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THE REBUILDING OF A HOUSE

To know the inhibiting reasons
of trees and streams, old men
who shed their lives
on the world like leaves,
I watch them go.

And I go. I build
the place of my leaving.
The days arc into vision
like fish leaping, their shining
captured in the stream.
I watch them go
in homage and sorrow.

I build the place of my dream.
I build the place of my leaving
that the dark may come clean.

"For the Rebuilding of a House" from FARMING: A HAND BOOK,
copyright 1970 by Wendell Berry, reprinted by permission of
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
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HISTORIC FARM STRUCTURES AS MATERIAL CULTURE:
AN OREGON STUDY

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This is a case study that records two historic family farms in Oregon and their relationship to an Upland South folk culture. The study focuses on architectural material culture as a tool for documenting an ethnocultural heritage. The intent of this thesis is to capture the cultural essence of the farms and to reveal how the loss of historic family farms is a loss to our rural heritage.

The case study researches the Riggs-Splawn family and their farms' material culture at a micro level. The family exemplifies an Upland South culture that migrated by way of the Oregon Trail during the mid 1800s. By "overlaying" the Upland South architecture on the Riggs-Splawn architecture in Oregon, certain similar imprints emerge. Thus, the structures built in Oregon act as evidence of a transmigrated cultural tradition from the Missouri-Kentucky matrix. The architecture of the family farms indicates the persistence of traditional forms over time, space, and distance (Kniffen and Glassie 1966:159-161,174-175). This researcher can only theorize that the Upland South folk culture migrated with the Riggs-Splawn family to Oregon.

Exploration of the folk architecture of the Riggs-Splawn family will span four generations, from 1847 through 1955. The migration of their culture to Oregon is architecturally documented by (1) scholarly studies of material culture and Upland South folk architecture, (2) Ann Riggs-Splawn's 1850 farm, (Figure 1) and (3) Susan Robinson and Jesse Merle Splawn's 1915 farm (Figure 2). These two separate family farms will be distinguished throughout this study by either the 1850 farm or the 1915 farm.

The study was prompted by the observation that historic family farmsteads are disappearing. The term historic, as defined in this study, is a farm at least fifty years old. Peter Caday's recent thesis defined family farms as those deeply
Figure 1. Riggs - Splawn Family Settlements
Figure 2. Jesse and Susan Robinson Splawn's 1915 Farm
embedded in their local communities (Caday 1988:3). Family farms are usually united socially and economically within an area. Family farms can be either large, medium or small. They can be wealthy, moderate, or poor. They are not the agribusiness farms that are usually industrial and corporate. Research indicates that family farms are declining due to social and economic factors. Farm acreage loss due to land development, changing farm economics, and new farm practices has resulted in economic decline (Humstone 1990:10). Socially, family farms are run by aging farmers who will retire from their land in ten to fifteen years. It appears that the younger people will not take up this void in family farming. In 1860 there were 2 million farms on the American landscape increasing to 6 million by 1900. Family farms have declined back to the 1860s figure of 2 million (Canine 1991:30-32). The number of Oregon farms has been declining since 1945 (Long 1959:2). The trends of decreasing farms and aging farmers add up to a change in the farming fabric of the United States. Historic farm buildings do not meet the technological and economic needs of the newer agribusiness practices. Modern metal and quasi-wood structures are replacing the old wooden and masonry structures. The rural farm landscape is changing. With this change it appears that diverse family folk cultures are being threatened with nonexistence.

This researcher proposes that values and customs of a historic family farm are embedded within its structures, and that the structures are significant to the cultural whole that exists on a traditional farm. Farm structures form a "skeletal" complex that reflects both the past and present cultural context. The structures are recognized in architectural forms and created functions. The structure's form and functions cause settlement patterns to appear and fulfill a purpose upon the land. These patterns develop systematically; the garden evolves around the farmhouse, the path continues to the barn, and the gate endures in its place to welcome farm visitors. Only by acknowledging the whole of the farm complex can one realize the cultural landscape within. Structures, along with their organization upon the land, broaden our awareness of a rural cultural heritage.

This case study records the structures of two farms belonging to the Riggs-Splawn family that began farming in Oregon in 1850 and 1915. The purpose of this research is to record linkages between their tradition and their Oregon farms. The Riggs-Splawn family's traditional heritage was the Upland South region
of Missouri and Kentucky. The family migrated from the Upland South area during the 1800s and, therefore, is representative of a regional culture transmigrated west. In this instance, transmigration denotes the journey from the Old West to the New West during the nineteenth century.

The area of Upland South architecture is delineated both by geography and nationalities. John Morgan, a cultural geographer, in his research on log houses of Tennessee states that Upland South cultural maps vary considerably. The Upland South geographical area is loosely defined as West Virginia and Kentucky; western Virginia and North Carolina; upper South Carolina and Georgia; northeastern Alabama; Tennessee; southern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois; and the lower two-thirds of Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma (Morgan 1990:8). Upland South vernacular structures represent several nationalities that converged in the geographic area: Scotch-Irish from trans-Appalachia, the Germans from southeastern Pennsylvania, and the English from the Tidewater region (Glassie 1964:25; Morgan 1990:7-8; Kniffen and Glassie 1966:10).

The Scotch-Irish nationality needs definition. Shirley Abbott, an Upland South historian, describes the Scotch-Irish as Ulster-Scots from Northern Ireland who, in 1720, began to make their way to the American shores. They were fleeing from economic and religious discrimination both within Ireland and from England. Thousands flooded the ports of Philadelphia and Charleston and a few to Boston. They became the settlement front of the Appalachian wilderness. They were poor, uneducated but determined and unafraid to settle the sparsely populated areas of the then western frontier. They were individualistic and mobile, usually moving westward to newer lands in the Upland South with each succeeding generation. Many of the Scotch-Irish intermarried with the Cherokees and the Catawbas Indian tribes (Abbott 1983:30-33). Their ranks filled the Upland South. The Scotch-Irish average migration to America's shores was 12,000 per year from 1720 through 1770 (Campbell 1969:23).

By examining the Riggs-Splawn farms, contextually, one can document the architectural forms and functions that persist, and thereby identify remnants of a cultural heritage. Folk culture is traditional, has great variation in space, and experiences little change over time (Deetz 1977:24,41). Folk culture and settlement patterns contextually intertwine with structures. Settlement patterns dovetail with
the existence of the vernacular architectural structures. As an example, the act of constructing a vernacular log house or a barn is composed from a cultural pattern within the mind of the folk builder. Residing along with the inherent abilities of constructing houses and barns are the traditions and values that have been planted within the mind’s knowledge. Thus, folk building reflects folkways that are socially, economically, and environmentally linked, and, folk architecture reflects customs within the builder’s mind, both consciously and unconsciously. An analysis of vernacular architecture can reveal a pattern that expresses the culture (Glassie 1975: 13, 17, 18).

A description of the research begins with the methodology in Chapter Two which is composed of three parts. The first part describes the collection techniques of historical and material culture data, oral history, and photography. The second part discusses the study’s theoretical and historical data. The third part is the development of a farm patterns model that uses folk structures and an oral history to validate the folk culture on the Riggs-Splawn farms in Oregon.

Chapter Three discusses the migration of the Upland South material culture, through the Riggs-Splawn family, from the Kentucky/Missouri route to Oregon. The chapter focuses on two of the transmigratory family members, Timothy A. Riggs and his sister Ann Riggs-Splawn, who crossed the country in 1846 and 1850 to settle in Oregon. It describes the Riggs-Splawn family "before and after" the Oregon Trail and the architectural types that they planted at the end of the trail in Linn County. The Ann Riggs-Splawn 1850 farm structures and Timothy A. Riggs’s log house are discussed as persistent transmigratory types.

Chapter Four concentrates on the Splawn 1915 farm. This is a family farm established by a descendent of the Ann Riggs-Splawn 1850 farm. The 1915 farm structures are recorded and an oral history is given by a descendent of the Riggs-Splawn family. Within this chapter is a time increment survey of the farm’s settlement patterns from 1915 to 1955. The time increments capture the folk dynamics of the farm.

Chapter Five provides a summation of the study. The Riggs-Splawn data of the farm patterns model is filtered diachronically through Upland South architectural traditions. The model interprets the relationship of the Upland South culture to the Riggs-Splawn farms in Oregon. The paper concludes with the suggestion that there
appears to be an Upland South folk culture evident on the Riggs-Splawn farms. Findings lead to the conclusion that an examination of the farm structure complex of historical farms is necessary to understand the culture.

The bibliography is divided into two parts. The first part lists references cited and the second list is for additional readings. The additional readings could be helpful for scholars researching historic farms.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The research methodology is divided into three parts: field work; historical and theoretical data; and a farm patterns model. Field work provides the data base for the study. The farm patterns model uses an architectural comparative analysis designed by the researcher. The model consists of comparative factors between theoretical and historical data and the Riggs-Splawn historic farms.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork began by a process of awareness. Originally the study was to be an oral history and settlement pattern recording of the Jesse Splawn 1915 farm. As the fieldwork progressed it became evident that it was necessary to include the Riggs-Splawn 1850 farm. The full portrayal of the family and its diffusion from east to west added depth and a fuller understanding of the cultural significance of the Jesse Splawn vernacular farm.

Fieldwork included data collection, field notes, interviews, and photographic sessions in the research area. The study began in the fall of 1990 and ended in the winter of 1992.

The fieldwork was conducted in Linn County, Oregon. It encompassed the 1850 and 1915 farms of the two Riggs-Splawn families. The bulk of the research was conducted at the 1915 Splawn farm near Brownsville, Oregon. The Riggs-Splawn 1850 farm is no longer in the family. However, it still contains two of the original structures from the 1800s (Splawn 1990). Several photos of the 1850 farm were taken from the road and a quick walk through the barn was the only access the researcher had to the property. Approximately twenty-five trips were made to the area for either interviewing, photography or other research. General observations of the cultural landscape surrounding the 1915 farm and the 1850 farm were part of the fieldwork. Data collection was carried out through literature searches and field work. Preparation for the field work required literature searches
at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Brownsville libraries. Literature searches ran the gamut from anthologies, dissertations, theses, periodical articles to books. Linn County government supplied deed and donation land claim information. Literature from the researcher’s personal library was also used.

Field notes consisted of site sketches, measurements, and written notes. Sketches of structure locations and layouts were important for the study. Perimeter measurements of the structures gave an approximate scale when laying out the 1915 farm’s settlement patterns.

Merle Jesse Splawn, a family member residing on the 1915 farm, provided an oral history of the Riggs-Splawn farm culture. Unstructured interviews included prepared questions along with informal questions. Approximately ten two-hour interviews were conducted with Merle Jesse Splawn. Merle is an original settler of the 1915 farm. He was three years old when his parents settled the 100 acres in western Oregon’s Willamette Valley. The Splawn family’s 1915 farm is no longer an operational farm. Mr. Splawn is retired from farming.

Four photographic sessions were used to document the 1850 farm and the 1915 farm along with the surrounding landscapes. Every structure was photographed on the 1915 farm as well as the historic barn and house on the 1850 farm. Historical photographs of family members were given to the researcher by both Merle Jesse Splawn and his sister, Barbara Wasmundt of Denver Colorado. A 1950 aerial overview of the 1915 farm was supplied by Mr. Splawn.

Historical and Theoretical Data

Historical and theoretical literature provides strong underpinnings for this thesis. The scholarly works covered a wide spectrum of sources: social history, cultural geography, anthropology, folklife, and American studies. Government documents and other primary sources together with the scholarly writings also provided a base for this study.

The first part of this section includes the term definitions used in this thesis. Some terms are self explanatory but are further explained to clarify the perspective of this study. Following the definitions are the scholarly discussions of vernacular rural farm structures particularly of the Upland South region. The discussions are
reviewed and presented chronologically from an early log house form, to barns and outbuildings, and ending with a late T house type. Besides the vernacular architectural discussion, there is a brief summary of primary source books generically called "pattern books." Available nationwide during the nineteenth and twentieth century, "pattern books," or architectural plan books, presented detailed designs for both houses and farm structures. By synthesizing elements from the scholarly writings it is possible to develop a framework to illustrate Upland South vernacular farm structures. The farm patterns model uses the framework to develop two constructs in Chapter Five.

A farm is defined as a tract of agricultural land, together with the fields, buildings, animals and people, assembled to produce a crop or crops. The term "farm" for this study contains mainly vernacular or folk architecture. The two terms, "vernacular" and "folk architecture" are similar in definition. Folklorist Howard Marshall conducted a rural study on Upland South culture in Missouri. He identifies folk architecture as that which provides shelter for daily living needs, and resists changes over time (Marshall 1981:17-29). The emphasis here is that it resists change. Amos Rapoport, a cultural geographer, suggests that in vernacular architecture the owner-occupant is part of the building process; it is neither high style nor primitive (Rapoport 1969:2-6). Alan Gowans, also a cultural geographer, defines vernacular to mean an unaffected and unselfconscious way of building (Gowans 1987:41). John Brinckerhoff Jackson, another cultural geographer, suggests that vernacular architecture is a rural or small town dwelling designed by a crafts person using local forms and related to local tradition (Jackson 1984:85). Within this study the meaning of vernacular and folk architecture are reflections of the latter scholars definitions. The terms vernacular and folk are used interchangeably in this study.

Folk culture is the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions and all other products of human work and thought characteristic of an ethnic or racial population that are passed down from generation to generation. Archeologist James Deetz defines folk culture as a traditional culture that has great variation in geographic space and little change over time. He compares this to popular culture that changes at a fast pace with time and displays a commonalty over geographic space. According to his definition, culture is socially
transmitted rules of behavior that reflect the way we shape our world (Deetz 1977:41).

Material culture is a complex term that represents an important concept for this study. To break the term down we can define it as material, meaning the substance or substances out of which a thing is made, and culture, meaning the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought characteristic of a community or population. Material and culture, brought together as the term "material culture," means artifacts of socially transmitted behavior patterns of a community or population. It would be correct to use artifacts and material culture interchangeably (Deetz 1977:24). Therefore, an artifact represents a thought pattern of a human. Thomas J. Schlereth, an American studies scholar, claims that material culture creates symbols of meaning and encourages researchers to recognize the interplay between object and creator. The study of material culture unveils a cultural understanding (Schlereth 1982:3). He states that material culture is man-made artifacts and excludes natural things such as plants and animals, but the latter are included when they interact with humans (Schlereth 1986:2). Howard Marshall identifies material culture as traditional artifacts and landscapes that have evolved over time and represent a group’s customs and order (Marshall 1981:17). Henry Glassie, a folklore professor and author, describes material culture as objects that humans have learned to make. (Glassie 1969:2). John Moe, a social historian and folklore specialist, looks at material culture as cultural ideas being embedded in the artifact. He emphasizes the need to translate the artifact into meaning. He advocated field research to acquire a humanistic view of the environment (Moe 1986:40-44). E. McClung Fleming, an American Studies researcher, purports that historical information of a primary nature can be obtained from studying artifacts. These facts may lead to revealing craftsmanship, standard of living and life style (Fleming 1982:171).

Material culture has "meaning." What is this "meaning?" Anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss asks, what does mean, mean. His answer is: "to mean means the ability of any kind of data to be translated in a different language" (Levi-Strauss 1979:12). Therefore, the meaning given by an artifact to a person is through language. Obviously, to understand the language a person needs the rules. In the
case of structures as artifacts, rules exist to disseminate the information. This dissemination system can be duplicated with other structures. Using the same set of language or rules, one can gain evidence and validity. This evidence and validity will provide a cultural context (Glassie 1975:19-21). Meaning for the sake of this study is the cultural language bound within the artifact. Christopher Tilley, an anthropologist, expanding on the Levi-Strauss vision of "meaning," terms the artifacts as "codes" in a language. The "meaning" is the "message" that is communicated by the artifact. The codes ("rules") communicate messages ("meaning") which are systematically linked ("language"). To understand the cultural linkages within a system one must know the codes and the messages of the system (Tilley 1990:4-8). For example, a certain type of smokehouse structure (artifact) has a code. The code is made up of symbols such as square, one level, wood, dirt floor, and a fire pit in the center of the floor. The code will communicate, when symbols are linked, that it is a type of smokehouse.

The artifact or material culture has a syntax like language. In architecture, the form and function act as the words; the structure acts as the sentence. (Glassie 1975:19-21). Levi-Strauss defines a "cultural language" as a complex set of codes that need to be translated into one language. Therefore, he suggests, a language that is common to all is needed (Levi-Strauss 1979:10-14). Thus, architecture is "read" as the prevailing culture at a particular time and place. In this thesis the "reading" is in the form and function.

Form and function of farm structures are the most basic components of the language of the structures. Henry Glassie believes that studies of form should answer questions of process -- how it is conceptualized. Structures are "composed" or constructed by builders; the finished product documents their "performance" or artifact form. Within the builders' mind are the traditions of their culture. The form is a reflection of the builders' tradition with which they are familiar. By examining the form or architectural competence one can discover the composition of the tradition. Glassie defines architectural competence as:

...an account not of how a house is made, but of how a house is thought, it is set out like a program. It is a scheme, analogous to a grammar, that will consist of an outline of rule sets interrupted by prosy exegesis [Glassie 1975:21].
Along with the form is the function of the building. The function is another part of the language. The form, together with function, will "tell" the meaning of the structure. Form is the horizontal and vertical organization as well as its construction. Function is the purpose for which the structure is built along with its sequential use. The parts are equal to the whole, but the whole is greater than its parts (Glassie 1975:17-21). The structure, therefore, reflects its culture.

Settlement pattern is a part of material culture. In farms, the settlement pattern means all evidence of human involvement with the land. Settlement pattern involves both the structures and the land. Christopher Alexander, a planning and architectural scholar, presents the idea that patterns are rich and complex and evolve into an order in a timeless way; patterns are a result of a structured language made of a network of individual patterns (Alexander 1979:xii). Examples of settlement patterns are pathways, fields, fencing, structures, roadways, lanes -- that is, boundaries and spaces that form patterns on the human landscape. Settlement pattern is a pattern language implemented to build a structure or define the spaces in between; it is sequential and provides a system of understanding for our cultural landscape. Patterns link systems (Alexander 1977:xii-xxxiv). Settlement pattern is formed by humans upon the landscape. Pierce Lewis, a cultural geographer, defines the human landscape as one consisting of tangible forms or patterns that reflect our tastes, values and ideas (Lewis 1982:176). Thomas Hubka, an architect and ethnographer, contends that patterns organize and connect to farmstead buildings: they hold the same influences that shape buildings (Hubka 1984:227). Settlement patterns reflect the culture and are a means of access to understanding culture.

Fred Kniffen, a cultural geographer, used the concept known as "diffusion." for his study. His focus on diffusion encompasses houses and barns of the 1850s era. The concept of diffusion is a principle that has become established among investigators of folk architecture and human landscapes. The principle is important to this study as it is a key to the idea that the Upland South culture diffused to the northwest part of the United States with the Riggs-Splawn family. His study identified routes emanating from three areas on the East Coast; these areas were the cultural sources for housing and barn types that would spread out across the eastern portion of the United States. The areas are New England, Middle Atlantic and the Lower Chesapeake (Kniffen 1966:10-13). Diffusion data was unavailable from
Kniffen, or other sources, for areas west of the Mississippi Valley area. Settlement was sparse in the expanse between Missouri and the Oregon country at the time of the initial Riggs-Splawn migrations. It is plausible that Upland South culture flowed west with the family. Kniffen’s diffusion route theory helps explain the presence of Upland South architecture in Oregon.

Letters back to the people remaining in the Upland South could provide knowledge about the newly settled area. Stewart McHenry, a cultural geographer, proposes a migration theory that states that all subsequent settlers to an area will probably originate from the same previous area because of limited communications. An unknown area becomes known through the communication lines of the first settlers to the future settlers. It would be unlikely that new settlers coming after the first influx of migrants would prefer to settle in unknown country. (McHenry 1978:112).

To understand Upland South rural structures, we need to turn to the studies of the following scholars. Their research adds dimension to identifying the movement and types of rural structures that were and are part of the Upland South. William Lynwood Montell and Michael Lynn Morse have conducted a comprehensive study on the folk architecture of Kentucky. Their book contains many photographs of rural farm structures as well as text. They note that between the Civil War and 1900 there was a nationalizing affect upon architecture that ran concurrently with folk construction. This nationalization was a result of pattern book publications. However, where stability outweighed social change, folk architecture structures dominated (Montell and Morse 1976:4,5).

John Morgan’s study of log houses in Tennessee broadly discusses the types and origins of log structures. He mentions four types of log houses in the Upland South. The four types were the central chimney or saddlebag double-pen; the double pen or the Cumberland; the dog-trot and the single pen. Each of these could be one-story, one-and-a-half-story or two-story dwellings (Morgan 1990:31-33). The log structures appeared during the early eighteenth century and continued to the beginning of the twentieth. Log structures migrated to the United States with the Germans of southeastern Pennsylvania and the Swedes and Finns of the Delaware Valley. The log houses were later reinterpreted by the Scotch-Irish and English populations of the Middle Atlantic coast in the 1700s. Log houses swept west from
this Middle Atlantic area (Morgan 190:7-9). One log house type was the dogtrot that probably originated in Virginia and became common to various parts of Kentucky. The dogtrot house evolved from an original one room (pen) log house needing an addition. The addition was a separate one room (pen) built next to the original log structure. A common roof was built over the two structures leaving an open breezeway between the two. The two structures become one with an open central corridor running front to back. This open corridor gave the house type its common name of the dogtrot (Figure 3). Log houses were common to Kentucky until the post-Civil War era (Montell and Morse 1976:7-22).

Barns in the United States are of two basic types, English and German. It is important to note the difference of the two types as the terms are used repeatedly throughout this study. The English barn has side openings; that is a wagon opening on both sides, opposite the gable end of the barn. This opening allows the wagon to enter on one side and continue through and out the other side. The other type of barn is the gable end opening, considered of German origin. It was common before the 1820s to find farms with several small barns. Between the 1820s and the 1850s the large single barn became the norm on farms in the United States (Hubka 1984:182). The lone barn became a cultural benchmark, along with the farmhouse, upon the farm landscape.

Joseph Glass, a cultural geographer, researched and wrote a publication on the Pennsylvania culture region with an emphasis on its barns. He points out that among the early barns of the region were ground barns with vertical walls on all four sides. A ground barn is one without banks built flush with the ground. A bank is a ramp incline built for wagons to egress barn doors when the barn foundation is highly elevated. The ground barn he discusses is English and found in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia (Glass 1986:10).

English and German barn types are found in Kentucky. However, English barn types found there are mostly in the northern and central part of the state. An English-type barn that became popular in Kentucky was the tobacco barn which used pole construction (Montell and Morse 1976:77). Henry Glassie’s study of old barns in Appalachia revealed that the English barn was never common in the mountains. Those that were evident appear as a synthesis of a mountain-stable type and a double-crib type found in the mountains. He reported that the barns of
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Figure 3. Dogtrot type
Virginia had a slight ramp and, therefore, could be either English or German type (Glassie 1964:30). The double crib outbuilding is similar to the English barn layout. Mountain stables are of modest dimensions compared to the English and German barns.

Henry Glassie's study of folk housing in the Virginia area explores patterns in architecture. At one point he discusses "flatland architecture," a term he applies to structures built on flat land. He discovered that Virginians continued to build their structures as if on flat land even when they encountered a hillside. He found that in the Virginia study that outbuildings were a "straggling row" that was parallel to the house or perpendicular to it. He found outbuildings organized along a certain division of labor -- male or female. (Glassie 1975:144,145).

Howard Marshall’s study examines Upland South artifacts present in Missouri, especially, barns and houses. He notes that English barns were uncommon in his study region. He mentions the Ben Cook English barn that is in the transition zone of his research. The Cook barn has stables or pens that flank the interior drive-through. The drive-through measures 12 feet across. The main timbers are hewn square while the framing is sawed and nailed. German barns were also present in the study area (Marshall 1981:82). The study's houses are either painted white, whitewashed, or weathered gray while the study’s barns and the outbuildings are usually not painted (Marshall 1981:100).

Henry Glassie's study of the outbuildings of the Appalachian southern mountains divided vernacular outbuildings of the area into three types: 1) the Tidewater outbuilding 2) the Pennsylvania one-level type and 3) the Pennsylvania two-level type. The Tidewater type has a square floor plan and a pyramidal roof. It was brought to the southern mountain area by the Tidewater English settlers. The Pennsylvania one-level type has a rectangular floor plan, regular double pitch roof and a door in the gable end. It sometimes is built in the hillside and sometimes has a projecting roof constructed on the cantilever principle. This type was brought to the southern mountains area by the Pennsylvania Germans and the Scotch-Irish. The Pennsylvania two-level type usually has a room added above. The two-level possessed the same form as the one level and was brought to the mountains by the same populations as the one-level (Glassie 1964:21-25).
Steve Mitchell, Donald Brown and Michael Swanda, vernacular architecture researchers, discussed a construction technique called southern box construction. The "box" was a derivative of the colonial English plank-frame construction and diffused through most of the eastern states until the Civil War. Southern box construction was usually associated with small low-quality structures (Mitchell et al. 1987:9,10). Their study focused on the Arkansas region. The construction consists of boards, usually about 12 inches wide, applied vertically to the plate and sill. It does not require any other type of framing. Their research suggested that box framing is a type of construction method that was economical and easy to build and, therefore, it was used on many small, isolated, southern farms (Mitchell et al. 1987:9-14).

William Lynwood Montell and Michael Lynn Morse detail Kentucky roof construction used with rural vernacular structures. Handmade wood shakes were used extensively as roofing material. The shake shingle roof is a German contribution (Morgan 1990:9). A photograph in their publication illustrates horizontal rows in which the shakes were applied. The photograph also features a roof detail called "feathering" (Montell and Morse 1976:43-46). This is when the shakes are fastened to the roof at the ridge line and project above, partially in space, on the windward side, protecting the ridge against inclement weather. "Feathering" was deleted if there was a ridge line cover. A publication featuring Farm Security Administration photographs, taken in Kentucky from 1935 to 1943, features many historic rural vernacular structures. Of these structures, approximately 90 percent have "feathering" prevalent on both houses and farm structures (Brannan and Horvatch 1986). Photographs of Kentucky outbuildings with pole construction appear in Montell’s and Morse’s publication (Montell and Morse 1976:20,57,62).

The T house type was discussed in Howard Wight Marshall’s study. He researched an area in Missouri denoted as the Northern Plains. His study covered eight counties in that area. The migrants that settled his study area were from Virginia, the Carolinas and Kentucky. He points out that, in the late nineteenth century, a T house was a prevalent type in the region. Marshall reported the T house was part of the traditional housing type for that period (Marshall 1981:35-37). The T house was a product of pattern books.
John Jakle, Robert Bastian, and Douglas Meyer, all cultural geographers, have conducted research on common houses from the Atlantic Coast to the Mississippi River Valley area. Their approach has been to identify certain elements of housing and apply them to like distribution across geographical regions in the eastern United States. Their identifying characteristics of houses include the perimeter configuration, the form and orientation of the roof and the number of stories that it contained. One of their study areas was Herman, Missouri, created as a German settlement yet, the surrounding area contained settlers from the Upland South. In Herman they have identified a T House type. The T type had various names in the common house study: Upright and Wing, Temple Form House, and Lazy T House. This type of house migrated from New England and upstate New York. The T type was primarily found in the northeastern part of the United States (Jakle et al. 1989:40,41,160,161,197,224).

Upland South vernacular landscapes contained front yard ornamental gardens. Shirley Abbott mentions a historic account of gardens in her *Womenfolks* publication. It notes that in North Carolina women spent time tending their front yard blossoms during the early part of the twentieth century (Abbott 1983:37). Folk houses in Kentucky had front yard gardens of various shrubs and flowers; this was part of the folk tradition. Both annuals and perennials were included along with roses and trees (Montell and Morse 1976:50).

Besides the latter studies on vernacular material culture, nationally published pattern books emerged in the United States. The books were published during both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is necessary to include these commercial pattern books in our discussion of the Upland South culture as they influenced the national pattern of constructing structures during this time. These books contained plans for constructing barns, outbuildings and houses. Farm journals were also available with construction plans for farmers. Both influences led to the homogenization of structures on farms.

Primary sources of pattern books give an idea of the dissemination of information on farm structures. In 1870, George Harney published a nineteenth century pattern book titled *Harney's Barns, Outbuildings and Fences*. Within are plans for farm structures that are reflective of the state of New York. Although
Harney's book is directed at a New York audience, it is an example of an early nationwide "pattern book" publication (Harney 1870).

A "back to the land movement," during the early part of the twentieth century, resulted in a flood of nationwide publications on farming (Layton 1988:39-58). Publications promoted new plans for farm structures. Early in 1907 Isaac Phillips Roberts published a book plainly titled *The Farmstead*. The book was a summary on buying and establishing a small family farm. He discussed the construction and spatial lay-out of a farm as well as its virtues of beauty, health, education, and leisure (Roberts 1907). The Sanders Publishing Company marketed several versions of pattern books titled *Farm Buildings*. These books were compilations of plans for general farm barns, cattle barns, dairy barns, horse barns, sheep folds, swine pens, feeding racks, and poultry houses (Sanders 1907, 1909). Alfred Hopkins' *Modern Farm Buildings* (Hopkins 1920) and Herbert Shearer's *Farm Buildings* (Shearer 1917) were pattern books of the latest designs for farm structures. As technology changed, pattern books included plans for automobile garages (Olney and Olney 1931). There was a plethora of information for those farmers who needed information on farm construction. For those already ritualized in a farm culture, perhaps these publications played little importance.

The following is the farm patterns model. The model's intent was to bring order out of disorder. Claude Levi-Strauss mentions that it is impossible to find meaning without order (Levi-Strauss 1979:11). Therefore, the model should make order possible.

**Farm Patterns Model**

The farm patterns model, constructed as an architectural comparative tool, unveils a transmigratory pattern of folk culture with the Riggs-Splawn family. On the basis of the 1915 farm and the 1850 farm, it provides several features for research: (1) 17 extant farm structures, (2) oral history, and (3) historical antecedents.

The research provides a cultural glimpse of a specific Oregon family. The 1850 farm had an extant barn and a house surviving from the occupancy of the Riggs-Splawn family (Splawn 1990). The 1915 farm had fifteen extant structures.
Although, the 1915 farm had only 15 at the time of the research, it once contained 23 structures built during the time of 1915 to 1955 (Table 1).

An oral history was provided by Merle Jesse Splawn, a family member of the 1915 farm where he had lived since its establishment in 1915 (Figure 4). His memory assisted with historical insight to both the 1850 farm and the 1915 farm. Much of the information for the tables and site plans derived from Merle’s oral history of the 1915 farm. The oral history provides a "fleshing out" of the written resources for both the 1850 farm and, especially, the 1915 farm.

Howard Marshall and John Moe have developed models that are synthesized for this study. Each supports the idea that structures reflect the culture. Marshall’s approach is an architectural profile that consists of artifactual descriptions, sketch maps of physical settings, public records, and oral histories (Marshall 1981:29). Moe believes that folk patterns disclose history and human movement. He has developed three categories in evaluating artifacts: (1) cultural signposts, (2) tools for living, and (3) adaptations to the environment (Moe 1986:39, 43, 44).

The farm patterns model compares theoretical and historical data with the Riggs-Splawn settlements through the strategy developed below:

1. Recording the 1850 farm structures for cultural signposts.
2. Recording the 1915 farm structures for cultural signposts.
3. Recording the 1915 farm culture through an oral history.
4. Recording the evolution of the 1915 farm structures reflecting its settlement patterns.
5. Developing comparative constructs by a "filtering process."

Each family farm structure is profiled by at least four of the following: (1) physical sketch map of the structures on the land, (2) photographic profile, (3) table of architectural characteristics, (4) oral history, and (5) theoretical and historical data. The farm structures provide cultural signposts for determining the transmigratory culture of the Riggs-Splawn family. A settlement pattern is established from the extant structures of the 1915 farm. The "tools for living" are the functions of the structures and are established by an oral history. The farm patterns model accomplishes two things: 1) it determines that Upland South culture is possibly evident on the Riggs-Splawn farms, and 2) it records an Oregon farm family culture. The characteristics of the 1850 farm and the 1915 farm structures
### TABLE ONE

23 Structures of the Splawn's 1915 Farm Complex

1. Barn (and addition)*
2. Outhouse*
3. Woodshed*
4. Farmhouse (and addition)*
5. Smoke House*
6. Incubator*
7. Tool Shop*
8. Small Brooder
9. Chicken House #1
10. Hog Pen
11. Cattle Shelter
12. Chicken House #2*
13. Sheep Shelter
14. Machine Shed*
15. Prune Dryer*
16. Chicken House #3*
17. Large Brooder*
18. Water Tower* (*water tank only)
19. Milk House*
20. Single Garage #1
21. Single Garage #2
22. Double Garage*
23. Dog House

*15 Extant Farm Structures (1992)
Figure 4. Merle Jesse Splawn 1990
are "filtered" through the theoretical and historical data, resulting in two constructs (Figure 5). The two constructs systematically arrange the "filtered" information to create comparative evidence that Upland South culture is apparent on the Riggs-Splawn farms. Construct A charts the movement of structures both in time and distance. Construct B plots Upland South cultural signposts against the Riggs-Splawn cultural signposts.

In Chapter Three the historic antecedents and structures of the 1850 farm are studied for characteristics that can be acknowledged Upland South "cultural signposts." Chapter Four records the farm structures of the 1915 farm. The structures are recorded over time denoting their form and function. The 1915 farm is observed as a structural settlement pattern viewed over time. The settlement pattern is discussed over five time-frames between 1915 and 1955. These time-frames are presented graphically, underscored by material examination, oral history, and photographs. The recording of each extant structure includes both a physical and functional description for each structure. Examples of physical elements are form, axis orientation, and construction materials. Changes are noted including razing, construction, additions, and relocations. The form of each extant structure is recorded by a photograph. The names of the structures on the 1915 farm are those used by Merle Jesse Splawn. Some of the structures are designated by number for clarity. Besides the structures on the site plan, other patterns such as fields, gardens and a roadway are displayed. These are the settlement patterns that resulted from the placement of the structures. They are included in some of the oral history as they are consequential patterns of the structures. Chapter Five discusses the farm patterns model and the resultant cultural signposts constructs. The variables of the model are analyzed for evidence of Upland South culture.

Overall, the farm patterns model will provide a micro-culture view of both the 1850 farm and the 1915 farm. It is vital to keep the idea of form and function in mind when understanding the 1850 farm and the 1915 farm. Beckow states that form relates to pattern and function to process. Form is a constant aspect of structure; it changes little over time (Beckow 1975:122). Howard Wight Marshall refers to form as the horizontal layout and vertical massing (Marshall 1981:25). The function provides the variable aspects (Beckow 1975:122; Marshall 1981:25). This view is important to keep in mind when reading the following chapters.
Figure 5. Farm Patterns Model
CHAPTER THREE

1850 FARM SETTLEMENT

The family background is important to this study as it characterizes the culture of the historic Riggs-Splawn family (Figure 6). It establishes the Upland South diffusion pattern from Kentucky to Missouri to Oregon (Figure 7).

The Riggs-Splawn genealogy was partially reconstructed from various sources. The oral history given by Merle Splawn indicated that the family was buried at the Crawfordsville Union cemetery; this was a starting point. The other sources were the Donation Land Claims of genealogical material (Genealogical Forum of Portland 1957, 1959, 1962), the Linn county census (Haskins 1976), and Linn county pioneer stories (Haskins et al. 1984).

Early migrants from Ray County, Missouri to Linn County, Oregon were cross-referenced and documented using census data (Haskins 1976; Boyce 1982) along with Oregon historical publications (Genealogical Forum of Portland 1957, 1959, 1962; Haskins et al. 1984; Workers of the Writers’ Program nd; Haskins 1976). Although the Riggs-Splawn genealogy has not been completely reconstructed, it provides the basic framework for this study.

Contemporary historians provide information about the history of Linn County, Oregon. William Bowen, a historian, and Peter Boag, a cultural geographer, provide excellent documentation for social and settlement patterns of the mid-nineteenth century (Bowen 1972; Boag 1988). Carlos Schwantes’ historic overview put the period in perspective (Schwantes 1989). Primary rural resource materials were investigated from the 1850s to the present.

Migration

Missouri U. S. Senators Lewis Fields Linn and Thomas Hart Benton exposed their constituents in the 1840s to Oregon "fever." Both senators favored opening the Pacific Northwest to settlement and recommended that an official Oregon Territory be established by the United States government (Bowen 1972:49). By 1848, the
Figure 6. Riggs - Splawn Partial Genealogy
Figure 7. Riggs - Splawn Diffusion Route
Oregon Territory was established and included areas that would be later divided into the territories of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming (Kimerling and Jackson 1985:17). Senator Linn was instrumental in initiating an Oregon country land law. After his death in 1843, the Donation Land Claim Act of 1850 was enacted. It provided 320 acres free to an individual and 640 free to a married couple provided they reach the Oregon Territory before December 1, 1850 (Schwantes 1989:103). Oregon’s fame was as a land of opportunity with good climate, fertile soil and free land. The people who decided to venture to the Oregon country at this time were not adventurers or trappers but families seeking new lands in which to farm (Kimerling and Jackson 1985:16). Missourians made up the majority of those traveling to Oregon in 1850 (Boag 1988:54; Bowen 1972:102-103). Ray County, Missouri, considered a trade and rural settlement, provided many settlers to the Oregon migrations through 1850 (Bowen 1972:102a).

Timothy A. Riggs and Ann Riggs-Splawn were a brother and sister living in Missouri during the 1840s. Timothy A. Riggs was 21 years of age and a resident of Missouri in 1846 when he was to leave on the Oregon Trail with part of his family (Boyce 1982; Haskins et al. 1984). Timothy and Ann left Missouri at different times to head for the Oregon country (Genealogical Forum of Portland 1962:116; Writers’ Program Oregon nd:16). Tracing their individual paths to Oregon, will reveal the migration of not only the people but also their cultural traditions.

In 1842, the first wagon train migration of families left Independence, Missouri bound for the Oregon country (Kimerling and Jackson 1985:18; Bowen 1972:29; Simmons et al. 1979:43). In 1846, Timothy A. Riggs left Ray County, Missouri along with his brother Thomas (Figure 8), sister Elizabeth, brother-in-law Stewart Lewis (Haskin 1984:97), father and mother Leah (Crawfordsville 1990). Unfortunately, Timothy’s father died crossing the plains (Haskin 1984:97). Timothy’s personal account cites reasons for traveling to Oregon,

As to the motive for coming to the Willamette Valley at that early date I hardly know how to answer, unless it was the love of adventure, as the question of sovereignty had not been settled between the United States and England when I came here. True the United States senate had been discussing the matter of giving each settler in Oregon six hundred and forty acres of land and we rather expected that would be done, but we had no real assurance that such would be the case [Goodall 1903:76].
Figure 8.
Thomas Riggs and Timothy Riggs
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Timothy A. Riggs and family reached Oregon in the fall of 1846. The brothers found work raising a crop for a doctor when they arrived in Oregon City (Haskin 1984:97). Oregon City was a stopping off point for exhausted emigrants who were coming off the Barlow Trail, a western branch of the Oregon Trail. The tendency of migrants was to stay in the area of Oregon City for the winter and to find work while they got their bearings in the new country (Boag 1988). Such was the case with Timothy Riggs. He gave the following account of his trip,

I crossed the plains in 1846, stopping near Oregon City til the next fall, when I settled in Brush Creek Valley, Brush Creek being the south fork of the Calapooia. When I came here I found Alexander Kirk, W. R. Kirk, James Blakely, Hugh L. Brown, and Jonathan Keeney... all having crossed the plains in 1846 and come on up the valley to the Calapooia. I also found R. C. Finley some six miles farther up the stream, who also crossed the plains the same year, but settled on the Calapooia in the spring of 1847. Mrs. Agnes B. Court'nay who came to Oregon in 1845, and whose husband had been killed near Oregon City by a falling tree, made up the settlers on the Calapooia at that time... I and Asa Moore settled in Brush Creek Valley... [Workers of the Writers' Program nd:16].

It would be four more years before Timothy’s sister and family would decide to join the migration to the Oregon country. Ann Riggs Splawn was born in Green County, Kentucky in 1809 (Genealogical Forum of Portland 1962:116; Crawfordsville Union Cemetery). This county was a part of the state of Virginia through 1792 as was all of Kentucky. Virginia originally settled the land in Green County by giving it to Revolutionary War soldiers as payment for their participation in the war effort. Green County, located in the south-central part of Kentucky, contained many former Revolutionary soldiers and Scotch Irish people (Bryant 1992). Ann’s marriage in 1825 to Moses Splawn in Ray County, Missouri confirms that the family was mobile and was moving west to newer lands with each succeeding generation (Genealogical Forum of Portland 1962). This characteristic exemplified the Scotch-Irish as described by Shirley Abbott (Abbot 1983:30-33).

Moses and Ann Riggs-Splawn decided to leave for the Oregon country in 1850. Ann was 41 years of age and still living in Ray, County Missouri (Figure 9). Many influences could have been involved in their decision to migrate to the Oregon country. Ann’s brother Timothy had perhaps communicated the glories of Oregon. Ann and Moses were perhaps anticipating the passage of the Donation Land Law
Figure 9. Moses Splawn and Ann Riggs-Splawn (circa 1850)
which would mean 640 free acres for married couples. The act was passed September 27, 1850. Another reason could have been that she had family in Oregon. It would have been natural for Ann Riggs-Splawn to follow her mother and siblings to Oregon as most pioneers either migrated together or were joined later by close friends and/or relatives in the new Oregon country.

Ann and Moses left for Oregon with six children in tow. Moses’ ill-timed death on the trail near Fort Laramie left Ann to finish the trip as a single parent. Family sources attribute the death to an illness (Splawn 1990). Ann’s oath at the land office in Roseburg, Oregon, when she received her Donation Land Claim patent in 1876, attests to her harrowing trip across the plains. The historical oath is presented in its entirety as follows:


The oath contains the names of people from Missouri: her brother, a son-in-law, and a former Ray County resident, John Fields. The oath is a testament to the continuance of regional ties. The Carter name is from an 1858 second marriage to a man who had origins in Kentucky (Gurley 1975:116).

The custom of migrating with kin and neighbors suggests that Ann would have traveled with them along the Oregon Trail. These ties would nurture the clan as they traveled (Bowen 1972:80). Such ties would have been sustaining to Ann during the loss of her husband. Ann would not be alone once in the Oregon Territory. There was a tendency for friends and relatives from "home" to settle in the same area. It gave settlers a feeling of continuity (Bowen 1972:877-81). Clans tended to settle near one another and probably provided Ann with a continuance of familiar cultural surroundings.

Settlement

Timothy Riggs was the first in the Riggs-Splawn family to settle in the upper Calapooian Valley. In 1847, he settled around Brush Creek, the south fork of the
Calapooia River (see Figure 1). He immediately built a log house. His account is as follows,

... In the fall of 1847 when I and Mr. Moore came into Brush Creek Valley we were not aware that there were any Indians near there and selected a place to build a cabin in which to spend the winter, we being single men, were going to batch through the winter, when I intended to bring my mother to live with me, my father having died soon after starting for Oregon ... we commenced cutting logs for our cabin ... [Boag 1988:102].

Timothy’s mention of log construction is a validation of the Upland South type of construction (Morgan 1990:9). Timothy’s Donation Land Claim would eventually be recorded as Township 14 SR1W and included 640.28 acres in sections 7, 8, 17, and 18 (Gurley 1975:109). The number of acres reflects his marriage to Celia Russell in 1849 which allowed them 640 as a married couple.

We can speculate that other Missouri settlers were building log houses for shelter. In the mid-1800s, Missouri was located within a zone of major log construction (Morgan 1990:9,10). Peter Boag discusses several pioneer accounts of initial shelters in the Calapooian area. The pioneer accounts mention log shelters including the dogtrot house type (Boag 1988:103) (see Figure 3). The building of log structures would be culturally correct as 62% of the settlers in Linn County were from this trans-Appalachia, Upland South area (Boag 1988:53).

Timothy’s brother Thomas and sister Elizabeth Riggs also settled in the Brush Creek area. Thomas is believed to have taken up a donation claim with his brother Timothy. Elizabeth, married to Stewart Lewis, had a Donation Land Claim a few miles from Timothy (Haskin 1984:97). Their mother, believed to be named Leah Riggs, would have been 65 years of age in 1847 (Crawfordsville Union Cemetery 1991). It is possible that she lived with Timothy Riggs until her death in 1857.

Ann Riggs Splawn settled in the Calapooian Valley in 1850. Her land claim was a few miles from the Calapooia River and near Brush Creek where her brother had settled in 1847 (see Figure 1). In 1850, she claimed 320 acres as the widow of the deceased Moses Splawn. This was the allowable portion under the Donation Land Claim Act of 1850. Her certificate, number 1617, filed at the land office in Roseburg, Oregon stated her legal land description as Township 14 S, Range 1W, Section 11 (Hallberg 1992). This first settlement along Brush Creek was an example of a folk culture defined on the basis that it was a small and isolated
close-knit society (Kroeber 1948:281). There were many people that knew each other through kinship; many were former neighbors within the same county in Missouri. Due to the isolation it is probable that the group was dependent on one another.

Many of the first Brush Creek settlers were from Ray County, Missouri. The neighbors' names show up on various land documents. Such names as Mary Cary, Abirham R. Breeden, Stewart Lewis, John Fields, James Lewis, Noah Shanks, James Huntsucker, Richard Davis and George Splawn. George Splawn appears in the land documents but validation as a kin is not available. If the men were not from Ray County then their spouses were; land claims show that they were married in Ray, County Missouri (Linn County Indirect Deeds nd; Genealogical Forum of Portland 1957, 1959, 1962; Haskins et al. 1984; Workers of the Writers' Program nd; Boyce 1982; Haskins 1976; Splawn 1991).

Two of Ann Riggs-Splawn 1850 farm structures, a house and a barn, are extant in 1992 (Splawn 1990). The barn is a mid-nineteenth century, English type barn (Figure 10). This type can be traced back to the Upland South region in Missouri and Kentucky. The German type emanated from the Pennsylvania area while the English type emanated from the English Tidewater areas. Glassie states that the Upland South contains both German and English types of barns and outbuildings. The German type is found in greater number than the English type in the Upland South. He points out that in southeastern Kentucky the English Tidewater influence is considerable (Glassie 1964:21-25). Montell and Morse concluded that the English type barn is more common in the northern and central part of Kentucky (Montell and Morse 1976:77). The two authorities appear to disagree. It is possible that the English barn diffused from the southeastern part of Kentucky to the central part up through the northern region.

The 1850 farm barn's configuration is a one-level, rectangular structure with side openings on the east and west elevations, providing a roadway through the middle section of the barn. A wagon could be driven through the middle of the barn when the side doors were open. The frame is hand hewn square post and beam with exterior siding of vertical fir boards. Mortises and tenons fit the supporting posts, joined by wooden pegs. Side bays are stables and storage areas. There is not an overhead loft above the center aisle. Storage of hay was in side lofts (Splawn 1990).
Figure 10. Ann Riggs - Splawn 1850 Barn
The barn's orientation takes into consideration the prevailing winds. The winter south-to-north winds dictate the side-opening east/west position.

The construction of the 1850 farm barn probably predates the 1880s. The barn's type of construction dates to a pre-sawmill period indicating that the barn was probably built in the 1850s when there was not access to a sawmill that could perform the task of handling the large timber pieces. The earliest sawmill was established in 1854 east of Crawfordsville (Workers of the Writers' Program nd:15) (see Figure 1). Primitive road conditions would have been prevalent during the 1850s. The road conditions suggest difficult transportation means. Large wagons, animal teams, and fairly developed roads would be needed to transport sawmill lumber to a primitive land site. The old method of hewn and mortised construction was costly in time to farmers. By the 1880s this method of barn construction was beginning to be set aside for newer methods as transportation means improved. Sawmills became available to obtain lumber for constructing barns although large supportive parts of the barn still incorporated some hand-hewn beams. Such beams were slowly phased out by the early twentieth century (Klamkin 1973:30).

A house, representing a late 1800s type, is located on the 1850 farm (Figure 11). This type is a two-story T house. It is a type that became popular from plan books in the late 1880s (Marshall 1981:35). Marshall's folk region study found two-story T houses representative of counties close to Ray County in Missouri. Missouri T houses have their gable front facing the road. Marshall found that these houses replaced traditional folk architecture yet was neither folk nor academic types. The houses, adapted by size, filled the needs of the dweller while the floor plan remained essentially the same (Marshall 1981:34-38) (Figure 12).

The 1850 farm T house is located near the extant English type barn. By the end of 1886, Green Berry Splawn, was the only living son of Ann Riggs Splawn. Ann deeded Green Berry Splawn the 1850 farm (Linn County nd:115). This suggests that perhaps Green Berry built the house that presently is extant on the 1850 farm property. The T house was recognized as the family house during the early part of the twentieth century by family member Merle Jesse Splawn (Splawn: 1991).

Green Berry was only three when he came to Oregon with his mother in 1850 (Figure 13). He married Amanda Matlock, a daughter of original settlers in the area. Amanda's mother was from Missouri (Boyce 1982). Green Berry and
Figure 11. Green Berry Splawn’s 1850 T House (1991)
Roof Plan

Figure 12. T House Plan
Figure 13. Green Berry Splawn
Amanda (Figure 14) had nine children (Spawn: 1991). One of their children was Jesse Merle Spawn, born in 1885. Jesse was to buy and farm land in 1915 after he married Susan Margaret Robinson in 1910 (Spawn 1990).

Susan's family came to the Linn County area from Missouri around 1887. Perhaps the Robinson family chose Oregon because they had heard so much about it from either friends and/or relatives. The Robinson family consisted of the father Robert A, and the mother Thirza. There were three children, two sons and one daughter. One of the sons was Robert Orr Robinson and the daughter was Susan Margaret Robinson. Around 1910, the Robinson family including Susan moved back to Missouri. However, Robert Orr Robinson remained in Oregon and married a sister of Jesse Spawn (Spawn 1990).

Jesse Spawn, having courted Susan Robinson while she was living in Oregon, traveled to Missouri in 1910 and married her (Figure 15). The two remained in Missouri until 1912 when they moved back to the Holley area in Linn County. They set up a household in a rented place and started looking for a farm to buy (Spawn 1990).

In 1915, they purchased 100 acres, the 1915 farm. The move involved both people and traditions.
Figure 15. Susan Robinson Splawn and Jesse Splawn (circa 1915)
CHAPTER FOUR

1915 SETTLEMENT

A movement from rural to urban triggered a back-to-the-land movement in the country beginning in the early 1900s. Literature began to advance the rewards of country life to offset the trend of the "country to city" movement. Even President Roosevelt advocated farming and promoted the farmers as the conservators of our land (Layton 1988:23,58). The 1915 farm was established upon the land during a favorable social climate.

The 100 acre 1915 farm was established by Jesse and Susan Robinson Splawn along with their three year old son Merle Jesse Splawn. When Jesse and Susan settled the farm in 1915 there were no existing structures on the land. Jesse Splawn could trace his family ties in the area back to 1847. Susan Robinson Splawn's family lived in Oregon during the late 1800's. Both had direct family ties to Missouri where their families were exposed to Upland South traditions. They now made the decision to continue the family farming tradition in Oregon and established the 1915 farm approximately ten miles from the Green Berry Splawn (Ann Riggs) 1850 farm (see Figure 1).

Twenty-three structures were built on the 1915 farm between 1915 and 1955. In 1992, only 15 structures were extant (see Table 1). The following presents the 1915 farm in time segments accompanied by oral histories given by Merle Splawn.

1915-1920

Structures

During the first year on the land the family built three buildings, a woodshed, barn and outhouse (Figure 16). These structures would provide the shelter and the basic needs to survive that first year on the land. All three structures are extant in 1992. The woodshed provided the living quarters for the family while Jesse and helpers built the barn (Figure 17). The outhouse was a two-seater located west of
Figure 16.
1915 Farmstead Settlement Pattern
FIGURE 17. 1915 Farm Woodshed (Northeast Elevation 1990)

Builder: Jesse Splawn  
Built: 1915  
Size: 16’ x 22’  
Functions: Family shelter, 1915  
Wood and miscellaneous storage, 1916 -- 1955  
Form: Rectangular, end opening, one level  
Ridge line: North/south  
Roof type: Gable  
Construction materials: Wood  
Frame: Pole, fir  
Exterior: Vertical board sheathing, 1’ x 1”  
Exterior finish: Unpainted  
Roof materials: Fir shakes, handmade  
Floor: Dirt
the barn and north of the woodshed (Figure 18). The outhouse was built over a fast moving spring where the water carried the waste away from the outhouse site. The barn was built using trees and rocks from the land and wood from a local sawmill (Figure 19). It was built on sills that were hand hewn from property timber. The framing was fir poles, varying in size depending on the strength required. The peeled and unpeeled poles were from the 1915 farm. The footings were rock boulders found on the land. The barn's side openings faced east and west. This orientation avoided the prevailing winds of winter. The manure heap was placed east of the barn where drifting winds in the summer and winter could not reach the farm house. The barn functioned for cows and horses and the storage of potatoes, oats and grain storage. The barn had a ceiling over the first level, including the runway, that was the storage area designated the mow. The mow served as storage for the threshed hay grown on the farm. Within the mow area, attached to the ridge line of the barn, was a wooden track that held a carrier with a pulley. This carrier facilitated the lifting of the harvest's hay to the storage of the mow. The carrier ran along the track with a hay fork attached to the pulley. The carrier ran the entire width of the mow and slightly extended outside the north side of the barn. The hay fork, a double harpoon type, lowered at the outside location to a stacked hay wagon. The hay fork could hold large amounts of hay that was raised to the mow. The carrier would slide back along the track until someone standing in the mow released the fork at an appropriate place. A rope attached to the carrier extended down to a person on horseback stationed at the west end of the barn’s doorway. The horse would be guided back and forth with the rope to raise the loaded hay fork to the mow. The hay was stacked loose in the hay mow. In the twenties or thirties, the original double harpoon hook was replaced by a grapple type of hay fork.

Several structures were added to the land during the 1916-to-1920 period (Figure 20). These were busy times for the Splawn family. They were not only farming but also building structures and adding new members to their family. By 1920 a daughter Barbara and a son Harold were added to the family.

In 1916 an addition was built on the barn to increase storage capacity (Figure 21). The addition was built out of the same materials as the original barn. The addition was a shed type that blended with the barn type. The addition's roof had
FIGURE 18. 1915 Farm Outhouse (South Elevation 1991)

Builder: Jesse Splawn
Built: 1915
Size: 4' x 6'
Function: privy
Form: Rectangular, one level, side opening
Ridge line: East/west
Roof type: Gable
Construction materials: Wood
Frame: Pole, fir
Exterior: Vertical board sheathing, 1' x 1"
Exterior finish: Unpainted
Roof materials: Fir shakes
Floor: Wood
FIGURE 19. 1915 Farm Barn (Southwest Elevation 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Jesse Splawn, probably brother Francis, unknown if others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built</td>
<td>1915, 1916, addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>40' x 54' (includes addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addition</td>
<td>18' x 40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original barn</td>
<td>36' x 40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Animal shelter, feed storage, produce, wheat and grain storage (family use), equipment storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Rectangular, two level, side opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge line</td>
<td>North/south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof type</td>
<td>Gable, addition - shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Pole, fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Vertical board sheathing, 1' x 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior finish</td>
<td>Unpainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof materials</td>
<td>Original barn, fir shakes, handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition, fir shingles, handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>26 feet at center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footings</td>
<td>Field stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Wood, fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Addition, 1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20.

1916 - 1920 Splawn Farm Settlement Pattern

Figure 21. 1915 Barn Addition (Left)
hand hewn shingles rather than shakes. Shingles were shorter and applied in a staggered manner.

The house, also built in 1916, was a two-story T house, duplicating the house style of the 1850 farm (Figure 22). The front upright gable faced the public roadway. The materials for the house were purchased at a local sawmill. Jesse built the house, along with his brother, in fourteen days. The interior languished for a few years before it was finished. The house received a first coat of white exterior paint in the twenties (Splawn 1991). The floor plan is similar to those that are cited in Marshall’s Missouri study (Marshall 1981:35) (see Figure 12).

The smokehouse functioned as a place to smoke hogs that were killed in the late fall (Figure 23). It also provided space to store the hogs after they were smoked. The smoking was accomplished by building a fire on the structure’s dirt floor. The intent was to keep the smoke inside, therefore the structure’s boards were aligned tightly around the perimeter.

A tool shop was built approximately a year after the 1915 farm was occupied (Figure 24). The tool shop’s purpose was to function as a blacksmith shop. Other tools were stored in the tool shop such as large saw blades for cutting wood for their home heating, animal traps, a drill press and assorted small hand tools. A small wood burning stove kept the tool shop warm on cold winter days.

The nonextant structures, represented in the 1916 -- 1920 settlement pattern, are as follows: a small chicken brooder, a small chicken house, and a hog pen. See the 1916 -- 1920 site plan for orientation (see Figure 20).

Following is the oral rendition of the farm, beginning in 1915 and continuing through 1920, as related by Merle Splawn. Merle was a very young man during this period and his remembrances are those seen through a young person’s eyes. The words are his. Merle describes himself as a "do it yourselfer" and he felt that his mother and father were pretty much that way too.
FIGURE 22. 1915 Farm T House (South Elevation 1990)

Builder: Jesse Spawn and brother Francis
Built: 1916
Size:
  West upright, front facing gable, 24' x 14'
  East wing, side facing gable, 14' x 14'
Function: Family shelter, bulk food storage
Form: T house
Ridge line:
  West upright, north/south
  East wing, east/west
Roof type: Gable, both upright and wing
Construction materials: Wood
Frame: Balloon
Exterior:
  Horizontal ship lap (including addition)
Exterior finish:
  Painted, white (including addition)
Roof materials:
  Original, cedar sawed shingles
Addition size: 4' x 16'
Addition roof:
  Cedar sawed shingles
Addition roof type: Shed
Porches:
  Shed type, (1) front and (1) back of wing
Figure 23. 1915 Farm Smokehouse/incubator

Builder: Jesse Splawn
Ridge line: North/south
Roof type: Gable
Construction materials: Wood
Frame: Pole, fir
Exterior: Vertical board sheathing, 1' x 1"
Exterior finish: Unpainted
Roof materials: Original, fir shakes, handmade
Floor: Dirt (wood when incubator in twenties)

1915 FARM INCUBATOR
Built: 1916
Size: 8' x 8'
Function: Incubate chicken eggs
Form: Square, end opening, one level

1915 FARM SMOKEHOUSE
Built: Circa 1925
Size: 8'x 8'
Function: Smoke hogs
Form: Square, one level, end opening
Other: Common wall with incubator (formerly smokehouse)
FIGURE 24.  1915 Farm Tool Shop (South Elevation 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder:</th>
<th>Jesse Splawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built:</td>
<td>circa 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>16' x 32' (with addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function:</td>
<td>Blacksmith shop and workshop area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form:</td>
<td>Rectangular, one level, end opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge line:</td>
<td>North/south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof type:</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame:</td>
<td>Pole, fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior:</td>
<td>Vertical board sheathing, 1' x 1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior finish:</td>
<td>Unpainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof materials:</td>
<td>Fir shakes, handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes:</td>
<td>Addition, 1920s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition size:</td>
<td>16' x 16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor:</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was said that my family was originally Irish. My family first came to Oregon on the Oregon Trail. The family’s barn and house of the first settlement is still standing.

I’d say that the part that all the farm buildings are on is about five of the hundred acres that is here. We were pretty much self sufficient farmers. We sold eggs, cream and butter. We raised our own feed for our stock and raised our food in our gardens.

The barn was built by my father and I believe some other helpers, maybe some relatives -- probably his brother Francis helped. It was built before the house. Our family lived in the woodshed until the barn was built. The barn materials were taken from the land and from a local sawmill located above Crawfordsville. The year after the barn was completed my dad built an addition on the west part of the barn.

The roof material is what you would call shake style on the original part of the barn. The addition had what you would call a shingle style roof. They are both made of fir taken mostly from our land. You could usually tell if a tree would give you good shakes by the way it grew. You could look at a nice straight tree and think it had good shakes in it but sometimes the trees, when you went to working on them, did not have what you thought would be nice straight wood. We made all our own shakes for our buildings. We didn’t do it all at once but when we had time we would work up some and store it for use later. A shake is about 30 to 32 inches by six inches. There is a five or six inch lap on the upper end. The lower end has a 24 inch exposure (Figure 25). A shingle was different from a shake in size. A shingle was shorter than a shake and left only 10 to 12 inches exposed. It was applied in a different pattern than a shake.

We kept a farm wagon in the barn in the winter and outside in the good weather. We used the wagon for different things around the farm. My dad built special beds for our farm wagon for hauling wood, hay, and gravel. We had a team of horses then, Percherons.

In 1915 we planted an orchard on the front part of the east side of the property. We planted prune, pears, apples and quince. Quince was a favorite of my mother. A guy came around selling trees and gave my mother an extra tree for the orchard. Salesmen on horses was common. He took the fruit tree order and delivered it at a later date.

The house took only 14 days to build. That was just the exterior, it took some time to finish the interior. The house didn’t have paint until the twenties. One of my first memories was my dad nailing the wood ceiling on in our kitchen. The kitchen ceiling is wainscoting. I couldn’t figure out how you could nail upside down. The house originally had 16 inch cedar shingles for the roof which were bought. The house materials were bought. The exterior wood is what you would call lap siding, it has a groove that can be seen. The inside walls are ship lap, it makes a flat wall. The walls are covered with wallpaper to cover the knots and cracks in the wood. The house was built with two by fours. All the floors are wood. My dad got the idea for the house plan from what he had in his mind. I imagine it was just in his head, seeing other houses in the area built that way. We used a room upstairs to store supplies that we bought in bulk. We bought sugar, flour, coffee and other
Figure 25. Shake Roof (Tool Shop Interior)
things this way. The storage in the house was for food supplies only. We also used the upstairs room for some of the canning storage.

We kept our horses and cows along with oats, grains and potatoes in the barn (Figure 26). We had a special stall in the barn for a person’s horse when they would come to visit. Loose hay was stored up in the loft.

When I was young I remember going up to Holley at Christmas time to visit my grandfather, Green Berry. My dad would go out to the barn with a lantern as it was dark and hitch up the horse to the buggy. He would come back to the house and blow the lantern out as it was just getting daylight. It would take us three hours to travel 10 miles to the place. We would have to start home by two in the afternoon to get home by dark. Our visit would be for about four hours. People traveled only by daylight then. The roads weren’t good, you couldn’t see very good in the dark. People just never thought about traveling at night.

I remember my father doing blacksmithing since the time that I remember anything. The blacksmith equipment was set in the same place in the tool shop as long as I can remember. My dad did repair on the farm machinery and would use the forge for horse shoeing. We had to reset the shoes on our horses about every six weeks. When you are blacksmithing the fire is made in the forge. Our forge was made of boards with a cement bottom where there was a hole. A blower would blow air up through that hole to feed the fire. We used a special coal in the forge called blacksmith coal. This got hotter than other kinds.

Sometimes my dad would build a fire outside near the house if he was working on metal rims for the wagon wheels. He would build a trench and place rocks in the trench. He would build it close to the house so that he would be near water. He would place rocks in the fire so that the metal would be set off the ground and so the fire could go around the metal. Once the metal was red hot my father would take it off the fire with a kinda hooks thing that my father had made. He would use the water to shrink the metal on the wheels. He usually did this kind of work in the summer time. He made a lot of the hardware for our buildings too. Not everybody around here could do this type of work. My dad did not do it as a business, just for the farm. Oh, sometimes he would help a neighbor out.

We had a hog pen behind the tool shop at this time. The hogs were fenced there. We smoked the hogs in our smoke house. There was quite a bit of preparation to getting a hog ready for smoking. We would shoot them and then cut their neck. We would dig a ditch and place a vat over the ditch. We would build a fire under the vat and scald the hog. We would put wood in the ditch for the fire. We would have a stovetop leading down to the fire to have the smoke escape. We would then put a gambling stick in the back leg and hang the hog by this. We would do one or two hogs in the late fall. This would pretty much last us until the next fall. In the smoke house you built a fire on the floor and just let the smoke seep out through the eaves. The idea was to keep as much smoke in as possible. You need a hard fire in the smokehouse--apple wood, sometimes took off the property, sometimes used maple. Usually used it when it was not seasoned out -- a little green -- it would smoke more.
Figure 26. 1915 Farm Barn Functions
1921-1930

Several structures were added to the 1915 farm during the twenties. The farm's structures reflect this increasing productivity. Merle would be a young man during this time.

Structures

During the twenties the 1915 farm experienced technological and agricultural changes. The machine shed and the automobile garages reflected technological changes. The construction of the sheep shelter and the chicken houses reflected agricultural production changes (Figure 27).

The hog pen, located north and next to the tool shed, was moved to a location north of the barn. The second location of the hog pen is no longer in existence. The tool shed gained an open back addition. The addition was open on the east and north sides.

A change in the function of the smokehouse resulted from an increase in chicken production. The smokehouse became the chicken incubator. When a smokehouse was needed again, a new structure was built contiguous to the "new functioning" incubator structure. By contiguous, it had a common wall, yet the incubator and smokehouse had separate entrances. The new smokehouse is located to the right in Figure 23.

A chicken house (#2) that held approximately 150 chickens was built north of the barn (Figure 28). The original chicken house (#1) was torn down and a new and larger chicken house (#3) was built in its place (Figure 29). The two new chicken houses built during this time brought the number of chickens on the farm to approximately 300. Compare this to the original chicken house that only held approximately 25 to 30 birds.

A straw barn was built in the back pasture to provide a sheltered feeding area for the cattle. A shelter constructed for sheep was built on the north hill. Sheep were introduced to the farm during the twenties. Neither the straw barn nor the sheep shelter are in existence in 1992.
Figure 27.
1921 - 1930 Splawn Farm Settlement Pattern

FIGURE 28. 1915 Farm Chicken House #2 (South Elevation 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Jesse Splawn and son Merle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>16' x 32'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built</td>
<td>Circa 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Chicken roost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Rectangular, one level, end opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge line</td>
<td>North/south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof type</td>
<td>Clerestory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Pole, fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Vertical board sheathing, 1' X 1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior finish</td>
<td>Unpainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof materials</td>
<td>Fir shakes, handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 29. 1915 Farm Chicken House#3 (South Elevation 1991)

| Builder:       | Jesse Splawn and son Merle |
| Built:         | Circa 1930                  |
| Size:          | 16' X 32'                   |
| Function:      | Chicken roost               |
| Form:          | Rectangular, one level, end opening |
| Ridge line:    | North/south                 |
| Roof type:     | Clerestory                   |
| Construction materials: | Wood                        |
| Frame:         | Milled lumber               |
| Exterior:      | Vertical board sheathing, 1' X 1" |
| Exterior finish: | Unpainted                 |
| Roof materials: | Fir shakes, handmade        |
| Other:         | Fir wood recycled from hop barn |
| Floor:         | Wood                        |
A machine shed was built northwest of the barn and near the production fields (Figure 30). This shed could house several pieces of farm equipment as well as tall machinery.

Two garages were built during the 1920–1930 period; one at the beginning of the decade and one at the latter. Each accommodated a single car.

Three vegetable gardens eventually evolved (see Figure 27). The purpose of the gardens was to provide a diverse supply of garden items for the growing family. Additions were made to the house kitchen and the tool shop.

Oral History

One way you got around to the different parts of the farm was through a gate. My dad always wanted a gate just about every place you wanted to walk. We had a lot of gates.

Hops was a popular type of farming around here in the twenties. I remember Indians coming to pick hops in the area when I was a boy. There was a young Indian boy riding with a whole string of Indians, riding along the road on horses. This young boy was having a hard time keeping his feet in the stirrups. The group had about 50 or 60 Indians altogether. They were dressed not too much different from us, but just a little different so you could tell they were Indians. The Indians camped at the hop gardens for about two to three weeks while they worked. Our chicken house on the hill was built from our neighbor’s old hop barn. The hop barn was no longer in use so my dad bought the barn for the lumber. Had several hop barn fires in the area then. After this time grass seed farms seemed to become popular.

We raised sheep for wool and the lambs. We sold wool and the lambs for meat. Both my dad and I sheared the sheep. It was some of the hardest work on the farm. We used a gas motor to run the cutters for shearing—looked sorta like clippers you now use to cut hair. The sheep liked the back pasture. They would get up under the trees where it was dry. My dad built a shelter for them up on the north hill but the sheep never seemed to use it much. So my dad eventually used it to store some of our equipment in it.

My mother and dad made a coverlet from the wool of our sheep. They did not card the wool. They washed and dried it. Then they laid it between two pieces of cloth and tacked it together.

I picked up shoeing horses from watching my dad. This and shearing sheep were very difficult. My knees were too high for the right angle of putting on the horse’s shoes.

We put in a second orchard up on the north hill. The first orchard that we planted when we first settled the land did not do so good. It seems that the land was too wet in the first location. In the second orchard we put cherries, apples, quince and prunes.

My dad would get up at five every day and take the kerosene lantern to the barn to do his chores. Then he would come back and sit at the table with the kerosene lamp waiting for his breakfast. He would sit at the table until it was light
FIGURE 30. 1915 Farm Machine Shed (North Elevation 1990)

Builder: Jesse Splawn and son Merle
Built: circa 1928
Size: Main section, 14' x 28'
      Bays, 12' x 28'
Function: Large farm equipment storage
Form: Rectangular, one level, end opening
Ridge line: North/south
Roof type: Gable
Construction materials: Wood
Frame: Fir
Exterior: Vertical fir board, 1' x 1"
Exterior finish: Unpainted
Roof materials: Fir shakes, handmade
Footings: Oak
Floor: Dirt
enough for him to go outside and begin his work for the day. He got up at the same time during the whole year. He went to bed early, especially in the winter time. Breakfast meals consisted of eggs, ham, oatmeal, and graham mush. Graham was wheat ground up. The wheat for the mush was ground in the tool shop. The mush was kinda brown, had a whole hull in it and you used sugar and milk with it. Sometimes we also had potatoes in the morning. Winter we added sausage and gravy to our breakfasts.

Several years after the smokehouse was built and it wasn’t in use, due to the time of year, we decided to use it for an incubator. The incubator was used to hatch more chickens. When it came time to smoke hogs, a new structure called the smokehouse was attached to the incubator. By turning the smokehouse into an incubator we could build more chicken houses and have more chickens.

In the beginning we had a small chicken house that held about 25 chickens. We tore it down and built another larger house in its place. We raised Plymouth Rocks which were good meaty chickens. We also had White Leggers, they were good egg layers. We got the White Leggers from a neighbor, they gave us 50 to start. My mother used to prepare the roosters for our dinners, didn’t need only so many roosters, better to eat them then to feed them.

We got our first car in 1920. The first garage was built shortly thereafter. It was a one car garage. It was built out of fir wood. We got another car toward the end of the twenties for which we built another garage. They were built side by side.

The machine shop was used for our 1929 McCormick Derring tractor among other machinery that was used for farming. The machine shed has an oak sill. The oak came from dead trees that were cut from the property. The machine shed is the only building with an oak sill.

Before we had a tractor and combine, we would have a threshing crew come in to thresh our wheat. The crew was made up of our neighbors along down each way on the road. They were all farmers. This was a system that was worked out by way of working for each other, it balanced out usually. If you didn’t have land to thresh and you helped, you were paid. Otherwise, it was just farmer in turn helping each other. Took about 12 to 16 men altogether. The threshing was done on our property until the forties. That is when we got a combine. Used that combine up through the sixties. The threshing machine was community property among the participating farmers. The neighbors all went together to buy the threshing machine. It was stored on one of the farmer’s properties and that farmer was paid a little rent for storing it. The crew only came once a year to our place usually. My mother and two or three of the neighbor women would cook dinner for the crew.

There is still machinery left in the machine shed. The 1929 McCormick Derring tractor, the combine and the binder. The manure spreader is outside in the field along with the farm wagon.

We got our tractor in the early forties. Up until that time we had horses. Horses really were the best for muddy conditions on a farm. They could get in the fields when it would be too muddy for a tractor. We kept one of the horses through to about 1950.

My dad built a straw barn up on the back pasture for the cows. We would have the thresher blow wheat in the barn. It was sort of an open sided deal that allowed the cows to eat in a sheltered area.

My mother was always busy. She made just about all of our clothes on a treadle sewing machine. She canned and made all of our cheese. She washed the clothes on the back porch and hung them in the woodshed in good weather and in
the house in bad. My mother made butter and cream in the house to sell. We kept our own butter in a hole in the ground in the woodshed. We did not have an icebox. She also had a flower garden as long as I can remember. Many of the plants that are in the garden now were started by her. I have added some of the flowers that are out there now.

My mother had a hand in raising the chickens. She checked on the heating systems in the incubator. Everyone in the family took part in taking care of the chickens.

We had just one garden for the family's vegetables at first. As the family grew, we expanded to two gardens and then to three. The first garden was to the front of the property, to the east side. The second garden that we put in, was during the twenties, in the southwest front field area. The field in back of the west garden was used for wheat when we had horses. The third one, also started in the twenties but a little later, was up on the north hill by the old snag and was two acres. It had kale and potatoes sometimes. During this time of the twenties and into the early thirties we had a total of six or seven acres in vegetable gardens. The three gardens were all mixed crops such as beans, both dry and green, tomatoes, and corn. Farm diversity for the small family farms is what kept family farms nearly self sufficient. The diversity offset price fluctuation in one area of cash stock or crops.

1931-1940

Social and economic factors effected the Splawn's 1915 farm during the 1931 through the 1940 period. An economic factor that may have contributed to a slow down in construction activity was the Great Depression. A social factor was the change in the family to land distribution. The Splawn land holdings increased from an inheritance of a portion of Green Berry's estate. The inherited land of 110 acres was located ten miles away from the farm. In the thirties, son Harold left for an outside job and daughter Barbara left for teachers' college. The family was encumbered with additional land while experiencing less family members to work it. Jesse, Susan, and Merle were the only family members left to farm in the late thirties.

Structures

There was a slow down in the construction of farm structures (Figure 31). The large brooder (Figure 32) and the prune dryer (Figure 33) were the only new structures constructed during the thirties. The brooder was related to the chicken
Figure 31.
1931 - 1940 Splawn Farm Settlement Pattern
FIGURE 32. 1915 Farm Large Brooder (South Elevation 1990)

Builder: Jesse Splawn and son Merle
Size: 10' X 12'
Built: Circa late 30s
Function: Raise baby chicks
Form: Rectangular, one level, end opening
Ridge line: North/south
Roof type: Gable
Construction materials: Wood
Frame: Pole, fir
Exterior finish: Unpainted
Roof materials: Fir shakes, handmade
Floor: Wood
**FIGURE 33.** 1915 Farm Prune Dryer (East Elevation 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder:</th>
<th>Jesse Splain, Merle Splain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built:</td>
<td>Circa 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>4' X 4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function:</td>
<td>Dry prunes and other fruit occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form:</td>
<td>Square, one level, side opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge line:</td>
<td>North/south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof type:</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame:</td>
<td>Box board construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior:</td>
<td>Vertical board and batten, 1' X 1''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior finish:</td>
<td>Unpainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof materials:</td>
<td>Fir shakes, handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Plywood liner added circa 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor:</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
production of the farm while the prune dryer provided an additional type of food supply for the family.

The brooder, constructed at the southeast corner of the property, assisted in the raising of young chickens. It was oriented so that the prevailing winds were buffered by the sides rather than having the doorway or windows in line with the winds. The windows were in the east gable end while the door was in the west gable end.

The prune dryer served the purpose of drying prunes for family use. It had a side opening consisting of two doors, one over one. The top door opened to a tray set that held the prunes for drying (Figure 34). The bottom door opened to a compartment that held a small metal stove sending heat up through the above drying trays.

Oral History

The farms around here were small. If you had a large farm is was usually because you had timberland.

During the Depression there were certain things you couldn’t buy. Eggs were six cents a dozen. These were the lowest prices we ever got for our eggs. Cream prices were low too. Trade wasn’t done a lot then -- sometimes though. We sometimes took our wheat up to Thompson Mill, east of Shed, and traded it for flour. Sometimes merchants took eggs but they rather have money.

We went to town quite a bit in the summer time, usually on a Saturday. The men would meet at the blacksmith shop and talk while the women went to the store to shop. In the winter we didn’t go as often.

My mother continued to sell cream. We sold to the Brownsville Creamery in Brownsville. She would use a cream separator in the kitchen. Another thing she would make is soap. The large iron pot stored in the smokehouse was used for making the soap. When she was finished making the soap she would store it in jars. Sometimes if the weather was bad she would make the soap in the tool shop. She would let the fire go out and the soap would settle to the bottom. It would get kind of gray and hard. She would cut it into squares. The soap was for family use only. The big black iron pot was also used to render lard by my mother. The pot had a stand to set in and a fire could be built under it.

My mother was a good cook. One of her favorites along with the family’s was a picnic loaf cake. She made it quite often. Other family favorites were prune conserve, orange pie plant marmalade, and gum drop cookies. (Appendix A).

After my sister and brother left in the mid-thirties we reduced the size of our gardens. My sister left to attend Monmouth College. We still canned quite a bit because we didn’t want anything to go to waste. My dad inherited 110 acres from my grandfather’s estate. We put the land in oats and wheat and eventually sold it. It was a lot of work because it was located so far from our place. We had a threshing
Figure 34. Prune Dryer with Merle Splawn holding drying tray
crew from up around there that would come in and thresh the fields for us. Sometimes my mother would help out with the farming up at the 110 acres.

All the fences on the property were built by my dad. The gates on our drive are made of sapling poles (Figure 35). You don’t see them built that way anymore. They were more common on farms around here at one time.

Our prune dryer shed was made of double thick boards. This was to keep the heat inside. You had to keep a fire going all the while the prunes were drying. A vent in the back of the dryer released the smoke from the stove below, only the heat went up into the trays. The vent on the top of the dryer is to release the heat.

The brooder was built by our vegetable garden located east of the garage. A larger brooder helped us raise more chickens. We had two chicken houses, one on the north hill and one in the barnyard. They were separated by a distance so that if a disease broke out in one chicken house the other one would be far enough away that it wouldn’t be exposed. Each house held 150 chickens. We had water pumps at both of the chicken houses so we could get water to them easily.

1941-1950

World War II upset not only the world it upset the balance of the 1915 farm. Merle Splawn was in the service for four and one half years during the beginning of the forties. This meant that his father and mother were the lone operators of the 1915 farm. The Green Berry land that was inherited in the thirties had to be sold in 1944. The extra 110 acres overloaded the labor that was available to run it. In 1947, Jesse passed away, followed by his wife Susan in 1948.

Structures

Construction activity was held to a minimum (Figure 36). A milk house addition was added to the barn (Figure 37). The farm was turned into a milk-producing operation during the early forties. The milk house contained a milking machine that was run by a gasoline motor. It was a one-story, shed-roof, wooden structure. It was built on the southeast corner of the barn, near the cow stanchions.

Technology arrived not only with a motorized milking machine but also with running water available to the farmhouse. A water tower was built directly north of the farmhouse kitchen (Figure 38). The tower was bought in 1942. The total height
Figure 35. Sapling Pole Gate
Figure 36.
1941 - 1950 Splawn Farm Settlement Pattern

FIGURE 37. 1915 Farm Milk House (Southwest Elevation 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder:</th>
<th>Jesse and Merle Spawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>6' x 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built:</td>
<td>Forties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function:</td>
<td>House milking machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form:</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof type:</td>
<td>Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame:</td>
<td>Fir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior:</td>
<td>Vertical board sheathing, 1' x 1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior finish:</td>
<td>Unpainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof materials:</td>
<td>Fir shakes, handmade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor:</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 38. 1915 Farm Water Tank (1990)

Builder: Manufactured kit
Size: Approximately 4' x 4' circumference
Bought: 1942 (used)
Function: Provide household water
Form: Circular
Roof type: Gable (of tower that tank sat in, nonexistent 1990)
Construction materials: Wood
Frame: Vertical wood boards
Exterior: Metal circular bands
Exterior finish: Unpainted
Roof materials: Unknown
Other: Tank was used in tower that was approximately 20' high
of the tower was approximately 20 feet. A wooden water tank was placed on high wooden poles with a roof covering the tank. The object was to mechanically pump the water into the water tank. With the twist of a faucet inside the farmhouse, the water would gravity feed down through the faucet.

The large brooder house located east of the garage was relocated about 1942 to an area northwest of the barn.

Oral History

We got electricity in 1945. The barn had electricity before we had it in the house. These modern changes didn't change the fact that I would be out working all day long. I served time in the Army for four and one half years. This had been the only time that I have ever traveled away from the farm. I spent time in Alaska and then in South Carolina and Georgia for awhile. We rode in box cars to the South, had bunks lining the cars that could be pushed against the walls when you weren't sleeping. It was hot in the South. Spent 30 months in Alaska building camps in Juneau and Nome. Wherever you go you need to stay awhile to know what it is all about.

People around here mostly logged or farmed. Brownsville was known for its sawmills rather than for logging itself. But, during the war, people had money with no place to spend it. You would go into a store and they would have a model of something like a stove, it would just be a small model. You couldn't buy a stove because of the war, you just looked at the different small models of things.

We began milk production in the early forties. We got a bull and stabled him in the winter where we used to keep the horses. We still had one horse with the farm until 1950. Dad kept it around for certain things that a tractor couldn't do. We sold our milk to two different places over the years. One place was Borden's in Albany and the other was the Farmers Co-op out of Salem.

The egg business continued and we sold at stores in Brownsville. I never cared for chicken to eat or eggs for that matter. We never had a disease wipe us out all the time we were raising the chickens.

My mother always wanted inside running water. We bought a used water tower from my uncle Robert Orr Robinson. He had bought it as a kit of some kind. We put the water tank up on poles and placed a roof over the top of it.

During the forties we moved the headstone of Ann Splawn from her burial place on her land to the Crawfordsville Union Cemetery. She had been buried on her land with one of her children. She and the child are still on the land with no markers, just the headstone is at the cemetery along side the other members of the family. Part of the cemetery land was donated by Timothy A. Riggs for the pioneer families. The cemetery land is on part of his donation land claim.

My father did blacksmithing right up until a year before he died. He had an accident a year before -- had a tractor accident up the hill -- broke his leg and hip.
1951-1955

The 1915 farm had become a one-person operation as the fifties began. Technology assisted in the operation of the farm, a contrast to the beginning days of the 1915 farm. No longer was there a need for a threshing crew, horses, kerosene lanterns, and gasoline driven motors. However, the shadows had begun to fall on small farms in both the country and in Oregon. Technology allowed agribusiness to flourish. The downward spiral of farm ownership had begun in Oregon in 1945. Only the period of 1950 to 1955 is represented in this chapter. This short period was when the last structure was built on the 1915 farm (Figure 39).

Structures

A double garage, built with fir wood and shakes, replaced the two garages that had stood until this time (Figure 40). A covering of shingle board was added to the exterior. The gable end opening faced west and toward the drive. It was located toward the front of the property in line horizontally with the farmhouse.

The large brooder was moved to a location between the outhouse and the tool shop. It was located with the gable ends running north and south. This position meant that the door would be located to the north and the window toward the south.

Oral History

I tore down the two garages and built one garage at the beginning of the fifties. I used as much of the old lumber that I could. The original roof was shake until recently when I put a metal roof on the north side.

I moved the brooder house to where it stands now. It just seemed more convenient to have it where it is now.

I insulated the prune dryer with plywood during the early part of the fifties. I was trying to make it so the heat would stay in. I still used the dryer.
Figure 39.
1951 - 1955 Spawn Farm Settlement Pattern
FIGURE 40. 1915 Farm Double Garage (West Elevation 1991)

Builder: Merle Splawn
Built: Early 1950s
Size: 20' x 20'
Function: Two car garage
Form: Square, one level, end opening
Ridge line: East/west
Roof type: Gable
Construction materials: Wood and shingle board (fake brick shingle-type siding)
Frame: Fir
Exterior: Shingle board
Exterior finish: Shingle board
Roof materials: Original, fir shakes, handmade
Floor: Dirt with gravel
Bay: 20 X 10, shed roof
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The case study of the Riggs-Splawn family presented against the farm patterns model illustrates the linkages of material culture to cultural ethnicity. The model of the farm patterns supports the hypothesis that the material culture of the Riggs-Splawn farms reflects their traditional farm culture. Their farm structures mirror their cultural heritage.

Theoretical and Historical Data

The pattern of diffusion is an important theory that describes how culture travels with people across geographic areas. Fred Kniffen's diffusion study only incorporated the areas in the eastern half of the nation. However, his diffusion theory is important in helping one to comprehend how structure types advance through regions. Kniffen's geographic diffusion route includes Kentucky and Missouri. The two states are in the Upland South culture region that emanating out of either the Tidewater area or southeastern Pennsylvania. Theoretical and historical data indicate that structure types were associated with various ethnocultures such as the German, English and Scotch-Irish (Glassie 1964; Montell and Morse 1976; Abbott 1983; Morgan 1990; Glass 1986; Marshall 1981; Kniffen and Glassie 1966; and Jakle et al. 1989). The data revealed that ethnocultures and structure types were inextricably intertwined as they moved along diffusion routes. At points along diffusion routes are transition zones or "melting pots" where structure types are adapted to changes based on cultural influences (Glass 1986:195-215). However, in the vernacular sense certain variables changed while the form remained fairly constant (Marshall 1981:25). Size and materials are examples of variables that could change.

The Kniffen pattern of diffusion extends from the eastern seaboard region to the Mississippi River Valley. His diffusion is based on the 1850 period. In this study we need to extend the 1850 diffusion route from Missouri to Oregon and
compress the diffusion time to approximately six to seven months. Here there are no intervening generations, as noted by Abbot's study, that would influence architectural patterns (Abbott 1983:30-33). The time compression allowed the Upland South folk culture to be evident in Oregon. The immigrants spent the time between Missouri and Oregon traveling toward their objective, the Oregon country. Diffusion routes, established in the eastern United States, "leaped" from Missouri to Oregon. This "leap" assured that eastern cultural influences would be part of the newly-settled areas (see Figure 7).

Isolation, for most emigrants, would be the norm upon settling in the Oregon country during the mid-nineteenth century. As pointed out by Boag and Bowen, there was a large coterie of Missourians who settled in the Linn County area (Boag 1988; Bowen 1972). Amid these Missourians in Linn County were migrants from Ray County, among them the Riggs-Splawn family. Cultural influences would continue in harmony with neighbors and friends who were located in the nearby areas during the first family settlement period in Oregon.

**Historical Antecedents**

The Oregon phase for members of the Riggs-Splawn family undoubtedly reflected their cultural heritage. Boag's documentation of log houses in the settlement area is an indicator of Upland South presence. Timothy Riggs built a log "cabin" when he first arrived in the Brush Creek area. The log house strongly suggests a cultural influence reflective of the architectural "melting pot" -- mainly German and Swede-Finn influences (Morgan 1990:7). We can conjecture that Timothy might have built a log house for his sister Ann. Perhaps she lived in a log structure until the T house was constructed in the late 1880s. The extant T house mirrors the influence of a continuing stream of Missouri immigrants to the region (McHenry 1978).

The extant barn on the 1850 farm was built before the availability of sawmills in the area. Its construction pattern is English. Theoretically, the English type indicates that the Riggs-Splawn family was influenced along their diffusion route by the Tidewater stream of culture. The types that were brought into Kentucky from the Tidewater and the southeastern Pennsylvania area created a "melting pot" or
"shatter zone" of architectural types. The types became traditional to the Kentucky zone. Within this zone the local population could adopt types despite their ethnic heritage.

Oral History

The oral history by Merle Splawn provides an extra dimension to the study. Merle identified the functions of the extant structures. Often, vernacular family farms are either vacant or the occupants have no ties to the original family. The structures' historic functions slip away as family descendants vacate farms.

Merle Splawn's claim of an Irish heritage indicates that the family origins are probably Scotch-Irish. John C. Campbell's benchmark study of historical rural Appalachian southern culture discussed the idea of being "Irish." The Appalachian migrations during the period of 1780 to 1800 were predominately Scotch-Irish. Campbell reported that people who claimed "Irish" heritage from the 1780-1800 migration were actuality Scotch-Irish. The Scotch-Irish were from northern Ireland and were Ulster Scotch and Protestant (Campbell 1969:50-61). Merle's mention of Irish descent probably is the Ulster Scotch and Protestant definition of being "Irish." Ann Riggs-Splawn's birth in Kentucky in 1809 places the family amongst the migratory sphere of the Scotch-Irish.

Extant farm structures

A total of 17 structures are extant on the two Riggs-Splawn farms. Linking the 1850 farm to its cultural heritage would be very difficult if it were not for the oral history. The two 1850 farm structures provide valuable information but do not produce nearly the information gleaned from the 15 extant structures of the 1915 farm. This reality illustrates the need to document farm structures before they disappear rather than trying to piece together the cultural complex after they vanish.

There are questions left unanswered on the 1850 farm. Was there a log structure before the T house? Could there have been an interceding house between the first shelter and the T house? What other types of farm structures were there? What were the settlement patterns? Is the barn in its original location?
Pattern Books

Pattern books enjoyed wide spread publication during the period following the Civil War and continuing through the period of this study. Among these pattern books were farm structure designs. Pattern books tend to homogenize structures. This "homogenization effect" reflects national trends rather than ethnoculture influences. The "homogenized architecture" cannot be "read" in the same way that vernacular structures can. The 1915 farm contains some pattern book structures. The farmhouse, for example, reflects a pattern book structure. However, Howard Marshall pointed out that the pattern book type became a traditional type over time in Missouri (Marshall 1981). This type of house probably traveled to Oregon with new waves of migrants during the late 1800s. Therefore, this suggests that the house type was a reflection of the traditional Missouri culture. The chicken houses #2 and #3 and the water tower (tank) are types that are found in early twentieth century pattern books. The garage is definitely a result of the pattern book genre.

Cultural Signposts Constructs

Thus far, in this study, there has been a discussion of the Upland South architectural forms that would have been prevalent at the time of the Riggs-Splawn family's location in the Kentucky and Missouri regions. Also, the study has recorded the structures of the two family farms in Oregon. At this point, the Upland South architectural patterns will be compared to the Riggs-Splawn farms in Oregon. How will this be accomplished? Two constructs are designed to compare 1) Upland South forms with Riggs-Splawn farm forms over time and distance, and 2) Upland South "cultural signposts" with Riggs-Splawn farms "cultural signposts."

Construct A (Figure 41) charts the barn and house forms from Kentucky to Oregon. Column 1 and Column 2 are locations where the family is known to have lived. The architectural characteristics in columns 1 and 2 are those deciphered from the theoretical and historical research of the study. The architecture in columns 1 and 2 are not documented as belonging to the family rather that the architecture was present at the time of their being located in those particular areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Riggs - Splawn</td>
<td>Riggs - Splawn Family</td>
<td>Timothy A. Riggs</td>
<td>Ann Riggs - Splawn</td>
<td>Jesse Splawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 1850 Structure Types</td>
<td>Log House</td>
<td>Log House</td>
<td>Log House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Barn</td>
<td>English Barn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 - 1900 Structure Types</td>
<td></td>
<td>T House</td>
<td>English Barn</td>
<td>T House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 1950 Structure Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Barn</td>
<td>T House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geographical Diffusion**

Figure 41. Construct A
Architectural Diffusion Pattern Splawn-Riggs Family
Columns 3, 4, and 5 present architecture that is Upland South and that can be directly attributed to the Riggs-Splawn family in Oregon.

Construct B (Figure 42) plots comparative points between the Upland South "cultural signpoints" and the Riggs-Splawn farm "cultural signpoints." Construct B lists the 17 extant structures of the Riggs-Splawn farms against 15 architectural elements that were identified as being indicators of Upland South culture. An example of construct comparison is that the 1850 farm barn has five characteristics of Upland South "cultural signposts" while the 1915 farm has seven of the Upland South "cultural signposts." One of the striking factors is that although certain structures were influenced by the pattern books they did not completely extract all of the Upland South architectural elements. As an example, the Upland South is evident in the "pattern book" chicken houses which are unpainted and have hand hewn shakes applied in the traditional manner. Also, the garage has a shake roof with feathering although the structure is both a new form and function with the arrival of the automobile. This last example documents the tenacity of folk elements which are resistant to change. The two constructs connect cultural signposts and structural type diffusion.

Validation

The constructs point out an abundance of similar signposts (indicators) between the Upland South and the Riggs-Splawn structures. Construct A (p. 86) delineates the movement of forms through time and distance. The forms are the "words" that communicate the culture. Construct A delineates a commonalty of types. Construct B (p. 88) links architectural signposts (indicators) of form, function, and patterns between Upland South and the Riggs-Splawn farms. Construct B shows little change over space and time defining the phenomena as folk forms. Together, Constructs A and B communicate evidence of a folk culture. The constructs make clear that the Upland South culture is evident on the Riggs-Splawn farms as mirrored by the architecture.
### SIGNPOSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURES</th>
<th>ground outbuildings</th>
<th>pole construction</th>
<th>drive through 12 ft.</th>
<th>hewn mortise tenon</th>
<th>flat land architecture</th>
<th>white painted houses</th>
<th>outbuildings unpainted</th>
<th>T house</th>
<th>end gable door</th>
<th>german rectangular floor plan</th>
<th>Tidewater square floor plan</th>
<th>Penn. two level outbuildings</th>
<th>box construction</th>
<th>handmade woodshakes</th>
<th>feathering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barn 1800</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house 1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barn</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outhouse</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woodshed</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smokehouse</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incubator</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool shop</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chicken house (2)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machine shed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prunes dryer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chicken house (3)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large brooder</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water tower (tank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk house</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double garage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42. Construct B. Upland South Signposts
Recommendations

Historic family farms are recognized as an important part of our heritage by museums, preservationists, historians, and anthropologists. However, historic family farms are not always recognized by public museums for their traditional ethnicity. As an example, visits to farm museums can be disappointing for scholars as many times the "farm life" is portrayed generically without the traditional "cultural continuity." Unfortunately, some historians and preservationists often work on the assumption that a "barn is a barn is a barn, no difference." There is a need for a comprehensive classification system of comparative data on cultural farm types. A complex of farm vernacular architecture could provide a "type" or "template" for identifying cultural farm heritages. A system with different "templates" could be used within a uniform classification system. This classification system is presently nonexistent.

Vernacular farm architecture can provide future researchers "building blocks" for determining traditional cultures on family farms. The culture can help unlock the settlement patterns. A cultural "template" overlaid on a historic farm, can help reconstruct the form and shape of the pieces and parts that have been lost. The challenge of recording the historic farms is that many of the original farm families are no longer living on the farms. The investigator of this thesis found vernacular studies of the "farm complex" very sparse in the realm of architectural material culture. Some studies were found to concentrate on particular types of farm structures such as barns -- they lacked cultural vision of the whole farm complex. Research dealing with historic farm cultures needs to concentrate on viewing the whole of its parts -- the architectural complex.

Time is not on the side of preservation in recognizing, recording or physically preserving whole farmsteads. The effort should involve universities, volunteers, and historic agencies to listen, record, fund, and educate.
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Susan Robinson Splawn's recipes

The following recipes are copies of the originals:

Gumdrop cookies

4 eggs
2 cups brown sugar
2 cups flour
1 cup chopped nuts
18 large gumdrops


Orange Pie Plant Marmalade

3 lbs Pie Plant
4 Lbs Sugar
1 Or 2 Oranges
1 Lemon
Cup Walnuts Meats

Cut pie plant as for stewing nite before and cover with 3 lbs sugar Let stand till morning Grate lemon rind. cut up center part. cut orange rind in thin strips. Cut center in pieces. put 1 lb Sugar over this stew till tender Boil 20 minutes. This fills 10 glases

(Investigator's note: pie plant is rhubarb)
Picnic Loaf Cake

1 cup raisins
cup walnuts
1 Teaspoon Grated Orange rind
cup butter
1 cup sugar
2 eggs
1 teaspoon vanilla
2 cups Drifted Snow Flour
teaspoon salt
1 teaspoon soda dissolved in 1 Cup Butter milk

Orange Glase
1 cup sugar Mixed with cup orange Juice
Grind raisins nuts and Orange. Cream butter and sugar until Fluffy. Add eggs and raisin mix. sift flour and salt all alternate with buttermilk Put in floured and greased 8 by 8 by 2 pan. Bake at 350 degrees 50 min. Remove from oven spread with glase let cool

Prune Conserve

5 Lbs Prunes
3 Lbs Sugar
1 Lb walnuts
1 Lb raisens
2 Oranges

Put all thru food grinder Cook Slow 2 to 2 Hrs
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