Editorial

Wee Beasties

This January I embarked on converting part of the modest-sized barn on our property into a studio and guest house. I hope to be done by the time this issue is in your mailbox. To accomplish this, the first step was to empty it of generations of scraps from long-finished projects, along with a cord-and-a-half of hand-split hickory, black cherry, and ash, and at least seventy years of chipmunk dinners—thousands of hickory nut shells, each and every one with a perfect hole in it.

After building a lean-to on the outside of the barn for the cordwood, I set about clearing out the stacks of 2x6 cut-offs, quarter sheets of plywood, broken axe handles, chair legs, 13” long cedar clapboards, and lawn signs for candidates long-dead – “Eleet Hanson to Congress, 1956.” There was even left-over hay in the single horse stall where no horse has resided for at least forty years.

The rabbit hutch in the corner of the stall was the last vestige to go. It was twelve degrees and snowing the morning I lit into it with the sledgehammer. On the first blow, out jumped—one after the other—seven field mice. I stopped the demolition and encouraged them to flee, which they did, in seven different directions and out into the icy day.

And as I stood there, brutish tool at my side, something in the pathetic scene stirred a memory—a glimmer of a poem learned in Miss Vandewater’s ninth-grade English class.

I have found it and present part of it here because, really, we all need more poetry.

Warren Ashworth
May 2022

To a Mouse, on Turning Her Up in Her Nest With the Plough, November 1785

Wee, sleekit, cowrin, tim’rous beastie,
O, what a pannic’s in thy breastie!
Thou need na start awa sae hasty,
Wit bickering brattle!
I wad be laith to rin an’ chase thee,
Wi’ murd’ring pattle!

I’m truly sorry man’s dominion,
Has broken nature’s social union,
An’ justifies that ill opinion,
Which makes thee startle
At me, thy poor, earth-born companion,
An’ fellow-mortal!

I doubt na, whiles, but thou may thieve;
What then? poor beastie, thou maun live!
A daimen ick’r in a thraive
’S a sma’ request;
I’ll get a blessin wi’ the lave,
An’ never miss’t!

Thy wee bit housie, too, in ruin!
It’s silly wa’s the win’s are strewin!
An’ naething, now, to big a new ane,
O’ foggage green
An’ bleak December’s winds ensuin,
Baith snell an’ keen!

Robert Burns
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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.
President Ulysses S. Grant, his son Jesse and wife Julia on the porch of their summer cottage, c. 1872. Gustavus Pach, photographer. Courtesy Library of Congress.
Through the Stereoscope:

GUSTAVUS PACH AND EARLY IMAGES OF OCEAN GROVE, NEW JERSEY

Jenny H. Shaffer

As the summer of 1875 came to a close, the Ocean Grove Record noted, in a brief article entitled "Ocean Grove Through the Stereoscope," that, in addition to its print coverage of the season's social and religious enjoyment...memories [of the summer] cannot better be retained and perpetuated than by a series of those vivid and remarkably beautiful stereoscopic views taken by Mr. Pach and his assistants.¹

Ocean Grove, New Jersey, a camp meeting and Christian seaside resort, had existed for less than 6 years, and the newspaper, the official organ of the Camp Meeting Association that governed the incipient theocracy, had started publication only in June of 1875. During its first decade and a half, Ocean Grove experienced spectacular success: an explosion of growth termed Ocean Grove's "pioneer days" —a fleeting time and that saw the transformation of a dune and thicket-covered landscape into a town that exists today as a State and National Historic District.² In the 1870s and early 1880s, Gustavus Pach, landscape into a town that exists today as a State and National Historic District.² In the 1870s and early 1880s, Gustavus Pach, founder of what came to be a famed New York City photography studio that remained in business until 1994, was establishing his career. The coincidence of Ocean Grove's founding and instant popularity coincided with Gustavus Pach's early career and presence at the Jersey shore. Born in Berlin in 1848, Pach immigrated as a child to New York City with his family.³ From his teen years, he and his brothers, some of whom would join him in business, became

People clamored to lease lots from the Association, which retained ownership, and thus control, of the land. With the unexpected, if welcome demand, the Association had its work cut out for it. Much of the credit for the site's success lies with the first Association president—also the first editor of the Record—Reverend Elwood Stokes, who steered Ocean Grove's progress during his long tenure, which ended with his death in 1897.⁴

The map appended to the Association's 1881 annual report reflects Ocean Grove's extent about a decade later and makes clear its calculated design.⁵ Like other resorts springing up in the industrial northeast after the Civil War, Ocean Grove was intended as a respite from the stresses of modern urban life. Conceived explicitly as a middle-class, Protestant utopia thateschewed sin and ostentation, its foil was tony Long Branch, playground of the rich and famous, about 7 miles to the north. Focused inward, Ocean Grove turned its back to the world: bounded to the north and south by lakes, the east by the Atlantic, and the west by a fence with gates that were closed on the Sabbath, its Main Avenue was not the turnpike that ran parallel to the ocean, but an internal street that stretched from the entrance to the sea.

Ocean Grove's founding and instant popularity coincided with Gustavus Pach's early career and presence at the Jersey shore. Born in Berlin in 1848, Pach immigrated as a child to New York City with his family.³ From his teen years, he and his brothers, some of whom would join him in business, became
interested in photography: a new and rapidly changing scientific process with promising career opportunities. When Pach was 15, an unspecified respiratory ailment necessitated a move away from the city to Toms River, New Jersey. By around the summer of 1866, Gustavus and his younger brother, Gotthelf, were photographers in Long Branch. The foundation story for what would come to be Pach’s highly successful photography studio relates that the brothers came to the attention of three prominent men in Long Branch: Philadelphians George W. Childs and Anthony J. Drexel, newspaper publisher and banker, respectively, and their friend, victorious Union General Ulysses S. Grant, who would be elected President in 1868 and then spend two terms in the White House. In 1867, the men asked why the young Pachs had no permanent business address, and, learning they required funds, provided money for a studio in Long Branch. As early as 1866, Gustavus had a presence in New York, and this enterprise, which came to be called Pach Brothers and moved to various locations in the city over the decades, was known for its portraits of U.S. presidents—its first subject President Grant.

Pach was one of a handful of photographers in Monmouth County—the northernmost of New Jersey’s Atlantic coast—who produced stereographs in the 1870s and 1880s; perhaps the first in the area to do so, he produced far more than any other local photographer during this circumscribed time period. Stereoscopic vision was about both scientific discovery and popular novelty. Theories of optical reality and vision met rapidly changing photographic interests and methods in an age obsessed with empiricism and veracity. Evolving processes were shortening the minutes-long exposure times that had produced the posed, often stiff images of past decades, photographic works increasingly able to capture their subjects with an immediacy and freshness.

A stereograph is a mounted pair of nearly duplicate images from slightly different points, inches apart, to mimic human

vision. The collodion process, which allowed multiple positive photographic prints on paper, made the astonishing veracity of the photographic stereograph viable commercially. When viewed through an optical device called a stereoscope, a photographic stereograph, as Oliver Wendell Holmes stated in a famed 1859 article in *The Atlantic Monthly*, "produce[s] an appearance of reality which cheats the senses with its seeming truth." Holmes championed the more accessible stereograph form—paper photos mounted on a stiff card—and enabled their viewing by devising an affordable stereoscope. Stereographs were to have many uses and applications, from mementos to educational tools, as their popularity continued into the early twentieth century.  

Why Pach first came to Ocean Grove is unknown, though the new town no doubt presented a good business opportunity. He may simply have been aware of the camp-meeting-cum-Christian-seaside-resort that was, until the railroad arrived in 1875, a stage coach ride from Long Branch, or perhaps his awareness was tied to Grant. The President was on occasion invited by Association members to Ocean Grove for official events, and at times he came for personal reasons, his mother and sister staying in a cottage there, near Wesley Lake. Grant’s comings and goings, particularly when he was in office, were a great honor for the town, as well as testimony to the political connections of Association leaders.  

If the reasons for Pach’s awareness of Ocean Grove are unsure, it is also unclear when he became a more permanent presence. From occasional notices in the Record, he was a familiar face in town, with his “rotund and smiling countenance,” in the 1870s and early 1880s. He certainly was settled in by mid-decade: the 5 June 1875 edition of the Record reported that Pach was “putting up a beautiful gallery, next to the Association Office” on Main Avenue. In the first issue of the paper, the back pages, dedicated to ads for lodging and services, included one for “Pach’s Photograph Gallery” that promised “everything of interest at the Grove,” with images “taken at shortest notice and reasonable rates, both the Stereoscope and for framing.”

Given strategies for dating Pach’s stereographic production, he was present in Ocean Grove from its very first years. His earliest stereographic photos were mounted on yellow, green, or gray card stock, with these colors discontinued around 1870. Ocean Grove stereographs such as one of Wesley Lake on yellow stock and another of the home, complete with inhabitants, of Philadelphia merchant and Association member Joseph Thornley, affixed to green stock, indicate Pach’s presence as early as 1870 or 1871. The vast majority of Pach stereographs were on the studio’s signature orange-red card stock. While titles and labels on the stereographs went through numerous permutations, the production dates of the cards themselves—not necessarily the photos, as stereographs were reissued—can be approximated by noting the New York studio address on the card: 858 Broadway between 1871 and 1877; and 841 Broadway, where it remained, under various names, from 1868 until 1890. Handwritten notations on cards can solidify dates for when the card was acquired or when the images were taken. A bathing scene on a card bearing the 841 Broadway address was, according to a note on the reverse, purchased during a stay in Ocean Grove in early August of 1882, while a group portrait taken in front of a tent, labeled 858 Broadway, carries a handwritten date on the lower left margin of August 19, 1876. Part souvenir, part advertisement, Pach’s stereographs recorded and disseminated Ocean Grove’s curious lifestyle in an affordable and popular medium. Harnessing the power of memory for those who had been there and offering the thrill of simulated presence to potential visitors and outsiders, the images—most brimming with people—intermingle personal and public, unofficial and official, in compositions intended to maximize the sensation of depth when viewed through the stereoscope. For Holmes, the transformative and experiential powers of the stereograph—

I creep over the vast features of Ramses, on the face of his rockhewn Nubian temple; I scale the huge mountain-crystal that calls itself the Pyramid of Cheops—

were a modern marvel of alternative travel. Stokes, too, understood the powerful experience of stereography, and celebrated it specifically as superior to the written word, the *Record* noting that Pach’s pictures, showing lakes, ocean, cottages, tents, boarding-houses, groups, &c., …give a better idea of Ocean Grove life, than long pages of description, however actually drawn.  

Taken during the first decade and a half of its existence and largely confined to the area delineated in the 1870 map, Pach stereographs bring to life the peculiar and transitory reality of
Ocean Grove’s communal paradise. Beyond more typical resort images of the sea and bathers, they draw the viewer into a striking, and rapidly changing, landscape of worship sites, cheek-to-jowl tents amongst trees, unpaved and partially developed streets with large hotels, multiple boarding houses, and small cottages—all with porches, built in unostentatious wood by local builders, and requiring the permission of the Association to build—and, time and again, Wesley Lake. 23

Numerous views of the rustic, yet genteel worship sites broadcast Ocean Grove’s religious focus while documenting increasingly permanent forms. Multiple images of surf meetings—an evening ritual marked, by the late 1870s, with a pavilion at the foot of Ocean Pathway—showed the throngs that participated in religious life.24 Championing Pach stereographs at the end of the first summer, Stokes remarked:

*The finest pictures we have ever seen of this kind are the series of surf-meeting pictures...We can distinguish in some of them nearly a hundred faces that we know.* 25

A view of Dr. Ward’s Tent—a large canvas structure donated by a lot owner and used for religious gatherings until about 1880—underscores the temporary, rural nature of camp meetings that inspired the Association’s notion of worship at the outset, while multiple images of Bishop Janes Tabernacle—constructed in 1877 and still extant—reveal the desire, as the first decade was winding down, for permanent, if still simple, religious structures.26 Views of the transforming main worship space in the 1870s underscore this transformation. At the outset a classic camp meeting of benches in a grove of trees before a preacher’s stand, by decade’s end, in its third iteration, it was marked by a permanent roofed structure.

Moving from the worship sites into the grid, stereographs capture an emergent urban space of unpaved major thoroughfares: Main Avenue, with its mud puddles and spotty development; equally broad Central Avenue, stretching from lake to lake; and Pilgrim Pathway, a left off Main that led from the grided resort towards the tent-filled camp meeting space. Pach’s numerous stereographs of long-gone hotels that fronted on these streets—rambling wooden structures wrapped in breezy, open porches—underscore the souvenir as well as advertising power of the medium. The oft-photographed Pitman House, two blocks north of Main on Central, was a community anchor. In July of 1875, the *Record* proudly related that:

*correspondents...write to ask us whether the boarding accommodations at the Grove are up to the standard of Cape May or Long Branch. We answer No – not in extravagance – but equal to the reasonable expectations of the most refined classes. Our ‘Pitman House’ is equal to anything on the shore.* 27

President Grant, in town for the Fourth of July that summer, dined with Stokes and others at the Pitman.28 By the summer of 1878, the hotel, renamed the Arlington, had been enlarged to extend from Central to Pilgrim Pathway.29 Gaining an additional floor as well, this enormous landmark—able to accommodate 250 guests—strategically straddled resort and worship centers as it responded to Ocean Grove’s rapid growth, a Pach stereograph capturing the angled hotel as a coach drove past.

The penchant for communal life intrinsic to Ocean Grove is recorded in images of its many boarding houses: wooden
homes with spacious porches that reflect the vernacular forms and decorative styles popular in the 1870s. From Ocean Grove's first years, Elizabeth Sheridan operated the Ocean Avenue House on Ocean Avenue. This female entrepreneur represented numerous women who owned and operated businesses in Ocean Grove, and she was one of many whose enterprises were disseminated through stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.}}}} Other\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.\footnote{Others were temporary proprietors: in the summer of 1878, famed “Railroad Evangelist” Jennie Smith took a small cottage on Pitman Avenue, christened it “Grace Cottage,” and advertised for guests in the \textit{Record}, her tenure recorded in stereographs.}}}}

While hotels and boarding houses were plentiful, the quintessential Ocean Grove accommodation was the tent. These temporary structures were found throughout town in the summer, though their clustering around the main worship center highlighted traditional camp meeting practice.\footnote{Pach’s numerous stereographs of tent life—residents gathered before canvas homes of varied sizes and forms—underscore their ubiquity. While most are of now-nameless tenters, underscoring how stereographs functioned as personal keepsakes, others, such as an image from the early 1870s of a lane of tents and their residents with Association members Stokes and Alfred Cookman in the left foreground, are reminders of the fame and recognizability of Ocean Grove’s religious leaders.\footnote{Pach’s numerous stereographs of tent life—residents gathered before canvas homes of varied sizes and forms—underscore their ubiquity. While most are of now-nameless tenters, underscoring how stereographs functioned as personal keepsakes, others, such as an image from the early 1870s of a lane of tents and their residents with Association members Stokes and Alfred Cookman in the left foreground, are reminders of the fame and recognizability of Ocean Grove’s religious leaders.\footnote{Pach’s numerous stereographs of tent life—residents gathered before canvas homes of varied sizes and forms—underscore their ubiquity. While most are of now-nameless tenters, underscoring how stereographs functioned as personal keepsakes, others, such as an image from the early 1870s of a lane of tents and their residents with Association members Stokes and Alfred Cookman in the left foreground, are reminders of the fame and recognizability of Ocean Grove’s religious leaders.}} Pach’s numerous stereographs of tent life—residents gathered before canvas homes of varied sizes and forms—underscore their ubiquity. While most are of now-nameless tenters, underscoring how stereographs functioned as personal keepsakes, others, such as an image from the early 1870s of a lane of tents and their residents with Association members Stokes and Alfred Cookman in the left foreground, are reminders of the fame and recognizability of Ocean Grove’s religious leaders.\footnote{Pach’s numerous stereographs of tent life—residents gathered before canvas homes of varied sizes and forms—underscore their ubiquity. While most are of now-nameless tenters, underscoring how stereographs functioned as personal keepsakes, others, such as an image from the early 1870s of a lane of tents and their residents with Association members Stokes and Alfred Cookman in the left foreground, are reminders of the fame and recognizability of Ocean Grove’s religious leaders.}

Tents found competition in small wooden cottages. While single-family houses sprang up throughout the grid, Lake Avenue—the walkway along Wesley Lake—saw early building activity. A number of Association members, including Cookman and next-door neighbors Stokes and Thornley, built houses on Lake in the opening years of the 1870s.\footnote{These modest and charming cottages—Stokes’ tiny Sylvandale Cottage, with its arched double doors and decorative Juliet balcony, and Thornley’s duplex with its lacy posts, paper-doll railing, and bargeboard—were typical of Ocean Grove’s opening years.}

Association members had secured lots before the general public, and the choice to live on Wesley Lake no doubt had to do with proximity to the main worship site and a water pump, as well as unobstructed views of the then-undeveloped lake and ocean fronts.\footnote{The choice also may be tied to the memory of Ocean Grove’s conceptual beginnings in the summer of 1869: a group experience that inspired the establishment of the Association and the chartering of Ocean Grove. As a respite from city life with like-minded Christians, a group of families, including the Cookmans, the Stokeses, and the Thornleys, had camped in the then-wilderness next to the lake in July of 1869. During a spontaneous prayer meeting in Mrs. Thornley’s tent,}
the participants experienced what Stokes described as a sanctified moment—a meeting of heaven and earth—that inspired the idea of a more permanent place of religious retreat. This origin story, which conjures images of a perfected new world, was memorialized in the open space of Thomson Park, next to Wesley Lake.

The draw of the area for the founders combined with the lake’s practical and recreational uses, and the lakefront was developed rapidly. Wesley Lake’s prominence in Ocean Grove life and experience was given national attention in an 1878 Harper’s cover, which attested not only to the town’s popularity, but also to the lake’s practical function as a watery main thoroughfare. From the mid-1870s, many visitors arrived by train, the depot near the head of the lake in neighboring Asbury Park, and ferries on Wesley Lake provided a means to get to and through Ocean Grove. Many a Pach stereograph attested to the lake’s function as a center for leisure, including multiple images of picturesque Fairy Island, a natural land mass removed in 1880 to improve sluggish water flow towards the ocean, that was a destination for boaters. Stereographs capture the transformation of Wesley Lake from an untouched, natural body of water in the early 1870s—with a meandering shoreline marked by a footpath, a few rowboats on the water, and an incipient Asbury Park on the far shore—into a crowded and popular recreation center and increasingly fashionable address—with numerous boaters, a regularized shoreline, and a proper sidewalk lined with dwellings atop a steep embankment.

Later images underscore Wesley Lake as a locus of rapid development, the building activity on Lake Avenue documenting Ocean Grove’s transformation from a more simple, seasonal enterprise into an established, year-round town. Changes over the course of the 1870s to Stokes’s much-photographed Sylvandale Cottage—a landmark, the fame of the Association president transferred to his abode—underscore Ocean Grove’s increasing permanence and relative grandeur. The little cottage, expanded in 1876, gained, by the end of 1879, a prominent, square, corner tower. By 1876, there was already a substantial population of winter inhabitants in a place initially envisioned only for summer habitation.

By the second half of the 1870s, boarding houses and large homes were popping up all along busy Wesley Lake—stairs leading up the embankment for visitors arriving by boat—this impressive and photogenic avenue publicized through

---


numerous Pach stereographs. The most conspicuous and grand structure was the home of Dr. Sanders: an oft-photographed departure from the tiny cottages of a mere five years previous. The Record, on 16 September 1876, celebrated the new addition, noting:

The Saunders [sic] Cottage, fronting on Wesley Lake... will be one of the most imposing and elegant buildings on the Ocean Grove grounds. The location is very desirable, and the property in the vicinity has been enhanced in value by this splendid improvement. 41

By 1880, the Sanders family had new neighbors, the Record prophesying that the enormous new home, complete with astronomical observatory emerging, silo-like, from the roof, “will hereafter attract a share of the admiration which previously centered in the [Sanders Cottage].” 42

Through Pach stereographs, viewers are immersed in the captivating—and disappearing—world of pioneer Ocean Grove in a medium that itself disappeared as a popular form of imaging the town after its first decade and a half. From its earliest years, Ocean Grove knew, and celebrated, Gustavus Pach’s fame, the Record noting his studio’s accomplishments over the decades. 43 The photographer, who died unexpectedly in 1904, maintained an outpost in town throughout his life, moving to the north end of the boardwalk as it became a center of commercial activity. 44 A postcard—by then, the requisite tourist memento—sent in 1904 depicts an Ocean Grove recognizable today: a representation of Ocean Pathway looking west towards the iconic 1894 auditorium—Stokes’s last gesture to the town before his death—its manicured lawns lined with grand hotels, boarding establishments, and stately homes. In 1872, Stokes forecast that,

Cottages are now being built on both [Ocean Pathway and Ocean Avenue], and when the grounds are completed...[these] will be the most magnificent avenues to be found. 45

In the new century, National Geographic would dub Ocean Pathway “the most beautiful short street in America.” While the postcard allows the viewer to admire this showpiece of the stunning and staid Queen of the Christian Resorts, a Pach stereograph of Ocean Pathway invites the viewer to stand among Ocean Grove pioneers and experience their sandy, windswept reality.
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Notes

1. "Ocean Grove Through the Stereoscope," Ocean Grove: A Record of Faith and Progress, September 18, 1875, 2. The Record existed, with some gaps and various titles, into the twentieth century. I will refer to it as the Ocean Grove Record in this article.

2. For the 1975/1976 nomination form for inclusion on the National Register, see: https://catalog.archives.gov/id/135815306


4. For Ocean Grove’s history, see the indispensable: Morris S. Daniels, The Story of Ocean Grove Related in the Year of Its Golden Jubilee 1869-1919 (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1919). The town’s history is chronicled in the Association’s early reports, all of which are available at the HSOG, as well as in the Ocean Grove Record, available online through the HSOG website, the reports the main sources, I assume, for Daniels’s book. For shorter historical overviews, see: Warren Boeschenstein, Historic American Towns along the Atlantic Coast (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1999): 155-174; and Wayne T. Bell, Ocean Grove (Portsmouth, NH: Arcadia, 2000). Bell, a long-time resident of Ocean Grove and local historian, used single shots from Pach stereographs to illustrate his history, as did Daniels.


9. Sources for Pach’s life and work are scarce and general, and accounts differ on years for events. See: http://dilib.nyu.edu/findingsaids/html/nys/pach/biographist.html; George H. Moss, Jr. and Karen L. Schnitzspahn, Those Innocent Years, xiii-xx; and Moss, Double Exposure, 113. See also Gustavus Pach’s obituary and the more extensive obituary of his brother, Gotthelf, who worked with him throughout his life: “Gustavus W. Pach Dead: Founder of Photographic House Dies in an Operation,” The New York Times, October 11, 1904, 9; and “Gotthelf Pach, 73, Dies in His Sleep: Pioneer Photographer, Noted for His Pictures of Presidents, Succumbs in City Home,” The New York Times, April 18, 1925, 15.

10. Moss, Double Exposure, 81-82. For Pach’s Monmouth County stereographs, including a partial catalogue of images taken in Ocean Grove, see: Moss, Double Exposure, 113-155.


14. For the train, see: Stokes, Summer by the Sea. Sixth Annual Report and Historical Address of the President of the Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association (Philadelphia: John A. Haddock, 1875): 13; Ocean Grove Record, September 4, 1875, 4; and Stokes, Centennial By the Sea. Seventh Annual Report of the President of the Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association (Philadelphia: John A. Haddock, 1876), 11.

15. For Grant and Ocean Grove, see: Daniels, The Story of Ocean Grove, 197-207. Grant’s visits were chronicled in the Ocean Grove Record. Ocean Grove’s early Association members included Judge James Black, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who ran for President in 1882 as the first Prohibition Party candidate, and James L. Hays of Newark, New Jersey, who served as a state senator, among other political offices: Richard F. Gibbons, “Retrospect,” Ocean Grove and Neptune Times, March 7, 1991, 7; and “Personal,” The Christian Advocate (June 8, 1916): 772.

16. For Pach’s “smiling countenance,” see: Ocean Grove Record, June 4, 1881, 2. Pach’s arrival for the season was at times noted, as were instances of his activities. See, for example: Ocean Grove Record, July 7, 1877, 1; Ocean Grove Record, August 9, 1879, 2; Ocean Grove Record, August 6, 1881, 4.

17. Ocean Grove Record, June 5, 1875, 3.

18. Ocean Grove Record, June 5, 1875, 4.

19. Moss said Pach had a studio in Ocean Grove by 1873, though I am not sure why: Moss, Double Exposure, 113. I follow his general strategies for dating Pach stereograph production: Moss, Double Exposure, 124.

20. Thornley’s house was built in the spring of 1871, indicating that
Historian Lyndell O’Hara has done extensive research on women in Ocean Grove, see: Ocean Grove Record, August 14, 1875, 6. For these earliest stereographs, the photos are clearly pasted on by hand.

Ocean Grove Record, August 25 1875, 5. The Association’s yearly reports chart Ocean Grove’s growth in words, and are much less engaging than the stereographs.

Ocean Grove’s early structures were constructed largely by local builders – including Cook Howland, Austin Patterson, and J. M. Dey – who regularly advertised their services in the back pages of the Record. The Association had strict rules for life in Ocean Grove. For rules as they stood on 1875, including for building in town, see: Ocean Grove Record, July 21, 1875, 6. By 1876, a permit from the Association was required: Ocean Grove Record, January 8, 1876, 96.

For surf meetings and the pavilion, see: Daniels, The Story of Ocean Grove, 83-86 and 102.

Ocean Grove Record, September 18, 1875, 2.

It is difficult to imagine what fig. 7 (see page X) could be besides Dr. Ward’s Tent. Through his close studies of Ocean Grove’s development – in this instance of the location of the tent and the implementation of lighting systems – David H. Fox, in correspondence, said that he sees the image as very likely Dr. Ward’s Tent. Dr. Ward’s Tent played a large role in the religious life of early Ocean Grove as a locus of Holiness Meetings before the construction of Bishop John Tabernacle and for gatherings of young people before the construction of the Young People’s Temple in 1879. For Dr. Ward’s Tent, see: Ocean Grove. Its Origin and Progress, as shown in the Annual Reports published by its President, to which are added Other Papers of Interest, including List of Lot-Holders, Charter, By-Laws, &c., &c., ed. E. H. Stokes (Philadelphia: Haddock & Son, 1874); 60; and Daniels, The Story of Ocean Grove, 70. For the Tabernacle, see: Elwood Stokes, Worship by the Sea. Eighth Annual Report of the President of the Ocean Grove Camp-Meeting Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church (Philadelphia: National Bureau of Engraving, 1877): 10-11 and 33.

Ocean Grove Record, July 17, 1875, 2.

Ocean Grove Record, July 10, 1875, 2. A 1877 guidebook to East Coast seaside resorts gave a very positive notice for the Pitman: Charles Newhall Taintor, American Seaside Resorts; A Hand-Book for Health and Pleasure Seekers, Describing the Atlantic Coast, from the St. Lawrence River to the Gulf of Mexico (New York: Taintor Brothers, Merrill & Co., 1877): 111-112.

The hotel was enlarged in phases: Ocean Grove Record, May 13, 1876, 237 and 240; Ocean Grove Record, March 23, 1878, 2; and Ocean Grove Record, July 6, 1878, 2.

Historian Lyndell O’Hara has done extensive research on women in nineteenth-century Ocean Grove, and my knowledge of their role in the development of the town comes from her.

For Jennie Smith, see: https://recollections.wheaton.edu/2010/12/jennie-smith-railroad-evangelist/ and http://www.19thcenturyphotos.com/Jennie-Smith,-the-Railroad-Evangelist-126167.htm. For her 1877 visit, see: Ocean Grove Record, September 29, 1877. Her exploits in the summer of 1878 were chronicled in the Record, and she regularly advertised her cottage in the back pages during the 1878 season: Ocean Grove Record, June 29, 1878, 1; Ocean Grove Record, July 13, 1878, 1 and 2; Ocean Grove Record, August 24, 1878, 2 and 3; Ocean Grove Record, September 14, 1878, 2 and 3; and Ocean Grove Record, November 2, 1878, 2.

Tents of various sizes could be rented from the Association, with rates published in the Ocean Grove Record.

Stokes appears in many Pach stereographs, and is easily recognizable through his stance and unchanging haircut. Cookman, the younger man to Stokes’s left, was identified by Bell. Bell, Ocean Grove, 11. Cookman died unexpectedly in November 1871, so this image must have been taken in Ocean Grove’s first or second summer. Daniels dated the image to 1870: Daniels, The Story of Ocean Grove, 136.

In an age preoccupied with commemoration, at the dedication, on the sixth anniversary of Ocean Grove’s founding, of a memorial vase, the Record reported that “Pach, the photographer…with his artistic corps, took a number of views,” these stereographs often reprinted. Ocean Grove Record, August 7, 1875, 4.

Both Thornley and Stokes built their cottages in the spring of 1871: Ocean Grove Record, August 14, 1875, 6. This particular stereograph of Sylvandale Cottage is a reprint, the image taken in the early 1870s, as it, and that of Thornley’s house, appear to have been used as models for images of Association members’ homes in an 1872 broadsheet advertising Ocean Grove, a copy of which is in the archives of the HSOG.

Kevin Chambers, former President of the HSOG, noted in conversation the importance of the water pumps in members’ choices for lots.


Ocean Grove Record, November 13, 1880. My thanks to David H. Fox for this reference.

Ocean Grove Record, April 29, 1876, 224; and Ocean Grove Record, December 6, 1879, 2.

Stokes may have been in Ocean Grove full-time as early as 1875, when he began to oversee the site full-time. For increasing winter residents, see: Ocean Grove Record, November 18, 1876, 452. The Association had to grant permission to stay beyond the season: Ocean Grove Record, September 25, 1875, 3.

Ocean Grove Record, September 16, 1876, 384.

Ocean Grove Record, May 1, 1880, 2.

Especially noted were Pach photos of presidents and their families: Ocean Grove Record, August 9, 1879, 3; Ocean Grove Record, October 1, 1881, 2; and Ocean Grove Record July 18, 1903, 1.

For Pach’s death, see: “Gustavus W. Pach Dead.” The Record noted a Pach studio at Ross’ Pavillion in 1898, and it was still there in 1903: Ocean Grove Record, June 25, 1898, 1; and Ocean Grove Record, July 18, 1903, 1.


This general designation is known to locals, but I cannot ascertain the issue of National Geographic in which this was stated. It must have appeared before 1939, as the Record uses the term: Ocean Grove Record, August 4, 1939, 4. The New York Times also referred to this designation, citing the National Geographic, but called the Pathway “the most beautiful short street in the world.” Susan Ann Brady, “Ocean Grove Journal; Needy Residents Clash With a Town’s Vision,” The New York Times, June 12, 1994, Section 1ANJ, 2.
Amherst College Octagon complex, c. 1860. Henry Alexander Sykes (1810-1860), architect. Courtesy Amherst College Archives and Special Collections.
Two College Octagons:
EXPERIMENTS IN CAMPUS ARCHITECTURE

David Hosford

In 1848 Amherst College and Williams College each dedicated an academic building constructed in the shape of an octagon. They are of considerable interest as rare—perhaps unique—architectural conceits in an academic setting. They are also a fascinating study in contrasts, with their respective architects creating designs for buildings intended for entirely different purposes and with quite different storylines over the years. Both survive, albeit modified over time as institutional needs at the schools have evolved from their common origin as small Congregational seminaries into highly selective liberal arts colleges.

The octagon at Amherst—really a complex of structures—was the brainchild of the Reverend Edward Hitchcock, appointed to the faculty in 1825 as a Professor of Chemistry and Natural History and who subsequently served as president between 1845-1854. A geologist of renown in terms of research interests, he also entertained an interest in astronomy and undertook a year’s advanced training in chemistry at Yale early in his tenure. What fascinates is the fact that between 1836 and 1840 Hitchcock built himself an octagonal cabinet in the yard of his Amherst home to display his private collection of minerals. Entirely constructed of wood, the exterior was marked off in squares imitating blocks of stone, and inside were shelves from floor to ceiling with a narrow gallery permitting close examination of specimens at the upper reaches. Arguably, it was not unlike a partial template for the octagon that was to appear on campus about a decade later.

After just a year in office as president, Hitchcock persuaded the Amherst trustees to erect “a fireproof building for a Cabinet of Natural History and an Astronomical Observatory.” To Hitchcock then fell the twin tasks of raising the funds necessary and hiring an architect. For the latter he reached out to Henry Alexander Sykes (1810-1860) of Suffield, Connecticut, who had just completed a sizeable ‘design and construct’ project for the Union House hotel complex in Springfield, Massachusetts. As Hitchcock recalled in his memoirs, he directed Sykes to design both the “Cabinet and the Observatory octagonal” and apparently left to him the matter of determining the dimensions. Solicitation of sufficient funds was a more difficult task, but finally by the summer of 1847 pledges totaling some $8,500 were in hand and construction began almost immediately even though Sykes himself was already engaged elsewhere. The Octagon—as the complex soon became known universally—was dedicated in June 1848 despite insufficient funds to purchase a telescope immediately.

The geological cabinet or museum was housed in the principal octagon on two stories measuring 45’ from angle to angle, with a gallery above the second and taller floor providing access to additional display cases, a vaulted ceiling above that, and the whole topped by an octagonal oculus to supplement window lighting. Building walls were brick with stucco applied
both inside and out, the latter with lines etched to imitate cut stone. Stone floors—supported by brick arches at the ground level and iron columns at the second floor—and the use of iron doors weighing up to a half ton each were part of the effort to fireproof the facility. The observatory was connected to the museum by a common entrance and interior stairways to various levels and had a height of 44’ to the base of the dome with an interior diameter of 18’. From the outset president Hitchcock had insisted that the plan should be able to accommodate additions, and an octagonal geology lecture hall designed by Sykes was built in 1855 followed in 1857 by the Nineveh Gallery for display of massive Assyrian stone reliefs sent back from a missionary in Iraq. Unfortunately, none of the original drawings for these structures survive.

For most of its history, the Lawrence Library at Williams College has been attributed to Thomas Alexander Teft (1826-1859), a versatile and talented young Rhode Island architect. Four drawings of his for the building survive in the archives of Brown University, but at this early stage of his career it would appear that Teft essentially served as draftsman for Charles Coffin Jewett, the first full-time academic librarian at the school whose abilities subsequently took him on to leadership positions at the Boston Public Library and head of the Library of Congress. Jewett was an enthusiastic advocate of panopticon theory which posited the advantages of placing library staff at a central desk surrounded by a series of radiating aisles arranged
to increase efficiency and promote collection control. Basically, he seems to have pared down existing plans for an unrealized library project in Paris that was to have been built on panoptic principle to fit a proposed budget of $5,000.5

In addition to Jewett, two other individuals play central roles in this story. First is Mark Hopkins, the longest serving president of Williams, who was both Professor of Moral Philosophy and Rhetoric and an active Congregationalist theologian. In 1844 he had delivered a series of lectures on the “Evidences of Christianity” at Lowell, Massachusetts. These were attended and much appreciated by Amos Lawrence, a wealthy retired industrialist and philanthropist whose particular interest focused on helping academic institutions establish or enlarge their libraries. The two men also discovered a family connection and became friends which, in turn, led Lawrence to quietly make a gift to Williams in January 1846 for its first library building. Also the friend of Brown University’s Charles Jewett, Lawrence presumably recommended him as best choice for architect, although he himself carefully reviewed an early draft of the plans. To them he responded,

Amos Lawrence then pledged another one or two thousand dollars as needed to effect the change.

Construction of Lawrence Library was completed by the beginning of the 1848 fall term and, viewed from ground level outside, it has been described as a “jewel of a building” in a recent campus architectural guide. Inside, the only entrance provided access to stairs leading upward, but the ‘basement’ level itself was reserved largely for the supporting mechanics of a library. It was the second or principal floor that revealed the shortcomings of Benthamite panoptic principle applied to a building of this size and purpose. The central rotunda was and is stunning, encircled by eight Ionic columns supporting a dome originally surmounted by an oculus with stained glass. From each column, shelves extended to the angles in the outer wall with large windows flooding light into each interior wedge, one of which was reserved for the stairs from below. Jewett’s plan, as presumably elaborated by Tefft, also called for seven
foot high iron bookcases with future expansion to be accommodated by the addition of two additional seven foot tiers—one atop another with gallery access to each. These tiers were never constructed, and the twelve foot high bookcases substituted suggest that despite Jewett’s enthusiasm the library’s function was flawed from the outset.⁷

Adaptive reuse accounts for the survival of both buildings. Amherst College built a new observatory in the early twentieth century, and the geology department moved out of the Octagon, too. Olmsted Associates subsequently recommended demolition, but campus lore suggests that a unique donor plaque recognizing the forty-four individuals—as well as the amounts each contributed—ultimately saved the day. Although new uses have led to some interior change and removal of the observatory dome, the building would still be recognized today by its architect if not its yellow exterior with white trim.⁸ The same cannot be said for what is now called Lawrence Hall at Williams. A first major alteration there came in 1890 in the form of east and west wings added to the octagon to cope with collection growth. It was then followed by two more additions to the rear of the building before a more recent multi-million dollar renovation by the postmodern architect Charles Moore created a significant presence for the Williams College Museum of Art (WCMA) on site, preserving some important features of the original structure but obscuring others. Plans are now well advanced, however, for WCMA to have its own building by 2026 at another location leaving the future use of Lawrence Hall aka Lawrence Library uncertain.⁹
Mid-nineteenth century American architecture saw great stylistic experimentation, but the sudden rise and fall of interest in the octagon is remarkable. In addition to the buildings dedicated at Amherst and Williams in 1848, the same year also saw publication of the first edition of Orson Squire Fowler’s slim book promoting the benefits of the octagonal house. Ultimately it left only a scattering of such dwellings across the country and had limited impact on other types of building design. But the same is true of the college octagons considered here, which stand as curious but isolated experiments. The spark for the Williams design was clearly of European origin rooted in the social theory of Jeremy Bentham. While one may speculate about the source of Hitchcock’s predilection for octagons at Amherst, any connection is impossible to document. Could it be simply the inspiration of a pragmatic scientist seeking as much area for specimen display as possible but constrained by limits of budget? An octagon does, after all, provide significant advantage over the more traditional rectangle in terms of useable interior wall space.

Notes
1. Williams College was established in 1793. Amherst was founded in 1821 by a breakaway group from the former, including its then-president.
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John J. Boyle (1853-1917), *The Stone Age in America*, 1885, as seen in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia. The sculpture is Boyle’s most enigmatic work. Photograph by Caitlin Martin, Association for Public Art.
Lizzie Spider, John J. Boyle
AND THE STONE AGE IN AMERICA

Michael J. Lewis

Philadelphia's Fairmount Park, that vast outdoor hall of fame, has memorials to martyred presidents (Lincoln and Garfield), victorious Union generals (Grant and Meade), and even luminaries of culture (Schiller and Humboldt). But one sculpture stands apart, John J. Boyle's enigmatic Stone Age in America. It defies all pat interpretation and does something rare in our often-moralizing public art: instead of preaching at us, it asks us to think.

Boyle's bronze sculptural group perches on a round granite base, about 200 yards to the north of Philadelphia's Boathouse Row, where it can easily be seen by pedestrians, cyclists, or motorists. It is instantly arresting. We first see a compact family group, an American Indian woman striding forward with two children, a toddler at her breast and an older child clinging to her skirts. But as we approach we notice the stone tomahawk in the woman's hand and the dead bear cub at her feet. We realize she is looking warily ahead, ready to defend her brood from attack should the mother bear appear to avenge her cub.

This is not the stuff of conventional memorials. It is not even clear what it memorializes. Maternal devotion? The march of civilization? The riddle of prehistory? None of these fits exactly. And it is not all clear what we should feel: triumph, reverence, regret—or a confused jumble of all three? Each time we imagine we have figured it out, we look again at the face of the young Indian mother, defiantly refusing to be a mere symbol. She is uncannily realistic and, we now discover, quite real. She doubtless unsettled Boyle, just as she unsettles us.

The Philadelphia sculptor John J. Boyle (1853-1917) is not widely known, even to specialists. He is not well represented in major American museums, and there have been no biographies, monographs, dissertations or exhibitions. Even his most prominent work, the colossal seated Benjamin Franklin at the heart of the University of Pennsylvania campus, is scarcely noticed by the thousands of students who bustle by every day. It is unfortunate that he is best remembered for what is essentially a platitude, because Boyle was very much a free-thinker who was almost incapable of conventional work.

Boyle's friends and colleagues were likewise free-thinkers. Louis Sullivan selected him to create the allegorical sculpture of the Transportation Building, the most radical building of the 1893 Columbian Exposition. Frank Furness likewise selected him to model the soldiers and sailors for the 1899 Grand Army of the Republic encampment, which turned Philadelphia's Broad Street into a monumental Court of Honor. Boyle was on intimate terms with the freest of free-thinkers, Walt Whitman, whose 72nd birthday celebration he attended as a private guest.

Boyle was born in 1853 and grew up in Philadelphia, one of a long line of stonemasons, a trade he sought to avoid. A short stint as an iron moulder taught him there were worse jobs than cutting stone. He began as a simple laborer, gradually advancing to the position of "lot ranger—a man who sets up the small pieces of marble and the steps in the long rows of cheap houses." Setting his sights higher, he took evening classes at the Franklin Institute drawing school and also at Central High night school. His tendency to talk philosophy in the stone yard earned him the nickname "professor."

By 1873 Boyle was a journeyman, and during the winter he would draw on his summer earnings as a stone cutter in order to draw, dissect, and study anatomy. At the Philadelphia Sketch Club he came under the inspiring influence of Thomas Eakins.

When the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts opened in 1876, Boyle immediately enrolled; he later boasted that he "was one of the first four that ever dissected inside its walls" (the others being Emily Sartain, Susan McDowell and Charles Francis Browne). In the meantime he had advanced to carving his first architectural ornament, a column capital for a bank.

Boyle frankly idolized Eakins, whose example he followed by enrolling at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris. He arrived in
Paris in October 1877, not knowing a word of French, but did well, well enough to earn a medal for his modeling that spring. The next summer, having exhausted his savings, he went to London to earn enough to tide him over for another year. He carved a pair of muscular caryatids over the entrance to the Leather, Hide and Wool Exchange in Southwark, as well five relief panels illustrating the leather trade, a congenial commission for a man who enjoyed modeling. The building still stands, letting us see Boyle’s hand at the outset of his career.

Boyle was now accomplished enough to have a work accepted at the Salon of 1880, a bronze bust of Dr. Edward Warren, an eccentric American physician living in Paris who was his “best friend in the city.” Warren admired Boyle’s work enough to recommend him to Martin Ryerson, a Chicago businessman who was in Paris and looking for a sculptor. Boyle later recalled his first meeting with Ryerson in the spring of 1880:

> On calling on Mr. Ryerson I found a gentleman of plain habits and unassuming manner of about 53 years of age and over six feet in height. He told me he had some property in Muskegon, Michigan, and a part of it was an Indian cemetery, which contained the graves of many Indians, among whom he had spent his boyhood and early manhood. Of this he wished to make a little park, and he desired to place a group of Indians in the centre, but had so far not secured a satisfactory design.

Such was the story Ryerson told Boyle.

Of course Ryerson did not tell the whole story (and if he did, Boyle never revealed it). Martin L. Ryerson (1818-1887) was born in Paterson, New Jersey and at the age of 16 went west to Minnesota, where there were many Ottawa, the people Mr. Ryerson wished to represent. Boyle spent two months there, giving him enough time to observe the tribal customs that he depicted in four high-relief panels for the base of the memorial. He took pride in them, especially the one depicting “The Corn Dance,” which he exhibited at Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts in 1881.

Throughout the process Boyle was assisted by Ryerson, who “gave assistance in costuming my figures and in little things that are easily overlooked.” He recommended one crucial change. The original composition had shown only the Ottawa man and woman but he suggested placing a swaddled infant child in the arms of the woman. Was he was thinking of his daughter Mary and her Ottawa mother? If so, he alluded to them in perhaps the only way he could permit himself to, obliquely and symbolically.

A photograph taken in the summer of 1881, now in the collection of the Chicago Historical Society, depicts the full-scale model of the sculpture as it was being finished. By then Boyle had returned to Philadelphia, triumphantly. No longer a mere “lot ranger,” he was an architectural sculptor of the highest order. Wilson Eyre engaged him to create the superb stucco reliefs of Anglecot, the finest of his suburban houses. Meanwhile, his Indian Family was cast in bronze at the Philadelphia foundry of the Bureau Brothers at 811 Fairmount Ave. Even before its completion, it was winning praise for its...
unusual subject matter and ambition. In June 1882 the Philadelphia Inquirer called it “an important work” and one that should be emulated in Philadelphia. The Fairmount Park Art Association should commission a similar sculpture, to be sited where the Wissahickon Creek flowed into the Schuylkill. Boyle, it proposed, might represent “some striking incident in the life of Logan, the great chief, who once ruled the land in this vicinity.”

As word of the sculpture spread, Ryerson had second thoughts. Without explanation, he abruptly decided it would not go Muskegon but to Chicago, where it would sit in Lincoln Park. The decision is baffling. Why would he commission such a deeply personal work, a devotional act of remembrance, and then offer it up as a public memorial in a great municipal park? Perhaps Ryerson, caught up in the excitement of seeing his heroic bronze take shape, regretted the thought of placing it out of public sight. In the end he was carried away by the thrill of playing the civic patron.

Before being installed in Lincoln Park, the sculpture was renamed. Boyle had called it An Indian Family but now it was dubbed The Alarm, a title that suggested an entirely different meaning. It no longer evoked the somber Ottawa “watching over the ashes of his fathers” but “the heroic child of nature foreseeing the advance of the power destined to destroy at once his dominion and his race.” Boyle indignantly refused to accept the new title, and for the rest of his life continued to call it An Indian Family. Perhaps he was dismayed how Chicagoans could misunderstand his sculpture so badly as to claim that it was not created “out of any particular regard or respect for the race at all.”

Critics in Philadelphia were more appreciative. They understood the novelty of depicting the Indian brave as a figure of immense natural dignity, without no condescending mawkishness. He was a mighty figure of a man, moulded in heroic proportions, with all the dignity of grandeur and carriage that tradition assigns to the noble savage, but with no trace of mock sentimentality. They also noted the subtlety of his expression, his “attitude of expectancy, earnest and vigilant, but not suspicious,” and yet showing the first flicker of “dawning anxiety.” Only his snarling dog, baring his teeth, seems aware of mortal peril.

Before The Alarm was shipped to its patron, it was displayed to public view outside Philadelphia’s post office in September 1883. It drew a warm response yet it rankedled to know that this performance of indigenous Philadelphia artistry would grace Chicago. “Philadelphia's sculptor should not be without honor in his own city,” insisted the Philadelphia Inquirer, which repeated its demand that he create “an Indian group, embodying some appropriate local legend, to be placed at the mouth of the Wissahickon.” The Fairmount Park Art Association was listening, and began negotiating with Boyle that fall.

But Boyle did not want to depict “some local legend.” He wanted to express his own ideas, not piously depict a popular myth. That was no better than book illustration. Fortuitously, the Philadelphia Sketch Club had just proposed a provocative theme for its regular sketch competition, “Protection,” a theme that could be expressed in all sorts of configurations or situations. Inspired, Boyle decided to render the theme in terms an Indian mother defending her two children from an attack by an eagle. He did not so much paraphrase The Alarm as rethink it, and in heightened, much more concentrated and fraught terms.

Once again a tightly bonded Indian family looks ahead towards an uncertain future, but now the peril is imminent and it is not a mighty brave who confronts it but the young mother, bearing a toddler in one hand and a tomahawk in the other. Boyle submitted his sketch model which clearly pleased the Art Association. In December he was awarded the commission and given two years to complete it, for which he would receive $10,000.

This time Boyle did not need to travel to Michigan to find his models. During the Civil War, Philadelphia had established a home for war orphans, known as the Lincoln Institution. As the last of their wards were coming of age, it needed a new mission. In the fall of 1883 it opened a home for destitute and
orphaned Indian girls at 324 South 11th Street, and here he found his models. An Osage girl named Edna Eaglefeather was the model for the nude child clutching her mother’s skirt. To represent the mother Boyle selected a striking full-blooded Sioux with the curious name of Lizzie Spider. With this inspired choice, his sculpture would take on deeper meaning, for Lizzie was a remarkable woman.

At their sessions, Boyle would have followed Eakins’ preparatory method, first photographing Lizzie and modeling her head in clay. This, he learned, was not a novel experience for her. She had already been photographed and even had a plaster cast taken of her head. This was in 1878, when she was fourteen, and her Sioux father sent her from Yankton, Dakota to be educated in the east. She was put in the care of Richard Henry Pratt, the army officer who founded the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania. At her enrollment Lizzie, along with 49 other young Indians from various tribes, was measured and recorded by the sculptor Clark Mills, who took plaster casts for purposes of ethnographic research. It must have been a refreshing change for Lizzie to be treated by Boyle as something other than a scientific specimen.

Lizzie, however, was not sent to Carlisle. She went to the Hampton Institute in Virginia, the celebrated school for freedmen established after the Civil War, where her fees were paid by a progressive Congregational church in Massachusetts. Her sponsors treated her well, following her progress, and even bringing her to Stockbridge for summer vacation. But it cannot have been easy: a progress report of May 1883 says that Lizzie had not done as well as she should have, but that she now “appears to be leading a more earnest reformed life.” Yet if she did not feel at home in the respectable middle-class parlors of the eastern seaboard, Dakota no longer suited her either. A stray item in the Philadelphia Times of 1884 makes this clear:

There is a very bright and interesting girl, named Lizzie Spider, the last being her father’s name, which she assumed, a custom the girls nearly all follow. A few years ago she was at the Indian school at Carlisle [Hampton], a pupil, where she learned considerable. When she went back, during the summer vacation, her father sold her to a young Indian brave for a number of ponies, which is the accustomed form of marriage among the Sioux. She has just received enough education to revolt against the savage life that was to be thrust upon her, so she ran away and lived for many months hidden in the woods, going by stealth occasionally to the huts of friends to get...
supplies of food. During his last visit to Yankton Captain Pratt heard of her and after a search found her and brought her back with him and put her in the Lincoln School, where she now is. She says she don’t want to be sold for ponies and to cook and work for a savage lazyboots. 27

That angry last sentence has the ring of authenticity; across the decades we hear Lizzie’s distinctive voice. Her diction and attitude show a woman suspended between two worlds but perfectly capable of speaking for herself.

This would have consequences for Boyle’s sculpture. However he had originally envisioned the Indian woman in his little sketch model, it could hardly survive intact after an encounter with such a feisty and independent spirit as Lizzie Spider.

His research completed, Boyle returned to Paris to complete a full-size plaster model and to cast it in bronze. Early in 1885 he sent a photograph of his model to Art Association, which showed his fierce eagle as it “lay upon its back clawing the air and apparently shrieking defiance in important rage.” To his surprise, the image met with displeasure. The Art Association belatedly realized the implications of an American Indian woman vanquishing such a hallowed symbol of America. Boyle was told to substitute another animal for the eagle. One member of the association put it in crass terms: if the sculpture showed an Indian battling an eagle, “The Shiffler Hose boys would carry it out to the Park and throw it into the Schuylkill.” (The Shiffler Hose Company was a notoriously bigoted volunteer fire company; its motto was “None but Americans need apply.”) 28

Boyle bridled at this late change but he had no choice but to comply. He first tried a cougar before settling on the dead bear cub. There was anotherreservation; one of his patrons was unhappy with the depiction of the older child and requested some adjustments. Again Boyle complied. A photograph shows him in his Paris studio with a French child serving as stand-in for Edna Eaglefeather. 30

The revised design approved, it was cast in the Paris foundry of Thiebaut Freres, and in time to be exhibited at the Salon of 1887. Later that summer it was shipped to America and publicly exhibited in Philadelphia that September. On October 1, 1887, the association chose a site near Sweetbriar Mansion, West Fairmount Park, where it stood until 1985 when it was moved to its present location on the banks of the Schuylkill.

Boyle may have resented the last-minute substitution of a bear cub for his eagle but he had to realize that it improved the work immensely. Instead of depicting a moment of lurid action, it turned the scene into one of tension and suspense. The young mother has killed a bear cub for food, a very dangerous thing to do, and now she warily awaited the consequences. Whether it was his switch of animals or his encounter with Lizzie Spider, Boyle’s thinking about his work had changed. On May 12, 1885, he notified his patrons that he wished to call it The Age of Stone. 31

The sculpture is sometimes interpreted as an allegory of colonial conquest, in which the real threat to the Indian family is not the bear but the destructive and pitiless march of colonial settlement. But this was certainly the intention of Boyle, who deliberately placed his scene deep in prehistory, which allowed him to say and show certain things that would not be possible if set in current or recent times. His setting was the Stone Age, when there was “little or no trace of society even in the most rudimentary form [and] men rarely met except in hostile encounter.” 32 This, for Boyle, was a matriarchal age:

In that stage of human development the woman was unquestionably the dominant being. She it was who held the fortunes and the fate of the race in her hands; she it was who, in the strife with nature and the elements, conquered the conditions that made life possible. She perpetuated the species, reared the young, protected the defenseless, kept the family together, built the hut or cleared out the cave dwelling, provided food and fire, fashioned garments from pelts, tilled the ground, tended the crops and harvested the handful of corn, and garnered the products of the forests and fens for winter stores. Whatever was done to preserve life and make existence tolerable was done by women’s hand. 33
Boyle defended his interpretation by citing “evidence collected by biologists.” In an age coming to terms with women’s rights (The Age of Stone comes almost exactly between the Seneca Falls convention of 1848 and the Nineteenth Amendment of 1920), this was heady stuff. He might also have cited the example of Lizzie Spider, who had all the self-sufficiency of a matriarch of the stone age (“lived for many months hidden in the woods”) but was as emancipated as any woman of the future (“don’t want to be sold for ponies and to cook and work for a savage lazyboots”). These were hardly things Boyle could directly speak about, but by placing it far back in time, he let the public appreciate and accept it on its own terms, with no worrying distractions about its implications for contemporary society.

That society, alas, was not quite ready for Lizzie Spider herself. In 1887 she was sent through the University of Pennsylvania Hospital’s School for Nurses (where, in deference to her patients, she was called Miss Vinton). The last item we have is a poignant report in a Hampton Institute commemorative volume.

In 1890, Lizzie returned to the West, and finding no hospital position ready, she entered the Gov’t School at Yankton Agency as an employee, remaining there until her health failed. In ’91, she married an ex-student of Haskell, Charlie Ree, and now lives at Ponca. She is in consumption, and, though amid poor surroundings, has the speech and bearing of a lady. The sudden failure of the many plans made for her by her Eastern friends is, of course, disappointing, but need not be discouraging.

I have been unable to find any further information.

As for Boyle, he remained proud of The Stone Age in America all his life, regarding it as a thoroughly humanistic work. When he presented his miniature 27-inch version of the sculpture to President Roosevelt in 1907, he placed on its base the inscription

To Theodore Roosevelt
His Love for Humanity
John J. Boyle

One can view it at the Sagamore Hill National Historic Site in Long Island. Roosevelt, for his part, admired the way that Boyle was “able to give virility without brutality.”

In a sense, The Stone Age in America fulfilled the original humanistic vision of Boyle’s first Indian family, before Ryerson permitted it be vulgarized as The Alarm. For all its human sympathy, however, it is a fundamentally tragic work, in that the Indian mother who stands ready to defend her children is the mirror image of the mother bear who could not defend
hers. And so it will be through the centuries, Boyle seems to tell us, and in the fullness of time, tragedy and loss will be their common lot. But he gives us no easy answers, and we are left to contemplate his allegorical figure—and whatever of Lizzie Spider he embedded in it—as she faces the future with shoulders squared and her dignity intact.

But perhaps Boyle asked too much of his American viewers. When the Philadelphia Press reported on the sculpture, it noted drily that his meticulously depicted stone hatchet was “secured by two metallic hoops. A queer representation of the stone age, certainly.” At least two dozen American newspapers reprinted the item.
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Kingscote dining room. McKim, Mead & White, designers, 1881. Courtesy The Preservation Society of Newport County.
“Color and light are the two great tonics of the body and the feelings, and in glass we find them each enhancing the charm of the other,” wrote nineteenth-century journalist Mary Gay Humphreys. According to Humphreys, colored glass carried an aesthetic, even sensorial power. The same sensitivity to stained or leaded glass windows appeared across Aesthetic Movement interiors in Newport, Rhode Island. Jewel-like materials covered surfaces in floral motifs and patterns. Windows filled halls and prompted moments of contemplation. Colored glass offered visual delight.

The early 1880s became a distinct era for American architects during which they emphasized the brilliant effects of contemporary glass. Windows responded to Queen Anne, American Colonial Revival, Japanese and Islamic architectural details, as if engaged in a dialogue. Residential buildings relied on the aesthetic effects of what later came to be known as the Shingle Style, suggesting an informality and lightness. Specifically, Newport’s leaded glass bears a striking similarity in style. Designs included transparent glass in pale palettes, often arranged in geometric patterns. Windows incorporated jewel-like “bullseye,” a roundel resembling the bottom of a bottle with a rough, center knob. “Lead came,” or the black lead holding the glass pieces together appear in wavy, undulating patterns. Examples include the Newport Casino on Bellevue Avenue with skylights in the former card room, and the Isaac Bell House interiors oriented around leaded glass. The entryway greets visitors with an abstract array of roundels, and windows fill the stair landing with wavy leading and a heraldic symbol, trimmed by green tinted bullseye. The pair cast a glowing haze across the landing.

This article focuses on glass installations in a selection of McKim, Mead & White’s Newport architectural sites and interiors, specifically residences. Within many McKim, Mead & White cottages, windows went unattributed. Who was the designer behind the blooming dahlias in Kingscote (1881), and the organic assortment of roundels within the Samuel Tilton House (1880-82)? Overall, this essay constructs a social and cultural framework around these surviving windows in Newport by two relatively unknown glass firms: D. Turno and S. Slack & Co. McKim, Mead & White were not simply viewing the companies and artisans as subordinate contractors in a commission, but as close collaborators to provide light, color, and decorative patterns. They viewed artisans as peers in the architectural process. The architects’ own designs were a modern approach for the late nineteenth century, ones that worked in tandem with contemporary glass.

At Kingscote, David King, Jr. (1839-1894) and Ella King (1851-1925) commissioned the new firm, McKim, Mead & White, for a dining room addition in 1881. Dahlia-bedecked transom windows encircle the space, subtle references to the natural domain beyond the house. The architects installed dahlia designs to frame Louis C. Tiffany & Company opalescent tiles. Swirls of vibrant, red tones form the circular blossoms, and windows include subtle variations in the number of flowers and green-tinted leaves. Leaves and branches travel up the stem and curl toward the bloom, offset by a grid background. Petals and grass are hand-painted to enliven each flower and grass sprouts from patches of green, blue, and yellow pieces, framed with an accent of red. Each transom also includes layers of scallop patterns in the upper portion, similar to mosaics. Floral motifs continue with transoms in the adjoining hall. Patterns include pale gold and green tiles, with touches of violet and wavy lead lines, as if organically pieced together. Dahlias face the viewer in bunches or individual blossoms. Broken roundels provide delicate breaks in the lead lines, and the transoms take on the semblance of bouquets above the dweller.

The manufacturers of the Kingscote windows have been traced back to the King family records and expenses. Since David King, Jr. rented the property from his uncle, William Henry (1818-1897), he was required to note alterations and acquisitions for the estate. Within the probate records of the
McKim, Mead & White dining room addition, King wrote the name “D. Turno” alongside the term “stained glass.” The firm was rarely listed within nineteenth-century design publications or advertisements, unlike their New York peers J&R Lamb Studios and Tidden & Arnold. However, D. Turno finally appeared within an 1884 New York Supreme Court case transcript. The transcript recorded a lawsuit between a Charles H. Turno and his business partner, Augustus Mayers. Witness accounts and evidence presented a wealth of information on the late nineteenth-century firm, ranging from commissions, glass suppliers, shop assistants, and clients, including McKim, Mead & White. Included among the receipts, the Kingscote commission appeared under the architects. The name was also inscribed under McKim, Mead & White accounts for the Kingscote commission with other contract artisans.

D. Turno was based in New York, an environment transforming into the center for stained glass. When the firm was established in 1881, around 2,000 people were employed in the design and manufacture of the stained or leaded glass industry across the city. Companies, like D. Turno, responded to a late nineteenth-century desire for decorative materials. Previously, American stained glass had been reserved for ecclesiastical structures and crafted in a formal, figural style. By the 1870s, however, styles were transforming with the impact of the Aesthetic Movement, which led American designers to begin experimenting with the material. “D. Turno,” likely named after Charles H. Turno’s wife Dorothea, a German immigrant who called himself a “glass stainer,” of the Gilded Age art world. Charles H. Turno (c. 1834-1906), a German immigrant who called himself a “glass stainer,” managed the firm, whether corresponding with clients or selecting materials. Turno would likely be considered an artisan, one who joined other German immigrants to New York. In court, Turno also noted he would often use a translator to speak with clients in English, raising questions on the collaborative process with McKim, Mead & White.

D. S. Hess & Company of New York, which specialized in interior designs and artistic furniture, provided a type of financial support and developed a relationship with D. Turno. Interior designers like D. S. Hess would contract artisans to create decorative elements in a residence, whether with wallpaper, furnishings, or glass. Above all, the close relationship between the firms suggests how D. Turno would have been aware of principles that defined Gilded Age design, specifically how windows harmonized a residence. In the early 1880s, New York was in a state of flux when building new structures and residences, leading to a range of styles appearing across the city. Commissions for designers arose out of this constant building environment and the need to decorate commissions. The majority of D. Turno’s clients would not be considered the elite, like the patrons of La Farge or Louis C. Tiffany. Instead, the firm appeared popular with a range of upper and middle class clients for New York residences, design companies, and ecclesiastical structures. One of the firm’s large-scale projects included the Church of the Holy Spirit (775 Madison Avenue at 66th Street), comprising a multitude of windows across the structure. Residences and addresses reference a typical brownstone dwelling, giving a sense of the pervasive “look” of 1880s New York. By the late 1870s, brownstones began developing into “artistic” houses in a Queen Anne style. D. Turno created a range of transoms, door panels, skylights, or domes to enhance the decorative quality of New York residences. Commissioning windows from a company like D. Turno granted the possibility of transforming one’s home into a work of art. Every decorative element was intentional. Yet, the New York firm only lasted for a brief time from 1881 to 1882. The company quickly dissolved when Charles H. Turno failed to account for payments to the firm (the verdict was found in his favor when payments were clarified in the court case). By 1882, D. Turno ceased to exist.

Yet, D. Turno’s recorded commissions seemed to only account for the Kingscote transoms, leaving the remaining Newport glass in McKim, Mead & White residences unaccounted for. After reviewing the architects’ receipts from 1880–83, another glass firm frequently appeared: S. Slack & Co. The company, led by Stephen Slack, was based in Orange, New Jersey and often designed church windows. For recorded commissions with the architects, the glass firm was listed multiple times in coordination with New York residences and Pennsylvania country houses, totaling almost 10 projects. For example, the firm completed windows for the McKim, Mead & White estate, “Millwood” in Cornwall, Pennsylvania, the country residence of R. Percy Alden. Windows, whether entry transoms or arrangements in the great hall, include distinct wavy lead lines and pale hues, combined with bullseye. Based on the early 1880s time frame for the architects and distinct stylistic unity found across S. Slack & Co. commissions, the Tilton House windows were likely designed by this glass company.

In a similar organic, avant-garde style to Kingscote, the Samuel Tilton House incorporates colored glass throughout the interior. In 1880–82, McKim, Mead & White designed a residence on Sunnyside Place in Newport for Samuel Tilton. Upon entering the residence, guests would be greeted by entryway glass framed by a grid pattern. Clear or blue-tinted bullseye in different tones were arranged in a rectangular format, broken up by fragments of red glass. The array of roundels appear as if haphazard in the rhythmic arrangement. Turning the corner in the central hall, visitors would see a pair of windows installed over the landing. The matching panels include pale violet and green grids, surrounding sections of colorless glass. Across the surface, there is an emphasis on the linear quality of the design, a precision in the geometric arrangement. Each square holds a different, pale hue. Layers of mosaic-like bricks and trim encase the pockets of colorless glass, finished off by sections of red. Adjoining rooms include...
colorless plate glass windows with sunburst accents and geometric motifs.

Exploring these two glass firms begins to reframe an understanding of the longstanding idea that McKim, Mead & White worked solely with John La Farge and Louis C. Tiffany. The distinct styles of D. Turno and S. Slack & Co. are either unacknowledged, or simply considered copies after the more well known Gilded Age glass designers.23 Charles McKim and Stanford White often recommended La Farge to clients and collaborated in the 1880s.24 The glass designer also lived in close proximity to the McKim, Mead & White designed residences in Newport.25 How did D. Turno and S. Slack & Co. secure commissions from the firm? Late nineteenth-century artistic circles were extremely interrelated and produced constant collaborations. By the summer of 1880, La Farge was busy with the Cornelius Vanderbilt II residence on West 57th Street in New York (1881-83). The large-scale commission included jeweled transoms, skylights, door lunettes, and vestibule doors, specifically installations in the dining and watercolor room. La Farge’s Peonies Blown in Wind (c. 1883) showcases the artist’s compilation of rich, jewel tones, originally installed in the reception room.26 However, the designer began experiencing difficulty with budget over-runs and delivering work on schedule, which created conflicts amongst artist, architect, and patrons.27 During the Newport glass commissions, La Farge would have been preoccupied with the schedule and demands of the Vanderbilt project. Perhaps the architects were directed to other available glass firms in the New York area, especially those willing to closely follow design ideas and understand the aesthetic motifs of interiors.

D. Turno and S. Slack & Co.’s Newport creations emerged from a Gilded Age design environment of the early 1880s, a time in which designers and patrons were passionate about decoration. The Aesthetic Movement reached the United States by the 1870s, and emphasized the individual beauty of each object. Clarence Cook’s seminal 1878 décor book The House Beautiful disseminated the idea of living amid beauty and elevating the domestic arts. Designers and patrons celebrated the sinuous movement of lines, beauty of jewel tones, and form, also known as “art for art’s sake.” Popular Aesthetic Movement motifs included abstract, decorative patterns, or motifs from plant forms, often mixing styles within a single interior as a sign of “artistic” taste.28 Within a space, designers paid particular attention to the unity of materials, creating subtle relationships between murals, wallpaper, architectural details, and above all, glass. Significantly, McKim, Mead & White intersected with the bohemian circles of the New York art world during the early 1880s. The architects would have been extremely aware of contemporary trends, or ideas circulating with befriended artists, including John La Farge and Augustus Saint-Gaudens. For example, in Kingscote’s dining room, McKim, Mead & White pulled from various cultural and temporal sources, staging materials. Japanese motifs appeared in stylized chrysanthemum brass sconces. A dividing screen at the eastern end of the room combined Renaissance roundels and Islamic patterns. The firm covered the ceiling with cork tiles, and incorporated American Colonial decorative art with mahogany furnishings. As a final touch, White included a Colonial spinning wheel taken from the King family barn. Shapes, textures, colors, and above all lighting, worked together to create a “poetic” effect.29 The Aesthetic Movement design relied on the impact of the eclectic ensemble.

Glass windows coincided with a passion for embelli
surfaces in decoration. During the 1880s, the medium rose in popularity in the United States. As D. Turno and S. Slack & Co. began collaborating with McKim, Mead & White, American glass artisans were experimenting with a range of materials. Glass firms elevated the medium to a “fine art” and considered themselves artists rather than craftsmen. This idea especially applied to John La Farge. He began redefining the field by emphasizing colored glass and its ability to carry light. Roger Riordan, a nineteenth-century glass critic, often discussed the pivotal role of the medium in the United States. For Riordan, American stained glass, whether transoms or sashes, could “satisfy the eye with a beautiful pattern or picture.” For practical reasons, decorative leaded glass windows could provide privacy or create an idealized scene to change the view outside. Decorative art manuals and publications constantly discussed leaded windows, whether possible design or installation ideas. Publications introduced illustrations of Japanese patterns, furniture, and articles to “invite open interpretation” for designers. Nineteenth-century discussions circulated around the physical, even psychological impact, of glass. One humorous article passionately discussed the impact of an ugly window, stating “That window persecuted me by day and haunted my dreams by night; waking or sleeping.” Among American audiences, everybody wanted to live with a decorative window.

Though Newport was not necessarily a center for American stained glass, the city reflects the fashionable turn to the medium, whether with windows that were interspersed in rooms as subtle details or great halls planned around installations. Elite audiences would have been familiar with heavy, stylized designs before the arrival of the McKim, Mead & White’s installations. Examples include the pair of stair landing windows in Chateau-sur-Mer by William McPherson & Co. The William Watts Sherman House, one of the first Newport interiors on which Stanford White assisted, included Daniel Cottier’s “Morning Glories,” detailed floral motifs and stylized patterns across trellises.

Writing in 1872 on the impact of Japanese aesthetics, critic and collector James Jackson Jarves explained how American art and design was to progress by “assimilated examples...
drawn from all sources.” D. Turno and S. Slack & Co. answered this call. Designers selected, mediated, interpreted, and incorporated patterns into windows. These glass creations emerged out of a community fascinated by the decoration of other cultures. For nineteenth-century American audiences, the idea “cosmopolitan” began with the arrival of the Aesthetic Movement at the 1876 International Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. A Japanese Bazaar included folding screens, porcelain, and chrysanthemum banners. Egyptian exhibitions showcased cultural artifacts, and a New England pavilion of American Colonial objects reminded audiences of their country’s decorative past. Yet, these exhibition arenas also presented stylized versions of cultures and included imperialist undertones, emphasizing the exotic nature of a design or the notion of “otherness.” Pavilions offered idealized and romantic interpretations of the styles. Nineteenth-century audiences, including Newport designers and patrons, were soon introduced to a variety of global styles and design.

Stanford White attended the exhibition, likely viewing East Asian architecture within the Japan pavilion. David and Ella King noted the visit to the Centennial in their personal journals. Additionally, S. Slack & Co. received special mention for a stained glass window in the exhibition. The Turno and Slack windows in Newport developed out of this environment. In their choice of aesthetics, the two firms directly responded to contemporary trends that were still quite “modern” or “avant-garde” for the early 1880s. Windows evoked an idea of a country, period, or the original decorative source. McKim, Mead & White and their Newport clients were likely attracted to these windows as a sign of cultivated taste. Colored glass was a subtle, albeit dazzling, reference to being in the “know.” The Kings were tied to artistic circles in New York through Stanford White, and acquainted with fashionable décor of the 1880s. Specifically, David King was close friends with White and would have been aware of the décor in his dining room. Samuel Tilton was originally a painter who then moved to Naples and became a dealer advising American collectors. Late nineteenth-century viewers became drawn to cosmopolitan patterns, either to revisit the past or imagine a future in a post-Civil War America. Underlying the Newport interiors was a concept of cosmopolitanism as a higher or ideal aspiration. For nineteenth-century patrons, like the Kings and Tiltons, the term connoted an optimistic global environment, in which cultures could aesthetically coexist, even in a glass window.

Among other influences, art glass windows were inspired by Islamic artistic tradition and surface ornament. When glass artisans began crafting the Newport installations, they looked to nineteenth-century visions of Islamic patterns for the aesthetic appeal, or Orientalism. Originally, the idea of Orientalism in America associated Islamic ornament with beauty and the senses, offering nineteenth-century viewers a type of exoticism and sensuality to what they perceived as the “Orient.” Geometric arrangements or heavily encrusted surfaces suggest Near Eastern designs popular among American designers and clientele. Newport audiences would already see “Orientalist” styles when La Farge decorated the United Congregational Church from 1879–81. The church included encaustic murals and leaded glass windows with Near Eastern motifs on either side of the structure. In the design, La Farge mixed Romanesque and Byzantine styles for the window motifs. Pairs include abstract, geometric fretwork and intercrossing lines to suggest Islamic patterns. The La Farge windows would have been an example of fashionable glass for viewers, created at the same time as McKim, Mead & White’s Newport Casino and Kingscote addition. With the number of historical patterns or global styles, designers could easily take up motifs in “a spirit of free translation.”

For D. Turno and S. Slack & Co.’s own designs, various windows relate to nineteenth-century design portfolios and plate books circulating in artistic circles. One example included Prisse d’Avenne’s L’Art Arabe (1877), a series of color plates documenting Near Eastern designs, locale, and architectural sites. Lithographs include floral decorations and mosaic patterns, or arabesque decorations. McKim, Mead & White owned a large number of books and folios with drawings and scrapbooks. Though the glass firms may not have owned the publications in the workshop, the architects referenced pattern books to then collaborate with artisans. White himself collected “exotica” when traveling in France, likely bringing back the book L’Art Arabe. Perhaps, D. Turno was inspired by the heavily decorated surfaces or jewel-toned color in the Prisse d’Avennes print of a stylized floral bouquet to transfer into the Kingscote transoms. Sinuous lines curl around the natural motif with layers of trim, similar to the movement of lead lines framed by a heavily encrusted border and geometric pattern. Additionally, the arabesques within the Tilton House stair windows also suggest the rhythmic linear patterns, scrolling forms, and abstract motifs of Islamic design. Sections of the glass are joined into interlocking patterns, evoking interlaced geometric motifs. Surfaces are broken by ornament, as if encrusted in gems. The “exoticism” of Islamic patterns
connected to a fascination with the unfamiliar and the nineteenth-century mindset of pleasure in the senses and escapism, one tied to colonialist ideologies.44 Windows perhaps offered a so-called “armchair Orientalism,” in which dwellers could look upon the jewel-like surfaces and luminous tones of colored glass to dream of a fantastical “Orient.”

Japonesque aesthetics was another popular design reference that appears across the Newport glass installations. Some late nineteenth-century glass firms became drawn to Japanese motifs and patterns, including asymmetry and surface effects. Particularly, American designers took up Japanese art’s sensitivity to the natural world and ornament.45 Designers began associating Japan with a shift from industrial life, a reaction against the increasing modernization, and a greater connection to the natural world.46 The Kingscote transoms drew upon these natural motifs and playful asymmetrical compositions. For the dahlia transoms, unique variations appear in each window with the different floral styles and placement of roundels, taking on an organic style.47 With the craze for the Japonesque, design theorists also emphasized stylized patterns. The Aesthetic Movement British designer, Christopher Dresser discussed how a window is a two-dimensional pattern, similar to Japanese landscapes flattening components of a composition. Designs were drawn from nature and then stylized, as seen with Dresser’s flowers illustrations in his Japan: its architecture, art, and art manufactures (1882). In the case of the Kingscote windows, D. Turno crafted stylized floral blooms by emphasizing the circular motifs and painting detailed petals. Patterns appear compressed against the wavy leading, as if the viewer is looking upon the flower head on. For the Newport residences, McKim, Mead & White and the glass firms crafted interiors or windows that fused Asian patterns and aesthetics into a space, rather than a room devoted entirely to Asian artifacts of collector.48 The designs did not overtly imitate Asian design, but reinterpreted motifs.

Lastly, American Colonial Revival details and glass materials surfaced within the Newport windows. Charles McKim directed the firm to the study of early American architecture, inspired by the picturesque qualities of Newport residences.49 In 1877, McKim, White, and William B. Bigelow took a trip along the New England coast to study eighteenth-century ancestral homes. McKim, Mead & White became captivated by early Colonial buildings and created “modernized colonial” structures, which included the installation of shell motifs in Kingscote’s sideboard and built-in seats within the Tilton House.50 Windows referred back to interiors with subtle eighteenth-century details. Similar to the American use of Islamic patterns, the motifs were not a specific version of the design sources, but recalled the informality of Colonial decoration.51 Bullseye referenced the older tradition of glass roundels originally found in early American transoms. Within the Kingscote hall, D. Turno inserted small, fragments of cut bullseye to break up the lead patterns. The firm also likely incorporated English antique glass to compose the brick-like background. Within the Tilton House, S. Slack & Co. filled the entryway window with bullseye in a dense, pulsating pattern. Each roundel, handcrafted by the glass manufacturers as evidenced by the rough, pontil mark (where the glass roundel was broken off of the pontil rod), suggested the simplicity of eighteenth-century structures and making an allusion to American Colonial design immediately upon entering the Newport residence.

Above all, nineteenth-century designers did not accurately translate Near Eastern, Asian, or Colonial design sources, but selected for the sake of aesthetics. In George Sheldon’s 1883-84 portfolio Artistic Houses, he remarked upon this type of cosmopolitan, decorating style when he discussed Louis C. Tiffany’s New York residence:

By Moorish decoration the reader is to understand, not a copy of anything that ever has existed or still exists, but only a general feeling for a particular type... In this drawing-room, for instance, the Moorish feeling has received a dash of East Indian, and the wall-papers and ceiling-papers are Japanese, but there is a unity that binds everything into an ensemble...52

Design sources coexist in one window. By assimilating global patterns, the glass firms crafted a fusion of Eastern and Western motifs. The Newport leaded glass windows were part of McKim, Mead and White’s aesthetic innovation that led directly to the Modern Movement.

During the period of D. Turno and S. Slack & Co.’s creations, there was a rising interest among Americans in leaded glass for the aesthetic impact. An 1878 home décor manual includes an illustration of a woman captivated by stained glass transoms. Leaning upon the windowsill, she gazes up toward the transoms, as if mesmerized by the ensemble. The illustration captures how glass was placed in specific arrangements to augment interiors. Windows could craft ambient spaces. N.G. Egleston, Jr. in his article on “Mosaic Glass,” discusses how a designer should study the place where the work is to be located, the style of architecture of the house, and plan of decoration, including the natural, outside environment.53 The D. Turno or S. Slack & Co. creations carried the interior of a space, while establishing a spatial dialogue between patron and decorative surface. Since early McKim, Mead & White structures emphasized the circulation of space and open plans, rooms were planned to work with glass. Interiors were “interwoven” as one space lead into the next.54 Architects and designers introduced a room with glass, causing visitors to move through the rooms to follow color and light with an organic movement, rather than confined to partitioned sections.55

Within the firm, Stanford White is credited with carefully composing the interiors. The architect, part interior designer, likely collaborated with the glass firms to decide upon the particular aesthetics of each window.56 Across an interior, there was a visual continuity between glass and decorative details. Material dialogues ensued between decorative objects and windows. Rooms, especially Kingscote’s dining space, relied on the “aesthetic effect of the ensemble,” and the role of glass tying together an interior.57 Besides these iconographic references, White played off the sensorial quality of D. Turno’s glass. When...
creating a fluid blend of objects, the young architect considered textures, materials, and surfaces for objects to work together. According to a colleague: “To White architecture meant color first, then form, texture, proportion, and plan last of all.” In Kingscote, White combined sensuous materials to interact with each other. The glistening, flat surface of the transoms in the dining room continued the reflective form of the Sienna marble fireplace. Light could be absorbed or reflected onto different objects. These material dialogues allowed glass and light to continue across discreet, decorative surfaces.

Nineteenth-century discussions circulated around the effects of stained or leaded glass itself. Artists and critics began taking into account the presence of the owner in relation to colored glass. Diminished light gave off a feeling of comfort, or brightness became startling. Patches of prismatic color from glass could pass over the face and create a “disagreeable impression.” For example, the Tilton house glass windows highlighted the dramatic introduction of colored glass for the dweller. If windows overlooked a stair landing, it was believed the panels could create a profusion of color in the hall. Moving through the interior, a guest might turn the corner to ascend the staircase and view the pair of windows. Upon seeing the panels from a distance, viewers would also see the visual continuity between the Japanese grid pattern on the wood paneling and the leaded glass geometric frame. The 1886 Century illustration depicting a woman passing the Tilton stairs captures how the panels would frame the dweller. The illustration also notes how viewers considered living with installations. Curtains hang near the clear glass, pulled back to introduce light into a section of the house, or limit summer luminosity. The Decorator and Furnisher discussed glass on these type of landings as “the caller is now greeted by a flood of brilliant sunlight that gives a mystic and inviting appearance to the entrance.”

Kingscote’s dahlia transoms created a luminous surprise turning the corner into the dining room. According to Roth, the expanson of the translucent glass and the shimmering, shifting colors create a sense of intimate enclosure and privacy, while opening up the wall to the sun at the same time. Colored glass windows, like those found in Kingscote, added to the creation of a nineteenth-century home sphere, instilling a sense of intimacy and privacy in the containment of the room. Turno’s glass also served as a visible display for visitors, a symbol of artistic taste. The majority of leaded glass by the two companies cannot be seen in detail from the exterior or remains obscured, reflecting how the windows were less a symbol of design or taste for passerby. Guests would have to be granted access to view the artistic installations. This dazzling material was intended for specific eyes.

Artists began playing with the effects of glass and natural transparency of the material. D. Turno and S. Slack & Co. preferred transparent glass for the gradations of color, and relied on textures to add dimension. As seen with the Newport windows, colorless glass, by incorporating the factor of light
and shade, produced “the full effects of atmosphere and distance.” A type of glass termed “antique” included a rough, uneven thickness to the material, and became valued for its striations, markings, and imperfections, even believed to be beautiful on its own as a fragment. The uneven surface of glass was able to absorb the light and hold it, “giving out the rays from its innumerable inequalities as from the facets of a gem, and producing a richness and brilliancy.” Crown glass also appears in the swirling movement of red tones for dahlias. These irregularities lent a type of organic, natural quality to the material. Bullseye glass, another antique material, created subdued or mellowed light. In addition, the bullseyes in the Tilton House were hand-made roundels with the rough center, compared to versions blown in molds with a uniform quality.

During the late nineteenth century, painting details on glass was still popular, though paint often limited luminosity. Instead of relying on this dated technique, Turno and Slack’s windows are quite modern for the early 1880s, emphasizing the material qualities of the glass itself. With specific types of glass, plates varied in tone and shades, therefore no longer requiring heavy paint applied to the surface. The only painted enamel details include petals or grass (appearing on Kingscote’s transoms). In nineteenth-century publications outlining the principles of stained glass, writers discussed the benefits of material catching the light. David Ramsay Hay, a Scottish decorative painter and theorist on the science of aesthetics, examined how color was dependent on interior decoration and the control of natural light. As artisans began understanding the nature of glass itself, this new understanding of the material became reflected in designs. Colored glass could be purely decorative, creating designs simply for the luminous effects. Above all, decorative color was meant to give particular emphasis on designs with “intensity and clearness.”

Colored glass, specifically those created by D. Turno and S. Slack & Co., existed in McKim, Mead & White spaces to create atmospheric interiors. Above all, windows integrated the
dynamic effects of natural light. Clarence Cook in The House Beautiful explored the improvement of public taste by displaying beautiful objects. For Cook, “These objects have a distinct use and value... as educators of certain senses, sense of color, touch, sight.” Leaded glass could, in turn, “educate” a sense of color and sight for Newport audiences. It became fashionable to pass tones through color, rather than the “glare of the white light of day.” Nineteenth-century journalists discussed if windows were placed on the sunny side of a house with strong light, dark rich colors should be used. Wall tints would be adapted to fit the exposure of the room, whether windows faced north or south. Critics placed importance on whether the light source would come from direct or western light. For example, Louis C. Tiffany’s New York apartment hall accounted for natural light passing through the windows. Tiffany installed windows in the gable to be raised by a large wheel and chain, manipulating light entering the passage. Daylight constantly interacted with the glass and these light interactions depended on the specific location of the window. As seen in a Decorator and Furnisher illustration, designers and dwellers considered this ever changing, natural light. A stained glass window on the stairwell creates a mystic appearance once light casts a shadow upon the wallpaper. Likewise, glass artisans took advantage of ambient light, notably the summer luminosity during the Newport season.

Aesthetic Movement led glass across Newport reflects the dynamic role of the medium. But some of McKim, Mead and White's artistic glass manufacture remains a mystery. Specifically, the colorful windows and arrangements in Isaac Bell House (1881-1883) remain unattributed. Did S. Slack & Co. insert the finishing touch of green bullseye around the stair landing windows and abstract array of entryway glass? Or did D. Turno, under a different company name, design the wavy lead patterns in the upper sashes? D. Turno and S. Slack & Co.’s contribution to the Newport design environment can best be captured in an early 1880s Architect and Building News article on the presence of windows, principles perhaps taken up by the firms:

You never feel its presence obtrusively. Your attention is not attracted, nor your eye pained by bright patches of glaring colors; but there is just that hazy, quiet light thrown around you which best prepares the eye to appreciate form and color in everything else. This then is magic.

Preserved in McKim, Mead & White interiors, D. Turno and S. Slack & Co.’s creations encapsulate a nineteenth-century desire for an aesthetic intimacy, one between dwelling, patron, and design.

Notes
3. The early 1880s was also a distinct era for the architectural firm before their shift to historical revival styles.
4. The term “leaded glass” is used throughout the essay since D. Turno used this specific technique, rather than the technical “stained” glass, in which glass was “stained” with silver nitrate and fired. However, nineteenth-century artists, critics, and clients did not distinguish between the two terms in publications. For example, D. Turno called itself a “stained glass” firm, though they did not stain the glass sheets or windows.
5. The leaded glass windows in the Isaac Bell House are also unattributed. The stairway and entryway windows are likely completed by S. Slack & Co. The Newport Casino skylights and surviving leaded glass windows in the structure also remain unattributed.
7. McKim, Mead & White was formed in 1879 with one of their first projects included the Newport Casino.
8. The D. Turno commission was $437.00. David King, Jr. also listed Tiffany & Co. tiles for 0.25 each. Tiffany completed the mosaic floral designs over the fireplace. “King Family Probate Records Transcript, 1875-1890,” Kingscote related documents, Archive, The Preservation Society of Newport County.
9. “Supreme Court General Term. First Judicial District. Charles T. Parks,

10. D. Turno receipts are often not detailed and only include the client’s name, address, and the amount for the project.

11. One receipt includes the note for a “lantern.” The lantern possibly corresponds with an example from the Isaac Bell House. The remaining D. Turno receipts still need to be deciphered with possible McKim, Mead & White projects. “Supreme Court General Term. First Judicial District. Charles T. Parks, as Receiver, against Charles Turno: Case on Appeal,” 169.


13. Though it remains uncertain why Dorothea entered into the partnership, perhaps for legal reasons, the firm’s management passed into the hands of Charles H. Turno. Dorothea Turno’s involvement in the firm requires further inquiry, especially her role in the management of a company.

14. Turno’s background as a “glass stainer,” likely relates to Germany, specifically Munich, as a center for stained glass. Additional information on Charles H. Turno and family found in New York City directories (1875-1890) and Ancestry.com census records from U.S. City Directories and Federal Census documents post-1880. Charles H. Turno, Jr. (c. 1863-1920), son of Charles H. Turno, completed lead glazing and served as a workman in the firm.

15. German artisans immigrated to America in hopes of continuing businesses that were quickly becoming obsolete when faced with modernization on the European market. Edwin G. Burrows, and Mike Wallace, Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898 (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 742.

16. Similar relationships occurred between other design companies and glass artists, seen with Herter Brothers and John La Farge from 1880-82.

17. Receipts also include contracts with D.S. Hess & Company, and other interior design or upholstery firms, including B.L. Solomon’s Sons. Clients include the financier, William Belden (810 Fifth Avenue), Dr. S.A. Main (666 Fifth Avenue), and Saint Thomas House and Chapel (229 East 59th St.), a German mission. One of the Turno receipts also includes an order from the Penn. R.R. Co. The majority of the structures are largely lost. Many of the clients listed in the D. Turno receipts are simply noted as “Mrs. Downing,” “William Fink,” or “John Fitzpatrick,” and other non-descript names, which are difficult to trace in early 1880s New York directories.

18. A few of the brownstones connected to D. Turno were built in a Queen Anne style by Anson Squires of Squires & Woolley at 79th St. and 4th Avenue c. 1879 (present day Park Avenue). Robert A. M. Stern, Thomas Mellins, and David Fishman, New York 1880: Architecture and Urbanism in the Gilded Age (New York: The Monacelli Press, Inc., 1999), 570.


20. The end of the trail found the verdict in the defendant’s (Charles H. Turno) favor when he clearly explained how incoming funds were spent on the business and glass materials.

21. Stephen Slack also partnered with the stained glass designer, Charles Booth from 1870-76. Grateful to Julie Sloan for her preliminary information on S. Slack & Co.

22. S. Slack & Co. was commissioned for other residences, including the Ross Winans residence (1882) in Baltimore, and Robert Goettel estate “Southside” on Ochre Point (1883) in Newport. S. Slack & Co. existed from 1860-98 and was located in Orange, New Jersey.


24. La Farge could be considered in a separate category due to the scale of his client commissions compared to S. Slack & Co. and D. Turno. La Farge’s patronage through McKim, Mead & White seems to lessen after 1881. Yarnall, “Brilliant but Stormy Collaborations,” 40.

25. In the 1880s, La Farge would travel back and forth from New York and Newport to spend time with his family. He also lived next door to the Tilton House.

26. Unfortunately, the Vanderbilt window’s present location is unknown and only watercolor, nineteenth-century illustrations of the window, and installation photographs exist.


30. By the 1890s, stained glass became more pictorial rather than the ornamental patterns of D. Turno’s windows.

31. La Farge organized the Decorative Art Company in 1883, but it quickly dissolved by 1885 due to legal disputes though he continued to produce stained glass until the end of his life. The company can be compared to D. Turno’s financial difficulties and the short time span of nineteenth-century stained glass firms. Even after a company closed, artists could continue designing glass under a new company name.

32. Roger Riordan, “The Use of Stained Glass,” The Art Amateur 12, no. 6 (May, 1885): 130.


34. Publications include The Decorator and Furnisher, Art Amateur, and Art Interchange.


38. S. Slack & Co.’s special mention also suggests how the Centennial showcased the work of American artists.

39. The couple attended the opening of the Newport Casino and became acquainted with the contemporary design of the McKim, Mead & White site.


46. Another plate book circulating among designers included Owen Jones, *The Grammar of Ornament* (1856), a multivolume chromolithographed publication that reproduced decorative styles of various cultures and periods.


49. The Kings were also perhaps fascinated with the Japanese styles. Leland M. Roth, *Ellen E. Roberts, "Japanism in Stanford White's Dining Room for Based on various descriptions and previous studies on the Kingscote* (1887), 58.


51. Based on various descriptions and previous studies on the Kingscote dining room, the flowers have been identified as dahlias. Though the blooms bear a resemblance to the popular Japanese symbol of the chrysanthemum, the flowers include the distinct vibrant, red tones of the dahlia.

52. The Henry G. Marquand house in New York, designed in 1881 included a "Japanese Room" filled with Asian objects and bric-a-brac.

53. Charles McKim called for the preservation of Colonial buildings to study the "picturesque features" in *The New York Sketchbook of Architecture*, 1874.


60. White may have closely directed artisans in the glass design since various motifs directly match interior details of the residences. Wayne Craven, *Stanford White: Decorator in Opulence and Dealer in Antiquities* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 8.


63. White, *The Houses of McKim, Mead & White*, 34.


68. Specifically, the D. Turno court transcript provides a perspective on how a late nineteenth-century New York firm selected materials, and examples correspond to the Kingscote transoms. Glass materials listed under receipts and inventory included opal sheets, jewels, English rolled glass, and American antique.


72. Page, Harding & Co., glass manufacturers references owners connected to the Berkshire Glass Works in Lanesboro, MA. Kingscote's dahlia motifs include a red and pink streak material for the flower blossoms, a material similar to surviving Berkshire Glass samples.


74. A contemporary of D. Turno, Donald MacDonald, described how his designs "tried to induce people to let glass remain in its full beauty, undimmed by an enamel and if the sun troubled them to place curtains in windows and to pull them down until the light ceased to trouble them." Lance Kasparian, "The stained glass work of Donald MacDonald of Boston: a preliminary study," *The Journal of Stained Glass* 28 (2004): 16.


“Snohomish,” described in 1941 by writers of the *American Guide* series:

...at the confluence of the Snohomish and Pilchuck Rivers in Washington state, is the market center of outlying truck and dairy farms; small shingle mills operate part of the time.1

The *Guide* describes the town’s founding in 1853, its eventual settlement in the 1860s, and the establishment of an active cultural life in the early 1870s, including an Atheneum Society and a separately-housed public library.

The central business district flourished in the 1890s and comprises today a designated National Register Historic District. Nineteenth and early twentieth century churches, residences, and commercial buildings fill the district and the hills of the surrounding neighborhoods. Tourism highlights the historic character of the district, and shops, galleries, restaurants and pubs create a lively and flourishing atmosphere.

The *American Guide* series writers chose to highlight the library, built in 1910, in a separate paragraph, describing how the building differs considerably from the majority of Carnegie libraries: it is of frame and buff-colored concrete designed in modified mission style, with a tile roof.2

Their attention to this building is notable for the time; they completely ignored the nineteenth century buildings in what comprises today’s designated historic district. The situation was reversed some thirty years later, when the historic district proposals lifted up the nineteenth century shop fronts, but largely omitted mention of the library building, which was also in the designated district.

The Snohomish City Council accepted a $10,000 gift from Andrew Carnegie for construction of a new library building in March of 1909 and agreed to expend $1000 annually for its maintenance.2 A board of trustees was appointed in the following month. The newly formed architectural partnership of Frederick Thomas Bigger (1881-1963) and James Smyth Warner (1881-1914) began preparation of drawings.

Both architects had arrived in Seattle just months prior, each working temporarily for different Seattle firms. They had studied at the University of Pennsylvania and had—by the Pacific Northwest standards of the time—impressive (even intimidating) academic, international travel, and professional credentials. Bigger had worked for Tiffany in New York, Alden & Harlow in Pittsburgh, and A. B. Lacey in Philadelphia. Warner had also worked for Alden & Harlow, as well as for Furness, Evans & Co., in Philadelphia.4

Their Seattle partnership began in January of 1909, and in a short time they were working on sanitarium and hospital projects, one of them in collaboration with the Olmsted brothers. Seattle was experiencing one of its periodic construction booms; this on the heels of the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition of 1909, and other East Coast architects were attracted to set up practices. For a time, it looked like a period of great opportunity for a new generation of architects. Seattle’s architects had their drafting boards full of projects and proposed projects, and fresh impulses from academically-trained designers gave new energy to a professional corps still largely populated by self-taught architects and builders. The fledgling City Beautiful movement called for quality civic, educational, and cultural buildings and urban ensembles.

Bigger & Warner’s library design was for a stucco-clad rectangular building with a shallow, tiled hip-roof and featured a...
monumental double entrance stairway embracing a ground level fountain. Decorative tilework on the exterior included four renditions of historic printer’s marks as medallions on the front elevation and bands of colored courses sparingly applied below windowsills and just below the cornice. The cast stone pediment at the front entrance featured naturalistic floral ornament in the Arts and Crafts style, closely mirroring English and German examples of the period. Renderings and photographs of the building occupied a two-page spread in the 1910 exhibition catalog of the Seattle Architectural Club.5

The local Seattle economy and construction prospects soured as Bigger & Warner began this project. The larger-scale projects they had planned remained on hold or were taken over by other firms. They ultimately had departed Seattle in late 1910 before the Snohomish Library building was finished and resumed their partnership for a time in Philadelphia. Bigger shortly thereafter returned to Pittsburgh and embarked on a long and distinguished career as both architect and in urban planner, ultimately becoming a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects. The talented Warner continued in an architectural partnership with Edmund Evans and served as well as an instructor at University of Pennsylvania until his premature death following surgery in 1914.4

Their elegant library building served the Snohomish area for decades, even as the town went into steep economic decline. Disastrous fires leveled two major lumber mills, and the local economy reverted to small-scale farming. The main business district and the residential areas remained frozen in time as the Seattle and Everett economies boomed. Responding to increased needs, local architects designed an unfortunate 1968 addition to the Carnegie library building that obliterated the front staircase and partially covered the elaborate pediment of the original front entrance door. Tilework had long since been painted over, including the remarkable “printer’s marks” medallions. The modernist cubic block addition created what seemed like a permanent intrusion on the original building and the library site. Five years later, the entire downtown Snohomish business district was placed on the National and State Historic Registers, acknowledging a remarkable collection of late nineteenth century buildings. While the Carnegie building was included in the district designation, it was described at that time as “non-contributing.” Small wonder.

A new and expansive library was built in 2003, blocks away. The Carnegie building then served for a time as a community center and gathering space until it was declared unsafe in 2007. Ten years elapsed, peppered with many public hearings and three proposed master plans, until the tenacious Snohomish Carnegie Foundation could finally coordinate a systematic renovation and restoration of the building. A seismic upgrade and structural stabilization was possible by 2013, and vigorous community fundraising and advocacy resulted in the restoration project that began in 2019 and was completed in 2021.

The work included removal of the incongruous 1968 addition, seismic retrofit, ADA accessible entrances, upgraded mechanical systems, and a new roof. Interior woodwork and trim were refurbished, layers of old flooring removed, windowsills restored, and period appropriate lighting replaced rows of hanging fluorescent fixtures. The front entrance stairway was reconstructed using historic photographic evidence. Cast stone was repaired and in some cases recreated. Exterior paint was removed to uncover the brilliant period tile work and the “printer’s marks” medallions that had been invisible for years. A kitchen was installed in the basement, and accessible bathrooms were created in the basement and main floors. ARC, a Seattle architectural firm, shepherded the rehabilitation in conjunction with the engineering firm Swenson Say Fagé.

The vibrant tilework medallion is revealed; the ensign of William Caxton, 15th century British printer. Courtesy Northwest Vernacular Historic Preservation.

Work was completed in 2021, “on time and under budget.” The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation accorded the project its 2021 Award for Outstanding Rehabilitation.

Hearty community and city government support, together with thousands of volunteer hours, have brought back the beauty and Arts & Crafts eloquence of this Carnegie library building as it retains in a new way its central place and gathering function in the lively Snohomish Historic District.

Notes
2. Ibid., p. 347.
The Bibliophilist

Modern Gothic: The Inventive Furniture of Kimbel and Cabus, 1863-82

Barbara Veith and Medill Higgins Harvey, eds. With essays by Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen, Max Donnelly, Melitta Jonrd, Veith and Harvey. Catalog entries by Cooney Frelinghuysen, Brooklyn Museum and Hirmer, 2021.

Full disclosure: I have long loved the quirky furniture created by Kimbel and Cabus and decades ago bought one of their drop-front desks. I soon found myself among a growing fan club that included Barry Harwood, a curator at the Brooklyn Museum. For many years he hoped to organize an exhibition on the firm, and when funding materialized, he came out of (a brief) retirement to do the project. He and his collaborator, Barbara Veith, moved forward until his sudden death in 2018. This book, and the exhibition it documents, is therefore something of a memorial to Harwood. Veith and Medill Higgins Harvey, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, are to be praised for picking up Harwood’s torch and carrying it forward with the publication and exhibition produced by the Brooklyn Museum. This volume not only illuminates the distinctive work of Kimbel and Cabus, it is a deep dive into the Modern Gothic style. Also known as Reformed Gothic, the Modern Gothic style advocated simplicity and “honesty” in design by adapting medieval motifs and forms for use in contemporary life. Kimbel and Cabus’s version of the Modern Gothic was particularly exuberant, making it also in line with the Aesthetic Movement’s emphasis on art for art’s sake.

Not surprisingly, the four essays and the catalog entries in this volume thoroughly record the genesis and products of Kimbel and Cabus. A brief introductory essay by Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen traces the scholarship on the firm and states that it supplied furniture to the burgeoning upper-middle class. Donnelly’s essay follows the roots of the Modern Gothic as defined by British makers, designers, and writers. Much of this story has been told before, especially how design reformers like A. W. N. Pugin turned to the forms and the ethos of the historical Gothic era to formulate the Modern Gothic style. But Donnelly adds new details, delving into the publications by Bruce Talbert that illustrated interiors and highlighting the influence of the Medieval Court at the London International Exhibition of 1862. The essay by Melitta Jonas describes the Kimbel family, who were, for several generations, leading designers and cabinetmakers in the city of Mainz, whether it was under Prussian, French, or German control. The Kimbels were part of a cosmopolitan network of artisans that was dissolving the guild system, publishing design journals, and otherwise pursuing the most progressive ideas in cabinetmaking and interior design. After training in his father’s workshop, Anton Kimbel’s apprenticeships in Cologne and Paris were sponsored by his uncle Philipp Anton Bembé, enabling him to become a designer in the New York City workshop of Charles A. Baudouine for several years. Around 1854, with the backing of his uncle, Anton Kimbel opened the firm Bembé and Kimbel in New York which made furniture in a variety of styles. Upon Bembé’s death in 1861, Anton Kimbel had to sell the stock in order to repay the start-up capital; he then left the firm.

But his career was far from over, and the essay by Veith and Harvey, the most substantive in the volume, shifts the focus to the firm of Kimbel and Cabus. By 1863 Anton Kimbel had gone into business with Joseph Cabus, a French immigrant who had worked for, and briefly been in partnership with, Alexander Roux, well known master of the Rococo Revival. The authors use a wealth of primary data to chronicle the firm’s rise, including census records, R. G. Dun & Company business reports, patent applications, advertisements, and a fascinating survey of New York City cabinetmakers describing labor conditions during an 1872 strike. (Kimbel and Cabus, a relatively small concern with 77 workers, was typical in requiring ten-hour days and having about half their employees on strike.) With a large commission from the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in a restrained Gothic style, and an 1875 sale of its older, mainly Neo-Grec stock, the firm was poised to turn to a new line. They did so by positioning themselves as experts in the newly-fashionably Modern Gothic style, soliciting media coverage in trade and general publications, and mounting a handsome booth at the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition which, in turn, garnered more press. It was fitted out as a corner of a drawing room with wainscoting, a frescoed frieze, and walls hung with maroon damask, and it was crowded with furniture in the new style; the booth demonstrated the firm’s capacities not only in cabinetmaking but decorating. The essay goes on to delineate the firm’s innovative, idiosyncratic, “extreme” Gothic goods, and how they collaborated with hardware, leather, and fabric manufacturers, and, perhaps uniquely, with Charles W. Spurr of Boston, who made printed-paper decorative panels that were inset, like tiles, into furniture. The essay describes important patrons, who like John Bond and Emily Trevor at Glenview in Yonkers, New York, bought suites of furnishings, or James and Catherine Kernochan, who commissioned an entire palatial dining room in their Fifth Avenue mansion. Veith and Harvey are also responsible for the fulsome catalog entries, which beautifully illustrate individual objects and connect them to period documentation, especially to photographs in a circa 1875 photo album produced by the firm, and to the designs of Edwin Oppler, a leader in the Hanoverian school of architecture who edited a German-language design journal.
A number of themes and insights emerge in this volume. With their splayed arms and legs, intriguing voids and mirrors, flashy nickel-plated hardware, and their more-is-more aesthetic, the products of Kimbel and Cabus appealed to a clientele eager to show their adventurous taste. The firm was a master at product placement, providing images to the growing numbers of illustrated periodicals and books. While Veith and Harvey point to many instances of this practice, they leave a loose end. They publish a set of 13 drawings they discovered in the Kunstbibliothek of the Staatliche Museen in Berlin and, in a set of tortuous footnotes, prove that three of these are preparatory sketches for illustrations that appeared in an 1876 Harper's Monthly article by Harriet Spofford on “Medieval Furniture,” and that they had been supplied by Kimbel and Cabus. But Veith and Harvey do not explain who in the firm made the sketches, whether interiors, or how they ended up in Berlin. I wanted more research that they had been supplied by Kimbel and Cabus. But Veith and Harvey do not explain who in the firm made the sketches, whether

A few points come to mind as one travels with Carso from site to site. She has defined her subject in the broadest of terms which unfurls in the chapters that follow. Within the general framework of 1776-1876, the author’s professed end date for the book (although later examples are cited), themes are represented as they relate to temples, summerhouses, towers, and ruins. The iconography of our new nation, the response to urbanization, memory, and the passage of time are among these. We meet American shapers of taste from Thomas Jefferson to A. J. Downing at places as diverse as Bremo Plantation in Virginia, Niagara Falls, and Kingfisher Tower on Otsego Lake, Cooperstown, New York. (Kingfisher Tower, an early inspiration for Carso’s interest in the subject, appears as the cover image.)

A number of themes and insights emerge in this volume. With their splayed arms and legs, intriguing voids and mirrors, flashy nickel-plated hardware, and their more-is-more aesthetic, the products of Kimbel and Cabus appealed to a clientele eager to show their adventurous taste. The firm was a master at product placement, providing images to the growing numbers of illustrated periodicals and books. While Veith and Harvey point to many instances of this practice, they leave a loose end. They publish a set of 13 drawings they discovered in the Kunstbibliothek of the Staatliche Museen in Berlin and, in a set of tortuous footnotes, prove that three of these are preparatory sketches for illustrations that appeared in an 1876 Harper's Monthly article by Harriet Spofford on “Medieval Furniture,” and that they had been supplied by Kimbel and Cabus. But Veith and Harvey do not explain who in the firm made the sketches, whether interiors, or how they ended up in Berlin. I wanted more research that they had been supplied by Kimbel and Cabus. But Veith and Harvey do not explain who in the firm made the sketches, whether all 13 are by the same hand, how they relate to specific furniture or interiors, or how they ended up in Berlin. I wanted more research into the provenance of the sketches within the Kimbel family and more clarity in the writing. Likewise, I would have liked even more discussion of the firm’s workforce, which seems to have consisted of well-trained German immigrants who moved around among the hundreds of cabinetmaking shops in New York City. The authors state that Kimbel and Cabus epitomize the “timeless immigrant success story” by combining artistic talent, business acumen, technical skills, and ambitious marketing practices. To this roster I would add the advantage of old-world training and family connections that bridged the Atlantic and must have facilitated collaboration between Anton Kimbel and his workers.

Follies in America: A History of Garden and Park Architecture

Follies in America begins in that span of time when our country was new and struggling to define itself, to shape its image, to determine what styles of architecture and artistic expression were appropriate. What communicated our values? What was distinct and set us apart from Europe and the values? What was distinct and set us apart from Europe and the

Karen Zukowski is an independent writer and historian of nineteenth-century visual culture.
defines the beautiful, the sublime, and the picturesque but new readers would benefit from definitions early on. These terms have specific meanings, and how they are made manifest visually and architecturally—"seeing" what they mean—takes practice. When the author discusses the Catskills and the Hudson River Valley as sublime and beautiful in "Burkean terms" those unfamiliar with the subject will struggle. Another quibble: for reasons that are unclear, Carso shies away from discussing or using the term "gazebo" although we meet one early in the introduction's first image (illustration 1.1). In an assessment of meaning one wonders "gazebo" although we meet one early in the introduction’s first

Carso's book, a worthy read, takes those steps. But these are questions that continue the discussion of what the author has given us: an introduction. And in the process of grappling with a new subject the first steps are always the hardest. Carso’s book, a worthy read, takes those steps.

Reviewed by Carol Grove

Carol Grove taught as an adjunct assistant professor of American Art at the University of Missouri, Columbia, and specializes in the study of American landscapes and architecture. Grove’s articles can be found in Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, and Journal of the New England Garden History Society.

Gideon Shryock: His Life and Architecture, 1802-1880


The name Gideon Shryock may not be familiar unless one has pursued some of the classics on the American Greek Revival such as Talbot Hamlin’s Greek Revival Architecture in America (1944) or the writings of Rexford Newcomb and Clay Lancaster on historic Kentucky architecture. Shryock, a Bluegrass architect, designed some of the state’s most notable buildings including its third statehouse, 1827-30, in Frankfurt. (The Old State Capitol, as it is now known, is the home of the Kentucky Historical Society.) Possessing the distinction of being the first major Greek Revival structure west of the Allegheny Mountains, it represents the beginning of the westward march of the new architecture that would help define the country. A graceful Greek Ionic portico drawn from the Temple of Minerva Polias at Priene (c. 350 BCE), as pictured in the English Society of Dilettanti volume Antiquities of Ionia (1821), fronts the two-story edifice which contains a circular staircase under the rotunda at the center and is topped by a cupola/lantern. Only twenty-four years old when he won the competition for the Statehouse, Shryock would go on to design a host of other Greek Revival buildings in Kentucky and provide drawings for the first Arkansas Statehouse in Little Rock, 1833–42, though it was altered during construction.

A Kentuckian most of his life, Shryock was born in 1802 in Lexington where his father was a builder. Builders frequently contributed the design of the project they would construct. This practice was not unusual for the period since the separation of builder and architect really emerged after the Civil War. What differentiated the elder Shryock from the others was the elegance of his work and the use he made of ancient sources. In 1823, Matthias Shryock, who owned Asher Benjamin’s The Builder’s Assistant as well as other architectural books, sent his son Gideon east to Philadelphia to study/apprentice with William Strickland, a leading American architect and the designer of many renowned buildings, such as the Second Bank of the United States. Strickland had learned architecture from Benjamin Henry Latrobe in company with Robert Mills, William Dakin, and Thomas U. Walter. Hence, Shryock became a member of the Greek Revival cabal that came out of Philadelphia and changed the course of American architecture. He saw major buildings while east and picked up architecture books and/or copied with great accuracy plates in very expensive books, for example James Stuart and Nicholas Revett’s Antiquities of Athens (1762-1816), which was the ultimate source for the Greek Revival.

Back in the Bluegrass State, Shryock would design and build a host of major Greek Revival buildings including Morrison College for Transylvania University in Lexington, the County Courthouse in Frankfort, and structures that would define Louisville, for instance the City Hall and Courthouse. Louisville, the major city of the state, was now his home and he also produced commercial structures and churches including the First African Baptist, 1854-58. This building, and several of his others dating from the 1850s onward, illuminate his shift from the Greek Revival style to the new eclecticism of the mid-nineteenth century. More ornament and elements of the Italianate and the Romanesque appear in his designs as in the Headquarters for the Louisville Water Company, 1860-61. But his career comes to an end and his last building, the Chestnut Street Methodist Church, 1864-65, also in Louisville, returns to a plainer Greek Revival idiom with giant pilasters and only some trim. Shryock lives until 1880, but with very little work and none that stands.

This study of Gideon Shryock is marvelously researched by the historians Blackburn and Gill who have written two other books on Kentucky architecture. No central collection of Shryock papers exists and the authors have dug through a vast array of archives, files, and other materials. Only four identified drawings by
We, The House

Warren Ashworth and Sunday Kander.


Warren Ashworth and his wife Susan Kander have written an unusual novel that will captivate those convinced, as I am, that a house is the conscious guardian of its occupants. We, the House is a first-person narrative in the voice of Ambleside, a stylish villa erected in 1878 by wounded Union Civil War veteran Henry Luke Hart and his new bride Emmaline in the up-and-coming small town of Newton, Kansas. The story unfolds through conversations between Ambleside and the portrait of a Mrs. Peale which hangs in the dining room. When they discover each other’s voices, the house introduces itself, “We are Ambleside. We are the House,” clearly aware of its interior components, from cellar to attic, and of the gracious veranda and decorative corbels beneath its eaves on the exterior. Mrs. Peale reveals that it, or rather they, are Italianate in style.

The book begins in 2010, when a looming event sets the tale in motion. The friends had been interlocutors since 1879, and now had only two weeks to tell their story. Mrs. Peale had lived all her life in Connecticut, but her portrait was shipped to Kansas to adorn the new house. In life, she was a teacher of Classics at Catherine Beecher’s Hartford Seminary. Not long before her death in 1841, she sat for her portrait by a local artist named Ammi Phillips, who rarely signed his paintings. He slipped for motion. The friends had been interlocutors since 1879, and now.

Shryock found a patron in James Guthrie, a prominent politician and businessman who commissioned numerous buildings from Shryock over a thirty-year period. A patron is critical to an architect’s success. This is an excellent book that opens the career of an architect ignored for many years.

Reviewed by Richard Guy Wilson

Richard Guy Wilson is Commonwealth Professor Emeritus of Architectural History at the School of Architecture at the University of Virginia. His research interests have long included the firm of McKim, Mead and White, and he has been the director of the Newport venue of the Summer Schools of the Victorian Society in America.
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