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INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades the role of historic house museums has evolved in response to new historic scholarship and the modern needs and expectations of visitors. In light of this, historic house museum installations cannot be left in a static state but must be continuously evaluated and updated.1 Bradley C. Brooks states in his article, “The Historic House Furnishings Plan: Process and Product,” “while it can be tempting to put the final bound version on the shelf with a sigh of relief and satisfaction, the furnishings plan itself should remain a living document, open to periodic review and revision as the institution matures.”2 A basic understanding of the development of historical scholarship in recent years and the changing role of the historic house museum is important in shedding light on the value of a Supplemental Todd House Furnishing Plan at this point in time.

Today, house museums are recognized as important tools in teaching and engaging the public in social history and have become, over the years, tools for thought-provoking interpretation.3 This can be seen in all areas of a house from kitchens to parlors and bedrooms to cellars and garrets. Jessica Foy Donnelly, editor of Interpreting Historic House Museums, points out the familiarity of the house museum as a place of residence where former occupants ate, played, worked, slept, entertained, cooked, cleaned, and carried out various other activities. The house museum is as much about the experiences of past residents as the objects kept within. These objects or artifacts are, in a sense, catalysts that enable the experiences of past residents to come to life.4
The trend towards the importance of historic house museums in presenting and engaging the public in social history also includes a new importance placed by scholars in addressing all aspects of life at that time, both positive and negative, and includes all members of society, not just the elite. The roles of household members such as free, enslaved and indentured servants, women, and children have become as equally important as that of male heads-of-house in understanding the dynamics of the household. Similarly, the lives and daily responsibilities of members of all socioeconomic levels from the enslaved to the working class to government officials and leaders have become pertinent in gaining a broad and fuller understanding of early American society. Historic house museums offer the opportunity to discuss the lives of all of the inhabitants within, presenting a first hand view of each individual’s daily activities, concerns, and responsibilities. In this way, the house museum can “offer a much more complex vision of its past through a multilayered and multisensory experience that expands interpretive choices and creates connections.”

A key example of the importance of the inclusion of minorities and underrepresented members of society was seen during the mid-1990s when the Pennsylvania Humanities Council (PHC) became concerned with the lack of women’s history in Pennsylvania’s historic sites and museums. In response to this concern, the PHC developed the program, “Raising Our Sites: Women’s History in Pennsylvania,” “a three-year project to incorporate women’s history into the interpretation of fourteen historic sites throughout the state of Pennsylvania.” The aim of the project was to unite site staff with local historians to integrate programs that, while adhering to the site mission and long term developmental plans, emphasized the lives and activities of
women. Success of the program led to the eventual incorporation of other historically under-represented groups such “as laborers and servants, religious and ethnic groups, and African Americans and Native Americans.” The “Raising Our Sites” program has continued to be successful with current programs including the interpretation of the Italian-American community at the Germantown Historical Society, Quakers and slavery at Graeme Park in Montgomery County, and the Bartram family women at Historic Bartram’s Garden.

Patricia West points out the important role historic house museums play in portraying women’s history in the National Park Service in her article, “Interpreting Women’s History in Male-Focused House Museums.” Inherent within house museums are domestic spaces or “women’s spheres.” These spaces are often overlooked or underemphasized at many historic house museums in the National Park Service because the story of the dominant male figure of the house is defined as the “primary interpretive theme” while the role of the women in the household is given a “secondary theme” status. West points out the absurdity in this by asking how women can be seen as “secondary” in importance in spaces such as formal dining rooms where an understanding of the dominant role women played in planning dinners is key in understanding cultural assumptions about dinnerware, food, and guests.

West also argues that the lack of recognition of women’s roles in historic house museums is often due to the lack of interpretation of or accessibility to work spaces and maintenance functions of the household. Without access to these spaces the house becomes a static entity leaving visitors with an unbalanced picture of women’s past domestic roles rather than a realistic idea of the amount of work that was necessary to
maintain the household. This includes a lack of interpreted work spaces for residential servants, free, indentured and enslaved, who comprised a significant percentage of the household help. As a means to remedy this situation many curators of historic house museums have made an active effort to make such spaces accessible and to portray domestic activities when possible. A local example of this can be seen in the displays at Cedar Grove, an eighteenth-century summer residence outside of Philadelphia, which focuses on women’s daily activities such as cooking, sewing, and ironing. The displays, while still highlighting material culture, are set up in a manner that unmistakably leads the visitor to ask questions about the activities being presented giving way to discussion about women’s roles in the household.

Domestic activities of course were not only completed by women but also by other members of the household such as day servants, enslaved workers, and children. By opening up and interpreting areas of the house occupied by these individuals the visitor has the opportunity to have a much greater sense of the roles and responsibilities of each in various areas of the house. The interpretive program at Martin Van Buren National Historic Site, the thirty-six-room mansion and farm of President Martin Van Buren, is a positive example of the use of domestic spaces within a house museum. Visitors are led through five areas of the house that interpret the activities of servants: the servants’ dining room, the kitchen, the laundry room, the cook’s bedroom and the servants’ staircase. Taking the visitors through these areas of the house before the formal public areas allows the visitor to recognize the contrast between such public and private spaces.
Another example is seen at Edison NHS, the site of Thomas A. Edison’s home, where in July of 1994 the first floor of the house, including the service hall, the servants’ dining room, the kitchen, refrigerator room, and the butler’s pantry, was opened to the public on a permanent basis for the first time. Although not initially restored or furnished, the rooms were opened in response to public interest and their importance in interpreting Edison’s life in the house. The opening of the rooms also prompted research on the many female servants in the household. This research led to the identification of several individuals and revealed details about their lives and household roles.12

Although the Todd House differs from many of the examples given above in that the primary historical figure associated with the house is a woman, not a man, there is still room to expand the understanding of the roles of women and traditionally underrepresented members of the household through updates and additions to the furnishings. Interpretation of areas of the house that are currently closed will offer more thorough discussions on the roles of all members of the household including men, women, children, servants, and apprentices. While women’s issues and the roles of servants and other household members have become important in discussions on social history, current scholarship also recognizes the importance of addressing bigger themes and issues surrounding a given time period and place. Expanded furnishings for the Todd House will also allow for a greater opportunity to address social issues and concerns occupying Philadelphians at the end of the late eighteenth century.

Today curators of historic house museums face a continuous struggle with keeping exhibits current while dealing with staff and budget concerns. However, it is important for the guardians of the nation’s historic sites to give visitors the most fulfilling
and accurate interpretations as possible. The public not only expects this but demands it. It is the responsibility of museum professionals to find creative and innovative ways to keep history interesting, engaging, and thought provoking. In response to the static state of many historic house museums due to lack of space, funding, or enthusiasm, Jessica Donnelly well states that “with creativity, energy, and an eye toward new research and interpretive strategies, historic house museums can refresh and enliven the telling of their stories, all the while preserving authenticity, staying true to their sites’ missions, and illuminating the many engaging aspects of home life in the past.”13
CHAPTER I
PRELIMINARY RESEARCH

The Todd House is one of six historic house museums under the care of Independence National Historical Park.\(^{14}\) Restored in the 1960s and opened to the public on June 28, 1970,\(^ {15}\) the Todd House depicts the occupancy of Dolley Madison during the early 1790s when she was married to her first husband, Quaker lawyer John Todd Jr.

Over the past thirty-five years, changes in the installation have included the addition of new acquisitions and updates as outlined in park studies and reports conducted by interns and park staff.\(^ {16}\) This study continues in the park’s tradition of updating its installations to keep pace with current scholarly trends in order to create enriching and fulfilling experiences for park visitors.

Evaluation of the current Todd House installation began in January 2002 with a review of all park documents including the furnishing plan, historic structure reports, intern reports, and park records.\(^ {17}\) In short, the reports emphasized the objective of portraying the lives of an up-and-coming Quaker household in Philadelphia in the late eighteenth century that pays tribute to Dolley, a celebrated historical figure, and her first husband, John Todd Jr., an accomplished Quaker lawyer.\(^ {18}\) Encompassed within this dichotomy is the femininity associated with the rooms over which Dolley had jurisdiction contrasted against the masculinity of spaces, such as the law office, which were governed by John.\(^ {19}\)

The original furnishing plan was based upon the Todd family papers, estate inventories and other documentary sources of contemporary households, as well as “a
comparison of objects noted in the documentary sources with surviving documented pieces of similar provenance.”

Included in the Todd family papers are the “Inventory and Appraisement of the Goods and Chattles &c. late the property of John Todd Junior,” and the inventory of John Todd (Sr.) Estate, Nov. 21, 1793. Keeping in mind the familial roots of both Dolley and John Todd Jr., the furnishing plan reflects John’s Chester Co., Pennsylvania Quaker and early Philadelphia heritage and Dolley’s southern (Virginian) Quaker and English roots. Although other levels of the house are discussed within the original furnishing plan, only two levels of the house, the first and second floors were furnished. (See Illustration #1)

A review of park reports revealed suggestions made in the furnishing plan that differ from the current installation. While this is an expected occurrence because furnishings plans are not meant to be static documents but starting points, it was helpful to look at how the installation changed over time in both room interpretation and the inclusion or removal of individual artifacts. Some of these changes were due in part to suggestions outlined in reports by park interns who have worked in the park at various times within the last twenty years. A review of the discrepancies between the 1960s furnishing plan and the current installation can be found in Appendix A. It was also important to review the known and speculated individuals who occupied the house with John and Dolley. (Updated biographies of Todd and Payne family members can be found in Appendix B.) The limited amount of information available on the Todd and Payne families during this time period made a review of all park notes and reports, as well as all accounts found on the background of the Payne and Todd families, necessary to differentiate between the known and speculated occupants of the house.
Primary source material revealed that the known occupants of the house (at least for a period of time between 1791 and 1793) included: John Todd Jr., Dolley, their sons John Payne Todd (born Feb. 29, 1792) and William Temple Todd (born in August of 1793), Dolley’s younger sister Lucy (age 13 in 1791), and John’s law clerk Isaac Heston. Family members referenced in secondary sources include Dolley’s younger sister Anna (age 12 in 1791), Dolley’s younger brother John Coles Payne (age 8 in 1791), one or more other law clerks, and possibly a live-in servant. John’s hunting dog Pointer, mentioned in a 1785 letter to John’s brother, James, may also have shared the space. Although at present there is a lack of known primary documentation confirming that certain members of the family lived in the house at any particular time, this does not mean that they should be excluded from the exhibit; it simply means their inclusion is only one interpretation of multiple possibilities.

After park reports were reviewed, inhabitants of the house identified, and areas of the house that had the most potential for interpretive development through the use of objects were recognized, the next step was to decipher what those areas of development would be and what subjects or historical topics would be explored. In an effort to better envision possible interpretive themes for the Todd House and gain an understanding of the logistics involved in implementing such ideas, interpretive programs offered at other local historic house museums were reviewed. These house museums included the Powel House and Historic Waynesborough, both managed by the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, and Mount Pleasant and Cedar Grove both governed by the Fairmount Park Commission under the administration of the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Each of these house museums incorporate various display techniques in interpreting
each space or room which were considered in the interpretive suggestions laid out in this report.29

The final step was to assess how the exhibit could more thoroughly serve the mission of Independence National Historical Park. In the shadow of such great buildings as Independence Hall and the First Bank of the United States, the Todd House allows visitors an opportunity to relate on a much more intimate level to life during the early republic and to compare the daily lives and activities of those in the past with their own. Based on the unique educational opportunities inherent within the Todd House, the question was asked: What areas of life in late eighteenth-century Philadelphia can potentially be emphasized and discussed within the story of Dolley and John Todd?

As a result of the preliminary research and brainstorming sessions, an initial report or “Preliminary Direction Statement” was drafted in the fall of 2003 and distributed to various members from Cultural Resource Management (CRM) and Interpretation and Visitor Services (I&VS) divisions for review and comment. Concerns and suggestions made by reviewers were evaluated and taken into account when drafting this supplemental furnishing plan.
CHAPTER II
RECOMMENDED FURNISHINGS

Introduction

The purpose of the revisions recommended in this report is to supplement the original 1960s Todd House Furnishing Plan in an effort to contribute ideas and conclusions about the Todd House based upon recent scholarship in historic site installations. The subject matters presented here are ones that not only relate specifically to the Todds but which affected many families living in Philadelphia at the end of the eighteenth century. As with all furnishing reports, this revision is meant to be a starting point at which to implement changes, seen as guidance, not policy. In keeping with this practice, the installation will continue to transform and develop over time.

The recommended furnishings in this chapter are based on initial research done for the “Preliminary Direction Statement” as discussed in Chapter I of this report. Focus was kept on areas of the house that allow for an expanded understanding of the lives of the Todds while occupying the house. When possible, objects currently in collection storage that may be suitable for the installation are included in italics in the artifact recommendation lists.

Revision of the Todd House furnishings is based on four subject matters: the yellow fever epidemic of 1793, childrearing, domestic activities, and Quaker beliefs and values. Each subject matter is introduced with a historical narrative laying out the general issues and ideas surrounding the topic. The subject matter is then put into context as it relates to the Todd household followed by recommended furnishings listed by room.
Full recommendations for the third floor and garret, both currently unfurnished areas, are also included and integrate aspects of each topic.

As stated above, this report is meant to supplement the original 1960s Todd House furnishing plan, not replace it. The reader is encouraged to read both documents together to gain a better understanding of the entire site. This is of particular importance in having an understanding of not only Dolley’s role within the household but that of John Todd Jr. as well. A discussion of Todd’s law practice is not repeated in this report because it is included in the original 1960s furnishing plan, however it continues to be of primary importance when interpreting the lives of the Todds and their occupation of the Todd House.
Topic #1: The Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1793

Historical Narrative

During the late summer and into the fall of 1793, Philadelphia suffered a devastating yellow fever epidemic. Unprepared for the toll that it would take on the city, Philadelphians reacted as best they knew how, some fled the city and others, left with no other option but to stay behind, attempted to continue life as usual. President Washington and other government officials vacated, leaving the federal government at a standstill until the yellow fever subsided.\textsuperscript{30}

In 1793 the medical community was unaware that yellow fever was spread by mosquitoes, causing the disease to dissipate at the onset of colder weather. Eighteenth-century physicians fell into two primary groups of belief on how the disease was spread: 1) from one person to another or 2) transmitted from the environment.\textsuperscript{31} The first theory, backed by physicians William Currie and Isaac Cathrall was based on the belief that the disease was imported by refugees on unhealthy ships.\textsuperscript{32} The second theory, based on environment, was argued heavily by leading Philadelphia physician, Dr. Benjamin Rush. Dr. Rush was a strong believer that the yellow fever was caused by “miasma,” infectious air that was generated by local sources of decay.\textsuperscript{33}

At the same time that arguments were made over the question of how the disease was spread, opinions also differed as to the proper medical treatment. Medical knowledge at the time based much of its reasoning on the belief in a needed equilibrium between the body’s four humors: blood, phlegm, black bile, and yellow bile.\textsuperscript{34} Many
physicians fell under two schools of thought when it came to prescribing treatment for yellow fever. Dr. Rush was very adamant in his “new treatment” consisting of bloodletting and purging. His recommendation of 10 grams of calomel, a mercurial purgative and diuretic, and 15 grams of jalap, a Mexican herb and strong cathartic, was prescribed to help purge the body of toxins. The other main school of thought, headed by French physician Jean Devèze favored the combination of a large quantity of stimulants such as quinine bark, wine, teas and herbs taken in conjunction with the regular practice of rest, fresh air, and cold baths, a method used in both the British and French West Indies.

In his article, “Politics, Parties, and Pestilence: Epidemic Yellow Fever in Philadelphia and the Rise of the First Party System” Martin Pernick discusses the political forces driving thoughts on how yellow fever was spread and the best method of treating the disease. In 1793, Philadelphia was not only the political capital of the United States but the medical capital as well. Home of institutions such as Franklin’s Pennsylvania Hospital, the College of Physicians, and the American Philosophical Society, the relationship between medicine and politics in Philadelphia was no doubt evident. Pernick argues that in general, Jeffersonians, or Democratic-Republicans, were associated with the work and beliefs of Dr. Rush while Hamiltonians or Federalists were considered importationists and backed the use of stimulants to treat the fever. Pernick suggests that Democratic-Republicans opposed the argument of importationism because they saw it as an attempt by the Federalists to stop trade with the West Indies by justifying the need to quarantine immigrants. Federalists, on the other hand, saw the backing of localism as an attempt to discredit large cities so that the capital could be
moved to a rural setting.\textsuperscript{38} In response, Democratic-Republicans argued they did not want to destroy cities but to preserve them through sanitary reform.\textsuperscript{39}

Along with the treatments recommended by physicians, Philadelphians had their own folk medicines and remedies that they passed on to others via word of mouth and through publications in newspapers such as Andrew Brown’s \textit{Federal Gazette and Philadelphia Daily Advertiser}. Recommendations included diffusing tobacco smoke, sprinkling vinegar throughout the house, keeping a tarred rope in one’s pocket and camphor hung around one’s neck.\textsuperscript{40} Ads for such products as “Vinegar of the Four Thieves” were seen in the newspaper promising to “stop the progress of Infectious Disorders and should even be the companion of those who visit or attend the sick.”\textsuperscript{41}

One reader gave a personal recommendation for “Delaney’s Aromatic Distilled Vinegar”\textsuperscript{42} and yet another reader recommended “Directions to prevent Infections” which he had excerpted from a copy of “Mr. Poulson’s Town and Country Almanac for the year 1794.”\textsuperscript{43} Dr. Rush sold his own “Mercurial Sweating Powder” at several local chemists so that individuals could treat themselves at home while following his recommendation of a temperate diet of vegetables.\textsuperscript{44}

Philadelphia Mayor Mathew Clarkson also saw to it that announcements regarding recommendations and advice on the disease were printed in the \textit{Federal Gazette}. The following eleven measures of prevention and protection recommended by the College of Physicians were published in the \textit{Federal Gazette}, August 27, 1793:\textsuperscript{45}

\begin{itemize}
\item[-] Avoid every infected person, as much as possible
\item[-] Avoid fatigue, of body and mind. Don’t stand or sit in a draft, or in the sun, or in the evening air.
\item[-] Dress according to the weather. Avoid intemperance. Drink sparingly of wine, beer, or cider.
\end{itemize}
- When visiting the sick, use vinegar or camphor on your handkerchief, carry it in smelling bottles, use it frequently.
- Somehow mark every house with sickness in it, on the door or window.
- Place your patients in the center of your biggest, airiest room, in beds without curtains. Change their clothes and bed linen often. Remove all offensive matter as quickly as possible.
- Stop the tolling of the bells at once.
- Bury the dead in closed carriages, as privately as possible.
- Clean the streets, and keep them clean.
- Stop building fires in your houses, or on the streets. They have no useful effect. But burn gun powder. It clears the air. And use vinegar and camphor generally.
- Most important of all, let a large and airy hospital be provided near the city, to receive poor people stricken with disease who cannot otherwise be cared for.

Various articles were published emphasizing the need to keep streets and yards clean, being sure to conceal trash in barrels. People also strove to keep their houses clean indoors by scouring, whitewashing, “purifying” with vinegar, and burning gunpowder, tobacco and nitrate. The mayor’s original recommendation of purifying the air outdoors by use of firing guns was eventually revoked because of safety concerns.

As the number of deaths multiplied and those who had the means left the city, there was an increased need for people to care for the sick and dying. Benjamin Rush called on the African American community to care for the sick because of the generally held belief that African Americans were immune to yellow fever, a theory which was discredited when blacks began to perish from the disease. In the end “more than 300 African Americans would die in the epidemic, in a proportion close to that of the rest of the population.”

Even after it was discovered that African Americans were not immune to the disease, many continued to work under strenuous and dangerous conditions. Help was especially needed by Stephen Girard and Peter Helm, early managers of the temporary hospital set up at Bush Hill, a large unoccupied country estate north of the city boundary.
built in 1740 by lawyer Andrew Hamilton. Despite their tremendous service, the African American community still had to defend their actions and prove the honorableness of their assistance. In November of 1793, Mathew Carey wrote A Short Account of the Malignant Fever, lately prevalent in Philadelphia: With a statement of the Proceedings that took place on the subject in different parts of the United States, in which he implied that many African Americans who stayed in the city to attend to the sick charged exorbitantly high prices for their services and stole from those they were caring for. In response, African American ministers Richard Allen and Absalom Jones wrote A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People, During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia in the year 1793 and a Refutation of some Censures, Thrown upon them in some late Publications. Allen and Jones challenged this notion and justified the actions of the African American community citing the many instances when African Americans helped others asking for no compensation in return at a time when many whites refused to help the sick at all.

The yellow fever reached its height of devastation during the months of September and October, slowly dissipating as the colder weather settled upon the city. Although five thousand perished during the epidemic, when the disease subsided in November residents returned to Philadelphia in an attempt to resume the lives they had left behind.

The Todds’ Response to the Yellow Fever

As the yellow fever epidemic began to spread during August of 1793, the Todds would have been acutely aware of its impending presence and the need for protecting
their family, especially with an infant and toddler in the house. Although material evidence of the family’s efforts to prevent the disease would be subtle, it is possible to display evidence of the family’s response to the disease within the furnishings. In the weeks prior to John sending Dolley and the two boys to Gray’s Ferry on the Schuylkill, like others, the Todds would have made efforts to ward off the disease.\textsuperscript{52} As a lawyer, it is likely that John would have kept up with local news by reading newspapers such as the \textit{Federal Gazette} and so may have been influenced by recommendations and advice put forth within.\textsuperscript{53} Several reproduction copies of the \textit{Federal Gazette and Philadelphia Daily Advertiser} should be found lying on one of the desks in John’s law office or even in the dining parlor. The newspaper should display articles on the yellow fever that may have been used by Dolley and John as a reference for things they could be doing to prevent the disease.

One of the most common and simple recommendations made for warding off the disease was the use of vinegar which was both spread throughout the house and carried by individuals when traveling in the city. It would be appropriate to see several small bottles containing vinegar throughout the house that may have been sprinkled occasionally throughout each room. A handkerchief and small bottle of vinegar should be placed in one of the downstairs rooms suggesting its use by Dolley, John or other household members when they stepped outside. Two different vinegar products sold by nearby chemists may have been used by the Todds. One was the “Vinegar of the Four Thieves” sold by John White, Druggist and Chemist in Market Street and Goldthwait and Baldwin on the corner of Second and Walnut Street.\textsuperscript{54} The other was “Aromatic Distilled Vinegar” prepared and sold by William Delany, Chemist and Druggist at the corner of
Lodge Alley, No. 78 South Second Street. The Todds may have also heeded the advice of diffusing tobacco smoke or burning gun powder throughout the house. Small earthenware dishes with burnt tobacco should be placed in several rooms in the house. A woman’s pocket with the recommended tarred rope in it, alongside a camphor bag to be worn around a person’s neck should be placed on the table in the downstairs parlor.

A bucket with a long handled scrub brush should be placed in the southeast corner of the second floor middle room next to the closet indicating that the room is being whitewashed. Whitewashing was an activity that took place during spring cleaning but was also done during the yellow fever epidemic as a means of keeping the house clean and sanitized. Although furniture would normally be removed from a room before such an activity, due to the urgency of the situation, furniture is still seen within the room indicating that there was not enough time to empty the room which still needed to be used for daily activities of the household.

As the fever set in towards the end of August, Dolley, her children, mother, and other siblings who lived in both households, joined the many others fleeing the city and took refuge at a farm near Gray’s Ferry. Due to the financial difficulties many experienced as a result of the disease, John and his law clerk Isaac Heston elected to stay in Philadelphia to help individuals settle accounts and process paperwork. Evidence of Dolley’s preparation for the journey to Gray’s Ferry should be seen in the middle room of the second floor and the kitchen bedchamber where trunks should be placed indicating the quick packing of only the most essential of belongings. The room should appear as if essential belongings have been collected from Dolley and John’s bedroom on the third floor and other areas of the house, and brought to the room to be packed. Two travel
trunks placed in the room, one shut and one open facing the bed with clothing and personal items seen within would illustrate this scene.

Unaware of the amount of time that she would be away from her home, Dolley would have taken only those items she felt were most crucial and those she felt were too precious to leave behind. Along with her clothing (see section on Quakers for details) clean bed linens, many clouts (diapers), metal or ceramic basins, covered jars, a few books for personal reading, some sewing materials and a miniature of her husband John should be seen packed in the trunk.⁶⁰ Also during this month Dolley’s sister, Lucy, would have been packing her possessions, not to go with Dolley but in preparation of marrying non-Quaker George Steptoe Washington, and moving to Harewood Estate, Virginia. The kitchen chamber next door, interpreted as Lucy’s bedroom should have the coverlet and bedspread folded up on the mattress and an open trunk with some of the items from the room packed inside. A blood lancet should be placed on the dressing table in Dolley and John’s bedroom on the third floor as if it has been purposely left in the house where it might be needed. Inclusion of the blood lancet will allow for a discussion of the various yellow fever treatments of the day, specifically that of the Todd family’s neighbor, Dr. Rush.

The yellow fever epidemic not only had a devastating effect on Philadelphia but on the Todds as a family. On the verge of leaving Philadelphia to join his wife, John felt he could not leave Philadelphia when Isaac Heston became ill towards the end of September. At the same time, John’s parents would not leave the city without John. As fate would have it they all succumbed to the fever, Isaac Heston on September 29, John’s father John Todd Sr. on the 2nd of October, John’s mother Mary on October 12th and John
himself on October 24 (see Appendix C). As is indicated in a letter from James Todd to his cousin, John was out in the fields hunting the morning he began feeling sick. A brass dog collar should be placed in the kitchen as evidence of John’s hunting dog Pointer and a reminder of John’s enjoyment of hunting, a hobby he participated in just days before his death and during which, on his last excursion, he may have contracted the deadly yellow fever. John and Dolley’s infant son William Temple, who was still at Grey’s Ferry at the time, also died on October 24th although it is not known that his death was due to the yellow fever.\textsuperscript{61} Visitors should come away from the Todd House with a key understanding of not only the role the yellow fever played in Philadelphia history but also its role as a turning point in Dolley’s life aiding in her transformation from a Philadelphia Quaker to the wife of James Madison and eventual celebrated First Lady.

**Recommended Additional Furnishings:**

**Law Office:**
Newspapers (*Federal Gazette*, late August 1793), reproduction
Dish, redware, late 18th century (for burning tobacco)

**Downstairs Parlor:**
Handkerchief, linen, reproduction
Bottle, vinegar, 3 (*Vinegar of the Four Thieves or Aromatic Distilled Vinegar prepared and sold by William Delany*), reproduction
(smelling bottles may be used if vinegar bottles can not be replicated)
Rope, tarred, reproduction (on table)
Bag, Camphor, reproduction (on table)
Pocket, women’s, reproduction (on table) (possible after INDE 11801 c. 1780)

**Kitchen:**
Dish, redware, Pennsylvania, late 18th century (for burning tobacco)
Collar, dog, brass, late 18th century or reproduction

**Kitchen Chamber:**
Trunks (2) (objects from room placed inside)
Boxes, reproduction (2)
Second Floor Middle Room:

Dish, redware, Pennsylvania, late 18th century (for burning tobacco)
Bucket, wooden (for whitewashing) (INDE 3157, Pennsylvania, bail handle, 19th century)
Scrub brush, long handle (for whitewashing)
Trunks, travel (2)
Clothing (see “Quaker Life” section of this chapter), reproduction (in trunk)
Sheets, linen, reproduction (in trunk)
Clouts (diapers), linen, reproduction (in trunk)
The Mirror, Vol. 1., Philadelphia 1793 (INDE 6350 relocated from second floor parlor) (in trunk)
The Ladies Magazine, Vol. 1., 1793 (INDE 8306 relocated from second floor parlor) (in trunk)
Miniature, John Todd, reproduction (after original at the Macculloch Hall Historical Museum) (in trunk)
Stockings with knitting needles, reproduction, (relocated from first floor dining parlor) (in trunk)
Sewing etui or case (containing some or all of the following: scissors, needle case, thimble, bodkin/earspool, stiletto, and tweezers/file) (in trunk)
Lucet, wooden (in trunk)
Darning egg (in trunk)
Bottle, smelling (for Vinegar) (in trunk)
Jar, redware (in trunk) (INDE 56173, redware jar, 1750-1833)
Jar, stoneware (in trunk)
Basin, ceramic (in trunk)

Second Floor Parlor:
Vinegar bottle (Vinegar of the Four Thieves or Aromatic Distilled Vinegar prepared and sold by William Delany), reproduction (smelling bottles may be used if vinegar bottles can not be replicated)

Third Floor South Room (Dolley & John’s bedroom):
Lancet, blood (on dressing table) (INDE 9771)

*Personal items included in the second floor middle room are listed again in the Domestic Activities sections of this chapter along with all of the furnishings recommended for this room.
Topic #2: Child Rearing in Colonial America

Historical Narrative

During the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries childbirth in America was a female-dominated activity central to society’s notion of womanhood. Societal and religious attitudes towards childbirth labeled it woman’s “divinely ordained mission in life” as women spent a majority of their adult lives occupied by pregnancy, birth, and post-partum recovery. The birthing process took place in the home and was overseen by a female midwife with the assistance of female relatives, neighbors and friends. Midwives were trained through apprenticeships with other midwives, learning techniques and practices that did not include the use of medical instruments. While midwives did possess helpful skills, risks of childbirth for both mother and infant were at the forefront of concern to most women.

Although women dominated childbirth procedures during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the role of physician at that time was monopolized by men. This division of labor roles changed, however, toward the second half of the eighteenth century when American physicians began traveling to Europe for formal education. It was at this time, beginning in the 1760s, that physicians began the practice of obstetrics. While the place of men within the birthing process was taboo, it became practice for some middle and upper class women to include male physicians in the process with the thought that they would be able to provide a safer, easier delivery and would be cognizant of what to do if complications arose. Because physicians had a formal education which
included the study of anatomy, they were thought by some to be more knowledgeable than midwives.  

Some women who had the financial means preferred physicians because, unlike the fairly noninterventionist approach used by midwives, physicians brought with them opium and other drugs to alleviate pain and suffering as well as proactive methods to save lives during critical deliveries. Physicians introduced the use of new instruments, especially forceps or “hands of iron” that were seen as true contributors to safe deliveries. It is important to realize that although physicians’ intervening methods were seen as an improvement to the birthing process by many, the presence of a physician did not necessarily improve a woman’s chances of survival. Even into and throughout the nineteenth century, physicians' techniques created new sets of problems surrounding the misuse of instruments and later in the mid-century, careless administration of ether and chloroform.

It should also be noted that during this time period women did not universally support the emerging role of male physicians within birthing practices. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, a rising number of authors argued against the dominant and authoritative role of men, believing women to be intellectually equal to their male counterparts. Sparked by such works as Mary Wollstonecraft’s A Vindication of the Rights of Women, inequality between the sexes was contended to be due in large part to a lack of equal educational opportunities.

Given this heated resistance to male authority by some, it is not surprising that the transition from female midwives to male physicians did not happen overnight nor equally quickly for women of varying social and economic levels. While the middle and upper
class urban women had the financial means and physical proximity to call on physicians if so desired, both urban and rural lower class poor continued to use midwives well into the nineteenth century. A “new midwifery” emerged towards the last half of the eighteenth century which combined the efforts of physicians and midwives, often times placing physicians in a backup role requested only when complications arose. Into the nineteenth century, however, physicians progressively became more involved in the birthing process as men were increasingly seen as authority figures in the field, despite the protests for equality by early female advocates. Physicians such as Philadelphia’s William Shippen Jr. who went on to teach medical practices in the nineteenth century invited both physicians and midwives to their courses, however women were seen as unsuited to formally attend medical school and continued to be labeled as unscientific and inferior to physicians.

The introduction of men into the birthing room in the second half of the eighteenth century changed not only the power structure during the delivery, but also led to the breakdown of women’s larger social network. Before men entered the scene, neighbors, friends, sisters, and mothers came together, some traveling long distances to assist with the birth and give moral support and encouragement. It was a time when women shared intimate feelings and experiences. Lines of class, race, and ethnicity were crossed in times of need and women often stayed weeks afterwards to help with the household chores. Men offered technical assistance but could not make up for the need for psychological support.

Although women continued to provide emotional support, the strong networks between them began to break down during the nineteenth century as male physicians
came to dominate the field of obstetrics. Male domination in the field “gave obstetrics a sexist bias; maleness became a necessary attribute of safety, and femaleness became a condition in need of male control.” Also contributing to male domination of the field continuing through the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, was the desire by physicians to attract middle and upper class patients. Obstetrics was the first specialty taught in medical school and was seen as a steady reliable line of work helping physicians to build their clientele leading eventually to the development of family practices.

Just as the practices of child birth encountered changes in the last half of the eighteenth century so too did childrearing. During the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries many colonists held the world view that on earth there was a chain of increasingly superior beings from beasts to humans. Because humans were unique in their ability to speak, reason, and stand erect, they were thought to be superior to all other creatures. Babies were thought to be born without these unique human characteristics and parents felt it was their responsibility to guide or direct an infant’s development. Babies were seen as incapable of physically achieving regular adult form on their own, so midwives would attempt to lengthen and “straighten” babies by wrapping them with strips of linen to keep a tall upright shape, a process referred to as swaddling. Various other devices such as walking stools, corsets, and leading strings were used by parents in an attempt to manipulate a child’s development.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, peoples’ views on the world began to change, and many adopted the theory that everything “whether including organisms, whole species, or even human cultures, progressed through observable and predictable
stages of development.” Progression and development were seen as attainable through action. In this sense, these parents nourished infants as they engaged in the natural stages of development by putting fewer restrictions on the child. The restricting practices of the previous period, such as swaddling, were criticized by many and increasingly abandoned. The only practice which continued to be used was a flannel strip worn around the navel for extra support. “A linen or cotton shirt, a flannel petticoat, and a linen or cotton gown” were the standard attire for infants around the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries. Loose clothing also exposed an infant to the environment which was encouraged as new theories argued that it was healthy and natural for a child or infant to withstand the cold.

Birth at the Todd House

During late August or early September of 1793, Dolley gave birth to her second son, William Temple. No records have been found discussing details associated with the deliveries of either of Dolley’s sons providing for only the speculation of complications or lack thereof. It is likely that Dolley gave birth in the bedroom she shared with her husband, the most common room in which births took place. As will be discussed later in Section E, the location of Dolley and John’s bedroom is recommended to be moved from the middle room on the second floor to the south room on the third floor (see Illustration #21). This is also the room where the baby likely would have slept, making it easier to feed and care for him. Furnishing Dolley and John’s bedroom as if it is a week or two after William Temple’s birth will allow for the display of various objects associated with the realities of living with a new born.
Unlike the board cradle in the first floor parlor, a Windsor cradle should be placed next to the bed representing the switch in popularity from one to the other at the end of the eighteenth century.84 (see Illustration 11). Lined with a few folded blankets, Windsor cradles allowed the infant exposure to “fresh air and cool breezes” as fresh air was felt to be important for infants.85 Several small frocks, numerous linen clouts (diapers) and several wool pilches (diaper covers) for John Payne should be placed in the closet while a set of the baby’s clothes including a linen gown, flannel petticoat, and a cloth tape, should be placed hanging over the side of the cradle as if laid out in preparation to dress the baby.86 A rattle, replicating or similar to the coral-and-bells rattle held by the infant in the Copley Family portrait by John Singleton Copley should be placed within the proximity of the cradle such as on the windowsill along the west wall or on the dressing table (see Illustration 12). During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries coral was thought to protect a child against pain, death, and disease. The coral-and-bells rattle continued to be seen as a suitable toy and teether for infants well into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries due to the sustained association between coral and disease prevention.87

A Windsor rocking chair that could have been used for nursing should be situated at the end of the bed next to the window along the west wall. A dressing gown that Dolley would have worn during her pregnancy should be hung over the back of the rocking chair.88 Alcohol, opium or other drugs that were commonly used during this period to soothe the baby should also be placed on the dressing table in the bedroom.89 On the floor next to the dressing table and nursing chair, should be a small wash basin with several linens. The mahogany commode which is part of the current installation is
especially fitting for Dolley’s convenience following her pregnancy. This will be placed along the north wall close to the bed on the other side of the door.

The presence of the children should also be indicated in other areas of the house. The north room of the third floor should be interpreted as a bedroom where Dolley’s son John Payne and one or two of Dolley’s younger siblings, such as Anna, slept. Details regarding the furnishings of this room are discussed in “Additional Spaces” section of this chapter. Objects associated with the children in the downstairs dining parlor should remain as they are with the addition of a footstool which was commonly used as a convenience to both women and children. High chairs were used during this period but not by the majority, as they were considered a luxury. As an up-and-coming family, it is possible that the Todds had a high chair but because at the time it was not the norm to have one, a highchair will not be included in the furnishings.

**Recommended Furnishings:**

**Downstairs Parlor:**
- Bottle, nursing, pewter (INDE 2603)
- Cradle, walnut, Pennsylvania, c. 1750-1800 (INDE 11841)
- Footstool, 18th century or reproduction

**Third floor South Bedroom:**
- Bottle, medicine (*INDE 31224, glass, England, 1785-1830*)
- Bottle, medicine (*INDE 14758, glass, Philadelphia, 1750-1850*)
- Gown, dressing, linen, reproduction (hung over Windsor rocking chair)
- Chair, side, Queen Anne (*INDE 11837, c. 1720-1740*)
- Cradle, Windsor (out from the wall in the northwest corner of the room)
- Linens, reproduction (in cradle)
- Chair, Windsor, rocking, Philadelphia, 1770-1800.
- Linen gown, infant, reproduction (hung over side of cradle) (*possibly INDE 11770 or 11751*)
- Clouts (diapers), linen, many, reproduction
- Pilches (diaper covers), wool, 2 or 3, reproduction
- Petticoat, infant, flannel, reproduction (hung over side of cradle)
- Cap, infant (*INDE 11772, linen, Philadelphia, c. 1770*)
Rattle, coral-and-bells, silver, reproduction (on windowsill or dressing table)
Bottle, beer, black glass, porter shape, late 18th century (on dressing table [to sooth the baby]) (INDE 55128, beer bottle, Philadelphia, 1790-1840)
Commode, mahogany, Chippendale style English, c. 1770 (INDE 8513) (with chamber pot 8634) (in northeast corner of the room)

Third Floor North Bedroom:
See “Additional Spaces” section in this chapter
**Topic #3: Domestic Activities**

**Historical Narrative**

During the eighteenth century, “house-wifery” or activities and work associated with the everyday functions of the household were the number one responsibility of women. Women were accountable for preparing and presenting food, making and repairing clothing, keeping the house clean and comfortable, and caring for children and the sick or aged. A family’s size, wealth and social status influenced the amount of time a woman spent on household activities and dictated how much assistance she had from family members and servants.

Women in urban and rural settings also had varying tasks due to the availability of resources. Sarah Snell Byrant, a woman who lived on a farm in western Massachusetts in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, discusses in her diary (1795-1810) daily tasks associated with making cloth and clothing, sewing shirts, gowns, and coats, knitting gloves and stockings, baking, brewing, preserving food, churning butter, gardening, tending to the sick, making candles or soap, washing, ironing, scouring, quilting, and entertaining visitors. During the late eighteenth century, women in urban settings such as Philadelphia were also occupied by some of these tasks but had access to a wide variety of commercial goods and services. During the 1790s, markets in Philadelphia lined High and Seconds streets offering an array of goods, both local and imported, ranging from furniture, candles, and textiles, to bread, fish, and cheese. Those who had the financial means also had the luxury of hiring workers to perform such
services as washing laundry, sewing, gardening, chimney sweeping, repairing furniture, hauling and sawing wood, and wheeling snow. It was at this time and leading into the early nineteenth century that self-contained households became less desirable as communities began to experience greater economic growth, higher population density, commercial expansion, better communication and transportation, and specialization in agriculture.

Domestic activities in the eighteenth century would have also differed according to the season. The fall and spring were times when biannual cleaning took place in preparation for the winter and summer seasons. During the spring, the house was thoroughly cleaned from top to bottom involving tasks such as sweeping chimneys, washing windows, dusting wallpaper, washing paint, whitewashing walls, organizing closets, and scouring floors. Carpets and other objects associated with methods of keeping warm such as foot stoves, bed-warming pans, and andirons were put away in the summer and stored in areas such as the garret. Curtains were taken down and the muslin under-curtains left up or Venetian blinds or linen shades were installed. Carpets were either taken up, shaken out, and reinstalled or put in storage and replaced with straw matting.

To fight against dust and pests, steps were taken to protect not only those people living in the house but their valuable or vulnerable possessions as well. After being cleaned, pictures and looking glasses, especially those with gilded frames, were often covered with gauze, muslin or tissue paper (see Illustrations 13 & 14). Lamps and chandeliers were covered with gauze and upholstered furniture was fitted with covers. Beds were fitted with netting or “pavilion gauze” to protect occupants while they slept.
For decoration and further protection from flies, asparagus ferns were placed about the fireplace and hung around the room; flies were attracted to the asparagus fern which helped keep them off whitewashed walls and gilded frames. Empty hearths often housed large vases of flowers for decoration to fill the space.\textsuperscript{98}

In the fall, although a less intense cleaning process took place, the household was again prepared for the upcoming season. Objects put in storage over the summer were reinstalled and doors and windows were sealed using various materials and methods including seaweed, leaves, paper or baize, and leather strips. Heating devices and stored carpets were re-installed and netting and other protective covers were taken down.\textsuperscript{99}

**Domestic Activities at the Todd House**

As stated above, the extent to which and by whom household activities were performed depended on a family’s size, wealth, and social status. While the exact number of residents who occupied the Todds’ home in the early 1790s is unknown, we do know that at least, Dolley, John, their young sons John Payne Todd and William Temple Todd, Dolley’s younger sister Lucy (age 12 in 1790), and John’s law clerk Isaac Heston lived in the house. Varying references have also included Dolley’s younger siblings Anna and John Coles Payne, one or more other law clerks, and possibly day or live-in servants.\textsuperscript{100} Due to the fact that Dolley’s father-in-law, John Todd Sr. records in his diary that he hired live-in servants to do “housework,” it would not be surprising if his son’s household relied on similar laborers to help with day to day domestic chores.\textsuperscript{101} While it would have been part of Dolley’s daily routine to both visit others and receive visitors, she would have also spent a portion of her time managing domestic activities.
within the household. The fact that Dolley would have had at least the help of one sibling and likely a servant indicates that, while Dolley would certainly not have had the extended help that her neighbors, the Whites, had, Dolley would have had assistance in caring for her children and completing daily household tasks.\textsuperscript{102}

The Todds’ status and wealth as an up-and-coming young professional family in an urban setting allowed them the luxury of having access to imported and local commercial goods and services. Living in Philadelphia, the Todds would have frequented the markets where “local grocers, hucksters, butchers, fishmongers, oystermen, fruiterers, milk sellers, bakers, confectioners, and pastry cooks” sold their goods. They would also have had access to nonresident laborers such as washerwomen, seamstresses, mantuamakers, soapboilers, and tallowchandlers. With the variety of food and services available, the Todds would have been relieved from performing such tasks as tending their own garden, baking their own bread, slaughtering their own livestock, washing their own clothes, and making their own candles.\textsuperscript{103} Their daily lives would have been very much connected to the environment around them outside of the home. One way to bring this into the visitor’s perception is to include in the installation, not only faux food but other kinds of things that may have been taken on errands such as a shoe or boot in need of repair and letters ready to be sent to friends and relatives. The shoe can be placed in the kitchen on top of a basket of dirty laundry that is ready to be picked up or taken to the washer woman and the letters on the corner of the dining table in the first floor dining parlor as if they are ready to be mailed during the next outing.

Despite these conveniences, managing domestic activities would still have been a part of Dolley’s day to day routine. Washing, ironing and pressing textiles are tasks that
would have been completed on a weekly basis. Given the limited space in the kitchen and cellar, there is a good possibility that Dolley sent the laundry out to a washerwoman who would have “picked up, washed, dried and returned the clothes (ready to iron).” A basket of laundry ready to be sent out to the washer woman should be placed in the kitchen near the door as if it is ready to be dropped off. Despite the fact that some of the linens may also have been sent out to be washed, some would have also been washed at home and dried on the flat roof above the kitchen chamber. Dolley would have spent time marking linens and clothing, especially if things were sent out. Whether or not the laundry was done at home, the tasks of pressing and ironing the textiles would have still been completed by Dolley, her siblings and possibly a live-in servant. During the summer months, the second floor middle room may have been an ideal space for the activities of ironing and pressing linen as well as for storage of linen that was not currently being used. (The suggested change in interpretation of the second floor middle room from that of Dolley and John’s bedroom to an extra bedroom for the Todds’ relatives or guests and an area where domestic activities took place is addressed later in this section and in Chapter II, “Additional Spaces.”) During the winter months, when the family most likely spent much of their time in the first floor parlor because of its proximity to the warmth of the fire in the kitchen, ironing may have taken place in the kitchen in between cooking activities.

Dolley would have undoubtedly spent a portion of her time making and darning clothing for the family. Women engaged in sewing not only out of necessity but also as a social activity to share with other women. While the stocking added to the downstairs parlor in 2003 helps to demonstrate the time consuming task of knitting even just one pair
of stockings, other tasks such as mending, marking linens or making diapers could be added to the exhibit indicating that Dolley or one of her siblings in the house was working on such a task. This activity also could have taken place on the second floor middle room during the summer season.

Food preparation was yet another primary activity of Dolley and the other women of the house. Jane Busch outlines kitchen-related activities in her report, *Philadelphia Kitchens: A Special Report with Recommendations for the Bishop White and Todd Houses*. Busch discusses the various activities associated with acquiring, storing, and preparing food and offers a revised list of furnishings for the Todd House used to highlight such activities. Although some of these suggestions have been implemented over the years, the opportunity to fully realize the recommendations would add greatly to the interpretation of domestic activities within the exhibit, specifically the recommendation of two large tubs set on stools for washing dishes.¹⁰⁵

Similar to other households in Philadelphia, the Todds would have engaged in semi-annual cleaning in the spring and fall in preparation for the upcoming seasons. While it would be interesting to interpret the actual cleaning events, this is not feasible within a museum where doors must be kept shut for security and preservation needs of the collections. However, it is still possible to incorporate seasonal changes into the exhibit. Because the major themes in this report are centered on interpretation of the Todd House in August 1793, it is recommended that the household be interpreted during the summer season. Recommendations for the possibility of rotating the interpretation on a seasonal basis are provided in Appendix E.
**Summer:**

During the month of August 1793, the Todds would have been well into the thick of summer activities and seasonal changes administered in the spring would be evident throughout the house. Although carpets were often replaced with straw matting during the summer, it was not unheard of to simply shake a carpet out and put it back in place for the summer, especially carpets that did not contain wool and therefore where not vulnerable to moths (because it would be unfeasible to take up carpets within the exhibit they will be left in place). Muslin under-curtains should replace the curtains on the second floor middle room and the kitchen chamber and the linen curtains currently in the second floor parlor should be left in place. All framed prints and the looking glass should be covered with gauze to protect from flies and dust.

The high-post bed, relocated to the third floor south (see the “Additional Spaces” section of this chapter) should be enveloped in mosquito netting and the andirons and other objects associated with heating that are not in use during the summer should be removed and stored in the garret. A large vase filled with reproduction flowers should be placed in the hearth in the second floor parlor to decorate the empty space. The fire screen in the second floor middle room should be kept in place as a means of keeping 18-month-old John Payne from wondering into that space. Faux asparagus fern branches should be hung from several spots on the ceilings of the second floor drawing room, the law office, first floor parlor, and kitchen to keep flies away from the clean white walls. Also, the chairs in the first floor and second floor parlors should be fitted with covers.
Middle Room (Second Floor):

As will be outlined in the “Additional Spaces” section of Chapter II, it is recommended that Dolley and John’s bedroom be relocated to the south room on the third floor (see Illustration # 21). This leaves the second floor middle room available for reinterpretation. It is suggested that the second floor middle room be displayed as a space where domestic activities may have taken place and also an extra bedroom where relatives may have slept when staying with the Todds. During the summer, this space would have provided good lighting and the windows would have let cool breezes in. A work table with several linens draped over it for padding should be placed in the northeast corner with a basket of linens that has just come back from the wash set up next to it and a clothes horse draped with a few freshly ironed linens nearby (see Illustrations 10, 15 & 16). One iron should be on the table and two in the fireplace propped up on a trivet. Unlike in many of the other rooms, hardware associated with the fireplace will be left in place indicating that the fireplace was used to heat the irons.

As discussed in the previous section (Topic #1: Yellow Fever), a bucket with a long handled scrub brush should be placed in the southeast corner next to the closet indicating that the room is being whitewashed. Whitewashing was an activity that took place during the spring cleaning but was also done during the yellow fever epidemic as a means of keeping the house clean and sanitized. Although furniture would normally be removed from a room before such an activity, due to the urgency of the situation, furniture is still seen within the room indicating that there was not enough time to empty the room which still needed to be used for daily activities of the household. On the seat of a chair placed next to the empty fireplace should be a pair of men’s breeches in the
middle of being repaired with needle and thread. Also, a clout, or diaper, that is in the middle of being made should be draped over the back of the chair.  

Also discussed in the yellow fever section of this chapter, during the month of August 1793, Dolley would have been packing some of her possessions to take to Gray’s Ferry, where she and her young sons took refuge during the onset of the yellow fever epidemic. The room should appear as if essential belongings have been collected and brought to the room to be packed up. Next to the small bed should be two travel trunks, one shut and one open facing the bed with clothing and personal items seen within. Unaware of the amount of time that she would be away from her home and what amenities would be available to her, Dolley would have taken those items she felt were most crucial and those she felt were too precious to leave behind. Along with her clothing (see section on Quakers for details), clouts, or diapers, for both sons, personal care linens, a few books, sewing materials, some metal or ceramic basins, a few covered jars and a miniature of her husband John should be seen packed in the trunk.  

Given the amount of space in the house and the possible number of residents, it is likely that the room could have also partially functioned as a sleeping space for at least one person. One of Dolley’s younger siblings, a servant, or even her mother might have temporarily stayed in this room while assisting Dolley after the recent delivery of her son William Temple. A small, low-post bed should be placed in the southwest corner of the room with a rolled up mattress at the end. This will indicate that the space was used to accommodate another household member, but did not function solely as a bedroom.
Recommended Furnishings

Law Office:
Andirons (INDE 8343 & 8344) (remove to third floor Lumber Room storage)
   (Associated objects, INDE 5165, 8265, and 8284 should also be stored.)
Asparagus fern branches (faux) (hang from ceiling)
Gauze, reproduction, to cover INDE 7303 (map of VA)

First Floor Parlor:
Andirons (INDE 1510 & 1511) (remove to Lumber Room storage)
   (Associated objects, INDE 3798 and 8480 should also be stored.)
Asparagus fern branches (faux) (hang from ceiling)
Seat Covers (6), reproduction (for chairs INDE 6302-6307)
Letters (reproduction) (“ready to post”) (on the corner of dining table)

Kitchen:
tubs, wooden (2)
Cloth, dish, linen (INDE 10717, Philadelphia, c. 1780-1810) or reproduction
Laundry basket
Linens (reproduction) (in basket)
Shoe, leather (reproduction) (“in need of repair”) (on top of linens in basket)

Kitchen Chamber:
Curtains, muslin, reproduction
Trunk, travel
Andirons (INDE 4329 & 4329) (remove to garret for storage)
   (Associated objects, INDE 7130 and 7131 should also be stored.)
Gauze, reproduction (to cover INDE 8501 and 8502)

Second Floor Middle Room:
(This room requires complete removal of current installation)

West Wall:
Table, work, 18th century or reproduction (diagonal in northwest corner)
Sheets, linen, reproduction (on table)
Iron, flat (INDE 5071 relocated from kitchen)
Clothes horse or towel rack (away from the wall closer to the center of the room)
Curtains, muslin, reproduction

South Wall:
Trunks, travel (2)
Clothing (see “Quaker Life” section of this chapter) (in trunk)
Sheets, linen, reproduction (in trunk)
Clouts (diapers), linen, reproduction (in trunk)
*The Mirror, Vol. I., Philadelphia 1793* (INDE 6350 relocated from second floor parlor)
   (in trunk)
*The Ladies Magazine, Vol. 1, 1793* (INDE 8306 relocated from second floor parlor) (in trunk)

Miniature, John Todd reproduction (after original at the Macculloch Hall Historical Museum) (in trunk)

Stockings with knitting needles, reproduction, (relocated from first floor dining parlor) (in trunk)

Sewing etui or case (containing some or all of the following: scissors, needle case, thimble, bodkin/earspool, stiletto, and tweezers/file) (in trunk)

Lucet, wooden (in trunk)

Darning egg (in trunk)

Bottle, smelling (for Vinegar) (in trunk)

Jar, redware (in trunk)

Jar, stoneware (in trunk)

Basin, ceramic (in trunk)

Bucket, wooden (*INDE 3157, Pennsylvania, bail handle, 19th century*)

Brush, scrub, long handle

Bed, low post (head in southwest corner, bed running parallel with west wall) (*INDE 15695, folding bed, maple, American, 1750-1800*)

Mattress, feather (at end of bed if not using folding bed)

**East Wall:**

Andirons (10933 & 10934, brass/iron, Philadelphia, 1775-1780 or 19586 & 10587, brass/iron, reproduction - 1974)

Hook, jamb, brass, holds fireplace equipment Probably English, late 18th century (INDE 5164)

Shovel, fireplace (*INDE 51692, iron, American, 1750-1850*)

Tongs, fireplace (*INDE 10930, brass/iron, Philadelphia, 1770-1810*)

Armchair, Windsor (in front of the fireplace)

Breeches, men’s, reproduction (on seat of chair)

Case, needle, silver, late 18th century (on seat of chair)

Thread (on seat of chair)

Clout (diaper), linen, reproduction (partially finished - hanging over the chair)

Irons placed on trivets (2) (INDE 5072, & 5090)

**North Wall:**

Sheets, linen, reproduction (not ironed, loosely stacked in basket)

Laundry basket, 18th century or reproduction

Curtains, muslin, reproduction

Candlestick (on chest of candlestand) (*INDE 25496, bell metal, probably English, late 18th century*)

Candlestand

**Second Floor Parlor:**

Andirons (INDE 4014 & 4015) (remove to garret for storage) (Associated objects, INDE 3580 (jamb hook), 3581 (jamb hook), 8481 (shovel), 8482 (tongs) and 8498 (fender) should also be stored.)
Asparagus fern branches (faux) (hang from ceiling)
Seat Covers (4), reproduction (for chairs INDE 2036, 2037, 5713, and 5714)
Settee Cover, reproduction (for settee INDE 4302)
Jar, stoneware, American, blue and grey (Place in hearth filled with faux flowers)
Gauze, reproduction (to cover INDE 51856 (print) and 1465 (mirror))

Third Floor:
(Seasonal changes are indicated in the “Additional Spaces” section of this chapter)
Topic #4: Quaker Life

Historical Narrative

Around the time of the Revolutionary War, nearly 30,000 Quakers lived in and around Philadelphia. Having fled religious persecution in England a century earlier, over time many Quakers came to enjoy both political and social success in the New World. Quakers followed a set of beliefs and customs that distinguished them from those outside the community making them recognizable to fellow Quakers and non-Quakers alike. Such practices and customs grew out of a belief system envisioned by George Fox in seventeenth-century England. Based on the idea that all humans possessed an “Inward Light” through which every individual could find the path to God, Quaker beliefs encompassed ideals such as spiritual equality in men and women and pacifism. Earthly or outward activities such as music, theatre, fiction, art, and gambling were frowned upon as frivolous and a waste of time.

Quakers worshipped as a group twice a week at meeting houses. Purposefully excluding elements such as altars, candles, music, and physical sacraments, the meeting house was a place for quiet inward reflection and devotion to God. Meeting houses were plain and simple, with men and women at adjoining sides, any member having the opportunity to speak during worship if so desired. Monthly business meetings were conducted to discuss local issues and concerns. Quarterly and yearly meetings brought members together from larger surrounding geographic areas and were opportunities to host and entertain out-of-town relatives and friends. Issues were not voted upon but
were resolved by mutual conclusions through reflection and prayer.\textsuperscript{113} Marriages, such as the one that took place between Dolley Payne and John Todd Jr., were conducted in the meeting house in a simple ceremony before the congregation that did not include a minister but rather simple promises between the man and woman, following the belief that only God could facilitate a marriage union.

Modern concepts of Quaker practices tend to focus on the use of “plain” or “simple” dress and furnishings, often streamlining and simplifying such notions. Scholarship in recent years has sought to define what is meant by Quaker “plain” if it is definable at all. In the volume, Quaker Aesthetic, editors Emma Jones Lapsansky and Anne A. Verplanck collected various articles addressing this topic. Verplanck points out that many of today’s perceptions of Quaker material culture of the past grew out of the Colonial Revival period which tended to draw attention to the prominent and elite and minimize the remainder of society.\textsuperscript{114} Deciphering the difference between romanticized ideas about Quaker material culture and the true reality of the past is essential in attempting to recreate an authentic eighteenth-century setting.

One misconception that people today may have about eighteenth-century Quakers is the notion that the concepts of “plain” and “simple” were interpreted and implemented in the same way by all Quakers. J. William Frost discusses this topic in his article, “From Plainness to Simplicity: Changing Quaker Ideals for Material Culture.” Frost tackles the issue of the difference between what were seen as the ideals of living a pure Quaker life and the reality of how Quakers truly lived day to day. He reminds the reader that Quakers encompassed the full spectrum of social and economic levels and interacted with non-Quakers on a daily basis as neighbors and in conducting business.\textsuperscript{115} This being the
case, it is not surprising to find that Quakers incorporated outside ideas of gentility with the Quaker ideals of simplicity, diversifying the notion of “plainness” by class and occupation. An example is seen when looking at the Drinkers, an upper class Philadelphia Quaker family who counterbalanced the extravagance of certain fabrics (silk, velvet and cashmere) of which their clothing was made by keeping them in somber colors (dark greens, grays, and blacks). Susan Garfinkel, points out in her article, “Quakers and High Chests: The Plainness Problem Reconsidered” that in Philadelphia by the end of the eighteenth century, influences such as “purchaser’s economic status, the makers’ practices, the availability of materials, and fashion all played a role in defining the ‘plainness aesthetic.”

Often times, it is not only the true definition of plainness that can be elusive but the extent to which individuals actually lived a “plain” life. During yearly meetings, regulations about Quaker life were established and collected in Books of Discipline which were originally kept in manuscript form by the clerk of the meeting until the end of the eighteenth century when the books began to be published and distributed to members. These books contained “advices,” or guidelines, for the elders and “queries,” or questions of faith, for the members. Although the Books of Discipline served to guide members and were meant to direct their actions and beliefs, such documents did not always lay out Quaker rules and regulations in a specific and concise manner.

Some illicit behaviors were more obvious than others. Actions which were truly offensive, varying by region and era, can be seen in those that served as grounds for disownment. It was not uncommon in the eighteenth century for Quakers to be disowned for marrying outside of the Quaker faith (such as Lucy Payne) or drifting into
financial ruin (such as Dolley’s father, John Payne). Commissioning one’s portrait, however, although restricted was not an offense which alone was often grounds for disownment. John Todd Jr.’s brother, James, appears to be a relatively devout Friend noting in his journal his regular attendance at Quaker meetings. At the same time, however, he also notes various occasions when he attended plays and gambled, actions which were clearly not considered appropriate Quaker behavior but were overlooked by members of the meeting houses in Philadelphia where these activities were quite prevalent and common place among non-Quakers. John Todd Jr. himself was reported at the yearly meeting on July 25, 1793 to have “violated our peaceable Testimony in giving a Challenge to fight a duel with a person with whom he differed: On being treated with by the Overseers he acknowledged the Fact & its inconsistency with our religious Profession, but has not been reconciled to the Party with whom he differed…” The Friends did not feel that it was necessary to disown John Todd Jr. because he publicly acknowledged his illicit behavior.

The examples above help to reiterate the point that Quaker duties, actions, and physical possessions were not defined in black and white terms, but fell into a gray spectrum of appropriate, frowned upon, and unacceptable behaviors. Many meeting houses chose to simply define what was not plain rather than attempt to characterize what was. In this sense, Quakers often asserted their plainness by an avoidance of opulence and extravagance. In Mary Anne Canton’s article, “The Aesthetics of Absence: Quaker Women’s Plain Dress in the Delaware Valley, 1790-1900,” she points out that when studying Quaker dress, it is the absence of fashionable details that defines the aesthetic. Certain features considered high-style or based on fads were avoided. Canton points out
that early *Rules of Discipline* published by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting between 1682 and 1711 offered specific guidelines to what was considered plain and how to achieve it.¹²⁵ Later *Rules of Discipline* kept these same guidelines without adding new specifics. A 1797 *Discipline* states:

> “all Friends, both old and young, keep out of the worlds corrupt Language, Manners, vain and needless things and fashions, in Apparel, Buildings, and furniture of houses, some of which are immodest, indecent, and unbecoming…avoid also such kind of stuffs, colors, and dress, as are calculated more to please a vain and wanton or proud mind, than for their real usefulness.”¹²⁶

Even though the ideas from a century earlier continued to be addressed and emphasized, towards the end of the eighteenth century Quaker plain dress became more and more in sync with styles of mainstream fashion.¹²⁷

**The Todds as Quakers**

Married on January 7, 1790 at the Pine Street Meeting House near the corner of Pine and 2nd Streets, Dolley and John followed the Quaker doctrine of marrying within the faith.¹²⁸ Some references indicate that Dolley was encouraged to marry the young Quaker by her father who may have been trying to help her remain in good favor with the Society and avoid the fate he encountered when he was read out of meeting by the Society of Friends for landing in financial ruin after his starch business failed.¹²⁹ Whether or not this was the reason Dolley chose to wed John Todd Jr., is unknown. In any instance, as a young up-and-coming Quaker couple, it is reasonable to assume that the Todds would have been conscious of the Quaker testimonies of honesty, simplicity, equality, and peace. The degree to which the couple followed or adhered to Quaker
doctrine can only be speculated. As stated above, the “plain” or “simple” aesthetic is not easily defined, differing over time by social class and a person’s occupation.130

In a letter dated August 19, 1805, Dolley gives us a clue into how she viewed her life in Philadelphia prior to her marriage to James Madison. Returning to Philadelphia to have a knee operation, Dolley writes to her sister Anna, in reference to the many visitors that called upon her during her stay, stating “…this lecture made me recollect the times when our Society used to control me entirely & debar me from so many advantages & pleasures –& tho so entirely from their clutches I really felt my ancient terror of them revive to disagreeable degree.”131 Although this statement was made in retrospect years after Dolley was disowned by the Society of Friends, it appears that while living in Philadelphia, Dolley not only had been aware of Quaker rules of conduct and behavior but felt that they imposed unwelcome and intimidating restrictions on her.

John Todd Jr. himself engaged in causes that encompassed Quaker values, including providing free legal assistance to the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and signing a petition against theatres.132 His father was also a member of the Abolition Society and hired free blacks, including Absolom Jones, for tasks or jobs such as sweeping his chimneys and caring for his horses. He also donated money to various individuals including the impoverished, French immigrants from Cape Francois, and on occasion to enslaved individuals who needed assistance obtaining their freedom.133 An indication of the Todd family’s dedication to attending meeting is seen in a letter written by John’s brother James indicating that despite the severe yellow fever epidemic in September 1793, John, James, and their parents stayed in town for the yearly meeting before considering taking refuge outside of town.134 Having evidence of the
Todds’ keen awareness of Quaker doctrines and their attendance at Meeting it is not unreasonable to speculate that Dolley and John would have been aware of and likely had a printed copy of the *Book of Discipline*. Thus, a copy of the 1792 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting’s *Book of Discipline* should be placed on the dining room table as a constant reminder to Dolley of the restrictions placed upon her in her daily life.

Another way in which to portray the sense of restriction that Dolley felt from the doctrine of the Society of Friends, is to display several pieces of clothing that portray how “plain and simple dress” may have been interpreted by a woman of Dolley’s economic level and social status. As stated above, two ways in which Quakers chose to express simplicity in dress while still keeping up with current fashion was to use fine materials such as silk but with limited adornment and/or in muted colors. Placing garments of this description in the installation will help to reiterate that “plain and simple” did not mean that Dolley wore inexpensive unvarying clothing. At the same time, Dolley likely did not feel that she was at liberty to wear whatever she wanted and would have had a perception of what she believed would be considered too extravagant. This will help the visitor to understand how Dolley’s life as a Quaker in Philadelphia differed from her later life as the First Lady when she was known for creating innovative standards for dress and etiquette.135

Visitors may also have notions of Dolley as a very sociable woman, as they likely will associate her with her actions in later years as the nation’s hostess. While Quakers were known to have socialized and hosted guests, as the Todds would have done in the second floor drawing room, Quakers frowned upon many social activities such as games (cards and dice), theatre, music, and gambling. The absence of these activities in the
parlor is important for visitors to be aware of. It should also be mentioned, however, that not all Quakers followed every rule or recommended suitable behavior. One example is John Todd Jr.’s brother who attended plays regularly. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, as Quakers fell out of dominance in Philadelphia, they slowly became influenced by outside groups and activities. Some of these activities became less strictly enforced while others remained under high scrutiny. One of the volumes of Shakespeare currently in the Todd House library should be placed in the travel trunk in the second floor kitchen chamber as if Dolley’s sister Lucy is reading it and plans to take it with her when she leaves.

The Todds’ struggle with defining their own notions of what it meant to live a “plain” life occurred in an era which encompassed the Enlightenment as the core belief system. People of varying faiths valued the importance of the pursuit of knowledge. One aspect of this that Quakers took a particular interest was the study of nature. This being the case, it is not surprising that five of the nine founding members of the American Philosophical Society were Quakers. Early Quaker members of the APS included James Logan, William Rawle, and John and William Bartram who became America’s first botanist and ornithologist, respectively. Members of the Byberry Monthly Meeting located north of Philadelphia regularly brought natural and cultural specimens to meetings, donating them to the community library and collections. Although there is no direct evidence that the Todds held a personal interest in the natural sciences, it would not be inappropriate or wrong to speculate that one or more members of the family would have spent some of their free time engaging in such an activity. Dolley and/or her siblings may have enjoyed reading about and studying nature when not
engaged in domestic or social activities. John Todd Jr. enjoyed hunting and perhaps other family members, such as Dolley’s younger brother John Coles, had a chance to go with him and collect wildlife specimens. A natural history book with pictures of plant specimens should be placed on the chest of drawers in the north bedroom on the third floor with a few plant and animal specimens and a magnifying glass next to it.

As mentioned earlier, the subject of portraiture among Quakers has long been a confusing one. Early Quaker scholarship tended to dismiss Quaker portraiture on the notion that Quakers would not engage in such a worldly activity, preferring instead to capture likenesses through silhouettes, which, because of their convenient production and minimal expense, followed the tenets of plainness and simplicity while effectively portraying the likeness of an individual without the ostentation included in portraiture. Recent scholarship has proven that such was not the case with Quaker elite such as James Logan and Thomas Mifflin both whom commissioned portraits. While there is a miniature identified as John Todd Jr. and a silhouette of Dolley thought to be dated between 1785 and 1790, there are no know portraits of the couple. Whether it was a conscious decision by the Todds not to have their portraits commissioned is unknown, however placing replicas of the miniature and silhouette in the Todd House installation can facilitate a discussion about the use of portraiture and silhouettes within varying economic levels of the Quaker community. Although the making of silhouettes at the Peale Museum post dates Dolley’s occupation of the Todd House by a decade, an explanation of the Peale Museum during the interpretive tour would be beneficial. The Peale Museum was not only a place where silhouettes were made, but was of primarily importance as an institution that Charles Willson Peale created to explore and educate the
public about the natural sciences using collected specimens, an activity pursued by the Quakers as previously discussed.\textsuperscript{142}

As is evident, an effort to portray the Quaker faith of the Todds does not involve any drastic or dramatic changes to the current installation of the Todd House. It is hoped that subtle changes incorporating the addition of a few key objects will serve as starting points for discussion on related topics and issues. Incorporating elements of the Quaker belief system is not meant to simplify eighteenth-century views on the testimonies or make stark assumptions about the degree to which the Todds viewed their Quaker faith. Instead, the installation is meant to present reasonable assumptions about the way in which the Todds lived their lives as a means to facilitate discussions about a Quaker family living in late eighteenth-century Philadelphia. A dialogue about the installation and the reasoning behind chosen objects will also serve to educate the visitors on the process of historical interpretation and the challenges museums face in creating as accurate a view of the past as possible using historical documentation when available and filling in the gaps when information is missing.

\textbf{Recommended Furnishings}

\textbf{First Floor Dining Parlor:}
Silhouette of Dolley Todd (reproduction)
\textit{Three Treaties in which the Fundamental Principle, Doctrines, Worship, Ministry, and Discipline of the People Called Quakers are Plainly Declared, 1792 (INDE 223 - relocate from BW Study, shelf 38, west wall)}

\textbf{Second Floor Middle Room:}
Gown, fall front, silk, sage green, reproduction (in trunk)
Shawl, silk or muslin, grey, reproduction (in trunk)
Handkerchief, muslin, white, reproduction (in trunk)
Apron, linen, reproduction, dark green (in trunk)
Bonnet, white satin or lace, white, reproduction (in trunk)
Second Floor Kitchen Chamber:
_Dramatick Writings of Will Shakespeare, Vol. 1_ (INDE 14276) (relocated from Todd’s library in the Law Office)

Third Floor North Room:
Nest, bird’s (on chest of drawers)
Fossils, ocean shells/rocks (on chest of drawers)
Book, natural history (on chest of drawers) (INDE 14304) (relocate from Todd’s library in the Law Office)
Shell, turtle (on chest of drawers)
Magnifying glass (on chest of drawers)
Additional Spaces

Second Floor

Second Floor Entry Hall:

The hallway on the second floor at the top of the stairs would have been visible to guests as they made their way to the parlor to their left (see Illustration #21). The window would have provided light as they passed through the space. In keeping with the formality of the parlor, this hall would have remained simply and elegantly decorated. The current installation, consisting of a blanket chest and hanging print, serves this purpose. An early park report suggests this space be filled with a simple walnut or pine table next to the window decorated with a vase of flowers or bowl of fruits or nuts.\textsuperscript{143} Although this is a feasible use of the space, the current use of a blanket chest gives the added function of linen storage.

Although a small ingrain carpet would contribute to the formality of the space, because the installation is being interpreted during the summer months, the carpet will be left out as if it has been placed in storage. It is further recommended that the public tour begin in the main entrance on the first floor and that the door to the second floor middle room be closed at the start of the tour so that as visitors ascend onto the second floor they view the hall and parlor the way guests would have done historically, isolated from private areas of the house.\textsuperscript{144}

Recommended Furnishings

1503  Chest, blanket, walnut
       Possibly Baltimore, 1792

1.134  Print, Mezzotint engraving, “America,” after painting by R.E. Pine, 1778
       Published in London, 1781
Curtains, linen, reproduction

**Third Floor**

**South room:**

This study suggests that the south room of the third floor be interpreted as Dolley and John’s bedroom (see Illustration #21).\(^{145}\) A larger and more private space than the middle room on the second floor, the furnishings should primarily remain the same with several additions.\(^{146}\) One of the early park reports suggests that a high post bed would not fit on the third floor which has a lower ceiling than that of the second floor. However, the bed post in the current exhibit is 85 inches tall while the third floor ceiling is 88 ½ inches high leaving a small, but sufficient amount of space for the bed to be installed on the third floor.\(^{147}\) A mahogany bureau table should be added to the installation as this was a piece of furniture listed in John Todd Jr.’s receipt book purchased from Daniel Hay on Dec. 18, 1789 for four pounds, ten shillings.\(^{148}\) While the closet north of the fireplace has hooks on which to hang the same clothing that are in the closet in the current installation of the bedroom the south closet in the room on the third floor has three shelves. These shelves should be filled with folded textiles including clothing and extra bed linens. The sections of this report referring to the various themes should be consulted for suggested furnishings related to each theme.

**Recommended Furnishings**

Note: Objects listed below in italics are new additions, not part of the current bedroom installation.

**West Wall:**

1495 Bed, four poster, mahogany bedstead with plain tester (canopy) of poplar and pine (Probably Philadelphia, ca. 1770-1785) (with head of bed along the north wall)
5991  Mattress, feather, for double bed
      American, late 19th century
8004  Pillow, feather bolster
      American, late 19th century
8363  Bowl, sugar, with lid, creamware, English, ca. 1770 (On dressing table)
8622  Table, dressing, walnut “lowboy” with Spanish feet
      New Jersey or Pennsylvania, ca. 1750 (restored 1973)
11844 Chair, mahogany, Chippendale style (SN 6.043)
      Philadelphia, ca. 1765
8496  Sconce, tin, American, 18th century
8497  Sconce, tin, American, 18th century
13430 Candlestick, Adamantine, urn-topped, brass
      England, c. 1790 (on dressing table)
13374 Bottle, scent, glass
      England or American, 1770-1830 (on dressing table)
      -----  Curtain, blue and white cotton check with white lining, late 18th – early 19th
      century French, reproduction (an extra pair to match others)
      -----  Under-curtain, muslin, reproduction
      -----  Letters (one open, two sealed), reproduction (on dressing table)
      -----  Trunk, storage (under the window)
      -----  Gown, dressing, linen, reproduction (hung over Windsor rocking chair)
      -----  Cradle, Windsor (out from the wall in the northwest corner of the room)
      -----  Linens, reproduction (in cradle)
      -----  Chair, Windsor, rocking, Philadelphia, 1770-1800.
      -----  Linen gown, infant, reproduction (hung over side of cradle) (possibly INDE
      11770 or 11751)
      -----  Petticoat, infant, flannel, reproduction (hung over side of cradle)
      -----  Cap, infant (INDE 11772, linen, Philadelphia, c. 1770)
      -----  Rattle, coral-and-bells, silver, reproduction (on windowsill or dressing table)
      -----  Mosquito netting, green, reproduction (hung around the bed)

South Wall:
3374  Candelabrum, cherry
      Pennsylvania, ca. 1785 (in Southwest corner of the room)
13431 Candlestick, Adamantine, urn-topped, brass (on candelabrum)
      -----  Curtain, blue and white cotton check with white linen lining, 2 pairs.
      Reproduction late 18th – early 19th century French
      Waeverly Fabrics, Sturbridge Plaid, by Parisian Drapery Shop, Philadelphia, 1980
      -----  Under-ceilings, muslin, reproduction, 2 pairs
      -----  Bureau table, mahogany, circa 1789
      -----  Lancet, blood (on dressing table) (INDE 9771)
      -----  Bottle, medicine (INDE 31224, glass, England, 1785-1830)
      -----  Bottle, medicine (INDE 14758, glass, Philadelphia, 1750-1850)
      -----  Bottle, beer, black glass, porter shape, late 18th century (on dressing table [to
      sooth the baby]) (INDE 55128, beer bottle, Philadelphia, 1790-1840)
      -----  Asparagus fern (faux)
East Wall:
6421 Print, Mezzotint, framed “Faith” (London, ca. 1790-1800)
6422 Print Mezzotint, framed “Hope” (London, ca. 1790-1800)
6423 Print, Mezzotint, framed, “Charity” (London, ca. 1790-1800)
12316 & 12317
   Shoes, Men’s leather, 18th century style
   Reproduction, Bray Bros., Philadelphia, 1923 (at bottom of north closet)
   ----- Breeches, brown, reproduction (hanging in north closet)
   ----- Breeches, tan, reproduction
   ----- Waistcoat, tan, reproduction
   ----- Shirt, man’s white, reproduction
   ----- Shirt, drawstring, print, reproduction
13641 Hook, jamb, brass, c. 1790
   ----- Bed linens, reproduction (folded in south closet)
   ----- 2 shawls, reproduction (folded in south closet)
   ----- 1 fall-front gown, reproduction (folded in south closet)
   ----- 2 neckerchiefs, reproduction (folded in south closet)
   ----- Clouts (diapers), linen, reproduction (folded in south closet)
   ----- Pilchens (diaper covers), wool, reproduction (folded in south closet)
   ----- Chair, side, Queen Anne (INDE 11837, c. 1720-1740)
   ----- Gauze, reproduction (to cover INDE 6421, 6422, 6423)
   ----- Seat cover, reproduction (for Queen Anne side chair)

North Wall:
8513 Commode, mahogany, Chippendale style
   English, c. 1770 (with chamber pot 8634) (in east corner of the room)

Lumber room (small middle room on third floor):

   The small space at the top of the third floor stairs differs from that at the top of the second floor stairs in that it is within a more private area within the house and it has a door (see Illustration #21). This small room is similar to the “Lumber Room” located at the top of the stairs on the second floor in Historic Waynesborough, an eighteenth-century Pennsylvania farm manor house located in Chester County (see Illustrations 17 & 18). This type of space was given the term “Lumber Room” during the late-eighteenth century, referring to the storage of unused items rather than wood. Odds and ends as well
as possessions in need of repair were kept in such a room.\textsuperscript{149} Rooms of this size, too small to be used as sleeping quarters, yet able to be secured behind a locked door, were also sometimes used to store possessions of value such as liquor and fine tableware.\textsuperscript{150}

Although the original door and hardware do not survive to show conclusively that the room was under lock and key, it is feasible to assume that it was.

Interpreted as a Lumber Room, this space should incorporate various objects that were placed there for storage purposes. This should include a small mahogany breakfast table similar to the one that John Todd Jr. purchased from Daniel Hay for 3 pounds on December 19, 1788.\textsuperscript{151} Breakfast tables sometimes referred to small versions of drop-leaf dining tables and were meant to be stored easily and used on occasion.\textsuperscript{152} Other stored possessions in this space should include valuables, some of the heating related objects removed from the first and second floors during summer season, and other odds and ends.

**Recommended Furnishings**

Mahogany Breakfast Table, c. 1788  
Trunk, travel, small  
Objects removed for winter storage (see Appendix E)  
Kettle, tea, silver  
Coffee Urn  
Bottle, wine, 2 (INDE 3381, seal, 1767 & INDE 3382, seal, 1773)  
Andirons (2) (INDE 10931 & 10932, brass/iron, Philadelphia, c. 1785)  
Shovel, fireplace (INDE 10929, brass/iron, Philadelphia, c. 1770-1810)  
Tongs, fireplace (INDE 51688, iron, American, 1750-1850)  
Screen, fire

**North room:**

At the end of the eighteenth century separate nurseries were emerging but still very rare.\textsuperscript{153} Some set up temporary nurseries, a secluded place for mother and child to
sleep for several weeks after the birth, however this was not meant to be a permanent situation. More commonly, young children slept where ever was most convenient, usually with a servant or older sibling to look after them, while infants often slept in the same room as their parents, as discussed earlier. The north room on the third floor can logically be interpreted as a bedroom where toddler John Payne, Dolley’s younger siblings such as Anna or John Coles or other family members temporarily staying in the house may have slept (see Illustration #21).

The room should be relatively simple in decoration since this would have been a private family space not commonly viewed by visitors and guests. The Todds would have likely put their less contemporary furniture in this space saving their more elegant and fashionable furnishings for the public rooms of the house. While children’s furniture can be seen in Independence National Historical Park’s Bishop While House parlor on the first floor, such furniture is not recommended for the Todd House. Bishop White’s grandchildren resided in his house nearly forty years after the period of interpretation for Todd occupation, a time when specialized furniture for children was more common. During the late eighteenth century, children’s furniture was not seen as particularly necessary and in the rare occasion when it was recorded, it was primarily associated with girls who were seen as the more delicate of the sexes.

As a toddler, the older child John Payne would have outgrown a cradle about the time he learned to walk. Because it was not uncommon for more than one person to share a bed, a double, low post bed would have been sufficient for both John Payne and one of Dolley’s siblings, such as Anna. Although specialized children’s furniture did not become popular until the nineteenth century, toys were not uncommon in the late
eighteenth century as is evident by the inclusion of toys in portraits of children after the 1770s. Towards the end of the eighteenth century toys became increasingly more prevalent as children’s roles became distinct from adults, making children’s play time very different from adult recreational activities. During this time period there was also a difference between toys and games that were appropriate for boys (sleds, stilts, jumped rope, rolled a loop, cricket, marbles, ball) versus those that were appropriate for girls (dolls, “playing” house). Dolley would have likely kept toys for John Payne in this room thus a toy horse and a few small balls of various sizes should be scattered on the floor next to the bed. As a young mother, Dolley also would have likely consulted popular domestic advice books such as John Locke’s Some Thoughts Concerning Education and Dr. William Buchan’s Domestic Medicine. A copy of each should be placed on a chest of drawers. Next to these books a copy of An American Tutor’s Assistant, written in part by John Todd Jr’s father, John Todd Sr., should by placed for use by Dolley’s siblings Anna or John Coles, both of whom were of school age.

Across from the entrance to the room is a second door which opens to the roof of the kitchen chamber, an area referred to as the “flat” by General Moylan, an occupant of the house in the early nineteenth century. The flat would have been used for whitening and drying linens so it can be imagined that during the day this bedroom would have been seen as a utilitarian space through which laundry was brought back and forth. It is likely that toddler John Payne would have been kept elsewhere in the house while laundry was being collected from the flat, as the roof would not have been a safe place for the toddler to wander. A basket with a lump of linens inside should be placed next to the door as if it
has just been brought in from the flat and is going to be taken downstairs to be pressed and ironed.

**Recommended Furnishings:**

**West Wall:**
- Chest of drawers, walnut, Queen Anne, Philadelphia (in north corner)
- John Locke’s *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, 1693. (on chest of drawers)
- Dr. William Buchan’s *Domestic Medicine*, 1794, INDE 7384 (removed from current location in the first floor dining room) (placed on chest of drawers)
- John Todd Sr., Zachariah Jess, William Waring, and Jeremiah Paul’s *An American Tutor’s Assistant*, 1791 (on chest of drawers)
- Sconce, tin (2)
- Candlestick, hogscraper (on chest of drawers) (*INDE 7571, probably England, 18th – mid 19th century*)
- Curtains, linen, reproduction

**South Wall:**
- Low post bed, double (southwest corner with head of bed on south wall)
- Mattress, feather, reproduction
- Pillow, reproduction
- Pillowcase, linen, (2) (*INDE 11150 &11151, Lansdowne, PA, c. 1700-1800*) or reproduction
- Sheet, linen (*INDE 4980, Philadelphia, 1780-1810*) or reproduction
- Blanket, hand woven, wool (*INDE 5273, American, possibly late 18th century*) or reproduction
- Sconce, tin
- Pot, chamber (child’s), pewter

**East Wall:**
- Balls (toys), wooden (2) (in middle of room across from the fireplace)
- Toy horse (in middle of room across from the fireplace)
- Frocks, muslin, reproduction (for a toddler) (3)
- Print, framed (over fireplace)
- Candlestick, hogscraper
- Candlestand, Pennsylvania
- Hook, jamb
- Screen, fire

**North Wall:**
- Shoe, baby (*INDE 11763, leather/wood, Philadelphia, 1760-1860*) (on floor)
- Pot, chamber, redware (in east corner)
- Washstand
- Porringer, redware (on washstand)
- Wash basin
Curtains, linen, reproduction
Basket, large, laundry, splint wood, 18th century or reproduction
Table clothes, linen, reproduction (3) (bundled up in basket)
Clothespins (4) (on top of linens in basket)
Chair, side (INDE 382, Windsor side chair, bow back, 1716-1798 or INDE 362 bamboo turned armchair, Mahogany, 1770-1796)

Fourth Floor

Garret

Similar to most domestic structures in Philadelphia during the eighteenth century, the Todd House included a garret on the fourth floor. As with all of the rooms in the house, functions and furnishings associated with this space are not known for certain but can be speculated and reasonable assumptions made as to its use and occupancy. John Bacon discusses eighteenth and nineteenth-century garrets in his report, “Cellars, Garrets, and Related Spaces” stating they most commonly functioned as storage and/or lodging facilities for “children, boarders, or even the householder.” Garrets were often plastered and whitewashed or painted with a finished look similar to that of the rest of the house. Many houses divided the space with wooden partitions creating several rooms that could be used for varying functions.

Documents show that at least one of John Todd Jr.’s law clerks, Isaac Heston, lived with them while they occupied the Todd House. It is possible that Isaac occupied the garret, and since all other rooms in the house have been interpreted for other functions, the garret should be interpreted as the sleeping quarters for the young apprentice. Although the garret was originally and is currently one large room, physical evidence indicates that wooden partitions were used during the eighteenth century to divide similar spaces into two separate areas, allowing us the opportunity to interpret one
space as a living quarter and the other as an area for general and seasonal storage.\textsuperscript{165} The likelihood of the space being used as a sleeping quarter is strengthened by the fact that garrets which were utilized as primary living spaces can often be identified by the relative ease with which the space is accessed. The continuation of the broad newel stairs from the first floor all the way to the garret in the Todd House suggests that this space was easily and regularly accessed. Assigning Isaac a sectioned off, private space contrasts what might have been the case if he were a slave or servant who may not have been given as much privacy.

A likely choice for Isaac’s sleeping quarters was the north garret which was created by two partition walls, one running west-east connecting to the west wall between the two gable windows and the other running north-south forming a corner with the first partition wall and adjoining the north wall of the garret. (see Illustrations 1, 19, 20 & 21). Although divided into north and south primary spaces, similar to the way the first three floors are, the garret is distinguished by the lack of fireplaces.\textsuperscript{166} Plans of the fourth floor depicting eighteenth century physical evidence (see Illustration 20) indicate that a closet or shelf was located in the north portion of the north/south partition wall. This would have given Isaac some extra space for his belongings in what would have otherwise been a relatively simple space. A low-post bed, desk and chair next to the window, trunk, and a small chest of drawers would have made up the main furnishings of the room.\textsuperscript{167} Due to the absence of a fireplace and summer heat, it is likely that Isaac would have not have spent much time in the room during the day. Several books from John Todd Jr.’s library and personal belongings such as clothing should be seen on the shelves and throughout the room.
The south garret, which was not partitioned off with another wall or door would have been an open space to store odds and ends including possessions such as old or broken furniture, tools, linens, prints, and old papers. Although food was primarily stored in the cellar, dry bulk items such as barrels of salt and bags of coffee, as well as liquor were also sometimes kept in the garret. Additionally, seasonal storage including carpets, andirons, curtains, bed heaters and other objects would be properly wrapped and stored here (See Appendix E). Objects in this space should be somewhat haphazardly arranged; it is likely that Dolley would have kept the space organized in a manner in which she could find things, however being that this was not a public area, it would not have been formally arranged like other rooms.

**Recommended Furnishings**

**North Garret:**

**West Wall:**
Desk, writing (under the window) (*INDE 11838, Mahogany writing or architect’s table, possibly English, 1780-1820*)

Inkwell, pocket (*INDE 4970, pasteboard/ceramic, American, 1750-1850*)

Chair, Windsor (*INDE 15694, lowback armchair, Philadelphia, c. 1760-1770*)

Sconce, tin

Bed, low post, single (northwest corner)

Pillow, feather, reproduction

Pillow case (*INDE 8101, linen, probably Pennsylvania, c. 1770*) or reproduction

Mattress, feather, reproduction

Sheet, linen (*INDE 4981, American, 18th century*) or reproduction

Blanket (*INDE 5354, wool, American, second half of the 18th century*)

Books (2) (on desk and bed) (*INDE 5894, An Essay on Crimes and Punishment, Philadelphia, 1793 & INDE 6734, Travels Through Syria and Egypt, Dublin, 1793*) (both relocated from John’s law office)

Shirt, linen, white, reproduction (on bed)

Breeches, black, wool, reproduction (on bed)

Waist coat, brown, reproduction (on bed)

**South Wall:**

Sconce, tin

Trunk (*INDE 51798, cowhide trunk, American, 1750-1800*)
East Wall:
Candle stick (on chest of drawer) (INDE 10594, hogscraper, English, late 18th century)
Chest of drawers, Queen Anne, 1740-1760
Coat, wool, reproduction (in closet in southwest corner)
Shirt, linen, white, reproduction (in closet in northeast corner)
Undergarment, linen, reproduction (in closet in northeast corner)
Breeches, reproduction (in closet in northeast corner)
Mirror (hung over chest of drawers) (INDE 12256, mahogany, possibly English, c. 1800)

North Wall:
Pot, Chamber (INDE 4127, redware, probably New England, 18th or 19th century)
Wash basin and stand
Porringers

South Garret:
Flax Wheel (INDE 11846, American, 1783-1802)
Flax Reel
Trunks (2)
Chairs, Windsor (2)
Chair, rush bottom, mahogany, broken (2)
Barrels (2)
Prints, framed (3)
Bags, “filled” with coffee, reproduction
Box, bottle (INDE 4134, rectangular, pine, American, c. 1760-1830)
Bottles, case/gin (INDE 3597, 3611, 3612, 3788, 3811, 4048, 4049, 4068, 4069, 4182, 4915, 4916) (Inside bottle box if possible)
Sundries/lumber
Chest, tool, small
Looking glass
Saw, cross cut
Coal scuttle, tin (1)
Coal boxes, wooden (2)
Umbrella (INDE 12445, Philadelphia, c. 1780-1820)
Table, tea (INDE 10565, mahogany, late 18th century, New England, reproduction- 1974)
Duster (INDE 7986, oak leaves clustered together, Philadelphia)
Ax (INDE 51693, iron, wood, 1730-1770)
Boxes, storage, reproduction (4)
APPENDIX A

Review of the 1960s Todd House Furnishing Plan
A review of the 1960s Todd House Furnishing Plan

Initial review of park reports revealed suggestions made in the 1960s furnishing plan differ from the current installation. While this is an expected occurrence because furnishings plans are not meant to be static documents but as starting points, it was helpful, as part of the document review process, to look at how the installation changed over time in both room interpretation and the inclusion or removal of individual artifacts.

For example, the furnishings plan suggests that the room above the kitchen, or kitchen chamber, be interpreted as the bedroom of a middle-aged maidservant; presently (2007) this room is installed as the bedroom of Dolley’s younger sister, Anna (see Illustration 2). The furnishings plan did, however, account for Anna’s presence by suggesting that the second floor middle room be furnished as her bedroom with the thought that Dolley and John’s bedroom was located on the third floor. At the time of this report this middle room is furnished as the bedroom of Dolley and John (see Illustration 3). These are the only two major discrepancies since the remaining rooms in the current installation coincide with the original furnishings plan.

During a review of the original furnishing plan, a distinction was also made between the areas or rooms in the house where the basis for interpretation were most satisfactory in their present day states versus those areas or rooms which may be open for discussion of other possible interpretive uses. The current interpretation of all spaces and
rooms on the first floor installed as kitchen, dining parlor, front hall, and law office are consistent with room use laid out in the original 1960s furnishing plan and one can logically see that these were likely the way these rooms and spaces were used by the Todds while living in the house (see Illustrations 4, 5, 6, and 7).

The second floor is not as straight forward. Analysis began with the south room, currently installed as an upstairs parlor (see Illustration 8). Interpreting this room as a parlor was originally justified in early park reports by the fact that “architecturally it is the finest room in the house and the evidence of breast closets indicates the non-sleeping function of the room.” Also stated in these reports is that Philadelphia inventories for this period show that having the parlor on the second floor followed the custom of the time. No reference to specific inventories was noted however. A review of all inventories in “Appendix B” of the 1960s furnishing plan revealed that only seven out of twenty-two inventories divided goods by room and, of those, none contained a parlor on the second floor. This negates the possibility that the inventories mentioned in the reports are those collected in “Appendix B” of the 1960s furnishing plan. Thus, the referenced inventories remained unidentified.

The Todd House furnishing plan “Part D-F” supports the interpretation of the south room of the second floor as a parlor by reference to historic accounts by two individuals, Ann Warder twice in 1786 and Peter Stephen Du Ponceau in 1837. “Part D-F” mentions “a number of Philadelphia inventories of the period” but, again, does not include specific references. Research in the park history note card files was conducted to see if more examples of second floor parlors could be uncovered so as to better assess the validity of the interpretation of the room. This research yielded two additional
historic references to the placement of a parlor on the second floor as well as two primary sources that placed a parlor on the first floor. Additional evidence includes President Washington’s residences at Cherry and Queen Streets in New York and 190 High Street in Philadelphia, both of which had parlors on the second floor. While some believe that a second floor parlor is a product of Colonial Revival influences, examination of literature from the eighteenth, nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, as well as recent scholarship, confirms that the placement of parlors on the second floor was not a product of Colonial Revival period interpretation.

Although the specific inventories previously discussed were never found, having uncovered multiple historical references to second floor parlors from a contemporary time period indicates that the interpretation of the second floor south room is reasonable. John Todd Jr. was an up-and-coming professional and being as such it would have likely been part of his family’s daily routines to both visit others and receive visitors. The need for a formal space to entertain guests was necessary and given the limited number of rooms in the residence, the second floor south room as a parlor is logical to the interpretation of the house.

The middle room on the second floor poses more of a dilemma. This room is currently interpreted as the bedroom of Dolley and John Todd Jr. (see Illustration 3) which is consistent with the interpretation laid out in the 1960s furnishing plan “Part A-C” and different than that laid out in “Parts D-F” which suggests this room be interpreted as the bedroom of Dolley’s younger sister, Anna. Both “Parts A-C” and “Parts D-F” of the 1960s furnishings plan argue that justification of the interpretation of this room as a bedroom can be seen in contemporary practice and descriptions which often depict the
middle room of the second floor as a bedroom. However, no specific references are
given. Also stated in “Parts A-C” is that a high-post bed, like the one listed in John Todd
Sr.’s inventory, would not fit in any of the rooms on the third floor leaving the middle
room of the second floor as the only logical space for the bedroom of Dolley and John.
This argument is confusing on two accounts. First, there is no justification that a high
post bed would not fit on the third floor and second, a high post bed is only listed on John
Todd Sr’s inventory, not John Todd Jr's, which does not specify the bedstead as a high
post. While one cannot assume that just because John’s father owned a high post bed,
John Todd Jr. owned one as well, bed curtains on high post beds were commonly used for
added warmth during the winter and to hang mosquito netting during the summer and so
it is reasonable to assume that the Todds used them.\textsuperscript{178} In defense of the possibility that
Dolley and John’s bedroom occupied the third floor, it can be argued that the south room
of the third floor would be a more appropriate space for the master bedroom because of
the greater amount of privacy offered and the larger space allowing for the inclusion of
storage chests and a writing desk.\textsuperscript{179}

To the north of the middle room on the second floor is the kitchen chamber (see
Illustration 2). Similar to the discussion above concerning the middle room, there is a
discrepancy between suggested installations in “Parts A-C” and “Parts D-F” of the
furnishing plan and the current installation as a bedroom for Dolley’s younger sister
Anna. “Parts A-C” of the furnishing plan coincides with the current installation by
suggesting that the room be interpreted as the bedroom of one of the family members
living in the house. The family member in question, however, is not specified. On the
other hand, “Parts D-F” of the furnishing plan suggests the kitchen chamber be installed
as the bedroom of a middle-aged, live-in maid servant. While “Parts A-C” dismisses this idea due to the lack of direct evidence that the Todd’s had a live-in servant, “Parts D-F” argues that strong hints within the Todd Family papers and prevailing contemporary customs are justification enough to suggest occupation of the room by a live-in servant. As with the middle room on the second floor, the circumstances which occurred over the last thirty years leading to the current installation are unknown. Neither interpretation of the kitchen chamber is inherently wrong in terms of evidence or logic. One factor that plays a role in the interpretation of this room and others in the house is who exactly lived in the house during the Todds’ occupancy between 1790 and 1793 (see Chapter I).
APPENDIX B

Biographical Information on the Payne and Todd Families
THE PAYNE FAMILY:

(A) John Payne (Dolley’s father)
1740-1792

John Payne was born on February 9, 1740 in Goochland County, Virginia to Anglican parents Anna Flemming Payne and John Payne Sr. He married Quaker Mary Coles in 1761 and set up residence in Virginia on “Little Bird Creek farm,” land given to him by his father. Three years later he joined the Society of Friends at the Cedar Creek Meeting in Hanover County, Virginia. He moved the family to the Quaker community in New Garden, North Carolina in 1765 and he and his wife were granted a certificate to the New Garden Monthly Meeting on October 12, 1765. He moved his family back to Hanover County Virginia in 1769 and was appointed clerk of the Friends Monthly Meeting on August 12, 1775 and recorder of the manumission of slaves on December 12, 1778. Following the legalization of manumission in the state of Virginia he freed his slaves on February 21, 1783 and was granted membership for admission into the Philadelphia Meeting on April 12, 1783. The family moved to Philadelphia on July 9, 1783 and lived on the outskirts of the city for a short period of time before moving to 96 N. 3rd St. John Payne opened a starch business at 231 E. New St. Due to a failing economy, his business collapsed leaving him bankrupt in 1789. John Payne was left in great debt and was expelled from the Pine Street Meeting for not being able to pay his debts. He died on October 24, 1792 at the age of 52.

(B) Mary Coles Payne (Dolley’s mother)
1745-1807

Born in Goochland County, VA, to prosperous Quaker parents Williams Coles and Lucy Winston, Mary “Molly” Payne grew up in Hanover Co., VA on “Coles Hill.” She was sixteen years old when she was “read out of meeting” from the Society of Friends for marrying Anglican John Payne in 1761 but was later readmitted in 1765 when her husband John Payne became a member. She visited Philadelphia with her husband in 1779 and again in 1781 with her son Walter, before moving there with the family in 1783. Due to financial difficulties after her husband went bankrupt, she converted the family home into a boarding house for members of the federal government temporarily residing in Philadelphia. In November of 1793 she moved to son-in-law, George Steptoe Washington’s estate in Harewood, VA with her recently married daughter Lucy and Mary’s two youngest children, John Coles Payne and Mary Payne. She died October 21st or 22nd of tuberculosis (possibly contracted from her son-in-law George Steptoe Washington), at Clarksburg, VA (now WV) while visiting her daughter.
Mary Payne Jackson. She was buried in the Jackson Family plot (that later included Gen. “Stonewall” Jackson C.S.A.).

(C) **Walter Payne (Dolley’s eldest brother)**

1762-? (<1794)

Born in Virginia in 1762, Walter Payne was expelled for unknown reasons by the Society of Friends at the age of 15. He accompanied his mother on a visit to see the Drinker family in Philadelphia in 1781. One account states that by 1781 he was a captain for the Virginia militia. By 1784 he is known to be residing in Philadelphia and courting Sarah Drinker (his presence is noted several times in Elizabeth Drinker’s diary). He left Philadelphia on December 26, 1784 for Great Britain via Virginia and is not mentioned in Elizabeth Drinker’s diary after this point. On January 28, 1785 he was granted a certificate to Grace Church St. and elsewhere in London and on September 5, 1787 he received a certificate from Devonshire House Monthly Meeting in London. On February 27, 1789 he was disowned by the Friends for unknown reasons. In a May 13, 1794 version of Dolley’s will she bequeathed two hundred and fifty dollars to be paid to Walter one year after her death. Some sources speculate that he likely died while abroad.

(D) **William Temple Payne (Dolley’s second older brother)**

1766-1794

Born June 17, 1766, at New Garden, North Carolina, William Temple Payne was the supposed favorite brother to Dolley who was disowned by the Friends for joining the United State Navy. He died of disease in December 1794 at the age of 28 in Norfolk, VA.

(E) **Dolley Payne Todd Madison**

1768-1849

Born May 20, 1768 in New Garden, North Carolina, Dolley Payne grew up in Hanover County Virginia. In 1783 at the age of 15 she moved with her family to Philadelphia. She married Quaker lawyer John Todd Jr. on January 7, 1790 when she was 22 years old and had two sons, John Payne and William Temple. The year after her husband and youngest son died during the 1793 Yellow Fever epidemic, she was introduced by Aaron Burr at her 4th and Walnut residence to non-Quaker future president James Madison whom she married on September 14, 1794. She was expelled from the Society of Friends on December 12, 1794 for marrying out of unity. Dolley went on to become a celebrated first lady, national hostess, and heroine of the war of 1812 spending time in Washington D.C. and Montpelier, the Madison plantation in Orange County, Virginia. She died on June 12, 1849 at 81 years of age.
(F) Isaac Payne (Dolley’s first younger brother)  
?-1795

Birth date unknown, Isaac Payne was disowned by the Friends in 1790 for immorality. In a May 13, 1794 version of Dolley’s will she bequeathed part of her “waring apparel and personal ornaments” to Isaac’s wife and sixty dollars to be “laid out in a gold watch” to be presented to Isaac. He died in Virginia in 1795 (or possibly late 1794) of gunshot wounds during a quarrel with another man.

(G) Lucy Payne Washington Todd (Dolley’s first younger sister)  
1778-1848

Born in Virginia in 1778, Lucy Payne lived for a short period with John and Dolley Todd in their house on 4th St. She eloped with the president’s nephew, George Steptoe Washington in August of 1793 and was disowned by the Friends for marrying out of unity. The couple, along with Lucy’s mother and two youngest siblings, moved to the Harewood estate in Berkeley, Co., VA (now Harrison Co., WV). Her husband, George Steptoe Washington, died from tuberculosis at age 35 in 1808 at the Harewood estate. On March 29, 1812, she married Justice Thomas Todd (no relation to John Todd), Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Lucy had four children with her first husband and three with her second. She died at 71 years of age in 1848.

(H) Anna Payne Cutts (Dolley’s second younger sister)  
1779-1832

Born in Virginia November 11, 1779, Anna Payne went to live with her sister Dolley within several years after their father’s death and remained with Dolley through her youth, often being referred to by Dolley as her “sister-child.” She continued to live with the Madisons when they moved to Washington, until she married Congressman Richard Cutts Sr., a U.S. representative from Massachusetts on March 30, 1804. When Congress was not in session they resided at Cutts Island, Massachusetts (now Maine) where Richard Cutts grew up. The couple had seven children: James Madison Cutts, Thomas Cutts, Walter Coles Cutts, Richard Cutts, Dolley Madison Cutts, Mary E.E. Cutts, and Richard D. Cutts. She died at the age of 52 on August 4, 1832.

(I) Mary Payne Jackson (Dolley’s third younger sister)  
1782-1808

Mary “Polly” or “Molly” Payne was born in 1782. After her father’s death she stayed with her mother, eventually moving, along with her brother John Coles, to the Harewood estate of brother-in-law George Steptoe Washington and wife, older sister Lucy Payne Washington in 1793. On October 1, 1800, she married Justice John George Jackson, District Judge of Virginia. She died of tuberculosis in 1808 at the age of 26.

(J) John Coles Payne (Dolley’s youngest brother)
1783(or 1782)-? (>1814)

John Coles Payne was born in 1783 just before the family moved from Virginia to Philadelphia. He moved with his mother and sister Mary to the Harewood estate of brother-in-law George Steptoe Washington and wife, older sister, Lucy Payne Washington in 1793. He struggled with gambling and alcoholism despite his sister Dolley’s efforts to assist him in his professional pursuits. He eventually settled at Montpelier before moving to Kentucky. He married Clara (Clary) Wilcox in Virginia in December of 1814. His daughter, Anna C. Payne (later Anna Causter after marrying Thomas H. Causter in 1850) was a companion of Dolley’s after James Madison died.

(K) Mother Amy (house servant of Mary “Molly” Payne)

Originally a slave of the Payne family who served as Mary Payne’s house servant and a nurse to the children, Mother Amy moved with the family to Philadelphia in 1783 as a wage earner. She stayed with the Payne family until her death, the exact date of which is unknown.

THE TODD FAMILY:

(L) John Todd Sr. (John Todd’s father)

?-1793

Son of John Todd (I) and Margaret Cain Todd, little is known of John Todd Sr.’s childhood. On November 6, 1762 he produced a certificate from the New Garden Monthly Meeting (Chester County, PA) to marry Mary Derborow and settle in Philadelphia. A month later on December 9th the couple were married at the Philadelphia Meeting. The couple resided at 104 High St. (now 314 Market St.) and rented a stable at Whalebone Alley near Carpenter’s Hall. During his career as a schoolmaster he worked at Robert Proud’s School of Philadelphia (a Quaker institution for boys), and the Friends Academy on the southeast corner of 4th and Chestnut Streets. In 1765 he served as librarian of the Library of Friends at the Fourth Street Meeting House. He was also librarian of the Library Company of Philadelphia from December 8, 1778 to June 16, 1779. His diary from 1790 to 1793 records various accounts including donations to the abolitionist society, hiring free blacks, domestic purchases and attendance at Quaker meetings. In 1791, along with fellow Philadelphia teachers Zachariah Jess, William Waring, and Jeremiah Paul, he co-authored the book, The American Tutor’s Assistant. He died on Oct. 2, 1793 of yellow fever and was able to will his son John Todd Jr. $500 as well as $100 to be shared by his young grandsons.

(M) Mary Derborow Todd (John Todd’s mother)

1730-1793
Born in New Garden, Chester County, PA in 1730, Mary Derborow married John Todd Sr. on December 9, 1762 and had three children, John Todd Jr., James, and Debora. She died of yellow fever at the age of 63 on Oct. 12, 1793.

(N) John Todd Jr.  
1763-1793

Born to Quaker parents John Todd Sr. and Mary Debororow Todd on November 17, 1763, John Todd Jr. grew up in Philadelphia and attended the Friends Academy on S. 4th St. where his father was schoolmaster. He was admitted to the Municipal bar in 1783 and served as librarian of the Library Company of Philadelphia from January 13, 1784 to February 3, 1785. He practiced in the State Supreme Court and in 1791 he was allowed to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. Historical documents recorded that he gave free legal assistance to the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, signed a petition against theatres, gave $20 for the relief of yellow fever victims and he hunted fowl. Although he was referred to as a kind, patient, intelligent, and promising individual, he was at one point suspended by the Society of Friends for getting into a fight. Fanciful accounts depict John Todd Jr. as plump with false wooden teeth. These romanticized narratives allege that rather than romance it was his successful career as a lawyer, his loyalty to John Payne, and his willingness to marry Dolley without payment of a dowry, that made him an ideal bachelor to the Payne family. On December 25, 1789 John Todd Jr. was granted a certificate to the Philadelphia monthly meeting for the southern district to marry Dolley Payne. The couple were married on January 7, 1790 and moved into the house at Fourth and Walnut Streets on November 23, 1791. During the yellow fever epidemic in the fall of 1793 he stayed in Philadelphia along with his parents and law clerk, Isaac Heston, while Dolley and the rest of the family fled to Gray’s Ferry. He died October 24, 1793 (the same day his infant son William Temple died) of yellow fever at the age of 30 in Philadelphia at his brother James’s house, 103 Chestnut Street. He left his entire estate and possessions to Dolley.

(O) James Todd (John Todd’s brother)  
1766-1806

Born April 3, 1766 in Philadelphia, James Todd married Alice Poulteny November 13, 1788 at the Pine Street Meeting House and had five children, Samuel Poulteny, Deborah (later Miles), Mary (later Crabb), John and Elizabeth Blair. He worked as a bank teller at the Bank of North America and was later a successful dry goods merchant. Accounts recorded in his diary, 1786-1788, indicate that on various occasions he attended Websters lectures, the Debates of the House of Assembly, Quaker meeting, and theatrical plays as well as wagered bets and read Shakespeare. He survived the yellow fever epidemic and disputed with Dolley over the disposition of his father John Todd Sr. and
his brother, John Todd Jr.’s, property. He eventually paid Dolley several checks totaling $1900 after James Madison contacted him demanding that he provide Dolley with her share of her former inlaws’ estates. There is no further correspondence between Dolley and James after this point although Dolley did help his children, especially Samuel, later in her life.

(P) Debora Todd (John Todd’s sister)
1771-1772

Born April 7, 1771, Debora Todd was buried October 20, 1772 at the age of 15 months. Cause of death is unknown.

(Q) John Payne Todd (John and Dolley’s first son)
1792-1852

Born February 29, 1792 at the house on 4th and Walnut, John Payne Todd went by the name of Payne. The Todd house (4th and Walnut) was put in trust for him by attorney William Watkins until April 5, 1817. Payne sold the house in June 1818 to Mr. John Rea, an upholsterer. During Madison’s presidential years Payne spent time abroad including an unsuccessful assignment seeking Russia’s help to end the War of 1812. During this time he developed expensive spending and gambling habits. By 1829 he found himself in debtor’s prison in Philadelphia. After the death of his stepfather, President James Madison, his mother was forced to sell the family plantation at Montpelier, Virginia to pay her son’s debts.

(R) William Temple Todd (John and Dolley’s second son)
August/September 1793 – October 24, 1793

Born in late August or early September 1793, he died in infancy on the same day as his father John Todd Jr., Oct. 24, 1793. At the time of his death he was in Gray’s Ferry, Pennsylvania with his mother and brother escaping the yellow fever epidemic. It is unknown weather he died of yellow fever or other complications.

(S) Isaac Heston (John Todd’s legal apprentice)
1770 (or 71) - 1793

Born in Hestonville, Philadelphia Co., Pennsylvania to Edward Heston and wife, Isaac Heston was a law apprentice for John Todd Jr. and lived with the Todd family at their house at 4th and Walnut Streets. Isaac stayed in Philadelphia with John Todd Jr. during the yellow fever epidemic and succumbed to the disease in the Todd House at the age of 22 or 23 on September 29, 1793. Just weeks before his death he wrote a letter to his brother Abraham describing the devastating effect of the yellow fever epidemic on the Philadelphia community. After his death Dolley and James Madison disputed with
Isaac’s father, Edward Heston, in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County over money owed by Edward for his son Isaac’s board and apprentice fees as well as costs associated with Isaac’s illness and death during the yellow fever epidemic.  

(T)  **Pointer (John Todd’s hunting dog)**  
<1785 - ?  

Hunted fowl with John Todd Jr.  Pointer is mentioned in a 1785 letter from John Todd Jr. to his brother James Todd.
APPENDIX C

Letter, James Todd to his cousin William Lynn
Philadelphia, December 9, 1793 (INDE 633)
Dear Cousin –

Afflicted & tossed about as I have been for several months past I have hardly had leisure to think of or write to the particular Friends of our Family – Thee and Thy Family however have seldom or never been absent from my thoughts. – I knew your sincere affection for my Dear Father & Mother & their Children and I knew the sympathy you would feel and the share you would take in Our distresses, and had therefore determined that you should be among the first I would inform by letter of our situation – I received thine a day or two ago and it afforded me some Consolation as a further proof of the sincerity of your Attachment to my parents and your good wishes for the welfare of myself now their only Offspring - I hope not withstanding the Losses we have both sustained you will still continue your attachment to Philad.⁸ and your affection for the remains of a Family so dear to us both. – for be assured there is none whose love and esteem I would more fondly cherish than yours – It is too true indeed that my father Mother & Brother are no more. – Among thousands of others, they have fallen victims to the ferocious disorder that of late prevailed in our distressed City – About the 2ᵈ or Sept⁷ last I sent my own Family with Betsy Blair into the Country about 8 miles from town. –
About two Weeks afterwards I followed myself having been reduced to the necessity, on account of the fears of the people entirely from them and remaining in the City, or consenting to stay entirely in the Country – I chose the latter in consideration of the delicate situation of my Wife and the intreaties of my Parents. After having been a Week in the Country I returned to town in order to induce Father & Mother to go out – My Brother was then in town tho his Family was out, and he had not determined whether to leave at all or not – Our Parents did not seem entirely free to go and at any rate not to leave Johnny in town. – Some time was taken up & the Yearly meeting intervened before they could all agree to come out, and in the meantime Is’c Hastings a student of my Brother’s who had staid in town particularly to attend to his Business fell sick – My Brother could not leave him and my Parents could not leave Johnny. On the 28 Sep‘r the Day before my Brother’s young man died, Father was taken sick, and died on the 2d October about 5 In the Evening. I had procured a House in the Country for Mother & Brother to come to and they were preparing to set our on the 5th Oct.‘r when Mother was taken ill – She died on the 12th and the next day Brother came out – He was unwilling to come to the House I had prepared for his reception which was within a few yards of the one in which my family was placed, I wished him to come there as being near to me & could be constantly with him and our situation endearing us the more we might have been to each other a mutual Consolation – He chose rather to reside at some tavern near me but the Tavern keepers were afraid to take him in and he at length determined to go to his Family – Fearful of himself and unwilling to endanger the health of his Family he exposed himself more than was prudent - He slept by himself in a lower apartment of the House, and was out in the Dew both the Evening and the Morning before he was taken
sick – On the 17th Oct. after having been 3 or 4 days in the Country he arose very early and went out in the fields a gunning when he came in to his Breakfast he felt chilly and was apprehensive of the prevailing fever coming on. – he came that morning to town abt. 14 miles and went to the House where the nurse & domestic were I had left – I did not hear of it till that night and the next day I rode in to see him – Finding him better than I expected I flattered myself that it was only a Cold he had caught, He died six days after on the 24 October – His youngest died on the same day in the Country – so that our “woes indeed were not solitary” – We have now all returned to town that is both my Family & my Brother’s – I have given thee this particular detail of events both because thou wished to be informed of particulars and because reports with respect to the conduct of the Survivors of some Family who have suffered by the Contagion have been exaggerated to their prejudice – I shall be always glad to hear from thee & of the welfare of thy Family – My wife & Betsy Blair request me to mention them with best love to you all in which no one can join with more sincerity than

Thy real Friend & affec't Cousin

J Todd

[notation:] Copy of a Letter to Will Linn Dec't 9, 1793 – This letter is from James Todd to his first Cousin Wm Linn Father of the Rev John Blair Linn First Minister of the church at the corner of 7th & Washington Square.
APPENDIX D

Estate account of John Todd Jr. compiled by James Todd (INDE 623)
Dr Estate of John Todd jun. In acct with James Todd Cr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1793 October</td>
<td>To Estate of John the Elder for money reced by him belonging to said Estate per his acct</td>
<td>£ 55 17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ditto for amot of the following Accots viz 1790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 mo. 1 Cash pd Jac Enk for making Jack a suit of Clothes</td>
<td>£ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d° thread &amp; moles</td>
<td>1 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 mo. 1. 42 lbs Coffee</td>
<td>2 2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amot of Wm Roberts Accot and Order for Carpenters work</td>
<td>2 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d° 1789</td>
<td>10 13 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[October]23</td>
<td>To Cash pd hire of a horse to send a Messenger to</td>
<td>£ 3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolly Todd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pd a Man for going</td>
<td>3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 15</td>
<td>To proportion of Geo Weed’s acct -</td>
<td>„ 7 „ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferriage per acct &amp; Rect for</td>
<td>„ 7 „ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To 2 carpets, to be delivered to Dolly Todd which were in James Todd’s room in which John Todd Jun. lay in his last illness, rendered useless to James Todd who has been under the necessity of purchasing new ones. –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One nearly new and dyed ingrain</td>
<td>4 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 yards - @ 5/6</td>
<td>1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One abo’t ½ worn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To sundry articles belonging to James Todd used by and on acct of John Todd jr viz Blankets, some lost, or buried &amp; others infected, - Liquors, preserves, firewood, &amp;c - (allowed)</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To amo’t of household Furniture &amp; plate del'd to Dolly Todd as her husband’s two thirds of that part of the Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Mary Todd  Amo’t of Lot A

£ 78 „ 9 „ 7

123 „ - „ 1 1¼

201 „ 9 „ 8 ¼

To 2/3 of 15/ pd to Alex’ Tod, which he advanced to a
Clerk employed in dividing the household furniture -

„ 10 „ 9 ¼

£280 „ 11 „ 9 ¼

1794
Mar. 5  To balance due as per Contra

13 „ 17 „ 10 ¼

N.B.  In the above charge of £201 „ 9 „ 8 ¼ is included
£28 „ 3 „ 10 Amo’t of 2/3 wearing apparel of Mary
Todd which remains to be delivered as soon as an
equal division thereof in thirds is made, - but this can
make no difference in the balance, as the sum is
included in the £247 „ 11 „ 4 ½ Credited to this acc’ot as
above. Also there appears to be £150 lent by John Todd
sen’ to John Todd, jr for which there is reason to believe
there was a bond, which with another Bond of James
Pemberton for £100 is missing. –

1793
Oct’  By Estate of John Todd the Elder for this Sum, pd by
him to Jenny Smith on a/ of said Estate

1 „ 2 „ 6

15  By Cash, recd, being ½ the balance of the money
remaining in his hands, belonging to our father’s estate

18 „ - „ -

1794
Mar 5  By his 2/3 the balance of the Estate of Mary Todd per
acco’t herewith rend. d

247 „ 1 „ 4 ½

Balance due to James Todd

13 „ 17 „ 10 ¾

£280 „ 11 „ 9 ¼

1795  [superscription by Dolley Todd]

Jan. 31  By Est of Jno. Todd for 42 lbs charges per contra )
For which a credit has since been found in (  & 2 „ 2 „ 10
J. Todd’s Book )

By 2 Carpets charged per contra which have since been taken by me

6 „ 9 „ -

By balance

5 „ 6 „ ¾

13 „ 17 „ 10 ¾
Estate of John Todd Jr.

To balance brought over £13,,17 ,, 10 ¾

To Balance per contra £ 5 ,, 6 ,, ¾

APPENDIX E

Recommendations for Possible Seasonal Changes in the Todd House
Recommendations for Possible Seasonal Changes in the Todd House

Winter:

If desired at a later time, shifting the installation to reflect the winter season would involve removal of the summer recommendations and slight adjustments to the setup of several rooms. While portraying the winter months, domestic activities should be confined to the kitchen and first floor parlor where the family would have likely congregated during the day to consolidate heat. The irons and sheets on the work table in the second floor middle room can be relocated to one of the kitchen tables as if one of the women is working there. A basket with lightly folded linens returned from the washerwoman or from drying and ready to iron should be placed next to the table. A clothes horse should be set in the first floor parlor with a few linens draped over as if they have just been ironed. One iron should be set upright on the table in the kitchen and two others should be in the hearth placed on trivets.

During this season the upstairs middle room will be interpreted as a room where one of Dolley’s siblings slept and where linens were stored. Wool curtains should be hung in all of the second floor rooms and heating devices such as bed warmers and foot stoves returned from storage. If feasible, windows should be sealed with baize.
Although Venetian blinds were most popular during the summer months, those currently on the first floor should be retained year round for practicality of their convenience in protecting the collections from damaging exposure to light and possible vandalism. Also, artifacts associated specifically with August of 1793 as outlined in other sections of this furnishings plan should be removed and placed with other stored objects in the garret (see third floor recommendations)

Recommended Furnishings

Winter:

Law Office:

Andirons and associated objects (INDE 8343, 8344 5165, 8265, and 8284) (return from storage)
Asparagus branches, faux (remove from ceiling)
Gauze (remove from INDE 7303 - map of VA)

First Floor Parlor:

Andirons and associated objects (INDE 1510, 1511 3798 and 8480) (return from storage)
Asparagus branches, faux (remove from ceiling)
Clothes horse or towel rack (relocated from second floor middle room)
Seat Covers (6) (remove from chairs INDE 6302-6307)

Kitchen:
Linen sheet – (on table)
Flat irons (INDE 5071, 5072, & 5090 – one on the table, two on a trivet in the hearth)
Sheets, linen (not ironed, loosely stacked in basket) (relocated from second floor middle room)
Basket (relocated from second floor middle room)

Kitchen Chamber:
Trunk, travel (remove to garret storage)
Andirons (INDE 4329 & 4329) (return from garret storage) (Associated objects, INDE 7130 and 7131 should also be returned)
Remove gauze from INDE 8501 and 8502

Second floor middle room:
Trunks (2), travel (Remove to garret storage)
The Mirror, Vol. 1., Philadelphia 1793 (INDE 6350) (return to second floor parlor)
The Ladies Magazine, Vol. 1, 1793 (INDE 8306) (return to second floor parlor)
Miniature, John Todd reproduction (after original at the Macculloch Hall Historical
Museum) (relocate to dressing table in the south bedroom on the third floor)
Stockings with knitting needles, reproduction (return to the first floor dining parlor)
Sewing etui or case (containing some or all of the following: scissors, needle case,
thimble, bodkin/ear spool, stiletto, tweezers/file) (place on chair with breeches)
Lucent, wooden (place on chair with breeches)
Darning egg (place on chair with breeches)
Iron (return to kitchen)
Table, work (remove to garret storage)
Chest of drawers, high, three quarters, Chippendale, Pennsylvania, (northwest corner
against the west wall)

Second floor parlor:
Andirons and associated objects (INDE 4014, 4015, 3580, 3581, 8481, 8482 and 8498) –
(return from storage)
Asparagus branches (faux) (take down from ceiling)
Curtains, wool
Gauze (remove from INDE 51856 and 1465)
Seat Covers (4) (remove from chairs INDE 2036, 2037, 5713, and 5714)
Settee Cover (remove from settee INDE 4302)

Third Floor:

South Room:
4106 Warmer, bed, long handled brass pan with hinged cover
  English or American, 18th century (return from storage)
2044 Screen, fire, iron wire fireplace fender with brass rim
  American, c. 1800 (return from storage)
5271 Andiron, iron and brass, American, early 19th century (return from storage)
5272 Andiron, iron and brass, American, early 19th century (return from storage)
7159 Shovel, fireplace, wrought iron and steel, with urn-shaped brass finial.
  English or American, late 18th or early 19th century (return from storage)
7160 Tongs, fireplace, wrought iron or steel, with urn-shaped brass finial.
  English or American, late 18th or 19th century (return from storage)
------ Bed Set. Bed curtains, valance, and bedspread of blue and white cotton check,
  lined with white linen. Reproduction, late 18th - early 19th century French.
  Waverly Fabrics, Sturbridge Plaid (642268 indigo); Fabricated 1980 by Parisian
  Drapery Shop, Philadelphia. (return from storage)
------ Gauze (remove from 6421, 6422, 6423)

North Room:
Andirons (return from storage)
Shovel, fireplace (return from storage)
Tongs, fireplace (return from storage)
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5 Ibid., 2.
7 Ibid., 24.
9 Ibid., 9.
10 Ibid.
14 Along with the Todd House, historic house museums under the care of Independence National Historical Park include the Bishop White House, the Deshler-Morris House, the Declaration House, Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial, and Edgar Allan Poe National Historic Site.
17 NPS Reports:

INHP Internship Reports:
1720-1840” (Philadelphia, PA: National Park Service, Independence National Historical Park, 1995);

Other Reports/References:


20“Part C – Background of Inhabitants of House,” 6-12; Note: Most of the Todd Family Papers can be found in Appendix A of “Furnishing Plan for the D-T-M House, Parts D-F.” The majority of the Todd Family Papers are part of the Independence National Historical Park collections and include catalog numbers INDE 622-644. Representative Philadelphia household inventories, 1785-1832, with emphasis on the period 1791-1793 can be found in Appendix B of “Furnishing Plan for the D-T-M House, Parts D-F.”

21Original is at the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA. A typescript copy is in Appendix A of the “Furnishing Plan for the D-T-M House, Parts D-F.” 20.

22Original is at the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA. A typescript copy is in Appendix A of the “Furnishing Plan for the D-T-M House, Parts D-F,” 10. A slightly later copy of this inventory is included in the INDE collection, catalog number INDE 635 with a typescript copy in Appendix A of the “Furnishing Plan for the D-T-M House, Parts D-F,” 16.

23“Part C – Background of Inhabitants of House,” 6-12.

24In this paragraph use of the term “furnishings plan” is in reference to Parts D-F. An explanation of the reports referred to as “Parts A-C” of the Todd House furnishings plan and “Parts D-F” of the Todd House furnishings plan is necessary. In reviewing the Department of Interpretation Monthly Reports from August 1960 through March 1961, located in the INDE park archives, it appears that Historian Agnes Downey Mullins of National Capital Parks was hired on temporary assignment from August 1960 to February 1961 to act as Museum Curator and assist in preparing the Todd House furnishings plan. Independence Park historian Paul G. Sifton also assisted with the furnishings plan. According to the Monthly Reports, Mullins was assigned to write the document “Parts D-F” while Sifton was assigned to write the document “Parts A-C.” “Parts D-F,” which is attributed Agnes Downey Mullins as well as Ruth Matzkin Knapp and Charles G.
Dorman, are bound and currently kept with the other museum furnishing plans in the museum records area within the Department of Cultural Resources Management. However, the only place that “Parts A-C” is located is in draft form in the park archives, Office of History Box 26. A memorandum dated October 21, 1966 from INDE Superintendent M. O. Anderson to the Northeast Regional Director states that “Sections D through F, as prepared by the Park’s Museum Branch, have been in final form and mimeographed for distribution since April 1963.” The memo states that two drafts of sections A through C were completed, but neither were deemed acceptable. Anderson explains that he is attaching a copy of the completed Sections D-F to the memorandum with the idea that Sections A-C will be submitted at a later date after they are completed. Due to the fact that Sections A-C were never added to the completed Sections D-E, it appears that “Parts A-C” found in the INDE archives are the drafts versions that were never approved or completed in final draft. This would explain the discrepancy between “Parts A-C” and “Parts D-F.” Within the text of this report, unless a specific section of the furnishings report is indicated, use of the term “furnishings plan” refers to “Parts D-F.” The reason for the discrepancy between the furnishings plan and the current installation and by whom and when such changes were made was never deciphered. To avoid any further confusion, it will be mentioned that three other reports also found in the park archives, Office of History Box 26, “Part ‘A’ Draft 4,” “Part B” and “Part C – Background of Inhabitants of House” although not labeled as such, appear to be draft versions of historic structures reports, not part of the furnishings plan.

Covering the topics of textiles, domestic servitude, cellars and garrets, and kitchens, implementation of many suggestions made in each report never occurred due to lack of time and funding. The primary focus of most of the suggested changes is artificial in nature, not disturbing the basic setup of the house and function of each room. Karie Diethorn, however, in discussing the kitchen chamber does suggest that it could be interpreted either as Anna’s bedroom, as it is currently, or be changed to that of a live-in servant. John Bacon does not recommend changing any of the current room interpretations but discusses the closed areas of the house which are not currently interpreted suggesting that the garret be furnished as a sleeping area for the law clerks and a general storage area. Also concerned with the cellar, Bacon feels that implementation of intern Jane Busch’s revised furnishing plan for the kitchen would negate the need to develop the cellar because the new furnishing plan would successfully incorporate the connection between cellar and kitchen activities. Overall, the suggestions made in these reports are valid and were taken into consideration in a revision of the Todd House furnishings plan. Sources: Bacon, “Cellars, Garrets, and Related Spaces,” 134-135; Busch, “Philadelphia Kitchens,” 1-48; Diethorn, “Domestic Servants in Philadelphia,” 113-116; Newell, “Household Textiles,” 177-178.


An explanation of Anna Payne’s residency in the Todd House is pertinent to this discussion. While it is widely documented that Anna Payne lived with Dolley after the latter’s marriage to James Madison, no primary documents found confirmed her residency in the Todd House. The secondary sources reviewed gave contradictory accounts as to whether Anna began living with Dolley during the time she was married to John Todd Jr. or after. One account suggests that Anna and her younger sister Mary were sent to boarding school during the time Dolley and John lived in the house and only visited the Todds on occasion. Other accounts suggest that Anna did live with Dolley at the Todd House, perhaps moving there after their father’s death. Further, other accounts suggest that after the yellow fever epidemic killed John Todd Jr. in 1793, Dolley and Lucy made an arrangement to share responsibility for their younger sisters Anna and Mary; at that time Dolley took Anna in. The contradictory nature of these secondary accounts does not conclude or negate the possibility of Anna living in the house, but it is important to keep in mind that unless a documented primary account of her presence is located, her inclusion or absence in the exhibit is only one possible interpretation and is not definitive. Sources: For boarding school see: Gerson, The Velvet Glove, 50, 52-53; For after father’s death see: Moore, The Madisons, 9; “Furnishings Report (draft) for the Todd House, Parts A-C.” 5; Shulman, The Dolley Madison Project; Arnett, Mrs. James Madison 54; For after Yellow Fever see: Ketcham, James Madison, 378; Anthony, Dolly Madison, 51; Thayne, Dolley Madison: Her Life and Times, 29.
Paul G. Sifton, “Furnishings Report (draft) for the Todd House, Parts A-C,” 5-6; Arnett, *Mrs. James Madison*, 54; In reference to Lucy Payne and Isaac Heston: The Court of Common Pleas “James Madison and Wife vs. Edward Heston” (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: City Archives, Nov.-Dec. 1794, typescript in INDE Card Files); John Todd Jr., Letter to James Todd dated “Phila* 15* Septem*r 1785,” (Philadelphia, PA: Independence National Historical Park, INDE 626), 1785; In “Part B,” 1, it states that “The 1790 Census noted that Todd had in his household both ‘one free white male over sixteen’ and ‘one free white male under sixteen,’ presumably one or both were law clerks.”

One technique used at both the Powel House and Historic Waynesborough was to interpret different time periods in separate rooms. While only one room at the Powel House differs in time period from the rest of the house, several of the rooms at Historic Waynesborough reflect dissimilar time periods in order to show the functions of the house over time. In both cases the docent made a specific point of letting the visitor know that the rooms were of distinct time periods so as to avoid confusion. Although this took away from the fluidity of the house, especially in the case of Historic Waynesborough, it did allow for greater flexibility in interpreting multiple functions and occupants of the house over time. While it was helpful to learn about this approach, there is no need to have any of the rooms at the Todd House interpreted as different time periods because the time frame of the installation is precise and narrow.

Another interpretive technique was the presentation of both static furnished rooms and activity-centered object displays. Cedar Grove was especially effective in portraying household activities. Two rooms, the sewing room and the ironing room, specifically emphasized the tremendous amount of time and energy that historically went into such activities (see Illustrations 9 and 10). Other rooms, such as the bedroom adjacent to the bathing room and the kitchen, also emphasized related activities. These activity-based object displays proved especially useful at Cedar Grove during the presentation of a children’s program which included interactive activities in various rooms. Despite the effectiveness of the activity-based object displays, the docent pointed out that the decision to focus on activity-related object displays in some cases went against the likely function of the room as was seen with the sewing room which likely was a bedroom originally. In this case, a deliberate decision was made to use the space as a teaching tool rather than to furnish it in the most accurate manner possible. Although not the technique recommended in this report, it seems plausible that activity-related displays could coincide with an accurate display of the room’s primary function if desired. Overall, visiting these four historic house museums was helpful in gaining a better perspective on different ways in which historic house museums may use the spaces they have available to offer the visitor the best experience possible.

John Todd Sr. “Diary, 1790-1793” (Philadelphia, PA: Independence National Historical Park, INDE 644, 1790-1793). John Todd Sr. writes in September 1793, “The late general Assembly of the Pennsylvania commenced the 27th Ultimo, and ended the 5th day of the present ins1. (Sept.) During their Session five Acts were passed and one supplement to an Act. Their sudden adjournment was occasioned by the pestilential fever prevailing in this city.”


37 Ibid., 125.
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