IN 1959, LATE IN HIS LIFE, the sculptor Paul Manship (1885–1966) recalled the circumstances of his first major commission, the John Pierpont Morgan Memorial (Figure 1, Colorplate 19) for the Great Hall of The Metropolitan Museum of Art:

Of course it was a great opportunity and I was perhaps impressed to a great degree by the responsibility involved. I made many, many, many sketches. Seemed like it was such a simple thing that it could have been done immediately. I changed. I decided on new ideas, and different ideas. I spent a whole year just making sketches. I wouldn’t say I spent entirely that whole time, but a good part of it. And finally, when it was satisfactory with the architects of the museum I began to develop it. I spent six years doing this tablet. . . . [T]he actual carving of it, in stone, took three people. . . . I figured out when it was all done, that it represented for the carving of the stone alone, three and a quarter years, counting six days a week at eight hours a day.¹

Manship’s account testifies to the attention the Museum staff and trustees, the Morgan family, the Museum architects, McKim, Mead and White, and two different sculptors—first Daniel Chester French (1850–1931) and then Manship—lavished on the development of the memorial between 1913 and 1920. By the time the finished tablet was unveiled in December 1920, hundreds of letters and scores of photographs, models, and preparatory drawings had exchanged hands: what amounts to a meticulous record of the commission’s progress.² Collectively, these documents offer unprecedented insight into the memorial’s significance to the Metropolitan Museum as a permanent tribute to one of its greatest patrons.

The panel at the center of the memorial is inscribed with a lengthy celebration of Morgan’s longtime service to the Museum as a benefactor and to New York as a leading citizen and financier. This vertical slab is framed by twelve niche panels. On the sides are six high-relief allegorical representations of Morgan’s interests: on the left, from top to bottom, Commerce, Finance, and Science (Figure 2); on the right, Art, Literature, and Archaeology (Figure 3). Above the inscription are two winged putti flanking a wreath and, at the corners, winged lions that, according to Manship, are symbols of immortality.³ Below are reclining figures—an extolling female and a lamenting male—playing on lyres to either side of a festoon, which is echoed in the bottom corner panels. Surrounding and separating these panels is banding carved in very low relief, with scrolling and fluted ornament and figures that are thematically related to the high-relief allegories. In total, the memorial contains fifty figures of Manship’s design. In its original location on the northwest pier supporting the center dome of the Great Hall, it was surmounted by a decorative foliate scrollwork pediment (Figure 4). To accommodate its current setting on the south side of the Great Hall entrance vestibule, the pediment was removed during renovations in 1970, and the overall installation height was lowered considerably. In addition, the 6½-inch-deep sides of the memorial, which featured low-relief figurative representations of the twelve signs of the zodiac (Figure 5), were sunk into the present wall, regretfully obscuring them.⁴

J. Pierpont Morgan (1837–1913) was involved in the Metropolitan Museum almost from its founding, becoming a patron in 1871 and a trustee in 1885.⁵ In 1901 he was named to the trustees’ executive committee; three years later he became first vice president and then president of the board upon the death of his predecessor, Frederick W. Rhinelander. Morgan’s tenure, which lasted until his death on March 31, 1913, was marked by an expansionist mood, certainly in the physical scale of the Museum building but also in terms of its operating budget, in the professionalization of the curatorial departments, and, not least, in the size and quality of its collections. Morgan’s imprint
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Figure 1. Paul Manship (American, 1885–1966). John Pierpont Morgan Memorial, 1915–20. Limestone. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of the Trustees, 1920 (20.265). This photograph shows the monument after it was completed in 1920; the pediment was later removed. See also Colorplate 13.
Figure 2. Detail of the *Morgan Memorial* in Figure 1, showing left-side panels.

Figure 3. Detail of the *Morgan Memorial* in Figure 1, showing right-side panels.
endures in each of these areas. His first gift of a work of art to the Museum came in 1897, with donations continuing steadily before and after his death. As plans for his memorial were unfolding, negotiations were taking place between the Museum and Morgan’s son, J. P. Morgan Jr. (1867–1943), for what in 1917 became the spectacular gift of some seven thousand objects, many of which had been on loan to or stored at the Museum. These varied works, from Egyptian antiquities to medieval metalwork and ivories to European paintings and sculpture, are a collective tribute to Morgan’s near-frenzied acquisitiveness and his keen eye in areas representing almost every curatorial department. As one measure of the institution’s gratitude, the Wing of Decorative Arts (Wing F), which had opened in 1910 to house the Hoentschel...
collection of French decorative arts given by Morgan, was renamed in 1918 the John Pierpont Morgan Wing. His objects were displayed there until 1943, when the collection was dispersed throughout the Museum. The *Morgan Memorial* was a second material manifestation of the Museum’s appreciation.6

The Morgan Memorial Committee was formed in April 1913, several weeks after Morgan’s death. Museum trustees George F. Baker, George Blumenthal, John L. Cadwalader, and the new board president, William Church Osborn, were named to the committee; financier Edward Dean Adams (1846–1931) was appointed chairman.7 Ch argued with determining a suitable memorial to the late president, the committee initially turned to one of its own, fellow trustee Daniel Chester French, to create and presumably donate his services for the tablet.8 A trustee since 1903, French was the chairman of the committee on sculpture and the only professional artist then serving on the board; he was also friendly with Morgan, for not only were they board colleagues, French was one of a group of trustees who gathered informally to socialize in Morgan’s private library on Thirty-sixth Street.9 Then the country’s leading monumental sculptor, French was in the early stages of modeling his best-known work, the over-lifesize seated *Lincoln* (1911–22) for the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. By late May 1913, French was preparing bas-relief sketches for the *Morgan Memorial* at his summer home and studio, Chesterwood, in Stockbridge, Massachusetts.10

In early June French sent three preliminary plaster studies to McKim, Mead and White, the architectural firm responsible for the Museum’s master plan from 1904 to 1926, which were then passed on to the Morgan committee.11 One study, unlocated and presumed destroyed, depicted a single draped female figure over a tablet for an inscription. Another, dated May 1913 (Figure 6), shows cursorily worked nude figures—on the left a male, and on the right a female supporting a barely delineated infant—recessed within a flat frame. They flank an altar with hatchmarks indicating the intended location for the inscription, while a tree of life emerges above. The appearance of the third sketch, presumably a variation on the second, is unrecorded. French was partial to the single figure, but the Morgan committee opted for the design with two figures.12 Mindful of the future memorial’s public setting and lifesize scale, the committee also expressed its preference “for figures more or less draped.”13

French refined the multigure composition and in July presented to the committee an enlarged plaster sketch, dated 1913 (Figure 7). Far more sophisticated in terms of visual imagery, the sketch depicts, on the left, a bearded elderly male in classicizing drapery, representing Knowledge.14 He holds a globe in his right hand and rests his left foot on a stack of books. The woman, whose breasts and left hip are exposed, signifies the Arts; she holds a sketchily decorated Greek amphora, and there is an Egyptian sphinx head at her feet. By incorporating such references, French commemorated Morgan’s collecting interests in visual form (the objects) as well as in the inscriptions on the step-molded tablet and decorative horizontal panel below. The partially draped, idealized female was a favored motif in French’s monumental repertoire, as epitomized in the *Mourning Victory for the Melvin Memorial* (1906–8; this carving, 1912–15, acc. no. 15.75), an over-lifesize marble replica of a Civil War memorial commissioned for the Museum in 1912.15

From the outset, McKim, Mead and White served as the general contractor for the *Morgan Memorial* and as the official conduit between French, the Morgan Memorial Committee, and J. P. Morgan Jr., who served.
on the Metropolitan’s board from 1910 to 1943. The firm was later compensated for its services on a subcontract basis by Mansfield, receiving ten percent of the sculptor’s total payment. McKim, Mead and White retained authority over the appearance of the memorial’s architectural elements and installation. The architects and both sculptors would have been accustomed to this type of formalized creative collaboration between the arts, an interrelationship promulgated at the École des Beaux-Arts, its French and American academic offspring, and the American Academy in Rome. (The inspiration of Charles McKim of McKim, Mead and White, the American Academy had been established in 1894 as the American School of Architecture, with Morgan as one of its leading financial contributors.)

The firm’s first priority was to suggest, in collaboration with the Morgan Memorial Committee, where the sculpture should be sited and what alterations should be made to the existing building to accommodate it. The immediate consensus was to install the tablet on one of the four piers supporting the dome of Richard Morris Hunt’s Great Hall, which then contained pedimented niches used to display marble sculpture. Deliberations focused on which of the piers was most appropriate, and whether a pendant setting for a future memorial should be considered. French initially favored the northeast pier, to alleviate “want of balance” for entering visitors “in the two sides if the memorial were put in one of the West piers.” Adams proposed they create a second tablet bearing the names of less significant donors or that of Jacob S. Rogers, who had unexpectedly bequeathed the Museum five million dollars following his death in 1901. French and the architects eventually settled on a single tablet on the northwest pier, a recommendation approved by the trustees’ building committee in June 1913 and executed seven years later.

With French’s sketch in advanced stages, the committee prepared to present its concepts for the memorial to J. P. Morgan Jr. In June, McKim, Mead and White enlarged French’s earlier two-figure sketch by drawing it to full scale, with figures rendered about seven feet high (a copy of the blueprint drawing is in the MMA Archives). French then ordered solar photographs of his revised sketch, which were enlarged to two different sizes and positioned in situ so he could finalize the composition as well as the details of the architectural surround. In early August, French and Adams met Morgan at the Museum to review design concepts. The solar prints were set into the pedimented niches on the southwest and northwest piers for Morgan’s consideration (Figure 8); while he approved the recommended selection of the northwest pier, he found Hunt’s heavy architectural elements around the proposed tablet overwhelming and requested new installation photographs from McKim, Mead and White showing those features eliminated.

Revised photographs of the setting, supplied to Morgan, French, and Adams in September, show the tablet placed against a flat-faced wall with stone blocks drawn with a straightedge (Figure 9). Morgan’s preference, which was adopted, later necessitated the removal of the pedimented niche and the disc above it; during installation in 1920 they were replaced with plain ashlar limestone blocks.

As decisions regarding the scale and setting of the tablet proceeded on course, design matters took an unexpected turn. Morgan’s response to French’s solicitation for criticism was couched in vague praise: “As far as the general lines of the sketch are concerned, it seems to me to be well balanced and pleasing in its proportion.” He declined further comment until
Figure 8. View of solar print of Daniel Chester French’s sketch model for the Morgan Memorial as installed on the southwest pier of the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum, 1913. Photograph: Archives of The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York

Figure 9. View of solar print of Daniel Chester French’s revised sketch model for the Morgan Memorial, as installed on the northwest pier of the Great Hall of the Metropolitan Museum, 1913. Photograph: Archives of The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York
other family members had reviewed the photographs, and although he had stated to French that radical suggestions for change were inappropriate, Morgan was more forthright in a letter to Adams:

In regard to the design itself for the memorial, I must say that I am not satisfied. It does not seem to me that Mr. French has produced a sketch which is sufficiently suggestive of the manifold interests and sides of Father’s life and character. It is not very satisfactory to criticise [sic] destructively without making some suggestion, and I really do not know how to make any. . . . My feeling is that the Museum is doing an exceedingly kind and gracious act, and that it is ungracious of me, or any member of Father’s family, to criticise it; yet I really do not think that the design will be found to work out satisfactorily. It really strikes me as being somewhat clumsy and somewhat meaningless. . . . I hope you will forgive my criticism and take the matter up with Mr. Robinson [the Museum’s director] and see whether something a little different could be suggested to Mr. French without hurting any feelings.25

How French was informed of Morgan’s reaction—and, perhaps more important, how directly he was told—is unrecorded, but by late September the sculptor’s take on the situation, as he told William M. Kendall (1856–1941), of McKim, Mead and White, was that the Morgan family preferred an architectural to a figural tablet, and that he himself agreed.26 A month later French’s decision to abandon the commission was made official. The trustees authorized the Morgan committee to pursue the preparation of an architectural tablet, whose design was to be submitted for approval to both the trustees’ executive committee and Morgan Jr.27 Such cautious, conciliatory behavior was undoubtedly directly related to the trustees’ ongoing efforts to court Morgan for the acquisition of his father’s collection.

The matter was ultimately resolved in a manner that downplayed Morgan Jr.’s obvious dissatisfaction with French’s work and avoided a potentially uncomfortable dynamic between fellow board members. French’s sketches proved useful in determining the form, size, and placement of the final memorial, but the differences between French’s concept, as sculptor, and those of the Museum as patron—not to mention those of the Morgan family and McKim, Mead and White—had stifled the artist’s vision. French’s original design, of a single nude female, revealed nothing about Morgan as an individual, his interests, or his contributions to the Metropolitan. Furthermore, French found the deadline the committee had set for the completion and installation of the memorial—January 1, 1914, not even six months away—impossible to meet. The committee envisioned coordinating the unveiling of the memorial with the opening of the important Morgan loan exhibition, especially with the fate of Morgan’s collection still hanging in the balance. French, well aware of the complexities of the modeling, enlargement, and translation processes, had succinctly stated his opinion to William R. Mead of McKim, Mead and White the previous June: “It cannot be done.”28

McKim, Mead and White thus assumed full responsibility for the appearance of the tablet. In October 1913 an unsigned memo between firm members gave directions to “prepare drawings for the design of the Morgan memorial; also consider the subject of general memorial tablets throughout the Museum.”29 Letters over the next several months record slow and laconic progress that focused as much on the tablet’s architectural relationship to the Great Hall and on the selection of stone as it did on design specifics. Sometime during the winter of 1913–14, French stepped back in to recommend that the promising young sculptor Paul Manship be asked to give the project much-needed artistic direction. Manship had earned critical praise from French and others during his tenure at the American Academy in Rome, and he had clearly profited from his exposure to its closely knit group of artists and patrons, many of whom (including Morgan) were affiliated with the Metropolitan Museum. French wrote to William Mead, president of the academy, on Manship’s behalf: “Mr. Manship, who returned a year ago, achieved instant . . . success by his archaistic work—as fine as anything of its kind ever done. His achievements are most remarkable.”30 Correspondence from March 1914 onward cites Manship as the sculptor of choice.

French’s support of the untested Manship for such an aesthetically and socially prestigious commission was an act of both risk and generosity. French often recommended younger sculptors for commissions, including those he could not take on himself, but his advocacy for Manship had roots in cultural nationalism as well. The notion of an American “school” of sculpture was championed within professional artistic ranks at the turn of the twentieth century, and French was particularly committed to advancing new American sculptural stars to succeed Augustus Saint-Gaudens and John Quincy Adams Ward, who had died in 1907 and 1910, respectively. By 1908 French was following the development of Manship’s career with interest.

Born in Minnesota, Manship had worked as a commercial artist in Minneapolis and St. Paul before moving to New York in 1905. He studied at the Art Students League with Beaux-Arts–inspired sculptor Hermon Atkins MacNeil (1866–1947), and until
1907 he served as a studio apprentice to Solon Borglum (1868–1922), a French-trained sculptor of subjects from the American West. In 1907–8 Manship took life classes at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts in Philadelphia, where his instructors included Charles Grafly (1862–1929), a realist portrait sculptor, in modeling, and William Merritt Chase (1849–1916) in drawing. From 1908 to 1909 Manship worked in the New York studio of Viennese émigré Isidore Konti (1862–1938), who in 1909 encouraged Manship to compete for a three-year fellowship at the American Academy in Rome. French, a trustee of the aesthetically conservative academy, was chair of the selection committee. He endorsed Manship’s successful application, which afforded the artist three years to work in Rome and travel widely throughout Italy and Greece. While abroad Manship kept French abreast of his progress, sending him letters with photographs of his recent work; in response, French offered the younger artist critiques and study tips and visited him during a trip to Rome. Shortly after Manship returned to the United States in the autumn of 1912, French recommended him for two commissions: one was to a Massachusetts patron for an unrealized memorial, the other was for a bronze statue of a Revolutionary War soldier for Danville, Illinois (1913–14), for which French designed the memorial setting and oversaw contract and production details. His largesse is summarized in a December 1913 letter in which he told Manship, “Your success is a great satisfaction to me.”

In his capacity as a Museum trustee and as chair of the committee on sculpture, French used the Metropolitan as a platform to promote Manship’s career, as he did for certain other sculptors. This sustained encouragement extended beyond recommending Manship for the Morgan Memorial, for as the Museum’s de facto curator of sculpture French enjoyed purchasing powers. In April 1913, at the same time that the Morgan Memorial Committee was assembled, French recommended that the Museum purchase one of ten sculptures Manship had completed during his tenure at the American Academy in Rome and exhibited to acclaim in February of that year at the Architectural League of New York. The archaic Centaur and Dryad (Figure 10), a rhythmic statuette of a lecherous centaur with a startled wood nymph, surmounts a base with finely worked, low-relief mythological scenes that call to mind Greek vase painting. Difficulties in the bronze casting process delayed the accession of the sculpture until April 1914, by which time another replica (now at the Detroit Institute of Arts) had earned the National Academy of Design’s prestigious Helen Foster Barnet Prize for best sculpture by an artist under age thirty-five. The Metropolitan’s purchase was particularly beneficial to Manship’s rapidly developing critical reputation, for it placed a celebrated sculpture in a prominent institution. Manship later recalled that during the 1910s, between the Morgan Memorial and his other commissioned and non-commissioned works, he “had a studio going at full blast.” By the time the Morgan tablet was dedicated in 1920, Manship was represented in the Metropolitan’s collection with the Civic Forum Medal of Honor (1914; acc. no. 14.107) and Pauline Frances (1914; acc. no. 16.420), both gifts, as well as the Art War Relief Medal (1918; acc. no. 18.126), a purchase. By 1931, the end of French’s tenure as a trustee, an additional fifteen sculptures, coins, and medals had been acquired.

With the Morgan tablet in process, French continued to validate Manship’s critical standing through Museum auspices. His enthusiasm for the sculptor was reinforced by others affiliated with the Metropolitan, especially after the tablet had been commissioned. Edward Dean Adams, for example, expressed an interest in buying a cast of Manship’s Playfulness (1912–14;
Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, D.C.) at the time of the Museum’s purchase of Centaur and Dryad. He did not acquire one, but Wrestlers (1915; acc. no. 27.21.1), a gift to the Museum from Adams, bears a personalized inscription from Mansfield dated 1916. During the summer of that year, Edward Robinson (1858–1931), the Museum’s director since 1910, installed an exhibition of twenty-six bronzes by Mansfield in the Jesup Memorial Library in Bar Harbor, Maine. This remarkable vote of confidence by a museum director for a living artist resulted in a lasting friendship between the two men, with Mansfield in 1923 modeling a portrait medal of Robinson and his wife that he later cast in bronze and presented as a gift to the Museum in 1955 (acc. no. 55.19.1, 2). The catalogue for the Bar Harbor exhibition included a highly complimentary monographic article by A. E. Gallatin (1881–1952), an art critic and donor of American and British works on paper, that was reprinted in the Bulletin of The Metropolitan Museum of Art in October 1916. Gallatin’s puff celebrated Mansfield’s stylistic diversity and exquisite craftsmanship and became the basis of the first monograph on the sculptor, published the following year. French also selected sculptures by Mansfield for the Museum’s “Exhibition of American Sculpture,” a long-term installation of works by living artists that opened in 1918. Large colored plaster models of Mansfield’s Indian Hunter and Pronghorn Antelope (both 1914) and a bronze version of Dancer and Gazelles (1916) were included in the original installation (the Metropolitan now has in its collection bronze reductions of each of these groups, acc. nos. 48.149.27, 48.149.28, and 59.54). Despite this apparent coddling, Mansfield was subjected to an arduous step-by-step process to gain board approval for the Morgan commission. Rather than giving him complete artistic license, the Morgan committee provided Mansfield with a manuscript architectural template by McKim, Mead and White as a starting point, in theory limiting the sculptor’s purview to the design of the ornamental borders. Design specifics were negotiated between the Morgan committee and Morgan Jr. in the early months of 1914, and the final scheme—an inscribed tablet centered within a frame of low-relief ornaments and emblems—was quickly adopted. Adams had proposed to Morgan “the possibility of using some portion or all of the emblems significant of your father’s degrees and orders, and . . . if you approve of the general idea, I would thank you to furnish me with a complete list thereof.” Morgan complied, but he also expressed his preference for incorporating representations of countries in which his father had had particular interests and impacts: America, England, France, Germany, Italy, and Egypt. William M. Kendall, a partner in McKim, Mead and White since 1906 and the principle architect working on the project, provided the Morgan committee with a refined drawing of the architectural framework. Kendall also suggested that buildings Morgan had financed—such as the Harvard Medical School, the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford, Connecticut, and his own library (designed by Charles McKim between 1902 and 1906)—might also be worthy of representation in the panel surrounds. But the final selection and appearance, he felt, was best left to Mansfield’s discretion, as he indicated to Adams:

I should suggest that a list of possible subjects for the sculpture be prepared from which Mansfield might make his selection unless there are certain subjects which Mr. Morgan’s family and your Committee believe essential. We all feel that, as far as possible, Mansfield should be left to make his own choice. He would then model “con amore.”

This list, titled “Subjects Appropriate to the Life of John Pierpont Morgan,” included such categories as Coats of Arms, Degrees, Orders, and Buildings. It also presented Adams’s proposal for a scheme addressing Morgan’s spheres of work and collecting: Art, Painting, Architecture, Sculpture, Commerce, Literature, and Finance. Mansfield was provided with design drawings as well as this list, and from these broad categories he devised the six allegorical representations for the side panels, a program that remained unchanged throughout the sequence of sketch models.

Like the architectural skeleton upon which Mansfield’s designs were to be imposed, the content of the inscription was provided to the sculptor as a non-negotiable element. The text was composed by the Honorable Joseph H. Choate, a founding trustee of the Museum who remained on the board until his death in 1917. To guide Choate, Adams provided specifications, notably that the inscription should fill the entire tablet, and that it should be limited to approximately eighteen lines and sixty-eight words. The appearance of the inscription would necessarily depend on the size of the letters and their relationship to the scale of the tablet and frame. Choate’s solution, which hews to the exact word and line counts specified, underwent little refinement once he submitted it for consideration in December 1914 and inspected it on a model in Mansfield’s studio in 1916. Succinct yet encompassing, it celebrates Morgan’s “life full of work”: 
and originality. Entre nous, if we can allow Manship a little freedom and at the same time call a halt upon too great exuberance we may lead him to the production of a very beautiful and at the same time original work of art. He is ambitious to make this memorial one of character. 52

Adams agreed, “especially since [Manship] is now in a condition of thought and action that it is sometimes termed ‘full of his subject.’”53 But Manship did not present his first sketch models until the spring of 1915, establishing what would become a pattern of chronic delays. As correspondence over the next several years attests, the relationship between the sculptor and the Morgan committee grew increasingly

For Manship, the decorative appearance of the inscription—the proportions and relationships between words and letters—was an integral part of the overall composition. 54 It was also a component he was well suited to design, for as a commercial artist in St. Paul he had painted signs and advertising and had become adept at a range of lettering styles.

With the raw materials for the design in hand, Manship worked on sketch models during the summer of 1914, first in his New York studio in MacDougal Alley and then in Europe, especially Rome. These sketches were to be submitted to the full board of trustees for approval in October. Later that year, after the deadline had passed, Kendall nonetheless sent Adams an optimistic report:

I paid a visit to Manship’s studio to-day to see what had been done by him about the memorial to the late Mr. Morgan. I am convinced that if we give him time enough that we shall have a very satisfactory result and a thing of beauty.

Manship has by no means been idle all this time and has tried many schemes, but has not definitely arrived at one which either he, or we, are satisfied with. They all, however, show points of great interest

Figure 11. Manship’s first plaster sketch model for the Morgan Memorial, 1916. Photograph: Peter A. Juley & Son Collection, Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, D.C. (Jo039095)
strained, with McKim, Mead and White serving as the mediating party.

Manship’s plaster working models as well as his finished plaster tablet are documented in a group of fourteen photographs by Peter A. Juley—at the time New York’s leading fine-arts photographer—that are now in the collection of the Smithsonian American Art Museum. The Juley photographs of three of the plaster sketch models are particularly valuable because they summarize the progress of the memorial’s development from Manship’s initial designs, presented to the Morgan committee in the spring of 1915, to the final version as installed in 1920.

Manship prepared his first and second plaster sketch models from 1914 to 1915. The first (Figure 11) introduced key elements that carried through to the final version: an architectural framework; the tablet at center; flanking vertical panels with allegorical figures and decorative banding; and a horizontal figurative panel above the inscription. This tightly conceived composition, in which each unit is integral to the overall effect, reflects Manship’s skill as a designer. The ensemble was crowned, however, by a group of three figures (Wisdom, Bounty, and Architecture) that served as a kind of pediment; far larger in scale than the figures in the main part of the tablet, the trio had the inadvertent effect of directing visual attention toward the top, and away from the center, of the memorial.

The variety of Manship’s designs for the Morgan Memorial reflects his widespread artistic inspirations and catholic tastes. As A. E. Gallatin aptly noted in his
1916 Bulletin article, the artist’s “mind has acted as a crucible, into which various influences have been poured.” Without a specific teacher during his three years in Rome, Manship was free to explore and study what he referred to as “points of view,” meaning influential aesthetic and technical touchstones for his own art. He drew on familiar high classical sculpture as well as a rich visual vocabulary of Western and Eastern sources, from the art of ancient Greece and Rome and the Italian Renaissance to that of Egypt and India. He was particularly attracted to the sculpture and vase painting of archaic Greece, which predates the classical precedents favored by Beaux-Arts-trained American sculptors at the turn of the twentieth century but also moves beyond those in terms of aesthetics. Before Manship returned to Italy in the summer of 1914 to work on the memorial, he had announced to Adams that he planned to make a study of bronze wall monuments; while abroad, he gathered ideas that he later put into sketch form on paper and in clay.

Drawing was critical to Manship’s creative practice. Interviewed decades after the completion of the memorial, he explained his usual working method: “I think that drawing is part of the process of sculpture . . . [I]t’s quicker for me in designing something to draw it first, as a rule . . . I make hundreds of little sketches, indicating proportions, indicating movement or whatever that interests me, composition—and especially work that is done in relief, that really is drawing from the beginning.” Of the “many, many, many” sketches that Manship said he completed for
the Morgan commission, just eight pencil drawings, in
the collection of the Minnesota Museum of American
Art, remain to guide our understanding of the memorial’s conceptual evolution. Six of these correlate to the
preliminary and final designs for figures in the allegor-
cal side panels; two others are unrealized concepts
that do not relate directly to the documented sculpted
models. All are executed on cream-colored tracing
paper, Manship’s preferred support, because he could
draw over, and thus refine, earlier sketches. The
drawings related to the Morgan commission are executed in an outline style that pays little attention to
the recording of bodily form; most of the figures are
shown surrounded by rectangles, already framed
within their niche surrounds. Some, such as Finance
(Figures 12, 13), as depicted in the first and second
models, have a confident gestural appearance, with
free-flowing sweeps of the pencil. Others, including
Literature (Figures 14, 15), a male figure introduced
in the second model and shown holding an open
book, are more studied, their lines firmer and more
static. Most of the extant drawings relate to the figures
as executed in the first two sketch models, with certain
attributes carrying forward to the final design. This is
the case with Archaeology (Figures 16, 17), even
though the positions of the vase and column she holds
were eventually switched in the final limestone.

Manship’s first sketch model was shown to the
trustees’ executive committee in May 1915. The
committee accepted the design scheme but reserved
the right to recommend additional compositional
changes. Manship began his second version, despite
this vote of confidence, after seeing the enlarged photograph of the first model. While Adams requested that Manship temporarily cease work on the project (for reasons undокументed, but probably because a contract had not been signed), the sculptor continued with the second version, correcting what he perceived as the faults of the first. By late June Manship had completed the second model (Figure 18); he then had it photographed and prints sent to McKim, Mead and White for their inspection and critique.

The second sketch model maintained the requisite center tablet, but it departed from the earlier plaster sketch in a number of significant aspects: notably, in how the sculpture now seems subsumed within the architecture, and the problematic disparity of scale among the elements. The size of the inscription was reduced, and the line spacing and word format introduced in this sketch were eventually retained in the final limestone. But Manship eliminated the framework banding and set the six allegorical figures into the same field as the inscription. He also rearranged the placement of the figures and changed the gender of three to male: Commerce, in the guise of Mercury; Science, as an astronomer and chemist; and Literature, as a bearded, laurel-wreathed philosopher whose appearance changed little from the sketch drawing to the final result (see Figure 13). The panel was surrounded by a scrollwork frame and topped by a small, low-relief pediment with an urn at its center. The pediment was crowned by a male representation of Wisdom much larger in scale than the other figures, with winged sphinxlike creatures, inspired by those that surmount archaic Greek grave stelae, gracing the two top corners.

McKim, Mead and White, the Morgan committee, and French together weighed the merits of the two sketch versions and agreed that the first was preferable, as Manship himself eventually conceded. The general consensus was that the group of three figures on top was more interesting than a single figure, and that architectural framing bordering the panels was necessary. With the first sketch model deemed acceptable after suggested refinements, the parties proceeded to negotiate contract terms, a process fraught with politely couched disputes over payment amounts and time frame. Widely different expectations for the total project budget nearly caused a rupture between Manship and the Morgan committee, differences that were reconciled only after Manship agreed to reduce his price and to execute the work in two years. Manship also drew the ongoing ire of McKim, Mead and White, which as the intermediary between the sculptor’s design and the architecture of the Great Hall reminded the sculptor that the memorial’s architectural features were subject to its control and must be “distinctly classic in feeling.” The contract was finally signed in November 1915; McKim, Mead and White’s elevation drawing (Figure 19) was inserted into each copy as the architectural template from which Manship’s work was expected to proceed at an expedited pace.

Manship completed a third sketch model (whose appearance is unrecorded) in the spring of 1916 after numerous pleas for progress from Adams (“public and private interest wane greatly if prompt action delayed”), which he answered with his own reassurances (“It gives me pleasure to say that the work on the small models is progressing favorably”). At this point Manship and the Morgan committee debated the appropriateness of incorporating into the design a
out of deference to his father’s private nature and a
desire not to record in sculptural form (particularly in
profile) the elder Morgan’s rhinophyma, a disease
that had enlarged his nose into a bulbous mass during
middle age. The iconic photograph of Morgan,
Edward Steichen’s 1903 print (MMA acc. no. 49.55.107),
records the condition, but there it is allayed by the
subject’s indomitable glare.

The exact appearance of the final small sketch
model, which was formally accepted in February
1917, is unknown, but it clearly moved toward an
overall simplification of design. The elimination of
the proposed portrait medallion allowed more space
for Choate’s inscription; there were also modifi-
cations made to the architectural elements, whose
appearance had become a subject of considerable ten-
sion between Manship and McKim, Mead and White.
In his earlier designs Manship seems to have failed,
despite repeated appeals from the firm, to produce
what they characterized as “a thing that is classical in
spirit” to harmonize with the Great Hall. Correspond-
ence and drawings thus recommended altering the
general proportions and dimensions of the tablet as
well as the width of the border ornament; the neces-
sity of adding a crowning gable was also questioned, as
was the possible elimination of the heavy brackets on
the bottom edge. In summarizing these changes,
Kendall firmly reminded Manship: “I think a little
closer co-operation in the future would insure better
results all around, always bearing in mind, however,
that we want the imprint of your hand and feeling in
the ornamentation, provided it does not stray too far
from the classic which you know so well how to do.”

Although stone had always been the presumed
medium for the memorial, the specific type was subject
to prolonged consideration. Discussions began in
the months after French withdrew his sketches and before
Manship was selected as sculptor. Adams, aware of the
family’s wish to tailor the memorial to Morgan’s indi-
vidual interests, suggested to Morgan Jr. that por-
phyry, framed by stone of a harmonious color, might
be appropriate for the center of the tablet, as his
father had been fond of it and had collected porphyry objects; light Botticino marble was also men-
tioned. Manship raised a short-lived idea for a
bronze surround, citing it as more readily repro-
ducible and sympathetic to his best style of work
(indeed, the majority of his oeuvre is in bronze).
Although the porphyry center appealed to Morgan Jr.,
it proved impossible to locate a suitably sized and rea-
sonably priced piece in Italy. Other proposed materi-
als included Pompton granite with raised bronze
letters, red Verona marble, Tennessee marble, red
granite, and, finally, French Champville limestone, a

---

Figure 10. McKim, Mead and White. Preparatory drawing
attached to contract for the Morgan Memorial, November 1915.
McKim, Mead and White Collection, box 247, file 5-192,
Department of Prints, Photographs, and Architectural Collec-
tions, New York Historical Society.

medallion-like profile bust portrait of Morgan, space
for which had been included in the recent sketch.
Eager to include the portrait, Manship requested
photographs of Morgan for reference purposes from
Herbert L. Satterlee, Morgan’s son-in-law, who
possessed a sizable collection. But after visiting
Manship’s studio to view the sketch model, Morgan Jr.
objected to the portrait, an outcome that Adams had
anticipated. Undoubtedly the son’s resistance grew
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the Piccirilli’s estimate of no less than ten thousand dollars to carve the detailed sculpture, agreed to undertake the translation from plaster to stone in his own studio.76 The Piccirilli Brothers were eventually retained, but only to set the memorial into the Great Hall pier. Manship’s full-size plaster model (Figure 20), the reference from which the final limestone was carved, evolved from the final small sketch over the course of nearly twenty months until September 1918, when it was accepted by the committee. Assembled in sections, it presented the compositional scheme mostly as it would be finally realized, although minor refinements were later made to the top and bottom bands of figures. The six flanking figures, as realized in the final sketch and limestone tablet, were altered from the first and second models in terms of individual placement as well as stylistic treatment. The sculptor reintroduced the framing gridwork of the first model, now with supplementary figures to enhance the iconographic narrative; for example, the draped female Archaeology (see Figure 17) is accompanied by a man with a shovel and a woman holding a sphinx in order to illustrate, as Manship explained, “the means by which Archaeology makes its discoveries and the mystery of it.”77 With the exception of the two exaggerated Scurving figures at the top, Commerce and Art, the representations are totemic, rigid, and tightly positioned within their narrow frames. By this time Manship’s “points of view” had shifted to Romanesque and Early Gothic sculpture of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a particular collecting interest of Morgan’s.80

As evident in Literature (see Figure 15), Manship had appropriated such medieval conventions as expressionless masklike faces, smooth stylized anatomy, and garments that fall in rigid, knife-like lines and ellipses to indicate bodily form. This increasing restraint is evident when the preliminary drawing for Finance in the first and second models is compared to the final result (see Figures 12, 13). What had been an almost levitating figure is, in the end, firmly grounded and as stolidly vertical as the scepter she holds. The exuberant swirling drapery and the coins overflowing from the cornucopia in the sketch are likewise made to appear almost motionless in the limestone.

In addition to refining and enlarging the panels, Manship transformed the lettering for the inscription, arguably the key element of the design, away from the quirky, stylized treatment he had employed in his early sketches. After repeated experiments with full-size models, he finally moved toward McKim, Mead and White’s hallmark classicizing style. The sole modification was that the letter V was not substituted for U, an exception that Museum director Robinson, a classical scholar, insisted upon since U is standard in fine-grained stone particularly suited for detailed carving. McKim, Mead and White had given the responsibility of selecting the piece and procuring samples of it for the committee to inspect and approve.

McKim, Mead and White had first solicited estimates for the carving and installation of the memorial in the spring of 1914. Two New York firms were contacted: Donnelly and Ricci, who were untested, and the better-known Piccirilli Brothers.79 The latter, six Italian immigrants who operated a studio in the Bronx, were the carvers of choice for most American sculptors, including Saint-Gaudens and French. The Piccirilli’s proposed cost of translating the monument was renegotiated over several iterations, contingent on the type of stone,77 but it always exceeded what the Morgan committee felt was within its original budget allocations. The matter was thus left unresolved until the full-size plaster was in progress. Manship, faced with

Figure 20. Manship’s final plaster sketch model for the Morgan Memorial, 1918. Photograph: Peter A. Juley & Son Collection. Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, D.C. (J0094107)
the modern alphabet.\textsuperscript{81} The second main feature that underwent substantial modification was the architectural element at the top of the tablet. The awkward, overscale allegorical figures were eliminated in favor of a scrollwork pediment with stylized flowers, garlands, and palmettes. Mansion's adaptation of specific historical precedent is evident in this pediment, whose lotus, palmettes, and snail-shell scrollwork are freely appropriated from the ornamental stone frieze of the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi (530 B.C.). Mansion had copied sections of the frieze in detailed full-scale drawings (Figure 21) during his first trip to Greece in 1912, the pivotal six-week visit when he encountered the archaic style that definitively redirected his art away from a more formulaic classicism.\textsuperscript{82}

In July 1918, as work on the final plaster model was progressing, Mansion was preparing to leave for Italy to volunteer for Red Cross war-relief efforts; at the same time, the pieces of Champville limestone arrived in his studio.\textsuperscript{83} Before the artist's departure Kendall reported to Adams: "It is my belief that Mr. Mansion has produced, as a memorial to Mr. Morgan, a design of very great beauty and originality and one also of the proper shape and size to harmonize with the pier upon which it is to rest."\textsuperscript{84} Meeting in Mansion's Washington Mews studio, the Morgan committee unanimously approved the final full-size plaster model and the stone to be cut; upon separate inspection, Morgan Jr. proclaimed the tablet "most satisfactory."\textsuperscript{85} Mansion entrusted responsibility for the carving during his absence to his principal assistant, Gaston Lachaise (1882–1935), an established sculptor in his own right who was best known for sensuous female representations inspired by his wife, Isabel.\textsuperscript{86} Born in Paris, Lachaise emigrated to the United States in 1906 and worked in Mansion's studio, out of financial necessity, from about 1914/15 to 1920 while pursuing his own career.\textsuperscript{87} Working with the aid of an Italian stonemason, Lachaise, an expert carver, completed a substantial portion of the preliminary cutting during Mansion's time abroad.\textsuperscript{88}

Pneumonia ultimately prevented Mansion from serving with the Red Cross, and in February 1919 he returned to New York. Lachaise continued to undertake the majority of the carving, while Mansion, who had less carving experience, made refinements. That process, including delays caused by the carving of a second scrollwork pediment, continued until September 1920, when Mansion notified the Museum he was ready to deliver the tablet.\textsuperscript{89} The memorial was inspected in Mansion's studio and approved by the Morgan committee in October. Later that month, the Piccirilli Brothers began to set the tablet into the reconstructed northwest pier in the Great Hall (Figure 22); Mansion then finished and toned the stone and colored the letters in situ.\textsuperscript{90}

By the time the Museum trustees gathered to view the completed memorial, Mansion had matured from promising talent to highly successful artist, enjoying a meteoric rise to fame. His 1916 show at the Berlin Photographic Gallery in New York had been a runaway critical and financial success, with more than ninety works ordered. His sculptures were exhibited nationally and were frequent recipients of awards, including a gold medal at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in 1915. He was named an academician of the National Academy of Design in 1916 and a member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1920. Mansion had become an acknowledged leader in his field, and his authorship of the Morgan tablet was as much a boon for the Museum (and indeed the American Academy in Rome) as the actual commission had been to Mansion's developing career five years earlier.

Critics who celebrated Mansion in the 1910s were attracted by his attention to fine craftsmanship and his synthetic style, which mediated between naturalis-
tic and abstracted impulses. His simplified linear compositions, particularly those in an archaic vein, were considered a refreshing departure from the kind of Beaux-Arts classicism French had pursued in his own sketches for the Morgan Memorial. Manship's innovative works had a kinship with modernism, but they were sufficiently removed from the developing non-objective movement in sculpture to please popular and academic tastes alike. Although Manship often collaborated with architects during his long career, the Morgan Memorial, a tablet executed in stone and installed in a public setting, is, as such, a departure even within his varied oeuvre.93 In the ensuing years it was celebrated, and in some camps denigrated, as an impressive compendium of styles: a demonstration piece of eclecticism in terms of both Morgan's collecting interests and Manship's aesthetics.94

Although the collaborations, both creative and logistic, among the principal parties on the Morgan commission were at times sorely strained, all were satisfied with the end result. Manship wrote to Adams in September 1920, "I hope that you and others whose opinion I respect will think that the efforts I have expended upon the Morgan Memorial will have been justified by the result. I have worked upon the Morgan Memorial for this long time always with the one idea to do the very best art within my possibilility. . ."95 Manship successfully argued for an additional $5,850 in payment to offset his expenses, which had overrun the projected budget considerably, and for the Museum to pay for the tablet's installation.96 Robinson supported Manship's appeal, observing that "the Museum will possess not only a worthy memorial of Mr. Morgan, but a work of art of great and permanent value."97 The Morgan Memorial Committee was disbanded in December 1920, with the appreciation of the trustees for effectively performing its duties and for "the gratifying results of its devoted labor."98
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21. McKim, Mead and White Collection, box 247, file 5-19.
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25. Morgan Jr. to French, August 13, 1913 (copy), Morgan Jr. Papers. Morgan reiterated these points in a letter to French, September 11, 1913 (copy), Morgan Jr. Papers.
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