a Committee Room for men’s business meetings.

The plans and specifications for the school building and committee room addition were produced by Yarnall & Cooper, Builders & Carpenters. The building contract, however, was awarded to John H. Hellensick. In May of 1869, the building committee reported that they were engaged in “carrying out the instructions of the meeting relative to the erection of a new school house and a room for the accommodation of men’s meeting for Discipline,” and that they hoped to have it completed “in good season.”⁵² Mr. Hellensick received his first payment for both projects in May of 1869. Regular payments are made through September, with the final payment coming on January 13, 1870. The completion date for the Committee Room was not recorded. But on October 21, 1869, heating the new business meeting room was completed. A significant change to the committee room was the replacement of the original benches with chairs in 1889.⁵³ The latter improvement suggests that the room was originally set up in keeping with the main meeting room, with the equivalent of a facing bench and other benches turned towards it. The removal of the benches probably allowed for more flexibility in the use of the space. By 1903, a kitchen and dining room that opened into the Committee Room was added. The dining room, later referred to as the Social Room, was built for the accommodation of the “Tea Meetings.” These meetings were popular among members of the Germantown Meeting during the early twentieth century.⁵⁴

The new meeting house, while at a quick glance outwardly resembled the old, was a significantly larger, more urbane form. Its design more closely resembled mainstream religious architecture than the typical Friends meeting house of that era. At the same time, its wrap-around porch, large ornamental brackets, over-sized windows, and neatly stuccoed finish blended well with the new residential architecture springing up around it. The interior plan was also a marked change from the old. It relinquished the former house’s partitioned meeting room for an attached Committee Room and its youth’s gallery for a more spacious interior plan. Moreover, the fact that its distinctive design was the work of a professional architect, as opposed to a committee of meeting members, reflected the rising affluence and “worldliness” of the Germantown Friends.

Shifting Quaker Demographics & the Germantown Meeting

The construction of a large urbanely styled meeting house in Germantown reflected the on-going shift in Philadelphia’s Quaker population from Center City to the surrounding suburbs. The

⁵¹ Ibid., 25th day of the 3rd month 1869.

⁵² Ibid., 27th day of the 5th month 1869.

⁵³ Ibid., report of the property committee, 13th day of the 6th month 1889.

⁵⁴ On the 5th day of the 2nd month 1923, the “rebuilding” of the social room and kitchen is recorded, although what is entailed is not known.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 17)

Society of Friends had maintained a meeting house in Germantown since 1690, but their numbers grew significantly during the mid to late nineteenth century as many Friends fled the increasingly congested city of Philadelphia. What had begun during the eighteenth century as a handful of villas and summer retreats eventually blossomed into full-scale suburbanization. The development was facilitated by the establishment of commuter rail lines from Philadelphia in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Many Friends migrated into North and West Philadelphia neighborhoods. As opposed to these new communities, the previously established Friends community in Germantown attracted the more traditionally minded Orthodox Friends. Many of Germantown's new members were received from the wealthier Center-City meetings.⁵⁵ By the late nineteenth century, Germantown had the second largest concentration of upper-class or higher-income Friends in the Philadelphia area. Between 1880 and 1920, a period when many meetings were in decline, the population of the Germantown Meeting doubled.⁵⁶

Founded as an independent borough, Germantown is almost as old as the City of Philadelphia. Its growth as a suburb of Philadelphia in the late eighteenth century was spurred by the yellow fever epidemic of 1793. Those Philadelphians who could afford to, developed country homes or villas just outside the city in areas like "The Liberties" along the Schuylkill River in what would become Fairmount Park, along the Delaware River, and in Germantown. The early turnpikes radiating out of the city, including the Germantown Turnpike, provided a path along which wealthy Philadelphians built large country seats. Probably the best known of the early Germantown villas was "Clivenden." It was built by Chief Justice Benjamin Chew along the Germantown Pike in 1763-67. The mayor of Philadelphia, Matthew Clarkson, also had a country home in Germantown, which was occupied by Thomas Jefferson (then Secretary of State) and Edmund Randolph (Attorney General) during the 1793 epidemic.⁵⁷

In 1832, further growth was prompted by the development of the Philadelphia, Germantown, and Norristown Railroad Company's line from Philadelphia to Germantown. The construction of this and other commuter rail lines made it possible to travel on a daily basis from areas previously accessible only as retreats. Thus, it made it more affordable to a greater number of city dwellers. Boarding houses catered to those Philadelphians without the means to erect their own summer houses. During the mid to late nineteenth century, the rise of Philadelphia's middle and upper class businessman and industrialists fueled further development. Their house designs were selected from pattern books or were created by one of Philadelphia's many accomplished

⁵⁵ This statement is based on the membership rolls, which are extant only for the women Friends of the Germantown Meeting. Over eighty women--most with children (and presumably spouses)-- were received from Center City meetings between the 1860s and 1890s.

⁵⁶ Philip S. Benjamin, *The Philadelphia Quakers in the Industrial Age, 1865-1920* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976), 68, 70.

⁵⁷ The Clarkson-Watson House at 5275-77 Germantown Avenue was later the home of John F. Watson, author of the famed *Annals of Philadelphia*, a history of the region published in three volumes in 18 and was later converted into a bank (see HABS NO. PA-1681).

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 18)

architects. Among them was Samuel Sloan, whose architectural pattern books published in the 1850s and 1860s, helped to popularize the suburban villa. Villa architecture was touted by numerous influential spokespersons for suburban and country living. Among the more famous proponents for the villa was architect and landscape designer, Andrew Jackson Downing.⁵⁸ The modern villa was thought to reflect allusions to historic grandeur, and the traditions of elite culture. The suburban home was also touted as a natural refuge from the city. For many of its newly arrived upper-middle class occupants, the villa reflected their rise to prominence in the industrial era.

Other factors helped to spur the growth of Germantown and other suburban areas during the later nineteenth century. One was the influx of large numbers of immigrants from Eastern Europe, and African-American migrants from the south contributed to the dense urbanization of Philadelphia. A pattern that seemed to escalate into the twentieth century, it resulted in the loss of some of the older fabric of the city. Much of the Quaker population seemed particularly disturbed by a breakdown in the sense of community caused by increasingly dense population. In his book, *The Philadelphia Quaker in the Industrial Age, 1865-1920*, Philip Benjamin discusses the motivations behind the flight of urban-dwelling Quakers. The problem centered around the decline of Center City's "vitality as an elite neighborhood." In addition to dense, smaller-sized row-house development were large-scale civic works. In the 1880s, the Pennsylvania Railroad erected the Broad Street Station opposite the new City Hall. It entailed the construction of a viaduct to carry the tracks from the new station across the Schuylkill River. Dubbed the "Chinese Wall," it occupied much of the area between Filbert and Market Streets, isolating the Logan Square neighborhood from the rest of Center City. Further disruption to the Center City area came in 1918, when the Benjamin Franklin Parkway was erected from City Hall to Fairmount Park. The parkway cut diagonally across the grid pattern of streets, leveling hundreds of homes in its path. Thus, Benjamin claimed that by 1919, much of the Quaker elite had moved either south of Market Street or had retreated to the suburbs.⁵⁹ Benjamin also pointed out that although suburbanization among Friends was, in part, an elite phenomenon, their motivations ran deeper than that. The move to the suburbs also reflected the Friends "deep-seated antipathy toward life in the industrial city which cut across status lines."⁶⁰

Suburban flight was not restricted to any one area, but did break down largely along class lines. Quakers of "modest estate" generally fled to the working-and middle-class districts west of Germantown Avenue in North Philadelphia. Hicksite settlement in North Philadelphia resulted in

⁵⁸ Downing's many works, including his well known *The Architecture of Country Houses* published in 1850, were instrumental in popularizing what was viewed as an ideal American way of life. His writings on the topic included descriptions and designs for houses types most conducive to this life style, which capitalized on the growing enthusiasm for architectural eclecticism and the picturesque.

⁵⁹ Philip S. Benjamin, *The Philadelphia Quakers in the Industrial Age, 1860-1920* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.), 69.

⁶⁰ Benjamin, 72.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 19)

the establishment of a new preparative meeting, and the construction of a meeting house at Girard Avenue and 17th Street (since demolished). Middle-class Friends mostly migrated to West Philadelphia, residing in the Italianate villas and Victorian era mansions in the Powelton section and in the neighborhoods south of Market Street. The introduction of horse car and trolley lines to Center City encouraged the growth of middle-class row housing west of these neighborhoods. The Hicksite Friends already had erected a meeting house at 35th Street and Lancaster Avenue in 1851. In 1878, a corresponding Orthodox meeting house was erected nearby, at 42nd and Powelton Avenue (currently being used as the Lombard Central Presbyterian Church). And in 1901, the Hicksites replaced their 1851 structure with a new meeting house and school complex. By 1910, the largest proportion of urban Friends was living in West Philadelphia.⁶¹

Germantown, on the other hand, attracted Friends from the wealthier professional and business classes who left Center City for the security of an older established enclave of Quaker culture. Of the Germantown Friends, Philip Benjamin wrote, “these Friends took little interest in the affairs of their meetings in Center City. A conservative Quaker characterized them as ‘rich and cultivated’ people who demanded learning and urbanity in their religious leaders.”⁶² Next to the upper-class Friends living in townhouses in Rittenhouse Square or along Spruce, Locust, or Delancey streets in the 1880s-1910, the next largest group of elite Friends lived in Germantown. Germantown was to the wealthy conservative Orthodox Quakers what Chestnut Hill and the Main Line were to other, generally Episcopalian, segments of upper class Philadelphia. In *Philadelphia Gentlemen; The Making of a National Upper Class*, E. Digby Baltzell discussed how elite groups of Episcopal and Quaker society existed in parallel but separate worlds. The Germantown Meeting became a focus of his study of the Quaker elite. He argued that the Quakers who remained in the city were more easily lured by the Victorian aristocratic social life of the prevailing Episcopalian upper class. This generally occurred through business affiliations or mere proximity to mainstream Philadelphia society. Germantown, however, remained a stronghold of Quaker society.⁶³ The fact that the Germantown Friends were more successful at maintaining their own distinct identity may also be attributed to the “Wilburite” leanings of many of Philadelphia’s Orthodox Friends. Thus, the migration patterns of urban Friends to suburban areas was also dictated by the divisions that existed within Quakerism, namely the Hicksite and Orthodox factions.

⁶¹ This is no longer the case. While both of these meeting houses are still standing, neither are used by Friends. The former is now a community arts center, and the latter, a Baptist church.

⁶² Benjamin, 67-68.

⁶³ E. Digby Baltzell, *Philadelphia Gentlemen; The Making of a National Upper Class* (New York: The Free Press, 1958), 267. According to Baltzell, by the 1940s Philadelphia’s “Quaker Gentry” was spread throughout the suburban regions of the city, with centers not only in Germantown, but clustered around the Quaker colleges of Haverford and Swarthmore and at Bryn Mawr.

Orthodox Quakerism & the Effects Mainstream Evangelical Thought

The spiritual reform and quietist outlook that contributed to a heightened sense of Quaker identity and separatism in the eighteenth century gave way to philosophical differences that divided American Friends in the early nineteenth. Disputes over the reliability of biblical interpretations presented by the early Friends versus those being offered by evangelical Christians were at the heart of a major schism that erupted in 1827, creating “Hicksite” and “Orthodox” factions. The disputes brought to the fore questions of belief, authority, and practice that would continue to fracture the Society of Friends into the twentieth century. Matters of concern such as the “first principles,” and the source and nature of the “inner light” seemed to pose a threat to the very essence of the Quaker religion. External pressures such as a rising evangelicalism and increased industrialization were taking their toll. This was particularly true within the Orthodox segment of the population where religious thought was becoming more and more aligned with that of the mainstream. Here the rifts were the greatest. In 1845, Orthodox Friends witnessed another schism, separating them into the “Wilburite” and “Gurneyite” camps. Splinter groups were responsible for the creation of even greater diversity in Friends’ thought and practice. By the 1870s, the dissensions had reached crisis proportions as “Renewal” Friends contended with the new “Holiness” movement for control of the Gurneyite meetings. Although the Friends would again find common ground in the twentieth century, the infusion of mainstream religious culture ultimately resulted in the stripping away of Quaker distinctiveness.⁶⁴ Within the Wilburite-controlled Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, the most severe effects of evangelicalism upon Friends through the holiness movement were fairly successfully thwarted. The yearly meeting chose to isolate themselves from outside Quaker groups rather than risk another schism.

The conflicts began with a schism between the followers of Elias Hicks, referred to as the Hicksites, and the self-proclaimed “Orthodox” Friends, that occurred within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1827. The dispute centered around diverging interpretations of the scriptures and the role of Christ. The Hicksites, while recognizing the importance the scriptures, refused to be bound by them. Instead, they stressed the superiority of the revelation imparted by the Holy or inward Spirit, relating it to the original Quaker concept of the “Inner Light,” or that of God in everyone. Believing themselves to be the defenders of traditional Quakerism, the Hicksites continued to look to the biblical interpretations of the early Friends. Although the Orthodox also believed they were upholding the original vision of Quakerism, on many key points of interpretation they were aligned in thought with the evangelical mainstream. They accepted the notions of atonement and original sin dismissed by the Hicksites. The Orthodox believed in the divinity of Christ who, through his atonement and crucifixion, had paid for the sins of all mankind. Later historians have suggested that socioeconomic forces were also at work. Historian Robert Doherty claims that the split was caused by the two Quaker groups’ diverse

⁶⁴ The basis for this argument was formed largely from information present in, Thomas D. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism, Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988). For more information see Hamm.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 21)

reactions to the newly emerging capitalist order. The Orthodox, who represented the urban merchants and entrepreneurs, embraced evangelical beliefs because it allowed them to participate in worldly activities and accept their wealth as divine reward.⁶⁵ The Hicksites were represented the agrarian Friends, while the Orthodox Friends were concentrated in the city. Within Philadelphia, the Orthodox controlled the yearly meeting and the influential Meeting for Sufferings.

The questions of biblical interpretation raised by the Hicksite/Orthodox split continued to form the basis for disputes among Orthodox Friends. As suggested, however, the search for clarification on points heretofore unquestioned was also a response to the external pressures imposed by the evangelical movement and rising industrialization. Regionalism was giving way to a growing national economy facilitated by innovations in areas such as transportation and communication. It was becoming increasingly difficult for the Quakers to live exclusive of the larger society. For these reasons, many Orthodox Friends found it less desirable to maintain their seemingly-peculiar identity through distinctive dress and speech or through isolation. Many sought interaction on a par with other evangelical religious groups, citing declining membership as the basis for such action. The breach in world view was not to be tolerated by many Orthodox Friends still reeling from the Hicksite separation. Their attempts to maintain unanimity through over zealous implementation of the discipline only made matters worse. Increasing factionalism eventually lead to another schism.

In 1845, the Orthodox members of the Society of Friends were divided among the followers of Joseph John Gurney and John Wilbur. The Gurneyites further challenged many of the older traditions and beliefs. They placed even greater significance upon scripture and bible study over the direct revelation characteristic of traditional Quaker thought. They blamed the Hicksites' lack of scriptural knowledge for the prior schism.⁶⁶ Their emphasis on scripture undermined the traditional Quaker understanding of the nature and significance of the inner light.⁶⁷ Perhaps equally important, the Gurneyites encouraging interaction with non-Quaker evangelical groups in order to promote their religious and social agenda. The Wilburites, on the other hand, held fast to eighteenth-century notions of Quietist isolation. By the 1870s, the western-based Gurneyites would again become splintered, first by the "renewal" and then by the "holiness" movements. The most evangelical offshoots of Quakerism, they challenged the discipline on issues such as

⁶⁵ Hamm, 16. Cites Robert W. Doherty's work on the separation within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Doherty suggests that the split was caused by the two Quaker groups diverse reactions to the newly emerging capitalist order. The Orthodox, who represented the wealthier, urban merchants and entrepreneurs, embraced evangelical beliefs because it allowed them to participate in worldly activities and accept their wealth as divine reward.

⁶⁶ Hamm, 25.

⁶⁷ The Gurneyites made a distinction between the attainment of justification (state of acceptability to God) and sanctification (state of sinlessness), which Friends had viewed as inseparable. While both groups agreed the latter could only be attained through a gradual process, the Gurneyites asserted that the former could be attained by simply believing in the efficacy of Christ's atonement. Like separating thought from deed, the Wilburites saw this concept as subverting the very essence of Quakerism.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 22)

dress and marriage and shifted the balance of leadership from elders to ministers. By the 1880s, the holiness faction became the first to introduce pastoral ministry into the Society of Friends.

Although the majority of those within the Orthodox Philadelphia Yearly Meeting sided with the Wilburites, a small but powerful enclave of Gurneyites centered around the Twelfth Street Meeting. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting tried for many years to maintain a middle ground in the hopes of avoiding the schism effecting other yearly meetings.⁶⁸ In response to external pressure to denounce Wilburism, however, Philadelphia took a drastic step and cut-off official correspondence with all other Friends groups.⁶⁹ Their actions were not out of keeping with Wilburite thought. They viewed strict isolation from the influences of the outside world as essential to maintaining the form of Quakerism that they espoused.⁷⁰ By so doing, the Philadelphia Friends were much more successful in resisting the larger culture and maintaining Quaker traditions.⁷¹ Unlike western Friends, the members of the Orthodox Philadelphia Yearly Meeting resisted changes to the discipline and pastoral ministry. Instead, they clung to their “peculiar identity,” as it was often referred to, and to their “plain” style. And while some of their meeting houses become more church-like in appearance during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, they still maintain the austerity that typified their earlier buildings.⁷²

As a more urbane group, the Germantown Friends Meeting sided with the Orthodox during the 1827 schism. A census taken by the monthly meeting in 1829 reveals that of the 101 adult members of the Germantown Meeting, seventy identified themselves as “Friends,” while only nineteen were identified as “Hicksite,” and twelve as “doubtful” or undecided.⁷³ Most likely, they later sided with the Wilburites, as did most Orthodox Friends in the Philadelphia region. In keeping with the isolationist tendencies of Wilburite Friends, they had created a self-sufficient enclave of Quaker culture in Germantown by the mid to late nineteenth century.

⁶⁸ The split between Wilburites and Gurneyites also divided Friends in Ohio and Indiana. In New York, Baltimore and North Carolina the Yearly Meetings went Gurneyite. Hamm, 32-33.

⁶⁹ Hamm, 34. While they continued to receive visiting Friends, they would not issue or receive epistles or any other official correspondence.

⁷⁰ According to Thomas Hamm, Wilburites feared contact with the outside world and carried the plain life to extremes of austerity. Hamm, 29.

⁷¹ Hamm, 41.

⁷² A number of meetings in Ohio, Indiana and North Carolina build “meeting houses” that are nearly indistinguishable from churches. These include gable fronted buildings with single entries and, in some cases, even steeples.

⁷³ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Membership records, “An accounting of the members of Frankford, Germantown, and Byberry Meetings, as they stood at the time of the separation, now composing Frankford Monthly Meeting,” 1829 (HV: J4.26). The 1829 accounting provides an interesting demonstration of how the division broke down along class lines. In the urban Germantown Meeting, the vast majority goes Orthodox. In Frankford, which is urban but working class, the meeting is almost equally split (55:52). But within more rural Byberry, the vast majority sides with the Hicksite (11:210).

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 23)

In addition to an innovative new meeting house, there were other improvements at Germantown directed towards the preservation of their “peculiar” way of life. Perhaps most significant were new facilities to provide for the “guarded education” of Quaker children.⁷⁴ In 1869-70, a new structure was erected for the Germantown Friends School, which had started in 1845.⁷⁵ The Friends Free Library & Reading Room, also begun in the 1840s, received a new structure in 1873-75. The library was open to Friends and non-Friends alike, and contained carefully selected volumes conducive to Quaker values.⁷⁶ In terms of social life, the meeting house became the focus of a number of activities by the late-nineteenth century. In 1889, the Committee Room benches were replaced with chairs, presumably to facilitate its use as a multi-purpose room. The mention in 1908 of a stereopticon “to be used in the committee room” suggests that the room doubled as a lyceum. The kitchen and dining room, later referred to as the “Social Room,” was added in 1902 to accommodate the well-attended “Tea Meetings” sponsored by the ladies of the Germantown meeting.

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: Built in 1868-69, Germantown is a fine example of a mid-nineteenth century urban meeting house, the plan of which was drafted by one of Philadelphia’s most accomplished Quaker architects, Addison Hutton. This structure likely constitutes one of Hutton’s earliest independent works and may also be the only Friends meeting house designed by him. The design is somewhat unusual. It does not conform to the typical doubled meeting house type that was popular from the late-eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century. The orientation and arrangement of their building’s interior plan is more like that of a church than a Friends Meeting House. This is a significant shift in meeting house layout. Rather than erecting a partition to accommodate separate men’s and women’s business meetings, a plan was adopted that combined a “main meeting room” for worship and women’s business meetings with a

⁷⁴ The establishment of a Friends school was important to the preservation of the Society. It helped to shield the next generation from the detrimental influences of the outside world, while indoctrinating them into the Quaker value system.

⁷⁵ The school campus has continued to expand over the years.

⁷⁶ The intention of the library, as it was later stated in the minutes was as follows: “The primary design in the establishment of a free public library under the care of this preparative meeting was to furnish a good supply of wholesome and instructive reading matter as well for our members as for the general public in the vicinity of the library.” 15th day 5th month 1885. An earlier reference to the types of works featured, and the use of the library by non-friends appeared in the minutes during the 3rd month of 1875, “The readiness with which such minds are induced to accept wholesome literature instead of the exciting novels, at first sought for, continues to be a very interesting feature of this connection with us, and our success in inducing the substitution of works of a more instructive character confirms the belief hitherto expressed, that more care on the part of the controllers of our public libraries would lead to valuable results to our young reading community.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 24)

rear “Committee Room,”⁷⁷ in which to hold the men’s meeting. The main meeting room, void of a partition or gallery, is church-like in its spaciousness and orientation. Its facing benches running the width, rather than the length, of the building. For these reasons, Germantown Meeting House is representative of the later nineteenth and early twentieth century trend within the Friends’ community towards the adaptation of more mainstream church architecture.

The use of mainstream ecclesiastic architectural forms was particularly prevalent within Orthodox meetings, such as Germantown, where a majority of Friends had moved closer to the dominant religious culture. Although it is important to note that among the Orthodox, the Philadelphia Friends were dominated by the thinking of the more conservative Wilburites. They were the least likely of the Orthodox groups to engage in extremes of evangelical or mainstream religious practices. Thus, the Orthodox meeting houses within the sphere of influence of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting express milder interpretations of mainstream ecclesiastical architecture. The most church-like structures appeared in western meetings controlled by the holiness factions that grew out of the Gurneyite movement.

While Germantown maintains a certain austerity commensurate with the Quaker tenet of simplicity, it also exhibits elements seen in the fashionable Italianate villas springing up in suburban neighborhoods. These structures were being designed by a plethora of well known Philadelphia architects of the period-- including Sloan & Hutton--for the city’s rising class of businessmen and industrialists. The architectural elements of these fashionable buildings included in the design of Germantown Meeting House include its neatly stuccoed walls, over-sized windows, and deep veranda. Although its gable-front orientation is also somewhat unusual in a meeting house design, it is more popularly used in urban settings where building lots are generally deeper than they are wide. The Race Street Meeting House erected in 1856 with a pedimented gable-front facade is a good example of this trend. The distinctive design of the Germantown Friends Meeting House can therefore be attributed to a number of factors including its professional design and construction, and its Orthodox members’ leanings towards mainstream church and high-end domestic architectural forms. The stylish design elements also reflected the rising affluence and “worldliness” of the Germantown Friends.

2. Condition of fabric: The meeting house has been well maintained and appears to be in good condition. The structural problems of the early twentieth century were mitigated when the meeting house was underpinned and reinforced with steel I-beams in 1914.

⁷⁷ A similar “Committee Room” is found at the Arch Street Meeting House.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 25)

B. Description of Exterior:

1. Overall dimensions: Germantown Meeting House is a large, two-story, three-bay-by-five-bay, rectangularly-shaped structure with a southeast facing, gable-fronted orientation. The meeting house proper measures 57'-½" across and 74' in depth, and stands 42'-5" in height. It is joined by a single-story, wood-frame hyphen to the "Committee Room" section, which is a single-story, rectangularly-shaped, gable-roofed structure that sits perpendicular to the main block. The hyphen is approximately 12' in depth and just a little shorter in width (accounting for the shallow depth of its wood frame construction). The Committee Room is the same width as the meeting house, and 28'-9" in depth. A dining/social room and a kitchen addition was made to the rear, measuring approximately 38' x 30' together. Later, an office section was appended to the northeast elevation of the kitchen. (see plans).

2. Foundation: The foundations are of rubble stone.

3. Walls: The walls are of rubble stone covered with a plastered finish. The hyphen that connects the meeting house and committee room is of beaded match board.

4. Structural system, framing: The meeting house is of load-bearing masonry construction. The roof consists of a joist and rafter system, with common rafters and purlins. The purlins are fitted into pockets in the stone end walls. Timbers forming a V-shape and resting upon the joists lend support to the rafters. They are held in place by notches cut into the rafters. The joists have been reinforced with steel I-beams, and slender iron bars have been added in lieu of a king post supporting member. The roof structure of the committee room is a variation on the king post system, with the bracing spring from the joists rather than the center post.

In June of 1905, the deterioration of some of the girders and many of the floor joints in the meeting house was noted. It was discovered to be the work of Powder Post Beetles. The damaged wood was removed and new parts installed, underpinned with bearing resting on brick or marble plinths. The damage extended into the "rear meeting room." The work was undertaken by William E. Wright, builder at a cost of \$302.23.⁷⁸ And in November of 1914, iron beams were installed to support and strengthen the floor of the main meeting room. The beams were set on iron columns imbedded in concrete.⁷⁹

5. Porches, stoops: A large porch or "veranda" wraps around the southeast front and both the northeast and southwest sides of the meeting house. It is supported by chamfered

⁷⁸ Germantown Preparative Meeting, Property Committee, Minutes, 12th day of the 6th month 1904.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 6th day of the 11th month 1914.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 26)

posts with a simple plinth at its base and squared “capital” of molding elements. A pair of supporting brackets springs from the top of each post. The roof has a deep overhang, supported by plain struts. The porch floor is of brick laid in a herringbone pattern, resting on a rubble stone foundation. The porch posts rest on an outer border of slate.

Germantown was among the first meeting houses erected with a full-length porch. Beginning about the 1860s, many older meeting houses abandoned the traditional gabled hoods in favor of a porch extending the length of the front and/or side elevations. The porches provided social space for gatherings before and after meetings as well as protection from the inclement weather. The Committee Room section has pedimented entry porches to either side facades. They are supported by chamfered posts.

6. Chimneys: The main block of the meeting house has two plain brick chimneys. The first is an interior chimney located in the gable end of the front elevation. The second, an exterior T-shaped chimney, is located in the opposing gable end. It was probably added in 1902 as part of a new heating and ventilation system. A third brick chimney is located in the Social Room and kitchen section. It is a simple, rectangularly shaped chimney built in three sections, each marked by a clay chimney pot. It serves the kitchen facility and the fireplace in the social room.

7. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The principal entry is to the center of the southeast front facade, located in the gable end. It consists of a double-width doorway with a simple architrave surround and stone sill. The paired doors each have three flush panels with a molded surround. Two additional doorways provide access to the main meeting room. They are located to the center of the northeast and southwest side elevations, on axis with each other. They all have the same surround and double doors as the front entryway.

The hyphen has wide, single-door entryways with a plain wood surround and full-length side lights. The door has six panels with molded surrounds. There is a double-door entry to the center of both side elevations of the Committee Room section. Each has a simple, narrow architrave surround with a transom light above, and a pair of three-panel doors. Doorways also provide entry into the kitchen, located to the center of the rear elevation, and into the office section, at its southeast elevation.

b. Windows and shutters: The meeting house is lit by long six-over-six-light-sash windows on both the first and second stories, separated by a distance wide enough to accommodate the porch roof. The close proximity between the windows on both stories is most evident on the interior, where the effect is of a single continuous span. The windows have a narrow wood surround with a molded strip along the outer edge, and are slightly recessed within the stuccoed walls. In the

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 27)

gable ends are a pair of more ornamental, round-arched, two-over-two-light sash windows. There are no windows in the hyphen. The Committee Room section is lit by nine-over-nine-light sash windows that flank the centrally located entries. There is a half-round light in the gable ends. The Social Room section is lit by a tripartite window, separated by simple pilasters. The center section has a twelve-over-twelve-light sash window, flanked by narrower, six-over-six-light sash windows. The rear office section is lit by large, eight-over-eight-light sash windows; without a surround.

8. Roof:

a. Shape, covering: The meeting house has a gable-front roof covered with slate. The roof line is pierced by three ventilators. The rear sections have low gabled roofs covered with raised-seam metal. The Social Room and kitchen section has a gable roof with a low hipped roof section to the rear over the kitchen.

b. Cornice, eaves: The roof of the meeting house overhangs and forms a large pediment in both gable ends. Beneath is a wide frieze board with molded sections at the top and bottom. The roof of the Committee Room section has a boxed return cornice and overhanging eaves with only a narrow strip of molding beneath.

C. Description of Interior:

1. Floor plans: The interior of the meeting house consists of a single, large, rectangularly shaped open space rising two stories in height. The principal entry is to the southeast, and the facing benches are to the center of the opposing wall. Exterior doorways are located at the side elevations. Interior doorways flanking the facing bench lead to the women's (west) and men's (north) Cloakrooms, located in the wood frame hyphen. The hyphen adjoins the Committee Room section. This section consists of a large, rectangularly shaped room that sits perpendicular to the meeting house. A bench along the southeast wall mimics the facing bench in the meeting room. At either end of the room is an exterior doorway. Built-in cupboards are located along the northwest wall, flanking a large opening into the Social Room. The Social Room has a fireplace to the center of the northwest wall, and bay windows with window seats flank the room. A doorway to the north side of the rear wall provides access to a hallway, with the kitchen to the rear of the social room, and offices to the north of the kitchen (see plans for more detail).

2. Stairways: A closed, single run wood stairway provides access to the unfinished basement, and is located in the vestibule within the men's cloakroom (toilet room).

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 28)

3. Flooring: Floor tile--in a checkerboard pattern of brown shades--has been laid over the hardwood floors in the area beneath the benches. The aisles and the stand are covered with carpeting, as are the Committee and Social rooms.

4. Wall and ceiling finish: The walls are of plaster covered with a beige, canvas-like covering. The walls flanking the recessed doorways, and the corners of the room are rounded and the ceiling is coved. There is wainscoting on the wall behind the facing benches only; this treatment is repeated in the Committee Room, along the southeast wall where a bench is located. The other walls of the Committee Room have plain wainscoting with rounded corner boards, and there is a wide frieze and a boxed cornice. The Social Room also has plaster walls with plain wainscoting and a heavy cornice molding. The fireplace has a paneled overmantel, and the window seats that flank it have paneled backs.

5. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The doorways leading to the exterior, found to the center of the southeast front and northeast and southwest walls, are recessed, with rounded, plaster reveals. They have double, three-panel doors with molding around the panels. The interior doorways that lead through the hyphen into the Committee Room, have paneled reveals, but no doors. The Committee and Social rooms are adjoined by a large doorway with pocket doors.

b. Windows: There are six-over-six-light sash windows on the first and second levels of the meeting house, resting only a few inches apart. The vertical spacing of the two levels conveys the impression of a continuous span of glazing, running almost the entire height of the wall. This effect is accentuated by fact that is span is recessed within a single, slightly splayed reveal. As they were originally, each window is covered with blinds.

6. Benches: There is a facing bench to the center of the northwest rear wall. The facing bench consists of a two-tiered platform with three rows of mounted or fixed benches, divided at the center by steps leading to the upper tiers. There are also steps at either end of the facing benches, with a turned balustrade along the outside. There is match-board wainscoting along the wall behind the uppermost bench. The upper tier includes a foot rest. At the center bench is a collapsible clerk's desk. It is mounted to the middle of the railing behind the lower bench. The benches throughout the rest of the meeting house are movable. They are currently arranged to face the facing benches (see plans).

7. Partition: There is not now, nor was there ever, a partition that divided the meeting room into two apartments for separate men's and women's meetings for business. Women met in the meeting room for business, while the men met in the Committee Room to the rear of the meeting house proper.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 29)

8. Mechanical systems:

a. Heating: The meeting house has been centrally heated from the time of its initial construction. Changes were made over the years to improve upon the original system. The first effort made to better heat and ventilate the meeting house was undertaken during the Winter of 1879-80. One of the furnaces in the cellar was rebuilt, and a large ventilating shaft was installed. In January of 1903, the minutes record the installation of the new ventilating system and other improvements, at a cost of \$3,789.61. The 1903 boiler was replaced. And in 1924, the ventilation fan was replaced.⁸⁰

b. Lighting: Gas was introduced to the meeting house, probably in 1871. For this to be possible, the meeting had to fund the installation of a gas main along Coulter Street.⁸¹ The extent of this early lighting system is not clear; it may have consisted of outdoor lighting under the veranda only. In August of 1881, the minutes record the steps being taken for "lighting the meeting room for our evening meetings."⁸² The gas-light fixtures that once hung in the meeting house may have been installed at that time.

Recorded on the 21st of January 1908 was the removal of the old gas pipes around the meeting house porches, which had become clogged. They were replaced with nine incandescent lights, controlled by three switches. In April of 1908, an electrical connection was made in the Committee Room for the use of the stereopticon, a projector for glass slides that were usually produced with a pair of identical images that merged together to create a sense of depth. Although interestingly enough, the installation of electric lights in the Committee Room was not discussed until October 16, 1911. The old gas pipes used for lighting purposes were leaking and had to be abandoned. The installation of three circuits in the Committee Room and one each in the dining room and kitchen was recorded on June 22, 1912.

In 1917, electric lights were installed in the men's and women's toilet rooms, as was a new, higher pitched roof with ventilators.⁸³ Finally, electric lights were installed in the main meeting room. As recorded on the 20th of October 1919,

⁸⁰ The installation of fan "operating directly on the drive shaft of the motor replaces the old, noisy, chain-driven fan," was recorded on the 14th day of the 4th month 1924, Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes.

⁸¹ The introduction of gas was first discussed during a preparative meeting held on the 22nd day of the 9th month 1870, and the expenditure is recorded in the Treasurer's Accounts on the 21st day of the 12th month 1871.

⁸² Germantown Preparative Meeting, Minutes, 7th month of 1881.

⁸³ Ibid., 22nd day of the 10th month 1917.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 30)

Wires have been introduced and fixtures installed for lighting the main meeting room and mens and women's rooms by electricity, the Welsback gas-lighting burners on the side and rear walls of the main meeting room have been replaced by the old style gas burners & globes, in harmony with the fixtures over the gallery. The new system has eight lights placed in circumference of the ventilator in the middle of the room, they being on four circuits of two lights each, controlled from a switchboard in the men's room.

The meeting house is fully electrified today.

c. Plumbing: The meeting house is equipped with plumbing. There are restroom facilities in the wood hyphen that connects the meeting house with the Committee Room. There is also a full kitchen in the 1902 addition.

D. Site:

1. Historic Landscape Design: The construction of the new meeting house was the beginning of a larger building campaign that resulted in complete transformation of the meeting house property. The meeting house project included new horse sheds, grading around the site and a wall along Coulter Street. Within the period between 1869 and 1880, was the construction of a buildings for the Germantown Friends School and The Friends Free Library & Reading Room, and the erection of a janitor or caretaker's house on site. Extensive improvements were made to the grounds, not the least of which was the reorientation of the site. Rather than face the Germantown Road as the previous meeting houses had, the new house looked out onto Coulter Street, thus turning inward and away from the noise and congestion of the growing city. More property was acquired to accommodate buildings or to provide a buffer of green space. A wall was erected around the new burying ground in 1874. In addition, a whole interconnection of macadamized roadways and paths were laid out to enhance, and to improve access in and about, the meeting house property.

Between 1904 and 1905, additional improvements were made to the landscaping and drives. In June of 1904, a row of ten Hemlocks were planted between the burying ground and the Janitor's House, to replace the "Privet hedge" that had died. Driveways leading from the meeting house to both gates on Coulter Street and to the Main Street gate were rebuilt in September of 1904. The construction of driveways 8' wide with flanking 2' brick gutters, laid on a stone foundation, was undertaken by G.W.N. Barrett and recorded on the January 17, 1905. On the same day was recorded the removal of the driveway "leading to Germantown and opening an outlet to Coulter Street."

2. Outbuildings: There are numerous other buildings on the property, including a Friends School complex, library building and caretaker's house. The Friends Free Library &

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 31)

Reading Room, begun in 1873, was opened on September 7, 1874 (the final disbursements were made by March of 1875). The construction of the "Janitor's House," authorized during June 1879, was completed and occupied by February of 1880.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Note: FHL refers to the Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA., and HV refers to the Quaker Collection at Haverford College. The two institutions are the major repositories for information relating to the Society of Friends.

A. Early Views:

Germantown Monthly Meeting, Property Committee, Blue print, Pennell & Wiltberger, Consulting Engineers, Philadelphia, PA., Heating System Rearrangement, Germantown Monthly Meeting, Coulter Street, (basement plan & details), 1945 (HV, 01.3.2)

B. Interviews:

Nicholson, Christopher. Interview by author, June 1999, Germantown Meeting House, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Mr. Nicholson is Chair of the Property Committee for the Germantown Meeting.

Yarnall, Richard. Interview by author, January 2000, via telephone from his home in Doylestown, Pennsylvania. Mr. Yarnall is the grandson of the builder, Hibberd Yarnall.

C. Bibliography

Primary and Unpublished Sources:

Germantown Monthly Meeting, Men's Meeting Minutes, 1906-51.

Germantown Preparative Meeting. Minutes, Mens' Meeting, 1798-1860.

Ibid., Minutes, Mens' Meeting, 1860-1896 (HV, N5.7).

Ibid., Minutes, Mens' Meeting (Orthodox), 1896-1939 (HV, N5.2.1).

Ibid., Treasurer's Accounts (HV, N5.13); 1880-1908 (HV N5.10)

Ibid., Receipt Book, 1859-1895 (HV, N5.25).

Ibid., Building Committee, Account book, 1868-76.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 32)

Ibid., Property Committee, Minutes, 1889-1903; 1904-1936 (HV, 01.3.1).

Harris, Dorothy. "Factors Influencing the Architecture of 19th Century Meeting Houses."
Unpublished paper, Amer. Civ. 600, May 1955 (FHL).

Secondary and Published Sources:

Baltzell, E. Digby. Philadelphia Gentlemen; The Making of a National Upper Class. New York:
The Free Press, 1958.

Benjamin, Philip S. *The Philadelphia Quakers in the Industrial Age, 1865-1920*. Philadelphia:
Temple University Press, 1976.

Bronner, Edwin. "Quaker Landmarks in Early Philadelphia." *Transcript of the American
Philosophical Society*, FHL.

Ibid. "The Center Square Meeting House & Other Early Meeting Houses of Philadelphia." *The
Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*, vol. 44, no. 2 (Autumn Number 1955): 67-73.

Butler, David M. "Quaker Meeting Houses in America and England: Impressions and
Comparisons." *Quaker History*, vol. 79, no. 2, (Fall 1990): 93-104.

Ibid. *Quaker Meeting Houses of the Lake Counties*. Friends Historical Society, 1978.

Ibid. "The Making of Meeting Houses." *Friends Quarterly* (July 1980): 316-24.

Chedbunn, O.S. "Theology and Architecture in the Tradition of the Meeting House." *The
Friends Quarterly*, 20, no. 2 (April 1977): 60-73.

Cooledge, Harold N., Jr. *Samuel Sloan, Architect of Philadelphia, 1815-1884*. Philadelphia:
University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Faris, John T. *Old Churches and Meeting Houses in and Around Philadelphia*. Philadelphia &
London: J.B. Lippincott, Company, 1926.

Hamm, Thomas D. *The Transformation of American Quakerism, Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907*.
Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University, 1988.

Ingle, Larry. *Quakers in Conflict: The Hicksite Reformation*. Knoxville, TN: , 1986.

Jenkins, Charles F. *The Guide Book To Historic Germantown* (Prepared for the Site & Relic
Society). Philadelphia: Innes & Sons, 1902.

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE
HABS NO. PA-6654 (page 33)

Lidbetter, Herbert. *The Friends Meeting House*. York: The Ebor Press, 1961.

Ibid. "Quaker Meeting Houses, 1670-1850." *Architectural Review* (London) 99 (1946): 99-116.

Milligun, Edward H. "The Worshipping Community & its Meeting Houses." *The Friends Quarterly*

Pennsylvania Historical Survey, Division of Community Service Programs Work Project Administration. *Inventory of Church Archives; Society of Friends in Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: Friends Historical Association, 1941.

Price, Walter. "Old Meeting Houses." *The Friend* (24 September 1936): 115-18.

Thum, Charles. "Creative Quaker Architecture." *Friends Intelligencer*, vol 107, no. 40 (7 October 1950): 587-88.

Trueblood, D. Elton. "Quaker Architecture." *The Friend* (29 September 1936): 118-19.

Yarnall, Elizabeth Biddle. *Addison Hutton, Quaker Architect, 1834-1916*. Philadelphia: The Art Alliance Press, 1974.

PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION:

The documentation of the Germantown Friends Meeting House was undertaken during the summer of 1999 as part of a larger program to record the Friends Meeting Houses of the Delaware Valley. The project was undertaken by the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER), E. Blaine Cliver, Chief of HABS/HAER; Paul Dolinsky, Chief HABS; funding was made possible through a congressional appropriation for documentation in Southeastern Pennsylvania. The project was planned and administered by HABS historians Aaron V. Wunsch and Catherine C. Lavoie; and architect Robert R. Arzola. Measured Drawings were produced by supervising architect John P. White, and architectural technicians Cleary Larkin, James McGrath, Jr., Elaine Schweitzer, Kelly Willard, and Irina Madalina Ienulescu (US ICOMOS). The project Historians were Aaron V. Wunsch and Catherine C. Lavoie; this report was written by Catherine Lavoie. Large format photography was undertaken by HABS photographer Jack E. Boucher. Special thanks to Chris Nicholson, Chair of the Property Committee of the Germantown Meeting, for his assistance and support.