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ABSTRACT

Henry Francis du Pont became increasingly conscious of architectural accuracy as he added period interiors to Winterthur. His architectural installations gained integrity from the 1930s to the 1950s, and the 1940 Flock Room was an especially important step in this transition.

Research indicates that there was not a corresponding change during these years in the way Winterthur interiors were furnished. The proportional quantities of furniture remained relatively constant, as did the way in which these furnishings were displayed within the rooms.

Architect Thomas Waterman encouraged du Pont to view architectural elements as he viewed the decorative arts: as American craft products worthy of the most advantageous display available. Du Pont's changing attitudes about interior woodwork at Winterthur are more than a gesture to increase the historical accuracy of the interiors; the transition reflects a growing respect of native architecture as art product.
HENRY FRANCIS DU PONT'S INTERIOR DESIGN AESTHETIC
AND WINTERTHUR'S FLOCK ROOM

Winterthur has been justly heralded as the foremost museum of American furniture and decorative arts.¹ The period interiors created by Henry Francis du Pont display some of the finest and most important objects used in colonial and federal America, and the

¹Jay E. Cantor uses this phrase on the jacket of his book, Winterthur (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1985). Winterthur is the largest and most comprehensive work to date that deals with Henry Francis du Pont, his home, and his collections. While Cantor's book is an outstanding introduction to the museum, it does not serve well as a scholarly reference as there are no notes or citations. Fortunately, much of the information compiled by Cantor is available in other publications, most notably within the volumes of Winterthur Portfolio, and the numerous writings of John Sweeney.


Sweeney has published prolifically about Winterthur, including several short works which focus on du Pont. His Winterthur Illustrated (New York: Chanticleer Press, 1963) was the most thorough summation of the museum's interiors prior to Cantor's book, and remains especially useful for its combination of historical and aesthetic interpretation.
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rooms themselves are among the nation's most beautiful. To many people, an impressive interior such as the Flock Room (fig. 1) represents the standards and aesthetic sense of the Winterthur Museum and of Henry Francis du Pont as an individual.

Few people are aware of how drastically interior spaces at Winterthur have changed since du Pont began installing period rooms in the late 1920s. The section of the house in which the Flock Room was installed in 1940, for example, had been an Empire era Billiard Room prior to that date (fig. 2).

Fortunately, documents exist which can help us to envision the rooms as they appeared in the 1930s. Especially useful are floor plans of rooms drawn by estate superintendent Leslie Potts. These plans not only specify each piece of furniture in the room, but also chart the objects' precise locations.²

²Potts prepared a floor plan for each major interior space installed at Winterthur through 1947. These detailed plans document more than architecture and furniture; they include accessories such as books and candlesticks, and even the patterns in oriental carpets are reproduced with colored pencils. Original drawings by Leslie Potts are stored in the Winterthur Archives.
Fig. 1: The Flock Room, 1985.
Fig. 2: The Billiard Room, 1935 stereopticon view.
Useful also are a set of hand-colored stereographic prints of selected rooms made in 1935 and 1937 by photographer Robert Brost (figs. 2, 3, 4). While du Pont sometimes rearranged the furniture within particular rooms for the photographer, the contents themselves were unaltered.3

Finally, a great deal of correspondence exists in which details regarding the installation of architectural elements and the selection of furnishings are discussed by du Pont and the many people who assisted him. Especially valuable are the many letters written between du Pont and coordinating architect Thomas Waterman.4

3Winterthur archivist Paul B. Hensley provides the historical background for these images in his article, "The Brost Collection: A Glimpse Of The Past," Winterthur Newsletter, 32, no. 1 (Winter 1986), p. 11. In April, 1935 and again in July, 1937 Brost made stereoscopic negatives of Winterthur rooms to produce positive prints in the form of stereographs. About forty different rooms are represented in the collection of Brost images, and there are usually two different views of each room -- one view showing the summer textiles and the other showing the winter textiles. "Miss Karge," an artist employed by Brost, colored by hand specific views selected by H. F. du Pont. This collection of images is held in the Winterthur Archives.

4Original copies of du Pont’s correspondences are held in the Winterthur Archives.
One reason that du Pont altered the contents and appearance of his rooms over the years was that his attitudes toward the collections and interiors changed. From 1930 until 1950, a subtle transition from private home to public museum occurred. Du Pont at no point suddenly decided to alter his carefully created rooms so that they met the standards of a history museum, but rather moved gracefully toward architectural settings that were installed to museum standards.

A few typical room installations from different eras in Winterthur's development illustrate this point.

When the Port Royal Parlor (fig. 3) and Entrance Hall (fig. 4) were installed during the major wing addition of 1928-31, there was insufficient eighteenth-century interior woodwork to span the architectural superstructure. The satisfactory solution was to expand the woodwork to fill the space by adding on lengths of reproduction woodwork.5

5While the Port Royal woodwork was skillfully reproduced, it is not difficult to determine the point where it merges with the original woodwork. This joint can be seen easily in the cornice of the north wall in either the Port Royal Parlor or the Port Royal Hall.
Fig. 3: The Port Royal Parlor, 1935
stereopticon view.
Fig. 4: The Port Royal Hall, 1935 stereopticon view.
When the Blackwell Parlor (fig. 5) was installed in 1939, a space was specially selected for it which would require no modifications of its architectural proportions. Plans for the Flock Room were under way simultaneously, and great pains were taken to reconstruct the woodwork for that interior as accurately as possible.

The du Ponts moved out of the house in 1951 in preparation for its opening as a museum, and the installation of the Fraktur Room (fig. 6), from a Berks County, Pennsylvania, house began. Not only were the unique painted wainscot and woodwork were kept in their original proportions, but articles of furniture found in the room were also transplanted to Winterthur and kept in their original environment. An architectural corner cupboard painted to match the room's woodwork was included in the move, as was a large Pennsylvania German wardrobe.

---

Fig. 5: The Blackwell Parlor, circa 1962.
Fig. 6: The Fraktur Room, circa 1962.
In 1958, several rooms from a Pennsylvania farm house were moved to the Winterthur Museum along with a bakehouse which stood on the same property. The spatial relationships between rooms were maintained, and the actual exterior stone walls were moved and reconstructed so that a feeling of walking from the outbuilding to the main house was recreated within the confines of the museum walls (fig. 7).

The Winterthur interiors clearly demonstrate an increasing commitment to architectural accuracy on the part of du Pont. Was this transition toward more historically accurate architecture part of a larger shift in du Pont's display techniques? Was he also changing the ways in which the interiors were furnished in order to make them more historically accurate?

One way to help answer this question is to mentally refurnish an interior as it originally appeared, and then compare this interior to similar Winterthur rooms created earlier. The 1940 Flock Room is a good choice because it represents an important stage in Winterthur's transition to museum standards.
Fig. 7: Exterior of the Kershner complex, circa 1962.
The Flock Room installation, under the leadership of Henry Francis du Pont and Thomas Waterman, demonstrated the most sincere commitment to architectural integrity at Winterthur to that date. The woodwork was installed only after the advantages and disadvantages of several proposals had been deliberated, and the furnishings were selected and arranged with comparable attention.

After considering how carefully the Flock Room furniture was selected and arranged, and comparing these furnishings to those of earlier interiors, it should be apparent whether du Pont was still decorating in his traditional mode, or trying an altered technique in tandem with his new attitudes toward architectural integrity.

The important role architect Thomas Waterman had come to play at Winterthur by 1940 must be appreciated before the complex processes of installing and furnishing the Flock Room can be understood.

Waterman had a unique approach to architectural design as a result of his diverse training. In 1919, at age eighteen, Waterman began eight years of training
under Ralph Adams Cram, a Gothic architect most noted for his church designs and influential text, *The Substance of Gothic*. Cram believed that a good designer must have a strong background in art history and an understanding of the aesthetic sense which motivated an era’s artistic products. Waterman, fortunately interested in these issues by choice, was rigorously schooled in art and aesthetic history.  

Cram’s approach to architectural design demanded confidence in one’s own subjective sensibilities and called upon the innate spirit of the artist in an almost mystic way. Although the Gothic style for which Cram was

---

7 Fay Campbell Kaynor, "Thomas Tileston Waterman: Student of American Colonial Architecture," *Winterthur Portfolio*, 20, nos. 2/3 (Summer/Autumn 1985), p. 104. This article, written by a niece of Waterman’s, is the most thorough consideration of the architect to date. Kaynor considers Waterman’s entire career, from his work at Williamsburg and Winterthur, to his career with the National Park Service and the Historic American Buildings Survey. Kaynor’s scholarship is superb; extensive oral interviews and archival research thoroughly buttress her statements, while citations from architectural journals of the 1920s through the 1940s provide examples of Waterman’s designs and essays. Kaynor also provides a summary and interpretation of Waterman’s four major publications, *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia* (1932), *The Early Architecture of North Carolina* (1941), *Mansions of Virginia* (1946), and *The Dwellings of Colonial America* (1950). The information on Waterman in this thesis is taken largely from Kaynor’s article.
famous never entered Waterman's own work, Cram's methodological convictions did: the belief, for example, that

if an architect sufficiently immersed himself in the ethos of a past era, he would be able to design a true regeneration of its original style, free of the revivalists use of mimicry.⁸

At the age of nineteen Waterman met his second mentor, William Sumner Appleton, who introduced the young architect to architectural preservation. Appleton, founder of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, felt passionately toward old buildings and endeavored to stabilize and restore them. When time permitted, Appleton and Waterman would go investigate threatened buildings together, and Waterman was soon producing measured drawings for the SPNEA.⁹

With the background of an intuitive architect and the agenda of a preservationist, Waterman had a fresh perspective on historic buildings. One of his most publicized efforts was the conjectural interpretation of the original seventeenth-century core of Boston's

⁸Ibid., p. 105.

⁹Ibid., p. 105.
Province House. Although his basic theory was later disproved, the project demonstrated Waterman's ability to reconstruct architecture conceptually based upon existing fragments. This foreshadowed Waterman's eventual role in the field of architectural history: "Documentation and speculation were combined in a way that challenged others to decide the merits." 

In July 1928, Waterman was one of the first four draftsmen hired to design the reconstructions at Colonial Williamsburg. Here, Waterman's ability to graft documentation and speculation was much needed, for no matter how heavily archaeological evidence and accuracy were stressed, educated conjecture was sometimes necessary.

---


12 "Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg," Architectural Record, 78, no. 6 (Dec. 1935), pp. 355-458. This article explains that when specific archaeological data was unavailable, the men in the drafting room had to present the best proposals possible based on educated conjecture (Kaynor's research at Williamsburg, p. 109 of her article, supports this statement).
Charles Hosmer, in describing the academic and cultural atmosphere surrounding the Williamsburg reconstruction, reinforces this idea and cites Williamsburg draftsman Clyde Trudell, who perceived that the Advisory Committee of Architects did not fully recognize that the real scholarship at Williamsburg was fast developing within the group of young men working down in the drafting room.13

Waterman's ability and willingness to work intuitively made him a valuable asset to the Williamsburg team. While others involved with the restoration "worked back through time" in search of documentary evidence, Waterman worked from a different direction:

Having placed himself mentally in the eighteenth century, according to Cram's theory, he addressed the architectural problems as he thought they would have been addressed by eighteenth-century people.14

While allowing him to work in his intuitive mode, the scholarly atmosphere at Williamsburg had also steeped


Waterman in research techniques and reinforced within him that historical accuracy was the primary objective.

His knowledge of architectural history, love of beauty, commitment to authenticity, and attention to detail now made Thomas Waterman the ideal architect to help du Pont rework the old portions of Winterthur and to add more period interiors to the wing superstructure.

In November, 1932, du Pont wrote to Waterman inquiring if the architect would be willing to plan and guide a short tour of Virginia architecture. Du Pont chose his guide well, for Waterman had not only learned a great deal about structures in the area through his work at Williamsburg, but had also just co-authored *Domestic Colonial Architecture of Tidewater Virginia*.

A shared enthusiasm for history and the physical record of the American past was evident during the tour, and the two men quickly became good friends. Waterman left for Europe in March of 1933 on a Guggenheim Fellowship, and du Pont encouraged the architect to continue his studies in Europe and even sent him money.14

Upon his return in December to his Washington, D.C., office, Waterman began an almost daily correspondence with Henry Francis du Pont that would continue for many years.

Their letters begin with polite salutations, but then immediately turn to the concerns of current Winterthur installations and remodelings. Du Pont's letters to Waterman typically present ten to twenty issues that need discussion or counselling, and Waterman was requested to serve not only as architectural consultant, but also as historical researcher, draftsman, and as general first assistant. Waterman would write back with his thoughts on paint color, architectural proportions, or whatever du Pont had inquired about, and the response from Winterthur would sometimes offer further commentary on the same points, or call new issues to Waterman's attention.

The following excerpts from lengthy letters written in 1937 focus on the shelves of particular rooms. The correspondences indicate not only how closely the two men worked, but also the attention to detail that was being exercised at Winterthur:
(Du Pont to Waterman, October 23, 1937)

Dear Tom:

I received your proposed arrangement for the Lowestoft Room and am not very enthusiastic about it.

In regard to the shelves for the Lowestoft, if we still keep painted shelves do you think it would be better to have them perfectly straight in front or would you leave them as is? Please give me your expert advice on this whole room.

(Waterman to du Pont, October 26, 1937)

Dear Harry:

I am not surprised that you are not enthusiastic about the Lowestoft Hall sketch. Straight painted 3/4" shelves would be certainly correct for the cupboards. I don't recall mahogany shelves in an open painted cupboard.

The question concerning the Wentworth Room shelves was the material and thickness. Why not use plain old unpainted pine boards 3/4" thick, and sheath the closet with the same?

(Du Pont to Waterman, October 30, 1937)

Dear Tom:

Thank you very much for your letter. I note that you are not surprised that I am not enthusiastic about the Lowestoft Hall sketch. I note what you say about the Wentworth Room shelves. How about the Ipswich Room?

---

15 Letters from Henry Francis du Pont to Thomas Waterman, October 23, 1937, and from Waterman to du Pont, October 26, 1937, Winterthur Archives, 75HF3/ Box 506, Folder Title: "Waterman, Thomas."
Waterman visited Winterthur with increasing frequency through the 1930s, and was continually campaigning for du Pont to have his interiors installed as accurately as possible. During these years, Waterman worked on some of Winterthur's most celebrated interiors.

In 1934 he committed his talents to the installation of eighteenth-century woodwork removed from Patuxent Manor in Lower Marlboro, Maryland. The fifth floor Red Room (fig. 8) was thus transformed into the Marlboro Room (fig. 9), and the bedroom directly above became the Patuxent Room (fig. 10).

From 1935 to 1936 du Pont and Waterman concentrated their attention on reworking the old Entrance Hall of the house. A massive marble staircase (fig. 11) was removed, and in its place was installed an elegant spiral staircase from the North Carolina Montmorenci House (fig. 12).

These installations are all located in the wing of Winterthur built by Henry Francis du Pont's father, who designed and furnished rooms according to a high Victorian aesthetic. Du Pont and Waterman were now systematically remodeling this wing in the 1930s; the
Fig. 8: The Red Room, circa 1920.
Fig. 9: The Marlboro Room, circa 1960.
Fig. 10: The Patuxent Room, 1985.
Fig. 11: Marble stairs in 1902 wing Entrance Hall, circa 1930.
Fig. 12: The Montmorenci Stair Hall, 1938 stereopticon view.
Victorian architecture and furnishings were being replaced by eighteenth-century elements.

In 1937 and 1938, initial designs were made for some eleven interiors, and the installation of woodwork for these rooms began. Among these were the Hart Room (fig. 13), China Hall (fig. 14), which is the "Lowestoft Hall" mentioned in the letters of 1937, and most important to this study, the Flock Room (fig. 15).

The Flock Room installation, created of woodwork from the 1715 Morattico house in Richmond County, Virginia, was a turning point in du Pont's commitment to architectural integrity.

Three scenic painted panels from Morattico had been on display in Winterthur's Wentworth Room since 1929 (fig. 16), but it was not until almost a decade later that additional Morattico woodwork was acquired. Soon after the panels were sold to Winterthur, the property changed hands and the new owner demolished the Morattico house. A summer cottage was built on the site, but it was not learned until years later that a 50' section of dado and three of the original doors from Morattico had been used in the cottage. Upon removal of this dado, it
Fig. 13: The Hart Room, circa 1960.
Fig. 14: The China Hall, circa 1960.
Fig. 15: The Flock Room, circa 1960.
Fig. 16: The Wentworth Room, 1935 stereopticon view.
was discovered that a large quantity of the remaining trim from Morattico had been stored under the eaves. Waterman was able to measure and retrieve sufficient woodwork to design the Flock Room, in which the painted panels were reunited with their original interior architecture, and the adjacent Morattico Hall (fig. 17).16

The acquisition of old woodwork does not immediately generate a period interior, though, and now decisions had to be made concerning the new room's design and its location within Winterthur. Additionally, the original Morattico fireplace and mantel had been destroyed, and a replacement was constructed based upon a contemporary example from another Virginia mansion. Waterman prepared several different installation schemes showing how the woodwork could be installed in different places and in different ways, and presented the sketches to du Pont.

16 Although it is not germane to this study to trace the evidence which allowed the Morattico elements to be installed accurately, Waterman's deductive mental reassembly of the interior architecture is fascinating. His thorough notes detailing how original schemes were determined have been edited by John Sweeney under the title "The Evolution of the Flock Room," Winterthur Newsletter, 4, no. 6 (August 27, 1958), pp. 1-4.
Fig. 17: The Morattico Hall, circa 1960.
Du Pont's first choice was to remove the paneling in the Pine Kitchen (fig. 18), present location of the Kershner Parlor and Kitchen, and install the Morattico woodwork and painted panels there, along with green flocked wallpaper that would cover the walls above the Morattico dado. "The Vauxhall Room is so swell," du Pont wrote to Waterman, "I think the present Pine Room suffers between it and the Wentworth Room."\textsuperscript{17}

The Pine Room, featuring hooked rugs and country furniture, was cast in the mold of Henry Davis Sleeper's interiors at his home, Beauport, on Eastern Point in Gloucester, Massachusetts. Sleeper had been a close friend of du Pont's, and had strongly influenced his early historic interiors; in 1927, they had even seriously discussed opening du Pont's Long Island Chestertown House as a public museum. Sleeper and du Pont had a falling out in the early 1930s, partially because du Pont's knowledge and tastes had grown beyond Sleeper's country interiors. The Pine Room, then, was not only less grand than the interiors surrounding it,\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17}Letter from Henry Francis du Pont to Thomas Waterman, July 28, 1938, Winterthur Archives, 75HF3/ Box 506, Folder Title: "Waterman, Thomas."
Fig. 18: The Pine Kitchen, 1935 stereopticon view.
but also possibly a sore spot for du Pont, making it a likely candidate for replacement.18

Upon a trial installation, it was discovered that the mantel and Morattico panels would not fit correctly in the Pine Kitchen.

Du Pont now had to find another location for the Morattico elements, and he sought the council of his long-time friend, Bertha Benkard. Like du Pont, Benkard was both a collector and a student of decorative arts, and shared his love of visiting museums and attending auctions and sales.19 Du Pont not only appreciated Benkard's friendship and respected her opinion on matters in the decorative arts, but also found that unlike Henry Sleeper, her tastes and senses of interior harmonies were quite similar to his own. For this reason, she was frequently called upon to help with the furnishings at Winterthur, and probably played a role secondary only to du Pont himself in decorating the interiors until her death in 1945.

18 Good discussions of the relationship between Sleeper and du Pont can be found in Hosmer, Preservation, pp. 913-916, and in Cantor, Winterthur, pp. 114-118.

19 Hosmer, Preservation, p. 915.
Benkard assisted du Pont in selecting the objects that would be placed in a room and helped to determine their final arrangement. She also helped select colors for walls, paper, and architectural details. Benkard's largest contributions, though, were in the area of textiles; she conducted extensive searches for appropriate fabrics, coordinated upholstery procedures, and oversaw the design and execution of curtains.20

Du Pont called upon Benkard's textile expertise in regard to the Morattico installation because wherever the woodwork would be installed, he wanted flocked wallpaper to accompany it. Du Pont had been working with Winterthur superintendent Leslie Potts to secure appropriate lengths of rare period flocked paper while Waterman was working on architectural proposals.21

Du Pont wrote to Benkard in 1941 asking for her opinion on two different samples of flocked wallpaper that could be used in the Morattico installation—soon

20 Ibid., p. 915

21 Letter from F. O. (probably du Pont's secretary, J. Frank Otwell) to Henry Francis du Pont, September 15, 1938, Winterthur Archives, 76HF3/ Box 507, Folder Title: "Flock Room."
to be called the Flock Room. He also wanted to know if
she thought it would be all right to hang mirrors and
pictures over the paper, as he feared it would "be
monotonous to have two rooms with nothing but wall-
paper." 22

In December 1939 Waterman surprised du Pont with
news that the beautiful effect created by flocked paper
would also be historically appropriate:

I have been doing some research at the Library
of Congress today and in reading the letter
book of Rawleigh Dowman of Morattico find that
while he was in England in 1763 he wrote home
for the size of the rooms as he proposed to
paper the rooms! In 1764 he wrote he would
bring the paper with him. I thought you might
like to know this in view of your proposal to
use the flock paper. 23

Du Pont thought next that he would like the
Morattico components in the fifth floor White Room (fig.
19), present location of the Empire Parlor (fig. 20).
Waterman obligingly drew up the requested plans, all the
while suggesting that the Morattico woodwork was best

---

22 Letter from Henry Francis du Pont to Bertha
Benkard, April 17, 1941, Winterthur Registrar's Office,
Room Folder Title: "Flock Room."

23 Letter from Thomas Waterman to Henry Francis
du Pont, December 6, 1939, Winterthur Archives, 76WC4/
Box 1323, Folder Title: "Flock Room."
Fig. 19: The White Room, circa 1920.
Fig. 20: The Empire Parlor, circa 1960.
suited to the fourth floor Billiard Room due to that room’s size and fenestration. Note that either of these plans would eliminate a Victorian interior.

After much polite deliberation and voluminous correspondence regarding the various places and ways in which the elements could be installed, Waterman concisely advised du Pont that his "Scheme C," the Billiard Room proposal, was more historically accurate than "Scheme A," the White Room proposal, and therefore preferable:

While I agree that the woodwork would look well in Scheme A, it is an impossible arrangement archaeologically and now that you have the original woodwork I think your responsibility to rearrange it as it was is greater.... In Scheme C it is ideal and approximates the original more than any other would.

Du Pont was persuaded, and in 1940 the Morattico woodwork was installed in the Billiard Room. The mantel, removed from the Woodhouse House in Princess Anne County, and the fireplace, a rebuilding of that in the Woodhouse

---

24 Letters from Henry Francis du Pont to Thomas Waterman, October 27 and October 28, 1938, Winterthur Archives, 75HF3/ Box 506, Folder Title: "Waterman, Thomas."

House, were installed in the east wall. The three painted panels were placed above the mantel, and the rest of the fireplace wall was covered with rectangular panels from Morattico. Waterman succeeded in reuniting these panels according to their former arrangement in the Morattico house. The adjacent Morattico Hall was designed with left over materials, and Waterman produced a five-page report detailing the steps he had taken to reassemble the Morattico paneling.

Waterman's council had yielded a beautiful and satisfying room, and du Pont was pleased with the results. His realistic attitude toward increased architectural accuracy at Winterthur is reflected in a letter to his sister, in which du Pont wrote that the new Morattico rooms were "just as practical for living purposes as before, and greatly improved from a museum point of view." Even though the Flock Room woodwork had been installed satisfactorily and the twin goals of accuracy


27 Cantor, Winterthur, p. 196.
and beauty had been achieved, the room was certainly not finished. The Flock Room now had to be appropriately furnished with antique domestic objects. Since du Pont invested so much time and consideration into having the woodwork of the room installed in the optimum manner, it comes as no surprise that he was also dedicated to achieving the best possible selection and arrangement of furnishings for the room.

Just as it was necessary to understand Waterman's background before considering the way in which the Flock Room architecture was installed, it is appropriate to consider du Pont's motivation as a collector before discussing the particular contents of the Flock Room.

The early decades of the twentieth century saw the development of period interiors in American public museums. Some of the important early period room installations will be discussed later in this essay in relation to du Pont's personal decorating style. For now it will suffice to say that after experiencing period rooms at major museums, wealthy Americans like Henry Francis du Pont, Henry Ford, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. were inspired to develop their own collections of American goods in American settings. The allure of
period rooms to private individuals of wealth can be seen as the logical conclusion of several trends.

First, a growing enthusiasm for collecting in general emerged in the 1920s. One of the major factors contributing to the collecting impulse was the growth of mass consumption, induced by the consumer revolution of the decade. Industrial production expanded tremendously during the twenties, and countless new products of all sizes and prices entered the marketplace—plastics, electrical appliances, new furniture styles, and innovative textiles.28

This explosion helped make Americans more sensitive to the precise age and status of objects; model and brand names established consumer status. With objects an increasingly large part of personal identity, it was no wonder that a renewed passion developed for learning more about and collecting older artifacts.29

28 Neil Harris, "Winterthur and America's Museum Age" (Winterthur, DE: The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1981). Harris describes the social stimuli behind the collecting impulse, explains the different environments presented at institutions such as Winterthur, Williamsburg, and Greenfield Village, and also explains how mass transportation and folk culture effected the explosion of museums.

The growing interest in old objects was due in part to the sudden proliferation of new objects. Antiques, for many people, represented "the antithesis of badly designed and homogenized modern mass productions."\(^{30}\)

Parallel to the sudden growth of mass consumption was an increasing interest in American things and ideas. Not so much a new fascination, this was a rediscovery of the roots of American folklore, poetry, crafts, architecture, and other manifestations of the human spirit. Biographies of Carry Nation, William Jennings Bryan, Horace Greeley, and other colorful Americans were written and avidly read. The New England Quarterly and American Literature were established, and Vernon Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought won a Pulitzer Prize.\(^{31}\)

In retrospect, it seems inevitable that these two inclinations would be united in the avid collecting of things American. Wealthy Americans like Henry Francis

\(^{30}\)Ibid. p. 6.

\(^{31}\)Ibid. p. 4.
du Pont began pursuing tangible bits of their nation's past which could be purchased and taken home. More than just a collecting impulse was at work, though, and the things they bought had special qualities. First, the acquisitions were not humble curiosities like sea shells or rocks; they were more like works of art and deserved to be displayed accordingly. Second, some of the objects were quite large and required significant space for storage or display. Finally, many of the finds were household goods and a portion of these goods were usable to some degree, not necessarily just idle treasures.

For private collectors who wanted to display and enjoy their swatches of America, the period room concept seemed an interesting, current, and visually pleasing option. John Sweeney notes:

they wanted to be creative in their collecting, to arrange (their collections) to best advantage and to live with them in the manner to which they were accustomed. In adapting the period room concept . . . they interpreted their arrangements in terms of their own lifestyles and the taste of the times. The rooms of the collectors of the 1920's are now themselves historic documents.32

Now that the Flock Room's architecture has been assessed and du Pont's motivation for furnishing the room as a period interior has been considered, the actual contents of the Flock Room may be examined and compared to the contents of earlier Winterthur interiors. The results will indicate if du Pont's attitudes about furnishings were changing along with his attitudes about architectural integrity. Several types of documents exist which indicate the original Flock Room furniture. First, there are a series of itemized furniture proposals with descriptive commentary on each object. Second, the floor plan of the Flock Room by Leslie Potts visually depicts the chosen furnishings--for example, two wing chairs and one desk. By comparing the information in these documents to the records in the Winterthur Registrar's Office, the specific objects originally in the room can be determined--for example, the particular wing chairs and desk chosen. These specific objects can then be tracked to their present locations at Winterthur and studied.

The same procedure can be repeated with other, earlier, interiors and their exact original contents then compared with those of the Flock Room.
This study focuses upon the actual furniture selected for the Flock Room—articles such as tables, chairs, and candle stands. While other decorating choices, such as color harmonies and the selection of accessories, are also important, it is the major furniture that defines the function and content of the room. The major furniture is also of prime importance since it establishes the boundaries of human movement through the room, and determines how spacious or crowded the room appears to be. In addition, the accessories in the room (candlesticks, ceramics, glass, etc.) are largely dictated by the tables and desks available for their display.

The earliest proposal of furniture and accessories for the Flock Room is dated August 29, 1940. More than a list of textiles, chairs, tables, and candlesticks, the inventory includes details regarding the objects' provenance, composition, and present location in the collection. Many lines and portions of lines in the typed text have been crossed-out, and additional comments have been added in du Pont's distinctive handwriting.
A few typical examples from the inventory indicate that even at this early stage of the furniture selection process, du Pont was thinking of particular pieces he wanted to move into the room, not just general types of objects. Also, he was considering the placement of objects within the room:

- Huge gateleg table (from Entrance Hall Southampton), center of room.
- Highboy (Joe K's), north wall, if needed.
- Huge brown leather back and seat armchair.
- Two iron floor lights, 2-arm with brass cups. 1 still to get.33

Three other similar proposals exist, dated September 19, 1940, January 13, 1941, and March 17, 1941. Each successive list is based upon the penciled revisions of the one which preceded it.

The revised proposals of major furniture for the Flock Room may be summarized as in Table 1.

33Document titled "Flock Room 1714-1725 Queen Anne died 1714," August 29, 1940, Winterthur Archives, 76HF3/ Box 507, Folder Title: "Flock Room." Du Pont noted, "No, put in Pine Room," next to the entry for the brown leather armchair, and changed the order for iron floor lights from two to three. The parenthetical "Joe K" indicates that the object came from the antique shop of Joe Kindig.
Table 1: Summary of Flock Room furniture proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Armchairs</th>
<th>Side chairs</th>
<th>Wing chairs</th>
<th>Day bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/29/40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stools</th>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>High chest</th>
<th>Small chest</th>
<th>Tables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/29/40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wooden candle stand</th>
<th>Iron candle stands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/29/40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The March 1941 furniture proposal corresponds almost exactly with the furnished floor plan of the Flock Room drawn by Winterthur estate superintendent Leslie Potts in 1943 (fig. 21). The Potts plan indicates four changes that du Pont apparently made after the 1941 proposal: 1) another side chair has been added; 2) another iron candle stand has been added; 3) a high chest has been added; 4) a small table has been deleted.

Potts had a numbering system that he consistently used during the preparation of his many Winterthur floor plans. Each interior was assigned a prefix of one number.
Fig. 21: The Flock Room floor plan by Leslie Potts, 1943.
and one letter; the prefix for the Flock Room, for example, is "1S." Major furnishings are numbered by adding consecutive numerals to the prefix; i.e., 1S1, 1S2, 1S3, etc. Accessories are numbered by adding consecutive numerals to the prefix which has a lower case letter; i.e., 1s1, 1s2, 1s3, etc.

Knowledge of this system allows the major furnishings of the original Flock Room to be identified in the Potts floor plan (Table 2).

Table 2: Flock Room contents identified on floor plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1S1</th>
<th>Side chair</th>
<th>1S14: Andirons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S2</td>
<td>Desk</td>
<td>1S15: Stool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S3</td>
<td>Side chair</td>
<td>1S16: Sconces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S4</td>
<td>Side chair</td>
<td>1S17: Iron candle stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S5</td>
<td>Wing chair</td>
<td>1S18: Wing chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S6</td>
<td>Wooden candle stand</td>
<td>1S19: Small Chest-on-Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S7</td>
<td>Iron candle stand</td>
<td>1S20: Daybed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S8</td>
<td>Side chair</td>
<td>1S21: Iron candle stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S9</td>
<td>High chest</td>
<td>1S22: Armchair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S10</td>
<td>Side chair</td>
<td>1S23: Armchair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S11</td>
<td>Stool</td>
<td>1S24: Armchair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S12</td>
<td>Armchair</td>
<td>1S25: Armchair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S13</td>
<td>Iron candle stand</td>
<td>1S26: Armchair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1S27: Table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information can help determine if there was a shift in du Pont's manner of furnishing rooms as Winterthur moved toward increased architectural accuracy. The original contents of the Flock Room can be compared.
to the original contents of earlier Winterthur interiors.

For this type of analysis, it is especially appropriate to compare the Flock Room to earlier rooms which are similar in nature. Although not a "parlor" in the modern sense of the word, the Flock Room is a parlor-type interior set up for general domestic seating, and should be compared to similar interiors—not, for example, to bedrooms and kitchens. The following parlor-type interiors were furnished prior to the Flock Room and comprise an appropriate fourteen-room comparison pool:

- Baltimore Drawing Room
- Blackwell Parlor
- Chestertown Room
- Chinese Parlor
- Dining Room Hall
- Gamon Room
- Imlay Room
- Lancaster Room
- Marlboro Room
- Phyfe Room
- Port Royal Parlor
- Readbourne Room
- Readbourne Stair Hall
- Wentworth Room

Like the Flock Room, the original contents and arrangements of these rooms may be ascertained by consulting Potts's floor plans. In addition, the series of hand-colored stereographic prints taken in 1935 and 1937 document the appearance of rooms. These prints are valuable because they serve as a double-check when used in conjunction with the floor plans, and they can
often make clear the exact pieces placed in a room when the floor plans are not specific enough (candle stands, for example, are often identical in plan).[^34]

The treatment of seating furniture—chairs, daybeds, sofas, and stools—is of particular importance when considering the interiors. These furnishings are more numerous than any other genre of major furniture in Winterthur rooms, and are instrumental in du Pont's overall design schemes. An examination of the concentration and arrangement of seating furniture in the Flock Room and in the fourteen-room comparison pool indicates two techniques to achieve visual balance within an interior, and two larger general methods of displaying seating furniture. From these two latter methods can be identified a pair of historical traditions within which du Pont is operating.

The Flock Room serves as a satisfactory example to explore du Pont's two techniques of creating balanced interiors since the room is typical not only of the rooms in the comparison pool, but also of Winterthur interiors.

[^34]: Stereographic views exist of every room in the comparison pool except for the Blackwell Parlor.
as a whole. First, balance is achieved by making one half of the room mirror the other half. Symmetry is realized in the Flock Room plan if a line is drawn from the middle of the south wall to the middle of the north wall: each piece of seating furniture has a counter-weight, with wing chairs balanced by armchairs, side chairs balanced by other side chairs or stools, and the daybed is divided evenly in half.

Second, balance is achieved by uniformly using seating furniture to flank other large forms: the desk is flanked by side chairs, as is the high chest, and the hearth area has a chair at either end. In this way seating furniture is used as a consistent framing device for other objects. Again, the practice is not just employed in the Flock Room, but is typical of du Pont's decorating aesthetic.

There are two basic strategies regarding du Pont's concentration and arrangement of seating furniture which operate on a more general level than his techniques of achieving balance. First, du Pont almost always locates seating furniture against the wall so that it faces into the room. This strategy can be seen at work not only in the floor plan and images of the Flock Room,
but also in the images of other rooms presented earlier in this study. Second, selected pieces of seating furniture are frequently grouped in a conversational manner in the room.

The first strategy, a lining up of seating furniture against the walls, is apparent in every room of this study's pool and also in almost every interior at Winterthur. The second strategy, arranging seating furniture in one or more conversational settings, is evident in the original arrangements of eight of the fourteen rooms in the pool. In some cases chairs are arranged around a table, similar to the central arrangement in the Flock Room, while in other rooms sofas and chairs are grouped facing each other, or chairs are clustered in front of an inviting fireplace. Fig. 22 shows how a sofa and corner chairs are arranged conversationally around a table in the Marlboro Room, and fig. 23 illustrates a variety of furniture clustering techniques in the Chinese Parlor.

These strategies of seating furniture placement locate du Pont in two historical traditions. First, du Pont shows an awareness of seventeenth- and early-
Fig. 22: The Marlboro Room, 1985.
Fig. 23: The Chinese Parlor, 1935 stereopticon view.
eighteenth-century custom by placing furniture against the room walls. Many American houses of that era were built in the manner of medieval English structures which typically included a "Hall." The Hall, one of the usual two ground-floor rooms of a house, was intended to serve many purposes: a family could eat, work, cook, and sleep in the same space.\textsuperscript{35} An obvious requirement of this sort of room use is that space-consuming furniture such as tables and chairs can not be permanently stationed in the middle of the room. Hence, it was customary to keep furniture against the walls of the room and to bring it out as was required and return it when no longer needed.\textsuperscript{36}

It is important to acknowledge this Winterthur display technique faithful to historical practice since this study concerns aspects of du Pont's increased commitment to historical accuracy. This is an historically truthful furniture display technique used by


du Pont even in his earliest Winterthur interiors, not a later effort to increase the authenticity of his settings.

It must be noted, however, that this method of display has practical advantages independent of historical reference. Lining furniture such as chairs up against a wall is an efficient use of space which allowed du Pont to display more objects in his interiors. In effect, two display options are in use simultaneously: seating furniture is located against the walls as though the room is uninhabited, but conversational settings are also present as though the inhabitants had just left the room for a moment. Although not a literal "doubling" of furniture, more furnishings are present than would be if either separate scenario were being individually depicted.

The conversational settings in the interiors which suggest that the room is potentially in use identify a second historical tradition within which du Pont is operating. This tradition concerns the way in which period interiors have customarily been presented in the twentieth century.
The first true period rooms in the United States were designed by George Francis Dow for the Essex Institute in 1907.\textsuperscript{37} The furniture of Dow's three interiors was not only accurate, but was also arranged to give the impression that the rooms were lived in.

The Essex Institute's 1800 Parlor (fig. 24) featured a side chair and tea table arranged comfortably in front of the fireplace as well as a fire screen, or pole screen, situated between chair and hearth as though the inhabitant had been protecting his face from the heat of the fire.

Du Pont's Flock Room has chairs gathered around the large central table in a way which suggests conversation, and a side chair is positioned at the fall-front desk as though someone had recently been working there.

The particular pieces of seating furniture chosen for the Flock Room demonstrate du Pont's ability to provide a concise lessons in material culture scholarship based on visual comparison. Almost every interior at

Fig. 24: The Parlor at the Essex Institute, 1907.
Winterthur offers this sort of lesson to the careful observer. Both the furniture and the interior woodwork of the Blackwell Parlor, for example, demonstrate the intricate carving devoted to the most metropolitan Chippendale tastes (fig. 25), while the furnishings of the Phyfe Room (fig. 26) concentrate upon the style of a particular cabinetmaker.

One outstanding lesson offered by the assortment of seating furniture in the Flock Room is a menu of decorative and finishing options available to craftsmen of the William and Mary period. The full range of upholstery options are presented: leather or textile upholstery, caning, and plain wooden seats and backs. Some chairs feature carved decoration while others rely upon turned ornament, and a full range of foot treatment is offered—turned feet, Spanish feet, and ball feet.

The variety of seating furniture present in the Flock Room—wing chairs, side chairs, armchairs, stools, and daybed—is consistent with du Pont's earlier interior compositions. Every room in the comparison pool has an assortment of seating furniture comparable to that in the Flock Room, with consideration given to changing styles and regional preferences.
Fig. 25: Detail of chair and carved woodwork in the Blackwell Parlor, 1985.
Fig. 26: The Phyfe Room, circa 1960.
Through the preceding examination of the Flock Room's seating furniture, some major aspects of du Pont's furniture selection and arrangement processes have been identified, such as his knowledge of historic practices, continuation of established period room display methods, and missions of visual interest and balance. Furthermore, it has been discovered that the Flock Room is very much like du Pont's earlier interiors in its selection and arrangement of seating furniture.

The remaining furniture of the Flock Room—a table, a desk, two chests, and a few candle stands—deserve brief attention now since they have additional useful information to offer.

The central table and high chest, easily seen in figs. 1 and 15, are important to the over-all room composition because of their Solomonic, or spiral-turned, legs. Du Pont's meticulous attention to coordinating details within a room has not been noted yet in this study, but is exemplified well by the repeated spiral elements in the Flock Room. Not only the table and high chest have spiral-turned legs, but also the small chest-on-frame and a side chair. This shape is echoed
throughout the room by brass andirons and candlesticks which also feature a twisting contour.

A visual theme such as twist-turnings is present in virtually every one of du Pont's interiors. Visual themes are worthwhile assets to the rooms since they provide unifying elements that require no special connoisseurship skills or artistic appreciation. The Blackwell Parlor, for example, features furniture with rare "hairy paw" feet; the Imlay Room furniture has painted decoration; the Readbourne Room features objects with "japanned" ornament that imitates oriental lacquer work.

The high chest and the smaller chest-on-frame are complimentary objects with more in common than just their spiral-turned legs. Each comes from the Carolean area of New York and has a reddish-brown luster, although the high chest has rich veneer while the smaller object is painted. The chests also have a similar design, each having three levels of drawers in its top section and a single drawer in its base.

Du Pont's arrangement of the high chest and the smaller chest is clever and effective. A sense of
balance is created by the two forms since they are visually similar and located on opposite walls; however, the smaller chest is positioned at the head of the daybed so that its low top can serve as a convenient end table. Du Pont has accessories on the small chest such as a candle stick and a snuff box.

The desk at the Flock Room's west wall balances the east wall hearth area, and also extends the illusion that the room is actually lived in. The desk's writing surface is exposed and appropriate accessories such as an ink well, sander, and quill holder seem to be ready for use.

Candle stands are a form for which du Pont seems to have held a particular fondness, and they appear quite commonly in Winterthur interiors. There are two basic types of candle stands: iron candle stands with a cross arm holding candle sockets (two are visible in fig. 22), and wooden candle stands which are essentially small, usually round, tables on a columnar shaft. While candles are inserted directly into the cups of the iron type, the wooden type is intended to support a separate metal candle stick which holds the candle.
The iron type is an older form which remained popular through the 1730s, the early Queen Anne period. The wooden type came into use around 1715, the William and Mary period and the era represented by the Flock Room, and was most popular during the Queen Anne and Chippendale periods, through the 1780s.

Du Pont's selection of appropriate candle stands for his interiors again demonstrates a knowledge of historically correct usage and a desire to furnish his interiors with accuracy. The Flock Room has mostly iron candle stands with one wooden one; an appropriate mixture for a William and Mary period interior.

One of the most significant ways of comparing the contents of the Flock Room to the contents of the earlier interiors is to consider the furnishings in terms of the relative room space they occupy. Percentages of room space occupied by furniture in the fourteen earlier rooms may be compared to the percentage of room space occupied by furniture in the later Flock Room. The results will indicate whether the Flock Room is more sparsely or densely furnished.
Such a comparison has many advantages. A one-to-one comparison of furnishings, for example, would pose such questions as: The Flock Room has exactly one daybed and one desk. Is this consistent with the fourteen earlier rooms in the pool? Any answer would be of limited value since the daybed form had fallen from favor by the Chippendale period; nine of the fourteen rooms in the comparison pool are Chippendale or later, and therefore would not logically have daybeds. Additionally, some of the interiors, such as the Chestertown Room and the Gamon Room, are quite small and simply could not contain more than one large piece of furniture such as a daybed or desk.

Table 3 is a summary of the percentages of floor area and the percentages of room volume occupied by furniture in the comparison pool rooms and the Flock Room. Detailed accounts of each room's furnishings and space requirements may be found in tables 4-18 (pp. 80-107).
Table 3: Room areas and volumes occupied by furniture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOM NAME</th>
<th>FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED</th>
<th>ROOM VOLUME OCCUPIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Drawing Room</td>
<td>27.72%</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell Parlor</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestertown Room</td>
<td>24.28%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Parlor</td>
<td>35.13%</td>
<td>8.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Room Hall</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamon Room</td>
<td>24.05%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imlay Room</td>
<td>27.42%</td>
<td>7.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Room</td>
<td>21.06%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlboro Room</td>
<td>29.84%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyfe Room</td>
<td>24.33%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Royal Parlor</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readbourne Room</td>
<td>31.27%</td>
<td>9.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readbourne Stair Hall</td>
<td>26.97%</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth Room</td>
<td>21.42%</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flock Room</td>
<td>22.88%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in table 3 indicates that comparable amounts of space were devoted to furniture in the older interiors and in the Flock Room. While the proportions of space occupied by furniture in the Flock Room are slightly lower than the average amounts, they are not different enough to suggest that du Pont was making any effort to furnish the Flock Room more sparsely.

It can be stated, then, that as of 1943 du Pont was making no effort to respond to a major historical misrepresentation within his interiors: there is simply too much furniture in the rooms for them to be
If there were substantially less furniture in the Flock Room than in the earlier interiors, du Pont may have been striving to make his interior settings more historically accurate as his woodwork installations became more authentic.

Instead, it seems likely that du Pont's increased interest in architectural accuracy is more closely linked to object connoisseurship than it is to historical accuracy. Due to Thomas Waterman's influence, du Pont became more aware of architecture as an important part of American material culture and wanted to display it at its finest. Just as a chair with many repairs and new parts was not as desirable to du Pont as one in pristine condition, he came to prefer architectural elements that were installed as authentically as possible and with as few new additions as possible.

---

38 Abbott Lowell Cummings, Rural Household Inventories 1675-1775 (Portland, Maine: Anthoensen Press, 1964) is a good source for actual colonial inventories, and indicates the amounts of furnishings common in homes. Also useful and accessible is The Probate Records of Essex County, Massachusetts (Salem: Essex Institute, 1917). A cursory examination of household inventories indicates that du Pont's interiors have an excess of furniture in them; even interiors of the upper classes did not have the quantity of seating furniture and textiles commonly found in Winterthur.
Several examples of object selection and placement have been presented in this study which demonstrate that du Pont was concerned with historical accuracy. But his increased commitment to architectural integrity is part of his desire to display the finest colonial American products possible.

Du Pont's motivation to display the most exquisite and artistically beautiful products is another part of the "period room tradition," but it rises not from the work of Dow at the Essex Institute, but from the second great public period room display: the Metropolitan Museum of Art's American Wing of 1924.

The American Wing was made possible through the purchase of the enormous H. Eugene Bolles collection, which included outstanding examples of American furniture. Although Henry Watson Kent negotiated this purchase and made the original proposals for the American Wing, it was Committee Chairman R. T. H. Halsey who played a role similar to du Pont's at Winterthur and orchestrated the interiors. Halsey was responsible for choosing colors for woodwork, walls, and fabric. He selected the floor treatments and window treatments that were to be used, and arranged the furnishings. He
accessorized the interiors with prints, ceramics, glassware, and the other stuff of daily life.  

Halsey's interiors differed sharply from those Dow had created at the Essex Institute, and du Pont echoed many of the options chosen by Halsey. Most of the rooms at the Metropolitan Museum of Art were completely open and guests could walk about in them freely (fig. 26), an idea repeated by du Pont. This stands in sharp contrast to Dow's rooms, which were basically three-walled compositions which were to be viewed from the cut-away fourth side.  

More importantly, Dow selected objects for display which represented the common man from the American past, not the elite. His furnishings were, appropriately, not of the highest quality and not the most visually pleasing. Dow's objectives were historical  

---  


Fig. 27: The Wentworth Room at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985.
and educational. He was interested in old objects not because they were beautiful or artful, but because they could yield information about America's past.  

Halsey, on the other hand, insisted on exhibiting only the most perfectly designed and executed objects available. His interiors displayed what he felt to be the pinnacle of American tastes and craftsmanship, not the material culture of the common man. Although du Pont emulated Dow by arranging Winterthur interiors to appear lived in, he was more akin to the philosophy of Halsey: the finest objects available displayed as beautifully as possible.

Du Pont became increasingly appreciative of architectural elements as fine objects, and sought to display them as beautifully as possible; that meant with a minimum of modification and reproduction.

Du Pont's commitments to historical accuracy, then, appear as "constants" through his decorating career; not factors which he sought to enlarge and

41 Stillinger, The Antiquers, p. 141.
perfect. His skill as an object connoisseur, conversely, expanded through his life.

His first period interiors, in his seaside Chestertown House in Southampton, Long Island, were devoted primarily to country setting of pine furniture, hooked rugs, and displays of colored glass.

At Winterthur he further developed his collection and knowledge of more metropolitan furniture and accessories. Elegant interiors such as the Port Royal Parlor and the Readbourne Room were created in the 1930s which featured outstanding Queen Anne and Chippendale furniture, as well as fine silver and ceramics.

Through his friendship with Thomas Waterman du Pont strongly increased his consideration of architectural elements as fine objects in the 1940s. The commitment would continue to escalate until Winterthur woodwork was being installed with virtual perfection.

By the end of his life, du Pont's knowledge of American objects and his collections of these objects had expanded to include the most elaborate rococo interiors and beautifully austere Shaker architecture and goods.
The result is a museum which carries Henry Francis du Pont's ideals of scholarship and interior design into the present. While new objects continually become part of Winterthur's collections and new educational facilities are created, the museum remains committed to du Pont's vision of outstanding American objects displayed beautifully. Unlike an art museum limited to aesthetic presentation or an historic site devoted to social interpretation, Winterthur offers the rare opportunity to view objects both as articles of artistic and craft accomplishment, and as physical documents of history.
Table 4: Flock Room data.

FLOCK ROOM dimensions:
  24 ft., 6.5 in. X 18 ft., 8 in.
  10 ft., 7 in. ceiling.
  Area: 458.11 ft.²
  Volume: 4848.34 ft.³

Flock Room contents:

1-5) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 5)
    H: 47 in.; W: 18 in.; D: 17.75 in. (each)
    Area: 2.22 ft.² (each)  Volume: 8.69 ft.³ (each)

6-11) Arm chairs (measurements are averages of 6)
    H: 47.25 in.; W: 24 in.; D: 23.5 in. (each)
    Area: 3.92 ft.² (each)  Volume: 15.42 ft.³ (each)

12-13) Wing chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
    H: 49.75 in.; W: 31.75 in.; D: 33.25 in. (each)
    Area: 7.33 ft.² (each)  Volume: 30.39 ft.³ (each)

14-15) Stools (measurements are averages of 2)
    Area: 2.00 ft.² (each)  Volume: 3.67 ft.³ (each)

42 Tables 4 through 18 present the original contents of rooms as documented in floor plans by Leslie Potts. Each major piece of furniture was identified in its current location, and measured to the nearest quarter inch. When numerous examples of the same form are present in a room, the objects were measured individually and then the mathematical mean is determined and presented. For example, the Flock Room originally contained 25 major pieces of furniture; 5 of these were side chairs (numbered 1-5 in Table 4). These side chairs were located, measured, and then their dimensions were averaged together to find a mean chair with measurements of 47 in. X 18 in. X 17.75 in. This procedure greatly reduces the amount of space needed to present the measurements while still allowing each object to be considered individually.
16) Daybed
   Area: 10.79 ft.²   Volume: 33.94 ft.³

17) Desk
   H: 38.25 in.; W: 35.5 in.; D: 19.75 in.
   Area: 4.87 ft.²   Volume: 15.52 ft.³

18) High chest (Chest-on-Frame)
   H: 49 in.; W: 42.25 in.; D: 26 in.
   Area: 7.63 ft.²   Volume: 31.15 ft.³

19) Small Chest-on-Frame
   H: 41.5 in.; W: 27.5 in.; D: 13.5 in.
   Area: 2.58 ft.²   Volume: 8.92 ft.³

20) Gateleg table, open
   Area: 16.50 ft.²   Volume: 31.96 ft.³

21) Wooden candle stand
   H: 26.5 in.; Diam: 15.5 in.
   Area: 1.69 ft.²   Volume: 3.74 ft.³

22-25) Iron candle stands
   (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 66.5 in.; W: 19.25 in.; D: 14 in. (each)
   Area: 1.87 ft.² (each)   Volume: 10.37 ft.³ (each)

Total area occupied by furniture: 104.82 ft.²
22.88% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 370.80 ft.³
7.65% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 5: Baltimore Drawing Room data.

Baltimore Drawing Room dimensions:
16 ft., 2.75 in. X 24 ft., 3.75 in.
12 ft. ceiling
(Less fireplace/flue with area 6.68 ft.² and volume 80.21 ft.³)
Area: 387.89 ft.²
Volume: 4654.65 ft.³

Baltimore Drawing Room contents:

1-7) Side chairs (measurements are average of 7)
H: 36.75 in.; W: 20.5 in.; D: 21 in.
Area: 2.99 ft.² (each) Volume: 9.16 ft.³ (each)

8) Armchair
H: 41.5 in.; W: 24.5 in.; D: 27.75 in.
Area: 4.72 ft.² Volume: 16.33 ft.³

9-11) Sofas (measurements are averages of 3)
H: 39 in.; W: 70.5 in.; D: 25 in. (each)
Area: 12.24 ft.² (each) Volume: 39.78 ft.³ (each)

12) Desk and bookcase
H: 102.5 in.; W: 42.25 in.; D: 22.75 in.
Area: 6.67 ft.² Volume: 57.01 ft.³

13-16) Pier tables (measurements are averages of 4)
H: 36.25 in.; W: 44.25 in.; D: 20.75 in. (each)
Area: 6.38 ft.² (each) Volume: 19.26 ft.³ (each)

17-18) Tables (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 28.25 in.; W: 24 in.; D: 18 in. (each)
Area: 3.00 ft.² (each) Volume: 7.06 ft.³ (each)

19) Card table, closed
H: 29.75 in.; W: 35.75 in.; D: 17 in.
Area: 4.22 ft.² Volume: 10.46 ft.³

20) Kettle stand
H: 27.75 in.; W: 13.75 in.; D: 12.5 in.
Area: 1.19 ft.² Volume: 2.76 ft.³
21-22) Wooden candle stands
(measurements are averages of 2)
H: 27 in.; Diam: 12 in. (each)
Area: .78 ft.² (each)  Volume: 1.77 ft.³ (each)

Total area occupied by furniture: 107.53 ft.²
27.72% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 364.72 ft.³
7.83% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 6: Blackwell Parlor data.

BLACKWELL PARLOR dimensions:
  19 ft., 6 in. X 18 ft., 1 in.
  11 ft. ceiling.
  (Less fireplace/flue with area 14.44 ft.\(^2\) and volume 158.81 ft.\(^3\))
  Area: 338.19 ft.\(^2\)
  Volume: 3720.06 ft.\(^3\)

Blackwell Parlor contents:

1) Wing chair
   H: 45 in.; W: 34.25 in.; D: 31 in.
   Area: 7.37 ft.\(^2\) Volume: 27.65 ft.\(^3\)

2-9) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 8)
   H: 38 in.; W: 23.5 in.; D: 22 in. (each)
   Area: 3.59 ft.\(^2\) (each) Volume: 11.37 ft.\(^3\) (each)

10) Settee
   H: 38.75 in.; W: 66.25 in.; D: 30 in.
   Area: 13.80 ft.\(^2\) Volume: 44.57 ft.\(^3\)

11-13) Card tables, closed
   (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 30.25 in.; W: 32.25 in.; D: 15.75 in. (each)
   Area: 3.53 ft.\(^2\) (each) Volume: 8.89 ft.\(^3\) (each)

14) Tea table
    H: 28 in.; Diam: 34.5 in.
    Area: 5.76 ft.\(^2\) Volume: 13.44 ft.\(^3\)

15) Table
    Area: 7.45 ft.\(^2\) Volume: 21.12 ft.\(^3\)

16) Pole screen
    Area: 2.11 ft.\(^2\) Volume: 10.91 ft.\(^3\)

17) Iron candle stand
    Area: 1.57 ft.\(^2\) Volume: 9.42 ft.\(^3\)
Total area occupied by furniture: 77.37 ft.$^2$

22.87% of floor area occupied by furniture.

Total volume occupied by furniture: 244.74 ft.$^3$

6.57% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 7: Chestertown Room data.

CHESTERTOWN ROOM dimensions:
15 ft., 9 in. X 13 ft., 9 in.
10 ft., 5 in. ceiling
Area: 216.56 ft.²
Volume: 2255.86

Chestertown Room contents:

1-2) Arm chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 41.75 in.; W: 25.25 in.; D: 26 in. (each)
Area: 4.56 ft.² (each) Volume: 15.86 ft.³ (each)

3-4) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 37.25 in.; W: 21 in.; D: 18.75 in. (each)
Area: 2.73 ft.² (each) Volume: 8.49 ft.³ (each)

5) Stool
Area: 2.91 ft.² Volume: 4.18 ft.³

6-8) Tables (measurements are averages of 3)
H: 26 in.; W: 33.25 in.; D: 20.75 in. (each)
Area: 4.79 ft.² (each) Volume: 10.38 ft.³ (each)

9) Card table, closed
H: 29.5 in.; W: 32 in.; D: 15.5 in.
Area: 3.44 ft.² Volume: 8.47 ft.³

10) Chest of drawers
H: 33.5 in.; W: 38 in.; D: 20.5 in.
Area: 5.41 ft.² Volume: 15.10 ft.³

11) Desk
Area: 5.10 ft.² Volume: 14.34 ft.³

12) Fire screen
Area: 4.59 ft.² Volume: 19.14 ft.³

13) Kettle stand
Area: 2.19 ft.² Volume: 5.29 ft.³
Total area occupied by furniture: 52.59 ft.$^2$

24.28% of floor area occupied by furniture.

Total volume occupied by furniture: 146.36 ft.$^3$

6.49% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 8: Chinese Parlor data.

CHINESE PARLOR dimensions:
25 ft. X 27 ft, 10.5 in.
12 ft., 8 in. ceiling.
(Less fireplace/flue with area 6.84 ft.² and volume 86.60 ft.³)
Area: 690.03 ft.²
Volume: 8740.48 ft.³

Chinese Parlor contents:

1-4) Arm chairs (measurements are averages of 4)
H: 39.25 in.; W: 25.5 in.; D: 23 in. (each)
Area: 4.07 ft.² (each) Volume: 13.32 ft.³ (each)

5-6) French arm chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 41 in.; W: 28.25 in.; D: 29 in. (each)
Area: 5.69 ft.² (each) Volume: 19.44 ft.³ (each)

7-19) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 13)
H: 39 in.; W: 24 in.; D: 21.5 in. (each)
Area: 3.58 ft.² (each) Volume: 11.65 ft.³ (each)

20-21) Wing chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 46.75 in; W: 39 in.; D: 30.25 in. (each)
Area: 8.19 ft.² (each) Volume: 31.92 ft.³ (each)

22-24) Sofas (measurements are averages of 3)
H: 41 in.; W: 99.75 in.; D: 33.75 in. (each)
Area: 23.38 ft.² (each) Volume: 79.88 ft.³ (each)

25) Card table, closed
Area: 3.69 ft.² Volume: 8.85 ft.³

26) Card table, open
Area: 7.39 ft.² Volume: 17.09 ft.³

27) Tea table
H: 27 in.; Diam: 33 in.
Area: 5.94 ft.² Volume: 13.36 ft.³
28-29) Breakfast tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 27.75 in.; W: 14.25 in.; D: 28.75 in. (each)
   Area: 2.85 ft.²  Volume: 6.58 ft.³

30-33) Tables (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 28.25 in.; W: 32.5 in.; D: 17.5 in. (each)
   Area: 3.95 ft.²  Volume: 9.31 ft.³ (each)

34) Large table
   H: 30.25 in.; W: 56.75 in.; D: 27.5 in.
   Area: 10.84 ft.²  Volume: 27.32 ft.³

35-37) Stands (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 30 in.; W: 20 in.; D: 14 in. (each)
   Area: 1.94 ft.²  Volume: 4.86 ft.³ (each)

38) Piano
   H: 38.5 in.; W: 57 in.; D: 67 in.
   Area: 26.52 ft.²  Volume: 85.09 ft.³

Total area occupied by furniture: 242.42 ft.²
   35.13% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 763.78 ft.³
   8.73% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 9: Dining Room Hall data.

DINING ROOM HALL dimensions:
11 ft., 6 in. X 43 ft., 2.5 in.
12 ft., 1 in. ceiling.
Area: 496.90 ft.²
Volume: 6004.16 ft.³

Dining Room Hall contents:

1-3) Arm chairs (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 36.5 in.; W: 21 in.; D: 21.25 in. (each)
   Area: 3.10 ft.² (each) Volume: 9.43 ft.³

4-7) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 39.5 in.; W: 21 in.; D: 21 in. (each)
   Area: 3.06 ft.² (each) Volume: 10.08 ft.³ (each)

8-11) Lolling chairs (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 44 in.; W: 25.5 in.; D: 26.5 in. (each)
   Area: 4.69 ft.² (each) Volume: 17.21 ft.³ (each)

12-14) Sofas (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 37.5 in.; W: 80.25 in.; D: 33 in. (each)
   Area: 18.39 ft.² (each) Volume: 57.47 ft.³ (each)

15) Desk and bookcase
   H: 89.25 in.; W: 67.75 in.; D: 17.75 in.
   Area: 8.35 ft.² Volume: 62.11 ft.³

16) Desk
   H: 41.5 in.; W: 37.75 in.; D: 19.75 in.
   Area: 5.18 ft.² Volume: 17.91 ft.³

17) Card table, closed
   H: 30.5 in.; W: 34.5 in.; D: 16.25 in.
   Area: 3.89 ft.² Volume: 9.89 ft.³

18-19) Work tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 24.5 in.; W: 22 in.; D: 21 in. (each)
   Area: 3.21 ft.² (each) Volume: 6.55 ft.³ (each)

20-22) Tables (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 29.25 in.; W: 33 in.; D: 18.25 in. (each)
   Area: 4.18 ft.² (each) Volume: 10.19 ft.³ (each)
23) Piano
   H: 38.5 in.; W: 68 in.; D: 26.5 in.
   Area: 12.51 ft.\(^2\)  Volume: 40.15 ft.\(^3\)

24) Piano stool
   Area: 2.07 ft.\(^2\)  Volume: 5.34 ft.\(^3\)

Total area occupied by furniture: 146.43 ft.\(^2\)
29.47% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 488.93 ft.\(^3\)
8.14% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 10: Gamon Room data.

**GAMON ROOM dimensions:**
10 ft., 6 in. X 13 ft., 6.5 in.
7 ft., 4 in. ceiling.
(Less triangular corner cupboard with area 3.82 ft.² and volume: 28.01 ft.³)

Area: 138.37 ft.²
Volume: 1014.70 ft.³

Gamon Room contents:

1) Side chair
   H: 34.5 in.; W: 23.5 in.; D: 22.5 in.
   Area: 3.67 ft.²  Volume: 10.56 ft.³

2-5) Arm chairs (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 39.75 in.; W: 28.25 in.; D: 22 in. (each)
   Area: 4.32 ft.² (each)  Volume: 14.30 ft.³ (each)

6-8) Tables (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 26.5 in.; W: 32 in.; D: 18.5 in. (each)
   Area: 4.11 ft.² (each)  Volume: 9.08 ft.³ (each)

Total area occupied by furniture: 33.28 ft.²
24.05% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 95.0 ft.³
9.36% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 11: Imlay Room data.

IMLAY ROOM dimensions:
16 ft., 2.5 in. X 22 ft., 2 in.
9 ft., 4 in. ceiling.
(Less fireplace/flue with area 17.00 ft.²
and volume 158.63 ft.³)
Area: 359.28 ft.²
Volume: 3353.32 ft.³

Imlay Room contents:
1-8) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 8)
H: 33.25 in.; W: 19 in.; D: 15.5 in. (each)
Area: 2.04 ft.² (each) Volume: 5.67 ft.³ (each)
9-10) Arm chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 34.25 in.; W: 19.75 in.; D: 16.75 in. (each)
Area: 2.30 ft.² (each) Volume: 6.56 ft.³ (each)
11) Wing chair
Area: 2.98 ft.² Volume: 10.43 ft.³
12) Sofa
H: 34.5 in.; W: 76.75 in.; D: 21 in.
Area: 11.19 ft.² Volume: 32.18 ft.³
13) Settee
H: 32.75 in.; W: 80 in.; D: 19 in.
Area: 10.56 ft.² Volume: 28.81 ft.³
14) Window seat
Area: 4.76 ft.² Volume: 12.50 ft.³
15-16) Work tables (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 28.5 in.; W: 19 in.; D: 15.75 in. (each)
Area: 2.08 ft.² (each) Volume: 4.94 ft.³ (each)
17) Card table, closed
Area: 4.62 ft.² Volume: 11.06 ft.³
18-19) Card tables, open (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 28.75 in.; W: 36 in.; D: 35.75 in. (each)
   Area: 8.94 ft.² (each)  Volume: 21.41 ft.³ (each)

20-21) Nests of tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 27 in.; W: 19.5 in.; D: 13.5 in. (each)
   Area: 1.83 ft.² (each)  Volume: 4.11 ft.³ (each)

22-23) Tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 31 in.; W: 41.5 in.; D: 18.75 in. (each)
   Area: 5.40 ft.² (each)  Volume: 13.96 ft.³ (each)

24) Wooden candle stand
   Area: 1.93 ft.²  Volume: 4.22 ft.³

25) Canterbury
   Area: 3.29 ft.²  Volume: 7.69 ft.³

26) Pole screen
   H: 64 in.; W: 23 in.; D: 11 in.
   Area: 1.76 ft.²  Volume: 9.37 ft.³

Total area occupied by furniture: 98.51 ft.²
   27.42% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 263.58 ft.³
   7.86% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 12: Lancaster Room data.

**LANCASTER ROOM dimensions:**
- 18 ft., 9 in. X 18 ft., 5 in.
- 10 ft., 11 in. ceiling.
  (Plus two recesses, each with area 6.0 ft.² and volume 65.5 ft.³)

| Area: 357.31 ft.² | Volume: 3900.66 ft.³ |

**Lancaster Room contents:**

1-2) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 2)
- H: 36.5 in.; W: 22 in.; D: 20.75 in. (each)
- Area: 3.17 ft.² (each) Volume: 9.64 ft.³ (each)

3-5) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 3)
- Area: 2.73 ft.² (each) Volume: 8.42 ft.³ (each)

6) Corner chair
- Area: 4.57 ft.² Volume: 11.99 ft.³

7-8) Wing chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
- H: 46.5 in.; W: 34.25 in.; D: 28.5 in. (each)
- Area: 6.78 ft.² (each) Volume: 26.27 ft.³ (each)

9-11) Card tables, closed
  (measurements are averages of 3)
- H: 28 in.; W: 33 in.; D: 16 in. (each)
- Area: 3.67 ft.² (each) Volume: 8.56 ft.³

12) Dressing table
- Area: 6.14 ft.² Volume: 16.25 ft.³

13-14) Chests of drawers (measurements are averages of 2)
- H: 35.25 in.; W: 39.75 in.; D: 22 in. (each)
- Area: 6.07 ft.² (each) Volume: 17.84 ft.³ (each)

15) Desk and bookcase
- H: 97.5 in.; W: 45.5 in.; D: 22.75 in.
- Area: 7.19 ft.² Volume: 58.40 ft.³
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16) Pole screen  
    H: 50.75 in.; W: 17.5 in.; D: 17.25 in.  
    Area: 1.44 ft.²  Volume: 6.08 ft.³  

17) Wooden candle stand  
    H: 28 in.; Diam: 23.5 in.  
    Area: 3.08 ft.²  Volume: 7.18 ft.³  

18) Iron candle stand  
    Area: 1.60 ft.²  Volume: 8.82 ft.³  

Total area occupied by furniture: 75.26 ft.²  
   21.06% of floor area occupied by furniture.  
Total volume occupied by furniture: 267.16 ft.³  
   6.85% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 13: Marlboro Room data.

MARLBORO ROOM contents:
   Eastern end: 19 ft., 10.5 in. X 20 ft., 4 in.
   Western end: 19 ft., 4 in. X 23 ft.
   11 ft., 10 in. ceiling.
   (Less fireplace/flue with area 16.46 ft.² and volume 182.92 ft.³)
   Area: 832.34 ft.²
   Volume: 9666.44 ft.³

Marlboro Room contents:

1-6) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 6)
   H: 38.25 in.; W: 22 in.; D: 21.5 in. (each)
   Area: 3.28 ft.² (each)  Volume: 10.47 ft.³ (each)

7-10) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 39.25 in.; W: 30.75 in.; D: 22.5 in. (each)
   Area: 4.80 ft.² (each)  Volume: 15.71 ft.³ (each)

11-13) Wing chairs (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 45.5 in.; W: 36.75 in.; D: 31 in. (each)
   Area: 7.91 ft.² (each)  Volume: 30.00 ft.³ (each)

14-15) Corner chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 31.25 in.; W: 29.5 in.; D: 25.25 in. (each)
   Area: 5.17 ft.² (each)  Volume: 13.47 ft.³ (each)

16-17) Back stools (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 38.5 in.; W: 22 in.; D: 25 in. (each)
   Area: 3.82 ft.² (each)  Volume: 12.25 ft.³ (each)

18-21) Stools (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 17.5 in.; W: 21 in.; D: 16.5 in (each)
   Area: 2.41 ft.² (each)  Volume: 3.51 ft.³ (each)

22-23) Sofas (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 37.25 in.; W: 90 in.; D: 33.75 in. (each)
   Area: 21.09 ft.² (each)  Volume: 65.48 ft.³ (each)

24) Desk
   H: 40.5 in.; W: 29.75 in.; D: 33 in.
   Area: 6.82 ft.²  Volume: 23.01 ft.³
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25) Card table, open
   H: 28 in.; W: 33.5 in.; D: 32.5 in.
   Area: 7.56 ft.\(^2\)  Volume: 17.64 ft.\(^3\)

26-33) Tables (measurements are averages of 8)
   H: 27.5 in.; W: 42 in. D: 37.35 in. (each)
   Area: 10.89 ft.\(^2\) (each)  Volume: 24.96 ft.\(^3\) (each)

34-36) Wooden candle stands
   (measurements are averages of 3)
   H: 26 in.; Diam: 1.71 in. (each)
   Area: 2.31 ft.\(^2\) (each)  Volume: 3.72 ft.\(^3\) (each)

37-40) Iron candle stands
   (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 62 in.; W: 17 in.; D: 16 in. (each)
   Area: 1.89 ft.\(^2\) (each)  Volume: 9.76 ft.\(^3\) (each)

Total area occupied by furniture: 248.40 ft.\(^2\)
29.84% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 702.63 ft.\(^3\)
7.27% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 14: Phyfe Room data.

**PHYFE ROOM dimensions:**
- 17 ft, 4 in. X 32 ft.
- 11 ft., 3.5 in. ceiling.
  (Less fireplace/flue with area 9.33 ft.² and volume 105.39 ft.³)
- Area: 554.67 ft.²
- Volume: 6263.11 ft.³

**Phyfe Room contents:**

1-10) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 10)
- H: 33 in.; W: 19 in.; D: 21 in. (each)
- Area: 2.77 ft.² (each)  Volume: 7.62 ft.³ (each)

11-12) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 2)
- H: 33 in.; W: 21 in.; D: 23 in. (each)
- Area: 3.35 ft.² (each)  Volume: 9.22 ft.³ (each)

13) Lolling chair
- Area: 2.94 ft.²  Volume: 9.88 ft.³

14) Sofa
- H: 37.5 in.; W: 80 in.; D: 31.5 in.
- Area: 17.5 ft.²  Volume: 54.69 ft.³

15) Settee
- Area: 14.64 ft.²  Volume: 44.82 ft.³

16) Window stool
- H: 30.25 in.; W: 42.75 in.; D: 16.5 in.
- Area: 4.90 ft.²  Volume: 12.35 ft.³

17-18) Card tables, closed (measurements are averages of 2)
- H: 29 in.; W: 36 in.; D: 17.75 in. (each)
- Area: 4.44 ft.² (each)  Volume: 10.72 ft.³ (each)

19) Work table
- Area: 2.41 ft.²  Volume: 6.22 ft.³
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20-24) Tables (measurements are averages of 5)
   H: 29.5 in.; W: 38.5 in.; D: 26.6 in.; (each)
   Area: 7.11 ft.² (each)  Volume: 17.48 ft.³ (each)

25) Piano
   H: 35 in.; W: 70 in.; D: 25 in.
   Area: 12.15 ft.²  Volume: 35.45 ft.³

26) Piano stool
   Area: 1.95 ft.²  Volume: 5.32 ft.³

Total area occupied by furniture: 134.96 ft.²
   24.33% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 372.21 ft.³
   5.94% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 15: Port Royal Parlor data.

**PORT ROYAL PARLOR dimensions:**
33 ft., 1 in. X 22 ft., 8 in.
12 ft., 2 in. ceiling.
(Less fireplace/flue with area 18.58 ft.²
and volume 230.74 ft.³)

Area: 731.31 ft.²
Volume: 8892.91 ft.³

Port Royal Parlor contents:

1-11) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 11)
   H: 38.25 in.; W: 24 in.; D: 22 in. (each)
   Area: 3.67 ft.² (each)  Volume: 11.69 ft.³ (each)

12-16) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 5)
   H: 39.25 in.; W: 30 in.; D: 23.25 in. (each)
   Area: 4.84 ft.² (each)  Volume: 15.84 ft.³ (each)

17-20) Wing chairs (measurements are averages of 4)
   H: 47 in.; W: 38.75 in.; D: 33.5 in. (each)
   Area: 9.01 ft.² (each)  Volume: 35.31 ft.³ (each)

21-22) Corner chairs (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 31.5 in.; W: 30.5 in.; D: 28.25 in. (each)
   Area: 5.98 ft.² (each)  Volume: 15.71 ft.³ (each)

23) Stool
   Area: 2.25 ft.²  Volume: 3.28 ft.³

24-25) Sofas (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 37 in.; W: 79.75 in.; D: 34.25 in. (each)
   Area: 18.97 ft.² (each)  Volume: 58.49 ft.³ (each)

26) Desk and bookcase
   H: 100.25 in.; W: 45 in.; D: 23.5 in.
   Area: 7.34 ft.²  Volume: 61.35 ft.³

27-28) High chests (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 96.25 in.; W: 45.75 in.; D: 25 in. (each)
   Area: 7.94 ft.² (each)  Volume: 63.71 ft.³ (each)
29-30) Dressing tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 28.75 in.; W: 35.25 in.; D: 20 in. (each)
   Area: 4.90 ft.² (each)  Volume: 11.73 ft.³ (each)

31-32) Side tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 30.75 in.; W: 36 in.; D: 19.75 in. (each)
   Area: 4.94 ft.² (each)  Volume: 12.65 ft.³ (each)

33-34) Tea tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 29.25 in; Diam: 35 in. (each)
   Area: 6.74 ft.² (each)  Volume: 16.43 ft.³ (each)

35-36) Tables (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 28 in.; W: 41 in.; D: 31.25 in. (each)
   Area: 8.90 ft.² (each)  Volume: 20.76 ft.³ (each)

37-38) Wooden candle stands
   (measurements are averages of 2)
   H: 28 in.; Diam: 25 in. (each)
   Area: 3.41 ft.² (each)  Volume: 7.95 ft.³ (each)

39) Pole screen
   H: 60 in.; W: 19 in.; D: 19 in.
   Area: 2.51 ft.²  Volume: 12.53 ft.³

Total area occupied by furniture: 236.27 ft.²
  32.30% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 841.05 ft.³
  9.46% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 16: Readbourne Room data.

READBOURNE ROOM dimensions:
16 ft., 10 in. X 15 ft., 2 in.
11 ft., 10 in. ceiling.
(Less corner fireplace/flue with area 16.33 ft.$^2$
and volume 193.29 ft.$^3$)
Area: 238.98 ft.$^2$
Volume: 2827.83 ft.$^3$

Readbourne Room contents:

1-6) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 6)
H: 42 in.; W: 21.25 in.; D: 19 in. (each)
Area: 2.80 ft.$^2$ (each) Volume: 9.81 ft.$^3$ (each)

7-8) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 2)
H: 42 in.; W: 32 in.; D: 21.5 in. (each)
Area: 4.78 ft.$^2$ (each) Volume: 16.72 ft.$^3$ (each)

9) Sofa
H: 36 in.; W: 86.25 in.; D: 32.25 in.
Area: 19.32 ft.$^2$ Volume: 57.95 ft.$^3$

10) High chest
H: 95.75 in.; W: 42 in.; D: 24.5 in.
Area: 7.15 ft.$^2$ Volume: 57.02 ft.$^3$

11-14) Tables (measurements are averages of 4)
H: 28.25 in.; W: 35 in.; D: 19.5 in. (each)
Area: 4.74 ft.$^2$ (each) Volume: 11.16 ft.$^3$

15) Wooden candle stand
H: 27.75 in.; Diam: 23.25 in.
Area: 2.95 ft.$^2$ Volume: 6.82 ft.$^3$

Total area occupied by furniture: 74.74 ft.$^2$
31.27% of floor space occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 258.73 ft.$^3$
9.15% of room volume occupied by furniture.
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Table 17: Readbourne Stair Hall data.

READBOURNE STAIR HALL dimensions:
- 15 ft., 5 in. X 20 ft., 8 in.
- 11 ft., 11 in. ceiling.
Area: 318.81 ft.²
Volume: 3796.78 ft.³

Readbourne Stair Hall contents:

1-4) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 4)
   - H: 42.5 in.; W: 32.25 in.; D: 22 in. (each)
   - Area: 4.93 ft.² (each)  Volume: 17.45 ft.³ (each)

5-9) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 5)
   - Area: 3.06 ft.² (each)  Volume: 10.72 ft.³ (each)

10) Wing chair
    - H: 47.25 in.; W: 35.75 in.; D: 33.5 in.
    - Area: 8.32 ft.²  Volume: 32.75 ft.³

11) Back stool
    - Area: 4.45 ft.²  Volume: 14.45 ft.³

12) Desk and bookcase
    - Area: 6.38 ft.²  Volume: 52.88 ft.³

13) High chest
    - Area: 7.34 ft.²  Volume: 59.97 ft.³

14) Tall case clock
    - Area: 2.04 ft.²  Volume: 17.52 ft.³

15-16) Tables (measurements are averages of 2)
    - H: 30 in.; W: 50.75 in.; D: 27 in. (each)
    - Area: 9.52 ft.² (each)  Volume: 23.79 ft.³ (each)

17) Wooden candle stand
    - Area: 1.42 ft.²  Volume: 5.21 ft.³
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18) Iron candle stand

H: 75.75 in.; W: 18.75 in.; D: 14.75 in.

Area: 1.92 ft.²  Volume: 12.12 ft.³

Total area occupied by furniture: 85.93 ft.²
26.97% of floor area occupied by furniture.

Total volume occupied by furniture: 365.88 ft.³
9.64% of room volume occupied by furniture.
Table 18: Wentworth Room data.

**WENTWORTH ROOM** dimensions:
- 27 ft., 9 in. X 13 ft.
- 7 ft. ceiling.
- **Area:** 360.75 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 2525.25 ft.$^3$

Wentworth Room contents:

1-3) Armchairs (measurements are averages of 3)
- **H:** 35.75 in.; **W:** 22 in.; **D:** 21 in. (each)
- **Area:** 3.21 ft.$^2$ (each)
- **Volume:** 9.56 ft.$^3$ (each)

4-9) Side chairs (measurements are averages of 4)
- **H:** 35 in.; **W:** 18.75 in.; **D:** 15.5 in. (each)
- **Area:** 2.02 ft.$^2$ (each)
- **Volume:** 5.89 ft.$^3$ (each)

10) Daybed
- **H:** 39 in.; **W:** 61.75 in.; **D:** 21.75 in.
- **Area:** 9.33 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 30.31 ft.$^3$

11) Stool
- **H:** 22 in.; **W:** 18 in.; **D:** 12 in.
- **Area:** 1.5 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 2.75 ft.$^3$

12) Desk
- **H:** 40.5 in.; **W:** 35 in.; **D:** 19.25 in.
- **Area:** 4.68 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 15.79 ft.$^3$

13) High chest
- **H:** 58 in.; **W:** 40.25 in.; **D:** 23 in.
- **Area:** 6.43 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 31.07 ft.$^3$

14) Chest
- **H:** 35 in.; **W:** 49.5 in.; **D:** 19.25 in.
- **Area:** 6.62 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 19.30 ft.$^3$

15) Dressing table
- **H:** 30.75 in.; **W:** 33.75 in.; **D:** 21.5 in.
- **Area:** 5.04 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 12.91 ft.$^3$

16) Circular table
- **H:** 28 in.; **Diam:** 48 in.
- **Area:** 12.57 ft.$^2$
- **Volume:** 29.32 ft.$^3$
17-18) Tables (measurements are averages of 2)
  H: 24.5 in.;  W: 23.5 in.;  D: 24.5 in.  (each)
  Area: 4.00 ft.²  (each)  Volume: 8.16 ft.³

19) Spinet
  H: 30.5 in.;  W: 71.5 in.;  D: 27 in.
  Area: 13.41 ft.²  Volume: 34.07 ft.³

20) Iron candle stand
  H: 56 in.;  W: 14.5 in.;  D: 13 in.
  Area: 1.31 ft.²  Volume: 6.12 ft.³

Total area occupied by furniture: 77.27 ft.²
  21.42% of floor area occupied by furniture.
Total volume occupied by furniture: 250.20 ft.³
  9.91% of room volume occupied by furniture.
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