## 1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL OF DESIGN FOR WOMEN

Other Name/Site Number: Moore College of Art; Forrest House; Gaul-Forrest House

## 2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 1346 North Broad Street Not for publication: ___

City/Town: Philadelphia Vicinity: ___

State: PA County: Philadelphia Code: 101 Zip Code: 19121

## 3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property
Private: X
Public-local: ___
Public-State: ___
Public-Federal: ___

Category of Property
Building(s): X
District: ___
Site: ___
Structure: ___
Object: ___

Number of Resources within Property

| Contributing | Noncontributing | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | _____ | buildings |
| _____ | _____ | sites |
| _____ | _____ | structures |
| _____ | _____ | objects |
| 1 | 0 | Total |

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 1

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: N/A

## 4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this ____ nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Certifying Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

## 5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I, hereby certify that this property is:

____ Entered in the National Register _____
____ Determined eligible for the _____
National Register
____ Determined not eligible for the _____
National Register
____ Removed from the National Register _____
____ Other (explain): _____

_____ _____
Signature of Keeper Date of Action

## 6. FUNCTION OR USE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Historic: | Education | Sub: | School |
| | Recreation & Culture | | Museum |
| | Other | | Art Studio |
| Current: | Recreation & Culture | Sub: | Theater |
| | Vacant | | |

## 7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Late Victorian (Italianate)

MATERIALS:

| | |
|---|---|
| Foundation: | Brick |
| Walls: | Brick, sandstone |
| Roof: | Asphalt |
| Other: | Iron (cornices, pediments, etc.) |

**Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.**

DESCRIPTION OF SITE:[1]

The present occupant of 1346 North Broad Street is the New Freedom Theatre. The house was formerly the Philadelphia School of Design for Women (later Moore College of Art), the Edwin Forrest House, and the Gaul-Forrest House. It is situated on the southwest corner of Broad and Master Streets in north Philadelphia. During the third quarter of the 19th century, impressive townhouses of the wealthy were built along this section of North Broad Street, the city's main north-south thoroughfare. Now however, few of these townhouses remain, and those that do, like the Forrest House, have been converted primarily to institutional uses.

The immediate environment is now dominated by the monumental William Penn High School, standing directly across Broad Street from the Forrest House, and a mix of commercial and institutional buildings, both modern and historical, lining Broad Street to the north and the south. The neighborhood directly behind, and to the west of the property, is characterized by typical two- and three-story Philadelphia rowhouses, many in deteriorated condition.

The Philadelphia School of Design consists of three main sections: the original ca. 1853 Italianate townhouse, built for brewer William Gaul and attributed to Philadelphia architect Stephen Decatur Button (1813-1897)[2]; a one-story gallery/theater addition appended on the south side of the house, ca. 1863; and a long, three-story rear addition built ca. 1880 as classrooms and studios of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women, and attributed to Philadelphia architect James Hamilton Windrim (1840-1919).[3]

Stephen D. Button, designer of the original Gaul-Forrest townhouse, was a prolific Philadelphia architect who specialized in the popular and picturesque Italianate style of the mid-1800s. Among his notable works are the Alabama State Capitol, the Spring Garden Institute, and the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, and the Camden (New Jersey) City Hall. The architect of the studio/classroom wing of the school, James Windrim, is known for his elaborate design for the Philadelphia Masonic Temple,

---

[1] Architectural description prepared by: J. Randall Cotton, Director, Preservation Programs and Historic Religious Properties Program, Philadelphia Historic Preservation Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, May 1992.

[2] Sandra L. Tatman and Roger W. Moss, *Biographical Dictionary of Philadelphia Architects: 1700-1930* (Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1985),*p846X122.

[3] Tatman, 871.

numerous commissions for Girard College, and his appointments as Supervising Architect of the U.S. Treasury, and Director of Public Works (Philadelphia).

The integrity of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women ranges from excellent to fair. The facade, north elevations, and upper-floor interiors are notable for retaining their original architectural fabric. The first-floor and lower level interior spaces have been compromised by numerous alterations and partition additions, a consequence of the building's various occupants and uses. Most of these alterations are reversible.

The condition of the building varies from good to poor. The exterior needs overall maintenance, and sections of the masonry are deteriorated. Most of the basement and first-floor spaces, which are used by the New Freedom Theater, are adequately maintained. The second, third, and attic floors are presently vacant, and subsequently, have suffered from lack of heat and maintenance resulting in overall failure of the finishes. Nonetheless, these upper levels represent the least altered spaces in the building.

The original townhouse section of the building is a good example of the popular mid-19th century Italianate style, a style at which architect Stephen Button was particularly adept. It consists of a three-story block, nearly square in plan (approximately 50 x 50 feet), with a raised basement and a low attic. The townhouse is brick except for its facade which is brownstone (sandstone), and is rotted or exfoliated at many places, notably at the window heads. The brickwork is in good condition and is set with narrow, flush joints which appear to have been pigmented a dark color.

The symmetrical facade, facing Broad Street, is composed of five bays and typical fenestration for an Italianate townhouse. The wall surface is ashlar brownstone. Above the raised basement level, the first-floor facade consists of the central entrance, accessible via a single-flight, brownstone porch stair, flanked by two windows on each side.

The second-level fenestration consists of a central, projecting, three-sided, oriel window (which is made of galvanized iron, and is possibly a later alteration) flanked by two windows on either side which, in detail, are nearly identical to those on the first level but are somewhat shorter. The third level consists of five regularly-spaced windows which are not ornamented as those below, and are shorter still. These are banded together by a beltcourse at sill level. The facade is topped by a heavy, cyma-reversa-bracketed cornice above which is a parapet wall which hides the low, hip-roofed attic.

Much of the architectural character of the facade stems from the projecting brownstone entablatures over the doorway and first- and second-level windows. These entablatures are supported with decorative consoles on the sides. The entablatures of the doorway and oriel window are further embellished with brownstone

cartouches rising at the center. All the window sash has been replaced by modern, bronze-colored aluminum frames. This is true for the rest of the building as well. The facade's basement windows and the lower portions of the first-floor windows are covered with metal grates. The facade doorway is recessed within panelled side reveals and set beneath a transom window. Heavily molded panels embellish the double-leaf doors.

Although successive owners have altered the interior of the townhouse by adding partition walls, closing off the stairway to comply with fire codes, and removing original marble mantels, many significant remnants of the original fabric survive. The original floor plan of the three principle levels remains virtually intact. The only alterations occurred on the first floor. This floor consists of a central hallway intersected midway on the north at a right angle by the main stairway. The architectural detail of the spaces and the ceiling heights progressively diminish from the first floor to the third floor.

On the first floor, the entry vestibule features a colorful encaustic-tile floor (ca. 1880) and an ornamental cast-plaster ceiling. Double-leaf doors with full-length sidelights separate the vestibule from the center hall. This hall also has an ornamental cast-plaster ceiling which is broken into two panels by an archway standing midway in the hall. The ceiling height in the hall and throughout the first floor is approximately twelve feet. A picture rail, at approximately eight feet, runs around the hall walls. Door and window surrounds consist of heavy bolection moldings, as do the panels of the doors. Ten-light transoms top the doors opening into the hall.

A full-depth parlor on the south side has now been bisected by a low partition wall. The ornamental ceiling remains intact, however, and is the most elaborate in the house. In general, all the ornamental ceilings feature high-relief classical or rococo motifs and borders, and carved corner molding embellished with console brackets.

The north front parlor has been altered and is not accessible to the public. The northwest room was originally the dining room, but is now an office and retains a running-plaster ceiling cornice. Between these two rooms is the main stairway, now enclosed, on the first floor. The stair rises three floors with a landing between each floor. The mahogany rail, supported on turned balusters, is continuous, ending at the bottom in a volute. Elliptical archways, springing from ornamental consoles, frame the stair hall on the first and second floors.

The second, third, and attic floors of the townhouse are vacant. Although much of the wall and ceiling surfaces are deteriorated or failing, these spaces are largely original in plan and detail. Four rooms arranged around the center hall originally comprised the second floor, but in 1860, Edwin Forrest removed the wall

between the south rooms to create a full-depth library.[4] This room and the others on the second floor have ornamental plaster ceilings of simpler designs than those on the first floor. Also similar, but simpler, are the bolection-molded door and window frames and the six-panelled doors.

The details, while still similar, are even simpler in the six original rooms of the third floor. In the attic, the three plaster-walled rooms are unadorned. The basement level is now a warren of modern office spaces for the New Freedom Theater, with very little evidence of original fabric.

Adjoining the south side of the townhouse is a one-story auditorium addition which was originally built ca. 1863 for Edwin Forrest as a small picture gallery with a basement theater. This auditorium was enlarged several times by Forrest and subsequent owners.[5] Its present size dates from ca. 1880 when the Philadelphia School of Design for Women extended the space rearward.

The Broad Street brownstone-ashlar facade of the auditorium is Georgian in style, consisting of a slightly projecting central bay flanked by side bays. Each bay is enframed at the sides by quoins and capped by a continuous bracketed cornice of galvanized iron. Above is a parapet wall embellished at the center bay by a broken-scroll pediment. Barrel tiles, ca. 1920, cap the parapet wall. Below the central pediment is a center window identical, except for an additional cartouche, to those on the second-level facade of the townhouse.

Projecting from the right side of the auditorium's facade at ground level is an enclosed brownstone porch which features a projecting cornice below a parapet wall. Paired consoles support the cornice and flank double-leaf modern doors.

The interior of the auditorium is a single, clear-span space approximately eighteen feet high. The walls and floors have been covered with various modern materials, except for some remnants of tongue-and-groove matchboard siding on sections of the walls, and simple wood pilasters which break up the side walls into regular bays. No fixed theater seating remains. A raised, full-width stage against the west, rear wall is the auditorium's most notable feature. It is enframed by a rectangular opening and fronted by recessed panels. The basement contains a small, 120-seat theater--now regularly used by the New Freedom Theater--and associated dressing and prop rooms, all of which are modern.

---

[4] From a handwritten 1860 insurance description of the Forrest House, a copy of which is on file at the Philadelphia Historic Commission. Also in the Commission's file on the Forrest House are detailed insurance surveys from 1854, 1864, 1873, and 1880.

[5] *Ibid.*

When the Philadelphia School of Design for Women bought the property in 1880, they shortly thereafter built a large, three-story rear addition which served as its primary classroom and studio wing. This addition necessitated the demolition of the original rear service wing of the Forrest House. The new school wing, designed by James H. Windrim and built by contractors B. Ketcham and Son[6], is L-shaped with the long arm running along Master Street, and the short arm returning along Carlisle Street, a secondary street running along the rear of the property. This L-shaped configuration, along with the original Forrest House, creates an interior courtyard which opens to a parking lot on the south.

Although compatible in materials and height with the original townhouse section, the school wing, on the Master Street side, displays the more exuberant ornaments of the late-Victorian era. The wing is brick with narrow joints and adorned with galvanized-iron cornices, pediments, and window surrounds. The fenestration is complex. At midpoint, there is a three level stack of triple windows, the top level of which lie within a semi-circular arch. Flanking this central feature on each side are two vertical rows of three-tiered windows, and flanking these are three-tiered pavilions which break the bracketed cornice line with segmental-arch pediments. Finally, near both ends of this elevation are more vertical rows of windows.

The window heads on this north elevation are variously decorated with galvanized-iron entablatures supported on cornice consoles, or with flat heads with drop moldings embossed with pressed-metal corner roundels and foliated decorative panels. Where the windows are paired or tripled, they are separated by fluted pilasters. Between the first- and second-floor windows are brick spandrel panels decorated with sawtooth brickwork.

The rear, Carlisle Street, elevation is unadorned and has large expanses of brick wall broken irregularly by paired windows fronted by fire escapes. This simple, utilitarian wall treatment is repeated on the south end wall of the rear ell, and on the three walls forming the courtyard. These walls are terminated by simple brick corbels, and are punctuated at three levels by regularly-spaced, simple window openings, several of which have been bricked-in at ground level.

Two other features of the school wing are of note. Two large sawtooth skylights, which provided light to the third floor studios, punctuate the flat roof of the Carlisle Street ell. Also, two, third-floor cantilevered porches project toward the courtyard on the south elevation. The original function of these enclosed rooms is unclear, and until recently they were clad with copper sheets which have been stolen, leaving the underlying wood sheathing exposed.

---

[6] *Ibid.*

The interior detail of the school wing is utilitarian, and the L-shaped plan of each of the floors is essentially the same: uninterrupted hallways run the length of the two arms on the courtyard sides. Along the Master and Carlisle Street sides are a series of large classrooms with high ceilings (about 12 feet). While the classrooms on the first floor are used and in good condition, all the spaces above are vacant and the surface finishes deteriorated.

As the building was built for utilitarian purposes, there is little significant architectural detail in the school wing. The classroom door frames, however, reflect 1880s styling; they have wide, fluted moldings with corner blocks with embossed roundels. Many original doors survive, each featuring six molded panels incised and chamfered in the Eastlake manner. Tall, six-light transoms top the doors. Very few of the fixtures associated with the School of Design survive except for some relatively modern sinks and ceramic wall tiles. The basement of the school wing, like the other basement spaces, consists of a maze of modern office, mechanical, and service rooms, and a small studio theater in the rear ell. In 1921, the firm of Bailey and Bassett altered the building, adding a gallery for exhibits.

The courtyard contains neglected garden areas and a notable California redwood, thought to be the only example of this species in Philadelphia. There are also four, free-standing Ionic columns.

## 8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties: Nationally: X Statewide: ___ Locally: ___

Applicable National Register Criteria: A X B ___ C ___ D ___

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A ___ B ___ C ___ D ___ E ___ F ___ G ___

NHL Criteria: 1

NHL Theme(s): XXVI. Decorative and Folk Art

XXVII. Education
F. Vocational Training
1. Conceptional Development
H. Special Populations
3. Women's Education

XXXI. Social and Humanitarian Movements
L. General Philanthropy

Areas of Significance: Education
Art
Social History

Period(s) of Significance: 1880-1959

Significant Dates: 1880, 1881, 1886, 1920, 1932

Significant Person(s):

Cultural Affiliation: N/A

Architect/Builder: Stephen Decatur Button;
James H. Windrim (1880s construction);
B. Ketcham & Son (contractor, 1880s construction)

**State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.**

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE:

The building at 1346 North Broad Street in Philadelphia is historically significant as the only remaining historic location of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women. The school is currently located in a building at Logan Circle; however, it achieved its national significance prior to this move. From 1880-1959, the building at 1346 North Broad Street was the principal structure of the school. The School of Design was the first school of industrial design for women in the United States and filled a gap in the American vocational, educational, and industrial schema. Led by numerous nationally significant art educators, and producing innovative and nationally recognized graduates hailing from all over the United States, the School of Design excelled in industrial design and art education. Within the context of the National Historic Landmarks Program Thematic Framework, the Philadelphia School of Design relates to themes: XXVI. Decorative and Folk Art; XXVII. Education, (F) Vocational Training, 1. Conceptional Development, (H) Special Populations, 3. Women's Education; XXXI. Social and Humanitarian Movements, (L) General Philanthropy.

Although this form focuses on the significance of this property because of its association with the Philadelphia School of Design for Women, it should be noted that this building was also the home of Edwin Forrest (1806-1872), the earliest American actor of the first rank. His portrayals of Shakespearean characters were highly acclaimed. He was especially well-known for his roles as King Lear and Coriolanus. In recent years, the building at 1346 North Broad Street has been the home of the New Freedom Theatre, Pennsylvania's oldest and most distinguished African American theatre. In addition to holding an annual professional season of plays, the New Freedom Theatre runs a nationally acclaimed theatre arts training program for youths and adults.

The Philadelphia School of Design was the first school of its kind in the United States. Not only did the School help free American industry from foreign design dependence, but it enabled women from across the nation to become trained in a "higher" occupation than society had previously allowed. Sewing, housework, and factory labor were no longer the only options. The practical and artistic profession of industrial design was indeed thrust forward in the United States by the Philadelphia School of Design. Women were given the opportunity to sell their own work while still enrolled, and thereby increase their chances of success after graduation. In addition to the branch schools that were established, countless other facets of American art and of education were touched by the graduates of the School. Jessie Willcox Smith, Lucille Howard, Harriet Sartain, and others were all distinguished graduates of the School. The School was further graced by the presence of nationally recognized faculty members John Sartain, Robert Henri, Thomas Braidwood, Thomas Moran, Emily Sartain, and others.

Before undertaking a discussion of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women's national contributions, it is necessary to explore the motivations that stood behind its founding. In November 1848, Sarah Worthington King Peter, a noted Philadelphia philanthropist and wife of British consul William Peter, established a drawing class for women in her own home. Paying the teacher out of her own pocket, this twenty student class was the modest beginning of the first school of industrial design for women in the United States. Like many of her contemporaries, Sarah Peter was very much concerned with the plight of unmarried women who could not provide for themselves. Possibly she was influenced by her husband, a former Whig Parliamentarian during the 1840s, who was undoubtedly familiar with the state supported industrial design school system in Britain. For whatever reason, Sarah Peter became very interested in giving these women gainful employment. The western migration in the United States left men vastly outnumbered by women on the east coast. Additionally, given the "cult of true womanhood" mentality of the mid-19th century, female employment was very narrowly defined within the homemaking sphere. For these reasons, philanthropists and moralists alike feared that these "superfluous" women might fall into a sinful occupation to support themselves. Sarah Peter therefore established her drawing class, which suited the woman's "delicate sensibilities," to combat this looming moral danger.

Additionally, industrial design was chosen by Sarah Peter as the vocational training for women for two other more practical reasons. First, there was a need in the United States for American industrial designers to creatively formulate innovative and original patterns for "oil-cloths, wallpaper, and calicos as well as executing lithographs and wood engraving."[1] Patterns for industrial mass productions had been dominated by foreign companies, and therefore, calicos, prints, and engravings had to be bought from abroad or were merely facile American reproductions of European designs. Sarah Peter had the notion to rid America of this foreign dependence and make the United States an innovator in industrial design rather than merely a consumer or "imitator." This made the vocational education of American designers paramount for America's sake. Secondly, women were most perfectly suited for this new occupation. It could "be practiced at home, without materially interfering with the routine of domestic duty."[2] The British system of state supported design schools, which mandated female pupils in the study of commercial design, showed Peters that often times the

---

[1] Judith Stein, "The Genesis of America's First School of Design: The Philadelphia School of Design for Women," unpublished paper, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1976, copy in possession of NCC), 20.

[2] Franklin Institute, *Proceedings of the Franklin Institute for the Promotion of the Mechanic Arts, Relative to the Establishment of School of Design for Women* (Philadelphia: Franklin Institute, 1850), 1.

skill of female designers surpassed men and that women could indeed excel in this profession. The school, under Peter's aegis, received national and even international recognition by the "celebrated Swedish author and reformer" Fredrika Bremer during the 1850s.[3]

As the drawing class grew too large for Peter's own house at 320 South Third Street,[4] merger negotiations began in 1850 with the Franklin Institute, a noted vocational school in Philadelphia. By December 1850, Peter's classes moved to the Franklin Institute and were expanded to not only include drawing but also formal design training, engraving, and lithography. Established in 1824, the Franklin Institute was a pragmatic, "hands on," all male school for the "promotion of the Mechanic Arts." With the noted exception of the drawing school for men in the Franklin Institute, "other attempts at formal, classroom education were all stillborn or short lived."[5] Conversely, the Franklin Institute School of Design for Women stressed, above all else, the English curricular model of one dimensional, geometric, and mathematically precise drawings, and "Contrast and Repetition" in its classroom-based curriculum. While the Franklin Institute at large focused upon "scientific investigators and inventors" to be trained to solve the problems of the shop floor, the mandate of the Franklin Institute School of Design for Women was to "make designs which could be applied to industrial products." The differences in emphasis and venues of teaching were manifest, but complimentary. Since "friendly relations" and a vast business network existed between the Franklin Institute and local industry, "securing a market for the [female] students' work" was greatly facilitated.[6]

As a leader in Industrial Arts, the Franklin Institute quickly subscribed to Peter's brainchild, but the Franklin Institute decided that financially the School of Industrial Design for Women would be independent of the Institute. Although the sum of $2000 was set as a minimum endowment before the School could be established, by the end of 1850 contributions were still below this amount. The notion of a design school did catch on, however, and the six managers--three women who were to run the

---

[3] Anna Shannon McAllister, *In Winter We Flourish: Life and Letters of Sarah Worthington King Peter* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1939), 145.

[4] Theodore C. Knauff, *An Experiment in Training for the Useful and the Beautiful: A History* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia School of Design for Women, 1922), 8.

[5] Bruce Sinclair, *Philadelphia Philosopher Mechanics: A History of the Franklin Institute, 1824-1865* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 264.

[6] Thomas Coulson, *The Franklin Institute from 1824 to 1949* (Lancaster, PA: Lancaster Press, 1950), 10-11.

School and three men who were to supervise--decided to give the School a one year trial period. Thus, in December 1850, a building was obtained at 70 Walnut Street and soon classes began.[7]

Eileen Boris' assertion that the Philadelphia School of Design was primarily focused on "'gentlewomen'-that is the middle class"[8] is without any supporting evidence when considering the early years of the school's founding. For example, nowhere in Sarah Peter's original petition to the Franklin Institute's Board of Managers, or in their response to her, is there mention of "gentlewoman" or "middle class." In fact, the original correspondence between these two parties has an unmistakably philanthropic and paternalistic tone concerning these poor and "suffering" women.[9] Additionally, since design classes were given to "the poor free of cost, the more wealthy on the payment of a small sum," the enrollment, during the 1850s at least, seems to be economically heterogeneous. Finally, since the school's original mandate was in part to help "superfluous" women who "would probably not attend the classically-oriented Normal School" of art,[10] the argument that posits the enrollment in the 1850s as predominantly lower or lower middle class, whose students "varied greatly in age,"[11] is much more compelling than Boris' overly simplistic observation. While it is true that by 1870 tuition for an elementary course rose to $40,[12] and therefore out of the reach of many lower class women, the fact remains that the school began, and stayed for well over a decade, an institution open to nearly all socio-economic ranks.

The school was a success in 1851, and it therefore easily survived its first year probationary period. Central to this success (if only indirectly by impressing male philanthropists to give handsomely) was the unique marketing of the school's products. Once a student became competent in her field, she would sell her designs to an American industrial firm with one quarter of the proceeds going to the school. It has been reported that between December 3, 1850 and January 1, 1852, the institute raised $448.25 from these sales.[13] Although not enough

---

[7] Sinclair, 261.

[8] Eileen Boris, *Art and Labor: Ruskin, Morris, and the Craftsman Ideal in America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986), 100.

[9] Franklin Institute, 1.

[10] Sinclair, 262.

[11] Stein, 20.

[12] Callen, 45.

[13] Knauff, 25.

to keep the school financially solvent, these sales impressed Philadelphia's philanthropic community, and thus enabled the school to amass a $17,000 endowment by 1853.[14]

By 1853, however, there were internal tensions within the administration of the school. While Sarah Peter was abroad touring numerous European design schools in 1852, Anna Hill, the first principal of the school, died. With her died an important "harmonizing element" between the outspoken Sarah Peter and the Institute's Board.[15] Although it is not exactly clear why the school broke away from the Institute, perhaps administrational disputes between Sarah Peter and the Franklin Institute came to a head after Peter returned from England bringing back many new ideas. This may well have provoked an internal schism between Peter and the upper echelons of the Franklin Institute. In addition, the split might have been simply because "fund raising efforts for endowments were slower than anticipated."[16] In any event, the School received an independent charter from the Franklin Institute. The time Sarah Peter's vocational school spent as part of the Franklin Institute was important, however, for it gave the school an opportunity to expand, both in enrollment and in curriculum. While the school was associated with the Franklin Institute, the enrollment rose from around 20 in 1850 to 70 in 1852,[17] and the curriculum was expanded to include wood engraving, lithography, and formal textile, furniture, and household furnishing design training,[18] in addition to the already established drawing courses. Also, more teachers were employed, and enough money was raised to put the school on a firm base.

The Philadelphia School of Design for Women moved to Eighth and Locust Streets in 1853, and reestablished itself under twelve male Directors and twelve female Managers. The death of Sarah Peter's husband in 1853 must have influenced her departure for Cincinnati in that same year. Her most important philanthropic effort, the Philadelphia School of Design for Women, was now in ascendence, and the market for her students' calicos, prints, engravings, and other textile designs was burgeoning. In fact, some early work produced by the school was displayed in Great Britain's Crystal Palace after the Great Exhibition of 1851.[19] Sarah Peter returned to Philadelphia for the 1876 Exhibition, but never again was a real force behind the Philadelphia School of Design for Women.

---

[14] Sinclair, 263.

[15] Sinclair, 263.

[16] Stein, 22.

[17] Stein, 20.

[18] Sinclair, 262.

[19] Stein, 21-22, n. 77.

Due to continued expansion, the school needed a more spacious structure. In 1863, the school bought the Collins mansion at Broad and Filbert Streets for $11,000, and spent an additional $12,000 renovating and building additional structures to expand the class space.[20] After 17 productive and expansive years at the Collins mansion, and with enrollment in 1880 numbering over 250, the school needed more space.[21] Additionally, the Pennsylvania Railroad forced the ever expanding Philadelphia School of Design for Women to seek new accommodations due to the expansion of its Broad Street Station. The school sold this property. The destruction of the Collins mansion was unfortunate as the school flowered while within this structure. The Philadelphia School of Design for Women "directly founded branch schools in Pittsburgh and at Wilkes Barre,"[22] and by virtue of being the very first in the country and producing very successful artistic designers, the School became the model for others to emulate. Many art institutes and smaller design schools, in addition to American industry, benefited greatly from the contributions of School of Design graduates.[23]

The school chose the Forrest mansion, located at 1346 North Broad Street, as the most applicable site. The Forrest Mansion was built sometime between 1853 and 1854, originally for the successful Philadelphia brewer William Gaul. Edwin Forrest, a noted Shakespearean actor, was in residence from 1855 to 1872.[24] After his death, the Forrest Mansion remained vacant until 1880, except in 1876 when the Theodore Thomas Orchestra used it for summer night garden concerts.

The Philadelphia School of Design bought the Forrest Mansion in 1880 for approximately $45,000.[25] The school made alterations and improvements such as a built-in kiln for china decorating[26] and a "new four story addition" along Carlisle Street.[27] In

---

[20] Knauff, 47.

[21] Knauff, 74.

[22] Knauff, 61. See also Britta Christina Dywer, "Nineteenth Century Regional Women Artists: The Pittsburgh School of Design for Women, 1865-1904" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1989), 46.

[23] Dwyer, 41.

[24] Richard Webster, *Philadelphia Preserved* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976), 296.

[25] Moore College of Art, *Design for Women: A History of the Moore College of Art* (Wynnewood, Pennsylvania: Livingston Publishing Co., 1968), 37.

[26] Knauff, 66.

[27] Moore College, 37.

addition, the third floor balconies facing the courtyard were enclosed, but were properly ventilated to allow the chemical-intensive art of glass etching to be practiced without harmful effects to the students. The Forrest Mansion already had an art gallery, and the ample space within the house was transformed into at least 16 studios and classrooms.[28] All these improvements and renovations increased the total cost of the building to $103,000.[29]

The Philadelphia School of Design for Women played a role within the context of the Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century. Candace Wheeler, the noted American textile and embroidery designer who formed the Society of Decorative Arts in New York City and other important design and interior decorating institutions, was "awakened" to the possibility of female design when she visited the Centennial Exhibition of 1876. As Judith Stein shows, Wheeler's comments on the innate suitability of women to art and design "echo[s] so closely the sentiments of Sarah Peter and the members of the Franklin Institute." The 1870s and 1880s saw the growth of the Arts and Crafts movement which led to the Art Nouveau "aesthetic of the 1890s, [which] helped restore prestige to the execution of the minor, or decorative arts." Building upon these art mentalities, after the 1893 Columbian Exhibition, Candace Wheeler stated that only since 1880 have "manufacturers all agree[d] that the most popular designs they can furnish are made by our native designers, who are, to a very large extent, women." Judith Stein, however, observes that "Wheeler had neglected to note that Sarah Peter and the Philadelphia industrialists had begun that happy alliance of women and the arts of design nearly a half century before."[30]

Evolving from Sarah Peter's small, twenty student drawing class, held in her own home at her own expense, the Philadelphia School of Design for Women vastly expanded its curriculum through the years. By merging with the Franklin Institute, the School expanded its curriculum to include formal design training, engraving, and lithography, in addition to drawing. The students practiced china painting and wood engraving through the 1880s, and in 1881, Peter Moran began teaching an etching class, a course which "was not taught in any other school in the country."[31] In 1884, the school added carpet design to the curriculum, and one year later added metal work. Soon students' products were very much in demand by manufactors. Calicos, wallpaper, carpet, etchings, and other designs poured forth from the school. For example, "the orders ranged from designs for Turkey-red tablecloths to the illustration of a Christmas poem for the publishing company of J.B. Lippencott." It is evident

---

[28] Moore College, 37.

[29] Knauff, 78, 80.

[30] Stein, 24-25.

[31] Knauff, 78.

that many graduates of the school found "gainful employment in their own city."[32] Additionally, during the 1880s, the education of art teachers became an increasingly important aspect of the curriculum.[33]

The 1880s also witnessed a profound change in philosophy within the school. The "Mathematical Perspective" used at the school until the 1880s emphasized the use of mathematics and geometry to create artistic and design perspective and was the approach propagated by the British State system. Adhering to this strictly commercial approach until the death of principal Elizabeth Croasdale in 1886, who herself was a graduate of the Kensington School of Design in London, this "out of date" approach was changed when the French trained artist Emily Sartain assumed the duties of principal upon Croasdale's death.

Emily Sartain was born in 1841 in Philadelphia. She demonstrated her artistic ability at an early age, and studied for six years at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. She then continued her studies in Paris, and in 1875, and again in 1883, she exhibited works at the Paris Salon. Upon her return to the United States in the mid-1800s, Sartain concentrated her work on mezzotint engraving. This technique involves burring a copper or steel plate to produce an even grain, resulting in a print with no harsh edges. In 1886, Sartain became principal of the Philadelphia School of Design. She altered the curriculum, patterning it away from the traditional Kensington School of Art, which taught students by having them copy the works of masters, to the French method of instruction. Sartain instituted the study of perspective and the use of live models in the classes at the Philadelphia School of Design. Furthermore, her educational philosophy held that both commercial and non-commercial art demanded the same skills; thus, the work produced by the students at the Philadelphia School of Design for commercial purposes was also of high artistic quality.[34]

Sartain's goal of converting "the flat paper into a plastic reality" shifted the fundamental mentality of the School from an industrial design, linear drafting approach to a more fine arts oriented curriculum. Despite the shift toward the fine arts, the school never totally lost its practical goals. The only difference seen by Sartain between fine art and industrial art was in its uniqueness and quality. Sartain stated that "Barye's bronzes, less well done, would be mere mantel ornaments."[35]

---

[32] Dwyer, 96.

[33] Knauff, 78.

[34] Edward T. James and Janet Wilson James, eds. *Notable American Women: A Biographical Dictionary, 1607-1950*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1971), 235-236.

[35] Knauff, 87, 88, 90.

Among the school's distinguished faculty were the influential painters John Sartain and Robert Henri, the "pioneer designer in this country" Thomas Braidwood,[36] Thomas Moran, who later would become the "eminent artist-explorer of the west,"[37] and the highly lauded painter and art educator Emily Sartain.

Under the direction of Emily Sartain, the school flourished both artistically and commercially. Upon her retirement in 1920, her niece, Harriet Sartain, took over direction of the school. As a graduate of the school herself, Harriet Sartain continued the policies of her aunt, but more ambitiously expanded the curricula. Night classes were added for working women. Interior decoration, garden architectural design, and lectures on human anatomy were also offered. Although the school had shed its strictly utilitarian, commercial emphasis with the adoption of a more diverse curriculum, it never wholly lost its industrial design roots. In fact, in 1922 a student sold a textile design which soon produced "16,000 yards of tapestry, and the looms were working night as well as day producing this and other materials designed by the pupils of the School."[38]

In addition to its commercial success, by the 1920s, fine artists trained at the school were a substantial force in the American artistic scene. In fact, throughout the 1920s, "the majority of women painters exhibiting in all the important galleries of the country [had] received their early training in this school."[39] The impact these women artists had on the national level should not be underestimated.

The resourceful, creative, and highly talented artists Jessie Willcox Smith and Lucille Howard were but two of the School of Design's distinguished graduates. Some years after her graduation, Esther K. Hayhurst became the first female principal of the Pittsburgh School of Design, and thus spread the influence of her alma mater to more American women.[40]

The School merged with the Moore Institute of Art, Science and Industry in 1932, but continued residence at Forrest House until 1959. In 1963, the Institute changed its name to The Moore College of Art. The Philadelphia School of Design is still recognized and appreciated as the direct ancestor of this modern college of art.

---

[36] Frank DeWette Andrews, *Thomas Braidwood, Born 1818, Died 1906; A Paper Read at the Annual Meeting of the Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society, Oct. 19, 1906* (Vineland NJ: The Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society, 1909), 5-6.

[37] Dwyer, 119.

[38] Knauff, 91, 93.

[39] Knauff, 94.

[40] Dwyer, 25.

## 9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Andrews, Frank DeWette. *Thomas Braidwood, Born 1818, Died 1906; A Paper Read at the Annual Meeting of the Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society, Oct. 19, 1906*. Vineland NJ: The Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society, 1909.

Boris, Eileen. *Art and Labor: Ruskin, Morris, and the Craftsman Ideal in America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.

Callen, Anthea. *Women Artists of the Arts and Crafts Movement, 1870-1914*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.

Coulson, Thomas. *The Franklin Institute From 1824 to 1949*. Lancaster, PA: Lancaster Press, 1950.

Croasdale, Elizabeth. *System of Industrial Art Drawing Issued in Sets from the Philadelphia School of Design for Women*, 1st series, #1. Philadelphia: School of Design, 1876.

Dwyer, Britta Christina. "Nineteenth Century Regional Women Artists: The Pittsburgh School of Design for Women, 1865-1904." Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1989.

Franklin Institute. *Proceedings of the Franklin Institute For the Promotion of the Mechanic Arts, Relative to the Establishment of School of Design for Women*. Philadelphia: Franklin Institute, 1850.

The John Wanamaker Junior High School Local History Club. *The Edwin Forrest House: An Historic Landmark*. n.p., 1985.

James, Edward T. and Janet Wilson James, eds. *Notable American Women: A Biographical Dictionary, 1607-1950*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1971).

Knauff, Theodore C. *An Experiment in Training for the Useful and the Beautiful: A History*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia School of Design for Women, 1922.

McAllister, Anna Shannon. *In Winter We flourish: Life and Letters of Sarah Worthington King Peter*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1939.

Moore College of Art. *Design for Women: A History of the Moore College of Art*. Wynnewood, Pennsylvania: Livingston Publishing Co., 1968.

Moore Institute of Art, Science, & Industry. *Catalog for the 105th Year, 1949-1950*. Philadelphia: Moore Institute, 1949.

Sinclair, Bruce. *Philadelphia Philosopher Mechanics: A History of the Franklin Institute, 1824-1865*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Stein, Judith. "The Genesis of America's First School of Design: The Philadelphia School of Design for Women." (unpublished paper, copy in possession of NCC) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1976.

Tatman, Sandra L. and Roger W. Moss. *Biographical Dictionary of Philadelphia Architects: 1700-1930*. Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1985.

Webster, Richard. *Philadelphia Preserved*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

___ Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
___ Previously Listed in the National Register.
___ Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
___ Designated a National Historic Landmark.
_X_ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #PA-1730
___ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #_____

Primary Location of Additional Data:

_X_ State Historic Preservation Office: Pennsylvania Register (1971)
___ Other State Agency
_X_ Federal Agency
_X_ Local Government
___ University
___ Other (Specify Repository):

## 10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: Less than one (1) acre

UTM References: Zone Easting Northing

**A** 18 486380 4424700

Verbal Boundary Description:

The nominated property occupies parcel number 88-6-1662 in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as recorded by the Board of Revision of Taxes, in the Deed Registry # 10N13151.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary is that which has historically been associated with the property.

## 11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Dr. Page Putnam Miller; Jill S. Mesirow; J. Randall Cotton

National Coordinating Committee
for the Promotion of History
400 A Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Telephone: (202) 544-2422

Date: 30 June, 1992

Edwin Forrest House
(Philadelphia School of Design for Women)
1346 N. Broad Street