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Settlement, Transportation Improvements, and Development of the Greensboro/New Geneva Area, c. 1760-1944

In order to explain later cultural and commercial developments in the area, it is necessary to summarize the early history of the area. In the early eighteenth century the upper Ohio territory, that land drained by the Upper Ohio River, was the largest unexplored region east of the Mississippi. It was shut off from the English by the mountains and from the French by the Iroquois control of Lake Erie. The Iroquois had stripped the area of other Native American inhabitants by their conquests. Nevertheless, France laid claim to the Mississippi and all its tributaries, and England held sea to sea charter by right of the Cabot explorations.

Some histories claim that settlement of the Delaware and Shawnee in the Allegheny Valley began in 1724. From that time until the French and Indian War, a rivalry continued between the English and French for the Indian trade. Early on, the bulk of the Indian trade was with Pennsylvanians. The location of paths and roads into southwestern Pennsylvania played a major role in the settlement patterns of the region, and the trade rivalry between the British and French and between American colonies affected where the paths originated and their stopping points along the way. As the traders had basically followed the paths and routes of the Indians, the earliest settlers followed the routes of the traders and subsequently settled on or near these routes.

George Croghan headed the Pennsylvania contingent of traders into the region in the 1740s. When the Virginians learned that there was a profit to be made, a group of them formed the Ohio Company in 1749 to secure a share in these profits. Of course both efforts raised the ire of the French who claimed the region west of the Alleghanies.

By the mid-eighteenth century both the English and French realized the strategic importance of the Forks of the Ohio, at what would later become Pittsburgh. In 1753 Marquis Duquesne began building a line of forts from Presque Isle on Lake Erie to the Forks to stop the movement of English into the Ohio region, and thus began the French occupation of western Pennsylvania. Open hostilities began in 1754 with the English defeat at Fort Necessity located in the southeastern section of present-day Fayette County. The French held undisputed possession of western Pennsylvania for three years following General Edward Braddock's defeat in 1755. (The battle area became known as Braddock's Field and was located about ten miles southwest of the Forks on the north side of the Monongahela River.) After their defeat, the British realized that in order to take control of southwestern Pennsylvania, they would need to build a line of forts connected with a good supply line or road. General John Forbes was commissioned to accomplish
this, and consequently cut a road from Carlisle through Bedford, Ligonier, and finally to Fort Duquesne which he took control of in 1758. Forbes' most difficult decision concerned the route he should take, and this was complicated by the rival interests of Pennsylvania and Virginia in the western country. Instead of the Braddock route which lead west from Fort Cumberland, Maryland, to near present-day Uniontown and then north to the Forks, he chose a northern route from Bedford through Loyalhanna to Fort Duquesne.(1)

Indian hostilities continued off and on in the ensuing years with Pontiac's War, Dunmore's War, and the Revolutionary War being particularly animated periods. The threat of Indians in western Pennsylvania ended with their defeat by the forces of General Anthony Wayne at the Battle of Fallen Timbers near present-day Toledo, Ohio in August 1794.

Due to the hardships of travel to the county seat at Carlisle, Bedford County, was created in 1771 out of the westernmost section of Cumberland County. It was the first county west of the Tuscarora Mountain. This land had become part of Pennsylvania with the signing of the 1754 Indian treaty at Albany. At that time it included the eastern part of what would become Somerset County and extended to the Allegheny Mountain, the western boundary set by that treaty. Intrusions by white settlers west of the Allegheny Mountains and speculator agitation spurred another meeting of British, American, and Iroquois representatives at Fort Stanwix (present-day Rome, New York) in 1768. The treaty that resulted added all the remaining territory to what would become southwestern Pennsylvania.

Far western settlers were still not satisfied that Bedford served them well, and the Pennsylvania Assembly created Westmoreland County in 1773. It included all the land west of Laurel Ridge and south of a line due west from the head of the West Branch of the Susquehanna "to the limits of the province." About this time Lord Dunmore became governor of Virginia. He saw the feasibility of establishing jurisdiction over the Upper Ohio not only for controlling the area itself but as a possible base for exploitation of the whole western country.

By 1776 the claims of different colonies had not been resolved, and Virginia set up its own political boundaries for the region that eventually would become southwestern Pennsylvania. The county of Yohogania had its eastern boundary at the Laurel Ridge, its northern boundaries were the Kiskiminetas, Allegheny, and Ohio rivers, and its southern boundary was nearly a direct line northwest from the point where the western boundary of Maryland met the Mason-Dixon line ending where Cross Creek enters the Ohio. (There is still a feeling among the people of the Mid-Mon Valley which includes parts of
Washington, Westmoreland, and Allegheny Counties, that this area should be a separate county. The Pennsylvania government is blamed for deliberately splitting the area into separate counties.) Monongalia County included territory south of this line and included the headwaters of the Monongahela and Cheat Rivers. And lastly, the territory tributary to the Ohio south of Cross Creek was denoted as Ohio County.

Some of the people living in these areas were not adherents of either Pennsylvania or Virginia. As early as 1776 there was a movement for a separate colony called Westsylvania. The petition for the new state lacked the focus required to attract influential political interests whose support was necessary to carry it through. The states without claims to land in the transmontane country urged that all such claims be surrendered to the nation. This along with the settlement of the boundary unsatisfactorily to the Virginia adherents in the disputed area, revived agitation for creating a new state. (Although Pennsylvania and Virginia agreed to use the Mason-Dixon line as their boundary in 1780, the actual line delineating the boundary was not marked until 1784-85.) Pennsylvania had no intention of surrendering any of her territory either to the federal government or a new state. In answer to this agitation, Pennsylvania passed an act in 1781 for the organization of the territory south of the Ohio and west of the Monongahela as Washington County. Talk of secession from Pennsylvania would be revived again during the Whiskey Rebellion in 1794.

Pennsylvania created Fayette County out of the southern portion of Westmoreland County in 1783. It had the Monongahela River for its western boundary, the Youghiogheny River and Laurel Ridge for its eastern boundary, the Mason-Dixon line for its southern boundary, and Jacob's Creek for its northern boundary.

Greene County, the last county to be created in southwestern Pennsylvania, was carved out of the southern portion of Washington County in 1796. Being in the extreme southwest corner of the state, it is bound today by West Virginia on the south and west and the Monongahela on the east. Its northern boundary is made up of the connection of two points: one, where the North Fork of Ten Mile Creek meets the Monongahela River, the other, where Enlows Fork of Wheeling Creek meets Pennsylvania's western boundary.

Between 1725 and 1775, Pennsylvania witnessed its greatest period of colonial-era immigration. The population of southeastern Pennsylvania rose by 68,000 between the years 1750 and 1760, the greatest amount per decade during the eighteenth century. These were largely Germans from the Palatinate and Scotch-Irish from Northern Ireland. This population surge was the driving force, prompting settlers to cross the Susquehanna for more land. During the
Revolutionary War, the population continued to grow in the west. Following the War there was a sharp increase which peaked c. 1790.

Pennsylvania's religious, political, and economic diversity continued to attract settlers in the late-eighteenth century. Nineteenth century historian Henry Adams called post-Revolutionary Pennsylvania, "the only true democratic community then existing in the eastern states." The Swiss native, Albert Gallatin, was equally impressed and stated, "from the suburbs of Philadelphia to the banks of the Ohio I do not know a single family that has extensive influence. An equal distribution of property has rendered every individual independent, and there is among us true and real equality."(2)

The lure of unoccupied land was the great magnet that drew thousands into southwestern Pennsylvania. The settlers that came into the Bedford area came by way of the Raystown path along the Juniata River or the pack trail (later Forbes Road) that came east through Carlisle and Shippensburg or from the south over the Indian path from Old Town, Maryland. Raystown (now Bedford) was first settled about 1751.

The religious sect known as the Brethren was among the original groups of settlers west of Allegheny Mountain in what became Somerset County. Brothersvalley, which takes its name from this group, was also the name of the first township between the Alleghenies and Laurel Hill. Another early settlement in southern Somerset County became known as Turkeyfoot, which takes its name from the peculiar configuration of the land formed by the confluence of three rivers. Consequently, and quite typically, the settlement of these areas first occurred along the rivers, creeks, and trails into the region.

Beyond the Alleghenies, the Monongahela River Valley was the focal point of settlement. The eastern half of Fayette and Westmoreland Counties contain the last ridges of the Appalachian Mountains before the topography breaks away to the rolling foothills which dominate the rest of southwestern Pennsylvania. Most settlers kept moving through the mountainous region, having set their goal as the fertile Monongahela or Ohio valleys. One stream of settlers came from eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey by way of the Forbes Road. They entered the region from the northeast and spread southwest over Westmoreland, northern Fayette, and eastern Allegheny counties. They were of great ethnic diversity and had strong loyalties to Pennsylvania. Another stream of settlers entered the area from the southeast via Braddock Road. These people came from Maryland and Virginia and
entered more directly into the Monongahela Valley. They gave to Washington, Greene, southern Allegheny and Fayette counties a more homogenous English population with stronger loyalties to Virginia.

Settlement naturally occurred along the rivers first. But in Westmoreland, the threat of Indian raids caused settlement to be heaviest along and to the south of Forbes Road. Historian R. Eugene Harper, in his study of southwestern Pennsylvania, found the course of settlement to be first centered along the rivers, then moving to the interiors, and lastly to the border regions of each county. This geographical pattern of settlement affected the pattern of land ownership. Harper found the river townships to have the lowest percentage of landownership and smallest acreages, the interior townships next, and the border townships with the greatest percentage of land ownership and the largest acreages. In other words, the greatest number of absentee landlords or greatest amount of tenancy occurred in the river townships, and the disenfranchised of these townships were important forces in the whiskey excise protest movement. Thus the way in which a township was settled and the duration of time in which it had undergone settlement were important factors in shaping the land patterns of western Pennsylvania. (3)

According to historian Thomas Purvis, the ethnic breakdown for the region comprising the counties of Allegheny, Washington, Fayette, Westmoreland, and Bedford in 1790 was as follows: English-34%, Welsh-3%, Scotch-12%, Irish-11%, Scotch-Irish-24%, and German-14%. (See Table 1 for the county breakdowns.) The English group was the largest in all of the counties. The Germans had the strongest showing in Bedford County. They also had strongholds in Fayette and Westmoreland counties. However, the Scotch-Irish had an even higher percentage in Westmoreland, southern Allegheny, and Washington counties. The 1989 Atlas of Pennsylvania shows that the highest proportion of Scotch-Irish in 1790 were in central Pennsylvania (Cumberland and Mifflin counties) and the above mentioned counties in southwestern Pennsylvania. (4)

Most of the settlers living in western Pennsylvania in the 1780s were living at a subsistence level. The amount of cleared acreage of farmers in Springhill Township in 1783 is undeniable proof that they were operating at subsistence levels. The median cleared acreage per farm was 20 acres. (Some studies suggest 40 acres were needed to support an average family.) By 1795 in Fayette County, cleared acreage had doubled, enabling median landowners to
As new regions came to be more thickly settled, the percentage of land ownership sharply dropped. By the 1790s there was a marked decline in the size of land holdings. For example, in Fayette County the newly emerged frontier society showed that the typical settler was already landless by 1796. (Many were tenant worker/artisans for industrial complexes such as those being created by Isaac Meason and Albert Gallatin.) Similarly, tax records show that the majority of persons in the river townships of Fayette and Washington counties were landless by the 1790s. As the frontier developed more wealth became concentrated in the hands of a few men. This peaked about 1795 in Springhill Township where nearly 60% of the wealth was controlled by the top 10% of men.

The 1790s also showed the spread of non-agrarian occupations, and the class structure of western Pennsylvania had begun to develop a small class of wealthy individuals. The wealthy were becoming entrenched, having a greater percentage of the wealth than they had in the 1780s. James Lemon found a similar trend in his studies of southeastern Pennsylvania. Tenants comprised 20-25% of the taxable population of western Pennsylvania. This was usually a short term arrangement and mutually beneficial for landlord and tenant. About 40% of the absentee landlords were from outside the western region.

There are only limited eighteenth-century tax records from Washington, Greene, and Fayette counties available. Abstracted information from the extant records showed that the average acreage owned by those involved in leadership positions, even in a local way, during the Whiskey Rebellion was 267 acres. Of this amount an average of 55 acres or 20.5% was cleared. This indicates that most of this group were above subsistence level farming. The men of this group owned an average of three horses and five cows. This compares to wealthy ironmaster Isaac Meason who owned 3200 acres and 17 horses. Solon and Elizabeth Buck mention similar statistics of cleared land and number of farm animals for the average late eighteenth century settler in their history of western Pennsylvania.

Historical geographer James Lemon noted that the most demanding periods for the typical late 18th century farmer were June and July when hay was cut and small grains harvested. The farmers then labored less intensively until the October harvest of Indian corn. Associated with the harvest and hard work was the whiskey distributed to the field hands to ease their pain and fatigue.
According to local histories, the Monongahela Valley was particularly suited to the growing of rye grain. Agricultural historian Stevenson Fletcher noted that rye yields were somewhat higher than those of wheat, especially in light or poor land or land under indifferent management. Fletcher also found that more rye was grown in the colonial period up to 1840 than barley or oats. This was particularly true during the period when the Hessian Fly was scourging wheat fields. (The Hessian Fly first appeared in Pennsylvania in 1786 and by 1797 had spread west of the Alleghenies.) English traveler, Henry Wansey, stated in 1794, that whiskey is the general beverage of the back settlers because every man with a small still and little rye can produce it in his own house. Fletcher attributes William Strickland to stating in 1801 that all the backcountry of America is very favorable to the growth of rye, and it is entirely consumed in the distillation of whiskey. (10)

Tench Coxe wrote in 1810 that the American manufacture of spirits was principally from rye, apples, and peaches. Very little whiskey or liquor was imported at that time, as most was produced in American distilleries. The large amount of rye produced for these distilleries helped keep the price of wheat high because it employed a proportional part of the cleared land and labor of the country. Earlier figures were not found, but Pennsylvania in 1840 ranked number one in the United States in the production of rye. (11)

Historian Leland Baldwin estimated that about 25% of United States stills in 1794 were located in the Monongahela country, but it may be more accurate to say 25% of the stills were in Pennsylvania. The earliest known, most complete record is from Tench Coxe's 1810 list of manufactures. This records 36 Pennsylvania counties with 3,594 distilleries. Of this number 799 were in southwestern Pennsylvania. (For unknown reasons Greene County was not listed with any distilleries.) This last number represents 22% of the total distilleries in Pennsylvania. Adam Seybert's 1818 Statistical Annals notes 14,191 stills in the United States in 1810. Accordingly, 25% of all United States stills were located in Pennsylvania. (Please note that these early reports are often unreliable, but they are used here to give an idea what may have existed at that time.) (12)

Although local southwestern Pennsylvania histories have stated that at the time of the Rebellion every fifth or sixth farm had a still, a look at the tax records indicates that this number was high. For example, using the tax records for Strabane Township, Washington County 1791-93, there was an average of 234 taxables in that township with an average of 15 stills. This would mean that approximately one in fifteen had stills or about 7% of the taxable population had stills. (These tax records included land holders as
well as tenants.) R. Eugene Harper's study of Fayette County tax records showed a similar statistic of one in 15-16 taxables having a still. Historian Dorothy Fennell determined that about 11% of the western taxable population had stills. (13)

Neville's 1796-97 list of stills and stillers for Washington County shows 413 stillers with 602 stills. (This list was comprised of Greene County townships as well.) Somerset Township had the largest number of distillers at 34, but Cumberland Township had the largest number of stills at 55. The percentage of distillers with only one still within a township ranged from 50% to 80%.

Across the Monongahela River, opposite Greene County, Springhill Township, Fayette County, had eighteen stills by 1786. A resident of Springhill, Albert Gallatin was a key figure in moderating the protest of the whiskey excise. He was assessed as a distiller himself in 1789. In 1799 Gallatin advised his business manager James Nicholson to establish a distillery in order to more cheaply supply the needed 2000 gallons of whiskey for the men at the gun and glass factories. Distilling continued to be an important industry in the area into the late nineteenth century. Springhill Township still retained nine distilleries in 1816. Wealthy farmer and prominent businessman, William Gray owned much land, a grist mill, and distillery in Monongahela Township from the 1850s. His son J.R. Gray took over the distilling business after his father's death in 1885. A late nineteenth-century stoneware jug stencilled with the words, "Old Monongahela Pure Rye Whiskey--W. Gray S.M. Gray" recalls the company trademark. (14)

Historians have long stated that the one of the burdens of the whiskey excise was the fact that whiskey had to be hauled over the Alleghenies at an added expense. There is no doubt that hauling would be an added expense, but there is little documentation as to how much of the whiskey manufactured in the Monongahela Valley was hauled over the mountains. On the other hand, documents found in the Thomas Hamilton Collection at the Westmoreland County Historical Society indicate that whiskey, maple sugar, and ginseng were being shipped down the Ohio river by 1793. Likewise, historian Harper had found that by the 1790s the yeoman class, about one third of the western population, had developed commercial agriculture based on a growing down-river trade. A stronger assertion for the Ohio River trade is made by Pennsylvania historian S.K. Stevens, who states that by 1794, one hundred thousand gallons of whiskey were being exported down the Ohio. In addition, by the early nineteenth century Monongahela flour was celebrated in foreign markets and generally sold for a dollar more per barrel in New Orleans. (15)
Whether farmers were converting their rye to whiskey or wheat to flour, by the 1790s agriculture in southwestern Pennsylvania had developed to the point of being able to support the industrial revolution that would take place there. Successful industries, such as iron and glass, would help transform the region. This agricultural and industrial success spurred transportation improvements which opened new markets for farm products. In the early nineteenth century Washington and Greene counties were able to specialize in livestock production and were particularly successful in the sheep industry. By 1920 Greene outstripped Washington County to become the largest wool producer in the state. (16)

In 1850 there were 116 farms in Nicholson Township, Fayette County, and 67 in Monongahela Township, Greene County. Although there was more improved farmland in Greene County in 1860 than in Fayette, Fayette County farms were more highly valued. From 1850 to 1900 the number of farms in Fayette and Greene counties rose, but the average farm size declined. Nicholson's population stayed about the same from 1850 to 1870. Monongahela's population slowly dropped between 1830 and 1850, but rose slightly between 1850 and 1860. Then the township's population grew by 16% between 1860 and 1870 but thereafter continued to dwindle through 1900. Although the 1890-91 Pennsylvania Gazetteer stated that Greensboro's population was 650 at that time, the 1890 and 1900 census records indicate much lower figures, 427 and 399 respectively. Nicholson's population grew by 11% between 1870 and 1880 and diminished until 1900. Between 1900 and 1910 Nicholson's population more than doubled. The above mentioned Gazetteer estimated New Geneva's 1890-91 population at about 400, but again this was probably high. (17)

Increasingly after 1900 farms were permanently destroyed as they were stripped for the coal that lay beneath them. As the Connellsville coal seam became depleted coal/ coke operations moved west into the Klondike region along the Monongahela River and into Greene County. There were new demands on the coke industry as the steel industry expanded in Pittsburgh. Therefore, the population of Nicholson Township more than doubled between 1900 and 1910 and rose another 25% between 1910 and 1920 as it went through this boom time in coal/ coke production. Greensboro's population did not rise significantly between 1900 and 1910 and only 15% between 1910 and 1920. However, Monongahela Township's population more than doubled between 1910 and 1920. By the mid-1920s and 1930s hard times had hit the coal/ coke industry, and unemployment correspondingly rose. Fayette County's population peaked in 1940 and Greene County's in 1950. (18)
Transportation

The first routes into southwestern Pennsylvania were by either of the major river systems: Susquehanna-Juniata east of the Alleghenies or Ohio-Allegheny-Monongahela west of the Alleghenies. The chief overland routes partially followed tributaries of these waterways or had major junctions along them. The biggest obstacle in the flow of water and travel by man was the mountains curving southwesterly across the state. The route chosen depended on the time allotted for travel and the load to be carried. Some routes were miles longer but did not have steep slopes to traverse. All of the routes had the Forks of the Ohio as their focal point.

The major Indian trails into the area that became Bedford County were the Raystown and Frankstown branches of the Allegheny Path. The Raystown Path was the southern branch and lead from Harris's Ferry to the Forks, passing through Raystown, present-day Bedford. The northern branch, the Frankstown Path, according to historian Paul A. W. Wallace, was by far the more important and most frequently traveled road across the Pennsylvania mountains. (By the late 18th century, the well-traveled paths had become roads, albeit often poor ones.) The Frankstown Path diverged from the Raystown Path in western Cumberland County, passed through the mountains along Aughwick Creek and the Frankstown Branch of the Juniata River to Frankstown in present-day Blair County. (19)

The earliest route from the south into the Monongahela region was named after the Indian, Nemacolin, who guided the Ohio Company's route from Wills Creek, present-day Cumberland, Maryland, in 1752. At Half King's Rock near Jumonville (on Chestnut Ridge) the road split, one section going to Redstone Old Fort (Brownsville), and the other to the Forks of the Ohio. General Braddock nearly followed the latter path in 1755, and after that time this section of the path became known as Braddock's Road.

In 1758 General John Forbes set out from Carlisle using the road Colonel James Burd had cut to Raystown in 1755 (using the Raystown Path) to remove the French from Fort Duquesne. Forbes wanted to insure his army had a continuous supply of provisions. To accomplish this, a line of forts with a good connecting road were needed. Of great importance to Pennsylvania was his decision to build his road west from Bedford using the general route of the Raystown Path which was shorter than by going by way of Fort Cumberland. There had been political pressure from Virginians to use the Braddock route. When Forbes successfully eliminated the French from the Forks, his completed road connected eastern Pennsylvania with western Pennsylvania. The military
roads created by Braddock and Forbes would become the major eighteenth century routes into the region. (20)

In 1759 Colonel Burd built a road from a point four miles west of Bedford (Bonnets Tavern) to Redstone (Brownsville). This route generally followed the Glades path through Somerset into Fayette County, but where Braddock's trail turned north on Chestnut Ridge toward Fort Pitt, Burd digressed and continued westward to Redstone. This was a favorite route for westward settlers during dry seasons. The Burd Road from Mt. Braddock (now the area of the Isaac Meason house) to Brownsville facilitated the transport of supplies from Virginia and Maryland to the Monongahela where they could be shipped to Fort Pitt. This was the shortest and easiest land route between the eastern and western water systems. (21)

State Representative Hugh H. Brackenridge of Pittsburgh proposed state aid for a road system from Philadelphia to western Pennsylvania which resulted in the 1792-93 "omnibus act for internal improvements." This act initiated construction of the Pennsylvania Road from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh. The route followed the Forbes Road to Ligonier, but from there took a slightly more southern route to Greensburg and onto Pittsburgh. The alternate route was the Upper Glade Road through Somerset and Mt. Pleasant to Greensburg. (22)

As already stated, the Forks of the Ohio was the destination of all paths and roads to the west. Travelers, traders, and settlers from Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania were funneled into southwestern Pennsylvania by the mountains and rivers of the area. The bulk of traffic from the Chesapeake regions to the upper Ohio went north to Chambersburg and then took the Pennsylvania Road west. These well-traveled routes provided trade and settlement opportunities as well.

George Washington, Tench Coxe, Thomas Jefferson, Albert Gallatin, and others early on saw the need for roads from the coastal areas to the interior. By 1790 Pennsylvania had begun a survey for a system of canals and roads to facilitate transportation across the state. Although Pennsylvania took the lead in transportation with the Philadelphia/Lancaster turnpike in 1794, other projects within the state languished. Coxe and others saw a great industrial potential for the interior regions of the country. Coxe stated in the 1790s, "The interior of Pennsylvania is peculiarly adapted and impelled to the manufactory of glass, earthen ware, stone ware, and iron ware." Although some of these industries saw their beginnings in the late eighteenth century in southwestern Pennsylvania, they would not be developed to their prime until the
mid-nineteenth century when river and rail systems were fully developed. (23)

Albert Gallatin in his report of 1808 as Secretary of the Treasury promoted the "early and efficient aid of the federal government" to create good roads and canals which will shorten distances, facilitate commerce and unite a community of interests. This report also mentioned that the state of Pennsylvania had incorporated two companies to extend the road from Philadelphia by two different routes to Pittsburgh, the southern route through Bedford and Somerset, and the northern route through Huntingdon and Frankstown. Although the Pennsylvania Road west to Chambersburg was made a toll road in 1806, work on it was not completed until 1818. (24)

Work on the Jefferson administration's National Road was equally slow. This road was projected from Cumberland, Maryland to Wheeling, Virginia, and Gallatin was its greatest supporter. Congress had set aside $30,000 from the sale of wilderness lands for highway construction in 1806. The location was agreed upon by the states through which it passed in 1808. Then as now, the highways of America were built chiefly of politics. Learning that the eastern terminus for the road was Baltimore, which would siphon trade away from Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1807 authorized the road through the state but stipulated that it go through Uniontown. Likewise in 1816, the Assembly postulated that the road go through Washington, Pennsylvania. This curving of the National Pike through major Pennsylvania towns insured certain trade benefits for the state. The National Road passed through Brownsville and intersected the Monongahela River such that goods shipped from the Greensboro/New Geneva area could then be sent overland to markets in Wheeling or Baltimore. From 1818-1852 the bulk of east/west trade passed on the National Road. (25)

The majority of early roads in Fayette County did not run north/south but ran in an east/west direction. One that did go north and south followed the warrior branch of the old Catawba Trail. According to historian James Veech, this trail intersected the main one at William Gans' sugar camp, went by Crow's mill, James Robinson's, Albert Gallatin's old gun factory, and then toward the mouth of Redstone Creek. There was a petition for a road from Uniontown to the Mason-Dixon line in 1783. This became the direct route from Uniontown to Morgantown. (26)

The Sand Creek Road was the second one viewed and laid out by the Fayette County Court. It originated at Washington, passed through the Ten Mile settlement of Greene County, crossed the river at Big Whiteley Creek, and passed the south side of Masontown. The road continued along the
Monongahela River to New Geneva where it followed Ferry Street over Georges Creek. In 1808 the bridge over Georges Creek at New Geneva was completed. It passed near the first glass factory and continued southeast across Laurel Hill to Widow Moore's on Sandy Creek and then over the mountains. The 1792 Reading Howell Map shows a variation of this road crossing Georges Creek east of the future New Geneva. It then passed through the New Geneva site, crossed the Monongahela and through Greensburg [Greensboro] with four houses, ran north to Carmichaels, and then further north to Washington. This is probably the same road referred to as the "Mud Pike" which crossed the Alleghenies, passed near Fairchance, came down Georges Creek Valley, forded the river at New Geneva, and headed for the Ohio River at Wheeling. (27)

It appears that the Braddock or Virginia Road did not play a major role in east/west transportation during the 1790s because Pennsylvania was not interested in improving western transportation from the Baltimore region. Despite the number of roads that continued to be built from the late eighteenth century on, travel to Philadelphia and eastern points was a continual hazard. The Monongahela River would be the main artery of travel and commerce for this section of southwestern Pennsylvania. (28)

In 1848 a "state road" was laid out from Waynesburgh, Greene County to widow Griffin's tavern in New Geneva. It came east down County Street through Greensboro, crossed the Monongahela River at the ferry site, passed by widow Griffin's, the northwesternmost house in New Geneva, then south on Ferry Street, east on Old Street, and north again on County Street going past James Nicholson's house out of town. (29)

The earliest settlers of the region and eastern political leaders recognized the military and commercial connections of the Monongahela River with the Ohio/Mississippi River system as well as the role it would play in further settlement of the American frontier. Governor Patrick Henry of Virginia put Colonel George Rogers Clarke in charge of an expedition against the British and Indians in 1778. Clarke put Colonel John Minor, of what would be Greene County, in command of having the boats built for this expedition against the British posts on the Mississippi and Wabash rivers. The boats were constructed near the mouth of Dunkard Creek, just south of present-day Greensboro. Gallatin felt that his town of New Geneva and adjoining town of Greensboro lay on "the nearest portage from the western waters to the Potowmack and the Federal City." This is what prompted Gallatin to start a store on Thomas Clare's land in 1784. He and his partner John Savary hoped to sell supplies to pioneers passing through on their way west. Flour and whiskey were the two principle products shipped down the Monongahela/Ohio rivers. Some of this flour was produced at river mills. These mills received
their power by forcing the river’s current in near the shore and fixing an undershot wheel in the current. By 1786 James Gray was assessed with one of these type mills at New Geneva. Later this New Geneva mill became part of the Gallatin Company property. As early trading centers, both Greensboro and New Geneva had tanneries to convert both domestic and wild animal hides into leather. (30)

Section of the 1792 Reading Howell Map Showing the study area. It also outlines some of the early roads into the area, particularly the Sand Creek Road from Widow Moore’s on the east, at lower right, to the Ten Mile settlement on the west, at upper left.
From the 1790s into the 1840s keelboats were generally used to ship goods up and down the Monongahela. Also called flatboats or Kentucky boats, these boats could hold 400-500 barrels. Among the principal places of embarkation for travel down the Monongahela/Ohio rivers was Brownsville and Pittsburgh, but boats could be had at New Geneva as well. Through a state act, the Monongahela Navigation Company was established in the 1830s. After Locks and Dams Number 1 and 2 were completed in 1841 and 3 and 4 three years later, slackwater navigation was provided up the Monongahela as far as Brownsville. At Brownsville, there was an overland connection through the National Pike to Wheeling or Baltimore. The Navigation Company operated on a system of tolls. In this period the steamboat came to dominate river travel, and packet boats began regular service between Pittsburgh and Brownsville. This naturally brought a rise in river traffic. The range of navigation remained there until completion of Lock and Dam Numbers 5 and 6 in 1856 which extended the head of navigation to New Geneva. Packet service began there at that time. In about 1868 the packet line became known as the Pittsburgh, Brownsville and Geneva Packet Company. The steamers, Geneva, Germania, and James G. Blaine made daily trips from Pittsburgh to New Geneva.(31)

A survey of the Monongahela River from New Geneva to Morgantown, West Virginia was directed as part of the 1871 River and Harbor Act of Congress. The survey recommended the building of three new locks and dams. Although the federal government had surveyed the river in 1833, it was only after this last survey that federal involvement in this river's transportation system produced significant changes. Congress appropriated money for Lock and Dam Number 9 near the West Virginia line, which was completed by 1879, and the federal government completed Lock and Dam Number 8 in 1889. In the meantime, the Monongahela Navigation Company built Number 7 which was opened in 1883. Thus, by 1889 slackwater navigation extended from Morgantown to Pittsburgh, a distance of about 100 miles.(32)

The federal government took over the Monongahela Navigation Company in 1897 which eliminated tolls on the Monongahela. After the government took over operation, most of the old structures were rebuilt or had new structures built in nearby locations. A Congressional Act of 1922 provided for the reconstruction and relocation of Lock and Dam Numbers 7 and 8. New Lock and Dam Number 7 was located at Greensboro, two and a half miles above the old location. By 1929 this work had been completed.(33)

In 1888 four ferries operated in Monongahela Township. Two ferries operated into the twentieth century from the east side of the Monongahela to the
Greensboro/Glassworks area. Both were positioned above ripples in the river. The Greensboro ferry crossed at the Geneva Ripple and Glassworks ferry crossed at the Glass House Ripple. The ferry landing at Glassworks was behind the Crawford house. It provided service for foot passengers, many of whom used the Uniontown/Masonstown streetcar which ended at Martin on the east shore. Ernest Gabler operated the ferry at this point for years. The bulk of his customers were coal miners. Although Duquesne Light Company paid him, the ferry was owned by Ernest King. The Greensboro Ferry had its landing at the end of County Street in Greensboro. Since there was little demand for their use, both ferries ceased operations between 1951-54.\(^{(34)}\)

The late nineteenth/early twentieth century brought other transportation improvements to the area. In the 1890s, shipments could be made by boat or by rail via Fairchance, on the Southwestern Division of the Pennsylvania Railroad. (Fairchance is northwest of New Geneva in Georges Township.) Mail was delivered by steamboat or overland after the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad extended its line to Smithfield. (Smithfield is nearly midway between Fairchance and New Geneva.) The Monongahela Railroad was built through New Geneva during the years 1911-12. The first regular trains began in November 1914. After the arrival of train service, the mail was delivered by this means. The packet boats which had brought freight and passengers into the area ceased operation in the early 1920s.\(^{(35)}\)

Road improvement in the area continued in the early twentieth century. In 1928 the old covered bridge at New Geneva collapsed, and in 1929 a new steel bridge replaced it. State Route 266 from Smithfield to New Geneva was built 1929-30, and the section of the road from New Geneva to Point Marion was constructed in 1933. New Geneva received bus service from Uniontown about 1931. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation put the cement road through Greensboro in 1929. About 1950 Greensboro was by-passed when Route 88 took a more direct route south.\(^{(36)}\)

**Early Development of Greensboro/New Geneva**

Small towns in western Pennsylvania had key roles in the commercial and industrial development as well as the cultural development of the region. They acted as trading centers and provided opportunities for laborers and craftsmen to establish economic stability. These small towns created a market center where goods and services could be exchanged. Social historian R. Eugene Harper found that almost 50% of the lot holders in other small towns in western Pennsylvania were held by artisans. Approximately 20% were held by speculators and another 20% were held by unskilled or
Greensboro (Greensburgh) was laid out by Elias Stone in 1791. Primarily created in 1797 to house workers/craftsmen and their families for Gallatin's glass and gun industries, New Geneva is directly linked to the industrial development of the region and was not unlike an early company town, possibly the first in the region. These two towns were among seventeen founded before 1800 in the three southwestern counties of Washington, Greene, and Fayette. Gallatin applied to the Postmaster General in 1799 to have a post office established at New Geneva. Lots in Greensboro were one half acre while those in New Geneva were one quarter acre. (38)

The original plat for Greensboro contained 86 lots. Lot 60 was presented to the citizens for public uses. Among the earliest Greensboro lot owners to erect buildings were tanner Andrew Klinesmith, Mary Douglass, William Eakins, tanner John Ebert, Charles Ferry, Zachariah Gapen, saddler Henry Sheets, Samuel Clark, Uriah Williams, and hatter George Yeager. It is hard to determine for certain from tax records how many houses were actually built there in this early period but there were at least ten lot owners with houses in 1798. By 1801 there were at least twelve lot owners with houses. These included those of Dr. John Bell and tanner George Flickman. In 1802 there were three men who owned distilleries in Greene Township, and one man was assessed as a "stiller." By 1807 ten men were assessed with stills and still houses in the township. Gunsmith Peter Engle and storekeeper Charles Alexander Mestrezat appeared on the tax rolls for the first time in 1803. (39)

In 1808 there were 269 taxables in Greene Township. Of this number 44% were farmers and 20% were laborers. Among the occupations were seven glass blowers, four tailors, seven blacksmiths, five hatters, three traders, and three storekeepers. That same year Christian Shroyer first appeared as a tanner. An indication of the further development of society in the area is the appearance of nonessential tradesmen such as silversmith William Neighly and coppersmith Jacob Medirk on the 1812 tax rolls. In 1814 Christian Reppert was first taxed with a tanyard in Greensboro, and in 1815 the Greensburgh Manufacturing Company appeared on the tax rolls. This company had purchased lots from Emanuel Hoover, John Shroyer and Alexander Vance as well as a half lot from Mary Williams. One item this company manufactured was barrel staves. These were shipped to Brownsville and constructed into barrels. (40)

In 1816 clock maker Peter Hugas opened a shop in Greensboro. Hugas
continued to be taxed there until 1835 when his heirs were assessed with one house, four lots, and forty acres. Many other specialized crafts appeared in Greene Township in 1817 including: a powder maker, sickle makers, a chair maker, a box maker, a cabinet maker, and two joiners. By this time the Greensburgh Manufacturing Company was assessed with a grist and saw mill.

The Pennsylvania Legislature passed an act March 13, 1816 incorporating the Greensburgh Manufacturing Company to erect steam mills to be adapted to sundry manufactorys. According to tradition, Alexander Vance had gone to Pittsburgh and there saw the wonders performed by the steam engine. Members of the Kramer, Reppert, and Eberhart families listened to his report and decided to build a large steam mill. A mill sixty feet square, three or four stories high was subsequently built. Evidently, it never paid off and was later abandoned. (41)

Besides the glass workers and potters in 1820, Thomas Faulkner was assessed as a china maker. Also that year Timothy Leek, a "black man," was taxed as a millwright. The number of cabinet makers in the township had risen to eight and the number of cooperers to five.

Monongahela Township was formed from the eastern section of Greene Township in 1822. In 1825 the merchants in Monongahela Township included: David and John Crawford, George Kramer, and James Vance. Judge John Minor and Aaron Stone were assessed with "ports of profit." The Greensburgh Manufacturing Company was taxed that year with a steam grist mill, saw mill, a house, and three and a half lots. In 1830 this property was listed as "transferred to Mr. Parner." The 1832 Gazetteer of Pennsylvania had this to say of Greensburg [Greensboro]. "There are extensive glassworks here, established by the munificence of Mr. Albert Gallatin, for a German company, who have grown rich, have transferred the works to some young men, who conduct them profitably. The town contains about 100 dwellings, 4 stores, 1 tavern, and 500 inhabitants." (42)

Previous to Gallatin's ambitious town plan for New Geneva, William George Wilson had laid out a much smaller plot in 1793. According to Wilson's agreement with purchasers of lots, a house had to be erected within three years. These had to be at least 18 x 16 feet with a shingled roof and a stone or brick chimney. The purchasers had the liberty of taking out stone from the adjoining quarry. This village became known as Wilson's Port. According to Wilson's 1795 agreement to sell Gallatin his tracts of land as well as his village, twenty-two lots had been sold or bargained for
previously. (This does not include the seven lots sold to Gallatin or Gallatin & Co. previously.) The 1798 Direct Tax shows that most did not live-up to the original agreement of building within three years of sale. Thomas Williams, a native of Delaware, was the first resident of New Geneva. A tailor by trade, he was elected justice of the peace in 1797.(43)

Unlike most early towns in southwestern Pennsylvania, Gallatin incorporated two public squares into his plan. One, called Hill Square, was an oblong lot at the intersection of Ferry, County, and Dug Streets. The other, called Fancy Square, was plotted at the intersection of Pleasant and Middle streets. Many lots were never sold in that northeastern section, and possibly this square was never developed. At the intersection of Front, Middle, and Short streets was a small triangle of land which Gallatin gave for a school or public library. Gallatin also stipulated that there should not be any burial grounds within the town. Gallatin had experienced first hand the 1793 Yellow Fever epidemic in Philadelphia. At that time there was a strong belief that epidemics spawned from graveyards.44)

Sketch of the Greensboro/New Geneva Area Showing the Streams and Township Divisions
Probably due to his political connections, Gallatin had speculators investing in his town from as far away as Philadelphia. Early lot holders saw the trading opportunities of the area. William Martin, who had purchased lots 1 and 2, sold them with houses in 1803 to Zachariah Wheat of Germantown. According to their agreement Wheat was to pay $300 in bar iron, $100 in castings or hollow ware, $100.00 in window glass, $100 in rifle guns, and $100 in flour along with $1100 in cash. Everything was to be delivered to his house except the castings which were to be taken to the mouth of Brown's Run on the Monongahela. Wheat continued as an innkeeper at New Geneva until at least 1820.  (45)

Philip Pearce, assessed with two stills, was the largest landowner and wealthiest person in Springhill Township in 1796. Similar to Albert Gallatin, Pearce was assessed in the 1798 Direct Tax with a brick house valued at $600. However, if Gallatin's personal lands (350 acres) were combined with his company's lands (550 acres), he would have been the largest landholder in Springhill. By the end of century with his glassworks in production, Gallatin likely was the wealthiest man in the township. (46)

The 1804 American Gazetteer described New Geneva, 230 miles from Washington, as having "a manufactory of glass bottles and muskets. Iron ore and coal are found in great plenty in the vicinity." Thomas Ashe characterized New Geneva in 1806 as "a thriving town" where Kentucky boats are built, but portrayed Greensburg as "a small village, of which nothing favourable can be said." Historian I.D. Rupp noted of New Geneva in 1849 that, "Many years ago, Gallatin established extensive glass-works here." However, by 1882 historian Ellis described New Geneva as antiquated, and "the streets, except along the river and creek, are in most parts steep and difficult." He further stated, "There are few pretentious buildings here, either business structures or residences." Rupp noted that Greensburg (Greensburg) "was once a place of considerable trade--a depot for produce sent down the river in arks and steamboats; larger places on the Ohio and National Road, have diverted the trade from this point." (47)

Like the rest of the Monongahela Valley, Springhill Township was developing industrially during the early nineteenth century. This can be seen in the 1816 tax list where twenty-six men were involved in some way in the iron industry. These included ironmasters, forgemen, colliers, moulders, founderers, blacksmiths, scythe makers, and sickle smiths. There were also three gunsmiths, possibly holdovers from Gallatin's gun
factory. In addition, there were eleven Springhill men involved in mercantile related trades. Placed in this category were: merchants, innkeepers, storekeepers, traders, and wagoners. Gallatin's brother-in-law, James Nicholson, was one of the merchants. (48)

According to Ellis's history, Gallatin offered inducements in the late eighteenth century to those who would engage in carding, spinning, and weaving. Another history states that Gallatin's saw mill was refitted for the wool business and a Mr. Collins was hired to conduct it. Ellis Stephenson was also involved in this industry, but further up the Georges Creek. The 1816 tax shows fourteen men employed in various aspects of these trades. These included tailors, weavers, carders, clothiers, and hatters. By 1840 the manufacture of woolen goods was the highest valued industry in the county. (49)

John Davenport established a store in New Geneva by 1810 when he purchased lot 15 from Thomas Graham. He also purchased lot 14, the location of Gallatin's store, which had a log tenement there in 1813. Davenport's son James (1812-1904) established another store across Ferry Street by 1842. This last store was continued by James' son William into the early twentieth century. Ledgers from 1827 through 1857 exist for these stores. The ledgers record the purchases of some of the glass blowers and cutters. At various times the post office was located in these stores as well. (50)

A variety of businessmen and artisans lived in New Geneva in 1818 including a tailor, two laborers, an innkeeper, a merchant, a shoemaker, a hatter, a carpenter, and a blacksmith. Additional houses and lots in town were owned by nonresidents and farmers. Ten houses and lots were assessed in "old glassworks" that year. Some of these houses were occupied by artisans as well, but none were related to the former glass industry there. Ironmaster Andrew Oliphant owned one of these lots.

In 1820 merchant James Nicholson was taxed with two warehouses, and in 1825 he has two ferry houses and a warehouse. That last year Albert Gallatin was taxed with a grist mill and one half a ferry. That same year two tailors, two innkeepers, a tanner, and a cabinetmaker were among the businessmen/ artisans of New Geneva.

Thirty-one houses and lots in New Geneva were taxed in 1830. Two innkeepers and two merchants were assessed that year. Andrew Oliphant was taxed with a grist, saw, and oil mill. William Pinn, "Negro," was listed
with a house and lot in town that year. Most of the lots were owned by artisans including: three tailors, two carpenters, a saddler, shoemaker, blacksmith, and a hatter. Dr. John J. Steel was the resident doctor that year. David Wood was a tanner located in old glassworks where he owned three houses.

By 1835 fewer area men were depending upon farming as their main livelihood. In 1816, 56% of the taxables of Springhill Township were farmers. By 1835 this number had dropped to 41%. However, whereas 16% of the taxables in 1816 were noted as laborers, by 1835 this number had more than doubled to 34%. The tax list for 1835 continued to show a relatively high number of hatters (6), blacksmiths (12), and millers (5). Among the artisans taxed that year were: two chairmakers, three ferrymen, three boatmen, three cabinetmakers, and a boat builder. In 1835 there were twenty-six taxables with lots in New Geneva. Seven persons, including two women and a "black man," were lot holders in old glassworks.

In the 1830s Albion Mellier, of French heritage, was active in the commercial and manufacturing enterprises at New Geneva. In 1834 Albion and his brother Adolphus purchased Gallatin's Friendship Hill. By 1838 Mellier was taxed in Springhill Township as a farmer with a merchant mill, saw mill, carding machine, two houses and lots, and two yoke of oxen. He was even taxed with the glass factory in 1840. He constructed a three-story, steam operated flour mill along with a steam saw mill, and had a large storeroom on the south side of Georges Creek. Mellier was also involved in the manufacture of steamboats. Two of his boats, the Albert Gallatin and the Napoleon Bonaparte became widely known. Evidently, Mellier became heavily indebted, and to escape his creditors, he left aboard the Albert Gallatin, never to return. His brother Adolphus continued to be taxed there until 1844. (51)

The Gazetteer of Pennsylvania in 1832 noted that New Geneva contained "about 60 dwellings, 1 church, 2 schools, 4 stores, 2 taverns, 1 grist mill and 1 saw mill." In 1837 Andrew Kramer & Company opened a new glass factory in New Geneva which certainly brightened the prospects for the town. About 1840 a foundry was established by William James in New Geneva. The next year Shealor and Merryman Company purchased it and produced a widely-sold cook stove known as the "drum stove" until about the time of the Civil War. In 1842 the wool industry was still doing well in Springhill township with two woolen factories and carding machines at two other mills. Daniel Boughner (associated with the Greensboro pottery
industry) arrived in New Geneva as a merchant that year and continued until 1844. The number of workers (17) involved in the New Geneva glass operation peaked in 1843. There was also a large number (7) of cabinetmakers in the township that year. Nicholson Township was formed from the northern section of Springhill Township in 1845. It was named for James W. Nicholson, Gallatin's brother-in-law. (52)

Later Development of the Greensboro/New Geneva Area

David Downs was taxed in Nicholson Township by 1850 as a threshing machine maker. According to the Monongahela and Youghiogheny Directory of 1860, Alexander Conn had the agricultural implement manufactory on Old Street in New Geneva. Downs is listed as a machinist that year. In addition the directory enumerates one foundry, one pottery, one grist and saw mill, and two or three stores in New Geneva. There were several blacksmiths, one moulder, and other craftsmen besides several coal diggers (miners). (53)

New Geneva continued to receive more national and state recognition than Greensboro. The 1853 Gazetteer of the United States notes that New Geneva, 195 miles southwest of Harrisburg, has a manufactory of glass and several stores but lists Greensboro only as a post village of Greene County. (54)

By 1860 Greensboro had become a cultural center with three churches, a school, an Odd Fellows Hall, and a Masonic Hall. It also boasted two doctors, three grocers, two dry goods stores, and a general store. Besides the usual craftsmen and mechanics, it had a gunsmith and a cabinetmaker located there. At that time most of the stores lined county Street from Second Street to the river. Later the town would have more commercial development north along Front Street. (55)

In 1876 there were four "physicians and surgeons" along with a druggist in Greensboro. Seven merchants were located there in addition to a jeweler and the Kramer & Pennington tin store. In that year there were various craftsmen/mechanics as well, including carpenters, harness makers, blacksmiths, a gunsmith, and a wagon maker. By the mid-1880s Greensboro had its own newspaper, the Greensboro Graphic. (56)

There was much greater diversity in the 1890s Greensboro shops and businesses than those of New Geneva. Besides the general stores, hotels, and potteries, these was a furniture dealer and undertaker, druggist,
cigar manufacturer, harness maker, dressmaker, and a photographer. T.F. Pennington had a foundry there also. There were three flour mills at New Geneva at that time. Besides the three stores, three hotels, and one stoneware manufacturer, there were two tailors, two blacksmiths, a dentist, and a physician in New Geneva. Three men also advertised coal there.\(^{(57)}\)

As will be discussed under the glass and pottery contexts, the area's glass industry appears to have peaked in the 1840s while the area's pottery industry peaked in the 1870s and 1880s. Although there was glassmaking into the 1850s and pottery making up until 1915, the decline in each industry marked a decline in commercial and economic growth generally for the area. While the coming of slackwater navigation by 1860 promoted commercial growth, particularly in Greensboro, the expansion of this system further up the river by the 1890s lessened the need for Greensboro as a regional commercial center. After that time its industries and commerce became more localized. In the early twentieth century, there were relative boom times for the area as coal/coke operations developed, but as seams played out, operations moved on, leaving the area economically depressed by the 1930s. In 1911, there were three coking operations at Martin, about two miles north of New Geneva.\(^{(58)}\)
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Glass Industry of Greensboro/New Geneva 1797-1858

Pennsylvania played a significant role in the early American glass industry. By the 1760s Baron Henry William Stiegel of Manheim (Lancaster County) was making glass. Although establishing a high standard in artistic glass production, Stiegel's glass factory closed by 1774 after going bankrupt. John Frederick Amelung, another German by birth, started a glass factory near Frederick, Maryland in 1784. One of Stiegel's blowers, Baltzer Kramer, came to work for Amelung. Amelung's factory also went bankrupt, and by 1795 the property was offered for sale. In 1799 part of the property was sold to Adam Kohlenburg and John Christian Gabler. The prospects of a glass factory west of the Alleghenies were enticing due to the high demand for glass there and little competition from imports. Evidently some of Amelung's workers not only went to New Geneva, but to Pittsburgh and Baltimore as well. These German families passed the secrets of glass making from one generation to the next. Thus, the Kramer and Gabler families, involved with production at the Stiegel and Amelung glass houses, would play significant roles at New Geneva and Greensboro. Although several late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century glass manufacturers prospered in the Philadelphia area, Pittsburgh and surrounding western counties quickly became the national center of the industry.(1)

In 1797 U.S. Congressman and entrepreneur Albert Gallatin (1761-1849) with several of his business associates began gathering men, equipment, and materials in order to establish the first glass producing factory west of the Alleghenies. A native of Switzerland, Gallatin first came to western Pennsylvania in 1784 and by 1795 had formed a development company with other Swiss immigrants and his brother-in-law James W. Nicholson (1773-1851). Gallatin envisioned this company would create a Republican commercial/industrial community on the American frontier. Unlike Jefferson and the agrarian wing of the party, Gallatin felt that the Republican values of democracy and civic virtue could be realized in the factory as well as the farm. Called New Geneva, the town was laid out on the rise of land just north of where the Georges Creek empties into the Monongahela river. The town's 160 lots were laid out and recorded at the Fayette County Courthouse in 1797.(2)

Although a local legend states that Gallatin met glass blowers at a tavern on their way west to Kentucky, this is not borne out by his correspondence. In May 1797, John Badollet, life-long friend and business partner of Gallatin, wrote Gallatin informing him of the investment opportunities in the glass industry. By June Badollet felt certain that the six-member German company
was "Struck with the advantages of our situation--they will come back [from Kentucky] and finally settle with us."(3)

In September of that year an agreement was made between the Albert Gallatin Company and glassmakers, George Kramer, Adolph Eberhart, Ludwig Reitz (1772-1831), Christian Kramer (1773-1858), and George Reppert for the purpose of erecting a glassworks and establishing a manufacture of glass." According to this six-year agreement, Gallatin's company was to advance all the money for the erection of buildings on a location they had chosen near New Geneva. George Kramer and his associates would receive half the profits for the enterprise after they paid for one-half of the costs of erecting the manufacturing complex.(4)

The German glassblowers quickly constructed the glassworks on the south bank of Georges Creek, about a mile southwest of the village. The frame building erected for the glassworks was forty by forty feet, with one side constructed of stone. Louis Bourdillon, Gallatin's enthusiastic glassworks superintendent, noted in early December 1797 that "the oven is completely finished--all we have left to do is build two ovens, a task that we will be able to do no matter how cold it gets, all [the] buildings being closed right now."(5)

Bourdillon continued by reporting to Gallatin the current situation with making pots for the glass furnaces. "The pots are made and dry. We have 53 of them perfectly intact." (Tench Coxe in his report on United States manufactures remarked that "crucibles are made in several places.") Bourdillon also remarked that Jonathan Davis of Morgantown sent them a sample of clay which looks perfectly like the one from New Castle, so our Germans are perfectly satisfied with it." He also predicted that glass making would begin by Christmas or New Year's. The first melt occurred in the factory on 18 January 1798. The following day, Bourdillon wrote to Gallatin, "The quality of our glass is superior to any in America. We have made bottles and window glass of different sizes." This was no small feat considering that some of the essential equipment and ingredients such as clay, glass pots, and cullet (broken or refuse glass) had to be hauled in from the East. Bourdillon was equally pleased with the quality of sand which had come from Thomas Clare's land. Although one history states that the first furnace contained only four pots, correspondence indicates there were eight pots, at least by 1799. At first, the small furnace was only capable of producing common green (aqua) glass for windows, whiskey and porter bottles, and various types of hollow ware.(6)
Moving goods and products on the Monongahela was the most cost effective method of running business operations. Salt had to be shipped in. Corks had to be supplied for the bottles manufactured or they would not be saleable. Gallatin's records show that even ashes, indispensable to the glassmaking process, were shipped up the river to his operation. (Ashes were used in the making of one of the key ingredients, potash.) Other necessary ingredients included an abundant supply of wood and sand. (7)

Although some histories indicate that government contractor and entrepreneur James O'Hara and business partner Isaac Craig pioneered the first western Pennsylvania glass house at Pittsburgh, Craig's November 1799 letter to John Kinnear of Natchez suggests otherwise. Craig laments that the "glass ware of this boat is not of the first quality as it is the product of the first attempt." This indicates that they were almost two years behind New Geneva. O'Hara and Craig did pioneer the first use of coal in melting the glass. Starting with the Craig and O'Hara Company, Pittsburgh would become a center for cut and pressed glass in the early 1800s. (8)

Perhaps more remarkable than the fact that the Gallatin company was able to quickly assemble skilled labor, ingredients, and equipment was the gathering of capital to accomplish this. The output of the New Geneva Glassworks' third and fourth blast more than doubled what had been produced in the first and second blasts. Whereas O'Hara later wrote that he spent $10,000 to yield only one bottle in his first blast, according to the Gallatin Company bookkeeper, that company spent nearly $14,000 for four blasts and came away with a net profit of $1,400 by December 1799. In 1816 Gallatin elaborated on his financial involvement in the glass industry. He stated that they began the works with $10,000 and made no profit during the first years or until the capital reached near $20,000. He further explained that the current total $40,000 investment provides an annual profit of $8,000 which is divided among seven men. (9)

Bourdillon wrote to Gallatin in February 1798 that the high cost of production was due to the inexperience of the "shearers" which resulted in the burning of more wood than expected. Bourdillon requested that Gallatin send three or four diamonds, needed to cut the glass. Bourdillon felt that if clay for the glass pots could be obtained locally and "stone coal" burned instead of wood, production costs would drop considerably. In March of that year the first boat started for Kentucky with a load of glass. In speaking of Kentucky, Bourdillon wrote, "We will hurry to fill the holes of their windows, so they help us fill the holes in our purse." That same month, a disappointed Gallatin wrote to business partner James Nicholson that production only amounted to 65 boxes [of window glass] in five weeks. He was ready to abandon the
works.(10)

The 1798 Direct Tax lists Louis Bourdillon as the tenant on the Albert Gallatin & Company property which contained five log houses and a glass manufactory. None of the five mentioned glassmakers were individually taxed so they evidently resided in these five company houses. However, George Kramer owned a 22 x 25 foot log house tenanted by Jesse Shimer. Bourdillon himself was assessed with a 28 x 30 foot frame house owned by the company. The old glass house had been torn down by 1882, but the company dwelling houses were still standing at that time.(11)

By December 1798 the company had contracts to deliver glass at least as far as Frankfort (Kentucky). The following January Bourdillon reported that the brewer from Pittsburgh asked "for 1200 black bottles to be delivered to him immediately and 6000 more to be delivered in March." George Reppert was among those who traveled with the glass down the river. In February 1800 a boat was loaded with three sizes of window glass, bottles ranging in size from pint to two gallon, and "black and green bottles for cyder."(12)

By 1800 Gallatin and Nicholson were the only remaining members of the original company. Anthony Cazenove had moved to Alexandria, Virginia where he became a merchant. Badollet departed in 1798 to devote his time to interests in Greene County. During the summer of 1799, Gallatin dissolved the Albert Gallatin Company. At the same time he dismissed Bourdillon because of his poor judgement and requested the books, monies, and other property be put in his hands. By October of that year Ami Mussard was superintendent of the glassworks evidently taking the place of Bourdillon.(13)

In December 1799 Mussard, tallied the debits and credits for the glassworks. The single largest expense was for labor "blowing, shearsers & boys." The next highest amount went for buildings. The third costliest item was for "clay & pots." His figures show a net profit of $1,400. On February 6, 1800, Mussard wrote the following to Gallatin, "I have concluded to blow tonight for the last time window glass and then fill the pot for bottles, that will be all pints as they are the most called for and being those of which we have the least in provision."(14)

Evidently money was slow in coming in and the glass blowers, shearsers, and wood cutters fell upon Mussard in mid-February [1800] for money. Mussard proposed to Gallatin that as soon as the river was boatable to send Richard Graham and Reppert with 600 pounds of glass with the understanding that
Reppert was to return immediately with the produce of the first glass sold. (15)

Thomas Worthington of Chilicothe, Ohio, wrote to Nicholson in February 1801 that Ross County "has undertaken to build a handsome and convenient courthouse." They had been offered what they needed from the Pittsburgh glassworks, but learned that the New Geneva works produced a better quality and therefore sought their product. An 1806 advertisement noted that a Pittsburgh merchant had "superior quality New Geneva window and hollow glass for sale at the Pittsburgh prices." (16)

In 1803 new articles of agreement were drawn between the glass blowers and Gallatin. The other six men involved in this venture were: Lewis Reitz, Adoph Eberhart, Sr., George Reppert, Baltzer Kramer, Christian Kramer, and John C. Gabler. Only Baltzer Kramer and John Gabler had not been included in the first agreement. It seems that the works consumed an inordinate amount of wood, and Gallatin was adamant that no wood on his farm be cut for the works. Andrew Hoover was the bookkeeper for the glasshouse, and his records show that in 1807 Reitz, Eberhart, Christian Kramer, and George Reppert were each paid for one year superintending the works. This again appears to represent the Republican ideals of Albert Gallatin. Although the company retained the title "New Geneva Glass Works," tax records show it variously as George Reppert & Co., Christian Kramer & Co., and Baltzer Kramer & Co. (17)

In 1806 George Reppert & Company proposed starting a new glassworks although the old works were to run until the end of 1807. Gallatin tried to induce the company to continue a few years at their present position, evidently unsuccessfully. Gallatin was concerned with disposing of the "old seat and buildings." Although of little value, he feared intruders there. (18)

By 1808 after the glassworks had moved across the Monongahela to Greensburgh, George Reppert & Company was assessed with six houses and five cabins. In 1809, the company was also taxed with a barn and five horses. Gallatin's May 1816 letter to Nicholson directing him to divide his tracts into saleable lots provides some description of the "old glassworks" at that time. It delineates its location as near to "the old saw mill or middle mill seat." And to this mill seat is to be attached "all the land between the road or street in front of the five glass blowers former dwellings and the creek, ought to be annexed to it, so that a race may be cut from the dam towards the house where they used to dry the pots & the mill be placed in that vicinity & that of the run, near where the county bridge stood with privilege of tail race to the head
of the back water of the new saw mill dam. Perhaps the old glass works lot & buildings may be also attached to it, unless there is a good opportunity to sell such of those buildings as must otherwise decay."(19)

Early nineteenth century traveler, Thomas Ashe, described New Geneva in 1806 as a thriving town, "Distinguished for extensive manufactures in its vicinity which make and export large quantities of good glass." Although Gallatin had labeled his company's investment in the glass industry "a lottery ticket" in 1797, by 1816 he had come to appreciate its value. While preparing to leave the United States to take his position as minister to France, he wrote Nicholson "to keep the glass works which are my most productive property." It was probably through Gallatin's strict financial management that the New Geneva works survived its early years. More than half the operating glasshouses in the United States failed between 1815 and 1820. In 1830 Gallatin deeded his share in the glass works to his son Albert Rolaz Gallatin.(20)

Pattern glass molding is generally thought to have been started around 1810, but there is evidence of its having been made at New Geneva about 1800. Mrs. Rhea Knittle stated that the New Geneva furnace "made some of the finest early blown glass in America, and turned out large numbers of beautiful colored pocket flasks of the expanded ribbed and also diamond chestnut type."(21)

Tench Coxe's 1810 Report of Manufactures shows that Allegheny County was the largest producer of glass in Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh reportedly had three glassworks at that time, one green and two white glass. There were three glass houses outside the city as well. Unfortunately no figures were received from Greene or Fayette counties, but they likely would have ranked high at that time. Coxe noted that with United States' great progress in the production of fermented liquors, there would be a corresponding increase in demand for glass bottles. He felt there were great opportunities for large profits by glass manufacturers, if they could purchase lands and materials at low prices. Again, interior manufacturers would have an edge on competition from eastern imports due to the cost of transportation. Pittsburgh writer Zadok Cramer noted that $10,000 worth of "Geneva" glass passed through T. & J. Cromwell's Pittsburgh warehouse each year during the period 1810-14.(22)

Early tax lists evidently note who the key owners/workers were in the local glass industry, but they do not provide information about workers with less prestige or value. The 1808 tax list for Greene Township shows six men
associated with the glass works: James Clark, Adolph Everhart, Christian Kramer, Baltzer Kramer, George Reppert, and Lewis Wright (Reitz). Although Andrew Hoover is known to have worked for the company at this time, he is simply listed as a clerk. At that time the company owned six houses and five cabins which indicates several more were involved in this industry. In 1810 Gallatin requested that a brick store be built on his lot at the glassworks. The 1814 tax list for Greene Township shows Baltzer Kramer & Company Glassworks with 417 acres and eight houses. Few occupations are noted that year, but Adolph Eberhart is taxed as a glass cutter, George Kramer is listed as a glass blower, and Andrew Hoover is taxed with an unnamed occupation. The 1817 tax shows five glass blowers in Greene Township. There were seven glass blowers and two glass cutters there in 1820. This was the first year Samuel Eberhart was noted as a pot maker. In 1822 there were five blowers and one cutter taxed. Baltzer Kramer & Company was assessed that year at $23,000 for 480 acres, sixteen houses, and one glass furnace. It appears that the glass industry flourished here despite the hard depression of 1817-1823. The number of men associated with the glass industry from 1808 to 1820 varied from six to eleven.(23)

There were six Monongahela Township men assessed as glass blowers in 1825: Nicholas Burgh, Adolph Eberhart, Charles Eberhart, Lewis Lantz, Philip Minor, and George Reppert. Christian and Baltzer Kramer and another Adolph Eberhart were taxed that year as glass cutters. The Baltzer Kramer & Company was assessed at $12,800 for 400 acres, eleven houses, and a glass house and works that year. This shows a considerable drop in the value of the glassworks from 1822.(24)

The 1830 tax list for Monongahela Township shows ten glass blowers and three cutters there: Nicholas Bugh, Adolph Eberhart (2), Baltzer Kramer, Jr., Christian Kramer (2), Philip Minor, George Reppert, David Shroyer, John Gabler, and Theophilus P. Kramer. These duplicate names illustrate the persistence of these same families in this family oriented craft. Evidently it was part of a centuries old tradition of keeping glass making techniques within the family. It can be seen that all these families were of German heritage except Minor. Baltzer Kramer & Company is assessed with 200 acres, eleven houses, one glass house and works that year.

Eight men were assessed as glass blowers in Monongahela Township in 1835: Adolph and Albert Eberhart, Alexander Gabler, Baltzer, Jr., Christian, Christian, Jr., and Theophilus P. Kramer, and David Shroyer. No occupation was given for Lewis Lantz, and Philip Minor was listed with his own company. Although McKearin states that this glass company operated as B.F. Black &
Company after 1830, it does not show up on the tax lists as such. Rather, it continues as Baltzer Kramer & Company until 1859 when the glass factory is noted as "not in use." The tax records also indicate that if this factory did burn, it was rebuilt. The 1850 Manufacturer's Census also indicates that this factory was still active with 22 workmen producing $18,000 worth of glass. (25)

Despite the Panic of 1837, Andrew, Baltzer, and Theophilus Kramer and Philip Reitz established a new glass factory at New Geneva in that year. While the first factory had been located south of Georges Creek, this one was located within the town. It continued under the name of "New Geneva Glass." In 1840 there were six glass houses and one glass cutting establishment employing 151 hands in Fayette County. They produced $80,000 worth of glass. In 1850 the New Geneva factory out-produced its sister factory across the river by about 500 boxes of window glass. (26)

Although a local history states that John C. Gabler and Charles Kramer made the last glass in this factory in 1857, this appears to be incorrect in its details. From 1837 until 1843 the property was assessed as Andrew Kramer & Co. However, in the latter year, Andrew Kramer was noted as a non-resident. The year 1843 shows seventeen, the highest number of glass company workers at this location. These included blowers, cutters, shearsers, and one packer. The two "moulders" taxed there that year may have been associated with the glassworks as well. That same year "Nicholson and John Hall" was assessed as a glass manufacturer. By 1844 Philip Reitz is assessed with the glass works property, but there are only four workers assessed in association with the glass industry that year. (27)

Some of the men involved in the operation of the third factory include Alexander and John Shroyer, who are taxed as glass blowers from 1837 through 1851. John Shroyer, Jr. continues on the list from 1852 until 1854. Joseph Denny is a glass blower from 1842 through 1852. Although one history states that Adolph Eberhart manufactured glass at New Geneva 1850-52, he does not show up on the tax lists as such. Samuel Daugherty continued as a glass blower in Springhill/Nicholson Township from 1844 through 1860. Benjamin Shaffer first appeared there in 1849 and continued until 1859 when he was listed as a part time laborer. The 1850 census identified Shaffer as a twenty-five year old glass blower in Monongahela Township. By 1860 he had left the area. Philip Reitz was first listed as a glass cutter in 1843. In 1850 he was taxed with two houses and lots in Glassworks and from 1851 through 1858 he was taxed with three houses and lots and the glass factory. Although he was not a resident of Nicholson Township, Reitz continued to be taxed for the glass works from 1859 through 1864. Most historical records state that the
factory closed in 1858. That year ten Nicholson residents were taxed in the glass industry: William Campbell, Samuel Daugherty, Joseph Denny, James and William Gray, Alexander and Filmer Gabler, Charles Kramer, Philip Reitz, and Isaac Young. (28)

This study of tax assessments on both sides of the Monongahela serves to illustrate and reinforce several historic features about the early glass industry: how volatile the markets were, how certain families persisted and flourished in this occupation, and how easily men moved year-to-year from one glass factory to another within the region. It also illuminates the fact that other, lesser known families were involved in the industry over a period of years, but some workers' names never appear on records. For example while the 1850 Manufacturer's Census shows 22 men and four boys employed in Nicholson Township factory, only eight men appear on the tax lists as glass workers. The impermanence of the factories also shows why there is little above-ground evidence of the glass industry in Greensboro/New Geneva. (29)

Although histories indicate that the last glass factory in the Greensboro/New Geneva area closed in 1858, several area men continued to be listed in later years as glass blowers or cutters. According to the 1860 census four men were still listed as glass blowers in Nicholson Township. James South recalled that his grandfather James Jones cut the windows for his house when it was built in 1879. South did not know if these men continued their occupations at other locations or not. The biography of James Springer illustrates what may have happened to men who trained and worked in the Greensboro/New Geneva glass industry during the mid-nineteenth century. James was a son of Marshall and Susanna (Shroyer) Springer, so he was born into a glassmaking family. In 1847 at age fourteen he apprenticed as a glassblower at New Geneva. With his apprenticeship completed, he moved to Pittsburgh in 1853 where he continued in his trade until 1873. In that year he returned to Nicholson Township where he bought a farm. (30)

This last glass works was located on lot 163 which fronted on the Monongahela River and adjoined Low Lane. In 1865 the sheriff of Fayette County sold this quarter acre lot to Alexander Crow "on which is erected an old glass factory." Also included in this property was lots 5 and 6 with "an old log pot house," lot 22 with a two story frame house, and lot 23 with an old log dwelling. Crow sold the glass factory property to William Sheldon. Lastly, the property was sold to Isaac P. Eberhart who demolished the factory. Eberhart had been taxed as a glass cutter in 1864. By 1882 Eberhart was using the property for a garden. Another history states that part of one of the buildings associated with this factory was still standing in 1933. In 1858 Christian Kramer died at
age 85, the last member of the original glass company. As previously mentioned, the houses built by that company in Springhill Township were still standing in 1882. (31)

In 1860 there were 31 glass plants in Pennsylvania employing about 3,000 men. About 63% of Pennsylvania plants were in Allegheny County at that time. The value of glass produced in Pennsylvania was three times that of any other state in 1870, and by that year 66% of the state's glass was made in southwestern Pennsylvania. By the 1880s the Pittsburgh glass industry led the nation. During this period it shifted to natural gas for power and built large plants at several sites. By 1900 there were 119 glass plants in Pennsylvania employing about 19,000 persons. During the period 1860-1900, about two-thirds of production was in glassware, the other third being flat glass. Although Allegheny led the region in 1900 with number of plants, Washington and Westmoreland counties also expanded their interests in the glass industry. Throughout the late nineteenth century the Pittsburgh region's glass industry continued to break ground in mechanized production, new fuel sources, and plate glass manufacture. (32)

In the twentieth century the glass produced at New Geneva/Greensboro became known as Gallatin-Kramer. It was called this because Gallatin had been a national political leader and instrumental in founding the glass house, and the Kramer family because it was foremost in the production of glass there. Leroy Kramer in his writing makes the assertion that it should be called Kramer glass since "99% of its production was after Gallatin and Nicholson left the firm." Kramer evidently didn't know that Gallatin had an interest in the firm until 1830. (33)

Like the iron/steel industry, the glass industry became centered in Pittsburgh as the nineteenth century progressed. By the 1850s, Pittsburgh had transportation advantages such as rail connections to Philadelphia and Baltimore, and the West. In addition, slackwater navigation had been completed to Brownsville, and the city had greater proximity to down-river markets. As a commercial/industrial center, it had advantages to capital investments which could harness new technologies and build larger plants than outlying areas. Nevertheless, entrepreneur Gallatin along with the glass workers deserve credit for their pioneering success in the industry. It was quite a feat to bring financial resources, skilled labor, and the required raw materials together on the frontier to produce a high quality glass. In terms of American glass production, the Monongahela district, encompassing New Geneva in its fifty-mile length, and the Pittsburgh district combined during the nineteenth century to form "one of America's premier glass producing
regions."

The 1986 archaeological tests done at the stone foundations on or near lot 163 in New Geneva were inconclusive as to their association with the 1837 Kramer glass factory which had been located there. Although glass fragments, including small glass rods and globs, were found there, no obvious glassmaking deposits were recovered.
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Pottery of the Greensboro/New Geneva Area c.1800-1914

Pottery, the utilitarian ware for the cooking and storing of foodstuffs in most households for centuries, had a ready demand in southwestern Pennsylvania and in frontier areas down the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. Therefore, it is no surprise that potteries appeared in the region by the 1790s. The construction of a pottery in a newly settled area was a much heralded event because of the great need of storage vessels. For example, the Moravian records of 1761 Salem, North Carolina note, "June 15--people gathered from 50 and 60 miles away to buy pottery but many came in vain, as the supply was exhausted by noon."(1)

The potteries of the Greensboro/New Geneva area generally followed nineteenth-century national trends. Earthenware or redware was the usual type of pottery made in the early part of that century, and it was thrown exclusively from local clays. This was followed by the fabrication of stoneware which required a knowledge of different techniques and a higher quality clay. By the end of the century, many local Pennsylvania producers returned to low-fired clay products as large companies capable of mass production captured national markets. Tench Coxe predicted in 1810 great opportunities for the establishment of potteries in the western districts where fuel, grounds, and building materials were cheap and where the breaking and expenses of transportation caused the prices of imported ware to be excessive. He said, "There is no manufacture, for which this country is more perfectly prepared, than those of potters and glass wares, nor is it probable, that the progress of any other manufactures will be henceforth so rapid."(2)

Zadok Cramer reported in 1814 that Alexander Trotter was establishing a pottery in Pittsburgh with the intention of "making all kinds of earthen ware, in a superior style, to any which has been attempted in the western country." However, he was having difficulty finding suitable clay. Cramer enlisted the help of his readers to locate banks of clay to alleviate the high cost of imported pottery.(3)

The first known record of a potter in Fayette County is that of Christian Tarr who was taxed with a log potter shop in Union Township (Uniontown) in 1798. He had purchased lot 29 from Jacob Beeson in 1791. He operated his pottery on this lot for a number of years. It would appear that Tarr was fairly successful; he also owned a two-story brick house and one-story brick kitchen. The western glass industry, which began at New Geneva in 1797, was in constant need of particular clays to make the pots (crucibles) for glass furnaces. This is why the seams of clay were discovered in the New
Geneva/Greensboro area. These seams would serve the area well for the next hundred years. (4)

The pottery in this study was essentially from natural clays, not processed clays as used in English tableware or fine white stoneware. The potter used traditional methods in preparing his clay as well as in turning his ware. Clay in its purely natural state was not usable, however. The semidry clay was put into a pug mill where it was pulverized into a homogeneous state. To give the clay strength and elasticity, fine sand and water were then added. When the refined clay was removed from the pug mill, it was screened to remove any impurities such as stones. The clay was then ready for the turner. Other materials required in pottery production were ingredients to make glazes. Colored glazes, made from metallic oxides, provided the simplest form of decoration. Iron oxide, often present in the clay or added with iron filings, produced a range of browns. The finished earthenware was brushed or dipped into the glaze desired. (5)

Alexander Vance, long recognized as the first potter in the area, was first taxed in Greene Township (Greensboro) in 1807 with five lots, one house, and the potter trade. Vance had previously bid on Greensburgh lots 49 through 52 at Albert Gallatin's auction of 1803 but evidently did not pay on these until 1806. That same year he purchased lot 22 from Elias Stone, and this is where his pottery operation began. In 1808 he had seven lots, one house, and two cabins. In 1809, Vance was joined by James Vance, evidently a brother, in the potters trade. (The Vances were the sons of James Vance, Sr., a native of Ireland, who settled near Morristown, New Jersey. Vance purchased 92 acres on the Big Whitely Creek in Greene Township in 1797.) Both continued to be taxed as single men potters until 1812 when Alexander was also taxed as a storekeeper with three lots and two houses. (6)

One history states that Alexander Vance was the first man to attempt the manufacture of stoneware in Greene County, but due to poor quality clay he instead produced earthenware. Some local histories state that Daniel Boughner became a partner in the Vance pottery by 1811, but tax records do not confirm this. Daniel Boughner was first taxed in Greene Township in 1816, and he was not taxed as a potter until 1817. At that time, he was also assessed with two lots and a house. Daniel married Mary Vance, sister of Alexander, in this period. "As in all early traditional crafts, the closely guarded secrets of the potters' trade was passed on from father to son, master to apprentice, by word of mouth and example." In 1819 Alexander and James Vance along with their wives, then residing in Cincinnati, sold the pottery and an additional lot to Boughner. Alexander reportedly died in Cincinnati in 1850. Lot 22 "with all its buildings" was sold for $3,450.00, a hefty price for that time. (7)
By 1820 in addition to Boughner, Joseph Keener and Henry Stephens were also enlisted in the pottery trade in Greene Township. In that same year Samuel Eberhart was the pot maker for the glassworks. Stephens had removed by 1821, but Keener continued there as potter until at least 1830. Little early earthenware or stoneware is marked with the maker's name. This may have partially resulted from storekeeper's requests so that local ware could be sold as imported as well as from the potter's lack of time or lack of pride in their product. (8)

The earliest potteries in the United States produced earthenware or redware. The low-firing clays used in the manufacture of this ware contained iron oxides which produced a red color when fired. This porous, less durable pottery did not require the technology that stoneware did. Waynesburg College has several lead-glaze earthenware pieces from the early Vance/Boughner era. These large jars have an ovoid shape typical of the era. Historian Walter Hough pictured a gallon jug, also ovoid in form but heavier at the base, thrown by William Boughner (1819-1901) in 1849. A similar shaped jug is attributed to a mid-nineteenth century New Jersey pottery. This may reaffirm one history which states that the Vances came from New Jersey. However, this style is representative of the classic period in American pottery (1790-1820) when pottery had small bases with almost top-heavy bodies. The Boughner pottery continued to produce this type of ware until that year. (9)

As the nineteenth century progressed, the classic ovoid forms of pottery gradually gave way to more utilitarian shapes. The curves of the sides became flatter and less striking while the bases became wider and more substantial. The crocks produced in this later period had straight sides with ample rims. The expansion of pottery markets also promoted the straighter lines because they allowed for more efficient shipping. (10)

Although archaeologist and ceramics expert Edwin Atlee Barber indicates that Morgantown was an early center for the stoneware pottery industry, the local histories are vague as to how early the industry developed there. Potter John Scott was located there by 1800. John W. Thompson, born in 1784, was also an early potter there by at least 1814. Another history states that potter Jacob Foulke was there by 1784. This information indicates that these potteries were not much earlier, if at all, than those at Greensboro. None confirm that anything other than redware was produced at these potteries. In fact, one history states that the first kiln of Morgantown stoneware was fired in 1834. (11)

Stoneware was thrown from a fine, dense clay, sometimes called kaolin, which
was found in abundance only in a few places in United States. This type of clay fires to a hard vitreous body, hence the name stoneware. It also requires firing at a much higher temperature than redware. Stoneware was commonly glazed by throwing salt in the kiln, which then vaporized and condensed on the surface of the ware. Unlike the lead glaze on earthenware, the salt glaze united with the body and consequently was not liable to chipping and spalling. Albany slip was usually used to glaze the interior of this ware, but it was also sometimes used on the exterior and produced a rich brown color. Philadelphia became a pioneer center of early stoneware production because it not only had access to sources of clay in New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania, but was a shipping port as well. (12)

By the early eighteenth century stoneware potters had arrived in eastern ports of the United States. However, there was only a very gradual growth of the industry. It was not until the second quarter of the nineteenth century that stoneware production in the United States rapidly expanded, Earthenware or redware apparently lost favor with the growing knowledge of the lethal nature of its lead glaze. Because stoneware is fired at a higher temperature, it is also far more durable. Stoneware reached its zenith in America during the mid-nineteenth century when industrial technology was rapidly taking over other crafts. (13)

Despite being locked into its utilitarian position, stoneware by 1860 entered its peak of glaze painting. During this period from 1860 to about 1870 the finest pieces emerged from the potteries of northeastern United States. Pottery expert Donald Webster wrote, "Particularly in the Northeast, including Ohio, where competitive stoneware potteries were heavily concentrated, by 1865 or 1870 'pot painting' became almost a craze, with greater percentages of pottery than ever before now bearing at least some blue decoration." (14)

The most common kind of stoneware produced was one to five gallon crocks and jugs which were used for storage in the cellar or kitchen. The different type of clay, the required high firing temperature, and heavy use demanded thick walled forms quite different from redware. Although utilitarian in nature, they became highly embellished by the 1850s. Decorating techniques were limited to various methods of incising or impressing designs onto the body of the pottery. Although the finished stoneware usually emerged in various shades of buff, brown, or grey, cobalt blue was generally the only color to otherwise adorn this ware. This was because cobalt blue was the only metallic oxide capable of withstanding the high temperature needed to fire stoneware. (15)
The most uniquely distinguishing feature of the jug is the height and lip of the neck. In Pennsylvania the neck was usually thick and squat with a pronounced overhanging lip. Greensboro/New Geneva jugs characteristically have straight, but slightly flared spouts which give a Spartan look to the jug. (16)

Although it is possible that the Boughners were making stoneware by the 1840s, the earliest dated piece of Greensboro stoneware is 1852. As previously stated, redware was being produced there until at least 1849. In 1850 Daniel Boughner, Sr. was taxed as a merchant with two houses on two lots, and his son William was listed as a single man potter. The 1850 federal census showed sixty-one year old merchant Daniel Boughner with sons William aged twenty and Alexander aged nineteen as potters. Daniel Boughner & Sons had their store at the corner of Front and County streets and their factory at the corner of Front and Minor streets (lot 22). Daniel had purchased the store property from the estate of Henry Sheets in 1853. A local history indicated that Alexander V. Boughner began learning the potter's trade at age thirteen. Daniel, Sr. died in 1861, and in 1865 Alexander purchased lot 22 from his father's other heirs. Alexander and his brother William purchased the store property from the heirs at the same time. Alexander was engaged in that trade almost twenty-five years before he became a full-time storekeeper in 1868. (17)

Southwestern Pennsylvania took a comparatively early lead in the manufacture of pottery. Pittsburgh was listed with two earthenware potteries in 1807. In 1810 Fayette County ranked fifth in the state in the value of its potteries, and Washington County ranked seventh. There were 164 potteries valued at $164,520 in the state at that time. The 1840 manufacturer's census shows Greene County with seven potteries employing ten men, and producing $3,800.00 worth of finished products. That same year Fayette County had six potteries with seven men employed, and producing $3,000.00 worth of pottery. At that time Allegheny County only had one pottery which employed four men and produced $1,000.00 worth of goods. (18)

The 1850s saw the Hamilton brothers enter the Greensboro pottery industry. The 1850 census showed William L. Hamilton (1815-1888), locally known as Leet, as a potter in Monongahela Township. Hamilton's possible nephew Leet Davis, aged eighteen, was also listed in his household as a potter. (In 1860 David Leet Davis was listed as a potter on Ferry Street in New Geneva.) In 1854 James and William L. Hamilton were taxed only for their unnamed occupation, but in 1855 James was also taxed with a house, lot, and pottery.
In 1851 James Hamilton had purchased two-thirds of Greensboro lots 5 and 6 and the lots opposite these from George Debolt. Hamilton purchased the remaining third from Debolt in 1854. This was known as the "steam mill property" and is the location of the Hamilton pottery works according to the 1876 Atlas of Greene County. The actual pottery works was on the northwest corner of Walnut and Water streets. In 1860 Hamilton advertised the works as the "Eagle Pottery and Chemical Ware Manufactory." His advertisement claimed that his pottery was "the best article made in the country" and "can be freely used for cooking." He also boasted that he had facilities for making the largest size in ware "from 40 to 50 gallons in size." In January 1880 James Hamilton sold two thirds interest in lots 5 and 6 to William T. Williams and Thomas F. Reppert. Lot 5 contained a frame pot shop. Hamilton died in December 1880, and the following year Williams and Reppert purchased the remaining third from Hamilton's daughters. Later generations referred to this pottery as the one on the river bank. (19)

Evidently, Leet Hamilton purchased Greensboro lots 50 and 51. However, no deeds could be located to confirm this. This became the location of the Hamilton and Jones pottery, also known as the Star Pottery. Lots 50 and 51 were among the lots purchased by Alexander Vance from Albert Gallatin in 1803. In 1893 Hamilton & Jones Company made a deed of assignment to James Black and Uriah Jones, and the following year the company's property on lots 50 and 51 was sold to Robert M. Jones of Baltimore. (20)

Many times the local histories and tax records did not agree as to who were potters or when they operated. In 1854 the above mentioned George Debolt was the only one taxed with a pottery in Greensboro. In 1855 the assessor noted that Debolt had removed to Nicholson Township (New Geneva), where he was listed as a potter. Debolt remained there until 1859. One local history noted that the first kiln in New Geneva was constructed in 1854 by S. A. Dilliner. Another writer stated that George Debolt and Henry Atchison built a kiln at New Geneva in 1849. However, Debolt and Charles Bower were the only potters taxed in Nicholson Township from 1850 to 1860. Samuel R. Dilliner was listed as a stoneware manufacturer and Joseph Dilliner a potter on Ford Street [New Geneva] in 1860. (21)

The New Geneva potteries changed hands often with partnerships being dissolved and new ones being formed. Debolt returned to Nicholson Township in 1863 and remained on the tax rolls there through 1882. Debolt and Joseph E. Dilliner are the two potters that consistently show up on the Nicholson tax lists in the 1860s. L. Leet Davis and H. K. Atchison appear on the tax rolls once during that period. Eberhart and Williams were taxed with a pottery
shop in 1870, and by 1871 this shop had been transferred to Conrad and Patton. Alexander Conrad was taxed with a pottery shop from that time through 1882. John P. Eberhart didn't show up on the tax rolls as a potter until 1879. L. B. Dilliner first appeared in 1875, and Charles E. Dilliner appeared in 1877. Robert Williams was only sighted as a potter in 1879. Joseph Eniex was first taxed in 1881. The 1882 list noted that a house and lot of L. B. Dilliner had been transferred to J. P. Eberhart. In 1876 J. Evans was listed with a pottery in Nicholson Township, south of New Geneva on the bank of the Monongahela. (22)

By 1859 Greensboro's two potteries employed thirty workers and produced 225,000 gallons of ware per year. Most of the pottery produced was shipped to various points down the Monongahela and Ohio rivers and to ports along the Mississippi, as far south as New Orleans. The finished product was loaded onto large wooden barges, sometimes called "broad-horn boats" or "pottery arks." An 1866 receipt from a Belle Vernon businessman indicates butter and cream jars and milk pans were received on the steamer "Chieftan" from William Boughner. (23)

The 1860 tax showed Daniel Boughner as a merchant with a store house and lot, and William and Alexander Boughner were noted as potters and dealers in stoneware. Also that year William L. Hamilton was taxed as a potter and dealer in stoneware while James Hamilton was taxed with a pottery and four lots and was likewise a potter and dealer. Other men taxed as potters that year included Thomas Cox, William Couch, Alexander Conrad, and Edward Couch.

Throughout the 1860s Alexander Conrad continued as a single man potter in Monongahela Township, but by 1872 he is listed with lot 21 in New Geneva. This lot wasn't actually purchased by Conrad until 1873. The previous owners were Adolph Eberhart and Joseph Williams. Giovannone's history comments that Conrad's ware is more common than some of the other potters in the region. The property remained Conrad's until 1882 when the sheriff sold it to Charles W. Williams for a debt Conrad owed Williams. The property at that time was described as having "a frame dwelling, a frame potter shop, and other buildings." (24)

The sheriff of Fayette County sold lot 21 to C.L. Williams, Arthur Robbins, Margaret Hamilton, and Isaac Herrington in 1896. At that time, the pottery was described as having three frame buildings joined together. One of these was two-story and the others one-story. There was also a stable, two kilns, and "such other buildings and machinery as used for a pottery works" on the property. C.L. Williams sold his interest in this pottery to Robbins and
Hamilton in 1898, and in 1902 Gredily Williams, widow of R.T. Williams, sold the adjoining lot, lot 22, to Hamilton and Robbins. R.T. Williams had purchased this lot in 1890 from D.D. Sandusky. According to local legend, Robert disappeared on the way to Pittsburgh to deliver a load of pottery. (25)

Biographical information on some of the more prominent families involved in the pottery industry serves to illustrate how the business was retained in certain families very similar to the glass industry. Obviously, there were trade secrets which were not passed on to present-day potters. For example, certain colors and glazes have not been reproduced. This information also tracks the potters' movements and confirms how close, both in family and business relationships, the people of Greensboro were to those of New Geneva. Robert T. Williams (1852-1895) apprenticed in Greensboro at the Johnston Little pottery in 1869. When that pottery closed in 1870, he joined the Hamilton and Jones company, where he was employed until 1875. He left Greensboro in 1880 and worked for the John P. Eberhart pottery in New Geneva. In 1882 he became manager of the Alexander Conrad shop which was owned by Charles Williams. In 1889 he purchased this company from the Charles Williams heirs. It was described then as "having erected one dwelling, buildings, sheds, kilns, etc. in use for the manufacture of stoneware." An 1889 biography of R.T. Williams noted that, "His ware is in demand, and he enjoys a liberal patronage and support." (26)

It appears that the first pottery in New Geneva was located on lots 5 and 6. This was part of the Andrew Kramer & Company glassworks property which was sold to Alexander Crow in 1865. That sheriff's deed describes these lots as having thereon erected "an old log pot house." Isaac P. Eberhart bought these lots in 1868. (27)

The 1933 Davenport history notes that New Geneva pottery shops made fruit jars and jugs from clay hauled from local farms. These same clay banks supplied Greensboro potteries as well. The New Geneva clay was described as a "white stiff clay." According to another account, the industry thrived on a rich vein of clay near Mapleton, a clay recognized all over the country for its superior quality. In the 1880s Adolph M. Eberhart had a bed of potter's clay on his Springhill Township farm from which he realized about $500 a year. Schaltenbrand writes that the Greensboro/New Geneva clay beds were the first major source of stoneware clay to be found west of South Amboy, New Jersey. (28)

John Jones (1839-1919), a partner in one of the foremost pottery companies in the area, learned the potter's trade early in life. He purchased lot 21 in
Greensboro in 1862. Located on the corner of Front and County streets, this lot contained a two-story house, store room and warehouse. Jones married Mary, the daughter of William L. Hamilton in 1865. He went into partnership with his father-in-law in 1866. In 1888 they manufactured earthenware and tile roofing at Greensboro. (29)

Henry K. Atchison, born in Elizabeth, New Jersey, in 1820 learned the potter's trade under his father. In 1855 he came to New Geneva where he stayed six years. By 1860 he was listed as a stoneware manufacturer with his factory near New Geneva. In 1870 he was a storekeeper and potter along with two of his sons in Monongahela Township. The 1880 census shows him as a "U.S. storekeeper." Possibly this means that he was a postmaster. Apparently his son Henry P. Atchison (1852-1941) was married to a daughter of the previously mentioned George Debolt. (30)

In 1870 Alexander V. Boughner was assessed as a merchant, and Alexander and William Boughner were assessed with a storehouse and lot. At age 39 Alexander Boughner had real and personal property valued higher than any of the pottery manufacturers in Greensboro. Boughner's store ledgers are indicative of how cheaply the pottery of that era was sold. In 1887 a Mrs. Thomas Lyons purchased 100 one-gallon jugs for $5.00, and in 1888 the Barb brothers of Garards Fort bought two dozen flower pots for $1.75. Robert Peters of Greensboro purchased five squares of tile for $15.00 in 1886. (31)

Also in 1870 James Hamilton & Company was assessed with three horses and a pottery while Hamilton Jones & Company was taxed with a shop and lot. James Hamilton, aged 45 and apparently single, was living at David Jones' hotel. James' brother, William L. Hamilton, aged 54, wife Susan, and son James aged 20 were living in a separate residence. The younger James was also a potter. Men taxed as potters that year include: Alexander Conrad, William H. Couch, Thomas Cox, David Cox, David L. Davis, James Hamilton, Frank Hamilton, John Jones, and James Littell. Single men potters included: George Baltzer Kramer, William J. More, Daniel H. Smith, John A. Rumble, and J.W. Ingram. The 1870 census for Monongahela Township noted that fifty-four year old William L. Hamilton was a stoneware manufacturer, and his twenty-year-old son James was a potter. James Hamilton, aged forty-five, and Lawrence Crawford, aged thirty-six, were also listed as stoneware manufacturers. In 1870 fifty-two Monongahela Township men were employed in the pottery industry.

The 1870 manufacturer's census shows how incredibly productive Greene County was. It had four pottery establishments, employed 53 hands, and produced $40,095.00 worth of goods. That same record showed Fayette
County with five establishments which employed 23 men, and produced $14,860.00 worth of pottery. At the same time, Allegheny County had nine establishments, employed 79 men, and produced $51,750.00 worth of pottery. For further comparison the data from Philadelphia County is included. This southeastern Pennsylvania county had nineteen potteries, employed 535 men, and produced $877,550.00 worth of pottery. These figures include both earthenware and stoneware.(32)

The 1880 manufacturer's census again shows Greene County with four pottery plants. However, now they employed eighty men and boys and produced $36,800.00 worth of finished pottery. While Greene County slipped a little in production from 1870, Allegheny County more than tripled its output despite the fact that less than half the number of 1870 plants were still operating. With four plants in 1880 and ninety-two men, women, and youths, they produced $137,181.00 worth of pottery.(33)

The 1880 population census for Greensboro showed sixty-five men involved in some aspect of the pottery business. These included those that worked at the stoneware shop, the tile shop, were salesmen, artists, or wood cutters. Many of the same families continued in the business: Hamiltons, Couches, Robbins, Rumbles, and Atchisons.

The following were assessed as Monongahela Township potters in 1890: G.J. Core, James H. Core, John P. Kramer, P.E. Kramer, and Grant Kramer. Williams & Reppert were listed with a pottery and general store that year. On the Fayette County side of the river, R.T. Williams was listed as a stoneware manufacturer with a general store.(34)

A comparison of the 1880 and 1890 manufacturers censuses showed that the number of manufacturers of clay and pottery products decreased in that period. However, the value of the products produced more than doubled. By 1890 Trenton, New Jersey, and East Liverpool, Ohio, were the principal centers of the clay and pottery industries. Pennsylvania ranked fourth in the nation in number of clay and pottery establishments in 1890. In 1880 the value of its pottery products were $5,561,322.00, but in 1890 this number was $11,143,688.00, the highest in the nation. Ohio's value in 1880 was $5,760,765.00 and $10,860,938.00 in 1890.(35)

The 1900 census showed nine remaining potters in Greensboro: Adam Hayden, Hugh Hamilton, Larry and John A. Rumble, Isaac and William Herrington, Lloyd Mallory, Ernst Dilliner, and Larry D. Cox. There were three stoneware salesmen: James Neil, William J. Moore, and John Jones. In addition, John
Hughes was noted as an artist. No potters were listed as living in Nicholson Township.

Arthur Robbins (1867-1914) operated the last pottery in the Greensboro/New Geneva area. He along with his potters constructed the last kiln in New Geneva about 1907. When it was completed, he called a photographer from Uniontown to photograph the kiln with his workers in front. The two old kilns were removed after the completion of the new one. The original photo survives in the hands of his daughter-in-law. The last ware manufactured there was a utilitarian, undecorated type used as whiskey jugs. New, early twentieth-century government regulations in liquid measure advanced the use of glass, with its accurate sizes, over pottery, which was less precise in its dimensions. Someone tried to operate the pottery after Robbins' death but was unsuccessful. There was never sale of the remaining pottery, tools, or machinery. According to tradition, wagon loads of pottery were taken out to a nearby farm and buried. Robbins' wife Margaret sold the property (lot 21) to T.B. Eberhart in 1916.(36)

Besides the indigenous families who had been involved in the glass and pottery industries for generations, itinerant potters or men from outside the area came seeking work. Schaltenbrand reports the legend that two freed slaves worked as wood choppers in the early Greensboro potteries. According to tradition, Robert Peters was owned by a doctor in the south. He was freed and wandered down the river to Greensboro. Mr. Hamilton told him that he could sleep in the pottery if he worked for him. The 1870 census for Monongahela Township listed Peters as working at a pottery.(37)

After the pottery production dwindled at Greensboro/New Geneva, some potters moved on to other locations. Among these locations were New Brighton, Allegheny County, where four potteries were still operating in 1890. The New Brighton Pottery Works, with a branch office in Pittsburgh, advertised "fine glazed stew pans, milk pans, fruit jars, stoneware, greenhouse pots, lawn vases, stove flues, etc."(38)

In addition to the regular items of clay manufacture, potters, in their spare time, turned pieces for special occasions or for family use. These included money banks, pitchers, mugs, animal door stops, and fireplace pieces. Most of these were done in what is locally termed "tanware." The majority of these have a buff tan background because there is no overall glaze. The decorations done on these pieces are in dark brown or maroon. These decorations are often reminiscent of the Pennsylvania German tulip design. According to one writer this type of ware was largely produced in the 1870s.
and 1880s. Although these items are quite rare now, the museum at Waynesburg College has accumulated a fine collection over the years. (39)

In 1953 Larry Rumble, aged 76, was one of three potters still living, who had worked in the Greensboro potteries. He began work at age seven in 1884 and received twenty-five cents a day. He advanced to "turner" where he fashioned jugs and jars by hand. He earned $1.65 a day at this position. During this period there were two pottery shops in Greensboro: the Hamilton and Jones pottery and the Williams and Reppert works, where Rumble worked. Each plant employed about thirty to thirty-five workers. (40)

Rumble recalled that "In order to get off on Christmas Day, the men would work longer and utilize the spare kilns, the one or two kilns each shop maintained in the event of a breakdown." The plant he worked at was a five-kiln shop. The kilns were from twelve to fourteen feet high inside. They held between 2300 to 3000 gallons worth of ware depending on the size of the products. There was a series of openings in the kilns at various levels to allow the insertion of wood, coal, salt, and air. Between ten and fifteen percent of the ware broke during the firing. There was also crockery which could not be sold due to imperfections. One way of disposing of imperfects or seconds was to hold a lottery. Purchased tickets allowed a person to get a certain number of stone throws at a row of seconds. A gold piece had been placed in one of the creaks. If the thrower broke that creak, he would get the gold piece. (41)

Clay for the shops was first hauled from the "Beard place" in Fayette County. It was hauled across the river at the location of the New Geneva ferry until the lock and dam was put in 1882. Then it was hauled across the river in boats. Later a bank was opened on the west side of the river on the "Dunlap place," just off Route 88. Pick and shovel was used to dig the clay, and it was hauled by wagon to the shops. (42)

Rumble said a turner could make during a working day around 320 half-gallon jars. For other sizes, the daily output would be around 225 gallons. For example 160 two-gallon jars or 120 three-gallon jars could be made. Potters described items such as fruit jars and butter crocks as "open ware." Long after the pottery shops were closed Rumble would set up his potter's wheel at Greensboro carnivals to demonstrate his craft. (43)

The decline of the pottery industry in Greensboro can be charted in the tax records. In 1885 the Frank Reppert pottery (originally the James Hamilton works) was valued at $4290, but by 1895 the Williams & Reppert pottery was
valued at $2350. As previously mentioned, due to financial embarrassment the Hamilton & Jones pottery had been sold to Robert Jones of Baltimore in 1893. This pottery was only valued at $1200 through 1897. After it burned, it was further devalued to $285 in 1898. Although a Hamilton Stoneware Co. was taxed from 1902 through 1904, it was only valued at $150. The Williams & Reppert plant was consistently valued at $2400 through this period. As with other industries of the region, the pottery industry became more concentrated where transportation networks provided cheap and convenient routes for raw materials and products. Similar to the glass industry where Fayette and Greene counties lead the region in the early part of the nineteenth century, by the end of the century Allegheny County lead the region in pottery production. Nevertheless, the Greensboro/New Geneva potteries, because of their distinctive forms and designs, earned a permanent niche in the development of pottery in the United States. In addition, the ware from these potteries continue to give name recognition to the Greensboro/New Geneva area.

Not only was pottery mass produced in industrial centers, other factors affected the industry as a whole. By the late 1860s housewives could safely vacuum can vegetables and fruits in glass jars eliminating the need for heavy pottery jars whose contents were more likely to spoil. The increasing popularity of tinware after the Civil War took a bite out of the pottery market. In addition, the 1880s saw the introduction of mass-molded, low-priced glass of all kinds. Innovation and technology virtually wiped out all the small pottery operations across the United States by the early twentieth century, and those in Greensboro/New Geneva were no exception. The industry grew rapidly in Greensboro after 1855, spread across the river to New Geneva, and peaked between 1870 and 1880. It declined rapidly to 1890, and by 1900 the industry was only a shadow of what it had been twenty years earlier.(44)

Archaeological tests done between New Geneva lot 22 and Georges Creek in 1986 recovered considerable stoneware sherds there. These tests revealed that pottery waste was deposited on the terrace above Georges Creek to the rear of the pottery. In addition to kiln furniture, the stoneware sample included storage jars, canning jars, jugs, milk pans, and possibly butter dish sherds. The sherds contained both hand painted and stenciled designs in cobalt blue. The archaeological report concluded that the waste area was used during the 1860s or early 1870s.(45)

Tests done at the James Hamilton pottery site in Greensboro resulted in the discovery of a large deposit of sherds on the upper terrace (lot 84) of this site. Over 80% of the sherds recovered were hand painted which would
indicate that most were deposited before 1870. The additional presence of sherds from the Williams and Reppert Company indicates that the waste area was being used after 1880. The report concluded that the site appears to be both vertically and horizontally stratified and therefore may yield culturally significant information.(46)
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Architecture of Greensboro/New Geneva c.1790-1944

On the surface the architecture of the Greensboro/New Geneva area is not striking, but an in-depth study of its individual components reveal a varied tapestry of forms, styles, and changing patterns from the late eighteenth century into the early twentieth century. The area's architecture was influenced by various forces: not only by the builder/architects and the natural environment but by the inhabitants as well. The inhabitants were of various ethnic backgrounds and also former residents of various regions of the United States. The majority came from two basic cultural hearth areas: southeastern Pennsylvania and the Tidewater South. In addition, this study area is on the cusp of three cultural regions: Mid-Atlantic, Upland South, and Midwest. Therefore the architecture reflects the various traditions of these people as well as the ongoing force or process of modernization which means the increasing influence of the Georgian form and national styles. (1)

A Georgian house in its purest form is recognizable by its five-bay facade. Each bay is evenly spaced, and the external expression is one of symmetry. In these houses there is a central passage, and each room is designed with a specific function in mind. In earlier building traditions, such as the hall/parlor plan, entry into the house was directly into the hall, an inclusive term which denoted both kitchen and living space. This hall/parlor served as the social center of the house. In addition, in these earlier building forms, rooms were multi-functional. (2)

Vernacular architecture best describes most of the architecture in the Greensboro/New Geneva area. The vernacular architecture approach to architectural history focuses its study on human communities. Thus, the study of vernacular architecture not only involves the common, the local, and the regional, but also popular, broadly based architecture, as well as the architect designed houses of the elite. Vernacular architecture uses local materials and a technology which is personal to the people for whom the buildings are constructed. This connection between vernacular architecture, its immediate surroundings, and the producer/user populace create a stability that lasts generations. Therefore certain vernacular architectural features often become symbols of a people and their region. (3)

The earliest inhabitants were largely of English or Scotch-Irish ancestry, but it was an open frontier society nevertheless. However, by the 1790s Albert Gallatin was influential in attracting some Swiss, French, and German business/craftsmen to settle in the region. The various ethnic and individual influences have resulted in a varied architectural landscape, but there are
common threads, and trends can be charted. The initial settlement imprint of the builder/craftsmen of the early Gallatin era was long lasting and affected the building patterns of succeeding generations. Elements of nineteenth-century national architectural movements including Federal, Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, Italianate, and Queen Anne were adopted by Greensboro/New Geneva builders. However, many homes retained elements or floor plans related to earlier styles and vernacular traditions. The simple, yet handsome newel posts, fireplace surrounds, and fenestration moldings of Greensboro and New Geneva houses had antecedents in southeastern Pennsylvania, eastern Maryland, and Virginia which often reflected earlier classical European forms. (4)

Generally, the earliest buildings of southwestern Pennsylvania were constructed of logs. Log construction was best adapted to frontier living as it was relatively simple in form and economical in materials and time. There were some notable exceptions. For example, certain areas of Fayette County had a higher than usual ratio of stone houses. Examples of these stone houses include the Edward Cook house in Washington Township and the Andrew Rabb house in German Township. Both are believed to have been built in the 1770s. Both Cook and Rabb became large landholders/entrepreneurs and pronounced their success on the frontier through powerful architecture of substance and solid craftsmanship. Brick houses weren't usually built until after 1800. However, Swiss entrepreneur Albert Gallatin chose to build his 26 x 29 foot house of brick in 1789. According to architectural historian Charles Stotz, stone was the choice building material for men of means from the late eighteenth century through the early nineteenth century, but by 1830 brick buildings were overwhelmingly in evidence throughout the region. (5)

To document the kind of housing found in southwestern Pennsylvania in the late eighteenth century, the 1798 Direct Tax was used. The 1798 Direct Tax, a federal tax, often referred to as the glass tax, was enacted to raise resources to strengthen the army and navy in response to an undeclared war with France. Houses and outbuildings were assessed according to size, material, age, number of windows, and apparently sometimes workmanship. It was a progressive tax with the largest levies to be paid by the top percentiles of wealth. There were at least five lists for some but not all counties. List A contained the highest valued buildings within a municipality and also gave the most detailed information on each building including the building material, size, number of stories, number of windows, and number of panes of glass. List B not only described lower valued houses, but also detailed certain outbuildings as well as commercial and industrial buildings. However, the windows of the buildings on this list were not enumerated. Lists lower than B did not give particular details such as the materials or dimensions of the building. (6)
The writer used the 1798 tax in a previous study of the southwestern Pennsylvania counties of Bedford, Somerset, Westmoreland, Fayette, Allegheny, Washington, and Greene. The results showed that 88% of the highest valued houses of the region were built of logs. Just over 5% were built of stone and less than 1% were built of brick. Actually the percentage of stone houses may be even smaller because the majority of dwelling houses of the region were appraised at less than $100.00, and the building materials for these were not specified. In addition, since log or wood construction was the cheapest construction form in terms of materials and labor, those inhabitants of low or middling income would have lived in small buildings of this type. (7)

Again using the 1798 federal tax, 67% of the region's houses were found to be of two stories. Another 13% of the houses were one-and-a-half stories, and 12% were just one story. This illuminates the fact that elites of the region preferred two-story houses but the more traditional one-story house was still favored by some men of means. (Please note that these percentages are based on the raw data found in the tax records in which there were omissions of information. Consequently, the percentages do not necessarily equal 100 percent.)

The 1798 federal tax was also used to obtain information as to the average size of buildings in this period. List A was used in this exercise. This list assessed all those houses within each township that were valued at more than $100.00. Consequently, these were the finest houses in the township. A representative township was chosen for each county except Bedford where no lists of this level are extant. Those townships chosen were nearly equal in size in terms of number of properties recorded on the list. The results indicate that Greene County had the smallest houses and Somerset County had the largest. This appears to be logical as Somerset is in the eastern part of the region where settlement should have occurred first, and Greene is in the westernmost part of the region where settlement should have occurred last. The average size house of a person of the upper class at that time was 21.9 feet x 28.4 feet which by today's standards is quite small. This size also indicates that most had one- or two-room floor plans.

This study of building materials, number of stories, and dimensions as provided by the 1798 Direct Tax gave the writer insight into what the typical late 18th century house of southwestern Pennsylvania should look like. It also provided a model or standard for comparison when doing the actual field or survey work, and clued the researcher that few of these small wooden structures remained in the Greensboro/New Geneva area. Similarly,
vernacular architecture historian Orlando Rideout had studied the 1798 federal tax for Maryland. He found that large two-and-a-half story stone and brick buildings had a 50% survival rate, while simple frame hall and parlor houses had a 15% survival rate. Those of the smallest size had less than a 1% survival rate. This comparison serves to substantiate the probability that few of the wooden houses of the earliest settlement period in New Geneva or Greensboro have survived to the present. The typical late eighteenth-century house in southwestern Pennsylvania was a small rectangular, wooden two-story house. (8)

Focussing on the Greensboro/New Geneva area, compilation of 1798 tax data from Springhill Township, Fayette County reveals that 69% of the best buildings there were constructed of logs and another 23% were of frame construction. This means a total of 92% of the township's buildings were constructed of wood. Only 4% were constructed with bricks and another 2% were of stone. Greene Township, Greene County has a nearly identical statistic of 93% of its housing constructed of log or frame. Greene had no brick buildings, but 7% of its highest valued properties were constructed of stone. Although Denise Grantz found in her survey of Fayette County that early frame buildings had virtually disappeared there; at least two are located in this study, one, the Davenport house and store building in New Geneva, and the other, the Fettermen/Herrington house in Greensboro. The core of this last house measures 25 x 15 feet, corresponding with what Gallatin's friend John Badollet owned in 1798. Overall, there was a slightly higher amount of wooden (4-5%) and brick (4-7%) buildings in the Greensboro/New Geneva area in 1798 than was found in the southwestern Pennsylvania region as enumerated above. (9)

Springhill Township had 46 properties in the List A category. Sixteen of these (34%) had separate or detached kitchens measured, and four had meat houses listed. Springhill houses had a mean size of 21.2 feet x 26.7 feet. Six houses measured 18 x 24 feet. These houses were likely similar in plan and layout to the one architect Benjamin Latrobe described in 1806 for quarrier William Robertson at Acqua, Virginia. This little log house was delineated as "24 feet by 18, two stories high, each [floor] divided into two rooms." These two-room houses will be discussed in further detail later. Springhill closely followed the regional trend of having about a third (34%) of its best houses built with just one story. (10)

On the other side of the Monongahela, Greene Township only had 28 houses described in List A, and of that number, eleven (39%) had separate or detached kitchens measured. The average size of these houses is 19.6 feet x
26.2 feet, making them a little smaller than those in Springhill. Five houses measured 20 x 24 feet. Anthropologist/folklorist Henry Glassie felt that the rectangular cabin was most commonly found in those areas where the Pennsylvania influence was greater than that of the Tidewater. This may mean that the Pennsylvania influence was greater in this area than some previous historians have indicated. Ten (35%) of the Greene Township houses were of one story.\(^{(11)}\)

This 1798 record indicates that not only did Springhill Township have a larger amount of better housing but also a greater range of building types. These housing differences reveal a great deal about the total income and assets in real and personal estate of men on both sides of the Monongahela. The value of a dwelling provides a broader perspective into life-style than does the value of real estate. Thus the 1798 census was more than a count of windows or doors; it was also a reflection of value by size, materials, and location.\(^{(12)}\)

The 1798 tax shows New Geneva as something of a boom town. List A shows three lots in town with log houses, two of which had kitchens as well. Two of these houses were owned by Thomas Clare and the other by tavernkeeper Samuel Clark. Data from List B of this tax reveals that sixteen properties or lots with seventeen buildings were listed in New Geneva. Twelve of these properties had unfinished houses on them. Of this total number, Albert Gallatin & Company was assessed with two unfinished houses, a store house, and a warehouse. Of the twelve buildings not assessed to Gallatin, six were apparently being built as tenant houses. One of these was owned by Philadelphia speculators Benjamin and Robert Johnston. It appears that local residents Alexander Bothwell, John Clark, Thomas Graham, Thomas McCleary, and Robert McClain, all had buildings in some stage of construction. Only Graham was building his of stone. McCleary, hired to build Gallatin's store and other houses, had not finished his own dwelling. At the time only three houses, those on List A were finished.\(^{(13)}\)

Other property of Albert Gallatin & Company appears on List B, but this was not located within New Geneva. This includes four cabins, a grist mill, and two saw mills, evidently located south of Georges Creek but adjoining the Monongahela. In addition, five log houses were assessed on this list for the workmen of the glass manufactory (glassworks). These were evidently located just east of the above grouping.

On the opposite side of the river, List B shows that twenty properties were taxed in Greensburgh (Greensboro) in 1798. Of this number, ten were unimproved. In addition, four of the properties had unfinished houses or
cabins. Among these were the houses of shopkeeper Zachariah Gapen and innkeeper Charles Ferry. Andrew Clinesmith and John Ebbert each had tan shops and bark houses. Saddler Henry Sheets and hatter George Yeager were also taxed with shops. Dr. William Williams had two lots there, but his cabin was tenanted by Samuel Clark. The 1798 county tax for Greene Township shows an additional seven people with lots in Greensburgh. It appears that many local small businessmen and professionals were investing in Greensburgh lots at that time, but few had actual liveable or usable buildings there.

The fact that practically all of the buildings in the towns of New Geneva and Greensburgh show up on List B indicates how recently settled these towns were. Therefore, the houses (largely unfinished) there were not valued as highly as those located elsewhere in their respective townships. Although well-known community leaders such as John Corbley, John Minor, Albert Gallatin, and John Badollet owned lots in Greensburgh, all were unoccupied in 1798. Apparently, the development of these towns was appealing to men of means who were cautiously willing to speculate on their future success.

Some of the difficulties of building on the frontier can be learned from Albert Gallatin's correspondence. A letter of December 1795 notes that "Poor [Thomas] Thompson fell from the top of the Mill house about two weeks ago with a pair of rafters between his legs; he went head foremost and luckily for him his shoulder struck first on a large block which miraculously saved his life." The letter also discusses the state of Gallatin's store [house]. Evidently Thomas McCleary, who was building it, was behind in his work and was just "chunking and daubing" it. Since it was impossible to build the chimney that winter, the building could only be used to store goods. The letter continues by discussing the lack of skilled builders. "We are more and more convinced every day that it will be totally out of our power to build houses for other people unless workmen can be induced to settle among us either from New York or Philadelphia." Other builders on the scene besides Thompson and McCleary at that time were Jacob Clemmer and John Cheyney. Robert Nailor was another of Gallatin's workmen, but his skills are unknown. Cheyney had a small house in Springhill Township, while Nailor lived in a company house near New Geneva. By 1816 only Clemmer and Thompson survived or remained in Springhill Township. At that time Clemmer was a farmer/distiller, and Thompson was a sickle smith.(14)

The above mentioned letter writer also wanted Gallatin to persuade James Boyd to "emigrate" to New Geneva from the East. As part of Boyd's inducement, he would be offered the "two log houses and cleared land adjoining." Furthermore, the Gallatin Company would bind themselves to take from him
whatever frames of houses he would make while there, "provided they do not exceed ten annually and pay him according to dimensions, that is to say 30 by 30, 33 by 26, 25 by 20, 20 by 18." They had made these propositions to Thompson but he was evidently too heavily involved in other projects. This not only demonstrates that house frames could be made-to-order but also that frame construction was still an ideal on the frontier where labor shortages abounded. Some of the house frames being produced here were likely shipped down river to settlements where saw mills had not yet been built or were not keeping up with demand. Other studies have shown that exporting house frames occurred where shipbuilding was taking place.(15)

Gallatin's company sold two acres to [Ezekiel] Ball "for the purpose of a brick yard." Ball did improve the property for a brick yard, and by 1801 this property was occupied by John Cheyney. It was necessary to have a brick yard in town because brick or stone chimneys were required by New Geneva's founders. In his 1816 advertisement to sell his property in New Geneva, Gallatin described one of his houses as "a good two story frame house filled with bricks, with stone cellar."(16)

Neither Boyd or Thompson appear on the 1798 tax list. Evidently Boyd did not stay long in New Geneva, if at all. McCleary, Cheyney, and Ball are taxed with two-story log houses in Springhill Township. James Nicholson, Gallatin's brother-in-law and business partner, is taxed with an 18 x 24 foot log house. Likewise, Andrew Oliphant, in the iron business with his brother John, was assessed with a two-story 20 x 25 foot log house. Oliphant was also the assessor of Springhill Township. Nicholson and Oliphant were among the elites of the area, and their small houses were valued no higher than those of builder/artisans such as Cheyney and Ball.

Gallatin entered a contract in September 1795 with McCleary to construct "two hewn log houses twenty-three by thirty feet in the clear, two stories high to be divided by a hewn log partition and also by plank partitions; the upper stories of each house laid out in the same form, with a door to each room from the landing place and two windows in the long rooms, one in the small ones and one to give light to the Landing places." Each was to have a door opening onto the landing at Georges Creek. McCleary was paid additional money "for making the four doors downstairs fronting the street pannel doors." These may have been the first two-door, two-room houses in New Geneva. The work was to be completed by July 1, 1796.(17)

One of the few known houses that may survive from the pre-1800 period is on lot 25 in New Geneva. This two story log house, measuring 22 x 18 feet, was
owned by Alexander Bothwell in 1798. It was among those not finished at that time, and consequently no dimensions were given for it. However, its size, construction techniques, and materials indicate that it dates from that time. Although local histories give various eighteenth-century dates for the stone Wilson/Ripple House, tax records indicate that it was not built until later. As stated earlier, the only stone house in New Geneva in 1798 was an unfinished building on lot 31 owned by Thomas Graham. Likewise, a Greensboro log house known variously as the Badollet or Hugus House (measuring 26 x 22 feet), does not match any of the ten houses or cabins taxed in Greensburgh in 1798.

While log continued to be the predominant building material in Greensboro and Glassworks well into the nineteenth century, New Geneva branched out into a variety of building materials earlier. Scholars pinpoint the origins of American log building technology to the Delaware Valley of southeastern Pennsylvania. While discussion continues as to whether the log form was introduced by German/Swiss settlers or by Finnish or Swedish immigrants, it is generally agreed that later immigrants, particularly those of German and Scotch-Irish origin, carried the form further west and south. Although no buildings of the log cabin type (those crudely built of round logs) survive in this study area, some one or one-and-a-half story log houses do remain. (18)

The tax lists from this early period indicate that English and Scotch-Irish settlers predominated. Likewise, the known carpenter/builders on the east side of the river appear to have been of English or Scotch-Irish nativity. Albert Gallatin had Thomas McCleary and Daniel Duggan work on buildings for him. Duggan built the porches for Gallatin's brick house in 1791. The double stacked porches on this house may have set the precedent for others in the area such as the Wilson house and the Nicholson stone hotel on lot 12 (demolished in 1985) in New Geneva. McCleary, Duggan, and the previously mentioned Thompson were also likely of Scotch-Irish descent. In addition, Gallatin had Scotch-Irishman Hugh Graham design and build the stone addition to his house in 1823. He is one of the few known architect/builders in early southwestern Pennsylvania besides Adam Wilson, also of Scotch-Irish ancestry, who designed Isaac Meason's mansion in 1802. Gallatin was not pleased with Graham's finished product. He disparagingly labeled it a "Hyberno-Teutonic style." He said the exterior had the appearance of an "Irish barrack style" while the interior finishes were similar to those of a "Dutch tavern." (19)

There are Scotch-Irish antecedents for the two-room type houses found in the Greensboro/New Geneva area. Henry Glassie has presented the case that
southern mountain log cabins built within the traditions of the north of Ireland were often divided transversely into two rooms. The traditional stone and mud construction of the Scotch-Irish was not practical in the forests of North America and almost from the beginning they adopted the log house of their German neighbors. In Ulster the chimneys were built inside the gable wall, but in America they were built outside in English fashion. The average internal dimensions of this type of log house are 16 x 22 feet which compares closely with an average 15 x 21 feet for the traditional Ulster kitchen. (20)

In 1973 Henry Glassie and other vernacular architecture students conducted a study of log buildings centered in Greene County. They located 28 houses, of which 14 were one-story and 12 were two-story. A vast majority had v-notching, similar to that found at Greensboro. Unlike those at Greensboro, 69% of these houses had interior or exterior end chimneys. Only 19% had central chimneys. In addition, 53% of these buildings were only one-room. No historical research was done to date these structures, but they likely dated from the late eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century. Twelve of these houses were measured and had an average dimension of 25 x 20 feet. This nearly matches the average size of Greene Township houses in 1798 and apparently represents the survival of some of the county’s earliest houses and certainly the persistence of their type. This survey conducted throughout the county indicates that the most common pre-1850 type of plan (two-room, central chimney) found in Greensboro is not typical throughout the county. (21)

Another survey, that of Washington County architecture, Greene’s neighbor to the north, was completed in 1975. This local study included copious photos but limited the text to description. It illustrates some one- and two-story log houses. Although a few of these had central chimneys, most apparently had interior or exterior gable end chimneys. A third of the examples had exterior chimneys. Over half were two-stories and less than a third had two front doors. Almost two-thirds had asymmetrical fenestration. Again, this work indicates that there are similar house types in this county, but not to the same degree of concentration as those found in Greensboro/New Geneva. (22)

Warren Hofstra’s study of the Scotch-Irish settlement at Opequon in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia found that structures initially were conceived as single units. He also learned that the Ulster vernacular tradition of adding a unit when expansion was needed, was used in America as well. The 1798 tax illustrates that this tradition was being carried on in the Greensboro/New Geneva area as well. One third of the Greene Township/Springhill Township properties on List A were noted with separate kitchens. This practice
continued into the nineteenth century with kitchens generally not included in the main block of the house. Instead, they often appear as single-story shed roof additions to the rear of the house. (23)

A local builder on the west side of the Monongahela was Jacob Dillinger. Of Germanic heritage, Dillinger is believed to have built most of the early log houses in the area. Colonel John Minor had hired Dillinger in 1778 as foreman of the timber framers for the boats of the George Rogers Clark expedition. According to tradition, he became a house builder when he returned from Kentucky. "He was known as the best mechanic west of the mountains." One source notes that Dillinger built the first house at Greensboro, "a two-story log house with an eight foot fireplace on the bank of the Monongahela River." Local historians claim that this is the present log building on County Street, known as the Boughner store. However, this 27 x 25 foot building does not match any of those listed for Greensboro in 1798. (24)

Fifteen of the earliest known surviving houses from c. 1795 to c. 1850 in Greensboro, Glassworks, and New Geneva show an average measurement of 22 x 29 feet. (These were selected according to three criteria: appearance, location, or known history. All except one building in Greensboro and New Geneva are within the proposed historic districts there, and these are located within the earliest developed sections of each town. All of those in Glassworks have been determined individually eligible.) Thirty-three percent of these buildings are one- to one-and-a-half-story in height, with the remainder being two-story. The construction materials of these buildings are 80% log and frame while the remainder are of brick and stone. Over half (53%) of these houses have a two-room/central chimney plan. Another 26% have one- or two-room plans with gable end chimneys, and 20% have a two-thirds Georgian plan with back-to-back corner fireplaces.

Although Koegler's study of southwestern Pennsylvania architecture found the three bay, side hall plan the most common house plan, the writer's previous study of Whiskey Rebellion related properties, dating from the 1770s to c. 1815, showed a variety of bays and plans. Houses ranged from two bays to seven bays, and were built with side halls, central halls, and variants of the hall/parlor plan. In fact there is a wide variety of forms found in the region. The greater part of these houses were constructed with plans that show some ethnic influences or retain earlier vernacular features but also display the ever increasing influence of the Georgian plan. (25)

As previously mentioned, some historians have indicated that southwestern Pennsylvania was largely influenced by people south of the Mason-Dixon line.
Therefore, it was necessary to research what type of architecture was prevalent there in the eighteenth century. While the predominant house plan in early eighteenth century Virginia was a traditional English one and consisted of a large hall and a smaller chamber or parlor, by the mid-eighteenth century many new houses built there were showing the Georgian influence with central passages, two-room depth, and back-to-back corner fireplaces. Georgian style houses with back-to-back fireplaces were also built in eastern and central Pennsylvania from the 1750s through the early nineteenth century. This type of house continued to be built in Greensboro and Glassworks in the early nineteenth century as well. Perhaps the best example is the log Gabler house in Glassworks. (26)

**Floor Plan, Log Gabler House, Glass Works**

Henry Glassie found the folk house types from the Chesapeake Tidewater area to be one room deep. The most common of these is the two-story I house. Fashioned after English originals, most have external gable end chimneys, but some do have internal chimneys. In a seminal 1965 article geographer Fred Kniffen labelled two-story, two room per story, one room deep structures as I houses because they were so common in Mid-Western states beginning with the letter I. Hofstra found that this Georgian-inspired house to be the dominant type in the Shenandoah Valley in the nineteenth century as it came to symbolize the economic success and ethnic assimilation of the people there. American antecedents of the I house with its two adjoining rooms can be traced to the seventeenth century Delaware Valley. Georgian influence prompted the insertion of a hall between the two rooms to provide greater control of movement through the house. Several examples of the I house with a stair hall can be found in the Greensboro/New Geneva area. (27)

As concluded above, over half the surveyed houses had a two-room/central chimney plan. Various vernacular architecture historians view the two-door
house from varying geographic perspectives and attribute it to different ethnic influences as well. Other studies south of the Mason-Dixon line have found examples of this type of house also. Joe Getty in his study of Carroll County, Maryland, attributed this type to the tidewater influence in central Maryland. Here, the houses were of one-and-a-half stories with a steeply pitched roof, and timber-framed construction. Vernacular architecture scholar Orlando Ridout of Maryland sees the two-door house as a Pennsylvania characteristic. However, what architectural surveyors see in Carroll and Washington counties have two gable end chimneys. Henry Glassie found the one-story two-room house with two front doors and a central chimney as a common type in the deep south or Lowland South. These had evolved from cabins in the mountains and on the coast. (28)

**Example of Glassie's four bay, double door house from the Lowland South**

A local forerunner of this type is the previously mentioned Bothwell house. (Although Alexander Bothwell was taxed for the property on lot 25 in 1798, he didn't actually purchase it until 1799. In 1811 he also purchased lots 26 and 39 from Gallatin.) Although it has a single, off-center, front door, the house on lot 25 was constructed with a central chimney/two-room plan. The angled wall between the rooms and the off-center door suggest a pre-Georgian influence. An enclosed dogleg stair goes up between the chimney and the rear wall. (29)
The four bay/two door house was also a common vernacular form in German/Swiss areas of eastern and central Pennsylvania. However, the chimneys there were placed on the gable ends of the houses. Scholars have theorized that Pennsylvania Germans adopted the outward look of the Georgian type, but retained the familiar traditional configuration of the rooms. In order to do this, they created the four bay, double door version of the symmetrical facade. Each door opened into a separate room, rendered more spacious by the absence of the stair hall. One door opened into the general living space and kitchen, while the other opened into the good parlor, which was often used on special occasions. (30)

Another interesting feature of Greensboro/New Geneva architecture is that it was still a viable option to build a one-and-a-half story house there until the time of the Civil War. Most towns of eastern and central Pennsylvania consistently display architecture of two-and-a-half stories. When towns were expanding commercially or industrially, it was more practical and financially rewarding to construct buildings of two or more stories. Therefore, as the nineteenth century progressed, these smaller buildings were replaced with larger buildings not only with additional stories but of better materials and finer details as well. One reason that this type (single story) housing can be found interspersed among the two story buildings in these towns is that a feeling of egalitarianism pervaded the relatively small-scale industries there. No ostentatious mansions were built within either town. As was found in 1798 with buildings in this area, owners/managers were living among the artisans at nearly the same standard of living or in similar housing. Late-nineteenth century tax records show that most of the difference in an individual's valuation is from the commercial/industrial buildings and structures on his
property. Finally, one foundation for the survival of these buildings is that as the industrial and commercial sources for the livelihood of these towns was eliminated, there was no demand for a better use of the land. (31)

It would appear that the carpenter/builders of the Greensboro/New Geneva area adopted a house type or types which conformed to the Georgian influence of symmetry on the exterior but kept the traditional English single pile layout of the interior. The central chimney/two-room plan houses of this area represents a type found less frequently throughout the remainder of Fayette and Greene counties. Doris Hawk recalled her grandmother's house having two front doors. One opened into a parlor which was never used and the other into the living area. The doors of the John Minor house (formerly located on Minor Street and demolished in the 1950s), another house with two front doors, opened respectively into the parlor and dining room. (32)

As with most of United States, the 1850s through the 1880s was a period of transition in the architectural development of the Greensboro/New Geneva area. In this period some traditional forms were retained, but at the same time national architectural trends were influential, especially in exterior designs. Extant houses show that the tradition of interior back-to-back fireplaces was retained in the area into the late nineteenth century. Examples of these include the Late Victorian addition to the Thomas Gabler house and the Italianate Crawford house, both in Glassworks. Likewise, the 1879 Jones

Floor Plan of c.1810 Gabler House and transom detail, Glass Works
In summary, the architecture of Greensboro/New Geneva is reflective of change as well as continuity. Most of the architecture of this area can be characterized as vernacular: local materials and traditional building methods were used to construct houses suited to the area's needs. The designs and plans of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century builders were themselves the result of the marriage of various cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Records indicate that entrepreneur/political economist Albert Gallatin played a major role in the design of early local buildings there. Once types agreeable to the needs of the inhabitants were established in this area, they served as models for future building up until the late nineteenth century. For example, the two-door, central chimney house, introduced to the area by the late eighteenth century, remained a popular design until the 1850s. Similar to areas east of the Susquehanna River, which had distinctive local architecture, the Greensboro/New Geneva area had its own predilection for certain architectural types. The fact that the 1790s company housing of the original Gallatin glassworks survived into the 1880s and other settlement period housing remained into the twentieth century illustrates the impact that this architecture had on generations of carpenter/builders of the Greensboro/New Geneva area. The major shift in local architectural trends occurred after 1900 when the coal/coke industry had a tremendous impact on this area. This brought new people into the area, most with few ties to the architectural heritage there. In addition, new rail and communication lines along with gas and electricity helped promote popular national styles, which would soon subordinate most local building traditions. (33)
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Associated Property Types

Name of Property Type: Residences of the Greensboro/New Geneva Area

Description: These residences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area are those associated with the established glass, pottery, or architectural contexts. These houses can range in construction date from c. 1790 to 1944. As mentioned in the context, "Architecture of Greensboro/New Geneva c. 1790-1944," wood was the most common building material in the area's early settlement period (late 18th/early 19th century) with stone and brick buildings becoming more common as the nineteenth century progressed. Generally the earliest surviving buildings of this area are of log or timber frame construction.

The Greensboro/New Geneva area experienced an economic boom after the glass industry became established in 1797. Therefore several buildings in the area have details characteristic of Federal style architecture. Several residences of the mid-nineteenth-century mirror popular national trends with details of the late Federal period and Greek Revival movement. Although the pottery industry began in the area c. 1810, production did not peak until the 1870s. Along with the prosperity of the pottery industry, increases in commercial activity were sparked by the c. 1860 to c. 1890 slackwater development of the upper Monongahela River. Correspondingly, housing of the late nineteenth century often reflected this prosperity in varied elements of the Victorian era. Working in conjunction with the national architectural movements was the influence of local builders and regional vernacular preferences. For example, there appears to be a continuity in the use of certain floor plans from the late eighteenth century into the late nineteenth century. The boom of the coal/coke industry in the early twentieth century brought popular national architectural styles to the area with little or no regional input. Greensboro, in particular, has some fine examples of the Bungalow style.

Alterations to these residences include diminutive additions to the rear of the main block. Late eighteenth/early nineteenth century windows have generally been replaced with late nineteenth/early twentieth century windows. Twentieth-century kitchens and bathrooms have been added to most of these houses. Most of these houses are located on the Monongahela floodplain, and many have been damaged over the years by various floods. Consequently, some of these buildings have had their original foundations replaced or supplemented with twentieth-century materials. After the last major flood (1983) many of the first floor interiors of these buildings were covered with plywood panelling. However, there is still enough of the original fabric and
character of these houses remaining to convey their historic period and significance.

Significance

Under Criterion A, residences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area are significant in the area of industry. Some of these houses may be associated with the development of the early glass or pottery industry in southwestern Pennsylvania.

Under Criterion C, residences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area may be significant in the area of architecture. They may be representative of late eighteenth- through early twentieth-century regional vernacular architecture or display elements of popular national styles.

Registration Requirements

To meet Criterion A, a residence must be directly associated with a glass manufacturer, a glass worker, a glass company, a pottery manufacturer or a pottery worker. Residences significant for their association with the glass industry must have been built prior to 1850, the period of greatest development in the glass industry in the Greensboro/New Geneva area, and must retain their dominant architectural features and physical setting. Residences significant for their association with the pottery industry must have been built prior to 1880, the period of greatest development of the pottery industry in this area.

To meet Criterion C, residences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area must be representative of late eighteenth- through late nineteenth-century regional vernacular architecture or representative of popular national styles. They must retain sufficient integrity of materials and stylistic details to be representative of that style. Fenestration patterns and door openings should not be greatly altered or blocked in. The interior of the buildings should retain most of their original floor plan.

Name of Property Type: Nonresidences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area

Description: These buildings or structures are associated with the established architectural or historic contexts of the area. These properties may be buildings or structures constructed from c. 1790 to 1944. Properties in this category may include public buildings used as schools or structures such as locks and dams used in the slackwater navigation of the Monongahela River.
Greensboro continued to be a commercial and transportation center in the early twentieth century. As such there was an ongoing need for better and more efficient schools. Public education had become more widespread and democratized as the nineteenth century progressed and largely reflected the utilitarian goals of Pennsylvania as an industrial state. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century educational reformers advocated the consolidation of schools, but progress was slow. Naturally, better lighted schools facilitated the learning process. These schools were typically designed using current popular national architectural styles but were influenced by regional preferences as well. These well-built schools were typically of masonry construction.

After the federal government took over the slackwater navigation system of the Monongahela River, it initiated a program of replacing or rebuilding the old inefficient locks and dams of that system. As part of that program, by 1929 lock and dam #7 was relocated further upstream at Greensboro. The best engineering techniques and substantial materials, usually concrete, were used in these structures.

Surviving nonresidences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area generally date from the early twentieth century and therefore generally retain a high degree of integrity. Minor changes include the installation of heating, plumbing, and electrical systems. Superficial changes, such as late twentieth-century roofing materials, have been made in many instances to replace original materials.

**Significance**

Under Criterion A, nonresidences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area may be eligible in the areas of education, transportation or other areas of significance.

Under Criterion C, nonresidences of the Greensboro/New Geneva area may be eligible in the areas of architecture or engineering. These buildings may be representative of regional examples of early twentieth-century architectural styles or may be significant for their engineering or construction designs.

**Registration Requirements**

To meet Criterion A, a nonresidence must have been associated with important events or pattern of events during the period of significance of the historic contexts of this nomination. The resource must retain its dominant architectural features and its physical setting.
To meet Criterion C, a nonresidence must be a regional example of early twentieth-century architectural styles or be significant for its engineering or construction design.

**Name of Property Type:** Historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area

**Description:** These districts are associated with the commercial, industrial, architectural, and transportation development of the Greensboro/New Geneva area c. 1790 to c. 1944. Both Greensboro and New Geneva were laid out in the 1790s, Greensboro in 1791 and New Geneva in 1797. However, settlement in both areas extends back at least to the 1780s. Greensboro was laid out in grid form, but New Geneva's plan had to conform to the steep contours of the bluff rising up from the Monongahela River. Commercial agriculture had developed in frontier areas such as in Greene and Fayette counties by the 1790s which provided an impetus for founding towns to create trading and shipping centers near the frontier. These entrepots provided eastern goods to settlers and raw materials and agricultural products to eastern markets. In addition, political economist Albert Gallatin saw this area of the Upper Monongahela Valley as on the most convenient route from the Potomac river watershed to the Ohio watershed. Eastern settlers would travel to villages such as New Geneva, where boats were being built, and continue their westward travel on down the Monongahela/Ohio rivers. Indeed, the river was the life thread of these towns and dominated their industrial and commercial history.

The architecture of these towns reflect the various periods of development from the late eighteenth century into the early twentieth century. As previously noted, the earliest surviving buildings generally are of log or timber frame construction. However, more log buildings have survived in Greensboro than New Geneva. New Geneva became somewhat industrialized with the glass and gun factories by the end of the eighteenth century. It experienced an economic boom after the glass factory was established, but by 1812 Gallatin still owned about 100 of the proposed 167 lots there. New Geneva continued having small industrial plants into the mid-nineteenth century. However, there was never a large concentration of these, and a large population never filled the town.

Greensboro probably enjoyed growth as the result of the construction of the new glass factory at Glassworks in 1807. By the 1830s Greensboro appears to have outstripped New Geneva in population, and by 1879 it had separated from the surrounding township to become a borough. Greensboro also became a center of stoneware manufacture by 1860. This industry peaked in the 1880s and by the 1890s the town's population was dwindling. New Geneva shared in the pottery boom of the
1870s and 1880s, but never to the degree of Greensboro. Census records indicate both towns were declining in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, Greensboro still continued to have a good variety of commercial ventures.

The various popular national styles displayed in these districts range from the Federal in the early nineteenth century, through the Greek Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, and Second Empire styles of the mid and late nineteenth century to the Colonial Revival, Prairie, and Bungalow styles of the early twentieth century. Whereas, the national architectural movements of the early to late nineteenth century usually bear traits of the local carpenter/builders, most of the early twentieth century buildings show little regional influence.

Alterations in these districts include buildings which have been sheathed in modern siding but still retain the form, height, and feeling of the original structures. Modern windows have generally replaced earlier nineteenth-century ones. Greensboro particularly has been prone to flooding and most of the buildings in the district there show the effects of damage to foundations and basements over the years. Both the Greensboro and New Geneva Historic Districts retain sufficient integrity of feeling to portray their historic periods of development.

Significance

Under Criterion A, historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area may be significant in the areas of industry, commerce, and transportation. These districts are associated with the industrial, commercial, and transportation development of the area.

Under Criterion C, historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area are significant in the area of architecture. The buildings of these districts may be representative of the late eighteenth- through early twentieth-century regional vernacular architecture or displays elements of various popular national styles, depending on the period of construction.

Under Criterion D, historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area are significant in the area of historic archaeology. The archaeological sites of these districts have been tested to show that they may yield culturally significant information about the historic industries of these
towns.

Registration Requirements

To meet Criterion A, historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area must have been associated with the historic industrial, commercial, or transportation development of the area c. 1790 to 1944. These districts must retain the form, feeling, and layout of their historic period. Their connection to road and river routes must still be evident.

To meet Criterion C, historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area must be representative of late eighteenth- through early twentieth-century regional vernacular architecture or display elements of various popular national styles. They must retain sufficient integrity to represent the various styles of these periods. The original layout of these districts must be retained, and there must be a minimum of intrusions and open spaces.

To meet Criterion D, historic districts associated with the Greensboro/New Geneva area must have been shown to have archaeological sites that will yield culturally significant information relating to the former industries of these districts. Artifacts from these sites will reveal information about the development of technology related to these industries.
Identification and Evaluation Methods Used in the Greensboro/New Geneva Multiple Property National Register Nomination

The multiple property listing of historic and architectural resources associated with Greensboro/New Geneva is based upon the 1993-94 historic context and historic sites inventory of the Borough of Greensboro and Monongahela Township, Greene County and Nicholson Township, Fayette County, in the most southwestern region of Pennsylvania, conducted by Jerry A. Clouse of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

The preparation of this multiple property nomination is part of the work stipulated in the Memorandum of Agreement which was signed by the Pittsburgh District of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Pennsylvania Bureau for Historic Preservation, the Borough of Greensboro, and Nicholson Township, and specifically addresses the need for documentation of areas affected by the Grays Landing Lock and Dam Project. This is part of the mitigation requirements for the lock and dam project under Section 106 of the National Register Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 1992, and the regulations (36 CFR Part 800) of the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

The scope of this context includes not only the historic background of the early settlement of this region, the cultural and social background of the region’s people, but the economic forces involved as well. Insights are provided into how these elements along with the geography molded lifestyles and the built environment from the early settlement period, through the nineteenth century, when economic expansion spurred internal as well as domestic improvements, and into the early twentieth century after local industries had peaked and commercial interests shifted.

Much time has been spent by the staff of the Bureau for Historic Preservation to make a conscientious determination of the eligibility of properties in the Greensboro/New Geneva area, specifically those affected by the Grays Landing Lock and Dam Project. In October 1989 the Bureau determined that Greensboro was not eligible as a district. However, a district in New Geneva was determined eligible. After new information was presented to the staff in March 1990, they determined that a contiguous historic district encompassing areas in Greensboro and New Geneva was eligible.

In January 1991 three buildings in Glassworks were determined individually eligible. Boundaries for this contiguous Greensboro/New Geneva historic district were defined June 25, 1991 by Historic Preservation Board member
Sarah Neusius, and Bureau for Historic Preservation staff, Dan Deibler and Jerry Clouse. Interested parties from Greensboro and New Geneva and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also participated. At the time of this site visit the Greensboro School, the Jones House, and Parreco House were also determined individually eligible. In May 1992 Building 224 in Glassworks was determined eligible.

Due to requests from area residents and the Corps of Engineers, another site visit was conducted October 7, 1993 by Preservation Board member Verna Cowin, and Bureau for Historic Preservation staff, Greg Ramsey and Jerry Clouse. At that time it was decided that there should be two separate districts. In addition, the boundaries of the New Geneva district were expanded to include the upper section of town which encompasses a c. 1810 stone school building there. The boundaries of the Greensboro district basically remained the same, but the Boughner House was determined to be individually eligible. Finally, there had been discussion during the October site visit as to the eligibility of the Robert Peters House. A survey form on the property was presented to the staff in November 1993, and it was determined eligible at that time.

Early research in this project involved the primary records of Greene and Fayette counties, specifically tax and court records. These were used to build a context for the early industries in the area, particularly the glass and pottery industries. Data was compiled from these lists to learn how much of the working population was involved in industry or agriculture and ascertain which industries or trades dominated that area at a particular time. This data was also used to note trends in the commercial and industrial development of the area. These tax records along with population, agricultural, and manufacturing censuses were also used to confirm or void earlier histories and reports. Other primary records included the Albert Gallatin Papers and the 1798 United States Direct Tax. Secondary sources included early traveler's reports of the region as well as early histories. Local historical papers, writings, and scholarly reports were consulted at regional libraries such as the Hillman and Carnegie at Pittsburgh, the libraries at Washington and Jefferson College and Waynesburg College as well as the State Archives and State Library. The manuscript records for the extensive glass and pottery collection at Waynesburg College were explored also.

Days were appointed when residents of New Geneva and Greensboro could bring documents, manuscripts, and photos to be examined and copied for future use as documentation. These days also provided an opportunity to meet local residents who could be later interviewed for oral history. Doris
Hawk, Ernest Gabler, and Eleanora Robbins were particularly informative about certain aspects of local history, and Lydia Aston graciously made introductory calls enabling the preparer's entrance into private homes. The local residents' sense of the glass industry was vague, but not surprisingly, there was a more immediate recognition of how important the pottery industry had been to the area. Many families retain pieces of pottery as remembrances either of their family's involvement in production or their long-time residence there.

The preparer conducted further research using county and state histories, gazetteers, and subject specific histories to document the area's significant role in various industries, transportation, and architecture. All buildings individually eligible were surveyed and floor plans for each were drawn. A few buildings in each of the districts, thought to be exceptional in age or architectural significance, were surveyed also. This helped determine what national influences were used as well as what regional preferences dominated the architectural landscape there. After improved floor plans were drawn from the original sketches, they were compared with those of houses done by architectural historians from other sections of the country. Findings indicate that the Greensboro/New Geneva area displays influences from both the Tidewater South as well as eastern Pennsylvania.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Historic Preservation Board Members
FROM: Brenda Barrett

RE: Historic Preservation Board Proposed 1995 Meeting Schedule

Please note that there is one meeting remaining on the 1994 schedule: November 8, in Harrisburg.

With respect to the schedule of Board meetings for 1995, the Bureau for Historic Preservation proposes the following schedule for adoption at today's (September 13) Board meeting:

Tuesday, March 14, 1995 - Harrisburg

Monday, June 12, 1995 - Annual "On the Road" Meeting; Location Open for Discussion

Tuesday, September 12, 1995 - Harrisburg

Tuesday, November 14, 1995 - Harrisburg

Also please note the tentative dates for the next Annual State Historic Preservation Conference, April 23-26, 1995, to be held in Wilkes-Barre. The annual conference will again be coordinated with the state Heritage Parks Program, PA Department of Community Affairs.
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