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In this thesis the author uses oral histories to study vernacular architecture, analyzing the changes in the way people in the Catskills have used buildings, specifically farm dwellings, to make a living, first as farmers and then as proprietors of boarding houses. The Catskills region in upstate New York is well known for its dairy farms and also for its resorts, but little has been researched to trace continuities and discrepancies between the rural residents and urban visitors.

Boarding on farms in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries showed continuity between the two groups: recent immigrants who lived in New York City and rural families, whether long-established or recently arrived. The two groups used their living spaces in similar ways, one to achieve a healthful family vacation and the other to earn a living for the family on the farm. They
made generalized use of unitary spaces (rooms), accommodating multiple activities and numbers of people in ways that were antithetical to the suburban middle-class' prescriptions for individual privacy, family privacy, and the specialization of spaces.

Using oral histories and other primary sources, the author describes these similarities in space utilization as a commonality between urban and rural people in the Catskills, demonstrating that neither group is a passive consumer of architecture. Instead, they not only modify the rooms in the farmhouse but also continue to use or actively revive ways of using space that meet their goals, within the material resource at hand.

Vernacular architecture is sometimes inaccurately equated with buildings that lack style. For architecture that may not seem to meet the criteria of the historians of style, people's words are the most eloquent interpretation of buildings and of the lives they sheltered.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Urban visitors have been part of life in the Catskill Mountains of New York State throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For over one hundred and fifty years people from the New York metropolitan area have sought the pleasures of nature and the comfortable summer climate of the Catskills, at first in grand hotels, then in boarding houses, bungalow colonies, resorts, and finally in vacation homes. This thesis examines the impact of those urban visitors on local residents, as shown in changes in the construction, use and modification of Catskills farmhouses used as boarding houses.

The following case studies of three farm houses in Delaware County, New York, emphasize interviews with residents and former boarders more than quantitative evaluation and documentation (Figure 1-1). The residents' own words reveal how they made use of space to accommodate boarders and how that response might illuminate the relationship between urban and rural people in the Catskills. Local resources, such as town and county histories, maps, photographs, historic preservation surveys,
newspapers and government records have been useful in supplementing interviewees' recollections and in reconstructing earlier versions of each farmhouse. Scholarly resources for this inquiry come from the growing fields of rural history, family history, women's history and social history, as well as high style and vernacular architecture studies.

In the Catskill Mountains there has been no complete survey of rural architecture. Most past work has been in villages, but little has been done to record the houses in the more intensely farmed valleys or to record the houses of marginal sidehill farms in the steep hollows so common in the region. The historic preservation surveys conducted in the 1970s are almost entirely of houses in villages. Books and articles that treat the region's architecture tend to catalog styles and histories of buildings' roles in historical events (Sherwood and Aronson 1982). The Vernacular Architecture Forum came close to the Catskills with their 1986 meeting in Kingston, New York, but the accompanying essays confined themselves to the culture and architecture of the Hudson Valley, which is distinct from the Catskills region (Larson 1986). No typology derived from a thorough survey exists for the Catskills.

There is, however, much scholarship on farmhouses in the United States, from their origins in Europe through
their various manifestations in the United States. Vernacular architecture studies have focussed strongly on the dwelling and, because until this century the U.S. population was primarily rural, many of the dwellings studied are farmhouses. Rural residences have been examined from many different points of view: charting their reflection of urban styles; mapping the spread of various forms over space and time; and analyzing their structural systems (McAlester 1990, Kniffen 1965, Kniffen and Glassie, 1966).

Dwellings, including farmhouses, have been the subject of other scholarship which has influenced my approach to Catskills architecture. These folklorists, historians and vernacular architecture scholars have gone beyond the house as an artifact of its own production to inquire into the building’s use and meaning to its residents. Bernard Herman relies on court proceedings to indicate the significance of an eighteenth century house to its rightful heirs. Sally McMurry tracks the changing arrangement and functions of rooms in her study of nineteenth century farmhouses designed by farm families for progressive agriculture publications. Michael Ann Williams and Gerald Pocius use residents’ own accounts to interpret the social use and meaning of space in, respectively, single pen dwellings in the southern Appalachians and houses in a fishing community in
Newfoundland. Oral histories of people’s experience of
buildings were also the foundation for Charles Martin’s and
George McDaniel’s evocations of life in buildings that
otherwise might have been mute. Thomas Hubka uses all these
resources, but especially maps derived from primary sources,
to interpret gendered space use (Herman 1992, McMurry 1997,
Hubka 1984). These studies have inspired me to base this
master’s thesis on firsthand sources, whether written or
oral, as much as possible.

"Rural history" differs from "agricultural history,"
which has interpreted farms and farming primarily as
economic activities, tracing their development from
supposedly self-sufficient, traditional, diversified farms,
to specialized, market-oriented crop farms. Agricultural
historians usually examine farm labor according to
efficiency and levels of mechanization, dairy and other
production by their price standards, and farming skills in
terms of methods supplied by "experts" (Bidwell and Falconer
1925, Gates 1969, Danhof 1979). There is little room in
such studies to find out how families organized their work,
how they made use of the house, barn and equipment they had,
or how they made decisions about what to produce or whether
to participate in farming at all. Of course such studies do
not consider the roles of gender, age and class in
agriculture, assuming that work assignments, and therefore the use of space on the farm, followed the patterns contemporary to the authors themselves.

Agricultural history is helpful, on the other hand, because it reveals the outside economic factors as well as the technological conditions that affected everyday decisions made by farm families. In the early nineteenth century in Delaware County, as settlers replaced the roving teams of bark-removers and lumbermen, farmers aimed beyond subsistence to production of wool and butter for sale. In the years before the Civil War, dairying increased and butter was shipped by cart to the Hudson River, where it went by steamboat to New York City (Thomson 1842). The war made farming profitable and the arrival, in the 1870s, of the railroad in Delaware County stimulated the growth of farms and the construction of large barns. The train allowed both the shipment of fluid milk to the New York metropolitan area and also the transportation of urban visitors to the county. The first boarders arrived when the county’s economy was on the rise; one of the boarding houses I present in this thesis began operation during the heyday of dairy farming.

By World War I, which brought temporary prosperity to farmers, the agricultural sector of the economy was already fighting the cycle of production versus prices. Alternating
high and low demand created difficulties on farms in the otherwise prosperous 1920s which were followed by economic crisis in the 1930s with the Great Depression. Dairy farming for a while was insulated from the cycle because an increase in dairy consumption allowed farmers to meet low milk prices with increased production, but eventually they faced the same dilemma as grain and meat farmers: the more they tried to increase production, the lower the price fell. This problem has persisted through this century and remains with dairy farmers today, almost a century later. Certainly these economic considerations affected a family's decision to take in boarders.

The new study of rural history, as described by Sally McMurry in the Preface to the new edition of her book, *Farmhouses and Families*, brings together the efforts of social historians, family historians and women's historians. These scholars emphasize "values, ideas, [and] identities" over the exchange focus of agricultural historians (McMurry 1997). Like the vernacular architecture scholars and folklorists, they approach the landscape "from the ground up," examining the farm and household economy not from impersonal statistics but in terms of the people who lived there. They look at class, gender and age roles in work and sociability, and study the impacts of technological change on all family members, not just men. While many scholars
have thus been freed to focus on previously ignored roles of women in households and on farms, some have concentrated on the ideology of the "women’s sphere" to the exclusion of the interchange between genders.

In her book about women in the Nanticoke Valley of New York State, Nancy Grey Osterud questions the assumption that the urban, middle-class ideology of "separate spheres" for genders applies to farm women (Osterud 1991). She shows that in the nineteenth century, in an area less mountainous but otherwise similar to Delaware County in its commitment to dairy farming, women’s work was characterized by mutuality and reciprocity with men. In subsistence production, but more importantly in commodity production, men’s and women’s work was integrated, with the two working sequentially or side by side or as substitutes for each other in a number of farm processes. In no way does this line of inquiry de-emphasize the inequalities between men and women; patriarchy was certainly in effect in the organization and valuation of work, in the ownership of land, and the ability to vote. But more than her urban sisters, the nineteenth century woman on a farm had a chance to meet men on common ground.

Both Sally McMurry in her examination of nineteenth century farmhouses designed by progressive farm men and women and Thomas Hubka in his study of connected farms in
New England find evidence of Osterud’s conclusions in the plans and patterns of space use in the farmhouses they study. McMurry’s more elite houses show the specialization in space use dictated by the urban middle class ideology of the home as a refuge from worldly corruption. But she finds that specialization does not necessarily mean segregation of genders, though it did mean separation by age and class. With the commercialization of agriculture, farmhouses developed specialized work spaces for farm production. In the northeast, and in Delaware County in particular, these spaces were often for the dairy process and were used by both men and women. Osterud points out that many of those spaces, because of the great extent of work exchange among households, should properly be considered public spaces as well. Hubka shows how the construction and use of space responds to economic imperatives: more efficient arrangement of general farms’ work spaces enable them to compete with specialized farms. But he also shows, in maps of the organization of work in farmyards, farmhouses and outbuildings, just how nineteenth century women’s and men’s work spaces overlapped and sometimes coincided. In all these cases, the authors have discovered explanations for the appearance of vernacular dwellings that are deeper and more subtle than the obvious and ubiquitous assumption that folk houses are from a uniformly static past, a traditional
culture whose artifacts dictated behavior in rigid categories.

In this work, I will examine three farmhouses/boarding houses in Roxbury and Middletown, towns in southeastern Delaware County, New York (Figure 1-2). Although this area is distant from the southern Catskills, the home of the "Borscht Belt" resorts, it was also popular with urban boarders from the late nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth. I have chosen the buildings by finding people who have experienced boarding from many different points of view: owners of farms, their families, workers at boarding houses, the boarders themselves. Basing my inquiry on these oral histories helps me avoid the pitfalls of the "windshield survey," in which the surveyor's aesthetic can play a stronger role than the actual experience of residents with their own buildings in determining the significance of a structure. Not only does this "people-first" method enable me to investigate the relationship of oral material and buildings, but by focussing on only a few sites, I am able to conduct in-depth studies of all of them. As well as being justified from a scholarly standpoint, this approach is more in keeping with my role in the community. The respondents are all my friends and acquaintances, and it would be difficult to explain to them why I might wish to
survey their houses quickly, rather than listen to the layers of stories each building evokes.

When I asked around town about people who had kept boarders, the same names kept coming up.

"Oh, you've got to talk to Martha Hewitt."

"I think Stella Kelly's mother kept a boarding house."

"Denny Spielman's mother was brought up in that big boarding house that used to be a farm up in Bragg Hollow."

Even though the farmhouses included in this study were chosen because of recommendations such as these, the three case studies cover the boarding house period, from about 1880 to about 1970, very well. They also represent boarding services provided for a variety of ethnic/religious groups (Jewish, Protestant, Polish and Ukrainian Catholic), and different approaches to taking visitors: rooming only, full-meal service, use of the family quarters, and separate housing. They show the gradual change from farming to boarding, and from summer boarders who were for the most part families, to hunters and skiers, for the most part single. While three case studies cannot demonstrate what was typical of the boarding situation in this part of the Catskills, they can certainly show the range of responses to the idea of boarding.

In each of the case studies families were actively farming when they began to take visitors from the city, and
the houses they used for their new enterprise were not new. Before examining the phenomenon of tourism and boarding in the Catskills, one must become acquainted with farmhouses in southeastern Delaware County and how farm families lived in them.

Farmhouses dating from the late nineteenth century in this region are not always the earliest houses that were built. There are government records, photographs, and stories of log houses on farms before the present houses were constructed, but none seem to have survived. Single or two-room timber-frame houses have pre-dated the larger houses in two case studies, and their remains are included in the present structures. The oldest extant freestanding houses that may have been farm houses seem to be in villages (Figure 1-3). Now town residences, they may have originally been farmhouses at a time when village centers were relatively open and included farm fields, before the commercialization of the mid- to late nineteenth century.

Most of the historical farmhouses seen today in southeastern Delaware County appear to have been constructed, or greatly renovated, well after initial settlement took place in the late eighteenth century. Some retain the shape of the earliest village residences: one- or one-and-a-half story symmetrical houses, two rooms wide and seemingly one-and-a-half rooms deep (Figure 1-4). Later,
more prosperous farms supported the construction of full two-story houses, two rooms deep, with a central doorway (Figure 1-5). While these houses are still the shape of the earlier ones (long side to the road, central doorway) their Greek or Gothic trim reveals that they were built, or trimmed, in the mid-nineteenth century. Other modest farmhouses of the one and a half story shape, but sometimes without the central door, are on sidehill farms away from the more prosperous valley floor and show the influence of the Greek Revival trend only in their very simple trim - deep architraves, pilaster-like vertical edge boards, "eyebrow windows" - though only the fanciest of these have strong Greek details such as dentils, full pilasters, and entablatures (Figure 1-6). Some farmhouses in more open valleys represent the rural Greek Revival at its fullest: asymmetrical entrance on the gable end of a large, two-story building, often with an ell and recessed porch (Figure 6-4). Entablatures and sometimes even columns grace these former homes of successful farm families. Later nineteenth century styles, such as the multi-textured, asymmetrical, unevenly massed Queen Anne, are more common in Catskills villages such as Fleischmanns but versions do exist on farms. Like village houses, farms in the early twentieth century used forms of bungalows, the four square house and, in the second
half of the twentieth century, ranch style houses, trailers, double-wides, and modular homes (Figure 1-7).

Any of these, up to mid-twentieth century house types, could have been used as a boarding house. There is no particular type of farmhouse associated with boarding. It is possible to recognize houses that have been expanded for boarders, but it is equally possible that a building will have no outward signs of its previous use as a boarding house. Most of the evidence concerning boarding and its impact on the houses and people who resided there exists in the minds of family members, former employees and guests.

The three houses chosen for the case studies are similar in that they look like ordinary farm houses. They differ in the forms of boarding families over the years decided to offer, and they differ somewhat in outward style. The Hubbell/Townsend farmhouse is a two-story building with its long side to the road. Its facade is symmetrical like a Georgian plan house, but it was originally a one-and-a-half story "classic cottage" that was later expanded to two full stories (Figure 1-8). Nothing but the large size of the Townsend house, and possibly its rear ell, hints at its use for boarding.

The Mech farmhouse is a tall building, made to seem taller by its location atop a knoll above the road. While it shares some of the asymmetrical massing of the Queen Anne
style, with a tower or hexagonal bay forming its southeast corner, "widow’s walk" balustrades at the peak and on top of the tower, and the characteristic entrance hall with wood-panelled staircase, its facade looks almost symmetrical, like a two-story Georgian (Figure 1-9). The plan inside resembles a four-square house, and the footprint of the house is roughly square. There is little to be seen in the house to make it seem a likely candidate for boarders. An additional dormitory, built after boarding was in full swing, is no longer on the site. It’s hard to imagine how it fit into the house’s relatively small yard.

The Boughton/Hewitt farmhouse also shows no outward signs of being a former boarding house, other than its generous size, the large parking space beside the road, and the presence of other residential structures (Figure 1-10). Like the Mechs, the Hewitts constructed an additional building to provide more bedrooms for boarders. They also added an apartment-size house, used primarily by family members as a starter house. The main farmhouse has grown by accretion. The original structure, which consisted of two rooms, one above the other, and a kitchen behind, was moved to its present east-facing site from up the hill across the road. Several additions were made: a lean-to south of the original house was expanded into an ell, making the entire house resemble an "upright and wing." Later rear ells added
productive space, such as a buttery, a much later kitchen and walk-in cooler, and more bedrooms upstairs. In spite of the plethora of additions and additional structures, the farmhouse site does not immediately suggest a boarding house. Some farmhouses went through similar renovations and additions just to accommodate family members.

These introductions to the houses tell the reader how they look. But psychological geographer Yi-Fu Tuan says the most superficial way to get to know a landscape (and by the same token, a house) is visually (Tuan 1974). In the remainder of this thesis I will more closely examine each of the farmhouses that became boardinghouses, concentrating on the use of spaces recalled by interviewees who used to live there, visit there or work there. For periods farther in the past, especially at the Hubbell/Townsend farm and the Boughton/Hewitt farm, I will make use of historical, scholarly, and local materials. With these resources, it should be possible to discover the aspects of farm work organization that survived the change to boarding. Of what importance was family privacy, to the farm family or to boarders? Were boarders more sensitive than farm family members to crowding? In what ways does the use of space reveal work roles, gender and age roles? Are there indications of attitudes about the city and the country or evidence of the tension that often exists as groups define
themselves? Were boarding houses places where differences were mapped in ways that can be seen in household routines? Or were they places where these tensions were worked out?

Ron Ballard, a community scholar in Roxbury, said, "Oh, everybody did it. Everybody took boarders." Boarding on farms was very common until the middle of the twentieth century. How this phenomenon took place in active or former farmhouses is the subject of this thesis.
CHAPTER 2

TOURISM IN THE CATSKILLS

Eighteenth century botanists such as John and William Bartram, looking for new species of useful plants, and agents of the great landholding families from the Hudson Valley were among the early European American explorers of the Catskill Mountains. On their heels came sportsmen, hunters and fishermen early in the nineteenth century, to ply the waters and hunt the hills of the region. At first they came only from the nearby Hudson Valley, but by the early nineteenth century the Catskills had gained a wider reputation for trout and game (Evers 1972).

These first fishermen often stayed with local families, whose houses thus became the first tourist accommodations in the Catskills. Some of the sportsmen were artists as well as fishermen. The two practices were seen as closely allied: painters took to the woods and streams in the mountains with both paintbrush and fishpole in hand. Among the fisher/painters were Thomas Cole and Asher B. Durand, whose paintings helped establish the Catskills as a tourist destination.
Soon the scenery of the mountains attracted the attention not only of writers from the Romantic period and artists of the Hudson River School of painting but also of elite families from the Eastern Seaboard, who desired a way to visit the Catskills. Precedent had been set for this type of resort. In Europe there already existed a tradition of seeking healthful mineral waters at spas such as Bath in England, or fresh air at the seaside. Similarly, since the mid-eighteenth century, European planters and their families from the West Indies had been migrating each summer to cooler and healthier climates, such as Newport, Rhode Island. The establishment of Niagara as a tourist site set the precedent for the development of the Catskills as a viable venture. The region could offer a healthful alternative climate and could feature the "sublime" scenery of nature, including its own Kaaterskill Falls, instead of mineral waters (Evers 1972, 354-56; Van Zandt 1966).

Tourists discovered the Catskills at the height of the exploitative use of the mountains as a source of lumber for construction and hemlock bark for tanning leather. Ironically, at the very moment that mountainsides were being stripped of their trees, large hotels were being built at scenic points on the Escarpment, the cliff where the eastern Catskill Mountains drop off precipitously to the Hudson
Valley below (Brown 1995). Favored by writers and painters of the Romantic movement, these hotels, especially the Catskill Mountain House (Figure 2-1), were some of the earliest large scale tourist facilities in the United States (Van Zandt 1966). It began in 1824 as a large version of the inns and taverns that were seen then in hamlets and villages along turnpikes and highways. By 1846 the Mountain House had been increased in size, with a huge veranda facing the view over the Hudson Valley. The veranda sported two-story Corinthian fluted columns that advertised the hotel to tourists on the steamers on the Hudson River. Prominent guests included presidents and captains of industry as well as artists and writers. The women and children of socially prominent families often stayed much of the summer, escaping the heat and health threats of the summer in the city. Sunday services and communal dining were usual activities. The proprietors of the Mountain House did little landscaping around the hotel in its early decades and they did not allow hemlock cutting or peeling on the large tracts of land they bought surrounding it. The natural features of the landscape were the main attraction for visitors who expostulated about them, made paintings of them, wrote about them, and hiked to them. The Catskill Mountain House was "a
romantic outpost of civilization set in the wilderness" (Evers 1972, 461).

The Catskill Mountain House had its imitators and followers in the Kaaterskill Hotel, the Overlook Mountain House, and the Laurel House, among many others. All these were reached at first by steamer on the Hudson and stagecoach up the mountain escarpment. Tourists who could not afford at these watering holes for the rich came to stay at the inns on turnpikes, and at this time farmers began to take boarders. In mid-century the plank road along the Esopus Creek was improved, providing access to the western Catskills from the Hudson. While this improvement was most beneficial to tanneries, and to farmers, teamsters and drovers trying to get their products to market in New York City, it also eased access for tourists.

Regular travellers in the Catskills had long used taverns on the turnpikes, some of which looked like ordinary houses while others took on a characteristic look in the northern Catskills: either a two-story Georgian front with a door and portico centered in the second floor facade, or a full width second story porch connected by two-story high columns or squared pillars, as seen in the Grand Gorge Hotel, near Roxbury (Figure 2-2). Taverns may have
sometimes resembled ordinary houses, but ordinary farmhouses themselves were also used by early boarders.

The most important factor, however, in increased access for tourism was the coming of the railroad in the 1870s. The construction of the Ulster and Delaware created immediate competition for the less reachable Catskill Mountain House and its neighbors. But the railroad also served a new sensibility among tourists. While the visitors at the great hotels in the first part of the nineteenth century had been Romantics, interested in the sublime, wild, natural scenery of the mountains, the new tourists were happy to reach in the agricultural landscape in the northern, western, and southern Catskills.

By the 1880s large hotels had been built along the Ulster and Delaware Railroad leading to Delaware County: Tremper House in Phoenicia, and the immense Grand Hotel at the top of Pine Hill, where the famous horse-shoe curve in the railroad tracks became one of the "wonders" of the view. Hotels in villages expanded and some village residences became boarding houses. At the same time, farmhouses in southeastern Delaware County, the area of this study, had begun taking boarders. The Directory for the Ulster and Delaware Railroad in 1888 lists the adult population and features many advertisements for local businesses (Figure 2-
3). Among the listings for farmers, blacksmiths, and butter dealers, it shows that twenty-one houses in Roxbury, Fleischmanns (Griffin’s Corners) and Halcottsville, took boarders. Nearby Margaretville accounted for three hotels and boarding houses. Of all of these, five in Griffin’s Corners and one in Roxbury were farm boarding houses. According to Alf Evers, local Catskills historian, by 1888 half the passengers on the trains to the boarding area were Jewish, many from the Lower East Side of New York City (Evers 1972, 517). Others were from European ethnic and religious groups including Irish Catholics, Germans, and Ukrainians. Most boarders arriving on the trains with their families were working people: clerks, bookkeepers, and even industrial and sweatshop workers. Mothers and children came for the summer to escape the heat and illness of summer in the city (Figure 2-4). Fathers and husbands visited on weekends, a pattern already established at the tony Catskill Mountain House. The boarders seemed to relish the natural, agricultural landscape of fields and streams (as opposed to deep forests and mountain tops), but it is not clear whether this preference arose in contrast to their living and working conditions in the city, or because the pastoral surroundings reminded them of their origins in Europe.
In response to the influx of a largely Jewish tourist group, boarding houses in the late nineteenth century Catskills sorted themselves according to ethnicity and religion. Many included "No Hebrews" in their advertisements in the railroad guides and an anti-Semitic movement began in 1889 in Pine Hill (Figure 2-5). It culminated in a confrontation at a farmhouse boarding Jews, and after it was apparent there was little popular support for violence, more accommodations became available for both wealthier and poorer Jews (Evers 1972, 519). This is not to say that there was no prejudice against Jews: there were anti-Jewish campaigns in 1903 and again in 1920, but they did not repeat the violence of 1889. Boarding houses still labeled themselves "No Hebrews" or "Kosher." And there is evidence of everyday prejudice in the experiences of both visiting Jews and boarding house hosts (Kanfer 1989; Avery 1998).

Another response to the poorer tourists, who came largely from immigrant backgrounds, was the establishment around the turn of the nineteenth century of exclusive cottage colonies such as Onteora Park and Twilight Park in Greene County. As clubs that passed summer cottage property from generation to generation, the colonies were able to control their social composition to favor established and
mostly wealthy families with pre-Revolutionary forbears or elite European pedigrees. Sullivan County, in the southern Catskills, was quicker and cheaper to reach by train, and so became a predominately Jewish boarding and hotel area, starting with farm boarding houses and kuchaleyns, in which families cooked for themselves, then bungalow colonies, and eventually the now famous resort hotels such as Grossingers (Kanfer 1989).

At the turn of the century boarding in the northern and western Catskills, including Delaware County, was more prevalent where there was access by rail. The Ulster and Delaware guide for 1902 focusses entirely on boarding houses and accommodations for tourists, omitting the information that the 1888 directory held for local residents and business people (Figure 2-6). The guide reveals that there were now a total of sixty-four boarding houses in Roxbury, Fleischmanns and Halcottsville. Some of these were no doubt farm boarding houses located in the valleys flowing into the villages. Two of the farm boarding houses featured in this study were in such valleys, and one is listed in the 1902 railroad guide.

There was less dependence in the northern and western Catskills on the extremely large hotels for elite families. Although there were wealthy patrons among the clientele at
the Grand Hotel, many wealthy families had country estates in the area, such as the ones maintained by financier Jay Gould's descendants. Furlough Lodge in a remote valley of Middletown, and Kirkside on Main Street in Roxbury are both located in towns concerned in this study (Figure 2-7).

Three generations of the Gould family summered on these estates, bringing their entourage of friends to fish, play golf, and enjoy the countryside. Sometimes an estate could stimulate tourist growth for nearby hamlets and villages. After it became the summer home of the well-known yeast industrialist, the village of Fleischmanns was a resort for wealthy Jewish families.

Most boarding houses outside the villages started on farms. In all three cases involved in this study, farming had been going on before boarding was considered. From diversified agriculture before the Civil War, to the butter trade, and finally to fluid milk, farms had come to specialize year-round in dairying, and as a result suffered from the economic swings of the agricultural market.

The economic troubles of the 1870s may have made boarding an attractive alternative once the railroad was built. The change in farm production from butter to fluid milk, a new technology requiring a larger scale operation may have required the influx of capital offered by boarders.
To judge by the dates posted in the gables of the large barns in the study area, many are from the late nineteenth century and must have represented a large investment. Improved communication may have made farm families feel the need for more income in order to keep up with the consumer society. In any case, at a time when the rest of the country suffered economic declines, dairying was well-established and even growing in the same area that felt the boarding boom.

In the study area of southeastern Delaware County, in the towns of Middletown and Roxbury, near the villages of Halcottsville (Middletown), Fleischmanns (Middletown), and the hamlet of Denver (Roxbury), active dairy farms became boarding houses. While most local histories uniformly call the phenomenon "boarding," some informants interviewed for this study have indicated a variation that existed at the time of their initial experience with visitors from the metropolitan area in the 1930s and 1940s. At first, in two of the three farm boarding houses studied, the visitors were "roomers." They rented rooms for sleeping, but did their own cooking. This somewhat resembles the kuchaleyn in the southern Catskills, which were popular at about the same time these informants remember "rooming" to have preceded
"boarding" as the preferred method of hosting visitors on their farms (Kelly 1998; Avery 1998).

It is unclear whether the boarders fifty years earlier in the late nineteenth century were also roomers or whether, under influence from the southern Catskills, the pattern switched from boarding to rooming, but then back to boarding again. It is possible that this is the case, because travelers who passed the elite hotels like the Catskill Mountain House might have expected more hotel-like accommodations, scaled to their own finances. Like the very first fishermen and hunters, the early boarders probably expected to be fed as well as housed.

As in larger American and European resorts, boarders in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came for "the season." Summers in the country were not only more comfortable but kept families away from epidemics of yellow fever and cholera, and offered healthful surroundings for the sound and the tubercular. By 1902 the Ulster and Delaware Railroad touted the Catskills as "A breath of Nature, uncontaminated by the dregs of city civilization," and more healthful than the humid atmosphere of the shore (Ulster & Delaware 1902). By 1910 boarders included "two weekers," single young people of both sexes--salesmen, librarians, stenographers, and bookkeepers--who anticipated
the later trend for families to spend only a two-week vacation, instead of all summer, in the Catskills.

Farmers during this period (the early 20th century) were struggling with the specialization and the industrialization of their way of life, finding it difficult in the hard times before and after World War I, and again during the Great Depression, to continue their operations at the given price of milk. It was a time of experimentation with scientific methods of increasing yields and becoming more efficient, and a time of ferment, with the formation of cooperatives, the instigation of sanitation regulations, and threat of milk strikes (Delaware County Farm Bureau 1913). Boarding at farmhouses apparently continued during this time, though without as much attention by contemporaries or current historians as it had received in the late 19th century. The Farm Bureau publications for Delaware County do not mention taking boarders as a way to produce income for the farm. Possibly, like other women's work, it was not calculated publicly, out of habit or pride, as true income.

The informants for this study remember what it was like to take boarders beginning in the 1930s and 1940s. At first, until just after World War II, the pattern was as it had been earlier: families, whether rooming or boarding, were in residence for the summer, with the bread-winner
arriving on weekends on "the husband train." While the outdoors continued to be seen as healthy, the emphasis was on rest and diversion, more than escape from pestilence. Pleasant rural surroundings were seen as a safe and relaxing alternative to the bustle of city life (Figure 2-8). Enjoyment of nature meant going for a walk, or swimming in a brook, not communing with sublime wilderness scenery, as it had meant one hundred years before.

With the advent of the automobile, the schedule for visitors' stays at the farms changed. More and more, families came to the country together for the father's two-week vacation. Mother and children might stay for a few weeks before, or a few weeks after, his vacation. But the emphasis had shifted from a summer in the country to an intense two weeks of "vacationing." That roomers might become boarders at this point should not be surprising. On a shorter visit, vacationers needed to spend all their time in activities that were vacation-like and not perform their usual work, even in a rural setting. Informants for this study have indicated, from their vantage point as hosts, that the switch from offering rooms to offering boarding was decided for two reasons: boarding brought in more income, and the farm family cook, in all three cases the wife and
mother, no longer wished to share the kitchen with visitors (Kelly 1998; Avery 1998; Hewitt 1998).

For both roomers and boarders, the opportunities for enjoyment were similar: cooking in a big country kitchen (for roomers), helping with farming, participating in local entertainments (storytelling, square dancing, hay rides), enjoying the outdoors, or just playing cards or knitting. For children, this meant afternoons in the swimming hole, learning about wildlife, field trips to natural and historical sights, and parties invented by parents (Figure 2-9). Unlike boarders in the southern Catskills, who "grew tired of such bucolic pastimes," roomers and boarders in southeastern Delaware County did not require much formal entertainment (Truckey 1994). Other than providing transportation and making the connections for dancing and storytelling, the farm family did not feel required to provide diversions. Thus the northern and western Catskills did not develop the professional entertainment industry that accompanied the tourist business in the boardinghouses and resorts of the southern Catskills. Special activities were more likely to be of the family sort, such as a marshmallow roast. There were, however, the same trips to neighboring, wealthier resorts, to view performances or just "look at the people with their big diamonds" (Kanfer 1989; Avery 1998).
At about the same time that family vacations began to average two weeks, boarding houses added another schedule of visits. In the late 1940s and 1950s, hunters from summer families asked if they could return to stay while hunting deer in November. Unlike the extended stays early in the century, or even the two-week vacation, these visits were short and took place on weekends. Hunters as boarders continued into the 1960s and 1970s, until the deer herd began to thin out. By that time, families had found other ways to spend time in the country. The combined improvement of communication and transportation meant that people could find out about and get to much more distant destinations. What is more, they could use the transportation efficiency to go to specialized ethnic resorts or to justify owning a vacation home in the Catskills, rather than pay rent for boarding (Etherington 1994). Summer homes proliferated on the mountainsides in the western and northern Catskills, the farm population continued to shrink, and boarding came to mean taking in weekend visitors. The rise in the popularity of skiing extended the weekend boarding season into the winter, but the summer boarding business gradually ended in the 1960s.

From the time of the Catskill Mountain House, visitors to the mountains have been seen as a source of
revenue. Whether they stayed in the resorts of the wealthy, the railroad hotels, or farm boarding houses, tourists brought money to spend in the mountain region where farming gradually declined as a business opportunity or a potential occupation. Now in the 1990s the twenty-five year old trend for building vacation homes has resulted in a different landscape, with regrown forests interrupted by houses on five acre plots, and a marginal economy that hopes to support itself in services to the vacationers.

There is still talk about tourism being the solution to the area’s lack of industry though construction workers and contractors, as well as the local supermarket, are realizing that the vacation home owners do not actually add much to the local economy (Lawrence-Bauer 1998; Hinkley 1998; Rosa 1995). In hopes of capturing the attention of vacationers in their insular, seasonal homes, the 1990s tourist initiative has been to draw them into community activities, either by providing tourists sites and spectacles or by "marketing Catskills culture, since we don’t have anything else to sell" (unknown 1998). In this form of tourism, unlike boarding, the Catskills residents may gain a way to make a living from tourism but at the same time they will retain privacy in their homes, a kind of privacy that we
shall see in this study was not necessarily a characteristic of earlier generations in the mountains.
CHAPTER 3

FAMILY HISTORY AND THE USE OF SPACE IN CATSKILLS FARMHOUSES

Introduction

The allocation of space to activities of daily life is affected by certain underlying factors that can change over time. For example, in the northeastern United States, the functions of the family have varied historically, and so has its customary use of space. In rural New York State, as families have changed from being producers of goods for family needs to consumers of goods, so their use of space in the home has changed.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this development toward a consumer lifestyle was more prevalent in northeastern cities and suburbs. It was less common in the country where farm families remained producers much longer than their urban counterparts. As farmers, they showed their resistance to the market system in the economic choices they made, such as taking boarders, as well as in their relationships with each other (Osterud 1991) and in the way they organized space in the farmhouse and the farmstead (1).
The use and division of household space not only reflects the function of the family and its members as producers and/or consumers, but it is also made to support roles in the family assigned by gender and age. The organization of public space within the house to protect privacy or to accommodate non-family members reveals the family’s relationship to the community outside the household.

Preindustrial Families, Households and Farmhouses

Whether in the city or the country, sociability rather than privacy characterized families prior to the Industrial Revolution (Hareven 1991, 2). Not only was a great deal of work done within the family to produce for its needs but also carrying on the business of a local exchange economy required that the house in town or on the farm host a variety of visitors who came by to settle accounts, to buy and sell, and to discuss community affairs.

The spaces in which these activities took place could be relatively large in number or extent, but Catskills’ farms early houses were likely to be small and their rooms few in number. These earliest, small houses are likely to be from the early nineteenth century rental period, when farmers in the Catskills could not own their farms but instead rented them from wealthy absentee landlords.
Consisting of one or two ground floor rooms with a loft or partial story above, they made flexible use of space for the many, sometimes conflicting, activities that the family members had to perform in them: cooking, sleeping, child care, education, worship, hosting visitors, food processing and preservation, clothing preparation and care, tool making and repair, and recreation (Figure 1-3). In a house with one main room, cooking and sleeping would have taken place in the same room. The adult couple would have slept in the room with the hearth, relegating children to an ancillary space such as the loft or an unheated upstairs room (2).

With so many activities going on in one or two main spaces, the use of space was integrated according to age and gender: men and women, boys and girls worked together or alongside each other in the same space. Even if their work role assignments were very different, they were likely to run into each other (3). Children were expected to work with adults and to learn from them, and men and women helped each other (Osterud 1991). Basic processes for meeting needs for food and clothing required work by adults and children of both genders, bringing them to work together in systems (the food system, the clothing system) rather than in tasks isolated in time and space (Cromley 1996). These systems included outdoor work spaces, making the farmyard’s
outbuildings and barn part of the house’s spatial organization (Hubka 1984).

This generalized space utilization for work roles was not random as some scholars suggest (Demos 1970), but relied on a set of behaviors and understandings that divided the space, physically and temporally, as effectively as walls would have done (4). In their research about twentieth century uses of such generalized spaces, scholars have found that the household members had well-defined space assignments for themselves, and for products and processes, even though there were no architectural elements to suggest them. George McDaniel documents a one-room house in Maryland in which the resident, though very poor and not owning much furniture, had divided his space according to social, personal, storage and work functions (McDaniel 1982, 175). Moreover, Michael Ann Williams’s study of single pen log houses in southwest North Carolina shows that the simplicity of the single room plan belies the complex system of space use within. Where Demos found "an easy flexibility, a willingness to improvise in spaces that did not have predetermined function," (Demos 1970 p. 39) Williams found the southern log houses divided in practical, social and symbolic terms. Cooking and sleeping were conceptually separate; other spaces might be divided temporally, with the same space serving several different
functions in the course of a day or over the seasons. Or the space might be assigned hierarchically, with the head of the household or the eldest having the chair or bed nearest the hearth (Williams 1991, 54). Whether or not privacy as it is currently defined was achieved, people got along in these undifferentiated spaces through the cultivation among the occupants of reserve and respect (Williams 1991, 61).

In the small farm houses in the early nineteenth century Catskills, family members understood not only where objects and processes were to be located but also when they had priority for a certain space. If the table was required for food preparation, the cutting and sewing of garments had to give way. Priority also followed authority roles within the family, centering generally on the parents (5).

The preindustrial house juxtaposed its public and private functions. Cooking and other household activities could take place at the same time in the same space as hosting visitors for business or for socializing. Another "public" function of the household concerned the accommodation of unrelated individuals. The preindustrial family was not the fabled extended family, popularly understood to consist of all members of several generations living together under one roof. Family history scholars have found a persistence in Europe and in North America of
residential separation of the generations. In other words, when one's child married, and a new couple was formed, every effort was made to provide them with their own residence or at least their own cooking space; it was not assumed that they, as a couple, would form a subservient part of a multi-generational household, ruled by a venerable elder (Hareven 1991, 2). However, households were entirely nuclear; if elders were present it was usually because they needed some kind of special care, or had ceased being the dominant working adults (6).

In the early nineteenth century the family performed what later would be society's role in providing care for the elderly, the poor, the developmentally disabled, and other dependent persons (Hareven 1991, 2). In fact, household residents who were not members of the nuclear family were as likely to be unrelated as they were to be close relatives such as grandparents, adult siblings, etc. (Hareven 1991, Hubka 1984, Small 1997). Housing of unrelated individuals to provide additional labor for the farm has a long history in the northeastern United States. (Demos 1970). This custom included not only hired help but also able bodied young people who went to live with other families to "learn the arts of housekeeping" or to gain skills as apprentices (7). The informal education of apprentices may have been
accompanied by more formal instruction in basic literacy and computational skills.

When finances permitted an expansion of the earliest, smallest houses, the family might have added rooms or built an entirely new house. Additional spaces would have allowed the separation of sleeping and food preparation, and possibly the use of these separate spaces for some other activities such as dairy processing, care of the ill, family social activities or reception of visitors (Cummings 1979). Even when the new house was a cottage with two to four rooms on the first floor and the same number in the partial story above, it represented a great increase in space available (Figure 1-4). Nevertheless, flexibility in space persisted. When they lacked central hallways, these farmhouses continued to encourage the generalized use of space seen in the smaller houses: a room housing one kind of activity had to be passed through to reach another room (8). Possibilities for encounter among household members remained high, and exclusive access to space remained low, as the household economy continued to involve most of its members in connected and overlapping spaces.

The greater number of rooms must have seemed to increase convenience because there would have been more alternatives for space assignments and thus fewer temporal overlaps of activities in the same space. (The cream rising
pans might have their own space and thus not be disturbed for the preparation of supper, for example.) Additional spaces did not, however, lead directly to the specialization seen later in Victorian houses. Instead, space use intensity remained at its earlier high level as formerly outdoor activities moved indoors and the family undertook activities such as weaving that greater prosperity allowed.

Both Nora Pat Small and Sally McMurry have pointed out the expansion of farm houses, from the time of the early Republic in New England to the mid-nineteenth century in the Northeast, in order to accommodate the productivity of the household, making tasks of farming and home industry more convenient by increasing the size of the house. New sections were added in the form of ells or by moving and attaching existing buildings (Small 1997). Similarly, a one-and-a-half story house could be expanded to two full stories, or turned into a Greek Revival "upright and wing" house. While the appearance of two-story farmhouses, some with elaborate trim in the current style (Federal classic, Greek, Gothic, or combinations) might seem designed to impress the viewer, it is important to remember that the renovation was more likely driven by new market demands and strategies (Small 1997). In the Catskills between the Anti-Rent War in the 1840s and the Civil War, farms began to
prosper marketing butter. The new, larger farm houses, of whichever type, incorporated the commercialization of agriculture by providing improved work spaces for dairy processing and other home industries. For example, an 1843 Ohio farmhouse illustrated by McMurry includes a dairy room, ice house, and wood house (Figure 3-1). In the same spirit of improvement, the farmers described by Thomas Hubka rationalized the work spaces in and adjacent to the house by actually connecting the farmhouse and barn in order to raise efficiency in the increasingly competitive farm economy (Hubka 1984). While men and women continued to work together to produce farm income, according to McMurry, the farmhouse spaces designed for the productive farm wife were beginning to segregate the genders.

The label "preindustrial" implies that the integrated, productive space use described here took place prior to the mid-nineteenth century (in the U.S.) when industrialization, commercialization, and urbanization began to change living arrangements for many North Americans. According to Hareven, rural and urban family functions and accompanying space use in this period were more similar to each other than they would be later, after industrialization (Hareven 1991).

The integrated use of smaller generalized spaces may not have survived into the industrial era among the middle-
class, but it did continue in the houses and tenements of the urban working class and in rural farmhouses (Hareven 1991). As will be seen in the case studies of farm boarding houses, both the use of the home to produce income and some aspects of the "pre-industrial" use of space persisted well into the twentieth century in the Catskills, even in houses that had been designed for the more modern world of industrialization, commercialization and urbanization. Urban and suburban middle-class families began to define their homes as havens from the commercial, working world, and dedicated them to the moral development of individual family members (Beecher 1869). Farm houses adapted some of the spatial characteristics of these citified houses, especially regarding private sleeping quarters, but they retained their ability to produce goods and income to meet family needs, and to provide an arena for encounters in work and leisure that crossed both gender and age.

Industrial Era Families, Households and Farmhouses

The view that the family and thus its house should be a retreat from the bustling industrial and commercial world accompanied the growth of the middle-class after the beginning of industrialization and urbanization in the nineteenth century. This domestic ideology saw home and family as the "sphere" of women, in which they would not
only provide or supervise services for family members but would also nurture the moral development of children and husband (Beecher 1869). The house was no longer the site of production of income nor of goods to meet family needs. No longer did systems of work and space usage link different ages and different genders. Instead the house was organized with many specialized spaces that separated occupants by class, gender and age, and that differentiated between public and private functions of the house and family (Figure 3-2).

Houses that met this description of middle-class industrial era spatial use included the many styles of asymmetrically massed, multistoried "Victorian" houses going up in post-Civil War cities and in their burgeoning suburbs. In these houses, the spatial progression was from public to private areas. The parlor at the front of the house was usually separated from the service part of the house (the kitchen) by the dining room. The sleeping area was for the most part housed on the upper floor, with some houses retaining the first floor bedroom for the main couple or for guests. In more elaborate houses each phase of the day and each major activity might have its own room with its own behavioral norms (Smith 1971, 68).

The suburban Victorian house was designed for a family that no longer produced major goods for its own needs, but
instead used or processed consumer goods purchased with income from work done away from home. Rather than incorporate unrelated individuals into the home, these families hired servants who lived and worked in spaces separate from the rest of the family’s activities. Service areas, such as the kitchen, were pushed to the back of the house, away from its public spaces. Non-productive family functions took over the remaining spaces in the house. Other than services for food and clothing, these were focussed on the cultivation of moral, educational and self-improvement values for family members. Increased privacy, exclusive access to a certain space such as a bedroom, was supposed to be conducive to the development of these values, as was the ornamentation and furnishing of the family’s parlor. The family home still provided space for some specialized services such as funerals, marriages, women’s socializing, but the social space of the house was no longer integrated with the space for work or for ordinary family activities. The parlor by this time had become a place for edification, for display, and for entertaining visitors.

McMurry has found that during this post-Civil War period in the nineteenth century the ideal farmhouse responded to economic and social changes that affected the lives and work of farm family members. Like their urban and suburban counterparts, these farmhouses provided more
specialized spaces that effectively divided occupants and their activities by gender, age and class, and that more clearly separated public from private functions of the family. Kitchens became more specialized and isolated; no longer the primary space for processing farm goods, they moved away from the barnyard and sometimes even faced the road. There were more specialized child spaces, but they were located away from the kitchen. Rooms for farmhands were separated from the rest of the house or eliminated all together (Figure 3-4). Rooms set aside for eating (dining rooms) were incorporated into the new farmhouse plan.

The second half of the nineteenth century was a period of commercialization of farms and of rural migration to cities. After the Civil War creameries and cheese factories centralized the production of dairy products. But at the same time that improved technology was easing the labor burden for men in the fields, no such development helped women with their tasks necessary to meet rising standards of housekeeping, health promotion and diet. Although women’s work roles were less and less devoted to productive work, in fact their burden increased (Cowan 1983). Progressive farm women, according to McMurry, came more and more by the 1860s and 1870s to accept their assignment to the woman’s "sphere" of domesticity, nurture and cultural improvement (McMurry 1997, 102). However, farm women in New York, according to
Osterud, chose to retain their egalitarian bond with men in farm production, in spite of the expectations about home and family communicated to rural areas by an increasingly dominant urban culture.

Kitchens during this period tended to become smaller, to gain pantries and sometimes cupboards, and to have step-saving appurtenances such as an indoor pump or quick access to the wood house. The quest for efficiency, that earlier in the century had supported increased farm production and benefitted both genders' work, now was intended to alleviate the farm wife's "drudgery," and focussed on the kitchen (McMurry 1997, 128 and 188).

Not all spaces were adapted to the urban/suburban model. Many farmers who designed their own houses rejected the urban parlor as symbolic of artificiality, conspicuous consumption, and idleness (McMurry 1997, 163). Instead they used a sitting room with its associated informality and family togetherness. According to McMurry, with the influence of rural populations that migrated to the city, the farm sitting room became the living room that was widely accepted in the city and country in the early twentieth century (McMurry 1997, 169).

Use of such houses on farms was different than in the suburbs, because the farm family continued to use the house as a site of production. The choice to use Victorian styles
and space organization, such as Queen Anne houses with individual bedrooms for children, might have been intended to encourage the next generation to stay on the farm (McMurry 1997). A family might show the desire to keep up with such urban trends at the same time that they rejected the urbanized parlor and all it stood for. Nonetheless, the era of suburban Victorian houses coincides with the conversion of the farm to fluid milk and the beginning of the farm boarding business in the Catskills. Some of these boarding houses reflected the forms and styles that imitated urban and suburban developments.

**Early Twentieth Century Farm Families and Houses**

As farm families came to be producers of a cash crop, rather than producing for a variety of their own needs, houses required fewer types of spaces. Some farmhouses adopted features of progressive city house plans. Like these suburban or urban houses, farmhouses could be smaller and could focus on services to the family, with the spaces for income-producing work and public functions taken care of elsewhere. These bungalows and cottages of the 1920s and 1930s were consciously the antithesis of the Victorian house that preceded them: they emphasized natural materials, ease of maintenance, healthful surfaces, and built-in furniture and other conveniences (Figure 3-4).
Eschewing the ornate pretensions of the Victorian parlor, urban and suburban bungalows usually featured a more informal living room, with plainer surfaces and more comfortable furniture. Bedrooms continued to be individual and isolated, but often were all on one floor. Specialized room use seemed to prevail in the dining room, but they were sometimes outfitted as a kind of conservatory and were used for many family activities besides dining. The kitchen remained at the back of the house. This arrangement of rooms and usages suited the health-oriented, efficiency-minded middle-class home owners of the period. Maintaining the Victorian progression from public to private spaces, the modern bungalow still provided a family refuge, but without the Victorian devotion to edification and moralizing.

Bungalows are considered to be an urban or suburban phenomenon. In rural areas they are more likely to be found in villages and towns than on farms. The relatively few bungalows and cottages adopted for farm use might have been built for a hired hand's family (the "hired man's house" as it is called in Delaware County) or to replace a farmhouse lost by fire. The farm example could have resembled its urban counterpart in every detail because of the prevalence of plans and kits for bungalows and cottages, but such was not always the case. In Sussex County in the state of Delaware, where Susan M. Chase documented farm bungalows,
they possess the exterior appearance of the style, but their interiors retain the essentials of the one- or two-room plan of the traditional Sussex County farmhouse. She quotes Henry Glassie that "people are most conservative about the spaces they must utilize, and in which they must exist" (Glassie, 1986 [1972], 407). Chase sees the contradiction in the rural bungalow as evidence of a "not uncommon effort to mediate popular ideas and traditional values" (Chase 1995).

In the early twentieth century in Delaware County, some families maintained certain traditional productive characteristics of farming as a way of life. They still provided their own fuel, raised large gardens and animals for their own use, they made their own clothing, and counted all this productivity as additional profit for the farm. But they also selectively adopted scientific management of the home, as it was promoted by emerging departments of home economics at state universities. Rationalized procedures and sanitary practices supported health and nutrition, but also augmented productivity and increased the farm wife's time for self-culture.

It is not at all clear, however, that a family living in a big, old farmhouse maintained generalized spaces for their productive activities, nor that a family aspiring to the suburban ideal adopted the bungalow, or a house of
similar size or type. In fact, farm families have gone on living in both kinds of houses throughout the twentieth century, incorporating into them emerging domestic technology and adopting developments in building materials and in space usage.

Mid-Twentieth Century Families and Farmhouses

After the hiatus in housing-starts during the Great Depression and World War II, the booming construction industry attempted to provide returning GIs "the American Dream House." The combined efforts of architects, builders, materials suppliers and advertisers caused the cottage and bungalow, prevalent before the war, to be put aside in favor of the one-story, southwestern-style ranch house. More than the cottage or bungalow, the ranch house allowed the development of the open plan, which could be built less expensively. Activity areas, determined by function rather than aesthetics, blended spaces formerly divided into separate rooms and gave a sense of spaciousness for less cost per square foot (Clark 1986) (Figure 3-5). The open plan was itself based on an ideal of family life that still saw the home as a refuge from the working world, a place for family togetherness and recreation. Indeed, the lack of hallways in the social and utility zones of the house encouraged family encounters (Smith 1971). Work in the home
(for men, but especially for women) was billed as "fun."

Suburban kitchens became the social centers they had always been in farmhouses, but these had counters and islands to allow the hostess to work and entertain or supervise children at the same time. In the social spaces of the house, indoors and outdoors could be blended, again emphasizing spaciousness and recreation. Dining rooms became alcoves or L-shaped spaces off the living area. The sleeping zone was set off from the rest of the house, as it had been in the early twentieth century cottages and bungalows, and in their Victorian predecessors. The bedrooms were protected by a hallway and sometimes by the provision of a guest bathroom closer to the living area (Clark 1986). Spaces, especially in the utility zones of bath and kitchen, became even more multipurpose, combining sewing and laundry, for example, with the children's bathroom (Adams 1995).

The suburban open plan of the mid-twentieth century was available to the few farm families that built new houses while they were still farming. More often, these families redid older houses, renewing or updating surface finishes (walls and floors), installing contemporary storage and work surfaces in the kitchen (cabinets), and updating plumbing in the bathrooms (built-in fixtures). In the course of these improvements they could improve circulation and visual
access in a nineteenth century house’s many specialized rooms by removing doors and perhaps replacing them with wall board archways.

Since the 1980s non-farmers, both weekend vacationers and full-time residents, have occupied most of the surviving farmhouses in Delaware County. It has not been unusual for the renovation of these houses to include "gutting" the interior. While maintaining its historic exterior the occupants create a visually connected interior with flexible space use focussed on the kitchen and living areas, a pattern not unlike the kinds of suburban spaces they grew up in.

Frank Lloyd Wright, an architect who made great use of the open plan, consciously encouraged this relationship between the open space plan and memories of farmhouse living in houses he designed (Smith 1971). Ironically, the actual farmhouses that adopted suburban notions of privacy and efficiency eighty to one hundred years ago are now being renovated back to a semblance of the generalized spatial use, at least on the first floor, that they had in their earliest forms in the region.

Summary

The farmhouse in Delaware County in the nineteenth century changed from a relatively small space incorporating
the large variety of family functions to a set of spaces designed to improve productivity and later to reflect values of family privacy and consumerism. It could however retain earlier forms of interior space usage, even when plans were enlarged and exteriors updated. Later, however, under the influence of twentieth century suburban trends, farmhouses might appear historic on the outside, but be entirely contemporary on the inside. By the time this change came about, however, they were no longer farm houses.

Gradually, rural families' occupations and division of home from workplace have come to resemble urban/suburban patterns. Rural residents do continue to engage in productive activities in their homes (gardening, maintaining a wood supply for heat, making maple syrup). For some residents these activities, plus others such as plowing snow, yard maintenance, cutting trees and fur trapping, are ways to piece together a living. But for most practitioners they are done out of preference rather than necessity. Professionals and tradesmen in rural Delaware County commute long distances to work and when shopping may do so a long distance from home. Rural towns have become bedroom communities with essentially suburban expectations of their dwellings.
How Summer Boarding Fits Into Changing Patterns of Family Function and Space Use

Accommodations for summer boarders in farmhouses did not take on a single form. Boarding occurred through most of the period described in this chapter, except in the earliest smallest houses. It was a phenomenon that bridged the eras of the 1850s classic cottage, the specialized Victorian, the bungalow and the ranch house. As will be seen in the case studies that follow, farmhouses that were adapted as summer boarding houses continued to look like farmhouses more than they resembled resorts or hotels. These homes reflected the new use of space that accompanied changing farm family roles and functions at the same time that these farmhouses were renovated to accommodate large numbers of visitors. How those alterations were made depended on the prevailing ideology of farm family life more than on the style of the building being altered.
NOTES

1) McMurry considers the farm family's choice of sitting or living room over parlor to be a sign of their resistance to urban values.

2) Abbott Lowell Cummings uses probate inventories to identify rooms for sleeping in seventeenth and eighteenth century houses in eastern Massachusetts.

3) Smith discusses house plans in terms of their likelihood for encouraging encounter between family members.

4) Smith, pp. 53 and 74. Hareven refers to Aries's research about European families in which he describes them as "living on top of each other." While Demos acknowledges behavioral controls, he considers the assignment of space within the house random.

5) Smith, pp. 66-67). Williams also records elders or primary couples having the beds closest to the fire.

6) In seeming contrast to this scholarly research, the elders in most of the families in the case studies remained on their farms after the younger generation took over, or they went to live with children after giving up the farm. But this was an example of elder care, not an extended family structure.

7) Hareven, p. 4. Hareven calls young people placed with other families to earn or learn, "life cycle servants."

8) Nora Pat Small discusses the one and a half story symmetrical cottage in New England which has behind its central door a lobby entry and a dogleg stair, even though the central chimney has given way to end chimneys. The space the chimney occupied was replaced by a small work or storage place. Many "classic cottages" in the Roxbury area have a version of this plan, i.e., the central door does not imply a central hall and stair.
CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDY 1: HUBBELL'S MOUNTAIN HOME

When D.W. Hubbell and his wife Huldah Jaquish Hubbell purchased her father's farm in Bragg Hollow in 1866, it was a familiar place for both of them. D.W. had been born there when his parents farmed it, and Huldah may have been living there at the time of her marriage in 1864. Located in the town of Middletown, up Bragg Hollow from the village of Halcottville, the farmhouse still overlooks rolling meadows and has a remarkable view to the east southeast.

The house the Hubbells moved into was most likely the one illustrated in Diane Galusha's history of Halcottville, As the River Runs (Galusha 1990, 136). (Figure 4-1). It was one and a half stories high and appears to be two rooms deep, with a room on each side of a symmetrically placed front door. Behind the door there would have been a lobby and winding stair or, less likely, a central hallway and straight stair (Small 1997). This is the house type that has since been called a "classic cottage" and resembles others that were built in the 1840s and 1850s in nearby villages and farms (McMurry 1997) (Figure 1-4). It was probably built by either the husband's or the wife's
parents: Milo and Polly Hubbell, when they lived on the place in the 1840s, or Daniel and Sarah Jaquish who bought it in 1854.

In the mid-nineteenth century, Delaware County farms such as this one had emerged as leading producers of butter in the nation, even though farmers rented the land and its improvements from absentee landlords many of whom lived in the Hudson Valley: the well-known Hardenburgh, Rensselaer, and Livingston families. After the Anti-Rent War of 1848, it was Milo Hubbell, D.W. Hubbell’s father, who bought the place that he had apparently been renting from James K. Armstrong (Delaware County Deed Book 37, p. 91 and Book 39, p. 163).

Renters were not known to have prosperous farms. Theirs was a diversified type of agriculture, raising food, fuel and fiber for their own needs, and to pay their annual rent. If there was a cash crop, it was wool from sheep that were allowed to graze in the fields and woods to the tops of the mountains, or it was timber from the farm’s more remote slopes. While there are exceptions, the few houses that survive from the renting period (1790s to 1840s) tend to be small, one story structures, one room or one and a half rooms deep (Figure 1-3).
A SMALL FARMHOUSE IN BRAGG HOLLOW

The Hubbells

It is perhaps one of these small houses that Milo Hubbell rented before he bought the place from the landlord in 1851. The current occupant of the Bragg Hollow farm, Dave Riordan, says that during renovation of the present house he found evidence of "truly ancient timbers and some of the widest boards that anybody around here has ever seen" in the rear wing, with a hearth close by.

There is an ancient piece of construction just underneath — just behind the big house there ... there is an ancient cabin that forms that living room and what's now a bathroom and pantry ... The farm probably started out with this tiny cabin, truly small, and that in short order they got up and running and built [the classic cottage] ... When we had to cut the old floor system out, there was evidence of a really old, some kind of fireplace or cooking area ... laid up of dry laid stone with cinders and what not (Riordan 1998).

Along the stairway on the first floor, the Riordans have reused the wide boards that they believe came from the earliest "cabin." The twenty-six inch wide boards are beaded on one edge and rabbitted to fit together. Based on their location prior to demolition, Dave Riordan believes these boards were the partitions in the oldest structure. Like most of the rest of the house, they appear to be hemlock.

These findings made Dave Riordan think that the one and a half story "classic cottage" Milo's son occupied in 1866
might have been built in front of an older house consisting of one or two rooms (Figure 4-1). Because parts of this small house were found in the existing ell, it might have been located there, serving as an ell for the earlier cottage. However, no ell is evident in the photograph because of the angle from which it was taken. The old house might have been torn down in time for the undated photo or just did not show in it (1).

In 1840, when the Hubbell’s son David W. was born on the Bragg Hollow farm they were renting, Milo and Polly were forty-two years old. All eight surviving children were under 18 and most likely living at home: Nancy age 18, Catherine 16, Harvey 12, Patrick 10, Mariam 8, Fanny Jane 6, John D. 3, and David W. [D.W.], an infant (2). Even if there was no hired laborer and if neither of the couple’s parents were living with them, the household consisted of at least ten persons.

This family in 1840 may have lived in the small house the remains of which were included in the later structure. All ten people would have carried on their everyday indoor activities in at most two main rooms: processing food from the garden and stable, making butter and cheese, preparing honey and maple sugar for sale, spinning wool, sewing and other home manufactures, providing child care and instruction, cooking, eating, and sleeping. Competition for
interior space was eased in summer because much farmwork was
done outdoors; but during the cold season outdoor
activities, such as repairing small farm items and doing
laundry, might come indoors (3). The Hubbells' earlier
house would have been an example of the generalized space
use common over the previous two centuries in the houses of

THE CLASSIC COTTAGE

The growing economy before the Civil War might have
offered incentive to former farm renters, now owners, to
build more substantial houses for their families (4). The
one-and-a-half story "classic cottage" may have been built
by Milo Hubbell in the 1840s because his family was getting
larger, or after the Anti-Rent War when he became owner
(Figure 4-1). Or it may have been built by Daniel Jaquish
when he purchased the farm in 1854, or even by D.W. Hubbell
when he and Huldah took over the farm in 1866. Whenever it
was constructed, no doubt it provided ample accommodations
for family, hired help and their activities.

As seen in the undated photograph (Galusha 1990, 136),
the cottage had a center front door and a classical cornice
with pilasters. Two small chimneys emerge from the ridge
line at either end of the house, which appears to be one or
two rooms deep. During the Riordans' renovation, they found
that the internal structure was timber framed in sixteen or eight foot lengths and that the sheathing was nailed vertically to the frame.

[Interior walls were] sawed boards; ... they had taken the wide boards and with a hatchet, or whatever they used, just split them along the grain and nailed them to the base and then nailed them to the top ... they would just stagger them and nail the lath to them [for plastering] (Riordan 1998).

Dave Riordan found that these interior walls carried no weight, for when it came time to remove them he could "run through these walls and never have the chain saw bind." The cottage was set on a full cellar dry built of stone without mortar.

The use of space in the one-and-a-half story house when it was first built may not have changed a great deal from the earlier, smaller house. In her research concerning southern Appalachian log houses, Michael Ann Williams finds that "periods of discontinuity in house plan are marked by continuity in space use, while major change in spatial use was countered by a period of stability in house plan." (Williams 1991, 91-92). Similarly, the Lynds studying Middletown in the 1920s found that it was "not uncommon to observe 1890 and 1924 habits jostling side by side" in the same space (Lynd 1956, 5). Therefore the inhabiting of the new house in Bragg Hollow did not necessarily imply a
wholesale change in the Hubbells' habits or in their world view.

For one thing, when D.W. and Huldah Hubbell established their household in the "classic cottage" in the 1860s, the economically productive activities had changed more in quantity than in kind. Divided into two, three or four downstairs rooms, with a similar number upstairs, the farmhouse probably would have had a sitting room, kitchen and bedrooms (Hubka 1984, 36). The downstairs space could have been divided evenly in four segments or unevenly with two larger front rooms and a row of smaller ones in the rear (5).

The number of people living in the house may have been large. D.W. and Huldah Hubbell had six surviving children born from 1865 to 1883 (6). Figure 4-1 shows seven adults and one child. Among the adults may be Huldah's parents, Daniel and Sarah Jaquish. In the 1870s the other in-laws, Polly and Milo Hubbell, were living at the Hubbell farm in Kelly Corners with D.W.'s brother, John D. Hubbell, who had married Huldah's sister (7). Because of certain artifacts and portraits found in the Hubbell house in Kelly Corners, Carolyn Hubbell, historian for the Delaware County part of the family, believes that the brothers and sisters divided the care of their parents between the two homes (8). Even if some of the adults in the photograph are visitors, the
number of people living in the house by the 1880s would have been at least eight and more likely ten.

The larger number of rooms in this second house would have allowed the separation of sleeping from cooking. The upstairs likely remained unheated and its slant-ceilinged rooms used for children’s or hired laborers’ sleeping quarters and for storage, and it is probable that at least one downstairs room continued to be used for sleeping, most likely by the central married pair (Hubka 1984, 36). In the smaller house, their bed may have been in the room with the hearth, but in the new house the upstairs and downstairs spaces could be divided in a number of ways to provide bedrooms for the principal couple as well as the resident in-laws.

Judging by their small size in the photo, the chimneys on each end of the house were for wood heating and cooking stoves. Cast iron stoves had become available in the area by this time with the result that houses such as this one were often built without fireplaces. The kitchen might have been located in one of the main front rooms or in the smaller rooms in the rear. Perhaps the builders did not consider a hearth in the second house necessary for another reason: the family may have gone on using the one in the old house (Strausser 1982, 36). For a time, if the older house functioned as an ell, it would have been a reasonable place
for the kitchen, according to Hubka. Perhaps some or all of the cooking in the first years of this new house was done on the old hearth. Then, when the family could afford a wood-burning cookstove, the hearth could gradually have been abandoned.

By the time D.W. and Huldah took over the farm in 1865, butter was the primary crop of Delaware County farms. By 1880, they were producing over two thousand pounds of butter on the Bragg Hollow Farm. The railroad had reached Halcottville in 1871, providing increased demand and faster transportation of butter to the metropolitan area for sale. There were more cows and therefore more milk to churn into butter and to make into cheese. More space would have needed to be devoted, for example, to cream rising pans, an important but space-consuming step in the production of butter. The kitchen and its ancillary spaces would have absorbed the dairy function in addition to cooking and serving meals, food preservation, laundry, and other processes, plus storage of food related items and wood for the fire. The additional space from having two more rooms on the ground floor, or possibly the old house as an ell, would have allowed specialization for butter making, even in a modest farmhouse such as this one.

The remains of the twentieth century barn are located north of the house, away from the road. If this
spot was the site of the nineteenth century barn, it would make sense for the kitchen to be on the rear of the house, for easy access when carrying milk from the barn. This connection was made at some time in the farm’s past, because prior to the 1990s renovation there was a door in the north wall of the ell and a bluestone walkway connecting it to the barn. The barn and house made an efficient workspace both outdoors and indoors for the many tasks required on the farm. Outdoor work for both men and women was more comfortable because the farmyard was behind the house (where the later ell would be located) protected from the north wind by the barn and warmed by the sun on the southern exposure.

The increased number of rooms in this mid-nineteenth century farmhouse would also have made it possible to separate family gatherings and guest socializing from cooking. While the kitchen remained a hub of activity and probably remained the site for eating, one of the downstairs rooms could be set aside for social and other functions. Not a parlor in the Victorian sense, this sitting room (or multipurpose pre-Georgian parlor, Grier 1992) was the location for family members’ activities, separately or together, once they had finished work in the barn, barnyard, fields or kitchen. It was here, near the stove, that household members might do their part in the textiles
process (children carding wool, adults spinning), adults might keep account books, and toddlers might play while their parents repaired clothing or tools. This room would also have hosted visitors and would have been used for weddings and funerals. The multipurpose parlor was not yet like its Victorian successor which specialized in rites of passage and whose objects were intended to symbolize domesticity and gentility.

The front of the Bragg Hollow house was clearly oriented outward socially. A much-prized bluestone carriage step is featured in the photograph of the one and a half story house. It was connected to the front porch until recently by a bluestone path. The location of the carriage step would indicate that at least one of the front rooms was intended for receiving guests visiting the farm family. Perhaps the step is the first indication, too, of the property's new use that began in the 1880s: boarding.

THE TWO-STORE "GEORGIAN" HOUSE

The Bragg Hollow homestead may have seemed the perfect place to begin to take in boarders. It was far enough up the hollow to be in the country, but close enough to Halcottsville for ready access to the railroad. The train made it possible to ship dairy products, at first butter and later fluid milk, much more quickly to the metropolitan area
for sale. It also brought visitors to the area as boarders, an already established custom farther down the rail line toward the Hudson Valley.

After farming in Bragg Hollow for fifteen years, establishing a boarding house may have seemed to D.W. and Huldah a positive financial step to supplement the farm’s income and underwrite the change to fluid milk production. It seems likely that this modification came about in the late 1880s, a decade when more and more farm families adapted their households and their lives to taking in boarders.

D.W. Hubbell is listed in the 1888 Directory of the Ulster and Delaware Railroad as a farmer, but by 1895 the Hubbells’ boarding house is listed in the Biographical Review of Delaware County as one of the busiest. Sometime between 1888 and 1895, if not before, the Bragg Hollow farm became a summer boarding house. It is clearly included in the 1902 railroad directory for tourists where it is listed as a boarding house and continued to be so until D.W.’s death in 1906 (Figure 2-6).

An 1895 photograph published in Galusha’s history of Halcottville shows Hubbell Mountain Home, as it had come to be called, renovated to full two stories (Galusha 1990, 76) (Figure 1-8). Apparently the bottom of the house kept its proportions and the roof itself was raised. Dave Riordan’s
renovations in 1997-98 revealed the old second story sidewalls and showed where they had been cut to permit the additional height.

You can see for the expansion that they cut— we could look at them during the renovations— they cut the timbers right about there ... just above the windows. ... There are eight of them around that whole section. They cut them all off and lifted the roof up in one piece and stuck four foot pieces of wood in between them and then lowered it down. And their one and a half story became two (Riordan 1998).

In the attic of the later ell, Dave Riordan also saw the old wood shingle roof of the earlier house used as the roof for the taller version. "It’s the old roof of the one [and a half] story house" (Riordan 1998).

On the exterior it is possible today to see where the one and a half story pilasters on the corners of the house were lengthened when the second story was added. There were some changes to the windows, the door with sidelights was replaced with a double door with arched windows, and the classic front portico was replaced at this time or later with a porch that wrapped around the southeast corner of the house, facing the view down the valley. Without the porch, the effect on the front of the house was of a complete Georgian facade, as if it had been built that way.

If the one and a half story house had had a winding stair opposite the front door, it was certainly this renovation to two stories that allowed a straight stair and
a center hallway on both floors. From this time on, if not before, the two sides of the house were separated by a hall that paralleled the new central stairs going straight up to the second floor. Upstairs the bedrooms on each side of the house were separated by a generous hallway, with each bedroom opening into it. Thus the interior plan was made to match the facade, a unity not necessarily met by all the two story farmhouses being built or renovated in the area at this time.

In 1892, when the state census was done and just prior to the photo that shows the renovations, D.W.'s and Huldah's eldest children were old enough to leave home to start their own households. John, age 27, was not at home; George, age 21, was away studying medicine (N.Y.S. Census 1892). So the household consisted only of the parents and three children: Sarah age 24, Burritt age 17, Ursula age 9, and William Osby, an elderly gardener (Figure 4-2). Thus it would appear that sheer numbers did not cause the enlargement of the house from one and a half to two stories, nor did household size cause the construction of the ell. Increased expectations for individual space for six people could still be reasonably met in the six to eight rooms of the "classic cottage," even if it did not have the old house as an ell. If the family desired a parlor, then additional space could have been provided in the cottage by moving all the bedrooms
upstairs or the kitchen to the old ell. D.W.’s brother’s house in Kelly Corners by the 1880s had been expanded from a one-and-a-half story "classic cottage" to a large two-story edifice with a center door and side porch (9). It is possible that by raising the roof D.W. and Huldah were keeping up with their older brother and sister. But with the addition of the new ell, it was clear that the expansion was to accommodate boarders (10).

If the "classic cottage" did not have an ell into which the Hubbells could move the kitchen, the 1895 two-story ell certain provided the opportunity. The front rooms in the house would thus be available as social spaces, continuing perhaps a sitting room or developing the Victorian-style parlor that would be there thirty years later. These social areas could have separated boarders and family or they could have been used together (11). One of the front rooms, or one of the narrower spaces at the rear of the main house, or even part of the ell might have been used as a dining room. If the kitchen was kept at the north end of the ell (where it would be found a few decades later), it may have been because that was the traditional position close to the barn the kitchen had held for thirty to fifty years, but it may also have been in response to late nineteenth century trends that separated public or social parts of the house from the service or utility spaces. Thus we have seen the procession
of the kitchen from the main living space in the first house, to one of the primary front rooms in the second house, to the ell with a possible intermediate location in one of the rear rooms of the main house.

At the time of the roof raising or later, but before the 1895 photo, the ell was added to the back of the house, providing more bedrooms and, depending on how it was divided and used, several first-floor work or bed rooms. Present-day inspection of the attic reveals construction variations that show the two parts of the ell were added at different times. At least the first ell addition is in place in the 1895 photo. Perhaps it was to the second section that an article in the Roxbury Times referred in 1897. This article reports that the Hubbells' son Burritt, who had taken over management of the farm and boarding house in the mid-1890s, had expanded the house's capacity to seventy-five (12). A more likely number of thirty guests is listed for Hubbell Mountain Home in the 1902 railroad directory of boarding houses.

Raising the roof made the upstairs bedrooms in the main house full height, accommodating more people. The expanded ell provided six or seven upstairs bedrooms across a center hall from each other. Connecting to the center hall of the main house, the ell contributed that ubiquitous and
characteristic interior of boarding establishments: the long, narrow hall flanked by bedrooms (Cromley 1979).

As they were found in the 1990s, the upstairs ell bedrooms were small, some only ten feet by ten feet. These dimensions were not unusual at a time when there was pressure to accommodate as many people as possible. Bedrooms in the elite Catskill Mountain House in the 1820s were as small as seven by ten, while more elaborate rooms at its competitor, the Kaaterskill Hotel in the 1880s, were fifteen by fifteen. The bedrooms on the second floor of the main house must have seemed luxurious too, as they were all corner bedrooms with cross ventilation. For both sets of upstairs bedrooms, the center hallway provided a measure of privacy, even if there were many people in each room. With ten or more guest bedrooms the house could easily accommodate the thirty boarder capacity listed in the 1902 railroad guide. To house the claimed seventy-five patrons, there would have had to be six to seven people in each room, with no space for the family.

It is not impossible that this many people stayed together at one time at Hubbell Mountain Home, though there is no direct evidence other than Burritt's claim in the newspaper. From operators of boarding houses, on this site and at others, there are accounts both of large boarding families sharing rooms, of putting up tents on the lawn and
of family members and boarding house employees giving up their rooms and their own beds to accommodate boarders (13). It is possible that displacing the farm family occurred during the Hubbell's tenancy, because theirs was a very popular boarding house. It certainly happened with later operators at the Bragg Hollow farm.

Later residents in this house refer to it as a double house. The division into two sets of living quarters was useful both for the later boarding house run by the Townsends and for the home for state mental patients run by the Averys. But there is no evidence from Carolyn Hubbell's account of the family genealogy that the house was originally designed to accommodate two families at a time (14). Perhaps it was the presence of the center hall way that created the impression of the double house. This hallway and the maintenance, in subsequent years, of separate spaces for boarders and family are the more likely foundations for the oral tradition.

The Townsends

D. W. Hubbell died in 1906 and his wife, Huldah, died a year later, at which time the heirs sold the property to the Townsends. While there are no survivors of the Hubbells' boarding house era to describe it, many informants have contributed their knowledge of the house in more recent
times. Primary among these former residents of the farmhouse in Bragg Hollow is Bernice Townsend Spielman who along with her husband, Les Spielman, contributed much of the following. The Townsend family consisted of Bernice, her older sister Mamie, her grandmother Townsend and her father George Townsend. Bernice’s mother and brother had died when she was very young. Together the Townsends ran the farm and boarding house until 1944.

Like the Hubbells, the Townsends carried on a full scale dairy operation at the same time that they took boarders. In the first part of the twentieth century, dairy cows produced the most milk in the summer, as they had in the previous century during butter production. They were dry all winter when they were fed just hay, and gave birth in the spring, supporting their first and highest lactation on the flush of early grass in the mountain pastures. Successful farmers were able to change their cows’ reproductive schedule to freshen in the fall, when the price for more limited supplies of milk was higher. Even if the Townsends were in the transition to having a fall dairy, most of the labor for caring for the cows, milking them, and harvesting hay for the winter would have happened at the same time the boarders were in residence. Off-season, George Townsend harvested cauliflower and made maple syrup
and candy, the sale of which supported the dairy business (Spielman 1999).

The boarders who came to the Townsends were primarily Ukrainian and Polish Catholic immigrants. There were mothers and children from as many as nine families who planned to stay for the summer. Some husbands visited on weekends and others came only for a week’s vacation sometime during the summer. Bernice Spielman remembers

We were close. Just like a big family ... And every year they reserved their room. Of course the room they had, the next year they always wanted it. And they’d send the deposit onto it. And at that time it was twenty dollars a month. And the boarders all came up on [the] train and they would come as soon as school was out and we would meet them at the train station and bring them up to the boarding house. And they’d go right back after Labor Day so the kids could go back to school They enjoyed it (Spielman 1998).

In what may have been a change from the days of the Hubbell family’s management, Townsends did not cook for their visitors. The term "boarders" is actually a misnomer, for the people who came to stay for the summer cooked for themselves.

It seemed to me they were on vacation - but they were always cooking; I couldn’t quite understand that. Because they liked to cook the fresh vegetables from the garden. They made beet soup ... and they had their fresh chicken and they had their - they were always cooking in that hot weather ... And they always had that fire going, cooking this and cooking that and the other thing. And I asked them once, I said, ‘How come you’re cooking all the time?’ They said they enjoyed it. But to me that wouldn’t be a vacation. And that’s the way they done it (Spielman 1998).
Though the people renting rooms were not from the same families, they shared the cooking, rotating cooks every few days.

The collective cooking arrangement at Townsends resembled a pattern developing at the same time in the southern Catskills in which boarders cooked for themselves. But in the "kuchaleyns" or "cook-alones" the common kitchen was divided into territories for each family's cook, who prepared meals only for her family (Kanfer 1989). There were often several stoves, and shelf space was labelled. By contrast Bernice Spielman describes a more congenial arrangement.

They had that [stove] going constantly cooking. And they all got along too, because you take all them people together you'd think there would be a little dispute - no, they all got along fine (Spielman 1998).

The congeniality extended to the host family too. Bernice tells that "the boarders kind of took me over with their kids." She enjoyed the food so much that her father noticed she had gained weight. The boarders made borscht and chicken soup and they made their own bread and cakes. "They weren't like ours," Bernice says, "they were not so sweet - it was good" (15).

The Townsends provided ingredients for boarder meals from their farm:

Now we had a big garden. My father raised a garden so they could buy all their vegetables
right on the farm. [We] sold them by the pound, ... twenty cents for beans ... [we] had our own eggs ... chicken, ducks (Spielman 1998).

Since the days of the Catskill Mountain House, a common theme in advertising the boarding house experience was the availability and abundance of fresh food, often raised on the place. While the Mountain House had to turn itself into a farm for the summer by importing cows, many late-century boarding houses were located on active farms, as happened in Bragg Hollow at the Hubbell Mountain Home. Farms were less expensive alternatives to the big hotels, but offered the same fresh air and access to fresh food and water for middle class and working class boarders as the elite hotels offered their wealthier clientele.

For entertainment the boarders were interested in outdoor activities and events that took them outside their rooms. Bernice Spielman remembers that the boarders liked to help with the field work:

I'll tell you another thing they done, they'd go right out in the hay field. They loved it, those women, and help my father in haying. They thought that was a big deal (Spielman 1998).

They went on regular walks, swam in the stream, and sat on the porch. But they also walked down to visit other boarders at a neighboring farm. They went out to the regular Friday night dance in Halcottville and to the county fair in Walton. Sometimes the entertainment was homemade. The Townsends would make ice cream and organize a house
dance or invite someone to entertain the boarders with songs and stories.

And then nights they'd sing or we'd have somebody come up there and play for them, and they'd sing. Some of them had beautiful voices, too (Spielman 1998).

The image is of an idealized rural life, with its healthful resources and supposedly benign relationship with nature. The boarders' experience included some of the hard work and collective obligations of farming and the community benefits. Whether for health reasons, or to recall their own past experiences, the city visitors were willing to crowd into bedrooms for three months, and to live (until 1935) without electricity, in order to take part in boarding in the Catskills.

By the time the Townsend family took over the boarding house in 1907, the house consisted of two full stories and both ell additions (Figure 4-3). It was effectively divided on the first floor into family and boarder precincts, one to the left of the stairs, the other to the right.

It was like a two family house. They had their own kitchen; they had their own dining room ... there was another room there which would have been their living room or parlor, whatever, but it was made into a bedroom because they needed it for boarders (Spielman 1998).

The boarders' side encompassed the west side of the first floor of the main house, the central hall and stairs (Figure 4-4). Their kitchen, was located in the ell, but opened
directly into their side of the main house. Because their side of the house had no living room, the boarders used their dining room with its large table as their gathering space. The Townsend family had the east side of the main house plus all of the downstairs ell, except the space for the boarders' kitchen. In the family's part of the main house the space was used as a formal parlor and a dining room followed by a kitchen in the ell. The west side of the ell was divided into several small rooms: bedrooms for Bernice's father and her sister, Mamie, a pantry, and a bathroom. A stair at the end of the ell led directly to the second floor and Bernice's room. The Townsend family entered their section through the ell's side door facing the driveway. The boarders used the front door.

For sleeping space, the boarders had the bedroom on the first floor, the four bedrooms upstairs in the main house, and all but the one at the end of the ell that belonged to Bernice. Often one whole family of boarders would share one bedroom. The rooms in the main house and one in the ell could accommodate at least a double bed plus a chest of drawers, if not more; the others were smaller. For twenty dollars a month the family could occupy the room. Especially because they provided their own meals and bought the ingredients from their hosts, the boarders' fee was based on space rather than the number of mouths to feed.
The arrangement and use of space in the boarding house during the Townsends' management reflected Bernice's description of its operating "like a big family," in the sharing of work and leisure space outdoors. But in other ways, space use reflects differing values for family and boarders, each group balancing varying aspects of their use of space between tradition and newer trends.

Indoors, the house on the Townsend family side at first glance seems to represent a pattern of room use reminiscent of suburban houses and farmhouses in the late nineteenth century, with the formal Victorian parlor at the front of the house, its public social space mediated by the dining room next, and the service spaces in the rear. The parlor might seem to have been preserved from the Hubbell era because it was useful in handling boarders. Bernice is emphatic that it was not intended for these visitors, and was not used by anyone, least of all herself as a child.

On our side was a parlor. Nobody used that ... How can I explain it? It was velvet - cushions - high back - fancy designs on the chairs. There was an organ in there too ... beautiful rugs ... old fashioned rugs ... [and] big framed pictures. [The parlor] was a no-no ... My father had a bear rug and they put that - with a head on it - they put that [in the doorway] when I was small because no way was I going by that bear head to go in the parlor ... But the parlor to me was kind of spooky anyway, but I would like to go in there and look at things ... they had the old fashioned lamps - what did they call them - with the globes (Spielman 1998).
Why then was this room retained on a farm where it has been argued such formal parlors were considered inappropriate? Scholars have shown that by the time the Townsends bought the Hubbell place in 1907, rural immigrants to the city had taken with them the tradition of the multi-purpose parlor, now called the living room, and popular literature was promoting among the middle class this more casual space in place of the more pretentious parlor (McMurry 1997 and Grier 1992). Later in the twentieth century, in the middle class suburbs parlors were being given up because houses were smaller, there was less household help, rites of passage were turned over to professionals and locations away from the home, more entertainment was available outside the home, especially by car, and telephone calling had replaced the social call.

Few of these conditions were present in the country and the impact of transportation and communication technology arrived there much later, so perhaps it is not surprising to find a full-fledged Victorian parlor in a 1930s farmhouse. What is more, during this time parlors had found acceptance in prosperous working class homes and were still found there by the Lynds in the 1920s (Lynd 1956). The Townsend parlor was identified with Bernice Spielman's mother. Bernice was remembers when she was very young both her mother's and her grandmother's funerals being conducted in the parlor. So in
the 1930s the formal social function of the parlor for rites of passage was still extant, as was its symbolic role in the family (16). Unlike the urban parlors its furnishing resembled, the Townsend's parlor was not used for family gatherings or receiving guests.

The dining room seems to have offered the Townsends sufficient space for the family to gather, as did the boarders in their own dining room. If the dining room seems to mediate between the social and service spaces of the Victorian suburban house, in both these cases it takes on some of the functions of the living room. On the family side the main wood stove for heat was located there. But according to the Spielmans, "most farmers gathered around the kitchen." The Townsend's kitchen, at the rear of the ell, had gained the efficiency by the addition of a pantry. But contrary to early twentieth century "step-saving" advice it remained relatively large.

The conversion of farms to producing fluid milk—which with rail transport could reach New York City still fresh—relieved the farmhouse of space demands for processing cream and making butter because the milk could be strained and cooled in the barn's milkhouse or in a spring house and processed at the creamery. The kitchen and its supporting spaces no longer needed to provide for the dairy production, but still had to accommodate a wood stove and wood storage
and the larger-scale cooking (canning, meat processing) that occurred in kitchens of families that grew their own food (17).

The transition to fluid milk required a scale of production and a level of technology that created a demand for larger herd and larger barns. In the last days of the Hubbells tenancy, but certainly by the time Bernice remembers at the Bragg Hollow farmhouse, the farm family would have been shipping milk in cans, which required a place to keep them cool. Prior to refrigeration need had been met by a vat with flowing cold spring water. Sometimes cooling was achieved in or near the barn and at other times at a springhouse that might be a some distance from farm or house. Occasionally house cellars were fitted for cooling milk. Eventually all these methods were replaced by refrigerated vats in a milk house that was attached to the barn.

With a full dairy of twenty-five Holstein cows, Mamie found the opportunity to work outdoors and in the barn rather than having more milk to handle in the house. While the boarders’ kitchen was relatively small and faced only its dining room, the family kitchen remained near the rear of the house. It was located there not to separate services from public spaces, as in the suburban Victorian house, but to face the barn and farmyard in the gender-
shared work relationship that still survived on the Townsend's farm.

The Townsend's assignment of family sleeping spaces followed a pattern older than the earliest house in the Bragg Hollow Farm, but still seen in nineteenth century farmhouses, in which the adults responsible for the household sleep on the first floor, and the young are assigned spaces above. The father's bedroom was "off the dining room" and the sister's bedroom was "off the kitchen." He remained close to a more formal room and the sister was close to her domain in the kitchen. While the use of an upstairs bedroom for Bernice recalls the former pattern of relegating children to the unheated upstairs, it may have had another meaning. Having her own room, instead of sharing her sister's room on the first floor, was something that may have been important to Bernice. It had certainly become important to the individuality of suburban, middle class youngsters in the early twentieth century (Cromley 1992). The family may have responded to current trends by assigning separate bedrooms to family members, but because of boarding it did not use the plethora of bedrooms in the house to establish the progressive twentieth century "sleeping wing," which isolated bedrooms from work and public spaces (Cromley 1992).
The Townsend family members had more individual privacy than the boarders if only because they each had their own bedroom. And to the extent that a smaller number of people claimed more space on the family side there was also more opportunity for privacy because of the lack of crowding. As the year-round residents, the Townsends reserved for themselves as much space as they might have had in a smaller house, such as a modern bungalow. But this privacy was not inviolable. Not only was Bernice allowed to eat with the boarders but also to support the boarding enterprise, as the youngest, she would still be asked to give up her room for boarders if needed. Bernice recalls

I know one year I had to give up my room because somebody wanted to come and they didn't have room for them and so I stayed with my sister in her room and gave my room up to them (Spielman 1998).

While the boarders might seem to have spatial priority in taking away family members' sleeping quarters, in fact they had less space per person inside the house. Living together in one room and many families in one house, boarding families no doubt had to reinvent patterns of behaviors for accomplishing personal tasks in shared space (18). Laundry was done by hand in their kitchen and dried outside on the yard; personal washing up took place in the kitchen where there was hot water or outside at the spring-fed tub in the dooryard; they washed their hair with water from the rain barrel; and they used the outhouse, not the
bathroom in the Townsend family’s part of the house. The only privacy for boarders was offered by the hallway access to each of their bedrooms. While the boarders had little privacy for sleeping within their family groups, or in carrying out personal activities in the common spaces, they were well separated from the other families in their sleeping quarters.

Why was this apparent crowding acceptable to the boarders? Perhaps the answer lies in Bernice’s description of the boarders’ living in her house "like a big family." If the boarding vacation was an escape from the city, intended to provide a relaxed, refreshing version of family life, then sharing sleeping space with close family members and cooking and eating together with other families met the description. For some boarders who may have grown up in crowded conditions in the city, sharing sleeping quarters with family might have seemed familiar. And for boarders who were immigrants from rural parts of Europe, cooking together in the big kitchen with fresh country produce may have reminded them of home.

Thus in its stage of life as a boarding house in the 1930s and 1940s, the Bragg Hollow house had changed from a family farmhouse, with multipurpose work and sleeping spaces, to a house that combined specialized and integrated space use for family and for boarders. Both family and
boarders negotiated between former ways of using space and current criteria. The boarders needed the privacy from each others' families provided by the hallway, but gave up privacy in sharing one room with the entire family. The farm family dedicated space to a formal parlor, used almost as a museum, while the boarders gave up their parlor and both groups "lived in" their dining room.

The boarders traded living in crowded conditions for a healthy environment. The Townsend family maintained the privacy it needed by effectively sealing off the boarders' side of the house, and then themselves living in the remaining spaces in generalized ways reminiscent of the previous, smaller houses on the site. Adapting their space usage in order to take boarders, the Townsends were able to continue making a living on their farm and to retain their home as the site of income production. Like the Hubbells when they moved from the one room "cabin" to the classic cottage, the boarders and the Townsend family retained past space usages to meet current goals.

The Averys

While they used it, the Townsends' house was clearly divided and it was divided even more clearly by the next owners, Viola and Marshall Avery, who lived there from 1944 to 1981. Viola had worked in Olla Scudder's boarding house
in Halcott, a nearby valley. Olla helped Viola and Marshall buy the Bragg Hollow place so Marshall could farm. They kept boarders at first, but Viola found it not to her liking, and for their final thirty years devoted the other half of the house to the care of state mental patients.

At first Averys changed the business to a true boarding house, finding that there was more income if the farm provided all the boarders' meals. The Townsends' boarders continued to come to the boarding house at first, but gradually went elsewhere as policies changed to discourage them from bringing their children and from doing their own cooking. The boarding house was no longer intended to emulate a family atmosphere, but was more like a hotel with employees providing services for individual guests.

When we moved in there, they had light housekeeping people. They rented like a couple of rooms to each family and then they cooked on the big stove down in the kitchen ... When I took the place over, of course, I turned it into a boarding house ... I hired five girls; I had waitresses and I had chamber girls and I thought I had the place pretty good (Avery 1998).

The Averys charged fifteen dollars a week for children and thirty-five dollars a week for adults. Viola Avery's new customers tended to be Jewish and to spend the entire summer at the farm.

In the summertime - they had to get to the country. And they came with their trunks and they stayed all summer. Their husbands came up on weekends. They came by train ... I did take children for the first two years, and then I cut
that out ... [because] I had to have two settings at each meal. I think I had the children a half hour before the adults and you had to clean that mess all up. And I said, "I'm not going to do that anymore" (Avery 1998).

The menu served at the boarding house reflected the ethnicity of the visitors by including special dishes and ingredients, such as borscht and sour cream. Viola had learned to cook for boarders from Olla Scudder who had trained at Cornell University and had developed a vegetarian cuisine that, because it avoided meat and included dairy products, was especially useful in meeting dietary needs of boarders.

The boarders' entertainment under the Averys continued to focus on leisure activities outdoors. Going for walks, knitting and crocheting on the porch, and sunbathing are the activities Viola Avery remembers,

They had to entertain themselves. I entertained myself working. They just enjoyed the country. Walking in the evening, sit out there and look at the stars ... My boarders, they'd sit out on the lawn at night - that was during wartime [World War II] - and they said, "I can't believe it is so peaceful here. Some people are fighting" (Avery 1998).

They also enjoyed the view from the porch: "You could see all over the valley from any place in our house." In the living room, on the family's side of the house the Averys installed a big picture window and sliding glass doors. "It was just beautiful when I lived there" (19). The social highlight of each week was the arrival of the husbands.
[The husbands] came up every Saturday and that dining room - talk about perfume - The women, they all had showers and put on all this perfume, our dining room, my God almighty, almost knock you down ... On Saturday nights they'd all go over to the Takanasy [Hotel] in Fleischmanns. They used to have entertainment there. And they loved to see the rich people in their diamonds (Avery 1998).

Sometimes they also visited the Grand Hotel on Highmount, one of the last huge railroad hotels, patronized by the very wealthy.

To prepare the house for boarding, the Averys did little to change the structure or the arrangement of the rooms. Instead they focused on redoing most of the surfaces in the house: paint and wallpaper for walls and trim, and linoleum for the floors.

I can’t believe what I did in that house. I papered, I painted, and I scrubbed and I cleaned ... [The house] had twenty rooms, and I did them all over except one storeroom. Painted them and papered them. I did it all myself (Avery 1998).

The Averys maintained the "boarders’ side" on the west side of the house. The downstairs section in the main house became two bedrooms (with the pocket doors closed) and a bathroom was added in the crook between the main house and the ell (Figure 4-5). They hired Viola’s brother to build it, and paid him twenty-five pounds of sugar. It was wartime, and as a boarding house they could obtain rationed goods that could be traded. Upstairs the four rooms in the main house and six in the ell remained boarders’ rooms. At
one time Viola had forty-nine boarders. Sometimes she dealt with the overflow by having extra guests sleep at neighbors’ houses in the village; other times she and her family and employees slept in the loft above the garage.

See, the family and the hired girls, we slept when I had city boarders, up over the garage. In the wood house. We only had - I hung up like bags to separate us ... and we had the window out completely on that end to give us air (Avery 1998).

Boarders weren’t the only unrelated individuals at the farm. Each summer Marshall had farm cadets, urban agricultural highschool students, to help with the farm work.

They slept in the wagon house, all over. We had tents, yes, they didn’t sleep in the house ... [Everyone] said it looked like Kass’s [a large resort at the foot of Bragg Hollow] (Avery 1998).

The family bedrooms were, as before, in the ell next to the kitchen and dining room: one for Marshall and Viola and one for their daughter Vivian who was six when they moved to the farm in 1944. The family maintained the larger bathroom at the end of the ell, but another bathroom--or at least a shower--had been installed on the second floor (20).

On the family’s side there was a living room where the Townsend’s Victorian parlor had been, at the front of the house overlooking the valley. While the boarders side had pocket doors, Viola Avery remembers this room with only a partial partition. The dining room with four big tables and two small ones was in the ell, with a large kitchen beyond.
The pantry remained next to the small bedrooms in the ell, opening into the kitchen. Viola Avery tells of cooking for the boarders in a "great big dish [pot] like they have in the army ... right full of chicken on Sundays," and she recalls the clean-up. "I didn't have a dishwasher then, I did get a dishwasher after a while." Eventually she also acquired a freezer to help with the preservation of large quantities of food.

When the Townsends were in residence, the central hallway provided adequate privacy for the host family, especially as the entries to the two sections were sealed off. Even though the boarders had their own entrance through the front door, and only one door connected the hallway on the first floor to the family precinct, Viola Avery felt a genuine lack of privacy.

When I had city boarders they had the run of the whole place ... I didn't like it when they came in the kitchen. They'd like to once in a while, when I was kneading bread or something. Oh, they wanted to watch me knead bread. And I'd just as soon they didn't. But you can't tell them (Avery 1998).

When Viola Avery tried to go for a walk and sit up in a field just to get some time alone to plan meals, the boarders would follow her. Finally she sought out the only privacy left to her:

I'd go to bed at night [in the loft over the garage] and I'd take my cookbooks and I'd sit up there and I'd try to figure out what I was going to have the next day. I'd fall asleep. I had to
write letters, too, you know. They’d send a deposit and ... I’d have to - I’d fall asleep and I’d wake up about eleven o’clock. "Oh I’ve got all this to do yet" (Avery 1998).

Not only was space in need of protection but time as well. When boarders wanted to come to the farm for holidays such as Thanksgiving and Christmas, Viola refused. "I wanted to enjoy it with my family."

As it was for the Townsends, taking boarders was necessary to supplement farm income. Since the early twentieth century, when milk became a cash crop, farms have operated on a very thin profit margin. In Farm Bureau bulletins from the 1910s and 1920s, farmers contrast unfavorably the price of milk with the costs of running the farm (Delaware County Farm Bureau News 1911). Boarding income was essential to make farming worthwhile. It was also a way for the farm wife who had been mechanized and commercialized out of her role in farm production to take part in creating income. Viola Avery contends:

I made more money at boarders than they ever made at cows ... We borrowed money from Olla to buy the farm and I made the payment once a year out of the money I earned in the house. You wouldn’t do that out of the barn. You had all you could do to pay the feed bill (Avery 1998).

After taking boarders for about four or five years, the Averys switched to taking state mental patients. State agencies placed higher-functioning patients with families in order to get them out of state institutions Though there
were fewer patients at Averys' than there had been boarders (eight instead of thirty) and Viola would have to do all their laundry instead of just the bedding, it seemed worthwhile. There would be an income year round, and the patients could help with the farmwork.

The state patients used only the upstairs bedroom in the main house. Downstairs the west side of the main house was turned back into a dining room and a living room, with the pocket doors left open between them. Adjacent was the bathroom the Averys added previously, for twenty-five pounds of sugar. The door at the end of the center hall, leading to the ell, was replaced with a cupboard, and the entrance to the Avery's living room changed to the east, so it could be entered from the ell without going into the now inaccessible hall. "What I changed was, they had their side and we had our side. They never came through this door."

Ensured of their privacy the Averys could take the state patients all year round. With eight to ten patients they actually gained family time and family space. The work was not as hectic as it had been with boarders. Viola prepared meals in the kitchen and took the food to the dining room, now in the main house, on a little cart, then retrieved the dirty dishes the same way.

The Averys' improvements, painting and linoleum, contributed to the sanitary atmosphere desired by New York
State for its patients, but it is not clear that they were mandated. Viola does remember being required to do put up a fire escape and fire alarms, and to conduct fire drills on a regular basis, but she does not remember health codes for housing the state patients. She does remember that the state administrator said her house was "perfect."

Apparently the arrangement worked for both the Avery family and for the state mental patients, for it persisted for almost thirty years. By finally ensuring family privacy, in terms of time and space, the Averys were able to continue making their living at home. This living depended, however, on separating the farm from the boarding function and the boarders/patients from the resident family. A house that had originally been built to shelter the interconnected activities of a relatively self-sufficient farm family yielded to a highly articulated structure that housed two businesses as well as the family home. The integrated space use of the early nineteenth century houses yielded by way of boarding to the twentieth century need for architectural and temporal privacy, in which the individual's ways would not be questioned or stifled, and the family would no longer have to share its living space with unrelated individuals.
The Goths and the Riordans

When the Averys sold the Bragg Hollow place to Jack and Leslie Goth in 1981, it ceased being a farm, a boarding house or a community home for mental patients. The Goths redecorated and maintained it as their family home, while their antiques business was eight miles away in Margaretville. The Averys had used strong privacy measure to be able to make a living on the place, but now in the 1980s the former tourist destination was purposefully a single family house not intended to produce income. It did retain an aspect of its old role one winter when a young woman from the community rented a room from the Goths. But in general it remained a single family home.

The Goths redid some parts of the house, turning the first part of the downstairs ell into a family room with a Franklin stove and large windows looking out on the same view seen through the plate glass the Averys had added in the living room. On the second floor they joined two bedrooms, creating a "master bedroom," incorporating a small sitting room. Heating and plumbing were upgraded and the kitchen improved. But the cost of heat combined with the 1980s rural economic slowdown made it impossible for the family to maintain the house the way they would have wished. In 1996 it was sold to Dave and Joan Riordan, who undertook a major renovation that amounted to rebuilding.
There was so little of the house that was really worth saving ... that we figured we would keep the footprint. We weren't even striving for anything like restoration. We did a real renovation.

... It turned out it needed a real foundation under [the ell]. You would stand in what was Viola's kitchen and look toward where we're sitting now [across the driveway] and if you got down on your hands and knees you could crawl right out of the building.

... We brought in a little excavator and dug it out, and did all sorts of drainage work and there are just tons of gravel and concrete and now heat in the floor (Riordan 1998).

The Riordans upgraded all the systems in the house to meet not just current needs, but future ones as well.

It got a new roof and it got all brand new windows .. all new plumbing because there wasn't any worth keeping ... all new electric. There's more than a mile of Romex in here ... phones and computer and cable wires all over the place (Riordan 1998).

The Riordan's historical intentions went beyond preserving the footprint of the house.

Where we've been able to we've saved the woodwork and the doors and everything else and we're putting those back in, so there is some sense of what it was long ago (Riordan 1998).

They plan to restore the bluestone walkways that surround the house and to recreate the portico that framed the door of the classic cottage. They had to remove the wraparound porch, but have preserved the appearance of the two-story Georgian facade, complete with pilasters (Figure 4-7).

Even more than the Goths, the Riordans are changing the arrangement of spaces in the house and how those spaces are
used. There is no formal living space in the house. Instead there are several types of gathering spaces: a TV room on the west side where the patients had their dining room, the Goths' family room in the ell, and most importantly the kitchen/dining room that occupies the entire first floor of the main building on the east side, where the formal parlor used to be. To create the ample sense of space in this room, with important functions for family living, and for entertaining, the Riordans eliminated any sense of dividing the space architecturally (there will be a kitchen island one day), and they removed the wall separating this room from the center stairs.

Leaving the doors open surrounding the stairs creates a flow of open space from the side entrance (where the twenty-five pounds of sugar bathroom was located) through the west side of the house, past the arched double front doors and into the amplified kitchen and dining room. They have eliminated the sense of division caused by the hallway and any temptation to divide the house in two again. Upstairs each child has his or her own room and the master bedroom has gained a private bathroom. The rear portion of the ell on both floors is being renovated as an apartment, with a separate entrance in the rear.

For now the Riordans are not planning to rebuild the barn or other agricultural outbuildings. Though their
housewarming with a livestock theme may indicate that they may engage in hobby farming in the future, the Riordans live a basically suburban life style. It is brightened by the benefits of living in the country - lack of crowding and the enjoyment of nature - and it is burdened by its inconveniences, especially the difficulty and length of travel to jobs, schools and services. The Riordans have invested a great deal of time and money in the structural soundness of the house and its future systems, indicating their intention to live in Bragg Hollow for a long time. Even if they could find a way to be self-employed, most likely it would require travelling long distances and being away from home.

The Bragg Hollow house is thus more like its suburban counterparts of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a haven from which the Riordans go forth to carry out their lives, and not the place where they make their livings. Its use of the open space plan in some ways resembles the integrated space use of the previous centuries on the site, but also reflects the developments during this century that define the ideal house as one that balances open space and individual space, providing places for both family togetherness and private psychological development. If the open plan was promulgated by Frank Lloyd Wright consciously to remind inhabitants of the security of the traditional
farm house, how much more it means to the Riordans, who both grew up in the suburbs, to settle in an old farmhouse in a profoundly rural valley.

Ironically, through the little apartment, the house retains the ability for the family to produce income and to incorporate unrelated individuals under its roof - a pattern that has been seen in every step of the Bragg Hollow house's development over the past one hundred and fifty years.

The Bragg Hollow farmhouse has taken on at least four different forms in its life time and has accommodated diversified and cash crop farming, boarders, mental patients, and now a single family with apartment tenants. It has served as a material resource to the families living there to support themselves. To meet their economic goals the families adapted their space usage to include unrelated individuals who produced income for the family either as laborers or as guests. Not just an example of a typical form or an exemplar of architectural style, at each stage in its development the Bragg Hollow farmhouse was a malleable form that the family could use to improve their lives.
NOTES

(1) Dave Riordan believes that the old house could have been moved to the rear of the new one from another location. Dave Riordan notes

Because of this frame and because of the way it was set back in the ground, they either picked this up and moved it here, or this is what they started adding on to ... it's all free standing from the rest of the house (Riordan 1998).

If so, the hearth might have been constructed as the two buildings were joined, and was used for cooking until the cast iron cook stove arrived.

(2) I have reconstructed the Hubbells' household in 1840 from two sources, the 1850 U.S. Census and Diane Galusha's account of Hubbell family genealogy (Galusha 1990, 137).

U.S. Census 1850:
Household of Milo and Mary (Polly) Hubbell:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milo Hubbell</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Faulkner</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariam</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Jane</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David W. [D.W.]</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing from this census are five other offspring of Milo and Polly: two who died as children, one who died as a young adult, Catherine 26, and Harvey 24. By this time, the family was probably living in Kelly Corners, the site of the present Hubbell Brothers family compound, and the current home of Robert and Carolyn Hubbell.

(3) Ten years later the 1850 Census of Agriculture records the holdings and production of Daniel and Sarah Jaquish, most likely on the Bragg Hollow farm:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>acres improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>cows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 sheep
4 pigs

Production:
60 pounds of wool
150 pounds of potatoes
1,800 pounds of butter
400 pounds of cheese
25 tons of hay
199 pounds of maple sugar
100 pounds of honey
$25 worth of "homemade manufacture"
$50 worth of "animals slaughtered"

In judging these dollar figures, keep in mind that a farm laborer, according to this same census, earned $11 per month, plus board. All the activities required to produce these items would have had to take place in the house, barn, an outbuilding if any, or outdoors. Since this list is probably from the time of the second house, the "classic cottage," it can only suggest the activities that took place in the much smaller "cabin."

(3) Some renters managed to build substantial houses while still paying rent. For example, near the Hubbells in Bragg Hollow, Russel (sic) Hewitt built a stone house while still renting the farm (Galusha 1990, 12).

(6) Other cottages of the same era as the Hubbells’ second house in Bragg Hollow have similar overall dimensions and are divided inside with two squarish rooms along the front and smaller rectangular spaces along the back. The front rooms in my house, for example, are about 15 feet square, and the rear rooms are almost 8 feet deep. The total depth, 23 to 24 feet, is about the same as the Hubbell house. Hubka documents similar proportions in one and half story houses in New England (Hubka, 1984).

(7) The family members listed in Diane Galusha’s As the River Runs are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Age in 1880</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.W. Hubbell</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huldah Jaquish</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L.</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>d. 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L.</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritt</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(8) It was to this farm that Milo moved from Bragg Hollow in the 1850s, and it was this same farm in which D.W. sold his interest to his brother in 1861. He then bought the Bragg Hollow place from his father-in-law shortly after his marriage in 1864.

(9) Conversation with Carolyn Hubbell, December 9, 1998, at the former Hubbell Brothers store in Kelly Corners, N.Y.

(10) Viola Avery, a later owner, believes that the house was "built for boarders." She associates this conclusion with a visit fifty-five years ago by Fanny Hubbell, great niece of D.W. and Huldah Hubbell, when Viola was still taking boarders at the Bragg Hollow farm.

(11) The Delaware County Historical Association holds the collection of Hubbell family primary sources, including many account books and diaries. Unfortunately none of these was kept by anyone at the Bragg Hollow farm during the boarding period. Thus the assignment of functions to spaces in the cottage-turned-Georgian house is based on secondary sources about similar houses, and what can be observed in the house as it exists today.


(13) Linda Norris in "A Home Away from Home," an unpublished manuscript at Delaware County Historical Association, interviewed boarding house operators who recalled renting rooms that were occupied by two and even three families at one time (Norris n.d., 6).

(14) A double house exists in Roxbury, with plans of the two sides mirroring each other upstairs and down. It is the Burroughs House on Main Street; the Hubbell house in Bragg Hollow does not possess these features.

While there is no evidence that the Hubbells constructed or re-constructed the house for two Hubbell families, but by the time it had been used for several decades as a boarding house, it had the reputation of being a "double house." In the era that Bernice remembers, the doors to the main rooms just inside the front door were non-existent or sealed. In general, informants about this house have described the interior from the perspective of the doors they would have used to enter one part of the house or the other, i.e. the doors near the rear of the main house, beyond the stairs.

The term "double house" itself could also have contributed to the longevity of the Bragg Hollow house legend.
Apparently it was in use in New England to refer to a "symmetrically divided center door house" (Hubka 1984, 47). Old timers could have used the term in this sense, distinguishing the classic cottage from the earliest house which might have been less symmetrical.

The story that the Bragg Hollow house is a double house is actually true of D.W. Hubbell's nephews, who shared the family home in Kelly Corners. Listeners in the early twentieth century might have layered on the story of the two bothers to the ancient term. In any case, the Bragg Hollow house was probably not designed as a double house in the manner of Burroughs House on Main Street, Roxbury, with mirror image accommodations on both floors. But it was certainly turned into a double house when it was expanded to take in boarders.

(15) Rachelle H. Saltzman wrote about boarders' foodways as reminders of ethnic heritage and as a way to maintain ethnic identity in "Food in the Resorts," an article in an unpublished manuscript at Delaware County Historical Association, Delhi, N.Y.

(16) Grier calls the Victorian parlor a "memory palace" in which objects become symbols of the family's devotion to the domestic ideology and its aspirations to gentility (Grier 1992). Gerald Pocius, who studied parlors in a rural, coastal setting in Newfoundland, found that even in very small houses, parlors were maintained as kinds of museums (Pocius 1991).

(17) Sally McMurry shows that in progressive farmhouses of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century kitchens were breaking their relationship with barnyards, as farms became more market and cash crop oriented (McMurry 1997).

(18) In a social work textbook on housekeeping in a tenement flat in 1911 Mabel Hyde Kittredge gives instructions how to take a bath in a room with other people present (Kittredge 1991).

(19) Viola Avery expresses strongly her landscape aesthetic.

But now they've put in so - I hate to swear, but - damn many trees. We've got enough trees. We don't need any more trees up in Bragg Hollow. [The new owner] put out a thousand more ... And you go up the Denver Valley [where Viola grew up] you can't see nothing, it's all trees. City people come up here and they set out trees ... Down in
Brooklyn, nothing grows. It's all cement (Avery 1998).

(20) Viola Avery mentions that the boarders took showers, whereas Bernice said the Townsend boarders either washed up at the sink or took a bath by swimming. That the second floor shower might have included a toilet is indicated in this story, told by Viola:

But the hall upstairs, I had this one old man, he was out of season, ... his name was Shikey, ... the hall, of course, was the whole length of the house, and he had his room in the front, and he says, 'You know, at night' - the bathroom was all the way the other end - and he said he'd have to get up and go to the bathroom at night and he said he got back to bed he had to go again, our hall was so long (Avery 1998).
Sometime during or just after World War II, Charles and Antonina Mech changed from taking roomers to taking boarders at their farmhouse on Breezy Hill Road outside Fleischmanns, New York. About the that same time Viola and Marshall Avery had began farming in Bragg Hollow and had started their boarding house. While the two couples' decisions to undertake the boarding business may have been inspired by the same economic conditions and the same desire to continue to make their living at home, the architectural results were very different. The Averys inherited a house that had enabled the families who took roomers there to create relatively separate spaces for family and urban visitors. The Mechs purchased a farm that included a newer house with different spaces and brought to it different expectations.

While architectural spaces can constrain or inspire space use, a family's spatial response to incorporating numbers of relative strangers into their household could also vary according to the family's acceptance of or resistance to the dominant culture, in this case the middle class "cult of domesticity" (1). Prior experience, first-
hand or passed on as customary behavior, could affect the way in which middle-class values are accepted or rejected in the family's activities and use of space in their home.

The First Farm Family: David A. and Rollens Boughton

The first records of the Mechs' farm refer to it as having been rented a century before to Daniel Griffin by Henry B. Armstrong (Delaware County Deed Book No. 53, p. 523). Like the Bragg Hollow farm, it was owned by an absentee landlord. But Armstrong was wise to avoid the coming conflict of the 1848 Anti-Rent War and sold his holdings to tenants as early as 1839, when David A. Boughton bought the Griffin farm on the Portertown Stream. Boughton was just twenty-two when he purchased the farm. At the time of the 1850 census he was thirty-three, as was his wife Rollens, and by that year they had four children: sons John and Avery, ages ten and eight, and daughters Harley and Mary, ages five and two (U.S. Census, Town of Middletown 1850). The Boughtons had ninety-three "improved" acres out of one hundred sixteen total. They farmed with two oxen and had seven cows that produced nine hundred pounds of butter (but no cheese) in 1850; they were raising eight heifers or steers and one pig. The family also had six sheep that produced twelve pounds of wool. They made fifty pounds of maple sugar and fifteen pounds of honey, raised one hundred
pounds of potatoes, fifty bushels of buckwheat and ten bushels of corn for their own consumption, and twenty-five bushels of oats and fifteen tons of hay for the animals to eat. In addition they recorded thirty dollars' worth of home-produced meat and ten dollars' worth of "home manufactures" (U.S. Census of Agriculture, Town of Middletown, 1850). In other words, the Boughtons were a typical Catskills farm family, raising products for most of their needs, bartering with neighbors and selling butter and maple sugar at the local store for the rest.

A Small House on the Portertown Stream

Practicing this form of preindustrial diversified agriculture, before farming in the area settled on milk as its single cash crop, the Boughtons no doubt resembled the first residents at the Bragg Hollow farm. As did the Jaquishes and the Hubbells, they most likely lived in a small farmhouse in which work life and home life were not isolated from each other and the rooms in the house had multiple purposes. There were clear gender work roles, but spaces were not identified by gender or age. In the processes for providing food, clothing, heat and shelter family members worked side by side or sequentially, contributing both services and productive labor. The farmwife and children took part in the productivity of the farm,
and spaces were planned to support that work. The lack of specialized public institutions meant that the spaces in the home played public roles not just for hospitality, but for religion, education, and the care of those who could not care for themselves.

There is no physical evidence of the house that the Boughtons lived in, except perhaps the presence of a cellar under the current Victorian house that appears to be quite old. It is constructed of dry-laid wall (stones without mortar), has a dirt floor, and is much smaller than the later house built on top of it. A later resident describes it:

The basement was not poured or anything, it's all stone, pieces of stone ... It's not very big downstairs. In fact, where the kitchen was ... there was nothing underneath there, just a crawl space. The main part that had something underneath was ... the living room ... The basement [was] just a dirt floor ... we had a wood stove and used coal - but there's just storage like a root cellar ... and a little coal bin, but other than that there was not much there at all ... much smaller than the rest of the house (Karol Mech, 1999).

Like the present house, the existing barn across the main road, with its "overshot" entrance and one-story stable, appears to be of later construction (2). A diversified farm like the Boughtons' would probably have had what is called an "English" barn, a three bay structure entered from a door on the long side. It would have had hay lofts above the entrance to left and right that would have provided enough
winter feed for the Boughtons' seven cows (Kniffen 1986, 12). The barn would have been more closely associated with the house, not "down over the bank" and across the road like the present barn (Figure 5-1).

The Boughtons' son Henry was thirty-six and living on the farm when the New York census was taken in 1892. (Interestingly, the census taker for this part of Middletown was D.W. Hubbell, of the Bragg Hollow farm.) With him lived his wife, Mary, age thirty-three, and their daughter, Mertia, age fifteen. Also listed in the same house were David and Rollens, both age seventy-six, and a forty-one year-old hired man named Faulkner. David and son Henry are both designated as farmers. By this time Henry and Mary had purchased the farm and most likely had succeeded the elders as the principal productive couple on the farm (Delaware County Deed Book No. 117, p. 71, and No. 114, p. 509). Signing over control of the farm but continuing to live there was not uncommon; the parents of D.W. Hubbell and of Huldah Jaquish Hubbell both apparently lived with their adult children after either transferring the farm or selling it to them outright.
The Second Farm Family: Henry and Mary Boughton

The Victorian House

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, perhaps in the 1880s when Henry and Mary bought the place, the older Boughton house was replaced by the present structure, a two-story house whose exterior possesses some attributes of the Queen Anne style of architecture. The Mech family refers to it as "Victorian," an apt label for a house that epitomizes no particular style but is recognizable as being from the late nineteenth century (Figure 5-2).

By the time this house was built, Fleischmanns had become a tourist town. It was full of hotels and boarding houses, all basking in the glory of the nearby Grand Hotel. Even today, Fleischmanns harbors a remarkable collection of Queen Anne and other turn of the century style houses. The Boughton farm was only two-and-a-half miles north of the village of Fleischmanns, but was a world away in its pastoral surroundings.

A two-story hexagonal "tower" on the northeast corner of the house and variation of intersecting roof lines make the Mech house outwardly asymmetrical, and shingles on the upper story provide textural variety. These are characteristics of the Queen Anne style popular from the 1880s through the turn of the century. Missing however, are the other kinds of materials that provide texture—terra
cotta porch gables, stained glass, for example—and the wrap-around porch so common in the Queen Anne houses in the village. The classical balustrades on the hexagonal tower and the peak anticipate the Colonial Revival style, as illustrated in Virginia and Lee McAlester's *A Field Guide to American Homes* (McAlester and McAlester 1990, 327, figs. 1 and 2). Or they may be related to the octagonal houses earlier in the century that used balustrades (McAlester and McAlester 1990, 236-237, figs. 4 and 6).

Inside, the house contains references to stylish materials that could be shipped in by rail to a local retailer or could be ordered by mail. Elaborate wood panelling frames and underscores the stairs, forming the back wall of the living room which is continuous with the entry, reminiscent of panelled entries and stairs in Queen Anne and other Victorian houses (Figure 5-3).

With these outward references to styles popular with the suburban middle class, the farmhouse could have been intended to recall its city relatives. According to vernacular architecture historian Sally McMurry, progressive farmhouses at the turn of the century resembled urban and suburban homes in style and especially in plan, because they eliminated income producing work from the home, separated public from private spaces, and sorted rooms and their
activities by gender, class and age (McMurry, 1997 [1988], 161, fig. 5-14).

Progressive farmhouses, therefore, no longer needed to house agricultural functions such as the dairy. The capitalization of milk production and the focus on the market economy had moved the dairy process to the barn and the creamery where it became the province primarily of male workers (3). No longer were spaces needed for churning and cleaning butter, nor for carding, spinning and weaving wool. Instead there were specialized spaces for children (nurseries, their own bedrooms) and single-use rooms for women's activities such as cooking, sewing, laundry, and food preservation. These along with cleaning became services to the family that some farm wives saw as "drudgery." The women were no longer part of the productive work of the farm. What is more, the late arrival of labor saving technology in the home combined with higher standards to make their work more difficult (Cowan 1983). Smaller kitchens with increased storage were intended to relieve drudgery, and while they were located on the sunny side of the house or near the roadway, they were isolated from the rest of the house. The farm family continued to choose the socially heterogeneous living room over the formality and conspicuous display of the parlor. Otherwise, progressive farmers' houses at the end of the nineteenth century and the
beginning of the twentieth came to resemble their urban and suburban counterparts in many ways (McMurry 1997).

Even more than its outward appearance and interior stylistic elements might imply, the Boughton house meets many of the criteria for a progressive farmhouse. The house seems to have been built with a living room that is unlikely to have been a parlor; its position as part of the entry access to the stairs is the antithesis of the location and isolation of Victorian parlors. Clearly too, by the time the house was built, the dairy process was entirely moved across the road to the barn. The kitchen, on the back of the house, could not have been farther from the productive part of the farm. A series of small rooms along the north side of the house could have started out as the productive and efficient spaces characteristic of mid-century farmhouses (washroom, dairy, woodshed), but they could equally well have been originally the kinds of specialized, single-use storage and activity spaces found in turn-of-the-century progressive farmhouses (Figure 5-4).

The upstairs might have been seen as a "sleeping zone," separate both from the public spaces and from the service areas on the first floor. There were certainly enough bedrooms for the two couples, the daughter, and even the hired hand, if he was allowed to sleep near the family. Although the kitchen meets McMurry's requirements of the
progressive farmhouse in its small size, according to a later user, it was far from convenient or "step-saving" (4). Though evidence is lacking, there is another possibility for the use of space in the Boughton house, and even for its construction in the first place. The 1902 directory for the Ulster and Delaware Railroad shows a D.H. Boughton who lived four miles from the Fleischmanns railroad station and who took boarders. Another that might have been the Boughtons' farm is listed as "Breezy Hill House," a half mile from the depot and reflecting the new name of the road past the Boughton place. Henry and his wife, Mary, were in their thirties at the time of the 1892 New York State census, appropriate ages to have built a house and to have started a business. Perhaps the reason to build was to take boarders; or the taking of boarders was a way of supporting the costs of construction, just as taking boarders for others had been a way to pay for the costs of expanding into fluid milk production. Without oral or documentary evidence, the Boughtons' role as progressive farmers or as boarding house proprietors remains hypothetical.

The Third Farm Family: Charles and Antonina Mech

There seems to have been no doubt in the minds of Charles and Antonina Mech that the house they bought in 1928 was appropriate for guests from the city. Two years earlier
Henry Boughton had transferred for one dollar the farm and its house to Myrtle Parker (who may have been his daughter listed as "Mertia" in the 1892 census), and it was she who sold the place to the Mechs for five thousand dollars. A Mech family story holds that Charles Mech's sister who lived in nearby Arkville heard that the place was for sale and put the money down for it (Anna Mech Kelly 1998). Both of Antonina's and Charles's surviving daughters, Anna Mech Kelly and Stella Mech Kelly, remember that their parents rented out the farm for three years after they bought it. When the Mechs moved to the country in 1931, Antonina spent the first winter there while her husband continued to work in a restaurant in New York City. Taking care of three small children, milking cows, and maintaining the house were too difficult for Antonina alone and as a result Charles gave up his city job and came to live on the farm permanently.

The timing of the family's arrival in the country might seem to coincide with after effects of the stock market crash in 1929. According to Anna, the Mechs were also interested in moving to the country because Charles's son Eddie, from a previous marriage, was developmentally disabled. They hoped that the farm would provide better surroundings for him while he was growing up, in addition to
offering the family an economic opportunity during hard times.

Charles and Antonina Mech both immigrated to the United States from Poland (Figure 5-5). They met in New York City after Charles’s first wife had died. Their first three children, Helen, Stella, and Anna, were born in New York City, but grew up on the farm outside of Fleischmanns. A fourth child, Karol (pronounced "Karl") was born later in Fleischmanns. For this thesis, I have been able to interview the three youngest Mech children, Stella Mech Kelly, Anna Mech Kelly, and Karol Mech. Helen Mech passed away in 1998 (5).

The Rooming Business

The Mechs hosted city guests at their farm for about thirty years beginning in the mid-1930s until their retirement in the 1960s. At first their urban visitors were "roomers," but during or just after World War II the Mechs changed to taking boarders. The roomers who first came to the Mech farm were relatives and friends whom the Mechs had known well while they lived in New York City. Generally, they were Polish and Ukrainian Catholics and like the Mechs were recent immigrants to the United States. According to all three informants, the Mechs did not need to advertise
for their guests; roomers who were not relatives or close friends learned about the Mech farm by word of mouth.

The families that came to the Mech farm usually consisted of women and children who planned to stay for the summer.

Roomers, they did their own thing. They just paid rent for the room, for the season. So they took care of everything else themselves (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

For a monthly fee the guests had a room in the farmhouse and kitchen privileges. The men came up for the weekend on the "husband trains" that stopped at the Fleischmanns depot, where the Mechs met them. Room rental may have included clean bedding but did not include personal laundry. The Mechs supplemented the rental income by selling roomers farm produce to use in their meals. In addition, they provided transportation not only to and from the train depot but also to stores in the village.

The entertainment Stella and Anna recall was predominantly of the homegrown variety. Unlike children in the village of Fleischmanns, the Mech sisters couldn't find others nearby for after-school play, and were grateful for the presence of youngsters from the city. Pinochle, bingo, board games, playing tag, playing ball, jumping in the hay, berry picking and going to the swimming hole were common activities for the sisters and the boarders, as was dancing.

That's where I learned how to dance, do the polka.
We had the old record player and we went out on the porch, and the kids from the city knew how, so they'd teach us (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

Local dancing also played a part as the Mech children got older.

On Thursday nights there was a round and square dance at the Halcott Center Grange Hall and ... we [girls] would be primping and fixing our hair and nails, and polishing our shoes up to go to the dance (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Sometimes they sought entertainment in Fleischmanns:

When my sisters and I were still young we had a lot of fun playing with a lot of the children that came up [from the city]. ... There was about fifteen or sixteen of us kids - we went down to the theater [in Fleischmanns] and that was our entertainment (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Apparently, the city and country children had no problem sharing local activities and recreational space at the farm with each other.

In contrast, sharing the kitchen required the greatest amount of adaptation on the part of the family. Unlike the Bragg Hollow house, which also took roomers early on, the Mechs did not have separate kitchens for roomers and family, and the roomers did not cook communally as they had at the Townsend's. Each family cooked their own meals using the Mech's kitchen.

The roomers did most of their cooking themselves, down in the kitchen. And it was mass confusion, because when one person would want to use the stove someone else was using it (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).
Anna remembers her mother's description of what it was like to have several cooks, each trying to prepare food for her family.

Everyone shared the woodstove, and I know once in a while someone would push somebody else's pot off because they wanted to get their cooking done quicker. Which I think would be the only friction that they had (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

With four cooks preparing meals at once, Antonina waited until they were cleaning up to fix meals for the five other members of her family, who usually ate around the kitchen table. When there were too many people for the dining room, roomers would sometimes join the family at the kitchen table.

The Mech sisters described the kind of organization required to share an ordinary farmhouse kitchen. The big center table was used for food preparation prior to cooking on the big wood stove, which was fed from a large woodbox against the kitchen's south wall. After a number of years of taking roomers, the Mechs installed a gas stove to supplement but not replace the wood cook stove. A big black cast-iron sink with a long drainboard served for cleaning up. Roomers brought some of their own cooking utensils and supplies which were stored in the pantry on assigned shelves. The Mechs had a small ice box, but until they installed a refrigerator—or when there was overflow—the roomers kept their perishables on the cool cellar floor.
The small dining room on the northeast corner of the house was inadequate for four families of roomers, so the living room was converted to the "summer dining room." Extra tables and chairs were moved in, allowing each family to sit at its own table, though there was one table that was big enough to allow several families to eat together. It was this conversion of living room to dining room that relegated Stella’s piano to the woodshed (6). Before it became the summer dining room, the front room was definitely a living room, which according to Anna did not have a set of upholstered furniture early on. After electrification in 1935, when not in demand as a dining room, it was used for listening to the radio and eventually for TV. Though Anna referred to it once as a parlor, it lacked the attributes of that formal and ceremonial kind of space.

The room in the northeast corner was used by the Mechs as a dining room for special occasions (Figure 5-6). But most often the Mech siblings called it a bedroom, or a dining room converted to a bedroom. Stella Kelly remembers it as an unused guest room, while Anna and, much later, Karol remember sleeping there when they had to give up their rooms.

Although there were more than enough bedrooms upstairs for the entire family, only the daughters slept there. The
three of them shared the bedroom located above the living room, with the same hexagonal "corner" on the south wall.

This is where your pretty room was upstairs, over top of the living room, that’s the room we girls [had.] ... Sometimes it was real cold in wintertime, all three of us would sleep in the same bed, and other times, two would be in one bed and one in the other (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

The other three upstairs bedrooms were vacant except when roomers used them. The older brother Eddie slept in a small room adjacent to the kitchen along the north side of the house. Charles and Antonina shared a bedroom off the other side of the kitchen.

To accommodate as many families as possible, the Mech daughters gave up their "pretty" bedroom above the living room. Anna Kelly remembers sleeping in the unused dining room, while Stella Kelly remembers taking her featherbed and quilts to sleep in the barn for the summer:

My mother had what they call a feather bed. They put that in the hay in the barn, and of course we took our pillows out there too and we slept on the feather bed and had quilts to cover ourselves up with. We enjoyed it, It was fun (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Roomers did not require separate rooms for adults and children.

With this room having three beds, when the roomers were here, you had the parents in one bed, and the children in another and maybe some other kids in another. And that’s how they all were in one room. And sometimes they’d have to bring a cot or a crib or something if in the other rooms they wanted some additional family members to be there (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).
The bedrooms were furnished with two or three double beds and two dressers. Bedrooms without closets got wardrobes (chiffoniers), but in one room a closet was made by hanging a piece of cloth across the landing to the attic stairs.

During the first years with roomers there was only one bathroom, on the first floor between the family dining room and the pantry.

When the city people were there, there would always be a line at the bathroom, because it was kind of hard to - you know, everyone had to share the one bathroom ... Everyone waited and visited while they had their towels on their arms waiting to get in the bathroom (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

The bathroom was probably added after the house was built. It appears to have been carved out of the pantry leaving the latter an L-shaped room with the window to the outside. Karol remembers that the bathroom had a frosted glass window but that it was on an interior wall with the pantry. None of the Mech siblings remembers an outhouse being used at the farm, though there was probably one in the Boughtons' time. Eventually a second bathroom was built upstairs, after roomers had been coming to the farm for several years.

The Mech family made major changes in their occupation of the house in order to accommodate roomers. Sharing the kitchen and its storage areas, evacuating bedrooms, giving up their living room and dining room, and sharing the bathroom were not easy adaptations. But Stella and Anna Kelly remember doing them readily. These sacrifices were
not a constant source of irritation to the family. When asked if there were conflicts between residents and roomers, between country and city people in the house, both sisters denied it and went on to describe conflicts among the roomers themselves (7).

Farming

During this time, in the 1930s, Charles Mech was a full-time farmer, milking twenty-five to thirty cows and shipping their milk to the creamery in Halcott, the next valley over. Although the house got electricity in the mid-1930s (8), Charles apparently did not obtain a milking machine until somewhat later, for Stella Kelly remembers hand milking when she was a teenager in the early 1940s.

When I was a teenager, and not married yet or anything, I always liked to go outdoors and everything, get up six o’clock in the morning, go down to the barn. That was before my father had a milking machine. And I’d milk about three cows, help him out, then I’d have to come up to the house, wash up and get ready to go to school. My sisters Helen and Anna they weren’t that kind. They didn’t want to bother with the cows (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

The work horses were replaced possibly as late as the first years after World War II, for Stella Kelly recalls driving the tractor to help in haying:

Before I was married [in 1948] and still living home, I used to have to help my father in haying. He taught us how to drive more or less. And that was when I was in my teens ... and he’d need help unloading the hay off the wagon. He had a hay
fork and we'd have to drive the tractor—just a certain place he said, 'Whoa' and then he would release the hay fork in the barn that way. But he didn't want us girls working in the field. [He said,] "That's not a woman's work." (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Charles's main helper in farmwork was Eddie, who was able to contribute his labor but could not operate machinery. Antonina too worked in the barn, more often when there were roomers than later when she had to cook for boarders. Before there were boarders, Stella says "My mother went down [to the barn] every morning and every night to help my father milk and feed the cows" (Stella Mech Kelly, 1999). As Stan Kelly, Anna's husband said, "The [women] do all the housework and half the farmwork too" (interview with Anna Mech Kelly 1998).

The workspaces in and around the barn included the silo where ensilage was stored and fed out, the hay mows on two levels where loose hay was stored and pitched out with a fork, stalls and pens on the middle level where horses and calves were cared for, the stable on the lowest level where milking took place, and the milk house where cans of milk were kept cool and daily hauled up the stone steps to Charles's truck to be delivered to the creamery.

Feeding and milking the cows, cleaning the barn, and haying were not the total of farm work. Some tasks that farmers had always done remained, especially those associated with the family's own consumption, and were made
more demanding by the need to supply the roomers. The roomers obtained milk and eggs from the farm and Charles and Antonina kept a large garden to provide them vegetables (Figure 5-7).

They had a garden ... if you go back up on the hill, there was a garden. And that [thing] was big and looked like it had stones [in it] ... but everything grew for them. ... especially his onions... and they'd take stuff from the garden to use (Karol Mech, 1999).

They had the corn out of the garden, the onions, the tomatoes, and the cucumbers and everything (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Occasionally the Mechs supplied meat for the roomers' meals. Charles had specialized in meat during his restaurant career and so was able to carry the process from slaughtering to fine cutting. The exigencies of butchering meant that chickens were served on certain days: Wednesdays and Sundays there was chicken dinner.

They would kill chickens ... My father would put the chicken between his legs, raise the neck up, slice the neck, then put his foot on the chicken so it wouldn't run around. He would do that for several minutes. Then they would have boiling water, and they would put [the chicken in it] and they would pluck it, and then they would take the guts out ...if the plucking was not done properly and you had the pin feathers left, you burn them off [on the gas stove]. And that smell was terrible" (Karol Mech, 1999)

When the Mechs obtained a refrigerator, and much later a freezer, they were able to butcher beef and pork for boarders' meals.
He’d kill the pig [in the barn], stick the pig, - what I hated about it was the squeal - Then he would take the pig after it was killed, bring it to this tree where he had a big barrel, 55 gallon barrel, with water in it that he had boiled. And he’d dip the pig in there and bring it out and shave it .. with a big knife. Every knife he used was sharp, because he kept all his knives sharp (Karol Mech, 1999).

Charles, Eddie, and later Stella and Karol supplied the wood that ran the cook stove and the furnace and stove that heated the house in winter.

This is where we would saw. He had a circular saw. And he would use the power from a tractor, the power take-off, the belt. And he would go up in the woods, cut the logs, bring them down, and we would cut the logs into [pieces/blocks] like this ... and then we’d throw them down this hill, right next to the woodshed. And the next job was, if it had to be split, we split it and pile it into the woodshed (Karol Mech, 1999).

Then the wood would be carried to the house for the cookstove or to supplement coal in the furnace.

In establishing their new business, the Mechs laid out three kinds of spaces: space for the rooming business (bedrooms, "summer dining room," kitchen, bath, porch, lawn); space for production for the market economy, i.e., milk (barn, stable, silo, manure pile, barnyard, fields, milkhouse); and production space for on-the-farm consumption by family and roomers (garden, butchering site, chicken house, wood shed, woodlot) (Figure 5-8). Little remained as personal or private space for the Mech family or for individual family members. The same standard applied for roomers who not only shared space in the house with family
members but also shared their bedrooms with each other. As experienced during the summer season, the big Victorian house became the opposite of what it was designed to do: provide a haven from the necessity to produce income and from the distracting values of others. Instead, to continue making a living on their own farm, the Mech family established more complex patterns of interaction and space use based on their own and their roomers' backgrounds. While some differences may be ascribed to adaptations for roomers, the Mechs' own space utilization actually shares some important characteristics with past rural practice in the region, and with space use by immigrant and working-class families in cities.

That the Mech daughters shared beds in a poorly heated upstairs bedroom while the parents slept near the kitchen can be seen as a continuation of the practice in pre-industrial farm households of having the children sleep upstairs while the parents remained near the hearth. It was certainly an intentional plan, for there were three unused bedrooms upstairs, enough for the parents and all three daughters to have their own rooms. In the 1930s having one's own room had become important, especially for the young, but the Mechs chose not to use space this way (Cromley 1992). No doubt they wished to conserve heat and to limit cleaning, but possibly they just couldn't conceive
that the children would need that much space. "So darn many bedrooms," Stella said (Stella Mech Kelly, 1999). The other three bedrooms were left unused, treated as seasonal accommodations.

The kitchen at the back of the house, away from the barn, at first looks like the suburban relegation of kitchens to the service part of the house, isolated and out of view. However, the kitchen was the main entry. The driveway delivered visitors and family members to the door (as opposed to climbing forty eight steps up from the road to the front door). To take care of this foot traffic and to lessen the amount of dirt tracked in, Charles built a one-story back porch outside the kitchen door. Even though the front door of the house faced the barn across the road, Charles always entered and left the house by the kitchen and back door, and then walked down the steps to the barn.

The kitchen might seem only to face the steep hill behind the house, away from the farm operation. In fact, this hill was the farmyard, containing the remaining farm functions other than dairying which was centered around the barn. Uphill and almost visible from the kitchen window were the springs that provided the house's water, plus the chicken houses and the vegetable gardens that supplied both family and roomers (Figure 5-9). Uphill from the kitchen
too was the woodlot where Charles and the children cut wood and processed it in the chip yard just above the driveway.

The kitchen remained the center of sociability for the Mechs and their local friends. It was also the business center, with the telephone nearby in the parents' bedroom next to the kitchen. Antonina is remembered as being the financial one in the family, as well as being an excellent cook. One can picture Antonina in her kitchen engaged in food preparation and preservation, supervising the supplying of the house from the farmyard. Even without the rooming business, Antonina's role can be seen to have much in common with McMurry's mid-nineteenth century "productive" farm wife and to support Osterud's contention that farm women stayed more involved with income production than did their sisters in the suburbs (Osterud 1991).

A few scholars have begun to note the similarity between rural families' approach to the home and that of urban working-class families. Tamara Hareven, one of these scholars, speaks of rural families after industrialization in the later nineteenth century.

The household continued to serve as the site of production in agriculture as well as in domestic industries. Family members worked side by side in related tasks, and there continued to be little separation between domestic life and work life ...

In rural families, and in urban working-class families, the home was viewed less as a specialized retreat, and was open to a multiplicity of functions and activities as it had
been in preindustrial society ... Even after working-class families began to emulate middle-class domestic life-styles and furnishings, they continued to use the household space in a more diversified and complex way (Hareven 1991, 9-10).

These writers have refused to generalize about family life based on middle class experience, and have questioned the "trickle-down" theory that assumed working class values were mere dilutions of middle-class values.

Sharing beds and bedrooms was commonplace for working class families as well as for farm families. The same could be said for the sociability associated with the kitchen (Hareven 1991). Most importantly in both groups, work life was not necessarily isolated from family life. As was suggested for the urban guests at the Townsends in the last chapter, the roomers' use of space on the farm was not that different from immigrants' experience living in the city. In a reversal of roles, the roomers at the Mech farm might themselves have been boarders or have taken boarders in the city. Boarders in urban households, as in rural ones, enabled families to pay off their mortgages.

Lizabeth Cohen in her argument for a working class culture has studied the material values of the working class at the turn of the century. She has found that in the use of space as well as choice of furnishings and interior decoration families made decisions that were different from and even resistant to middle class norms, especially as
promoted by the many reform agencies. Like Hareven, Cohen notes that workers' and immigrants' families maintained European rural customs, sharing beds and bedrooms, using homes as workplaces, and socializing and eating in the kitchen even when they had a parlor. If they had a dining room they used it for other things such as sewing and ironing. For furniture they chose to retain case pieces such as wardrobes and feather beds and upholstered furniture, items that had been important in their European rural past, but were anathema to the reformers. Cohen sees these choices not as belated imitation of the Victorian taste of the middle class but as a significant "recurrent, symbolic pattern" (Cohen 1986, 273-74).

Not a simple emulation of middle-class Victorian standards with a time lag due to delayed prosperity, but rather a creative compromise forged in making a transition between two very different social and economic worlds ... The "Victorian Solution" was not an inevitable stage working people had to pass through, but a circumstance of need finding available product (Cohen 1986, 273-274, 275).

The roomers and the Mech family show similarities in their use of space and in their material values to these descriptions of working-class life in the city. This likeness should not be surprising since the Mechs were recent immigrants who had moved from the city to the country. But these space utilization practices and material values also resemble ones recently in place in rural
Delaware County. Perhaps future research about the integration of pre-industrial populations into late nineteenth and early twentieth century America, especially in rural areas, will reveal the reasons for these apparent similarities (9).

The Change to Taking Boarders at the Mech Farm

In the mid-1940s, the Mechs decided to change from taking roomers to taking boarders.

Times were getting better and it got so people would have their own cars, it seems. And then in order to make more money my mother decided that she would cook for them. So then they would be boarders. And she would take reservations so she'd know how many she had, make sure she had room enough for everyone (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

Charging for three meals a day increased the Mech's income from the city visitors, but it also increased the family's labor. "Modernizing," according to Stella, included not only food but also adaptations in spaces offered to boarders and the timing of their visits. By the time the Mechs changed to boarding, many of their adult guests were children of the original roomers. Rather than rent one room for a large group, they were willing to rent smaller spaces if there were fewer beds in them. These smaller families, and sometimes single individuals, no longer spent the entire summer at the farm. There were no more "husband trains."

Transportation schedules were much more flexible with the
automobile, and most visitors now had a two-week vacation they wished to spend in the country with their families.

The husbands would come up with the family for a few weeks, but sometimes the wife and the children would stay just two weeks longer (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

So the Mechs adjusted. They began to offer Antonina’s well-known cooking.

A lot of people didn’t want to come up for vacation and do cooking … My mother and father had a lot of relatives in New York City and a lot of friends. And one would tell the other, "Hey, you’ve got to come up here, the cooking … is fantastic! (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Antonina cooked in a way that fit both the Polish and Ukrainian foodways of her Catholic boarders. According to Anna Mech Kelly, the Poles and Ukrainians "They were all familiar with the same kind of food."

Sundays and Wednesdays were always roast chicken day. And … Friday was the meatless day … sometimes she’d fix something for somebody if they wanted some meat, but [otherwise prepared] pierogi or ... borscht (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Antonina’s menu was eaten by the Jewish visitors as well (10).

There was one Jewish family that came up and she had to serve some of them on glass dishes … but they ate mostly everything that mother prepared (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

The increased work load meant that Antonina needed help from her now adult daughters as waitresses and chamber maids.
We didn't just wait on tables, ... we helped with the cooking. There wasn't any dishwasher, so we did all the dishes by hand and we did all the laundry ourselves, and made the beds and everything else, so it was busy (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

Helen lived next door and of the three sisters was able to devote the most time to working in the boarding house; Stella was married and living in her own home three miles away in Red Kill, but managed to work in the boarding house; Anna was soon married and living with her in-laws on their farm where they took roomers, but until she moved to Halcott she helped with the boarders. Stella says that "Long ago, families, the children had homes near their parents" (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

It was not always easy to combine child care and the increased intensity of boarding house work. Living next door to her parents' boarding house, Helen was not too far away from her children when she was working. Karol, who was born at the beginning of the boarding period and was the same age as his nephews, remembers Helen's children spending a lot of time at the boarding house farm (11). Stella too brought her children to work. Her older child, Linda, played with the boarders' children, while her younger child, Lynn, was still an infant. Sometimes he had to stay in his play pen all day, though frequently the boarders would entertain him.
The Mechs offered rentals to boarders for shorter periods of time, again meaning more work for Antonina, Helen, Stella and Anna. Rooms had to be cleaned and bed linens had to be washed more often, as boarders changed every week or two. In fact, at one point Antonina sent the laundry out to Halcott Home Laundry run by Anna’s mother-in-law in Halcott. When laundry was done at the farm, it took place in the same two "rinse" tubs outside the house, with the aid of an electric Maytag wringer washer and hot water brought outside by a hose.

Antonina cooked for the boarders in her own kitchen for the first few years. Not able to afford remodeling, she added cabinets over the sink to the gas stove and the refrigerator that had come during the rooming period. In 1950 to accommodate the larger number of boarders and to provide a more efficient space for cooking, the Mechs built a separate house for boarders. The "summer house" had a dining room and a rectangular kitchen that had no other function than to provide meals for boarders. There was a long front porch with swings where boarders could relax. Downstairs there were two bedrooms and a bathroom and upstairs four bedrooms and another bath.

The Mechs still rented out the bedrooms in the farmhouse, for a total of ten bedrooms. In the summer house the bedrooms were smaller than the ones in the main house.
Stella describes this trend as "modernizing." At the same time that families began to favor the two-week stay, they seemed to prefer fewer people in each bedroom. To meet the need for less dense occupancy, the Mechs moved extra beds from the big bedrooms in the main house to the summer house. They also purchased new beds, some three-quarter size and some twin beds.

In the new house ... she got three-quarter size beds, too, because people got to the point where some of them ... slept alone ... [such as] older women, that were up there by themselves [and needed] twin-sized beds in a room ... or three-quarter size (Stella Mech Kelly 1998).

The Mechs and the boarders no longer assumed that whole families would share rooms or that guests would share beds to the extent that they had in the past.

The dining room in the summer house occupied about one-fourth of the downstairs floor space, making an L around the stairs that Charles positioned in the center of the building, going lengthwise. Boarding families still had their own tables in the dining room. But now the Mechs, their sons-in-law and their grandchildren, took their meals with the boarders in the summer house because their wives and mothers, Stella and Helen, were working full-time in the boarding house.

Under the stairs was a pantry, but storage in the new kitchen was also provided by cabinets for dishes and groceries. The kitchen was entered from one end and was
laid out in a U, with multiple gas stoves and sinks, a refrigerator, and a table Charles made to provide generous counter space with storage underneath. According to Stella, the summer kitchen was a work space, not a gathering space. In shape, layout, and storage features this kitchen incorporated step-saving concepts that had been promoted by reformers throughout the first part of the twentieth century, turning the kitchen from a social space to a food production "laboratory" (Van Rensselaer 1919). Cooking there, Stella found it newer and more convenient than the main house kitchen. The enclosed kitchen porch retained an older function. Like the ells in farmhouses one hundred years before, it was used for storing seasonal and large items – such as big cooking pots – and it was a space for Charles and others to do rough prep work like peeling potatoes.

Boarders, especially adults, sat in the swings on the front porch overlooking the road and the meadow beyond. The small porch on the main house was relieved of some use. The living room was no longer needed as the "summer dining room" and could go back to being a gathering space for family members. Boarders sometimes shared the living room, which in the early 1950s gained a television.

When I was in grade school, I came home one day and I looked ... we had a TV! And that TV was put right about here [in the hexagonal section of the
living room] and the couch ... was against the [dining room] wall (Karol Mech, 1999).

Karol was a child and highschool student during most of the boarding period. He did have to give up his bedroom for the boarders in the main house.

When things were really [crowded, they] made this dining room, I remember one year, they put in one, two, three beds. And me and [Helen’s] boys would sleep there (Karol Mech, 1999) (11).

Most of all, he remembers playing with his same-age nephews (Helen’s sons) and with the children from the city.

We stayed in [the dining room] and I remember one incident: what we would do with fireflies, we would purposely catch them, put them in jars, and let them flicker at night ... and someone would sometimes let them out ... on purpose! (Karol Mech, 1999).

The kids also played marbles and football (in the living room), dug a tunnel, played hide and seek and a game they made up themselves called "around the house," climbed trees, and played kick the can.

When he was old enough Karol helped with farming, as his sister had done, mostly with haying. Together Charles and Eddie provided most of the labor for the farm. Antonina had been a regular milker, but now was no longer available to help in the barn because she, Helen and Stella had so much more work to do for the boarders. Even though most members of the family were working on the place to make the family’s living, the older males were focussed on the cows
and the females on the boarding business. But gender roles were still not absolute. Milking and haying continued to be tasks in which gender roles were bent. Stella also helped her father split and stack firewood and to do other chores around the place. Charles in turn helped feed the boarders more than just by his gardening and butchering. He did prep work for the kitchen, and he cut and cooked meat. He helped the waitresses deliver plates of food, stacking them four or five at a time up his arm—restaurant style. That these work exchanges across gender-role lines were understood to be temporary is evident in the word "helped." After giving up farming, Stella Kelly says, her father "helped my mother more in the kitchen." This phrasing indicates that gender roles were clearly understood, as they were in areas that did not switch, for example, in Charles's belief that women should not do unmechanized field work (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998). Nevertheless, the descriptions the Mech children have given are not of strictly gendered spaces that separated family workers, but of family members pitching in to get things done.

Karol remembers that family expectations for him were different than they had been for the older Mech children. He and his sisters grew up in different eras, the Depression and the post-World War II boom, by which time the Mechs had achieved more security in their family's own cycle of
development. Though at first the family had hoped Karol would continue to farm, it soon became clear that he was expected to have a "white collar" career.

[Father] said, "No, no you’re going to get a desk job." So when it came to milking, I was never really required to help. Eddie, yes, but not me. But he definitely needed my assistance when it came to haying. That’s something he did demand. But other than that, "No, we can do it ourselves."

Karol was aware as he got older of privileges not shared by his siblings, such as having a room of his own in the winter, owning a car, and going to college.

Karol attributes his chance to develop off-the-farm interests to his sisters’ devotion to the boarding house and to Eddie’s labor assistance on the farm. It was also Eddie and the introduction of the milking machine, according to Stella, that made it possible for the family to take boarders in the first place. Hand milking, at the scale required for the fluid milk market, would have required too much labor for family members to do anything else.

Eddie’s condition, however, did not allow him to stay in this situation indefinitely. Eventually, he was placed in a state-run facility in Rome, New York. Charles and Antonina may have realized, in setting different goals for Karol, their youngest child, that farming would not be viable in the future on this place - this place which had produced income, food, shelter and clothing for families for over one hundred and fifty years. Even with two businesses
operating there, farming and boarding, the farm could not support the change in milk technology required by the industry and by state regulators in the early 1960s. The Halcott creamery would no longer accept milk delivered in cans and the farmers had to build bigger milk houses, install expensive stainless steel bulk tanks, and change from dumping stations to pipeline milkers. Barnyards had to be bulldozed to allow the huge tank trucks to back in to pick up the milk. These requirements were too expensive for the Mechs to afford.

The Mechs went out of farming before Karol graduated from high school in 1964. Until they retired a few years later, they devoted all their efforts to the boarding business. They kept a few cows and went on providing milk, meat, eggs and vegetables for boarders' meals. Eventually, Charles and Antonina sold the place and moved next door to live with Helen. They died in the mid-1980s. The Mech children have all achieved their parents' goals of having secure employment and comfortable homes. But Stella has often reflected that she wishes she had recognized at the time the size and dignity of the house she grew up in.

Eventually the house and barn were bought by Alan Sidrane and his wife. Since the Mechs' last boarders went home from their country vacation, the big Victorian house
has been a single-family vacation residence, restored but not highly renovated.

Conclusion

The Mech family managed household space differently for roomers than for boarders. The roomers fit in more like visitors to a pre-industrial farm, participating in activities in most major spaces in the house. The pattern resembled the integrated use of space on the early nineteenth century diversified farm, in which family life and work occupied the same spaces. The services required by roomers were mostly productive ones and were similar to the work on a diversified farm: they did their own cleaning and cooking while buying farm products from the Mechs. Adaptations by the Mech family had to do with sharing what might be considered personal space in bedrooms, the kitchen, and in giving up family gathering space. But these patterns - of many people occupying bedrooms, of productive work occupying domestic space - were characteristic of both earlier rural families in the region and of contemporary urban working class and immigrant families in the metropolitan area. During the rooming period at the Mechs’ farm, the most significant indicators of Victorian, suburban, middle-class values were the spatial separation of the market economy milk process and the style of the house
itself, both of which were inherited from the previous owners, the (hypothetically) progressive farmers, Henry and Mary Bouton (12).

At first, the change to boarding meant a large increase in the family’s service labor—cooking, cleaning, laundry—carried out within the same shared spaces. Once the summer house was built, the boarders and the work associated with them were spatially more separate from the family. Even though boarders used some spaces in the main house, family members were not as likely to encounter them there as they had been in the past (Smith 1971). The family home was less hectic, and the kitchen in the main house was almost abandoned for the summer except for ironing. The house and yard became the arena for Karol to play with his nephews and the boarders’ children. During the school year he had his own room and was instructed by his parents to attend to his development rather than do farm labor.

The house and yard therefore were separate from the two business sites and became the springboard for the youngest child’s development, as much as they were the location where the family made its living. Once the Mechs had gained economic security and a degree of comfort, their management of spaces, of work activities, and of family relationships more closely resembled the domestic spatial organization of
suburban families who had never farmed and never taken boarders.
NOTES

(1) Catharine Beecher, writing in 1869, formed the basis for the "cult of domesticity." Intended to gain more respect for women's family and work roles, Beecher's books advocated systematic household organization but also women's devotion to nurturance and the cultivation of refinement (Beecher, 1869).

(2) In Delaware County, New York, barns from the late nineteenth century were often built down over the sidehill, allowing entrance on the top level from the road. The hay mows could thus be one or two levels deep, and the cow stable could be on the lowest level, theoretically the warmest. The wall of the lower levels could be of stone and be built into the bank, or it could be of wood, with a "moat" between the barn and the road. The driveway into the barn used a little bridge to go over the moat, thus the term "overshot." These barns seem to have been built when farms were expanding to produce fluid milk, the large amount of space for hay and tracks for hay forks indicating much larger herds than in the past.

(3) Note that McMurry's claim of greater gender separation is being made for progressive farm families, not the majority. In her study of women on farms in the Nanticoke Valley, New York, Nancy Osterud finds that women continued to work along side their husbands and sons in the barn and in the field (Osterud 1991).

(4) Anna Mech Kelly describes the farmhouse kitchen from the point of view of a mid-twentieth century kitchen:

"the kitchen itself is very - inconvenient ... if you wanted to build cupboards around like this, the way it was cut out with so many doors, ... I remember five or six, but that's how the old farmhouses were built. Basically from the kitchen. And it was so you couldn't put built-in cupboards. Or have space for storage. I guess maybe that's why they have the pantry" (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

(5) Stella's and Anna's husbands are not related. They each married a man named Kelly.

(6) Stella's piano was put in the living room, but "summertime came and my mother says, 'Stella we have to get rid of this piano, because we need the space for the tables,' where they converted the living room into the
dining room for the summertime for the boarders." So it was put out in the woodshed. Stella practiced there for a while. She felt a little silly, but it was worth it. The piano stayed in woodshed because it was too big to move again. "It isn’t the proper place for an instrument to be out in the woodshed ... it stayed out in the woodshed and lost its tune and everything else ... And my father - fall time came - and he put wood in the woodshed and then the piano got damaged ... and eventually turned to kindling. So that was the end of my piano playing in the woodshed" (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

(7) Stella remembers:

"There was always that little bickering sometimes. It was language. The Polish and Ukrainian languages are very similar but the Polish is more like an elaborate language, compared to the Ukrainian ..." (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

There were some roomers who believed

"If you’re going to speak Ukrainian, speak Ukrainian; if you’re going to speak Polish, speak Polish. Don’t ... talk my language - because I’m Ukrainian; don’t ask me to speak Polish ... Sometimes we ran into certain ... ones like that, not very many" (Stella Mech Kelly, 1998).

(8) Anna’s story about getting electricity:

"I can remember I wasn’t going to school yet and we didn’t have electricity. We had the kerosene lamp in the kitchen ...
There was a teacher from District #19, his name was Leslie Streeter, and he was also an electrician. I can remember him coming to the house and hooking up - putting in the electricity. After that then we had electricity. And he was the teacher I went to for six years in a one-room school house" (Anna Mech Kelly, 1998).

(9) Lizabeth Cohen remarks that Herbert Gutman in his Work, Culture and Society recommends that more attention be given to the transition of both native and foreign-born people into industrial society. This inquiry could include the industrialization of rural life (Gutman 1977 cited in Cohen 1986).

(10) Stella went on to say,

"They [the Jewish family] ate what they were served there, otherwise they would have had to go to a different place."
But you see, as I said before, this Jewish family they ate everything my mother fixed, because they liked her cooking. And there were some that were more strict than others. But she didn’t have too many Jewish people. Because that wasn’t what this boarding house was for" (Stella Mech Kelly 1998).

This comment reflects the division in this region of boarding houses into those that accepted or catered to Jewish boarders and those that refused to take them. The village of Fleischmanns had predominately Jewish boarding houses by this time. (See Howard Kelly’s remarks in interview with Viola Avery Kelly, 1998) Fleischmanns is not far from Pine Hill where the "Anti-Hebrew" campaign took place in the late nineteenth century (see chapter 2 of this thesis).

(11) While her parents were running the boarding house, and she was working there, Helen also took roomers in her own house next door. The visitors cooked for themselves, as her parents’ earlier visitors had done. Her house had two kitchens so the family did not have to share with the roomers. No doubt the reason her sons had to sleep with Karol in the converted dining room in the Mechs’ house was because they had given up their bedrooms to roomers.

(12) It is speculative to claim that the Victorian house the Boughtons built functioned according to the progressive farmer’s pattern of space utilization. What may have been the norm in the suburbs, or may have seemed to be the trend in prescriptive literature for farmers, may not have been adopted by the Boughtons when they actually lived in the house. Gerald Pocius found in Calvert, Newfoundland, that people there would continue traditional habits of space use, associated with the older houses, into contemporary ranch houses (Pocius 1991).

It is ironic that the house the Mechs bought was built in a style or styles whose popularity was fueled by middle-class flight from cities where there were more and more poor immigrants. According to Lizabeth Cohen these styles, such as the Queen Anne and the Colonial Revival, were related to "Nativism, anti-industrialism, and a propensity toward environmental solutions for social problems" (Cohen 1991, 264).
CHAPTER 6

CASE STUDY 3: CRYSTAL SPRING FARM

Introduction: Native Americans and the First Farm Family

Joe Hewitt leaned his lithe frame over the corn ground, recently plowed. A shape, a texture, a color, discernable in the clay soil, matched the template in his mind. He worked the smooth stone carefully out of the clinging dirt. It was a banner stone, five or six thousand years old.

I found this when I was eight, this is the first thing I ever found ... It’s a banner stone. It’s a counter weight for an atlatl ... a throwing stick ... It fits on an atlatl which is an extension of your arm. ... It changes the physics of the stick ... a piece of hunting gear ... I think the guy died on my father’s farm. I found this big scraper - like a knife ... and two broken points [along with the banner stone]. There was no fire, no camp. And this is not the kind of thing you lose (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Joe had learned a lot about prehistoric arrowheads, anvil stones, and banner stones from Ralph Felter, who was his father’s friend, a carpenter who came to Crystal Spring Farm to help build a separate cottage for the boarders.

One hundred-forty years earlier, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, Stephen Mullineux may not have realized the long history of indigenous peoples on this place on the Bataviakill stream that he had leased from
landlord John Mier in 1804 (Delaware County Deed Book 233, p. 284). There is evidence that native peoples were in the Catskills for many thousands of years before European settlement. Twentieth century histories describe the Catskills as hunting grounds rather than the site of many permanent settlements by Native Americans. However, a few bands of Delaware Indians, under pressure from white settlement in flatter, more fertile areas, established isolated communities in valleys along the Delaware River. The Delawares, an Algonkian-speaking group, depended more on agriculture and fishing than on hunting. In southeastern Delaware County they may have left some evidence of their passing in rock ledge shelters and in beaver meadows along the rivers and streams where they built their round houses and tended their crops. The Delawares sided with the British during the American Revolution, and by its end had moved out of the region to the north and west (Adams 1988, 21-22). Stephen Mullineux, his wife and two children are shown the 1810 federal census for Roxbury (U.S. Census Town of Roxbury, 1810). When the Mullineux family farmed their leasehold on the Bataviakill, in a valley now named "Denver," they most likely did not have to consider native people a threat, and probably lived on the place.
The Second Farm Family: The Whipples

By the 1840s, the Denver Valley farm was in the hands of Edward I. Burhans, a trader in village and farm properties who eventually became a state senator from Delaware County. Burhans swore he had legal right to one section of what would become Crystal Spring Farm, and sold it to Daniel Whipple in 1851 (Delaware County Deed Book 40, p. 493). At that time Daniel, age 48, was just starting a family with his young wife, Mariah, age 25, and had an infant daughter, Jane (U.S. Census, Town of Roxbury, 1850).

The fields that make up Crystal Spring Farm are cradled in the Denver Valley, stretching from the Bataviakill stream up the sidehills in both directions. A story from the Hewitts, the family that eventually ran a boarding house there, holds that the farmstead was originally up the hill, east of the stream and of the present day house site (Martha Hewitt 1997, Sarah and Rick Porter 1998). According to Joe Hewitt, son of the twentieth century boarding house proprietors, the valley road was at first located part way along the sidehill, rather than in the valley (Figure 6-1).

The road was not in the valley originally. And the people wouldn’t live in the valley because they called it - they thought they got consumption from it. I guess the fog; they called it "the bad air." So the houses were all up on the hills ... the old road was probably ... four hundred yards or so up in back of the [present] barn (Joe Hewitt 1999).
After living on the sidehill farm for fourteen years, Daniel and Mariah's household had expanded by 1865 to include six children and Mariah's sixty-four year old mother (N.Y.S. Census Town of Roxbury, 1865). There is no record that it was the Whipples who moved the house to the valley floor, but evidence may exist in the form of two spruce trees.

Those two big trees as you looked out towards the road - they call them husband and wife trees ... They used to plant them when they moved into a house ... newlyweds (Joe Hewitt, 1999). Joe believes that the trees were planted at the time the house was moved from its upper location and rebuilt on the present site. "That was probably around 1860, because them spruce trees was probably planted ... We counted the rings [when one of them was cut] and it was around 1860" (Joe Hewitt, 1999). Whether they had moved the house or not, the Whipples added sixty-six and a half more acres to Stephen Mullineux's original eighty-three and then sold the place in 1865.

The Third Farm Family: Joeseph and Mary Boughton

The buyer was Joseph Boughton and, give or take a few tree rings, it may have been his family that moved the house down the hill. A Hewitt family story, passed from Amanda Boughton to her grandson and then to Joe Hewitt, indicates that the spruce trees were already planted but not very big
when the Boughtons were first in residence. (Amanda was thirteen when they moved there.)

The [spruce tree] on the right was noticeably shorter than the one on the left ... and Dad said that his grandmother, probably Amanda, told him that when she was a kid the cows got out and them trees was little and the young stock ran over that one and buggered it up (Joe Hewitt, 1999).

Not only the house had to be moved from the upper site. The foundation for a new, larger barn had been laid and had to be abandoned.

They found out they were going to put a road through the valley and they were in the process of building a new barn up there. Delvern Kelly's father contracted to lay the foundation and it was started ... so they held off on it and they built the house that's there now, I would assume, and the barn that's there now you can see that was tore down, cause you can see the old [pinnels] and how it was reconstructed, probably bigger than what was tore down and moved down and rebuilt down there [on the road] (Joe Hewitt, 1999).

According to Rick and Sarah [Hewitt] Porter, current residents of the Boughton house, it was the northeastern part that was moved to its present site near the stream when the town of Roxbury built the main road along the floor of the valley (Sarah and Rick Porter 1998). It appears to have consisted of a square room on the first floor and behind it a rectangular space about one half the depth of the square. Today enclosed stairs occupy part of this ancillary space, which has been modified often over the years. Joe Hewitt recalls evidence of cellar access from this space.
There was also another [door] that went down cellar, right where Ma’s shower is in that downstairs bathroom. There’s a blocked off door there, that went down cellar. And the stairs are gone now, you go down cellar and the stairs are cut off and they’re gone ... I guess it must be Dad did that - because the bathroom’s been there quite a while (Joe Hewitt 1999).

As we have seen in previous chapters, such one-room houses, with ancillary space and loft, were some of the earliest houses on farms in the region. Where they survive, they seem to be part of a larger, renovated structure such as this one. How soon was this basic house expanded to include the full second stories and wings surviving in the house today (Figure 6-2)? Were they built immediately after the house was moved down the hill? Or were they added gradually over years of successful farming?

Five years after he purchased the farm, in 1870 Joseph Boughton was fifty years old. His household included his wife, Mary, ten years younger, their son George, age twenty, daughters Manda and Sarah who were eighteen and fifteen, and George Davis, age thirty-five, a "laboring man." The real estate was worth $7000; the personal estate of $2000 represented the value of the family’s possessions. In the agricultural part of the 1870 census the farm itself was valued at $4000, and tools $150 (U.S. Census Town of Roxbury, 1870) (1).

The Boughtons listed one hundred forty five of the one hundred sixty acre farm as "improved": meadows for hay, lots
for grain, pastures for grazing, woodlots for fuel, or a sap bush for making maple syrup. The landscape at this time in southeastern Delaware County was primarily open fields, not wooded mountain sides, as be seen in the background in Figure 6-1 of the Denver Store. A better view of this agricultural landscape is illustrated in the engraving of a late nineteenth century farm from Munsell's *History of Delaware County* (Figure 6-3).

The Boughtons were farming the place with two horses and two oxen. They made twenty three hundred pounds of butter from nineteen cows, kept twelve sheep that gave thirty pounds of wool, and had two pigs and two young cattle. For the animals they raised one hundred bushels of oats and forty tons of hay. To feed themselves they raised sixty bushels of buckwheat and fifty bushels of potatoes. There was $30 worth of orchard produce, one hundred fifty pounds of maple sugar, $50 worth of "home manufactures" and $200 worth of animals slaughtered, presumably for consumption on the farm. The stock was valued at $1550 and the farm's production at $1690.

Once again we find a family engaged in diversified farming, producing for their own needs, but clearly focussing on certain crops in quantities to sell: butter and maple sugar. There was a column on the census form where farm wages could be recorded, but none were listed for the
Boughtons, even though they had a hired man, George Davis. If he was not paid wages, he was probably living in the house, receiving his board in exchange for work (2).

As the construction of the railroad approached, the Boughton farm was improved with the moving of the house and the construction of a larger barn. Some of the recently extant outbuildings such as the wagon house, the ice house, the wood shed, the shop and the smokehouse may date from these early years of the Boughton family's residence (3). The Boughton house, as it may have appeared in this period, had been expanded to two full stories in the upright section and in the lateral wing. Rick Porter and Joe Hewitt both note the similarity between the Boughton expansion and two houses in the village of Roxbury. They believe that they might have been built by the same carpenter (Sarah and Rick Porter 1998; Joe Hewitt 1999).

It would be reasonable for the expanded house to take on an appearance similar to others already existing in Roxbury in the 1870s. Bertha Cammer's house on Locust Street is recognizable as the "upright and wing" or "gable-front and wing" house type with a two-story upright and a one-story wing (McAlester 1984, 93, 193). It is related to the Greek Revival style that was very popular among prosperous farmers in the Catskills beginning in the 1850s. Bertha's house represents a smaller version because its
second floor rooms are not full height: they have slanted ceilings above knee walls (Figure 6-4). Lindon Morse’s house on Main Street is a full two stories in the "upright," but like the Cammer house it has a three-bay front and Classical molding over the front door (Figure 6-5). The Morse house is marked with its date of construction, 1870.

The Morse and Cammer houses were built with concern for the three-bay proportions that characterize Greek versions of the upright and wing house (McAlester 1984, 193, fig.3). The proportions and some details of the Boughtons’ farmhouse, which may have been an "upright and wing" at one point, nevertheless are different from the other Roxbury examples. The Boughton upright seems taller than the other two buildings because it is only two bays wide, and its roof pitch is steeper. While its door is off center toward the ell, there is no stairway immediately inside the front door, as there would be in a newly built Greek Revival house. Also, while the village houses have one story wings, the wing of the Boughton farmhouse is at present two stories high, making it resemble a L plan house.

There are substantial differences between the Boughton house and the other two in Roxbury village, but the similarities are equally important. The details and proportions may be absent that would indicate a single craftsman following a personal method or concept. But in
the arrangement of the upright with wing all three of these dwellings reflect a house type known generally throughout the northeast. By the 1870s it had become as well-known in southeastern Delaware County as the late nineteenth century Georgian housetype, such as Hubbell's Mountain Home.

Rick Porter uncovered evidence during his renovation that there was some kind of shed south of the original section, before the farmer/builders added the wing or ell and raised it to two stories. A one story wing, like ones on the Cammer and Morse houses, could have been built after the shed and later raised to two stories. This lateral wing on the first floor contains a square room, sometimes called the front room, and a rectangular room on the end, at present a bedroom. The enclosed stairs to the second floor open into the front room, but give access directly to the rooms above the oldest part of the house, a possible indication that the stairs were placed in their present position after or as the wing was built, because without the wing they would lead to the outdoors. The bedrooms in the upright open off the landing at the top of these stairs, and the ones in the wing open off a hallway leading from the landing. Also on this landing are the stairs to the attic, which are remarkable in that they have very narrow, wedge-shaped treads that spiral upward in a very tight space, no more than four by four feet. Could they have been the
stairs to the second floor of the original house, reused for the attic when the loft or partial second story was raised to two full stories? Or were the main stairs re-oriented from within the ancillary space to the square room, toward the new wing?

It was the front room in the wing that Rick thinks had the lower shed roof. This room received heavy use at some time in its history, as it would if it had been a kitchen. Joe Hewitt tells a family story that was later confirmed by physical evidence:

Dad didn’t call them by name, he just called them "the old people - the old folks" ... He never said who they were. He said somebody in the family there had told him in the living room where you walk in the house [the "front" room] ... Somebody had told him that they rocked so much they wore a hole in the floor. He always thought it was nonsense, you know? And there’s a little chimney there where I suppose ... probably was the kitchen or something, and he did some work in there and he tore out [the floor covering] ... and there were two big patches in the floor there - where they’d evidently they rocked a hole through the floor. [Laughs.] It was right next to the - where this chimney went up through. I suppose they probably sat there and rocked in the winter time (Joe Hewitt 1999).

At some point in the Boughtons long tenure, one or both of the upright and wing were made two stories high, and the wing was extended to its present length, including a rectangular room on the south side of the squarish front room. At the same time or later the first part of the rear ell was built.
Rick Porter and his wife Sarah speak of a space, now their dining room, that is just behind the wing and was called the "buttery" (Sarah and Rick Porter, 1998). Rick says this is where "the roof lines don't match up." A space across from it, immediately behind the oldest part of the house, Joe Hewitt calls "the back porch," acknowledging that it had been closed in as long as he remembered (Joe Hewitt, 1999) (Figure 6-6). Behind these is the present rectangular kitchen with stairs to the second level of the rear ell. These spaces are in the first part of the rear ell which attaches to the two-story wing or lateral ell already described. Together with the upstairs rooms, the first part of the rear ell creates a footprint that is half again as long as it is high.

It is impossible to say, from the evidence so far, whether the rear ell was built at the same time as the wing or lateral ell, nor how long after the original house was moved these renovations and additions took place. The agricultural census figures from shortly after the Boughtons moved to the farm indicate that the farming was succeeding well enough to support the family and increase the value of the place. The productive activities of the family, especially Mary Boughton and her daughters, Amanda and Sarah, would have made good use of the buttery and the other service areas behind the lateral wing, in the space that is
now the kitchen. Perhaps the summer kitchen started out here, further forward, and moved back when the main kitchen was placed in the rear ell. The census data is incomplete concerning the Boughtons for the rest of the nineteenth century, so it is hard to tell whether increased production, the presence of hired hands, or other activities necessitated the additional spaces.

The Fourth Farm Family: John and Amanda McEwan

The farm did not change hands again until Joseph Boughton died, after which, in 1898, his daughter Amanda and her husband John McEwan bought part of the place from the other heirs (Delaware County Deed Book 163, p. 425). The lateral wing may have already been added and the one room house raised to two stories during Joseph’s and Mary’s tenure, in the 1870s and 1880s, when similar houses were familiar in Roxbury. The first part of the rear ell could have come later, even after Amanda and John took over the farm, though it seems unlikely that a buttery would have been built so near the turn of the century, when farms were converting to fluid milk.

Upstairs in the upright, the lateral ell and the first part of the real ell are all bedrooms, though two later were converted to bathrooms. At this point in the house’s development, there were at least six bedrooms upstairs and
places for one or two more on the first floor. If all these alterations and additions had happened soon after the Boughtons moved in, with just six people to occupy the rooms, could there have been another reason to construct all this space? Was it to accommodate hired hands and their families? The additions, especially the first part of the rear ell, might have happened a little later, after the railroad had proved it would be bringing urban visitors. Is it possible that at ages sixty and fifty, with all their children grown up, Joseph and Mary decided to take boarders? Or was this the point at which Amanda and John became the primary couple on the farm, expanded the house and supplemented their farm income with boarding?

Joseph Boughton’s heirs in 1898 included his wife, Mary, and his son, George, and his other daughter, Sarah. Amanda bought the other part of the farm from the heirs in 1911, soon after which George was living with his family in a valley called West Settlement in the town of Roxbury (New York State Census, Town of Roxbury 1915). Mary Boughton had died, and so possibly had Amanda’s husband who does not appear on the deed or in the subsequent census. This acquisition seems to be somewhat after the fact. The 1911 transfer was done for one dollar, and Amanda was sixty years old. Her own daughter, Sarah, called "Sadie," was married and living elsewhere with Howard Hewitt who was listed on
the 1905 state census as a jeweler (New York Census Town of Roxbury 1905). The 1915 state census shows Amanda as "head" of a household of one (New York Census Town of Roxbury 1915).

The Fifth Farm Family: Amanda and Sadie Run the Farm

Sadie and Howard do not appear in the 1915 census, with Amanda or elsewhere, but by 1925 Howard had died and Sadie, in her early forties, had taken her son John B. Hewitt (born 1906) to live with Amanda (New York State Census Town of Roxbury 1925). Significantly, on the 1925 census, both Sadie and Amanda are called "head" of household, though they clearly reside together.

It is not clear, however, whether farming was continuous after the retirement and death of Joseph Boughton, though it seems likely that Amanda and John McEwan continued to farm. Sadie was still a teenager when her father, John, died, but it appears from a Hewitt family photo taken in 1920 and from family recollections that Sadie and Howard did farm it for a while (Figure 6-7). According to several informants, John B. Hewitt developed an early dislike for farming because he took on an adult's burden in the barn and in the fields when he was very young. He didn't intend to stay on the farm. But when his father died of tubercular meningitis when he was only forty-two, as the
only child, John B. Hewitt had to stay and run the farm for his mother and grandmother (Figure 6-8).

The 1925 state census suggests that Sadie and Amanda had hired hands living at the place. Entered just after Amanda's and Sadie's household are the Rossmans: Ruben and Mary, a couple in their forties, and his brother Barent. Both the men are listed as "farm laborers." A 1921 photo of the farmhouse shows sitting on the porch, two women, two men, and a youth too old to be five-year old John B. Hewitt (Figure 6-9). The women could be Amanda and Sadie, one man might be Howard Hewitt and the other two could be Ruben and Barent, or Ruben and his own son, Ken.

John B. Hewitt’s son, Joe, recalls hired men on the place when he was young, just before his father quit farming; he also remembers a way the house was divided to allow a hired hand and his family a relatively private entrance (4):

You see, that house was - had been set up to have a family living - two families, in other words, like a hired man. That’s what Dad always said - that upstairs there’s doors that are gone now and stairs ... that are gone, where you had access to go on upstairs and it was for hired [help] ... we always had hired men [in the early 1940s], but they never had a family. (Joe Hewitt 1999)

According to Joe, the ancillary space behind the oldest part of the house has been changed repeatedly and may also have been the entrance used by the hired man and his family.
There was a door from the back that came in here and then - where these [main] stairs are ... it was like a step up and there was a little door there and you open that door and you went upstairs ... the ones you go up now. But you can't see that; it's all sealed up now ... and that was an entrance - as I understand - it was an entrance for a hired man - family that lived upstairs - so they could come and go [without] going through the whole house (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Perhaps that family was the Rossmans or a similar family who resided in the farmhouse. Their presence would explain how farming could have been continued when Amanda lived there alone in the early decades of the century and how she and her daughter, both having lost their husbands, carried on until John B. Hewitt could take over the heavy work.

The Sixth Farm Family: John B. and Martha Hewitt

In 1926 a new member was added to the Hewitt-Boughton household. At a square dance in Margaretville, John B. Hewitt - now known as Jack - met Martha Sutter, a nineteen year old bank clerk.

I met him at a dance, you know. A bunch of us girls hired a car and went from Fleischmanns to Margaretville to the dance ... When we went to go home the man that had taken us was drunk and I wouldn't get in the car ... and so when Jack says, "Well, we'll drive you home," I thought, "Well there's three of us girls and only two of those fellows, so we ought to be able to be [all right]. So on to Fleischmanns and [Jack asks,] "How about you and I going out tomorrow night?" ... I said, "Call me up." ... So that's how my romance started with him (Martha Hewitt 1997).
Martha lived in Fleischmanns with her father, a plumber, her mother and six younger siblings. They had moved to Fleischmanns from New York City where the five oldest children were born, and where the family had lived in a tenement apartment. Martha described tenement living as resembling the farm after she began taking boarders.

And where we lived [everybody knew their neighbors] because it was a poor neighborhood. They were all working and the women stayed home and took care of the kids ... [There were] four floors in each house, four apartments - well, flats they called them, so there was sixteen families in the house ... Two families used the same bathroom ... we used to take a bath in the washtub. In the kitchen you’d have to heat the water on the stove, you know. Even when you washed clothes (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Martha’s father was originally from Fleischmanns (or Griffins Corners, as it was called), and when the family moved back to the Catskills from the city they stayed in a house owned by Martha’s grandfather.

I thought we were wealthy when we moved to Fleischmanns. We had our own [house.] ... So we had a bathroom all our own with a tub and a wash basin and toilet and we had six rooms, you know, an down there we only had four. So we really thought we were [wealthy] - I did anyway (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Martha came to live with her husband, mother-in-law (Sarah McEwan Hewitt) and her grandmother-in-law (Amanda Boughton McEwan) at the farm in the Denver valley, as shown in a multi-generational photo, taken just after Martha’s and Jack’s first son was born in 1928 (Figure 6-10).
When we were first married [Jack's] father was dead and we lived together for a while. And then - it would get like - we got along fine and everything - but of course, everybody likes to live by themselves, you know, so we fixed this side of the house for ourselves [the oldest part of the house] (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Joe Hewitt recalls that the wood stove now in the front room in the wing used to be in his parents' living quarters in the oldest part of the house, where they had set up housekeeping when they were first married. They were still living there twelve years later when Joe was born in the northeast room.

Jack and Martha ran the farm through the Great Depression in the thirties, and Sarah lived with them until her death in the early 1950s.

We had cows on the farm at first, we had cows ... We didn't have any electric lights or anything. We had kerosene lamps, you know (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Unless the Hewitts had a gasoline powered milking machine, no electricity meant hand milking. Martha only worked in the barn occasionally:

No, I never did work in the barn. Maybe once or twice, I might have helped out a little bit. But I never really worked in the barn. Jack's mother [Sadie] did though (Martha Hewitt 1997).

It was difficult to make a living by farming any time, but especially in the 1930s.

It was during the Depression - and farmers were getting a dollar a can for milk. It was terrible. And the feed bill was mounting and mounting ...
Bob Smith [the feed mill owner] let the feed bill
run so high ... See, I didn’t know much. Because [Jack’s] mother was really the head of the thing and it was her farm, really ... One day I just happened to see [the bill] laying there and I picked it up and saw it. And it was thousands of dollars ... I said to Jack, "We’ve got to do something," and I started to take boarders. That’s how I started to take boarders ... And that’s how I got started (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Martha remembered that Joe was about four years old when she and Jack began taking boarders, about 1942, just before or after the beginning of World War II. Jack went on farming until immediately after the war when he sold the cows.

Joe Hewitt remembers some aspects of farming associated not just with the barn and milking but also with the outbuildings and the lay out of the place (Figure 6-11).

Well, there used to be a wagon house ... it set right on the road. It ran north and south right along the road ... When Dad quit farming, they went in the chicken business ... They used to keep twenty-five hundred chickens in there (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Joe doesn’t remember horses being kept in it, but assumes that there were. When the building was renovated as a chicken barn there was "a lot of cool stuff in it:"

I know they had a couple of big one-lung engines into it that went to the dump. And some tack. And a couple of wagons and stuff. (Joe Hewitt 1999)

In addition to chickens, Jack tried to create agricultural income by growing brussels sprouts.

Dad, he used to grow sprouts ... He had five acres of sprouts. I want to tell you, that’s a lot of sprouts ... that was before boarders ... He and Ralph Felter run that five acres of sprouts. I
can remember them picking them damn things ... they'd pick them all day long. And then they'd pack them. Sit there in that little corner over by the kitchen table and they'd dump all of them out. And Grandma [Sadie Hewitt], my brother, everybody packing sprouts. And you had to pack them then so you put the loose ones in the bottom. They were in quarts or pints ... And then you took the nice little tight ones and just stick them down in with the round end up and they had to be packed tight enough so you could tip them over like that and they wouldn't fall out [demonstrates] ... quite a knack to it. They'd pack them damn things until two o'clock in the morning sometimes. (Joe Hewitt 1999)

Joe also remembers a pig pen above the cow barn, a shop and a regular-size chicken house (for forty chickens instead of twenty five hundred) between the wagon house and the farmhouse, an ice pond and an ice house, an outhouse ("it was a nice one too ... all wainscoted inside."), and a stone smoke house, one of several in the vicinity (Figure 6-12).

There's one of them here. There's one up to the old Morse Farm and there was one at what's the Roxbury Run [Restaurant] now. That was Parker Morse's farm ... they were built by Bruce Ford's father. He quarried the stone, Elmer German told me about that. He said Bruce told him. His old man, he remembered doing the one up to - Henry Morse's ... Bruce said when he was a little boy he remembered going up there and helping his dad finishing ... Quarried the stone, built the stone house and furnished the iron -they had iron corners on them - for five dollars ... [Bruce] was an old man ... when I was a kid ... [so the stone smoke house was built] a hundred years ago, I guess (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Joe's recollection would place the smokehouse's construction before the turn of the century, during the Boughton expansion or when the McEwan's took over the farm. Martha
and Jack used the smokehouse to burn trash; but Joe Hewitt remembers accounts of Sadie using it to smoke meat. By the time Joe was growing up on the farm, some of these buildings were being torn down or removed. When the valley road was rebuilt in the 1960s, the wagon house was demolished, as was the regular chicken house. Joe remembers his father tearing down the ice house with a tractor made from a Model T (Figure 6-13). The shop "wound up up on the hill as a camp" for his brother John’s children. The smokehouse remains standing.

Joe also remembers the layout of the farm complete with field names:

I could draw you a picture of the lots and meadows and things up there too, how they was when I was a kid. They all of course had names, you know, every lot had a name. The Big Knoll, the Lot Below the Big Knoll, the Barn Lot, the Mill Dam Lot, the Lot Below the Old Mill Dam, the Flat, the Upper Flat, Harris Ballard’s Flat ... one way up there, that was Pasture Lot. No, that was the Buckwheat Lot. They used to grow buckwheat when he [Jack] was a kid. Then it was the Lot Below the Buckwheat Lot. That’s all grown up there now (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Joe was less than ten years old when his father quit farming. Like his mother, Martha, he sees boarding as a replacement for agriculture - though he has fewer memories than she did of boarders before the end of World War II, when he would have been seven.

I can tell you how they got into the boarding business. Well, first the old man went out of the farming business. He didn’t like to farm it
anyway. And he got into it with the milk inspectors. Well, the guy came and he inspected the old man's barn and he said "You've got to change the milkhouse. You've got to have so many square feet of space in your milkhouse" ...

"Well, all my water lines run right by the ... milkhouse foundation. I'm going to have to tear all them water lines out and change all that stuff. Why can't I just -?" Nope, wouldn't do at all. [Jack] says, "I ain't going to do it."

"We'll shut your milk off."

"I'll sell my cows."

"You wouldn't sell your cows."

"I ain't fixing that milkhouse the way you want it. I'll run it out, but I won't widen it." And they got into it and he sold the cows. That was it. That was the end of his farming (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Jack went to work at the hardware store in Margaretville and later worked at the feed mill in Roxbury, for the same Bob Smith who had helped him with the feed bill. Nearby farms were taking boarders too, and occasionally the Hewitts would inherit their overflow, supplementing the clientele gained through advertising and word of mouth.

Accommodations for Family and Boarders at Crystal Spring Farm

Some of Martha's and Jack's boarders followed the seasonal schedule established at earlier boarding houses: guests, especially single school teachers, would come to Crystal Spring Farm for the whole summer. They did not,
however, follow the earlier pattern of cooking for
themselves. From the beginning Martha provided three big
meals a day for her boarders. Other guests were families
arriving throughout the summer for their two week vacations.

They arrived different times. [They would] write
and people who had been here before would make
their reservations, "I want my room back," you
know ... We didn't charge very much. I think when
we first started into take boarders we charged $14
a week for one person and that was very cheap, you
know, because they had seven days, three meals a
day. And we had a lot of school teachers, and
mostly Jewish people (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Bedrooms

Counting the downstairs bedroom in the wing or lateral
ell, but not the room in the oldest part of the house,
occupied at first by Martha and Jack, there were six
bedrooms in the house, and four more were added when Jack
built on the second part of the rear ell. Until the early
1950s, Grandmother Sarah Hewitt (Sadie) occupied the bedroom
in the upstairs of the first part of the rear ell and
Martha's father, John Sutter, lived with them in a bedroom
in the lateral wing for a few years before he died. By the
time Joe Hewitt remembers in the 1940s, his brother John
used the downstairs bedroom in the wing and their parents
were still in the oldest part of the house. Joe himself
"slept all over the place." His description offers an
inventory of the bedrooms:
I lived in every room in that house, pretty near, at one time - if you call ... sleeping [living]. I slept in Grandma’s room - a year or so, I slept in the room next to that - they call that the middle bedroom, and then there’s another room on around there - I slept in that awhile, then there was a big room in the front, and then when they got to boarding they divided that off, and made two little rooms out of it. I slept in one of them for a while, and - I slept in what’s Ma’s bedroom there [first floor bedroom in the wing] - I slept in my brother’s room when he left, I slept in that for a year or two I guess ... (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Asked whether he took his possessions with him when he changed sleeping quarters, Joe said

I didn’t really have that much stuff ... Only had some clothes. I didn’t have nothing ... everything else like guns and fish poles and all that stuff was all kind of common property. I didn’t have any treasures (Joe Hewitt 1999).

In the winter, Joe got to stay in one room and some bedrooms were used for storing produce such as pumpkins.

Eventually Jack and Ralph Felter built a cottage (sometimes called the "cabin") with four bedrooms and a bathroom on each floor. Martha kept a bulletin board with the schedule of visitors that might "roll over" completely each week (Figure 6-14). One time the schedule got overbooked and in the course of a week or two Jack put up the little house out back, and he and Martha stayed in it, so more rooms would be available in the house. By the 1950s, when Mike Finberg’s family were guests at the Hewitt’s, the second part of the rear ell and the cabin were in use; the Hewitts’ son John and his family occupied the
little house out back; and the square room in the oldest part of the house, where Martha and Jack set up housekeeping and Joe was born, was being used by boarders (Figure 6-15).

To deal with weekly changes in accommodations for guests, Jack, Joe and presumably John had to move beds from one room to another.

That was the bed routine, you see. Cots! And beds! And mattresses! and all that stuff ... A double bed would have to come out of the middle bedroom and go down to grandpa’s room. And the cot in there would have to go over to the cabin, and then the double bed over there had to come back to the house and go in this room, and it was like musical beds. And next week, it was ... back again the other way, moving beds. Geeze, I used to hate that (Joe Hewitt 1999).

As Sarah Porter remembers them, the bedrooms contained one or two beds, though one bedroom, now hers and her husband’s, had five beds in it: four twin beds and a cot. Sometimes the single rooms got a three-quarter bed to accommodate a couple. The bedrooms in the second part of the rear ell were often rented to a family because there was no hallway: to get to the farther rooms guests had to pass through those of others.

Bathrooms and Utilities

There were two bathrooms upstairs - one at the top of the main stairs and one at the top of the kitchen stairs, at the end of the first part of the rear ell. It is unclear
when the bathrooms were put in, but hot water for bathing was not available in unlimited quantities for guests or family. Three stories illustrate. First, Rick passes on a story he heard from Jack.

Remember Pop was saying when they had that - the hot water was from the wood stove - and they had that guy who would just run the water to shave. And he used to [crank] the valve on him ... shut his water off, because it was just a quick hot water deal - right out of the cook stove. And he'd turn it off on him (Rick Porter 1998).

Water heated in a reservoir on the side of the cook stove was piped to the bathroom at the end of the first part of the ell, but the supply valves were in the kitchen. Sarah continues:

Originally, other than the kitchen, the bathroom upstairs ... where the first hot water went upstairs ... was Grandma Hewitt’s bathroom. And Ma [Martha] thought she’d just ... died and gone to heaven because she didn’t have to cart hot water up the stairs to take a bath ... They piped it up.

Piped hot water upstairs may have been available only when boarders were in residence, for Joe remembers heating his own water for baths in the wintertime.

We had no hot water much. I remember you used to heat [it]. When I was a little kid (actually I wasn’t all that little either) we used to [do this] in the wintertime, before boarders, I used to heat water on the wood stove - it probably was a wood stove then and I had a couple of tea kettles, and you’d heat that water up and go upstairs. There wasn’t no heat upstairs. You’d draw a little cold water in the bath tub. We had cold water up there. Then you’d pour your hot water so you could stand it [laughs], so it wasn’t
quite so cold. Take a bath in that (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Otherwise Joe didn’t have to compete with boarders for hot water. He "never took a lot of baths during the summer because I used to go swimming" (6).

Electricity arrived before the Hewitts began to take boarders, but it was not immediately installed throughout the house.

I’ll never forget the first people we really had ... it was just two ladies and we didn’t have any electric lights, only downstairs. We didn’t have any electric lights upstairs. Then when they come back we had put the electric lights upstairs, and they were so disappointed. "Oh why did you [do that]? We like those lamps that you used to use" (Martha Hewitt 1997).

The guests thought the kerosene lamps were romantic; Martha was more practical: "It was a darn nuisance filling those lamps every night, and washing the chimneys and everything."

Similarly, when a frog clogged the water supply pipe from the spring above the barn, the guests thought it was charmingly rustic. When one woman said, "Isn’t this romantic? We have to go to the barn to wash;" Jack became angry, thinking of all the work it would take to pull the pipe from under the road in order to unplug it. "I can’t imagine anybody thinking it would be romantic to wash with cold water in the barn," said Martha.
Food Service: Menu

"I used to cook three big meals a day, you know. Not anything like a sandwich that you can eat nowadays for lunch ... actually it was a dinner," said Martha Hewitt in 1997. When they began to take boarders, Jack’s mother taught Martha how to cook.

She made wonderful pies. And sometimes, you know, she didn’t want to make pie every day - so like on Wednesdays and Sundays I’d have ice cream and cookies and they’d say, "Oh, why didn’t Grandma make a pie today?" ... Honest, the crust was - melt in your mouth. She was a wonderful baker (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Even though most of the guests were Jewish, Martha wasn’t expected to change the way she cooked.

No, no, no. I never cooked pork much. Even though they weren’t religious, they were not used to eating pork. They ate bacon, though ... And they would eat baked ham, sliced. Always on Saturday night we would have potato salad and cold cuts. We had a big dinner at lunch time, chicken or turkey every Sunday (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Often, Martha catered to her guests’ needs and preferences. Joe remembers his mother and father staying up at night to hand squeeze orange juice for the guests’ breakfast. If the boarders were going away for the day, Martha would pack them a lunch (Mike Finberg 1998). And for fussy eaters she would serve potatoes with skins, or not, strain peas, and for the children who refused to eat what was served she would offer to make a hamburger.

We always had something that somebody’ll eat. Somebody might not like it as well. And then we
also had people that really would take - you'd put a lot on the table and some people would take too much. Because we served - we didn't serve individually - it was put on the table. That's the way, and help yourself. And then I got so that I put one [serving dish] on one end of the table and one on the other. Because I saw what some people did (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Martha was in charge of dinner and supper. Mornings she slept in while Jack made breakfast. The menu offered several kinds of hot cereal, toast, bacon, sausage, and "how do you want your eggs?". He would preside over the griddle at the end of the long, narrow kitchen. Then when breakfast was done he would go to work at the feed mill (Sarah Porter 1998)(7).

Jack also provided a lot of the vegetables served to the boarders. He was a big gardener too. The old man used to grow an hell of a garden. They eat a lot of stuff out of the garden there for them. Yeah, that was a big - he worked a lot in the garden. And they got a lot of stuff out of the garden, fresh stuff from the garden ... (Joe Hewitt 1999).

The farm also provided eggs, once they went into the chicken business, but for the boarders they bought milk. They had a milk man come. We used to get milk down to Leon Woolheater's, but I don't think they fed the boarders raw milk. They probably wouldn't drink it (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Along with going to meet the bus, and taking garbage to the dump, Jack bought the supplies, including meat, for the kitchen.
He ... went to town, he got all the groceries, and that was a big thing. Used to buy most of their groceries down to Bussy's [in Margaretville] ... That was right there on the corner, it was a privately owned store and they used to run a tab down there in the summer ... Big business, because if they had any people, they bought a lot of stuff down there. And he did all the shopping (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Food Service: Employees

At first Martha and Jack hired young women from the area to work as chambermaids and waitresses. They hired so many over the years that people asked, "What, did everybody in this valley work for you?" The girls, as they were called, were hired two at a time to wait on table, help wash dishes, and clean rooms (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Later Sarah Porter and her siblings worked for their grandmother, who "counted on family" to help run the business. "It was an understanding," says Sarah, "It wasn't bad because we made money. The boarders left us tips and my grandmother paid us." Sarah worked in the boarding house while living in the little house out back. Her uncle Joe's children were just enough younger that when Sarah and her brothers and sister got older, they "moved into the position that we had."
Food Service: Dining

There were three dining rooms. 1950s guest Mike Finberg describes them:

We all ate together, as I'm recalling. There was one dining room right outside of the kitchen. There was one larger one to the right with a long trestle kind of table and then the front room which I think now is a living room, depending on the number of guests, also held a dining room table ... or two, but they were all large, and all the guests came to dinner at the same time. We were called by a bell ... They were ... served at regular times; it wasn't haphazard. And when we sat down ... I don't recall if there was a grace, but I'm sure we all waited for everybody at least to be seated. ... Then we would all eat together ... And the people that Martha had helping would serve and there would be bowls of mashed potatoes or string beans or platters of meat loaf ... always home cooked ... and always good ... I think that meal time and eating together helped that feeling [of an] extended family (Mike Finberg 1998).

The dining room with the trestle table was located in the area remembered as "the buttery." A big double door opened into it from the kitchen. The smaller dining room to the right was connected to the kitchen by a opening through which food could be passed. Joe Hewitt remembers this dining area being called a "back porch" and that it remained cold even after it was enclosed and made into a dining room (Figure 6-16).

Food Service: Preparation, Service, and Family Spaces

Inside the swinging double doors to the kitchen, there was a small table to the left that had been used for family
meals (and packing Brussels sprouts). Down the center of this room, that Joe remembers as being not much more than eight feet wide, was a long, three foot wide table, covered with sheet aluminum. Here serving dishes were laid out and waitresses completed assembling food for the tables. Along the sides of the room were a dish washing sink, a hand washing sink, two electric cook stoves tended by Martha, a wood cook stove that had been converted to oil, and the griddle Jack used to prepare breakfast. Near the stove area was the pass-through to the small dining room. "It was really close quarters in there," comments Joe. Sarah demonstrated the "Martha Bump," how Martha would use her hip to gently move someone aside so she could get to the sink, for example (Figure 6-17).

Behind the main back wall of the kitchen was the other set of stairs to the second floor. Behind the stove area was a pantry used for storage.

This was like a dead space here, nobody did anything with this - there was nothing going on here. It probably as some kind of a kitchen at sometime, because there was flour bins ... wooden flour bins. There was really old fashioned cupboards and a couple of doors (Joe Hewitt 1999). Ironically, it was this pantry that had the only counter space, and it wasn't used. Joe says, "I never remember anybody doing anything other than they stored - like they had flour [in there]."
The summer kitchen or "back kitchen" was also beyond the stove area. It served a number of functions, primarily for the Hewitt family and workers.

That was a summer kitchen because they cooked with wood and it was so damn hot. They just called it the back kitchen. And we used to eat in that in summer time and it was pretty rough. It wasn't finished up much. You could see the rafters; we used to keep our fish poles on the rafters ...

[There was] a table and there was a cupboard and stuff back there. I slept out there a lot in the summer time, when we had boarders. There was an old couch out there and I used to sleep on that (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Sarah remembers Martha and Jack sleeping in the summer kitchen.

The summer kitchen then became a summer bedroom for my grandparents. They turned it into a bedroom so that they could get away from everybody ...

... It was somewhat removed from everybody, so they would sleep out there in the summer. And the guests could party and carry on and do their thing because there was a juke box out in the front room (Sarah Hewitt 1998).

"We were so busy, we could hardly sit down to eat," said Martha. Joe remembers that

[We] never sat down and ate ... I take that back. When she fed the boarders, I would eat. If Ralph Felter was working there she would always feed anybody that was working there. Like he did carpenter [work], and I'd be working around with him ... and we'd just go in, we'd eat in the back kitchen (Joe Hewitt 1999).

An important service area, beyond the rear stairs on the first floor, was the walk-in chill room and freezer installed by Jack and Lee Keator in the 1940s. Built on a concrete block foundation that formed a walk-in cellar on
the lower level, the cooler/freezer was an old Army field freezer that came in sections. Jack bought several sections from a farmer in Gilboa who originally acquired it for his chicken business (Joe Hewitt 1999). Above the walk-in freezer were the four newest bedrooms; together they formed the second part of the rear ell.

Down cellar from the kitchen was the laundry area.

There were three windows:

Because that's how my grandparents hung clothes out - line after line. There were three clothes lines. One with sheets and towels, because the washer was here and you could just open the window and hang out your laundry, and close the window (Sarah Porter 1998).

Before there was plumbing, Sarah believes, laundry was done down cellar in a washtub that now decorates the yard. Whether with piped hot water, or earlier with a tub and hauled water, Martha did the laundry for the guests: bedding, towels, and at the end of the season, forty pairs of curtains. Guests did their own personal laundry.

They used my washing machine. ... I should never have allowed that, either. Because it was too much confusion ... Some of them took it to the laundry ... they must have had a laundry down in Margaretville ... Some of them washed out things in the wash basin upstairs, put it in their room (Martha Hewitt 1997).

In her interview, Martha talked less about routine cleaning that must have gone on daily, and weekly between customers, but more about end of the season cleaning: not only forty pairs of curtains, but windows to wash as well.
Floor and wall surfaces seem to have been smooth and hard, especially in areas of heavy use. Linoleum was laid throughout the house (with the intriguing exception of Grandma Hewitt’s room) and the kitchen was painted regularly. Joe describes his Grandmother Hewitt painting the kitchen when he was young, just before the boarding period.

I can remember when I was a kid ... My grandmother used to paint this every once in a while. This was before boarders when they were farming - I was just a little kid - and they painted it brown. She got brown paint somewhere, and painted it brown. And then she got green and red and yellow and maybe even blue ... And she’d paint that brown, and it dried. And then she’d spot it. [Joe gestures, snapping wrist as in sowing seed]. Put spots all over ... And then that would take a couple days to dry, so ... she’d put planks up ... and that was what you walked on when you was in the kitchen while the paint was drying. I always loved that story. I guess they painted it that way so it didn’t show dirt much. Couple times, I remember her painting that a couple of times. Spotting it (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Outdoors and Recreation

As the child of the proprietors of the boarding house, Joe Hewitt was not expected to help out indoors other than moving beds. Outdoors his job was to keep the lawns mowed, and apparently he did a lot of it.

Mowing yards! Man, I hate to mow yards too. I didn’t like to mow yards. I don’t like moving beds and I don’t like mowing yards ... that’s the biggest waste of time I could ever think of (Joe Hewitt 1999).
Joe developed many other outdoors interests and pursuits as an adult that he may have started while still a youngster at the boarding house: bee keeping, fishing, trapping, and making maple syrup.

The outdoors had a different meaning for boarders. Adults played golf at the nearby Kass Inn course, went for hikes and walks, and sat in chairs on the lawn while they talked or played games. Scrabble and cards were popular, and the players would move to the porch or the front room if it were more comfortable.

The front porch was a central point for the guests because in inclement weather, since it was covered, you could be outside, yet out of the rain ... but when it was nice people sat both on chairs on the porch and on the edge of the porch, and did such things as [playing] checkers ... (Mike Finberg 1998).

The lawn south of the house was the site of the fireplace where guests roasted marshmallows and had cookouts.

Another outdoor space intrigued Mike, because it was a kind of transition space from the family’s back kitchen to the outside.

It was a little interesting and fun for me as a kid - off the right side and in the back, there were a couple of pine trees and there was an old soda cooler ... and there was a spring nearby and the Hewitts had devised some way for the water from the spring to flow into and out of this cooler which kept bottles of soda cold. This was an occasional treat ... There were blue stone stairs and I think this is where I’m remembering Jack occasionally came outside to smoke. It wasn’t a space where any time we wanted we could go and get a soda ... It has some air of mystery
to me and I’m not sure if that was because of the physical space or because of the treat of occasionally having a soda kept cold by the spring. (Mike Finberg 1998).

There was no television at Crystal Spring Farm in the 1950s, so after dinner adults and children would sometimes walk to the Denver Store which had one pinball machine [and] penny pretzel sticks and other kinds of penny or two penny or nickel candy. So the group would walk down ... to the Denver Store which was run by Jean and John Kelly ... I don’t know what the adults did ... there was no bar or any other reason [for the adults to go there] ... And then we walked back, and then soon after that ... we went to bed (Mike Finberg 1998).

On these walks, Mike learned to situate himself differently on the road. The street in his suburban home town was a place to play stick ball. On the way to the Denver Store we all learned to walk on the side of the street where the approaching traffic could see us - which was again new for kids from the suburbs, because we didn’t walk. We either got rides or we were in the street playing (Mike Finberg 1998).

Mike’s mother organized other excursions away from the farm, including several "adventures."

[We] would regularly have a couple of adventures in the two weeks. One was "Indian Trail," which Mom - maybe it was just a trail through the woods, but at that age we could go to the ... [Margaretville] Department Store and get an Indian headdress or a rubber spear, and march along the Indian Trail. I think that was a credit to Mom’s imagination ... We would do something similar with the haunted house (Mike Finberg 1998).

Of course, there was swimming.
I was filling my time with the swimming hole, which simply was a dammed up part of the creek, over which went a wooden bridge that has two support timbers and wood planking, so we could jump off the bridge or lie down on the bridge and see the suckers beneath (Mike Finberg 1998).

John and Doris Hewitt lived in the little house out back; their four children, Beth, Michael, David and Sarah, grew up there. Before they were old enough to work in the boarding house they played with guests’ children.

I don’t know if there were rules that determined it - but those children, Martha’s grandchildren, were around often, and we incorporated both play and time with them. But they had certain restrictions where - not that they couldn’t mix with the guests, but they didn’t join us for dinner ... but they could as I remember join us in the swimming hole (Mike Finberg 1998).

Crystal Spring Farm, even though it was not a working farm anymore, was "a place to be and to find out things or experiences that were not going to happen in Malverne, Long Island," continues Mike Finberg. It was a place where he encountered wildlife: "a newt or a salamander or a woodchuck - these were all animals ... we didn’t have at home." At the Hewitts’ Mike had his first experiences with guns for hunting and knives for carving walking sticks. BB guns and pellet guns were available. The father of another boarding family, the Workmans, took Mike hunting woodchucks.

We went hunting woodchucks as sport and we would spend hours at it. And we never ate the woodchuck, the farmers never asked us to rid their fields of woodchucks. It was just a way to use guns ... I remember the fields and the view, and [Mr. Workman] would have binocularars and sometimes
the rifles would be very powerful, 30-30s, or a 30-06, so that was exciting for me (Mike Finberg 1998).

One time Mike took the BB gun, went into the barn and shot a bird. It didn’t die and he had to finish killing it. It was "sufficiently unpleasant" that he stopped hunting.

The outdoors around the farmhouse was a work location for Hewitts, mowing lawns, hanging out laundry, gardening, tending buildings, and occasionally relaxing. For children, it was a place to play, and to lay the groundwork for adulthood. Learning to use a gun was a rite of passage for Mike Finberg; for young Joe Hewitt, early outdoor activities led to lifetime passions.

Privacy

Boarders were not expected to spend time in the kitchen, especially the area around the stoves. "This was all private stuff here," says Joe Hewitt. Around the stoves it was kind of isolated. There wouldn’t be a lot of traffic there. Somebody might ... walk in and out of the back kitchen or something, but most generally you stayed out of there when they were trying to serve and cook because it was just pandemonium in there (Joe Hewitt 1999).

When asked how she felt the lack of privacy, Martha comments that boarders would "come in the kitchen and stand there and talk," when she was trying to get a meal prepared.
We never would come in [the front room] ... once in a while I might come and sit down for a little while, but there was always so much work to do that I was always glad to go to bed early (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Lack of privacy to Martha, in this instance, was being observed or even impeded at her work. It wasn’t having to share bathrooms or giving up her bedroom that made her feel the lack. More than space, she worried about the demands of business on her time.

Joe - you know Joe, my son? - Well, he was a little boy, about four years old, and one day he came in and I felt so bad, cause he - you know, you couldn’t give him the attention that he really needed. He’d play with the kids ... and he says, "Mommy when are we going to be boarders?" (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Martha thought that Joe got along well with the boarders’ children; he would play with them and was always ready to go swimming with them, but in fact, Joe disliked the boarding business.

I never liked it. I never liked them people around. I didn’t really dislike them, but I just didn’t really ... (Joe Hewitt 1999).

It was a relief to all the Hewitt family members when the end of the season came.

... and I would think sometimes just before a holiday ... and I was praying for the day to be Labor Day so they’d go home ... have a little time to yourself. But then you had so much cleaning to do ... (Martha Hewitt 1997).

As soon as the boarders left, according to Joe
it was like letting the air out of a balloon ... I went back to school, the old man went back to work in the feed mill, Ma always - generally worked out somewhere ... in the insurance agency or something (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Boarding Year Round

Improved transportation had enabled the boarding business in the first place, and in the 1950s and 60s better highways reduced the driving time from the metropolitan area to the Catskills from eight or nine hours to three hours. Increased access contributed to a new year round schedule for boarding houses.

I can remember they used to come on the train and we'd go down to Arkville to the train. And then ... not very long after the war they started running busses up here. And then we used to go to the bus. Sometimes we'd go two, three times a day to the bus [at Christian's Drug Store in Margaretville.] ... And then they built the Thruway and that totally changed the boarding business because they always used to leave in September. But then we started getting hunters and skiers and then we wound up we had people all year round (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Sometimes guests would come for the Jewish holidays in September, and in October people would come to see the leaves and hunters would arrive for small game. There were even times when the place was rented for Thanksgiving which overlapped with hunters and deer season in November. "We never took anybody on Christmas. That was a day that we reserved for ourselves," Martha asserted. By the time Sarah Porter was working for Martha and Jack, there were also
boarders during ski season, turning Crystal Spring Farm into an almost year round business.

Even though the boarding season had expanded, the spatial impact in the cooler seasons was not as great as summer boarding had been.

In the winter time they never were really full for the most part ... Summertime they ... were jammed. That was it. Every closet, everywhere they could put a bed they would have somebody. But during the hunting season and the ski season, they weren’t [so full] ... I had my own room. I never got run out of my room (Joe Hewitt 1999).

Hunters and skiers did not stay for weeks at a time. Skiers came primarily on weekends, "big bus loads of young people" according to Sarah; hunters would come on the day before hunting season and stay several days, then return the next weekend.

While time and space were not pinched as much by fall and winter boarders, they did bring a different way of enjoying the place that affected Martha’s and Jack’s privacy. There was a juke box in the front room, and skiers and hunters liked to stay up late.

They had boarders who would stay up all night, partying and playing the jukebox, and dancing out in the front room, because it was linoleum then, and they moved the tables aside (Sarah Porter 1998).

But then there was a lot of noise around, because they ... Wow, they would stay up half the night playing cards and when they would get a good hand, they would scream bloody murder. We were sleeping there (Martha Hewitt 1997).
According to Sarah, this is one reason Martha and Jack slept in the back kitchen on occasion. Hunters were not as interested in the family atmosphere that had attracted summer guests.

No, they'd just sit around the table and play cards ... And another thing that used to annoy me too, they'd want to go hunting for the day and take their [lunch] - I put their lunches up. And then I would cook just for the ones that didn't go out. ... They just didn't want to go out - they would stay in bed. And then they'd come and in they would have eaten the lunch I'd packed, and then they'd sit down and eat another lunch (Martha Hewitt 1997).

The Decline of Boarding

While hunters and skiers were discovering the benefits of off-season boarding houses, summer visitors had found other alternatives. Suburban families, according to Martha, "would travel a lot more; they would drive different places, go to Europe, go to California" rather than board in the Catskills. Also, some families that had been boarders established summer or vacation homes in the area. Mike Finberg's mother and his step father had a house in Roxbury Run, a development of suburban style homes built on a subdivided farm not far from Crystal Spring Farm. Another boarder retired to the nearby town of Bovina, even though his wife was still employed in the city and had to commute each week. Mike Finberg had such fond memories of the area
that as an adult he moved permanently to Margaretville where he and his wife, Joanne, have raised their family.

By the 1970s Martha’s and Jack’s boarding business focussed on weekends as much as it did on the summer season. Though Martha remembered deciding to retire at age sixty-five, she and Jack got out of the boarding business gradually.

I was sixty-five when I said, "This is it." I wasn’t feeling too good then and so I said, "This is it; I won’t take another boarder." But I did take ... I had some fishermen that used to come and I got very friendly with them (Martha Hewitt 1997).

Sarah recalls that rather than pay high rates for heating such a large house.

We closed the house down and they lived in the downstairs apartment. They did that for about three or four years in a row ... But they would open it up for big groups. They’d come over here and they’d open it back up and these big groups of hunters and skiers would come and occupy the entire house ... Probably in the late seventies ... she gradually stopped cooking and then she still had guests and she allowed them to use the kitchen to make their own meals. And then it gradually changed that she wouldn’t have them cooking in the kitchen anymore, and then the guests stopped coming (Sarah Porter 1998).

Martha stayed in touch with many boarders, who wrote letters and visited her. Occasionally she would see former boarders. The one living in Bovina would drop of trout during fishing season. Or she might run into Mike Finberg in Margaretville.

If I happen to be in a restaurant or something, he comes in, puts his arms around my neck and kisses me
and everything. He's such a nice [man] (Martha Hewitt 1997).

**Current Residents: Sarah Hewitt Porter and Rick Porter**

In 1988 Sarah and Rick Porter bought Crystal Spring Farm from Jack and Martha, giving them a life right to live there in the "existing apartment" and with "joint use of lands" (Delaware County Deed Book 698 p. 1112). This arrangement continued the family practice of housing elders, going back to Amanda Boughton McEwan, Sarah McEwan Hewitt, and John Sutter.

Jack died shortly after the transfer of the property in 1988; Martha lived in the little apartment in the oldest part of the house until her death in 1998. Sarah and Rick undertook a major renovation of the house, removing the back kitchen and the walk-in freezer (a tremendous task), modernizing the kitchen with built in cabinets, and opening up the space that had been the boarders' rear dining rooms and the pantry. The kitchen retains its rectangular shape, but now opens over a counter into the dining room. The "little dining room" that Joe remembered as an enclosed back porch is now fully winterized and is used as a sitting room adjacent to kitchen and dining. Behind the rear stairs they have added another bathroom. Upstairs the Porters and their children have used the bedrooms in the upright, wing, and
the first part of the rear ell. The second part, the newest bedrooms, are used for storage.

The front room is still called the living room sometimes, but it lacks the upholstered furniture, television, etc., that the name might imply today. It contains a piano, the Franklin stove moved from the oldest part of the house, a Victorian coat tree, and a dining table with a nice flower arrangement. While it may serve a variety of family uses, it also has public ones. I once attended a 4-H meeting there in which the socializing and refreshments were located in the kitchen-dining-sitting space, while the 4-Hers projects were displayed in the front room. And after Martha’s funeral, the buffet was in the front room, but most everyone visited with each other in the new social spaces or in Martha’s apartment living room - the oldest space in the house, where she had begun housekeeping, where her children were born.

Meaning of the Boarding Experience

The place that Martha and Jack created for their summer boarders was in many ways an extension of family life for them. While the focus was relaxation and recreation, children and adults could use Crystal Springs Farm for serious rites of passage of childhood, as in Mike Finberg’s
case, and of adulthood in the case of his mother for whom it was an appropriate place to handle grief.

Boarding families developed relationships with Martha and Jack, but also with each other. Mike Finberg’s mother met her second husband, a boarder, through Martha. Two brothers who came as boarders married two sisters from another boarding family.

There was that chemistry among the people with both Martha and Jack, certainly as host and hostess - and then [among] the group that evolved to decide to spend two weeks of the summer together (Mike Finberg 1998).

Even though it was only two weeks that the families spent together each year, it created what Mike calls an "instant bond" that was recognizable when Crystal Spring Farm boarders met thirty years later. Children of the Kusnikoff family went with Mike Finberg to visit Martha recently and "had that link reforged" (Mike Finberg 1998).

The boarding house at Crystal Spring Farm, then, was successful because of human relationships. Its rural setting and good food at a reasonable price played their part, but the enduring effect seems to come from the bonds created among boarders and between boarders and the Hewitts. Indeed, Martha’s interview about the boarding house is devoted more to describing the people she got to know than it is to the business itself or the spaces it took place in. As Joe Hewitt says:
She liked the people. You can't like that business other than she liked being around people. She was very gregarious and liked being around people (Joe Hewitt 1999).

For the Hewitt family, Martha's and Jack's children, and their children, the boarding business had a different meaning than it did for the boarders. For Joe, as he has already explained, the boarders were an intrusion on his childhood. For Sarah, on the other hand, who worked at the boarding house at a later period, the boarders opened up new areas of experience.

If it weren't for some of the boarders - the experiences we had growing up as children here - we never would have had if it weren't for the boarders. That's how I got to go the World's Fair, that's how I visited [White Plains] for the very first time, went on a bus ride for the very first time ... The other big educational experience for us was that three-quarters of the people who came here were Jewish ... We learned so much from [them] ... If someone came and they were kosher, [Ma] would try her best, and that's how I learned about that.

Grant Rose, whose family invited the Hewitt children to White Plains, now lives just down the road from Crystal Spring Farm; he and his wife and children are regular visitors at Crystal Spring Farm.

The contrast between city and country families was evident to Sarah growing up and working at the boarding house.

[We] always felt sorry for the city kids, because they loved it here ... not like a class difference, definitely the kids that came here were a little bit more upper class. Their
families were - they just had a different lifestyle ... They had more money, they drove nice cars, they could afford to come here ... But we always felt that we had more than them. We always felt that they were the ones that were cheated (Sarah Porter 1998).

When the Roxbury Run subdivision of suburban-style vacation homes was built there was a significant difference in the relationship between the more recent city arrivals and the established rural families.

It seems in a sense that it brought in different people ... It was really hard to be friends ... They were snobbier [than the boarders had been], plain and simple, which really is hard. It’s hard to be friends [with people like that]. I tried ... [The boarders] had come to stay in what was considered my home. They were being allowed to stay here, so it was different. These [Roxbury Run] people would choose not to have anything to do with you and they did. They chose not to have anything to do with a lot of people (Sarah Hewitt Porter 1998).

Interestingly, this uncomfortable relationship exists even though some of the people who bought houses in Roxbury Run, had been boarders at Crystal Spring Farm.

Conclusion: Space Use Analysis

Crystal Spring Farm has gone through stages in its spatial development that are now familiar for farms in the Catskills: beginning with a small unified space, enlarged to accommodate more productive activities on a diversified farm beginning to commercialize its dairy; then enlarged several times to provide more specialized rooms and to take in the
families of hired men and to take in boarders; and finally renovated as a single family home.

The house type with the single main room, with generalized or integrated use of space for many work and family roles, may have existed for as much as forty or fifty years, from the time of the first known farmers, the Mullineux family in the early nineteenth century. The Hewitt's farmhouse could have begun as a log house, a few of which were still evident in Roxbury's rural neighborhoods as late as the 1850s (U.S. Census Town of Roxbury, Montgomery Hollow 1850; see also a photograph in DeNatale 1987, page 33). It would have been replaced later by the not much larger timber frame house that is encased in the present structure. Mid-century brought the "productive" house type, which sheltered agricultural activities that may have taken place outdoors or had to share space in the one room house in the past. It was elaborated with additional bed chambers and a separate kitchen in the wing, allowing the original room to become a parlor or sitting room. A rear wing included spaces for the new specialization in butter - such as the buttery, and other service areas. It also added enough space upstairs to accommodate a hired man's family. Up to this point the spaces in the farmhouse were in general occupied by farm family and farm workers.
It was the additional space for the hired man’s family that enabled Amanda Boughton McEwan to consider running the farm herself. Farmhouses with this kind of accommodation for hired men, either groups of men or families, have been discussed by Sally McMurry who found them in published designs from 1859 (McMurry 1988 [1997] figure 4-4). With sufficient help, Amanda could keep the family farm going until her daughter and son in law could run it. The space for another family was necessary again when Amanda’s daughter joined her in running the farm, with the help of Sadie’s young son, Jack. Hired men, though not necessarily families, continued to work on the farm the mid-twentieth century, even when Jack was an adult.

It is unclear when the kitchen was moved from the lateral wing to its present position at the end of the first rear ell. Eight feet wide, and extending the width of the rear ell, its shape indicates that it was no longer expected to be a social space, though it might be a work space in which workers sat down to do their tasks. The pantry area and the narrow kitchen may have been intended when they were built to be efficient and "step-saving" and a relief from drudgery. While this seemingly compact kitchen plus pantry may resemble progressive turn of the century ideas, the builder, farmer or cook who designed the space added to it the traditional summer kitchen, a continuity with past
plans. By the time Martha and Jack were cooking for boarders, the summer kitchen was a haven for family and farm workers, and the pantry was only for storage; the kitchen may have been considered crowded, but its former functions - such as family eating space - were taken on by the summer kitchen.

Like the Townsends and the Mechs, the Hewitts fell back on well-known ways of using space to be able to accommodate the boarding business in their house. They added space for boarders rather than renovating their work space or accommodations for the family. Family members worked and socialized in the rear of the house, and gave up their sleeping quarters for guests. Except for elders, during the boarding period bedrooms (especially for children) were not identified with individuals. Like the Townsend and Mech children, the Hewitt offspring were expected to accept alternative sleeping arrangements. Sleeping even took place in what had been a kitchen (the back kitchen), next to the active kitchen, and sometimes even in the cow barn.

"It wasn’t easy because you didn’t have a normal life," Martha pointed out. Martha hesitated and seemed about to say what it would have been like if her family had had a separate house from the boarders’ quarters. The cottage could have been that house, but it was built as all bedrooms. The little house out back was built for Martha’s
and Jack's family one summer, but soon after was needed for son John's family. By the time she and Jack had their own apartment again, their children were grown and no longer lived with them. I had the sense that what stopped Martha from wishing for a separate house, retrospectively in her interview, was that she knew it was necessary for the business that her family live in the same house as the boarders, not only to keep track of its details, but also to provide that desired "family atmosphere." Clearly, the sense of one family visiting another represented the meaningful difference to Mike Finberg and his family, and to Sarah Porter who grew up at Crystal Spring Farm on the cusp between urban and rural societies.

As a case study, this account of the Crystal Spring farm house shows how hired men's families might have been accommodated; it also shows that the pattern of spatial development, from single room to multiple winged structure, can happen in an upright and wing house type as easily in a Georgian house type. But most importantly, the Hewitt's experiences within the spaces of this farmhouse-turned-boarding house reveal the meaning that it had for them, and the roles that meaning plays in their lives today. A house that was no longer a farm house provided for both groups, the boarders and the Hewitt family, a bridge between two
cultures, each of which benefitted by experiences taken for granted by the other (Figures 6-18 and 6-19).
NOTES

(1) Discrepancy between two figures may reflect other land Joseph owned. The Whipple farm was not the only property he bought in 1863-65.

(2) Hired men were present through on the farm into the twentieth century. Family recollections include stories about single hired men. The federal census indicates the presence of what may have been a hired man’s family in the 1920s, and family memories describe the former design of the house to provide separate accommodations for them. See below.

(3) See the account of the smokehouse’s construction on page 19.

(4) Joe Hewitt tells two stories about hired men that he remembers:

JH: This bedroom here we had a hired man - I’m trying to think what the hell his name was - he was a teacher. I just remember having him as a very, very little kid. We had one guy named George [Lyon] but it wasn’t George. But he played the fiddle this guy. One of the first memories that I have as a child was - he slept in this middle bedroom - was sitting on his bed, and I don’t know why I was there ... there was a couple of closets ... And he says, "I’ll play you a tune on my fiddle." And he went over to the closet and he got the fiddle, and that’s all I remember ... He was quiet, a very quiet man.

George Lyons was a big gruff guy.... Too bad you didn’t talk to the old man about hired men. God, he had some characters. ... You could do a thesis on ... hired men. ... They are so cool.

VS: They’ve showed up in two different interviews. Why do you say they’re so cool?

JH: They’re just characters, most of them. ... The only ones I remember is George Lyons and this guy ... I can see him, small man. His name escapes me. George was a big gruff guy. I can see him. He called my grandmother "Sadie." And he’d eat pretty good. He’d sit to the table there and he’d eat and he’d push his plate back and say "By God, Sadie, that was pretty good." He’d sit there a minute
and he'd say, "I think I'll have some more." [laughs] And he'd [cuff] off some more.

I remember he cut his foot terrible with an axe. He hated thorn brush and bushes. He couldn't stand to have a bush on the place. And over by the big knoll there was a strip of brush that went up through there, just rocks. It wasn't even pasture it was just - wasn't nothing. Hadn't even cleared it. And he was over there cutting that brush for whatever reason, and laid his foot open with a double bitted axe - I can remember that - it was during the summer. And boy he did a pretty good job on it.

VS: Did he recover?

JH: Oh, yeah, I guess he must have. I just remember them bringing him over to the house there and his foot was bleeding pretty good (Joe Hewitt 1999).

(5) Mike Finberg tells a story about immodest guests that shows the oldest room was used for boarders:

That guest room was notable one summer because it was occupied by .. a mother and two daughters, but they were all older, so the mother -- the two daughters were women ... and they undressed with the shades up, and the activity then after dinner was that there were a group of men and boys ... sitting out under those big pine trees which are no longer there -- in the dark on the same front lawn, watching this. And I think the story got where Jack as the "enforcer" ... finally had to ask them either to put down the shades or actually to leave. But this in the absence of television and in the entrance of prurient interest was big activity. So I know that that was a guest room (Mike Finberg 1998).


(7) Though Sarah's account shows Jack going off to work at the feed mill, according to Joe Hewitt he often did not work outside the farm in the summer. It was a slow time at the mill and thus he could stay home and help with the boarding business.
CHAPTER 7

Conclusion: Space Use in Farmhouses That Became Boarding Houses

Much has been made of the Victorians' specialization of room use and their sharp division of public and private family space within the house to support their view of the family as a haven from a corrupting public world. Following them, early twentieth century reformers emphasized step-saving efficiency to prevent drudgery, cleanable surfaces to promote health and individual bedrooms to support children's psychological development.

In analyzing farm houses it is important to remember that these trends were associated with the middle class, and with the urban/suburban environment. Rural populations were not merely left behind by nineteenth century progress and migration to cities (Barron 1984). They were the ones who chose to stay in the country, for whom rural life was preferable to the city, even if rural economics posed great difficulties. One way for farm families to deal with the challenges of the commercialization of the milk industry was to produce more income on the farm by taking boarders. When
farm families adapted their houses and space use patterns to accommodate boarders, they could choose whether or not to respond to metropolitan trends, which often arrived in the rural areas via prescriptive literature (McMurry 1997 [1988]). They might choose to emphasize one aspect of Victorian space values, such as formality of the Townsends’ parlor, or they might incorporate reformers’ criteria by installing linoleum (as at Averys’ and Hewitts’ boarding houses). They could also retain former usages, as they did at all three boarding houses studied here, by preserving certain aspects of the generalized use of space associated with the preindustrial household. Innovations and traditions in space use, therefore, could exist side by side.

In the nineteenth century, farm families had had generations of experience taking in unrelated individuals, such as apprentices, domestic workers and farm laborers, as well as caring for dependent relatives. More recently, farm dwellings were altered to house hired men in spaces cut off from the farm family’s part of the house (McMurry 1988 [1997]). The need to protect the family from the intrusion of workers was a reflection of the concern in the Victorian era for privacy, and marked a distinct change from the earlier corporate use of space associated with the preindustrial household, when unrelated individuals lived in
the same spaces as the family. The Boughton house in the Denver valley had just such a separate entrance and quarters for hired men. At one point, this portion of the house sheltered a hired man and his family, much in the way roomers were accommodated separately from the farm family in the boarding house in Bragg Hollow.

The two boarding houses that had evolved from preindustrial farmhouses, Boughton/Hewitts’ and Hubbell/Townsends’, were altered repeatedly. The farm families adapted them for boarders by increasing the number of bedrooms and by adding an element not very common in the farmhouses with which they were familiar in southeastern Delaware County. When bedrooms for boarders were added, they were connected not directly to each other but to a hallway, as in contemporary hotels. In the Boughton house in Denver Valley, taking boarders may have been the reason to carve a hallway out of bedrooms at the top of the stairs in the upright and wing sections and to provide a hall for the bedrooms in the first part of the rear ell (1). The hallway in this case may have seemed to be necessary to provide boarders with more privacy from each other than the connected rooms of a farmhouse upstairs would offer. There were many more boarders, individually and as family groups, than there previously had been hired hands or workers and their families living in the farmhouses.
In Bragg Hollow, the Hubbells raised the second story and built an ell for additional bedrooms and work space. They included a new, central hall that provided a buffer for family groups renting upstairs and downstairs rooms. In the Townsends’ usage - and possibly earlier under the Hubbells - the house was effectively divided into two separate apartments by sealing doors onto the central corridor. The architectural changes for accommodating boarders, therefore, reflected the same needs for family privacy that in the past had led to separate quarters for the hired men.

Living spaces clearly were mutable during the boarding season. What had been a parlor in the roomers’ side of the Townsends’ house was converted to a bedroom and both visitors and farm family used their dining rooms as gathering spots. The Hewitts’ and the Mechs’ living rooms became dining rooms and the Mechs’ family dining room became a bedroom. Summer was probably the time the farm family needed their living rooms the least. With three meals a day to cook and clean up, more and different garden crops to produce, chickens to butcher, lawns and buildings to maintain, and long days spent in the hayfields, there was little time to sit indoors (Brown 1995). According to one informant, it was time with each other, more than space, that farm families lost because of boarders.
As for the boarders, it is clear from all three case studies that their "living room" was outdoors on the porch or lawn as much as possible. Adult boarders at Townsends might be found going for walks, or out in the fields haying or in the barn milking. For the children, the lawn, the barn, the stream (and at Hewitts' the swimming hole) constituted their playroom. For the Mech children the city youngsters were welcome playmates, and at Hewitts' visiting children could engage in country activities unavailable to them in the suburbs such as fishing and hunting. Especially in the earlier form of boarding, in which the farm family only rented rooms to the visitors, the flexibility of interior living space, the type of work that went on inside the house and outdoors, and the kinds of outdoor recreational activities of the boarders were not that different from the way life had gone on in these farmhouses in the past. The same activities, and therefore spaces, that represented leisure for the boarders, meant work for the proprietors and their families. The greatest disruption and demand for investment in construction or renovation was, as we have seen, in providing bedrooms for boarders. In all three cases, bedrooms upstairs and in added wings were reserved for boarders. Though hallways at the Townsends' and at the Boughton house provided privacy from each other for boarding families, these boarding houses lacked an exclusive
sleeping zone for the host family and did not emphasize individual privacy for farm family members or roomers. To make best use of the available space in the farmhouse for producing income, the farm family fell back on space use practices they may have known from the past. Farm children were expected to give up their bedrooms for boarders, and slept "all over the place." This practice resembled the way children were relegated to the loft in single room preindustrial homes, and may still have been rural children’s experience during the boarding off-season. Similarly, bedrooms for the primary farm couple had been retained or added on the first floor, opening into kitchens or living rooms, as they had in preindustrial farm houses. These first floor bedrooms opening into social or work spaces were still being used in the 1940s and 1950s, even though suburban housing standards had for over a generation argued for individual bedrooms for family members, in a part of the house separate from public or service spaces (Cromley 1992). Children’s and parent’s sleeping spaces were not the only traditional adaptations employed by farm family, or boarders, to make cohabiting work.

The boarders’ way of inhabiting the house also reflected what might have been former or existing space use in their city dwellings. For example, at the boarding houses whole families stayed in one room, sharing beds as
they might have in a small city apartment. At Townsends' there is evidence of a close relationship between traditional space use in farmhouses and tenement living in the city. The long, narrow shape of the respective precincts of farm family and roomers, created by sealing off the downstairs central corridor, strikingly resembles urban tenements (Cromley 1990). Like the tenements, the first floor rooms at Townsends' were arranged so that residents in the "apartments" had to pass through one room to get to another. Preindustrial farmhouses, such as the classic cottage in Bragg Hollow that preceded the boardinghouse, and the upright and wing at Boughtons' in the Denver Valley, also originally lacked hallways. By being connected the rooms accommodated more generalized rather than specialized space use. The plans for the Townsend "apartments" therefore reflect space usage that was found in both urban and rural environments.

It should not be surprising that the two groups--city visitors and rural hosts--seem to share similar ideas of furnishing and using rooms. Neither of them came from middle-class suburban or urban backgrounds, and so would be unlikely to adhere to the tenets of Victorian ideology or reformists’ doctrine. The earliest boarders in this study, at Hubbell Mountain House in the 1880s, may have been white-collar vacationers, but by the time the Townsends and Mechs
took roomers in the 1930s, their clientele consisted of working people, primarily immigrants from eastern Europe. What is more, three of the boarding house proprietors studied here (Charles and Antonina Mech, and Martha Sutter Hewitt) were themselves from immigrant families and moved to the country from the city.

While both city visitors and farm families in these case studies relied on former or currently familiar patterns of space use in adapting to live together for a season, there were changes other than adding hallways to make the farmhouses more suitable for boarding. There were rooms to be subdivided to accommodate more boarders, linen closets to build and additional bathrooms to install—once the technology was available and affordable—and in two of three case studies kitchens were re-thought and made more convenient. Efficiency was clearly the emphasis for Hewitts and Mechs, who by the 1950s cooked in long, narrow kitchens with generous work surfaces and step-saving U-shaped plans. Hewitts probably inherited their kitchen from Jack’s mother and grandmother, who may have taken boarders themselves. The Mechs, having cooked with roomers in a supposedly more modern, small kitchen in their Queen Anne house, built a kitchen to their own specifications in their newly constructed "summer house." It was a dedicated work area that featured well-planned storage and counters and had no
seating for workers or family meals. The traditional social function of the kitchen for feeding the proprietors' family and for rural visitors was adjusted. While the Mechs used to eat in the main house kitchen after the roomers had finished their meals, in the new summer house farm family spouses and offspring ate in the dining room with the boarders. The Hewitts had a table in the end of the narrow kitchen that they used in the off season for family meals (and for packing Brussels sprouts); when the kitchen was busy serving boarders, family members and local workers or visitors ate in the back kitchen. In these later examples it seems that space divisions and construction did less to protect family privacy at meals, and more to protect the work space. Principles of efficient space use and step-saving were adopted when they would ease the increased burden of providing hotel-like services to more transient guests. Major investments of time, energy and money went into those aspects of the enterprise that would produce income, focussing on the farmhouse as a work place, consistent with its function for several generations before there were boarders.

A major change took place at all three boarding houses at about the same time, c. 1950. Mechs and Hewitts constructed separate buildings for boarders, and Viola Avery went out of the boarding business. Viola emphasized that it
was the lack of privacy and the intensity of the seasonal work that led her to take year-round state mental patients instead of boarders. It was another way to use the big Bragg Hollow house to produce income to pay off the farm, but with fewer, more tractable residents and a work load evenly spread throughout the year.

The Mechs and Hewitts built separate structures to increase the number of boarders they could accommodate, but also to provide more private space for themselves and for families who by the 1950s had shorter vacations. The Mechs included a dining room in their "summer house" and thus regained the use of the social areas in their house. The Hewitts' "cottage" without a kitchen or dining room was all bedrooms and bathrooms. At both boarding houses, the main house continued to offer bedrooms for boarders, and the Hewitts' main house also provided dining space.

The decision to construct separate buildings, not attached ells, may have come from a number of factors, including the carpenters' habits and experiences and the shape and location of the building. Jack Hewitt had already added a second part to the rear ell at Crystal Spring Farm, and may have felt he had exhausted the possibilities for additions. The Mech house, based on a suburban model, did not lend itself to additions. It is unlikely that separate buildings were cheaper, because the new structures required
plumbing distinct from the main house’s system (interior piping, fixtures, but also septic tank and field). By partly separating out the economic function of the boarding business, both the Mechs and the Hewitts gained some privacy for their families. Increased numbers of bedrooms also accommodated boarders’ needs for more individual privacy, providing separate rooms for adults and children in the same family (Finberg 1998). While more rooms meant more income, putting them in a separate building reduced the load on the main house, gave back to the family some social spaces (in the Mech’s case) and may have reduced the intrusions in their work spaces, especially the kitchen, that all three proprietors complained about.

The farm families could have built the new structures for themselves, and let the main house be the seasonal residence for boarders. The Hewitts did this one summer when they overbooked the main house and Jack built the little house out back. The Hewitts lived in it that summer, but soon it was needed for son John and his family. Apparently, it provided the familial privacy for John, his wife, and children, but Martha, Jack, and younger son Joe went back to living with the boarders in the main house thereafter. The pattern of incorporating boarders in one’s household was a time-honored method, it was practical, and it was part of the boarders’ image of the farm vacation to
live as part of the farm family. (Significantly, boarders went on calling the Hewitt place a "farm" long after Jack sold the cows.) Former boarder Mike Finberg agrees that it was the relationship with the host family, as much as the built accommodations, the food, and the recreational possibilities that made Crystal Spring Farm attractive to his family and others (Finberg 1999).

Several who experienced boarding from the proprietor's point of view continued until recently the tradition of housing unrelated individuals or maintaining multiple households on the same place. Though she no longer lives on the Bragg Hollow Farm, Bernice Townsend Spielman and her husband, Les, have raised twenty-five foster children, as many as four at a time, along with their own four children. Martha Hewitt, until she died last fall, lived in the oldest part of the Hewitt house. Her grand-daughter, Sarah, with husband, Rick, and their children, live in the rest of the house, much as Jack and Martha shared it with Grandmother Hewitt and Grandmother McEwan while they were alive.

The Hewitt's "cottage" and the little house out back have been converted to apartments for local families, making five the total number of households on the place. The Mech house, whose plan and style were modeled on single-family suburban houses in the first place, has given up its multi-family focus and become a vacation home for a family from
Brooklyn. The vacation home represents one of the more positive outcomes of boarding, in which city people become seasonal residents, or in the case of Mike Finberg, a permanent resident of the area they came to love.

Conclusion

Farmhouses that were used as boarding houses were not contested spaces in the sense that country values clashed with city values. Especially in the early days, with roomers rather than boarders, the space use habits of visitors and hosts seem to have had much in common. These similarities existed in part because some farm boarding house proprietors actually came from the same urban working class background as their guests. More significantly, similarities existed because neither the urban guests nor their rural hosts participated in the Victorian, middle-class ideology that separated family and home from occupation. Both had been objects of the early twentieth century reformers who critiqued their "lack of privacy" within the home for the development of family values and individuals' psyches. Both groups knew how to inhabit a house's spaces flexibly and meet their goals, for work and leisure, respectively, without feeling crowded.
Many factors, not the least of which was a workable space use pattern, contributed to the success of these three farm boarding houses. The earliest examples for which there is oral evidence, the Townsends, provided the fewest services for the roomers who intruded least on the living spaces, work spaces, and time of the farm family. There, as at the Mechs' and the Hewitts' in the 1930s and 1940s, urban visitors and rural residents accommodated each other by relying on space use patterns familiar to both groups, and rejected prescriptions of individual privacy and room specialization from the urban middle class. A generation later not only had all the businesses converted to boarding to remain successful but they had also provided more individual accommodations for their now middle-class suburban visitors, often in a structure separate from the main house. The one boardinghouse that had neither retained the lower level of interaction and services of the rooming arrangement, nor provided a separate structure for boarders, went out of business.

Using farmhouses as boarding houses was a way for families to go on making a living at home. They identified, used and changed spaces both to maintain the house's function as a work space and to accommodate visitors. The boarding house proprietors treated the house as a flexible material resource that could be modified to meet their
business needs, taking advantage of recent trends and expectations about housing standards and technology, while respecting the inhabitants' space use patterns. The customary use of generalized space, shared by urban visitors and rural hosts, enabled them to live together for the summer season. Such accommodations, to boarders and to the farm families, were part of country living, a life that included fresh air, home-grown food and, for the farm family, hard work.

Boarding houses with their dual purpose space arrangements have been eclipsed in the second half of the twentieth century by impersonal motels, where tourists and travelers can get what they need without talking to anyone. Toward the end of the boarding period in the 1970s the only vestige of the practice occurred when hunters and skiers came for weekends, and stayed in former boarding houses and in the Bed and Breakfast establishments that were trying to attract tourists. As Martha Hewitt described, they were looking for a country experience very different from the farm family vacation offered in the past.

Taking family vacationers filled a niche for both boarders and farm families in the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. It was an inexpensive way for urban dwellers to enjoy nature and to escape the city in the summer, and for farm families it was
a way to stay on the farm. Because boarding by definition combined the family home with income production, it could not rely on principles of space use that prohibited that combination. Boarding income was essential to supporting the farm enterprise, but also in some cases it was a way to resist the specialization and capitalization needed to become a "factory farm," while maintaining many activities, such as raising one's own food, that are associated with farming.

Nowadays Catskills residents, including both those whose roots in the region go back for generations and those who have recently moved to the mountains, find it difficult, if not impossible, to make a living at home. While most who choose to live in the area where farm boarding was popular engage in rural activities that used to produce income, such as maple syrup production, bee keeping, animal husbandry, and gardening, these pastimes are primarily hobbies. Even the tradition of multiple households among former boarding house families must be supported by what used to be called "working out." For eighty years, however, boardinghouses provided farm families with ways to maintain their occupation and lifestyle. They were successful until the expectations for family privacy and guest services made running a boarding house unappealing to the next generation
and uneconomical in competition with other tourist attractions in the Catskills and nationwide.
NOTES

(1) Interestingly, the most recent bedrooms for boarders added in the 1940s at the rear of the ell did not have a hallway and had to be rented to a family that would share it as an apartment.

INTERVIEWS


Figure 1-1
The three boarding houses in this thesis were in Middletown and Roxbury in Delaware County, New York.

Figure 1-2
Southeastern Delaware County, Towns of Middletown and Roxbury. The three boarding house locations are marked in red.
Figure 1-3
Late eighteenth and early nineteenth century houses on Main Street, Margaretville
Figure 1-4
"Classic Cottage" in Roses Brook, Town of Stamford
Figure 1-5

Nineteenth Century "Georgian" type house

Virginia Scheer's house in Montgomery Hollow, Roxbury

Figure 1-6
A "classic cottage" without a center door
Virginia Scheer's house in Montgomery Hollow, Roxbury
Figure 1-7
Trailers have replaced the farmhouse
Back River Road, Delhi, New York
Figure 1-8
Hubbell’s Mountain Home, 1895.
Reproduced from Galusha’s *As the River Runs*, p. 76.
Figure 1-9
The Mech House, Fleischmanns, New York
Figure 1-10
The Boughton/Hewitt Farm House, 1998
Figure 2-1
The Catskill Mountain House, after renovation in 1846.
Reproduced from Alf Evers's
The Catskills: From Wilderness to Woodstock, p. 440.
Figure 2-2
Grand Gorge Hotel on the Catskill Turnpike
Reproduced from W.W. Munsell's *History of Delaware County*, 1880, p. 305.
Figure 2-3
Listing for Lawrence Shutts, farm house for summer boarders, Prattsville Road, Roxbury
Directory of the Ulster & Delaware Railroad 1888
Courtesy of Ron Ballard
Figure 2-4
Boarders at Townsend's Farm in Bragg Hollow
Courtesy of Bernice Spielman
The Westholm,  
MRS. H. S. PRESTON,  
STAMFORD, DELAWARE COUNTY, N. Y.

Is situated in the western part of the village of Stamford; has accommodations for forty persons. The house is new, and has all modern improvements for the convenience and comfort of the refined and better class of summer visitors. The rooms are large, and many of them connecting, while all have remarkably pleasant views both of mountain and valley. Great care has also been taken to have the plumbing work as perfect as possible. Within five minutes' walk of depot, post office or either of the five churches in the village. Cuisine the best. References given if desired.

Terms: $10 to $18 per week. Special arrangements with parties remaining during the season.

Parties will be met at the depot upon notification. No applications desired from Hebrews.

Figure 2-5
Advertisement: Anti-Semitism in Boarding Houses
Ulster and Delaware Railroad directory, 1902
Helen Gould’s Home Kirkside

*Courtesy of Frances Gorsch*

**Figure 2-7**

Summer estate of Helen Gould Shepard, daughter of financier, Jay Gould.

*History of the Town of Roxbury,* 1995
Figure 2-8
Boarders relaxing at Crystal Spring Farm, Denver, New York
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt

Figure 2-9
The Swimming Hole at Crystal Spring Farm, Denver, New York
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 3-1
Matilda Howard’s design for a farmhouse, 1843, Zanesville, Ohio. 
Reproduced from Sally McMurry’s Families and Farmhouses in Nineteenth Century America, 1997, p. 69
Figure 3-2
Design for a suburban, "Victorian" House

Reproduced from Katherine Grier's "Decline of the Memory Palace: The Parlor After 1890," p. 52.
Figure 3-3
Figure 3-4

Design for a bungalow.

Reproduced from Katherine Crier's "Decline of the Memory Palace: The Parlor After 1890," p. 65.
Figure 3-5
Design for a Ranch House.
Reproduced from Clifford E. Clark's The American Family Home, p. 214
Figure 4-1
D. W. and Huldah Hubbell’s “Classic Cottage” at the Bragg Hollow Farm
Reproduced from Diane Galusha’s *As the River Runs*, p. 136.
Figure 4-2
D.W. and Huldah Hubbell's family, 1908.
Courtesy of Bernice Spielman
Figure 4-3
Floor Plans during Townsends' residency.
Figure 4-4

Bernice Spielman’s brother, Raymond, sits on the horse block. Note the closed shutters on the “roomers’ side” of the house, where they had a bedroom instead of a parlor. Courtesy of Bernice Spielman
Figure 4-5
Plan of the first floor during the Averys' residency.
Figure 4-6
Viola Avery and her husband, Howard Kelly
Figure 4-7
Hubbell/Townsend boarding house, showing Riordans’ renovations
Facade and horse block (top)
West side (bottom)
Figure 5-1
Pioneer Farm, Delaware County
Reproduced from W.W. Munsell's History of Delaware County, New York, 1880, p. 54.
Figure 5-2
The Mech House and Barn, possibly built by Henry and Mary Boughton
Figure 5-3
Panelled Stairs, Front Room, Mech House
Figure 5-4
The Mech House, 1930s-1950
First and Second Floors
Figure 5-5
Charles and Antonina Mech
Courtesy of Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-6
The Mech family dining room used for a holiday meal.
Courtesy Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-7
Antonina Mech and a boarder in the garden above the house.
Courtesy Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-8
Plan of the Mech Farmstead
by Karol Mech
Figure 5-9
The work area between the house and the chicken house, behind Karol Mech and his niece, Linda.
Courtesy of Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-10
The Mech living room at Christmas
Photo courtesy Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-11
Helen Mech, daughter of Charles and Antonina Mech
Courtesy of Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-12
Stella Mech Kelly with infant, Linda
Courtesy of Stella Mech Kelly
Figure 5-13
Anna Mech Kelly, daughter of Antonina and Charles Mech,
with her husband Stanley Kelly
Figure 5-14
Karol Mech, son of Antonina and Charles Mech
Figure 6-1
Denver Store, showing route of earlier road on sidehill.

Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-3

Nineteenth Century Farm

Figure 6-4
Bertha Cammer’s House in 1998, Roxbury, New York

Figure 6-5
Lindon Morse’s House in 1998, Roxbury, New York
Figure 6-6
Hewitt farmhouse in 1998, north elevation showing additions
Figure 6-7
Sadie and Howard Hewitt, 1920
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-8
John B. Hewitt (Jack)
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-9
The Boughton Farmhouse in 1921
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-10
Martha Hewitt, a friend, Amanda McEwan holding infant John Hewitt, and Sarah Hewitt, 1928
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-11
Young John Hewitt with wagon house and shop in background.
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-12
Plan of Hewitt Farmstead, before 1950
by Joe Hewitt.
Figure 6-13
Ice House Behind Joe Hewitt
Photo Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-14
Crystal Spring Farm
Figure 6-15
Crystal Spring Farm, 1950
Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-16
Jack and Martha Hewitt in the small dining room with the pass through.

Courtesy of Joe Hewitt
Figure 6-17
Sarah Hewitt Porter, granddaughter of Martha and Jack Hewitt in her kitchen at the former boarding house
Figure 6-18
Martha Hewitt, 1997
Figure 6-19
Joe Hewitt, son of Martha and Jack Hewitt
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