ABOVE: This design for a "Unitarian Chapel" was the first design by Frank Lloyd Wright to be published in a professional journal. It appeared in the Inland Architect & News Record of June, 1887. It is remarkably similar to Unity Chapel designed by J. L. Silsbee for Helena, Wisconsin a year earlier. Wright worked on the earlier building as well as having been the designer of the one shown here.

COVER: This is a detail of the Palm House and Conservatory for Lincoln Park, Chicago, Illinois, designed by J. L. Silsbee in September of 1890. The building still stands. Photo by The Prairie School Press.
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Residence for F. H. Hazard,
in Syracuse, New York, designed
by J. L. Silsbee.
From the EDITORS

The State of Illinois is on the verge of becoming a model of excellence in the carrying out of a Survey of Historic Buildings under the matching grant program provided for by the National Historic Preservation Act. This act provides for the survey of properties significant in American history, architecture, archeology and culture. It also sets up a National Register of such properties which periodically publishes an up to date list of these properties. When an historic building or site is so listed, it then becomes protected from destruction or damage by any federally funded enterprise. It is expected that the State of Illinois will establish its own Register of Historic properties which will add the protection of any State of Illinois funded projects. With luck, many historic Illinois buildings will also fall under the protection of local preservation ordinances such as the City of Chicago’s Landmark Law.

Illinois has been slow in getting their state survey under way. The administration which preceded the present one did next to nothing to get it started and it was under Governor Ogilvie and his Department of Conservation that plans took shape. A distinguished statewide advisory committee was formed, staff assistance was provided and the basic survey plan was worked out over a two year period.

One of the principle reasons that the State of Illinois Survey plan is significant is that the advisory committee and the Department of Conservation realized that the final survey plan was really beyond the scope of their expertise. Therefore, a professionally well qualified planning firm was commissioned to prepare the actual written plan and present it in Washington along with the proposed two year budget totalling nearly a million dollars, half the funding to be provided by the State with the remainder from the Federal government.

Finally, the decision was made to have the actual survey done by a private firm under contract. This permits the employment of the very best architectural historians, archeologists, researchers, etc., without the possibility of political interference. From what we have observed to date as one of the advisory committee members, the team being assembled to do the Illinois survey will be composed of some of the best experts available. Many will be academic personnel employed on a part time basis. All the better, this kind of people tend to be thorough, conscientious, and dedicated to this type of work which, in a sense, is really scholarship of the most useful kind for the architectural historian.
Silsbee: by Susan Karr Sorell

The Evolution of a Personal Architectural Style

Susan Karr Sorell did her undergraduate work at The University of Tennessee and later took a Master of Arts in Art History at the University of Chicago. This article grew out of her Master's dissertation under the direction of Professor Paul E. Sprague during the academic year 1968-69. Following graduation she taught at Western Illinois University and is now Research Assistant to the Illinois State Survey of Historic Sites and Structures.

It was about 1882 when Joseph Lyman Silsbee left Syracuse, New York, to establish an architectural practice in Chicago. Although versed in the various architectural styles then current in the East, some of which he may have introduced to Chicago, the quality of his work while well above average would not in itself have earned him a national reputation. But Silsbee has indeed become known nationally, if not internationally, because of several remarkable young apprentices who found their way to his office. Serving apprenticeships under Silsbee


2. Silsbee and a former draftsman, in his Syracuse office, Edward A. Kent, maintained a partnership from 1882 until

This sketch for a house in J. L. Cochran's Edgewater real estate development was executed by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1888. Photograph from The Inland Architect.

1884. The last notice bearing both names appeared in April, 1884. The Inland Architect, III (April, 1884), 43. The next notice, in July, 1884 and those following were submitted under Silsbee's name alone.

3. Although Grant C. Manson suggests that Silsbee introduced both the shingle style (p. 14) and the Colonial revival style (p. 21) to the Chicago area, the architecture of the period has not been sufficiently studied to rely on this conclusion. Grant Carpenter Manson, Frank Lloyd Wright to 1910 New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1958. Furthermore, as this paper will show Silsbee does not seem to have worked in either of these styles until several years after he had settled in Chicago.
in the late 1880's were Cecil Corwin, George Elmslie, H. G. Fiddelke, George W. Maher, Paul Mueller, Elbert F. Wilcox, Frank Lloyd Wright, and a man identified by Wright only as Kennard. Of this group, perhaps the names of Maher and Wright are better known. Each went on to found a personal architectural idiom that was not only individual but which also broke away from the prevailing nineteenth-century concern with historic styles. Although Wright went on to attain an international stature, Maher's achievement has so far remained local and much less well known. And to the degree that Joseph Lyman Silsbee was in part responsible for providing each with the essentials of architectural design, a knowledge of then current styles and a sense of freedom of creative choice, the significance of his work rises above the purely regional.

It is difficult to draw conclusions from Silsbee's personal architectural style until his work done in Chicago is catalogued and studied, two tasks which this article sets out to do.

George W. Maher joined Silsbee's staff 4 a few months after Frank Lloyd Wright entered the office in the spring 5 (c. March) 6 of 1887. Both Wright and Maher remained with Silsbee for approximately a year. 7 Wright left early in 1888 (c. February), 8 to join Adler and Sullivan, but Maher stayed on with Silsbee until about June, 1888, 9 when he resigned to open an independent practice.


5 Wright, An Autobiography, p. 72.

6 According to Paul Sprague.

7 Wright was employed by Silsbee during this period except for a few weeks when he worked for Beers, Clay and Dutton. Wright, An Autobiography, p. 72.

8 According to Paul Sprague.

9 It is difficult to ascertain the exact date of Maher's departure. The announcement of his partnership with Charles H. Corwin appeared in The Inland Architect, XIV (September, 1889), 25. Another statement, four months later, reported that Maher "has commenced the practice of architecture" with no mention of Corwin. Building, X (December 22, 1889.) H. Allen Brooks, states that Maher established the partnership with Corwin in 1888. Brooks, "The Prairie School; the American Spirit in Midwest Residential Architecture 1893-1916" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1937), 60. However, sketches under Maher's name alone appear in The Inland Architect Vols. XVI (October, 1888), p. 27, XII (June, 1889, 90, and XIII (July, 1889), 104. Since there was usually a lag of several months between the date of design and the time when these sketches were published, it seems likely that Maher did not leave Silsbee before May or June of 1888. Presumably he worked alone until forming the partnership with Corwin. To further com-

Silsbee's work in Chicago seems to have lagged several years behind stylistic currents in the East. Notices in The Inland Architect between 1882 and 1884 which call his houses "Moorish," "Colonial," and "Queen Anne" imply that he produced buildings in the styles favored at the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Available illustrations provide sufficient data to discern four different periods in Silsbee's work from 1884 to 1897. His production from 1884 to 1886 was generally "Queen Anne." This style, difficult to define because of its considerable variety, is one which was generally characterized on the interior by a plan that includes a living hall with entry, fireplace inglenook and stairs, and other rooms varied in size opening off the hall through wide doorways in an irregular manner. On the exterior, wall surfaces are usually broken, being interrupted by orielcs, bays, and continuous fenestration. These varied surfaces were generally covered with brick on lower levels, and shingles or half-timbering on upper stories. The whole was capped with a roof articulated by dormers often compressed between the slopes of the gables and by boldly massed chimneys. Although notices of 1883 mention Silsbee's work in this style, it was not until 1884 that we have an example illustrated in a house built in Buffalo, New York

This house was designed by Silsbee in 1884 for a client in Buffalo, New York. Photograph from The American Architect and Building News.
designed after he settled in Chicago. Queen Anne elements appear in the general massing of the volumes, in the two story polygonal bay, and in the continuous fenestration of the end wall. It also appears in details such as the plastic ornamentation in the gable, in the frieze separating the first and second stories, and in the complex shapes of the chimneys. Silsbee continued to employ the Queen Anne style in the Warfield house of April, 1886. But there he modified the idiom by means of the peculiar placement and shape of the oriel above the polygonal bay and by the application of ornamental friezes to the chimneys as well as to the area beneath the eaves.

Silsbee's experiments with the Queen Anne idiom are finally concluded in the George W. Hale house of 1886. Here he used linear detailing to articulate the simple planar wall surfaces and confined the sculptural ornaments to a few select areas such as the gables, the porch railing, and the frieze separating the second and third stories.

The simplification that the shingle style gave to the Queen Anne characterizes Silsbee's work from 1885 to 1889. In the shingle style, a shell formed by extending shingles over the surface is wrapped around the separate and usually distinct volumes typical of the Queen Anne house. By contrasting the projecting roofs and overhanging upper stories with the spatial void of the wide verandas, interior and exterior spaces appear to flow into one another.
The Henry A. Knott House in Buena Park was designed by Silsbee in 1886. Photograph from The Inland Architect.

Plastic Queen Anne ornament is generally eliminated. This style appeared in the East about 1878 and ran its course there by 1883.10

Silsbee produced his first shingle variation of the Queen Anne in All Souls’ Church of June, 1883. Queen Anne detail appears in the stepped chimney treatment, and in the ornamental panels. On the other hand, in the shingle surface, Silsbee begins to tie the volumes together. In a later design of the same year, Unity Chapel, he simplified the forms and practically eliminated the ornament. By 1886, in the Knott house he has enclosed the volumes in a sheath of shingles. However, the Queen Anne detail in the front gable and the complex form of the chimney demonstrates his continued reliance on elements of the earlier phase of this style.

As Silsbee matured in the idiom, he invented a different configuration of forms. Two houses of early 1888, built in Edgewater for John L. Cochran, show geometrical, rectilinear forms locked together in an irregular composition held together by the roof.11

Silsbee then changes this configuration of shapes by covering the geometrical and rectilinear forms with a veil of shingles and by increasing the emphasis on horizontality. He seems to be seeking a unity of composition during this period. This change to a more unified product first appears in the R. A. Waller house of February, 1889, where he modified the stark geometrical, rectilinear forms of the Edgewater houses by way of a shingle covering and horizontal bands on the second and attic stories. Queen Anne elements persist in details — in the ornamental panel of the second story bay, and in the intricate shapes of the chimneys. By 1889, in an unidentified house in Edgewater, he succeeds in

10 Scully, The Shingle Style, p. 70. Scully's book further amplifies this definition and provides numerous examples of the shingle style.

11 This same pitch of the roof was later seen in Frank Lloyd Wright’s work in his George Smith and Charles Roberts houses, although they also have flaring eaves not seen in Silsbee’s designs.
This house, built in Edgewater in 1889, marks the high point in Silsbee's use of the shingle idiom. Photograph from The Inland Architect.

Silsbee designed this house for R. A. Waller in Buena Park in early 1889. Photograph from The Inland Architect.
This sketch of 1887 for the Chicago Telephone Company Building was signed by Silsbee's apprentice, George W. Maher. Photograph from The Inland Architect.
This house was designed in 1891 by Silsbee for W. H. Bartlett in Evanston. Photograph from The Inland Architect.

The H. B. Stone House of 1888 at 56 Bellevue Place is a surviving example of Silsbee's masonry building style inspired by Richardson. Photograph by Thomas Yantz.

Completely eliminating Queen Anne detail. Now shingles cover the entire surface and give a sense of unity by virtue of their continuous texture. The horizontal bands of the porch rail, porch roof, and eaves serve as further unifying elements. This house marks the high point in Silsbee's shingle idiom.

Next, from the years 1887-1892, Richardson's so-called Romanesque, a masonry building style, serves Silsbee as the basis for his work. In his first essay in this style, the Telephone Building of 1887, he combines properties of Queen Anne ornament with simple, bold masonry. By 1888 in the H. B. Stone house, Silsbee abandoned the Queen Anne in favor of a complete dependence on monumental masses of masonry. Several years later in his W. H. Bartlett house he began to experiment more freely with the Richardsonian style. In this house, his arrangement of geometrical, rectilinear masses is reminiscent of those in his last house in the shingle style. The consistency in the texture of the stone, and the horizontal bands of the porch roof, railings, and eaves also reflect that solution. The H. N. May house of November, 1891 concludes his Richardsonian phase. It is the last design that is wholly composed of bold masses of masonry. The classically derived third story columns point to a new interest in the colonial revival.

The colonial revival popular in the East after 1885, characterizes Silsbee's architecture between 1888 and 1892. And indeed, his work in this idiom is more specifically antiquarian and less original. In the beginning, in 1888, classical details of early American architecture found their way into his designs. The classically derived columns of the porches, the fan light in the Greeley house, and the Palladian fenestration in the Burnet house illustrate the new trend. On the other hand, Silsbee seemed uninterested in breaking completely with the shingle style. Thus these houses retain the veranda and covering roof of that style. And as well, the Greeley and Jamieson houses are entered in a non-

axial way in the manner of the shingle style houses. Gradually, specific revival details become more common and indicate Silsbee's gradually increasing interest in the colonial style. However, the asymmetrical facades of the shingle style which continue during these years prevent his work from becoming wholly classical in the sense of colonial revival.

Fan lights, oval windows, Palladian motifs, semi-circular classic porches, and columns become more frequent in his work. The Arthur Orr house of 1889 incorporates classically inspired columns, a semi-circular porch, a colonial fan light, and an oval window. This technique continues in the R. A. Keyes house of 1891 which also displays classic detail in the columns, fan light, and Palladian fenestration. The West Virginia Building of 1891 for
the World’s Columbian Exposition marks the culmi-
nation of this phase. There, the antiquarian detail of
the earlier buildings is applied to a careful, sym-
metrical facade, producing a design that breaks
away from the shingle conception of asymmetry,
and becomes more positively classical.

In the years after 1892, Silsbee’s much dimin-
ished production was increasingly characterized by
eclectic and exotic elements. The F. R. Hazard
house of 1892 is composed from varied sources.
There are classical columns in the gazebo, Richard-
sonian masonry arches in the porticoche, and a
kind of Queen Anne half-timbering in the upper
stories. The Bandstand for Garfield Park of 1897 is
an example of his work in exotic types. It was
described in a contemporary journal as “Indian
architecture of the Saracenic type.”

Five general trends in design are evident in
Silsbee’s work accomplished in Chicago during the
years 1882-1897. From 1882-1884 it appears that
he was still designing in styles that were popular
during the previous decade in the East. Then, from
1884-1886 his production was generally in the
“Queen Anne” style. Beginning about 1885 and
continuing until 1889, the “shingle style” was
reflected in his oeuvre. Next, from 1887-1892 the
Colonial revival characterized Silsbee’s architecture.
Finally, after 1892 his diminishing production be-
came dominated by eclectic and exotic elements.

13 “Indian Architecture in Garfield Park,” The Inland Archi-
tect, XXIX (March, 1897), 19.
The earliest known published drawing by Frank Lloyd Wright. Drawing from Fourth Annual, All Souls Church, 1887.

The Earliest Work of Frank Lloyd Wright

by Wilbert R. Hasbrouck, AIA *

*The author is indebted to several persons who aided in various ways in the preparation of this article. First, to Professor Paul E. Sprague who actually discovered the two drawings of All Souls Church by Frank Lloyd Wright in the files of Jenkin Lloyd Jones now held in the collection of the Meadville Theological Seminary. This discovery was made after the author suggested to Professor Sprague that he examine these files in connection with a project jointly undertaken by Professor Sprague and the author to research the history of the Abraham Lincoln Center building in Chicago. That building was initiated by the Reverend Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Appreciation is also due to Robert Twombly who did a great deal of independent research on the early work of Frank Lloyd Wright and discovered much of the information noted herein before, but without the knowledge of the author. Finally, thanks are due to Mrs. Susan Karr Sorrell, whose dissertation on the work of J. L. Silsbee is an example of tireless, thorough scholarship.

Until recently, scholars and historians have relied on Frank Lloyd Wright’s own writings, largely his book, An Autobiography, for information concerning his early training and exposure to architecture. Grant Manson expanded somewhat on Wright’s early days, in his Frank Lloyd Wright, The First Golden Age, but he also relied generally upon the architect’s memory and previously published work.

Wright’s early life has been characterized as that of the boy genius, overcoming seemingly impossible odds, and coming to Chicago to enter the profession of architecture with little more than courage. Mr. Wright was always inclined to romanticize his career as one which was constantly in crisis. In some ways this was true but often time and memory failed to tell the true tale.

In 1967, research finally proved what had been suspected for many years, that Frank Lloyd Wright was born in 1867, not 1869 as he claimed.1 There-

1 Thomas S. Hines, Jr., "Frank Lloyd Wright, The Madison Years, Record versus Recollection," The Wisconsin Magazine of History, L (Winter, 1967), 109-119. Also, the author has been certain of the earlier birthdate for several years since first reading “The Early Work of Frank Lloyd Wright” by R. C. Spencer, first published in The Architectural Review of June 1900. Spencer wrote, “... Here... a young man’s work... as he is but thirty two...” indicating that Wright was born in
fore, we know that he was actually more mature when he began his professional life than he would have had future scholars believe. Other studies have established accurately the period of formal education Wright had at the University of Wisconsin. He entered the University in January of 1886 as a "Special Student" in view of the fact that he had never received a high school diploma. The last evidence of attendance at the University was in "December of 1886." 2

It is also possible to determine within a few weeks when Wright first arrived in Chicago to begin work for J. L. Silsbee. This occurred in the early spring of 1887 after he had finished the fall semester of 1886 at the University of Wisconsin. 3 It is highly probable that Wright had been in Chicago before since we know that his father had preached at Wright's uncle Jenkin Lloyd Jones' church during 1884. 4 It is entirely possible that Wright accompanied his father at that time and would have been most unusual if a family as close as the Lloyd Jones'

1867. Furthermore, the author has a zerox copy of an undated letter written by Wright's daughter, Catherine Wright Baxter, to a number of editors wherein she stated that she and her brothers had known for many years that her father was born in 1867 and not 1869 and thus was "a man of 23 and not a boy just turned 21 when he married in 1889."


3 Ibid.

4 Second Annual, All Souls Church, 1885. p. 7. "... in addition to words from our pastor we have listened to ... Rev. W. C. Wright of Wisconsin, ..."

J. L. Silsbee's Unity Chapel built in Helena Valley, Wisconsin in 1885. According to Unity magazine, Frank Lloyd Wright "looked after the interior." Photographs by Donald Kolec.

had not visited their distinguished relative in Chicago at other times.

We also know that Wright was acquainted with Silsbee before he left Wisconsin. Jenkin Lloyd Jones wrote early in 1886 that "... Out of City ... I have preached ... at Spring Green and Helena, Wis. At the latter place I helped conduct a grove meeting and to lay plans for the building of a Chapel for the use of my first and still my vacation parish, which Chapel is now in the process of building." The next year Jones wrote "Gratefully do I remember that this year (1886) has housed without debt ... the country chapel at Helena, Wis." William C. Gannett wrote in Unity magazine of August 28, 1886, which Jenkin Lloyd Jones edited, the following text concerning the Helena Chapel: "If anyone seeing it should prefer to call it a glorified school-house, with proper accent on the 'glorified' we should not be unhappy, - liking that kind of church. ... Inside, the Trinity of rooms which the modern church demands, - an audience room, a parlor (those two parted only by a heavy curtain), and a mite of a kitchen. In the first room eighty people can listen ... The parlor adds space for seventy seats more. Both are wood-ceiled, with pine in its own color; one is calcimined in terracotta, one in olive-green; - a boy architect belonging to the 5 Third Annual, All Souls Church, 1886. p. 4. (Ed. Note: Helena, Wisconsin no longer exists as an independent village. The Chapel still stands, however.)

6 Fourth Annual, All Souls Church, 1887. p. 8. (Ed. Note: It is in this issue of the Annual, dated Jan. 6, 1887, where F. L. Wright is first listed as a member of All Souls parish. His address was 3921 Vincennes Ave., just a few blocks from Jenkin Lloyd Jones who lived at 3939 Langley Ave.)
family looked after this interior. . . . If you want one like it . . . write to the architect J. L. Silsbee . . .”

The signed drawing shown here of the Chapel was published in the Fourth Annual of The All Souls Church which was dated Jan. 6, 1887. Thus Wright must have made the drawing during 1886, probably during his summer on the farm of his uncle James while the chapel was being built. The drawing and the building are both extraordinarily similar to the Unitarian Chapel for Sioux City, Iowa, Wright’s first work that was published in an architectural magazine and which is illustrated on the inside front cover of this issue.9

The other two drawings shown here have a special interest because they undoubtedly represent the earliest original work of Frank Lloyd Wright still extant. One appears to have been a worksheet with pencil lines under the India ink and comments penciled in, possibly by Silsbee. The second, which is signed, was apparently the final drawing. Both were probably drawn after the All Souls building was completed since they show the building nearly as it was built and not as Silsbee’s earlier rendering indicated. Note the different window treatment, for example. These drawings may have been copied from a photograph, a technique Wright used throughout his life to prepare perspectives of buildings already constructed. They were not, however, traced since the originals are 22” wide and facilities for making photographs of that size were not available in 1887.

Thus we can conclude with some reasonable accuracy that Frank Lloyd Wright came to Chicago early in 1887, at the age of 19, after having had some brief training at the University of Wisconsin, but more important, having already worked with J. L. Silsbee with whom he found employment in the city immediately. In view of the fact that Wright’s uncle Jenkin Lloyd Jones had arranged for two commissions for Silsbee and that Silsbee knew of Wright’s obvious talent, it is not surprising that he was willing to employ the young man in his office. Wright remained with Silsbee almost exactly a year until early in 1888 (c. February) except for a brief period with Beers, Clay and Dutton. He then joined the firm of Adler and Sullivan where he was to remain until he began his own practice.

7 Unity, XVII, August 28, 1886, pp. 356-57, Wm. C. Gannett, “Christening a Country Church.”
9 Inland Architect & News Record, Vol. 9, June, 1887, Plate. (Ed. Note: Assuming a three month lag from submission to publication and allowing at least a month for design, this would indicate that Wright arrived in Chicago no later than February, 1887.)
A Catalog of Work by J. L. Silsbee

by Susan Karr Sorell

The following initials denote the sources. Complete entries appear in the bibliography.

- AABN The American Architect and Building News
- AR The Architectural Review
- BB The Building Budget
- CD Chicago City Directory
- CT The Chicago Daily Tribune
- DCBC The Development of Chicago Building Construction
- E The Economist
- HWF History of the World’s Fair, Truman
- IA The Inland Architect
- ISAB Illinois Society of Architecture Bulletin
- ODWCE The Official Directory of the World’s Columbian Exposition
- Shepp’s Shepp’s World’s Fair Photographs
- U Unity

"Chicago” in parenthesis indicates that the site has now been incorporated into the city.

1. 1883-JUNE FLAT FOR B. F. NORRIS, OAK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, I (June, 1883). 72.
2. 1883-JUNE FLAT FOR B. F. NORRIS, OGDEN AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS IA, I (June, 1883). 72.
3. 1883-JUNE L. Z. LITTER (LEITER) HOUSE, LAKE GENEVA, WISCONSIN. IA, I (June, 1883). 72.
4. 1883-JUNE LUCIUS C. PARDEE HOUSE, 1222 (404) NORTH STATE STREET, CHICAGO ILLINOIS. IA, I (June, 1883). 72, demolished.
5. 1883-JUNE W. HOBSON HOUSE, 1218 (402) NORTH STATE STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, I (June, 1883). 72, demolished.
6. 1883-JUNE J. J. LUTHER HOUSE, 1216 (400) NORTH STATE STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, I (June, 1883). 72, demolished.
7. 1883-JULY TWO HOUSES FOR POTTER PALMER, BANK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, I (July, 1883). 84. IA, II (August, 1883). 92, demolished.
8. 1883-JULY H. J. TILFORD HOUSE, CORNER OF FOURTH AND WESSINGER AVE-
1 The first mention of Silsbee and Kent in Chicago was in the March, 1883, Inland Architect, p. 28. The firm entered the competition for the office and bank building of the Commercial Deposit Company of Chicago. IA, I (March, 1883), 28.
2 The entries are arranged chronologically according to the date when notice of the commission appeared in the architectural press. In the absence of notices, the dates were arrived at by stylistic analysis.
3 The following form is used:
   1) person for whom the commission was executed
   2) location of the building
   3) periodicals in which the notices appear
   4) present state of the building if known
   Where a name given in the published notice seems to be misprinted, the name believed correct is enclosed by parentheses.
   A number in parenthesis denotes the street number at the time of construction. (Chicago streets were renumbered about 1909.)
17. 1884-JULY HOUSE FOR MRS. POTTER PALMER, CEDAR STREET NEAR LAKE-SHORE DRIVE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, III (July, 1884), 86.
18. 1884-JULY HOUSE FOR POTTER PALMER, RICHIE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, III (July, 1884), 86.
19. 1885-APRIL NINE HOUSES FOR ANDREW McNALLY, CORNER OF CLARK STREET AND GARFIELD AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, V (April, 1885), 41.
20. 1885-APRIL THEODORE SHELDON HOUSE, 33 BELLEVUE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, V (April, 1885), 41, standing.

TWENTY-NINTH STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, I (September, 1885), 65.; IA, VI (October, 1885), 46.

21. 1885-JUNE CHURCH FOR ALL SOULS' SOCIETY, CORNER OF LANGLEY AVENUE AND OAKWOOD BOULEVARD, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. U, XV (June 20, 1885), 202.; IA, VI (August, 1885), 8.; BB, I (September, 1885), 66, demolished.
22. 1885-JULY JAMES E. TAYLOR HOUSE, 2954 CALUMET AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, I (July, 1885), 45.; IA, VI (August, 1885), 8.; BB, I (September, 1885), 65.; IA, VI (October, 1885), 46, demolished.
23. 1885-AUGUST WILLIAM F. WHITE HOUSE, TOPEKA, KANSAS. IA, VI (August, 1885), 8.
24. 1885-AUGUST GIES AND COMPANY BUILDING, BUFFALO, NEW YORK. IA, VI (August, 1885), 8.
25. 1885-AUGUST FRANCIS HOUSE, BUFFALO, NEW YORK. IA, VI (August, 1885), 8.
26. 1885-SEPTEMBER BARN AND CAR HOUSE FOR THE CHICAGO CITY RAILWAY COMPANY, COTTAGE GROVE AVENUE AND

West front of the Church-Home, showing proposed Parsonage to the right.

28. 1886-FEBRUARY EPISCOPAL CHURCH, ANTRIM, PENNSYLVANIA, BB, II (February, 1886), 22.
29. 1886-APRIL W. S. WARFIELD HOUSE, QUINCY, ILLINOIS. BB, II (April, 1886), 44, standing.
30. 1886-APRIL TWO HOUSES FOR JOHN F. GEORGE, (IA, July) (IA, May) (BB) TEMPLE 2943-43 CALUMET AVENUE, (Note conflict of names for same 2 houses) 3943 CALUMET AVENUE (CD: 1887), CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, II (April, 1886), 44; IA, VII (May, 1886), 25.; IA, VII (July, 1886), 102, demolished.
31. 1886-JUNE FREDERICK W. RUECKHEIM HOUSE, 4201 VINCENNES AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, II (June, 1886), 72.; IA, VII (July, 1886), 102, standing.
32. 1886-JUNE TEN HOUSES, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS. (CHICAGO) BB, II (June, 1886), 72.
33. 1886-JULY TWO HOUSES FOR MR. H(ENRY) A. KNOTT, SHEFFIELD AVENUE, LAKE VIEW (CHICAGO). BB, II (July, 1886), 88.

Henry A. Knott moved into a house in Buena Park prior to

2 Two details of Silsbee's work appeared in the Inland Architect, VI (November, 1885) — p. 50: detail of a house on Cedar Street near Lakeshore Drive, p. 64: detail of a house on Bank Street.
May 1, 1888 (CD: 1888). That house in Buena Park was illustrated in IA, XIX (May, 1892). CD: 1890: h. 1677 Sheffield Avenue. House at 1677 Sheffield demolished.

34. 1886-JULY COMMERCIAL BUILDING FOR JOHN L. COCHRAN, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS (CHICAGO). IA, VII (July, 1886), 102.

35. 1886-AUGUST FIVE HOUSES FOR WILLIAM WELLER, ASTOR STREET NORTH OF SCHILLER STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, II (August, 1886), 102.; BB, II (September, 1886), 114.

36. 1886-AUGUST FOURTEEN HOUSES ON THE LAKE SHORE, NORTH OF LAKE VIEW. BB, II (August, 1886), 102.

37. 1886-SEPTEMBER GEORGE B. SHAW HOUSE, LAKE GENEVA, WISCONSIN. BB, II (September, 1886), 114.

38. 1886-SEPTEMBER GEORGE W. HALE HOUSE, 1413 (539) DEARBORN AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, X (December, 1887); IA, VIII (September, 1886), 33, demolished. CD: 1888 lists Hale's address as 541 Dearborn which is 1415 (new). I did not check this address.

39. 1886-NOVEMBER DR. E(MELIUS) C. DUDLEY HOUSE, 1619 INDIANA AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, II (November, 1886), 140.; IA, VIII (December, 1886), 87.

40. 1887-MAY REMODELING THIRD AND FOURTH FLOORS OF HENNING AND SPEED BUILDING FOR THE UNIVERSITY CLUB, 125 (old) DEARBORN AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. (Letter from Miss Elizabeth Bahnman to Thomas S. McCormick of February 28, 1950 files of Chicago Historical Society. The reference comes from a document published by the University Club on its anniversary in 1937.)

41. 1887-MAY CHICAGO TELEPHONE COMPANY BUILDING, 203-205 (old) WASHINGTON STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, X (November, 1887). 70.; IA, IX (May, 1887), 66.; DCBC, Randall, p. 115, demolished.

42. 1887-JULY TEN VILLA RESIDENCES, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS. BB, III (July 30, 1887), Sup. 2.

43. 1887-JULY CHARLES R. STEEL HOUSE, WAUKEGAN, ILLINOIS. BB, III (July 30, 1887), 2.

44. 1887-JULY DOUBLE HOUSE FOR MRS. A(NSON) S. PIPER, INDIANA AVENUE NEAR NINETEENTH STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, III (July 30, 1887), Sup. 2.; BB, III (August 31, 1887), Sup. 2.; IA, X (September, 1887), 28. CD: 1885-1889 lists her address as 1920 Indiana.

45. 1887-JULY JOHN WILKINSON HOUSE, 1310 (482) LA SALLE STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, III (July 30, 1887), Sup. 2. The present building at 1312 LaSalle Street seems to answer the description and the two earlier ones on either side do not.

46. 1887-AUGUST WILLIAM A. STILES, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). BB, III (August 31, 1887), Sup. 2.; IA, X (September, 1887), 28. A house at 5463 Winthrop Avenue answers this description.

47. 1887-AUGUST GEORGE R. PHILLIPS HOUSE, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). BB, III (August 31, 1887), Sup. 2.; IA, X (September, 1887), 28.

48. 1887-SEPTEMBER HOTEL, QUINCY, ILLINOIS. BB, III (September, 1887), Sup. 2.

49. 1887-DECEMBER SEVEN VILLA RESIDENCES, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). BB, III (December 31, 1887), 1.

50. 1888-c. JANUARY JOSEPH LYMAN SIBLEE HOUSE, 1042 (1328) HOLLYWOOD AVENUE, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). IA, XVI (November, 1890).

51. 1888-c. JANUARY HOUSES FOR WILLIAM WALLER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XI (May, 1888).


54. 1888-c. FEBRUARY-MARCH HENRY B. STONE HOUSE, 56 (45) BELLEVUE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XII (September, 1888).

55. 1888-FEBRUARY GEORGE R. HOWARD HOUSE, BUFFALO, NEW YORK. BB, IV (February 29, 1888), 24.

56. 1888-MARCH HOUSE, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). BB, IV (March, 1888), 36.

57. 1888-JUNE COTTAGE FOR LINCOLN PARK, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, IV (June, 1888), 74.

58. 1888-JUNE CHURCH, ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS. BB, IV (June 30, 1888), 2.

59. 1888-JUNE THREE HOUSES FOR H(ENRY) R. DURkee, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, IV (June 30, 1888), Sup. 2.; IA, XI (July, 1888), 91.

3 Joseph L. Siblee was invited to submit plans in the competition for a library building for the Chicago Historical Society to be erected at the corner of Dearborn Avenue and Ontario Street. *Inland Architect*, IA, XI (July, 1888), 91.
60. 1888-c. AUGUST STABLE, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). IA, XVI (January, 1891), 94.
62. 1888-AUGUST FREDERICK GREELEY HOUSE, WINNETKA, ILLINOIS. BB, IV (August 31, 1888), sup. 2; IA, XIII (March, 1889), 48.
63. 1888-AUGUST JUDGE EGBERT JAMIESON HOUSE, #28 (IA, January, 1893) #38 (CD:1890) NEWPORT AVENUE, (Note conflict in street numbers) LAKEVIEW, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). IA, XIII (May, 1889); IA, XXIV (January, 1895); BB, IV (August 31, 1888), sup. 2.
64. 1888-AUGUST E. B. LINDSLEY HOUSE, THREE RIVERS, MICHIGAN. BB, IV (August 31, 1888), sup. 2.
65. 1888-OCTOBER M. DEWITT BURNET HOUSE, BURNET PARK, SYRACUSE, NEW YORK. BB, IV (October 31, 1888).
66. 1889-FEBRUARY THREE HOUSES FOR R. A. WALLER, BUENA PARK, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). IA, XVI (September, 1890); BB, V (April 30, 1889), p. x.
68. 1889-AUGUST WILLIAM S.BOOTH HOUSE, 4709 GRAND BOULEVARD, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. CT (August 18, 1889).
69. 1889-AUGUST JAMES S. MORTON HOUSE, LAKE GENEVA, WISCONSIN. E, II (August 31, 1889), 769.

This is Silsbee's design of 1888 for the house of Judge Egbert Jamiesson in Lakeview. Photograph from The Inland Architect.

70. 1889-AUGUST JAMES SHAW HOUSE, MOUNT CARROLL, ILLINOIS. E, II (August 31, 1889), 769.
71. 1889-AUGUST MRS. M. L. BAILEY HOUSE, WHEATON, ILLINOIS. E, II (August 31, 1889), 769.
72. 1889-AUGUST W. B. BULL BARN, QUINCY, ILLINOIS. E, II (August 31, 1889), 769.
73. 1889-c. SEPTEMBER ARTHUR ORR HOUSE, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS. IA, XV (July, 1890).
74. 1889-SEPTEMBER GEORGE S. PAYSON HOUSE, 1352 (90) ASTOR STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. CT (September 15, 1889).
75. 1889-SEPTEMBER FRED W. SMITH HOUSE, 4725 (old) GRAND BOULEVARD, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. CT (September 22, 1889), demolished.
76. 1889-c. NOVEMBER-DECEMBER RESIDENCE, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). IA, XVII (March, 1891), 27.
77. 1890-FEBRUARY W. I. STILES STORE FRONT, 15-17-19 (old) CLINTON STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, VI (February, 1890), viii.
78. 1890-MARCH RESIDENCE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA. BB, VI (March 31, 1890).
79. 1890-JULY MANUFACTURING BUILDING FOR MRS. EMMA WEIGLE, NORTHWEST CORNER OF CANAL AND JACKSON STREETS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, VI (July 31, 1890), ix.
80. 1890-SEPTEMBER PALM HOUSE AND CONSERVATORY FOR LINCOLN PARK, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XVI (January, 1891); BB, VI (September 30, 1890), ix, standing.

81. 1890-SEPTEMBER ALTERATIONS FOR R. GUTHMAN BUILDING, 95 (old) SOUTH HALSTEAD STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. BB, VI (September 30, 1890), ix.

82. 1890-c. DECEMBER KIRKLAND SCHOOL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XVII (June, 1891).

83. 1891-FEBRUARY W. H. BARTLETT HOUSE, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS. IA, XVIII (November, 1891); IA, XVII (February, 1891), 13. And a two story barn; E, V (February 7, 1891), 234.

84. 1891-MARCH COULTER BLOCK REMODELING, AURORA, ILLINOIS. E, V (March 28, 1891), 546.

85. 1891-MARCH ROLLIN A. KEYES HOUSE, 140 MELROSE, KENILWORTH, ILLINOIS. E, V (March 28, 1891), 546, standing.

86. 1891-MAY W(INFIELD) S. SMYTH HOUSE, MOZART STREET, (CD:1892) CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. E, V (May 9, 1891), 828.

87. 1891-MAY M(ALCOM) M. JAMESON HOUSE, 50 (old) NEWPORT AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. E, V (May 9, 1891), 828; E, V (May 30, 1891), 978.

88. 1891-OCTOBER FLAT FOR J(AMES) S. NORTON, CORNER OF LINCOLN AND LILL AVENUES, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. E, VI (October 3, 1891), 598; IA, XVIII (October, 1891), 33, demolished.

89. 1891-NOVEMBER H(ORATIO) N. MAY HOUSE, 1443 (147) ASTOR STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XIX (June, 1892); IA, XXVI (August, 1893); E, VI (November 7, 1891), 800; IA, XVIII (November, 1891), 55; CT, November 8, 1891, standing.

90. 1891-NOVEMBER W. A. HAMMOND HOUSE, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS. E, VI (November 7, 1891), 800; IA, XVIII (November, 1891), 55.

91. 1891-NOVEMBER STATE BUILDING FOR WEST VIRGINIA, WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XIX (February, 1892); ODWCE, p. 101.; HWF, I, p. 475.; IA, XVIII (November, 1891), 55; Shepp's, p. 442, demolished.

92. 1892-FEBRUARY STATE BUILDING FOR NORTH DAKOTA, WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS IA, XIX (February, 1892); ODWCE, p. 95 HWF, I, p. 500; demolished.

93. 1892-MARCH ALEXANDER OFFICER HOUSE, 158 MELROSE, KENILWORTH, ILLINOIS. IA, XIX (March, 1892), 27, standing.

94. 1892-MARCH J. C. SCOVEL FLAT, EDGEWATER, ILLINOIS, (CHICAGO). IA, XIX (March, 1892), 27.

95. 1892-MARCH F. R. HAZARD HOUSE, SYRACUSE, NEW YORK IA, XIX (March, 1892).

96. 1892-NOVEMBER J. L. TYFFE HOUSE, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS. CT, (November 20, 1892); IA, XX (December, 1892), 58.

97. 1892-NOVEMBER POWER HOUSE FOR CALUMET ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. CT (November 20, 1892); IA, XX (December, 1892), 58.

98. 1892-DECEMBER HAGENBECK GEOLOGICAL ARENA BUILDING, MIDWAY PLAINSCANCE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XX (December, 1892), 58.

99. 1893-JULY HENRY D. BARBER HOUSE, POLO, ILLINOIS. IA, XXI (July, 1893).

100. 1893-DECEMBER REMODELING FOR C. JEVNE AND COMPANY, 109-111 (old) WA-BASH AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XXII (December, 1893), 49.; E, X (December 9, 1893), 625.

101. 1894-APRIL ANIMAL AND PALM HOUSE FOR NORTH CHICAGO STREET RAILWAY COMPANY, LINCOLN PARK, E, XI (April 7, 1894), 384; AABN, LIV (November 21, 1896), 63.

102. 1894-DECEMBER APARTMENT HOUSE FOR T(HOMAS) J. HODGSON, 1311 (1049) MELROSE AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XXIV (December, 1894), 50.; E, XVII (January 2, 1897), 23.

103. 1895-MAY J. F. PALMER HOUSE, SHENSTONE ROAD, RIVERSIDE, ILLINOIS. E, XIII (May 25, 1895), 641.

104. 1896-JANUARY POWER STATION FOR WEST CHICAGO PARK BOARD, GARFIELD PARK, KENZIE STREET AND HAMLIN AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XXVI (January, 1896), 66.; E, XV (February 20, 1896), 275.

105. 1896-JANUARY ANIMAL HOUSE FOR HIGHLAND PARK, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA. E, XV (January 25, 1896), 123.

106. 1897-MARCH BANDSTAND FOR GARFIELD PARK, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XXIX (March, 1897), 19, standing.

107. 1897-NOVEMBER CALUMET ELECTRIC RAILROAD COMPANY BARN, 1670-1706 (old) NINETY-THIRD STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. IA, XXX (November, 1897), 78.; E, XVIII (November 20, 1897), 595.
service to life in the development of new forms which bear a likeness of the inhabitants whose shells they are.

The presence of other traditions in the Middle West, such as the introduction of the International Style, continue to play an important role and provide the indigenous men with a distinct challenge — something to measure against. The International Style, through its preoccupation with industrial processes and machinery, has produced an architecture with all the orderliness and predictability of the assembly line. The manner and meaning of these buildings, rooted as they are in the imperatives of tools and technology, give credence to the myth of empirical man and express the technological isolation of man from man, man from nature. The vast, deliberately empty lobbies and uniformly blank facades of these buildings tell us that no one is home, no one is there. And yet as bleak as this psychological picture may appear to us, we also know that buildings — like machines — do not invent themselves. They are but mirrors to the spaces of our minds — the space within which the creative mind functions.

Unlike the International Style buildings (or even Wright’s Usonian houses), each with their strong family resemblance, the work of Bruce Goff presents us with a consistently varying series of forms which display a wide range and depth of feeling. To some, this may appear to be “the same old unusual thing”. But if we are not to restrict the possibilities of what a building should be allowed to look like, we must concern ourselves with the deeper meanings of form; we must open new possibilities in the creation of human environment. To do this we must have the capacity to transcend technique and to imagine new solutions.

Goff’s approach to design is akin to something as personal and as inevitable as one’s own handwriting. The sources of his inspiration are many: science-fiction; industrial machinery; avant-garde music; and especially the formative principles of the natural world where an effect of overall harmony is given not by the dominance of any one form but through a great variety of forms. To those not familiar with the actual spaces of his designs or the nature of his clients, it comes as a surprise to learn that these buildings are, in fact, very direct solutions to problems of site, climate and client. To hear Goff enumerate a typical list of requirements to be met by a single design gives one cause to wonder how many of the projects were realized at all. Each design, therefore, carefully respects and reflects those elements unique to each situation; each is regarded as both “an obligation and an opportunity”. Given this premise, no single design can be
selected as 'best' as each is a unique matrix of a specific set of conditions.

Goff's clients, however, will frequently insist they have the most satisfactory solution. This is to be expected as they themselves are a unique part of the matrix which is "their house". Goff often tells of a party where a number of his clients had gathered. In the course of the evening, each of the guests would ask the others, "What shape are you?" Apparently to save the trouble of asking, Goff suggests they all wear badges designed in the form of their house. While this may appear as a casual remark, it immediately suggests the houses are a personal kind of heraldry — a symbolic "badge", as it were, to their individuality.

In the prophetic teachings of Louis Sullivan, architecture, we are told, must express the needs of all the people by providing them with forms that follow function. In the work of Bruce Goff, this dictum is given a new psychological dimension: form creates function. By designing an environment in which individual needs become an integral part of the matrix, Goff has created an individualized context of situation wherein these needs can be fully realized and experienced. All human behavior takes place in some kind of formed setting, and architecture, being the creation of these settings, becomes a matter of no little consequence. The design of scenery, while it does not determine the play, does, nevertheless, have a great deal to do with how we experience the play as a total object of communication. Architecture is communication: our buildings tell us something about ourselves and we, in turn, play out our lives in accordance with the setting.

While Goff's method for the realization of architectural form should be sufficient to explain the variety in his work, it does not explain the forms themselves. It also does not explain why he chooses to use certain collections of forms which evolve into complicated kinds of imagery. In other words, what is said is more important than the handwriting.

In addition to a range of forms, Goff also presents us with a range of ideas. As expressive devices, these ideas are more than a result of casual relationships: they explore the very depths of consciousness itself and show the way to return to a world of personal and individual identity. While his designs present themselves as rationally conceived and controlled solutions, they also present us with irrational statements of newness and originality that both startle and delight. If we find elements of whimsy and humor in his work it is because they contain elements of surprise. If they seem gaudy and contrived it is to the extent we personally fail to open our own imaginations to what is possible. They do, nevertheless, capture our attention and sometimes provide us with vivid and overwhelming experiences.

Goff's ideas tend to be universal in both origin and meaning. To all men in all cultures, the reality of "house" lies within and derives from a symbolic act of consciousness — it is a quality of experience. What we come to expect of this experience is a feeling of shelter, security and protection; a center for the family; a place of human continuity, both past and present. If architecture is a form of communication, we must find ways to manifest these fundamental experiences in our lives. To do this we must speak a language of symbolic form which will enable us to reach these common levels of human experience.

Collective levels of human experience are symbolically expressed through the use of their central patterns or archetypes. Goff is a master of evocative archetypes and defines these universal concepts in terms of the individual condition. He therefore presents us with variations on a theme: while the forms are never repeated, the theme is frequently the same. An often-used theme is the image of the cavern or the cave which is evocative in a manner similar to, but more fundamental than, Wright's ever-present sense of roof and hearth. This theme is given in the winding labyrinth of the Duncan House (1965) punctuated with ruin-like openings; the ascending catacomb of the Bavinger House (1950); and the crystalline grotto of light and water as seen in the Crystal Chapel (1949). Other themes include the ruinous forms of the Giacomo Motor Lodge (1961) which project permanence and longevity; the aqueous forms of the Dewlen Aparture (1957) whose juxtaposition with the desert site are symbolic of life itself; and forms symbolic of organic growth, inorganic development, and the architectural metaphors of hovering and flight.

Yet another set of archetypes is given in a series of improvisations on basic geometric shapes — geometry being universal theories of space and figures in space. All of these ideas can be seen in isolated examples and in complex combinations as well. To provide us with this range of expressive forms, Goff must employ an elaborate vocabulary of structures and materials whose use is integral with the idea of the building. Their internal development is directed by timeless principles of design as found in all forms of expression. Each constellation of structure and material is directed toward a specific effect not as affectation but as a deep belief in the very atmosphere of form itself.

As a collection of forms, Goff's buildings are telling us that we are "less earth-bound, more
flexible and athletic, more ever-changing and free” as a people. As individual forms, they defy mere formulation and require a deeper kind of understanding. As the continuation of a tradition of change, they influence but cannot be imitated. As the principal context in the drama of our lives, we experience them through a system of symbols and imagery and in this they are without peer. In the final analysis, when the architect has satisfied all the requirements of the project, it is the content of the style that we ultimately live with and eventually come to value in our buildings. It is what we most vividly remember and therefore come to require of our environmental experiences. If form is to follow function, we must learn to recognize functions other than physical ones. When we choose to substitute only mechanical images for images of our total experience — images fundamental to the meaning of life — we become like the players in Beckett’s Waiting For Godot: men who are lost in a drama of despair and loneliness; lost in a life of separation from reality and from ourselves.

So the battle has not been won: the dialogue of the American Middle West continues to produce forms symbolic of life and forms symbolic of power over life. Regional artists such as Bruce Goff continue in a tradition of innovation and change just as the men of the conformist tradition continue to produce objects of fashion to sell in the noise of the marketplace. It is within the dynamic interplay of these polarities that the history of architecture will be given — a fact historians of the region and the period have either ignored or chosen to disregard.

The work of Bruce Goff has been an integral part of the American scene for more than forty years. This new and important contribution to the bibliography of architecture from Japan also indicates a wide range of influence. In it we are given considerable testimony to the prodigious and fertile imagination of a man who, as explorer of the uncharted wilderness of inner space, continues to demonstrate the American penchant for discovery.

Reviewed by Richard Helstern
Makanda, Illinois


While one might have thought there was a finite limit to the possible number of new books on Frank Lloyd Wright, apparently the seemingly endless flow will end only when writers run out of what amount to ingenious new ways of reworking familiar material. In some cases, the process of putting old wine in new bottles can in fact produce an interesting and altogether new product: Leonard K. Eaton’s recent book, Two Chicago Architects and Their Clients (review, PSR, VII, No. 1, 20-1), if sometimes inconclusive, is none the less an example of the new insights that can be provided by taking a very different view of Wright’s work, in his case a sociological one. The present book also attempts to find a previously untried approach to Wright, but unfortunately, the wine this time turned to vinegar. The idea was a good one, of course, which only makes the failure proportionately more disappointing.

The first of two volumes to be devoted to Wright in Simon and Schuster’s new “Library of Contemporary Architects” series, this book deals exclusively with the non-domestic buildings. Well, almost exclusively: for some mysterious reason, the two Taliesins have been included with the various churches, school, governmental, commercial and related buildings rather than in volume two which will deal with the domestic work. This, however, is the least of the book’s shortcomings and may be overlooked. By separating the public buildings from the domestic, the author, in concept at least, has recognized and underscored an important aspect of Wright’s work that is often lost in more typical art historical or biographical treatments: namely, that Wright was not a narrow specialist, a designer of houses, but a man whose deep human concern led him to explore virtually every major building type currently in use. Unhappily, this is more suggested by the title than documented in the book, the text for which is extremely brief (11 pages, plus six pages of notes on the plates) and often misinformed.

For example, the first thing encountered in the text is the following: “In 1869, the year of Frank Lloyd Wright’s birth . . . ” By now, I thought everyone concerned with such things had learned that Wright was born in 1867, not 1869. Granted, two years are hardly worth quibbling over — the most interesting thing about the birth controversy is why Wright deliberately falsified his own birth date in the first place. But when a writer begins his book by signalling his ignorance of recent research on his subject, the reader tends to become hypercritical, and further errors of fact and interpretation are not difficult to find. Madison, Wisconsin, was not his “home town,” Uncle Jenkin Lloyd Jones did not get him his first job with Silsbee (both p. 10), and David Lloyd Wright did not write My Father Which Art on Earth sic (p. 19). Nor, if we turn to the notes on the plates, were the foundations of the Imperial Hotel balanced “on a central pile bored deep into the subsoil” (p. 119) and the Price Tower is not a “sixteen-storey design” (p. 122): simply by counting the stories in his own plate 62, Pawley would have seen the building has at least 18 stories, and a little reading in the Wrightian literature would have indicated the actual 19. As for interpretation, few people who really know Wright’s buildings would
speak of "The absence of great height" as "an abiding consideration in Wright's domestic architecture" (p. 14). Unless by "great height" he means something on the order of the baronial halls of English manor houses, it is hard to reconcile this with Wright's well-known spatial modulations (e.g. Isabel Roberts house, Taliesin, etc.) which became "cathedral ceilings" in contemporary tract houses.

In fact, based on many of the author's comments, the reader begins to suspect that Pawley discusses some buildings he has never seen in the flesh, and basing observations on knowledge gained exclusively from photographs can be disastrous, particularly with an architect whose space experiments were as complex as Wright's often were. This does not mean that Pawley is always wide of the mark, however. Some of his comments on the Johnson Wax complex are excellent: the research tower is "the kind of facility which could scarcely be conceived today without someone mentioning the likelihood of future expansion or the unforeseeable demands of new equipment." (p. 17) His observations on the social role of the buildings — and Wright's own social thoughts — are sometimes trenchant as well, although often derived from other writers such as Peter Blake and particularly Norris Kelly Smith.

The greatest shortcoming of the book, however, is its scope. From the title, we naturally expect to find here the complete corpus of Wright's non-domestic work. Instead, a mere 13 buildings, including the two Taliesins, are presented, and of the remaining eleven, only two or three would be considered mildly obscure, in terms of the number of times published, by even the most casual Wrightophiles. Granted the buildings are well illustrated with very handsome and numerous photos, some in color, but do we really need more pictures of the Unitarian Church, the Guggenheim Museum, the Morris Shop or the Johnson Wax Buildings? Much less reproductions of six familiar prints, c. 1923, of the Imperial Hotel?! The interesting and ambitious title is only a promise which hopefully may yet be fulfilled one day: what is needed is a complete study of this aspect of Wright's work, including the many unpublished projects as well as some of the less well-known executed work.

For example, the present book includes several — but not all — of the buildings at Florida Southern College. Would not the inclusion of all of Wright's buildings for education have made a wonderful chapter here, ranging from the Hillside School and the "Little Dipper" kindergarten (and by the way, has anyone pointed out that the plan for this delightful structure is almost identical with the plan for the Florida Southern library?) to the small Wyoming Valley School Wright built for his neighbors and the University of Wichita buildings? Why not all the churches? And all the commercial work? This, of course, would require open access to the Taliesin archives, and that is another problem. Even so, the available published lists of Wright's works include in excess of fifty structures which could be called "public buildings" in the context used in this book. Pawley's "Chronological list of public buildings" on pages 125-126 lists only twenty two. Fifty is probably a low estimate of Wright's executed buildings and for the time being we just don't have the information to list them all. But meanwhile we have Pawley's book, and its text is very lean, contributing little that is new.

But was it really meant? Why, indeed, was the book published at all, besides perhaps to cash in on the considerable lay interest in Wright and modern architecture generally? Simon and Schuster clearly hopes to compete with the highly successful and well conceived monographs brought out by Brazil- ler several years ago — in fact many of the same architects are treated in the new series, with only Paul Rudolph, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and Arne Jacobsen being newly raised to the architectural pantheon. But based upon this one example, it is hard to imagine the competition being very intense: Martin Pawley is no Vincent Scully! The author's background and the book's publishing history alike suggest that this opus is more a publishing venture than a serious contribution. Pawley, a British architect, was trained, among other places, at the Ecole des Beaux Arts which lends a note of subtle irony to the whole project, and the pedigree is Simon and Schuster out of Bijutsu Shuppan-sha, Tokyo (1967), sired by Thames and Hudson, Ltd., London (1970).

Reviewed by Bruce F. Radde
San Jose State College


The Oxford Companion series of books have been a part of every cultured person's library for too many years to remember. The Companion to Music has gone through ten editions and the several others have fared nearly as well. Now we have The Oxford Companion to Art which takes its place proudly beside its predecessors. The 116 contributors under the general editorship of Harold Osborne have brought together a remarkably concise and useful reference work for the art or architectural historian.

The book is primarily devoted to matters of art, but a substantial number of entries are, in fact, architectural in nature. This is particularly true in regard to definitions of architectural terms and in biographical references. The book is not without
error, some obvious to readers of this journal, such as the wrong birthdate of Frank Lloyd Wright still given as 1869. In the same biography, the author has referred to Joseph Lyman Silsbee by his second two names only, a curious practice we often see in European publications.

One hopes that the inclusion of numerous architectural references in the present volume will not discourage the preparation of a similar volume devoted entirely to architecture. Such a work is sorely needed and one of a quality similar to The Oxford Companion to Art would be welcome indeed.


The American Association of Architectural Bibliographers has continued its excellent series of volumes of PAPERS. We have reviewed the three earlier issues here and our earlier criticisms still apply. Primarily, our only real complaint is the lack of a standard stylistic system throughout. This does not, however, detract substantially from the usefulness of the series. This usefulness will continue to grow as the number of volumes increases.


Volumes VI and VII are monographic in form, with VI being "An Intelligent Interest in Architecture, A Bibliography of Publications about Thomas Jefferson as an Architect, together with an Iconography of the Nineteenth-Century Prints of the University of Virginia." Volume VII is devoted to "Sir Nikolaus Pevsner: A Bibliography." These last two are, in the opinion of the reviewer, the most valuable of the four volumes mentioned.

This series is undoubtedly a labor of love, but it would seem that by now sufficient material must be in preparation or completed so that subjects of similar interest could be combined when they are not enough for a single volume. As the series is now progressing, sooner or later an index for the entire set will have to be done to make it truly usable.

**Preview**

The next issue of The Prairie School Review will be the first of two issues devoted to the life and work of sculptor Richard Bock. Bock's career paralleled that of the architects of the Prairie School and he did much of the modeling of the ornament which was so much a part of their work.

A number of recently published books will be reviewed including:

- The Pope-Leighey House
  National Trust for Historic Preservation
- Bruce Goff, A Portfolio...
  William Murphy and Louis Muller
- An Organic Architecture/The Architecture of Democracy
  Frank Lloyd Wright

Our readers are invited to suggest or submit articles for possible publication in The Prairie School Review.

Contributors are asked to write for our style manual "Notes for Contributors" as noted in Volume VII, Number 2.

**Binders**

Handsome and durable library type binders for your copies of The Prairie School Review. Binders are covered in brown leatherette with gold stampings on the cover and backbone. Single copies can be easily removed if desired.

Price: $3.50 each (US Funds)
Address your order, enclosing check or money order to:

**THE PRAIRIE SCHOOL PRESS**
12509 South 89th Avenue
Palos Park, Illinois 60464

Illinois residents please include 5% sales tax. (18¢ for each binder)
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