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Abstract

In this article we investigate two medievalist enterprises built in the 1920s and 1930s: Glencairn Museum in Bryn Athyn, Pennsylvania, and Hammond Castle in Gloucester, Massachusetts. Both buildings were created as homes for wealthy industrialists—Raymond Pitcairn and John Hays Hammond Jr., respectively—and both are structures built in a medieval style that also incorporate actual medieval objects, including architectural fragments, stained glass, and sculpture. Although they do it somewhat differently, the two buildings resituate the art of the past in the present, reinterpreting the past but also re-inventing the medieval objects through recontextualization. We examine these revivalist buildings as products of the trend of medievalism prevalent among collectors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, who conflated original and reproduction elements to create a pastiche of medieval and modern. Instead of searching for origins and privileging the “authentic,” however, we interrogate the very meaning of authenticity. The spoliated fragments of architectural salvage, sculpture, and glass function as relics of the Middle Ages, but they also transcend their identity as historical markers of the past. Resituated and re-grouped in their new environments, the objects in these eclectic collections span centuries but work together to create richly evocative meanings that free them from the constraints of provenance. Glencairn and Hammond Castle provide experiences of the medieval world, ultimately reminding us that all interpretations of a period, whether scholarly or popular, are, in the end, reconstructions.
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*Gesta* v57n1 (Spring 2018).

0031-8248/2018/7703-0004 $10.00. Copyright 2018 by the International Center of Medieval Art. All rights reserved.
and are equally distant from the "real" Middle Ages. A vast range of cultural products created over several centuries are described as participating in medievalism, leading to the development of descriptions for subfields or categories of the phenomenon. The two homes on which we focus here are essentially examples of what some scholars have termed "traditional medievalism," characterized in part by its desire for re-creation of the medieval. This type of medievalism has been contrasted with postmodern medievalism or "neomedievalism," which "comments directly on the process of that re-creation, playing with the entire idea of accessing the past," and is often characterized by a "gleeful embrace of the absurd" and "denial of reality." The kinds of medievalism prevalent in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century North America include the popularity of Arthuriana; anti-industrialization and the craftsmanship ethics of the Arts and Crafts movement; building of medieval-style cathedrals such as St. John the Divine in New York and the Washington National Cathedral; and the collecting and display of medieval art. They are often discussed in terms of nostalgia. That nostalgia may be characterized as noble and earnest, or naive and hopeless, but either way, such critiques are imbued with implications of desire and loss. This interpretation of medievalism, in which America yearns for a past it does not have, for the Middle Ages that once were, often makes sense. It is difficult to disagree with the argument that American industrialists who became interested in the medieval, expressed through public commissions or private collecting, were enacting an aspect of the country's
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7. For more on the collecting of medieval art in the United States, see esp. Elizabeth Bradford Smith, ed., Medieval Art in America: Pat-
growing imperialist power when they appropriated the Middle Ages for themselves.11 In this essay, however, we argue that there is more to the phenomenon than that: other things also happen when medieval art is acquired, relocated, and displayed in new, American contexts.

The two buildings under consideration here were created as homes for wealthy industrialists: Glencairn for Raymond Pitcairn and Hammond Castle for John Hays Hammond Jr. Both are structures built in a medieval style that also incorporate actual medieval components: architectural fragments, stained glass, and sculpture. Although undertaking this process somewhat differently, each building resituated the art of the past in the present, reinterpreting the past but also reinventing the medieval objects through recontextualization. We argue that these buildings reinvigorate their medieval objects, engaging viewers with immediacy and directness that are wholly different from how the objects would have operated in their medieval contexts, and that, as a result, these homes reorient our usual focus on the origins of medieval art to prioritize the longer life of surviving medieval objects. In this essay we interrogate the different ways that “authenticity” can signify in revivalist buildings such as Glencairn and Hammond Castle. In particular, we consider how the present and the past work together to make meaning beyond the original moment of creation. What compels us about these two buildings has very little to do with how authentic they are and much to do with how they manipulate our expectations and create new and unique experiences of the medieval.


In the former home of Raymond Pitcairn and his wife, Mildred, built between 1928 and 1939 and now the Glencairn Museum in the Philadelphia suburb of Bryn Athyn, the lines between medieval and modern are overtly, and successfully, blurred (Fig. 1). Although described as “Romanesque in style, its form in fact is decidedly from the 1930s. Pitcairn began to collect medieval art to inspire the artists working on the nearby cathedral, a building overseen by Pitcairn and erected between 1913 and 1928 for the New Church, a Swedenborgian Christian denomination founded in 1890 in Bryn Athyn in opposition to the established Swedenborgian Church of North America (Fig. 3). Pitcairn’s purchases were made possible by the wealth generated through the family company that he ran, the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company. This collecting eventually developed into a passion, and in a relatively short period of time, primarily between 1916 and 1928, he had bought hundreds of medieval sculptures, stained-glass windows, and architectural fragments, ultimately amassing one of the largest private collections of medieval art in the United States.12 Glencairn was built to house the artworks and to be his family’s home, right next door to the cathedral. Although Bryn Athyn Cathedral was constructed using ostensibly medieval methods and appears to be a genuine attempt at re-creation, Glencairn engages with the medieval differently. On the one hand, we see the influence of the cathedral in the home’s re-created stained-
glass windows, carved stone, and intricate mosaics; on the other hand, Pitcairn’s rich collection of medieval artworks is thoroughly integrated into the very modern fabric of the house. At Glencairn, past and present collide.

Hammond Castle sits perched on a cliff overlooking the sea in Gloucester, Massachusetts, like an architectural relic from another age standing proudly amid the stately New England-style shingled summer homes and modern McMansions that populate the coastline (Fig. 2). The castle was built between 1926 and 1929 as a home for John Hays Hammond Jr., who is best known for being a prolific inventor, reportedly second only to Thomas Edison in the number of patents he acquired. His “castle” housed his laboratory, in which he produced hundreds of inventions that included radio and weapons systems for the U.S. military, as well as various technological advancements in musical instruments and music reproduction. The most notable aspect of the castle, though, is its use as a stage setting for Hammond’s sizable collection of ancient, medieval, and Renaissance artifacts. Some of these were sculptural and architectural elements that Hammond purchased abroad and then incorporated into the fabric of the house.

While both of these homes include medieval remnants alongside modern construction, they do not always do so in the same way. Pitcairn’s Glencairn, although fantastic in design, was built with craftsmanship and artistic display in mind, and his collection of medieval art would eventually receive significant respect and praise. By contrast, Hammond’s castle, with its mix of real, fake, and composite elements, registers as a theatrical pastiche of historical references primarily intended to give visitors a memorable experience. As we consider these buildings, we foreground three interrelated themes: authenticity, the spoliated fragment, and confusion. We explore what it means to incorporate “authentic” and inauthentic spolia into a revivalist setting and how the space itself plays a role in the viewing experience. The medieval fragment comes to stand in for the original whole, functioning as a relic that both reflects and creates cultural memory; the evocative modern setting enables the visitor to make a virtual pilgrimage to the past. At the same time, the relationships created among the fragments, and between the fragments and the building, blur and confuse the lines between past and present, old and new, European and American.

Such medievalist projects are often criticized for their disregard of historical identification as kitschy or, worse, intentionally dishonest. We ask whether any reconstruction of the past—fanciful, museological, scholarly—can ever be truly “authentic.”\footnote{16} Exploring multiple, interwoven types of authenticities, we encourage a move away from thinking about such buildings as more or less “real” and advocate instead a range of different “reals.” We discuss the appearance of the buildings, their methods of construction, authenticities of the objects in the collections, and the overall effect of the combinations. As Pam Clements points out, the challenges of grappling with the notion of authenticity are precisely these “intertwined definitions” that she describes as “authenticity as historical accuracy . . . the authentic as the original . . . the authentic as the authorized version” and “authenticity as believability or verisimilitude.”\footnote{17} Places like Glencairn and Hammond Castle provide a heightened experience of historicized space; they preserve cultural memories at the same time as they construct new ones, of spaces and places that never existed but seem as if they did.

\section*{Authenticity}

Raymond Pitcairn was not an architect, but he led the building projects for both Bryn Athyn Cathedral and Glencairn. The designs for these buildings evolved gradually, relying on what he perceived to be more “medieval” methods of architectural planning and building, such as scale models and then full-size plaster models of sections.\footnote{18} Shops were constructed on

\begin{thebibliography}{16}
\item[14.] There has been almost no scholarly work done on Hammond Castle. An exception is James F. O’Gorman, “Twentieth-Century Gothic: The Hammond Castle Museum in Gloucester and Its Antecedents,” \textit{Essex Institute Historical Collections} 117, no. 2 (1981): 81–104. The castle has been featured in various newspapers and magazines and occasionally in books published for a general audience; see, e.g., the entry on it in Pamela W. Fox, \textit{North Shore Boston: Houses of Essex County, 1865–1940} (New York: Acanthus, 2005), 296–301.
\item[17.] Clements, “Authenticity,” 19.
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the cathedral’s building site for working in stone, wood, metal, and glass. Pitcairn was determined to reproduce the textures and colors of the early Gothic French windows he admired during his trips to Europe to research construction. In order to revive the medieval art of making pot-metal glass, he arranged for Arthur Kingsley Porter—professor of art history at Harvard and noted scholar of medieval art and architecture—to translate Theophilus’s twelfth-century text on the subject. Pitcairn’s artists were sent to England and France to photograph and draw windows in specified churches. Stained-glass craftsmen were sought, and they experimented with color recipes before they made the hand-blown windows seen in the cathedral today. Emblematic of the assessment of the “authenticity” with which Pitcairn’s Gothic cathedral was viewed are the words Porter wrote to him: “your church, alone of modern buildings, in my judgment, is worthy of comparison with the best the Middle Ages produced.” By contrast, the architecture of Pitcairn’s home is not a re-creation of a specific medieval architectural style; instead, it is a quirky combination of medieval-like elements with 1930s mansion design and Arts and Crafts aesthetics made popular earlier in the twentieth century in the United States by such architects as Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959) and the brothers Charles Sumner Greene (1868–1957) and Henry Mather Greene (1870–1954). The Great Hall, for instance, includes handcrafted elements such as a large mosaic arch with New Church iconography (Fig. 4); bookshelves, doors, balconies, and furniture carved from wood and decorated with patterns, family names, and biblical text (Fig. 5); and the enlarged interface patterns and Swedenborgian quotations in mosaic decorating the high ceiling (Fig. 6). Nevertheless, the decoration of the house, exemplified by the Great Hall, was very much informed by the work that had been done next door at the cathedral. Pitcairn saw his house as a valuable opportunity to keep the workshops running and to continue to employ the artists who had worked on the church.

While Hammond Castle was under construction, many reports in the popular press described it as a building brought stone by stone from Europe, but in fact it was a modern structure embellished with the detritus of medieval doorways, windows, and other pieces, often separated by war or neglect from their original sites. These were readily procurable in the early twentieth century because of lax European regulations controlling exports, although these would later begin to tighten. Many collectors benefited from the availability of such artifacts, including Isabella Stewart Gardner, William Randolph Hearst, and George Grey Barnard, in addition to

24. E.g., in a letter to E. Donald Robb written in 1938, Pitcairn explains that, “In spite of taxes and other difficulties which, from a practical and economic standpoint, make my house-building project seem a colossal blunder and the creation of a burden for which my family may have scant reason to thank me in the future, the work has progressed and from a creative and architectural standpoint I get considerable satisfaction out of it. Besides this there is the fact that it has provided employment for many people who were interested in doing a type of work which, in any other but a New Deal age, might be considered as worth-while and constructive” (our emphasis). Raymond Pitcairn to E. Donald Robb, 21 March 1938, Glencairn Museum Archives.


39; and Beth Lombardi, “Raymond Pitcairn and the Collecting of Medieval Stained Glass in America,” in Smith, Medieval Art in America, 185–232, at 185–86.

19. Hayward (“Introduction,” 47n31) cites a letter of 1918 that refers to Porter’s translation of Theophilus for use in Bryn Athyn, but the results of Porter’s efforts are unknown.

20. These artists included Winifred Hyatt and Lawrence Saint. Lombardi, “Raymond Pitcairn.” Hayward (“Introduction,” 38–39) cites correspondence by Raymond Pitcairn to Paul Froelich, another artist who also worked on the church’s glass, 7 July and 9 December 1921, Glencairn Museum Archives, Bryn Athyn, PA.


22. The complete statement is: “I had expected much of the Bryn Athyn church, but nothing like what I found. If it existed in Europe, in France or England, it would still be at once six centuries behind, and a hundred years ahead of its time. But on the soil of great architectural traditions, it would be in a measure comprehensible, and the presence in the neighborhood of the great works of the past would in a way prepare the mind for this achievement of the present age. For your church, alone of modern buildings, in my judgment, is worthy of comparison with the best the Middle Ages produced.” Arthur Kingsley Porter to Raymond Pitcairn, 24 October 1917, Glencairn Museum Archives.

23. Greene and Greene were based in California, and several of their best-known houses were built in that state: Gamble House (1908) and Blacker House (1907) in Pasadena and Thorsen House (1909) in Berkeley.
Hammond and Pitcairn. While the latter paid attention to medieval methods of production, Hammond was apparently more interested in giving his visitors a virtual tour through the architectural styles of the Middle Ages than in trying to re-create an authentic-looking, stylistically cohesive building. Thus, Hammond Castle is a pastiche of spaces meant to evoke a medieval monument without truly emulating one. Several early proposals for and detailed descriptions of the building prepared by Hammond make it clear that each room was supposed to represent a different type of space; only some of these were completed. For instance, he originally intended to have an entire twelfth-century cloister, in which the museum would “show a collection of marbles, tombs, windows and doorways.”28 As the castle now stands, its most noticeable elements are a Romanesque-style section reminiscent of a castle keep, an array of Gothic-style buttresses complete with flyers (Fig. 7), and an area modeled after a late medieval French château. Inside, narrow, winding staircases lead to a variety of rooms that suggest diverse medieval spaces, as well as some bedrooms and sitting rooms furnished in early colonial American style. Like Glencairn, Hammond Castle has a Great Hall (Fig. 8): one hundred feet long and sixty feet high, it was built to be acoustically perfect for Hammond’s enormous pipe organ. Its pointed arches, stained-glass windows, and overall ap-

pearance are reminiscent of a church interior. While the dimensions of the Great Hall are said to have been modeled on the transept of the basilica of Saint-Nazaire in Carcassonne, Hammond actually made this connection on a visit to Carcassonne after plans for his castle were already under way. In a diary entry in 1926 he wrote, “Visit the Cathedral of St. Nazaire. . . . Its transept has exact proportions of Great Hall in my new house.”

In one of the early memoranda about the arrangement of the house, Hammond detailed his ideas about how the architectural space should be structured: “The scheme for the lay-out of the buildings, which I contemplate, is first the erection of a central pile, now fairly complete, representing an abbey of the 15th century.” To complete this vision of a repurposed church, Hammond’s Great Hall is anchored by a fifteenth-century fireplace that would be more at home in a medieval manor house; in this way the hall became a sort of religious/ secular hybrid. This functional duality is reflected in its use, both past and present. Hammond organized concerts in the Great Hall featuring some of the most famous organists of the day, who often played religious music, but he also used it as his personal living room. Today the space is rented out for wedding ceremonies, but it also serves as a site for wedding receptions, so that both religious sacraments and secular feasting occur in the same space.

Both Hammond Castle and Glencairn rely on the presentation of works of art in contextually relevant revivalist surroundings, in which visitors can feel that they are experiencing a facsimile of actual medieval spaces. A better-known

32. On the phenomenological experience of space, see Maurice Merleau-Ponty, esp. Phénoménologie de la perception (1945), trans. Colin Smith, Phenomenology of Perception (London: Routledge,
example of this type of installation is The Cloisters, the branch of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York dedicated to medieval art. Its architect, Charles Collens, was a partner at the Boston-based firm Allen and Collens, which had designed Hammond Castle more than a decade earlier. One of the most memorable features of The Cloisters is the way that art is displayed in re-created medieval spaces, both sacred and secular, such that authentic sculptural and architectural fragments are seen in a cultural context that attempts to evoke atmospheric viewing experiences for visitors. The Cloisters provides a roughly chronological tour through the Middle Ages, ranging from its twelfth-century Romanesque chapel from Fuentidueña in Spain to the Unicorn Tapestries room, modeled after a sixteenth-century manor hall. Elizabeth Bradford Smith describes the phenomenon of integrating objects and building this way as the “Barnard method,” referring to the original Cloisters, the home built by George Grey Barnard to house his medieval collection that he opened to the public in 1914. Although the staff of the Metropolitan Museum was not impressed with the lack of art historical integrity evident in Barnard’s whimsical arrangement of his objects, they adopted his vision of medieval objects presented in a revivalist building in contextually appropriate spaces. Unlike the other collectors discussed here, Barnard amassed his medieval art collection mainly out of necessity; he hoped to sell the pieces to fund his activities as a sculptor. When he failed to find immediate purchasers, he installed the collection in a medieval-style building in New York,34 where he attempted to underscore the air of authenticity by lighting the interior with candles and having tour guides dressed in monastic robes lead visitors through the building.35 The collection, purchased

in 1925 by the Metropolitan Museum of Art with funds provided by John D. Rockefeller, became the basis for The Cloisters, which opened to the public in 1938.\textsuperscript{36}

Glencairn and Hammond Castle have frequently been discussed in terms of their authenticity, whether as part of the rhetoric of their owners, by the popular press, or in scholarly writing. Their respective levels of authenticity have even been directly compared. In a complimentary article on Pitcairn’s collection in the \textit{Philadelphia Inquirer} in 1982, Walter Cahn, professor of medieval art history at Yale University, contrasted Glencairn and Hammond Castle. He described the Massachusetts collection this way: “It’s a Disneyland there. Most things are not very authentic.” This evaluation of Hammond’s assemblage certainly differs from the way it was originally received. Hammond was the subject of much fawning press after his castle was built (one breathless newspaper account described him as the “owner of the most extraordinary art museum in the world”\textsuperscript{38}), particularly since he almost immediately turned it into a museum; the board of trustees hired him as resident curator. Later evaluations of Hammond Castle, however, have characterized it as fantastical, idiosyncratic, and eccentric, confirming Cahn’s dismissal of the building and the collection housed there. For example, Faye Ringel groups Hammond Castle with such medievalist buildings as Hearst Castle at San Simeon, California; Belcourt Castle in Newport, Rhode Island; and the Higgins Armory Museum in Worcester, Massachusetts. The latter closed in 2013, and its collection was transferred to the Worcester Art Museum. She characterizes them as “Xanadus,” the name of the house in the film \textit{Citizen Kane}, based on the life of William Randolph Hearst, and places them in a chronological sequence of anachronistic American appropriations of the Gothic.\textsuperscript{39} Her judgment of Hammond Castle even extends to referring to its builder as a “mad scientist.”\textsuperscript{40} Perhaps part of the reason for these negative judgments was that Hammond’s collection was notably eclectic, its objects ranging widely in time and place of manufacture. In addition to architectural fragments taken from medieval European build-

\textsuperscript{36} Husband, \textit{Creating The Cloisters}, contains the full account of the complicated chain of events that led to the construction of The Cloisters. See also Peter Barnet and Nancy Wu, \textit{The Cloisters: Medieval Art and Architecture}, 75th anniv. rev. ed. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2012), 9–16; and Leuchak, “‘Old World for the New.’”


\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 149.
ings and reincorporated into his revivalist castle, he collected inscriptions from ancient Roman tombs, medieval sculpture, Renaissance furniture, early American glass and pewter, and a variety of other objects, some picked up in the Caribbean when he spent several months sailing there. These included such items as church pews, cannons, and even a skull that he believed might have come from a crew member on Columbus’s second expedition to the New World.

Unlike Hammond’s wide-ranging tastes, Pitcairn’s endeavors—his buildings as well as his collection of medieval art—have been treated as more serious and intellectual, and therefore as more authentic. Before the construction of Glencairn was complete, many of Pitcairn’s medieval objects were on extended loan to the Pennsylvania Museum of Art (later renamed the Philadelphia Museum of Art) and installed in its new medieval galleries. In 1982 the Metropolitan Museum of Art mounted a large scholarly exhibition of objects from Pitcairn’s collection; Cahn coauthored the accompanying catalogue with Jane Hayward, curator at The Cloisters, and other contributors. Already in the early years, when he was actively building and collecting, Pitcairn forged relationships with such experts as Porter and Fiske Kimball, director of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, whose involvement with Pitcairn’s enterprises denotes a certain level of validation.

We see Cahn’s statement as a useful springboard for thinking about the limits of attempting to assess authenticity, although we also acknowledge the offhandedness of his remark. The reference to Disneyland places Hammond Castle in the realm of child’s play, even suggesting that its owner was childlike or childish. It may also imply that Hammond’s motivations were economic or profit-driven rather than intellectual, perhaps because Hammond operated his house as a museum for a paying public despite his entrepreneurial and financial success as an inventor. Even though Pitcairn, a successful industrialist, was probably wealthier than Hammond, his home remained private. The Disneyland referent also evokes superficiality: a charming veneer that disguises a more mundane (that is, modern) structure underneath. Hammond Castle may be primarily an imaginary simulacrum of the “real” Middle Ages. In his well-known essay on Disneyland, Jean Baudrillard characterized the amusement park as a simulacrum that is, in a way, more authentic than its surroundings: “Disneyland is presented as imaginary in order to make us believe that the rest is real, whereas all of Los Angeles and the America that surrounds it are no longer real, but belong to the hyperreal order and to the order of simulation.” The medieval fantasyland created at Hammond Castle masks the fact that there is no “true” Middle Ages, but only our modern perception and reconstruction of what the Middle Ages might have been. In the words of Norman Cantor, “the image of the Middle Ages which obtained at any given period . . . tells us more about the difficulties and dilemmas, the intellectual commitments of the men of the period than it does about the medieval world itself.” To our minds, Hammond Castle is no less “authentic” than Glencairn, and Hammond’s creation is no more Disneyland than that built by Pitcairn. In the end, they are but two versions of the Middle Ages—imaginary reconstructions, yes, but no more or less “real” than any other.

Only rarely are extant medieval structures products of a single unified style; more often they are pastiches and overlays of evolving architectural interventions and aesthetic tastes that shifted and changed over time. Hammond’s eclectic mélange of building styles plays with the idea of architectural authenticity. Both the castle and Glencairn were early twentieth-century homes, buildings made up of thousands of parts; some of these were from other historical periods, but many were contemporary. In this sense, both Hammond and Pitcairn built houses that engaged creatively with juxtapositions of new and old, past and present, and intentionally subverted the distinctions between what was actually old and what was made to look old. We get a better sense of what Cahn may have meant from his survey of Romanesque sculpture in New England collections; Hammond Castle is listed in the section titled “Doubtful Authenticity” with the statement, “All Romanesque

41. Numerous letters from Pitcairn to the museum director and others in 1931, the year the new medieval galleries opened, reflect this agreement, which appears to have been in place for several years. Glencairn Museum Archives.


44. Michael Camille (Gargoyles of Notre-Dame, 351–52) refers to a new eagle gargoyles added to Notre-Dame in 2000 as “Disneyfied,” but in this case the reference does not seem so much a critique as a visual description of the cartoonish character aesthetics used in contemporary Disney animation.


sculpture exhibited appears to be of modern workmanship.”

It seems likely that this determination derived primarily from the photographs and descriptions in the first guidebook to the museum, written by Hammond’s secretary after he died and she became the museum’s director,49 which Cahn listed as a source in a footnote. Indeed, the Romanesque-style sculpture in the castle does appear to be of later workmanship.

This early guidebook to Hammond Castle is full of inaccuracies about the dates and history of many of the objects, and it includes some farfetched stories about provenance; for example, a fireplace is said to have been made from a window that came from the house of the mother of Gregory the Great.49 Hammond’s own correspondence about his acquisitions includes many such fanciful anecdotes, and the source of some of these inventions and exaggerations is not entirely clear. Dealers may have polished the particulars of authenticity and provenance for quicker sales, but Hammond himself seems not to have been immune to the charms of embellishment for the sake of a good story. He claimed that he was careful and discriminating about his purchases, and, like Pittcarn, he cultivated relationships with art historians and museum curators. His guest book and surviving correspondence at Hammond Castle contain the names of people like Hanns Swarzenski, curator of decorative arts and sculpture at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and a noted medievalist;49 the same time cheapest collections of old architectural pieces in America. . . . I have avoided all New York antiquaires and all famous collectors abroad. . . . I have had my pieces checked by experts. As a result I have found things at unprecedented prices. I have also developed an eye for fakes.51

It is possible that Swarzenski, Taylor, Porter, and others were tapped to offer Hammond expert advice about his acquisitions. On one occasion he sought advice from his friend Helen Clay Frick, daughter of the industrialist and art collector Henry Clay Frick, about a marble plaque of the Virgin and Child that he had recently bought, which was probably the work of the contemporary artist Alceo Dossena.52

Thus, while Hammond was certainly on the lookout for “authentic” objects, and he trained himself to spot forgeries and paid attention to provenance evidence when it existed (he was quite proud of a processional cross he had acquired in the 1949 estate sale of items from the Brummer Gallery in New York, for example), his collection included a large number of reproduction and pastiche pieces, some of them commissioned by Hammond himself. The stained-glass windows in the Great Hall of Hammond Castle are modern reproductions: the rose window at one end is a version of one at Reims Cathedral, created by a stained-glass artist, Jacques Simon, who was based in Reims; the window at the other end is a reproduction of the famous “Notre-Dame de la Belle Verrière” from Chartres Cathedral. Correspondence with Armando Paci, the Rome-based agent who sold Hammond many objects, confirms that Hammond requested that damaged objects be restored, rebuilt, repainted, or regilded, depending on the object and its condition. He modified objects to serve new functions, asking, for instance, that holes be drilled in marble sculptures so they could function as waterspouts.53 It seems that, above all, Hammond was trying to acquire objects, whether authentic items, restorations, or copies, that worked together in his revivalist space to tell a story about the Middle Ages and serve as inspi-

Mother told me you are worried about my expenditures for antiques. You have seen my house and I am very proud to say that it is one of the best and at

49. Witham, Hammond Museum Guide Book, 48. This provenance was repeated in private correspondence and public accounts of Hammond’s collection.
52. John Hays Hammond Jr. to Helen Clay Frick, 22 September 1931, Frick Collection/Frick Art Reference Library Archives, New York. Hammond believed it was from a church that had been damaged in the 1930 earthquake near Campobasso, Italy. A year and a half later, Miss Frick’s librarian sent Hammond a catalogue of the works of Dossena and suggested that he compare his plaque with one there. Ethelyn Manning to John Hays Hammond Jr., 1 March 1933, Frick Collection/Frick Art Reference Library Archives. Frick herself had been taken in by a Dossena masquerading as a Renaissance sculptural group of the Annunciation; David Sox, Unmasking the Forger: The Dossena Deception (London: Unwin Hyman, 1987), 49–53.
53. Armando Paci to W. I. Randall, 27 May 1929(?), Hammond Castle Archives.
ration for later generations. He wrote, "My ambition is to leave a modest, but beautiful museum. . . . I want only an authentic atmosphere [with] some furniture and genuine architectural pieces, doors, windows, etc. In cold restrained New England a place with the romantic beauty of the Italian and French past may prove the inspiration of many poor artists and students to come." Ironically, Hammond collected many of the sorts of objects he originally eschewed, and his tapestry collection and some pieces of classical and medieval sculpture were sufficiently valuable to be auctioned in the 1990s on behalf of the museum at Sotheby’s and Christie’s in New York. 55

Raymond Pitcairn seems to have actively encouraged the perception of his acquisitions as selective, refined, and private. The publicity around his purchase in 1921 of the large collection of medieval stained glass assembled by the stockbroker Henry C. Lawrence is emblematic of the way Pitcairn is often portrayed. A relative unknown on the collecting scene before the sale, he seemingly appeared out of nowhere to outbid Hearst and others for what was an exorbitant purchase at the time, $153,850 for twenty-three panels. 60 Later publications have also contributed to this popular image of Pitcairn as a skilled and devout collector who was self-taught, private (even suspicious), and very discriminating, and whose motivations for buying objects were largely religious in nature: "[the collections’] artistic quality, by the testimony of experts in the field, is remarkably consistent—testimony also to Raymond Pitcairn’s perceptive eye for the beauty of form."57 The 1982 Philadelphia Inquirer article quoted above states that "Pitcairn is reputed to have had a truly exceptional eye. Few of his pieces are fakes, and in this respect he differed greatly from some of his contemporaries."58 Nevertheless, he did not necessarily differ from his contemporaries in his opportunism, as surviving correspondence between Pitcairn and several dealers suggests that even though Pitcairn prided himself on his discerning taste and wished to purchase artworks of top quality, he still wanted to make sure that he procured them at the most reasonable price possible.59

Hayward points out that the core of Pitcairn’s collection "was formed at the only time in this century when acquiring works of art of quality and, specifically, of the medieval period, was possible," and his successes were at least partly attributable to fortuitous timing rather than to unique skills.60 The characterization of Pitcairn as extremely discriminating implies that he was not easily swayed by dealers, yet at times he clearly was susceptible to their rhetoric. For example, in 1922 Pitcairn purchased a thirteenth-century sculpture of St. Paul from the dealer René Gimpel that another dealer, Georges Demotte, had sold to Gimpel some years earlier (Fig. 9). Gimpel described it as "one of finest specimens of French art, School of l’Ile de France, 13th; that it has retained its original polychromy and that no modern part whatever has been added thereon."61 Pitcairn eventually paid $110,000 for the sculpture, which was treated as medieval by the curators and art historians who wrote the catalogue for the 1982 exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, even positing that it "might belong to" the important Notre-Dame atelier responsible for the decoration on that building’s south transept doorway.62 Since then, scholars have

55. These items were sold in the following sales: Sotheby’s, New York, Antiquities and Islamic Art, 14 December 1993; Sotheby’s, New York, European Works of Art, Arms and Armour, Furniture and Tapestries, 12 January 1993; Sotheby’s, New York, European Works of Art, Arms and Armour, 11 January 1994; Christie’s, New York, Antiquities, 15 December 1994; and Christie’s, New York, European Works of Art, Furniture and Tapestries, 10 January 1995.
56. Glenn (Glencairn, 173–75) quotes a rather evocative description of the auction from Thomas E. Norton, One Hundred Years of Collecting in America: The Story of Sotheby Parke Bernet (New York: Abrams, 1984), 91: "Joseph Duveen (bidding for Philadelphia Collector Joseph Widener) and William Randolph Hearst (bidding for himself) were expected to carry off most of the finest pieces. However, on the afternoon of the auction a mystery bidder outshone (and outbid) the two old pros. When lot 372, the Tree of Jesse Window [from Soissons], was put on the block, a tall young stranger astounded the audience by paying $70,000 for this masterpiece of medieval glass." That "tall young stranger" was, of course, Raymond Pitcairn. The sale took place 27–29 January 1921; Pitcairn describes various aspects of the experience in several letters written in February 1921. Generally he seemed pleased with the purchase, but annoyed by the auction and the subsequent attention it garnered him. For instance, in a letter to E. Donald Robb he exclaims, "It was a terrible experience; however, I secured some of the best things in the Lawrence collection and it will have a tremendous affect [sic] upon our stained glass, as you will agree when you see it." Raymond Pitcairn to E. Donald Robb, 10 February 1921, Glencairn Museum Archives.
57. Glenn, Glencairn, 161.
58. Mangold, "Splendid Medieval Art of Glencairn."
59. Surviving correspondence with dealers, including Joseph Brummer, Henri Daguerre, Georges and Lucien Demotte, and René Gimpel, Glencairn Museum Archives.
61. René Gimpel to Raymond Pitcairn, 19 April 1922, Glencairn Museum Archives.
expressed doubts about this sculpture, wondering if it was actually carved by the nineteenth-century artist Jean-Baptiste Lassus working under Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc’s restoration of the Sainte-Chapelle. Such instances of dubious or unknown origin are understandably underemphasized in the Glencairn Museum’s current minimalist wall labels, which rarely reflect the questions about provenance that one encounters in some of the object files.

In thinking about the different sorts of “authenticities” on display at both Hammond Castle and Glencairn, we agree with Stephanie Trigg’s succinct statement: “it is clear that the concept of ‘authenticity’ is deeply problematic.” In her essay on cathedrals and medievalism, Trigg explores the ways that surviving medieval churches can bring into question our training as historians, which “bids us be wary of the post-medieval accretions, revisions, and reforms,” and she suggests that no historians—medieval or otherwise—can deny that they have participated in such attempts to separate out what is “original” from what is not. Her goal is not just to signal this but also to argue that a similar “appeal to the authentic” drives both scholarly activity by historians and broader tourism of medieval sites and buildings, despite the fact that the “authenticity” at such sites is often a complete fabrication.

As a result, she makes clear the blurry distinction between “medieval” and “medievalist.” William J. Diebold, in his recent analysis of the term medievalism, has even proposed that what medievalists do is in fact medievalism, especially if we understand that medievalists do not just recover the Middle Ages but actually create it anew with every exploration of the past. Trigg may focus on a select number of examples—the Canterbury Tales visitor attraction, Westminster Abbey, St. George’s Chapel at Windsor Castle, The Cloisters, and the 2001 film A Knight’s Tale—but her arguments get at the heart of the problems with “authenticity.” Simply put, nothing can really be authentically medieval if it exists in the modern world. Trigg’s concluding words neatly sum up the situation: “Whether we like it or not, there is no ‘pure’ medieval; there is only medievalism.” Her assertion applies also to Glencairn and Hammond Castle, two buildings that exist in the space between modern and medieval, real and fake.

American Collectors of the Fragmented Past

The appropriation of medieval fragments in the buildings erected by Hammond and Pitcairn is in some ways remark-

63. Charles T. Little to Martin Pryke, 1 September 1983, Glencairn Museum Archives; and Charles T. Little and Georgia Wright, 24 September 2008, memo in object file, Glencairn Museum Archives. The latter elaborates on the former exchange between Little and Glencairn director Martin Pryke in 1983, asserting that “several things argue against the piece being of the 13th century,” including the similarity of the sculpture’s head to another head in the Glencairn collection, which Little had determined was from the nineteenth century. Numerous works have attracted similar misgivings. For instance, Walter Cahn argues that the Daria relief (displayed in the Great Hall) and related sculptures in several other collections “are without much doubt modern fabrications.” Cahn, “Romanesque Sculpture in American Collections, VII: New York and New Jersey,” Gesta 10, no. 1 (1971): 45–53, at 49–50.
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ably evocative of the appropriation of fragments in the Middle Ages; both suggest associations with relics and spolia. If we think about these fragments as relics, as the venerated remains of a historical past, they become spiritualized with a kind of aura created through contact, conduits to a past that only these specific objects can conjure. Memorialized but also sometimes violated, relics are often pieces of a bigger entity and thus may also contain the implication of that violence, whether to body or to building. As spolia, older materials that are removed from one context and used in a new one, these reused pieces continue to evoke violence, but cultural or political violence as much as the corporeal kind; they often represent potentially aggressive domination alongside physical acquisition. In a more neutral sense, spolia can also be considered in economic terms as recycled pieces that may retain a vague connection to their past roles but also, in their new context, become something else entirely. This complex range of associations for medieval fragments is provocatively on display at both Glencairn and Hammond Castle.

The Great Hall of Glencairn comprises a seemingly infinite array of objects and materials. About fifty medieval artworks, grouped into conglomerations, are embedded into the walls or placed in specific positions for display, with additional medieval capitals resting atop bookshelves and figurative sculptures poised on the balcony railing (Figs. 4, 9, and 10). An abundance of stained glass is incorporated into the walls, including fragments of medieval glass purchased by Pitcairn, modern replicas created by the artists working for him, and all-new window designs created specifically for Glencairn. In addition, throughout the large hall are medieval-inspired elements that are not replicas but channel the medieval through an Arts and Crafts aesthetic: the huge mosaic arch; numerous carved stone columns and capitals; and hand-hewn wood elements such as bookshelves, doors, and furniture, often painted with medieval designs (Figs. 4–5). The highlight of this handmade medievalesque decoration is the high ceiling, the beams of which are encrusted with dazzling glass mosaics that enlarge the famously complex interlace patterns of the early medieval Book of Kells (Fig. 6). In this rich context, several groupings of medieval objects are created out of freestanding artworks arranged in front of architectural remnants built into the walls (Figs. 9, 11).

In one of these conglomerations of fragments, the aforementioned thirteenth-century (or perhaps nineteenth-century)
French polychrome statue of St. Paul is placed at the center, standing on a twelfth-century capital from France carved with a seated Christ flanked by lions (Fig. 9). Above this, set into the wall, is an eleventh-century tympanum thought to be from Italy. To the right is a twelfth-century capital depicting the Baptism of Christ, and to the left is a polychrome wooden Virgin and Child, poised atop a capital, column, and base attributed to the twelfth-century cloister at Saint-Michel-de-Cuxa in the French Pyrenees. Above St. Paul are installed several twelfth-century heads from France and a twelfth-century(?) Italian relief of St. Daria with a lion. Across the hall, a mid-twelfth-century statue-column of a queen from Saint-Thibaut in Provins is positioned in an equally complex grouping of objects from different places and periods, framed by an archway that is now thought to be modern (Fig. 11).

The same sorts of conglomerations are also present at Hammond Castle. Each room contains objects of widely varying style and date, from the ancient tomb inscriptions decorating the walls of several rooms, to the authentic, pastiche, and reproduction furniture placed throughout the castle; the pieces of wood and stone sculpture; and the different sorts of metalwork, from crucifixes and monstrances to colonial American pewter plates. The dining room, for example (Fig. 12), contains walls made of linenfold paneling; a fifteenth-century Spanish ceiling, purportedly a wedding gift from William Randolph Hearst to Hammond and his wife; a floor with medieval-reproduction French tiles (according to Hammond’s household staff, a few original tiles are scattered among the modern copies); pieces of medieval and Renaissance furniture (probably pastiches of historical and modern elements); and, along the plate rail, a large collection of plates, mugs, and other items in pewter. At the end of the room hangs a fifteenth-century painting depicting the martyrdom of St. Romanus—a gruesome image for a dining room, which apparently suited Hammond’s macabre sense of humor.

Not unlike the decontextualized manner in which things are often displayed in museums today, these objects and architectural remnants at Glencairn and Hammond Castle are presented so that their original purposes or contexts are obscured. When we are in a museum, perhaps we are right to expect information about that lost context, but in someone’s home that expectation needs to be kept in check, because this integration of old and new, while clouding the past, also offers another way to understand the lives of the objects. Grouped aesthetically rather than historically, artifacts from different places and times have been combined in new configurations. In each conglomeration at Glencairn and Hammond Castle, connections are established between previously unrelated pieces, spotlighting these surviving fragments instead of the lost wholes from which they came and creating unexpected dialogues between multiple pasts and presents that were never intended or imagined when these artworks were created. Hence they do not seem to be relics of a lost past, preserved but isolated symbols; on the contrary, in this complex context the fragments seem rehabilitated, reformed, newly significant.

In appropriating a romanticized lost Middle Ages and procuring its displaced architectural remains, wealthy private

---


70. This has always been the story told about the ceiling by museum staff, and even though it cannot be confirmed, it is not unlikely. Hearst and Hammond definitely knew each other. Hammond’s father, John Hays Hammond Sr., was a mining engineer and at one time worked for Hearst’s father, George Hearst, a mining magnate. William Randolph Hearst collected a large number of medieval wooden ceilings (forty-four are listed in the William Randolph Hearst Archive at Long Island University), so he certainly had some to spare.
collectors seem to have been searching for atmospheric and authentic experience in the face of tremendous social and technological change. In Hammond’s case in particular, collecting the art and architecture of the past might seem at odds with his career as a scientist and inventor with his eye on the future. Yet aesthetically, Hammond, like Pitcairn, was drawn to the past, often the religious past. The medieval religious artifacts that they collected were taken from churches and monasteries, although because of religious and political upheavals these religious buildings were seldom still serving their original purpose, if they survived at all. Many of the items at Hammond Castle and Glencairn had been long separated from their original locations, often already repurposed for other functions before they entered these new collections. The objects themselves became secularized by being removed from their place of origin and by being made to function as house decoration, but in their new American surroundings, they created an aura that can be perceived as a quasi-spiritualized appropriation of the past, not so much because of their religious origins but because they provide a tangible, even visceral, connection to the Middle Ages.\(^{72}\)

Just as a body-part relic connotes the presence of the holy through fragments of the sacred body standing in for the intact whole, architectural fragments embedded in the reliquary of the revivalist building suggest the presence of the “true” Middle Ages. Dale Kinney and Richard Brilliant, among others, have discussed the phenomenon of spoliated objects from one culture or era reused in another.\(^{73}\) The fragments that Hammond and Pitcairn collected and installed in their homes function like spolia and in their new environments provide an aura of a past time even as they contribute to the construction of the present. The use of spolia has connotations of remembrance, and even souvenir, particularly since Hammond often acquired items on his numerous trips abroad. In some instances it is difficult not to associate the use of the fragment/relic/spolium with aggression and power, given that so many objects were sold to wealthy Americans as vestiges of violent displacement, even if this decontextualization had occurred before they took the final step of transferring the objects into their own collections.

The violence of the extracted and repurposed fragment is chiefly evident in the architectural elements that are built into the fabric of these two revivalist buildings. For the most part, the original locations of these pieces are uncertain, and it is likely that Hammond and Pitcairn did not know their provenance because most of them were purchased through dealers. For example, we now know that a Flamboyant Gothic doorway in the interior courtyard of Hammond Castle was forcibly removed from the château in Varaignes, France (Fig. 13);\(^{74}\) photographs of it in situ show a superimposed diagram for dismantling and reassembling the piece. Other images of the portal, a drawing from 1884 and a picture postcard from about 1920 (Fig. 14), provide evocative views of its original location.
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74. The doorway is similar to one installed in the Gothic chapel at The Cloisters, although that one is said to have come from the Cistercian abbey of Planselve in Gimont, about 200 miles from Varaignes.
while more recent photos of the château reveal the destructive extraction of the decorated doorway. It is not clear how, why, when, or by whom the château portal was removed, although correspondence between Hammond and a Jean Poly of Paris is probably about this door. In 1929, after Hammond Castle was completed, Poly sold Hammond a door that he called a “grande porte en pierre.” He writes that he is sure it must be one of the most beautiful things in Hammond’s building, and it certainly is the most spectacular medieval doorway among the several that exist at the castle. The dates also make sense, since originally there was a different doorway in the courtyard, a rather odd-looking, historicizing portal of modern date. Once he acquired the Gothic doorway, Hammond had this modern original ripped out and the medieval replacement inserted—an interesting reversal of chronology.

Whether or not these collectors knew the origins of a given fragment, the act of reappropriation itself is inherently tied to a type of violence. In Kinney’s words, “Spoliation entails a forcible transfer of ownership. . . . Spolia are survivors of violence.” The ethical and moral issues raised by modern instances of spoliation stem in part from the fact that spoliation inevitably destroys the original context, even taking into consideration that some of those original contexts may already have been partially destroyed. In her essay on Chicago’s Neo-Gothic Tribune Tower (completed 1925), which she identifies as an instance of “corporate appropriation” of a historical style that also integrates material fragments of more than 150 global monuments into its facade, Annabel J. Wharton describes this reuse of fragments as “pillaging”: “Each fragment implies a successful physical assault on its source.” Indeed, the Tribune Tower, and arguably Glencairn, Hammond Castle, and a number of other medievalist homes and buildings of the period, reflect an imperialist American attitude toward the non-American past and its material remains. The acquisitions of fragments by wealthy industrialist collectors, many of which were the result of the destruction of World War I, “suggest a peculiarly American concern with a dislocated past; they archive the contradictions of a nostalgia for a missing history and the pride in the brief American enterprise as the evolutionary fulfillment of all earlier ones.” All of these collectors—Hammond, Pitcairn, Barnard, Morgan, and Hearst—took advantage of the lack of strict export controls in the period following World War I, especially in France, until about 1928. An image of Morgan titled “The Magnet,” by Udo J. Keppler, which appeared in Puck in 1911, illustrates the collector’s great compulsion to acquire such fragments.
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time in which people were less educated and thus more innocent and childlike.\textsuperscript{87} This idealization of medieval life has been connected to a kind of primitivization; according to T. J. Jackson Lears, “[t]he same impulse which led some Americans to medieval Europe led others to the Orient.”\textsuperscript{88} For Lears, anti-modern medievalism was a response to the perception of apathy that accompanied industrialization.

Such ideological motivations behind the valorization of the medieval can also be linked to major architectural commissions and other kinds of American philanthropy in the early years of the twentieth century. Kathleen Davis, in her discussion of Andrew Carnegie and his “tycoon medievalism,” notes that for people like Carnegie and Rockefeller, philanthropy was underpinned by selective ideas about the superiority of certain European cultures and American participation in, and even inheritance of, that legacy.\textsuperscript{89} Carnegie was an early figure in a line of wealthy and powerful men who approached European culture in this way. Elizabeth Emery lists “J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, William Randolph Hearst, William Waldorf Astor, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson” as American figures who used medivalizing architecture to assert a particular view of American superiority and culture.\textsuperscript{90} The Cloisters was perhaps Rockefeller’s most visible and successful example of “tycoon medievalism.” His wealth, influence, and philanthropy created a lasting monument to the Middle Ages in the United States, even though it was created primarily out of objects displaced because of national traumas overseas, turning “economic capital into symbolic capital.”\textsuperscript{91} In the later part of this period, especially after World War I, Emery points to a clear “tendency to appropriate the world’s culture . . . in America’s postwar activities related to restoration, collection, and tourism—all forms of neo-colonialism—and it is also mirrored in the national cathedrals” as well as in such “cathedrals of commerce” as the Woolworth Building in New York, built by Cass Gilbert in 1913.\textsuperscript{92}

Early twentieth-century medievalisms existed at the intersections of imperialism, corporate power, racial superiority,
ties of war. According to Emery, Mond himself developed, Europe value. Ironically, because of some of the weapons that Ham- artifacts because their owners were unaware of their true include anecdotes about how easy it was to procure certain were American. Hammond working on radio-controlled torpedoes and similar commissions for the U.S. military. While at one end of his castle he and his lab assistants perfected sophisticated weapons of mass destruction, at the other end he could escape among his ob- jects into a constructed fantasy of medieval beauty and romance. Although Hammond acquired some armor and other items associated with medieval warfare, later in life he ex- pressed his deep dismay about the technological development of weaponry and especially what he saw as the potential for self-annihilation inherent in the nuclear bomb.

Some of these early twentieth-century collectors not only sentimentalized the Middle Ages but also infantilized the Eu- ropes who seemingly gave up pieces of their medieval leg- acy so willingly, as if the proper caretakers of these objects were American. Hammond’s correspondence and diary often include anecdotes about how easy it was to procure certain artifacts because their owners were unaware of their true value. Ironically, because of some of the weapons that Ham- mond himself developed, Europe’s historic sites were casual- ties of war. According to Emery, “The sense of duty toward war-torn Europe became so widespread that many wealthy Americans considered it a ‘patriotic act’ to ‘salvage’ European art, whether it was actually damaged in the war or seemingly unappreciated by Europeans. American collectors felt their intervention would assure the continuation of a treasured civil- ization about to disappear.” These acts of “charity” enriched both private and public collections in the United States: “Thanks to philanthropic figures such as Rockefeller, who single-handedly jump-started the restoration at Reims, and private collectors, who salvaged fragments that Europeans did not value, America was able to build its own medieval collections and found new museums and organizations dedicated to medieval sub- jects.”

In his 1889 essay “Gospel of Wealth,” Andrew Carnegie “defines capitalism and industrialism as hallmarks of prog- ress, and argues that continued progress requires great dis- parity of wealth.” Pitcairn, like Carnegie, was a Pennsylvania industrialist, and his attitudes toward his role in philanthropy and support of the arts are best indicated by his frustration with the New Deal, which in his view limited his ability to sup- port artists and craftsmen like those who had worked on Bryn Athyn Cathedral and Glencairn. This was, in a sense, a later version of Carnegie’s argument that the philanthropist is the person most qualified to manage his funds and other gifts. The strong link between American medievalist architecture and such industrialist resources, whether public commissions or private homes, is well articulated by Emery, who points out that “[a]lthough America’s medieval-style cathedral building of 1880–1930 may seem quaintly anachronistic today, the campaign to express particularly American values through reli- gious architecture was led by . . . some of the same politicians, industrialists, and financiers responsible for making America the world power it is today.” Of course, Pitcairn used his wealth on building projects that were not just medieval in style but also medievalist in technique, which is especially notable given the reputation of his Pittsburgh company as an indus- try innovator. The extra costs of these “medieval” methods required the resources of someone like Pitcairn: “Ironically, while Europeans were building religious architecture rapidly and inexpensively with iron, Americans embraced the finan- cial and temporal sacrifices of replicating the medieval tech- niques associated with handcrafted stone masonry.” While there were a variety of medievalisms in early twentieth-century America and numerous reasons why the Middle Ages were deemed worthy of appropriation by people far removed from them in time and place, arguably it was Raymond Pitcairn who most thoroughly embraced the possibilities of historical engagement with an earlier time. Although both Hammond and Pitcairn collected displaced fragments, often spoils of war, and reconstructed them in new configurations using contem- porary artisans, Pitcairn was not content with merely collect- ing medieval objects and installing them in a medieval-style building; he also consciously revived medieval methods of pro- duction, as if “authentic” techniques could not just re-create but actually create anew the aura of the past.
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Glencairn Museum and Hammond Castle}
Conflation and Confusion

At the same time that Glencairn and Hammond Castle construct idealized, fantastic new contexts for medieval remnants, they also confuse the lines between past and present. Without close examination it is difficult to determine what is old and what is new, and the result is buildings that are themselves unique composite objects. As Michael Camille describes in his study of the nineteenth-century gargoyles of Notre-Dame in Paris, the Middle Ages as a historical period “is hardly ever as distinct or as separate as we might want to think, but always flowing into other periods, haunting other epochs, emerging where we least expect it.”98 In Hammond Castle and Glencairn, the conflation of historical periods tends to make the reproduction itself seem authentic, particularly in spaces that make no attempt to distinguish between the original and the facsimile. The combination of the authentic and inauthentic produces not a copy, not a simulacrum, but a setting that transcends time and space and, because the original cultural contexts of the objects in the reconfigured setting have been destroyed, the new context is as rich as the old.

In these two buildings, authentic medieval objects exist alongside replicas, but that difference is rarely made clear to visitors; in addition, all these things are housed in a medialized setting that audiences may not always realize is fully modern. Rather than interpret this as intentionally misleading, however, we find that such conflation provides an opportunity to think about the more provocative implications of this kind of historical ambiguity.99 Camille argues that the nineteenth-century Notre-Dame gargoyles, which have come to symbolize the medieval despite their modernity, reveal just how modern our notions of the Middle Ages are. His point is to make the medieval in this setting both at once. Glencairn and Hammond Castle appear to function in very similar ways because they, too, integrate past and present with their mix of medieval and modern architectural styles and object collections, ultimately transcending both time periods to construct a new historical reality.

Glencairn now displays modern stained-glass windows, original medieval glass from Pitcairn’s collection, and modern replicas of medieval windows from Chartres (Figs. 4, 6, and 10).102 Furthermore, the glass tesserae for the mosaics found throughout the house, including the great arch and vaulted ceiling of the Great Hall, were produced in the same shops that made the windows, even though they are neither authentic nor based on medieval models. The ceiling mosaics that evoke the Book of Kells are particularly complicated; they engage with the medieval on multiple levels, but the result is a uniquely un-medieval artifact (Fig. 6). Pitcairn’s decision to take materials made in a medieval fashion—both the historically informed techniques used for the production of the glass and the selection of mosaic as architectural decoration—and apply them to a design based on another medieval source, of a radically different scale and medium, is a peculiar one. The jumbling together of multiple media reinforces the imaginary, fabricated nature of the medieval at Glencairn; at the same time, the creative refashioning evident in the building also reinstates the flexibility of the medieval and the intangibility of “historical accuracy” or the “original life” of medieval things.

One of the most intriguing spaces that Hammond built inside his castle was a simulated village square, consisting of an indoor pool surrounded by plants, several medieval or medieval-style portals and windows, and two medieval building facades (Fig. 16). He wanted to evoke the effect of the ruins of a Roman impluvium around which a medieval village had grown,103 but the entire installation is a mix of medieval and modern, anchored by some of Hammond’s own cutting-edge technological inventions. He told people that he found one of
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the doorways in pieces in a cellar in Naples, half-buried in the dirt; in a letter to Taylor, he states that this was the last remnant of a ruined church close to Ravello, on the Amalfi coast, and that it was carved of lava from the eruption of Vesuvius. The two house facades appear to combine original and reproduction elements, although there is no attempt made, either in materials or on the museum labels, to identify which is which. The woodwork of one is said to be intact, with brickwork finished by Gloucester artisans; Hammond’s diary states that he bought it from Auguste Decour, an art dealer in Paris, and that it was originally from Amiens (Fig. 17). Hammond used fluorescein, a dye used by the U.S. Navy, to color the pool an opaque green so that it obscured the depth of the water, and he loved to startle people by diving into the pool from the roof outside his bedroom window, which overlooked the courtyard. The entire space was surmounted by a skylight and a

107. Or perhaps from the bridge over the pool that led to the so-called Gothic bedroom; sources differ on the exact location of Hammond’s dives.
series of overhead pipes so that Hammond could produce rain inside, ranging from gentle showers to torrential downpours. The latter were supposedly used to cut short the late-night carousing of his frequent guests, who were an eclectic mix of writers, actors, musicians, politicians, society figures, and general bon vivants. In conceiving this courtyard, Hammond was probably influenced by his friendship with Isabella Stewart Gardner, a frequent visitor to Gloucester, and his knowledge of the interior courtyard of Fenway Court, her Venetian-style mansion in Boston, which was opened to the public in 1903 (Fig. 18). Gardner was yet another American collector who installed her art collection in a revivalist building, blending the historic and the modern into a new configuration, “where pieces of lost architectural monuments are set into a building whose seams remain visible, retaining their status as fragments while being integrated into a larger visual whole.”

Is the confusion created by these conflations intentional or just a side effect of our expectations? Perhaps confusion only occurs if one is looking for the distinction between medieval and not medieval, since with so many of the objects in the Pitcairn and Hammond collections a complete sense of their origins is lost (or in some cases never existed at all). The impossibility of that recovery seems to conflict directly with their assertive presence today. We tend to underestimate how remarkable that presence is. So many artworks, buildings, and objects from the past have been lost, dismantled, or destroyed that the mere survival of the pieces to which we have access today, including those on display in these homes, is significant. Their presence is aggressive, bellicerent, and powerful, and this persistence makes it arguably less important whether a particular sculpture was from this building or that one, or stood originally next to this saint or that apostle. Do the often inaccessible origins of an object really matter as much as we have assumed, or can we allow medievalist projects like Glencairn and Hammond Castle to release us from these expectations?
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108. Fozi, “‘Mere Patch of Color,’” 341.
tant or more meaningful things to be gleaned from extant objects when we no longer prioritize an (idealized) past over the many other moments (including the contemporary one) in the object’s life? The differences between past and present are not always clear. We welcome this confusion, and we invite more historians to do the same.

It is instructive to contrast The Cloisters with the homes of Pitcairn and Hammond. One of the most famous features of that museum is the area built of remnants from the cloister at the abbey of Saint-Michel-de-Cuxa. It is a convincing fabrication composed of actual medieval pieces—all of the capitals as well as some of the abaci, bases, columns, and arches—and modern elements that were quarried from the same region in Languedoc as the original elements (Fig. 19). Yet it is only half the size of the original, resulting in a misleadingly small “re-created” cloister compared with the probable French original. Trigg suggests that “visitors are fully conscious of [the] artificiality” at The Cloisters, and she echoes Baudrillard’s statement that “no one is fooled” by the medievalism there. But we would argue that nothing is self-evident at The Cloisters. Because the stone looks the same, the casual visitor would not know the difference between the medieval and modern components of the Cuxa cloister; nor would she know that it is notably smaller in scale. Echoing the way that Hammond Castle was characterized while it was under construction, visitors to The Cloisters sometimes have the impression that the entire structure was brought over, stone by stone, from Europe, whereas others believe the museum was originally a church or a monastery.

Even if its galleries are fanciful re-creations of medieval spaces, the goal of The Cloisters is to display objects and architectural elements that are authentically medieval. Yet ultimately the museum is creating a fantasy of the Middle Ages; as Tison Pugh and Angela Jane Weisl put it, “what is medieval becomes stuck in the ideal of a common civic experience.” Its curators were not immune to collecting, inadvertently, one of the many “fake” medieval objects that were on the market in the early twentieth century. The lion fountain on display in the Cuxa cloister was sold to the museum by the Parisian art dealer Paul Gouvert as a twelfth-century object from the monastery of Notre-Dame-du-Vilar in Roussillon, but in fact it is a forgery of the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. What all three buildings have in common is the effect they have on the visitor; for someone who has not been to Europe, walking through The Cloisters, Glencairn, or Hammond Castle can provide a deeply memorable experience of historicized space, something apprehended with the body as well as the mind, in a way that differs from the affected beholding that Tison Pugh and Angela Jane Weisl call “Spectacle,” in Emery and Utz, Medievalism: Key Critical Terms, 231–38.


110. The installation at The Cloisters contains only twenty-nine or thirty original capitals, making for a misleadingly small “re-created” cloister compared with the sixty-three thought to have existed originally, according to a 1779 plan of the abbey. Thomas E. A. Dale states that thirty-five remain at the abbey in France. Dale, “Monsters, Corporeal Deformities, and Phantasms in the Cloister of St-Michel-de-Cuxa,” Art Bulletin 83, no. 3 (2001): 402–36, at 405. Apparently some ninety capitals have been attributed to Saint-Michel-de-Cuxa (including another four in Pitcairn’s collection). See also Faye Hirsch, “Architectural Elements” and “Two Capitals” in Hayward and Cahn, et al., Radiance and Reflection, 55–59, cat. nos. 5–6.
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fers from viewing isolated objects in the more sterile space of the typical museum. As Trigg, an Australian, points out, “for many of us who live outside Europe, our first experience of walking in a Gothic cathedral took place in nineteenth-century buildings.” The shattered bits built into the walls of these buildings become reunited and reconstituted through their reuse.

In the Great Hall at Glencairn, visitors experience groupings of objects that have come together in a very different location in Bryn Athyn (Figs. 9–11). They are not just displayed alongside each other but are actively recontextualized within a new but still medievalized setting, and they are configured with a bold assertion that this is how they should be, and will be, seen now. At some point it becomes difficult to imagine these fragments in any other installation, especially those in the distant and inaccessible past. It becomes a challenge to imagine the St. Paul sculpture not under that tympanum or the queen statue-column not at the center of that particular doorway. The complex network of objects created in these conglomerations constructs new relationships among previously disparate pieces. Furthermore, in this type of display specific objects are brought into focus in a way wholly different from what occurred in their original contexts. How closely would any of us have looked at the St. Paul sculpture if it really had appeared somewhere at Notre-Dame, in a choir chapel or as part of the south transept doorway (or even if it was part of a later restoration of the Sainte-Chapelle)? The aesthetic logic of the arrangements made at Glencairn presents us with an entirely new, thoroughly modern, and fully engaging experience of these fragments in dialogue with one another and with the building as a whole.

**Conclusion**

The search for the “authentic” can become almost a colonialist enterprise, with the pure, unadulterated medieval building the only “true” architectural space, and the “original” object the only one deemed worthy of acquisition, study, and display. What we suggest instead is that scholars should rethink their privileging of origins and originals and understand instead that objects exist on a spectrum: things created in the past still exist in the present, and things created in the present might so successfully evoke that past that they become a viable substitute. Rather than talking about “more” or “less” real, we can talk about a wide range of “different” reals. In the same way that Baudrillard envisioned Disneyland as more “real” than its surrounding community, Glencairn and Hammond Castle integrate the past and the present, offering visitors actual reinventions of the Middle Ages that transcend time and place.

The objects in these simulated spaces participate in this reinvention, whether they are medieval or modern or a combination of the two. But instead of viewing these revivalist buildings on a scale sliding between authentic and anachronistic, with the collections inside fighting to assert their legitimacy as “real” objects, our aim in this essay has been to explore how these particular re-presentations alter or destabilize the meaning of the medieval objects. The medieval fragment comes to stand in for the original whole, functioning as a relic that both reflects and constructs cultural memory. Such temporal instability revives the medieval object as well, reasserting its capacity for new meanings.

The integration that we see at Glencairn and Hammond Castle does indeed obscure the past, but it also provides alternatives for understanding the lives of these objects. Someone standing in the Great Hall of Glencairn or the courtyard of Hammond Castle does not see the medieval or medievalizing objects as relics of a lost past, as preserved but isolated symbols; on the contrary, in these complex contexts the fragments take on new and richly evocative meanings. They communicate the personal passion that both Hammond and Pitcairn had for medieval art but, more than that, they offer a way to reconsider the lives of such objects.

With the passage of time, these buildings have become historic artifacts that tell us something about how people in the 1920s and 1930s collected, displayed, and envisioned the medieval. Perhaps more than any other historical period, the Middle Ages inspires later generations not only to try to understand it but also, in many ways, to relive it. Rather than seeing the scholarly enterprise as more worthy and rigorous than popular appropriation, however, we propose that both ways of seeing the Middle Ages are valid, and, ultimately, both are re-creations of a period that is fundamentally unknowable except through our own reconstructions of it. Glencairn and Hammond Castle present deeply evocative spaces that construct collective memories of a manufactured history and make new meanings for the medieval—meanings that are no less significant than any that have come before.