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INTRODUCTION

The Jarves collection of textiles, acquired in 1887, was the first collection purchased for Wellesley College’s new museum in the Farnsworth Art School. The textiles played a seminal role in constructing and representing the identity of the Farnsworth, as well as the identity of Wellesley College and its Department of Art. The textiles, acquired through a single-owner sale at an auction house in New York, also renegotiated the reputation and the social position of the collector who sold the objects. James Jackson Jarves amassed the fragments, vestments, laces, and borders in Italy from 1862 to 1887. His collection, which he allegedly sold off for financial reasons, was broken up as multiple buyers purchased the individual textiles with the two major buyers being Pauline Durant for Wellesley College and Sarah Amelia Cooper Hewitt for the Cooper Institute.

The textiles, objects that had once been used for a vast range of utilitarian and religious purposes, when acquired by Wellesley College, were recontextualized based on new relations to the institutional ideology of Wellesley College, the architectural gallery

---

1 The term “museum” is a problematic term when referring to the Farnsworth Art School’s gallery spaces, because the concept of a museum was still emerging at the end of the nineteenth century. Museums, as institutions that today follow the Standards and Best Practices, were not regulated or codified in the nineteenth century. With no central body, such as the American Alliance of Museums, defining the ethics and qualifications of a museum, the language was able to maintain a certain level of fluidity. Many of the press articles cited in relation to the opening of the Farnsworth call the areas where the art was displayed “galleries”. Martin Brimmer’s address at the opening ceremony of the building in 1889 shows the fluidity of this language as he calls the gallery space “rooms for the exhibition of pictures”, a “museum”, and a “central hall for instruction”, see Martin Brimmer, *An Address Delivered at the Wellesley College Upon the Opening of the Farnsworth Art School* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1889).
space, and the audience of students and professors. The change in reception and display of the textiles shifted the meaning of the overall collection and the individual textiles, while the textiles also shaped the institution and its future patterns of collecting. A group of textiles purchased as the initial acquisition for an emerging museum was outside of the normative domain of actions available to nineteenth-century museum founders. Since little was written on the acquisition and since both Jarves and Wellesley College’s administrators seemingly had no intentions to act in a radical manner, the logic behind the collection becomes an emergent gap in this historical narrative. I suggest that the gap can be closed through close investigation into the motivations and context of each of the actors within the collecting process. The collection is an anomaly compared to other nineteenth-century museum acquisitions because there were few large collections of textiles and none, that I have yet to find, which served as the core for a new permanent collection. There were, however, groups of textiles being acquired and displayed at industrial museums in Europe. By collecting textiles, Wellesley College administrators and Jarves repositioned the museum to be involved in the discourse on industrial art museums, so that the museum’s display techniques and collecting habits were ideologically and visually distinct from its peer colleges. With the collecting event rationalized as an action to transform Wellesley’s museum into an industrial, study museum, rather than a typical college natural history cabinet or hall of paintings, the Wellesley College administrators, through the purchase of the textiles, subverted the hegemonic collecting habits of colleges and conformed to the actions of public art museum founders. This subversion/compliance technique distanced Wellesley College’s museum from its institutional peers and repositioned it as a more authoritative institution
by mimicking the more elite, Europeanized public art museums, specifically industrial art museums, being founded concurrently across the United States.

The collecting process is never a static social network of people. A collection comes into reality through a fluid, moving network of various actors and agents who rearrange and categorize objects through the select employment of institutions and social practices. The process of bringing the textiles into the Farnsworth Art School involved Jarves as the collector, Alice Freeman as the voice and agency behind Wellesley College during the 1880s, Pauline Durant as the purchaser of the collection, the Wellesley students as the intended audience, and the actual textiles. These can all be organized as various agents within the network, or the collecting process, which culminated in the event of the acquisition.

A methodology based on an active network of participants allows for each agent, which could be a social actor or a thing, to be placed on a flat social plane in which there is no hierarchy of agency or importance. The source community, the collector, the

---


5 Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, 71-72. The term “agent” refers to, as Latour notes, “any thing that does modify a state of affairs by making a difference.” The thing does not necessarily cause the action or the event, but there exists a range of agency or causality. Objects and people can have varying levels of influence on the state of affairs. And while objects do not act on their own, their participation is often essential to the completion of an action making them still agents in the process. People and objects are both “agents”, but only people are “actors”, defined below, for Latour’s analysis.

6 Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, 46-50. Latour defines the term “actor” through metaphoric associations with stage actors. Like stage actors, social actors are dislocated from the action because they are not the sole cause. They never act alone but are part of a specific set, cast, and crew. Their motives are always uncertain and the action itself is never clearly defined.
receiving institution, and the group of objects are all independent agents and/or actors with their own motivations, intentions, and agency, but no single individual or group can act without the engagement and support of the entire network. The individual actors take a prominent position in the analysis, but they are firmly contextualized and not evaluated in psychological terms. Although numerous studies have explored the psychological motivations of individual collectors, I purposefully exclude all psychoanalytical interpretations and instead focus on how the collecting process renegotiated identities, interpersonal relationships, and power dynamics. Since the collection changed how objects are arranged in physical space, I use the analysis of each agent to make visible Michel Foucault’s theory of eventalization. Foucault claims that his method does not uncover any cause as to why a particular event takes place but rather constructs “around the singular event … a ‘polygon’ or rather a ‘polyhedron’ of intelligibility, the number of whose faces is not given in advance and can never properly be taken as finite.” While Foucault is correct in his idea that no action can ever be fully explained because of the multiplicity of influencing factors, the separate analysis of each agent provides a means to limit the scope of this analysis and focus on the most dominant influences of the collecting event.

Examining the collection from a methodology constructed partially from a social history perspective within a network-based structure concentrated around individual biographies, the collecting process becomes a complex flow of actions and words meant

---

to change lived reality and the nature of actual relationships. This prevents art collecting from being framed as just a personal endeavor, such as how Joseph Alsop defines art collecting: “To collect is to gather objects belonging to a particular category the collector happens to fancy; and art collecting is a form of collecting in which the category is, broadly speaking, works of art.”\textsuperscript{9} Alsop limits collecting to an individualized quest to control and order objects, but, when displayed in a public museum, the ordering and classifying of objects influences the public’s worldview and reception of the dominant ideology. A collection, when defined as a technique to construct new ontological categories that change the perception and ordering of reality for viewers, makes a collection a process and not a thing.\textsuperscript{10} This process is also not an isolated activity. The physical display space of the museum at Wellesley College, the original ideology of Wellesley College as constructed by its founder, Henry Fowle Durant, popular theories on aesthetics and art appreciation, and the economic limitations of Wellesley and of Jarves also influenced how this collection was amassed, displayed, and consumed. The network, then, is composed of individual agents, but it is also peripherally manipulated by exterior forces that have the power to remap the connections of the network. Studying only the actors and the institution, therefore, is not enough to understand how this collection came into being and why it ended up at Wellesley College, but a lengthier analysis runs the risk of losing all structure and falling into Foucault’s eventalization abyss. Despite the adherence to my tripartite structure, it still needs to be continually recognized that all actions operate on both a material, physical level and a conceptual, symbolic level, and that the flows of the network are not just interpersonal interactions,

\textsuperscript{9} Joseph Alsop, \textit{The Rare Art Traditions} (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), 76.
\textsuperscript{10} Sarah Byrne, "Networks, Agents and Objects: Frameworks for Unpacking Museum Collections," in \textit{Unpacking the Collection}, 15.
but they are informed by ideology, politics, and culture.\textsuperscript{11} The network is a group of people and things that exists not in a vacuum, but in a far more complex interlocking web of multiple social, political, and economic networks, never able to be fully mapped out or explained.

Three chapters, each dealing with a separate agent or actor in the network, allow for the narrative of the collecting process to take on a multivalent quality. There is no single impetus that led to the acquisition of the textiles by Wellesley College. Rather, the unique power dynamics and social position informing the identity of each actor worked together to create a historical moment at which the collecting process could be completed. Since museums structure knowledge and construct historical narratives for the public’s consumption, the collecting process is highly political. Each actor in the network is compelled by different political tensions and motives to influence the classification and hierarchy of knowledge.

The first chapter begins with an analysis of the collection. Since the purchase of the objects happened centuries after the original source community produced the textiles, the creators no longer exist in real time and space. The source community’s original intentions are still visible through the textiles’ methods of construction and design elements. Even if the textiles are cut up into fragments and literally torn from their original context, the formal elements are still objective evidence about the place and culture of production. This visual evidence, however, can be manipulated through display tactics and misinformed labels to signify alternate meanings. The collecting of the textiles and their subsequent placement in a museum context concealed their utilitarian function, since they were originally used for upholstery, religious rituals, and clothing, and

\textsuperscript{11} Byrne, "Networks, Agents and Objects," 10.
repositioned them as aestheticized objects. Despite these new nineteenth-century significations, the textiles have accrued, rather than lost, meaning over time through their physical and contextual manipulation.

Jarves reinterpreted the objects by writing geographical identifications and dates on the cardboard backings of many of the textiles. His identifications force the textiles to relate to and comply with his theories on the regional character of specific Italian cities. The textiles’ geographical places of origin are often misidentified by Jarves; therefore, the fragments within the collection are signifying concepts that would have been nonexistent in their original context. The tension between the purposes of the original producers and consumers and Jarves’s desire to teach the viewers about the regionalization of Italy is mediated by the actual objects. As much as Jarves wanted to impose his own interests upon the objects, their formal qualities exert a power and agency that cannot be entirely subsumed by the authoritative voice of the collector. For example, the French border samples are identified as Italian by Jarves; however, the obvious French character of the design and the embroidery technique signify notions about the splendor of the Napoleonic Empire regardless of the written attributions.

Jarves and the administrators at Wellesley College used the collection as a tool to achieve their respective goals and to establish their desired identities. The collection as the instrument used for this act of identity-creation, however, cannot be forgotten in this analysis. The textiles need to be considered both inside and outside of their original historical context. They are multivalent and have a biographical history of their own through time and space. As a collection, they renegotiate the political and ideological
positions of Jarves and Wellesley, but they also continue to exert their own messages and resist or subvert the identifications and interpretations placed upon them.

The second chapter examines the motivations and intentions behind the actions of James Jackson Jarves as both a collector and a seller of textiles. Motivated by personal financial concerns and an interest in the common social good, he was an active voice in the dialogue surrounding the shaping of museums. His reputation suffered multiple scandals due to misattributions of paintings, so the legitimacy of his identity as a dealer was often questioned by both friends and the press. His financial ruin and series of professional failures compelled him to seek opportunities through which he could successfully construct his identity as a dealer and an art connoisseur. Although he managed to act as a buying agent for many of the trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York throughout the 1880s, he was never recognized as a scholar or a reputable art dealer. In an attempt to reconstruct his liminal identity of not quite a scholar but more than an amateur into a more stable label or title, Jarves sold these textiles at auction in a single-owner sale. If a success, the sale would place many textiles, with his name in their provenance, in important museums and collections in order to legitimize his eye and taste. If a failure, the sale, with his name in the title, would further devalue his position in the art world in relation to scholars, curators, and other collectors. The sale was neither a success nor a failure because although his name was continually cited by the press in relation to the collection at Wellesley College, he was never able to translate the social capital gained through the sale into any other successful ventures.

He was, however, successful in shaping the future collecting habits and display tactics of the Wellesley College museum. As American museums were founded
beginning in 1870, debates about the ideological underpinnings of the institutions arose and each museum had to decide which model they would follow in their collecting habits and display tactics. Faced with an ideological spectrum that ran between the two poles of the lavish, overwhelming Louvre and the educational South Kensington Museum, Jarves was an active promoter of the South Kensington Museum model and its industrial museum ideology. The textiles are physical evidence of his interest in applied arts; and, his opinion pieces in newspapers and magazines helped create an ideological context in which many Americans favored the industrial museum as an ideal model. By selling the textiles to Wellesley College as the initial core of their permanent collection, Jarves was able to successfully perform in real space what he had formerly only theorized on in writing.

Jarves functioned as the connective link between the objects, with both their original history and their role in the nineteenth-century art world, and the museum, but he is hardly a genius figure, or a person able to transcend the social context and the hegemonic control of culture, without which this network could not exist. Instead, he is just another actor in this process who is informed and shaped by the ideological debates and the historical context of the late nineteenth century. Jarves may seem to exist on a higher plane than the other actors because of his dual participation in relationships with both the repository and the source community, but he is as equally embedded in the historical and social context as every other agent in this network.

The third chapter questions why Wellesley College sought out the textiles as their first major purchase for the Farnsworth Art School. The two major actors on behalf of Wellesley College were Pauline Durant, the widow of Henry Fowle Durant, the founder
of Wellesley College, and Alice Freeman, the second President of Wellesley College from 1881 to 1887. These two women had to ensure the realization of Durant’s vision for Wellesley after his death in 1881, while also shaping the institution to match their own interests. Together, they had a dual agenda for Wellesley College: the feminization of the college’s architecture and residential life and the bureaucratization and secularization of the curriculum. By the time Freeman resigned in 1887, they had created the Department of Art, commissioned the Farnsworth Art School, or the building that housed both the art classes and the gallery spaces, and acquired the textile collection. They were able to institutionalize the study of art at Wellesley College, which was formerly conceived of as an ancillary program to the previously more religiously focused curriculum, and transform the Department of Art into an innovative program which was vastly different from the departments at peer colleges.

The other collegiate museums, collecting mainly American oil paintings or cabinets of curiosities, were foils against which Wellesley College could form its institutional identity. Aligning itself with the rhetoric and practices of industrial museums, Wellesley College’s acquisition of textiles, applied arts rather than fine arts, signaled the institution’s goal to construct a serious, academic Department of Art. While industrial museums in the 1870s and 1880s were interested in supporting their educational displays with lectures and courses, Wellesley College sought to elucidate its art classes through object-based pedagogical methods. Breaking away from the college museum model and realigning the Farnsworth with American industrial museums, such as the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, Pauline Durant and Alice Freeman reconstructed...
Wellesley College’s institutional identity to highlight its more academically rigorous and scholarly aspects.

These three chapters, each dealing with a separate node in the network of collecting, work together to highlight the complexity of the collection and the process of collecting. Each decision requires the compliance of the other actors, so no act of power or identity creation is accomplished in isolation. For example, in order for Wellesley College to purchase the textiles the voices and actors behind the institution had to believe in the South Kensington Museum as the ideal museum model. Jarves, who both advised Wellesley College on art purchases and also wrote prominent pieces in multiple newspapers to promote his opinions on the ideal American museum and he worked to manufacture this ideological proclivity in Wellesley College’s administrators. Wellesley College complied with Jarves’s opinions, but then took them as their own by purchasing a part of his collection, which was a material type collected by industrial museums, and reframing it within the physical space of Wellesley College. The intricacies of the dynamics between objects, collector, and institutions display a wide range of techniques for identity-creation and the renegotiation of power. By exploring the flows between the actors in the network, one can get closer to the answer as to why Wellesley College purchased these textiles. The decision to purchase was not a unilateral decision of the institution, but it involved the acquiescence of all the other actors within the network and required a favorable historical context. Actions, individual motivations, and socio-historical context together shaped the outcome of the collecting practice and made it possible for the Jarves collection of textiles to end up at Wellesley College.
1. THE OBJECTS

The Process of Collecting

The Jarves collection of textiles at the Davis Museum at Wellesley College is composed of one hundred sixty three objects that were almost entirely produced in Italy from between the thirteenth century to the nineteenth century. The collection includes vestments, borders and trims, and fragments of different types of textiles, including velvets, damasks, lampas, and others. The majority of the fragments were stitched onto large sheets of cardboard that were then cut up into individual samples, which was a nineteenth-century method of display.¹ The majority of the cardboard backings also include hand-written notations by the original collector, James Jackson Jarves.² The notes usually specify a date or range of dates, and sometimes include a supposed place of production or additional information, such as “very rare”, “belt” or “Marie Antoinette velvet”.

¹ For other collections that include this method of display see the Kelekian Collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. There are only a few fragments in the Wellesley group that are not sewn onto cardboard. They mainly include the ophreys and vestments. Evidence for the fragments once being together on larger sheets of cardboard can be found in the inclusion of a pointing finger drawn on the cardboard next to Jarves.²³. The finger reminds the viewer that the specific written data was meant to match with that individual textile, meaning that there were other textiles originally sewn next to it. For this information, I am grateful to Melinda Watt, Supervising Curator of the Antonio Ratti Textile Center and Associate Curator of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

² List of the Jarves Collection of Laces, Stuff, Embroideries, Costumes, Church Vestments, Etc. (New York: Messrs. Ortgies & Co. Auctioneers, 1887), 10. Although there is no way to know that Jarves actually wrote these notes, Jarves writes in the catalogue that he has attached cards to each textile “with their dates and localities given when attainable” and many of the auction descriptions, which Jarves presumably wrote, match almost word for word with the notations on the cards.
Jarves collected these textiles from 1862 to 1887 while living in Italy. There is no documentation regarding the dealers, galleries, or estates from which he bought the textiles. Jarves sold these pieces to Wellesley College at auction on March 16 and 17, 1887 in New York City through Ortgies & Co. Auctioneers (Appendix A) after they had been on a loaned exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum in New York since 1884. Although the textiles now at Wellesley are the same objects listed for sale in the 1887 auction catalogue produced by Ortgies & Co. Auctioneers, the purchase of the textiles by Wellesley College was not immediately released to the press. The textiles were apparently purchased “for presentation to another public institution by some one whose name could not be obtained”. The other buyer at the auction, Mrs. Hewitt, presumably Sarah Amelia Cooper Hewitt, was publicly mentioned as purchasing one hundred thirty objects from the collection in order to give to the Cooper Institute. There is also no documentary evidence in the archives at Wellesley College to corroborate that the

---

3 List of the Jarves Collection, 3; Annie Isabel Willis, “Farnsworth Art School at Wellesley,” Harper’s Bazaar 22, no. 48 (1889), 863.
4 Although there are no bills of sale or even anecdotal evidence of Jarves buying textiles, Jarves does write extensively about the Italian art market, which provides evidence for which aspects of the market he was familiar. In James Jackson Jarves, “Bric-A-Brac at Florence,” The Independent, March 4, 1875, Jarves provides practical advice on how to purchase directly from aristocratic estates and Florentine dealers. With such extensive knowledge of the art market, it can be inferred that the textiles were purchased from similar sources throughout Italy.
7 The Jarves Textile Collection,” The Art Amateur, 136. The other buyer, Mrs. Hewitt, was explicitly named in this article.
8 “The Jarves Textile Collection,” The Art Amateur, 136. The industrialist Peter Cooper established The Cooper Institute in 1859 for education in the arts, architecture, and engineering. Sarah Amelia Cooper, Peter Cooper’s daughter, apparently purchased the Jarves textiles after she had married Abram Stevens Hewitt, the mayor of New York. She purchased them for the Cooper Institute, but the actual museum for the Cooper Institute was not created until 1897. It is unclear how they were displayed in the intervening years. The museum, now known as the Smithsonian Institute Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum, was created by Sarah Amelia Cooper Hewitt’s three daughters: Sarah, Amy and Eleanor Cooper.
College purchased the textiles directly from auction and not through an intermediary following the sale. The dearth of original documentation regarding the acquisition by Wellesley is due to a 1914 fire that destroyed many of the College’s original documents. Early museum records incorrectly date its acquisition to 1875, which is impossible since the textiles are listed as in Jarves’s possession in 1887. The consulted records which list the acquisition as 1875 are undated lists of acquisitions and the Art Museum Bulletin, which was first published in 1923.

The acquisition, in those same museum records, is listed as “Gift of Mrs. Henry Fowle Durant, bought from James Jackson Jarves and a friend”, and the collection is always referred to in the press as theJarves collection, or, in many misspelled versions, theJarvis collection, which indicates that there was a direct relationship between the auction and Wellesley College. The labeling of the collection with Jarves’s name and the recorded provenance establish a link between the Henry and Pauline Durant, the founders of Wellesley College, and Jarves but give no indication as to how the financial side of the relationship functioned. It was probably not a clear case of a gift or a purchase, but some sort of mutual financial agreement. The buyer might have even been concealed because the deal was not yet finalized, and Jarves could have negotiated with Pauline Durant, as Henry Durant had died in 1881, in order to sell off some of the passed lots after the auction as well.

Pauline Durant, and others Wellesley supporters, including Jarves, were identified by one contemporary magazine article as having had previously pooled money together

---

9 List of Museum Accessions, Box 1, Records of the Museum, 10S, Wellesley College Archives.
11 List of Museum Accessions, Wellesley College Archives.
to purchase over half, or three hundred thirty-four objects, of Jarves’s auctioned collection.\footnote{Willis, “Farnsworth Art School at Wellesley,” 863. This is the only source that indicates this breakdown of the purchase and it is unclear where Willis learned of this cost-splitting plan, although the original documents might have been lost in the 1914 fire at Wellesley College.} The splitting of the cost of an acquisition was typical for Wellesley, as evidenced by a document prepared by Pauline Durant for a trustee meeting sometime after 1889. In it, she wrote that since Wellesley’s inception friends of Wellesley College had donated large amounts of money, totaling to around $40,000, towards art acquisitions while she had also contributed $10,000 of her own money.\footnote{Mrs. Durant’s List of Expenditures to Mrs. Marion Guild, Done in Preparation for a Trustee Meeting, n.d., Founders File, 1MF, Wellesley College Archives.} For this particular acquisition, Durant was most likely financially supported and advised by Jarves, who could have provided her with advice as to which objects would be beneficial to the students.\footnote{Willis, “Farnsworth Art School at Wellesley,” 863.} Jarves had already been serving as an artistic advisor for Wellesley College beginning in 1887.\footnote{Francis Steegmuller, \textit{The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951), 286.} Jarves helped Wellesley in the process of creating a collection for its arts building, the Farnsworth Art School, which was still being constructed at the time. Wellesley College’s administration and Jarves, in collaboration, were able to secure a substantial number of textiles for the Farnsworth Art School where they were displayed beginning at the Farnsworth’s opening in 1889. Having donated a collection of glass to the Metropolitan Museum in 1881, Jarves already had a history of charitable donations to museums and understood both the gifting and accessioning processes.\footnote{James Jackson Jarves, "Ancient and Modern Venetian Glass of Murano," \textit{Harper's Magazine}, January 1882, 177-190; “The Metropolitan Museum of Art,” \textit{The American Architect and Building News} 25, no. 686 (1889): 77.}
It is unclear how much money Wellesley College spent on the textiles, but the auction was noted as achieving “very good prices.” The prices were high because the textiles had previously been on exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum for the last three years, raising their public profile, and because similar textiles were becoming increasingly more difficult to find on the European market. A contemporary article claims that Wellesley’s collection was valued at $5,000.

The decision to sell at auction rather than through a private sale is unclear, and Jarves’s biographers have speculated as to why he chose this public venue. Theodore Sizer claims that the collection was sold to Wellesley College in 1887 in a moment of economic desperation when Jarves had exhausted his inheritance and all profits he had garnered through his business transactions. Francis Steegmuller, another biographer, claims that Jarves became acquainted with Wellesley College through a meeting with Alice Freeman in 1886 after the College was given the $100,000 to build the Farnsworth Art School and immediately began serving as her artistic advisor. Rather than an act of financial desperation, the auction was conceived of as a mechanism to advertise Jarves’s collecting abilities. The auction would publicly link his eye and taste to that of an important collegiate museum. The sale of the textiles to Wellesley College could publicly identify Jarves with his role as an advisor to Wellesley College. Through the auction, he was able to advise, and financially assist, Alice Freeman and Pauline Durant on which

objects to purchase, while other dealers and collectors could purchase the remaining textiles.

**Wellesley’s Collection**

The original acquisition by Wellesley included twenty-three vestments, two hundred twenty-four French and Italian fragments, and eighty-seven pieces of lace, but the lace and many of the other pieces are now either missing or have been deaccessioned. The collection is currently comprised of seventeen vestments and one hundred forty-six French and Italian fragments. Pauline Durant’s purchase encompassed textiles from Genoa, Florence, Venice, and other production centers and included textiles of various sizes, designs, and materials. The Wellesley acquisition created a version of Jarves’s original collection on a smaller scale because it included all of the same collecting categories and types of objects except for vernacular clothing. Jarves had sought to create a grouping of textiles to represent and, in a sense, to codify what he saw to be the general Italian aesthetic. Jarves recognized that Italy was not a monoculture, even if he believed it to have a certain overall style, so he created regional subgroups within the collection to manifest the diversity of Italy. These geographical subgroups were meant to illustrate how the textiles of a specific region or city adapted the greater Italianate culture to the region’s own history and aesthetic impulses to produce an object that reflected the identity of the local populace. The regionalization of Italian art could be viewed through textiles, but Jarves intended for students to extend their observations to other forms of art as well. As Jarves writes in the introductory essay of the auction catalogue, the textiles visually taught how each subgroup “was governed by certain

22 List of Museum Accessions, Wellesley College Archives.
principles of decorative design, in harmony, especially, with its architecture, and which underlie all its arts, forming a family unity, as it were.”23 The regionally specific textiles were meant to be viewed in relation to architectural images, paintings, and other art forms from that same center of production in order for the student to understand the “family unity”, or the identity as Jarves conceived of it, of that respective city. This cross-comparison between textiles and other art objects was only possible within a museum context where other art forms from the same region were readily accessible. Jarves explicitly stated that he wanted these pieces to “find a final resting-place in some industrial museum, where they can be freely examined and studied by our artisans, manufacturers, and artists.”24

Despite Jarves’s interest in geography as a shaping force in the process of artistic production, the collection was not organized by place of origin. Instead, the auction catalogue groups objects together by type: vestments, orphrey fragments, French trim samples, borders, laces, and fragments. Each type is not internally organized by any prevailing logic. For example, within the series of borders, the textiles are not arranged based on chronology, geographical place of origin, color, material, or technique. Instead, the borders seem to be randomly numbered within their group. The auction catalogue numbers are not reproduced in the accession numbers system used by the Farnsworth Art School. The accession numbers are similarly loosely organized by type with no concern

23 List of the Jarves Collection, 5-6. My attribution of the authorship of the essay in the auction catalogue to Jarves is based on the fact that the style mirrors his other writings. The opinions about Italy and the explicit call for a museum to purchase the textiles are thematically connected to Jarves’s other writings. Also, none of the other auction catalogues from Ortgies & Co. Auctioneers in the nineteenth century seem to include an introductory essay. This seems to then have been included on the behest of the collector, and Jarves would have been the best source to explain the collection.

24 List of the Jarves Collection, 10.
for grouping objects of similar date or culture together.\textsuperscript{25} Since the auction catalogue and the Wellesley College accession numbers parallel each other in their style of organization, it seems that Jarves is the connective link between the two and would have helped structure both numbering systems. He was therefore active in Wellesley’s acquisition and subsequent display of the textiles. If Jarves was involved in organizing both groups, he then clearly had no intention of creating a structured collection that told a chronological narrative of progress or that promoted a specific perspective from which one was meant to interpret the textiles.

This vague organization indicates Jarves’s interest in the multiple meanings and interpretations of the collection and of the individual textiles. There is no central narrative or system of order within the collection because Jarves wanted the textiles, as a study collection, to be observed from multiple perspectives and methodological approaches. In the auction catalogue, Jarves specifically writes, “There are three points of view from which to study them, viz.: First the purely technical… Second, we are to regard them for their variety, purity, and harmony of design and coloring, in the artistic point of view… Third, in an antiquarian, historical, and ethical sense.”\textsuperscript{26} He advocated for various readings of each textile because he wanted the objects to be applicable and accessible to multiple audiences with differing agendas, such as “artisans, manufacturers, and artists”.\textsuperscript{27} Each type of person would interpret the textiles differently based on their religion, country of origin, and political inclinations because Jarves believed beauty to be

\textsuperscript{25} I claim that this is a general rule because sometimes an errant, seemingly misplaced textile interrupts the numerical sequence of one type. The vestments were also renumbered in 2001, so it is unclear whether or not they were separated into their own group as well, but since they were obviously marked as separate in the auction catalogue, it follows that the same isolation would have been preserved in the Wellesley College accession numbers.

\textsuperscript{26} List of the Jarves Collection, 3-4.

\textsuperscript{27} List of the Jarves Collection, 10.
an objective ideal that was interpreted and imagined through culturally specific perspectives. In an earlier editorial from 1871, Jarves writes that it is “impossible to fix on one rule of taste for all men [so] we must select enough examples of all styles of eminent artists of all schools as to fairly represent them, leaving each spectator in his appreciation of their beauty to be guided by his own standard of culture.” A loosely organized collection allowed the viewer space to project their own ideas onto the objects and make their own judgments without the guidance of the omnipresent authoritative voice of the institution. Jarves’s textile collection completes the stated function of his ideal museum: a wide-ranging collection of objects from multiple sources and styles organized in a loose manner to encourage individuals to cultivate their own aesthetic tastes and judgments.

Jarves’s concept of an individualized museum experience was ideologically influenced by nineteenth-century theories of the power of art, which will be discussed in more depth in chapter three. Briefly, Jarves and other social commentators believed that art could improve morals and they considered “aesthetics as a refining social element” that could be deployed through the institutions of museums in order to improve society. They operated under the assumption that museums were places for edification and that by studying an object, knowledge could be gained. Shaped and reinterpreted by this ideological background, the textiles become multifunctional tools to improve American
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design standards, decorative arts scholarship, and general levels of taste. If American
aesthetics and taste levels were to rise, nineteenth-century reformers thought so too
would the moral state of society. Jarves’s deconstructed system of organization opens up
a space for the viewer to accomplish these social goals. With no rigid structure, the
textiles act as multivalent objects of art historical study that can be individually
interpreted by viewers in order to empower them and thus improve their moral character.

In order to understand the collection as a whole, I have, as Jarves has done,
separated the textiles first by type or by accession number groupings: vestments, French
border samples, borders, orphrey fragments, laces, and fragments. The first five
categories are analyzed as unified types since they are complete objects with clearly
differentiated original uses. Each of these sections were also numerically grouped
together within the auction catalogue and in the Wellesley College accession numbers, so
Jarves envisioned them as independent units connected together by their status as parts
within the larger collection. The collection, brought together by Jarves, is unified by the
fact that all the objects are listed with his name. The language of identification and the
renaming of the objects as part of the Jarves Collection create a new, cohesive unity out
of the individual sections. The last category of fragments, however, are extremely diverse
and more numerous than the other sections. Most of the fragments also include written
notes about the original date or place of origin, attributed to them by Jarves, on their
cardboard backings and, therefore, can be subdivided by region.

The geographical separation of the fragments is informed by Jarves’s interest in
the regionalized appropriation of a general Italian style. In the auction catalogue, Jarves
writes, “Each central school of manufactures has a prevailing local sentiment, tone, and
character of design, derived from the dominating characteristics of the place itself.”32 The dynamic relationship between regional identity and artistic production interested Jarves immensely, as evidenced by his extensive analysis of each city’s “prevailing local sentiment” in the auction catalogue essay. His attributions are, therefore, personal and political because he wanted the textiles to visually manifest his imagined concept of each region’s cultural identity. Since he first published History of the Hawaiian Islands in 1843, Jarves considered himself to be at the very least an amateur historian, and he continued in this trajectory with the publication of an account of his travels in Italy that included historical insights and analyses titled Italian Sights and Papal Principles (1856). To validate his voice as a scholarly historian and cultural commentator on Italy, he was interested in promoting and legitimizing his concept of Italian culture. The textiles, as objects upon which he could project his ideas about the local identity of different Italian cities, acted as a means through which he could further develop his reputation as an expatriate scholar and collector living in Italy.

His attributions are an important feature of the collection because the textiles were defined by, while simultaneously defining, the “tone” of that region, as Jarves conceived of it. The labels, which are part of his system of classification, signal to the viewers that the objects can provide knowledge on the culture that produced them. Visitors consent to the authenticity of these historical assumptions because of the authority of the museum space, but they are also aware that the textile itself can never truly convey the lived reality of the place and time of production.33 The viewers must use their imagination and rely on past experiences to support the illusion that these objects can reveal anything.

32 List of the Jarves Collection, 8.
about their original source community and history. Like these later audiences, Jarves, as a collector, underwent these same processes when classifying the objects. His decision to acquire a specific textile was probably informed by how a textile complicated or reaffirmed his imagined vision of its respective place of production. It is important to note that Jarves is often projecting these design concepts and ideas onto the textiles and the links between a specific aesthetic and a city that can be read from the collection’s groupings are often false. When I therefore remark that a specific textile manifests, for example, Venetian splendor, I mean to imply that Jarves’s attribution has made that textile’s visual extravagance or its expensive materials signify the opulent quality of Venice, even if that textile may or may not have actually been produced in Venice. Through his attributions, Jarves has intentionally rewritten each object’s history by making it indicate his ideas of what its respective center of production, as an idealized fantasy, represented. The attributions shape the object’s reception while simultaneously constructing the imagined identity of the attributed city. The attributions, therefore, do not just change how one reads the textiles, but the textiles and their visual relationships represent, and create, an imagined history of Italian regionalization. This is a dynamic, interactive relationship between the imagined spaces of production and the physical textiles, and Jarves’s pairings of geographical identities with tangible productions reveal many of the underlying preconceptions and clichés of both Italy and textiles that Jarves held.

Preserving, not countering, Jarves’s regional attributions reveals much about the underlying ideology of the collection, but it is also a difficult task to prove or disprove that a textile comes from a certain center of production. Italy had several centers of silk

and wool-weaving production beginning in the fourteenth century, which all rose and fell at different times due to economics, politics, and trade.\(^{35}\) By the fourteenth century, Lucca, Venice, Sicily, and Florence were producing silks and selling them to both European and Arab markets.\(^{36}\) Some centers were known for specific stylistic differences, such as Lucca’s use of running animals and sinuous landscapes in their patterns, which even Jarves cites in his catalogue essay as being a characteristic feature of Lucchese textiles.\(^{37}\) Likewise, the early pomegranate motifs were believed to be initially incorporated into European textile design first in Lucca based on imported Byzantine and Arab designs. However, in the sixteenth century, due to political unrest, many Lucchese artisans emigrated to other textile production centers like Florence and Genoa and took the design with them.\(^{38}\) Migration of artisans, the rise and fall of certain centers, and the transmission of patterns via trade make it extremely difficult to attribute a pattern, a method of weaving, or a specific coloration to any one city.

The city governments tried to preserve their own aesthetic, but even these efforts only complicate contemporary attribution efforts. To promote their own guild systems, many cities held protective economic policies that outlawed the importation of textiles.\(^{39}\)


If a popular textile pattern had been developed in another city and could not be imported due to protective measures, local artisans had to find ways to replicate that design. Even textiles with heraldic symbols can be impossible to trace due to their spread across Italy. For example, a design with heraldic symbols [fig. 50], discussed later, from two families, potentially the Medici and the Peruzzi, was developed sometime in the sixteenth century but became popular as a universal symbol of aristocracy and the heraldry was appropriated by many families and used for both ecclesiastical and vernacular clothing.\textsuperscript{40} Since the design was copied so widely, the place of origin is unknown and, therefore, so is the identity of the commissioning family.

Some centers, like Genoa, tried to limit the spread of designs by forbidding the movement of looms and the copying of patterns in order to create monopolies on certain designs.\textsuperscript{41} Artisans, however, were able to imitate each other’s production. This copying is even seen within the Jarves collection. Two seemingly identical examples of two different colored palmette textiles differ upon closer inspection in their scale, angle of the ogival motifs, and geometric details (Jarves.272 and Jarves.273) [fig. 56, 57]. The slight differences indicate that the artisans were influenced by a general palmette design that was reworked by multiple artisans. Since the technical instructions for a design were often destroyed to preserve the secrets of production, there is no archive of patterns from which scholars could potentially identify the origins of certain textile motifs.\textsuperscript{42} These actions motivated by competition and economics have led to a general inability to

\textsuperscript{40} Andrea Bayer, ed., \textit{Art and Love in Renaissance Italy} (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2008), 125-126.
\textsuperscript{42} Herald, \textit{Renaissance Dress in Italy}, 87. Melinda Watt, in conversation with the author, April 1, 2013.
specifically and assuredly attribute a textile to a specific place of production. This problem affects most of the identifications in the Jarves collection as well, since his attributions are often too specific to be reliable and, at other times, his lack of information furthers the ambiguity of date and place of production. With museums only just emerging as educational institutions with full-time curators and without a well-connected system of textile collectors, there was no shared knowledge base on textiles from which Jarves could draw on for help with attributions.

The dating of textiles is also a scientific and stylistic dilemma that is often almost impossible to solve. I have tried not to use paintings for dating purposes, which Jarves explicitly states as one of his chosen methods of dating, since even paintings meant to record events, such as weddings, often use dress for sociopolitical purposes. The political use of dress means that dress could be depicted purposefully out of fashion or foreign to make the sitter appear more conservative or from a different region. I use paintings only to show how a certain textile was worn, such as if it was used for the whole garment or only as a border or decorative element. Surviving garments or fragments of garments are also a form of skewed evidence. Many were either purposefully conserved due to their political significance or taken from burial sites. Funerary wear and consciously preserved outfits often represent the best dress of the time and not the vernacular styles. Since textiles were costly to produce, articles of clothing

44 There are exceptions to this rule such as the funerary clothes of Eleonora of Toledo and her sons who were buried wearing socks with holes in them. Mary Westerman Bulgarella, “The Burial Attire of Eleonora di Toledo,” in The Cultural World of Eleonora di Toledo, ed. Konrad Eisenbichler (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 216-222.
could either be cut and re-sewn to match a new trend or redecorated with fashionable borders and trims.\textsuperscript{45} This practice of repurposing was so widespread that even the wealthy Medici family took garments to their tailor to be redecorated.\textsuperscript{46} A surviving eighteenth-century dress or seventeenth-century doublet, therefore, does not mean that the fabric’s date of production is concurrent with the costume’s date of manufacture.

While it is difficult to attribute a textile to a specific date or region, some of Jarves’s attributions are easily recognizable as false. I have tried to cite the places where his identifications are clearly not aligned with the dates or places of similar objects in other museums. Despite these factual faults, Jarves envisioned the collection as a group of Italian textiles that represented the regional appropriation and localization of the general Italian culture and aesthetic, and, therefore, it is important to preserve the original intentions of the collection by relating Jarves’s attributions. The rest of this chapter is, therefore, organized by sections: vestments, French border samples, borders, orphreys, laces, and fragments. The fragments are subdivided into regional groups in order to show what Jarves considered to be the “prevailing local sentiment” of each center of production.

**Vestments**

The nine intact vestments, not including the orphrey fragments, are visually different in construction, size, date of production, and level of completeness from the rest of the collection. There are four chasubles, two stoles, one maniple, one cope, and one


\textsuperscript{46} Currie, “Prescribing Fashion,” 168.
They are visually related based on their common use of floral embroidery. Together, they form a miniature collection within the larger collection to inspire, as Jarves hoped, contemporary designers. Jarves, as he states in his auction catalogue, was concerned with rectifying the “cheapness and superficial qualities of most modern work.” By collecting older, and thus superior, floral chasubles, which displayed the type of floral motifs still in ecclesiastical fashion in the nineteenth century [fig. 1], Jarves hoped to inspire contemporary manufactures to mimic, and maybe even improve upon, historical precedents.

The cope (2001.0.38) [fig. 2] is the largest and most elaborate piece of this subsection and, like the other intact vestments, is made from fine silk decorated with multicolored silk embroidery, metallic wrapped threads, and gold passementerie. The cope appears to be one of the earlier vestments in this collection and is probably from the late seventeenth century to early eighteenth century, as evidenced by comparisons to similar examples in other museums. Jarves lists the cope in his auction catalogue as, “Cope, corded white silk embroidered in gold and colors, coat of arms at borders, of
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47 For definitions of the textile terminology used in this paper, see the glossary (Appendix C). For a good account of the Roman Catholic tradition of vesture see Herbert Norris, *Church Vestments, Their Origin and Development* (London: Dent, 1949); The Reverend Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B. “Liturgical Vesture in the Roman Catholic Tradition,” in *Raiment for the Lord’s Service: A Thousand Years of Western Vestments*, ed. Christa C. Mayer-Thurman (Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 1975), 13-16.


49 Jarves was anti-Catholic and practiced spiritualism during most of his life, but he consistently wrote about improving all aspects of aesthetic culture as seen in James Jackson Jarves, “American Art in Tools,” *The American Architect and Building News* 10, no. 303 (1881): 198. He was also interested in Catholicism after having lived in Italy since 1851 and having collected early Renaissance paintings with strong Christian imagery beginning in the 1850s.

50 For vestments, silk was not just used because its luxury signified the wealth of the Church, but it was also symbolically important since vestments separated an ordained person from a lay person. Silk, as an expensive and luxurious material, marked a qualitative difference amongst bodies within a sacred space.
Prince Carraciolo, of Naples, A.D. 1746. Its delicate floral designs, the thin, snakelike stems, and the large amount of ground weave still visible relate the cope to an early eighteenth-century Italian cope at the Philadelphia Museum [fig. 4]. The weft of the ground weave of the Jarves cope was originally woven with silver metallic wrapped thread, but the silver is now worn away in many sections. The embroidery threads used for the connecting vines, like in the Philadelphia Museum example, have an added gold thread, which would have created a brilliant contrast against the original silver ground.

The coats of arms [fig. 5] that Jarves refers to are located at each end of the orphrey of the cope. The coat of arms contains a red cardinal’s hat, a crowned lion, and two castle towers. The red cardinal hat has tassels on either side of it framing the central cartouche; the tassels are ordered in three pyramidal rows of one, two, and three tassels each, which is characteristic of cardinal hats. The presumably elevated status of the commissioner of the cope accounts for the high quality of the vestment as compared to the other less elaborate floral embroidered vestments in the Jarves collection. Jarves also claims that the cope was produced in 1746, which would agree with the stylistic dating of the late seventeenth to early eighteenth century, but there is still no other evidence that I have been able to uncover to relate this heraldry with the Carraciolo family. No matter the individual patron, the cope was seemingly produced as an Easter vestment. The hood [fig. 6] contains Eucharistic imagery of wheat and grapes, while the silver or white color of the vestment marks it as a part of the Easter season. Jarves’s specific identification of this cope reasserts the historical context of the vestments. While they may be visually similar, the differentiation based on original use marks the cope as a more important and
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51 List of the Jarves Collection, 25.
52 Mayer-Thurman, Raiment for the Lord’s Service, 48.
interesting object of study because it is accessible under all three of Jarves’s perspectives: technical, artistic, and historical.

The cope is qualitatively differentiated from the other vestments through its extensive use of metallic thread in the ground weave and the coat of arms decorations that mark it as an individualized vestment. The embroidered flowers and vegetal motifs on the cope, like on the other vestments, adhere to a general Post-Reformation trend away from figural decoration and towards Baroque and Rococo-influenced floral motifs. Figurative embroidery was abandoned partly because many artists, influenced by their occupation’s rising status, no longer needed to design tapestries and embroideries to make money, so vestments were made out of silks with non-Christian imagery instead.

The plain silks with added embroidery were also in fashion and their popularity and expensive cost signified splendor and opulence to the seventeenth or eighteenth-century audiences. These seventeenth or eighteenth-century silks used pre-1600 embroidery techniques to reproduce the floral motifs used for fashionable Baroque and Rococo silk designs; therefore, these vestments combined traditional, expensive handcraft typically associated with the Church with contemporary fashions [fig. 3]. The reason for the popularity of floral motifs has been variously attributed to Marie de Medici’s passion for flowers, the new interest in French gardens, and the naturalism found in Dutch floral still
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55 Barnet, *Clothed in Majesty*, 12.
56 The use of fashionable textiles for vestments was an issue debated within the Church, but contrary to many earlier studies that stated that the floral silks were often repurposed from secular outfits or purchased from the secular clothing market, it seems that many of the silks were designed specifically for vestments see Mayer-Thurman, *Raiment for the Lord’s Service*, 49-50.
The preference for flowers could also have been due to their religious symbolism: roses for martyrdom, lilies for the Virgin and purity, carnations for pure love.\(^{58}\) The vestments, therefore, related to the larger artistic trends and fashions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but they also reframed those popular, fashionable motifs within a religious dialogue.

All of the collected vestments are elaborate and richly decorated in sumptuous materials, yet they display a wide range of possible design patterns for floral and vegetal decorative decorations [fig. 7, 8, 9]. The stylistic similarities between the vestments and other floral-inspired Baroque and Rococo liturgical objects indicate that Jarves conceived of a “family unity” of seventeenth and eighteenth-century religious art. The display and identification of these stylistic families or schools of cultural production was one of Jarves’s stated aims for his collection: “each epoch was governed by certain principles of decorative design… which underlie all its art.”\(^{59}\) The identification of stylistic schools or families was not just a scholarly effort for Jarves but it was also a means to improve contemporary design, specifically that of vestment production. With the cope acting as the exemplary example of floral vestment production, designers and artists could learn from the displays and improve contemporary taste.

**Orphrey fragments**

The collection contains eight orphrey fragments that can be divided into two different types: lampas fragments and more expensive embroidered fragments.\(^{60}\) For the
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\(^{57}\) Johnstone, *High Fashion in the Church*, 90.

\(^{58}\) Mayer-Thurman, *Raiment for the Lord’s Service*, 49.

\(^{59}\) List of the Jarves Collection, 5.

\(^{60}\) Barnet, *Clothed in Majesty*, 11.
lampas orphreys, there are two separate Annunciation scenes [fig. 10, 11], one repeat of a seated Madonna with cherubim [fig. 12], and three repeats of the Resurrection of Jesus [fig. 13]. The lampas orphreys were woven bands of repeated scenes derived from woodblock prints for devotional books. The images were typically created by well-known contemporary artists, like Antonio Pollaiolo, Andrea del Verrocchio, Alessandro Baldovinetti, Bartolomeo di Giovanni, and Raffaellino del Garbo. Since most of the artists were from Florence, Jarves attributes all four of the lampas orphreys to Florence. Siena and Lucca, however, were also major producers of these types of bands. Even if an original scene can be traced to a Florentine artist, weavers in other cities often freely adapted the work of those artists to their own orphrey designs. The slight alterations to architectural features or hand gestures in similarly composed examples [fig. 14, 15, 16] show how designers in different workshops or cities copied each other’s work without directly working from the same pattern.

Lampas orphreys were widely produced so there are many examples of almost identical scenes in other museums. For example, the Museo del Tessuto has almost an identical orphrey [fig. 17] to the red Annunciation scene in the Davis [fig. 10]. These orphreys are usually dated from 1450 to 1500 because they were no longer produced after chasuble and cope designs changed in the sixteenth century. Chasubles in the fifteenth century used these borders as central bands [fig. 18] and copes used them for borders or as vignettes for the hoods [fig. 19]. Beginning in the sixteenth century and as continued into the seventeenth and eighteenth century, as previously explained, vestment design

62 Barnet, Clothed in Majesty, 11.
moved away from figural representation and towards vegetal, floral, and geometric motifs. Since the earlier vestments with figured orphreys were no longer used by the clergy, the bands were removed from the expensive pomegranate velvets that could be repurposed for other liturgical objects. The orphrey bands, once composed of many repeated scenes, were often cut up into individual vignettes by nineteenth-century textile dealers who wanted to increase profits by selling the orphreys as multiple parts.

The more elaborate, embroidered orphreys in the collection are four connected scenes of the Life of Christ [fig. 20], and three connected vignettes of angels with the instruments of the Passion [fig. 21]. Similar examples of the angel orphrey at the Metropolitan [fig. 22] and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston [fig. 23] indicate that these architecturally framed angel motifs were concurrently popular with the lampas orphreys. Like the lampas examples, these more elaborate, embroidered orphreys from the fourteenth century and fifteenth century were also often designed or inspired by Florentine Renaissance artists, but were produced throughout Italy.⁶³ The angel example, interestingly, differs from the other two Italian orphreys [fig. 22, 23] where the full body of the saint or angel is depicted. In the Jarves angel orphrey, only the upper half of each figure is shown. Spanish orphreys [fig. 24] often just show the upper half of the body, so this example could be geographically misidentified. The orphrey with the scenes from the Life of Christ is narrative-based, unlike the static, architecturally contained images of sacred figures. Narrative embroidered orphreys were produced throughout the same period as the saint and angel orphreys. They did not depict only Jesus’ life, but also the lives of important saints or the life of Mary [fig. 25]. The vertically stacked orientation of the vignettes in both orphreys indicates that they were used as cope borders [fig. 26], not

as horizontal altar frontals or lectern hangings, which Jarves labels them as in the auction catalogue.\textsuperscript{64}

In the auction catalogue and on the cardboard backings, Jarves describes the two Annunciation lampas orphreys are “very rare”. None of the other orphreys are given this designation. The embroidered orphreys, as the more expensive version of the two types, seem more readily associated with rarity, but Jarves purposefully indicates that two out of the four lampas ophreys are the ones to be valued. When the two Annunciation scenes are viewed in relation to the Madonna with cherubim and the Resurrection of Jesus, the repetitive and common quality of the lampas orphreys becomes evident. The Madonna with cherubim ophrey is cut midway through a repeat, so that it is visually apparent that the scene was not created as an individual scene but was once part of a larger series of repeats. The Resurrection of Jesus also has three repeats with the edge ending the bottom-most scene before it has fully repeated. Like an unwinding roll of film, the scenes have a scrolling quality because of the bisecting edge that prevents a fully framed and completed re-presentation of the scene. The visible cut lines dividing the repeated pattern and the implied missing sections connote duplication and multiplicity, not rarity. None of the orphreys are unique but exist in multiples, so Jarves is then constructing a nineteenth-century system of valuation through his notations and comparisons.

Collections create scarcity by escalating demand for a particular type of object and reducing the available supply for other collectors. For scarcity to exist, objects must be classified so that the categories can delineate finite groups which collectors then arrange by value.\textsuperscript{65} Categories of utilitarian objects that are then collected and not used

\textsuperscript{64} List of the Jarves Collection, 26-27.
\textsuperscript{65} Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage
are not typically evaluated based on aesthetics but rather a highly desirable once-used object primarily obtains its value from its survival through time and its relative good condition.¹⁶¹ For commonplace objects, the object that is in good condition must also be emblematic of the category. It should be representative of the category while also being atypical in that it is a better quality repetition of the other objects within its category.

This valuation system is imposed on the orphreys to create a hierarchy within the collection and to teach students how to recognize quality. These orphreys were commonly used in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and were made even more ubiquitous on the nineteenth-century textile market through the process of cutting the bands into pieces. The two Annunciation scenes are in excellent condition in that they are cut without any evidence of their original relationship to a larger repeating pattern, unlike the other two larger orphrey fragments, yet they are emblematic of the collecting category of lampas orphreys through their ordinary formal qualities. Their value derives from their formal and stylistic adherence to their type and their difference in relation to the lesser quality objects within their category that are not as well preserved or as neatly cut. While the “very rare” notation at first appears misinformed, Jarves is not judging the rarity of these objects in their original context but rather in their nineteenth-century collecting categories. The imposition of a classification system places the object’s meaning outside of itself and creates an ideal form for that type. The display of objects of the same class creates a range of possible solutions to a specific problem of representation out of which

¹⁶¹ Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Destination Culture, 25.
a few of the displayed objects are identified as successfully solving the apparent problem and reaching close to the ideal of the category, and are therefore the most valuable.⁶⁷

The four orphreys, when viewed together, however, subtly resist this message. The cut lines, indicating a missing series of repeats, question the claim of rarity and challenge the collector’s hegemony over the textiles. The visible lack or the negative area where one looks for the continuation of the repeating pattern keeps the original context present. The objects imply parts of themselves that are not present, yet the ones that are most rare are the examples where the lack is less visible. Jarves wants to subsume all of the orphreys into nineteenth-century collecting categories that construct new systems of value, but the formal qualities and the physical condition of the orphreys remind the viewer that their rarity is an imposed concept and that the ideal form of their classification is a nineteenth-century construct.

**French border samples**

The second subsection is the group of twenty-seven late eighteenth-century or early nineteenth-century French border samples: Jarves.87 to Jarves.113. These embroidered borders [fig. 27, 28, 29] resemble French border samples, but they are listed in the auction catalogue as being “vest and coat embroideries” of Italian origin and from the seventeenth or eighteenth century.⁶⁸ While Jarves attributed them to Italy, it seems more likely that they were produced in France. The Besselièvre collection at the Metropolitan Museum in New York has a large group of similar borders for male dress, which were purchased by a donor at the auction of the archives of a Lyon embroidery
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workshop [fig. 30, 31, 32]. Both collections of trims were originally used to present the male client with options for the decoration of his waistcoat and overcoat. The larger scale samples would have been for the overcoat, while the smaller samples would have been used for the waistcoats. Napoleon’s wedding costume [fig. 33] used similar elaborate embroidered trims and many examples of the habit à la française, or the typical male costume of a coat, waistcoat, and breeches popular at the end of the eighteenth century, are embellished with similar trims [fig. 34].

The trims decorated the ends of the breeches, the shirt cuffs, and the front of the jackets. Women also adorned First Empire dress styles with embellished borders, as seen in both fashion plates and portraits of that time [fig. 35, 36]. The embroideries at Wellesley, however, are on darker, heavier fabrics, and female borders would have used pale, lighter-weight fabrics.

Navy, a color that is prevalent throughout this section, was the preferred male dress color beginning in the 1780s in both England and France.

Women’s trims adorned the hems of dresses and were designed to be viewed horizontally, while men’s trims ran vertically down the front closure of a jacket. To accommodate this difference in orientation, the design elements of a male border, like the examples in this collection, are often diagonally oriented in relation to the hem rather than perpendicularly arranged like in women’s dress.

The range of quality, their lack of wear, their consistency in size, and the fact that the embroidered work does not extend past the edges of the cut piece of fabric mark these textiles as samples and not fragments cut from actual clothing. There are variations in the
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70 For an example of the female border samples see the examples given by Richard Cranch Greenleaf to the Cooper-Hewitt National Museum of Design.
level of ornamentation and detail amongst the samples that indicate different price points. Some examples have sequins, jewel-like additions and lace [fig. 27], while other are more simple vegetal motifs [fig. 37]. France was known for its embroidery factories, specifically those in Lyon, and the other sample collections, like the Besselièvre Collection, are all attributed to France, not Italy. These could be Italian appropriations of the style popularized in France, but their high quality and their striking similarities to the French examples indicate that they were probably not from Italy. It seems that Jarves then wrongly attributed them to Italy and placed their date of production a century too early.

Like the vestments, they show design ingenuity and differing levels of quality within a set form or collecting category. They reveal much about how vernacular dress was accessorized, and Jarves meant for them to visually connect to the larger textile fragments used also for clothing. The viewer of this collection was meant to compare, as Jarves wrote, “the garments of the priest… of which excellent specimens are seen in this collection, in contrast with the fashionable costumes and embroideries in contemporary use in high society at the same time; although, as time went on, it will also be noted that the lords and ladies and the State began to outshine the Church in dress, and rival it also in the magnificence of their secular buildings.” This history was not imposed upon the viewer through the structure of the collection, but rather it could be drawn out by the observant viewer through careful cross-comparisons of the various types of textiles.

74 Another similar collection is found in the Cooper-Hewitt National Museum of Design. Purchased by the Museum in 1932, the samples show a range of French male border samples (1932-1).
75 List of the Jarves Collection, 6.
These samples, therefore, could be interpreted on multiple levels and had a domain of meanings accessible to viewers with various agendas and backgrounds.

**Borders**

Borders were popular accessories throughout the history of dress because they could easily and inexpensively be added to costumes to renegotiate economic relationships, social standing, or knowledge of style and fashion. The Jarves collection contains thirty-three borders (Jarves.114 to Jarves.146) that have seemingly all been used in actual garments, unlike the French samples. These borders are all cut into segments that range in length from three to eleven inches and generally seem to date from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. There are four heraldic borders [fig. 38, 39], seven monochromatic vegetal velvet borders [fig. 40, 41], fifteen polychromatic floral and geometric borders [fig 42, 43], and seven more elaborately detailed later floral borders [fig 44, 45].

Most of the heraldic borders as well as the polychrome and monochrome velvet borders were used for livery costumes. Liveries, or costumes worn by a wealthy family’s retinue, were used from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century and were decorated with brightly colored borders.\(^76\) Liveries visually marked and inscribed bodies with their class and social status and constructed collectives out of unrelated servants and bound them to specific families. Italian courtiers and diplomats, and not just their servants, also wore liveries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries during important social events, such as weddings or theatrical events.\(^77\)
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\(^76\) Currie, “Clothing and a Florentine Style,” 47-48.
\(^77\) Currie, “Clothing and a Florentine Style,” 47.
The livery borders [fig. 42, 43] deliberately indicated one’s social rank. The abundance and the size of the trims on a costume signified an individual’s rank, so livery materials and colors were codified and carefully observed. A colorful, velvet livery would not only show the wearer’s status as part of an important retinue, but it would also reflect well on the nobleman or woman supplying the costumes.\(^78\) The range in quality within the livery borders collected by Jarves displays how families of various means were able to utilize livery costumes to represent their respective status. The cruder bands with larger velvet loops [fig. 42] would have been used for the livery costumes of a family of lesser status than the family that would have commissioned the more elaborate, finely woven borders [fig. 44, 45]. Polychrome patterned velvets were popular for dress for the first half of the fifteenth century.\(^79\) The same bright coloration found in the borders is documented in larger fragments of silk velvet from the fifteenth century, like the example in the collection of the Museo del Tessuto in Prato [fig. 48] or the example in the Museo Poldi-Pezzoli in Milan [fig. 49]. Silk velvets like these two examples would have been used as the main fabric of a livery costume decorated with similar polychrome velvet borders. While a specific region is not known to have produced these borders, Italy was the main source for polychrome textile production. Italy was able to purchase the mordants from Eastern merchants through its central trade location and because the Italian dye guilds had learned the Byzantine dye technology through cross-cultural trade encounters.\(^80\)

---


\(^{79}\) Fanelli, *Five Centuries of Italian Textiles*, 16.

Some of the later borders might have been used for expensive livery costumes or for non-livery garments. The more detailed and finely woven borders, generally dating from the sixteenth to the seventeenth centuries, have smaller loops, more elaborate designs, and more naturalistic floral motifs [fig. 44]. A few of these later trims also include heraldic symbols, although the actual crests are no longer identifiable to any known family. Identifiable heraldic devices, mottoes and emblems were popular in textile design throughout the fifteenth century especially in liveries, but, in the sixteenth century, some of the heraldic devices became entirely fanciful and had no relation to an actual family crest. These whimsical crests and devices continued as decorative borders for non-livery clothing into seventeenth century. Textiles were sometimes personalized, such as the Medici family’s velvet pattern with a six-petaled flower and the seven red Medici balls [fig. 50] or the damask, discussed earlier, that was originally commissioned to commemorate a Medici-Peruzzi wedding [fig. 51], but these were exceptions. Setting up a loom to create a personalized silk textile was extremely expensive and was a rare occurrence, despite the fact that most families in the sixteenth century already spent at least 40% of their total wealth on clothing. Trims, on the other hand, could be easily produced with heraldic symbols, both real and fake, without having to incur the cost of a full-scale textile production.

Rather than constructing an entirely new garment with each cyclical change in fashion, borders inexpensively updated an out of fashion garment. Sumptuary laws in Florence and in other cities tried to restrict the application of small decorative trims and

---

81 Herald, *Renaissance Dress in Italy*, 186.
82 For more on the Medici textile see Bayer, *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy*, 123; and for more on the Medici-Peruzzi textile see Bayer, *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy*, 125.
embroidered pieces, since they made an outfit, and thus its wearer, look wealthier without having to actually spend much money. Trims were not exclusive to female dress; many men decorated their somber outerwear with more fashionable trims, passementerie, fringes, and cords since plain, dark, monochromatic textiles were often required for government officials or proscribed by sumptuary laws [fig. 46, 47]. Borders, thus, express a desire for fashion, but they also signified and problematized issues of class.

These later examples of borders demonstrate how Jarves constructed visual contrasts within his collection between the more naturalistic, advanced weaving borders and the polychrome livery trims with cruder motifs and designs. The polychrome velvet borders show the “strength [and] durability” of Italian textile production, which Jarves greatly admired, since they are worn but not destroyed after having existed for centuries. However, these polychrome velvets are less advanced in their weaving techniques and in the complexity of their motifs. The relationship between the two types of borders creates a dialogue between naturalistic and stylized designs. The livery borders of lesser quality are decorated with almost abstracted flora as well as simple geometric motifs, while the later borders, which are also more technically advanced, are decorated with undulating, naturalistic flowers and vegetation or with detailed heraldic devices. Between these two subsections, there exists a tension that relates superior design and superior technique with a more advanced civilization. There is a narrative of progress, both in design and in technology, that Jarves constructs within this portion of the collection. This narrative is not without limitations because, despite the visible design

86 List of the Jarves Collection, 6.
advances of the later borders, Jarves still admires the durability of the older borders. While progress is visible, it is a problematic concept even for Jarves. In the auction catalogue, Jarves laments the flimsy, cheap objects of nineteenth-century manufacturers. Design progress is the ideal but technology becomes a topic of anxiety that can hinder that development towards better product design and manufacture. Rather than fully turning against modern inventions, like many other nineteenth-century aesthetes, Jarves used the borders to show how technical advances, when rightly deployed, could improve rather than weaken design standards.

**Lace**

Wellesley College originally acquired eighty-seven pieces of laces from the 1887 Jarves auction. The auction sold a total of one hundred thirty laces, with Wellesley buying the majority. Jarves identifies most of the laces with exact dates in the auction catalogue and the majority are attributed to Venice, although there are examples from other Italian cities, Flanders, Spain, and England. The laces are now lost and it is difficult to track them after 1940. In a 1913 inventory of the Farnsworth Art School at Wellesley College there are short descriptions for some of the laces (Appendix B), which shows that they were still on view. The 1936 museum inventory indicated that Wellesley College still possessed eighty-five laces, although it is unclear if they were in storage or on view. A letter from the museum director to a textile conservator in 1939 cites the laces
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87 List of Museum Accessions, Wellesley College Archives.
88 Inventory of the Contents of the Art Building with Insurance Values, 1913, Box 2, Records of the Museum, 10S, Wellesley College Archives.
89 Inventory of the Contents of the Art Building, Wellesley College Archives.
as still in the museum’s possession. While it is not listed in the deaccession records, the records only begin in 1948. Besides these brief mentions, nothing else is known about the lace collection.

**Fragments**

The rest of the collection (Jarves.147 to Jarves.381) is composed of eighty-two fragments ranging in size from approximately 5 by 1 inches to 18 by 12 inches. The fragments encompass a broad range of weaves, applied decoration, and thread types. The collection includes examples of silk velvets, damasks, lampas, silk taffeta with brocaded elements, and many other material types. The designs represented in the collection range from early pomegranate designs to abstract geometric patterns to lacelike florals, or flower designs that are spatially compressed in order to mimic the appearance of lace. The diversity of the fragments relates to Jarves’s stated goal of constructing a study collection that could be viewed from multiple perspectives. The majority of the fragments include geographical identifications, so the following sections are organized by Jarves’s attributions.

**Venice**

Jarves marks twenty-four fragments as being specifically from Venice. In the auction catalogue, Jarves describes the relationship between Venice’s culture and their textile production:

Thus we find the stuffs of Venice have a predominating sense of splendor, luxury, and richness, Oriental in feeling, and influenced to some degree by her cherished
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90 Letter from Sirarpie Der Nersessian to Helene M. Fouche, April 21, 1939, Box 1, Records of the Museum, 10S, Wellesley College Archives.
commercial pursuits and claim to be the Queen of the Adriatic. Anomalous as it may seem, one of the pianete, or priest’s frocks, to be seen in this collection, of the 17th or 18th century, is a heavy brocade, covered with ships and marine views, which must have made an officiating priest at mass present a singularly nautical appearance.91

While Wellesley did not purchase the pianete, or chasuble, with the marine imagery, the objects identified as from Venice still correspond with his notions of Venetian culture as rich, commerce-based, and influenced by the East.

Jarves’s relationship with the English art critic John Ruskin whom he met while in England in the spring of 1855, shaped his ideas about Venice.92 Ruskin, a popular author in America, wrote The Stones of Venice in 1851, which retold the history of Venice as a cultural capital that failed beginning in the Renaissance due to its obsession with wealth and vice. Jarves’s Venetian textiles come from the stage that Ruskin classifies as Venice’s most corrupt phase, but also its most lavish and wealthy. Jarves does not seem interested in making moral judgments but rather he represents this period of extravagance through textiles that use lavish materials, intricate designs, and exoticism.

Jarves identified the most lavish textiles as Venetian to signify Venice’s superior economic and cultural position within Italy, which led to its corruption and subsequent fall. The lacelike brocade (Jarves.211) [fig. 61], which could also be French, signifies the splendor and luxury of Venice through the range of colors used in the brocading wefts, which indicate a level of artistic skill and material wealth not seen in the other textiles. The brocade also obliquely relates to the Oriental compression of space and opulence in design and color. The tightly interlaced floral design is dated to the eighteenth century.

91 List of the Jarves Collection, 8.
and shows a growing Rococo interest in naturalism, depth, and spatial effects. The design is far more complex and naturalistic than most of the other examples in the collection, which highlights the Venetian interest in extravagance.

While much of the collection is composed of small-scale velvet motifs that mix floral and geometric elements, the Venetian examples have an added richness to them through the inclusion of metallic thread in the ground weft (Jarves.305, Jarves.301) [fig. 62, 63]. The metal-wrapped threads, although often deteriorating or tarnished now, would have created a shiny ground with which the cut or uncut velvet motifs would have contrasted. The quality of the materials marked these textiles as examples of Venice’s “splendor” and its historical position as the capital of luxury.

The most overtly exoticized textiles in the collection, the chinoiserie silk (Jarves.218) [fig. 52] and the bizarre silk (Jarves.254) [fig. 53] are both identified as Venetian. The orientalized imagery of the two textiles represented Venice’s identity as a leader in trade and “Queen of the Adriatic.” Some of the textiles with the most curvilinear, sinuous, Eastern-inspired motifs in the collection are also identified as Venetian. The compact, swirling designs of the Venetian examples (Jarves.329, 223) [fig. 54, 55] mimic Japanese textile motifs [fig. 56]. Jarves was familiar with Japanese textiles, despite Jarves never having visited Japan, because he had written a book on Japan in 1876 titled *A Glimpse at the Art of Japan*. This book inspired one of the most prominent nineteenth-century Japanese textiles collectors, Denman Ross, to purchase Asian textiles. Ross’s collection, of which Figure 56 is a part of, is now at the Museum of Fine Arts. Jarves’s writings shaped Ross’s vision of Asia and the types of textiles he purchased. The
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93 Fanelli, *Five Centuries of Italian Textiles*, 261.
textiles he bought acted as material signifiers of Asia when he brought them back to the United States where they created a visual vocabulary of the Orient against which Jarves’s textiles were read. Jarves both defined other person’s collecting patterns but then his own collections were shaped and interpreted based on those objects collected by others. The culturally defined visual vocabulary of the Orient, created by Jarves and other collectors, lead Jarves to identify the condensed, swirling European textile patterns with Asian motifs. Likewise, Jarves would have recognized palmettes as Asian because of their prevalence in Persian carpet designs.\textsuperscript{95} The two Venetian palmette textiles (Jarves.272, Jarves.273) [fig. 57, 58] would have been visually connected to the Persian rugs produced [fig. 59] and collected [fig. 60] during the late nineteenth century. The dialectical relationship between Jarves’s attributions and actual Asian textiles constructed and reflected a nineteenth-century visual idea of the Orient.

**Genoa**

When describing Genoa, Jarves writes, “Genoa displays a more subdued but still brilliant and solid style of velvets, etc., especially those which are polychromatic in coloring and are commonly known as garden stuffs, because of their designs taken from flowers.”\textsuperscript{96} The Wellesley acquisitions did not include any of the polychromatic garden velvets that Jarves identifies as characteristic of Genoa; however, the Genoese velvets in the Wellesley collection do represent a more naturalistic floral style. Two ciselé velvet fragments (Jarves.350, Jarves.379) [fig. 64, 65] show a high level of detail in the individual articulation of flowers and stems. The three other Genoese examples

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{95} M.S. Dimand, “Palmettes in Near Eastern Rugs,” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 20, no. 8 (1925), 201-205. \\
\textsuperscript{96} *List of the Jarves Collection*, 8.
\end{flushleft}
(Jarves.324, Jarves.349, Jarves.369) [fig. 66, 67, 68] are more geometric and ogival in their compositions, but they also display similar “subdued” coloration.

In Jarves’s *Italian Sights and Papal Principles* from 1856, Jarves recounts his first visit to Italy as beginning with his entrance into Genoa. Jarves applauds the architecture of the palaces and churches of Genoa and attributes their beauty to the competitive nature of their aristocratic commissioners who were stymied by “the sumptuary laws of republican Genoa [that] forbade its trading Croesuses to expend their wealth in personal prodigalities.”\(^7\) Genoa was a wealthy city restricted in its beauty and displays of wealth by sumptuary laws on appearance; therefore, Jarves attributes many of the somber, yet well-crafted and designed textiles to Genoa. In the auction catalogue Jarves writes that each epoch and region has a “family unity” that binds all art forms, including architecture and textiles, together; Genoa is then an anomaly. The government’s intervention via sumptuary laws broke up this unity and forced textile design to be subdued and separate itself from the more lavish Genoese style Jarves recognizes in the architecture. The lack of artistic unity in Genoa and the problems that causes for Jarves’s argument could be part of the reason why there are so few Genoese textiles in the collection.

**Florence**

Jarves describes Florence, in the auction catalogue, as a city that “displays in her stuffs the more severe and serious beauty of Tuscan architecture, pure, and of her school

of art, in which line or form takes the precedence of color.”\footnote{List of the Jarves Collection, 8.} The examples identified as Florentine within this collection show a wide variety of styles and types; however, Jarves attributed the more geometric and religious textiles to his adopted hometown of Florence, in which he lived from 1852 till his death in 1888. These identifications are based on Jarves’s knowledge about Florentine art. All of the lampas orphreys are called Florentine, since he related those vignettes to the Florentine “school of art”, or the artists who created devotional woodblock prints. The strong geometric examples (Jarves.333, Jarves.343, Jarves.282, Jarves.291) show the Florentine preference for line over color [fig. 69], while retaining a subdued, almost “severe” coloration [fig. 70]. Jarves, as a collector of paintings, recognized the formal similarities between textile designs and paintings and consciously cultivated the visibility of those formal connections through his geographical attributions of certain textiles to Florence. He wanted to emphasize that Florence’s art, in all its forms, emphasized line over color.

Two fragments paired together of green cut and uncut velvet forming a grid-like network with metal thread loops decorating the center of the individual cells of the grid (Jarves.283) [fig. 71] was considered by Jarves to be a very rare example of Florentine textile production from 1500. The rigidity of the grid structure, as compared to the naturalistic ogival motifs found in the Genoese velvet examples [fig. 67], highlights the Florentine preference for line and architecture. Even though the technical difficulty and the expensive materials of the metal loops mark this textile as lavish and rare, it is telling that it is one of the few Florentine textiles with any metallic threads. The whole collection contains many textiles adorned with silk threads wrapped with gold or silver, most of which are attributed to Venice; however, only two Florentine pieces have any metallic
decoration (Jarves.283, Jarves.375) [fig. 71, 73]. Ciselé velvets, lampas, and even a supposedly thirteenth-century wool example [fig. 74], instead, reveal the humble, somber qualities of what Jarves identified as Florence’s culture.

Jarves thought much about his city and wrote extensively on what he perceived to be Florence’s innate character as an urban, historical space. In Italian Sights and Papal Principles, Jarves begins his section on Florence by writing; “There is something in the very name of Florence that suggests refinement and pleasurable emotions.”99 This refined aura of Florence, as explained by Jarves in his later book on Italy, Italian Rambles (1883), contributed to and formed out of the Florentine “unrivalled galaxy of civic greatness [that] stands out in prominent historic relief like a fair statue on a magnificent building.”100 The governmental history of Florence as a republic and then as a ducal was characterized by sumptuary laws and proscribed somber dress for those males in power.101 While the adherence to the standards of humble, ruling dress were not always upheld, Florence, held a mythological position in the public psyche as an ideal place of order and restraint.102 Jarves subscribed to that romanticized identification of Florence as a place of order and because of his theories about art he believed that the restrained political atmosphere directly influenced the style of artistic production. In Art-Idea (1865), Jarves writes:

99 Jarves, Italian Sights and Papal Principles, 34.
100 James Jackson Jarves, Italian Rambles: Studies of Life and Manners in New and Old Italy (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1883), 361.
101 Currie, "Clothing and a Florentine Style," 40-41.
102 Currie, "Prescribing Fashion," 161. This image of an idealized, ordered Florence was promoted later through the study of Florentine guidebooks, such as Baldassare Castiglione Courtier, Giovanni della Casa's Galateo, and Alessandra Piccolomini's La Raffaella. These books of social proscriptions present to the imagination an ordered, constrained, humble society where the ruling men are dressed in somber clothing.
Though the love of beauty is a fundamental quality of the human mind, yet its manifestations in the form of art are checked, stimulated, or modified by the influences of climate, habit, and traditions of race, relative pressure of utilitarian or aesthetic ideas, the character of creeds and tone of religious feeling, and above all by the opposite degrees of freedom of choice and qualities of inspiration permitted to the artist by Pagan, Papal, and Protestant governments.\(^{103}\)

The restrained freedom of choice in Florence equally limited the choices available for artistic production but in a productive manner. Florence was not allowed to lead a life of vice in the vein of Venice, but was instead inspired to a religious, democratic fervor reflected in its laws and art. This relationship between the political-artistic characterized Jarves’s theory on art. Instead of a linear progression of art, Jarves conceived of art as a series of localized struggles towards a singular ideal of beauty.\(^{104}\) Florentine textiles reflect what Jarves perceived to be the unique effort of Florence, as a politically distinct city, to reach the artistic ideal despite their abundance of restrictions. Jarves was interested in Florence as both an artistic and political city in which the two practices productively influenced each other to produce works of “serious beauty”.

**Tuscany**

Tuscany was a sort of catchall section for Jarves’s attributions, and many of the Tuscan examples follow the Florentine style of somber coloration, few metallic details, and an interest in geometry. Jarves identifies two of the early pomegranate designs (Jarves.277, Jarves.239) \[fig. 75, 76\] as Tuscan as well as some of the geometric motifs (Jarves.274, Jarves.357) \[fig. 77, 78\] that are of lesser quality than the Florentine examples. The less expensive woven fabrics with small scale floral and geometric motifs (Jarves.203, Jarves.279) \[fig. 79, 80\] were not attributed to Florence or Venice because
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\(^{104}\) Georgi, “James Jackson Jarves’s Art Criticism,” 221.
their provincial quality did not support Jarves’s claims of the cultural and artistic superiority of both cities. Instead, the category of Tuscany represents the appropriation of the Florentine style by less technically advanced artisans.

**Sicily**

For Sicily, Jarves writes, “Sicily shows largely Arab influences and motives of great delicacy and harmony of coloring, strictly conventional, and varied somewhat with Norman or semi-Gothic design, the North and South mingling in aesthetic embrace.” Like Venice, Sicily was seen as a crossroads between the East and the West; however, Sicily was more Arab than Italian, according to Jarves. Jarves does not write about Sicily in any of his books on Italy or in any of his articles. This silence indicates his concept of Sicily as outside of Italy or at least on the periphery of the Italian aesthetic. Instead, Sicily was subsumed into the Arab world, and this cultural relationship shaped the artistic attributions to Sicily.

The five Sicilian fragments display an Eastern-derived interest in geometry and stylization and are distinct in their coloration and forms from the other more Italianate textiles. Jarves would have been familiar with Middle Eastern and North African textiles because his contemporaries, like Dikran Kelekian and Denman Ross, were collecting and exhibiting them. Coptic, Near Eastern, and North African textiles were actively being collected and exhibited by these dealers. Jarves, like his contemporaries, was influenced by their efforts.
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105 List of the Jarves Collection, 8.

106 Dikran Kelekian was a dealer mainly in Near Eastern works who showed his textiles at the Chicago Exposition of 1893 and influenced later collectors like Denman Ross and W.T. Walters. Denman Ross built up his teaching collection, which was distinct from the personal collection he amassed during his Asian travels beginning in 1904 and then given to the MFA. His teaching collection, now in the Fogg Museum at Harvard, was part of his object-based pedagogical approach to his Harvard lectures which he began in 1899 see Frank, Denman Ross and American
bought and sold in the late nineteenth century; therefore, Jarves would have had those motifs as part of his visual vocabulary when he labeled certain textiles as Sicilian. Jarves identified the two, nearly identical, green and gold geometric patterned textiles (Jarves.230, Jarves.212) [fig. 81] as being derived from Arab designs. They would have visually related to similar geometric, frontal Turkish and North African textiles [fig. 82, 83] collected by dealers like Kelekian.

The two smaller striped Sicilian fragments (Jarves.179, Jarves.178) [fig. 84, 85] are composed of yellow, salmon, and green stripes, which is a palette that Jarves would never have associated with the more somber cities of mainland Italy, such as Genoa or Florence. The larger striped textile (Jarves.193) [fig. 86] is visually related to Perugian towels produced in Umbria [fig. 87], but its use of stylized birds and geometric motifs indicates a more direct Arab influence. This visual influence is a construct of the nineteenth-century eye because these designs were produced more often in textiles meant to imitate Arab examples than actually found in textiles from those regions. The blue and gold bird pattern [fig. 88] is a common Italianized Arab motif that was conventionalized by European centers of weavings in Italy and Spain [fig. 89]. Lucca adapted this Arab motif into its textile production in the fourteenth century through lampas borders, but the birds in the Sicilian textile do not have the same movement and energy as the Lucchese birds [fig. 90]. This example is probably another sixteenth-century Italian variation of the bird motif meant to mimic the Arab-derived bird motifs produced in Lucca in the fourteenth century. The East was never directly translated into Italian textile production but was rather interpreted and reinterpreted by multiple centers of production. Sicily, for

Jarves, would have been envisioned as a more direct appropriation of Eastern motifs than other Oriental-inspired cities, like Venice, because of its geographical distance.

**French**

Two examples are marked as explicitly French (Jarves.362, Jarves.269) [fig. 91, 92]. There were three French textiles in the auction catalogue. Pauline Durant did not purchase a stamped yellow silk with a Madonna and angels. They are earlier than the nineteenth-century embroidered borders, and seem to date from the eighteenth century. These French examples allow for those studying the collection to make cross-cultural comparisons. Jarves was most interested in the cultural production of Italy; therefore, the French examples act as precursors or influences upon which Italian design has improved.

**Conclusion**

The breadth of the collection purposefully allowed viewers to construct their own narratives in order to satisfy their individual needs, be they artistic, historical, or technical. Jarves’s limited use of Hegelian theory in his theory of art, in which artistic production is construed as a culturally specific effort towards an objective ideal of beauty also influenced his ideas of viewer reception and how a collection engages its audience. A type of period eye defined the audience, as it also did for the producers of objects. The influencing factors of the period eye that Jarves concentrated on in his writings were regional or geographic identity, religion, and government type. These realities changed production and later reception. The geographical identifications provided students with
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an opportunity to reconstruct the period eye of the producers, but the lack of an overall structuring framework for the collection provided space in the collection for each individual’s culturally defined eye to evaluate the works without the imposition of a nationalistic perspective, such as that found in larger museums like the Louvre. Jarves was conscious of these intentions when collecting and when he put the textiles up for auction. He outlined his goal in the auction catalogue:

As the utility and value of the small specimens, which are attached to cards with their dates and localities given when attainable, are much enhanced by being kept together as a series, it is to be hoped that they will find a final resting-place in some industrial museum, where they can be freely examined and studied by our artisans, manufacturers, and artists.\(^\text{108}\)

Despite Jarves’s interest in organizing the collection to be accessible to all viewers, the textiles still project their own agency and messages. Like the orphreys that subvert the title of “very rare” through their repetition or the Venetian or Sicilian textiles that expose the constructed nature of the European fantasy of the East, the objects are not subsumed under Jarves’s imposed systems of value and signification. While the subsections show how Jarves constructed internal tensions and points of interest within the collection, it is necessary also to step back and look at the ideological context out of which his ideas came. The manner in which he constructed his collection based on subgroups and multiple narratives was part of a larger cultural dialogue surrounding the creation of American museums, the collecting habits of the bourgeoisie, and the development of art history as a discipline within colleges.

\(^{108}\) List of the Jarves Collection, 10.
2. THE COLLECTOR

The Early Life of James Jackson Jarves

Jarves had multiple social and business connections that linked him to Wellesley College’s supporters and trustees, but there is no documented correspondence directly between him and Pauline Durant, the purchaser of the textiles. His involvement with the social network surrounding Wellesley prior to the sale of the textiles was limited and even his involvement as an artistic advisor to Alice Freeman was never commented on by the press or in letters. The sale of the textiles was a mechanism to represent or concretize these ambiguous relationships and to create a professional structured interaction between himself and Wellesley College. To understand Jarves’s role within this network of trustees, scholars, students, and bourgeois elites, it is first necessary to provide a biographical background.

Throughout Jarves’s life, he held a liminal position within Boston society. Jarves came from a wealthy Boston family led by his father, Deming Jarves, who owned a successful glass manufacturing company. Due to poor health, Jarves left Boston in 1837 for Hawaii where he participated in failed business ventures and edited a Hawaiian newspaper. He eventually moved to Europe with his wife and children in 1851 to pursue another short-lived business idea where he remained for the rest of his life with only short trips back to the United States. Transitioning away from his earlier publications of travel guides and histories, Jarves began to write about art after only a few years of living in
Florence. The unimpressed critical reviews regarding Jarves’s first art appreciation book, *Art-Hints* (1855), reveal a public apprehension to recognize his voice as that of an authority. In *Art-Hints*, Jarves advocated for Americans to study European works as a means to improve American art production and taste levels. This differed from the American isolationist strategy promoted by many art critics and active voices in art scholarship during the mid-nineteenth century. Jarves was attacked by those types of critics, such as William Stillman, the editor of the pro-Ruskin American arts journal *The Crayon*. Stillman claimed that Jarves idealized the corrupt, aristocratic, elitist models of art, which, as Stillman argued, could not provide proper inspiration for the new American art inspired by democracy and the local landscape.

Jarves’s ideas were also not accepted by his European counterparts, such as John Ruskin, whose style and philosophy he consciously imitated in *Art-Hints*. Ruskin and Jarves first met in London in 1855, before he published *Art-Hints*, and they initially kept up a brief correspondence. Early on in their relationship, Ruskin wrote to Jarves saying, “I think however you have true feeling for art, and that you will be very useful to the
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Ruskin and Jarves shared an anti-Catholic bias and an interest in the romantic style of criticism, or the idea that a work is evaluated based on multiple and varied reactions, but Jarves did not share Ruskin’s pessimistic view of the future and his distaste for capitalism. These ideological differences and Jarves’s increasing financial involvement in art as a dealer ruined the relationship. Ruskin complained to his confidante Charles Eliot Norton when he wrote to him on August 29, 1881, “…if you are not by this time ashamed enough of Americanism in its effect on Europe to understand what [it] is to me to see such a fellow as Jarvis consul at Florence…” Ruskin identified Jarves as the epitome of “Americanism” or a leader in the capitalist translation of European legacy and culture into monetary value, while he mourned the political situation that allowed Jarves to be elected as vice-consul of Florence in 1880. Ruskin also thought that Jarves was plainly copying Ruskin’s writing style and incorrectly manipulating his theories about art. Ruskin identified Jarves as a manifestation of America’s negative, modern future because of Jarves’s poor copying techniques due to his lack of original ideas and his uninhibited commercial pursuits. These opinions were not unique to Ruskin but were shared by others in England and American and kept Jarves from being able to participate in the social networks surrounding the art world.
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6 Stein, John Ruskin and Aesthetic Thought in America, 141-143.
8 John Ruskin to James Jackson Jarves, 29 October 1855, in Steegmuller, The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves, 152-153. Art-Hints is continually recognized as a pastiche of the styles and opinions of popular nineteenth-century art critics, whose writings Jarves attempted to appropriate and unsuccessfully blend together see Georgi, “James Jackson Jarves’s Art Criticism,” 217.
Jarves was excluded from the scholarly networks in both America and Europe because he tried to occupy too many roles at once: American art historian, Ruskinian disciple, international diplomat, and European dealer and collector. Charles Eliot Norton, another Ruskinian disciple and a member of Harvard’s art faculty, succeeded in casting himself as a publicly-recognized and acclaimed Anglicized American art historian. He accomplished what Jarves could not because he held an academic position, was a member of the Boston Athenaeum, and was not reliant on the art market for his income. His actions and opinions were recognized as being motivated by institutional and scholarly concerns, rather than by individual financial gains. Jarves, on the other hand, had no formal position in a museum or university and was not involved in any Boston social clubs or organizations.¹⁰ His books had no institutional support or authority to legitimize them and his dealings with museums were suspected of having underlying financial motives. The press and scholars could freely criticize his work and actions because he was an independent actor outside of the network of arts institutions.

This outsider status compelled Jarves to actively seek titles and honors for himself in order to legitimize his actions and his voice. When Jarves was elected into the American Oriental Society, a learned society to promote the study of Asia, in 1842, he listed that honor beneath his name on all his subsequent publications. The repetition and promotion of this title reveals his anxiety about scholarly recognition, which stemmed

¹⁰ Paul DiMaggio, "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America," *Media, Culture and Society* 4 (1982): 41-45. DiMaggio explains that museums were created out of groups of trustees that were composed of men who were almost all Harvard graduates. All but one of the MFA’s trustees were also proprietors of the Athenaeum, and both organization’s trustees were almost all members of one of three Boston social clubs: Sunday Club, Somerset Club, or St. Botolph’s Club.
from his lack of a college education. As a teenager, he had wanted to attend Harvard, but his eyesight and health were too poor. He was forced instead to move to Hawaii for its beneficial climate.\textsuperscript{11} When he finally moved to Europe, he had no degree, occupation, specialized skill set, or independent wealth separate from his allowance from his father.

Drawing on the practical writing experience from his previous job as a Hawaiian newspaper editor, Jarves began writing articles for American newspapers and magazines when he first arrived in Europe, but his articles were often unsigned columns and he was still without a steady source of income. \textit{Art-Hints} was, therefore, his first formal interaction with the art world and an explicit attempt to launch a new career. The book unfortunately coincided with Jarves’s scandalous sale of a supposed Titian, which further negatively impacted the perceived authority of his authorial, scholarly voice. In May of 1855, Jarves exhibited at the Boston Athenaeum two paintings he had purchased in Europe: a work by Claude Lorraine and a painting of Danae believed to be by Titian.\textsuperscript{12} They were quickly purchased by an American businessman, John Neal, but in July of 1855, William Stillman wrote in \textit{The Crayon} that the Danae painting was an incorrect attribution.\textsuperscript{13} Jarves and John Neal both wrote letters to \textit{The Crayon} to support the attribution, but Jarves’s reputation in the Boston arts scene was forever marred by distrust.\textsuperscript{14} His eye and his motivations were questioned because he was simultaneously attempting to enter the art world as a scholar, by independently attributing works, and as a dealer, by selling those same works. His failure to succeed in either role made both scholars and connoisseurs regard him with suspicion.

\textsuperscript{12} Steegmuller, \textit{The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves}, 147-148.
\textsuperscript{13} William Stillman and John Duran, “Boston Athenaeum,” \textit{The Crayon} 2, no. 2 (1855), 24.
\textsuperscript{14} James Jackson Jarves, letter to the editor, \textit{The Crayon} 2, no. 3 (1855), 41; John Neal, letter to the editor, \textit{The Crayon} 2, no. 3 (1855), 41.
After this first scandal, Jarves returned from Boston to Florence where he began to slowly amass a collection of early Renaissance Italian paintings. By 1858, his collection was publicly acknowledged in an unsigned letter from Florence in a Boston newspaper. The letter, presumably a publicity strategy written by Jarves himself, shows his lingering weariness towards the public’s perception of the authority of his attributions. In it he writes, “The authenticity of the pictures is in every case placed beyond a doubt.” This insistence on the accuracy of his attributions reveals his underlying concerns regarding his public image. After using the article to construct arguments to assure the public of his collection’s worth and prestige, Jarves began to look for institutions or individuals to purchase his collection of paintings. He privately reached out to Charles Eliot Norton. Norton initially helped Jarves gain the approval of the trustees of the Boston Athenaeum and he then set up a public subscription to raise money to purchase Jarves’s collection for the Athenaeum. Like with the reception of Art-Hints, the success of the subscription was hindered by an attribution scandal regarding a work supposedly by Leonardo da Vinci. Jarves unsuccessfully sued a Parisian dealer who had fraudulently sold him a painting of St. Catherine wrongly attributed to Leonardo da Vinci, but was actually by Bernardino Luini. Due to the further public denigration of the status of Jarves’s eye as a connoisseur, the trustees eventually ended all efforts to purchase the works. Jarves continued his search for a permanent gallery for his

16 “Letter from Italy,” Boston Courier, November 29, 1858.
17 Steegmuller, The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves, 239.
collection, but due to his inability to pay back a previous loan, he was forced to sell all of the paintings to Yale for a very low price of $22,000 on November 9, 1871.\(^\text{19}\)

**Jarves in the Age of Museums**

His failure to profitably sell his paintings was partially caused by the damage to his reputation from the two attribution scandals and his social remove from the elite networks of Boston social clubs, but it also stemmed from the fact that public art museums did not exist in America until 1870, three years after Yale first acquired the works on loan. Jarves had envisioned his collection acting as the core around which a public art museum could be built. The public, however, was not willing to spend money to support this idea, as evidenced by the meager financial support directed towards the Athenaeum’s subscription for Jarves’s collection. In attempts to dispel the widespread apathy towards cultural institutions, Jarves devoted much of his writing to promoting the growth and foundation of museums. He tried to incite rich Americans to financially support institutions and create collections by comparing them to Italian princes, and he used nationalistic rhetoric to evoke feelings of international competition in Americans. Jarves’s articles spoke to both individual and collective motivations in order to make the creation of museums a social mandate. By publishing books and articles in newspapers and popular magazines, Jarves democratized the conversation regarding cultural institutions.

After Yale acquired his collection, Jarves continued to publish books, sell individual paintings and amass collections of European works. Despite his efforts for

\(^{19}\) For the whole account see Steegmuller, *The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves*, 228-251 and Sizer, “James Jackson Jarves,” 341-347.
recognition, he was continually excluded from all elite art world networks. He was never invited to act as a trustee and his name was almost never listed in any of the newspaper accounts of the opening ceremonies of museums or art institutions. He found favor in his Florentine intellectual milieu because of his interest in spiritualism, but he was also disliked by many of the expatriate Florentine artists who thought that he favored contemporary Italian artists over Americans.\(^{20}\) Jarves socialized with Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Robert Browning, Mrs. Frances Trollope, Isabella Blagden, and Frederick Tennyson while in Florence, but he never seems to have sustained a serious, intimate friendship with any of them. Together they mostly bonded over a shared interest in Daniel Home, an English medium, whom Jarves had been introduced to through his mother, an avid spiritualist.\(^{21}\) He never exerted the effort to cultivate the social connections required to become a fixture in an elite milieu or network. Jarves courted book and art collection reviews from figures like Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Sir Charles Eastlake, Seymour Stocker Kirkup, and Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, but the correspondence usually ended immediately after the review was given.\(^{22}\)

The social connections of his father and his Florentine social circle could have potentially been of assistance in his artistic and business ventures, but his inability to sustain any lasting connections hindered his capability to translate those relationships into opportunities to gain recognition and profit. In 1871, after his initial painting collection was sold to Yale and he returned to Florence, Jarves began to pursue alternative means of


\(^{22}\) Steegmuller, The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves, 145-6; Sir Charles Eastlake to James Jackson Jarves, 14 June 1861, James Jackson Jarves Papers (MS 301), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Seymour Stocker Kirkup to James Jackson Jarves, 16 October 1859, James Jackson Jarves Papers, Yale University Library; Sir William Stirling-Maxwell to James JacksonJarves, 16 April 1876, James Jackson Jarves Papers, Yale University Library.
creating a legacy for himself. In the winter of 1872, Jarves began selling Florentine asbestos to the United States in hopes of making his fortune.\(^\text{23}\) This venture routinely failed, although he kept trying for a few years. While he concentrated on his finances and isolated himself in Florence, the early American museums were in their initial stages of foundation and growth. He was thus removed from the important dialogues surrounding the decisions made regarding museum philosophy and collecting habits of the first public art museums in the United States: The Metropolitan Museum in New York and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.

While he was not included on boards of trustees or involved in the funding process, Jarves was an active promoter of museums through his writings on patronage, collecting, display tactics, and the philosophy of public art museums.\(^\text{24}\) Beginning in December of 1871, Jarves had a regular arts column for the New York newspaper *The Independent*. He wrote on varied subjects ranging from artistic training to Asian art history to American art clubs. The column gave him a public platform through which he could express his opinions frequently and without fear of critical reviews, which always accompanied the publication of his books. In his first column, which praised Japanese art,

\[^{23}\text{James Jackson Jarves to Horatio Deming Jarves, December 9, 1882, James Jackson Jarves Papers (MS 301), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.}\]

\[^{24}\text{Jarves’s reputation as a social promoter of museums has suffered because of his physical remove from the museum-creation process. Many writers cite his failure with the Yale Collection as a turning point in the American progress towards public art museums but do not recognize his influential contributions towards the creation of museums in his writings. He often becomes a pre-museum era symbol or a passive figure whose failure served to compel others to found museums rather than an active agent in his own right. In the following museum histories of America, Jarves only appears as a collector and an inspiration to later, and more influential, collectors and not as a social philosopher or commentator see Laurence Vail Coleman, *The Museum in America*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums, 1939) 15; Constable, *Art Collecting in the United States of America*, 33-47; Nathaniel Burt, *Palaces for the People: A Social History of the American Art Museum* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977), 225, 294. Alan Wallach, *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998) does not even mention Jarves.}\]
Jarves laments, “our civilization is a powerful solvent, that pitilessly consumes all that is distinctively picturesque or beautiful in the past, without, as yet, yielding much promise of compensation”. This statement seems provoked by Jarves’s own experiences of having his collection of “picturesque or beautiful” paintings rejected by the public and the elite art patrons. In light of this personal failure, Jarves’s work for *The Independent* can be seen as an educational effort to never again let a collection of masterpieces go undercompensated and underappreciated.

After a few years of only being indirectly involved in the art world through his writing, Jarves began again to associate himself again with the American art market and social scene in 1876. Jarves served on a committee, formed in 1876, to select an artist to create a memorial, which was dedicated after a long delay in 1886, to commemorate what was believed to have been the archaeological remains of the original Norseman landing in Boston. This committee was one of the first mentions of Jarves in Boston society after his five-year European retreat, and it, therefore, marks the renegotiation of his social position within Boston society. As an initial entrance back into society, the committee and its members places Jarves within a social network with multiple links to Wellesley College and its administrators.

The committee’s members and its chosen artist provided social connections that introduced Jarves to Pauline Durant and Alice Freeman. Many of the members, such as Eben Norton Horsford, Mary Hemenway, Edith Longfellow Dana, and Alice Longfellow were personally involved with Wellesley College and its administration. Eben Norton Horsford, who served on the committee, was President of the Board of Visitors at

---

26 “A Statue to Ericksson, the First European to Visit Our Shores,” *Daily Inter Ocean*, December 4, 1886.
Wellesley College and a close friend of the Durants. Mary Hemenway was also friendly with the Durants and endowed Wellesley with a gymnasium in 1909. Edith Longfellow Dana and Alice Longfellow both served on the committee, as did the husband of their sister, Annie Longfellow Throp. The Longfellow daughters visited Wellesley College with their father, Henry Longfellow, and met with the Durants and Eben Norton Horsford on October 11, 1876. The members of this committee most likely acted as Jarves’s means of introduction to the Durants and Wellesley College.

The selection committee chose Anne Whitney, the sculptor, to create the statue of Leif Ericson for Faneuil Hall. Jarves later brokered a deal between Anne Whitney and Wellesley College for Wellesley’s 1886 acquisition of Whitney’s statue of Harriet Martineau. Jarves’s ability to act as a broker for this deal, regardless of how much influence he actually had, shows that he was still closely involved with those whom he had met while serving on the 1876 committee. Over the intervening decade between the Leif Ericson commission and the Harriet Martineau acquisition, Jarves managed to build up his connections to the other members on the committee, so that he was actively involved with the trustees and administrators of Wellesley College throughout the 1880s. He even served, in an unclear capacity, as an art advisor to Alice Freeman beginning in 1886.

29 “Wellesley College Visit of Prof. Longfellow Boating on Lake Waban,” Boston Journal, October 12, 1876.
30 “A Statue to Ericksson, the First European to Visit Our Shores,” Daily Inter Ocean December 4, 1886.
His capacity to sustain relationships and build up his reputation in the 1880s contrasts sharply from his ineffectual networking skills during the Yale debacle. Jarves took a more strategic approach to these later reputation-building activities because he crafted a reputable public image through his newspaper articles and slowly ingratiated himself with the administration at Wellesley College. Rather than working through intermediaries, like how he had Charles Eliot Norton argue on his behalf with the Yale administration, Jarves was in direct contact with Alice Freeman as an advisor before he tried to sell the textiles. He was also more confident due to the professional successes he began to experience starting with his appointment as vice-consul to the American consul in Florence in 1880. In this position he worked under Colonel J. Schuyler Crosby who was well connected with the New York art circle. Crosby was part of Mrs. Astor’s 400, or the four hundred people who could be counted as members of Fashionable Society, which also included Cornelius Vanderbilt and other important industrialists.33 Through Crosby’s social standing and his network of influence, Jarves began to act as a buying agent for Robert H. Coleman, a Pennsylvania iron businessman, Henry G. Marquand, a railroad magnate and a trustee of the Metropolitan Museum, and Cornelius Vanderbilt.34 He sold Cornelius Vanderbilt, a trustee of the Metropolitan, a group of six hundred fifty Old Master drawings in 1880 that were immediately presented as a gift to the Metropolitan Museum.35 These opportunities provided Jarves with a new source of income and also reestablished his reputation as an important dealer. He was no longer defined by his earlier attribution scandals but was recognized as an art buyer for the

34 Constable, Art Collecting in the United States of America, 38.
American elite. Following Vanderbilt’s example, Jarves then attempted to bequest his own collection of over two hundred pieces of glass to the Metropolitan. Although Jarves’s reputation as a dealer first made the Metropolitan suspicious because dealers were often motivated to gift second-rate items to a museum to elevate their status and then subsequently sell their blue-chip items for a higher price. The gift was eventually accepted by the Director, Louis Palma di Cesnola, and the bequest won Jarves his election as a Patron of the Metropolitan by its trustees.\footnote{Steegmuller, The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves, 277-278.}

In March of 1880, Jarves purchased textiles, sculpture, paintings, and other decorative arts objects for his various American clients at the highly anticipated San Donato sale of the estate of Prince Demidoff in Florence.\footnote{“San Donato Treasures in America,” The Art Amateur 3, no. 1 (1880): 17.} Not only was Jarves making a profit on these purchases but his name was repeatedly listed in the newspaper articles recounting the details of each auction during the multi-day sale. Listed alongside prominent collectors like Baron Nathaniel Rothschild and Mrs. Augustus Cleveland, who later gave many of her textiles to the Metropolitan, Jarves’s name was associated with the elite robber barons and wealthy connoisseurs, which instantly solidified his newly credible reputation as a dealer.\footnote{This auction is documented in a series of newspaper articles all titled “San Donato,” New York Herald, March 18-31, 1880.} By working for these wealthy magnates, Jarves was able to temporarily mask as one of them. Even though he was, for the first time in his life experiencing success, he was not content with his social position and tried to assume the role of his superior, Colonel Crosby, and act as an elite despite his continual lack of money.
When Colonel Crosby stepped down from his role as consul in 1882, Jarves petitioned vigorously to replace Crosby, but was thwarted by a petition signed by many expatriate American artists. The petition, which accused him of supporting Italian artists over American artists, led not only to his rejection from the position of consul, but also his resignation from his position as vice-consul.\(^{39}\) In the summer of 1882, Jarves left for the United States in order to have surgery at Massachusetts General Hospital, and subsequently traveled throughout the Midwest looking for a museum to purchase his latest collection of paintings. This proved to be unsuccessful, but by 1883, he was appointed commissioner for the Italian section of the American Exhibition of Foreign Products, Arts and Manufacturers held in Boston.\(^{40}\) The exhibition was a showcase of the industrial and design power of foreign nations and was meant to inspire American designers and manufacturers.\(^{41}\) He was able to display his new collection of early Renaissance paintings in the Italian pavilion. Liberty E. Holden subsequently purchased the collection for his wife, who eventually donated it to the Cleveland Museum of Art.\(^{42}\)

In 1883, Jarves’s two eldest children, Horatio and Chevie, died, followed in November 1884 by his favorite and youngest son, Pepero. Jarves was distraught and secluded himself again in Florence from 1884 to 1886. By 1886, however, he was in contact with Alice Freeman at Wellesley College and involved in the creation of the Farnsworth Art School. At the same time, he sold two sarcophagi for the Museum of Fine

\(^{39}\) Steegmuller, \textit{The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves}, 280.
\(^{40}\) Steegmuller, \textit{The Two Lives of James Jackson Jarves}, 285.
\(^{41}\) “Foreign Arts, Products, and Manufactures,” \textit{Boston Journal}, January 12, 1883.
Arts and one to the Boston Athenaeum.43 These ventures were not as successful as he would have liked because it was reported that the Museum of Fine Arts paid far less for its two sarcophagi than Jarves had spent, but these acts of collecting and selling continually reaffirmed Jarves’s status as an eminent dealer.44 While the financial success of these deals was crucial for the well being of his family who often suffered because of his insatiable, expensive collecting habits, these individual sales made his desired reputation a reality.45 Although he continually pushed for greater success, as with his fervor to become consul, and was often defeated in the process, these small acts of collecting were important events of identity-creation for Jarves. Following the success of the two sales to the Boston institutions, Jarves then sold his collection of textiles to Wellesley College through Pauline Durant, which marked the high point of his career as a dealer.

Collecting as Creation of Institutional and Individual Identity

The process of collecting for Jarves was simultaneously a personal endeavor of identity-creation and a means to alter reality and shape the philosophy and habits of art institutions. Museums are ideological apparatuses that collect objects to create and

44 “Monthly Record of American Art,” *The Magazine of Art* 10 (1887): xi. Jarves apparently purchased the sarcophagi from the granddaughter of Lucien Bonaparte, Napoleon’s younger brother. They were valued at $20,000, but the MFA purchased them for an undisclosed lesser amount.
45 Jarves’s letters are characterized by financial strain and he continually rebukes his children for spending money. In one notable letter to his youngest daughter Jarves writes, “I am awaiting news about my gallery- If favorable, all will go well, and you will have no such [monetary] troubles in future- if otherwise, we will all have to put our shoulders to the wheel to earn our living as we best can... I could not live in America as it costs too much- can live better here in half the money.” James Jackson Jarves to Flora Jarves, February 13, ?, James Jackson Jarves Papers (MS 301), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
delineate the category of Art, which is used as a social tool to construct the subjectivity of viewers.\textsuperscript{46} The museum creates a supposedly neutral frame in which the story of art is told and from which individuals are able to envision all times, places, and peoples. Museums have the power to shape history and the public perception of other cultures, but through the process of identifying what is different and non-normative, they also facilitate for viewers the formation of the concept of the self and of the group to which one belongs.\textsuperscript{47} Individual collecting is an even more active, personalized technique of identity construction through difference. The collector pursues and identifies objects, which are identified as “other”, and creates a system of classification that defines both what is included and excluded in the collection.

Jarves’s collecting process reaffirmed and established his identity as a dealer and as an art connoisseur because he exerted power and agency to construct and classify a category of objects that were recognized as different from contemporary objects but similar in comparison to each other. He became an expert on Italian textiles and had the freedom to create hierarchies of value for this category, since there had been little interest in the study and sale of such objects prior to the mid-nineteenth century. Through their status as foreign objects, according to their place and date of origin as well as their status as an atypical medium for academic collections, and through the process of manipulating and structuring the previously unidentified collecting category, Jarves acted out his desired self: a scholarly nineteenth-century dealer. The presentation of the ordered collection to a museum reified and made real this vision that Jarves held of himself. The collection simultaneously influenced the structure and identity of the accepting


institution. Issues of museum philosophy and display were of interest to Jarves; therefore, by empowering himself first through the collecting process Jarves gained the agency and the power to then sell these objects to an institution as a means to change the future space, displays, and collecting habits of that museum.

Jarves presumably began collecting the textiles in 1865 or twenty-five years before the auction; the continued purchasing of textiles over time shows that he was genuinely interested in the objects as works of art and not just as means for financial gain. In 1865, he was exhibiting his collection of paintings at the New-York Historical Society in order to entice potential buyers and he was embedded in the lawsuit over his purchase of the fake Leonardo painting of St. Catherine. To sell his painting collection as a whole and not as individual works to private collectors, Jarves was actively promoting the creation of an American art museum. His writings at the time that he began collecting textiles focused on encouraging Americans to collect works and then to donate them to the public arts institutions that he imagined would soon be founded, and he constructed himself as a consummate model. His textile collecting process was then a conscious effort to amass a museum-worthy group of objects to donate in order to embody an elite arts patron after his initial effort to act as a painting connoisseur and collector were unsuccessful. In 1860, in one of his earliest articles specifically concerning art, Jarves writes:

I have thus far made this collection [now at Yale] at my own risk and expense, hoping, as Americans become acquainted with my project, which embraces an illustration in the same manner of all the great schools down to our own times, substituting better specimens for interior, as they can be procured, and in every possible way seeking to add to the value of the collection, that it might be made the basis of a public gallery in one of our chief cities.\(^{48}\)

When this collecting process failed to successfully mark him as an arts patron and scholar, he instead used textiles, a less expensive and therefore less risky object to collect, to renegotiate his identity and publicly perceived reputation. By constructing systems of geographical attributions, Jarves was able to exert his agency over the objects and create a collection that was an extension of his self. Through organizational structures and attributions, Jarves attempted to speak for the objects and to use them as instruments to validate the image of himself as an academic connoisseur and collector. While he was collecting and embodying his ideal identity, he was also concerned with how his collection could influence the reality of late nineteenth-century museum construction.

Jarves was reacting to what was then the museum type best known by Americans, or the natural history museum-as-spectacle. Early American museums of this type had been visually overwhelming assemblages that combined natural history, spectacle, and art into a for-profit institution. Charles Willson Peale’s portrait gallery in Philadelphia, called the Philadelphia Museum and opened in 1786, embodied this model of art as entertainment and museum as spectacle [fig. 93]. Besides the natural history displays and the exotic cabinets, portraits were the only art.\footnote{For more on the contents and display of Peale’s Philadelphia Museum see William T. Alderson, ed., *Mermaids, Mummies, and Mastodons: The Emergence of the American Museum* (Washington DC: The American Association of Museums, 1992).} Portraits of popular or historical figures that were easily recognized increased tourist appeal. They were often interspersed with taxidermied animals and displayed as reminders of history, not as objects for aesthetic education.\footnote{Irwin Richman, “Charles Willson Peale and the Philadelphia Museum,” *Pennsylvania History* 29, no. 3 (1962): 263.}
Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, other for-profit museums that mixed natural history and art, such as Daniel Bowen’s 1791 Columbian Museum or Ethan Allen Greenwood’s 1818 New England Museum, both in Boston, proliferated throughout urban America. Peale’s spectacular for-profit museum and those like it were visited by people of all social classes and were popular forms of entertainment. Peale promoted his museum as a space in which visitors could participate and could derive “pleasure resulting from a careful visitation”. In the 1860s, when mentions of creating a European-style museum in the United States crept into the public discourse, Peale’s Philadelphia Museum was condemned as immoral and not educational enough by scholars and the press. The new museums and their founding members wanted to create distance between their proposed project and the types of museums currently in existence. Jarves, as one of these opponents of Peale, joined in the process of demonizing Peale by describing these types of uninformative and anti-intellectual museums as “chaotic gatherings of curiosities and monstrosities, real or artificial, united to dramatic entertainments.”

This outrage exposes the anxiety felt by museum founders and Supporters regarding how to garner public approval for their proposed institutions. Since many

Americans labeled art as an unnecessary, aristocratic luxury, scholars and art critics wanted to reconstruct art as an important educational field of knowledge which needed a new type of museum to protect and present it. The relabeling of art was part of a larger social process in which the American bourgeoisie sought to gain social power through the creation of institutions. Peale thought of his museum as a space for instructive scientific and artistic displays, but his museum positioned him as the empowered figure who controlled the classification and organization of objects and knowledge. Having a singular figure who had agency over the public’s perception of culture was a problematic concept and the American bourgeoisie wanted to usurp that agency by creating their own institutions where they could enact the role of organizing knowledge and defining high culture. To do so, they had to discredit Peale so that the public would turn to them and their new institutions for knowledge and education. While the process of disempowering Peale made the subordinate social classes identify the bourgeoisie as a hegemonic class that was interested in pursuing and protecting the interests of all classes, it also bonded the members of the bourgeoisie into a political collective. By investing in public institutions, the bourgeoisie spent their money on moral and intellectual reforms that catered to the lower classes so that the increasing poor-rich gap appeared beneficial to society. Solidifying their social and cultural capital through the formation of public

---

institutions, the bourgeoisie created structures that organized knowledge and naturalized and legitimized their hegemony. Through defining themselves and their institutional venture in opposition to Peale’s Museum, the cultural elites were able to classify and limit the scope of their intended projects and frame a new relationship between museums and the public.  

Peale’s Museum was finally closed in the 1840s after Charles Willson Peale’s death. The Philadelphia Museum’s decline was quickened when the Academy of Natural Sciences opened up to the public in 1828 and displaced Peale by taking over the responsibility of displaying and explaining natural history in a scholarly and educational manner. Conversely, P.T. Barnum’s elaborate exotic spectacles also infringed upon Peale’s territory and made the Philadelphia Museum appear modest and benign in comparison. Peale’s collections were eventually sold off to various collectors and destroyed or lost over time.

Since Americans like Jarves could find plenty of faults in the present museums in the United States, they had to turn to Europe for precedents. Even out of the European museums, there was not a clear positive model from which Americans could base their new institutions. This presented a problem for the bourgeoisie who needed to be a unified political collective in order to construct powerful institutions. The ideological debate regarding the ideal museum split the elite as a hegemonic class and increased the political importance of the comments of museum supporters like Jarves. As Charles C. Perkins,  

one of the founders of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, noted, “It will be seen that no one of the museums [the Louvre, the South Kensington Museum, the Dresden collection, the École des Beaux Arts, the New Museum in Berlin, the British Museum] of which we have been speaking offers a perfect example of what the American museum should be.”

While all the potential models listed by Perkins were radically opposed to Peale’s museum-as-spectacle, museum founders debated extensively on the merits of each European example. Jarves wrote a considerable amount on the type of museum he favored in this debate, namely the South Kensington Museum, in order to focus and unify the efforts of the bourgeoisie. Using Peale’s museum as a common enemy, in Jarves’s writings and those of other early museum founders, bonded the fragmented bourgeoisie and eventually provided the impetus for the creation of actual institutions by 1870.

The Ideological Debate Made Real

In Jarves’s writings and his thoughts on art, he was no radical. As explored through the study of Art-Hints, he acted more as a mouthpiece for the ideas and theories constructed by other intellectuals. Jarves’s contribution to the debate came in his ability to democratize the conversation about museum creation. By publishing his opinions in popular magazines and newspapers, he made the discourse regarding the new type of museum a shared American concern. The emerging institutions he wrote about needed the public for financial support, but they were also reliant on the public as a willing participant in this moralizing, educational program. Jarves’s writings helped to convince the public to participate in the museum creation process and to present the bourgeoisie as

---

a hegemonic class, or the embodiment of the national-popular collective will, even if they were in reality fractured over the issue of the ideal museum model.  

For Jarves, the textile collection gave him a means to enact his written ideas regarding the ideal type of American museum in real space. His thoughts on what that type of museum should be were mainstream, since many people, including museum founders like Charles C. Perkins, admired the South Kensington Museum; however, Jarves, as a dealer and a collector, had a unique opportunity to manifest his written word through the construction and sale of a collection. Jarves was able to transform his theories into a reality through the collecting process in three significant, and radical, ways: purchasing textiles, creating an educational display method, and selling the collection to an emerging collegiate museum.

Textiles as Radical Material

By purchasing the textiles through dealers, auctions, and private estates, Jarves participated in growing the market for European textiles. Jarves was apparently an early textile collector, since in an article regarding the auction, it is noted that “similar specimens have become, in the last few years, much more difficult to obtain in Europe.” Other collectors were not as interested in textiles in the 1850s and 1860s because they were not as expensive or as synonymous with high culture as paintings. Jarves’s collection was a statement on the importance of textiles and the responsibility of museums to collect more than just paintings. This idea was informed by the ideology of industrial museums, or museums with an educational focus to improve the design and

---
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manufacture of national products. Jarves’s preference towards the industrial museum model in both his writing and his collecting habits was a direct reaction to the hegemonic control of the Louvre and its display and glorification of the oil painting.

Jarves politicized his collection when he wrote in the auction catalogue that he “hoped that [the textiles] will find a final resting-place in some industrial museum, where they can be freely examined and studied by our artisans, manufacturers, and artists.”65 This statement is far more precise in its specifications about the type of museum and the use of the collection Jarves desires than any of his written expectations regarding the type of institution he hoped would purchase his paintings in the 1860s.66 The textiles were not, as Sizer claimed, purely a collection sold to help Jarves out of financial straits, but rather they were an active assertion and representation of Jarves’s position in the American museological debate. By selling the textiles, Jarves wanted to shape and encourage the growth of industrial museums in America according to the specific model of an industrial, study museum and, in turn, reduce the importance of the Louvre.

The industrial museum model was defined through negative comparisons to the universal survey museum, which was epitomized by the Louvre. The Louvre was a beloved and well-respected institution for both American tourists and Europeans because of its extensive collection of masterpieces, but it was not a model that Americans could readily duplicate. The Louvre was a royal collection that opened its doors to the public in 1793 during the French Revolution. It was one of the first European museums, but its
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66 James Jackson Jarves, “The Growth of Italian Art,” The Independent, December 13, 1860. Since museums were not founded until the 1870s, Jarves did not have as many options, but he was still aware of the possible range of models available for museums in Europe. In this article, Jarves advocates for a public art gallery but is unspecific about the display or use of the works.
scope and breadth marked it as the ultimate comprehensive museum displaying the full range of the history of art.\textsuperscript{67} The Louvre functioned in the American psyche as a singular, reified symbol of Western patrimony. For Americans, the Louvre was, and still is, indexical to high culture. With its myriad original masterpieces, the Louvre’s collection was impossible for Americans to duplicate because they did not have aristocratic or royal troves of paintings upon which it could found a museum.\textsuperscript{68}

Despite the infeasibility of reproducing the Louvre’s collection, its comprehensive display of the history of art was enviable to Americans trying to found museums in the United States. In 1872, Jarves wrote in \textit{The Independent}, “the contents of a museum should not merely be the best attainable specimens of every form of art; but they should be so arranged as to give immediate pleasure and subsequent instruction”.\textsuperscript{69} While Jarves implies that the Louvre’s system of display is neither pleasurable nor instructive, Jarves does acknowledge that the Louvre has the “best attainable specimens” of any other museum. The acquisition of masterpieces was the biggest obstacle facing the foundation of American museums, so the inability to obtain European masterpieces only made the Louvre a more desirable ideal.\textsuperscript{70}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{67} For a complete history of the Louvre and its founding and its European precedents, see Andrew McClellan, \textit{Inventing the Louvre} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
\item \textsuperscript{68} Constable, \textit{Art Collecting in the United States of America}, 5-6. The lack of European works in America was due to the initial lack of art businesses and experts, such as dealers, galleries, and auction houses. American collectors often employed European agents to buy works abroad for them, but the reliability of the agents and the works procured was still often suspect. Until museums were able to act as institutions of education that collectors could consult with, the collections in America were generally composed of second-tier examples or reproductions.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Perkins, “American Art Museums,” 6-7. Perkins ridicules Americans who think that they could ever challenge the Louvre in terms of quality of masterpieces. He writes, “Are they aware that the English, French, and Bavarian governments have gained their marbles, bronze, terra-cottas, and vases by fitting out expeditions to Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt, under the direction of men trained from their youth up in archaeology and art, and empowered to hire excavators, and bribe
If an American museum could somehow manage to amass the “best attainable specimens,” they could be reordered to project patriotic sentiments and be transformed into valuable objects of national patrimony, so that Americans could challenge French cultural dominance. The display of the collection in the Louvre placed French paintings as the culmination of artistic progress and reified France as the ultimate international tastemaker. Americans wanted to amass a collection as authoritative as the Louvre to reposition the climax of art within the American schools. Earl Shinn, the mid-nineteenth century art critic of *The Nation*, advocated for American museums to collect modern, American art in order to begin rewriting this history. While the Louvre was a repository for the Old Masters, Shinn’s imagined museum would display:

An art plainly modified by the industrial and practical spirit of the age, but modified just as plainly by its intelligence, and by the application of that scientific treatment which is changing history, physics and creeds beneath our eyes. For this art, on which posterity will sit in equity, America will be the judgment-hall for its Vaticans and Louvres are here.

According to Shinn, even if an American museum could not gain the critical mass of European masterpieces necessary to challenge the Louvre’s hegemonic control over the history of art, it could create an entirely new narrative in which American art symbolizes the ideal enlightened art.

---

Unlike Shinn, Jarves took a different collecting approach towards how the new American museum could challenge France. Rather than appropriate the collecting habits of the Louvre, Jarves reframed the debate entirely and collected textiles. He still tried to collect “the best attainable specimens” but of an entirely different classification and medium than the Louvre’s oil paintings. The textiles could tell their own history of art. The history did not present America as the climax in terms of production, because Jarves did not believe that Americans had reached their artistic potential; instead, Jarves thought that by bringing the best Italian examples to American audiences he could improve future artistic production. By delineating a new collecting category outside the purview of the Louvre, Jarves created a new space for American museums to exercise agency without having to challenge the Louvre’s dominance over the supply of Old Master paintings. In this sense, Jarves’s collection was a political act that renegotiated the goal of American museums from trying to compete with unattainable European models to establishing the future international dominance of the United States.

The model for the new American museums, however, was not entirely their own. While Jarves wanted to mimic the encyclopedic qualities of the Louvre, his choice of material was influenced by the collecting habits of a newly constructed British museum, which was also lodged in the American imagination as an ideal space. The South

74 For Jarves’s views on contemporary American production see James Jackson Jarves, “American Art in Tools,” *The American Architect and Building News* 10, no. 303 (1881): 198; James Jackson Jarves, “Public Monuments in Italy and the United States,” *The American Architect and Building News* 7, no. 222 (1880): 131; James Jackson Jarves, “The American School of Painting: Elihu Vedder and John La Farge,” *The Independent*, October 3, 1878. Jarves advocated for Italian works to be brought to America in James Jackson Jarves, “The New School of Italian Painting and Sculpture,” *Harper’s Magazine*, March 1880, 493, when he writes, “"It is an advantage of native art in America that statues like these, and pictures like those of Gelli and Conti, should go there, to raise its standards in sculpture and painting, and hasten the time when the New World can repay the Old World her debt in art, by sending to her, if possible, works as superior even to these as her mechanical inventions are to the old-time tools of Europe."
Kensington Museum, founded in 1852 and renamed the Victoria & Albert Museum in 1899, was the ideological foil to the Louvre model. The South Kensington Museum was the first museum of applied arts and was created following the success the 1851 Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations. British anxiety over their national product design in comparison to that of other nations compelled Henry Cole, the founding director of the South Kensington Museum, to display collections of scientific products, engineering tools, inventions, and art. By 1896, the museum had specialists assigned to different material-based art collecting categories, which included ceramics, metalwork, sculpture, textiles and woodwork, and the museum also had a collection of British oil paintings donated by John Sheepshanks in 1857. The philosophy of the South Kensington Museum was articulated by the government’s mission to construct an educational program in relation to a series of local schools of industrial science and art that would work together to improve British manufacturing, while also improving the morals and happiness of all visitors.

The South Kensington Museum had two early exhibitions of textiles: Chinese silks and embroidery (1860), decorative art needlework made before 1800 (1873). The other exhibitions focused mostly on furniture, jewelry, glass, miniature portraits, and

---

75 While I use the Louvre and the South Kensington Museum as the two models for American museums, there were many other options that were discussed by American museum founders as potential models: the Uffizi, the Pitti Palace, the Dresden collection, the École des Beaux Arts, the New Museum in Berlin, the British Museum, etc. Most of these museums, however, fall on the spectrum between the Louvre as universal survey museum and the South Kensington Museum as industrial museum. The two poles frame the dialogue; although, there were many mixed models. Other examples, like the British Museum, were conflated with Peale’s natural history museum-as-spectacle and were already recognized as a museum type in American culture.


77 James, *The Victoria and Albert Museum*, xv-xvi.


79 James, *The Victoria and Albert Museum*, 519-521.
other examples of decorative or applied arts. Jarves was duplicating the exhibiting and collecting habits of the South Kensington Museum within an American context. His collection brought the concerns about manufacturing and product design into the American discourse by selling the textiles at a public auction.

**The Power of Education**

Jarves’s collection also challenged the hegemonic narrative dominance of the Louvre by constructing his textile collection as an educational display. Even before he sold the objects to a collegiate museum, Jarves attempted to identify the geographical places of origin and the dates for many of the textiles. His efforts to contextualize the objects reveal an early interest in using the objects for educational purposes.

The Louvre was not a space that most Americans had access to, so it functioned as an idealized imaginary space constructed primarily through writings in newspapers and books. After the Civil War, for those who could afford to go to Europe, the Louvre acted as an initiation into art. These cultural expeditions became so normative that American art collectors inspired by European museums were frequent character types in literature of the nineteenth and twentieth century. Henry James and Edith Wharton’s art collecting characters embody the American fascination with European cultural institutions and art but also reveal a partial range of types of collecting habits initiated by the nineteenth-century Grand Tour. Christopher Newman in James’s *The American*.
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80 Harris, *The Artist in American Society*, 128-144; Saisselin, *The Bourgeois and the Bibelot*, 77-78; Kathleen Adler, “‘We’ll Always Have Paris’: Paris as Training Ground and Proving Ground,” in *Americans in Paris 1860-1900*, ed. Kathleen Adler, et al. (London: National Gallery Company, 2006), 11-14. The American Grand Tour was qualitatively different than the European version because it was conceived of as a pilgrimage to a foreign, almost timeless, space that possessed and owned high culture. The Grand Tour was a capitalist-inspired effort to bring that culture to America in order to participate in this cultural discourse.
(1877) is a ridiculed character who commissions copies of works from the Louvre based on the size of the canvas, the richness of the painting’s display, and the beauty of the women depicted.\footnote{Henry James, \textit{The American} (1877, repr., New York: Penguin Books, 1981); Lynne P Shackelford, "James’s \textit{The American}," \textit{Explicator} 48, no. 4 (1990): 255.} The copied European works associated Newman with the Louvre’s royal heritage and its connotations of wealth, prestige, and taste. In Edith Wharton’s \textit{False Dawn} (1924), Lewis Raycie is a romantic boy who uses his father’s money to buy early Italian paintings instead his father’s desired high Renaissance paintings.\footnote{Edith Wharton, \textit{False Dawn: the forties} (New York: D Appleton and Company, 1924).} Modeled on James Jackson Jarves, Raycie’s character reveals the emotionally transformative power of original art.\footnote{Adeline Tintner, “\textit{False Dawn} and the Irony of Taste- Changes in Art,” \textit{Edith Wharton Newsletter} 1, no. 2 (1984): 1, 3.} Newman and Raycie reveal the difficult position of American connoisseurs who did not have access to, through limited supply and funding, Old Master paintings. Collectors had to either purchase unappreciated works outside of normative tastes, or they could purchase copies of too expensive originals to attempt to signal mainstream prestige and intelligence; although, as seen with Newman, this method could have the opposite effect. While Lewis follows the former and Newman the latter, both characters went to Europe and specifically to the Louvre to pursue their burgeoning relationships with art. The ubiquity of the image of an American collector traveling to Europe for both educational and commercial pursuits reinforced the American idea that the Louvre, and even Europe in general, was the height of culture. By going to the Louvre and learning about its masterpieces, collectors were able to gain cultural capital, or “knowledge and familiarity with styles and genres that are socially valued and that
confer prestige upon those who have mastered them,” and effectively increase their social position in America.\footnote{For more on artists and the Louvre see DiMaggio, "Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston," 35; Otto Wittmann, “Americans in Italy: Mid-Century Attitudes a Hundred Years Apart,” \textit{College Art Journal} 17, no. 3 (1958): 284-293.}

Jarves, as a new expatriate, visited the Louvre in 1851 when he first arrived in Paris. He recounted the experience in \textit{The Art-Idea} (1865):

Our first great experience was the Louvre gallery. Wandering through its interminable ranges of pictures, or lost in its vast halls of statuary, we became oppressed, confused, uncertain, and feverish; filled with unaccountable likes and dislikes; passing, in a convulsive effort to maintain mental equilibrium, sweeping censures upon whole schools, and eulogizing others as foolishly; hurrying from one object to another with delirious rapidity, as if the whole were a bubble, ready to burst at any moment; until, with a weary, addled brain, but unmoved heart, we gladly escaped into the outer air for breath.\footnote{James Jackson Jarves, \textit{The Art-Idea} (New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1865), 19.}

Jarves describes himself as a Newman-type figure who has no ability to productively learn from and judge the art. The Louvre symbolized the American yearning for cultural capital, but it was not an effective arts educator through its displays.

Jarves was not the only American aware of the awe-inspiring yet unenlightening power of the Louvre. Henry James typified the American response to the Louvre in his autobiography, \textit{A Small Boy and Others} (1913), when he wrote, “We were not yet aware of style, though on the way to become so, but were aware of mystery, which indeed was one of its forms—while we saw all the others, without exception, exhibited at the Louvre, where at first they simply overwhelmed and bewildered me.”\footnote{Henry James, \textit{A Small Boy and Others} (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1913), 345. For a range of American experiences involving European art see Harris, \textit{The Artist in American Society}, 124-144.} James’s bewilderment was a typical American reaction to the vast display of works that were almost entirely
without wall text or explanatory catalogues [fig. 94].\textsuperscript{87} Having no previous experiences with similar museums in the United States, visitors to the Louvre, like James and Jarves, were unable to process the visual onslaught. The institution’s inability to frame the material in an instructive manner created what Americans recognized as the inherent educational weakness of the model. James emphasized that weakness when he wrote:

It was as if [the paintings] had gathered there into a vast deafening chorus; I shall never forget how—speaking, that is, for my own sense—they filled those vast halls with the influence rather of some complicated sound, diffused and reverberant, than of such visibilities as one could directly deal with. To distinguish among these, in the charged and coloured and confounding air, was difficult—it discouraged and defied.\textsuperscript{88}

For Jarves, the crowding of paintings together in the halls, grouped together by school without explanation, was not only uninformative but also actively “discouraged” some uninitiated viewers who felt overwhelmed.

To counteract this tendency of preferencing the overwhelming aesthetic experience over the informed education of opinions, Jarves created a collection that was focused on educating its audience. Jarves gives his viewers space to select their own methods and perspectives from which to study the collection, primarily from an artistic, technical, or historical point of view.\textsuperscript{89} He encourages individual responses and investigations, but he provides what he believed to be factual data on the object’s place and date of origin to support the viewers’ respective academic pursuits. By providing labels and promoting the careful study of the objects, Jarves was ideologically associating his collection with the displays and exhibitions of the South Kensington Museum.


\textsuperscript{88} James, \textit{A Small Boy and Others}, 346.

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{List of the Jarves Collection}, 3-4.
In the writings of American museum founders, the South Kensington Museum was constructed as the ideal educational museum. Charles C. Perkins claimed that the Louvre makes “collections of objects of art”, or amasses luxuries without meaning or purpose, while the South Kensington Museum used its objects “for the education of a nation”, which implies an intellectualizing, and moralizing, agenda enacted through arts education. Other critics, however, were not as rigid in their separation of the two museum ideals, and many American museums attempted to reinterpret and redisplay “collections of objects of art” in order to educate and moralize America. Jarves is one of the Americans who conceptualized the ideal museum to be a space informed by both ideologies. Jarves, not interested in modern industrial production, collected historical objects like those in the Louvre, but he displayed them with an educational focus.

The South Kensington Museum was popular in the United States because it manifested the ideas of the best-selling art critic, John Ruskin. Despite the American conflation of Ruskin and the South Kensington Museum, Ruskin, the leading Victorian era English art critic who is largely known for championing the pre-Raphaelite movement, did not actually support the South Kensington Museum. Ruskin attacked the South Kensington Museum and its associated schools for not improving artists’ working conditions, which he believed influenced the quality of aesthetic production. He also disliked South Kensington’s focus on industrial production over artisanal production. Ruskin wanted to recreate his imagined concept of the pre-Renaissance golden age of artistic production where independent but equal and empowered artists created works of
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91 Nadine Rottau, "'Everyone to his taste' or 'truth to material'? the role of materials in collections of applied arts," in Material Cultures, 1740-1920, ed. John Potvin and Alla Myzelev (Burlington VT.: Ashgate, 2009), 79.
art that honored both the innate qualities of their chosen material and their own creativity.\textsuperscript{92} Creativity, for Ruskin, was inspired by nature, not by antique or modern works, such as those displayed in the South Kensington Museum.\textsuperscript{93} Yet, for Americans, Ruskinian aesthetics and morals were often conflated with the South Kensington mission.

Americans, even Jarves, who had met Ruskin in England, interpreted \textit{The Stones of Venice} (1851), a bestseller on the historic rise and fall of Venice, as a warning to the United States and a foundational text for the rationale to create museums.\textsuperscript{94} Ruskin claimed that Venice failed as a civilization because of its attachment to wealth, its acceptance of widespread vice, and its unjust class divisions.\textsuperscript{95} The South Kensington Museum, for the early museum founders, was the antidote to prevent the United States from following in the footsteps of Venice. The South Kensington Museum embodied the concept of “rational recreation,” or the idea that museums were not institutions that only benefited the elites, although they were founded by elites, but were replacements for middle and lower class saloons and bars.\textsuperscript{96} In 1875, Henry Cole argued that museums, if properly educational and entertaining, could entice men away from vice:

\begin{quote}
Open all museums of Science and Art after the hours of Divine service; let the working man get his refreshment there in company with his wife and children, rather than leave him to booze away from them in the Public-house and Gin Palace. The Museum will certainly lead him to wisdom and gentleness, and to Heaven, whilst the latter will lead him to brutality and perdition.\textsuperscript{97}
\end{quote}

If taste levels rose, then so too would the morality and the ethics of the lower classes thus subverting Ruskin’s prophecy. In \textit{The Atlantic Monthly} in 1893, Edward S.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{92} David Morse, \textit{High Victorian Culture} (New York: New York University Press, 1993), 228.  \\
\textsuperscript{93} Morse, \textit{High Victorian Culture}, 434-435.  \\
\textsuperscript{94} Stein, \textit{John Ruskin and Aesthetic Thought in America}, 134.  \\
\textsuperscript{95} Stein, \textit{John Ruskin and Aesthetic Thought in America}, 135.  \\
\textsuperscript{96} Tony Bennet, \textit{The Birth of the Museum}, (London: Routledge, 1995), 20.  \\
\textsuperscript{97} Henry Cole, \textit{Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole}, vol. 2 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1884), 368.
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Morse, the director of the Peabody Essex Museum in Massachusetts, encouraged the growth and continued governmental support of educational museums and libraries. He wrote, “the public museum fosters the art of collecting; and of all habits to encourage… it induces habits of neatness, order, and skill… young people are kept out of mischief, to middle-aged people it is a rest and relaxation, and old people find in their collections a perennial source of pleasure.”

Jarves, a supporter of the growth of American collectors, would have advocated for any institutional model that could inspire his favorite habit in others.

The connection between educational recreation and moral improvement made museums into salvific symbols with the power to keep the United States on the correct path. Americans were then faced with how an industrial museum’s moralizing instruction on taste and aesthetics would attract an audience. The Louvre’s masterpieces were the draw for tourists, but an industrial museum, with a collection of applied arts and unattributed works, did not have the same allure. Proponents for the South Kensington Museum model in America argued that the institution would be able to reach its target group through early childhood arts education programs and through a change in product design that would subtly teach the public about aesthetics. As Jarves explains:

England now spends with open hand on schools of design, the accumulation of treasures of art of every epoch and character, and whatever tends to elevate the taste and enlarge the means of the artistic education of her people, -perceiving, with far-sighted wisdom, that, through improved manufacture and riper civilization, eventually a tenfold return will result to her treasury.

Elementary arts education was a concept that industrial museum promoters advocated for both in England during the founding of the South Kensington Museum and

---

in the United States in the late nineteenth century. In 1882, Walter Smith, the State
Director of Art Education in Massachusetts, submitted a proposal to the Pennsylvania
Museum and School of Industrial Art on how to organize their school and museum.
Smith advocated for an institution that educated through lectures, courses, teacher
training, elementary drawing classes, and instructive museum displays. In his proposal he
writes that teaching at the level of the people and addressing them as individuals is the
key to success:

…Actual present condition of the education of the people, bringing the
accumulated wealth of agencies for improvement down to the level of those to be
benefited... makes the difference between a living and life-giving influence, like
that of the South Kensington Museum, and a raree-show like the British Museum,
rich, solemn, and majestic though it be. Grand as is the latter as a national
monument, its relation to the former is like that which a bronze statue erected to
commemorate the achievements of a dead warrior would be, as compared with the
living hero himself victoriously leading his forces on the battle-field. The one is a
shrine; the other, a school, -one, historical record; the other, living power.100

Jarves also advocated for early drawing and coloring education, which would start with
copying models and build up to working from nature.101 If children were taught from a
young age how to color and draw effectively, they would thus have a better appreciation
for good craftsmanship and design. Jarves argued that the prevalence of mechanically
produced objects “blunts the appetite for beauty… and, in time, [we] actually learn to
prefer a monotonous multitude of cheap and ugly things to masterpieces of art.”102 He
went on to connect society’s atrophied ability to behold beauty to its degenerate morality:
“Without our noting it, the senses degenerate if stinted of a wholesome esthetic ailment.
Any race that neglects or misapprehends art gradually weakens its intellectual cognizance

102 Jarves, “A Fresh Field of Art.”
of aesthetic law, and finally confuses its practice and idea with other matters.”

Early arts education would not only limit the extent of this cultural and intellectual weakening, but it would inculcate the younger generation as a receptive audience to this new type of museum.

American advocates for the adoption of the South Kensington Museum model also argued that designers who were correctly inspired by the educational displays would produce objects that could subconsciously teach consumers honest and moral aesthetics. Educated product design brought the lessons of the museum to the consumers. Henry Cole created the so-called Chamber of Horrors in the South Kensington Museum as a tool of rational recreation that both educated the designers and entertained the masses. The Chamber of Horrors was a central hall in which objects based on bad or false design principles, such as glass cut in ways that destroyed the natural shape or materials mimicking the natural effects of other mediums, were displayed. Uneducated viewers might find pleasure in the spectacle, but designers could absorb the lessons and re-present them to consumers through their own designs.

The South Kensington Museum was also an accessible substitute for the unattainable universal survey museum model with its treasures and masterpieces of Western art. Charles C. Perkins wrote in relation to the founding of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston that “many persons when talking about an American Museum have a dim idea of another Louvre or National Gallery, whose walls are by some miraculous process
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103 Jarves, “A Fresh Field of Art.”
to be speedily covered with Raphaels and Correggios." He goes on to advocate for collections to form around groups of casts, architectural fragments, and archaeological objects. Perkins, Jarves, and many other early museum supporters believed that at first a collection should be centered on affordable applied and decorative art objects. With the core of the museum created around lesser and inexpensive objects, they argued that donors would quickly follow with gifts of Raphaels and Correggios. They reframed the debate by imagining a South Kensington style museum slowly growing into an American Louvre. With its roots in arts education and applied arts, the eventual American Louvre would be able to properly teach the American public how to appreciate the Raphaels and Correggios when they finally arrive.

The collection of textiles was one of these stepping stone collections for Jarves. Knowing that his early Italian Renaissance paintings failed to sell for their proper value because of an unreceptive and uneducated public, Jarves was interested in developing American taste levels so that museums would be able to purchase works besides Raphaels and Correggios with the public’s support. The textiles were a simple means to begin the educational process and to capture the public’s interest in aesthetics and design. For Jarves, the moralizing impulses of the South Kensington Museum were not as motivating. While he wrote about the moralizing potential of institutions, his own collection was more focused on pure aesthetic education than on promoting ethics.
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106 Wallach, “The Birth of the American Art Museum,” 250-251. Although the lack of supply was a major contributing factor in America’s inability to create a museum that resembled the Louvre, the inability of the upper class and the intellectual elites to come together and unite over the cause of museum creation was a major contributing factor to the delayed foundation of museums in America. It took until the 1860s for urban elites to reorganize and create stable political collectives that were able to exert cultural hegemony and found institutions.
through taste. He still draws in elements of the moralistic discourse, when, for example, in the auction catalogue he notes:

In every way these rags of olden times are precious. Ethically, as a text of humanity to moralize on... and altogether, most precious of all, to tame down the much vaunted superiority of the 19th century in the industrial arts to the level of real truth, convincing the living that the dead had not a few compensations for their lack of many of our “modern improvements.”

Jarves uses the rhetorical devices of the South Kensington museum promoters to characterize his collection as part of the movement. He is not only educating the public on aesthetics but he is changing reality and the current misconceptions about industrial design.

The Sale as an Efficacious Act

Finally, Jarves was able to present his radical materials and display methods to a wider public by selling his collection of textiles at auction. The sale gave him an opportunity to have his collection on display in the galleries of Ortgies & Co. Auctioneers in New York for two days prior to the auction, so that the public could learn from the textiles. When Wellesley College purchased parts of his collection to display in their art museum, which was still being built in 1887, Jarves’s goal of manifesting the ideology of the South Kensington Museum in a real space was successful. The spatial and tangible aspects of a displayed collection were far more efficacious than any written word because Jarves was able to shape the educational experience for multiple classes of Wellesley graduates through his labels, accession numbers, and curated selection.

108 List of the Jarves Collection, 9.
3. THE MUSEUM

Institutional Identity Politics

How did a collection of European textile fragments, laces, and vestments become the first major acquisition for Wellesley College? Other collegiate museums focused on American paintings or material culture from what were considered exotic island locations, but no collegiate or public art museum, that I have yet to find, began its permanent collection with the purchase of textiles. Wellesley College differentiated itself through its acquisition of textiles from its peer institutions by replicating a museum model used by public art museums rather than one followed by collegiate museums. The textiles marked the physical museum space as ideologically distinct from other college museums, which largely focused on collections of paintings, both originals and copies. By acquiring the textiles, the Wellesley College administration, led by Pauline Durant [fig. 95] and Alice Freeman [fig. 96], linked the Farnsworth Art School, or Wellesley College’s art museum, to the South Kensington Museum model, which was also explicitly copied by the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston but not by any other collegiate museums. The acquisition and the ideological transformation concretized by the accession positioned Wellesley College’s museum within the discourse of public art museums rather than collegiate museums to further the administration’s efforts at legitimizing Wellesley College as a rigorous academic institution.

Wellesley College validated their institutional authority by purchasing the collection from Jarves and repositioning the objects within their own space. The physical adoption of the objects also came with an appropriation of Jarves’s ideological concerns
since he fashioned his collection to appeal to the educational goals of the industrial museum ideal. Wellesley College was able to acquire a collection already formed to mimic the displays at the South Kensington Museum in order to represent its own philosophical support of that museum ideal. The objects transformed the museum into an industrial museum, while the earlier architectural decisions provided an ideologically conducive space for these modes of presentation. The act of acquiring these textiles allowed the college to objectively fix its identity on the spectrum between the two European ideals of the Louvre and the South Kensington Museum and stake a claim in the ongoing dialogue. That identity was further nuanced by Wellesley’s later acquisitions, but the textiles, as the first collection to be purchased, marked the beginning of the process of determining the philosophy and mission of Wellesley’s art museum within the broader context of nineteenth-century American museum creation.

**Wellesley College’s Department of Art**

While the numerous social connections between Jarves and Wellesley College’s administration were established primarily through Jarves’s role on the 1876 committee to commission the Leif Ericson statue link the two nodes, there is no documentation in the College archives regarding a relationship between Pauline Durant, Alice Freeman, and James Jackson Jarves. With no direct evidence, the impetus for the purchase of the textiles seems to lie in a common interest for both the donor and the purchaser in the South Kensington Museum. While there are no explicit writings that lay out a founding mission for the Farnsworth Art School or that even indicate any ideological debate surrounding its establishment, the actions of the collecting process speak to the verbal
and written discourse that would have surely been present but is now lost. The discussion surrounding the creation of the Farnsworth must have compared Wellesley to the other Seven Sisters colleges. Like when Henry Fowle Durant was founding Wellesley College and looked specifically to Mount Holyoke and Vassar for architectural and administrative precedents, Pauline Durant and Alice Freeman must have compared their new art school to the art programs and galleries at other colleges.¹

The Farnsworth Art School Building was opened in 1889 [fig. 97]. It was meant to be one of the few specialized buildings, along with Music Hall [fig. 98] and an unbuilt Medical School, that Henry Fowle Durant envisioned as decorating the hilltops surrounding the main architectural center of Wellesley College, or College Hall [fig. 99].²

The College of Music and the College of Art had been founded in 1878, the same year that Vassar founded their separate school of art.³ The opening of the two art colleges was an important decision by Henry and Pauline Durant to alter the earlier seminary model, or a school specifically directed towards educating teachers, and to instead embrace a full liberal arts curriculum.⁴ Wellesley College had begun as a seminary when it was incorporated in 1870, but Henry dropped the appellation from the College’s title by 1873.⁵ An art history program would have been unheard of for a seminary, but it was
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typical of a broader movement in liberal arts colleges to transform art into a serious
discipline for study during the period between the 1850s to the 1870s. Wellesley College,
along with Smith and Princeton, was one of the first colleges to actually construct a
museum building. The date when a college founded its museum and the date it instituted
its art history department almost never correlate, as seen in Wellesley College’s gap of
eleven years, because art or even images were not used for the early art historical
lectures. In the 1890s, with the rise of German art historical methods, which developed
the more historical and theoretical aspects of Art History as a discipline, museums were
recognized by college administrations as important parts of the educational process.
Looking at art, regardless of whether the work was original, became integral to art
historical lectures.

The Department of Art, which was different from the College of Art in that it held
classes for credit towards the major, was formally founded in 1887. The Department of
Art not only offered courses in studio art but also in art history, which had already begun
on a preliminary basis in 1883 with lectures on ancient, classical, and modern art. The
foundation of the Department of Art tellingly coincides with the acquisition of the textiles
and the end of Alice Freeman’s tenure as President. The Department of Art embodies
many of Alice Freeman’s goals as President of Wellesley College, a position which she
assumed after Henry Fowle Durant’s death in 1881. Following her appointment, Pauline
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6 Denise L. Stone, “The Campus Art Museum and its Relationship to Schools,” *Visual Arts
Research* 19, no. 1 (1993): 100. Wellesley College was the first to build an integrated arts
building that unified lecture rooms, studio spaces, and galleries. Princeton constructed its art
gallery in 1888 see Jean Harris, *Collegiate Collections 1776-1876* (South Hadley, MA: The
Trustees of Mount Holyoke College, 1976), 47-8. Smith built their first museum, the Hillyer Art
Gallery, in 1882, but they eventually integrated their museum and art department in 1973 see
7 Harris, *Collegiate Collections*, 16.
8 Sherman, “The Departments of Art,” 154.
Durant and Alice Freeman increased the domestication and feminization of Wellesley College. This process of feminization was not a singular movement within the administration of Wellesley College but was tempered by an increasing professionalization of the curriculum and the faculty.\(^9\) Henry had originally built College Hall as the single building to house all the students and classes, except for the fine art and medical classes, but, upon his death, Pauline began creating small domestic cottages that resembled her favorite rival institution, Smith.\(^10\) While Alice Freeman supported Pauline’s cottage-building initiative that created small, domestic spaces for students to pursue individual interests and enact their future roles as homemakers, Freeman simultaneously made her own changes that increased the secularism and professionalization of Wellesley. She abolished the preparatory school, organized the faculty into departments with heads, and replaced the daily Bible studies with a formal Bible class with exams.\(^11\) Paradoxically, Freeman did not want the increased academic rigor of Wellesley College to affect the future life decisions of the students. Instead, Freeman saw the curriculum as a tool to increase each woman’s communication skills and allow her to more effectively lead her future household. She never lost sight of her ultimate aim: to make women into cultured and active mothers and wives who embodied their sacred role as domestic leaders.\(^12\) Together, Pauline Durant and Alice Freeman transitioned Wellesley College away from Henry’s moralizing, rigid institutional model and moved towards an individualized, rigorous curriculum that allowed each woman to

---

fulfill her academic goals while preparing to accept her natural role within the domestic realm.

The Department of Art functioned as a microcosm of the institutional debates and changes that occurred following Henry’s death. The switch from College of Art to Department of Art marked, via a semantic and bureaucratizing switch, the increasing interest in organizing and standardizing the curriculum and the administration. The Department of Art was also indicative of the other institutional motivation to educate women on culture and taste in order to ensure their future success as homemakers. The significance of the Department vibrates between these two institutional goals: feminization and academic legitimation and innovation. These oppositional yet concurrent administrative interests highlight the increasing anxiety and desire to firmly establish an institutional identity. Labeling the College as an authoritative, legitimate, scholarly institution was accomplished through a process of internal structuring and external building that constructed Wellesley College to appear similar to the male and co-ed colleges rather than the female seminaries. The Department of Art enacted Wellesley’s dual, almost opposing, goals of feminization and academic validation through the creation of the arts building, the connections between the museum and the classes, and the displays within the museum.

The Farnsworth Art School

Before Alice Freeman ended her career as President, she acquired the textiles with Pauline Durant in March of 1887, accepted Isaac Farnsworth’s donation of $100,000 for the creation of the Farnsworth Art School after his death in 1886, and set up the structure
of the Department of Art. This was not a complete turn away from the earlier artistic initiatives of Henry Durant, but rather Freeman reoriented Henry Durant’s original collecting habits and his interest in art through a more rigid, bureaucratic framework.

Henry Durant [fig. 100] was known as a lover of paintings, but he also was interested in incorporating the works into the living spaces throughout the campus [fig. 101]. He was concerned with all the aesthetic details on campus including even, as noted by one alumna, “the patterns of the balustrades”. Wellesley College, nicknamed “The College Beautiful” early on in its inception, used beautiful objects and environments to morally elevate the women and improve their taste level. Following the early theories of Charles Eliot Norton and John Ruskin, Durant and other educators believed that moral and religious training acted as the most important educational foundation. Only a student with a strong moral code could properly absorb knowledge, and this intellectual activity and ethical and religious understanding was further amplified if the student learned how to seek the truth through artistic representation and genius. Henry Durant’s interest in creating a holistic aesthetic environment was part of the educational process at Wellesley that focused on religious, moral, intellectual, and artistic improvement. These forces were meant to work together to produce the ideal woman, which Durant once described as a woman who had “the pure, noble soul, the educated intellect, the brave, true, unselfish, unsullied radiance of lofty purpose”.

13 Guild, "Wellesley College's Founder: An Account of Henry F. Durant As He Impressed the Earliest Classes."
14 Guild, "Wellesley College's Founder: An Account of Henry F. Durant As He Impressed the Earliest Classes."
16 Guild, "Wellesley College's Founder: An Account of Henry F. Durant As He Impressed the Earliest Classes."
Prior to the foundation of the Farnsworth, art had functioned only to adorn the interiors of Wellesley; although, there does seem to have existed some type of gallery in College Hall where students were able to paint and copy from groups of casts and original works [fig. 102]. The Durants, before the death of Henry Durant in 1881, decorated Wellesley College’s College Hall with works of art that they purchased, which included paintings, marble statues, and a Wedgwood dining service for the dining halls.  

When Ada Howard was President of Wellesley College from 1875 to 1881, the Durants and Howard went on shopping excursions together to hunt for single objects with which to adorn College Hall.  

By the time that the Farnsworth Art School was created, they had spent around $50,000 on furniture and $10,000 on art for the College. The only collection created before Henry Durant’s death was the Browning Room [fig. 103], which was still an interior decoration scheme rather than an academic museum display. In 1880, the Durants financed the Browning Room, which was a reception room within College Hall, the main building of Wellesley. The space was decorated with Chinese and Indian furniture, leather walls, paintings and stained glass inspired by Elizabeth Barrett Browning’s poems, and sculptures of Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Henry Durant had considered the poet to be the consummate Wellesley woman and hoped his students

17 For more on the Wedgwood service see Horowitz, *Alma Mater*, 85; the other decorations are discussed in Alice Porter Shockley, “An Alumna’s Reminiscences of Wellesley’s First President,” *The Wellesley Magazine* 18, no. 3 (1934): 216, Papers of Ada Howard, 1DD, Wellesley College Archives.


would see her as a role model.\textsuperscript{21} The Durants also supplied Wellesley with a collection of books from their personal library in order to create the core of Wellesley’s library.\textsuperscript{22}

With the creation of the Farnsworth in 1889, objects were no longer purchased for living spaces but were donated and bought in order to fit within a single exhibition space. Henry’s interest in teaching students how to seek the truth through art was institutionalized and separated from daily life. The display space did not function as a supplemental, moralizing exercise to train the woman’s religious inclinations, like the earlier domestic displays of art, but it was conceived of as an educational space that had to perform specific functions for the Department of Art. Elizabeth Denio, a professor of Art History at Wellesley College beginning in 1885, helped design the Farnsworth Art School with the Boston-based architectural firm Rotch & Tilden.\textsuperscript{23} While Alice Van Vechten Brown, who became the head of the Farnsworth Art School in 1897, is often credited with establishing the laboratory method of teaching art history at Wellesley College, Elizabeth Denio seems to be the professor who actually coined the term.\textsuperscript{24} Brown’s laboratory method had students create art using the historical methods of production, while Denio’s laboratory method had students closely examine books and art objects to visually support the previous lectures [fig. 104]. These hands-on methods of art historical study pioneered by Wellesley College made the Farnsworth an instrument of the Department of Art and intertwined the missions of the two institutions.

\textsuperscript{23} Fergusson et al., \textit{The Landscape and Architecture of Wellesley College}, 65.
\textsuperscript{24} Sherman, “The Departments of Art,” 154-155; “Wellesley College: Completion of the Farnsworth Art School Building,” \textit{Boston Journal}, September 26, 1889.
Elizabeth Denio, Arthur Rotch, and George Tilden planned the architectural space to be conducive to this pedagogical approach and to represent the authority and importance of the newly established department. The main gallery space was painted purple with green wood panels [fig. 105], which mimicked the Louvre’s olive-green walls and minimal ornamentation [fig. 106].\(^{25}\) The allusion to the Louvre’s design scheme signified culture and authority and indicated the good taste of the architects and the administrators. The long processional and ceremonial gallery of the Louvre’s Grand Gallery [fig. 107] was mirrored in the central hallway of the Farnsworth [fig. 105].

Many museums duplicated versions of the Louvre’s directional architecture to project their authority over that of their visitors and create exhibitionary, disciplinary complexes.\(^{26}\) The display of paintings and their arrangement in large, axial hallways told institutionally sanctioned narratives of art history and created ritualized, almost sacralized, display spaces.\(^{27}\) Visitors consented to the authority of the overwhelming displays and the disciplinary techniques of the space, or the imperative for visitors to


\(^{26}\) Michel Foucault first theorized on the genealogies of power and knowledge for asylums, prisons, and hospitals in Michael Foucault, *Madness and Civilization* (1965; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1988), but many museum historians have adopted Foucaultian theories directly to the study of museums. Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London: Routledge, 1995), 73, nuances Foucault’s analysis and claims that museums order objects to encourage the self-regulation of the citizenry, while other commentators view museums more negatively and describe them as spaces of containment and discipline that force the viewer to submit by enticing them through means of entertainment, see Timothy W. Luke, *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 3-4. Despite Luke’s interesting take on how entertainment in museums keeps visitors contained, he is missing the important element of consent that is always present in a successful display of force. The visitors are not passive, but actively consent to all museum displays and entertainments. For more on the consent/force dynamic see Roger Simon, *Gramsci’s Political Thought: An Introduction* (London: ElecBook, 1999), 38-42.

ritualistically walk down the gallery and look at each work of art in sequence, because the paintings and their arrangement glorified the national patrimony or cultural legacy of the viewers. The debates, centered on issues of nationalism and the political future of the nation, surrounding how gallery spaces like the Louvre were hung mattered greatly because the hanging of the works and their ability to symbolize the collective were the means of controlling the viewers in the space. The inclusion of ceremonial architecture in American museums, such as in the Metropolitan Museum of New York [fig. 108] and Yale’s Trumbull Gallery, appropriated the Louvre’s ability to consolidate elite power and represent it through a nationalistic narrative that makes the hegemonic class appear as if they recognize the needs of the national-popular collective will. The museums chose to quote this architecture because a rigid, highly directional space transforms the visitor into the stable political subject who ritualistically and easily consumes the museum’s story of the present, ideal society being derived from a civilized past, radically different from the non-Western societies. The museum dictates history and the visitor absorbs it because the ritualistic process of walking and gazing gives a false sense of agency; therefore, museums used these architectural tools to represent and enact their authority. This model of creating consenting viewers through a limited inclusion of the participant in the space

---


and its ideology was appropriated by American museum founders who wanted a universal survey museum for the United States.

Denio, however, did not unconditionally appropriate these allusions to the Louvre but manipulated the architectural model of the Louvre to make the Farnsworth into an ideal study space that actually empowered the viewer. The ceiling of the main hallway that echoed the Louvre’s Grand Gallery was lowered so that the space was more intimate than grand. The movement through the space was not entirely axial but was broken up by the inclusion of alcoves and smaller rooms, so that multiple narratives, rather than just one nationalistic narrative, were told.31 As described in the *Boston Journal*:

> As a place for art study as well as for exhibition, it is safe to say that the Farnsworth School of Art is unrivaled. The rooms for study are not subordinated to the galleries, as usually happens in buildings which combine both features… One enters a small hall finished in ash, with green ceiling. On the right is a small room, tinted golden brown, with ash finishings, and on the left is a similar room, both of which will contain pottery and other collections. From the small entrance hall the great rotunda makes an impressive approach to the art galleries.32

The fracturing of the architectural space subverted the Louvre’s hegemonic control over the history of art by presenting multiple small collections organized in loose arrangements, unlike the nationalistic hanging structure of the Louvre. The Farnsworth was not alone in deconstructing the Louvre’s hegemony through architectural appropriation and subversion, but it was part of a series of industrial museums following the South Kensington Museum. The South Kensington Museum was a series of buildings built over time by various architects, but the complex included a theater, separate smaller
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31 Fergusson et al., *The Landscape and Architecture of Wellesley College*, 66-67. For more on how the Louvre strengthened its narrative of art history through the use of continuous rather than broken space see Kearns, “From Store to Museum: The Reorganization of the Louvre’s Painting Collection,” 66-69.

galleries for different types of art, and even restaurants and eating spaces [fig. 109].

South Kensington’s architecture was designed to accommodate, not overwhelm, the individual. The large viewing areas were not axial but were broken into subsections for individual displays of material-based collections [fig. 110]. These intimate spaces and the alcoves were echoed in the architectural choices at the Farnsworth. The Farnsworth’s creators were less interested in projecting institutional control and authority through the possession and organization of masterpieces and more interested in promoting individualized study of objects.

The multiplicity of viewing areas in the Farnsworth and the physical relationship between the galleries and the classrooms simultaneously indicate the subversion of the Louvre’s hegemonic authority, the dual function of the building, and the interrelated development of the museum and the Department of Art. The museum and the department were not conceived of as two separate entities; they worked together to produce an art school that taught through lectures and object-based studies [fig. 111, 112]. While this fusion of museum and art department was unusual in relation to other colleges, it was common rhetoric for industrial art museums.

As explained in the previous chapter, lectures and drawing lessons for young children were incorporated into the educational programs of industrial museums. For example, Walter Smith encouraged the
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Pennsylvania Museum of Art to productively educate the public on art through three simultaneous initiatives: teach drawing in public schools, create a museum of industrial art, and establish a normal art school or a school for art teachers.\(^{35}\) At the end of the nineteenth century, museums were using lectures and classes to explain their collections to the public, but college professors were only just beginning to use objects to clarify their art lectures, and Wellesley was one of the pioneers of this method.\(^{36}\)

This unity between the Department of Art and the gallery or museum space meant that the objects displayed within the gallery spaces affected the content of the art history lectures and the identity of the entire Farnsworth Art School. The textiles were shown in a small alcove at the end of the main picture gallery, so they, along with the casts and the pottery, were one of the several secondary foci of the main hallway [fig. 113]. The main gallery space held the Stetson collection of paintings. The sixty-five paintings in the Stetson collection, donated in 1889, created a core group of paintings around which Wellesley’s collection was centered. The textiles and the other collections of decorative arts broadened the permanent collection to a point of bifurcating the focus of the museum between the fine arts and the decorative or applied arts. While the pottery was displayed in cabinets and the textiles were relegated to an alcove, they still were highly visible and spatially integrated into the museum.\(^{37}\) The fracturing of the architectural space into multiple viewing areas limited the importance and authority of the narrative told by the oil paintings.

\(^{35}\) Walter Smith, *Popular Industrial Art Education* (Boston: Rand, Abery, & Co., 1882), 36

\(^{36}\) For example, Charles Eliot Norton began lecturing on art at Harvard in 1846, but object-based pedagogical methods were only incorporated into the department when Denman Ross began teaching in 1899.

\(^{37}\) Willis, “Farnsworth Art School at Wellesley,” 863.
The Farnsworth constructed a space for individual study and reaffirmed the industrial museum philosophy to art by displaying collections of varied materials: pottery, baskets, plaster casts, antique marbles, textiles, oil paintings, and others. This approach positively connected the Farnsworth with the South Kensington Museum and other industrial museums [fig. 114, 115]. The early exhibitions at the Farnsworth included exhibitions of architectural drawings by various architects from 1899 to 1900, stained glass, mosaics, and wall paintings loaned by various artists from 1901 to 1902, which are almost identical to the early exhibitions of the South Kensington Museum.\(^{38}\) These temporary exhibitions of decorative arts rather than paintings marked the College’s interest in the South Kensington Museum model. The Metropolitan Museum, even as an emerging institution, focused on paintings for its first four exhibitions in 1874.\(^{39}\) Although the Metropolitan was a far larger and more well-connected institution, Wellesley’s acquisition of the textiles as its first collection and the fractured gallery spaces indicate that these exhibitions were a conscious deliberate choice on the part of the administrators and the faculty of the Department of Art.

**Early College Art Museums**

Wellesley College created its identity through positive identification with the South Kensington Museum and through negative comparisons with other college museums, specifically those of the Seven Sisters. The founding of most college art
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museums was not as well documented and systematic as that of public art museums; therefore, the discourse on the ideal collegiate museum is harder to track. College museums were founded before the first public art museums of 1870. Prior to 1870, they were influenced by the museum-as-spectacle model created by Peale and did not define themselves as academic, independent institutions until the first public art museums were founded and art history became to form as an academic discipline. With the rise of art museums as public institutions in the 1870s, collegiate museums began to remodel their internal organization, collecting habits, and display methods to stake a claim in the ideological debate over the mission of American art museums. This also paralleled an increased rate in the founding of collegiate museums, so that by 1876, there were six college art museums and eleven public art museums in the United States.  

Colleges had collected art prior to the foundation of museums, but the administrators, like Henry Durant, displayed the art as objects to be lived with rather than studied. Before the Civil War, colleges accepted donations of paintings, furniture, and other art objects, but they placed them within dormitories or buildings as forms of interior decoration. Individual college founders who collected art, such as Henry Durant of Wellesley College, Matthew Vassar of Vassar College, and James Bowdoin III of Bowdoin College, often invested in portraits and history paintings. Like Charles
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41 Blanche Carlton Sloan and Bruce R. Swinburne, Campus Art Museums and Galleries: A Profile (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981), 12.
42 Guild, “Wellesley College's Founder: An Account of Henry F. Durant As He Impressed the Earliest Classes.”; For Matthew Vassar’s collection see A Catalogue of the Art Collection Presented by Matthew Vassar to Vassar College, June 28, 1864 (New York: S.W. Green, 1869); For James Bowdoin III see Carpenter, Kenneth E., ed. The Legacy of James Bowdoin III. (Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Museum of Art, 1994).
Willson Peale, these men collected works that represented important moments in history in order to inspire patriotic and moral values in their students. With the rise of American landscape painting in the 1840s, some collectors began to recognize that America’s artistic future lay outside of portraiture; however, portraits and history scenes were still favored because their educational value was more readily visible than that of landscapes or genre scenes.\(^{43}\) Whether they were portraits, history scenes, landscapes, or genre scenes, these paintings were almost always displayed as interior decoration and were amassed over time through purchases or donations of single works. They were contextualized as single objects, not as collections; therefore, there was no narrative of art history being told through their arrangement. Without a single collector orchestrating their arrangement, they functioned as individual works that were not bound together in a common viewing space and informed by a structured ideological organization.

Many colleges also amassed collections of what were then considered exotic artifacts. These collections attempted to familiarize students with objects from other cultures, but they were modeled on the sensational, for-profit natural history museums of the early nineteenth century.\(^{44}\) Prior to the construction of its art building in 1870, Mount Holyoke, when it was still a seminary, had a “Missionary Cabinet” that displayed objects culled from around the world by its alumnae.\(^{45}\) With over twenty pairs of shoes from various tribes and nations in the “Missionary Cabinet”, Mount Holyoke displayed an interest in nontraditional art forms different from the oil paintings purchased by other

\(^{43}\) Harris, *Collegiate Collections*, 10.
colleges. Mount Holyoke did not provide any contextual information alongside its objects, so the “Missionary Cabinet” acted as a symbol of the foreign and exotic rather than as an educational investigation of the other cultures. Amherst, Dartmouth, and Bowdoin echoed this same aestheticizing impulse in the display of their Nineveh reliefs; none of these schools included any archaeological data with the reliefs. These early collegiate collections, as donated by international-traveling alumni and alumnae, acted as symbols of each college’s external reach and influence. The display of these exotic collections, often in cabinets and without labels, was associated with Peale’s museological techniques.

The switch from art as interior decoration or museum-as-spectacle to scholarly institution was part of a larger movement to legitimize the study of art in colleges. Art was part of the cultured atmosphere of educational institutions and was not an object of scholarship until Charles Eliot Norton was appointed Lecturer on the History of the Fine Arts as Connected with Literature at Harvard in 1846. Charles Eliot Norton was a Boston-based businessman who transformed himself into a scholar of art after he met John Ruskin in 1855, with whom he sustained a lengthy correspondence. Norton and Ruskin were introduced to each other by James Jackson Jarves after Norton and Jarves met on a transatlantic voyage in the fall of 1855. Harvard created the lecturer position specifically for Norton, and it was the first lecture series to focus on the history of art in any college in the United States. Norton did not use slides, images, or actual art during his lectures, which was typical at the time when even books on art did not include
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46 Harris, *Collegiate Collections*, 23-29.
illustrations, but rather he used poetic language in the manner of Ruskin to describe the works for his students.\textsuperscript{48} Although Norton’s lectures proved to be a model for other colleges, including Wellesley, which instituted its College of Art in 1878, there was a historical disassociation between a college’s efforts to found a museum and its foundation of an art history program.\textsuperscript{49} For example, Oberlin, Antioch, and the University of Wisconsin were the immediate followers of Harvard in creating positions for lecturers on the history of art, yet the museums of Oberlin and the University of Wisconsin were not founded until the twentieth century, and Antioch College never created a museum.\textsuperscript{50} Many other colleges followed Norton’s pedagogical model of lecturing on art without actually displaying or investing in collections. Conversely, James Bowdoin III left Bowdoin College with an extensive collection of paintings long before any classes in the history of art were offered in their curriculum.\textsuperscript{51}

After the Civil War, scholars and social commentators began to imagine an active American interest in and promotion of culture and art. As the economy began to grow, they envisioned a bright future for America both in terms of its domestic peace and its international cultural prestige and influence.\textsuperscript{52} Many robber barons, such as John Jacob Aster, William Astor, August Belmont, W.T. Blodgett, Henry Probasco, and Henry C. Gikon, began to amass collections of paintings, decorative arts, and other art objects


\textsuperscript{49} Harris, \textit{Collegiate Collections}, 16.

\textsuperscript{50} Harris, \textit{Collegiate Collections}, 17; Oberlin opened its museum in 1917, University of Wisconsin opened its museum in 1969, and Antioch never created a museum.

\textsuperscript{51} Harris, \textit{Collegiate Collections}, 26.

immediately following the Civil War. Elite American collectors wanted to found cultural institutions that could contain similar types of objects to validate and glorify their own collections. Public art museums, therefore, were partially produced to reify elite hegemonic control of culture and to develop the bourgeoisie as a distinct class, separate from the lower classes in their ability to appreciate high culture. Institutions in the form of art museums, symphonies, and other non-profit spaces created canons and bodies of knowledge that were distinct from popular cultural knowledge. This knowledge and vocabulary was produced, used, and preserved by the elites and separated the field of art history as the purview of the bourgeoisie. Art museums and the study of art history, therefore, became a bourgeois social priority after the Civil War when the poor-rich gap grew and the upper-middle class desperately wanted to define itself as separated and above the middle class. College museums were founded by many of the same social elites and reflected similar desires. By teaching the younger generations who could afford a college education about art, the elites could keep the domain of artistic knowledge within a set socioeconomic group. College museums were constructed as a means of social control just like the public art museums.

Since they were as ideologically important as public art museums, college art museums also had to deal with the issue of selecting and representing a European museum precedent through architecture, displays, and collecting habits. While many early college museums ignored this debate by organizing their collections using Peale’s

framework or by dispersing their collections through the domestic environment, by the 1870s the elites who were founding public art museums were turning their focus towards college art museums. Wellesley College was one of the earliest colleges to take a firm stance in the ideological debate on the side of the South Kensington Museum. The administration chose this position to differentiate Wellesley College from its peer institutions and to represent the institutional dynamic of simultaneous feminization and academic legitimation.

Seven Sisters: Vassar and Wellesley

The Seven Sisters colleges had to reinterpret and reframe the ideological debate between the Louvre, the South Kensington, and the previous modes of collegiate art collecting within the context of an all-women’s college. Many of these single-sex colleges had art collections from their earliest years, but by the end of the nineteenth century they displayed a wide range of possible models for exhibiting and arranging art. Their vast differences in collecting habits and display methods reveal that each group of art history faculty and museum administrators interpreted the larger museological debate differently and produced a new type of museum to respond to the needs of their respective institution.

None of the Seven Sisters had a large enough endowment to purchase a collection of well-known paintings by recognizable artists, and were, therefore, forced to consider alternatives to the traditional Louvre model when deciding upon the ideology and appearance of their respective museums. Vassar College’s museum was founded in
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56 Other co-educational institutions were able to amass better-known collections. Yale was able to purchase the history paintings of the American artist John Trumbull and build a gallery space for
1864 and began with Matthew Vassar’s commission of Milo Jewett, the President of Vassar, to go to Europe to purchase plaster casts and copies of Old Master paintings.\textsuperscript{57} Elias Lyman Magoon, one of Vassar’s trustees, reacted against this collecting rubric and addressed the trustees on the subject of reproductions and copies versus originals in order to change the future of Vassar’s permanent collection.\textsuperscript{58} After Magoon won the support of the trustees through his passionate speech, the museum focused on purchasing American oil paintings and watercolors.\textsuperscript{59} This was not a purely ideological debate because Magoon encouraged the trustees to buy American oil paintings so that he could sell them his own collection and profit from it. Smith College began collecting American art in 1881 based on the initial monetary gift from Winthrop Hillyer, a Northampton businessman, and was led by the museum’s director Dwight Tryon, who was also an American landscape painter and studio art professor.\textsuperscript{60} The Smith College Museum did not acquire any textiles until a gift of two copes in 1921, and it only acquired examples of glass and ceramics beginning in 1912.\textsuperscript{61} All of its non-painting acquisitions were secondary and were created in the twentieth century. Mount Holyoke began its collecting process by purchasing examples of American art while it was still a seminary in 1876, but
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\textsuperscript{58} Musacchio, “Copies, Casts, and Pedagogy,” 4.

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Vassar College Art Gallery} (Poughkeepsie, NY: Vassar College Art Gallery, 1967), xiii.

\textsuperscript{60} Burt, \textit{Palaces for the People}, 166.

\textsuperscript{61} Elizabeth McGrew Kimball, \textit{Handbook of the Art Collections of Smith College} (Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, 1925).
it was chartered as a college in 1888 and continued its collecting of American art.\textsuperscript{62}

Mount Holyoke did have an exotic cabinet separate from its museum, as mentioned earlier, but it simultaneously accepted gifts of individual works American paintings until it established a fund in 1884 to acquire originals and reproductions of Greek and Roman art.\textsuperscript{63} Bryn Mawr developed collections through mostly single-item donations beginning in 1901, but the college never pursued the creation of a separate museum and adhered to the early model of art integrated into the collegiate environment as decoration.\textsuperscript{64} Radcliffe College and Barnard College never created their own museums due to their physical proximity and shared facilities with Harvard and Columbia respectively. Wellesley College’s Farnsworth Art School was, therefore, in dialogue with the museums at Vassar, Mount Holyoke, and Smith but radically departed from them.

Vassar and Wellesley had two of the earliest structured and independent museums out of the Seven Sister colleges, and they also clearly manifest the ideological debate of the Louvre versus the South Kensington Museum in collegiate museums. Vassar’s museum, under the leadership of Elias Magoon, wanted to fulfill Earl Shinn’s goal of creating a Louvre-style museum that would be a new “judgment-hall” for modern American painting [fig. 116].\textsuperscript{65} Wellesley College’s Farnsworth Art School, on the other hand, was modeled on the South Kensington Museum, more so than the Louvre. All architectural, ideological, and academic decisions at Wellesley, beginning with the initial founding decisions by Henry Durant, who began his involvement with the Seven Sisters colleges as a trustee for Mount Holyoke, as at all the other Seven Sisters, were always

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{62} Harris, \textit{Collegiate Collections}, 50-51.

\textsuperscript{63} Harris, ed., \textit{The Mount Holyoke College Art Museum}, 9-11.


\end{flushleft}
made with reference to the other all-women’s colleges. A constant dialogue and mixing of ideas between the schools and their founders shows that the differences and similarities between the museums at Vassar and Wellesley were not accidental but were purposeful and conscious decisions that reflected a desire for ideological differentiation between the two colleges.

Elias Magoon’s “Report of the Committee on the Art Gallery of Vassar Female College, 1864” outlines the emerging museum’s mission to the trustees of Vassar. Magoon begins his address by remarking on art as a philosophical entity that can connect viewers to greater spiritual truths and as an instrument of social good that can instill values in viewers, which parallels the ideas of Henry Durant. Magoon claims that art is a more advanced discipline or practice than science because science only discovers, while art has the ability to create. Following the Ruskinian belief that art has the ability to transcend reality and bring one closer to God, Magoon claims that art can “purify [our complex nature] with celestial fire”.

Magoon’s rhetoric uses similar language to Henry Cole, Jarves, and even Charles Eliot Norton, who all thought that the masses could be morally and ethically transformed through a proper arts education. Their common point of agreement was Ruskin’s assumption that the observation of nature required a sublimation of the self and the ego in order to lose one’s self in beauty. Despite these rhetorical similarities that emphasized the museum’s capability to act as a self-improving

---

technology of the masses, Magoon imagines the displays and objects of the museum at Vassar as similar to the Louvre, not the South Kensington Museum. He might recognize the institution’s moralizing potential, but he is more interested in overwhelming the viewer and glorifying the trustees and himself.

Magoon recommended that the trustees purchase one hundred oils of which the predominance should be American landscapes, one hundred American watercolors, real armor, Etruscan remains, Roman relics, and authenticated antique coins, which were the exact specifications of Magoon’s own collection that he sold to Vassar for $20,000. The structure of his collection was meant to highlight the good taste of American artists, while providing Vassar’s female students the watercolors as models for their own, feminine art. Most importantly, however, this collection would be a Louvre-style “judgment-hall” of American art because it would present the various schools and styles, highlight the masterpieces and master artists, construct a nationalistic narrative of history, and attract tourists. Magoon writes, “The great cities of our land would send pilgrims thither perpetually; and visitors from abroad, among other notable things about Vassar Female College, would feel that by no means least fascinating are its treasures of Original Art”.

Magoon envisioned Vassar’s collection as a magnet due to the reputation of the original masterpieces that it contained, not because of the institution’s ability to educate and moralize the population.

The textiles, in their display, material, size, and relative value, contrasted Wellesley’s museum with that of Vassar from the very start of its collecting process. In the Farnsworth museum, many of the textiles were shown in cabinets or in vitrines in the

---

70 Harris, *Collegiate Collections*, 36.
galleries. These display methods made them visually accessible to students who came to the museum as part of their laboratory period or for individual research. The Farnsworth’s acquisition of the textiles was, therefore, an important step in marking the museum as an institution interested in educating its viewers, not just overwhelming them with masterpieces. The unframed displays and the factual notes on the cardboard backings mark the textiles as historical objects rather than just as aesthetic pleasures. They were meant to be studied and placed within a larger historical context that connected the applied arts with the fine arts to understand the overall artistic production of a specific time and place. The textiles, as the first collection acquired by the newly emerging museum, create and reflect the educational institutional identity and contrast it with the painting-focused collection at Vassar.

While the collections of decorative arts at the South Kensington Museum were meant to inspire British manufacturers to raise their standards of production, Wellesley’s applied art displays were not about production but rather about research. With the rise of art history as a discipline, these objects were meant to cultivate intellectual curiosity and promote academic scholarship. As an 1889 article about the opening of the Farnsworth in the *Christian Union* noted, “Laces that had once graced royal shoulders; chasubles, stoles, and capes that had lent glory to church feasts; embroidered velvets and silks whose fading splendors dimly shadowed forth the frayed magnificence of long-deserted banqueting halls, would of themselves furnish ample material for an interesting paper.”72 Vassar’s museum had a similar academic imperative, but it provided paintings as the primary source for art historical research. Wellesley College’s professionally displayed collection, adhering to the style of the exhibitions at the South Kensington Museum,
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72 "The Farnsworth Art School of Wellesley College," *Christian Union*, November 7, 1889.
legitimized the academic rigor of the Department of Art, but the selection of textiles as the primary visual data for the art history students framed the Farnsworth Art School within a feminine discourse. The lace and textiles, as objects particularly suited towards the domestic connotations of femininity, would have been considered particularly inspiring to the female student population who were meant to return to the domestic sphere after graduation. Although needlepoint was a specifically feminized material and was almost exclusively collected by and studied by women during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, textiles and laces were less clearly gendered. Dikran Kelekian, a textile dealer whose collection is now at the Metropolitan, Jarves, and Martin Brimmer, a founder of the MFA, were all men who purchased textiles; however, their collections were constructed as secondary to their painting collections. Laces were also collected by men, like Jarves and Arthur Blackborne, who donated his collection to the Metropolitan. Despite the male ability to collect textiles and laces, when placed in the context of a women’s college, they were easily gendered and feminized.

The prominent display of the textiles in the Farnsworth Art School reflects this feminine, domestic focus because the laces were largely done by women and were seen as particularly fitting for a female college. As Annie Isabel Willis wrote in Harper’s Bazaar, “There are some advantages, after all, which would seem to belong peculiarly to a woman’s college. It was for the same reason that Miss Anne Whitney, the sculptor, preferred Wellesley as the home of her famous statue of Harriet Martineau.”73 While the Stetson paintings gave Wellesley credibility when compared to other institutions, like Vassar, that all had groups of paintings, the textiles and the other feminized objects, like baskets and pottery either created for women or by women, were used to construct a

73 Willis, “Farnsworth Art School at Wellesley,” 863.
museum where women’s domesticity was celebrated and encouraged. This is reflected not only in the Jarves collection, but also in gifts of sixteen textiles from Miss Adele Lathrop in 1926, four embroidered handkerchiefs made by Misses Thayer of Boston from 1800-1835, one piece of Point de Lille lace, one piece of Machelin lace from Mrs. Barnum W. Field, and an entire Victorian room of Chinese, Indian, and medieval German furniture to honor the Brownings. An article written about the opening of the Farnsworth states, "It seems to demonstrate the modern regard for education and especially of that branch of feminine accomplishment which is no longer looked upon as trivial, but worth serious cultivation at whatever expense and labor". This statement epitomized the dual effort to feminize and legitimize the Department of Art through the efforts of Pauline Durant and Alice Freeman. The Farnsworth’s displays feminized the South Kensington model by using the textiles and laces as art specifically focused on women. The textiles were part of the Farnsworth’s innovative techniques of teaching art history, yet they also kept the collection appropriately gendered and politically safe.

Conclusion

The ideological debate in America over how to form a new museum was articulated most aggressively and clearly when the argument was focused on the creation of a public art museum, but the discourse also manifested itself in the foundation of college art museums. In the United States, the Louvre model was appropriated by institutions that wanted to project authority and create a nationalistic narrative of art history. The Louvre’s collection of masterpieces, its overwhelming ceremonial
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74 List of Museum Accessions, Box 1, Records of the Museum, 10S, Wellesley College Archives.
75 "Wellesley College: Completion of the Farnsworth Art School Building," Boston Morning Journal, September 26, 1889.
architecture, and its lack of educational devices within its displays meant that the individual was conceived of as a passive recipient who could absorb high culture, if they already had the appropriate amount of cultural capital. American institutions modeled on the Louvre and controlled by a private group of elite trustees reified the connection between high culture and the bourgeoisie. While these institutions often promoted themselves as places of social and cultural betterment that could bring art and beauty to the masses, their displays and architecture were made to impress, not educate.

Institutions in the United States, on the other hand, that modeled themselves on the South Kensington Museum tried to elevate and educate the masses through contextualized, intimately displayed collections of applied arts and fine arts that could teach aesthetics, the honest use of materials, and the tenets of good design to both producers and consumers. While the displays did not use paintings to promote patriotism like in the Louvre, the concept of an industrial museum was still a nationalistic endeavor because industrial museums were built to improve design production and thus the economy. Despite these similarities, industrial museums expanded their mission further than the universal survey museum by focusing on the individual viewer. Smaller spaces and diversified collections were meant to empower the individual and construct the viewing experience as a more subjective, self-selected exploration of objects. The proponents of this type of museum argued that a culture with a strong understanding of beauty would also be morally and intellectually superior, and this rhetoric was quickly assumed by those administrators who wanted to create collegiate museums. This ideological appropriation was made visible at Wellesley College through its early acquisition of the Jarves textiles.
Museums, both public and collegiate art museums, did not rigidly follow either of these ideal models and instead appropriated features from each to form a new American typology. At Wellesley, the main hall of paintings shows the importance of oil paintings and a traditional, salon-style hanging reminiscent of the Louvre, while the separated spaces for collections of decorative arts and the gallery’s architectural connections to lecture rooms and study spaces shows a clear, purposeful connection to the South Kensington Museum. The negotiation of the ideological debate in the creation of the Farnsworth Art School meant that its earliest acquisitions were not neutral but active forces that shaped the future of the institution. The objects, as agents in the social network of collecting, marked how the Farnsworth was balancing its own mission in relation to these two European ideals in order to participate in the larger movement to create a new American type of museum that would banish the museum-as-spectacle and elevate art as high culture and an object worthy of academic study.

The Farnsworth Art School was able to enact this ideological viewpoint because of the earlier efforts of James Jackson Jarves. Jarves’s thorough involvement with the discourse surrounding the creation of public art museums led him to shape the collection as a manifestation of the industrial museum philosophy. In the auction catalogue, he explicitly states that he wants the textiles to be purchased by an industrial museum to educate artists, designers, and manufacturers. His collection may have been radically opposed to the display methods of the Louvre, but it is still just as nationalistic in its sentiment as the Grand Gallery’s arrangement of paintings. Jarves crafted this collection to be assumed by Wellesley College and to signify the association of the collector and the administrators with the promotion of the industrial museum model as the ideal institution.
for the United States. The objects themselves serve to represent the identities of the
collector and the repository, but they also signify their own histories, including their
original uses and their change in value over time.

This collection shaped the future of the Farnsworth Art School and led to a
collection that featured an increasing amount of decorative art and applied art objects.
While it was an important success for Jarves, he was unable to capitalize on the collecting
event because he died in 1888 and never even saw the opening of the Farnsworth Art
School. The objects ended up in storage after the Farnsworth Art Museum was destroyed
in 1958 to make room for the new Jewett Art Building; however, some textiles, a few
vestments, and the entire lace collection were either deaccessioned or lost. The continued
physical presence of the majority of the textiles at Wellesley College re-presents the
nineteenth-century ideological debates that influenced the actors and agents of the
network. The textiles, as a recently rediscovered collection in storage, invoke many
questions regarding their provenance and acquisition. This collection is no longer only of
interest for the three perspectives identified by Jarves: technical, artistic, or historical
study. Time has added yet another layer of meanings and significations onto the
multivalent objects. The textiles, as a constructed collection validated and reified through
an elaborate collecting process involving multiple actors, agents, and discourses, tell
multiple stories regarding nineteenth-century museums, social networks, and collecting
practices.
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APPENDIX A

The auction catalogue is from the New York Public Library’s microfilm collection. The introductory essay is unsigned, but it seems likely that it was authored by James Jackson Jarves. The textiles are split over the two days, but all of the laces were sold on the second day in a separate section at the end of the sale.
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6. Upon failure to comply with the above conditions, the money deposited in part payment shall be forfeited; all Lots unclaimed within the time aforesaid shall be re-sold by public or private Sale, without further notice, and the deficiency (if any) attending such re-sale shall be made good by the defaulters at this Sale, together with all charges attending the same. This Condition is without prejudice to the right of the Auctioneers to enforce the contract made at this Sale, without such re-sale, if they think fit.

ORTGIES & CO.,
Auctioneers.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

This collection of laces, stuffs, costumes, embroideries, and church vestments, consisting of about 650 specimens, was formed in Italy during twenty-five years past. It covers a period of six centuries, the oldest specimen being of the 13th century. At first thought, a collection of samples of the various stuffs worn by past generations may seem to be of little interest or utility. But a little study of the objects will dispel this idea. We find articles worthy of our admiration for their richness of color and beauty of design, and also historically and ethnically for what they reveal of the lives and tastes, and the artistic and technical skill of our predecessors in civilization. These fragments of dresses, wall-hangings, priests' robes, and rich apparel of all kinds for six centuries, the oldest dating back to about A.D. 1200 are in themselves a veritable study in art, of far more value than ever they were for mere utility, to all persons of aesthetic sensibility, and to artists particularly, as revelations in many ways of localities and incidents required in the picturesque treatment of their topics.

There are three points of view from which to study them, viz.: First, the purely technical, as regards their texture, tissues, strength, and cunning of workmanship. In this respect our manufacturers have much to learn from their, in general, material superiority to the stuffs of the 19th
<p>century. On examination, the cause of their durability is easily discovered in the fidelity and carefulness of the mere workmanship. The older the stuff, in general, the stronger it is. There are velvets and brocades three and more centuries old that might stand almost upright by themselves, such is the solidity of their fabrication.</p>

<p>Second, we are to regard them for their variety, purity, and harmony of design and coloring, in the artistic point of view, one which interests both sexes and all classes that have a sense of the beautiful.</p>

<p>Third, in an antiquarian, historical, and ethical sense. I will not dwell on the first view, because this is purely technical, and any manufacturer or lady will speedily discover in what respect they may differ as to taste and make from modern manufacture, and how much they can learn from them. Briefly, I will state that in Europe, at this time, they are largely sought for to form illustrative series to put into industrial museums; their histories are traced back to their sources, books are now written on them, and these fragments of ladies' court-robe, priests' vestments, gala suits, hangings, coverings, costumes of Church and State, have acquired a very considerable commercial value for public museums and private collections. The Germans take the lead with their love of erudition and research, and their keenness in turning to advantage every hint and secret of the past, in their pursuit of novelties for modern manufacture, and to aid their material industries. I have known as high as sixteen hundred dollars given for a single fine specimen of old work. Hundreds of dollars are not uncommon for superior pieces, and even rare old small bits now command prices that seem marvelous, considering the indifference to them of only a few years since. A good collection, therefore, costs much money; the more as every year the specimens are disappearing, just as has happened to old majolica. A master Giorgio plate, that a score of years since might be bought for $50 to $100, now fetches $2,000 to $5,000 at auction.</p>

<p>With the embroideries and stuffs, I also class the collection of laces, French, English, Belgian, Spanish, and Italian, which range over the five past centuries, each example of both collections being marked, as to date and locality, approximately correctly, when not precisely known. They are easily studied and compared without the necessity of an elaborate catalogue. They have become a special study in Europe recently, on the same principle as medals, coins, pictures, majolica, or any other works of art. Their uses as costume and clothing are of secondary consideration. Each class of fabrics being a specialty of distinct districts or towns, it is not difficult, in a general way, to classify localities. For dates, where city archives and old books fail the collector, he has resource, chiefly, to the contemporary painting and sculpture. Painters like Gentile da Fabriano, Benozzo Gozzoli, Crivelli, Paolo Veronese, Tintoretto, and the Venetians generally, painted the costumes of their times largely and with great accuracy; and even the sculptors made profuse use of them. Hence, both in color and design, we have their aid in identifying the fashions and fabrics of every period, helped further, as to the more ancient, by the pictorial and sculpture shows decoration of the Cassetti, or marriage chemises, in which families kept their costly wardrobe.</p>

<p>It will be seen that each epoch was governed by certain principles of decorative design, in harmony, especially, with its architecture, and which underlie all its art, forming
a family unity, as it were. In the earliest examples—12th, 13th, and 14th centuries—the influence of Arab and Saracen designs mingling with early Lombard is apparent. As in architecture and sculpture, the grotesque element and the geometrical are uppermost. Birds and animals are profusely introduced, bizarre in form, combining with conventional geometrical forms, or those borrowed from nature, simple in idea and reconstructed according to the artist’s fancy. Strength, durability, magnificence of effect, particularly characterize the earliest periods, and a rivalry between the Church, and lords and ladies, as to which shall make the richest show, the Church usually getting the better in the strife. Indeed we are now more indebted to the Church than to families for the finest specimens of stuff and laces, which, being well cared for, despite the service of centuries, have come down to us in almost their original splendor. Much of the fine needle work, gold and silk embroidery, of the vestments of the clergy, the robes of the Madonna—for, on the Queen of Heaven are bestowed the richest garments—the covers of caskets, altar decorations, etc., is the handiwork of the daughters and wives of the highest nobility, given to the Church for the good of their souls. It is this pious, on their part, rather than mercenary toil, which has so enriched the garments of the priests—the chasubles, dalmatics, stoles, capes, pluvias, costumes of the Madonna, etc., of which excellent specimens are seen in this collection, in contrast with the fashionable costumes and embroideries in contemporary use in high society at the same time; although, as time went on, it will also be noted that the lords and ladies and the State began to outshine the Church in dress, and rival it also in the magnificence of their secular buildings.

It should be remembered that not a few of these specimens were old before America was discovered; a fact which speaks eloquently for the strength of the materials and the honest, solid labor put into them, in striking contrast to the lightness, cheapness and superficial qualities of most modern work of the same kind, not to mention their artistic superiority of coloring and design.

The endless variety of design and quiet harmony of hints should be specially regarded; a wealth of splendor without gaud, beauty without extravagance, and competitive richness of contrasting varied effects and aims. By examining these, we get a graphic idea of the magnificence of ancient costumes, so often described by novelists and historians, and can judge accordingly as to what must have been the appearance of medieval and Renaissance church and state ceremonies and social entertainments. We must confess the dark ages, as they are called (for the earliest specimens are the direct descendants of the stuffs, etc., of those mysterious and wonderful, times), outshine nineteenth century display. In this line, as much in fine taste as to rich decoration, as they do also in the quality of their dry goods, to use the comprehensive appellation of textile fabrics.

Each centre of manufacture had its distinctive characteristics. So far as we know, Lucca was the earlier seat of the Tuscian industries of silk, velvets, cloths, etc., and she obtained her designs, and probably first workpeople, from the Arabs of Sicily and the East generally. From Lucca these manufacturers soon spread over Tuscany, chiefly established at Florence. The collection shows several examples, now extremely rare, of the earliest Lucca, known by the Arab design of birds or animals in dark
grounds and by a mixed paper and cloth tissue, *papèr-fère*, as it is called by the French connoisseurs.

The oldest specimen in the collection is a piece of cloth with alternate lines of five tints, blue, yellow, white, rose, and purplish colors, made (according to a pamphlet on this specimen by Count Gandini, Modena, 1883) by the Umiliani monks, who established themselves and their manufacture of cloths in Florence, A.D. 1251, for purposes of traffic.

Each central school of manufactures has a prevailing local sentiment, tone, and character of design, derived from the dominating characteristics of the place itself. Thus we find the stuffs of Venice have a predominating sense of splendor, luxury, and richness, Oriental in feeling, and influenced to some degree by her cherished commercial pursuits and claim to be the Queen of the Adriatic. Anomalous as it may seem, one of the *pianete*, or priest's frocks, to be seen in this collection, of the 17th or 18th century, is a heavy brocade, covered with ships and marine views, which must have made an officiating priest at mass present a singularly nautical appearance.

Genoa displays a more subdued but still brilliant and solid style of velvets, etc., especially those which are polychromatic in coloring and are commonly known as garden stuffs, because of their designs taken from flowers.

Sicily shows largely Arab influences and motives of great delicacy and harmony of coloring, strictly conventional, and varied somewhat with Norman or semi-Gothic design, the North and South mingling in aesthetic embrace.

Florence, on the other hand, displays in her stuffs the more severe and serious beauty of Tuscan architecture, pure, and of her school of art, in which line or form takes the precedence of color.

In all, types and epochs merge gradually into each other, with no abrupt transitions. Fashion is logically orderly, paying homage to its ancestry, as it goes on its kaleidoscopic way, and there is throughout all the schools and ages a magic unity of evolution, aim, and meaning. Beauty is the key-note to all objects, reckless of cost or use. It must have caused a shudder in the unseen world to the spirits of the prelates, belles, and beaux, the stately cardinals, the dainty fops and haughty grand-dames of past centuries; when their descendants burnt, as they did at one time, their ancestral tokens of high life, the rich family vestments, witnesses and instruments of departed vanity, jealousy, intrigue, and ephemeral triumphs of vain-glory, rivalry and display, simply to obtain the gold there was in them. But they have now fallen on better times; one pays gladly for the remaining fragments the cost of the new, that we may know what sort of clothes our forefathers wore, how their stuffs were made, and to copy where we fail to originate. In every way these rags of olden times are precious. Ethically, as a text of humanity to moralize on; historically, as an illustration of the tastes, fashions and vanities of buried generations; technically, to record what other races knew, and teach us how to rival them, and altogether, most precious of all, to tame down the much vaunted superiority of the 19th century in the industrial arts to the level of real truth, convincing the living that the dead had not a few compensations for their lack of many of our "modern improvements." I would recommend, especially, my fair readers to give these "samples" of old goods, once new, costly, and fashionable, their careful consideration. If they could reveal the secrets of the hearts they have covered, what a revelation of humanity it would
be; forstalling the confession of joys, sins and sorrows at the last trumpet. But they keep their secrets well, and here I leave them in peace to their own dainty devices.

As the utility and value of the small specimens, which are attached to cards with their dates and localities given when attainable, are much enhanced by being kept together as a series, it is to be hoped that they will find a final resting-place in some industrial museum, where they can be freely examined and studied by our artisans, manufacturers, and artists.

CATALOGUE.

FIRST DAY'S SALE.
BEGINNING AT 9.30 P. M.

1 Embroidered white silk, gold. Italian, Greek cross, gold rays.
2 Embroidered floral scroll work, gold lace border, white silk. Italian.
3 White silk, gold embroidery, renaissance scroll design, sun in the centre. Italian.
4 White silk, gold embroidery, renaissance design.
5 Yellow satin, Italian, embroidered birds, etc.
6 Sicilian, Arab cloth worked in gold and silk, 14th century extremely rare.
7 Scroll design, in white silk on gold and silk. Tuscany, 15th century.
8 Embroidery in gold and colors on white silk, floral designs and birds.
9 do. do. Tuscany, A. D. 1400.
10 Embroidery for appliqué silk. Milan, 16th century.
11 Damask, worked in gold and crimson, birds, etc.
12, 13, 14 Three breast pieces or pettinini of ladies' dresses in embroidered brocade and silks and gold. Venice, 15th and 16th centuries.

15 Satin, fawn colored, in colors and gold. Milan, 16th century.

16 Silk damask, in gold, salmon color. Sienna, 15th century.

17 Silk damask, pale pink, silver tissue, 15th century.

18 Silk embroidery, floral design in gold. Tuscany, 14th century.

19 Raised velvet, blue and white with yellow lozenges, alternating. Lombardy, 16th century.

20 Raised velvet, floral design. 16th century.

21 Silk brocade. Lombardy, 17th century.

22 Raised velvet, red and yellow scroll, do.

23 do. brown, 18th century.

24 Scroll embroidery, white silk on yellow. Venice, 17th century.

25 Damask, yellow and pale green. Sicily, 16th century.

26 Brocade, gold and silver, salmon color. Venice, 18th century.

27 Brocade, gold and silver, scroll work. Venice, 16th century.

28 Brocade gold and silver, salmon color. Venice, 18th century.

29 Gold and silver, mulberry ground. Venice, 16th century.

30 Net work in gold wire. Italian, 17th century.

31 Silk brocade, leaves in gold. Venice, 16th century.

32 to 48 inclusive. Seventeen vest and coat embroideries in silk and gold of varied designs of the 17th and 18th centuries—very beautiful and rare. Italian.

49 Damask—the Madonna—crimson and gold. Florence, 15th century.

50 Damask—The Annunciation—red, green and white (very rare), A. D., 1400.


52 Figured satin, yellow and olive green, 17th century.

53 Silk, dark crimson on red. Madonna and figures, 17th century.

54 Stamped yellow silk—Madonna and Angels—18th century. French.

55 Scroll embroidery, silver on white silk, 17th century. Misura del Cado di San Luigi Gonzaga.

56 Silver on white silk, 17th century.
57 Silk damask, floral design, white ground. Tuscany, 14th century, very rare. 
58 Raised velvet, dark green and gold. Tuscany, 15th century. 
59 Raised velvet, dark green and gold. Tuscany, 15th century. 
60 Bier cloth, gold tissue, design in raised dark brown velvet, Venice, 15th century, extremely rare. 
61, 62, 63 Tuscan fabrics in silk, damask, and satin, 15th century. 
64 Applique work, white linen, embroidered in silk and gold. Milan, 15th century. 
65, 66 Raised Italian velvets of 16th century. 
67 to 76 Ten vest and coat embroideries of finest workmanship and design, of 17th and 18th centuries. Italian. 
77 to 84 Eight raised and plain velvets of various colors and designs, gold tissues, of Florence and Venice, 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. 
85 to 95 Ten napkin borders, linen, fringes, etc., of Venice, embroidered in gold, silver and colors, 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. 
96 Silk damask, design white on crimson ground. Venice, 17th century. 
97 Green silk damask. Florence, late. 
98 Yellow silk damask, 15th century. 
99 Raised green velvet diaper on light fawn-colored silk, lace tissue. Florence, 14th to 15th centuries. Very rare. 
100 Purple velvet brocade, birds. Florence, 14th to 15th century. Very rare. 
102 Black velvet, raised diaper. Florence, 17th to 18th century. 
103, 104 Crimson velvets, floral designs and scroll work, gold. Florence, 15th century. Rare. 
107, 108, Genoese fabrics, 15th and 17th centuries. 
109 Figured crimson satin, floral designs, and large scrolls in gold. 
110 Silk damask, birds and animals, and foliage gold on white. Florence, 15th century. Both rare and beautiful designs. 
111, 112, 113 Blue, yellow, and purple satins. Italian, 16th century. 
114 Silk damask. Sicily, 16th century. 
115, 116 Raised velvets. French, 18th century, Marie Antoinette designs. 
117 Silk damask in red and gold, 15th century.
118, 119 Raised purple velvet, yellow plush, old designs.
120, 121 Old Italian brocades.
122 Cotton and silk border, yellow edgings.
123 Light pink velvet, raised silk and silver tissue, floral designs. French, 18th century.
124 Raised velvet, silver thread. Venice, 16th century.
125 Red silk. Italian, 16th century.
126 Silk damask, floral designs, in silver and colors. Florence, 17th century.
127 Florentine velvet, early 15th century.
128 Crimson satin embroidered dress of a small Madonna. Venice, 16th to 17th century.
129 Robe of the Virgin, yellow satin, silver and coral. Sicily, 15th century.
130 Crimson velvet, embroidered in yellow and gold, a church piece.
131 Raised velvet, gold tissue. Tuscany, 15th century.
133 to 140 Eight flowered silk brocades. Venice, 17th century.
141 to 143 Silk damasks, scroll, foliage and gold and yellow satin, floral design. Venice, 17th century.

144, 145 Florentine brocatellas of early 15th century.
146 Raised crimson velvet pattern on gold tissue. Florence, 15th century. Rare.
147 to 150 Genoese raised velvets, floral designs, varied colors, 16th century.
151 Genoese raised velvets, floral designs, varied colors. Venice, 16th century.
152 Genoese raised velvets, floral designs, varied colors. Florence, 17th century.
153 to 173 Twenty-three Florentine galloons of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries.
174 Brocatella, red floral scroll in gold, A.D. 1500 to 1580.
175 Florentine fabric, 16th century.
176 to 179 Flowered silk brocades. Venice, 17th century.
180 Silk damask. Venice, 17th century.
181, 182 Silk and gold damasks, 15th century.
183 Pale yellow satin gold wire, 16th century.
184 Tissue of white silk and gold, 16th century.
185, 186 Two silk damasks, scrolls and gold. Tuscany, 17th century.
187 Crimson satin brocaded with gold, 16th century.
188 Silk brocade, foliage in silver and gold, 16th century.
189 Silk damask, straw color lozenges in diamonds. Tuscany, 14th century. Rare.

190 to 195 Six brocades of Venice, 16th to 18th centuries, varied designs.

196 to 198 Three Tuscan brocades, varied designs and colors of 16th century.

199 Genoese velvet, raised flower design, 17th century.

200 Purple velvet brocade in large scroll diapers, 15th century.


202, 203 Two embroidered bonnets worked in silver, 17th century.

204 Doge's cap, gold thread. Venice, 16th century.

205 Venetian cap, red velvet, 17th century.

206 Venetian lady's costume, brocade, 17th century.

207 Venetian Madonna's dress, richly embroidered, rare, 16th century.

208 to 213 Six embroidered vests. Venice, 17th century.

214 to 216 Three embroidered coats. Venice, 17th century.

217 One pair trousers. Venice, 17th century.

218 to 225 Eight pieces Venetian velvet of varied colors and designs, 15th century.

226, 227 Two pieces gold, plush, and silk brocades, varied colors and designs. Venice, A.D. 1500.

228 Silk brocade, crimson and gold on white. Venice, A.D. 1600.

229 to 236 Eight pieces polychromatic velvets of Genoa and Venice of 16th and 17th centuries.

237 to 249 Thirteen pieces of Tuscan, Genoese and Venetian velvets, of varied colors and designs, and gold tissue of 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries. (No. 245, Tuscan of 18th century.)

250 to 266 Seventeen pieces of raised and other velvets of diverse colors and designs, gold grounds, rare tissues of Genoa, Venice, and Florence of 15th and 16th centuries.

267 to 279 Nine silk damasks and brocades of silver and gold tissues of Venice (No. 267 of Sicily), of earliest designs of these fabrics, from 14th century to 16th. (No. 274 of 17th century.)

280 to 283 Four damasks and brocade, Tuscan, 15th and 16th centuries.


286, 287 Two striped silks, Sicily, 14th century.

288, 289 Silk brocade and damask, Florence, 15th century.
290 Specimen of one of the earliest fabrics of wool in Florence, made by the Umiliati monks, who established themselves there A.D. 1251 and gave a great development to this industry. Excessively rare and of much interest, few examples being preserved.

291 to 303 Thirteen rare examples of raised velvets of varied designs and colors, of Venice and Florence, from A.D. 1400 to 16th century.

304 to 312 Nine specimens of figured and raised velvets in solid colors, of Florence fabrics of 16th and 17th centuries.

313 to 320 Eight specimens of Garden (so-called) velvets, of Genoa and Venice, 15th and 16th centuries.

SECOND DAY’S SALE.
BEGINNING AT 2:30 P.M.

321 to 324 Four brocades and damask. Venice, 15th century.

325 to 336 Twelve brocades. Venice and Florence, 15th and 16th centuries.

337 to 340 Four silk brocade, gold and silver tissues. Venice, 16th century.

341, 342 Two silk damasks. Venice, 15th century.

343 to 346 Four silk brocades. Venice, 15th, 16th and 17th centuries.

347 to 351 Five silk damasks (No. 348 very rare). Tuscany and Florence, 15th to 17th centuries.


353 Green silk damask, birds. 14th century, Sicily. Very rare.

354 Parasol cover, corded silk brocade. Venice, 16th century.

355 to 359 Five silk damasks and brocades of Venice, Florence and Tuscany. 15th and 16th centuries.

360 to 363 Four silk brocades. Venice, 15th and 17th centuries.
364 to 367 Four silk damasks. Florence, 15th century. Rare.

368 Raised velvet on gold. Florence, 15th century. Rare.

369 Paperière of Lucca, Arab pattern, in brown and black. 13th century. Extremely rare.


371 to 375 Five damasks and velvets of Venice and Florence. 15th and 16th centuries.


380 to 384 Five raised velvets of Florence and Venice. Very rare qualities and designs. 15th and 16th centuries.

385, 386 Embroideries on white silk. Florence, 16th century.


388, 389 Two silk damasks. Venice, 17th and 18th centuries.

390, 391 Embroideries of cherubs, etc., in crimson and gold church vestments, superb specimens. Siena, 15th century.

392 to 394 Three pieces satin, velvet and damask. Tuscany, 15th century.

395 to 398 Four pieces silk damask. Sicily and Venice, 15th and 16th centuries. Rare.

399 Silk and linen red and white diaper. Florence, A.D. 1400. Extremely rare.


401 to 403 Raised velvet. Venice, 16th century.

402 to 406 Five raised velvet and brocades. 15th and 16th centuries. (No. 404, 14th century. Rare.)

407 to 410 Four raised velvets. Venice, 15th century.

411 to 419 Nine raised velvets. Florence, 15th century. No. 411 early and rare tissue.

420 Silk damask, pink and gold. Siena, 15th century.

421 Silk damask, crimson and gold, animals. Florence, 15th century. Rare.

422 to 427 Six polychromatic raised velvets. Genoa and Venice, 16th and 17th centuries.

428, 429 Two linen embroideries, red dragons, blue scroll. 15th and 16th centuries. Rare, Sicily.

430 to 433 Silk damask, satin and velvets. Tuscany, 16th and 17th centuries.
434 to 436 Three damasks. Florence, 15th century.
437 to 447 Eleven pieces of linen embroideries with lace work of 15th and 16th centuries, Italian. No. 444 Sicilian of 14th century, lions and trees, white on red. Extremely rare.
448 to 450 Three napkin fringes and borders. Italy 15th and 16th centuries.
451 to 462 Twelve linen blue and white borders for towels, etc., early Arab designs. Sicily, 15th century.
463 to 466 Four pieces embroidered linen of 17th century. Lombardy.
467 to 469 Three bits of net-work and lace, of silver wire. Venice and Milan, 15th, 16th and 17th centuries.
470 Pair slippers, Oriental form, embroidered in silver and gold. 17th century.
471 Piece of black lace, early Italian.
472 Cover for ciborium in form of a Greek cross. White silk in gold and floss silk. 16th century.
473 Stole and maniple, tissue of white silk and silver scroll foliage, gold fringes and lace. 17th century.
474 Chasuble, white silk, gold scroll embroidery, large cross in front in gold, striped at back the same; coat of arms of Cardinal Baldeschi, A.D. 1530.

475 Stole and maniple, white silk, embroidered with bold floral scrolls in gold and colors, lined with green silk. 16th century.
476 Chasuble as above. 16th century.
477 Cope, corded white silk embroidered in gold and colors, coat of arms at borders, of Prince Carraciolo, of Naples, A.D. 1746.
478 Chasuble, blue satin, brocaded with foliage and landscape designs, houses and ships. Venetian, 17th century.
479 Chasuble, crimson velvet; broad striped back; cross in front of silk damask, with design of Annunciation in gold and pale pink. 15th century.
480 Chasuble, white figured silk, floral designs in gold and colors, cross in front. 16th century.
481 Chasuble, crimson velvet, appliqué scrolls of oak leaves and acorns in blue and white satin, scroll patterns in gold and silk. Symbols of the Dukes of Urbino, from their palace, A.D. 1680.
482 Dalmatica of same set and date, A.D. 1680.
483 Dalmatica, yellow satin, large floral scrolls in gold and silk, with Cardinal's arms (Colonna?), of 16th century.
484 Chasuble, white satin, embroidered in gold and colors, lined with yellow silk. 16th century,
485 Chasuble, heavy appliqué embroidery of colored floss and gold in purple silk. 17th century.
486 Virgin's dress, figured white silk, embroidered in gold and colors, floral designs. Venice, 17th century.
487 Linen hanging, embroidered in gold and colors.
488 Lectern hanging, purple silk embroidered in gold, large scrolls, etc., glass gems. 18th century.
493 Antependium for altars, white figured silk, large floral designs in gold and colors. 16th century.
494 Antependium, white silk, embroidered in gold and silver. Bust of a bishop in center. 17th century.
495 Lectern hanging, close embroidery in silk and gold, half figures of angels. Sienna, 15th century.
496 Lectern hanging, crimson silk and gold. The Resurrection three times repeated. Sienna, 15th century.

498 Venetian lady's dress, tissue of yellow silk and gold, floral brocade and silver. 16th century.
499 Pair of trunk-hose, floral brocade in bright colors. Venice, 17th century.
500 Vest to above. Venice, 17th century.
501 Coat “ “ “
502 White satin vest. “ “
503 White satin vest, floral embroidery. Venice, 17th century.
504 Vest, lavender silk and lace. 17th century.
505 Coat of brown woolen stuff and floral embroidery in white floss silk and silver. Venice, 17th century.
506 Vest to match above. Venice, 17th century.
507 Vest of moire antique green silk. Venice, 17th century.
509 Vest, worked in gold, back and sleeves of purple silk. Venice, 17th century.
LACES.

510 Coarse net-work. Italian, 18th century.
511 Spanish point. 14th century, very rare.
512 " " 16th "
513 Two fringes. 15th "
514 Four small pieces of 15th and 16th centuries. Italian.
515 One Gothic design.
516 Point a l'Équille. 15th century, extremely rare.
517 Calice cover. 16th century.
518 " " " Guipure.
519 Punto in aria. " "
520 Italian lace. " "
521 Altar " " "
522 " " 15th "
523 Milan point. 16th and 17th century.
524 Guipure. Venice, 16th century.
525 " entre deux. Italy, 18th century.
526 " 16th century.
527 " 18th century.
528 Bone point. 17th century.
529 Burano. 16th century.

530 Ivory point. 15th century.
531 Bordura entre deux. 17th century.
532 Guipure, rare. 15th century.
533 Burano. 16th century.
534 Bone point. 18th century.
535 " " 17th "
536 Guipure. Venice, 16th century.
537 " 16th century.
538 " " "
539 " " "
540 Punto Nastrino. 16th century.
541 Ivory point. 15th century.
542 Guipure. 16th century.
543 " Venice. 16th century.
544 Chalice covers. 16th century.
545 " " Venice. 15th century.
546 Venice point. 15th century.
547 " " rare. 15th century.
548 Guipure. Venice. " "
549 " " "
550 Venetian point. " "
551 " lace. 16th "
552 " Guipure. " "
553 Venetian Guipure. 16th century.
554 Lace. 16th century.
555 " " "
556 " 17th "
557 " 16th "
558 " " "
559 " " "
560 English point. 16th century.
561 Italian " 15th "
562 " 16th "
563 " triple relief. 16th century.
564 " " " " "
565 " " " " "
566 " " 15th "
567 " " 16th "
568 " " " " "
569 " " 15th "
570 " double-headed eagle. 16th century.
571 Point d'Espagne. 17th century.
572 Argental. 17th century.
573 " " "
574 " " "
575 " " "

576 Guipure. Flanders, 16th century.
577 Flemish point. 16th century.
578 Flanders barbe. 17th "
579 Cover of calice. Venice, 15th century.
581 Fine linen lace, open-work, etc. Venice, 15th century.
582 Italian. Venice, 16th century.
583 Rose point. Rare. Venice, 15th century.
585 Lace, Italian. Venice, 18th century.
586 Ivory point. Venice, 15th century.
587 and 5874 Ivory point. Venice, 17th century.
588 Italian silk lace in gold. 16th century.
589 Guipure. Venice, 17th "
590 " 16th "
591 Point vasse. 17th "
592 Milan point. 18th "
593 Italian. 15th "
594 Genoa point. 18th "
595 Milan " " "
596 Venetian " 17th "
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>Flemish point. 16th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>&quot; 17th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Flanders 18th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>&quot; 17th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>&quot; 16th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Guipure. 15th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>&quot; 18th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Lace and net-work of linen thread. 16th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Lace. 18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Entre deux en guipure. 15th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Guipure. 16th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Genoa. 18th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Burano. 16th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Milan point. 17th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>Rose &quot; Venice, 16th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Ivory &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Burano lace. &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>Rose guipure. Venice, &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Italian fringe. 17th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Guipure. 17th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Milan point. &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Italian, design of 15th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Fringe of altar napkin worked in gold. 15th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>English point. 17th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Argental &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; in silk, &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Flanders. 16th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>&quot; 18th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Barbe. Flanders. 16th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Flanders. &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Flemish point. &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Barbe. Flanders. &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>&quot; 18th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>&quot; 17th &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Venetian rose point shawl. Eleven feet long by four deep, extreme measures. 16th century. Belonged to a noble house of Parma; a magnificent specimen of finest work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

This inventory is from the Wellesley College Archives in Clapp Library. This list of objects in the Farnsworth Art Center and their respective insurance values is from 1929. The list is organized based on where the objects were shown in the museum and then by type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Record Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chalice Veil</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>be Spanish, not Italian</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reticella of finest description, almost counterpart of piece in 3. Kensington</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>same as 21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>very interesting</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Punto Maria middle 16c.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reticella sample style shown on edge due to interest</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>rotting</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>put on wrong side out late 15 c.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spanish, finished on edges for museum purposes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>wrong side out</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7 more of it</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>pale, 17 c.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jarvis Collection of Laces $1,286.00

10S Museum. File: "Inventories (no date, 1911, 1929, 1934)".
Wellesley College Archives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>rotting</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>84, not fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>modern, no value</td>
<td>$.50</td>
<td>163 Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>155-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>151-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>worn, good, cut</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>161, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>wrong side out</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>India muslin</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>same as 76</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>beautiful, laundered</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>wrong side out</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10S Museum. File: "Inventories (no date, 1911, 1929, 1934)". Wellesley College Archives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10S Museum. File: "Inventories (no date, 1911, 1929, 1934)". Wellesley College Archives.
| 336 | $ .50 | 378 | $1.00 |
| 338 | $1.00 | 379 | $2.00 |
| 339 | $ .50 | 380 | $3.00 |
| 341 | $ .50 | 386 | $1.00 |
| 342 | $1.00 | 308 |   |
| 344 | $3.00 | 319 |   |
| 345 | $ .50 | 317 |   |
| 346 | $1.00 | 314 | $ .25 |
| 347 | $1.00 | 312 |   |
| 349 | $1.00 | 310 |   |
| 350 | $3.00 | 311 |   |
| 352 | $2.00 | 321 |   |
| 353 | $1.00 | 322 |   |
| 354 | $5.00 | 318 | $4.00 |
| 356 | $3.00 | 320 | $2.00 |
| 357 | $1.00 | 316 | $1.00 |
| 360 | $2.00 | 277 | $5.00 |
| 361 | $1.00 |   |   |
| 362 | $2.00 |   |   |
| 364 | $1.00 | 158 | $3.00 |
| 365 | $1.00 | 159 | $2.00 |
| 367 | $2.00 | 164 | $5.00 |
| 368 | $3.00 | 187 | $2.00 |
| 370 | $2.00 | 183 | $2.00 |
| 371 | $5.00 | 190 | $2.00 |
| 374 | $1.00 | 196 | $2.00 |

**TEXTILES (CON).**

---

10S Museum. File: "Inventories (no date, 1911, 1929, 1934)."
Wellesley College Archives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brocades (cont.)**

**Velvets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Embroideries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Textiles—Florentine 17th Century**

In Trunk in the Egyptian Room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow gold brocade with red figures.

Basket, lace, red, 600

Red brocade.
Art Museum Inventory  June 1929

Painting Gallery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Chairs, Windsor (black)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>118.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teakwood stools, Chinese (marble tops)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Table, black carved teakwood,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Black cases for textiles (glass fronts and tops) (but glass alone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>would cost far more than that)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Glass top lifting cases, walnut (B.F W.A.) containing Egyptian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

American and Mycenean Collections

Cost 185.00 each. Replacement would be over 400.00 555.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Case, 3 doors, glass shelves (made by College)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Case, glass top and sides for lace collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Stand, painted green for above case</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Set of shelves for Mexican pottery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Glass door case, painted green for Indian basket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestal for cast of Henry Fowle Durant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pedestal for Roma (green)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rug, Oriental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mat, fibre, worn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cloth canopy in electric fixtures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collections

Egyptian Collection (This estimate includes study series in Egyptian Room) 1650.00

Mycenean Collection, loaned in part by Miss Walton previous estimate 127.00

Textiles, collection of (Jackson Jarvis including textiles in Eg. R) 8506.00
Painting Gallery (continued)

In the gallery those included are as follows:
1 Gobe, 17th c. moire brocaded with silver $3,000.00
1 Pair of ornateys, 18th c. Portuguese 250.00
1 Brocade (green) Italian, 15th c. 20.00
1 " 15th c. 30.00
1 Neither Sicilian nor Arab Cypriote 35.00
1 Perhaps Sicilian sampler 35.00
1 Cloth of gold brocaded 50.00
1 Venetian 15.00
1 Dalmatic, 2d quarter of 18th c 200.00
1 Frontal for altar 18.00
1 Portion of dress: Plastron, Venetian Woman's Costume, 17th c. 40.00
1 Stole 17th c. Lombardian Cloth of silver 50.00
1 Portion of cape, 17th c. 100.00
1 Chasuble, Italian under Chinese influence, early 18th c. 150.00
1 Part of panel 75.00
1 Re-applied work - chasuble 17th c. 150.00
1 Chasuble, Maniple and Stole 1,000.00
1 Wall or furniture covering 35.00
15.00
150.00

Cyprus, 14th c.
100.00
15th c.
300.00

Chasuble 17th c. Florentine, red with centre strips of blue and yellow 300.00

$7,780.00
Art Museum Inventory June 1929

Painting Gallery (continued)

Lace Collection (Jackson Jarvis) 35 pieces previous estimate $1288.00
Indian basket collection          72   "    "    "    "     500.00
Mexican pottery collection        65   "    "    "    "     300.00
American collection              11   "    "    "    ceramics and embroidery 250.00

2 Blue Staffordshire plates
Spanish lace                      2   "
1 Anne Whitney "Roma" bronze statue
2 Renaissance columns
1 Cast of Henry Fowle Durant
Photograph of Sistine ceiling

Paintings

1 Elihu Vedder "Cycnian Sibyl" previous estimate 8000.00
1 Adolf Schreyer "Bedouin Chief"                      5000.00
1 William Hunt "Study of Regamy"                      3000.00
1 W. Fisher "Portrait of Robert Browning"
1 Eliz. B. Green "Portrait of Mrs. Whitney"
1 John Collier "Portrait of Mrs. Whitney (loaned)
                (Special insurance was placed on this by college)
2 Charles H. Davis "Landscapes" (These are valuable)
1 W. Willard "Portrait of Hunt"
1 "Flowers" Italian (valuable)
1 Bartolomé Estéban Murillo "Children of the shell" Copy 100.00
1 Frank Duveneck Study for decoration (loaned in 1936)(val.)
1 Camille Corot "Landscape: Montigny les Corneilles
                Cost 1937 3500.00
1 George Morland "Sunday Repose" Added in 1929 Said to be valuable
1 Painting of Miss Warren, gift of Mr. Warren in 1929
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Chien Lun Vases</td>
<td>Lent by Mrs. Pyke in 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cloisonné Vases, set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bowl</td>
<td>Said to valuable but experts have not looked at them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hen Dynasty figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Charms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Medal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Silver dishes, Turkish</td>
<td>Loaned by W.V.V.Peet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 tray</td>
<td>W.V.V.Peet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Spanish chocolate tray</td>
<td>A.V.V.Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 English lustre pitcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 English m. # meltee pots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 chine pitcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pewter platter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English ale glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Pair of orphreys, 16th c. Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Brocade (green) Italian, 16th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Neither Sicilian nor Arab Cypriote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Perhaps Sicilian sampler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Cloth of gold brocaded Venetian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Dalmatic, 2d quarter of 16th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Portion of dress, Plastron, Venetian Woman's Costume, 17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Stole, 17th c. Lombardian Cloth of silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Portion of cape, 17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Chasuble, Italian under Chinese influence, early 18th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Part of panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Re-applied work - chasuble 17th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Chasuble, Maniple and Stole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Wall or furniture covering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Cyprus, 14th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>15th c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $7,700.00
APPENDIX C

Glossary

**bizarre silks.** Bizarre designs, popular beginning in the 1700s, are typically monochrome silk grounds decorated with brocaded elements of Asian-inspired, exoticized patterns incorporating strange and fantastical imagery.

**brocade.** Traditionally, a floral fabric that has supplemental filling threads that reach from selvage to selvage, or the edges of the fabric, to create the pattern, but now often refers to any silk fabric with a figurative or floral design that is not a damask, or a fabric that contains more than just one warp and one weft.

**chasuble.** Vestment worn by the priest during mass. A closed cloak or robe with holes for the head and arms that can be layered with over vestments.

**ciselé velvet.** Patterned velvet in which the patterns are created through the juxtaposition of cut and uncut pile.

**cope.** A semicircular vestment worn around the neck and left to drape open down one’s front with a nonfunctioning hood.

**cut velvet.** A velvet fabric in which the loops created by weaving the pile, or the supplemental warp or weft, over rods inserted above the ground weave in the loom are cut. When the loops are cut, the cut ends of the pile form the plush, soft surface of velvet.

**couching.** An embroidery technique in which heavy threads, often metallic threads, are laid on top of the ground weave and fastened to the surface by another finer thread that is actually sewn into the ground weave. Creates strong three-dimensionality on top of the ground weave.

**damask.** A reversible figured fabric, traditionally made of silk, with just one warp and one weft, so that the pattern emerges from the interplay between the warp and weft.

**embroidery.** Designs sewn onto a ground weave rather than woven into it as a brocading element or a supplemental warp or weft.

**lampas.** A figured fabric that is limited in its coloration due to the fact that it is made out of two warps and two wefts. The ground warp works with one main weft to create the base while the pattern is composed of floats or brocading wefts.

**maniple.** A wide, short strip of fabric clasped around the left wrist of subdeacons or higher clerics.

**orphrey.** Decorative border that can be attached to various vestments, such as the dalmatic, cope, chasuble, or tunicle.

**passementerie.** An ornamental trim applied to upholstery or clothing often used to hide seams or edges. Can be made from wool, silk, linen, cotton, or metallic thread and can be flat, braided, knotted, fringed, or another trim method.

**silk.** A thread made from the cocoons of silk worms. Two or three yarns are twisted together in the opposite direction of their natural orientation to produce a single thread. Can be woven together using various weaves and techniques to create different fabrics.

**stole.** A scarf worn either over the shoulder or around the neck depending on one’s clerical rank.

**stomacher.** A rigid garment worn around the upper body of both women and men from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. Women laced their gowns over the stomacher to reveal a decorated v-shaped portion of it down the front of their bodies.
taffeta. A very smooth, closely woven silk fabric in a plain weave, or a weave where the warp and weft alternate on a one-to-one ratio to produce a checkerboard pattern.

uncut velvet. A velvet fabric in which the loops created by weaving the pile, or the supplemental warp of weft, over rods inserted above the ground weave in the loom are left as loops. This velvet does not have a plush feel and instead has a surface of small loops, which change in size based on the diameter of the inserted rods.

velvet. A silk cut pile fabric, or a fabric that has a supplementary warp or weft that is formed by looping the supplemental pile, or fabric that is not associated with the base ground weave, over rods to form loops that can be cut to form a plush type of velvet.

warp. The yarn found in every weave that runs lengthwise or from selvage to selvage, or edge to edge. The warp is stretched in parallel lines in the loom and is raised and lowered by the loom at various points so that the weft can be woven into it.

weft. The yarn found in every weave that is shuttled through the loom at a perpendicular angle to the warp. It binds the warp ends together, but it is usually not as strong or made up of as tightly woven thread as the warp.