**Owen Biddle and Philadelphia’s Real Estate Market, 1798–1806**

CONOR LUCEY  
Trinity College Dublin

The master builder and protoarchitect Owen Biddle (1774–1806), despite a relatively brief career, stands as a pivotal figure in the historiography of American architecture.1 His landmark publication, *The Young Carpenter’s Assistant* (Philadelphia, 1805), was one of the first indigenous architectural books to rival the English literature that had dominated building practice in the colonial era.2 More significant perhaps is his reputation as a pioneer of architectural pedagogy in early America. Jeffrey Cohen, for example, has described Biddle’s unrealized plan to formalize design instruction with the foundation of an architectural school as “possibly the earliest such effort in the country.”3 James O’Gorman is arguably more effusive and situates Biddle’s emphasis on architectural draftsmanship, exemplified by his finely illustrated book, at the inception of “that separation of designer and builder that would produce an independent architectural profession by the mid-nineteenth century.”4 Throughout his working life, however, Biddle identified primarily as a carpenter; he is listed solely as “carpenter” in editions of *The Philadelphia Directory* published between 1801 and 1806, and on the title page of his acclaimed book he described himself first as “house carpenter” and second as “teacher of architectural drawing.”5 In spite of this, house building is the one aspect of his practice that has so far escaped the attention of his biographers, an irony compounded by the fact that his two ventures in real estate—the present 525 Delancey Street and 717 Spruce Street in Philadelphia—remain standing, if not fully intact (Figures 1 and 2).

Drawing on information from a variety of unexploited archival sources, this article sheds new light on the professional life of this important if enigmatic figure and presents a descriptive analysis of buildings hitherto unrecorded in his oeuvre.6 With reference to the social, cultural, and economic histories of Federal-era Philadelphia, it further situates those buildings, and Biddle’s business and property interests generally, within the contexts of his Quaker ancestry and the city’s prevailing building culture. More broadly, in response to the tenor of recent research on the domestic architecture of the Federal era, which has renewed the focus on the singular, custom-built house, this article reasserts the significance of the row house typology that constituted the city’s urban grain.7

**Biddle’s Early Career and Business Ventures**

As with the lives of the majority of house carpenters and master builders of the Federal era, the established facts of Owen Biddle’s personal and professional life are quickly summarized.8 Born in Philadelphia in 1774 to a renowned clock maker, scientist, and member of the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, Biddle trained as a carpenter and became, within a short time of reaching his majority, a prominent figure in the city’s building industry. This is evidenced by his role as principal contractor for some of Philadelphia’s most significant early nineteenth-century structures, including the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge (1798–1805) and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts (designs by John Dorsey, 1805–6) (Figure 3). In 1800, Biddle was elected a member of the prestigious Carpenters’ Company, the city’s foremost association for building tradesmen, and in 1804 he proposed an
ultimately ineffectual motion that the organization consider “the propriety of establishing a school of Architecture” in Philadelphia. By then already active as a drawing instructor, Biddle soon turned his pedagogical interests toward the publication of *The Young Carpenter’s Assistant; or, A System of Architecture, Adapted to the Style of Building in the United States*. The significance of this book aside, his architectural reputation rests on his reticent design for the Society of Friends meetinghouse at Third and Arch Streets (1803), for which signed drawings survive (Figure 4). Biddle’s personal life was equally bountiful before it was cut short, on 25 May 1806, at the relatively young age of thirty-two: on 2 May 1798, he married Elizabeth Rowan, daughter of Quaker carpenter Moses Rowan, and together they had five children, four of whom reached adulthood.

Given the importance of craft networks for prosperity in business during this period, the most important new biographical fact to add to this rudimentary portrait concerns the identity of the master under whom Biddle served his trade apprenticeship. On 26 March 1790, the minutes of the meeting of Friends of the Southern District record that Biddle was “placed an Apprentice” to Jonathan Evans Jr. (d. 1799), a house carpenter and master builder. Although little is known of Evans’s professional life, it has been established that he was from a renowned dynasty of Philadelphia carpenters and that he joined the Friendship Carpenters’ Company in 1769 before becoming a member of the Carpenters’ Company in 1787. In fact, Evans is best remembered for his dismissal from the Carpenters’ Company in 1792, and for the fact that his copy of the company’s “secret and closely guarded pricing book” was the source of an unauthorized edition published in 1801. In March 1790, as his apprenticeship began, Biddle was one month shy of his sixteenth birthday; by 1792, the year Evans was expelled from the Carpenters’ Company, Biddle was only two years into a formal term of service that traditionally took between five
and seven years. This potentially embarrassing circumstance, however, clearly represented no impediment to Biddle’s professional reputation. In October 1800, five years after reaching the age of majority, he was admitted as a member of the Carpenters’ Company by recommendation of George Summers (1768–1823), a master builder of some standing in the wider architectural community. Although he remained an active member throughout his life—he regularly attended meetings and contributed illustrations to an edition of the company’s price book published in 1805—Biddle never proposed or nominated others for membership.

The minutes of the Friends’ regularly held meetings also offer new information regarding Biddle’s professional relationship with carpenter and master builder Joseph Cowgill (d. 1813). To date, it has been established only that Biddle and Cowgill were in some form of business partnership between 1799—a year before both became members of the Carpenters’ Company—and 1801. According to an early history of the city, both were also founding members of the Philadelphia Fire Company, an organization that was formed by members of the Society of Friends in 1800. Cowgill first appears in the minutes of the Southern District of Friends on 12 November 1791, when his petition to join this meeting was endorsed by Clayton Cowgill, “Clerk,” who may have been a relative. By 1799, the year they commenced their business, Biddle was in his twenty-sixth year, and he no doubt formed his partnership with Cowgill with an expectation of securing professional opportunities predicated on the two men’s religious confession and shared artisanal networks. While we may only speculate whether Biddle’s business venture with Cowgill was financially “encouraged” by his immediate family, in her study of the city’s early nineteenth-century building industry Donna Rilling is unequivocal in asserting that Quakers in general “figured prominently in Philadelphia’s more highly capitalized artisanal occupations.” Good prospects in business...
also depended on the availability of capital and credit, and Billy Smith has argued that this was “undoubtedly much more significant than legal or social factors in determining the ability of many journeymen to establish their independence.”22 The Parent and Guardian’s Directory, published in London in 1761, certainly advised that a carpenter wishing to be a master builder should be a good draughtsman, and be able to draw plans, and to survey and estimate the expence of buildings; and also have a good sum of money to enable him to buy materials and give credit. Without these qualifications, the youth must be contented with the prospect of being a jobbing master; who does not require a great deal besides tools.23

More broadly, Roger Moss has noted the difference between the apprenticeship system in Europe, which was rigidly hierarchical in regard to professional development, and that in the American colonies, where “no impediment blocked a young artisan from styling himself a master once out of his indenture.”24 Indeed, in some instances the business enterprise of a bound individual might be actively encouraged. In 1806, the indenture binding sixteen-year-old Thomas Whitssel to carpenter Alphonso C. Ireland contained the proviso...
that Whitisel “be allowed the use of his said masters shop and tools to work after night for himself during the term.”

While the origin and nature of Biddle and Cowgill’s business relationship remain unclear, the pooling of credit resources and the sharing of capital risk were likely motivating factors. Equally, while no records survive to indicate the scale of their enterprise, their membership in the Carpenters’ Company identifies them as professional employers rather than as jobbing carpenters. Given this fact, it seems likely that they concentrated on the organization and management of projects, and employed journeymen and laborers under a variety of short-term or contract wage agreements. Rilling describes the fluidity of carpentry businesses in the early Republic, noting in particular that an aspiring entrepreneur often “interspersed journeywork on one construction site, with management as a master builder on another.”

Regardless of the structure of the business or the nature of the contracts undertaken, the partnership disbanded by June 1801, a fact that was formally announced in the 25 August edition of the American Daily Advertiser:

The partnership of

COWGILL & BIDDLE, House-Carpenters,

Having been dissolved on the 24th of the 6th mo. last, by mutual consent, those persons who are indebted to them are requested to make immediate payment; and those who have any demands against said firm are desired to furnish their accounts to either of the subscribers for settlement.

Despite the laconic nature of this notice, it now seems certain that the termination of Cowgill and Biddle’s professional relationship was preceded by, or perhaps anticipated, concerns about the moral and ethical integrity of their business operation. Following a preparative meeting of the Southern District of Friends on 29 July 1801—a month after the partnership between Biddle and Cowgill had been discontinued—the minutes record:

We have been informed that the Overseers have treated with Joseph Cowgill and Owen Biddle on account of frequent complaints made of their being indebted to several Persons, and not taking the necessary care for the discharge thereof—Joseph Cowgill having mostly transacted the business of their partnership has so often broken his promises and disregarded his engagements that little dependance can be placed upon him.

Even though Cowgill is here singled out as the troublesome party, Biddle was of course equally accountable to their creditors and to the Friends. Little wonder, then, that this precipitated the dissolution of their business association. Nonetheless, despite the seriousness of the accusation, the Friends were evidently soon satisfied that both Biddle and Cowgill had taken the necessary steps to address the situation. The minutes of a meeting on 28 October noted, “It appears that their affairs are likely to be settled to the satisfaction of their Creditors; and that they acknowledge their departure from their word, and want of punctuality in their contracts, but gave some reason to hope they would endeavour to improve in these respects hereafter.” In fact, with the partnership already annulled (as of 24 June) and both parties apparently willing to make amends, albeit independently, the Friends decided that “upon deliberation” it was “judged best to discontinue their case from our minutes.”

This exoneration did not lead to the reestablishment of the partnership, however, and less than a year later Cowgill was again under suspicion. On 28 July 1802, the Friends were disturbed by “accounts of his associating with unprofitable Company, not timely discharging his just Debts, frequently breaking his promises, and sometimes attending exhibitions at the Theater.” Despite being encouraged to seek reparation, the members appointed to “extend further care” later reported, on 25 August, that he did not appear to be in “a disposition that would encourage further labour with him.” Issued with a testimony against his misconduct, and declining the right to appeal, Cowgill was formally “disowned” by the Society. With his access to credit now compromised, it is perhaps unsurprising that he moved away from Philadelphia, settling in Dover, in Kent County, Delaware. Although his later building career remains obscure, further glimpses into his character, or perhaps merely his relationship to institutional authority, are afforded by the minute books of the Carpenters’ Company. Following his admission to the organization in January 1801, Cowgill rarely attended meetings and, based on his continued absences and arrears, he was categorized as a “delinquent” member in 1809.

Biddle’s career, in contrast, was about to flourish. Significantly, his partnership with Cowgill never appeared in the trade listings of The Philadelphia Directory, and Biddle made his first appearance in the edition for 1801, in which he was described as “house carpenter” and his address given as 23 Powell Street. Given that the listings for this directory would have been compiled during the course of 1800 and published in time for the new calendar year of 1801, Biddle appears to have anticipated the demise of his professional relationship with Cowgill. Indeed, given the evidence of Cowgill’s dilatory character and lack of business acumen, not to mention the importance of reputation for success in the building trade, it seems particularly astute of Biddle to have chosen this moment to advertise his professional independence.
The Building of 525 Delancey Street

In February 1798, Biddle purchased the ground rent at 23 Powell Street (now 525 Delancey Street) from John Douglass, cabinetmaker, and agreed to build and finish “a good three story brick house” within a calendar year (a condition of the sale and a typical clause of the period). This lot was part of a larger tract of 94 feet 9 inches frontage that comprises the present 519–529 Delancey Street, which was bought in 1796 by a partnership formed between Douglass and Benjamin Thornton, house carpenter. By December 1797, Douglass and Thornton, having already built two houses (numbers 519 and 521), agreed to “make Partition” of their business interests: on 16 February 1798, Douglass sold his two apportioned lots to Biddle (525) and Joseph Cowgill (523). Significantly, these property conveyances preceded the accepted date (1799) of the beginning of the professional association between Biddle and Cowgill. If these individual ventures initiated their business partnership, as seems likely, the partnership may have been intended as a speculative house-building enterprise. Property speculation, despite the attendant risks, was among the principal means by which a builder might achieve financial “competence” (or respectable livelihood). In this context it is worth noting that the two houses were first designed with identical elevations and plans, suggesting that they were erected in tandem. Also significant is the fact that 527 Delancey Street, adjoining Biddle’s plot to the west, was built by the house carpenter George Summers. This was the same Summers who had successfully proposed the election of Biddle and Cowgill to the Carpenters’ Company in July 1800. (In January 1799, Summers had already proposed the membership of Alphonso C. Ireland, carpenter, who was then building next door to Summers at 529 Delancey Street.) This kind of professional mutuality, as seems likely, the partnership may have been intended as a speculative house-building enterprise. Property speculation, despite the attendant risks, was among the principal means by which a builder might achieve financial “competence” (or respectable livelihood).

Powell (now Delancey) Street, between Fifth and Sixth Streets, was situated in a relatively undeveloped part of New Market Ward. Nonetheless, being contiguous to the two most exclusive residential neighborhoods in the city—the area today known as Society Hill and the streets in the immediate vicinity of the statehouse—the houses built on Powell Street had the potential to appeal to the “middling sorts.” Proximity to centers of commerce and/or fashion demonstrably affected ground rents—the principal means by which builders entered the world of property speculation—and ground rents were calculated by distance from what Mary M. Schweitzer has identified as the foremost “axis for real estate” in Philadelphia, located at the juncture between Market Street and the waterfront (Figure 5). At Powell Street in 1798–99, building lots of 15 feet 9½ inches frontage were sold at the annual ground rent of $48. At the same time, wider lots of 18 feet frontage in the nearby 300 block of Lombard Street cost only $32. Although larger in dimension than the Powell Street lots, and only minutes away by foot, the reduced ground rent almost certainly reflected Lombard Street’s status as a “modest residential area” at this time.

Though the façade of 525 Delancey Street has been altered slightly over time (see Figure 1), a 1916 photograph shows the house as originally constructed (Figure 6). The similarity with 523, built by Cowgill, is immediate and unmistakable, not only in the proportion of solid to void and the formal consonance between fenestration patterns and story heights but also in details like the shared belt courses and eaves cornice. Despite the fact that these houses were raised on individually held lots, Biddle and Cowgill clearly conceived and built them as a pair. Of further interest is the lack of deference to their immediate neighbors, 519 and 521, built a year earlier by the ground landlords, Douglass and Thornton. Such discordances and abrupt changes in scale were of course characteristic of even the most exclusive streetscapes in eighteenth-century Philadelphia. While the conditions and stipulations imposed by fire insurance companies improved standards of building construction across the city, controls and guidelines regarding the appearance of contiguous houses, and their relationship to one another in a street or block, were not a feature of urban design during the Federal period. With landowners demanding only that houses be well built and completed within specific time frames, master builders dictated architectural taste. House design thus regulated itself through established, long-standing building practices and protocols, but also, and increasingly after 1800, through wage labor agreements and the standardization of component parts—such as lumber—prepared off-site.

A fire insurance survey of 525 Delancey Street recorded in 1801, when the house was owned by Abraham Golding, provides a glimpse of its original spatial organization (Figure 7). The survey indicates that the house conformed to the common plan type of “Two Rooms on a Floor” (that is, two rooms on each of the first and second stories) and was adjoined at the rear by a “piazza,” a standalone space containing the staircase. The location of the kitchen “in The Cellar,” as opposed to in a separate structure adjacent to the piazza, was a cost-effective measure typical of a house of this scale. Given the house’s conformity to one of the most characteristic of Philadelphian house types, it seems clear that consumer expectation rather than architectural innovation was foremost in Biddle’s mind.
Figure 5  John Hills, "This Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Its Environs," engraving, 1797; this map contains a legend identifying fifty-four buildings, including such landmarks as the statehouse, Christ Church, and the Pennsylvania Hospital (courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University).

Figure 6  521–529 Delancey Street, Philadelphia, 1916 (Philadelphia Contributionship Collection courtesy of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania).
This is confirmed by his pragmatic approach to building construction: the plastered partitions and paint finishes (both “inside and out”), coupled with the solid 9-inch party walls, were clearly factors that influenced the low premium charged for this insurance policy (£400, at the rate of 40 shillings per £100).55 While references in the survey to the “lightly ornamented” mantels and frontispiece might be read as reflecting Biddle’s preference for “a due proportion of plain surfaces” in architectural design, they more likely relate to the modest character of the house overall, which extended to the cost-effective choice of white pine for the interior carpentry.56 At this time, houses built to higher specifications customarily boasted yellow pine flooring, marble mantels, stucco cornices, and open-newel stairs with mahogany handrails. Given its apparently unpretentious finish, not to mention its sale within eighteen months of completion, it seems likely that 23 Powell Street was built for selling from the outset. This contrasts with Biddle’s second house-building project in the 700 block of Spruce Street.57

Building Houses and Selling Houses

In the 1802 edition of The Philadelphia Directory, Biddle is listed twice: at Powell Street and at “Spruce above 7th.”58 Biddle had acquired a lot of ground on the north side of Spruce Street in July 1801, at precisely the moment when his character and moral reputation were under scrutiny by the Friends. On this site, he pledged to build a house within eighteen months at a minimum value of $800.59 This house, the present 717 Spruce Street, remained Biddle’s home until his death in 1806 (see Figure 2).

A key difference between the property transactions for Powell Street and Spruce Street was the codicil that the houses in Spruce Street should be built “of the value” of a specified amount (originally $800, later rising to $1,000). While this almost certainly reflected the ownership and control of the Society of Friends—a letter patent of 12 November 1795 records that the ground was held in trust for “the use of [their] monthly meetings”—the proximity of the 700 block of Spruce Street to both the newly improving Washington Square area and the elegant and uniform row houses then being built between Seventh and Eighth Streets on Walnut and Sansom (ca. 1799–1802) was undoubtedly another factor (Figure 8).60 Moreover, as one of the principal east–west arteries determined by William Penn’s original plan for the city in 1682–83, Spruce Street was both more imposing in scale and more geographically propitious than Powell Street. Biddle’s lot was, at 19 feet 4 inches frontage, one of the larger plots on Spruce Street, with a stipulated building value of at least $800.61 Within a year, those purchasing lots with a smaller frontage of 17 feet 6 inches were requested to build houses at a minimum value of $1,000, an increase that almost certainly reflected Philadelphia’s fluctuating real estate market at the time.62
On Spruce Street, Biddle was again in distinguished artisanal company. Further along the street, William Thackara Jr. (1770–1823), who created the decorative plasterwork in the Senate chamber at Congress Hall (completed 1793), was the builder-speculator of the present number 731. Thackara’s decision to build on Spruce Street may, of course, have been prompted or encouraged by Biddle—they were already neighbors in Powell Street—but it more likely relates to the particular social and professional advantages he enjoyed as a member of the Society of Friends. More significant still is the social demographic of the 700 block of Spruce Street. Before the Revolution, most Carpenters’ Company members lived in the Dock Ward, Mulberry Ward, or Southwark districts of the city, areas largely occupied by the lower and middle classes. Although Spruce Street boasted a higher proportion of nonmanual workers and genteel residents than Powell Street, 35 percent of those with addresses at “Spruce above 7th” in 1806 were building tradesmen.

The house at 717 Spruce Street has fared less well than Biddle’s earlier property venture. While its original footprint and some structural fabric survive, the original façade and interior partitions have long been lost to the vicissitudes of time and redevelopment. Based on its description in a fire insurance survey of 1821, it can be established that the house was built on a more genteel model than 525 Delancey Street: larger in area and proportion (measuring 19 feet 4 inches by 43 feet), the rooms on both first and second stories were flanked by a discrete circulation “passage” (or hallway) (Figure 9). The principal stair, located in the piazza, served the entire four stories of the house (including the garret); a second “private winding” staircase served a detached two-story kitchen building and washhouse. Although Biddle’s motivation for building this house remains unknown—did he build it for speculation or as a family home?—the interior was well appointed. Here a more formal approach to architectural decoration was realized. While finely turned door and window architraves were described in both first- and second-floor rooms in the 1821 survey, the distinction between marble mantels and mantels of wood, respectively, on these stories, not to mention mahogany doors to the first-floor rooms alone, highlights the commonly observed spatial hierarchies of the “polite” urban interior. Although such elements cannot be absolutely attributed to Biddle and may date from later tenancies, refined decorative finishes were an increasingly common feature of houses built for sale or rent during this period. In 1810, four adjoining houses on Ninth

Figure 8 Thomas Carstairs, “The Plan and Elevation of the South Buildings in Sansom Street in the City of Philadelphia,” ink and watercolor, ca. 1800–1802 (Library Company of Philadelphia).
and Race Streets, “built in the best style of modern architecture,” boasted “handsome fire places, cornices and stairways.”70 Significantly, this appears to accord with speculative building practices observed in late eighteenth-century London and Dublin.71

Having established the Spruce Street house as his residence and workshop, Biddle attempted to sell 23 Powell Street in the spring of 1801, when it was advertised simply as “A New Three story brick House.”72 This terse notice evidently did not elicit the desired response—it was repeated in newspapers throughout June, July, and August—and Biddle turned to the preferred method for selling property, seeking the professional advice of Shannon & Poalk, auctioneers, of Market Street. The house was subsequently announced for sale by public auction on “the 26th Oct. inst, at 7 o’clock in the evening.” On this occasion, while focusing on location and the dimensions of the building and lot, Shannon & Poalk’s advertisement employed the most commonly invoked descriptors used to sell genteel real estate, describing the house as being both “convenient” and “well-finished.”73 Electing to present the house to interested parties himself, Biddle offered attractive terms, part of the purchase cost being deferred on “the security of the property.”74 Five days after the auction date, on 31 October, the house was sold to Abraham Golding (or Golden), mariner, for the sum of $1,900.75 Although built as part of a pair, Cowgill’s house, 21 Powell Street, sold for $1,650 less than a year later, a substantial reduction that may be attributed to a national business depression in 1802.76

From Buildings to Books

Biddle resided at 717 Spruce Street for the remainder of his life. While living there, he completed the projects with which his name has long been associated: the design and building of the Arch Street Meeting House and the building of both the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Most significantly, at 717 Spruce Street Biddle composed his most enduring contribution to the American architectural profession, the text of *The Young Carpenter’s Assistant*, published in Philadelphia in 1805. A measure of his reputation within the building industry at this time can be determined by the relatively short period between the book’s announcement and its eventual publication by subscription, a process that frequently took a number of years and carried with it the risk of being “an embarrassing and degrading experience.”77 Proposals for printing the book by subscription were advertised in February 1805, when a local newspaper announced that it would be “contained in one neat quarto volume, strongly bound, and printed in a handsome style, on a superfine paper; illustrated with upwards of 40 copperplate engravings, in the execution of

Figure 9 Conjectural first-floor plan of 717 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, 1821 (author’s drawing).
which no reasonable pains or expense shall be spared to make
them complete.”

As early as July 1805, the manuscript was copyrighted by
the printer Benjamin Johnson; by November 1805, having
secured a respectable 198 subscribers, the book was “just
published.” It soon enjoyed a wide distribution, being avail-
able through bookshops in Philadelphia and New York in
1805, and in Richmond, Virginia, and Lexington, Kentucky,
by 1810. By contrast, the distribution of Asher Benjamin’s
*The Country Builder’s Assistant* (first edition 1797), which
enjoys the distinction of being the first American-authored
builder’s handbook, was apparently limited to Boston and to
the small towns in Massachusetts where Benjamin was
employed.

Aimed squarely at the building mechanic rather than the
architectural connoisseur, *The Young Carpenter’s Assistant*
was a potent distillation of building design and practice in
Philadelphia at the turn of the century. Comparatively large
in scale and illustrated by some of the finest engravers in
the city, it was clearly intended as a rival to the established
English titles by Abraham Swan, William Pain, and others
that had long enjoyed circulation in the colonies. Although
Michael Lewis is correct to suggest that Biddle’s book was
“a provincial variant of a European publishing genre” and
“highly formulaic in character,” Biddle outdid his English
competitors by addressing the immediate requirements of
the American building trades. Heavily reliant on Pain,
Biddle nonetheless selected an optimum number of plates
(addressing both practical and aesthetic concerns) and
focused on structural clarity and consistency in textual exe-
gesis (Figures 10 and 11). Moreover, where Pain’s books
simultaneously, and often confusingly, published designs
both modish and retardataire, Biddle’s plates directly
reflected the established tastes of Philadelphian carpenters
and housewrights.

A further measure of the significance attached to Biddle’s
book is confirmed by its influence on Asher Benjamin’s sec-
ond publication venture, *The American Builder’s Companion*
(1806), which apes the format, tone, and quality of *The Young
Carpenter’s Assistant* and bears little resemblance to Benja-
min’s first, decidedly amateurish, effort. John Quinan’s asser-
tion that the publication of *The Country Builder’s Assistant*
“originated out of Benjamin’s expressed dissatisfaction with
the expensive and excessively elaborate English architectural
handbooks which were regularly sold to American house-
wrights” is misleading. In the preface to *The Young Carpen-
ter’s Assistant*, Biddle decried the content of imported books,
“two thirds” of which he characterized as “unnecessary” for
the “American student of Architecture.” Benjamin’s state-
ment that “not more than one third of the contents of the
European publications” on architecture “are of any use to the
American artist” appears in the first edition of *The American
Builder’s Companion published in 1806, and thus postdates Biddle’s identical sentiment by a full calendar year. While both authors relied on English sources for content and illustrations, Biddle’s book was unquestionably a more accomplished production than Benjamin’s Country Builder’s Assistant in terms of design clarity and textual lucidity. Furthermore, this high standard of presentation, coupled with its wider network of distribution, almost certainly brought The Young Carpenter’s Assistant to the attention of Benjamin and other New England carpenters (one named subscriber to Biddle’s book hailed from Rhode Island). Benjamin was in fact part of a coterie of Boston housewrights who had, in June 1804, requested advice from the Carpenters’ Company in Philadelphia regarding “the rules & regulations by which your Society is Govern’d.” While this indicates Philadelphia’s centrality with respect to an emerging national building industry, it also suggests a nascent yet dispersed network of building mechanics and aspiring architects located in different urban centers, brought together principally through the instruments of their shared interests.

Although Benjamin’s American Builder’s Companion included designs for the kind of city houses he was then erecting in Boston (Figures 12 and 13), Biddle provided no designs for the type of row houses he had built on Powell and Spruce Streets. But while this might indicate Biddle’s lack of interest in that particular building typology, it more likely relates to the didactic purpose of his book. The city house, as the province of master builders, was not customarily regarded as “architecture” per se, and Biddle was evidently inclined to provide more ambitious design exemplars. Two house elevations of his own composition—one conservative, the other more ambitious but gauche—were clearly intended to display his capacity for domestic architectural design in a modernizing, classical idiom (Figure 14); his self-built houses, and even his design for the Arch Street Meeting House, could not have satisfied this criterion. (Modesty, of

Figure 12 “Plan and Elevation for a Town House” (Asher Benjamin and Daniel Raynerd, The American Builder’s Companion [1806; repr., New York: Dover, 1969], plate LII).

Figure 13 Asher Benjamin, 21–23 Hancock Street, Boston, ca. 1806 (author’s photo).
course, may have prevented Biddle from including the latter, although it is arguably not a building of any great consequence in architectural terms.) However, while attempts to “read” Biddle’s approach to row house design from The Young Carpenter’s Assistant are somewhat frustrated by the lack of plates and textual exposition, a comprehensible aesthetic emerges from the pages of the book. Biddle patently disliked the “unmeaning holes and cuttings of a gouge” that characterized the vernacular Adam style common in Philadelphia, favoring a more conservative classicism. His illustration of a “pitch pediment frontispiece,” for example, is plagiarized from a design by William Pain first published in 1766, almost forty years earlier (Figures 15 and 16).

Conceiving his book primarily as a pedagogical tool, Biddle was also anxious that it provide examples of the most important buildings in the modern style then being erected in Philadelphia. The inclusion of architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe’s design for the Bank of Pennsylvania (1799), which Biddle described as both “beautiful” and a “neat specimen of the Ionic Order,” was therefore both instructive and astute.
Mindful of the vagaries of architectural fashions, *The Young Carpenter’s Assistant* evinced a measured approach to the classical idiom that contributed to its continuing popularity among building tradesmen. Reprints of the original text were issued in 1810, 1815, and 1817, and a posthumous second edition, augmented with Greek revival designs by architect John Haviland, was published in 1833.96

A curious coda to the book’s early history is the fact that, despite Biddle’s regular attendance at Carpenters’ Company meetings, *The Young Carpenter’s Assistant* received no mention in the association’s minutes during his lifetime. In fact, of the 167 Philadelphian subscribers to Biddle’s book, only 20 percent were members of the Carpenters’ Company, suggesting that the company did not formally endorse or encourage the enterprise.97 Indeed, the record of a meeting of the Managing Committee on 4 March 1807 includes the request that member Alphonso C. Ireland purchase a copy on the company’s behalf, suggesting that its library did not in fact already possess one.98 While we may only speculate as to why this was the case, it seems certain that any book that threatened to undermine the authority of Philadelphia’s foremost craft guild, regardless of the identity of the author, would be regarded with a degree of suspicion.

**Biddle as Speculator or Carpenter?**

In the immediate aftermath of his death in 1806, Biddle’s debts were called in, and his workshop, benches, tools, and architectural books were advertised for sale.99 With his brothers John and Clement engaged in other professions and his sons being minors, there was evidently no one willing or able to inherit Biddle’s carpentry business.100 The workshop, described as being “new” and situated on “a lot of ground in Orange Street” between Seventh and Eighth Streets, evidently stood at the rear of the 130-foot-deep Spruce Street property.101 Donna Rilling’s study of the early building industry in Philadelphia indicates that carpenters’ workshops...
were typically utilitarian structures of timber-frame construction, often situated at the rear of dwelling house lots. In 1782, the sale of a “Carpenter’s Shop” at the rear of a house in Arch Street described the structure as being “34 Feet by 15, one Story high.” An “old frame work shop” in Spruce Street in 1805, on the other hand, was advertised as “containing in breadth east and west, 5 feet 2 inches, and in length or depth, southward, 70 feet.” In an inventory of Biddle’s effects made on 20 June 1806, his “Work Shop & Benches” were valued at $75, while the “Sundry Tools & implements of Trade” were valued at $76. Whereas the combined estimate of tools and shop, at $151, placed Biddle at the lower end of frame shop appraisals in Philadelphia at this time, the value of the tools alone was considerably higher than that of the average carpenter’s chest, and the most valuable item of his personal estate (Figure 17).

Although much has been made of Biddle’s architectural library—his estate inventory listed fifteen books devoted to the subject—the authors remain, for the most part, unknown. While builder’s handbooks by William Pain and Peter Nicholson informed the text and plates of The Young Carpenter’s Assistant, and were duly acknowledged in the introduction, the suggestion that Biddle’s library may have extended to the more expensive folio volumes authored by renowned British architects such as James Gibbs and William Chambers is without foundation, and the influence of these architects is not readily discernible in the buildings and designs that constitute his oeuvre. Given the character and nature of his business and professional formation, it seems more likely that the remaining unidentified titles were drawn from the available “ready reckoners” and books of mensuration that were among the most widely circulating books in early America. That said, Biddle’s membership in the Library Company of Philadelphia would certainly have provided him with ready access to a wider range of architectural publications.

In his will of 10 May 1806, Biddle empowered his executors—his wife, Elizabeth, and his two brothers, John and Clement—to sell the Spruce Street house, “where I now dwell,” if required to satisfy his “just debts.” In January 1811, the property was sold by private contract to Samuel Simes, accountant, for $2,750. Despite the fact that itemized payments from Biddle’s estate to various building mechanics remain inconclusive, it seems certain that the majority of these individuals were retained, or newly employed, to undertake projects left incomplete at the time of his death. Of particular interest are sums paid to John C. Evans “for carpenters’ work” in 1808 and 1811. In 1806, Evans (fl. 1805–50) was Biddle’s immediate neighbor, having built the adjoining house, the current number 719 Spruce Street, and he was also one of two persons appointed to appraise Biddle’s personal estate. Evans was a carpenter and a builder-speculator of some standing, and he worked as a surveyor for the Philadelphia Contributionship for more than forty years. In April 1810, he sold 719 Spruce Street to Charles Stewart, a navy captain, for $5,100. Given that the years between 1809 and 1815 represented “one of the most profitable times in early nineteenth-century construction,” the smaller amount paid for Biddle’s adjoining house a year later, though of identical plot dimension and ground rent to Evans, cannot be readily explained. What is clear is that 717 Spruce Street was available for short-term letting from at least 1808, and its disposal by Biddle’s executors was likely anticipated from the outset.
What does the foregoing indicate? The evidence of Biddle's two houses suggests that he was not a builder-speculator of any significance. Independent research into the eighteenth-century building trade in London, New York, and Philadelphia reveals that competitive house-building businesses had up to six properties in progress at any one time. While creditworthiness was evidently a problem during the short-lived partnership between Biddle and Cowgill, it also remains unclear as to what kinds of financial instruments Biddle used to underwrite his property ventures. Unlike Summers and Ireland, his immediate neighbors and colleagues, Biddle did not borrow from the Carpenters' Company. At other times, however, he mortgaged both the Powell Street and Spruce Street properties to the same person, Lydia Johnson, spinster, and she continued to receive regular interest payments from his estate before being fully reimbursed in 1811. In light of the financial problems encountered by the Cowgill and Biddle partnership in 1801, it is interesting to note that both retained ownership, and raised capital, on their respective houses in Powell Street independent of one another.

How much journeyman carpentry work did Biddle undertake in these years? His composition of a book on the rudiments of architecture, coupled with the larger building projects he took on at this time, such as the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge and Arch Street Meeting House, signal a departure from manual labor and the employment of a shop foreman and apprentices. About this, however, the records are silent. The 1800 census taken in Philadelphia, when Biddle was resident in Powell Street, records that his household included one male between ten and sixteen years of age, two between the ages of sixteen and twenty-six years, and two between the ages of twenty-six and forty-five years. Discounting his son John, born in 1799, we might only hypothesize whether some of these individuals were apprentices to, or employees of, Biddle's business. While a master carpenter might keep only one or two apprentices full-time, employing journeymen and laborers as needs dictated, successful operations might engage numerous hands. No fewer than eight apprentices were bound to house carpenter Peter L. Berry between April 1802 and February 1806. Master builders, on the other hand, managed sizable numbers of contractors and subcontractors. For the completion of a house on Second Street, undertaken between 1795 and 1798, twenty-eight individuals (or firms), including carpenters, stonemasons, plasterers, and plumbers, were coordinated by the project supervisor.

That Biddle's self-built houses had nothing architecturally distinctive about them should come as no surprise. The domestic real estate market then constituted, as it does today, a delicate balancing act between producer and consumer, and his conventional elevations and plans are perhaps best understood as an expression of his good business sense. Size, location, and character were among the factors that dictated a property's valuation, and a comparison with houses of a similar type helps to place Biddle's buildings in context (Table 1).

The U.S. Direct Tax Lists for 1798 record that Biddle's and Cowgill's properties in Powell (Delancey) Street were valued at $400 apiece. It is important to note, however, that these figures are based on the fact that these houses had yet to be fully built, the ground lots having been purchased only earlier in that year. The $731.25 valuation of the adjoining 19 Powell (built 1796–97) is perplexing in this context, given that the house was equivalent in area and frontage to its neighbors, its prominent corner location and orientation toward Fifth rather than Powell Street was likely a contributing factor. More difficult to account for are the considerably higher valuations for 427 Spruce Street ($3,825) and 244 South Third Street ($15,750). Although these houses were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Street frontage</th>
<th>Date built</th>
<th>Master builder</th>
<th>1798 valuation ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Powell</td>
<td>15' 9½&quot;</td>
<td>1798–99</td>
<td>Owen Biddle</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Powell</td>
<td>15' 9½&quot;</td>
<td>1798–99</td>
<td>Joseph Cowgill</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Powell</td>
<td>15' 9&quot;</td>
<td>1797–98</td>
<td>Benj. Thornton</td>
<td>731.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Powell</td>
<td>16' (dem.)</td>
<td>1796–97</td>
<td>Wm. Thackara Jr.</td>
<td>1,237.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427 Spruce</td>
<td>22' 9&quot;</td>
<td>1790–91</td>
<td>William Williams</td>
<td>3,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 S. Third</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>1765–66</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

certainly larger in scale and spatial dimension, here it seems likely that the less tangible qualities of association and reputation also influenced their appraisal: 427 Spruce was built by William Williams, one of the most celebrated builder/architects of the Federal era in Philadelphia, and was, in 1798, home to Don Joseph de Jaudenes, commissary general and envoy from the king of Spain; 244 South Third (the Powel House), one of the finest examples of the row house type in eighteenth-century Philadelphia, was successively home to some of the most distinguished families of the so-called Republican Court (Figures 18 and 19).124

More important, if we take into account the median dwelling space common to the city’s various occupational categories, from “low manual” to “high nonmanual,” we can surmise Biddle’s projected market. With a living area of approximately 1,417 square feet, 23 Powell Street was slightly larger than the median 1,335 square feet of the typical city-center houses occupied by storekeepers and other nonmanual workers, but smaller than the 1,812 square feet of houses favored by merchants, brokers, and other professionals. On the other hand, it was substantially greater in area than the 900 square feet common to the “high manual” category of skilled artisans (Biddle’s own particular demographic). With this in mind, it seems clear that Biddle’s house was aimed at a “middling” consumer class amply represented in the urban real estate marketplace.125

Conclusion

From arguably inauspicious beginnings—an apprenticeship to a master dismissed from the city’s foremost craft association and a business partnership that almost ended in disgrace—Biddle emerged as one of the leading figures in the building world of early nineteenth-century Philadelphia. Trained as a carpenter within the conservative milieu of the Carpenters’ Company, he evidently harbored loftier aspirations. This lay at the root of his attempt to establish a school of architectural design and, when that failed to transpire, to compose the first manual of architectural design aimed at the particular needs of the American building tradesman. His abilities and ambitions were complemented by serendipitous circumstances. Although historically disparaged as the “lower orders,” the mechanic and the craftsman were elevated within the social pecking order by eighteenth-century Enlightenment thinking. Nowhere was this more tangible...
than in America. Politically empowered in the aftermath of the Revolution, artisans emerged as part of the “independent producing class” during the 1790s, the decade when Biddle attained his majority and set up in business.126 By the time of his death from consumption in 1806, he had clearly achieved professional competence, a fact confirmed by his finely built, well-furnished dwelling in one of the city’s foremost residential districts.127

Even though Biddle’s self-built houses cannot claim a place among the ranks of the more significant city mansions erected in Philadelphia during the Federal era and may not rank among the most important buildings of his own oeuvre, they nonetheless shed important light on his everyday practice as a house carpenter. As a statement of both his individual artisanal abilities and the milieu in which the buildings were made, Biddle’s row houses stand as testimony to what J. Ritchie Garrison has recently characterized as the importance of a builder’s “performance”—related to design, business, and reputation—in early American architectural culture.128 Given their unpretentious form and appearance, and Biddle’s modest ambitions as a speculative builder, they also find a pleasing equivalence with Latrobe’s posthumous description of Biddle as “a very good and honest man.”129

Conor Lucey is an architectural historian whose research interests include the urban domestic architecture of the Federal period and the decorative interior in Europe 1600–1840. His current project considers the eighteenth-century property developer as both a figure of building production and an agent of architectural culture.
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111. Wills 1806: No. 50, “Settlement of the Estate of Owen Biddle.” Various payments to Evans “for lumber” in the period 1806–9 also suggest the completion of projects. Equally tantalizing, if inconclusive, are payments to, among others, Joseph Jordan, plasterer, in 1807; George Lybrand, brickmaker, in 1808; and Timothy Desmond, painter and glazier, in 1809.

112. Deeds E.F./28/498; Wills 1806: No. 50, “An Inventory of the Personal Estate of Owen Biddle.”


116. Wills 1806: No. 50, “Settlement of the Estate of Owen Biddle.” This document records that on 31 October 1808, Mordecai Churchman paid $378.69 for “Rent of dwelling house in Spruce Street.” This was followed by rental payments from three different individuals in 1809, by another named person in 1810, and by a further individual in 1811. As to the health of Biddle’s personal estate: there is no mention of any members of the Carpenters’ Company calling on his widow to “inquire into her situation,” a customary affair that constituted the offer of financial assistance and, more pressing, a request for the return of the company's price book. Unlike many other widows, Elizabeth Biddle did not apply for relief from the company; she married again in January 1812.

117. On Philadelphia, see Rilling, Making Houses, 5; on London, see Peter Guillery, The Small House in Eighteenth-Century London (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2004), 286; on New York, see Elizabeth Blackmar, Manhattan for Rent, 1783–1830 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989), 186. Cowgill appears only once as a grantor in the deeds document records that on 31 October 1808, Mordecai Churchman paid $378.69 for “Rent of dwelling house in Spruce Street.” This was followed by rental payments from three different individuals in 1809, by another named person in 1810, and by a further individual in 1811. As to the health of Biddle’s personal estate: there is no mention of any members of the Carpenters’ Company calling on his widow to “inquire into her situation,” a customary affair that constituted the offer of financial assistance and, more pressing, a request for the return of the company's price book. Unlike many other widows, Elizabeth Biddle did not apply for relief from the company; she married again in January 1812.

118. On Philadelphia, see Rilling, Making Houses, 5; on London, see Peter Guillery, The Small House in Eighteenth-Century London (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2004), 286; on New York, see Elizabeth Blackmar, Manhattan for Rent, 1783–1830 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989), 186. Cowgill appears only once as a grantor in the deeds records, when he sold his Powell Street house to a William Corbit, gentleman, in March 1802. Deeds I.C./9/42. This sale may have related directly to his departure for Dover.

119. Mortgages E.F./2/85 (Powell Street, 1800) and E.F./8/418 (Spruce Street, 1804), Philadelphia City Archives. Similar payments to a Moses
Bartram and, later, his widow, Rebecca, remain inconclusive: there is no record of Biddle having held a mortgage from Bartram during his lifetime.  

120. Mortgages M/18/166, Philadelphia City Archives. This transaction recites that in June 1799, Cowgill, to better secure the reimbursement of a loan of $1,000, mortgaged his house in Powell Street to Ann Emlen, widow.  

121. Second Census, 1800 Population, vol. 5, Philadelphia City, Pennsylvania, M32, Roll 43, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. The makeup of this household is unclear. Biddle was twenty-six years old in April 1800. His eldest son, John, born in February 1799, was the single child under ten years of age recorded here.  


123. Administration Records, 1794, no. 237, William Williams, City Hall, Philadelphia.  

124. United States Direct Tax of 1798: Tax Lists for the State of Pennsylvania, M372, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C. Biddle’s and Cowgill’s property assessments appear in the “Particular List B” category, referring to “all lands, lots, buildings and wharves … excepting only such dwelling houses as with the outhouses appurtenant thereto.” In addition to his Powell Street property, Biddle is described as the owner of a lot on “Clover Alley next to Rigbees Stable,” valued at $100. This property remains enigmatic but is clearly related to Powell Street, as Cowgill and Thornton are also described as owners of vacant lots here, all valued at the same amount. In The Philadelphia Directory for 1801, Clover Alley is described as “leading from S. Fifth street between 60 & 64” and boasting four discrete tenants (a gentlewoman, a boardinghouse, a bank clerk, and a house carpenter); the edition for 1802 notes that Clover Alley ran “from 90 South Fifth, to 125 Sixth streets.”  

125. The figures cited in this paragraph are from Blumin, The Emergence of the Middle Class, 42–47, Table 2.3, “Median floor space in dwelling by occupational category and zone of residence, Philadelphia, 1798.”  


127. Wills 1806: No. 50, “An Inventory of the Personal Estate of Owen Biddle.” Estate inventories are notoriously problematic as evidence. That said, Biddle’s estate amounted to the not inconsiderable sum of $729.18 and included mahogany furniture, looking glasses, china, plate, carpets, and “pictures.” Record of Interments in Friends Burial Ground on Fourth and Mulberry Streets for the Southern District Phila., pp. 44–45, Record of Births and Interments, 1734–1806, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania. Biddle was buried in the “Eastern Ground” (at Fourth and Arch, formerly Mulberry, Streets) deeded to the Quakers as a burial site by William Penn in 1701. It is also the site of Biddle’s Arch Street Meeting House (begun 1803).  
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