

**Comprehensive Endnotes for *Central Park, An American Masterpiece* by Sara Cedar Miller, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 2003.**

Note: Online additions to the text are in **boldface** type.

CHAPTER 1

1. In 1999, Park Commissioner Henry J. Stern completed the work begun in the 1950s by his predecessor Robert Moses to chisel the names of the eighteen original gates into the wall of the Park. **For Olmsted and Vaux’s interest in the granite entranceways to the Mall in Boston see BCCP Minutes, Sept. 16, 1858, 122-23.**

2. The Standing Committee on Statuary, Fountains and Architectural Structures delivered their *Report on Nomenclature of the Gates of the Park* on Apr. 10, 1862 to the full board of commissioners. *BCCP, Sixth Annual Report*, “Report on Nomenclature of the Gates of the Park” (1862), 125–36. **The commissioners in their mention of those grouped under ARTIZAN’S [sic] GATE specifically mention both skilled and unskilled labor and make a point of recognizing the potential for “skill and wit” and “taste and cleverness” in their work be it a “laborer” or a “mechanic;” ARTIST’S GATE for those musicians, painters, architects and sculptors etc. whose business is to “give animation and grace to the work that is done in the world, and to show that only the dull, the selfish, and the faint-hearted need to labor under the primal curse for... work is a fruitful blessing whenever thoughtfully conceived and beautifully executed.” MERCHANT’S GATE for those bankers, brokers, importers, traders, agents directors and store keepers, who represent New York as” the commercial center of the whole country, ” and lastly, SCHOLAR’S GATE, representing “the Poet,**

the Divine, the Statesman, the Lawyer, the Author, the Editor, the Teacher, the Physician, the man of Science, and all in fact, whose contributions to the welfare of the community, are of a specially intellectual character.”, “Report on Nomenclature of the Gates of the Park,” 129-130. The commissioners even chose to focus on children’s role in the ever-expanding work force. Describing the significance of Children’s Gate they write, “The band of little ones who are today so tender and helpless will help to keep in mind the fact that, in the course of the next twenty years, the whole army of industrious workers, who are now vigorously laboring for the general welfare must have received large reinforcements...or its ranks will already be perceptibly thinned and its efficiency seriously impaired.” Twenty gates, including Fishermen, Explorer, Women, Boys, Girls and All Saints, were originally cited. See “Report on Nomenclature,” 133.

Committee chairman Henry Stebbins introduced the idea of naming the gates after the professions, though it is more likely that his sister, sculptor Emma Stebbins, conceived of the idea or, at the very least, created statues that suggested the theme. In 1859 Emma had completed two twenty-eight-inch-high marble sculptures for the gateway to the Long Island estate of Charles Heckscher, who had made his fortune in the coal-mining business. These sculptures (now in the Heckscher Museum in Huntington), *Industry: The Miner* and *Commerce: The Sailor*, depict the workers with clothing and tools appropriate to their professions, while their poses echo classical Greek sculptures. These two works, along with a third, were offered up in the nomenclature report as examples of existing artworks that would typify future embellishments for the gates of Central Park. Authored by Henry Stebbins, the

**report alludes to his sister’s work, though not naming her outright: “The artistic adaptability of the general system of nomenclature has already been proved, and the worthy types of the Miner, the Trapper, and the Sailor, are now in existence, that have been conceived by American artists.” The Art Institute of Chicago has recently acquired a similar Stebbins sculpture of an artisan at work, *The Mechanic*, commissioned, most likely, by a patron in the mechanical field, but also suggesting possibilities for the adornment of the Artizans’ Gate. Emma Stebbins’ most famous work, *The Angel of the Waters* will be discussed in Chapter 2. The most complete discussion of Stebbins’s work is by Elizabeth Milroy, “The Public Career of Emma Stebbins: Work in Marble,” *Archives of American Art Journal*, Volume 33, Number 3, 1993, 2-12; “Work in Bronze,” *Archives of American Art Journal*, Volume 34, Number 1, 1994, 2-13.**

3. “Yeoman,” *New-York Daily Times*, Jan. 12, 1854, “The South,” quoted in Charles Capen McLaughlin et al., *PFLO*, vol. II, “Slavery and the South 1852–1857,” 240.

4. *Ibid.*, 240.

5. “Report on Nomenclature,” 128.

6. Edward K. Spann, *The New Metropolis: New York City 1840–1857* (New York, 1981), 135.

7. *Ibid.*, 35-44.

**7A. “This influx...further uptown.” In 1856, Commodore Perry, the father-in-law of wealthy financier August Belmont, proposed that he build a house near the new Park, but Belmont replied that he would do so only “if a half dozen families could purchase a large block together and build at once; they could all be assured of living**

**in an agreeable community.” Perhaps unsuccessful in this endeavor, Belmont, who later became a Park Commissioner, chose instead to build downtown; quoted in David Black, *The King of Fifth Avenue*, New York, 1981, 141.**

**7B. “Socializing...pleasure grounds.” In the 1840s and 50s New Yorkers frequented the newly-landscaped Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn for a local experience of rural scenery, or they would take a ferry to the Elysian Fields in Hoboken, New Jersey to play the emerging game of “base-ball.”**

8. Andrew Jackson Downing, “The New York Park,” *Horticulturist* 6 (Aug. 1851); quoted in BCCP, *First Annual Report*, doc. no. 5 (Jan.19, 1857), 164.

9. Originally the state legislature enacted a bill that included the land from 59th Street to 106th Street as well as the Jones Wood site, a 150-acre site along the East River, for a total of more than 900 acres. By 1854 the Jones Wood section was revoked. The Central Park site, originally 778 acres, was expanded in 1863 for the final total of 843 acres (see the map on page 78). The 1853 document does not officially name the Park, but does dictate the creation of “the Central Park Fund”; see “An Act to Alter the Map of the City of New York, By Laying Out Thereon a Public Place, and to Authorize the Taking of the Park,” in BCCP, *First Annual Report*, doc. no. 5, 89.

10. “Nomenclature Report,” 128.

11. Quoted in Edwin Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York, 1999), 792.

12. FLO to BCCP, *Documents of the Board of Commissioners of the Central Park for the Year Ending April 30, 1859*, doc. no. 5 (May 31, 1858), 6.

13. *Description of Plans*, FLO and CV, “Greensward: Description of a Plan for the Improvement of Central Park,” 35. **Charles Beveridge argues that to Olmsted “teaching civility has to do with the example and interaction of pedestrians of different classes,” rather than any interaction of pedestrians and riders. In personal correspondence with the author Aug. 10, 2002.**

14. Letter from FLO to Charles Loring Brace, Dec. 1, 1853, *PFLO*, vol. II, 235.

15. FLO, “Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns,” *Forty Years*, 171. **See also, *The Park and the People*, 239-241.**

16. Robert H. Byer, “Words, Monuments, Beholders: The Visual Arts in Hawthorne’s *The Marble Faun*,” *American Iconology* (New Haven, 1993), 167. **Charles Colbert stated the point succinctly, “Clearly, the cumulative intent of the Park’s statuary was to encourage [the Irish laborers] and fellow immigrants to acknowledge the ideology and identity of those who traced their ancestry to the Pilgrims.” Charles Colbert, *A Measure of Perfection: Phrenology and the Fine Arts in America* (Chapel Hill, 1997), 226.**

17. *Humboldt* was placed in the Park in 1869 on the west side of Scholar’s Gate near the entrance steps to the Pond. It was moved in 1982 and is now sited across from the American Museum of Natural History at Central Park West and Seventy-seventh Street.

18. *PFLO*, vol. III, 180–81. **Simon Schama considers the sunken transverse roads as “a modernized version of the ha-ha,” which could be defined as a deep trench that prevented grazing cows from escaping from their pasture. *Landscape and Memory*, (New York, 1995), 570.**

19. *American Carriages*, 69.

20. Clarence Cook, *A Description of the New York Central Park* (New York, 1869; rpt. 1979), 84.

21. Rob[er]t. J. Dillon and August Belmont, *The New York Herald*, June 7, 1858, 1.

22. CV to Clarence Cook, June 6, 1865, FLOP; CV to FLO, June 3, 1865, FLOP.

**In the Park’s first photographic guidebook, the author says of the designers’ vision that “faithful to the pure democracy of their doctrines, the best most varied and most numerous views lie along the path of the walkers;” quoted in Fred. B. Perkins, Jr. and W.H. Guild, *The Central Park: Photographed with Descriptions and A Historical Sketch*, 1864, 24. By 1874 there were more than twenty-eight miles of pedestrian paths, in contrast to only fifteen miles of carriage drives and bridle trails combined; see *DPP, Third Annual Report, 1874*, 340.**

23. FLO, “Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns,” quoted in Melvin Kalfus, *Frederick Law Olmsted: The Passion of a Public Artist* (New York, 1990), 291. **Social historian John Kasson called the rigid demand for body control “ a symbolic shield of privacy” which “permitted one to move through a public space while keeping aloof from engagement;” quoted in *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America*, (New York, 1990), 124.**

24. Dell Upton, “Inventing the Metropolis,” *Art and the Empire City: New York, 1825–1861* (New York, 2000), 43.

25. Another straight line is formed by the East Drive from 85th Street to 94th Street; however, that line is the result of a lack of space rather than to a pure design decision. There were also a straight walk, known popularly as “Lover’s Lane,” that disguised, as best as possible, the southern and western walls of the rectilinear reservoir; see also *Forty*

*Years*, 221, note 1. **see also footnote on page 221 in which Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. further explains Olmsted and Vaux’s design philosophy. This is corroborated by Charles Beveridge, who states that “they were willing to use rectilinear paths in formal, paved, social areas;” personal correspondence with the author, Aug. 20, 2002.**

26. *New York Times*, Nov. 11, 1858, 1.

27. I am grateful to Marianne Cramer for bringing this interpretation of the Mall—and so much more—to my attention. **“The natural evolution from the forms of trees to gothic architecture had been discussed by Englishman, James Hall in his 1785 *Essay on the Origins, History and Principles of Gothic Architecture*, a concept that appealed to the romantic sensibility. See Schama, *Landscape and Memory*, 233-38. John Ruskin, English art and architecture critic and influence on Olmsted and Vaux often compared gothic churches to “a great verdant wood.” See Reuben Rainey, “Architecture and Landscape: Three Modes of Relationship,” *Places*, Volume 4, Number 1, 1987, Cambridge, 5.**

28. *Nature and Culture*, 3.

29. FLO to Mary Olmsted, *PFLO*, vol. III, 19. **See Chapter 2 for a further discussion on Ruskin’s influence on the designers of Central Park.**

30. FLO to Pilat, *Forty Years*, 347.