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BIOGRAPHIES

JENNEY


Studied at Lawrence Scientific School. Graduated from Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures in Paris, 1856, as engineer and architect. Engineer on Sherman's and Grant's staffs in the Civil War. Settled as architect in Chicago. Built Grace Episcopal Church, Union League Club, etc. but chiefly known for his commercial buildings. Generally considered the first to use steel skeleton construction. A technician rather than a designer.


Photographs: #4, 5, 14

RICHARDSON

Henry Hobson Richardson. Born St. James Parish, La., 1838. Died Brookline, Mass. 1886

A.B. Harvard 1859. Worked and studied in Paris at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in the atelier of J. L. André and with Labrouste. Established himself after the Civil War as an architect
BIOGRAPHIES

HENRY RICHARDSON

July 28, 1837, Died Brockville, June 19, 1898
A.B. Harvard 1859. Worked and studied in Europe before entering the Harvard Law School and later in the office of William Farnham, prominent lawyer.

Born Northumberland, Nova Scotia.

Family: Anna and William Farnham.

Biographical: "William Farnham's Family History."
first in New York and then in Brookline. His reputation was established by his design for Trinity Church, built in Boston 1872-77, based on Romanesque precedent. In his later work the importance of reminiscent elements of design grew less and less, but his originality as an architect was based on the integrity of his use of traditional construction rather than on technical innovations. To the new national architecture he contributed not methods of building but a formative spirit.

Bibliography: Henry Hobson Richardson & His Works, Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer. Boston, 1888

Photographs: #7,8,9.


Studied M.I.T., 1873. Worked for a short while in the office of Furness and Hewitt in Philadelphia, and of Wm. LeBaron Jenney in Chicago. Studied from 1874 to 1876 at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris, in the atelier of Vaudremer. Returning to Chicago he joined Adler's staff in
Life in New York and then in Boston. My
tuition was so well-prepared by the Great
Triumph of the Reverend Father St. John.
In the former work, the importance of recalling elements of scholasticism and
the renewal of the Church was based on the liberty of the
use of traditional composition rather than on
the new rationalistic
innovations. To the new rationalism, the
oppoctance was contributed by methods of faith-
the part aTomatinap art.

H. H. Hopkins: Henry Hopkins. The "Gray
The Pericles of H. H. Hopkins may be taken
as the theme of Modern Art, 1888.
Proctorship: W. 6, 6.

Louis Henry Sullivan. Born Boston, 1856. Died
Chicago, 1924. 
Studied M. I. T., 1875. Worked for a short while
in the office of Tufts and Hewitt in New
York, then for A. M. Fisk in Chicago.
Served from 1876 to 1878 at the Ecole des Beaux
Arts in Paris in the studio of Viollet-le-Duc.
continued to Chicago. Joined Adler. Died in

1879 and was a full partner with Adler from 1881 to 1895. Sullivan's later associate, Elmslie, was never a partner and eventually left to work as an independent architect. Applying the basic stylistic discipline of Richardson's Marshall Field Wholesale Store (#7) to the new skeleton construction, Sullivan first found a dignified clothing for the skyscraper. In his work of the late eighties and early nineties his designs emphasized the vertical (#20). Soon, however, he found a more logical expression of the underlying construction with a scheme of wide windowed horizontality (#21,22). Sullivan led for two decades a considerable group of architects known as the Chicago School, but he alone made of the early skyscraper an aesthetic invention.


This work contains full bibliography on writings by or about Sullivan.

I was very much a full partner with Walter from 1931 to 1935. Stillman’s later associates, Mclntire, was never a partner and occasionally far to work as an independent architect. Applying the basic systematic articulation or Richardson’s template, Stillman worked to a new expression of composition. Stillman first turned to a grid-like organization for the skyscraper. In the work of the later skyscrapers and early milestones of the Bauhaus, there stems expressing the vernacular (1925). Soon, however, he found a more focused expression of his long-standing composition with a shape of the overlying composition, with windows and proportions (1927, 28). Stillman led two decades a concert, the Chicago School, put the skyscrapers known as the Chicago School onto the map of the early skyscraper as aesthetic invention.


This work contains full phonotaphony of Stillman's.pr. or spore Sullivan.


Photographs: #16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.

Dankmar Adler, Born in Langsfeld, Sachsen-Weimar, in 1844. Died in Chicago, 1900.
Came to America in 1854. Studied in Detroit with Julius Melchers, John Schaefer and Willard Smith, and in Chicago, 1857-62. First partnership with Kinney, 1869-71, with Burling, 1871-78. Adler, during his partnership with Sullivan was never a designer.


Frank Lloyd Wright. Born Richland Center, Wisconsin, 1869, now living at Taliesin, Spring
In the 1950s, after having been a part of the American Institute of Architects, Ira S. and Elsie A. Lurie began to protest against the planned development of the Manhattan neighborhood where they lived. They were concerned about the potential displacement of their community.

In the 1960s, they formed a group to fight the proposed development of the neighborhood. They worked with the American Institute of Architects and the New York City Planning Commission to preserve the community's character.

In the 1970s, they continued their efforts, ultimately成功的阻止了开发计划。
Green, Wisconsin.

Studied engineering at the University of Wisconsin, 1885-88. Worked in Chicago with Silsbee and then with Adler & Sullivan, 1889-94. His independent practice began with the Winslow House (#33) in River Forest, Ill., 1892-93. By 1900 his new type of domestic design had developed far beyond that of the rest of the Chicago School. In his early work only should he be considered a disciple of Sullivan. His great innovations lie outside the field of this exhibition.

A bibliography of Frank Lloyd Wright can be found in Modern Architecture, a catalog published by the Museum of Modern Art in 1932.

Photograph: #33.


Studied in Chicago architects' offices including that of Peter Wright where he met Root.

John Wellborn Root, born Lumpkin, Ga., 1850. Died Chicago, 1891. Graduated New York University, 1869. Worked in Renwick's office in New York, then went to Chicago after the fire of 1871, where in 1872 he met Burnham in Wright's office,
Green, Wisconsin.

Edward F. Stimson, 1886-88, worked in Chicago with Elbridge
andegan with Albert & Sullivan, 1888-90.

His independent practice began with the addition
House (1893) in River Forest IL. 1890-99. By
1900, his new type of commercial design had evolved
several "paying" trends of the East of the Chicago
school. In his early work only such work as orders
received a chance to Sullivan. His first two
visions set forth the height of his expression


1890. Deed transferred. II. 1918.

Evangel in Chicago architects. Office in
the heart of New York, were in the Root.

John Jeliffe Root, born in New York, "1850.

Deed Chicago, 1891. Graduated New York University.

1880. Worked in Remakul's office in New York.

Then went to Chicago after the fire of 1881,
where in 1881 he was assistant in Wright's office.

Photograph: 1891.
and formed a partnership with him the next year. This firm was responsible for the development of the highly organized and specialized American architectural office and methods of practice. Until Root's early death he was one of the more original Chicago Richardsonians. The prolific work of the firm beginning with the general supervision of the World's Fair was rarely original or distinguished in design.


Photographs: #10, 11, 12.


Martin Roche. Born Cleveland, Ohio, 1855. Died Chicago, 1927.

and formed a partnership with him the next year. The firm was responsible for the development of the mighty organization and specialized firms and can reproduce any office and warts of those until now's early years. No one of the more arbitrary Chicago specifications. The specialty work of the firm beginning with the general supervision of the writing of the first was especially interesting to theatrical in general. 

M. Jesse Green, Carter Moore, Boston, 1886.

1870, 11, 15.

William Hopper, 120 W. Adams St., Chicago. Born Chicago, Oct. 1885. Died Evanston, Ill., 1889. Having been a blacksmith for years, he was employed as an engineer after 1875. Sold some partnership with G. C. Gilman in 1880.

Martin Hopper, 180 W. Adams St., Chicago. Born Cleveland, Ohio, 1886. Died

Rochester, A. smaller

After working at the St. Louis Hospital in 1883, he left to become in the Hospital in Boston.

Photographs: #6, 24.

The tall commercial building, early labelled the skyscraper, was the most conspicuous achievement of American architecture in the second half of the nineteenth century.

In the creation of the skyscraper several auxiliary lines of technical development joined. First, in the 1850s, iron skeleton construction was often used to replace masonry bearing walls, sometimes in the interior of the building, sometimes as an ornamental cast-iron facade. Then, with the introduction of the elevator, buildings higher than six stories became convenient and acceptable. At the turn of the century, methods of fireproofing the metal skeleton were tried in New York, and effective pier foundations developed in Chicago.

Finally, in Chicago, by the late eighties, the protective masonry shell came to be carried by the metal framework, in which stainless steel replaced cast and wrought iron. The skyscraper, imminent for more than a generation, thus became an actuality.


Photographs: P. 24.
The tall commercial building, early labelled the skyscraper, was the most conspicuous achievement of American architecture in the second half of the nineteenth century.

In the creation of the skyscraper several complimentary lines of technical development joined. First, in the fifties, iron skeleton construction was often used to replace masonry bearing walls, sometimes in the interior of the building, sometimes as an ornamental cast iron facade. Then, with the introduction of the elevator, buildings higher than six stories became convenient and acceptable. At the same time, methods of fireproofing the metal skeleton were invented in New York, and effective pier foundations developed in Chicago. Finally, in Chicago, by the late eighties, the protective masonry shell came to be carried by the metal framework in which Bessemer steel replaced cast and wrought iron. The skyscraper, imminent for more than a generation, thus became an actuality.


The cell commercial building starts. Impelled by the urge of the century's most comprehensive evolution of American society, America entered the second half of the nineteenth century. In the creation of the skyscraper several companies were the most significant factors in the development of the steel tower. The introduction of the elevator, which made it possible to build higher buildings and change the appearance of office buildings, was the most revolutionary invention of the period. The age of the skyscraper was born.

The skyscraper, as an architectural concept that has been in existence for over a century, has become an integral part of the urban landscape. The introduction of the elevator, which made it possible to build higher buildings and change the appearance of office buildings, was the most revolutionary invention of the period. The age of the skyscraper was born.


"The skyscraper is the architect's greatest achievement, the engineer's greatest design, the technician's greatest challenge, the manufacturer's greatest triumph."

Vol. 4, No. 8, August 1959, pp. 11-18.
1848  Bogardus Building, Duane Street, New York, by Bogardus. Now demolished
First use of cast iron facade.

1851  Crystal Palace, Hyde Park, London, by Paxton Destroyed by fire, 1936
First structure entirely of iron and glass.

1851-65  Dome of Capitol, Washington, D.C., by Thomas U. Walter
Built of cast iron.

1853  New York Crystal Palace (in imitation of Paxton's) Now demolished
First passenger elevator in America.

1854  Harper's Building, Franklin Square, New York Now demolished
Introduction of wrought iron girders.

1855  Invention in England of Bessemer's converter for producing superior wrought iron known as "Steel".

1859  Fifth Avenue Hotel, New York Now demolished
Passenger elevator first used in a permanent building.

1862  Siemens' invention in Germany of the Open Hearth Process for steel.

1868  Equitable Life Assurance Society Building, Broadway, New York. Now demolished
First office building with elevator.
1871  Fire-resistant hollow-tile floor for use with wrought iron beams patented by Balthasar Kreischer.

1873  Introduction into America of Bessemer steel by Carnegie.

1880  Price of land in Chicago Loop district reaches $130,000. per quarter acre, thus encouraging higher buildings. Compare 1890.

1881  Buffington's dreams of metal "cloud-scarpers" based on Viollet-le-Duc's ideas.

1881  Montauk Building, Chicago, by Burnham & Root

1884-85  Home Insurance Building, Chicago, by Jenney

1886  Rookery Building, Chicago, by Burnham & Root

1887-88  Tacoma Building, Chicago, by Holabird & Roche

1888-89  Pulitzer Building, New York, by George B. Post

1880-85  Usually considered the first skyscraper. Weight carried largely by framework of cast and wrought iron concealed inside the masonry. Bessemer steel beams first used here above the sixth floor.

1886  Same construction as Home Insurance Building. New type of foundation of railroad steel in concrete.

1887-88  Often considered the first skyscraper. All the structural potentialities of metal frame construction are implicit, but the iron skeleton is called upon to carry less than half the weight of the building.

1888-89  At the time of its erection, the highest building in the world (349 feet). Masonry walls; interior piers of cast iron.
The latest method for cutting metal plates at high speed.

Introduction into America of Bessemer steel.
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1889 Tower Building, New York, by Bradford Lee Gilbert
Now demolished
First use of metal skeleton of true skyscraper type in New York.

1889 Rand-McNally Building, Chicago, by Burnham & Root
Rolled steel beams and columns of standard bridge shapes riveted together as still used today.

1889-90 Second Leiter Building, Chicago, by Jenney
First building in which all the walls are supported by the internal metal skeleton.

1890 Monadnock Block, Chicago, by Burnham & Root
Last tall building with solid masonry bearing walls. Sixteen stories.

1890 Price of land in Chicago Loop district $900,000 per quarter acre. Compare 1880
High buildings encouraged by high land values force land values ever higher.

1891 "Skyscraper - a very tall building such as now are being built in Chicago" - Maitland's American Slang Dictionary
Original design in the skyscraper did not keep pace with new developments in construction. The facades of the early experimental buildings in the late seventies and eighties (#4 especially), although often more honest in the expression of skeleton construction than many more modern buildings, were appallingly crude. Yet it was their frank emphasis on wide-windowed horizontality that fore-shadowed such developed skyscraper design as in the Schlesinger-Mayer Building (#22) and Gage Building (#23).

But the building which initiated a new spirit in commercial design was Richardson’s masonry Marshall Field Wholesale Store (#7). Deriving at first his inspiration from the Romanesque, Richardson in his later work reached a highly original and pure expression of masonry construction adapted either to residence or commercial design. The Marshall Field Wholesale Store provided for the young Chicago architects an aesthetic discipline of regularity and simplicity from which Sullivan rapidly created a new personal style.

The influence of Sullivan’s style was so great that it attracted a group of young architects who formed under his leadership the Chicago School.

The free non-traditional architecture of the Chicago
CHRONOLOGY OF THE AESTHETIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE SYMSCALE:

The first problem we face is to understand the continuity of the aesthetic development in connection with new developments in construction. The stages of the aesthetic evolution of the Béla Vargha, especially, "Aesthetic Afternoon" and the expression of the Afternoon" are seen as the most important contributions of the more modern architecture. The "Aesthetic Afternoon" was a pioneer of the post-modern movement in architecture and to some extent in the development of skyscraper geology as in the Rockefeller Center.

But the "Aesthetic Afternoon" with its ideas of a new spirit in construction raised many questions on modern architecture and its relationship to nature. The aesthetic Afternoon's approach to line and expression of raw geometrical forms was more in accord with the spirit of the times. The "Aesthetic Afternoon" was of great importance in the development of a new direction in the field of architecture.

The influence of Béla Vargha's style was so great that it created a trend of avant-garde movements in architecture, forming the architecture of the Chicago School.
School retained its vigor until about 1910 when the stylistic revivalism which had made its first striking appearance in Chicago with the World's Fair of 1893, vitiated its force.

1879
Leiter Building I, Chicago, by Jenney.
Non-stylistic expression of mixed masonry and cast iron construction.

1882
Anes Building, Kingston and Bedford Sts., Boston, by Richardson. Replaced in 1892.
Further simplification of the Richardsonian Romanesque.

1883-96
The masterpiece of early commercial architecture in masonry.

1866
The Rockery, Chicago, by Burnham & Root.
Unintelligent application of Richardsonian Romanesque. Uninfluenced by Marshall Field Wholesale Store.

1886
Fraw Building, Boston, by Richardson.
Further development of Richardson's commercial style. Shallow reveals and light spandrels at story levels.

1887-88
Tacoma Building, Chicago, by Holabird & Roche. Demolished, 1939.
General scheme uninfluenced by masonry design, though detail is slightly Richardsonian.
School presenting the vision until about 1810 when the scholar
revisited which had made the first striking appearance in
Chicago with the World’s Fair of 1893, assisted the local...
1874-75 Cheney Building (now Brown-Thompson Co.), Hartford, Conn., by Richardson.

A personal interpretation of Romanesque design applied to commercial architecture.

1879 Leiter Building I, Chicago, by Jenney.

Non-stylistic expression of mixed masonry and cast iron construction.

1882 Ames Building, Kingston and Bedford Sts., Boston, by Richardson. Replaced in 1892.

Further simplification of the Richardsonian Romanesque.


The masterpiece of early commercial architecture in masonry.

1886 The Rookery, Chicago, by Burnham & Root.

Unintelligent application of Richardsonian Romanesque. Uninfluenced by Marshall Field Wholesale Store.

1886 Fray Building, Boston, by Richardson.

Furthest development of Richardson's commercial style. Shallow reveals and light spandrels at story levels.

1887-88 Tacoma Building, Chicago, by Holabird & Roche. Demolished, 1929.

General scheme uninfluenced by masonry design, though detail is slightly Richardsonian.
Chapter Building (now Brown-Tompson Co.), Hartford, Conn., py. Richardson.

A personal interpretation of Romanesque genius applied to commercial architecture.

1879

Letter printing, Chicago, py. former.

Non-artistic expression of mixed manner and case from commercial architecture.

1880


Py. Richardson. Replaced in 1881.

Further simplification of the Richardsonian Romanesque.

1883-85


The masterpiece of early commercial architecture in America.

1888

The Hooker, Chicago, py. Burnham & Root.

Untimely application of Richardsonian influence, py. Burnham & Root.

1888

Pye Building, Boston, py. Richardson.

Further development of Richardson's commercial styling. Single storey and light proportions of Scott Italian.

1887-88

Teack Building, Chicago, py. Holabird & Roche.

Demolished 1889.

Fourth gesture in style of Richardsonian Romanesque general.
1887-89 Auditorium Building, Chicago, by Adler & Sullivan.

Strongly under the influence of Richardson's masonry Marshall Field Wholesale Store. In the tower appear the beginnings of Sullivan's more personal expression. Compare Walker Warehouse (#18).

1889-90 Leiter Building II, Chicago, by Jenney.

A direct development from Jenney's first Leiter Building (#4) in its clear expression of structure. Influenced in detail and general sense of form by the Marshall Field Wholesale Store.

1890-91 Monadnock Block, Chicago, by Burnham & Root.

Rigidly simplified masonry design with Richardsonian sense of form.

1891-92 Wainwright Building, St. Louis, by Adler & Sullivan.

Sullivan's vertical type of skyscraper design here fully developed for the first time. Compare Schiller Building (#20).

1893 Meyer Building, Chicago, by Adler & Sullivan.

Sullivan's more logical horizontal type of skyscraper design preserving wide fenestration of Jenney's Leiter Building I (#4).


Further development of wide-windowed design, with narrow supports and spandrels veneered with terra cotta.

1900-10 The heyday of the Chicago School under the inspiration of Sullivan's work of the previous decade.
LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS WITH COMMENTS

1. 33 SOUTH FRANKLIN STREET (corner of Monroe Street), Chicago. c. 1872.

This building retains the dignity and good proportions of the Classical Revival. The simple masonry post and lintel construction is clearly expressed in the design. Cast iron posts are used only in certain bays on the ground floor.

2. 221-227 WEST RANDOLPH STREET, Chicago. 1880.

Unusually large window area for masonry construction. Cast iron posts on the ground floor only. The elegance of extreme simplicity is still reminiscent of the Greek Revival.

3. WILLOUGHBY BUILDING, Jackson and Monroe Streets (north-east corner) Chicago. 1884.

Structurally a great advance: the use of wrought and cast iron instead of masonry walls permits building higher without sacrificing light on the lower stories. The peculiar ornament is ambitious in its originality, but no more appropriate to the new material than traditional forms.

4. WILLIAM LE BARON JENNEY
LEITER BUILDING I, 200 West Monroe Street, Chicago. 1879.

Two stories added later.

An important step toward the skyscraper: the use of cast iron posts between the masonry piers introduces more light. The design is crude, but the general horizontal
List of Problems with Comments

1. 34 South Franklin Street (corner of Monroe Street), Chicago, 1906.

The building retains the dignity and bulk proportion of the classical Revival. The simple annexory part and finish construction is strikingly expressed in the gable. Clear rows of panels are used only in certain areas of the ground floor.

8. 581-583 West Randolph Street, Chicago, 1880.

Unusually large window areas for Masonry construction. Clear row bases on the ground floor only. The blending.

One extreme simplicity is still reminiscent of the Greek Revival.

WILLOUGHBY BUILDING, Jackson and Monroe Streets (north).

53 east corner, Chicago, 1881.

Structurally a great advance: the use of masonry and cast iron. Instead of masonry walls, parapet building. Better. The be.

More appropriate to the new material. Clear tradition.

To me.

WILLIAM B. BARNES, CHICAGO.

LETTER BUILDING, 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago, 1909.

Two separate English Letter.

An important step toward the skyscraper: the use of cast iron. The gable is gable, but the general ornament
ordering foreshadows the more finished designs of the later steel skyscrapers. Compare with the Schlesinger-Meyer Building (#22).

5. WILLIAM LE BARON JENNEY
HOME INSURANCE BUILDING, Chicago. 1884-85. Two stories added, 1890. Demolished, 1931.

The crucial step in the creation of the skyscraper. The metal skeleton supports all the weight of the building except the exterior masonry walls which are partially self supporting. Above the second floor in the masonry piers between the windows are iron columns which strengthen the piers. This added strength makes it possible to diminish the width of the piers and increase the width of the windows. Part of the weight of the exterior masonry is carried by the metal frame. In principle the building has ceased to be a crustacean (chief support by masonry shell) and is already implicitly a vertebrate (chief support by skeleton, including support of exterior walls). Jenney did not yet realize the revolutionary quality of the device he had employed above the second floor.

For the first time in America, Bessemer steel is introduced in place of wrought iron above the sixth floor. The importance of the building lies entirely in the construction, not in the design.

6. HOLABIRD & ROCHE

Often considered the first true skyscraper. The outer walls, instead of supporting the building, were designed
Millard F. Bacon, Jr.

Home Insurance Building
Chicago 1883-85
Demolished 1961

The second step in the construction of the skyscraper. The metal skeleton supports all the weight of the building except the exterior Masonry walls which are partially self-supporting. Above the second floor in the Masonry beams between the windows are iron columns which strengthen the piers. The steel columns make it possible to diminish the width of the piers and increase the width of the windows. Part of the weight of the exterior Masonry is carried by the Masonry beams. The support of the Masonry beams is a key to a successful and nautical building.

A ccordingly, when one looks out from the twenty-first floor, the horizon is clear of other buildings. The importance of the building lies entirely in the construction form, not in the gable.

Hollabird & Roche
Tacoma Building, Chicago 1883-88
Demolished 1969

When considered the first frame skyscraper. The outer walls, interior of supporting the building were endeavor
from the first to be supported by the skeleton. But there are still important masonry bearing walls. The skeleton, though more developed than that of the Home Insurance Building, is called upon to carry less than half the actual weight of the building.

The ornament is reminiscent of Richardson, but the general design, unlike that of the Home Insurance Building is light and does not give the impression of masonry bearing walls. Like the first Leiter Building this represents a straight-forward if undistinguished expression of a new type of construction.

7. H. H. RICHARDSON
MARSHALL FIELD WHOLESALe STORE, Chicago. 1885-86.
Demolished 1930.

The masterpiece of commercial architecture in masonry, and the strongest single influence on the design of Chicago commercial architecture of the next generation. Even when this influence was no longer direct, the aesthetic discipline of regular and simple design continued.

8. H. H. RICHARDSON
GLESSNER HOUSE, 1800 South Prairie Avenue, Chicago. 1885.

Here, as in the Marshall Field Wholesale Store, Richardson generalized and recreated the traditional elements of design which he had earlier borrowed directly from the Romanesque. The disposition of the plan with the main rooms opening toward the court rather than toward the street is unusual in America.
from the time to be supported by the patronage. Put there
the self-importance and vanity, paying money. The patronage
should be developed from that of the home insurance
building. In calling upon to carry less plan rail the
secretary's watch of the building.

The arrangement is reminiscent of Richardson's plan for the cen-

ext gable, unlike that of the home insurance building
is right and does not give the impression of naivety
pointing off. Like the little letter. Building Cape Cod-
be seen a deliberate effort in maintaining the expression
of a new type of construction.

H. N. RICHARDSON


Demolition 1930.

The masterpiece of commercial architecture in Chicago, and
the strongest single influence on the gables of Chicago
commercial architecture of the next generation. Even when
this influence was no longer direct, the essential gable-
pickle of regular and simple gable contours.

H. N. RICHARDSON

Publisher House, 1660 South Prairie Avenue, Chicago. 1882.

Here, as in the Marshall Field Wholesale Store, Richardson
emerge and develop the traditional elements of
the gable with play and unmediated gablets from the
Romanesque. The disposition of the plan with the main
rooms opening toward the court lateral plan toward the
street in manner in America.
9. H. H. RICHARDSON
McVEAGH HOUSE, Chicago. 1885. Demolished.
Less original than the Glessner House, this house by
Richardson is nevertheless superior to most work of the
Richardsonians of the eighties. Compare Art Institute
(#10).

10. BURNHAM & ROOT
ART INSTITUTE (Later THE CHICAGO CLUB), Chicago. 1886-87.
Root here attained some of the regularity and dignity of
Richardson's work. The dormers, banded arches and profu-
sion of ornament derive from Richardson's more archaeo-
logical work of the seventies rather than from the
Marshall Field Wholesale Store (#7) and the Glessner
House (#8).

11. BURNHAM & ROOT
FIRST INFANTRY ARMORY (Now 131st INFANTRY ARMORY), South
Michigan Ave. at Sixteenth Street, Chicago. 1890. Rebuilt
after fire, 1894.
The contrast of tiny windows and colossal portal, the
avoidance of fussy detail, and the fortress-like scale
of the whole illustrate the possibilities of the free
traditional design which existed in Chicago before the
World's Fair. The medievalism is hardly Richardsonian
but rather that of the projects of the early nineteenth
century in France.

12. BURNHAM & ROOT
MONADNOCK BLOCK, 53 West Jackson Street, Chicago. 1891.
This entirely unornamented building is the last tall
structure with masonry bearing walls. In spite of its
H. R. RICHARDSON

ROYAL HINSDALE, CHICAGO, I888. Demolished.

Looe exterior to the classed house, the house ya

Historical is not precisely superior to most work of the

Richarsonian of the earlier. Complete Art Institute

H. R. RICHARDSON

ROYAL HINSDALE, CHICAGO, I888. Demolished.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute. 

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.

To the Institute (later the CHICAGO CLUB), CHICAGO, I888-89.

Art Institute.
great originality, this design could hardly have been evolved without the precedent of the Marshall Field Wholesale Store (#7).

13. BURLING & WHITEHOUSE
200 WEST ADAMS STREET, Chicago. C. 1892.

Although this building is Richardsonian in general design, the absence of arches, the unusual cornice and the curved brick corners give it original character.

14. WILLIAM LE BARON JENNEY
LEITER BUILDING II (Now SEARS ROEBUCK & CO.) southeast corner of State and Van Buren Streets, Chicago. 1889-90.

A direct development from Jenney's first Leiter Building (#4) in its clear expression of structure. The detail, however, and the general proportioning show the influence of the Marshall Field Wholesale Store (#7).

15. GEORGE B. POST
PULITZER BUILDING, Park Row, New York. 1889-90.

Although at its completion the tallest building in the world (349 feet), this New York tower is progressive neither in structure nor design. It has masonry bearing walls on the exterior, 12 feet thick at the base, and only the interior is supported on wrought iron columns. Yet the Home Insurance and Tacoma Buildings had been completed several years earlier.

The conventional scheme of academic Renaissance design (the dome of the Invalides has been placed on top of the Louvre) is characteristic of the Eastern architecture of
The conversion of some of the earliest Renaissance gardens to accommodate modern fire escapes has been a significant development in the city's history. The use of these escapes has led to the expansion of the Fire Panel Field, where several new panels have been added. However, the presence of these escapes has caused some concern among residents, as they fear potential safety issues. The Fire Panel Field, located on the western side of the city, is now equipped with these new fire escapes, providing a safer environment for residents. It is hoped that this conversion will not only improve safety but also enhance the aesthetic appeal of the area.
this period, and is inappropriate and devoid of scale. Compare the second Leiter Building (#14) built in the same year in Chicago.

16. ADLER & SULLIVAN
AUDITORIUM BUILDING, Michigan Avenue at Van Buren Street, Chicago. 1887-89.
The treatment here of the masonry bearing walls shows strongly the direct influence of the Marshall Field Wholesale Store (#7). The lower portions have been influenced by the Marquis de Vogüé's publications on early Syrian architecture. Only in the tower appears the beginning of Sullivan's more personal style.

17. ADLER & SULLIVAN
BALLROOM, AUDITORIUM BUILDING, Michigan Avenue at Van Buren Street, Chicago. 1889.
A monumental interior which reveals Sullivan's power of original design in a field totally different from the office buildings which made his fame.

18. ADLER & SULLIVAN
WALKER WAREHOUSE, Market Street between Adams and Quincy Streets, Chicago. 1888-89.
Here the flatter surfaces and the more vertical grouping indicate the direction Sullivan's manner was to take as it freed itself from the influence of Richardson.
This portfolio, and its transparent and general use,
completes the second letter building (A) part in the
same year in Chicago.

1. Adler & Sullivan
WATERBURY MACHINERY BUILDING, completed November 29,
Water Street, Waterbury, Connecticut, 1902.

Here the effect of Sullivan's art is a total different from the
other buildings which made his fame.

2. Adler & Sullivan
MILWAUKEE WAREHOUSE, Market Street, between Hanno and
Cherry Streets, Chicago, 1886.

The influence of the decoration Sullivan's manner was to make
as it used before, from the influence of European
19. ADLER & SULLIVAN
ANSHE MAARIV SYNAGOGUE (Now PILGRIM BAPTIST CHURCH),
southeast corner of Indiana Avenue and 33rd Street,
Chicago. 1890-91.

An interior, simple in general design, but lavishly orna-
mented with the delicate geometric and foliate patterns
so characteristic of Sullivan's later work. In this in-
terior the ornament is a gracious element in the design;
on his office buildings, on the other hand, it is often
incidental and redundant.

20. ADLER & SULLIVAN
SCHILLER BUILDING, (Garrick Theatre) 64 West Randolph
Street, Chicago. 1891-92.

An example of Sullivan's vertical skyscraper design. The
scheme developed in the Wainwright Building of the pre-
vious year in St. Louis is applied to the shell of a metal
skeleton building. The prominent cornice is a feature
which appears in many of Sullivan's buildings.

Note: In the foreground is the Borden Block, 1880, de-
signed by Sullivan when he was a junior partner
in D. Adler & Company.

21. ADLER & SULLIVAN
MEYER BUILDING, southwest corner of Van Buren and
Franklin Streets, Chicago. 1893. Cornice removed.

In this building the horizontal type of design provides
more logical expression of the underlying structure than
the vertical treatment of the Schiller Building (#20).
The wide windows preserve the practical advantages of
An interior, simple in general design, but lavishly ornamented with the delicate geometric and foliate patterns so characteristic of Sullivan's later work. In this in the ceiling and a decorative element in the ceiling of the office building on the other hand it is often incidental and decorative.

SCHILLER BUILDING (Curtiss-designed) 64 West Randolph

An example of Sullivan's vertical skyscraper design. The scheme developed in the Mather and Drummond building of the period. The materials used in the facade were of the same type as those used in the Schiller building. The ornamented cornice is a feature which appears in many of Sullivan's buildings.

Note: In the foreground in the Radar Block, 1890, ge- neral theory of Sullivan when he was a junior partner.

In O. Adler & Company.

MEYER BUILDING, southwest corner of Van Buren and Franklin Streets, Chicago, 1892. Cornice removed.

In this building the parenthesis type of decorative elements were more fully expressed than in the Mather building (460).

The wide window between the projecting cornices of
increased light achieved in the first Leiter Building (#4).

22. LOUIS SULLIVAN  
SCHLESINGER-MEYER BUILDING (Now CARSON PIRIE SCOTT & CO.)  
State and Madison Streets, Chicago. First section 1899.  
Second section 1903-04.  
A further development of the horizontal window treatment.  
The sense of an exterior wall has disappeared. There re-  
mains only a grille of vertical columns and horizontal  
beams, sheathed in terra cotta for fireproofing. The or-  
namental incrustation on the lower stories is typical of  
Sullivan.

23. LOUIS SULLIVAN  
GAGE BUILDING, 18 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 1899.  
Note: Only the facade on the right (Gage Building) is by  
Sullivan. The two facades on the left as well as the  
structure of all three buildings are by HOLABIRD & ROCHE.  
The structure of all three buildings is clearly revealed  
in the facades. The difference between Sullivan's facade  
and the other two is that between the studied proportions  
of fine architecture and ordinary structural honesty.

24. HOLABIRD & ROCHE  
CABLE BUILDING, southeast corner of Jackson and Wabash  
Streets, Chicago. 1899.  
The Chicago formula of skyscraper design used without  
great distinction. But even such ordinary Chicago work  
is more significant than the architectural revivalism  
then current in the eastern United States.
A further development of the perforated window treatment.

The sense of an exterior wall has disappeared. There is now only a slight variation in vertical columns and perforant panels, special interest in certain offices for their own design. The other surfaces are designed in relation of the lower sections to the upper of the building.

Louis Sullivan

Cable Building, South Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 1895.

Note: Only the façade on the right (Green Building) is of Sullivan. The façade on the left is that of Holabird & Roche.

The structure of all these buildings is clearly revealed in the façade. The difference between Sullivan's façade and the other two is that between the actual proportions of the structures and any arbitrary structural member.

Holabird & Roche

Cable Building, South Michigan Avenue, Chicago. 1895.

Greater attention has been paid to organic Chicago work and more significance has been given to the structural development.
25. FLANDERS & ZIMMERMAN
MALLERS WAREHOUSE, 225 South Market Street, Chicago. 1893. Cornice removed.

A further development from the Tacoma Building (# 6) toward the clear expression of new skeleton construction, but without the influence of Sullivan. All ornament is eliminated with the exception of incongruous detail on the doorway.

26. D. H. BURNHAM & COMPANY
RELIANCE BUILDING, southwest corner of State and Washington Streets, Chicago. 1894.

The last building of the type of the Tacoma Building (#6). The wide fenestration provides better lighting than the great majority of present day office buildings.

27. RICHARD E. SCHMIDT
NEPEENAU BUILDING, 63 East Adams Street, Chicago. 1903.

A fine example of the work done by the younger men who, under Sullivan's influence, constituted the Chicago School.

28. ADLER & SULLIVAN
CHARNLEY HOUSE, 1365 Astor Street, Chicago. 1892.

This is the finest of the few houses built by Sullivan. A large part of the design is due to the young Frank Lloyd Wright, then in charge of all the domestic work done in Sullivan's office. Without the stimulus and discipline of the new skeleton construction Sullivan's style was characterized chiefly by simple dignity and a new grammar of ornament. His domestic building was distinguished, but not as significant as his skyscrapers.
A further development from the Tacoma building (e) was the open expression of new skeleton construction, with the influence of Sullivan. All ornament is eliminated with the exception of inscriptions. As we enter the gates of the company...

D. H. Burnham & Company
160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago

The first building of the type of the Tacoma building is the Reuben Buell Building, southwest corner of State and Wabash. The wire latticework provides perfect lighting.

Can the greatest majority of present-day office buildings stand up to the example of the work done by the young men who under Sullivan's influence constructed the Chicago School.

Richard H. Schmidt
Independent Building, 65 East Adams Street, Chicago

A time example of the work done by the young men who went in Sullivan's office. Without the stimulus and great influence of the new skeleton construction, Sullivan's work was derivative and formula. His ceramic building was the first.

J. H. Haskins
153 Wacker Drive, Chicago

This is the first of the few houses built by Sullivan. A large part of the basement is due to the young American architect's flair for space, form, and economy. His ceramic building was the first.
29. GEORGE MAHER
FATTEN HOUSE, 1426 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Illinois. 1902.

A house by a member of the Chicago School which followed Sullivan's artistic leadership. The houses of this group, although they introduced few innovations, established a standard in non-traditional domestic architecture by their simplicity and dignity and by their careful use of materials and detail.

30. RICHARD E. SCHMIDT, GARDEN & MARTIN
SElz, SCHWAB & CO., northwest corner of Kingsbury and Superior Streets, Chicago. 1907.

This factory has real architectural quality based only on the character of the ferro-concrete structure. At this early date a factory at once so simple and so well studied in its proportions was a rarity in America.

31. RICHARD E. SCHMIDT, GARDEN & MARTIN
HUMBOLDT PARK PAVILION, Chicago. 1908.

The use of the style of the Chicago School in a decorative public building indicates the extent of the acceptance of non-traditional architecture at the opening of the century.

32. DWIGHT H. PERKINS
CARL SCHURZ HIGH SCHOOL, 3601 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago. 1910.

This building owes little specifically to Sullivan. But it indicates the ability of the members of the Chicago School to find a new type of design for new problems.
George Manor

1201 Tartan House, 1155 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Illinois

A house by a member of the Chicago School which follows Sullivan's artistic leadership. The houses of this group, although they introduced few innovations, established a standard in non-pretentious homes of distinction in their simplicity and dignity and on their careful use of materials and detail.

RICHARD E. SCHMIDT, GARDEN & MARTIN

301 Superior Street, Chicago, Illinois

This lesson was taught in the Chicago School at the kiln and in the studio. The pupils were instructed in the proportions of the facade and the height of the columns. The use of the style of the Chicago School in a facade is the pupil's delight. The extent of the open and the interior of the building were of the century.

Dwight H. Perkins

Carl Schurz High School, 507 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

The pupils were instructed in the calligraphy of the members of the Chicago School. The pupil to find a new type of gesture for new problems.
Especially in such a school is the superiority of their inventions over the archaeology of the stylistic revivalists clear.

33. FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT
WINGLOW HOUSE, Lake Street, River Forest, Illinois, 1892-93.

This, Wright's earliest important independent building, shows him still a disciple of Sullivan. Early in the 1900's he set out on new paths independent of the general Chicago School. Leaving the field of commercial building, he created a new domestic style which was to affect the course of modern architecture profoundly.
Especially in such a school as the Academy of their
inspiration over the.temperament of the.Victoria let
natural sight

FRAZIER IMP. WRIGHT
WINSLOW HOUSE, Lake Street, River Forest, Illinois
1892-93.

This Wright's splendid interior improvement of the
shows him at if a disciple of Sullivan. Early in the
1890's he set out on new paths independent of the Ren-
East Chicago School. Leaving the first of commercial
building, he created a new domestic style which was to
alter the course of modern architecture profoundly.