The Monument Question

For those with an interest in public culture, the twenty-first century has produced a heightened awareness to the often marginalized medium of monuments. When in graduate school—not that long ago—my professors of art and architectural history rarely mentioned the social implications of American monuments for people of color and other under-represented communities. Monuments were evaluated on the basis applied to all forms of art, built around long-standing hierarchical values shaped by powerful systems, from the art critic to the gallery to the museum to the halls of academia. Major public monuments sometimes made it into the main storyline of art history survey books (which are used to teach with), but, measured against works of art such as paintings, their appearance—and thus their perceived significance—was spread thin.

Today, of course, that has completely changed. It is rare these days to open social media and not find a new article about a public monument in the news. For example, in the past twenty-four hours on my feed, there have been two articles about public monuments in Charlottesville, Virginia. Especially since the race-driven murders at Emanuel AME Church in Charleston in 2015 and the Unite the Right Rally around the Thomas Jefferson monument by Moses Ezekiel on the campus of the University of Virginia in 2017, public monuments and their meanings remain a contentious subject across the country. Something that would have been seen as a preservationist’s nightmare only ten or twenty years ago, such as the removal of a nineteenth-century monument from its pedestal, is perhaps no longer seen as such. Society is changing, and it is those changes that reflect who we think we are, and who we want to be, in the second decade of the twenty-first century and beyond.

Wherever you fall on the monument question—whether to keep problematic monuments or remove them or re-interpret them or spray paint them—I would guess that readers of Nineteenth Century might all agree on one core value: the more we know about nineteenth-century monument culture, the more nuanced our views become, helping to make tough decisions more balanced. In this issue of Nineteenth Century we have a variety of voices writing about public monuments across the United States, from Chicago to Texas to the post-Civil War North and the South. We also follow American sculptors across the Atlantic to Rome and Paris. There are fresh perspectives on familiar names, such as Gutzon Borglum, Emma Stebbins, and Daniel Chester French, and there is also attention given to lesser known sculptors such as Elisabet Ney and Paul Wayland Bartlett. Public monuments will undoubtedly be featured more prominently in art history textbooks in the years to come and it is this kind of work that provides the well from which future scholars can draw.
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THANK YOU TO OUR PEER REVIEWERS
Nineteenth Century would like to acknowledge our peer reviewers. We at the editorial board are, as always, deeply grateful to this group of anonymous scholars who review all our author submissions for accuracy of content and application of up-to-date methods of research and scholarship.
(L to R): Gutzon Borglum, Edward Dunne, and William Jennings Bryan at the unveiling of the John Peter Altgeld Monument on September 6, 1915. The arm of the statue is visible protruding from the flags covering it. Courtesy Chicago History Museum.
How Not to Run a Competition
THE CIRCUITOUS ROUTE TO GUTZON BORGLUM'S ALTGELD MEMORIAL

Paul Kruty

On Labor Day 1915, Gutzon Borglum’s statue of Illinois governor John Peter Altgeld was unveiled in Chicago’s Lincoln Park before an enthusiastic crowd of 5,000 onlookers. Chicago’s “Progressive” monument, it faced east to greet a new day of responsive government, even, it was said, as it symbolically overlooked the beaches of Lake Michigan, Chicago’s public playground for its laboring classes. The composition, a bronze figurative group resting on a vaguely neo-classical base and platform, reveals a charitable Governor Altgeld protecting a father, mother and child, representative of the world’s downtrodden, from the unforgiving hostility of the modern state. The result of more than a decade of planning, and a controversial and ultimately fruitless competition, the monument traced its origins to events that took place almost thirty years earlier. The circumstances leading to this September celebration are a significant but forgotten tale in the history of public sculpture in America.

The story begins in 1886 at the infamous Haymarket riot on Chicago’s near west side, when a peaceful demonstration of unionists and anarchists morphed into a violent clash with police, turning deadly when a bomb was thrown into the crowd, killing seven policemen and four civilians. Seven of the eight men convicted of the crime were sentenced to be hanged. Four were executed, one committed suicide in prison, and two saw their sentences commuted to life imprisonment, which they began serving alongside the eighth man given a shorter jail term. Although it was clear to some that the trial had been improperly handled and grave injustices done to most of the accused, the general public and press were satisfied with the outcome meted out to “anarchist terrorists.” A heroic monument to the slain officers was erected on the site in 1886, designed by sculptor Johannes Gelert, its $10,000 cost paid for by the Union League Club of Chicago. Four years later, those convicted were privately memorialized with a monument designed by Albert Weinert, built by labor sympathizers and consecrated in Waldheim Cemetery, west of the city, where all but one of the “martyrs” were buried.

In 1893, Illinois’ new governor, John P. Altgeld, decided after a review of the records that the trial had been prosecuted unjustly. He pardoned the three surviving defendants. For this act of delayed justice, Altgeld was universally reviled, both locally and nationally. It was widely seen that his political career was now over, and he was never elected to office again. Twenty years after the pardon the memory of it was so fresh that an account of Altgeld began:

The newspapers [in 1893] were so extravagant in their abuse...that one not knowing the facts might have received the impression that the Governor had already pardoned most of the prisoners in the penitentiary, and would presently pardon those that remained.

Born in Germany, John Peter Altgeld (1847-1902) as a child was brought to Ohio by his parents. An avid reader growing up in a strict, if impoverished, household, Altgeld at an early age
exhibited a moral sense combined with great empathy. At age sixteen he joined the Union Army during the Civil War. He subsequently traveled as an itinerant laborer to Arkansas and Missouri, where his work for a local lawyer led him to study the law. Passing the bar exam in 1872, he moved to Chicago, where he practiced until 1886, when he was appointed to the Cook County Superior Court. In 1893 he became Illinois's twentieth governor, putting in place the most progressive agenda in the country, passing workers' safety initiatives and child labor laws. During the Pullman strike of 1894, Altgeld refused to allow federal troops to intercede, siding against President Grover Cleveland. And he pardoned the three convicted Haymarket rioters.

Altgeld died in 1902 following years of ill health and was buried in Chicago's Graceland Cemetery. The great progressive lawyer Clarence Darrow, in whose firm Altgeld had worked before his death, delivered the graveside eulogy, declaring,

Today we pay our last sad homage to the most devoted lover, the most abject slave, the fondest, wildest, dreamiest victim that ever gave his life to liberty's immortal cause.9

In 1905, one of Altgeld's most ardent followers, Joseph S. Martin, donated to the Chicago Historical Society a portrait of Altgeld that Martin had commissioned from the city's preeminent portraitist, Ralph Clarkson.10 At the dedication, the lead speaker, Edward Osgood Brown, marveled at the painting.11

No friend of Governor Altgeld who knew him well can see it, unmoved by admiration, not alone for the technical

---

9. Clarence Darrow, eulogy at Altgeld's graveside service, Chicago, June 20, 1902.
skill which the portrait shows, but for that infinitely higher, nobler and rarer thing, that ability...to suggest and bring upon the canvas the heart and mind and very soul which speaks in life through eye and lip.

Brown then quoted Francis Fisher Browne, editor of the literary magazine *The Dial* and another intimate of Altgeld's:

A pale, intellectual, thoughtful man with a sad and serious face, a temperament reflective and philosophical, yet alert and ready, calm, intrepid and inflexible, able to stand alone against a thousand...a friend of humanity and a hater of injustice to others as to himself.

Following Altgeld's death, his reputation steadily grew for what was now perceived as a self-sacrificing act of courage in the Haymarket affair. While ten days after he died two nationally-known “western” politicians, Minnesota Congressman Charles Towne and Senator Richard Pettigrew of South Dakota, proposed erecting a monument in Altgeld's memory, five years were to pass before the idea spawned an organization dedicated to that end. In 1907 the newly-formed John Peter Altgeld Memorial Association hosted the national political figure William Jennings Bryan, a strong supporter of Altgeld and his memory, as lead speaker before a full house in the Garrick Theater in Adler & Sullivan's Schiller Building. In 1909 the bill for “a memorial monument” asking for an appropriation of $25,000 was first introduced in the Illinois legislature. The proposed site was to be in Sherman Park located on Chicago’s south side, near to the notorious stock yards. The park, designed by the Olmsted Brothers with a fieldhouse by Daniel Burnham, was part of a progressive movement to bring open land to inner-city congestion. The bill failed to pass that year.

In September 1910 four bronze tablets etched with quotations from Altgeld's writings were added to his cemetery monument. At the graveside dedication George Fred Williams, former Congressman from Massachusetts and strong supporter of W. J. Bryan, dubbed Altgeld “the first insurgent,” naming him “among the first officials to take up a fight against special privilege.” This dedication, according to the *Indianapolis Star*, “was attended by members of Chicago labor organizations in a body.”

In 1912 the tenth anniversary of Altgeld's death was marked by the biggest rally yet. Held in Chicago's Orchestra Hall, designed in 1904 by Daniel Burnham, it again featured Bryan as principal speaker. He was joined by a host of well-known leaders of the progressive movement, including Judge Edward F. Dunne, former mayor of Chicago and soon-to-be governor of Illinois.

Altgeld's rehabilitation entered popular consciousness that same year with the publication of Vachel Lindsay's stirring poem, “The Eagle that is Forgotten.” Lindsay, the “vagabond poet,” was beginning his brief career as the conscience of Middle-American exceptionalism. His tribute to Altgeld begins, “Sleep softly, eagle forgotten, under the stone. Time has its way with you here, and the clay has its own.” It ends, “Sleep on, O brave-hearted, O wise man, that kindled the flame/To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name.” In 1914 critic Elia Peattie wrote in the *Chicago Tribune*, “Some portion of [Lindsay's poem] should be engraved upon the new statue when it is raised to that friend of the misunderstood.”

Peattie’s “new statue” is our subject at hand. By spring 1913, the Illinois legislature was ready to fund a memorial to Altgeld. State Senator John Waage of Chicago introduced a bill for the memorial in February, as he had the two previous years, that finally passed in a massive end-of-term session in June. The announcement of the successful bill rekindled memories of the events of two decades past. Typical of the editorials is one from central Illinois' *Decatur Herald*, which began by proclaiming “How time effaces old prejudices!” It expressed amazement that a memorial would be built to a man lampooned from one end of the country to the other, denounced as the friend of anarchists, and the inciter of revolt.

In fact, the newspaper was proud of this progressive development: Altgeld was a man ahead of his times. His views on social legislation, held radical in his day, have been adopted by many executives now called conservative.

It concluded, “To the virtues of a man once much feared and misunderstood his state at last is to do tardy honor.” Thus did public opinion come full circle.

At the end of July 1913, Judge Dunne, now governor of Illinois, appointed a committee of five to adjudicate the competition for what was assumed would produce a representational figure, perhaps in an allegorical setting. Joseph Martin, the long-standing supporter of Altgeld, was appointed chairman. The four other members included State Senator John Waage of Chicago, who had introduced the bill; Louis F. Post, editor of the liberal, “single-tax” weekly, *The Public*, and recently appointed assistant secretary of commerce and labor by President Wilson; Daniel L. Cruice, an attorney and president of the progressive Referendum League; and State Representative Charles A. Karch of downstate Belleville.

While all five appointees were champions of Altgeld's legacy who understood its cultural significance, they were perhaps less qualified to choose the best expression of that significance. Chairman Martin was a self-made man—circus performer, gambler, club owner—who turned to politics in the 1890s. He revered Altgeld as the greatest man he had ever met. In 1903, he arranged for the Illinois legislature to appropriate $5,000 for Altgeld's impoverished widow and in 1905 had donated Clarkson's portrait. In his will, in which he stated his desire to be buried next to Altgeld, Martin left $2,000 to commission a biography of his hero. For his part, Cruice in 1903 had served as pallbearer at Altgeld's funeral alongside Clarence Darrow, and chaired the memorial celebration for Altgeld held in March 1912 at Orchestra Hall. Louis Post, editor of *The Public*, the voice of the progressive movement in Chicago, had strongly supported Altgeld's Haymarket clemency as well as his progressive stance.

The competition guidelines for the monument were published in early August, although announcements continued to appear in the press as late as October. The requirements explained:

- Models or drawings of designs for the proposed statue and monument are invited in competition from sculptors residing in the United States. Such models or drawings must be ready for inspection in Chicago not later than Nov. 15, 1913, and the monument itself must be completed by Aug. 1, 1914.

This was a tight schedule to produce so important a work.

On August 20, the committee members met in Chicago and let it be known that the monument was now to be placed at the north end of Lincoln Park, a more prominent site than Sherman Park. They favored “a design after the style of the Lincoln Monument,” i.e. the famous figure of “Lincoln Standing” by Augustus Saint-Gaudens, placed on an exedra designed by Stanford White and unveiled in 1887. Here the mature Lincoln stands with downcast eyes, the burden of the country's situation weighing on his magnanimous soul. The committee hoped that the resulting Altgeld statue would provide a counterpart at the
north end of Lincoln Park to Saint-Gaudens’ Lincoln at the south end.

Thirty-four artists (sometimes numbered thirty-seven—no definitive list has been located) submitted designs from around the country, about half of whom can be identified. Most of the Chicago entrants were part of the circle of Lorado Taft, the dean of Chicago sculptors, whose Great Lakes fountain had recently been installed next to the Art Institute. These included Charles J. Mulligan, Frederick Hibbard, John G. Prashun, and Gilbert Riswold; and Tennessee-born Chicagoan Nancy Cox McCormack, a pupil of Charles Mulligan, who became known for her portrait-busts, including one of Clarence Darrow. Also submitting models were Richard Bock, remembered for his work for Frank Lloyd Wright; Albert Van den Berghen, a Chicago sculptor of Belgian descent who also worked for Wright; Chicago sculptors Emil Zettler, Maximillian Hoffman, and John Paulding; Cyrus E. Dallin of Boston, who created the iconic equestrian statue of Paul Revere; Leon Hermant and George Gamiere, two French-born sculptors living in Chicago; Giorgio Renaut, a Chicagoan from Milan; Pompeo Coppini, an Italian living in Texas, known as “the Sculptor of the Southern Cause;” and Sally James Farnham of New York City, then associated with her Piozzi of Discoverer on the Pan American Union building in Washington, DC.

From November 15 to December 3, 1913 the models were on display at the Art Institute, as arranged by Charles Mulligan, who taught there and also submitted an entry in the competition, as we have seen. Although no visual record of the group seems to survive, they all apparently were cast in the exaggerated mode typical of public sculpture of the era—the very opposite of Altgeld’s perceived significance by the Altgeld committee. Representative of the group was Pompeo Coppini’s entry, showing a heroic Altgeld atop a monumental pedestal, at whose feet a seated figure reviews Altgeld’s accomplishments in a great book of the final days. Harriet Monroe, Chicago’s leading art critic and co-founder of Poetry magazine, declared that “most of the designs are too grandiloquent.” She was particularly chagrined at several representations of “a recording angel—or whatever the winged figure is in certain sketches,” damning them as “so out of key with the subject and the time as to become ridiculous.” Monroe charged the judges,

As you value the late governor’s memory, no angel, Messrs. Committeeen, and no muddled stone groups of oppressed poor!

The Altgeld Committee met the weekend of November 29 - 30, with Amt. Labor Secretary Louis Post speeding by train from Washington, DC, to join his fellow judges. They had asked a trio of Chicagoans of marked aesthetic sensibility to review the work and to present unofficial recommendations to the committee. These included architect Irving K. Pond, designer of much of Jane Addams’s Hull House complex, who had recently served as the president of the American Institute of Architects; Frederick W. Gookin, a prominent banker who was renowned for his collection of Japanese prints and his publications on the subject; and Waldo
R. Browne, publisher of the famous journal of literary criticism, *The Dial*, and son of the magazine's founder, Francis Fisher Browne. "Their private report concluded that "none of the models submitted seemed of sufficient artistic merit to warrant acceptance."

Committee members agreed in principle with the recommendations of Pond, Gooikin and Browne. On December 3 they announced publicly that they could not declare any of the pieces worthy of an award and construction. However, they had invited five of the three-dozen sculptors to submit revised versions by February 15 for adjudication, including Mulligan, Riswold, Hermant, McCormack and Coppini.

Having a second stage in the competition was never envisioned, although the possibility was stated in the original guidelines. This development led to all sorts of rumors, both public and private. An embarrassing statement appeared in a local journal of stone monuments that Charles Mulligan had won, even announcing that, contrary to the competition guidelines calling for bronze, Mulligan would "execute it in Georgia marble, a favorite material with him." It had to be retracted the news in its next issue. Among the losers in the first round, there was general resentment at how the competition had been handled; Cyrus Dallin's brother threatened a lawsuit against the city, claiming that the competition had been rigged.

The work of the five finalists was again exhibited at the Art Institute. This time the event was deemed sufficiently newsworthy that the *Chicago Tribune* published a composite picture of the entries. Harriet Monroe critiqued each of them. She admitted that Mulligan "has greatly improved his design by eliminating the recording angel," while "the weakest feature" is "the figure of the governor, who stands with hand advanced in a 'see what I can do' attitude." Coppini's model "shows a shaft surmounted by a quite hopeless figure." McCormack's composition shows Altgeld "with his head thrust out and his forefinger gently beckoning." Monroe found that Hermant's otherwise weak entry "contains the best figure of Altgeld," crowning it as "the only one of the five that is not comical." She dismissed the lot by assessing that "none is immediately convincing as a work of art expressive of the subject and worthy of a permanent location in Lincoln Park."

Again, the advisory committee of Pond, Gooikin and Browne, echoing Monroe's verdict, pronounced that the revised designs still failed to measure up to the "requisite artistic standard." On February 22, the Altgeld Committee made its findings public: all five entries had been rejected. Cruze noted that "Every design lacked some symbol of Altgeld." Post declared, "None of the models shown is the governor," further lamenting.

If St. Gaudens were still with us, and we had $175,000 instead of $25,000, we could simply say 'give us a study of Altgeld,' and every one would be satisfied."

At this point Irving Pond felt compelled to respond publicly. Pond, who had framed the competition guidelines required by the A.I.A., found the whole procedure "highly unprofessional." He particularly criticized exhibiting the models prematurely, which "should never have been open to the public and comment until the commission had returned some sort of a decision." And he made it clear that he would not participate in any further discussions.

Responding to the dissatisfaction surrounding this latest outcome, the Altgeld Committee searched for a solution: why not invite the Swedish-American sculptor Charles Haag, who had not entered the competition, to submit a sketch? They told Haag, known locally as "the sculptor of immigrant life," that his creation was to be "not a portrait of the man but of his spirit and purpose." The advisory committee, now with landscape architect Jens Jensen replacing Irving Pond, was to give his aesthetic verdict. By late March, Haag was hard at work on a model at his Winnetka studio. On April 12, members of the Altgeld...
Committee visited his studio and requested that he turn his sketches into a plaster model. At this turn of events, the rejected finalists, with Pompeo Coppini leading the charge, complained bitterly in private and in public about the unfairness of the entire process.

Another Chicago figure entered the fray. Architect, landscape architect and urban planner Walter Burley Griffin, who had worked for Frank Lloyd Wright from 1901 to 1906, offered a suggestion. Griffin had won the international competition to design the new national capital of Australia, Canberra, and had become a figure of national prominence. As such he had been appointed to the Chicago City Club’s committee on public sculpture (unrelated to the group choosing the Altgeld memorial). Unaware of the committee’s new dealings with Haag, Griffin reviewed the events and became convinced that holding a competition for the statue had doomed it from the start. Griffin wrote a letter to the Altgeld commission calling for the committee simply to appoint the best sculptor available, whether he or she had entered the competition or not. Griffin argued that

this particular task should be committed to a sculptor who has attained in his art that fundamental character, the American ideal, which Altgeld served in his own field and exemplified in his career."

He then named that person:

There appears to be in our time at least one sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, who is recognized as bearing to the plastic arts a relation like [Walt] Whitman’s to literature.

With the sculpting of four presidents on South Dakota’s Mount Rushmore several decades in the future, Borglum’s national reputation in 1914 was based primarily on his 1908 marble bust of Abraham Lincoln encased in the Capitol Building in Washington. When the bust was unveiled in 1908, The Craftsman magazine editorialized, “In profound insight into character and in sublimity of portrayal,” Borglum’s Lincoln “must be accounted among the greatest achievements that have been made by any American artist.” Based in New York, Borglum (1867-1941), who had studied in Paris, was greatly influenced by the work of Auguste Rodin. Griffin and Borglum were known to each other, at least publicly, because of their shared criticism of architect Henry Bacon’s memorial to Lincoln proposed for the west end of the Washington mall, which each thought was a betrayal of American values. Borglum himself, following a trip to the nation’s capital where he met with Louis Post, wrote to thank Griffin on April 4, “I incidentally learned in Washington that it was you that had suggested my name to the Altgeld Commission.”

The committee members were so moved by Griffin’s argument that, once they realized how far above the previous level of aesthetic significance they had now set their sights, they immediately contacted Borglum. They made it clear that they could not send him a contract until they had ruled on Haag’s submission. This happened soon enough. Borglum signed the contract for the Altgeld Memorial on April 24, 1914. He promised
to do all in my power to build a monument, first worthy of Altgeld and secondly a credit to the commission and to myself."

The perceived procedure particularly annoyed the local press, which reported that

following several months of bickering, during which time thirty-nine [sic] models were rejected, the commission… last week secretly gave the job to Gutzon Borglum."

The reporter was apparently chagrined that “Borglum submitted neither model nor plans.” In response, advisory committee member Walden Brown explained that,

having exhausted other possibilities, the only course left for the commission was to select a sculptor of national reputation.”

Chicago’s conservative business newspaper Inter Ocean editorialized that there already was a monument “in honor of the martyrs who fell during the Haymarket riot, meaning the seven policemen, not the convicted protesters. Its conclusion?

Either Chicago should have a monument to Governor Altgeld or to the heroes of the Haymarket riot. It would be inconsistent to honor both.

It added that if only Altgeld’s predecessor, Governor Oglesby, had not commuted their sentences and, instead, had executed the whole lot, none of this would be troubling us now.

Sculptor Nancy McCormack recalled that one benefit of the “Altgeld fracas” was that a group of disgruntled entrants banded together to form the Western Society of Sculptors. “We formulated a Constitution for the new group which would announce OUR rules for competitions which would perforce be recognized by committees in charge of competitions.” The association, for which Hibbard served as president, Coppini as secretary, and McCormack as vice-president, held its first meeting on July 19, 1915. Its members included most of the known entrants to the first Altgeld competition.

Once again, Harriet Monroe had the last word.

The final choice of a sculptor of Mr. Borglum’s competence is one upon which the committee and its advisers are to be congratulated.

It was the procedure that had been flawed.

The deplorable thing was the numerous disappointments along the circuitous route by which the decision was reached.

The controversy intrigued one of Borglum’s students to make his own proposal. Italian-born Alfonso Iannelli was now in Chicago creating most of the sculptural pieces at Frank Lloyd Wright’s Midway Gardens, an entertainment complex arising along the west end of the Midway Plaisance in April, May and June 1914. Taking his cue from Lindsay’s poem, Iannelli envisioned a great eagle landing on a column, with four figures at its base. A detail drawing reveals that these sketchy figures were to be another quartet of eagles falling to earth. While not directly involved in the competition itself, Iannelli showed in his private sketches just what other possibilities might have been available to American artists drawn to Altgeld’s legacy.

With committee chair Martin ailing and the two politicians—Waage and Karch—otherwise engaged, Cruise and Post assumed the lion’s share of responsibility to guide the commission along. In early October, Borglum announced to Post,

I have made a number of experiments with this model and have a feeling that the right treatment of the subject is at hand."

In mid-November Borglum wrote to William Jennings Bryan, now Secretary of State in the Wilson administration, asking his advice on how the working model compared with the Altgeld Bryan remembered. Bryan wrote to Governor Dunne on Borglum’s behalf to express concern about the monument’s “exact location,” an issue worrying Borglum. Borglum received a detailed survey of the site.
By the end of 1914, Borglum was ready to exhibit his model at the Art Institute. In preparation for the next committee meeting, he commissioned plaster casts to be made for the Altgeld board members. Borglum explained his thinking about his representation of Altgeld in a passage worth quoting in full.

I never knew Governor Altgeld, but from all that I have heard and read of him, he stood for a square deal and always strove for a clear line between justice and injustice. The protection he afforded to the laborer is indicated by the two figures crouching behind the figure of the former Governor. The right hand is shown in a gesture of appeal to the public rather than menace. The left hand instead of resting on the head of one of his charges, is held above as an assurance of protection. Altgeld’s face was clean-cut and full of character. I have tried to present those features without undue harshness and yet make them true to life.

Borglum’s proposal was officially sanctioned on January 10, 1915, when Post and Cruice visited him in his New York studio with the final documents. Waage and Karch could not be present. Martin was too ill to travel, but he gave Post his proxy to provide a majority vote.

Borglum continued to refine the figures, while turning his attention to the siting, the circular platform on which the monument was to rest, and the pedestal supporting the bronze figures, all of which he intended to control. He hired New York architect Electus Litchfield to make working drawings for the pedestal, but in agreeing to do so Litchfield explained that his fee would be minimal,

in view of the fact that our work in connection with this undertaking is so small and that the whole scheme of the Memorial was practically decided by you in advance of our work.

Soon after, Borglum announced to Cruice that he had ordered the granite to be used for the circular pedestal.

When Borglum unveiled his finished design, members of the Municipal Art Commission of the City of Chicago, unrelated to any of the bodies so far involved but one charged with ruling on public art in Chicago, expressed dismay at its modest size (the figure of Altgeld is eight feet tall) and had “fault to find with the proportions.” Committee chair Charles L. Hutchinson, president of the Art Institute, complained that this was not a monumental composition placed on a high podium! Without explaining his memorial’s meaning, Borglum fired back,

I forget more about municipal art overnight than any of your Chicago Municipal Art Commissioners knows in a lifetime.

Borglum’s chief defense was that this body had no say in the matter.

It is I and the Altgeld memorial commission, composed of his devoted friends, whose business it is, not that of any municipal commission.

Governor Dunne concurred, in his muted way:

There are some very high-minded gentlemen on the Altgeld Commission—men like Louis F. Post, Daniel L. Cruice and Joseph Martin. I have heard no complaint from them.

By early August, the figures had been cast at Borglum’s chosen foundry, the Gorham Company of New York, which
advised him that "the statue is awaiting your decision as to color and method of fastening" the separate pieces. The concrete foundation to support the circular granite base was poured in early August, its condition approved two weeks later. The stone and bronze were set under the guidance of two of Chicago's most reputable contractors: John F. Gall, a builder of tombstones and mausoleums, and the firm of George Archer & Son. The reporter for Park & Cemetery and Landscape Gardening proclaimed that the results did, in fact, rank with Saint-Gaudens Lincoln in Lincoln Park, Lorado Taft's Fountain of the Great Lakes next to the Art Institute, and Charles Mulligan's Miner and Child in Humble Park as "the four finest public sculptures in Chicago." Unlike the works of Saint-Gaudens, Taft and Mulligan, Borglum's figures, sitting on a low pedestal and simple circular platform, welcomed visitors to engage personally with the benevolent governor.

The dedication on Labor Day 1915, during which Altgeld's niece pulled the cord that released the flag shrouding the monument, was attended by a vast crowd. Borglum, Governor Dunne and William Jennings Bryan were all on the speakers' platform. Both Dunne and Bryan spoke. But it was Louis Post who provided the day's most memorable words. He began by situating the new work:

At the southern end of this park there is the well-known statue of Abraham Lincoln, from whom the park takes its name. At the northern end we now dedicate a corresponding memorial to John Peter Altgeld.

He then developed this correspondence. "Both men were fundamental democrats—democrats such as Thomas Jefferson was." Explaining that this was unrelated to party names or organizations, he continued,

In that true sense of patriots upon the plains, of feudal lord upon helpless peasant, of aristocrat upon commoner, between slavery and emancipation, between assertions of special privilege and demands of equal opportunity, Abraham Lincoln in his day and John Peter Altgeld in his played the democratic part. For doing this both were hated and both were despised. But, also for this, both were loved and the memory of each is revered. It is well, then, that these two statues stand complementary to each other in this garden spot of the people of Chicago.

Finally, Post felt that the acrimonious controversy of the past two years over the role and procedure of public sculpture had been solved.

Gutzon Borglum, the American sculptor whose marvelous face of Lincoln under the capitol dome in Washington seems to make the martyred President live again, has caught that Altgeld spirit—the Altgeld likeness, too—in the statue we dedicate today. Truly this is Altgeld standing here in bronze, as he stood among us in life, a champion of the worker against the despoiler in the age-long war of Privilege upon Labor.

Returning to New York after the event, Borglum reflected to Cruise, "You and your committee, including our dear Mr. Martin, must feel a sense of profound relief" that their hard work had come to so perfect a conclusion. Borglum mused,

Hutchinson and his group, upon reflection, should feel it would have been wisest to have passed this whole event with indifference if they could not have shown some sympathy.

But he doubted they would do so.

The inscriptions meant for the platform and the pedestal had not been cut in time. Borglum's final instructions were to the mason John Gall.

I want the lettering cut in V shape, a single block letter; carefully spaced and well done. The letters on the platform, which I have suggested should be spaced wide apart, should be eight inches high, and great care should be exercised in not coming in contact with the joints. All letters should be capitals.

In the end, the Altgeld committee had found in Borglum the creative spirit to carry out their hopes, from profoundest feeling to minutest detail.

When Daniel Cruise returned alone to the site three days later, he reflected, "I cannot conceive of a more eloquent reproduction of Altgeld's career." It had taken ten years to do so; the result was one of the most moving masterpieces of public sculpture in Chicago. John Peter Altgeld, with his benevolent gaze and protective, outstretched arm, continues to do his best to protect the rights of the citizens of his state to this day.

Paul Kruty, professor emeritus of architectural history at the University of Illinois, has written extensively on American architecture and art, including the work of the Prairie School architects Louis Sullivan, Frank Lloyd Wright, Walter Burley Griffin, Marion Mahony and Robert C. Spencer. He has organized twenty annual meetings of the Walter Burley Griffin Society of America, directed his graduate students in making models of unbuilt Wright houses, and has researched the origins of the first architects licensing law, modern casement window hardware, the art collector Arthur Jerome Eddy, and the early oil portraits by B. J. O. Nordfeldt. His books include Frank Lloyd Wright and Midway Gardens, Walter Burley Griffin in America, and Marion Mahony and Millikin Place.
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Culture Capitalism:
EMMA STEBBINS’ ALLEGORIES FROM THE BRACCO NUOVO OF THE VATICAN

Melissa L. Gustin

Emma Stebbins (1815–1882) is not a household name these days, despite examples of her work standing in extremely public sites: she was the sculptor of Angel of the Waters at Bethesda Fountain in Central Park, New York City and the statue of Horace Mann at the State House in Boston, Massachusetts. Stebbins was active in Rome from 1857 to 1869, with work ranging from small ideal, allegorical, or poetic figures for private patrons to the grand public commissions like the Central Park’s Bethesda Fountain. Many examples of Stebbins’ work have been lost, and are only known through photographs or the biography assembled by her sister Mary Garland after Stebbins’ death. Stebbins never married, but lived for many years in a loving relationship with Charlotte Cushman; their household on the Via Gregoriana in Rome included fellow sculptor Harriet Hosmer (1830–1908), and they moved within the sophisticated Anglo-American circles that included Sophia and Nathaniel Hawthorne, Mrs. Adelaide Sartoris, and Frederic, Lord Leighton.

This article will look at two of Stebbins’ earliest sculptures, a pair of allegorical statuesque based on famous classical sculptures in the Vatican Museums in Rome. These were produced in marble for Charles August Heckscher between 1858 and 1860, and are now in the Heckscher Museum of Art in Huntington New York (founded by our Heckscher’s nephew in 1920). Art historians have quite happily recognized the ancient sculptural “types” upon which Stebbins based her Industry and Commerce as the respectively the Doryphorus, or Spear-Bearer, and Resting Satyr, a type made famous to nineteenth-century Americans as the central object in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s The Marble Faun, published in 1861. Despite multiple examples of both types being available in Rome, where Stebbins lived and worked, we’ll see that Stebbins referring to specific examples in the Vatican Museum’s Braccio Nuovo. In the Braccio Nuovo, the two works stand together, separated by only a single alcove, and present them—as nowhere else does—as a pair. Furthermore, the fact that the scholarship only identified the Doryphoros type in 1863 lends weight to the specificity of the Vatican versions, since the “type” itself was not famous when she was working on these pieces. This suggests that Stebbins expected her audience to recognize the pairing, which would in turn add to their enjoyment of the sculpture through validation of their sophistication, education, and shared experience.

“She Had the Sculptor’s Thumb”
Emma Stebbins was born September 1, 1815 to a wealthy New York family. She trained as a painter in her twenties, proceeding along the accepted lady-amateur route until she was nominated for membership as an associate of the National Academy of Design.6 Her sister, Mary Stebbins Garland, wrote that she worked steadily, at whatever her hand found to do, in


almost every branch of art, oil painting, water colours, pastels, and crayons. The walls of her brother’s house (H. G. Stebbins) attest the untiring industry of these early years.6

Stebbins turned to sculpture following an introduction to American sculptor Edward Brackett (1818–1908), who gave her “hints” and taught her the foundations of modelling. It was from his instruction that Stebbins “learned that form was the most satisfying medium of expression.” Thus the sculptor’s passion awoke, and she saw that she had the sculptor’s thumb, and the inner passion, which enabled the artist in form, to project before the mind’s eye a perfect image of the object to be rendered.6

Stebbins set off for Rome in 1857 to pursue a professional career in sculpture. She joined a thriving American expatriate community, and it was Rome where the “sculptor’s passion” was
fully ignited in the face of the antiquities and a flourishing culture of arts and letters. She studied with Paul Akers (1825–1861), and received advice and commissions from Harriet Hosmer's teacher, John Gibson (1790–1866). Garland specifically mentioned that Stebbins' formal training included the nude model along with casts and copying sculptures, perhaps because of social discomfort with female artists and the living nude. By emphasizing Stebbins' formal training under recognized international masters in a studio setting, Garland demonstrated Stebbins was a professional artist who had undergone formal, supervised training in the cosmopolitan atelier tradition, rather than being a lady amateur or dilettante, who might model a portrait bust on holiday but not produce the most difficult and elevated work, the ideal nude figure. It also posthumously protected Stebbins' reputation from any accusations of impropriety or immorality, which had occasionally flared around Hosmer, and which drove Louise Lander (1826–1923) from Rome in 1860.7

Unlike the majority of other nineteenth-century sculptors in Rome, who maintained workshops with teams of workmen to assist in the laborious process of producing works in marble (especially large works), Stebbins preferred to work a sculpture to completion on her own from clay model to finished marble. Given that she was forty-two years old when she arrived in Rome, and not accustomed to the kind of heavy labor that marble carving entails, this meant that her output was much slower than that of her contemporaries. Her most important public work was The Angel of the Waters at Bethesda Fountain, in Central Park, but Elizabeth Milroy points out that by the time the figure was installed in 1873 most New Yorkers had forgotten who she was, largely because she had given up full-time sculpting in 1869 to care for Cushman after her diagnosis of breast cancer. They left Rome in such a hurry in 1870 that several works remained in the studio, unfinished. Garland wrote that Stebbins looked back on her sculptural career with a mix of pleasure and pain; pleasure in the effort, which indeed was a second nature, pain in its incompleteness. She was never satisfied with her work when it [illegible, possibly "arrived"] at the point of completion. The aim was so high, the ideal unattainable, so those appeared in her a modesty and want of self assertion which surprised her friends.8

Stebbins died in New York, in October 1882.

Like her peers, Stebbins's work makes frequent reference in detail, form, or subject to antique sculptures on display in Roman galleries. The use of antique prototypes as models for imitation did not mean that she was unoriginal or lacking in skill, but rather that she and other neoclassical sculptors were engaged in a historically recognized intellectual practice described by Johann Joachim Winckelmann in Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture.9 Winckelmann's theories about the history of ancient art, through systematic visual and textual analysis of antique evidence, was hugely influential in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, especially on the development of neoclassicism. His aesthetic theories about the superiority of Greek art led him to suggest that artists train themselves by imitating antique works:

Imitation will teach the artist to think and to draw with confidence, since he finds established in it the highest limits of that which is both humanly and divinely beautiful.10
The practice of studying and imitating antiquities predates Winkelmann—for example, the Belvedere Torso at the Museo Pio-Clementino of the Vatican Museums was referred to as “The School of Michelangelo” from the eighteenth century—but it was Winkelmann’s **Reflections** that codified those practices, which then passed from abstract aesthetic theories into sculptural practice in the 1780s, most importantly and influentially by Antonio Canova (1757–1822).

Charles August Heckscher commissioned **Commerce and Industry** early in Stebbins’ career, between 1857 and 1858. According to Garland:

> An order was about this time executed for ‘Mr. Heckscher’ [sic] of New York, for two small figures, representing *Mining + Commerce* under the forms of a Miner and a Sailor.

This is echoed in the scrapbook, with **Industry** labeled:

> “1858 ‘Miner’ one of two ‘Statuettes’ made for Mr. C A Heckscher [sic] of New York” and Commerce labeled “1858 ‘Sailor’ for Mr. C A Heckscher [sic] of New York.”

Heckscher was born in 1806 to a German-Jewish merchant and banking family in Paris. He left the family business in Europe and emigrated to the United States in 1829, where he quickly became popular in the New York and Boston merchant and banking circles. It is likely that he was familiar with Stebbins’ family and this may have factored into his giving her the commission—indeed, she would have been fourteen or fifteen when he arrived in New York and may have socialized with him as a debutante. Even if she herself was not interested in men or marriage (a fair assumption, based on her spinsterhood and her relationship with Charlotte Cushman) her friends may have been and there is no reason to assume that she was not acquainted with a popular and successful young man of good family. By the 1850s, Heckscher was a major figure in Pennsylvania anthracite coal mining. It makes sense that the allegorical figures represented Stebbins’ dominant business interests of coal mining and shipping, while the classical references provide a veneer of culture, heroism, and elevation to the dangerous and dirty labor of the miner and sailor.

**Cultural Capitalism: Antiquity as Validation**

Stebbins’ **Industry** is a miniature coal miner made marmoreal. The piece denies the danger and dirt of coal mining by presenting the figure of a strapping young man in the pose of the **Doryphoros**. Coal mining in this period, especially the anthracite coal mining from which Heckscher profited, was extremely arduous and dangerous: the coalfields in eastern Pennsylvania were filled with faults or areas where the coal veins were interrupted by different geological strata, as well as gas or water pockets that could cause explosions, suffocation, or collapses. Miners were required to work in closed spaces with limited geological information, and further needed to carry all of their tools with them:

> The miner and his helper climbed to the working face of their breast through narrow manways carrying their tools and the heavy timbers needed to support the roof. They drilled holes for the powder charges, placed the roof props, and moved the broken coal entirely by hand.

Not only that, but the coal industry relied on child labor with “breakers” or “pickers,” normally boys from eight to fourteen years old.

All of this is omitted from Stebbins’ allegorical figure, whose pose—through the reference and through the bold action shown—has the effect of heroicizing the miner’s work. Stebbins portrayed her miner fully dressed, though with an open shirt, and with the tools of his trade: a pick ax held over his shoulder like the original model’s spear, and the hardhat. While the **Doryphoros** is bareheaded, this miner’s attribute may recall the helmets of ancient warriors and heroes. Stebbins also reversed the pose from the original model, which had the spear held in the warrior’s left hand and the right inactive. The industrious miner holds his ax actively in his right hand and rests his left not passively at his side but possessively on a protrusion of stone, which stands in for the seam of living rock from which he hews his coal and powers industry. Stebbins’ choice to reverse the pose creates a pleasing mirror to **Commerce**; she likely reversed the **Doryphoros** quotation rather than the Satyr as a way to underscore the allegory of activity and productivity in America, by showing the miner ready to continue swinging his ax with his right strong arm.

In turn, Stebbins’ **Commerce** updates the model of the **Resting Satyr** into the form of a modern sailor, the figure responsible for ferrying the products of Industry. In **Commerce**, Stebbins stuck even more closely to the original source material. The pose is not mirrored, though it is more relaxed than either the Braccio Nuovo Satyr or the Capitoline Satyr. As a further point towards Stebbins’ use of the Braccio Nuovo rather than Capitoline copy, the Braccio Nuovo version has a less exaggerated contrapposto and the bulk of the figure held more rigidly. Rather than the Capitoline Satyr’s dramatically jutting hip, the Braccio Nuovo Satyr leans more fully against the supporting tree trunk and presents a vertical composition. In contrast, the Capitoline Satyr is a study in negative space and sinuous curves from the plinth up. **Commerce** is also highly specific in its visual references to the Satyr’s clothing (such as it is) and his coifure (so much as a satyr’s hair could be coiffed). The Satyr’s animal skin cloak, so dramatically and dashing swept across his chest at an angle is echoed on the sailor in the sweep of folds in his shirt and the jaunty kerchief knotted at the center of his chest, all pulled to the right by the hand at his waist. The Satyr’s hair is a distinctively and dramatically upswept tangle of locks, an arrangement so distinctive that highly fragmentary or damaged heads can be identified as examples of the type. **Commerce**’s hair likewise sweeps heavenward, crowned with a round cap worn low on the back of the head.

Specific touches like the diagonal sweep of **Commerce**’s shirt and the cap make it clear that Stebbins was skillfully co-opting the classical form and modifying it to suit her purposes and the message she wished to convey in these figures. By quoting or referring to these classical prototypes, Stebbins elevated the working-class subjects, giving them a heroic, noble aura and sanitizing the danger, exhaustion, and poverty actual laborers faced in order to make them fit for consideration as fine art. In miniature, perhaps displayed in Heckscher’s office or home study, the subjects further emphasize the power of the industrialist over his workers and the land, allowing Heckscher to possess the bodies and images of the miner and sailor who were responsible for the production of his capital. The classical quotations allow the concepts of “commerce” and “industry” to be allegorized, rather than depicting the inelegant reality of contemporary labor. These
two famous Greco-Roman sculpture types, displayed in close proximity to each other in a single gallery as well as in disparate locations across Rome (and the rest of Italy, and Europe), would have been immediately recognizable to the travelled, cultured, and educated upper classes who commissioned these works and viewed them in their friends’ homes.

Stebbins’ artistic choice to merge contemporary costume and classical models in her statuettes meant that she was toeing a delicate line of taste. If she strayed too far in either direction, she ran the risk of either failing to produce a meaningful modern allegory by overdoing the classicism—say by leaving the figures nude and thus unrecognizable—or by being too specific in her depiction of contemporary workers and thus vulgar. The first complaint circulated around many of Stebbins’ contemporaries, with critics suggesting that many artists titled their ideal works “by lot” after completing the figure.” Likewise, the classical forms were sometimes seen as inappropriate to their contemporary subject, a famous example of which is Horatio Greenough’s partially nude sculpture of George Washington in the style of the Olympian Zeus. By using the poses of the classical prototypes, but giving them contemporary attributes, Stebbins struck the careful balance of imitation but not copying, and constructed modern allegorical figures, without making the dangerous reality of her subjects uncomfortably visible for the moneyed elite who viewed them.

It is important to recognize which of the many versions in Rome Stebbins was using as her models, rather than treating all versions as interchangeable. After all, the Resting Satyr of the Capitoline (more specifically, the Resting Satyr of the Sala del Galata of the Capitoline, also known simply as the Marble Faun) is substantially more famous than the Braccio Nuovo Satyr, and was even before Nathaniel Hawthorne made it a central motif in his novel The Marble Faun. Aside from the Braccio Nuovo copy, there are five more Satyrs in the Vatican collections and at least seven others in Roman galleries. The Doryphoros is not as numerous but is far from solitary: the Vatican has four apart from the Braccio Nuovo example, while there are five other whole or fragmentary versions elsewhere in the city. The most famous version of this type, from Pompeii, is now at the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Napoli, who also hold a beautiful bronze bust of the Doryphoros’ head from the Villa dei Papiri in Herculaneum.

The Braccio Nuovo opened in 1822, a brand-new gallery space designed by Raffaello Stero (1774-1820) and with an arrangement overseen by Canova. Though some of the sculptures have moved or been added since Stebbins was in Rome, many of the works are in their historic locations or very near to them. By consulting nineteenth-century guidebooks as well as provenance information, we can see that Stebbins indeed had access to both the Resting Satyr and the Doryphoros, which are still in place along the left wall of the gallery upon entry. The Resting Satyr came to the Vatican Museums in 1817 from the Palazzo Rospilli, and compared in quality to the more-famous Capitoline Satyr. The Doryphoros entered the collections even earlier. It was probably found in the Villa of Hadrian, in Tivoli near Rome, and was purchased from Vincenzo Pacetti in 1804. By 1806, it was placed in the Museo Chiaronti, and from 1822, it was in the Braccio Nuovo. However, it does not appear on many guides to the collection in a way that we would easily recognize today, if it is mentioned at all. It was also sometimes called the Discobolus, conflation this figure with the similar nude athlete in the Sala della Biga in the Vatican, which is not to be confused with the more famous Discobolus of Myron in the same room.

Because there are so many versions of these sculptures in Rome, it is worth considering what makes the Braccio Nuovo works the most likely candidates for Stebbins’ study over any other examples or the type as a whole. A key factor is first and foremost that of ease and access: if you are preparing a pair of statues, having the two right next to each other is far, far more convenient than having to make your way across the city to get from one to the next—especially for a woman in a corset and hoop skirts. A second key factor is that in the Braccio Nuovo, they are pre-set as a pair, separated by one alcove, and the relationship between the two for Stebbins’ allegories was validated in advance by the set up. She was not mixing and matching at random from the large body of antique male nudes but remixing a pre-existing set that was essentially pre-approved by the original curators of the Braccio Nuovo, headed by Antonio Canova. A well-traveled, cosmopolitan audience would easily have been able to recognize the works as the type generally, but also to make the connection to the pair of the objects from the only gallery where they were presented, in full figure and as discrete masterpieces, in such close proximity. Third and finally, the Doryphoros’ fame as a Polykleitan sculpture type was only present after 1865, when it was identified as such; when Stebbins made her works, it was only another anonymous, if beautiful, nude male sculpture. Its cultural capital derived only from its position within the Vatican, and its proximity to the more famous Satyr type.

Solidarity Forever? The Classical Mode Then and Now
Stebbins’ sophisticated audiences in Rome and in America, like the cultural elite who may have seen the pair of sculptures in Charles Hecksher’s home, would have recognized not only the type of sculpture that she was basing her figures on, but also the pairing of the figures. The classical prototypes therefore offered several points of intellectual and cultural value for Stebbins and Hecksher. The use of classical prototypes in modern sculpture was part of an accepted neoclassical mode of art-making that emphasized intellectual engagement with and reference to antique prototypes. The ability to recognize the correct prototype offered viewers membership to an in-group of sophisticated and well-travelled elites, something like an in-joke or password to identify people with similar social experiences. Finally, the classical prototypes elevated the modern, paeanic subjects from vulgar, rough working-class figures to a noble, even heroic status, and in turn made their patron’s mercantile, industrial pursuit heroic.

Classical sculptures and texts are still used to elevate subjects or users, disguise their unpleasant elements, or lay claim to fictive legacies of superiority. These range from politicians using Latin quotes, to white nationalists using the mythic Spartan cry ‘Molon Labe’ as a motto, to trolls claiming people who aren’t white men can’t appreciate the female form well enough to create true art. The nineteenth century pseudo-sciences of race and phrenology, which often used white marble sculptures like Stebbins’ to illustrate or demonstrate their theories, are having a resurgence particularly among white nationalists. The Apollo Belvedere, which stands not far from Stebbins’ models in the Museo Pio-Clementino of the Vatican Museums, is used to signpost the “Western legacy” of white beauty and intellectual superiority by groups like Identity Evropa [sic]; Ovid’s Amores are
being used by misogynist pickup artists as tips and tools for seducing or assaulting women. While Stebbins' works have not come in for any specific use in these kinds of sources, it is important to note that the use of classical sources and white marble has never been neutral. After all, many of the miners and sailors Stebbins' figures allegorize were people of color and immigrants, who worked dangerous and dirty jobs—but her sculptures, made of flawless white marble and with idealized "Grecian" features, provided a clean, acceptable object for the contemplation of their industrialist and bourgeois viewers.

That does not diminish Stebbins' accomplishment in merging her contemporary subject and antique models for her patron, as an artistic and intellectual endeavor. Stebbins' works reflect the specific historical moment in which she was working, and her use of specific classical sources for references is typical of her peers. Among Stebbins' peers, we see references to the Barberini Faun in Harriet Hosmer's Sleeping Faun (1865), images of Pothos, a Roman sculpture type, in Anne Whitney's Lotus-Eater (1868), and Thomas Crawford's Orpheus and Cerberus (1836) recalling the Apollo Belvedere and Borghese Gladiator of the Louvre, just to name a very small set of examples. It is worth identifying Stebbins' specific references not only because they are interesting, but also because these sources demonstrate her thoughtfulness and erudition. She was not a lady-amateur, but an intelligent and dedicated sculptor working at the highest intellectual and aesthetic levels, for an audience that recognized and valued these qualities in her sculpture.
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The Confederate monument in Indian Hill Cemetery, Hampshire County, West Virginia. Erected in 1867, it was the first of two Confederate monuments installed that year. This one has a rare funeral urn top. Author’s collection.
Forever in Mourning
UNION AND CONFEDERATE MONUMENTS, 1860 - 1920

Ernest Everett Blevins

In the first two decades of the twenty-first century, Confederate monuments have received a large amount of critical attention from scholars and the public. Across the country, many Confederate monuments have been removed or are in the process of litigation for removal, due to shifting political and social interests. Confederate monuments are in the news and academic journals, but there is little attention to the relationship between the rise of Union and Confederate monuments. Born out of the same war, their contribution to the shared memory culture and legacy in the United States is unnoticed. This essay is a first attempt to weave the history of Confederate monument-making back into the broader landscape of Civil War monuments. This perspective does not suggest that Confederate monuments do not deserve the critical attention they are receiving, but that there is more to say about how and why monuments were placed. This paints a picture that shows points of connection between North and South that is today missing from most discussions.

This article is based on my long familiarity in documenting both Union and Confederate monuments, especially on the East Coast and encompassing a variety of monuments and memorials created by Americans after the Civil War. The whole subject is too vast for a single article as there are many types of monuments in both the North and South, including highways which were named as part of the Good Roads Movement. Many schools, public buildings, and parks are named for leaders in the Union and the Confederate armies. For this work memorial buildings, almost all constructed by the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) or their Allied Orders as meeting halls, are not included. Additionally, both Union and Confederate veterans placed monuments on the battlefields marking the location of their positions, where leaders directed significant battle movements or died on the field. In the twenty-first century, battlefield monuments tend to be less controversial and are protected by the National Park Service—they are not a focus of this study. The focus of this work is on the Monument Movement, specifically addressing the monuments scattered across cemeteries, town squares, and public parks that are part of the built environment. The findings, however, can be applied to the resources mentioned above.

Emerging in the post-war years, the Monument Movement was a national effort to memorialize the tremendous loss of human life in the war, and is thus dominated by Union and Confederate monuments and memorials—the most significant war in American history, with the greatest loss of life. The post-war Monument Movement began haltingly after the American Revolution, expanding from a handful existing before 1860 to thousands by the turn of the twentieth century, coinciding with the City Beautiful and American Renaissance, which placed hundreds of new, large bronze monuments in major cities across the United States. The examples included in this essay come from both the more visible artistic commissions, to the more common and utilitarian community-based monuments—often purchased from catalogs (discussed later). In her preface to Civil War Monuments, Ellen J. Beckman writes:

Barely a town or village, north or south, in existence at the close of the war failed to erect some kind of monument in the town center, courthouse, village common, village green, or in the soldiers' plot of the local cemetery.

There are many books on the rationale, memory, meaning, and interpretation of Confederate monuments; however, there is little about Union monuments beyond descriptions or scholarship focused on large works by well-known sculptors, such as Augustus Saint-Gaudens. The Monument Movement is an overlooked phenomenon of American culture warranting further study of which this work is a beginning.

Methodology
For this study, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) list of Confederate monuments was utilized as a primary source. The Union monument list was created following the methodology the SPLC used to create its Confederate list from a variety of internet searches, archival documents, and personal visits to monuments. One variation is the Union list noted themes of the monuments. In contrast, in the specially created "Whose Heritage?" database, updated in May 2019, the SPLC does not list a theme. The SPLC overarching directive is to explore the symbolic language of white supremacy and its relationship to Confederate monuments, without consideration of other factors. Confederate monuments surveyed by the SPLC appeared typically at a rate of two a year from 1871 to 1876 except for four in 1872, and two each in 1867, none in 1868, and one in 1869. The SPLC survey leaves gaps in the location with five on courthouse grounds, one listed as "other government grounds" and seven as "other." Future research will determine clearer definitions and define the locations to more fully compare Union monuments against Confederate monuments, while utilizing similar terminology.

The War Years
The Civil War was the first war for Americans where, in the aftermath, there was a movement to raise monuments to the local communities' contributions to the war effort. Possibly the first monument was to Confederate Col. Francis S. Bartow of the 8th Georgia Infantry Regiment who was killed commanding a brigade during the First Battle of Manassas (July 21, 1861). The "small pillar, in all respects like a milestone...erected on the spot where General Bartow fell" was built by September 1861. The Bartow monument was destroyed less than a year later in the Battle of
Second Manassas (August 29-30, 1862). The base is the only surviving reminder of the memorial. Bartow, the first high ranking Confederate killed in battle, is also memorialized with a small monument in Forsyth Park, Savannah, Georgia; and namesakes in Bartow County, Georgia; City of Bartow in Jefferson County, Georgia; City of Bartow, Florida; and an unincorporated area called Bartow, West Virginia.

An early effort for Union war monuments is to the 32nd Indiana. The monument is believed to be the oldest monument from Company F, 9th Indiana under the command of Lt. Edward Crebbin built the monument between June and October 1863. The earliest Union monument not on a battlefield is the Ladd and Whitney Memorial in Lowell, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Dedicated on June 17, 1865 to young Privates Luther Ladd and Addison Whitney, the monument is an early example to specific individuals and to enlisted soldiers. Ladd and Whitney were mill workers who joined Company D "Lowell Guards" 6th Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Upon arriving in

surviving to the memory of the war casualties. After the December 1861 Battle of Rowlett's Station in Munfordville, Kentucky, Private August Bloedner carved the memorial to mark 13 fallen members of the 32nd Indiana completing it in January 1862. It was moved to a cemetery in 1867 along with most of the remains. In 2008, it was removed for conservation and on display at the Frazier History Museum in Louisville, Kentucky.

The earliest Union monument in situ is the Hazen Brigade monument near Murfreesboro, Rutherford County, Tennessee. Named for Col. William B. Hazen of the 41st Ohio, he held the line during the Battle of Murfreesboro in December 1862. At the site of the burial of the fallen, Hazen and Col. Isaac C. B. Suman, 9th Indiana Volunteers decided there should be a monument. A detail

Baltimore, Maryland, Ladd and Whitney were among the four soldiers and 12 civilians killed by a secessionist mob on April 19, 1861. Lowell placed the Ladd and Whitney monument in a public square across from the town hall.

The above are examples of exceptions to the emergence of memorializing the war. The Northern monuments recorded in the survey work to date lists 11 examples erected before 1866 including the previously mentioned monuments. Another ten monuments were documented in 1866 with 11 more in 1867 by the time the first post-war Confederate monuments were erected in Indian Mound Cemetery in Romney, Hampshire County, West Virginia and Saint David's Cemetery in Cheraw, Cheraw County, South Carolina in 1867. Both Romney and Cheraw claim the first,
although the Cheraw dedication on July 27, 1867, was months before the Romney dedication in September 1867."

The Post-War Years and the Late Nineteenth Century Monument Movement
Union monuments first appeared in cemeteries. An early, and possibly first, example of a non-cemetery monument is in Bristolville, Trumbull County, Ohio, where a memorial was placed in a park in 1865. The earliest surveyed Union Monument in the Deep South is in Key West, Monroe County, Florida, where the Key West Navy Club erected a Union monument in Clinton Place (a park) in 1866. The Union held Key West throughout the war thanks to fast action by the local regular garrison at the outbreak of the war. This monument appears to be decades before a non-cemetery or battlefield monument appeared in the Deep South. Later, a Confederate veteran added a decorative fence around the monument."

The earliest town hall monument to general memory of the community is recorded in the survey is in Gorham, Cumberland County, Maine, placed in 1867. Of the 66 Union monuments surveyed erected from 1867 to 1876, only 18 were in cemeteries while 26 were in a park, commons, or town square with six at a city or county hall or the state capitol. Twenty-six others were undetermined locations. In the South, the Chalmette National Cemetery, on the site of the 1815 Battle of New Orleans, was dedicated with a monument in 1874. In Beaufort, South Carolina, which fell to Union hands in 1861, the Tabernacle Baptist Churchyard installed a memorial in 1876 to Robert Scott Smalls. Smalls, enslaved and a native of Beaufort, stole The Planter and with his family sailed it to the Federal Navy blockading Charleston Harbor in 1862.

Over the next decade, 1877 to 1886 (including the 20th and 25th anniversaries of the Civil War), a dozen Union monuments surveyed had unknown locations with eight erected in cemeteries. Parks, commons, and public square type of public spaces added 14 monuments with another seven built at a town, county or statehouse government grounds. A monument to the Unknown Union Dead appeared in a cemetery in Salisbury National Cemetery, Salisbury, Rowan County, North Carolina in 1877. Tennessee was split between Union and Confederate loyalties. Greeneville, Greene County, Tennessee was a Union stronghold in East Tennessee. A Union monument was placed on the town hall grounds in 1916. In May 1931, a monument to Confederate General John Hunt Morgan, who died in September 1864 in Greeneville, was dedicated. The city believes it is the only town hall that honors both sides of the war with monuments. President Andrew Johnson, Greeneville resident and Lincoln’s vice president then became president in 1865, died in 1875. In 1878, the family put a monument at his grave, now the Andrew Johnson National Cemetery in Greeneville, Tennessee.

Dual monuments appear scattered across the Border States. Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware were slave states that did not join the Confederacy although Kentucky and Missouri maintained two state governments during the war. In Vanceburg, Lewis County, Kentucky, located on the Ohio River, the Union monument was erected in 1884 noting the sentiment of "The War for the Union was Right, Everlasting Right; And the War Against the Union was Wrong, Forever Wrong." Despite sending approximately two-thirds of the state’s recruits to the Union, there are an estimated six times as many Confederate monuments than

Union monuments."

In terms of divided states, West Virginia was created in Wheeling, Ohio County when the area seceded from Virginia; West Virginia finally joined the Union in June 1863. Wheeling is located in the northern panhandle of West Virginia approximately 250 direct miles, not accounting for slow travel and mountainous terrain, from the Virginia and Confederate capital of Richmond. Ohio County is bordered on the east by Pennsylvania and Ohio on the west with Wheeling on the eastern bank of the Ohio River. In 1880, the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ monument was built at the state capitol building in Wheeling, but not dedicated until 1886.28

Twenty-six surveyed Union monuments in public spaces of parks, commons, and squares appeared in the decade of 1887 to 1896. Cemeteries were still popular sites installing 17 memorials, while the memorials on government grounds remained steady

Detail of the soldier on the Confederate monument in Union, West Virginia. Visible is the design element of a cut log; a funerary motif symbolizing a life cut short. Its use is not limited to Confederate monuments, as it appears on some World War I monuments. Author’s collection.
32, the number on government grounds such as courthouses, statehouses, and libraries more than doubled to 20. During the decade, 112 Confederate monuments were erected with 68 appearing in 1901-1905 with 21 in 1905, spiking quickly and reaching a peak between 1910 and 1915, during the 50th anniversary years.

Closing out the period of interest, World War I took a toll on the Monument Movement. The installed monuments were likely ordered before the outbreak of World War I. Ten Union memorials went up in 1917. The numbers quickly dropped to four in 1918 and one in 1919. A decline in the Confederate monuments also occurred during the same period with 11 monuments erected in 1917 and eight in 1918 with only four in 1919 and 1920.

Monumental Themes and Meanings
The survey noted the themes of the Union monuments based on the memorials’ wording. Monuments represent the loss of sailors and soldiers of the Union; however, some monuments elaborate as to the why. Common Union themes were Defenders of the Union (24), Died so the Nation Might Live (20), Preservation of the Union (16), and Preservation of the Constitution (4) which sometimes appear in combination. Most of the monuments have an infantry soldier, although variations include multiple soldiers and/or sailors, or Liberty in the form of a female classical goddess frequently holding a sword.

All Union monuments reflected the community’s loss of soldiers and/or exhibiting their contributions of men to the war effort. However, the Bristowville monument (1863) in Trumbull County Ohio, is on the only Union monument in the survey with a funeral motif depicting a “funerary urn and decorated with crossed swords, cannon and rifles.” Another in mourning Union monument is the Soldiers and Sailors monument (1870) in Clark County, Ohio where the soldier is portrayed with his gun inverted and his hands-on the gun butt known as “Rest on Arms” which is used for Funeral Honors. Both monuments are in Ohio parks.

Funeral motifs are common in Confederate monuments. The depiction of a log, cut stump, or a broken column is a funeral symbol for a life cut short. The logs may be from the influence of the Woodmen of the World. The Woodmen of the World, established in 1890, is a large fraternal benefit society that placed carved stone logs as headstones to their insured, particularly in the early years of the organization. Many Confederate monuments have an upright stump, or less often, a horizontal log behind the soldier. One question to ask is: does this represent the life cut short of the soldier or the short life of the Confederacy? (which leaves this meaning open to interpretation). A sheet over the stone is another “life cut short” or “burial” motif. A variation is the use of a Confederate battle flag, such as the Fort Sanders Monument in Knoxville, Knox County, Tennessee and at the site of Camp Beauregard in Fulton County, Kentucky.

Like Union monuments, Confederate monuments are inscribed with various meanings. The Spartanburg, South Carolina Confederate monument proclaims “teach our children’s children to honor the memory and the heroic deeds in the Southern soldier who fought for his rights granted to him under the Constitution.” This reflects on one of the South’s views that secession fulfilled the spirit of the United States Constitution. The Civil War was a build-up over time over a variety of grievances; the order and even significance of each is of academic debate, but the war was not monocausal.
Some monuments have a snippet of literature, typically part of poem indicating mourning for the losses of the conflict. These small pieces can be misunderstood in the modern contexts due to the assumed meaning, use of words from the nineteenth century and early twentieth century altering their meanings by the twenty-first century, and the lack of a broader context of the words. Many contain a poem such as the Carroll County monument (1910) in Carrollton, Georgia, which lists the words from Englishman William Collins’ 1746 poem “How Sleep the Brave.” The poem is about soldiers who made the supreme sacrifice for their country written during the War of Austrian Succession (1740-1748). The Augusta, Richmond County, Georgia monument (1878) uses wording from a poem by Philip Stanhope Worley of Oxford, England who was thinking of General Robert E. Lee. One portion of this poem etched on the Augusta monument is the line “No nation rose so white and fair.” The references to “white and fair” in Worley’s poem, which I interpret as pure and fair, again citing the interpretation of the Constitution as one of the causes of the war.

In the nineteenth century, one unanswered question was: could a state that voluntarily joined a union leave it? The Constitution did not address this, and it took a war and more than 600,000 war casualties to answer the question. Most Confederate monuments simply state variations of “Our Confederate Dead” as the main memorial with some utilizing the idiom “Lest We Forget.” The Confederate monuments, as with Union monuments, address the mourning and community loss although the former also reflects on the loss of their young nation.

Union monuments often have a variation to the community dead generalizing along the theme of “those who gave lives from (name of the community).” Later monuments, erected by the Allied Orders, memorialized the loss of the Grand Army of the Republic Posts as veterans died off and posts closed.

While no Confederate monuments appear to mention slavery in wording or image, a small number of Union monuments do. Three of the 422 (0.7%) of the surveyed Union monuments mentioned slavery. The New Bedford Monument (1866) in New Bedford, Bristol County, Massachusetts is likely the earliest citing slavery noting: “Erected by the Citizens of New Bedford in Tribute of Gratitude to her Sons who fell defending their Country in the Struggle with Slavery and Treason.” It is the only one surveyed to mention treason. New Bedford is where escaped slave Fredrick Douglass ended his journey on the Underground Railroad; later marrying a local woman.
The Grand Army of the Republic monument (1880) in the Brookdale Cemetery in Dedham, Norfolk County, Massachusetts makes a longer statement of the community's sentiments:

Erected in 1880 as a monument to the loyal soldiers and sailors of Dedham, who served in the war of the rebellion 1861-1865. Many of whom died, and rest, in unknown graves and dying broke the bondman's chain and made the slave a man.

Dedham was the home of Edmund Quincy who was an anti-slavery writer and abolitionist leader involved in the abolitionist movement since the 1830s. The 1887 Lincoln, Penobscot County, Maine monument cites "Preserved the Union/Destroyed Slavery/Maintained the Constitution." This monument was paid for by an individual rather than an organization. Charles Stinchfield of Detroit, Michigan and a native of Lincoln, Maine, paid for it in honor of his father, Jacob Stinchfield, though he never served in the war.

Union monuments, like Confederate monuments, reflect the loss in the conflict, most monuments are a standing soldier, soldiers, and sailors, or stones with wording written on them. As time progressed from the war, and cannons were retired, the monuments began to include cannons as the primary focus or in surrounding a central memorial. The North and South varied on the themes of the war. Southerners proclaimed Constitutional rights. Northern monuments considered preserving the Union, and in some cases defeating the rebellion.

Monument Marketing and Production

Companies mass-produced many of these soldier monuments. Hallowell Granite Company in Maine is noted as producing at 12 works on the Union survey. Two firms built many of the soldier monuments in Ohio. The Monumental Bronze Co. of Bridgeport, Connecticut specialized in zinc, also known as white bronze, with monuments in multiple states; however, only produced one Union monument in Connecticut. The company's original casting was done in Bridgeport, but later opened offices in Chicago, Detroit, Des Moines, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. In 1882, the company was advertising a foundry to be built "soon" in Atlanta, Georgia. Monuments to the war were not the primary business as the company widely advertised over 500 designs of grave makers in their catalog all across the United States.

The W. H. Mullins Company of Salem, Ohio supplied many Union monuments in Ohio, but also across the united nation. Their catalog of 1913, titled The Blue and the Gray, pitched monuments with examples of completed works across the North and South. The foreword states:

...the memory of men and deeds—men who gave their lives for the deeds for a cause in which they honestly believed—goes on into indefinite generations. Those now living, on each side of the civil conflict [of 50 years ago] for each knows the sounds and scenes of battle; each known the heroism of the other...the permanent memorials that of the living heroes erect, in commemoration of their deeds, and those of their fallen comrades, will withstand time and all elements."

After the foreword, the catalog shows photographs of 30 Union monuments, nine Confederate monuments, four from the Revolutionary War at Guilford Courthouse, North Carolina, and a Spanish-American War memorial. Twenty-five pages showing off the various standard figures and flat plaques available demonstrates a willingness to memorialize the North-South conflict. It also acknowledges the Monument Movement dedicated monuments to other wars and honorers.

One notable—but likely untrue—mix up of the Monument Movement involves the monuments of Kingstre, Williamsburg County, South Carolina and York, York County, Maine. Erected in 1906 for $1,929, the York Soldier's Monument Committee paid Frederick Barnicoat of Quincy, Massachusetts for a monument. The monument features a soldier with a bedroll across the shoulder and a slouch hat, features typical of Confederate soldiers. In 2017, Mike Dow of York, Maine made the case that the monument was not a Confederate, but has the features of Spanish-American War soldiers, noting that Barnicoat did many monuments. Although debate still surrounds York's memorial, it is not conclusively a Confederate, Union, or Spanish American monument.

In Kingstre, South Carolina, the city is "content with [its] handsome Yankee friend" known as the "Kingstre Yank." While the myth persists on the switch, it is commonly believed the York-Kingstre mix up is unlikely. A Massachusetts company created the York monument in 1906, and a Spartanburg, South Carolina company created Kingstre monument in 1910. However, it does not rule out a crossing in monuments elsewhere. The York-Kingstre debate illustrates the mass production of monuments and potential for mix up or misrepresentation in the soldiers portrayed.

Monuments are Community Memorials

What is clear about the Monument Movement is that it was a national movement. Specific groups of veterans, veterans' families, and monument associations in a community created the Union and Confederate monuments. These communities came together in the time of war, contributing their men and boys (and a few documented women), then they came together again to memorialize these soldiers and their contributions to the cause as they saw it. Citizens paid subscriptions to memorials, to monument associations, or taxes were issued for raising needed funds. Major organizations such as the Grand Army of the Republic, Allied Orders, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the United Confederate Veterans all lead fundraisers for monuments. Northern companies made Confederate and Union monuments crossing former lines of conflict for communities to memorialize their losses. As such, these resources are part of the cultural landscape, and should be regarded as the historical monuments.

Today community support for monuments varies due to several factors. In the 150 years since the Civil War and Reconstruction, many communities have experienced drastic demographic, generational and social change. This fluid population's opinion is mixed on preserving monuments of the past, moving monuments to new locations, adding monuments to other histories, or putting new interpretation in place. This debate is sometimes racial, and sometimes about differing concepts of the role of history in local communities. The lines are often drawn between those that wish to retain honors of the past for the community, and those that want to redefine the community with contemporary or different views of the community and/or history. Much of the most recent research focus is on Confederate monuments and their possible meanings. The same attention is
This chart graphs the number of monuments identified to date. The top (blue) is the Union monuments with the Confederate monuments on the bottom (red) for comparison, based on the years the memorials were erected. It is the author’s opinion that while the Southern Poverty Law Center source for the Confederate monuments is relatively complete, more Union monuments will be added with further research. The major organizations commissioning monuments in the post-war period are identified with creation dates along with the anniversaries of the Civil War.

lacking for Union monuments. Union monument resources are mostly a listing and local histories of the memorial containing no context to the larger historical picture. This work is a beginning towards a deeper understanding of Confederate and Union monuments and how they fit into the national post-war Monument Movement.

Ernest Everett Blevins works as a structural historian in Review & Compliance at the West Virginia State Historic Preservation Office and consults outside of West Virginia under Blevins Historical Research. He is a member of the Sons of Confederate Veterans and the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War. In 2009 his interest grew in Confederate and Union monuments while participating in the 100th anniversary of the Carroll County Monument. In 2010, he researched and produced a video “Always Looking North” (shown at the Dixie Film Festival in Athens, Georgia and on YouTube), and a brochure. He writes a regular history-oriented column for the Charleston (WV) Gazette-Mail. Ernest lives with his wife, Lisa, and their six children in Charleston, West Virginia.

Notes
1. Such examples include the Lincoln Highway: the first transcontinental highway (designed in 1913). Further South, the Bankhead Highway (laid out from 1916 to 1920) was the second transcontinental highway, and the first all-weather highway. It is named after Confederate Veteran and father of the Good Roads Movement, John Hollis Bankhead. This area of study also includes the pre-1925 highway names of Lee, Dixie, Jefferson Davis, GAR (Grand Army of the Republic), and Blue-Gray Highway. In 1925, modern U.S. highway numbers were used to designate routes.
2. The Allied Orders are the ladies organizations of Auxiliary to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Woman’s Relief Corps, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, and the successor of the GAR, the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.
4. From the SPLC database of 1,875 Confederate memorials of all types (physical, names, songs, license tags, etc.), I reduced the selection to focus on 834 recorded monuments. This list further
was reduced to end in 1920 leaving 487 physical monuments. The Union monument survey consisted of 700 sites which included buildings during the early work. The list was then reduced to 628 monuments of which 422 were dated to before 1920. For the analysis, monuments without a date were removed, though future research may date these to the period in question. It should be noted that both lists should not be considered complete. It is believed the sampling covering North, Border, and Southern States is sufficient to begin drawing conclusions about the post-war Monument Movement. Ninety-five Union monuments have no date or an accurate date. Sixty Confederate monuments have no date.


7. The war from the secession of South Carolina in 1860 to the cessation of hostilities in mid-1865 is known by many names including, but not limited to, the War Between the States, Civil War, War of the Rebellion, War of Northern Aggression, and the Confederate War. Depending on one's view of the war, its origins, or side of the conflict, the names of the conflict will vary. Some monuments reflect various names for the war.


10. "Bartow was a colonel leading a regiment, typically the position of a Brigadier General. No paperwork for rank advancement is known to exist. It is possible that if he survived, he might have received a promotion.


16. For this study, Union and Confederate Monuments were counted and analyzed from the war years to the end of World War I. The Union monuments list was created by the author from various resources including, but not limited to, the national and division monument databases of the Sons of Union Veterans, Historical Marker Data Base (HMDB.org), State of Maine (maine.gov/civilwar/monuments), Massachusetts Civil War Monuments (macivilwarmonuments.com), and personal visits to monuments in West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Michigan, and Ohio. The Southern list is from the Southern Poverty Law Center’s Whose Heritage? (May 2019 update) plus personal visits.


19. Some data sources are better than others in including dates or locations of the monuments. Continuing research may change these unknown factors though verification with site visits or new data.


24. The East Tennessee region was divided to the point wherein 1861 Gay Street in Knoxville had two recruitments. One end of the street was Union and the other end Confederate. This is depicted by Samuel Bell Palmer in his sketchbook, see archive.knoxnews.com/news/local/sketch-depicts-gay-street-rife-with-divided-civil-war-sentiments-ep-409175872-357935191.html/ (accessed July 22, 2019)

Mountaineer Monument (U.S.), Soldiers and Sailors (U.S.), and “Lincoln Walks at Midnight” all occupy the West Virginia Capitol grounds.


31. Just before the war Lt. Col. William Hardee wrote the “manual of Arms” for the United States. The manual used in the war, sometimes modified for the Union army, was written by Lt. Col. Hardee who joined the Confederacy in 1861. The “Rest on Arms” is shown in several versions including An Officer of the 1st Regiment Virginia Volunteers, Volunteers Handbook Containing an Abridgment of Hardee’s Infantry Tactics, Richmond, Virginia: Wasp & Johnson, 1860: 31. (“Reverse Arms” is specified in “Honour’s Parades,” paragraphs 262-289 of the “Regulations for the Army of the Confederate States” (1864)).


34. Of the many causes in broad terms and alphabetical order are Constitutional interpretation, cultural differences, economy, labor system, slaves, states’ rights, tariffs/taxes to name some. Even aspects of these such as labor systems/slaves/economy could list with slavery under labor systems or under economy, or as a topic itself.


45. Ibid.


Elisabet Ney, *Sketch of Memorial*, c. 1902. Courtesy University of Texas at Austin.
Sculptor Elisabet Ney
THE ALBERT SIDNEY JOHNSTON MEMORIAL

Jacquelyn Delin McDonald

At least one Confederate memorial has thus far eluded the swirling national debate of honoring slavery's defenders, partly because of the superior aesthetic nature of its creator—sculptor Elisabet Ney. Today, Albert Sidney Johnston is remembered primarily for his ties with the Confederacy, as he was the highest-ranking official to die on either side during the Civil War. He was born in Kentucky, attended West Point and was a life-long military man. Johnston served as a general for the Texian Army in the war for Texas independence; the United States Army during the Mexican-American War and the Utah War; and for the Confederate Army in the Civil War. He died at the Battle of Shiloh on April 6, 1862 in southwest Tennessee. He was initially buried in New Orleans but his remains were exhumed and moved to the Texas State Cemetery in 1867, as he ante mortem requested. It was not until 1902 that a memorial was commissioned to aggrandize his grave site, a product of the determination of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. If we study the Albert Sidney Johnston memorial outside of the politics of its subject matter, considering primarily the aesthetic merit of Elisabet Ney, it serves as a telling case study divulging unique circumstances of female patronage. By examining the Johnston memorial and its layered history, discussion over the value of this work becomes quite complex.

The German-American sculptor Elisabet(h) Ney (1833-1907) attended the Munich Academy of Fine Arts as its first female sculpture student, and later worked under the famed Christian Daniel Rauch at the Berlin School of Sculpture. She gained recognition in Europe sculpting "great persons" such as Giuseppe Garibaldi, Arthur Schopenhauer, Otto von Bismarck, and Ludwig II. And what is extraordinary or 'außergerjamäahlich' is that Ney would also establish herself in Texas sculpting "the wildest of men" including Sam Houston and Stephen F. Austin. Although it took a bit more effort for an aging, nonconformist woman to gain the favor of Texans. Ney eschewed conventional women's fashions, cut her hair short, and despite living with her husband, Edmund Montgomery, publicly denied their relationship referring to herself simply as "Miss Ney." Yet, by the time of her death, she was revered as a local celebrity who produced some of the finest sculpture in Texas history.

Throughout the nineteenth century, many Germans emigrated to America and particularly, Texas, for various reasons including politics, fear of overpopulation, "Wanderlust," utopian ideals and economic opportunity. The Ney-Montgomerys emigrated to Thomasville, Georgia in 1871 in hopes of a utopian life, and later settled in Hempstead, Texas due to the desirable climate for Edmund's consumption. Ney would take a hiatus from sculpture to tend to her growing family and the demands of postbellum plantation living. However, in 1882, Ney would strive to regain recognition and sought sculpture commissions, but from a very different clientele. In order to showcase her talents as well as to interject her grander ideas for the Texas State Capitol, she produced a bust of the Texas Governor Oran Roberts.

Ney's efforts were returned in 1892 when President Benedette Tobin of the Women's World's Fair Exhibit Association asked Roberts his suggestions for artists to represent the Lone Star State at the 1893 Columbian World's Exposition. Arguably, due to her rapport with Roberts, Ney earned the commission for statues of Texas legends Sam Houston and Stephen F. Austin. Today, marble copies of the figures are housed prominently in the Texas State Capitol as well as the United States Capitol. Significantly, Ney's relationship with Tobin did not cease after the Columbian Exposition. Tobin became an advocate for the artist within other groups, including the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Thanks to her 1892 commission, Ney became acquainted with the local women of Austin interested in the nascent arts and culture scene in Texas, and her sculpting career ascended once again.

In the fall 1901, Elisabet Ney received word of the state's plan to build a monument honoring Albert Sidney Johnston. At the time, Ney was working on a bust of then-governor, Joseph Sayers, and expressed her interest in receiving the commission. Governor Sayers warned Ney that often Texans would rather pay for a larger monument than a well-executed work. Still, Ney tried to enlighten him on the dangers of artist competitions, as they often result with committees choosing the cheapest option rather than trusting the merits of artists. She also voiced her sentiments in a letter to her friend Ella Dibrell: "the greatest American sculptor, St. Gaudens, was never known to enter such competitions; nor had I ever done so..." Augustus Saint-Gaudens and Ney both attended well-established European sculpture academies, and stood on firm ground on this point. Additionally, when Ney learned that the

Elisabet Ney at the finished Albert Sidney Johnston Memorial, c. 1905. Courtesy Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin.
sculpture committee would perhaps consider Frank Teich, she disparaged his work stating in a letter she would hate "to see once more so much money go to a contractor instead of some artist."  

Despite the governor’s warnings and eager to be selected for the $10,000 commission, Ney began to prepare for the monument committee’s meeting in the Spring of 1902. After completing her plaster bust of the Confederate general in Fall 1901, she created mock-up sketches of the monument during the winter of 1901-02. Along with Governor Sayers, the current president of the Texas Division of the UDC also sat on the committee. The UDC was allowed an opinion on the matter, as the monument commission was awarded by the state because of determined lobbying by the women’s association. Following the tenure of Benedette Tobin, newly elected president, Adelia Dunovant, served on the committee for the Johnston monument. And from January to June 1902, there was extensive correspondence between Ney, Sayers, and Dunovant discussing the proposed monument. 

The initial clay sketches of the recumbent statue were of a different quality than a typical tomb effigy. Ney proposed to the committee a realistic version that presented Johnston as he would have appeared right after his battlefield death, carried off on a stretcher and in uniform. This presentation of the war hero was appealing since it emphasized his sacrifice to the Confederate cause. Also, Saskia Johann makes the argument that perhaps Ney dressed Johnston in contemporary clothing to "...allow for better identification and recognition for the untrained art audience in Texas." However, problems arose with Ney’s idea, as she preferred marble and it would require a covering. Governor Sayers suggested an imposing replica of the Alamo, perhaps a nod to Johnston’s role in the Texian army. But Ney was adamantly against this proposition, as Johnston did not die at the Battle of the Alamo, nor was he even in attendance. She argued that the public would perhaps be confused, as she stated in a letter, "Might it not be misleading to the beholder?" Ney’s ingenious solution was to house the work within a Gothic-style canopy, which could be likened to a chapel. In order to instill a sense of solemnity the sculpture, to "...mortals should be a most impressive, awe-inspiring sight." Further, Ney’s idea allows visitors to see the sculpture from all angles, yet protects the work from the harsh Texas elements. On September 16, 1902, an agreement was reached to award the commission to Ney, and the contract for the tomb monument of Albert Sidney Johnston was signed by all parties. 

This work should be considered in a transnational context due to both its aesthetics and its maker. Ney’s preliminary sketch of the iron-work covering for the sculpture is similar to a barrel vault design. But as we can see with the final result, the aesthetic of the Gothic-inspired baldacchino is more in-tune with the principles of the medieval style. It is interesting to compare this canopy structure to the architecture of the Cathedral of Münster, as Ney was born in the Westphalian town. We can definitely note similarities between the exteriors of the Gothic cathedral to the Johnston piece. Distinguishing the Johnston memorial is the prominent Texas Lone Star emblazoned on either end. Also, the final version is devoid of any cross-like designs, perhaps to welcome viewers of any creed. The roof is pointed, as well as the surrounding gates, which are topped with blade-like shapes. On the edges of roof and pediment are quatrefoils, trefoils and crenellation-like designs. Similar designs are found on the exterior of the Münster Cathedral, but also at the Babelsberg Schloss, located outside of Berlin in Potsdam. If we compare the exterior of the palace to the Johnston covering there is also an convincing resemblance, especially in regards to the ornamental design of the spires." Johann presents another plausible theory for the inspiration of the design, noting similarities between Ney’s sketch and the baldacchino of the tomb monument for Queen Louise in Gransee constructed by Karl Friedrich Schinkel in 1816. Both are of the Gothic Revival style, however, the Gransee canopy is much simpler in its embellishments. Regardless, each of these instances situate Ney’s aesthetic vision within a distinctive transnational
context.

If we take a closer look at the sculpture of Johnston, we see the general with his eyes closed, seemingly at peace after his final battle. The facial features are similar to the earlier bust Ney produced. Johnston is portrayed with a broad forehead, deep-set eyes, high cheekbones and smooth chin. The fine texture of the marble allows for exquisite detailing, even in his carved mustache. Ney, as a student of Rauch, was a skilled portraitist and worked to produce a sharp likeness of her sitters. Ney studied photographs and drawings of Johnston for her work, and she also likely wrote to surviving family members in order to render a most accurate portrayal. He is shown in uniform with one hand over his chest and the other by his side. Each of his large, lifeless hands are rendered with an exceptional attention to detail, which speak to the military power of the man, yet communicate the recent fate of the avid fighter. As is fitting, he is depicted wearing boots, which can be seen slightly peeking out from beneath the shroud covering his lower half. Below the stretcher that bears Johnston, Ney carved overgrown grass in a gestural manner, providing just enough of a narrative element to situate Johnston’s death. The covering, Ney argued, would have to be something readily available on the battlefield, so in effect he is covered with a Confederate flag. On one side of the sculpture, we can make out the broken pole still connected to the flag, included to provide a dynamic splicing of the form. Close inspection reveals that the flag is slightly incised with the Confederate southern cross design.

Interestingly, another prop was strongly suggested for the work by the Johnston Monument Committee. Dunovant would prove to be quite a nuisance for Ney, as she pushed strongly for the General to be holding a copy of the Constitution over his chest. President Dunovant stated that she considered it necessary as “As I died for the constitution...” and “...this ought to be seen.” Ney was abhorrent against the idea, as it threatened her attempts at Realism. Ney wrote a letter in rebuttal to Dunovant that the inclusion of the Constitution prop would allow “Sentiment [to] surmount ‘artistic-logic, artistic harmony.” Ney suggested instead that an inscription be made on the granite base to express such sentiments. Ultimately, the scroll was not included in the final version, so obviously Ney was able to negotiate out the issue with other committee members. The sculptor’s attention to detail as well as her placement and select inclusion of battle props allow for the sculpture not only to serve as a tomb marker that conveys the likeness of the deceased, it also produces a scene of a dignified battlefield death.

Studying the plaster copy of the final work further reveals the artist’s attempts toward Realism. Today, it is housed in the Elisabet Ney Museum in Austin, and is available to view from a much shorter and unguarded distance. For a brief time the Texas Division of the UDC held the plaster copy in their art collection and painted the work to mimic the look of bronze. Undeniably, the overall aesthetic of the grand tomb memorial was destined to be in marble, as its effectual power is nothing short of grandiose. From the “bronze” copy, we can view more clearly the detailing of Johnston’s coat, hands, and the Confederate flag. The differing vegetation beneath the litter is quite interesting to see as well. Arguably, if the statue were not placed upon a pedestal, it would allow for a natural transition from the sculptural form to grass typically surrounding cemetery steles. Significantly, just before the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904, Ney was able to travel to Europe to have the plaster study cut in marble. She submitted the finished marble version and it was selected for exhibition and also awarded a bronze medal. Perhaps this is because the lifelike, yet harmonious sculpture challenged the traditional tropes of recumbent statues, and also aimed to engage the viewer in the moment of most gravity—death.

Broadly speaking, Confederate monuments vary in artistic value. Whether created during the long nineteenth century or the Jim Crow era, the quality of the sculpture output ranges from fine to grotesque. Still, in the particular case of Elisabet Ney’s large memorial to Albert Sidney Johnston, there is more to consider than the sound aesthetics of the work itself. Many statues of Johnston, along with other Confederates leaders, have recently been removed due to the growing awareness of various communities, as “Lost Cause” ideologies are being divested and overturned. In 2015, three Confederate statues, including one of Johnston, were removed from the Campus Mall at the University of Texas in Austin, following the recommendation of a university task force. The committee considered the various options when dealing with such historically-loaded public monuments and ultimately decided to remove the statues to protect the morale of its diverse and politically-aware campus. A similar gesture was conducted earlier this year in Dallas, when officials decided to
remove statues from Pioneer Park created by Frank Teich in 1896. The cost of removal will be a steep $480,000.

Undoubtedly, the Johnston Memorial is filled with Southern biases due to the Confederate subject, with details such as the Confederate flag covering part of his body, and the “Lost Cause” inscription on the pedestal, which reads, Albert Sidney Johnston “...fell at Shiloh...while in command of the Confederate Forces in defence of the right of self government and of the Constitution.” But outside of the subject matter, this monument provides a rare example of female-to-female patronage. Elisabeth Ney was able to achieve a level of success in Texas and win commissions because of her relationships with various women’s groups, including the Women’s World’s Fair Exhibit Association and the United Daughters of the Confederacy. These women would advocate for Ney even after her death in 1907, and established the Texas Fine Arts Association to ensure her legacy at her Austin studio, Formosa. Arguably, Ney herself was an extraordinary figure, who built a career as a sculptor on not one but the other in limited agency and much criticism. However, the various women involved in philanthropic work had unique, albeit limited, influence to foster the preservation of their locale’s arts and culture, and their efforts should be noted as well. In this way, the Johnston Memorial is layered with multiple narratives that complicate its reception.

Ney’s effigy sculpture of Johnston was well-received and recognized at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904. Today, the marble version in the Texas State Cemetery with its accompanying mini-chapel provide a texturally dense sacred space. Ney’s rendering of the figure is done in a realistic manner that effectively engages the viewer to contemplate the solemnity of the general’s last moments. The included props allow for a balance of form and add to the holistic program of the her work. Viewers can only gaze at the organic forms of the marble statue through the contrasting Gothic-style metal gates, which allow for the entire work to be suspended in a sphere of reverence. We can undoubtedly say that the Johnston Memorial is one of Elisabeth Ney’s greatest works, a highlight of her transnational career. And due to the fact that this memorial is a grave marker, positioned above the body of Johnston, this artwork, aesthetically pleasing or otherwise, arguably should remain in situ because of the sanctity of its location. Further, in her recent presentation Dr. Caterina Pierre discussed Ney’s Johnston Memorial as an example of how graveyards function as heterotopic spaces. Pierre’s latest research concerning large grave sculptures further supports my reasoning, especially in considering the cemetery space as suspended and subject to differing cultural norms.

But the decisions regarding the fates of other Confederate statues remain precarious with various options ranging from keeping the works with more explanatory text, relocating the statues to a local museum, or even to a storage facility to shield these symbols of “ugly history” from the public. Admittedly, as an art historian, the aesthetics of the differing Confederate monuments as well as the potential historical significance of the commissions influence my opinion of what to do with these works of objectionable subject matter. And yet, also as an art historian, I realize the uncanny power of visual imagery, which is often armed with prejudicial historical and ideological tropes. Ultimately, in each instance, the decision must be left to the people in each community.

Jacquelyn Delin McDonald is currently a Ph.D. candidate of Aesthetic Studies at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her dissertation topic is titled "Modeling Fame: a Closer Look at the Work of Sculptor Elisabeth Ney" and considers the lesser-known transnational artist’s work through varying analyses. Trained in art history, her research focuses on art from German-speaking countries, American art, and the spread of feminist ideologies during the long nineteenth century. She currently holds a Capitol Research Fellowship with the United States Capitol Historical Society as well as a Graduate Research Fellowship with the Edith O’Donnell Institute of Art History at UT Dallas.

For further reading


Notes

1. "He was shot in the leg by a bullet that severed an artery, causing him to bleed to death almost before he realized he had been wounded." James M. McPherson, Battle Cry of Freedom the Civil War Era (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 410.

2. "He was known to have preferred burial in Texas; to his brother-in-law, William Preston, he once said, "When I die, I want a handful of Texas earth on my breast." In the fall of 1866, after obtaining the approval of Johnston's family, the Texas Legislature resolved to bring Johnston's body to Austin for interment." Charles P. Roland, and Gary W. Gallagher, Albert Sidney Johnston: Soldier of Three Republics (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001), 353.


5. While many Germans wished for Texas to become the new German state, the Ney-Montgomerys were not social with their compatriots and mainly kept to themselves. For more info: I. K. Stephens, The Hermits of Llano, (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1951).


8. "Then on 2 October 1901, while Ney was modeling Sayer's bust, the state legislature finally passed on appropriation of $10,000 for a Johnston memorial." Emily Cutrer, The Art of the Woman, 187.

9. Perhaps, this is the dawn of the saying "everything bigger is better in Texas."


11. Elisabet Ney to Ella Dibrell, October 11, 1901. Johann, 112.


13. Elisabet Ney to Ella Dibrell, October 29, 1901, Harry Ransom Center, Elisabet Ney Collection, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas. Johann, 613.

14. Johann, 612, 615. The original wax or clay statue model has since perished.

15. Cutrer, 188.

16. Various letters of correspondence between Elisabet Ney and Adele Dunovant are held at the Texas State Archives in Austin, Texas and The De Zavala Collection at the Briscoe Center for American History, Austin, Texas. Letters between Ney and Joseph Sayers are also at the Texas State Archives as well as the Elisabet Ney Museum Archives in Austin, Texas.

17. "So ist General Albert Sidney Johnston nicht heroisch mit unbekleidetem Büstenkorpus dargestellt, sondern trägt seine Uniform der Konföderierten Armee...Sie sind in zeitgenössischer Mode oder in ihrer Funktion entsprechenden Kleidungen wie Talar und Robe wiedergegeben, was eine zeitliche Verortung der Person gewährleistet und für das noch ungeschulte Kunstpublikum in Texas eine bessere Identifikation und Wiedererkennbarkeit ermöglichte." Johann, 147.


21. While there is no direct evidence that Ney visited the Babelsberg Schloss in person, it is very likely. An enlarged limestone replica of her Bulldogge sculpture was placed in the1890s to decorate and guard the Babelsberg Schloss gardens. Sibylle Einholz, "Elisabet Ney und die Berliner Bildhauerschule," in Herrin Ihrer Kunst, Elisabet Ney, Bildhauerin in Europa und Amerika, edited by Barbara Rommel (Münster: Wienand Verlag, 2008) 74-81. Johann, 103.

22. Similarly, Johann is unable to say with certainty whether Ney was familiar with this structure.

23. While there is no archival evidence that Ney contacted Johnston's relatives, I believe this is very plausible. She did this kind of detective work for her sculptures of Sam Houston and Stephen F. Austin.

24. In a letter to Governor Sayers, Ney mentions specific comments Adela Dunovant made during her recent visit to the artist's studio. Elisabet Ney to Joseph Sayers, no date, Sayers Collection, Texas State Archive. Cutrer, 189.

25. Elisabet Ney to Adelia Dunovant, May 2, 1902, The Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

26. Elisabet Ney to Adelia Dunovant, May 2, 1902.

27. Elisabet Ney Museum Archives, Austin, Texas. Object File, Albert Sidney Johnston, 192X.08.837. Notes that UDC member, painted the plaster copy a bronze tone by a Mrs. Lambe around 1915.


31. Frank Teich was previously mentioned, as the 'sculptor' that Elisabet Ney warned Governor Sayers about, claiming her rival was a mere "modeler." Her point is evident if we compare her works to those by Teich.


Preservation Diary

The New Study Gallery at Chesterwood

Donna Hassler and Dana Pilson

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the opening of Chesterwood as a site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. It is the only artist's home and studio in the portfolio of 28 historic sites of the National Trust which distinguishes itself, past and present, as a site of creativity and inspiration for one of America's foremost public sculptors, Daniel Chester French (1850-1931). French is best known for the "bookends" of his career: Minute Man (1875, Concord, M.A.), and the seated figure of Abraham Lincoln for the Lincoln Memorial (1922, Washington, D.C.). In addition to these distinguished works, during his prolific career French created more than 100 public sculptures located throughout the country and in Paris, France. Many of these works were modeled in his studio at Chesterwood before they were cast in bronze at a foundry or carved into marble by the Piccirilli brothers, Italian artisans who operated a studio in the Bronx, New York. The new biography, Monument Man: The Life and Art of Daniel Chester French by Harold Holzer, reviewed in this issue of Nineteenth Century magazine, includes a detailed geographical listing of the sculptor's public monuments and memorials, published for the first time.

Daniel Chester French and his wife, Mary Adams French, had purchased the Chesterwood property in 1896. The following year French enlisted the architect Henry Bacon (1866-1924) to design a purpose-built studio, with north-facing skylights and a 26-foot-high ceiling. When the original house on the property soon proved too cramped, Bacon designed a new English Georgian/colonial revival-style Residence for the family. French, his wife, and their daughter Margaret (born in Concord, MA, in 1889 and known as "Peggy") lived in New York City during the winter and spent idyllic summers in Stockbridge. French divided his time between tending the gardens and sculpting in the studio, often employing his daughter as a model. Mary entertained callers at weekly "at home" teas on the studio piazza.

As a young adult, Margaret French was at the center of the Stockbridge social scene. She had debuted in New York in 1909, and throngs of young people from the city traveled to Chesterwood for weekends and extended stays. She entertained magnificently: during the day her guests played tennis and croquet, frolicked on the lawn, and enjoyed picnics and tea parties. Evenings were filled with revelry: charades and masquerades in the Studio, wine tastings and dinner parties, and late nights in the garden, lit by Japanese lanterns. In 1921, Margaret French married the Philadelphia-born William Penn Cresson (1873-1932) in Taormina, Italy. An architect, diplomat, lawyer, professor, and writer, "Penn" Cresson helped her recover from severe depression brought on by personal losses during World War I. The couple spent summers at the Dormouse, a small cottage down the road from Chesterwood. Having lost a child at birth in 1922, Margaret French Cresson turned her focus to involvement in the Stockbridge community and her own sculpting career. A talented sculptor in her own right, she achieved recognition for her charming bas-reliefs of children and realistic likenesses of artists, actors, and Stockbridge luminaries. She also received important commissions for memorial tablets and portraits, including James Monroe (1926, James Monroe Memorial Library, Fredericksburg, V.A.) and Admiral Richard Evelyn Byrd (1928, bronze, formerly Corcoran Gallery, now in the Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery, Washington, D.C.).
French died at Chesterwood in October, 1931, and Penn died a year later, in 1932. After Mary French’s death in 1939, Margaret French Cresson inherited the house, studio, and all of the contents. She continued to spend summers in the Berkshires, but soon began to take in boarders. She leased the main residence and other buildings on the property to help pay the bills for maintaining the services of a caretaker and household staff. At one point, she told the caretaker not to buy any seeds to plant in the formal gardens, for she would later purchase the flowers if needed.

After she inherited Chesterwood, Margaret French Cresson mainly worked towards preserving her father’s artistic legacy. She wrote a biography of Daniel Chester French, *Journey into Fame* (1947, Harvard University Press) and published numerous magazine and newspaper articles about his work. She amassed a collection of French’s small preparatory studies and larger working models that had been languishing in museum basements and foundries. In 1954, she took the first step in the establishment of Chesterwood as a museum by donating the studio and eighteen acres to the Trustees of Reservations, a private, Massachusetts-based conservation and preservation group. Based on a mutual decision with the Trustees, in 1962 Margaret French Cresson decided to transfer ownership of the Chesterwood to the newly-created Daniel Chester French Foundation. In 1968, Margaret French Cresson and the Foundation ceded the property (except the residence, to which she retained life rights) to the National Trust for Historic Preservation as a memorial to Daniel Chester French and the classic period of sculpture in the United States. After her death in 1973, the residence was also transferred to the National Trust.

Thanks to a generous grant from the Henry Luce Foundation, a former resource room and storage facility in an original carriage barn has been transformed into a climate-controlled exhibition gallery. It features approximately 150 rarely exhibited objects from Chesterwood’s collection, including paintings; completed works in plaster, marble and bronze; and sketches, maquettes, and models created as preliminary studies for larger public commissions. As part of the Luce Foundation grant Monica Berry, Art Conservator, conserved many of the objects slated to be included in the new gallery. Jeff Daly of Jeff Daly Design designed the exhibition space and Anita Jorgensen of Anita Jorgensen Lighting Design created the lighting design.

The exhibition illuminates the development of Daniel Chester French’s work and provides a window into the artist’s working methods, techniques and creative processes. Works are presented in chronological order, beginning with highlights from the first half of Daniel Chester French’s career, including two plaster, neoclassical-style portrait reliefs of French’s older sisters,
Harriette "Hattie" Van Mater French (1870) and Sarah "Sallie" Flagg French (1869); a bronze reduction of the Minute Man, (1875, Minute Man National Historical Park, Concord, M.A.); maquettes of Architecture and Painting and Sculpture (1896-97, Richard Morris Hunt Memorial, N.Y.); two different bronze casts of the head of Mourning Victory from the Melvin Memorial (1907, Sleepy Hollow Cemetery, Concord, M.A.); and a bronze working model of the standing figure of Abraham Lincoln for the Nebraska State Capital (1910, Lincoln, N.E.). The exhibition continues around the room featuring works from the second half of the artist's career and includes the bronze working models of the First Division Memorial (1923, Washington, D.C.) and the Spirit of Life for the Spencer Trask Memorial (1922, Congress Park, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.); and plaster working models for the Manhattan Bridge groups (1914, final works now at the Brooklyn Museum, N.Y.). Placed among these works are lesser known plaster studies, small bronzes, and reliefs that invite exploration and add depth to the illustrated history of French's productive career in his New York and Chesterwood studios.

Oil paintings are arrayed along one wall of the gallery. It may come as a surprise to see that Daniel Chester French was just as talented with a brush and paint as he was with a modeling tool and clay. His masterful oil portraits of his daughter, Margaret and niece, Dorothy Schoonmaker (1890-1984), have never been exhibited. Also featured are works by French's artist friends, including portraits of French and his daughter by the American Impressionist Robert Vonnah (1858-1933). Highlights in this section also include French's sculpted portrait busts in plaster and marble of family and friends, beginning with one of his earliest portraits of his father, Henry Flagg French (1813-1885). Also included is a depiction of Margaret as a Bacchante (1907) by French's only female assistant and longtime confidante, Evelyn Beatrice Longman (1874-1954). Nearby is Margaret French Cresson's portrait of her husband in uniform, created shortly after their marriage. Chesterwood holds a large collection of Margaret French Cresson's work, including portrait busts and reliefs in plaster, bronze, and marble. Plans are underway to exhibit more of her sculpture in the studio and residence in the near future.

The Gallery features a portrait of Daniel Chester French by John C. Johansen (1876-1964). The sculptor is portrayed next to his plaster model of Sky, one of the allegorical figures from the Admiral Samuel F. DuPont Memorial (1921, Washington, D.C.).

The full-size plaster model of French's last work and unknown masterpiece, Andromeda (1929-30) occupies the central exhibition case. While the final marble Andromeda in the Chesterwood studio might be well-known to the frequent visitor to Chesterwood, this cast is closer to the hand of the artist, showing the sculptor’s tool marks as he worked the surface of the plaster. In the case at the end of the right/east wall, earlier models for Andromeda illustrate French's progress from his initial
conception of a popular nineteenth century academic subject to a more developed large-scale version. Clearly visible on the full-size plaster are “pointing marks”—small x’s and dots—drawn by the Piccirilli brothers, who skillfully transferred French’s design into stone. They were the talented family who carved the twenty-eight blocks of marble for the sculptor’s iconic nineteen-foot seated figure of Abraham Lincoln for the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. While Chesterwood’s Barn Gallery permanent installation entitled, Daniel Chester French: Sculpting an

American Vision offers an overview of the artist’s career, the new study gallery presents a chance for in-depth, up-close examination of French’s maquettes, models, and finished works. The Chesterwood site, which includes the Barn Gallery display, the new study gallery, and the residence, studio, and gardens, allows visitors an extraordinary look at the career, family, and lifestyle of one of the country’s most important sculptors.

Donna Hassler is the Executive Director of Chesterwood, a Site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. She is also the Administrator of the Historic Artists’ Homes and Studios program of the National Trust. An art historian and museum professional, Hassler is a noted authority on American sculpture and is co-author of American Sculpture in The Metropolitan Museum of Art (Vols. 1-2).

Dana Pilson has been working on curatorial projects at Chesterwood since 2011. She researched the history of Daniel Chester French’s studio and residence, and she has assisted with the organization of various exhibitions, including From the Minute Man to the Lincoln Memorial: The Timeless Sculpture of Daniel Chester French. Prior to relocating to the Berkshires, she was a research assistant in the American Paintings and Sculpture Department at The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Chesterwood is the former summer home, studio, and gardens of Daniel Chester French, one of America’s foremost public sculptors, and is a site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Stockbridge, Massachusetts. The new collections gallery is funded through generous support from The Henry Luce Foundation in New York.
Current Research

Paul Wayland Bartlett’s *Lafayette on Horseback*

Laura A. Macaluso

At a banquet held in Metz, France on August 21, 1920, a group of dignitaries and members of the Chevaliers de Colomb d’Amérique—known in the United States as the Knights of Columbus, the world’s largest Catholic fraternal organization—gathered to eat “Potage K. of C.,” “Saumon du Rhin à la Maréchal Foch” and “Poularde en Chaud-froid Lafayette.” The dinner finished with fruits, a “Bombe Washington” and Champagne. The Knights were on pilgrimage in France and their primary object of devotion was the dedication of a new memorial, Lafayette on Horseback, commissioned of sculptor Paul Wayland Bartlett as a “gift...an enduring pledge that America is still mindful of our ancient friendship, and also that America never forgets.” 237 Knights and their hosts were in this small, historic town located at the confluence of the Moselle and Seille rivers, in the northeast corner of France not far from the German border. The location and the purpose for the visit were intentional—Metz was the place where the Franco-American “ancient friendship” was to become symbolized in a bronze monument of Lafayette.

Together, the Americans and the French had much to celebrate. In November 1918 and June of 1919 the Armistice and the Peace Treaty of Versailles had closed out a disastrous four plus years of war, most of it on the ground in France. For the moment, Europe was calm and Metz was safe. The French were rebuilding and remembering the more than 1.3 million people killed during World War I, while the Americans were marking their own losses of more than 116,000, but also a renewed friendship with France. For the first time, Americans were also commemorating their contributions to a global war. Metz held great significance, for it was here that Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, the Marquis de Lafayette, left his country to assist George Washington and the American Revolution. In return, the words “Lafayette, nous voilà!” (Lafayette, we are here!) were among the first utterances by the American Expeditionary Force when landing in France in 1917. Metz was also the town where Marshal Ferdinand Foch (1851–1929), the Supreme Allied Commander who helped guide the very green doughboy American army, had spent his youth in a Jesuit school. Metz was staunchly Catholic, and had survived forty years of Protestant German occupation after the Franco-Prussian War. The Knights came to see Metz as a special locale for the display of patriotism through the lens of Roman Catholicism. The commissioning of Bartlett’s *Lafayette on Horseback* thus took on multiple roles by becoming the centerpiece for a pilgrimage route to honor the war-time dead, as well as reinforce Franco-American relations and a shared faith.

Fast forward 100 years to the centennial of World War I (2014–2018), when both Allied and Axis countries marked the remembrance of the transformational war with conferences, lectures, exhibits, and the production of more monuments. In October of 2017, dignitaries and the public assembled in Versailles, France to witness the dedication of two monumental sculptures in resin: one of General John J. Pershing by Joachim Costa (1888–1971) and another version of Bartlett’s *Lafayette on Horseback*. Both monuments were commissioned and the bases completed in the aftermath of World War I, but their pedestals had...
remained empty this entire time. What the twenty-first century celebrants seemed not to know is that this newest installation of Paul Wayland Bartlett’s Lafayette on Horseback was originally conceived as a gift to the French people many years before the Great War appeared on the horizon and many years before the Knights of Columbus commissioned their own Lafayette monument for Metz.

First erected in the courtyard of the Louvre in 1908 under commission from the Daughters of the American Revolution, Bartlett’s Lafayette on Horseback was paid for by American schoolchildren through a pennies campaign to celebrate Franco-American friendship. The 1908 Lafayette on Horseback was intended as a reciprocal gift in honor of the tremendous Statue of Liberty. The Knights of Columbus’ 1920 Lafayette on Horseback in Metz added to the story by taking on added meaning for Roman Catholics and for survivors of a world war. But Europe was not to remain at peace, and less than twenty years later, this second installation of Bartlett’s Lafayette on Horseback was destroyed by the German army in World War II.

Lafayette on Horseback has a long trajectory that no one has tracked, despite the fact that the monument—grounded in the aesthetics and techniques of the long nineteenth century—remained useful throughout the twentieth century and well into the twenty-first, continually re-cast, moved, replaced when needed and commemorated. This essay presents a brief history of the monument, and also hopes to create interest in the sculptor Paul Wayland Bartlett. Although Bartlett’s works appear in museums on both sides of the Atlantic, today his is not a well-known name outside of scholars of American Gilded Age sculpture.5

Paul Wayland Bartlett (1865-1925)
Paul Wayland Bartlett was born in New Haven, Connecticut a few months before the conclusion of the American Civil War. His father Truman Howe Bartlett had a minor reputation on the East Coast due to his sculptural work, art criticism and teaching at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston. As a youth, Bartlett showed signs of talent in sculpture, and his father sent him to Paris for training. As young as fourteen, Bartlett was showing sculpture in the Salon and in 1880 he entered the Ecole des Beaux Arts, where he was a drawing and modeling student of Pierre Jules Cavelier and then a student of animaleur Emmanuel Frémiet. From here, Bartlett went on to hit many of the high marks for a professional sculptor in the Gilded Age; his artwork, Bohemian Bear Tamer, won an Honorable Mention at the Paris Salon (1887, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art), he was awarded an Hors concours at the Paris Exposition and elected a member of the International Jury of Awards (1889), was awarded the Legion of Honor (1892), represented the United States on the International Jury of Awards for Sculpture at the Paris Exposition (1900), and elected member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters (1911) and the Royal Academy in Belgium (1917). Bartlett had a productive youth and young adulthood. In his twenties, the artist received prestigious commissions for the United States Capitol and the Library of Congress. Bartlett did not marry until age forty-eight; and he died of blood poisoning in 1925 at age sixty. The sculptor would live to see the first two Lafayette on Horseback monuments installed (in Paris and Metz), but he would not see the third, erected in his home state of Connecticut in 1932, nor, of course, the most recent in Versailles (2017). After his death, his wife Suzanne Ogden-Jones became the caretaker of his estate and artistic legacy, eventually passing on his papers to her daughter (from a previous marriage) who in turn donated them to the Library of Congress.

That his monumental design would become so strongly connected with World War I might have been unusual for other artists, but not so for Paul Wayland Bartlett. As an American in Paris, Bartlett was alarmed by the increasing rhetoric around war in the years leading up to the 1914, and the day after the RMS
Lusitania was torpedoed by the Germans in 1915—killing 1,198 passengers and crew—Bartlett began work on the statue Preparedness. Bartlett’s feelings about the Allied cause were on full display: an erect bald eagle stands on a shield featuring the stars and stripes with the word “Preparedness” below the talons—a political statement against the popular American position modeled by President Woodrow Wilson in the White House to remain neutral and out of the war. Watching the progress of European antagonisms develop into war, Bartlett witnessed the ramifications on France first-hand.

His first commission for Lafayette on Horseback was erected in 1908 and placed in the Cour de honor of the Louvre—where it stood until 2000, when removed for the creation of I.M. Pei’s inverted glass pyramid. Somewhat banished into a double strip of greenery called the Cours la Reine, a promenade located alongside the Seine, the monument seems somewhat neglected today—especially in contrast to the newest Lafayette on Horseback in Versailles. When the Knights of Columbus requested permission in November 1919 to use Bartlett’s original design for their monument, he was predisposed to assent. The Knights of Columbus played an enormous support role in World War I, and Bartlett was likely pleased to see his monument cast again to symbolize Franco-American friendship and the survival of democracy. His first commission for Lafayette on Horseback for Paris—more than 200 miles from Metz—had “endured him to the hearts of Frenchmen.” Perhaps he thought this would do the same.

The Origins of Lafayette on Horseback
Bartlett’s first commission for Lafayette on Horseback came in the last years of the nineteenth century, when he was already a successful working artist. The $50,000 raised in a penny drive by American school children took only two years. The Daughters of the American Revolution, whose headquarters are in Washington, D.C., commissioned Bartlett. He was well known in the nation’s capitol due to the success of his Michelangelo and Columbus for the Rotunda of the Library of Congress. For the Lafayette project he rented a studio twenty miles outside of Paris with a quiet atmosphere. Bartlett then began a project that was intended to last a year, but took eight. His first version, done in multiples of plaster growing in size with each new development, the last of which was life sized and gained warm critical reception when displayed in Paris on the Fourth of July, 1900. The commissioners, critics and public were pleased, but not Bartlett himself. According to American sculpture historian Wayne Craven, Bartlett ignored his commissioners and continued to refine the project, reworking both the horse and the figure of Lafayette. The conclusion he arrived at was to remove the “fancy attire with too many frills.”

George Dudley Seymour, a New Haven-based civic leader, collector, and preservationist wrote of the last design:

In contrast with the heavy mass of the horse, the slender, high-bred ride symbolizes the youthful enthusiasm and idealism which fired Lafayette at the age of nineteen to put aside the life of a young man of his class and throw his fortunes in with the American colonists.

Craven wrote that though the final design and execution of Lafayette on Horseback was considered to be a strong example of the historical field of equestrian monuments, in the end, the length of time it took to complete the work took a toll on the public’s interest. When the monument was finally unveiled in 1908 there was little fanfare. Few critics noted the drastic changes the artist had made between the earliest versions in plaster and the final work of art in bronze. Bartlett knew of this criticism regarding his pace of work, and his response was to put a turtle into the sculpture near the rear left hoof of Lafayette’s horse. As an animalier Bartlett sculpted lovely toads and other creatures with lustrous patina (see, for example, his superb Grenouille du Bresil in the Musee d’Orsay), but he must have found satisfaction in the simple symbolism of the slow-moving turtle.
Conclusion
The lack of enthusiasm due to the long working process of the first Lafayette on Horseback was not repeated the second time around in the recasting process. At the dedication in Metz, soldiers stood around the base, while Marshal Foch received a special highly decorated gilded baton. Girls dressed in traditional Lorraine clothing came from the countryside, while men wore straw hats due to the summer heat. Multiple news sources around the United States reported on the goodwill generated from the Knights of Columbus pilgrimage to Metz. The European trip, which had started as a journey to attend the dedication of the monument, was expanded to become a full pilgrimage, and a large group of American Knights traveled together through France to visit the gravesites of American soldiers, and then on to Italy and Switzerland, visiting holy sites and returning home to New York City on a steamer named, of course, Lafayette.

It must have been a blow for the Knights to hear in that in 1944, their Lafayette on Horseback—a symbol of Franco-American friendship, of Catholicism, of patriotism and of the Allied victory in World War I—was blown to pieces by the invading Nazi Army. In the post-war years there were more pressing concerns for the French government and people, and it took a new millennium to create a new monument. The town of Metz carried out the commission in 2004, and today an energetic conception of Lafayette on Horseback sits on the reconstructed base where Bartlett’s monument once stood, this one sculpted by Claude Goutin (born 1930).

Paul Wayland Bartlett’s Lafayette on Horseback, a traditional monument in form, presentation and material, offers a window into the ways in which artistic conceptions were adopted and adapted during the twentieth century and after. In an era of cutting criticism directed towards monument culture of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, Lafayette as a subject remains relatively unscathed. The success of Bartlett’s design and artistry stands the test of time; although abstraction and other forms of modern and contemporary art making have challenged the primacy of classicism and representation in monument culture, Lafayette on Horseback captured a spirit of friendship and gratitude that has traveled well over centuries and perhaps is needed now more than ever.


Notes
1. The menu for the August 20, 1920 banquet in Metz is part of the Archives Department of the Knights of Columbus Museum in New Haven, Connecticut.
3. While Paul Wayland Bartlett is covered in traditional American sculpture survey books, there is no monograph or catalog available of his work. The major repositories for information on Bartlett are his papers located in the Library of Congress, the Archives of American Art, and Tudor Place, all in Washington, D.C.
5. George Dudley Seymour, New Haven (New Haven, CT: Tuttle, Morehouse & Company, 1942), 146-147.
Ungovernable: The Victorian Parent's Guide to Raising Flawless Children

Therese O'Neill.


In her second book covering Victorian life, author Therese O'Neill achieves the same combination of witiness and scholarship she brought to her debut book Unmentionable. O'Neill delights and surprises with every conceivable topic discussed surrounding the upbringing of children. From conception to schooling to the dangerous period of adolescence, O'Neill covers it all—like a manner which welcomes readers only to make them feel squeamish when engaging in the conversation. O'Neill takes readers on a hilarious, over-the-top journey into the perils of Victorian motherhood, as seen from the perspective of the twenty-first century. If you are searching for a deep-dive into the subjects of Victorian pregnancy, birth, and childrearing, you have chosen well.

O'Neill's question and answer format establishes a tone like that of gossip between girlfriends, a writing style we saw with Unmentionable and which may make men feel less-inclined to read further than the introduction. Still, her work is a phenomenally fun read for those who ready themselves for discussions that might make the average person blush. She uses phrases like "cranky sex makes cranky babies" and "chemical anus cream." When discussing the perils of pregnancy, she gives a lengthy description of constipation and its remedies. She states, "the common method of removing true fecal impaction is...a crooked finger. It's going to put up a fight, so be ready for that. It's like a coal deposit up there." Phrases and descriptions like these illustrate her tendency towards bluntness and open dialogue surrounding these usually private topics.

O'Neill uses comedy and sarcasm to convey some pretty serious flaws embedded within the Victorian concept of parenting, from ideas about alcohol consumption during pregnancy to deformities in children. O'Neill is not afraid to engage in even the most controversial of conversations. For example, the discussion of disciplining children reads, to the modern reader, as a license to commit child abuse, a rare serious moment in the work. She even gives a warning to the readers, "you're going to want to skip the next few pages."

O'Neill's source material is not necessarily new to the bibliography of Victorian motherhood, but may be new to some of the readers of her last work. In Unmentionable, O'Neill was forced to default to primary source material written by men about women's bodies, something she discuses as a hypocrisy. In contrast, during the nineteenth century most works on the subject of childhood were written by women. Thus, in this book, O'Neill can delve into what was considered acceptable conversation for women: the domestic sphere. As a result, her sources for this work are primarily female authors and surround ideas about women's health, etiquette and homemaking. Some of the most notable are Caroline Benton's 1919 book The Mother's Book: A Handbook for the Physical, Mental and Moral Training of Children as well as letters written by Queen Victoria herself. There are also male-authored items, including advertisements from periodicals and newspapers and books primarily focused on women's bodies and pregnancy. There are also advertisements from large stores, such as Montgomery Ward. What makes this book easy to read is not just the inclusion of such fascinating material and its gossipy tone, but the hilarious and admittedly crass drawings and pictures she uses as illustrations. This book is not for the faint of heart, as it forces readers to think about subjects that most of us—then and now—deem private, such as sexuality and personal hygiene. The illustrations show everything from an actual birth scene to a man groping another man's privates. This book does not shy away from the uncomfortable, and its unpredictability is what makes it an entertaining read.

If you are looking for an openly sarcastic, well-researched, and easily digested book on child-rearing during the late nineteenth century, this is for you. If you are a man, you might want to think twice; O'Neill spares none of the gory details of bodily and mental distress that mothers and children experienced—and still experience! While it might not be everyone's cup of tea, this reviewer found O'Neill's work to be educational, yet accessible and entertaining for those willing to take the plunge into the hyper-sarcastic world she creates. I highly recommend it as a humorous look at all aspects of Victorian motherhood.

Reviewed by Jaclyn Spainhour

Jaclyn Spainhour is an author, historian, and the director of the Hunter House Victorian Museum in Norfolk, Virginia. She serves on the Board of Directors of the VSA, is the chair of its Book Awards Committee, and the copy editor of Nineteenth Century.
Lust on Trial: Censorship and the Rise of American Obscenity in the Age of Anthony Comstock


If any one person embodied what we now consider the Victorian sense of prudence, it was Anthony Comstock. Through sheer force of his moral indignation, he managed to become America's arbiter of obscenity. Amy Werbel's wonderful biography shows us the impact he had on the regulation of lust (as he termed any sexual impulse) and consequentially on American life, especially the culture surrounding images of the human body. While "Comstockery" is now a derisive term meaning excessive suppression of allegedly immoral material, his brand of censorship lives on.

Comstock was raised in rural Connecticut, where Calvinist strictures ran deep, and he saw himself as a soldier in the war fought by evangelical Protestants to spread Yankee Christian values across the land. After his move to New York City, and while working as a salesman, he fixated on the need to protect youth and women from the corrupting influences of gambling, profane speech, alcohol and above all, "lust." On his own initiative, he forced the police to raid pornography publishers. He railed against saloons operating on Sunday and the officials that refused to shut them down. His actions caught the attention of the anti-vice committee of the board of the Young Men's Christian Association. This committee had already successfully lobbied the New York State legislature to outlaw "obscene" literature, but were discouraged that the police were uninterested in enforcing the law and judges and juries were reluctant to convict those accused of breaking it. In 1872 the YMCA enlisted Comstock to do the dirty work of investigating the wide world of vice in New York City. Comstock gathered copious documentation that he shared with select groups of Christian gentlemen in closed-door displays and secret reports, thus convincing the City's white, male, wealthy elite of the enormity of the problem. Comstock was sent to Congress, carrying cartons of raunchy material as evidence. Legislators, eager to distract the public from the Crédit Mobilier scandal, passed the Comstock Act in 1873, which sought to suppress the "trade in and circulation of obscene literature and articles of immoral use." Comstock was made an unsalaried agent of United States Post Office with power to seize such material. In short order, the YMCA formally incorporated the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, whose representatives were empowered to work with police to enforce the Comstock Act, and authorized to collect half of all fines imposed upon violators of the law. Comstock, as an employee of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, had enormous discretion to define obscenity and immoral conduct, prosecute those who deviated from his definition, and fund his own work.

He wielded this power zealously for more than thirty years. Werbel tells the story of Comstock's quick rise as the national censor, and slower decline, as his work raised issues of free speech, women's rights, and artistic freedom. Comstock could not fathom any purpose for any aspect of human sexuality except procreation within the sanctity of marriage. With a dry sense of humor Werbel describes and illustrates Victorian sex toys, contraceptives, the diverse sexual activities occurring in bars and brothels at all price-points, and the proliferation of lewd bodies everywhere: on stage, in photographs, on art gallery walls, and even in the new peep-show machines. (As a collection of Victorian pornography, this book earns four stars!) As long as Comstock prosecuted bawdy music halls and smutty stereograph publishers, he had great success. But he got more push-back when he tried to have the posh Hoffman House hotel take down its Bouguereau or seized a catalog of the Art Students League that showed nudes. Comstock objected when newspapers described the evidence he presented at trial, saying it publicized and encouraged the very sins he was prosecuting; the publishers knew that salacious details sold papers, claimed freedom of the press, and covered Comstock's activities in greater detail. In courtroom testimony Comstock was forced to point out which particular details of a model's costume were obscene, much to his embarrassment and the reporters' amusement. Comstock fought long battles with Emma Goldman and Margaret Sanger and other champions of women's rights, especially those advocating for access to contraception and increasingly, the public sided with the radicals. Editorialists pointed out the hypocrisy of prosecuting prostitutes—even young girls forced into the sex trades—rather than their wealthy patrons. Nonetheless, Comstock and his employees seized and destroyed millions of images, jailed hundreds of people, and, as Werbel documents, can be held responsible for many suicides.

Ultimately Comstock's moral standards proved too rigid to impose, even within his own family. Werbel's biography concludes with the sad story of Adele, the adopted daughter of Anthony and Margaret Comstock; she gave birth to an illegitimate child and was eventually committed to the Vineland Training Institute for the Backward and Feeble-Minded. The culture that Comstock's work fostered resonates today, as we debate LGBT rights, women's contraceptive health care, the legal definition of marriage or obscene art, and the role of the press in a free society. Lust on Trial illuminates the many roads that led us to where we are today.

Reviewed by Karen Zukowski

Karen Zukowski is an independent writer and a historian of nineteenth-century visual culture. She is the book review editor of Nineteenth Century.
Forever Seeing New Beauties:  
The Forgotten Impressionist Mary Rogers Williams, 1857-1907


Forever Seeing New Beauties makes an important and delightful contribution to the field of women's history. Author Eve Kahn, formerly the Antiques columnist at the New York Times, knows a good story when she finds one, but likely could not have anticipated the degree to which Mary Rogers Williams's life and career would envelop her in what she lovingly calls “Mary-land.” That name refers to a world of women's creative endeavors, professional connections, and friendships that thrived in the late nineteenth century but have since been obscured in the manner familiar to students of women’s history. Kahn embraces the label of “Resurrectionist,” as she mines the life of Williams and her many friends and colleagues for raw material. Full disclosure—I possess a passport to Mary-land, having accompanied Kahn on portions of her journey by inviting her to serve as guest curator of an exhibition about Williams at the Florence Griswold Museum in 2014-15.

Readers will receive that invitation as well, and be charmed by Kahn’s breathless enthusiasm for Williams as she discovers her mesmerizing letters and artworks in the hands of the descendants of Williams’s close friend, the Tonalist painter Henry C. White. While Williams was lost to art history, she was never lost to the Whites. Generations of the family safeguarded her papers and artworks, recorded her biography for posterity, and remained firm in the belief that her day of merited recognition would come.

Kahn first reckons with “Why She Matters”—highlighting both the artist’s relevance and avenues for further inquiry, one of which is Williams’s ambiguous sexuality. The author then takes us along on her sleuthing as she assembles the picture of Williams’s daily life, attitudes, and the orbit of people in which she lived. Kahn fills the pages with enticing collages of Williams’s letters, sketches, family photos, and even colorful confetti sent home in chatty letters to her equally cultured sisters in Hartford, Connecticut. The portrait that emerges is of a keen observer who was acutely aware of the biases towards and limited expectations of women who showed, as Williams did, both artistic skill and an independent mind. Kahn takes us through Williams’s artistic education, including her study with fellow Hartford artist Dwight W. Tryon, a curmudgeonly figure who would become Williams’s boss in the Art Department at Smith College. Although their artistic instincts initially lay in similar directions their careers diverged. Williams’s labor with the female students at Smith enabled Tryon’s ease; she did the teaching and he breezed in occasionally to collect the credit and any prestige.

In a way, Kahn can share so much with us about Mary’s life and clear-eyed recognition of her position because of Tryon. During summers and sabbaticals Williams left the obligations of teaching and the academic life that Tryon had dropped in her lap and traveled to Europe. Her letters home to her sisters, to White, and to friends ranging from academicians to antiquarians sketch her activities and capture her wry perspective. Those trips increasingly became her reason for living. Many of the titles of the nearly thirty short chapters of Kahn’s book derive from phrases in Williams’s letters, a device that effectively restores Williams’s voice and allows her to narrate her own story.

Williams’s words convey her joy in traveling, when she was “forever seeing new beauties,” as well as her knowing eye-roll at the woman artist’s lot in a professional world that facilitated men’s labor and success, but not women’s. Williams’s pride in and grasp of her own abilities kept her going, especially once she entered uncharted waters. She stood up to Smith College’s administration for a promotion that would have recognized her full contributions to the college, resulting in her dismissal from teaching. Free at last she left for Europe, designing a frugal existence that allowed her to focus on her work. Her sudden death from cancer while living in her beloved Italy cut off this brave new chapter all too soon.

Kahn lovingly demonstrates Williams’s legacies, not only her vivid words and observations, but also her distinctive artworks. While Williams’s letters are a vivid tapestry, her stylized portraits and landscapes in oil and pastel are spare, even reticent, in a way that squares with the tongue-holding restraint expected of women. The book’s many color illustrations track William’s eye, her keen observations, and her deft conjuring of personalities and places.

Williams lived in a world that could not accept a professional woman artist like her, but now Kahn brings her to the fore, where we can recognize and admire her artistic skills and the perseverance she displayed in building and nurturing networks of friends that sustained her spirits and creativity. Yet the fact that it was only a fluke that led Kahn to learn about Williams’s extraordinary life—a story detailed in the book—suggests how much more of women’s history remains hidden and untold.

Reviewed by Amy Kurtz Lansing

Amy Kurtz Lansing is curator at the Florence Griswold Museum in Old Lyme, Connecticut. She has organized exhibitions and published on American art and material culture from the nineteenth century to the present.
Monument Man: The Life and Art of Daniel Chester French

Harold Holzer


Monument Man is a much-needed comprehensive one-volume cradle-to-grave biography of the great American sculptor Daniel Chester French, beautifully written by the renowned Abraham Lincoln scholar Harold Holzer. It is well worth reading, but with a couple of caveats. One is the arguably inordinate amount of attention given to the Lincoln Memorial (the bulk of three chapters). The other is the small physical size of the book and consequent tiny type (this septuagenarian finished it with a colossal headache).

In art criticism, the works of French have suffered in comparison with those of his contemporary Augustus Saint-Gaudens—and perhaps rightly so, for even French referred to Saint-Gaudens as “the master of my art.” But as Holzer points out, this is not the point, for from the triumph of his French’s Minute Man (1874, modeled in his early twenties) to his Daniel Webster (left unfinished after his death at eighty-one in 1931), he was the go-to artist for those knowing and wealthy organizations and individuals who sought sober, impressive and beautiful historical monuments and funerary memorials. Again referring to Saint-Gaudens, French said, “My only criticism of him... might be that he thought too much about art in working out his ideas.” The success of the narrative and commemorative aspects of French’s works, in other words, is how French’s output might best be judged.

A factor that helps to explain the relative dearth of writings on French and his works is that his life was seemingly without the ups and downs, the mysteries and the intrigues, the privations and calamities that often make for the most absorbing reading. From childhood on, he and his well-positioned family mingled with the noteworthy and the wealthy, and he shrewdly used these connections in obtaining pricey commissions and making lifelong acquaintances. He married a first cousin, thus solidifying an already close family life, and lived and worked quietly into his eighties, dividing his time between a New York City studio house and his estate, Chesterwood, in Stockbridge, MA. Chesterwood is open to the public, under the auspices of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and offers fascinating insights into French’s art and life.

Monument Man ends with a geographical list of the dozens of permanently displayed and publicly accessible works by French, perhaps one or more near you, all of which are worth viewing and contemplating. Despite the sculptor’s disclaimer, all of these demonstrate his superb artistic judgment in addition to the narrative and memorial power they emanate.

Reviewed by William Ayers

William Ayers, a retired curator and museum administrator, is a member of the board of the VSA and former editor of Nineteenth Century.

A Description of the New York Central Park

Clarence C. Cook, with an introduction by Maureen Meister.


This is a welcome reprint of an 1869 guide to New York City’s Central Park. It comes with a new introduction by Nineteenth Century contributor and art historian Maureen Meister and is otherwise a well-produced facsimile of the original which was published only a short time after the completion of the park. Meister outlines the intersecting lives of the three individuals responsible for the conception of the book: author Clarence Cook (1830-1900), illustrator Albert Fitch Bellows (1829-1883), and the visionary publisher, Francis Junius Huntington. Her excellent and well-researched essay sets the stage for the campaign that led to the park’s creation. The individuals she profiles in turn make clear that this book is dedicated to memorializing the designers, commissioners and builders of this masterpiece of city planning.

The book traces the history of how the park came to be. It reflects on the gradual loss of rural parts of Manhattan that, by 1850, made vivid the need for some kind of respite. It was a civic undertaking never envisioned by the drafters of the 1811 Commissioner’s Plan of Manhattan which laid out a street grid all the way to the Harlem River. Mr. Cook writes of a specific moment in
time, around 1830, when the population of Manhattan exploded and pushed the city very rapidly northward. With discretion, he describes the epic struggle to launch the park, since almost all those involved in the enormous undertaking were still living.

The author then leads the reader on a leisurely perambulation through every corner of the park while the book’s illustrator provides numerous wood engravings that, in themselves, would have been sufficient impetus to reprint this volume. The existence of these illustrations has been a boon to park preservationists—especially in the last 40 years as the park has been gradually and exquisitely brought back from the slopesy wasteland it was in the 1970s. The accuracy of Mr. Bellow’s illustrations have provided invaluable source material for the reconstruction of bridges, gazebos and—most recently—boat docks on the Lake.

In Cook’s tour of the park, those who know it will recognize many of its essential places. Likewise, as we read, we mark what has been lost: most poignantly perhaps the checked-pants clad shepherd etched in time by Mr. Bellow. Cook reports that this keeper tends his “flock of one hundred and sixty-three Southdown sheep” on “the lawn-like expanse of the green” we now call Sheep Meadow. His record brims with places one can’t wait to go search for or rediscover.

While not the only written guide to the park at the time, this was the most comprehensive. In it, Cook amusingly notes that the commissioners proudly prohibited “that ubiquitous nuisance, a [human] guide” as were found in every public place on the Continent or in England. “If you want to be directed, you can ask your way of a policeman... if you like to be lost you are at liberty to do so, and every year a hundred or so little children exercise that precious privilege, and are returned to their tranquil parents without loss of time, and without expense to anybody.”

Fortunately, this book was never lost and, even out-of-print, has played a crucial role in restoration of the park. In a city that changes overnight, every night, this remarkable book gives us—150 years later—the key to a visionary place that retains much of its original shape and all its original spirit.

Reviewed by Warren Ashworth

Warren Ashworth is an architect and professor of design and design history at the New York School of Interior Design. He is a writer, house restorer, and the Editor of Nineteenth Century.

Preservation Diary Update

The Spring 2019 edition of this magazine included the story of John Mallon’s Pacific Art Glass Company of San Francisco. Architectural historian Jim Wolf had found a design match between the art glass of Craigdarroch Castle in Victoria, British Columbia and the Winchester Mystery House in San Jose, California. Although he was confident of making an attribution to the Mallon glass studio, there was no documentary evidence. Last June he visited the Winchester House to present his research and incredibly, the very next day an envelope from Mallon’s company was found resting inside the wall of the house, above a door in a room undergoing restoration.

Addressed to Sara Winchester, and postmarked July 20, 1894, the envelope finally provided concrete proof of the connection to Mallon’s firm.
Milestones

Scandals and Sculpture

Anne-Taylor Cahill

Capricious, rebellious and highly artistic, Princess Louise, the sixth child of Queen Victoria, was a conundrum to the Royal family. She wished not to be “royal” but rather to be “ordinary.” She supported women’s suffrage, education and health reform. She sought to break into the very masculine world of sculpture, and she did it. Princess Louise was a woman ahead of her time. Yet in many ways her life was veiled in mystery as her papers in the Royal Archives remain closed to the public. Queen Victoria described her as “odd” and “difficult.”

Louise had her first art lesson at age 3 and as her talent developed, she became a recognized artist. Joining the Pre-Raphaelites, Louise was part of the London “artsy” set and dressed artistically as opposed to dressing royally. The Queen felt Louise “needed watching.” In 1866, at age 18, Louise completed her first sculpture and was slowly loosening the royal bonds. It was around this time that mysterious events occurred. In the late 1860s a rumor circulated that Louise had given birth to an illegitimate child. The father was said to be Lt. Walter Stirling, her brother Leopold’s tutor. Handsome and charming, Stirling spent a great deal of time with inseparable Leopold and Louise. Suddenly, he was dismissed after 4 months, much to the rage and grief of Louise and Leopold. Oddly, Stirling was given the title of Royal Groom and received an annuity. Was this hush money?

During this time, Louise made few public appearances; usually seated in a carriage. Her manner of dress was a departure from her usual artistic style and was “unusually decorated with lots of pleats, ribbons and bows.” She was huge crinolines and capes that were quite convenient for concealing a pregnancy. However, in early 1867 Louise was in the public eye again, attending the opening of Parliament and other events.

And what about the child? The story is that Queen Victoria’s gynecologist, Sir Charles Locock, arranged for the child to be adopted by his son Frederick. There is no record available for this birth. Frederick was then given a Royal Grace and Favor cottage from the Queen. The tale gets murkier as this alleged son, Henry, traveled to Canada to meet with Stirling in an attempt to discover his true paternity. Mysteriously, Henry’s body was found beside train tracks many miles short of his destination. The claim was that he was drunk and fell off the train. After Henry’s death his wife and children inexplicably came into approximately eight million dollars. Inexplicable indeed!

Two years later, sculptor Jacob Edgar Boehm was in residence at Balmoral, commissioned to do a statue of Queen Victoria, while tutoring Louise in her sculpting. Enamored with his work, Queen Victoria enjoined many commissions for his work, including a sculpture of John Brown. Daily contact with the Royal family, especially Louise, entrenched their friendship, with a mutual love of art and similar ideas drawing them close. It should be noted that Boehm was quite handsome and known to have many women friends. Eventually Louise and Boehm were found “in a compromising position” by none other than John Brown. The Queen was furious and decided Louise needed a husband. Louise refused every candidate... all foreign royal princes. Finally, she accepted Lord John Campbell Lorne of Scotland. Except for Queen Victoria, the Royal family were outraged by her choice, since Louise would be the first Royal to marry a commoner since 1516. However, Queen Victoria deemed her announcement of the marriage “the most popular act of my reign.” She believed new non-royal blood was the order of the day and that the public would love the idea of a “Britisher” marrying into the Royal family. She was correct. The public embraced the marriage enthusiastically. It was hoped that marriage would settle Louise down, but it did not. Louise kept on being her capricious self. At her wedding, she was anything but the usual bride, “demure and overcome with nerves and emotion.” Instead, Louise “laughed and talked with her friends, often ignoring royal protocol.” The relationship with Boehm continued. All their friends knew about it, but of course, the public did not.

In 1887 Louise began sculpting a statue of Queen Victoria, now on public view at Kensington Palace on the Broadwalk. It was unveiled on June 28, 1893, the anniversary of Queen Victoria’s coronation. In her opening speech Queen Victoria commented “It gives me great pleasure to...witness the unveiling of this fine statue so admirably designed and executed by my daughter.”

And what about Boehm? In 1890 Boehm died suddenly in his studio. Louise was said to have discovered his body. The rumor that Boehm died in Louise’s arms as they were making love gave much fodder to the national and international press. Curiously his private papers were quickly destroyed, and all Louise’s insistence, Boehm was buried in St. Paul’s Cathedral. The newspapers made much of Louise “breaking Royal protocol” by attending Boehm’s funeral. Louise herself lived to age ninety-one—capricious as ever.

Anne-Taylor Cahill is a professor of philosophy at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia, and serves on the national board of the Victorian Society in America. She is also a founding member and former president of the Eloise Hunter Chapter of the VSA.

For further reading:


Robert Stamp, Royal Rebels, (Toronto: Dundurn Group, 1988).
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- **Summer Schools**
  These schools, based in Newport, R.I., Chicago, Ill., and London, England, study facets of nineteenth/early twentieth century architecture and culture.

- **Publications**
  *Nineteenth Century* magazine is devoted to the cultural and social history during the Victorian era. *The Victorian Quarterly* newsletter covers activities and news from our local chapters.

- **Preservation**
  The Victorian Society engages in efforts to ensure the preservation and/or restoration of nineteenth century buildings throughout the U.S.

- **Chapter Affiliations**
  Members enjoy an even greater variety of activities by joining both the national and a local chapter.
2020 SUMMER PROGRAMS

19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN AND THE ARTS

Newport • Chicago • London

For over 45 years, the Victorian Society in America has been offering unique opportunities to explore 19th and 20th century art, architecture and decorative arts in the company of fellow students, academics, and enthusiasts.

Enjoy lectures by leading scholars, private tours of historic sites, and opportunities to go behind-the-scenes at museums and galleries.

Apply now for one of our three summer programs in Newport, Chicago or London!
Full and partial scholarships available!

VICTORIAN SOCIETY IN AMERICA

Applications due by March 2, 2020.
For more information visit victoriansociety.org/summer-schools or contact the Summer Schools Administrator at admin@vsasummerschools.org.