


**United States Department of the Interior
Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form**



See instructions in *How to Complete National Register Forms*
Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic The Scandinavian-American Pair-houses in Utah Thematic Resource
and/or common

2. Location

street & number Multiple locations; see attached inventory forms not for publication
city, town _____ vicinity of _____ congressional district _____
state UTAH code _____ county Millard, Salt Lake, Sanpete, & Sevier code _____

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use	
<input type="checkbox"/> district	<input type="checkbox"/> public	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> occupied	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> museum
<input type="checkbox"/> building(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> private	<input type="checkbox"/> unoccupied	<input type="checkbox"/> commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> park
<input type="checkbox"/> structure	<input type="checkbox"/> both	<input type="checkbox"/> work in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> educational	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> private residence
<input type="checkbox"/> site	Public Acquisition	Accessible	<input type="checkbox"/> entertainment	<input type="checkbox"/> religious
<input type="checkbox"/> object	<input type="checkbox"/> in process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government	<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thematic Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> being considered	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: unrestricted	<input type="checkbox"/> industrial	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> other:

4. Owner of Property

name Multiple Ownership; see individual inventory forms
street & number _____
city, town _____ vicinity of _____ state _____

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc. Multiple County listing; see inventory forms
street & number _____
city, town _____ state _____

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

title Vernacular Architectural Survey has this property been determined eligible? yes no
date 1979-1981 federal state county local
depository for survey records Utah State Historical Society
city, town Salt Lake City state Utah

7. Description

Condition		Check one	Check one
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> deteriorated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unaltered	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> original site
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> ruins	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> altered	<input type="checkbox"/> moved date _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> unexposed		

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

This nomination, "The Scandinavian-American Pair-house in Utah," gathers together 14 houses which represent a particular ethnic architectural type found in various parts of the state. This house type, briefly summarized as being three rooms wide and one room deep, was transmitted to Utah by Scandinavian immigrant converts to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the mid-19th century. The name used here to identify this house type comes from the Swedish "parstuga," which translates literally as "pair-house," or, a house with a central room flanked by a pair of rooms. The pair-house exists in Utah in a variety of forms and remains an inconspicuous but distinctive feature of the state's architectural landscape, historically documenting the multi-cultural nature of early Mormon society. Included in this thematic house type grouping are the following residences:

- 1) The Anders Hintze House, c. 1862-63
4255 South 2390 East
Holladay, Utah
- 2) The Thuesen-Petersen House, c. 1868
Block 36 Lot 1
Scipio, Utah
- 3) The Soren Simonsen House, c. 1880
55 West 100 North
Monroe, Utah
- 4) The Martin Johnson House, c. 1880
45 West 400 South
Glenwood, Utah
- 5) The Peter Hansen House, c. 1875
247 South 200 East
Manti, Utah
- 6) The Claus P. Andersen House, c. 1865
Block 3 Lot 7
Ephraim, Utah
- 7) The Andrew Petersen House, c. 1870-1875
92 East 200 South
Richfield, Utah
- 8) The Jens C. Nielsen House, c. 1870
Block 7 Lot 4
Ephraim, Utah
- 9) The Hans C. Jensen House, c. 1870
Block 14 Lot 2
Ephraim, Utah

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 2

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10) The Rasmus Jensen House, c. 1870
Block 16 Lot 1
Ephraim, Utah | 15) Jacobsen-Jensen House
Block 5 Lot 5
Ephraim, Utah |
| 11) The Oluf Larsen House, c. 1869-1870
Block 17 Lot 3
Ephraim, Utah | 16) Niels Mortensen House
Block 28 Lot 13
Ephraim, Utah |
| 12) The Lars S. Andersen House, c. 1865
Block 34 Lot 1
Ephraim, Utah | |
| 13) The Dykes Sorensen House, c. 1870
Block 7 Lot 6
Ephraim, Utah | |
| 14) The Andrew M. Barentsen House, 1872
Block 12 Lot 3
Fountain Green, Utah | |

These 16 dwellings were culled from a total of 48 such houses identified by an ongoing survey of the vernacular domestic architecture in the state of Utah. Three of these houses have already been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Two, the Peter Monson house and the Jens Jensen house, are listed as part of the Spring City Historic District in Sanpete County. Also in Sanpete County, the Fredrick C. Sorensen house in Ephraim was listed separately in 1980.

The final selection of these 14 houses for nomination was based primarily on architectural integrity. Most pair-houses were originally modest dwellings and were usually built of adobe. Since they are also some of the oldest buildings left in the state, the ravages of time, weather, and remodeling have taken a heavy toll, 30 of the documented houses of this unusual type have either been altered beyond recognition or are too severely damaged to warrant preservation. A list of these inelligible houses is provided as an appendix to this nomination form.

For the most part, these houses were constructed by the more humble people in their communities and unfortunately, there is not a great deal of historical information available to reconstruct their lives. The names and dates

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER

7

PAGE

3

provided on the attached inventory forms give only a vague impression of Scandinavian immigrant life in the American West. The architecture presented here serves in a surrogate capacity by speaking materially of the newcomers' response to their Utah home. What the people cannot tell us, their houses potentially can. The specific historical message is one of newly acquired economic status combined with ethnic pride. The immigrant convert was a rural laborer and tradesman in Europe, occupying a social niche just below that of the emerging bourgeois farming class. In America, land--even a few acres--carried with it immediate status and in Utah the Scandinavian immigrant quickly became the farmer he could not have hoped to become in Europe. This new social position required a corresponding change in external symbols and many (though certainly not all) Scandinavians chose to build, not the older peasant dwellings they had left behind nor the houses of their Anglo-American neighbors, but rather the house they associated with 19th century middle-class respectability in their Scandinavian homeland. This house was the pair-house.

Utah Pair-houses are bound together as a type by an adherence to three-room-wide floor plan. These rooms are located in a linear fashion along the axial ridgeline of the roof and constitute the base structure from which Utah carpenters generated a variety of real houses. Within the fixed structure of the tripartite plan, the houses demonstrate diversity in facade fenestration, chimney placement, height, depth, rear extension, and construction materials. The three-room-plan is a convention--a culturally determined preference which dictates how the house will be laid out and ultimately how it will look when completed. It is this base structure which the archeologist James Deetz calls "the mental template" of artifactual design. Deetz points out that the "idea of the proper form of an object exists in the mind of the maker, and when this idea is expressed in tangible form in raw materials, an artifact results."¹ The formal attributes of the house--the doors, the windows, the roof, the decorative trim, and so forth--are all logical continuations of the design momentum set into motion by the tripartite structure of the plan. The inherent ordering of ideas within this structure furnishes the carpenter with a conceptual blueprint which will guide the subsequent actions required in building the house.

Anglo-American domestic architecture, at least until the mid-19th century, was dominated by a transplanted English model which, when properly executed, was two-rooms wide. There are, of course, exceptions such as the square cabin house and the extended hall house (see, for example, the George W. Bradley house in Moroni, Utah), but most typologies of American vernacular

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM

FOR HCRS USE ONLY

RECEIVED

DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 4

architecture are limited to houses which are composed of but two bays.² The most common Anglo-inspired American house types are the hall and parlor house, the double-pen house, and the central hall house. Though composed of three spatial units, the central hall type cannot qualify as a three-room house because the hall is too narrow to function in any capacity other than as a passageway.

The Scandinavian building tradition, while offering a wide range of house types, presented an interesting alternative to the English double-bay style in a widely distributed house form which placed three rooms in a line under a gable roof. Dating to the 1600s in central and northern Sweden and in central and western Norway, this three-room-type gradually migrated southward into Swedish province of Skane and by the late 18th and early 19th century had crossed the channel into Denmark.³ In these areas the house first surfaced as an upper-class phenomenon, but later acquired general favor as a rural farmhouse type.⁴ In the second half of the 19th century, the symmetrically tripartite pair-house had become the principle dwelling form being built on middle-class farms in Denmark--an ubiquitous symbol of economic achievement. It was this house which the Scandinavian immigrants from Denmark, Norway, and Sweden brought to Utah.

The pair-house is found throughout Utah but survives in the greatest numbers in those regions where the Scandinavian population was the most concentrated. The Sanpete-Sevier county area, often called "Little Scandinavia" for its sizeable northern European population, accounts for over 90% of the recorded pair-house examples. The house form may be broken down into four major categories, each yielding houses in various sizes and architectural styles. These four main types are the following:


- 1) TYPE I. This first category contains those houses most closely resembling the oldest traditional pair-houses in Norway and Sweden. The distinctive feature of TYPE I is that the middle room is the smallest of the three. This center room is often about two-thirds of a complete square (designated Y₂ in the illustrations) and flanked by two roughly square rooms (marked X). The piercing rules for the facades of TYPE I houses require a door to be placed in the center room and either one or two symmetrically placed windows in the side rooms. The width of the center room is about 12-13 feet and thus is easily distinguished from the 6-7 foot passageway found in the Anglo-American central hall house type. The Oluf Larsen house in Ephraim is the best remaining example of a TYPE I pair-house in the state.

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 5



TYPE I




- 2) TYPE II. This heading represents the most commonly encountered pair-house in Utah. There are 29 TYPE II houses, or about 65% of the total. Here the main interior room is always the largest and formed by a square unit (X) or a slightly larger rectangle (Z). If the inside room is a square, then the side rooms will be either three-quarters (Y) or two-thirds (Y₂) of the square. If the inside room is a rectangle, then the paired outside rooms will be squares.

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 6



TYPE II Pair-house variants


The facade piercing rules for TYPE II houses normally place a symmetrical "window-door-window" pattern in the central room and only a single window in each of the side rooms. Such a facade is characterized by slightly exaggerated spaces between the internal cluster of openings and the windows to each side. The breaking up of the house front into three distinct bays is one of the classic and most easily spotted features of the TYPE II pair-house. The Soren Simonsen house, the Andrew Petersen house, the Claus Andersen house, the Rasmus Jensen house, and the Andrew M. Barentsen house are structures included in this nomination which represent the type of house.

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 7




GAPS IN OPENINGS REFLECTING INTERNAL
PLACEMENT OF WALLS

Typical TYPE II Facade

There are two main sub-types of TYPE II:

- A) TYPE IIA. This house is similar in plan and fenestration to the regular TYPE II house but is constructed two-rooms deep in what is often called a "double-pile" arrangement. The center area may or may not be partitioned into two rooms. The Anders Hintze house and the Peter Hansen houses are both examples of the TYPE IIA subtype.



TYPE IIA Plan

- B) TYPE IIB. This subtype category accounts for TYPE II pair houses which are composed of only two-thirds of the complete house form. The


**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET



ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 8

subtraction of one section of the geometrically conceptualized house is a common practice in folk architectural design.



TYPE IIB Plan

- 3) TYPE III. The houses in this group represent a variant of TYPE II, the main difference being that the TYPE III house has a balanced, symmetrical facade instead of the idiosyncratic three-bay arrangement found on the majority of such houses. By placing the openings equally spaced across the front of the house, some adjustments are required internally. TYPE III houses are recognized by asymmetrically room sizes. The Soren A. Mariager house is a pair-house whose TYPE III identity is revealed by the symmetrical facade and unusual floor plan. The present owner of this home has requested that the house not be listed on the National Register.



TYPE III Facade and Plan

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY
RECEIVED
DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET


ITEM NUMBER

7

PAGE

9


- 4) **TYPE IV.** This house, perhaps the most distinctive of the pair-house types, is characterized by a three-room linear pattern in which the side pair of rooms are squares (X) and the inside room in a square (X₁) which is only half as large. The smaller center unit creates an indented space which serves as a porch.



TYPE IV plan

The facade piercing rules for TYPE IV prescribe either a symmetrical "window-door-window" pattern or a simple two opening "door-window" arrangement for the smaller internal square. The side rooms can have one or two windows placed symmetrically. The Theusen-Petersen house (originally only a one story house) and the Jens C. Nielsen house are two excellent and well preserved examples of TYPE IV. There is one subtype of the fourth type:

- A) **TYPE IVA.** As in TYPE III, this subtype of TYPE IV consists of only two-thirds of the complete house. This rather peculiar house occurs with some frequency and the Dykes Sorensen house illustrates this design variation of the TYPE IV pair-house.



TYPE IVA

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY

RECEIVED

DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 7 PAGE 10

- 1 James Deetz, Invitation to Archaeology (Garden City, N.Y.: The Natural History Press, 1967), p. 45.
- 2 See R.W. Brunskill, Illustrated Handbook of Vernacular Architecture (London: Faber and Faber, 1971), pp. 95-105; Henry Glassie, Folk Housing in Middle Virginia (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975), pp. 19-41; and Austin Fife, "The Stone Houses of Northern Utah," Utah Historical Quarterly, 40:1 (Winter 1972), pp. 6-23.
- 3 Sigurd Erixon, Svensk Byggnadskultur (Stockholm; Aktiebologet Bokverk, 1947), pp. 286-331; and Gunnar Jahn, Byggeskikker Pa Den Norske Landsbygd (Oslo: Haschehaug, 1925).
- 4 Jonas Klercker, "Officersboställen I Skane Under Indelningsverkets Tid (1682-1878)," Skanes Hembygdsforbund Arsbok (1969), pp. 34-57.

8. Significance

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below			
<input type="checkbox"/> prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> community planning	<input type="checkbox"/> landscape architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> religion
<input type="checkbox"/> 1400–1499	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-historic	<input type="checkbox"/> conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> law	<input type="checkbox"/> science
<input type="checkbox"/> 1500–1599	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> economics	<input type="checkbox"/> literature	<input type="checkbox"/> sculpture
<input type="checkbox"/> 1600–1699	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> education	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> social/
<input type="checkbox"/> 1700–1799	<input type="checkbox"/> art	<input type="checkbox"/> engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> music	<input type="checkbox"/> humanitarian
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1800–1899	<input type="checkbox"/> commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> exploration/settlement	<input type="checkbox"/> philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> theater
<input type="checkbox"/> 1900–	<input type="checkbox"/> communications	<input type="checkbox"/> industry	<input type="checkbox"/> politics/government	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> invention		<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)

Specific dates 1855–1885 **Builder/Architect** Multiple

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

During the second half of the 19th century, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons, colonized much of the Intermountain West in an attempt to build a millennial Kingdom of God. Through intense missionary efforts, Mormon converts were gathered to this new Zion from many parts of the eastern United States and northern Europe. The Scandinavian countries were particularly susceptible to Mormon proselytism and sent over 20,000 emigrants to Utah by 1900. Despite this remarkable influx of Nordic blood, the Scandinavian cultural contribution to Utah has been consistently denied. Historians have maintained that the Mormon theocracy, charged with molding a heterogenous body of converts into a unified community of like-minded Saints, openly discouraged the retention of Old World values and customs.¹ Indeed, in statements made by many of the Church leaders the use of the Scandinavian languages was repeatedly denounced. New studies, however, have recently shown that among the first generation of immigrants many of the local Scandinavian LDS ward meetings, conducted primarily in Danish and to a lesser extent, Swedish, persisted into the 20th century.² The presence of the northern European pair-house type in Utah communities further reinforces the idea that a degree of ethnic identity was tolerated. The pair-house is historically significant, therefore, because in demonstrating the cultural diversity exhibited by Mormon domestic architecture, the house makes an important contribution to the dismantling of the prevailing monolithic interpretation of Mormon society. The pair-house functioned as a rather complex symbol of Scandinavian ethnicity and newly acquired economic status. It is a house which is inextricably tied to the history of immigration to Utah during the 19th century.

The Utah pair-house finds its origins in the folk building traditions of Sweden and Norway during the 16th and 17th centuries. In Sweden the house was found as the principle dwelling on the larger farms and Church estates and enjoyed a popularity in many sections of the country which lasted well into the 19th century. The Swedish folklife scholar, Sigurd Erixon, acknowledged that the pair-house, with a narrow entrance hall and a large living room on each side, could be considered "the typical Swedish form."³ In later examples of the type, the kitchen was moved from one of the side rooms into the central room where it occupied a position just behind the then greatly diminished entrance hall. In Norway, a similarly arranged, tripartite house has been called a "dobbblethus," or double house.⁴ The Norwegian house also places the kitchen in the smaller middle room and the Oluf Larsen house in Ephraim is an exact replica of this Old World arrangement.

In Denmark and in Skane, the southernmost Swedish province long controlled by the Danish kings, the pair-house is not encountered in venerable form. The traditional Danish peasant house appears as an irregular longhouse which is

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY

RECEIVED

DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 8 PAGE 2

broken up into a variety of small and often odd-sized compartments.⁵ The pair-house, however, was introduced into Skane in the 18th century with the Swedish army of occupation as an officers' dwelling. These houses differed from the normal pair-house in that they were often two-rooms deep and the center room was larger than the side rooms.⁶ This variant of the pair-house proved popular with the local residents and influenced the building of many farmhouses of similar plan. The balanced order of the pair-house facade was favored over the often disorganized asymmetry of the Danish longhouse.

There are several early houses in the Copenhagen area which indicate that the tripartite, symmetrical pair-house had penetrated the Danish upper-class by the beginning of the 19th century. Spurvekjul, an estate in Lyngby built in 1805, displays both the three-room plan and distinctive three-bay facade which characterize the pair-house.⁷ While extensive architectural research has not yet been accomplished for 19th century Danish farm houses, the pair-house type seems to have generally replaced the older longhouse on larger farms by the 1850s and 1860s. The house is almost invariably found as a two-room deep house and often sports a centrally placed cross gable on the facade. The pair-house was a relative newcomer to rural Denmark when the Mormon converts began leaving for Utah. Yet, the house was obvious on the prosperous farms as a replacement for older houses associated with a peasant agricultural heritage. Mormon converts generally came, not from the poorest level of society, but from the rural laboring and artisan classes, groups which had not shared in the prosperity of the 19th century land reforms. Utah offered a new set of opportunities and the memory of the middle-class house did not fade. When new houses were built in Zion, the pair-house became an attractive reality.

The pair-house type was, then, introduced into Utah from various points in Scandinavia. Oluf Larsen had known the house in Norway, Peter Monson had probably built them in Sweden, and Rasmus Jensen would have seen them as he worked the large farms around his village home in Denmark. Coming together in Utah, these diverse streams of tradition merged to create an essentially new architectural form. The pair-house at once looked back to its roots and forward as a model in its own right; it was both Scandinavian and Mormon. Its distinctive form was a reminder of the past, an expression of the present, and a hint of a millennial future. Not all Scandinavian immigrants chose the pair-house. A great many opted for the Anglo-American house types which they found being built by their new English speaking neighbors. But the crucial point is that these newcomers had a choice to make; all their decisions were

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY -- NOMINATION FORM**

FOR HCRS USE ONLY

RECEIVED

DATE ENTERED

CONTINUATION SHEET

ITEM NUMBER 8 PAGE 3

not already made. The pair-house is important as a symbol of the cultural diversity which was the early Mormon Church.

- 1 See William Mulder, Homeward to Zion (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957) pp. 248-273.
- 2 See Richard Jensen, "Glimpses of Mantua Ward's History," Unpublished manuscript, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Jensen's research demonstrated that in the primarily Danish community of Mantua in Box Elder County, Danish as the principle language persisted until the turn of the century.
- 3 Sigurd Erixon, Svensk Byggnadskultur, p. 286.
- 4 Gunnar Jahn, Byggeskikker Pa Den Norske Landebvgd.
- 5 Bjarne Stoklund, Bondegard og Byggeskik (Copenhagen: Dansk Historisk Faellesforenings Handboger, 1972), pp. 55-76.
- 6 See, Jonas Klercker, "Officers bostellen I Skane . . .," pp. 34-57.
- 7 Harald Langberg and Hans E. Langkilde, Dansk Byggesaet Omkring 1792 og 1942 (Copenhagen; 1942), p. 116.

9. Major Bibliographical References

William Mulder, Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952.
Sigurd Erixon, Svensk Byggnadskultur.

10. Geographical Data

Acreeage of nominated property See individual inventory sheets

Quadrangle name _____

Quadrangle scale _____

UMT References

A

Zone	Easting			Northing					

B

Zone	Easting			Northing					

C

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

D

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

E

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

F

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

G

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

H

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Verbal boundary description and justification

See inventory sheets

List all states and counties for properties overlapping state or county boundaries

state N/A code _____ county See individual code _____
inventory sheets

state N/A code _____ county _____ code _____

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Tom Carter, Architectural Historian

organization Utah State Historical Society date 1981

street & number 300 Rio Grande telephone 801-533-6017

city or town Salt Lake City state Utah

12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

national state local

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.


State Historic Preservation Officer signature Melvin T. Smith

title Melvin T. Smith, State Historic Preservation Officer date 8-26-82

For HCERS use only
I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register
See nomination sheet for details date _____
Keeper of the National Register
Attest: _____ date _____
Chief of Registration

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form



Continuation sheet

Item number

Page 1 of 2

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

dnr-11

Name Scandinavian-American Pair-houses Thematic Resources

State UTAH

Nomination/Type of Review

Date/Signature

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Andersen, Claus P., House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 2. | Hansen, Peter, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 3. | Simonsen, Soren, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Beth Grosvenor 10/20/82</u> |
| | | | Attest | _____ |
| 4. | Johnson, Martin, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Beth Grosvenor 10/20/82</u> |
| | | | Attest | _____ |
| 5. | Hintze, Anders, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 6. | Thuesen-Petersen House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 7. | Nielsen, Jens, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 8. | Jensen, Hans C., House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 9. | Jensen, Rasmus, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |
| 10. | Larsen, Oluf, House | Substantive Review | Keeper | <u>Claus P. Shue 2/1/83</u>
<u>Patrick Andrus 2/1/83</u> |
| | | | Attest | <u>accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83</u> |

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received 9-7-82
date entered

Continuation sheet

Item number

Page 2 of 2

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

Name Scandinavian-American Pair-houses Thematic Resources
State UTAH

Nomination/Type of Review

Date/Signature

11. Andersen, Lars S., House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

~~Carol Osler 2/1/83~~
Patrick Andrus 2/1/83

Attest accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83

12. Sorensen, Dykes, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

Bel Grosvorn 10/20/82

Attest ~~Carol Osler 2/1/83~~

13. Barentsen, Andrew, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

Patrick Andrus 2/1/83

Attest accept Patrick Andrus 1/31/83

14. Mortensen, Niels, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

DOE/OWNER OBJECTION

~~Carol Osler 2/1/83~~
Eligible - Patrick Andrus 2/1/83

Attest eligible Patrick Andrus 1/31/83

15. Jacobsen-Jensen House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

DOE/OWNER OBJECTION

~~Carol Osler 2/1/83~~
Eligible - Patrick Andrus 5/1/83

Attest eligible Patrick Andrus 1/31/83

16. Petersen, Andrew, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

DOE/OWNER OBJECTION

~~Eligible~~
Bel Grosvorn 10/20/82

Attest

17. Birch, Annie, House Entered in ~~NPS~~ National Register Keeper

for Helene Boyer 10/22/84

Attest

18. Johnson, Peter Axel, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

Bel Grosvorn 10/20/84

Attest

19. Larsen, Christen, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

Linda McCallum 9/13/87

Attest

20. Ottesen, Hans, House ~~Substantive Review~~ Keeper

Linda McCallum 8/6/87

Attest

Appendix I
List of Documented Utah
Pair-houses

The following list contains the total number of the Pair-house type recorded to date in Utah. Several other examples have been identified in both Arizona and Idaho. The status of each bulding is noted in the column at the right.

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Ahlstrom, Peter House, c. 1865, Ephraim. | Severely altered. |
| 2. Andersen, Claus House, c. 1860, Ephraim. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 3. Andersen, Lars S. House, c. 1870, Ephraim. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 4. Andersen, Rasmus House, c. 1875, Ephraim. | Severely altered. |
| 5. Barentsen, Andrew House, c. 1875, Fountain Green | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 6. Beal, Henry House, c. 1870, Ephraim.* | Severely altered. |
| 7. Bench, John L., c. 1865, Manti.* | Severely altered. |
| 8. Birch, Marie Annie House, c. 1865, Coalville.* | Deteriorated. |
| 9. Christensen, Jens Peter House, c. 1865, Ephraim | Severely altered. |
| 10. Greenwood, Barnard H. House, 1879, Central. | Severely altered. |
| 11. Hansen, Hans A. House, c. 1865, Ephraim. | Severely altered. |
| 12. Hansen, Hans Jorgan House, c. 1880, Spring City. | Severely altered. |
| 13. Hansen, Janes House, c. 1875, Mt. Pleasant. | Severely altered. |
| 14. Hansen, Peter House, c. 1880, Manti. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 15. Hansen, Rasmus House, C. 1870, Mt. Pleasant. | Severely altered. |
| 16. Hintze, Anders House, c. 1865, Salt Lake City. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 17. Jacobsen-Jensen House, c. 1875, Ephraim. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 18. Jensen, Hans C. House, c. 1870, Ephraim. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 19. Jensen, Jens House, c. 1865, Spring City. | NR 1980, demolished 82. |
| 20. Jensen, Rasmus House, c. 1870, Ephraim. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 21. Johnson, Martin House, c. 1880, Glenwood. | Nominated to NR 1981. |
| 22. Kjargaard, Peter Olsen House, 1865, Ephraim. | Severely altered. |
| 23. Larsen, Oluf House, c. 1870, Ephraim. | Nominated to NR 1981. |

24.	Lindberg, Aaron House, c. 1870, Ephraim.	Severely altered.
~25.	Monson, Peter House, c. 1875, Spring City.	Listed NR 1980.
26.	Mortensen, Niels House, c. 1875, Ephraim.	Nominated to NR 1981.
27.	Nielsen, Christian House, c. 1870, Ephraim.	Deteriorated.
28.	Nielsen, Jacob House, c. 1865, Ephraim.	Severely altered.
29.	Nielsen, Jens C. House, c. 1870, Ephraim.	Nominated to NR 1981.
30.	Nowers, Wilson G. House, c. 1880, Beaver.*	Deteriorated.
31.	Ottesen, Hans House, c. 1865, Manti.	Severely Altered.
32.	Petersen, Andrew House, c. 1875, Richfield.	Nominated to NR 1981.
33.	Rolfsen, Jacob House, c. 1875, Mt. Pleasant.	Severely Altered.
34.	Samuel, Ole House, c. 1865, Ephraim.	Severely Altered.
35.	Simonsen, Soren House, c. 1880, Monroe.	Nominated to NR 1981.
36.	Sorensen, Dykes House, c, 1870, Ephraim.	Nominated to NR 1981.
~37.	Sorensen, Fredrick C. House, c. 1870, Ephraim.	Listed NR 1980.
38.	Sorenson, Soren House, 1885, Elsinore.	Severely altered.
39.	Thuesen-Petersen House, c. 1870, Scipio.	Nominated to NR 1981.
40.	Unidentified house, c. 1880, Chester.	Altered.
41.	Unidentified house, c. 1870, Ephraim.	Severely altered.
42.	Unidentified house, c. 1870, Ephraim.	Severely altered.
43.	Unidentified house, c. 1880, Lehi.	Severely altered.
44.	Unidentified house, c. 1870, Manti.	Severely altered.
45.	Unidentified house, c. 1875, Mt. Pleasant.	Severely altered.
46.	Unidentified house, c. 1880, Mt. Pleasant	Altered.
47.	Unidentified house, c. 1875, Provo.	Nomination potential.
	(Identified after presentation of nomination.)	
48.	Whitlock, Charles House, c. 1860, Ephraim.*	Demolished 1981.

*Houses built for or associated with non-Scandinavians. The borrowing of the pair-house form by Anglo-American Mormons demonstrates the popularity and practicality of the type and further illustrates the architectural diversity of the early Mormon settlements.