1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Buckingham Friends Meeting House

Other Name/Site Number: Buckingham Meeting of Friends, Buckingham Monthly Meeting

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 5684 Lower York Road (Rt. 202) Not for publication:__

City/Town: Buckingham Township Vicinity:__

State: PA County: Bucks Code: 017 Zip Code: 18931

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property		Category of Property	
Private:	x	Building(s):	x
Public-Local:	___	District:	___
Public-State:	___	Site:	___
Public-Federal:	__	Structure:	___
		Object:	___

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
4	___ buildings
1	___ sites
3	___ structures
___	___ objects
8	___ Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 9

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing:

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this ____ nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Certifying Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ Entered in the National Register
___ Determined eligible for the National Register
___ Determined not eligible for the National Register
___ Removed from the National Register
___ Other (explain): _____

_____ _____
Signature of Keeper Date of Action

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic:	Religion	Sub:	Religious facility
	Funerary		Cemetery
Current:	Religion	Sub:	Religious facility
	Funerary		Cemetery

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Other: Friends Meeting Houses

MATERIALS:

Foundation:	stone
Walls:	stone
Roof:	slate
Other:	brick (chimneys)

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

The Buckingham Friends Meeting House, erected in 1768, is a large, symmetrically balanced, two-story, gable-roofed stone structure, three bays deep and six bays across to include separate entryways for men and women. The design of Buckingham Meeting House is indicative of the "Plain Style" associated with Quaker built structures, although architecturally it is among the most finely articulated rural meeting houses in the Delaware Valley. Like other Friends meeting houses, it maintains the flavor of the local vernacular, adopting building traditions and materials indigenous to the area in which it was erected. The meeting house is built of irregularly coursed, locally quarried stone and incorporates the doorway hood and pent eave indicative of domestic architecture of the period. Its construction by a recognized master builder and member of Buckingham Meeting accounts for its somewhat more refined elements, which are reflective of the Georgian style of architecture. The Georgian emphasis on restrained classical detailing and symmetrical balance lent itself to Buckingham's new meeting house design, that being the two-celled, or "doubled" plan that included equal apartments for men and women. Buckingham Meeting House is the embodiment of a balanced composition. The front elevation is six-bays wide with dual entryways. When bisected, each half constitutes a self-contained unit, with a doorway flanked by windows. The fenestration of the south front is repeated to the north rear where there are dual "carriage doors." The symmetry of the exterior is echoed in the interior plan, which consists of a single large room divided by a partition into two nearly equal parts. Both sections have the same axial plan with cross aisles terminated by doorways. The balanced plan is accentuated by the interior fittings and furnishings with each side containing identical wainscoting, stairways, facing benches, allowances for stoves, and other features.

This imposing two-story building measures 65' in length and 39'-11" in depth, and it rises 37' 7-1/2" to the roof ridge. It is erected of rough-cut coursed stone, slightly more refined in its coursing at the south front. The south front is also the only elevation ornamented by a water table. There is rough quoining at all corners of the building. In the east gable end of the meeting house is a date stone with a round-arched lintel and stepped quoining. It simply reads: "1768." The meeting house has a side-gable roof with a pent in the gable ends. The roofs, including those on the pents and hoods, are covered with slate. The eaves overhang and there is a large cornice with an oversized cove molding. The virtually identical south front and north rear elevations are symmetrically balanced with entries located in the second and fifth bays respectively. They all have plain wood surrounds with butt joints and a simple architrave backband. The doorways, flush with the exterior wall, accommodate double doors. The front doors are constructed of wide, vertical planks with a beaded edge. The rear doors are three panel. All doors have thumb-latch iron hardware. The doorways to the rear are slightly narrower, and although they correspond in location to the front doorways, they are elevated slightly to provide entrance onto the uppermost level of the facing benches that run along the interior of the wall. There is a centrally located entry flanked by windows at both the east and west side elevations. The west doorway is covered by a hood. At the east side elevation, the hood has been removed and a porch now runs its length. The first-story windows are twelve-over-twelve-light sash, and those on the second story are eight-over-eight light. The windows have plain wood surrounds with a simple architrave backband and wood sills. The first-story windows have arched stone lintels, while those in the second story are located directly under the cornice. All the windows have paneled shutters. Access to the attic is provided by batten doors in the west and east gable

ends (located just south of center to avoid the original chimney stacks). There are two interior brick chimneys centered along the roof ridge. The stacks rest on the summer beams in the attic so as not to interrupt the meeting space below. Stove pipes connect the chimney stacks to the stoves that provided heat. The stove in the west section of the meeting house remains in place, but the one in the east section is gone. (The original, shallow chimney stacks that rise to the top and center of the gable end walls are still visible in the attic. The stacks are splayed, extending approximately 12" at the top and narrowing to 3"-4" at the base.)

The meeting house is constructed of load-bearing masonry with a heavy timber-frame structural system. The roof structure consists of five large king-post trusses, the base of which are formed by large summer beams. The trusses are held with pegged joints. The base of the king post and the individual truss members are marked with corresponding Roman numerals for ease of assembly. The trusses support the principal rafters, intersected by purlins (two across) to support the secondary rafters. Lath, holding the roof shingles, is applied to the tops of the rafters. The king-post is reinforced with flanking wood braces, held by pegs. There are additional braces near the ends of the truss to support the weight of the purlins. There are twenty-two joists across the base of the attic. They are pegged into the collar beams and labeled with Roman numerals. To the front and rear of the structure, shorter members run perpendicular to the joists, allowing the roof to kick out over the stone walls to form a deep overhanging exterior cornice.

The interior of the meeting house consists of a single large room open to a gallery above that can be divided by a retractable wood-paneled partition into two nearly equal-sized meeting rooms (the men's meeting to the west side measures 40' deep by 35'-8" wide, and the women's meeting to the east is 40' deep by 29'-11"wide). The walls are plastered and painted white, with wainscoting below. The wainscoting is constructed of unfinished, beaded-board white cedar. It is higher along the north rear wall, between the rear doors, to accommodate the raised facing benches. Corresponding doorways are located, two each, at the south front and north rear walls, and one each at the east and west side walls. The doorways form the terminus for the cross aisles that regulate traffic through the meeting house. On the north rear, the doorways are elevated to the top level of the tiered facing benches. All doorways are recessed with plain, plastered reveals and have simple wood surrounds with butt joints. There are double doors all around, constructed of vertical boards held by nails with wrought heads. They have wrought-iron strap hinges, Suffolk latches and slide bolts. Large iron hooks support wood members used to bar the (south) front doors. The interiors of all the doors have been left unpainted. The windows are recessed with plain, plaster reveals. The deep reveals have wood sills and wainscoting and form a window seat. Like the doorways, the surrounds consist of plain, unfinished wood with butt joints. The floors are of random-width, unfinished wood.

The important interior features of the meeting house are all intact and include the facing benches, the partition, and the gallery. A two-tiered platform of three rows of fixed "facing benches" (sometimes referred to as "the stand" or "minister's gallery") lines the north rear wall, interrupted near the partition and at the ends to accommodate steps. The facing benches allowed for oversight by the ministers, elders and overseers. The benches are of plain unfinished wood with curving bench ends. There is a foot rest along the backs of the facing benches. A collapsing clerk's desk is located on the lower tier. There is also a single row of fixed benches along the south front and the east and west side walls. Fixed benches are also present in the gallery. The

remainder are moveable. The benches are built of poplar. Many of the benches have carved graffiti on them, which primarily takes the form of dates and initials, some dating back to the late-eighteenth century. A large, wood paneled retractable partition divides the meeting house into two rooms. The bottom portion runs the depth of the building, from the (near) center of the south front to the north rear wall, and rises up to the level of the gallery floor. It consists of seven sections of three panels each. The bottom section is fixed, while the top two retract upward. A separate section of paneled partition divides the gallery, and pivots on center to open. The partition panels show a more decorative face on the west side where they are raised (they are flush to the east side). The partition is made of unfinished white cedar.

There are two identical stairways that provide access from the meeting rooms to the gallery. They are located in the southeast and southwest corners of the meeting house. Both consist of two runs joined by winders. The first run is an open string with a balustrade that consists of a wide, carved handrail, a plain squared newel post, and rounded balusters set on square plinths. A gallery with fixed, tiered benches runs the length of the south front and east and west sides of the meeting house. The gallery narrows to a passageway along the north rear wall. The gallery provided space for young people, as well as overflow space for the convening of monthly meetings.

Other features of the meeting house structure include the following:

A single-story stone privy structure was added near the northeast corner of the meeting house and connected to the main block by a porch (the date of construction is unknown). It is a single-story, one-bay-by-one-bay, 13' square stone structure. It has a gable-front roof that rises to a height of 13'-11" and is covered with slate. The doorway is to the center of the south front elevation. Louvered ventilators are located on the east, west, and north sides. The privy is compatible with the meeting house in both style and craftsmanship. Originally a "four-holer" with a sand pit, it was updated with modern plumbing ca. 1935 to provide separate men's and women's restrooms. At the same time, the in-ground cistern (located to the rear of the meeting house) that supplied the site with water was replaced by a well and pump (placed near the school building). Electricity was introduced into the meeting house sometime during the early twentieth century, replacing the kerosene lamps that afforded lighting in the earlier days. Hot water base-board heating was installed around the walls and under the benches ca. 1960; the furnace is located in the small stone structure to the southwest of the meeting house. Prior to the installation of the furnace, two wood-burning stoves provided heat.

Also on the property are the following:

Contributing to the meeting house property are a number of outbuildings and other structures. The site included three mounting or upping blocks, to facilitate the mounting and dismounting of horses. The first, and probably the oldest, sits to the southwest of the meeting house, near what now serves as a utility shed. Another mounting block is found to the west of the meeting house, along the abandoned roadbed that probably served as a drive from the former path of York Road to the meeting house. (Originally running to the rear of the meeting house, it was diverted to the front ca.1800). The placement of this mounting block may also indicate the site of an earlier meeting house. The third mounting block is located to the northeast corner of the current

meeting house, set against the south facade of the privy, at the far east (or women's meeting) side of the structure.

Perhaps most significant to the historical context of the meeting house is what is almost certainly the remnant of the former Women's Meeting addition to the ca. 1720 wood frame meeting house (the second meeting house on the site). Located a short distance from the southwest corner of the current meeting house, it is a single-story, one-bay, 22' square stone structure. There are doorways in the east and west gable ends and small, four-light casement windows in the north and south walls. All other bays have been filled in and extensive reworking of the stonework is apparent. The building is now being used as a utility shed to house the heating system for the meeting house.

There are two historic carriage sheds located to the north and northeast of the meeting house, respectively. The shed located directly to the north was converted into a caretaker's house. The second is used as a garage and maintenance shed.

The burying ground located to the north rear of the current meeting house was used prior to the erection of the first meeting house in 1705-08. Friends traditionally did not mark graves much before the nineteenth century. Therefore there are many more internments than appearances suggest. A 1706 entry in Buckingham Meeting's "Yearly Meeting Discipline & Advices," stated, "This meeting do give as their sense of Judgement that it is altogether wrong and of evil tendency for to have any grave stones or any other sort of monument over or about the graves in any of the Friends burying grounds."[1] The boundaries of the burial ground are indicated less by grave markers then by the stone walls that surround them. Funds for the construction of a burying ground wall were raised through subscription in 1752, at which time walls were erected along three sides. During the Revolutionary War the meeting house was used as a hospital and the dead were interred in the burying ground. In 1856, many of these bodies were unearthed by the turnpike company grading Buckingham Hill and were reinterred further up the hill.

Other burials from outside the Quaker community include those of African Americans, which were interred in an area set aside in 1808 for that purpose. While the records clearly indicate that African Americans were permitted burial at Buckingham Meeting House during the early nineteenth century, little is known about the circumstances of that practice, or the exact location within the burying ground. However, the following can be deduced from Buckingham Meeting records and from practices common among Friends regarding this issue.

In 1805, additional ground was purchased for the purpose of burials at Buckingham Meeting House, the old grave yard proving to be inadequate for present and future need. According to the minutes from the period, the additional ground extended from "the present" northeast wall. The new ground allowed for the burial of non-members, providing that they or their heirs had been willing to conform to the custom of Friends. Friends were buried in succession, with no family plots or distinctive markers. As the committee for the burying ground extension project then

---

[1]Buckingham Monthly Meeting, Yearly Meeting Discipline & Advices, 1719-1780, Misc. Papers (1 volume, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania).

stated,

> It is our judgment that Friends would do well by advice and example to remove all distinction among themselves in their interments, so that a general arrangement of graves in a regular succession of funerals might supersede the custom of striving to extend to the remains of the deceased distinction kept up or looked for among the living.

The burial of non-Friends was restricted to a designated area and was extend to African Americans. As the committee on the grave yard reported in 1807:

> We have laid out a small portion of ground within the large grave yard to bury black people in, beginning at a stone standing at the north corner of the old enclosure, thence north 50 [degrees], 2 perches to a stone, thence north 40 [degrees] west to a stone standing at the back wall of the yard, and to be comprehended by these two lines, the back wall, and the foundation of the old wall.

This information suggests that the time period during which African Americans were buried here had more to do with the acquisition of additional space than with historical events. Although Friends are known to have been sympathetic to escaping slaves and were active participants in the Underground Railroad, there is no evidence to link the Buckingham Friends with specific events. Like all Friends, they dissuaded members from slave holding and threatened them with "disownment" or expulsion from the society if noncompliant. In fact, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting had maintained a "testimony" or regulation that prohibited Friends from any involvement in the slave trade since 1743.

The burial of non-Friends in Friends burying grounds was not uncommon. Records often indicate the burying of "strangers," like the indigent or African American who were not permitted burial elsewhere. Prior to the rise of the rural cemetery movement in the mid-nineteenth century, burials were restricted to church yards where deceased congregantes were interred. This system made it difficult for those not associated with an established church to locate suitable public burial. Of course, such unfortunate individuals were likely the poor and indigent or those otherwise ostracized from society.

The Friends likely felt empathy for such persons. Prior to immigrating to the Pennsylvania colony Friends were persecuted for their religious beliefs. Their property was subject to seizure and they themselves to a lengthy jail sentence for practicing their faith. For this reason, Friends rarely even built meeting houses prior to the 1689 Act of Toleration, preferring to meet in houses, barns, or even in the out-of-doors. They were regularly denied burial in the largely Anglican churches of their homeland. The first order of business once Friends arrived in the colonies was the establishment of a burying ground. While they could hold meetings for worship in the homes of members, as was generally the custom, they would need a place for the interment of their dead. In fact, Buckingham Meeting's records note the establishment of the original section of the burying ground in 1705, prior to the construction of the first meeting house by 1708.

With regard to the burial of African Americans at Buckingham, the exact location is not known, although the above metes and bounds provide clues. Adding to the difficulty in identifying the section of ground relegated to these individuals was the fact that it was not customary for Friends to mark graves, certainly not in a conspicuous manner. As the Buckingham Friends were

reminded in 1815, by a report of the committee on burials:

> All fixtures to grave with inscriptors thereon in order to distinguish one grave from another is contrary to the direction of the [Society of Friends book of] discipline; and as a great variety of such have been placed in the grave yard at Buckingham . . . we believe it would be proper for the Monthly Meeting to attend to the removal of them.

The African American burials here were made unnecessary within a few years, however, following the construction of an AME church in nearby Holicong.

Note: Adjacent to the meeting house site to the east, but not included within the boundary of the Landmark nomination, is the Buckingham Friends School complex. The two-story, gable-roofed school building was constructed by Mathias Hutchinson in 1794. Now much altered, the school provided for the "guarded" education of Quaker children, helping to insure adherence to Quaker values through select instruction in an atmosphere shielded from mainstream society. The school has been enlarged and/or altered several times in the twentieth century. In 1935, Arthur Bye designed an addition of three rooms to the northeast corner. In 1946, the library was added to the rear at the basement level. In 1960, an overall remodeling included the present offices, restrooms and a fire stair. A fourth phase of alterations and additions is currently underway. Other modern, non-contributing buildings associated with the school include: the gymnasium (1953), Lower School building, for grades K through 2 (1956, 1958); and the Fine Arts Building (1980).

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:
Nationally: X Statewide:_ Locally:_

Applicable National Register Criteria:	A_ B_ C X D_
Criteria Considerations (Exceptions):	A X B_ C_ D_ E_ F_ G_
NHL Criteria:	4
NHL Exception:	1
NHL Theme(s):	I. Peopling Places 5. ethnic homelands II. Creating Social Institutions and Movements 3. religious institutions III.Expressing Cultural Values 5. architecture, landscape architecture, and urban design
Areas of Significance:	Architecture Ethnic Heritage-European Religion
Period(s) of Significance:	1768
Significant Dates:	1768
Significant Person(s):	
Cultural Affiliation:	
Architect/Builder:	Hutchinson, Mathias
Historic Contexts:	XVI. Architecture X. Vernacular

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

English architect David M. Butler is a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London and has written extensively on the history and design of the Friends' meeting houses of Great Britain.[2] After a visit to the United States during which he examined meeting houses throughout the mid-Atlantic, Butler felt compelled to state: "To those accustomed to the variety of forms taken by Quaker meeting houses in England, the great majority of American meeting houses seem on first acquaintance very uniform. . . . Clearly the typical American meeting house design was established early on, was found by experience to be satisfactory, and did not need to be changed for many years."[3] Butler's 1990 article for *Quaker History* compares the meeting houses of the two countries. What he describes as the "typical American meeting house" is a six-bay-wide structure with dual entryways. It contains same-sized apartments for men's and women's business meetings, which Butler asserts was a manifestation of the American Friends "even-handed equality" with regard to the treatment of men and women. As Butler points out, "there was nothing to distinguish the men's side of the meeting house from the women's," and he concludes that "there is no doubt that this is the principal American contribution to the design of meeting houses."[4] While the typical meeting house form was actually about 100 years in the making, Butler is correct in his estimation of the preponderance of American meeting houses built in this style. Characterized as the "doubled" form, it first appeared in the mid-eighteenth century and remained in popular use through the mid-nineteenth.[5] The proliferation of the doubled type began with the construction of the Buckingham Friends Meeting House in Lahaska, Pennsylvania, in 1768.

Buckingham Friends Meeting House is nationally significant for its role in providing a model for the development of the American Friends' meeting house. Built in 1768, Buckingham was the first meeting house to be erected in the symmetrically balanced two-celled or "doubled" form that was used as a design prototype for nearly a century. Buckingham's doubled plan was based upon the duplication of the single-cell, three-bay, central-entry unit that was at the core of early Quaker meeting house design. The doubled form allowed for two identical apartments separated by a retractable wood partition. Prior to the development of the doubled type, a fixed format had not been established and so meeting houses varied more widely in both layout and exterior design. The first generations of Quaker immigrants adhered to a pattern of meeting established by the English Friends whereby men and women met together for worship in a single room and then separated for gender specific business meetings, with the women retiring to a separate space. This arrangement required an apartment or room large enough for joint meetings and a second room that needed only to accommodate the adult female population. Most early meeting houses therefore contained unequally sized, sometimes even non-contiguous, apartments for women's business meetings--a plan that was adaptable to the English program.

---

[2] See David M. Butler, *The Quaker Meeting Houses of Britain; an account of the some 1,300 meeting houses and 900 burial grounds in England, Wales and Scotland*, text & drawings by David M. Butler, 2 vol. (London: Friends Historical Society, 1999); David Butler, *Quaker Meeting Houses of the Lake Counties* (London: Friends Historical Society, 1978); David Butler, "The Making of Meeting Houses," *Friends Quarterly* (July 1980).

[3] David M. Butler, "Quaker Meeting House in America and England: Impressions and Comparisons," *Quaker History*, Vol 79, No. 2 (Fall 1990): 93.

[4] Ibid., 103.

[5] Damon Tvaryanas, "The New Jersey Quaker Meeting House: A Typology and Inventory," (M.A. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1993), 73-74. Tvaryanas coined the phrase "doubled" in reference to this building type.

Despite the fact that trans-Atlantic contact between the London and Philadelphia yearly meetings was maintained, the American Friends initiated an alternative pattern of meeting.[6] By the late eighteenth century, men and women began to meet on either side of a partition for worship *and* business, merely lowering the partition for the latter meetings. Buckingham was the first Friends' meeting house to manifest in both its plan and its balanced exterior fenestration this significant programmatic change, one that became a convention of American Quaker practice for well over a century.

The greater standardization of Friends' meeting houses that occurred with the formation of the Buckingham model was the inevitable result of over a century of experimentation in building design. Religious persecution, and the lack of regard for the "steeple houses" of other religious denominations, had prevented the early English members of the Society of Friends from creating a building type specifically for use as a meeting house prior to the 1689 Act of Toleration. Their early meetings instead were held in members' houses, in barns, or in other buildings adapted for meeting. Unlike their contemporaries on the other side of the Atlantic, however, the Friends who began immigrating to the Delaware Valley in the 1670s were free to create meeting houses without fear of reprisal. They could do so because the founder of the Pennsylvania colony, William Penn, was a convinced Quaker whose fervor for religious toleration spawned a lively period of experimentation in religious practice and building design. The Friends explored various alternatives in an effort to find a building form that best facilitated their silent meetings for worship and their separate men's and women's business meetings. By the mid-eighteenth century, other factors were to influence American Friends' meeting house design as well. The development of the Buckingham prototype coincided with a movement within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting that sought spiritual reform and saw the rise of Quietism, a period in which the Friends turned inward, further rejecting the mores of the larger populace. Reacting to the mounting tension between adherence to Quaker tenets and the lure of "worldly" influences, a call went out for strict obedience to Quaker Discipline, or the rules governing conduct. Rigid enforcement of the Discipline was exercised in an attempt to promote uniformity in Quaker thought and practice. The codification of rules and procedures eventually exhibited itself in the design of meeting houses with the emergence of the doubled form first presented in Buckingham Meeting House.

Buckingham Meeting House is also significant as the focal point for some of the Pennsylvania colony's earliest settlements. Members of the Society of Friends were among the initial immigrants to the colony upon its establishment in 1682, spurred by the promise of religious toleration that was at the heart of William Penn's "Holy Experiment." Religious toleration would remain a key theme of Pennsylvania's early history and development. The Bucks Quarter (1684), where Buckingham was located, was one of the three original "Quarters" established by Penn. The early Friends lived in what is now the southern portion of Bucks County closest to Philadelphia. They founded the towns of Bristol, Pennsbury, and Falls (or Fallsington), established

---

[6]The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was the highest rung in the ladder of Friends' meetings in the Delaware Valley. In general, the Society of Friends is organized in an administrative hierarchy descending from the yearly, down through the quarterly, and monthly, to the individual preparative meetings. A Yearly Meeting consists of a group of quarterly and monthly meetings that meets for several days annually to basically review the state of the Society, determine issues of policy and/or discipline, and to develop communiques with other yearly meetings. The meeting receives reports and/or responds to issues from constituent meetings. Held four times a year, quarterly meetings are comprised of representatives from all the monthly meetings within a particular region. Quarterly meetings serve as an intermediary between the yearly and monthly meetings, and as an appellate body for disciplinary matters. The authority to establish or discontinue monthly or preparative meetings is held by the Quarterly Meeting. The Monthly Meeting is the basic unity of Quaker administration, attending to issues of business and discipline. Meeting once a month, it maintains discipline, manages property, authorizes marriages, and sees to social needs. Preparative Meetings are the individual worshiping groups whose responsibilities are limited to responding to the queries--questions concerning adherence to discipline--and property management (in modern practice, preparative meeting status has been largely eliminated).

meetings for worship, and built meeting houses. In 1701, a number of Friends from the Falls Meeting migrated northward, settling the areas of Buckingham (currently Lahaska) and Wrightstown. An indulged meeting for worship was established at Buckingham in 1701 and a preparative meeting in 1705. Following Quaker tradition, they initially met for worship in members' houses until a meeting house could be completed. The current 1768 meeting house is the fourth on this site. It is the culmination of the Buckingham Quakers' experimentation with various meeting house forms that, coincidentally, constitutes a microcosm of the larger evolution of Friends' meeting house design in America. For nearly three hundred years this site has served as the center for the religious, social, and educational activities of Buckingham Friends, whose innovative building design has come to define the popular perception of the American Friends' meeting house.

History of the Buckingham Meeting & Their Early Meeting Houses

For nearly three hundred years, this site has served as the focal point for the religious, social and educational activities of Buckingham Friends. The current 1768 meeting house is the fourth on this site. The first meeting house was erected between 1705 and 1708 by English Quakers who were some of the earliest settlers to the southern portion of Bucks County. Buck Quarter was established by William Penn in 1684 and was among the initial regions of Pennsylvania to be settled.[7] Friends founded the towns of Bristol, Pennsbury, and Falls (or Fallsington), and established meetings for worship. The first meeting house in this region was erected at Falls on a lot given by William Penn in 1692. Around the tum of the century, a number of Friends from the Falls Meeting migrated northward, settling the areas of Buckingham (currently Lahaska) and Wrightstown. Although an "indulged" meeting for worship was established in 1701 and a preparative meeting in 1705, for many years the Buckingham Friends continued to travel to Falls for monthly and quarterly meetings.[8] Following Quaker tradition, they found it more convenient to meet for Sunday worship in members' houses while they constructed their own meeting house.

In 1705, James Streator donated a ten-acre tract upon which to establish a meeting house and burial ground. In September of 1708, the Buckingham Friends were admonished by the quarterly meeting for not completing their meeting house. They were advised to "get done with speed."[9] As was common during the initial settlement period, they were distracted from completing their meeting house by the establishment of their own houses and farmsteads. (A commemorative plaque marks the location of this early structure, near the southwest corner of the cemetery located to the north rear of the current meeting house.) All that is known of the first meeting house is the following: "on a clear grassy spot on the west side of a path or road that went winding up the hill they built a Log meeting house near the lower side of ye present grave yard."[10] In all likelihood, this was a small, single-cell structure of sufficient size to accommodate the initial Quaker community.[11]

---

[7] Philadelphia Quarter was established in 1682 and Chester in 1683 (Chester was divided in 1758). Also formed early in New Jersey and under the care of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting were Shrewsbury (1672) and Burlington (1682) quarters.

[8] Pennsylvania Historical Survey, 112-13.

[9] William W. H. Davis, *History of Bucks County Pennsylvania from the Discovery of the Delaware to the Present Time*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (New York & Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1905), 254.

[10] John Watson, "Description of the Area and Account of Persons and Events," hand-written unpublished manuscript, Friends Historical Library, SC141 Watson MSS, 1812, 24.

[11] Almost without exception, extant structures and/or the records of previous structures indicate that the early Delaware Valley meeting houses were single-celled structures with one front entry, often with a second entry to the side (probably to provide

As the population increased, the Buckingham Friends' log meeting house was supplanted by a larger building of frame construction that was built a little further up the hill from the original site. In 1720, a women's meeting section was added. The minutes of the monthly meeting for March 7, 1720 record that it was "fully concluded to go forward with *enlarging the meeting house twenty foot square* and appoints John Scarbough, Enoch Pearson and Thomas Canby to agree with the workmen and it is concluded by this meeting to *build no higher than the old meeting house.*"[12] The construction date of the stone addition corresponds with that of the founding of the Women's Monthly Meeting.[13] Part of a larger pattern of meeting house development in the Delaware Valley, such additions represent an attempt by the Friends to create a building form that allowed for separate men's and women's business meetings. The women's meeting section was most likely smaller than the main structure, reflecting the English tradition whereby men and women met together in a single room for worship and the women removed themselves to their meeting room for business. As the minutes indicate, the addition was to be built "*no higher* than the old building" and therefore in keeping with its overall diminutive size.[14] This stone addition is likely the single-story 22'-square stone structure currently located to the southwest of the current meeting house. Its proximity to the old roadbed and mounting block provides supporting evidence, as does the chronology of its use over time.[15]

The newly enlarged meeting house soon proved inadequate, most likely due to an increase in population. Most of the original tracts were settled and improved before 1720. Within the next decade, the same was true of the neighboring area of Plumstead.[16] At the May 6, 1729 monthly meeting, the construction of a new meeting house was discussed. By 1731, a large stone meeting house with a single-story stone addition for the women was built during a single building campaign, located near the crest of the hill (the site is likely near that of the second mounting block, just west of the current meeting house).

Buckingham Friends continued to grow in faith and prosperity. In terms of their secular life, the local economy was based upon agricultural production and trade. Wheat was the most valuable commodity and thus became a medium of exchange. The land was extremely fertile and so the people were "blessed with a plentiful

---

separate entries for men and women).

[12] Buckingham Monthly Meeting, Minutes, 7th day of the 1st month 1720. The italics are mine.

[13] According to *The Two Hundredth Anniversary of Buckingham Monthly Meeting*: "The Women's Monthly Meeting was established three years after the men's, in 1723. From that time until 1891 they held separate meetings for business." See 22-23.

[14] An extant example is found at Radnor, Pennsylvania. The Radnor Meeting House (1718) is a single-cell three-bay by three-bay structure to which was added a lower, two-bay long addition for women's business meeting.

[15] In a brief history of the meeting written in 1922, this structure is described as "*the little stone horse stable*" located approximately seventy feet from the Meeting House door. Henry D. Paxson, "Buckingham in Revolutionary Time," reprinted from the *Bucks County Daily News*, Doylestown, PA., 26 June 1922, Friends Historical Library. Currently used as a utility shed, the only reference to its use historically was as a stable. This is noteworthy, as other sources have suggested that former meeting houses often were put to use as stable buildings. Historian Robert H. Wilson noted, "When new brick meeting houses were built, the old log or frame ones often became shelters for horses or carriages." Wilson includes a photographic example in Centreville, Delaware. Robert H. Wilson, *Philadelphia Quakers, 1681-1981* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1981), 103. It is also interesting to note that when the third meeting house burned in 1768, the Friends held the following meeting in "the stable at Buckingham." See Watson, 39.

[16] Watson, 39.

increase."[17] This prosperity was reflected in their higher standard of living. With the construction of the new stone meeting house in 1731, several stone dwelling houses were built in the Friends community as well. The newly erected frame houses were not like the crude earthen dwellings of the early settlement period. They were covered with staved clapboards and had plastered interiors, hand-sawn wood floors, and partitions walls."[18]

When the war between England and France came to America in the 1750s, the Buckingham Friends, ironically enough, enjoyed increasing prosperity due to the war efforts. The influx of foreign money to finance the war and purchase provisions improved trade, significantly increasing the price for wheat and other cash crops. Their wealth was compounded by the creation of new markets for their agricultural products. In the 1760s, locally produced Indian (corn) meal was exported from Philadelphia. Wheat was sent to France and corn to the West Indies at prices higher then previously obtained. New products, such as potatoes and livestock feed, were produced and exported. Lime-rich fertilizers, a byproduct of the limestone industry that began in Buckingham Township in the 1760s, further boosted agricultural productivity. Thus, the Buckingham Friends were not immune to the prosperity and "worldly" influence that had given rise to the spiritual reform movement of the mid century. Reflecting upon the history of a half-century before, Dr. Watson lamented the taste for material (particularly foreign) goods that had overtaken the Buckingham Quakers. New-found luxuries were replacing their traditional Quaker gray apparel, homespun cloth, and plain-style furnishings. Household and personal luxuries created marked distinctions between the rich and poor Friends. As Dr. Watson summarized, "The vigilance of domestick (sic) economy was abating."[19]

During this era of prosperity, the Buckingham Friends began planning for the current meeting house. While the discussions regarding the construction of a new meeting house began as early as March of 1761, the group could not reach the "consensus" that was essential to their process and the issue was tabled for another six years. In November 1767, the minutes indicate that they were ready to proceed with the construction of the new meeting house. Through subscription, 554 pounds were raised, and Joseph Watson, Thomas Bye, Isaac Pickering & Henry Paxson were appointed to direct the work.[20] The masonry and plasterwork, and undoubtedly at least a fair portion of the design, were the work of local master builder Mathias Hutchinson of nearby Solebury. Hutchinson, a member of Buckingham Meeting, was also responsible for the Buckingham School erected just east of the meeting house in 1794 as well as other buildings in the area. The carpentry for the meeting house was the work of Edward Good of Plumstead.[21]

By early December 1767, they were able to report that some progress had been made. In January 1769, it was reported that the new meeting house was expected to be ready to accommodate the next monthly meeting. The Friends must have been pleased with their notably handsome and innovative structure; however, as was

---

[17] Ibid., 40.

[18] Ibid., 39.

[19] Ibid., 44-46. It is important to note that Watson, writing in 1812, was a product of reform era Quakerism. The ideas expressed here reflect the popular sentiment of the times regarding the negative effects of prosperity and worldliness upon Quaker testimonies and practices.

[20] Buckingham Monthly Meeting, Minutes, 2nd day 11th month 1767.

[21] Davis, 255. Davis also mentions that he was the father of Nathan Good. The only other information on the Good family is mentioned in Matlack, Bk. I, p. 10, which states that Edward Good was the grandfather of Pearson Good who for so many years was the caretaker for the meeting house and graveyard.

indicative of the Friends' attitude towards the material world, no further mention of the new Buckingham Meeting House was made in their minutes. T. Chalkley Matlack's compendium of Delaware Valley Meeting Houses, noted that a "Visiting Friend" of the period referred to Buckingham as one of the "most substantial and imposing country meeting houses in seven of our states."[22]

Spiritual Reform and Quaker Discipline; Setting the Stage for Standardization

By the mid-eighteenth century, response to external pressures had a tremendous impact upon Quaker thought and practice. The outbreak of the Indian Wars in the 1750s provided the catalyst for growing opposition within the Pennsylvania citizenry toward the Friends. The members of the Society of Friends objected strongly to participation in the war cause, including taxation. Passivism was an underlying tenet of their religious doctrine, and thus adherence to the "peace testimony" was responsible for placing under attack the value system upon which the Society of Friends was based. As their ideology came into conflict with the realities of pre-Revolutionary War America the Friends turned further inward, relinquishing their hold upon the State Assembly and other governmental positions. At the same time there arose within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting a significant movement for spiritual reform. An influential segment of the Quaker population of the Delaware Valley believed that the fervor of the early converts had been lost and a complacency had fallen over the later generations of birthright members.[23] By their estimation, a rise in affluence and involvement in worldly affairs had resulted in a weakening of the Discipline.

In 1755, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting responded by appointing a committee to revise the Discipline and by making provisions for its enforcement. The revisions reflected the reformers' desire to uphold the testimonies outlined in the Discipline as a mechanism for reversing the spiritual decline that was overtaking the Society. As it was then stated, "Elders, overseers, and all others active in the discipline (are) to be *zealously concerned for the cause of Truth* and honestly to labour to repair the breaches too obvious in many places that there may be some well grounded hopes of the *primitive beauty and purity of the Church may be restored"* (italics mine).[24] The "Queries"--a list of questions intended to gauge member's adherence to the Discipline--were also revised. Initially intended for self-introspection, the Yearly Meeting now required regular readings *and* the submission of written responses from the individual meetings. In an effort to ensure that members were in compliance, a committee was established to inspect each monthly and quarterly meeting. Behavior was carefully monitored by the elders and overseers, including home visits. Failure to comply could result in "disownment," or expulsion from the society. The subsequent rise in admonishments and disownments during this period is striking. The prosecutions of erring Friends as seen in six of the largest of the monthly meetings increased by seventy-five percent between 1755 and 1756, and by 1760 the total number doubled. In some cases, it even

---

[22] Matlack, Book 1, 10. "Visiting Friends" is a reference to the Quaker equivalent of a minister, also referred to as "Public Friends" or "Traveling Friends." They were, in effect, the early ministers or apostles, traveling from meeting house to meeting house--and often from state to state. Visiting Friends served as the vehicle through which Quaker beliefs and practices were transmitted. They served as a unifying force within the Society of Friends. Thus, they may have helped to transmit appropriate designs for meeting houses.

[23] Birthright members were those whom became members not through conviction, necessarily, but because both their parents were Quaker.

[24] Society of Friends, Discipline, 1755; as cited in Jack D. Marietta, *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), 54.

tripled. By 1775, the Society had disowned twenty-two percent of its members.[25]

Instruction was also provided through the distribution of written "advices," which were further indication of the prevailing mood. Among the advices issued during this period was one advocating a retreat into Quietism. The term Quietism refers to a state of consciousness conducive to divine insight, as in "quietly waiting upon the lord." Quietists argued for the submission of self will before the will of God. As the Yearly Meeting of 1770 urged, "seek after *Quietude* and stillness of Mind, in order that under the direction of true Wisdom, we may be Enabled to administer advice to any of our Brethren, who may be inadvertently drawn aside to join with or countenance . . . the Commotions prevailing."[26] While Quietism was practiced by Friends of previous generations, it took on added meaning during this period. Generally speaking, as the Friends became more insular and more focused on upholding the Discipline, conformity was seen as central to the future survival of the Society. Adherence to the Discipline, like submission to the will of God, was a dominant theme of the period. One result of the disownment of dissenters was a more homogenous population of Friends in the Delaware Valley. By codifying the rules and procedures, the reformists helped to facilitate uniformity in meeting house design as well as in meeting practice.

An important element of the reform movement was a strengthening in the Discipline with regard to marriage. Among the offenses to the newly codified Discipline most frequently recorded in the minutes of the individual meetings was "marrying out of meeting." Viewed as a threat to the purity of the Society, and thus their value system, marriage to a non-Quaker was officially declared grounds for disownment in 1762. Because marriage issues fell under the purview of the women's business meeting, the enactment significantly elevated the importance of the role of women within the meeting. Although the Society's founder, George Fox, advocated separate business meetings, acceptance was much more widespread in America than it was within the London Yearly Meeting. Female Friends in America *and* England played an equal role in the meeting for worship and could serve as ministers and elders. However, issues such as policy making and finance were determined in the men's meeting for business, while the women's meeting was confined to more socially based issues such as marriage and aid to the needy. With the new enactment, enforcement of the rules governing marriage is viewed as crucial to the viability of the Society. Reflected in monthly meeting minutes is a substantial increase in the amount of time devoted to addressing violations to the 1762 enactment. Men took greater interest in the proceedings of women's business meetings as they initiated cases for review, and generally found more frequent occasion to address women's business meetings.[27] The elevated status of the women's business meeting is further demonstrated when, in 1760, the "Great Meeting House," generally used by the men during the yearly meetings, is turned over for use by the women's business meeting. Concomitant with the rise of the spiritual reform and Quietist movements, therefore, was a programmatic change centered around the treatment of the women's meeting for business. The newly defined status for women likely contributed to the development of the equal apartments for men's and women's business meetings that was a key component of the doubled form.

Buckingham Meeting House & the Evolution of the Prototypical Doubled Form

---

[25]Jack Marietta, "Ecclesiastical Discipline in the Society of Friends, 1682-1776" (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford Univ. 1968), 148.

[26] As cited in Richard Bauman, *For the Reputation of Truth; Politics, Religion, and Conflict Among the Pennsylvania Quakers, 1750-1800* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971), 135.

[27] Margaret Hope Bacon, "A Widening Path: Women in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Move Towards Equality, 1681-1929," *Friends in the Delaware Valley: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (*Haverford, PA: Friends Historical Association, 1981), 179.

Completed and ready for use in January of 1769, the construction of Buckingham Meeting House was based upon a two-cell, doubled arrangement. In addition to a plan that incorporated equal apartments, the architectural design of Buckingham Meeting House treated the men's and women's sections not as two disparate parts, but as identical parts of a whole structure. Before Buckingham, meeting houses had generally taken one of two basic forms. The first was a roughly square-shaped, single-celled, three-bay structure that was comprised of unequally sized meeting rooms placed back-to-back. The larger of the two apartments contained the facing benches from which the ministers, elders, and overseers presided over the meeting for worship. This was where the Friends met together for worship and also where the men's business meetings were held. Located to the rear was the smaller apartment required for women's business meetings. Although most meeting houses of this type are no longer extant, Chichester Meeting House (1769) in Pennsylvania still provides a prime example (see figure #1). The second and perhaps more prevalent form consisted of a single-cell, three-bay, central entry structure to which was appended a smaller (generally two-bay) women's meeting section to create a telescoping building form. The women's section was usually markedly different in appearance from the meeting house, and was often the result of a separate building campaign. In fact, it was at times treated as a separate structure, with no interior access to the larger part of the meeting house. This telescoping form is still prominent in New England, but exists in the Delaware Valley only in the Radnor Meeting House of 1718 (see figure #2).

By mid-century, the development of a few new meeting house forms indicated that a consolidation of concepts necessary to the establishment of both the exterior design and the interior arrangement of the doubled form was taking place. The women's meeting section of some meeting houses became better integrated into the overall design, maintaining the same roofline and general appearance, and is more often separated by a retractable partition rather than by a wall.[28] In a few examples, the separate men's and women's sections are finally merged to form a five-bay, dual-entry structure as seen at Maiden Creek (1759), Eavesham or Mt. Laurel (1760), and Hardwick (1763, no longer extant). Built as a single unit, they still maintain the unequally sized apartments conducive to English meeting patterns. Exeter Meeting House, erected in Exeter, Pennsylvania in 1758, was the only meeting house built as a two-cell form with equally sized apartments prior to Buckingham. The two parts, however, are treated differently. While both are three bays across with a central entryway, prominence is given to the men's entry, which is larger and is covered by a hood. The rear facade of the men's section also has a carriage door flanked by windows, while the rear of the women's section has only windows (see figure #3). The Buckingham prototype, then, combined the new meeting program with a construction based upon the duplication inside and out of the original single-cell unit.

Confirmation for Buckingham Meeting House's status as the point of origin for this significant design prototype is found largely through a careful examination of the physical evidence rather than in written records. Discussion of meeting house design and construction is conspicuously absent from meeting minutes. This reflected the Friends' distaste for material concerns and the still strongly held notion that the buildings in which they meet are subordinate to the members themselves. Furthermore, the yearly meetings allowed the individual meetings relative freedom to design and build a meeting house that was particular to their needs. The only written guidelines for meeting house design are English and do not appear until 1820, well after the acceptance of the Buckingham prototype. Instead, Friends adopted local vernacular building traditions and used indigenous materials when constructing meeting houses, which accounts for the existence of distinct regional variations in

[28] In one illustration of the move from separate structures to partition spaces, in 1784 the London Grove Friends discussed making an alteration "between the old and new apartments" that would allow their meeting house to more efficiently deal with meetings for worship and separate men's and women's business. They proposed that "the middle wall that divides the two houses be taken down & falling partitions substituted in its room." Western Quarterly Meeting, Minutes, 2mo. 16, 1784, 8mo. 20, 1784.

building design. Friends were also free to adopt programmatic changes that influenced design and/or layout. Because there were no written mandates, it is hard to pinpoint the exact time when changes are initiated, including the change from the English to an American program reflected in the Buckingham prototype. The lack of mandates is made evident by large discrepancies in the time it took for various programmatic changes to manifest themselves from one meeting house to the next. In fact, some meetings never bothered to alter their meeting houses to conform to new meeting patterns. Field survey and an examination of primary and secondary resources for both extant and non-extant Friends' meeting houses reveal Buckingham to be the first meeting house built on the doubled plan by a significant margin of time.[29] This notion is further supported by a few early cases in which direct reference is made to Buckingham Meeting House as a design source.

The Diffusion and Impact of the Doubled Form

The impact of Buckingham upon American Friends' meeting house design cannot be understated. As news of Buckingham's attributes spread, building committees sent delegations to study its design and emulate its form in their own meeting houses. Particularly within the Delaware Valley, the vast majority of meeting houses erected from the late eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century take on the six-bay wide, two-cell form of Buckingham Meeting House. Many of the meetings that do not build anew create near-identical additions that constitute a "doubling" of the original one-cell unit in the decades after Buckingham's construction in 1768. Still more meetings renovate or otherwise retrofit their existing meeting houses to accommodate the new meeting pattern that called for equally-sized men's and women's meeting apartments. This is generally accomplished by either erecting a partition in the principal meeting room to create two apartments and adapting the separate women's section for other purposes, or by moving an existing off-center partition to the middle of the meeting house, as was done at Radnor, Frankford, Birmingham, and Old Kennett in Pennsylvania. While the adoption of the Buckingham type is most concentrated in the Delaware Valley, its use was diffused throughout areas of Quaker settlement to the north, south, and west.

In 1800, there were six yearly meetings in America: New England (1661), Baltimore (1672), Philadelphia (1681), Virginia (1684), New York (1695), and North Carolina (1698). The doubled form made its way to all of them, although nowhere is it found prior to Buckingham's construction in 1768. The Buckingham type is most prevalent in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, and Virginia; and appears in only a handful of examples in New England. As Friends migrated westward during the nineteenth century, they brought with them the prototype which by then was firmly entrenched within the eastern meetings. Between 1813 and 1908, the Friends formed nine new yearly meetings: Ohio (1813), Indiana (1821), Western (1858), Iowa (1863), Kansas (1872), Wilmington (1892), Oregon (1892), California (1895), and Nebraska (1908). The Buckingham type appears in those yearly meetings established in the first part of the nineteenth century, including Ohio, Indiana, Western, and Iowa. While the type appears in greater numbers in some areas, there is a correlation between its use and the growth or vitality of the Quaker communities in those areas. In short, the Buckingham type is found in all areas where new meeting houses were being constructed during the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. Significantly, adoption of the doubled prototype is particularly prevalent in the design of meeting houses intended for use by yearly meetings, the main institutional

[29]An inventory of meeting houses historically associated with the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting conducted by Historic American Buildings Survey historians Catherine Lavoie and Aaron Wunsch between 1996 and 1999 examined over 150 structures in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. The survey was combined with research that also identified meeting houses no longer extant. Particularly useful for this purpose was the Pennsylvania Historical Survey, Division of Community Service Programs, Work Projects Administration. *Inventory of Church Archives, Society of Friends in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Friends Historical Association, 1941). No other meeting houses were erected in the "doubled" form prior to Buckingham.

body within each region.

The first meeting houses to emulate the Buckingham form were located within the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, in the Burlington and Salem Quarters of New Jersey.[30] These were among the earliest Quaker settlements in the Delaware Valley and some of their meetings were already replacing their older meeting houses. In 1772, a meeting house that was clearly modeled after Buckingham was erected in the city of Salem. As was indicative of Quaker practice with regard to material concems such as building construction, their minutes do not discuss the source for the new design. However, the Friends in Burlington Quarter were more forthcoming. In 1773, the new meeting house at Crosswicks (also know as Chesterfield) was also erected in the doubled form. According to the meeting minutes, a committee of Friends from the larger Burlington Quarterly Meeting tasked with developing a plan for the new Crosswicks Meeting House began by examining various houses in the region. They later reported, "We have also considered of the size of the house and plan, and are of opinion the Buckingham Meeting House is nearest to what we would recommend."[31] Both the Salem and Crosswicks meeting houses are of the fully articulated Buckingham form, including the treatment of the rear facade to include six-bays with carriage doors that mirror the front facade (an element generally not repeated in later examples). In 1783, the Friends of Burlington Quarter built another doubled type meeting house in Burlington, identifying Crosswicks Meeting House as their model and building to its exact size and specifications.

The doubled plan quickly spread throughout New Jersey. Although its concentration is greatest in the Burlington and Salem Quarters, it had made its way as far north as Shrewsbury Quarter, where it was used to create the Plainfield Meeting House in 1788 and the Shrewsbury Meeting House in 1817. With the exception of a cluster of smaller, single-cell meeting houses located in Burlington Quarter, nearly every meeting house built in New Jersey between the 1770s and the 1850s follows the Buckingham plan. Also in Burlington Quarter was the Mansfield Meeting House of 1811, and in Salem Quarter the meeting houses of Woodstown (1785), Upper Greenwich (1799), Mullica Hill (1808), and Greenwich Hicksite (1857). Within Haddonfield Quarter similar meeting houses were built in Moorestown (1802), Cropwell (1809), Easton (1811), Medford (for both the Orthodox, 1814, & Hicksite, 1842, structures), Salem Orthodox (1837), and Haddonfield (Hicksite & Orthodox, both in 1851).

The influence is perhaps most profound within Buckingham's own Bucks Quarter, where virtually every extant meeting house resembles Buckingham. Between 1789 and 1836, six of the nine other meetings in Bucks Quarter replaced their older structures with those of the Buckingham-type. These include the meeting houses of Wrightstown (1789), Falls (1789), Middletown (1793), Solebury (1806), Newtown (1817), and Doylestown (1836). Each meeting house is carefully modified in size or detail to suit the needs, tastes, or perhaps budget, of its members. But like Friends throughout the quarter, when members of Buckingham Meeting living in nearby Solebury decided to build their own meeting house in 1806, the building committee recommended "erecting a house . . . on the model of the one at Buckingham."[32] The meetings that did not build anew altered or enlarged their houses to conform to the new pattern.

---

[30] Tvaryanas, 73-74. Tvaryanas' thesis was extremely valuable in providing the context for New Jersey Friends' meeting houses. The field survey conducted by Catherine Lavoie and Aaron Wunsch as part of the larger project to record Friends' meeting houses of the Delaware Valley also verifies the proliferation of the "Buckingham type" or the double house in New Jersey.

[31] Burlington Quarterly Meeting, Minutes, 30th day 8th month 1773.

[32] Atkins Family Scrapbook, newspaper clippings (chronicles the history of the Buckingham Meeting in a series of articles), 1889-93, No. VI 1805-20, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

By the turn of the nineteenth century, other areas within the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting had followed suit. In Pennsylvania, four of the five meeting houses built in Abington Quarter from 1800 through the 1860s were of the doubled form, including Horsham (1803), Byberry (1808), Gwynedd (1823) and Richland (1862). In the western quarters (original Chester and later divided to include Western, Concord & Caln quarters) the doubled six-bay prototype appears mostly in a single-story form in such meeting houses as Caln (1782), Marlboro (1801), London Grove (1818), Chester (1829), Parkersville (1830), Lansdowne (1831), New West Grove (1831), London Britain (1834), and Springfield (1851). In Philadelphia, the meeting houses at Twelfth Street (1812) and at Fourth Street (1813) are among those built in the doubled form. Also part of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting are the Friends' meetings within the state of Delaware.[33] Thus the Buckingham prototype was easily disseminated throughout Delaware, where it was used to create the Centre (1796), Wilmington (1817), Mill Creek (1840), and Stanton (1873) meeting houses (the remaining three extant Delaware meeting houses are of the smaller, single-celled type).

The doubled prototype soon made its way out of the Delaware Valley, first appearing within the New York Yearly Meeting. The Queen Street Meeting House, erected in New York City in 1776, is the earliest example. In 1774, their meeting sent a delegation to make a study of the Buckingham Meeting House. According to their minutes, "The committee appointed to Superintend the building (of the proposed meeting house) are requested to procure a plan of Buckingham Meeting House . . . take a plan of it and inquire if there are any parts of it that can be made better."[34] It is worth noting that this group of urbane New York Friends would have found Buckingham Meeting House worthy of emulating at home. The Queen Street Meeting House is no longer extant, although as New York City's premiere meeting house of its day it would have been seen by a wide geographic audience. There are thirteen extant New York meeting houses that take the form of the doubled prototype.[35] Following Queen Street, the next six doubled-type meeting houses to be built in New York are clustered together within what was then the Purchase Quarterly Meeting, establishing a clear pattern of diffusion.[36] These include the meeting houses of Creek or Clinton Corners (1777), Crum Creek (1779), Nine Partners (1780), Cornwall (1790), Oswego (1790, no longer extant), and Quaker Street (1807). A seventh, the Chappaqua Meeting House, was "doubled" by an addition in 1780. The likelihood that Friends from Purchase Quarter would have been familiar with Queen Street Meeting House is increased by the fact that their minutes indicate that they were assessed to help pay for Queen Street's construction.[37] The New York Friends may even have been exposed to the prototype as it appeared in the Delaware Valley. Their minutes for this time period make repeated reference to interaction with the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, including the readings of the

---

[33] While most of the Delaware meetings were established and under the care of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, those that were not were later brought in. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting established the Southern Quarterly Meeting which lasted from 1759 until 1822 and included those meetings in Delaware and the eastern shore of Maryland that had previously been part of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting.

[34] New York Monthly Meeting, Minutes, 10th day 9mo. 1774.

[35] New York Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, *The Yearly Meeting, Regional and Local Meetings, Pictures of Meeting Houses, Places & Times of Worship, Travel Directions and Maps, Historical Sketches* (New York: New York Yearly Meeting, 1993). This publication includes redundant meeting houses and discussions of earlier structures.

[36] Purchase Quarter was, in fact, established by the Flushing Quarter of which Queen Street was a part.

[37] According to the minutes of Purchase Monthly Meeting for September 9, 1779, payment "is yet behind towards New York Meeting House, which is left for the quarter to pay." This could only refer to the Queen Street Meeting House since it was the only meeting house built within the city and surrounding areas from the early eighteenth through to the early nineteenth century.

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting abstracts, and other correspondence including periodic epistles and advices. Also appearing are requests by various members of the Purchase Monthly Meeting for the necessary certificates to travel to Philadelphia to attend the yearly meetings and visiting other meetings in the vicinity.[38] Within the first three decades of the nineteenth century, the double form is carried to other parts of New York state to appear in such examples as the Manhasset (1812) and Orchard Park (1812) meeting houses in Long Island Quarter and Amawalk Meeting House (1831), in West Chester County. Meeting houses built much after this period in New York, which were generally the result of schisms within the Society of Friends and tended to be built by Orthodox Friends, were of the gabled-fronted chapel style.

The Buckingham type also appeared within the Baltimore Yearly Meeting. The first example is the Patapsco Friends Meeting House on East Fayette Street in Baltimore. It was built in 1781 as the new home of Baltimore's earliest Friends meeting. In 1784, the Deer Creek Friends first and only meeting house was erected as a doubled-plan structure. Maryland Friends continued to build Buckingham-type meeting houses throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. Extant examples include West Nottingham (1811), Sandy Spring (1817), Gun Powder (1821), Ellicott City (1840), and Colora (1841). The Buckingham model also had an effect upon the design of Third Haven Meeting House in Easton (1682), America's oldest standing meeting house. In 1797, Third Haven's once T-shaped form was altered and the meeting house enlarged in the image of the doubled type to create a six-bay front with dual entries and a centrally located partition.

Closely associated with the Maryland meetings was the Virginia Yearly Meeting. Although numerous Friends' meetings were established in Virginia during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, many were discontinued by the close of the eighteenth century. The reduction in Friends' meetings in Virginia was due in large part to western migrations and the issue of slavery, which was contrary to Quaker tenets. In 1790, the Fairfax Quarterly Meeting in Virginia joined with the Baltimore Yearly Meeting. In 1843, the Virginia Yearly Meeting was formally "laid down" and the remaining meetings also joined with Baltimore.[39] (Pastoral meetings in southern Virginia would later join with the North Carolina Yearly Meeting). Thus, Virginia was not an area of dense meeting house construction during the heyday of the doubled prototype. Still, its form appears in a number of examples, including Goose Creek Meeting House (1817), in Lincoln; the Woodland Meeting House, in Alexandria (1851); and the Centre Meeting House (1872), in Winchester. In 1788, the Hopewell Meeting House of 1739 was "doubled" by an addition of identical size and proportion.

The North Carolina Yearly Meeting was established in 1698. The early meetings were rather small and isolated, and most of these meetings were likely held in members' houses. The records indicate that meeting houses were built in locations such as Symons Creek, Wells, and Old Neck during the first decade of the eighteenth century. However, it was not until mid-century that growth in the Piedmont area warranted the establishment of monthly meetings, with the largest number of Friends migrating from Pennsylvania in search of inexpensive land. The majority of meeting houses within the North Carolina Yearly Meeting today are of a rectangular gabled-front type resembling mainstream ecclesiastical architecture. However, a number of doubled type meeting houses were erected in this region including New Garden (1791), Marlboro (ca. 1817), Providence

---

[38]Ibid. This entry includes one such incident Benedict Carpenter "informs this meeting that he had a prospect of attending the yearly meeting in Philadelphia, and likewise visiting some meetings adjacent in Pennsylvania and the Jersies (sic.). David Suthill, Joseph Walters and James Mott also make application to do the same. Many other references appear in the extant minutes, which were examined for this purpose from 1776 through 1780.

[39]Willna Uebrickpacheli, Meetings in Baltimore and Virginia Yearly Meetings, unpublished manuscript (1898), Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

(1884), South Fork (1888), and Durham (date unknown). In addition, a widely-published 1869 illustration of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting house depicts a doubled-plan structure.[40]

The Buckingham prototype is found far less frequently in New England. Beginning in the 1650s, Quaker missionaries were attracted to Rhode Island by Roger William's policy towards freedom of religion, and the New England Yearly Meeting was established in Newport, in 1661. By 1710, there were a dozen preparative meetings organized into three Quarterly meetings in the Narragansett Basin. An inventory of the Rhode Island Friends' meetings recounts numerous descriptions of early meeting houses as plain wood structures, roughly square in shape, to which was often added a smaller women's meeting addition.[41] With the exception of the Yearly Meeting house in Newport as it was later manifest, there is very little evidence to suggest that the prototype made its way to New England in great numbers. The strong meeting house tradition among congregationalists in this region appears to have impacted the design of New England Friends' meeting houses. Beyond simplicity, a common denominator of Friends' meeting house design is the ability to blend with the local vernacular. Apparently for this reason, the Friends' meeting houses maintained a strong congregationalist flavor into the early nineteenth century. In order to conform to the new meeting pattern that began in the latter part of the eighteenth century, most New England meeting houses were altered rather than replaced. This was accomplished by placing a partition down the center of the main meeting room and using the adjoining women's meeting sections for other purposes. It was not until the mid-nineteenth century that the New England Yearly Meeting house in Newport adopted the doubled form and forsaked its hipped roof and lantern that had become a hallmark of congregationalist meeting houses.

The other factor that likely contributed to the lack of doubled-plan meeting houses within the New England Yearly Meeting was the relative decline in the Quaker populations of this region at a time when the doubled form was gaining popularity. The Conanicut Friends Meeting House (Conanicut Island, Jamestown, Rhode Island) built in 1786 is among the few new Friends' meeting houses erected during this time period. Although this four-bay meeting house displays a degree of symmetry indicative of the doubled plan, the interior arrangement of the two apartments is very different and reflects the English meeting pattern.[42] A recent inventory of both past and present New England Friends' meeting houses indicates that only those of Pomfer (1805) in Connecticut, Apponegansett (1790) and Bedford (1822) in Massachusetts, and Henniker (1790) in New Hampshire were built to reflect the doubled type on both the inside and outside.[43] A resurgence of meeting house construction in this area during the mid- to late-nineteenth century produced the church-like, gabled-front structures that abound within the New England region today.

The migration of Friends westward that began in 1799 included many of the meetings within the southernmost regions and occurred largely under the jurisdiction of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting. Friends first moved

---

[40]Seth B. Hinshaw and Mary Edith Hinshaw, eds., *Carolina Quakers, Tercentenary 1672-1972* (Greenboro, N.C: North Carolina Yearly Meeting, 1972). illustration of yearly meeting house, p. 39.

[41]Work Projects Administration, *Inventory of Church Archives of Rhode Island, Society of Friends* (Providence, R.I., 1939). Examples include the Portsmouth, Jamestown, East Greenwich, Saylesville, Cranston, South Kingston, and Smithfield meeting houses.

[42] Visit by author, May 2001. The benches are fixed and so the meeting pattern is clearly established.

[43] Weeks, Silas B., *New England Quaker Meeting Houses, Past and Present* (Richmond, Indiana: Friends United Press, 2001).

westward up the Potomac River and down the Monogahela River to Ohio, branching out into Indiana, Iowa, and Illinois. Friends under the care of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting also migrated from Pennsylvania, and thus there was much discussion and correspondence between the Philadelphia and Baltimore yearly meetings regarding the new settlements.[44] In fact, when first established, the Ohio Yearly Meeting was officially referred to as "the new yearly meeting for the State of Ohio, Indiana territory, and adjacent parts of Pennsylvania and Virginia."[45] Although the western Friends would later adopt patterns of mainstream ecclesiastical architecture (as well as aspects of mainstream religious practice such as pastoral ministry), they originally built in the doubled format. The first Friends' meeting established within the Ohio Yearly Meeting was the Miami Meeting in Waynesville. Their meeting house, erected in 1811, was of the doubled type. It was not long after that the yearly meeting house was erected in Mount Pleasant, Ohio. Completed in 1815, it too took the form of the doubled prototype, as did the Western Meeting House in Alliance. Likewise, after the 1817 establishment of the Indiana Yearly Meeting, a doubled-plan meeting house was erected in 1822-29 (replaced by a more church-like cross-gable plan structure in 1865). In 1848, a two-cell doubled meeting house was erected of logs in Wabash, Indiana, and later replaced by a doubled house of brick in 1866. Other doubled meeting houses within the Indiana and Ohio yearly meeting include those of Spiceland (1833), Back Creek (1841), Pipe Creek (1851), Cherry Grove (1851), West Elkton (1872), and Milton (date unknown). The first Friends' meeting to settle in what would become the Iowa Yearly Meeting erected a doubled meeting house in Salem in 1825 and later used a similar plan to build meeting houses at Marietta and West Liberty (dates unknown).

By the early nineteenth century the Buckingham form was clearly established as a prototype for Friends' meeting house design throughout the mid-Atlantic region and in the Midwest. While the two-cell plan remained a constant, variations in the exterior design of meeting houses began to occur, particularly in the fenestration. These variations are important because they mark the acceptance of the doubled prototype. Several doubled meeting houses built after 1790 have no second story windows over the first story doorways. More pronounced are changes to the rear facades. In the earliest examples, the rear facade appeared almost as a mirror image of the front. Later examples have only a few enlarged windows at a single height. Among the more notable variations is the single-story version. In 1827-28, a schism occurred within the Society of Friends that divided them into Hicksite and Orthodox factions. The schism resulted in a boom in construction over the next decade or so, as the minority group left to join other meetings or erect new houses. These new meeting houses were largely based upon the doubled form and include the Orthodox Friends' meeting houses at Middletown (1835), Birmingham (1845), and Goshen (1849) in Pennsylvania. In some examples, the doubled type was consolidated into a four-bay structure by eliminating the two central windows and pairing the doorways. Examples of this type are a number of meeting houses built by Orthodox Friends including Little Abington Meeting House (1836) in Pennsylvania and Chesterfield/Crosswicks (1854) and Trenton (1855) in New Jersey. The doubled form also had an impact upon numerous extant structures. Many single-celled meeting house received additions that constituted a doubling of the original form, such as Hancocks Bridge (1756/1784) and Rancocas (1772/1830) in New Jersey and Plymouth (1708/1780), Abington (1787/1797), and Middletown Preparative (1702/1797) in Pennsylvania. Still others were retrofitted or remodeled to accommodate the new pattern of meeting by creating equally-sized meeting rooms.

The prototype remained popular for nearly a century. It did not decline in use until the mid-1800s. By the late

---

[44] Ellen Starr Brinton, "The Yearly Meetinghouse of Mount Pleasant, Ohio," *Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association* Vol. 41, no. 2 (autumn 1952): 94.

[45] Ibid., 96.

nineteenth century, changes ensued in both Friends' beliefs and practices that were reflected in the architectural program of their meeting houses. The evangelical movement that occurred nationwide during the late nineteenth century influenced the design of some Friends' meeting houses, which adopted more church-like forms. Some even included ornamental elements of Victorian-era styles. At the same time, the more conservative (generally Hicksite) Friends looked back to early meeting house designs for inspiration, creating retrograde building forms. Many of these meeting houses appear to be the early, single-cell type, but have been exaggerated in size to accommodate two equally sized meeting rooms with each half of the doubled doorway entering into separate apartments. Some Friends' meetings outside the Delaware Valley actually took on pastoral ministers. During the early twentieth century, meetings everywhere began to de-emphasize the role of ministers and of separate mens and women's business meetings, transformations that eliminated the need for separate apartments, partitions, facing benches, and other elements that previously had defined the Friends' meeting house. Still, as late as the early twentieth century, the doubled form enjoyed a resurgence during the Colonial Revival period. Quaker architect Walter Price wrote about the "traditional style," which he adopted for the design of a number of meeting houses, including one at the Westtown School in Pennsylvania in 1923; the Washington, D.C. meeting house on Florida Avenue in 1931; and another in Montclair, New Jersey in 1932.[46] As late as 1963, a doubled meeting house was built in Westfield, New Jersey.[47]

Buckingham is among the most finely articulated rural meeting houses in the Delaware Valley. Although a vernacular structure, its design was clearly influenced by the Georgian style of architecture. The emphasis on symmetry and restrained detailing characteristic of Georgian architecture made it a style suited to the new doubled prototype. Its sophisticated application to this particular meeting house may be attributed to the Buckingham Friends' affluence and worldly outlook. In addition to its aesthetic merits, Buckingham's plan was the most conducive to the new American Friends' program. For these reasons, it became a model for Friends' meeting house design throughout the mid-Atlantic region.

[46] Walter F. Price, "Old Meeting Houses," *The Friend* (24 September 1936), 115-18. The revival of the traditional style is also discussed in an article by D. Elton Trueblood, "Quaker Architecture" *The Friend* (24 September 1936), 118-19.

[47] These later doubled meeting houses did not include the interior partition or separate apartments.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Primary and unpublished sources:

Note on sources: FHL refers to the Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

Atkins Family Scrapbook, "History of the Buckingham Meeting of Friends," no. II through XII, newspaper clippings (publisher unknown), 1889-1893 and n.d. (FHL, 166).

Buckingham Monthly Meeting, Minutes, 1720-63; 1763-92; 1792-1803 (FHL).

_____. Misc. Papers, 1719-1969, 2v. 15 items (FHL RG 2/Ph/B8 vol. 1-5).

_____. Yearly Meeting Discipline & Advices, 1719-1780, Misc. Papers (1 volume, FHL). Hand-written compilation of rules of Discipline and Advices sent to individual meetings by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting.

Buckingham Preparative, Misc. Financial Records, Treasurer's Book, 1876-1926 (FHL).

Bucks Quarterly Meeting, Minutes, 1684-1774, vol. 1. Minutes examined from 1705-23, 1729-32 and 1766-91 (FHL RG 2/Ph/B86).

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

Lavoie, Catherine C. and Aaron Wunsch. "Friends Meeting House Survey, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting." For the Historic American Buildings Survey, National Park Service, Washington, DC, 1996-1999.

Matlack, T. Chalkley. "Brief Historical Sketches conceming Friends' Meetings of the Past and Present with special reference to Philadelphia Yearly Meeting," Book 1, pgs. 7-13 (the original volumes are located at The Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library; copy available at FHL).

New York Monthly Meeting, Minutes, 10th day 9mo. 1774, (FHL, 3N8, No. 1061).

Purchase Monthly Meeting (New York Yearly Meeting), Minutes, 1776-1781, (FHL).

Tvaryanas, Damon. "The New Jersey Quaker Meeting House: A Typology and Inventory," M.A. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1993.

Uebrickpacheli, Willna. Meetings in Baltimore and Virginia Yearly Meetings. Unpublished manuscript, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA. (1989).

Watson, John. "Description of the Area and Account of Persons and Events," handwritten manuscript (1812), FHL, SC141 Watson MSS.

2. Secondary and published sources:

Armor, Mrs. Maxwell G., Jr. & Catherine F. Black, "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Old Town Friends' Meeting House (Aisquith Street)," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 12 July 1972.

Bacon, Margaret Hope. "A Widening Path: Women in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Move Towards Equality, 1681-1929," *Friends in the Delaware Valley: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1681-1981.* Haverford, PA: Friends Historical Association, 1981.

Barry, Peter. "Buckingham Meeting House and the School House," undated printed pamphlet (Buckingham Friends Meeting).

Battle, J. H., ed. *History of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.* (Reprint) Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company, Publishers, 1985.

Bauman, Richard. *For the Reputation of Truth; Politics, Religion, and Conflict among the Pennsylvania Quakers, 1750-1800.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971.

Bene, B. Christopher and Richard B. Harrington. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Friends Meeting House (Conanicut)," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 31 December 1971.

Brinton, Ellen Starr. "The Yearly Meetinghouse of Mount Pleasant, Ohio," *Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association*, Vol. 41, no. 2 (autumn 1952).

Brinton, Howard H. *Friends For 300 Years.* Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Publications, 1952.

Bronner, Edwin B. "Quaker Landmarks in Early Pennsylvania." *American Philosophical Society Proceedings*, vol. 43, pt. 1 (1953).

Buckingham Monthly Meeting, *The Two Hundredth Anniversary of Buckingham Monthly Meeting, Buckingham Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.* Philadelphia: Walter H. Jenkins, 5th day 8th month 1923.

Butler, David M. *Quaker Meeting Houses of the Lake Counties.* London: Friends Historical Society, 1978.

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

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

_____. *The Quaker Meeting Houses of Britain; an account of the some 1,300 meeting houses and 900 burial grounds in England, Wales and Scotland*, text and drawings by David M. Butler, 2 vol. London: Friends Historical Society, 1999.

Davis, William, W. H. *History of Bucks County Pennsylvania from the Discovery of the Delaware to the Present Time*, 2nd ed., vol. 1, 1905.

Hayes, John Russell. *Old Quaker Meeting Houses*. Philadelphia: The Biddle Press, 1911.

Heintzelman, Patricia. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Old Quaker (Flushing) Meeting House," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 11 October 1975.

Hinshaw, Gregory, *Indiana Friends Heritage, 1821-1996; The 175th Anniversary History of the Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends (Quakers).*

Hinshaw, Seth B. & Mary Edith. *Carolina Quakers; Our Heritage, Our Hope; Tercentenary 1672-1972.*

Historical Records Survey, Division of Community Service Programs, Work Projects Administration. *Inventory of Church Archives of Rhode Island, Society of Friends.* Providence, R.I., 1939.

James, Pamela and Susan M. Deeney. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Deer Creek Friends Meeting House," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared September 1978.

Kennedy, Pamela A. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Smithfield Lower (Saylesville) Friends Meeting," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 16 September 1978.

_____. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Little Falls Meeting House," prepared September 1978.

Lidbetter, Hubert. *The Friends Meeting House.* York: William Sessions Limited- The Ebor Press, 1961.

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

Lutz, George W., III. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, West Nottingham Meeting House (Little Brick)," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 24 December 1975.

_____. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Colora Meeting House,"

National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 24 December 1975.

Lynch, Ancelin V. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Friends Meeting House at Portsmith," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared August 1978.

Marietta, Jack. *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

_____. "Ecclesiastical Discipline in the Society of Friends, 1682-1776," Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford Univ, 1968.

Marshall, Jeffrey. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Buckingham Friends Meeting," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared June 1996.

New York Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, *The Yearly Meeting, Regional and Local Meetings, Pictures of Meeting Houses, Places & Times of Worship, Travel Directions and Maps, Historical Sketches.* New York: New York Yearly Meeting, 1993.

Paxson, Henry D. "Buckingham in Revolutionary Time," Reprinted from the *Bucks County Daily News*, Doylestown, PA., Monday Evening, 26 June 1922. FHL.

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. "S.R. 0202, Section H15, Buckingham township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania; Historic Resources Survey, Determination of Eligibility, and Determination of Effect Report, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1994.

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

Price, Walter F. "Old Meeting Houses." *The Friend*, 24 September 1936.

"Quaker Meeting House Architecture." *Common Bond*, Vol 12, no. 2. New York Landmarks Conservancy, October, 1996.

Rose, Harold Wickliffe. *The Colonial Houses of Worship in America.* New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1963.

Russell, Elbert. *The History of Quakerism.* New York: The MacMillan Company, 1942.

Scharf, Thomas and Thompson Westcott. *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884.* Philadelphia: L.H. Everts & Company, 1884.

Smith, Raymond W. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Matinecock

Friends Meeting House," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared 2 June 1976.

Tolles, Frederick B. *Quakers and the Atlantic Culture*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960.

Trueblood, D. Elton. "Quaker Architecture." *The Friend*, 24 September 1936.

Watson, John E. *Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the Olden Time*, vol. II and III, 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Leary, Stuart Co., 1927.

Weaver, Lynn B. "National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, Oblong Friends Meeting House," National Register of Historic Places files, National Park Service, Washington, DC, prepared December 1972

Weeks, Silas B. *New England Quaker Meeting Houses, Past and Present.* Richmond, Indiana: Friends United Press, 2001.

Wilson, Robert H. *Philadelphia Quakers, 1681-1981.* Philadelphia: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1981.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

__ Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
_x_ Previously Listed in the National Register.
__ Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
__ Designated a National Historic Landmark.
_x_ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #PA-6224
__ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #

Primary Location of Additional Data:

__ State Historic Preservation Office
__ Other State Agency
__ Federal Agency
_x_ Local Government
_x_ University: Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA
__ Other (Specify Repository):

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 39 acres

UTM References:	Zone	Easting	Northing
A	18	496 200	4466 040
B	18	496 880	4466 040
C	18	496 880	4466 520
D	18	496 200	4466 520

Verbal Boundary Description

The Meeting House property encompasses approximately 37 acres and includes the metes and bounds as indicated below in the National Register nomination with the exception of approximately two acres to the east that are occupied by the Buckingham Friends School. The property is bounded to the south by the Old York Road, Rt. 202. To the east, the boundary is drawn from the driveway at Rt. 202 due north to the parking lot just east of the carriage shed. From there, the boundary proceeds northwest to the corner of the wall that surrounds the burying ground and follows that wall to the east, north, and to the west, returning southward past the utility shed to Rt. 202 (see enclosed map that shows the eastern boundary as amended to exclude the school property).

The boundaries as given in the National Register nomination are as follows: Beginning in a point on the northwesterly side of LR 263 at a point being approximately 200 feet northeasterly of the junction of LR 263 and US 202 at a corner in the line of Tax Map Parcel (TMP) 6-14-56; thence northwesterly along said parcel 6-14-56 approximately 250' to a corner; thence continuing by the same southwesterly approximately 390' to another corner; thence continuing by the same parcel westerly approximately 50' to a corner, thence by the same northwesterly approximately 150' to a corner, thence by same, southwesterly approximately 60' to a corner, thence by said parcel and parcel 6-15-55 northwesterly approximately 650' to a corner, thence by same and parcel 6-14-55 southwesterly approximately 640' to a corner, thence by same and parcel 6-14-62 west-southwesterly approximately 660' to a corner, thence by parcel 6-14-62 southeasterly approximately 170' to a corner, thence by same west-southwesterly approximately 250' to a corner, thence by said parcel 6-14-62 and 6-14-59 southwesterly approximately 770' to a corner on the northwest side of the combined US 202 and LR 263, thence along the northwesterly side of the road (and by LR 263 after the point of divergence) approximately 2200' to the place of beginning.

Boundary Justification

The boundary for this property encompasses the bulk of the current Buckingham Friends Meeting tract, excluding the property and buildings associated with the Buckingham Friends School, due to its non-contributing structures and dynamic use. The boundaries include the meeting house, remnants of a former meeting house and of the carriage sheds, and the walled burying ground to the north of the meeting house. These boundaries also take in the former road bed which lies between the meeting house and the burying ground, and the stone mounting blocks located in proximity to them. These resources are associated with the historic Buckingham Friends Meeting House and have retained their historic integrity.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Catherine C. Lavoie, Historian

Address: National Park Service
Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)
1849 C St., NW Room NC-300
Washington, DC 20240

Telephone: (202) 354-2185

Date: August 2001

Edited by: Patty Henry, Historian
National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Survey
1849 C St., N.W.
Room NC-400
Washington, DC 20240

Telephone: (202) 354-2216

Carolyn Pitts, Architectural Historian
National Park Service
Philadelphia Regional Office
200 Chestnut Street, 3rd floor
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Telephone: (215) 597-8875

DESIGNATED A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK
July 31, 2003