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1. Name of Property

historic name Hoyle House

other names/site number Heyl, Pieter, Homeplace

2. Location

South side NC 275, 1,400 feet southwest of South Fork
street & number of Catawba River N/A not for publication

city or town Dallas

vicity

state North Carolina code NC county Gaston code 071 zip code 28034

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this XX nomination □ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property □ meets □ does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant □ nationally □ statewide □ locally. (□ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title

Date

State of Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property □ meets □ does not meet the National Register criteria. (□ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title

Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that the property is: □ entered in the National Register. □ See continuation sheet.

□ determined eligible for the National Register □ See continuation sheet.

□ determined not eligible for the National Register.

□ removed from the National Register.

□ other, (explain:)

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action
5. Classification

Ownership of Property  
(Check as many boxes as apply)  
☐ private  
☐ public-local  
☐ public-State  
☐ public-Federal  

Category of Property  
(Check only one box)  
☐ building(s)  
☐ district  
☐ site  
☐ structure  
☐ object  

Number of Resources within Property  
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)  
Contributing  
Noncontributing  
3 buildings  
0 sites  
0 structures  
0 objects  
3 Total

Name of related multiple property listing  
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)  
N/A

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions)  
DOMESTIC/single dwelling  
DOMESTIC/secondary structure

Current Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions)  
VACANT/NOT IN USE

7. Description

Architectural Classification  
(Enter categories from instructions)  
Georgian  
Federal

Materials  
(Enter categories from instructions)  
foundation stone  
walls weatherboard  
roof metal  
other wood  
brick

Narrative Description  
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
### 8. Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark “x” in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria Considerations**
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- [ ] **A** owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- [ ] **B** removed from its original location.
- [ ] **C** a birthplace or grave.
- [ ] **D** a cemetery.
- [ ] **E** a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- [ ] **F** a commemorative property.
- [ ] **G** less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

### 9. Major Bibliographical References

**Bibliography**
(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**

- [ ] preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- [ ] previously listed in the National Register
- [ ] previously determined eligible by the National Register
- [ ] designated a National Historic Landmark
- [ ] recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- [ ] recorded by Historic American Engineering Record

**Primary location of additional data:**

- [ ] State Historic Preservation Office
- [ ] Other State agency
- [ ] Federal agency
- [ ] Local government
- [ ] University
- [ ] Other

**Name of repository:**

---

**Areas of Significance**
(Enter categories from instructions)

- **Architecture**
- **Exploration/Settlement**

**Period of Significance**
Second half 18th c. – First half 19th c.

**Significant Dates**
1794

**Significant Person**
(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

N/A

**Cultural Affiliation**
N/A

**Architect/Builder**
Unknown

**Narrative Statement of Significance**
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 8.95

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>4,8,7,4,6,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,9,0,9,0,9,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Catherine Bishir and Claudia Brown; Lucy Penegar
organization Gaston County Historic Preservation Office; Gaston County Historic Preservation Comm’n
street & number 109 E. Jones Street; Route 1, Box 855

city or town Raleigh; Gastonia
state NC
zip code 27601-2807; 28052

date

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps

A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s location.

A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner
(Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name

street & number

city or town
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DESCRIPTION

The Hoyle House stands on a hill overlooking the South Fork of the Catawba River in the county now named Gaston. It is a sturdy, two-story house sheathed in weatherboards and exhibiting important German-American construction features. The house faces south toward an overgrown dirt road; a twentieth-century macadam highway on the north side now gives access to the property. East of the house there are two dependencies dating from the nineteenth century: a brick well house and a frame smoke house. Almost nine acres of rolling farm land and several large walnut trees surround the buildings.

The house obviously reflects at least three phases of construction, but the specific dates and chronology of its construction remain uncertain. The main block of the house appears to date from the late eighteenth century, but it is possible, as related by local and family tradition (and explained in the statement of significance), that it was built as early as the mid-eighteenth century. Erected for an early member of the Hoyle family, this massively built German-American house was surely one of the most imposing dwellings in the area despite its simple finish. In its first stage, the house had very small, shuttered and unglazed windows set into thick, exposed log-infilled frame walls and an interior with whitewashed, unsheathed outer walls and exposed chamfered summer beam and joists. Either the partitions of stout walnut boards creating the current four-room plan were original or the interior initially was a single large room with a single fireplace on each floor and the partitions were installed in an intermediate phase, prior to the early nineteenth-century embellishments. In time, probably ca. 1810, Andrew Hoyle gave the house a more finished appearance in keeping with trends throughout the region: beaded weatherboards, larger windows, fine molded window and door frames, a handsome molded cornice, and a front porch with slim, tapered posts transformed the exterior; inside the house, the application of wall and ceiling sheathing and elaborate mantels concealed the old construction behind a newly refined and finished demeanor. By the middle of the century, space demands had required a log addition to the rear of the house, which was covered with weatherboards from the outset, and still later this addition was raised to two stories.

Main Block

Exterior

The earliest section of the house is three bays wide and two deep, measuring approximately 32.5 feet by 26 feet. It stands two stories high on a randomly laid rubble foundation, which is still visible along the eastern elevation. This section of the house exhibits several distinctive German-American construction techniques.*

*Much of this description is taken from a report prepared by Carl Lounsbury and John Larson, "Summary of Hoyle House Site Visit December 27, 1991," submitted to
Foremost of these is its heavy timber frame construction with down braces at the corners and horizontal log infill. The horizontal hewn pieces, approximately seven inches by sixteen inches, are tightly fitted between the heavy corner posts and other posts defining structural and formal units, including the posts on the side elevations that carry the summer beam. The interstices between the logs are filled with chinking. Interrupted at the second-floor level, the corner posts are slotted on the sides to receive the tenons of the horizontal logs. The horizontal logs and all but the top diagonal infill logs are pegged into the posts. The pegged down braces at the corners, as well as the top, bottom, and middle logs in the wall which function as sills and plates by passing over or under the corner posts, provide structural rigidity. The joint where these logs meet the corner posts appears to be a combination of lapping and mortise and tenon. The inside corner of the corner posts is chamfered to show the beveled face in the room, instead of being cut into an "L" shape.

Other German-American features include the "kick" of the eave and a triangular interior chimney at the east end of the house that serves two rooms on the first floor and one on the second. The apparently original and complete roof structure, now covered with early twentieth-century tin, is composed of common rafters with several of the collar beams pegged into the purlins and not aligned with the rafters. The "kick" at the end of the roof is created by placing an additional element on the top of the rafter that changes the roof angle by extending the roof line beyond the wall. Additional framing was nailed to the side of the front rafter joists to support the ca. 1810 cornice.

The exterior is weatherboarded with plain wooden corner posts, which rise to a distinctive molded, boxed cornice embellished by a strip of gouged and punched reversed dentils at its base. Much of the ca. 1810 beaded siding applied with cut nails with wrought heads survives. This siding is somewhat unusual in that the bottom of each board, behind the bead and in that area that overlaps the piece of siding below, has been rabbeted so the siding lies much flatter than is otherwise possible in lapped siding. Wide flush beaded boards sheathe the first story of the main elevation sheltered by the porch. Gable ends are flush with molded raking boards, although the raking boards at the east end have been lost. Evidence of weathering of logs visible in the staircase on the outer back wall (see floor plan, page 23), as well as logs beneath weatherboards removed from side elevations, reveal that the exterior originally was unsheathed, and it is likely that the ca. 1810 siding is the first exterior sheathing.

Fenestration has been somewhat altered, although early windows with nine-over-six and six-over-six double-hung sash remain. These are set in finely molded surrounds with molded sills and appear to date to ca. 1810. Removal of later interior
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sheathing at the first-floor east opening on the main facade reveals evidence that the windows originally were quite small (approximately two-and-a-half feet square) and possibly were filled only with shutters in the earliest period. The two small second-story windows on the main facade, containing six-over-three double-hung sash, are not much larger than the original window openings. Most of the sills of these two windows have been removed, apparently in the course of making repairs to the porch roof which abuts them. The eastern elevation is blind at both attic and second-story levels, but has two windows at the first story, the southern of which was introduced in the twentieth century. The western elevation contains two nine-over-six sash windows symmetrically positioned along the first and second stories, plus a single attic window.

The one-story porch with a tall shed roof across the main facade rests on a stone foundation that is not keyed into the house foundation, indicating that the porch is an addition, probably dating to the ca. 1810 renovation. The structure of the shed roof is original but it is covered with modern corrugated metal. Almost all of the west bay of the shed has been enclosed and partially screened in recent times as an entrance porch, but an original post with mortises for the rail on the front and side survives outside the enclosure, opposite the southwest corner of the house. Very slender at the top, the square-in-section post is shaped so that it gradually tapers outward toward the middle of its length where it quickly curves inward and then continues to the floor as a larger plain post into which the rail, now lost, was inlet. A used four-raised-panel door leads to the interior of the porch where the original wide, beaded horizontal flush sheathing and nine-over-six window in the west bay remain intact. The rest of the shed across the main facade accommodates a kitchen. This end of the porch has been extended southward with a modern weatherboarded addition on a concrete block foundation with a six-over-six window on the front and a small single-sash window on the east side. On the original main facade, the original shouldered front door surround remains, although the door is a replacement. The window opening in the east bay also retains its original surround but it has been altered to carry a modern door from the kitchen into the southeast front room.

At the rear, an original or early rear door nearly opposite the original front door has been covered by modern plywood but can be seen under the existing stair in the area that formerly was the rear shed. When the rear door was abandoned, a new door was cut to the east, probably when the stair was installed. An original or ca. 1810 window to the east of this later door also has been closed off and it is likely that there also was a second rear window on the west end of the wall that also was covered when the stair was installed.

In recent years the gabled west side elevation has served as the front of the house. Attached to it is a one-story five-bay porch running from the side of the shed entrance porch across the eighteenth-century porch and most of the large nineteenth-century rear wing. The porch, of early twentieth-century character, has a pressed tin hipped roof with exposed rafter ends and is supported by five wooden posts on
brick plinths. Near the middle of the west elevation of the main block, a battened hatch cut into the porch floor provides access to stone steps perpendicular to a short batten door leading to a small dirt-floored cellar. This space appears to be an alteration after the first building period, as indicated by the rebuilding of the original stone foundation when undercut by the cellar. The cellar walls do not relate structurally to anything above.

**Interior**

The first floor of the main block of the Hoyle House follows a four-room plan consisting of two larger southeast and northeast rooms with corner fireplaces sharing the single chimney and two smaller, unheated southwest and northwest rooms. Each pair is of equal width, but in both cases the front room is slightly deeper than the rear room. There is evidence that a second north-south partition, no longer in place, was inserted subsequent to the existing board partitions to create a center-hall plan. All rooms connect with adjacent rooms, but the door connecting the two smaller rooms is a later modification. The original staircase in the southeast corner of the larger front room, enclosed with one set of winders in the L-turn and two steps outside the enclosure, was removed in the late 1960s and the south window on the east facade (now the only window in this room) inserted.

The first-floor interior is carefully finished. Modern panelling and sheetrock were applied to most of the walls and ceilings, except for the interior walls and ceiling of the northeast room, but much of these later coverings have been removed within the past two years to reveal early board ceilings, walnut panelled partitions, and walnut panelling on the outer walls. In addition, portions of the early finishes have been removed to reveal structural elements and traces of features that were removed at an early date. While the partitions certainly pre-date 1810, all of the trim, ceiling, and outer wall sheathing probably date to the early nineteenth-century remodelling. In all four rooms, two-part molded surrounds frame all of the doors and windows and Federal-style chair rails with a narrow molded shelf double as window sills. Interior doors have six raised panels. Baseboards are typical of the period, simply molded at the top. Cornices are heavily molded, with that in the largest, southeast room the most robust.

All of the main block's first-floor walls are finished in vertical tongue-and-groove panelling. Flush beaded boards cover the outer walls, but whitewashed logs visible where the panelling has been removed reveal that the outer walls originally were unsheathed. Chamfered, unpainted joists supporting second-story floor boards that are beaded on both sides and stained by soot on the under side indicate that the flush board ceiling also is a later addition. The partitions, which consist of walnut boards fashioned in raised panels in various widths that are continuous from floor to ceiling and overlapped by the chair rail, are installed with wrought nails. The partitions apparently are very early, but it has not been determined if they date to the initial construction of the house. It is possible that the entire first floor began as one large room with a single fireplace parallel to the east wall.
However, evidence such as the pattern of soot stains on the under sides of the second-story floor boards and the remains of boxing near the top of the east-west partition, found between the floor boards and the ceiling, indicate that the first-floor partitions were in place for some time prior to ca. 1810 when the flush beaded boards were applied to the ceiling and outer walls and the current molded cornices and mantelpieces were installed. Where pieces of molded cornice have been removed from the north-south partition and outer wall sheathing, there is the line of an earlier, smaller cornice, perhaps identical to the simple coved cornice on the second floor. The larger, ca. 1810 cornice cuts across the tops of the pairs of vertical raised panels over the doors to the west rooms. Further investigation of the chimney and how the partitions engage the outer walls is necessary to determine whether there originally was a single fireplace on the first floor and whether the partitions were installed as an intermediate phase entailing reworking of the flues.

The principal features of the two larger first-floor rooms are the corner fireplaces. The fireplace in the southeast room has an overmantel as well as a mantelpiece. Here, the three-part architrave surrounding the opening is topped by a slightly narrower frieze with three raised panels (the middle one rectangular and the outer ones square) flanked by short grooved pilasters carrying a molded shelf that breaks out over the pilasters. Taller but similar pilasters enframe the overmantel which has two rows of raised panels identical to those of the frieze. These pilasters have molded caps that break out from the molded cornice. To the right, a narrow cupboard occupies the triangular space between the fireplace and the east exterior wall. The dining room mantelpiece is similar in its basic design but smaller and more distinctly Federal in character, with a narrower, two-part architrave at the opening topped by a frieze of the same width. The frieze also has three raised panels flanked by short grooved pilasters carrying a molded shelf that breaks out over the pilasters, but here the panels are all rectangular and vertically oriented, their molding is Federal, and a band of punchwork appears at the base of the shelf. The molding and punchwork are very similar to the exterior cornice. Again, a narrow cupboard also occupies the space between the fireplace and the outer wall.

The three-room plan of the second floor consists of a large east room that consumes about two-thirds of the space and two small west rooms. Here, the north-south panelled partition is stylistically very similar to the north-south partition of the first floor except that it has single raised horizontal panels over the doors to the west rooms. This basic three-room plan probably is original, although the partition has been moved at least twice. Notches on the baseboard and patching of the wall plasters and chair rail indicate that the wall was moved east, into the larger space, by about three feet. All outer walls were exposed frame and logs until they were plastered, probably early in the nineteenth century. As on the first floor, the installation of the flush beaded board ceiling, here with a simple coved cornice, truncated the tops of the panels over the doors to the west rooms. Doors, baseboards, and surrounds are similar to those of the first floor; chair rails consist of a narrow molded shelf in the Federal style on a short board. On the east
wall, the single unadorned fireplace servicing the second floor appears to be simply an appendage attached to the western side of the chimney serving the two fireplaces below.

A door in the northeast corner of the large east room leads to the enclosed attic staircase with two winders at the top. In the stairwell the structural system is clearly evident as the corner post, down braces, and log infill have never been sheathed. The attic is a single space, unfinished except for the plastered chimney and wide tongue-and-groove boards covering much of the floor. The flooring is nailed in place with some cut and some wrought nails, all with wrought heads. One small section of nineteenth-century wooden shingles remain visible where the ell was attached to the rear of the building. Also visible is the additional framing nailed to the side of the front rafter joists to support the ca. 1810 cornice. This does not appear on the rear rafters, which apparently remained unchanged until the second story of the ell was added.

Rear Wing

The large two-story, weatherboarded rear ell is three bays long and two bays wide, with a gabled roof covered in patterned pressed tin. Removal of selected weatherboards and examination of the second-story nail pattern reveal that this wing was built in two stages, beginning as a one- or one-and-a-half-story structure of pine logs with half-dovetail corner notching that was enlarged with a frame second story. The asymmetrically placed exterior gable-end chimney with single stepped, concave shoulders that is cut stone at the first story (much of it parged) and one-to-seven common bond at the second supports the theory of the ell's construction in two phases. The date of the log construction is unknown, but it certainly was after the ca. 1810 renovation of the main block, probably in the mid-nineteenth century as indicated by the siding applied with cut nails with machined heads. This appears to be the only siding ever applied. The absence of chinking or weathering on the logs of the test area indicates that the ell was probably covered with siding from the start. The ell's fenestration has been altered, with a window and door apparently added to the west wall and a door converted to a window on the north wall west of the chimney. The double-hung windows in plain post-and-lintel surrounds are in a variety of sizes and muntin patterns, including four (vertical)-over-one, six-over-one, and six-over-six. Three second-story windows—one in the west elevation and two flanking the chimney—are nine-over-nine. As the second story probably dates to the mid- to late nineteenth century, these windows probably were salvaged from an earlier building. Eaves are flush in the gable and the cornice is boxed without molding on the west side.

As originally built, the ell ran the full width of the ca. 1810 rear shed, which did not extend all the way to the east elevation of the main block, but the way in which the first story of the ell connected to the shed has not been determined. Panelling on the south wall of the west end of the hall between the main block and the ell (against the main part of the house) pre-dates the wing, indicating that that area
was enclosed as a shed, but whether or not the shed remained in place when the log portion of the ell was constructed, with the rest of the shed left open as a breezeway has not been determined. A seam in the weatherboarding of the second-story west elevation suggests that the second-story connection of the ell to the main block was made subsequent to the construction of the ell's second story. A two-story, almost flat-roofed addition along the entire east side of the ell expanded the wing to the full width of the front part of the house in the mid-twentieth century. The addition's irregular fenestration consists of a door approached by dilapidated brick and concrete steps on the east side and double-hung windows in various sizes that are predominantly six-over-six; a nine-over-nine window in the second story of the end wall probably was moved from the east wall of the ell.

Like the main block, the interior of the rear ell displays modern finishes on the walls and ceilings. On the first floor, segments of sheetrock and celotex ceiling tiles have been removed to reveal original outer wall sheathing of horizontal flush boards, a vertical board partition, and flush ceiling boards. Post and lintel door and window surrounds are flat boards. The mantelpiece features a recessed panel in each pilaster, a frieze with two recessed horizontal panels, and a plain shelf. The first-floor hallway between the main block and rear ell is finished in flush vertical paneling complete with chair rails and baseboards similar to those of the main block. The mid-twentieth-century single-run, open-string staircase lacks a railing. Original plain modern finishes characterize the second story and side additions.

Outbuildings

The two remaining outbuildings date from the early to mid-nineteenth century. Near the northeast corner of the main house, the well house is a one-story rectangular common bond brick building with ventilation holes on the east, north, and west ends and penciled mortar joints. A gabled tin roof extends beyond the west elevation as a porch with plain wooden posts sheltering the well. The well house stands at the southeast corner of the Hoyle House. East of the well house there is a one-bay wide and one-bay deep frame, weatherboarded smokehouse with a gabled roof sheathed in sheet metal.
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Summary

The Hoyle House in Gaston County is an important and in some respects apparently unique landmark of traditional German-American architecture in North Carolina. The unusually large and substantial dwelling exemplifies a construction method—heavy timber frame with log infill—seen elsewhere in the mid-Atlantic Germanic settlement areas but not hitherto identified in North Carolina. The date of construction and thus the identity of the first owner of the house cannot be determined from existing documentation, nor can the exact chronology of its development. The house stands on land granted to German settler Pieter Hoyle in 1754, but it is not clear that the house was built by 1761, by which time he and his son Jacob both had died. After being owned by Jacob’s minor son Martin and then by Jacob’s brother John, in 1794 the property went to Pieter Hoyle’s grandson Andrew, who became a wealthy farmer and entrepreneur. "Rich Andrew," as he was known, may have acquired the property with the house already standing and then executed improvements to the dwelling, or he may have built the house and subsequently upgraded it with new finishes in the early years of the nineteenth century. Before his death in 1856, Andrew also may have been responsible for the construction of the first story of the rear log wing, which appears to date from the mid-nineteenth century and completes the basic "footprint" of the house. With further investigation, if the Hoyle House can be firmly dated through archaeology, dendrochronology, or additional documentation, its place in the development of German-American architecture in the Piedmont can be more clearly understood. Whatever the details of its chronology, this complex and extraordinary house adds significantly to the story of German-American architecture in North Carolina, and promises to enrich that story further as additional research becomes possible.

Settlement Context and Historical Background

Gaston County was not established until 1846, but its history dates to the first half of the eighteenth century when it was part of Bladen County and its earliest settlers inhabited areas along the waterways among the Catawba Indians.¹ The settlers found life here peaceful, but somewhat unstable as English and French colonists commonly set one band of Indians against another to weaken their ranks.

¹Originally part of Bladen County, the area that today is Gaston County became part of Anson County in 1750 and part of Mecklenburg County in 1762. The area was in the short-lived Tryon County from 1768 to 1779, at which time it was encompassed by Lincoln County. When Lincoln was divided in 1846, the southern half was named Gaston after Judge William Gaston. David Leroy Corbit, The Formation of the North Carolina Counties, 1663-1943 (Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1950), 250. For the sake of clarity, the vicinity of the Hoyle House is hereinafter referred to as Gaston County.
against the white newcomers.² When the dispute over the boundary between North Carolina and South Carolina was settled in 1772, most of the Indians settled on a reservation in South Carolina.

Most farms were small, cultivated primarily by white yeoman farmers. North Carolina's colonial governor made a policy of restricting the size of land grants, and in Gaston County they tended to be about 400 acres each.³ One of the earliest grants in the area was given to Captain Samuel Cobrin, commander of a militia company, on September 29, 1750. In 1750 a land grant was requested by Bostian Best, and in 1754 two land grants went to Peter Hoyl, Best's father-in-law.⁴ It is believed that these settlers were already in the area as it was common for pioneers to have cultivated their land for several years before receiving title for it. As a result of these recordings of lands, many names became Anglicized. For example, Heyl became Hoyl and later Hoyle. (Hereinafter, the most recent Anglicized versions of the names will be used.)

Beginning in the late seventeenth century, thousands of Rhinelanders emigrated to the American colonies to escape the war and religious strife of their homeland. The earliest group to come to North Carolina settled in New Bern in 1710. Within a few decades more Germans arrived in Philadelphia and moved out into the mid-Atlantic zone and southward. By the 1750s, Germans were moving into the western Piedmont. The largest settlement was the Wachovia tract of Moravians that had come from Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The first winter was spent in a place they called Bethabara, or "house of passage." In 1766 these Moravians began to build Salem.⁵

During the same period of time the German pioneers were entering Gaston County and establishing homesteads. Of seventy-six identifiable persons in Captain Samuel Cobrin's list, land grant records and other evidence indicate that fifty-six were residents of what are today Lincoln and Gaston Counties. Of these fifty-six settlers, at least thirty-five were Germans, seven Scotch-Irish, seven English, five

Dutch, and two of French origin. Historically, the significance of the list lies in its revelation of a sizable settlement west of the Catawba River as early as 1748.6

Peter Hoyle and his family left the northeastern part of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, to take advantage of the good cheap land available in piedmont North Carolina. They passed through settlements in the Shenandoah Valley and eventually through Salisbury, North Carolina. Somewhere along the way Hoyle met Bostian Best who had left his cabin in Gaston County to find a wife back in Pennsylvania. He offered his cabin to Hoyle and his family until his return.7

Hoyle, his son Jacob, and Best were listed in Samuel Cobrin's militia in 1748, and on May 17, 1754, Peter Hoyle received the two adjoining land grants totaling 800 acres.8 It was on this tract of land that the original log portion of the Hoyle House was constructed, but it has not been determined for whom it was built as both Peter and his son Jacob died sometime prior to January 20, 1761, when they were listed in an estate sale record.9 Because of the laws of primogeniture practiced in the area, the estate of Peter Hoyle passed to his eldest son, Jacob, but due to Jacob's death the estate went to Jacob's eldest son, Martin, a minor. It was not until eighteen years later that Martin sold the tract to his uncle John Hoyle. Both of them moved to Cleveland County and John's son Andrew (grandson of Peter) took ownership of the property on October 20, 1794.10

Andrew Hoyle apparently was a very enterprising, hard-working, and influential young man. Credit was given to him for the establishment of the first federal post office in present Gaston County.11 The Hoylesville Post Office, now destroyed, began operation in 1817 and stood near the Hoyle House. Andrew Hoyle remained postmaster until his death in 1857 and Hoylesville, as the vicinity of his farm was known, served as the center of political and economic activity in the area.

8 "Captain Samuel Cobrin Militia List," Militia Returns, Bladen and Anson Counties' Records, 1748-1750, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, N.C.
9 "The Estate of Peter Hoyle Deceased," Anson County Records 1751-1795, Vol 801.1, p. 325, Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, N.C.
10 Deed Book 17, p. 328-329, Lincoln County Deeds, Lincoln County Courthouse, Lincolnton, N.C.
Known by relatives and friends as "Rich Andrew," he accumulated so much wealth that he was credited as being the wealthiest person in Gaston County at his death. The 1840 Lincoln Tax List credits him with 2,707.25 acres and sixteen black polls. His son Eli was listed with 476 acres and seven black polls. In 1846, with the creation of Gaston County from Lincoln, Andrew was listed with 18,831 acres, including 16,000 acres associated with the High Shoals Furnace, and other acreage in Lincoln and Cleveland Counties. He operated four stores and owned interests in the Kings Mountain Gold Mine and the Abernathy Forge. Today the most tangible indication of his financial success is the Hoyle House as he is credited with its remodelling with late Georgian and early Federal finishes around 1810.

The Hoyles were members of the Reformed Church, but due to the scarcity of Reformed churches in the area, the family attended nearby churches. Andrew became involved with the Presbyterian faith as a leader and lay minister and was instrumental in the creation of the Dallas Presbyterian Church, an outreach of Goshen Presbyterian. Statements and accusations he made against David Henkel, who was seeking ordination in the Lutheran Church (attended by certain Hoyle family members), were used by Henkel’s adversaries in the North Carolina Lutheran Synod. Ultimately, supporters of David Henkel created the Tennessee Synod of the Lutheran Church.

Andrew Hoyle died February 9, 1857, and his estate settlement was so complicated that it was not final for twenty-five years. The will written on November 2, 1856, was very explicit. He gave to his "only and loved but afflicted son Caleb W. Hoyl" the land "containing the home tract, the Cox, Hovis and Taylor places," about 720 acres. He also willed Caleb ten slaves, livestock, horses and mules, grain, farm equipment, a buggy, and his store in Dallas. Because Caleb was a deaf mute, Andrew Hoyle appointed three trustees.

The estate sale and settlement of Andrew Hoyle was a mammoth undertaking. His estate was worth over $200,000, excluding his large number of slaves. There were twenty-five heirs and a number of lawsuits concerning property holdings and payment of debtors to the estate. In addition, new trustees had to be appointed because two died and the third moved to another state. At Caleb’s death, only the homeplace tract of 280 acres remained in his possession.

---

12 Tax Lists, Lincoln County Records, Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, N.C.
13 Hoffman, Our Kin, 446-447.
14 Henkel Family Papers, Charles Lee Coon Papers (Miscellany re David Henkel, The Flowers Collection), Perkins Library Manuscript Department, Duke University, Durham, N.C. Also David Henkel Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.
15 Will Book 1, page 78, Gaston County Wills, Clerk of Court Office, Gaston County Courthouse, Gastonia, N.C.
16 "Andrew Hoyl 1857," Estate Papers, Gaston County Records, Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, N.C.
The Hoyle House has changed hands several times since 1877 when Caleb Hoyle's estate sold it to L. L. Suggs for $4,062.80. Mary Suggs, widow of L. L. Suggs, sold the property to T. A. Setzer in 1911. The next year it was sold to R. A. Lewis and sold again in 1914 to Mrs. Frances L. Stroup. It was conveyed in 1958 to Lawrence L. and Mary Ware Stroup and Ernest Q. and Helen Stroup.¹⁷

In 1938 Mrs. Elizabeth Hoyle Rucker published The Genealogy of Pieter Heyl and His Descendants. The publication renewed interest in the Hoyle family heritage, and two years later, on July 12, 1938, descendants erected a stone marker at the homeplace to promote the property. Later the marker was been moved to Kadish Church in Cleveland County, where family reunions used to be held. In 1991 the Hoyle Family Foundation was organized in order to purchase the house and surrounding 8.95 acres. Plans are under way for a careful restoration of the house and its eventual opening to the public and annual family reunions once again are occurring at the historic site.

Architectural Context: "German-American Domestic Architecture in the Western Piedmont of North Carolina in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries"

Although its construction date is as yet uncertain, the Hoyle House was built and remodeled during the first generations of settlement in the western Piedmont, and it is best understood as part of a broad tradition of German-American architecture in North Carolina which extends from the 1750s into the early nineteenth century. The following discussion is adapted by Catherine Bishir from North Carolina Architecture, published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1990, and augmented by observations on mid-Atlantic examples by Bernard L. Herman, "The Hoyle House, Dallas vicinity, Gaston County, North Carolina," unpublished report, 1992.

An important minority among North Carolina's piedmont settlers were German. Their language, culture, and architecture remained distinctive into the nineteenth century, providing the chief example of identifiable, non-British building traditions. Most North Carolina Germans were part of the massive immigration of Germans from the Rhenish Palatine and other parts of the Rhine Valley. Beginning in the late seventeenth century and throughout much of the eighteenth century, thousands of Rhinelanders left a homeland wracked by war and religious strife and emigrated, often via Holland and England, to the American colonies. They arrived in a growing stream in Philadelphia and fanned out into the southeastern Pennsylvania countryside and into Maryland and New Jersey. As good farmland in the mid-Atlantic country filled up, German farmers and new immigrants began in the 1730s to turn

their sights southward to the lands of the Shenandoah Valley and thence along the great valley road into the back country of piedmont North Carolina.  

A few German pioneers arrived in piedmont North Carolina in the 1730s and 1740s, but German immigration increased dramatically in the mid-1750s and continued throughout the century. In North Carolina, as in the mid-Atlantic colonies, English and Scotch-Irish settlers had already staked out much of the good land. Concentrating in the western Piedmont, Germans established clusters of farms and formed churches in certain sections of counties, while British farmers dominated other sections. The largest single German settlement was the Wachovia tract of nearly 100,000 acres centered in present Forsyth County, purchased by the Moravian Brethren from Lord Granville. The Moravians, a protestant sect who included members from many sections of northern and central Europe, shared many aspects of German language and culture with their Rhenish neighbors, but their community life was quite different, being a strictly regulated theocracy. Elsewhere in the Piedmont, German settlers established themselves in clusters of independent farmsteads linked by extended family connections and by participation in Lutheran, Reformed, or, less numerous, German Baptist (Dunker) congregations. The easternmost concentration of German settlement appeared in southwestern Guilford and northwestern Randolph counties on the edge of the Quaker and Presbyterian belt. The western Piedmont, including present Forsyth, Davidson, Davie, Rowan, Mecklenburg, Cabarrus, Lincoln, and Gaston counties drew strong contingents of German settlers. By 1790 it was estimated that 10 to 30 percent of the piedmont population was of German origins. Outnumbered by English and Scotch-Irish neighbors, the Germans were perceived as a distinct group, and many of them strove to maintain German culture and ways.  

The tenacity of German culture varied from community to community, family to family, and between one aspect of life and another. The use of the German language continued well into the nineteenth century, with a period of transition from German to bilingual and predominant English coming between 1825 and 1850. In the late eighteenth century, German dominated in many churches and families; by the 1830s, sermons in Reformed and Lutheran congregations were often preached in both languages; by the late nineteenth century, use of German had all but disappeared, and in the early twentieth century only a few old people knew the language. German artistic traditions flourished well into the nineteenth century, in ceramics, furniture, carpentry techniques, and, in some areas, gravestones. 

20 Carl Hammer, Jr., Rhinelanders on the Yadkin: The Story of the Pennsylvania Germans in Rowan and Cabarrus (Salisbury: Rowan Printing Company, 1943), 96-97; Ruth
Similar patterns appeared in architecture. Traditional Germanic construction methods—often the work of artisans trained in the fatherland—usually prevailed from the 1750s through the 1780s. From the 1780s or 1790s into the 1820s, German Carolinians were often "bilingual" in architecture as in language, blending Germanic traditions and mainstream stylistic developments. Finally, in the period from the 1820s to the Civil War, as popular national ideals gained sway throughout much of the countryside, German-descended families accommodated these trends.21

In North Carolina, traditional Germanic houses of the mid to late eighteenth century are very rare, especially outside the Wachovia tract settled by the Moravians, but surviving examples and early descriptions establish a few basic patterns of plan, construction, and finish. Normally these houses followed a few traditional plans of one to four rooms. Normally the main entrance opened directly into the main room, and from that room doors led to more private chambers, some heated and some unheated. Central chimneys were common, but some traditional Germanic houses were also built with interior end chimneys, such as the Adam Spach House (1774), a 30- by 36-foot stone house built by Moravian masons in present Davidson County, now lost.

Early Germanic houses in North Carolina were typically of one of three types of construction: stone, "fachwerk" or half-timber, or log. (As far as is known, brick construction did not appear in North Carolina Germanic buildings until the 1780s, and was not common until the 1790s; it apparently reflects interaction with British traditions.) The principal surviving example of a Germanic stone dwelling is the Michael Braun House, a two-story house, 29 by 40 feet, built in 1766 in present Rowan County for Braun (1721-1807), a native of Hesse-Darmstadt who arrived in Philadelphia in 1737 and appeared in Rowan County by 1758, where he became a wealthy


KEY TO THE PHOTOGRAPHS

The following applies to all of the photographs:

1. Hoyle House
2. Gaston County, NC
3. Carl Lounsbury
4. February 1992
5. North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, NC

A. Main and west side elevations, to the northeast.
B. Main and east side elevations, to the northwest.
C. Detail of main facade cornice, to the northwest.
D. Detail of original main entrance surround.
E. Detail of surround and sill of first-story window on main facade.
F. Rear and west side elevations, to the southeast.
G. Mantelpiece, first floor southeast room.
H. Mantelpiece, first floor northeast room of the main block.
I. View of west end of first floor northeast room of the main block.
J. Mantelpiece, second floor of main block.
K. Second floor east room of main block, looking toward west rooms.
L. In stair well to attic, exposed framing and log infill at northeast corner of main block.
M. Attic of main block, to northeast.
N. Wellhouse, to northeast.
farmer. "Fachwerk," or heavy timber framing infilled with soft brick or wattle and daub, was a traditional Northern European construction method favored by the Moravians and used in several buildings in Wachovia, as early as the 1750s; the largest example is the Single Brothers House (50 by 38 feet, completed 1769), which still stands in Salem. The most common construction method, however, among German settlers as among their British neighbors in North Carolina, was log construction. It was employed by all German settling groups in North Carolina, both for temporary cabins and for large and substantial dwellings as well as agricultural buildings. The Moravians, for example, moved into an existing log house formerly occupied by one Hans Wagner when they settled at Bethabara in 1753/4, and they employed log construction for many of their own first buildings at Bethabara, in Bethania, and in their principal town of Salem. Surviving log houses in the western Piedmont exhibit both V-notch and half-dovetail methods of corner timbering.

In houses of stone, fachwerk, or log, distinctive carpentry methods recur in Germanic houses in North Carolina. Many Germanic roofs take on a shallower slope as they descend to the eaves, giving a "kick" to the eaves, a form provided by placing a wedge atop the end of the rafter. Typically, German joiners fashioned doors and shutters in distinctive ways: some were composed of boards in herringbone patterns, but more often they were made of vertical boards crossed by a tapered horizontal batten dovetailed into the boards. Inside well-finished German-American houses, plaster usually covers the masonry walls, while partition walls may be made up of simple planed boards. German builders usually left structural members exposed, often finished with a bead or chamfer, such as corner posts, summer beams, and ceiling joists. These elements, like those of plan and construction, were shared among German-American houses of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century from the mid-Atlantic region into the North Carolina Piedmont.

Although few early Germanic houses survive outside the Wachovia tract, an early twentieth century description gives a vivid picture of one archetypal Germanic dwelling, now lost—the massive log house built in present Davidson County for Valentin Leonardt (1718-1781), who emigrated from Katzenbach, Germany. The house, recalled a county historian in 1910, was two stories tall, measured 30 by 40 feet, and was made of "immense logs." Moreover, "two long beams, twelve by fourteen inches, ran through the whole length of the house to support the joists of the upper floor. They were hewn with a 'broad axe' almost to perfect smoothness, and the lower edges nicely chamfered." The joists, too were "worked out of logs with the 'broad axe' and are much larger than carpenters now consider necessary." The lower logs of the walls themselves measured 12 by 20 inches, and were "rabbed on the inner side to receive the joists for the first floor." Nails and the hinges of doors and shutters were handwrought iron. "Under the west end of the house was the great cellar, walled with large rough stones. This cellar was entered by a heavy slanting door on the south side of the house. The immense chimney stood near the middle of
the house with a fireplace on either side below, but with none on the upper floor. The chimney was wide enough to receive wood eight feet long."22

Within this broad context of German-American construction in the western Piedmont, the Hoyle House appears to be both characteristic and unique. It shows familiar Germanic features such as the typical eave "kick" formed by shims atop the rafters; and the exposed and finished summer beam and ceiling joists. It has a massive interior end chimney that supports the summer beam. Not seen are batten or herringbone doors; instead doors are paneled in keeping with the paneled partitions and wainscoting. Whether the house originally had a single large room or a three or four-room plan with two unheated chambers is not yet clear. The two-story house is unusual in its size for an eighteenth century dwelling in the Piedmont, but its measurements (30 by 25 feet) compare with other substantial dwellings of the eighteenth century.

Apparently unique in North Carolina is its method of construction. As described in more detail in section 7, the walls are constructed with a heavy downbraced timber frame infilled with logs, a method seen in the mid-Atlantic area but not identified before in any North Carolina examples. Bernard Herman notes in "Hoyle House" (1992) that this type of construction, which "falls into a framing tradition that uses logs as a form of infill or nogging," is seen in the mid-Atlantic area occasionally in colonial period examples but more often in late-eighteenth and even early-nineteenth century buildings. He cites the example of the Hess House, ca. 1740, near Lititz north of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, a 25- by 42-foot house with a similar but not identical frame with heavy timber posts with log infill; and the ca. 1800 Webber-Glick House east of Lancaster, which measures 30 by 34 feet and has diagonally braced corner post frame construction with logs tenoned into the posts. Other related examples exist in the Delaware Valley and central Pennsylvania. The Hoyle House, built for a German family who had previously lived in the mid-Atlantic area before moving to the North Carolina Piedmont, is the first example of this system of construction identified in North Carolina.

Although the chronology and precise dates of renovations and improvements to the Hoyle House accomplished during the long ownership of "Rich Andrew" Hoyle (1794-1857) are not clear, these changes also fit into a broader regional context. Throughout the North Carolina Piedmont as throughout the nation, the early national period brought widespread improvement and updating of existing houses as well as construction of many new ones. In remodeling their houses, German-descended as well as British-descended citizens usually partook of the classically derived styles then popular for new construction: the late-Georgian style that persisted into the early nineteenth century and the Adam-influenced Federal style that began in the late eighteenth century but did not gain common use in North Carolina until the 1810s and 1820s. Owners of existing frame and masonry as well as log houses installed new

partitions to provide more rooms and, in many cases, passages; enclosed or covered over once-exposed construction elements; installed paneled instead of batten doors; applied paneling, plaster, or sheathing to old walls; installed stylish mantels and in many cases reduced the size of old fire openings; and applied new weatherboarding, moldings, cornices, porches, and other exterior finish in a fashion similar to new houses in their communities. They also added wings and ells to enlarge their dwellings. In these remodelings, houses often lost something of their traditional, ethnic character and gained a more stylish, acculturated, and genteel appearance. Examples abound throughout the Piedmont, in work done for both German and British citizens. Andrew Hoyle participated in this pattern in at least two major improvement campaigns to his house, another stage in the development of Germanic-American architecture in the Piedmont.
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VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

Beginning at a concrete monument in the SE right-of-way of N.C. 275 and the NW corner of the Coleman property, proceed with the western line of Coleman S 14-08 E 220 feet to an iron stake; thence N 73-02-30 E 334.07 feet to an iron; thence S 15-01 E 220.70 feet to an old iron; thence S 20-00-30 W 289.99 feet to an old iron; thence S 3-27 W 52.85 feet to an old iron; thence N 84-10-50 W 741.16 feet to a point; thence with the westerly line of Bertha S. Holland NE 342.49 feet to a concrete monument in the S margin of N.C. 275; thence with the road 494.50 feet to the beginning, containing 8.95 acres.

VERBAL BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The boundary encompasses all the property both historically and currently associated with the Hoyle House.
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N Plan by Carl Lounsbury, 1/93 (scale unknown)
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