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Report Overview

General Description

The structure of and information in this report are broadly based on the Cultural Landscape Report program of the U.S. National Park Service. The Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) is a preliminary document in the preparation of the Cultural Landscape Report, the principal treatment document for cultural landscapes developed by the Park Service. The Cultural Landscape Inventory assembles information that will be used in the eventual preparation of a Cultural Landscape Report. The Cultural Landscape Inventory is almost by definition an open-ended document that allows for the inclusion of information as it is compiled.

Inventory Parts

The Cultural Landscape Inventory for Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden is organized in three levels. Part I provides an overview analysis of the cultural and historic landscape of Stenton before 1900. Part II documents the history of Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden and places it within relevant cultural and historic contexts. Part III includes two elements: an overview of the important features of this garden and broad-based management recommendations. Finally, appendixes contain supporting information, including plant lists from the period of the Colonial Revival Garden’s establishment in 1911-1917.

Stenton Museum Colonial Revival Garden Landscape Inventory

The Cultural Landscape Inventory for Stenton Museum’s Colonial Revival Garden is a study, with summary preservation recommendations, that focuses on the garden created in the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century, when the National Society of Colonial Dames in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (NSCDA) were made the official custodians (by Philadelphia City Council) of Stenton, the eighteenth-century National Historic Landmark “mansion house” of James Logan (1674-1751), proprietary agent for William Penn, scholar, and bibliophile. This garden was substantially created between 1910 and 1917 by Letitia Ellicott Wright (née Carpenter, 1861-1933), working with landscape architect John Casper Wister (1887-1982). The CLI for Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden was prepared as part of the centennial commemoration of the NSCDA’s initial assumption of Stenton’s care in 1900. The report is intended to document the extant, and now historic and important, garden on site at the Stenton property, the creation of that garden and place it within appropriate cultural and historic contexts, and provide broad suggestions for its preservation and maintenance. This CLI covers only one aspect of the Stenton landscape, and specifically addresses one aspect of its history in the twentieth century, with only a broad characterization of events before that point, and emphasis on how those events were perceived in the 1910s. A systematic investigation of events before 1900 was beyond the scope of this project. A more detailed investigation of the history of the site before 1900 should be undertaken before the preparation of a complete Cultural Landscape Report.
Methodology and Inventory Status

This CLI was prepared using two main sources of information. The bulk of the information used was derived from the primary documents in the collections of Stenton, particularly the Colonial Dames Management Records and the photograph collection. Many of these photographs have been reproduced as part of this document. It should be noted that not all of the figures are referenced in the text. The Stenton sources provide an unusually rich level of documentation for any site. In addition, standard published sources on the history of Philadelphia and the region were consulted in preparing the background context of the Stenton estate (a bibliography is found as Appendix C). This CLI was written for Stenton by Emily T. Cooperman, M.S., Ph.D., and was made possible by Historic Preservation Project Grant from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Invaluable assistance in its preparation was provided by Margo Burnette, Director of Stenton, Lilian S. L. Chance, Chairman of the Garden Committee, who generously shared her own very extensive research, and Curator Laura Stutman. Kenneth J. Le Roy, certified arborist, provided crucial information on the trees on site; this was translated expertly into graphic form by Eric Baratta, whose plan accompanies this report.
Part I: Context and Background

Site Identification

Stenton, of which its Colonial Revival Garden is a part, sits in North Philadelphia, in what were the “liberty lands” of Philadelphia County outside the original city’s limits. The Stenton property is bounded by N. 18th Street on the west, Courtland Street on the south, W. Wyoming Avenue on the north, and Stenton Park on the east. It is located just to the southeast of the original German township, with a street address of 4601 N. 18th Street.

The Logan Family’s Occupation of the Site

As documented by the Historic Structures Report for Stenton, prepared by Reed Engle and John Dickey in 1982, Stenton house was entirely complete by 1730, when James Logan and his family moved there as a permanent residence from central Philadelphia. As the HSR also notes, Logan had previously (1714) begun to make land purchases that would eventually total over 500 acres in “a plantation” (i.e., a large farm that was intended to produce income) just below the southeastern end of the German township (see plan 1 and key). Stenton remained James Logan’s primary residence until his death in 1751.

Upon Logan’s death, his son William (1718-1776) inherited the house and contiguous property, but maintained it as a country seat rather than a full-time residence, essentially living the life of a gentleman farmer. At the time of his death, his oldest son and the inheritor of the Stenton property, George (1753-1821) was studying medicine in Edinburgh. After his return to the newly fledged United States, George and his wife Deborah, (1761-1839) née Norris, decided to make Stenton their full-time residence, as his grandfather had done, and a model farm, and moved there shortly after their marriage in 1781. George Logan was particularly interested in progressive agriculture, and a vocal proponent of agrarianism in its early republican rhetorical guise as an avenue to national self-sufficiency. He was an active participant in the Pennsylvania Society of Promoting Agriculture, and published tracts on his own practices including A Letter to the Citizens of Pennsylvania, on the Necessity of Promoting Agriculture, Manufactures, and the Useful Arts (Lancaster, PA: 1800). He also was an active politician, serving in the Pennsylvania state legislature and the U. S. Senate. He also holds the somewhat ignominious distinction of being remembered in the national Logan Act, which outlaws unauthorized private diplomacy, and which was a response to Logan’s efforts to resolve difficulties between the young country and France at the end of the eighteenth century. George Logan lived at Stenton until his death. Deborah Logan, who continued there until her own death almost twenty years later, was an early member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and collected, transcribed, and published correspondence of James Logan and William Penn. She also wrote a memoir of her husband, and kept a diary from 1815 until her death.¹

¹ Both the correspondence she collected and her diary are in the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Her Memoir of Dr. George Logan was edited by her descendant Frances Armatt Logan, and published in 1899 by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania with a preface by Charles Stillé.
George and Deborah Logan’s son Albanus Charles (1783-1854), the only child to survive them, inherited Stenton after his mother’s death.2 After Albanus’s death, his widow, Maria Dickinson Logan (1783-1860) continued to live at Stenton until her own death on the eve of the Civil War. Their son Gustavus George Logan (1815-1876) inherited the property. In 1860, after Maria’s death, the house was being used for summer residence only.3 The family of Gustavus’s wife Anna Armatt (1820-1895) owned Loudoun, nearby on Germantown Avenue to the northeast, and the family ceased to live at Stenton not long after the Civil War.

By 1888, the property surrounding Stenton’s buildings had shrunk by sale and subdivision to the block bounded by N. 18th Street, Windrim Avenue, W. Wyoming Avenue, N. 16th Street, and Courtland Street. This block was placed on the Philadelphia City Plan as Stenton Park that year, although the city did not own any of this property at the time.4 In 1891, the surviving children of Gustavus George and Anna A. Logan deeded the eastern two-thirds of this block to the city of Philadelphia as a park in order to protect the family graveyard, which was located to the east of the main house and its secondary buildings, from the proposed bed of Wyoming Avenue. This was reconfigured to the north in exchange for the property. It should be noted that the only Logan heir to produce children in that generation, Jane C. A. Logan Luxmoore, had emigrated to England to live in the country of her husband, Edward, effectively leaving both Stenton and Loudoun without direct family heirs after that generation. At some point between 1891 and 1900, the rectangle just to the south of the Stenton property, with a 50-foot frontage on 18th Street, was also deeded into Stenton Park. In 1909, the City of Philadelphia purchased the remaining property from the Logan heirs for the substantial sum of $70,225, and it has remained city property to the present.5

The Development of Germantown and North Philadelphia

James Logan’s first purchases for his “plantation” were in the “liberty lands” between the original limits of the city of Philadelphia and the German township, patented to a group of Quakers from the Palatine led by Francis Daniel Pastorius at the end of the seventeenth century. During the course of the eighteenth century, the areas to the south and east of Germantown generally became the province of relatively large landholdings, like Stenton, interspersed with smaller, subsistence farms. This pattern generally prevailed into the 1830s, when the establishment of the Philadelphia, Germantown, and Norristown Railroad (PG&N, opened 1832, completed to Norristown in 1835),6 the first railroad in the region, began to change the access to and development of Germantown and adjacent areas. It is notable that Thomas R. Fisher (1741-1810), Deborah and George Logan’s brother-in-law, was responsible for locating the track along

---

2 The insularity of the social circle of James Logan’s descendants is illustrated by Albanus’s marriage to Maria Dickinson (1783-1860), who was his second cousin on both his father’s and mother’s sides.
4 Memorandum, with accompanying plan, in regard to the park and its divisions, written by Andrew Wright Crawford, April 1906, is found in the C.1, Box 2, Colonial Dames Management Records, Stenton Museum Collection (hereafter CDMRSM).
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the east side of Germantown, near both Stenton and his own property, Wakefield, located to the northeast of Stenton.7

The establishment of the PGN had two principal effects on Stenton. The first was to affect its immediate surroundings, since the tracks were raised above Germantown Avenue from the inception of the line. The railroad trestle, and later embankment to the north, became a significant feature of the Stenton landscape, and one that forever altered its pastoral appearance.8 The second effect of the establishment of the railroad on Stenton was one that would increase as the nineteenth century progressed: development, both industrial and residential. Germantown had been from its beginnings a center of manufacturing, but the rail line became an increasingly densely-built spine of large industrial buildings in the vicinity of Wayne Junction, in part spurred by the development of later rail lines, either established or taken over by the Reading Railroad, which passed through this hub. The continuation and improvement of the original Germantown line to Chestnut Hill in the middle of the nineteenth century led to the development of both as commuting suburbs. The former German township -- Germantown, Mount Airy, and Chestnut Hill -- remained a zone of elite residence well into the twentieth century, and significant portions continue as such to the present.

In contrast to the fashionable residential areas to the northwest of Stenton, to its south and east the residential and industrial development of North Philadelphia, particularly after the Civil War, was not the province of the upper class. Densely-built row houses, interspersed with factories along rail lines, seemed to march inexorably north, with Broad Street as one of the main spines, as the decades passed. This development continued apace in the first decade of the twentieth century, when the Colonial Dames first established Stenton as a house museum. It is hardly surprising that Stenton was less attractive as a place to live for the Logan heirs at the end of the nineteenth century than Loudoun, which, while it stood at the edge of a growing industrial zone, was nonetheless part of an elite neighborhood.

The Stenton landscape before 1900

The place of ornamental gardening as a status marker would become a driving force in the creation of Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden in the 1910s, but there is scant information about a flower garden per se at Stenton through both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Family documents principally provide information in the form of the names of plants ordered by members of the Logan family, which resulted in the lists of plant material assiduously compiled by Letitia Wright in preparation for the creation of the Stenton garden (her lists will be discussed in detail in the Level III).9 The most reliable, nineteenth-century published sources are conspicuously quiet on the subject of an ornamental garden at Stenton, particularly through most of the eighteenth century. In contrast to Hannah Callender’s detailed description of the garden at

7 Keyser, p. 49.
8 Interestingly, if not ironically, Thompson Westcott, in his Official Guide Book to Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1875), produced for the Centennial Exposition, noted that Stenton could be seen from the “Germantown Passenger Railway” as the cars passed (p. 330), thus making Stenton part of rail tourism.
9 The principal Logan family archive is in the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, with photocopies of many documents in the collection of Stenton Museum.
Belmont (now in Fairmount Park), there are no known contemporary visitors’ accounts that
detail either statuary, topiary, or any other garden features at Stenton. The earliest published
accounts mention no ornamental garden. John Fanning Watson, who knew Deborah Logan and
her immediate family and consulted with her in preparing his well-known *Annals of Philadelphia*
(first published in 1830) mentions no garden at Stenton in the early editions of his work.
Instead, and tellingly, he remarks that “at one time the fields were cultivated in tobacco.” This
account presumably came from Deborah Logan herself. He does, however, speak with approval
of the house, characterizing it having been built “in a very superior manner.” His notes about
Stenton’s landscape are in definite contrast to his description of the (roughly contemporary)
gardens at Springettsbury and Bush Hill. He remarks on the former magnificence of their
gardens, even if he gives few details. Watson notes, for example, that Springettsbury, the Penn
family estate in the approximate location of Lemon Hill on the Schuylkill River, “was once
cultivated in the style of a gentleman’s seat,” that it was “celebrated . . . for its display and
beauty,” and finally, that “its former groves of tall cedars, and ranges of catalpa trees are no
more.” In regard to Bush Hill, the early eighteenth-century estate of Andrew Hamilton to the
east of Springettsbury, that “in the rear were avenues of stately cedars . . . and in the front was a
charmingly graceful descending green lawn. . . .” More important, perhaps, is the difference
between Watson’s brief discussion of Stenton and his characterization of the wonders of the
garden at the Norris family’s house in the 400 block of Chestnut Street in Philadelphia. He
describes the garden as “large and highly cultivated” and notes that “its rural beauties, so near
the city, were once very remarkable; and for that reason made it the frequent resort of respectable
strangers and genteel citizens.” Watson identifies the source of his information as “Mrs. L.,” that
is Deborah (Norris) Logan herself.

Although Watson does not describe a garden at Stenton, he does express a strong,
emotional response to the house and estate as a whole in his *Annals*, but this is in the light of its
association with James Logan and his importance. Watson notes that he approached “the
secluded shades of Stenton, in which [James Logan] sought retirement from the cares and
concerns of public life, with such emotions as might inspire poetry, or soothe and enlarge the
imagination.” The association of an idea, value, or narrative with a place (and an image of a
place) seems a “natural” operation, and one that underpins the fundamental assumptions that
inform the creation of all house museums (and publicly-accessible historic gardens). It was,
however, an operation adapted into American culture from Britain in the latter part of the
eighteenth century, and one that was intimately associated with the self-conscious process of

---

Fairmount Park, Philadelphia.
Thomas, 1857) 2, p.480.
12 Watson’s sketch of the house is reproduced in the Stenton HSR, and is in the collection of the Historical Society
of Pennsylvania.
13 Watson 2, p. 478. Watson’s scrapbooks include an eighteenth-century map that sites an allée of unidentified trees
to the rear of the Springettsbury house. Watson Scrapbook 2, p. 369, Am301, Collection Historical Society of
Pennsylvania.
14 Watson 2, p. 479.
15 Watson 1, p. 408.
16 Watson 2, p. 480.
17 On this point, it is notable that Watson’s early editions of his *Annals* include a view of Stenton as one of the few
illustrations.
nation building in full swing in the years shortly preceding and following the Revolutionary War. Broadly speaking, this associationist approach is best placed under the rubric of the “picturesque.” What Watson’s romantic vision of Stenton demonstrates was that the estate had become a site associated with the construction of American (and particularly Pennsylvania) history by the 1830s. One suspects that Deborah Logan had a hand in this. This imaginative aspect of Stenton’s buildings and landscape is key to its place in modern (that is, post-colonial) understanding of that landscape and one that would offer a dilemma for Letitia Wright in the “restoration” of a garden at Stenton nearly a century after Watson had visited there.

Virtually all other (reliable) nineteenth-century published descriptions reprise or enlarge Watson’s essential themes of agricultural activities and the importance of the association with James Logan and his family. Like Watson, Andrew Jackson Downing mentions Stenton’s agriculture early in the account included in his seminal, Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening, first published in 1841. Downing’s brief description opens with a general characterization that is closely related to Watson’s evocation of the estate. Downing terms Stenton as a “fine old place, with many picturesque features.” “Picturesque” here is closely related to Watson’s description. Downing undoubtedly uses the term to evoke the historical associations of the estate, rather than merely to define its aesthetic character, as he would in his well-known gardening advice to Americans included later in the Treatise. Downing includes Stenton in the “Historical Notices” section of the Treatise, admires the 700 acre farm “almost with division fences—admirably managed. . . .”

He also remarks on a “grand old avenue of hemlock spruce” which he describes as “110 years old.” In other words, Downing dates this hemlock allée, which, as he notes, led to “a family cemetery of much sylvan beauty,” to James Logan’s time. The allée survived to be documented by photograph and appears in several with Logan family provenance in the Stenton Museum collection (figure 1). These may date to as early as 1860. Later photographs indicate that the trees had died by the end of the nineteenth century (figure 2), although the graveyard persisted well into the twentieth century. It should be noted that despite the absence of any mention of this allée in Watson’s account, it was a similar landscape feature, if it did date to James Logan’s era, to the allées of evergreens found at Springettsbury and Bush Hill.

One of the best nineteenth century descriptions, and one of the most detailed, comes to us from a Logan descendant, the idiosyncratic and opinionated Philadelphia diarist Sidney George Fisher. Fisher recounts several visits to Stenton while his “Aunt Logan” (i.e., Deborah) is still

---

20 Downing, p. 43.
21 Series G, Audio/Visual Collections, Box 3. The appearance of the family graveyard is also documented in this series.
22 It is not known exactly when Downing visited Stenton, although we do know that he later worked with Logan descendant Joshua Francis Fisher at his country seat Alverthorpe (designed by John Notman and built in 1850-51), designing the garden there. See Constance Greiff, John Notman, Architect (Philadelphia: The Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 1979), p. 29.
alive, but his lengthiest account is nostalgic in character, again sounding the note of the historical associations of Stenton, here with a more personal agenda of a positive reflection on himself and his own values. Fisher visits “Cousin Maria [Dickinson Logan],” on August 4, 1860, and records the following:

we walked down the old avenue of hemlocks to the graveyard where they all lie, Dr. George Logan, Aunt Logan, Algernon, Albanus, and last, Miss Sally Dickinson. I was at the funeral of each. There is at each grave a marble stone with name & date of birth & burial & the ground is enclosed with a stone wall & kept in neat order. So, indeed, is the whole place & the house, and I never saw it look better. It is a large, substantial building of brick, well-proportioned & picturesque.23

Fisher then goes on to describe the estate more generally:

[the house] is situated near the center of the estate, which is well wooded, with numerous clumps & groves, so that, as no fences are in sight, it looks like a park. The grounds immediately around the house are neat & that is all. Their aspect is rather farmlike than villalike. There is no “high keeping,” no well-rolled gravel roads, nicely cut edges, parterres of flowers & no “glass.” These are all modern luxuries and Stenton belongs to the last century. The grass is mowed, not shaved, and the lawn front & back is shaded by noble forest trees, hemlocks, oaks, chesnuts, & c. There is no view.24

This description may seem cryptic, but it includes a number of key elements that indicate Fisher’s personal biases as well as some important clues about the character of the Stenton landscape. First, his general characterization of the area around the house as “well wooded, with numerous clumps & groves, so that . . . it looks like a park” is an evocation of the sort of landscape garden created by Launcelot “Capability” Brown in the mid-eighteenth century in Britain. This park-like appearance as Fisher defines it is at least partly corroborated by historic photographs, such as an undated stereograph view in the Stenton collection (figure 3), but Fisher is probably connecting his family by association with the English landed gentry. He continues by contrasting Stenton with fashionable country seats of the mid-nineteenth century and their landscape features (including “well-rolled gravel roads,” etc., and ‘glass’, that is conservatory greenhouses), and concludes by noting the absence of a “view.” This is an important, if undefined point in Fisher’s description, because it indicates a certain level of disinterest in the picturesque view from the house on the part of both James Logan and his descendants, and, by extension, a refusal to participate in a certain sort of upper class British, and later American, aesthetic taste. It is tempting, and probably at least partially accurate, to ascribe James Logan’s seeming disinterest in a primarily aesthetic practice to his Quaker faith. His Quaker simplicity should not, however, be overstated, and should be understood as a relative concept as well as, perhaps, as a personal preference.

Fisher’s description concludes on both factual and evocative notes:

in front is a field, with clumps scattered at wide intervals, & so large that the road cannot be seen from the house or the house from the road; in the rear is a green slope on which is a noble avenue

---

23 Fisher diary, pp.357-358.
24 Fisher diary, p. 358.
of hemlocks, very large & massy. There are seven on each side, 40 feet apart each way. At the end of it is the family graveyard. . . . There are not many places in America like Stenton. It has the prestige of time and the association of one family attached to it, together with some historical recollections of interest.

There was essentially one other description of Stenton to appear in the nineteenth century, although it appeared in three publications. References to Stenton as James Logan’s property and as a site in the battle of Germantown appear in Scharf and Westcott’s monumental History of Philadelphia 1609-1884. A romantic account of Stenton that borders on the fanciful appears in Sarah Butler Wister’s essay on her relative Deborah Logan in Worthy Women of our First Century, is largely repeated verbatim in Thompson Westcott’s Historic Mansions of Philadelphia, both published in 1877. Wister begins her description with an evocation of an English landscaped park that is even more rhapsodic than Sidney George Fisher’s:

[the Stenton landscape consists of] miles of softly swelling meadow, over which were scattered magnificent oaks and maples, standing alone in perfect development and dignity, groups of graceful beeches, and the pride of the place, an avenue of grand hemlocks, said to have been planted by William Penn.

The reliability of this account is somewhat tinged by the fact that William Penn was dead when Stenton was built, and had not been in Pennsylvania since the turn of the eighteenth century (other nineteenth century authors clearly understood the house to have been mostly built in the 1720s). Wister’s account continues in the same romantic vein:

The wide brook twisted through an open valley, towards which the land slopes from the house, sometimes between smooth green banks, sometimes with a narrow reach of soft sand on one side, and on the other little hollows thatched with the roots of tall trees; half its abundant purling water was diverted into a mill-race, as clear and glassy as the parent stream, which took a straighter course along the farther side of the meadows, the grassy footpath beside it shaded for its whole length by lofty, wide-spreading maples and buttonwood trees; brook and race met at last, near one extremity of the place, in a pretty little pond, bordered by woodland, at the foot of the curving vale, near an old stone mill, where the Logans ground their corn. Besides the great house and its dependencies which clustered about it, there was no other building on the place, except a small farm-house near the head of the vale.

As her description continues, it develops into a heavenly, bucolic vision. It is probably not coincidence that Stenton’s surroundings were starting to change significantly when Wister published her account. She concludes with the area around the house, and is the first nineteenth-century writer to specifically mention a flower garden:

25 Published in Philadelphia by L.H. Everts & Co., 1884. While unreferenced, parallel research has frequently shown that Scharf and his assistants worked extensively from original documents. The references to Stenton occur in volume 1: pp. 161, 353.
27 Wister and Irwin, p. 292.
the sweetest rural solitude brooded over these meadows, whether one sought them on a may morning, when the grass was springing and the woodland bursting into early leaf, the ground covered with blue and white anemones and tufts of the bright, red, slender, nodding columbine, the air ringing with the notes of the shyest birds; or on a summer noon, when a humming silence possessed the fields, and the only creatures stirring were the dragon-flies darting about over the new-mown, or the cattle leaving the shade of the great trees to straggle slowly down to drink at the fords of the brook; or when an autumn sunset was shedding double splendor on the maples, and the setting a halo round the dark heads of the hemlocks, and the ground beneath them was strewn with gold and crimson leaves, scattered there by the brisk October breezes. Round the house there was the quiet stir and movement of a country-place, with its large gardens full of old-fashioned flowers and fruits, its poultry-yard and stables.28

Thompson Westcott’s description of Stenton in his *Historic Mansions* adds a theme that would remain important to the Colonial Dames generally and Letitia Wright specifically. Westcott opens with the noble lineage of James Logan, a point of little or no importance to earlier historians – “of an ancient Scotch family, the Logans of Restalrig . . . his ancestors were Scottish lairds whose personal history can be traced through several generations in the chronicles of the kingdom.”29 After quoting a portion of Wister’s description, Westcott paraphrases her account of “fine old trees” and the hemlock allée. He rightly notes that the “legend” that Penn planted them is impossible (“he, poor man! was dead years before Stenton was built”).30 Westcott’s account is essentially repeated, in brief (not surprisingly), in Scharf and Westcott’s *History of Philadelphia*.31

**Conclusion**

Several important points can be derived from nineteenth-century descriptions of Stenton and its landscape. First, there is no clear evidence of a large, elaborate ornamental garden at Stenton in the eighteenth century, or even in the nineteenth century. Instead, the records generally concur on an emphasis on agriculture in the estate, which was indisputably the case in George and Deborah Logan’s era, given George’s interest in progressive farming, although the character of the Logan fields, “without division fences” (as Downing noted) would have been park-like in character, particularly with trees widely scattered in these fields. It is very unlikely, however, that any of the eighteenth century Logans created a landscape garden *per se* on a vast scale. Sarah Butler Wister’s account of a “large [flower and fruit] garden” cannot be corroborated, although fruit trees as well as specific flowering perennials and bulbs are known to have been purchased by the family (see Part II). Neither should it be discounted completely, although the haze of her nostalgia must be taken into account in analyzing her description. The only relatively dispassionate nineteen-century evidence about an ornamental garden at Stenton is contained in a photograph in the Stenton collection, which may, like those of the hemlock allée, predate the Civil War (figure 4). This photograph clearly shows beds planted on axis with the central door on the southeast elevation of the house, although the garden’s extent is impossible to determine from the photograph. No clear evidence of this garden is preserved in

---

28 Wister and Irwin, pp. 292-293.
29 Westcott, p. 141.
30 Westcott, p. 147.
31 Scharf and Westcott 2, p. 872.
any other nineteenth-century record, including other nineteenth-century photographs in the Stenton collection.

The second principal point is, that by the turn of the twentieth century, Stenton had long been part of a construction of Pennsylvania, if not American history, and James Logan held an important place within that history. By the end of the nineteenth century, a number of important values had been added to the association of Stenton, James Logan, and history. A noble lineage was seen as a key piece of James Logan’s importance (and that of his family) and his estate was imbued with the attributes of the mid-eighteenth landscape gardens of the British landed gentry. This association would have important consequences in the “restoration” of a garden at Stenton in the 1910s. James Logan, shrewd proprietary agent, merchant, scholar, and bibliophile and above all a self-made man, was remade in an aristocratic image, and Stenton was recast into the seat of an aristocrat’s family. Logan was hardly alone in receiving this treatment, rather, this was a fundamental sort of transformation for many early colonial or republican era figures. This sort of transformation was, in fact, one of the essential activities of the Colonial Revival. It is no coincidence that Wister and Westcott were writing around the Centennial Exposition, which has been recognized for quite some time as a watershed in the display of colonial forms and in archaeological interest in them.

32 Interestingly, the emphasis on “old trees” plays a role here. It is similar to the value placed on old oaks in Britain in the eighteenth century. See Stephen Daniels, “The Political Iconography of Woodland in later Georgian England,” in Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels, eds., The Iconography of Landscape (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 43-82.
Part II: Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden

The “Historical Object Lesson”

Photographs in the Stenton collection (figures 9-10) indicate that by the end of the nineteenth century, probably at the time the family had added the Stenton property to the City Plan in 1888, the house and its surrounding property were in serious disrepair, and had been quite neglected by the Logan heirs. An effort by the Pennsylvania Society of the Colonial Dames of America (later the NSCDA) to rescue the house was spearheaded by Mary Johnson Brown Chew (Mrs. Samuel Chew, 1839-1927) at the end of the nineteenth century. They presumably (and logically) chose Stenton as the only authentic site that met several important criteria: first, it was the only estate house in the Philadelphia region that could be directly linked to William Penn—through James Logan—and the beginnings of the colony, since neither the Slate Roof House nor Pennsbury survived. Second, it was a house rather than some other type of site, and it had been deemed appropriate for elite women to make their patriotic mark in the domestic sphere, creating house museums, since the saving of George Washington’s estate by the Mt. Vernon Ladies’ Association. Stenton provided the Pennsylvania Colonial Dames with a chance to make their own mark in a not-so-friendly rivalry with their New York counterparts, who had their own historic house, Van Cortlandt Manor house. And, finally, Stenton was available and needed saving. On December 9, 1899, the inheritors of Stenton in Philadelphia—siblings Albanus C. Logan, Maria Dickinson Logan, and trustees of the estate of their deceased sister Frances A. Logan—signed a lease giving the Dames a ten-year term as custodians of Stenton.33

The lease included several important provisions that affected both the site and its guardianship. First, the Colonial Dames agreed to pay back taxes owed on the property to the City of Philadelphia, which the family had neglected along with the physical well-being of the grounds and house. As Sandra Mackenzie Lloyd has noted, this was a remarkable undertaking, justified by the belief, in Chew’s words, that “this fine old mansion will prove to be an important acquisition, not only to the Colonial Dames, but to the city of Philadelphia,—in itself an object lesson, keeping in memory the worthy lives and deeds of the founders of the Province.”34 As Lloyd has also noted, Mary Chew had some considerable credentials in the sphere of historic buildings and Colonial Revival display, since she lived at Cliveden, had helped coordinate the “Colonial Kitchen” exhibition at the Centennial, and had organized an exhibition of “relics” at the Columbian Exposition in 1893, the same year she joined the Colonial Dames.35

The second most important, and related provision, was that, within a year of the signing of the lease, that the Colonial Dames would “paint, repair and put in good condition the said house [Stenton] . . . , and keep the same in good condition, preservation and repair during the continuance of this lease. . . .”36 The rehabilitation of the house was duly undertaken, at great

33 C.1, Box 2, CDRM. Neither Jane Luxmoore nor her representative was a party to the lease.
35 Lloyd, op. cit.
36 Lease, op. cit.
expense, with the assistance of the Philadelphia architect Walter Cope (1860-1902) of the nationally important firm of Cope & Stewardson.

The Stenton Garden Restoration Begins – Activities at the Turn of the Century

There was no provision in the lease that made it necessary to make changes to the grounds, but the Colonial Dames clearly thought this was an important part of their enterprise almost from the beginning. Considerable clean-up of the grounds was undoubtedly part of the initial project. In February, 1900, the Colonial Dames hired the tenant farmer presumably already on site to “care for the place.” The Colonial Dames turned their minds to the notion of a decorative garden at Stenton after the initial work on the main house, and Mary Chew was again the prime mover. In November 1900, she “proposed to lay out the garden next year, as nearly as possible as it was originally.” The subject was again raised in the spring, with the projects (planting “trees, honey suckle, etc., and beautifying the grounds”) more defined. It is clear from the “Annual Report of the Committee on Historic Houses” for 1901 that goals for Stenton’s garden were ambitious. It is interesting to note that one of the first priorities was the planting of trees, which played a key role in nineteenth-century descriptions, and that the act of planting them was a ceremonial occasion:

the Committee undertook to replace some of the beautiful trees which were formerly around the house at “Stenton” which had died from old age or neglect—also to have the garden restored to its original condition so far as could be done by following the suggestions of Miss [Maria Dickinson] Logan and others who remembered it in former days-gifts of money were made for the purpose by members of the Committee—and successful appeals made for donations of trees by Mrs. Thomas Leaming for seeds & flowers by Mrs. J. C. Harrison of the neighboring florists and for seeds & shrubs by Miss Anna H. Wharton to the Agricultural department. Various members of the Society also sent plants from their own gardens – and on the 12 of April, the Committee & the Members of the Society [of the Colonial Dames] assisted by officers of the Forestry Association and by liberal gifts from them, planted 40 trees – Hemlocks, oaks, lindens and maples, which were named after various distinguished men who had been visitors. . .

Analysis: Why a Garden at Stenton? – the Women’s Colonial Revival

It is also notable here, and quite typical for the period, that it was thought feasible to “restore” the garden “to its original condition,” using only the recollection of a family member who had never known this hypothetical garden in the eighteenth century. The notion of a period of interpretation, was, of course, foreign to the Colonial Dames who rescued Stenton from the neglect of its family (including Maria Dickinson Logan), or anyone else at this time, for that matter. Two other important assumptions were clearly in operation here: that Stenton had a garden to restore, and that it was important to restore it.

It is a crucial point that the Dames at the turn of the century felt that a defined, ornamental garden was a necessary aspect of the “object lesson” that Stenton was to convey. Underlying this was the assumption that a great early American figure’s estate required a garden

---

37 Annual Reports, Bound Volumes, 1900-1941, CDMR, p. 2.
38 Annual Reports, p.3
39 CDMR.
In order to be complete. The reasons for this were multiple. First, and perhaps most significant, Mt. Vernon was an important factor in the assumption that Stenton needed a garden. The saving of George Washington’s estate in the mid-nineteenth century by the Mt. Vernon Ladies’ Association provided the prototype of a patriotic act of public service by a group of elite women. As a number of authors, including Kenneth Ames have noted, one of most important features of the colonial revival was its emphasis on domesticity, particularly pre-industrial, rural domesticity.40 This emphasis was in part a reaction to a number of nineteenth-century developments, including increasing urbanization, industrialization, and foreign emigration. Not surprisingly, the domestic spheres of colonial revival activities (including the creation of house museums and the mounting of colonial artifact displays at international expositions) were women’s activities, and were, of course, extensions of the more general cultural spheres in which women operated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Part of this female domestic sphere was the flower garden, while agriculture was seen as a masculine undertaking. While these cultural gender roles at least partly persist to the present, in the case of Stenton, and other house museums, they led to an emphasis on flower gardening that was not necessarily historically appropriate. In addition, flower gardening prowess, and a notable flower garden, were valued personal and social achievements for elite women at the turn of the century, as they still are to a certain degree. One might say that creating a notable (historic) garden was part of the proper running of a household, or house museum, for that matter.

An interesting articulation of the historic garden as a women’s province is included in a slightly later publication by another women’s group. The James River Garden Club’s Historic Gardens of Virginia, published in 1923, includes in its introduction of a specific claim for the important female place in gardens. This introduction, written by Mary Johnston, emphasizes the geographic region of her subject, but many of her ideas are more generally applicable:

“God almighty,” saith Bacon, “first planted a garden; and indeed it is the greatest refreshment to the spirits of man.”
Let us add, “Of women also.”
For – at least in Virginia – women and gardens go together. Perhaps it is so in those British Isles from which sprang Virginia. At any rate, dwell in memory or in imagination upon Virginia gardens and there arise women—in late seventeenth dress, in eighteenth century dress, in nineteenth century, in twentieth century dress. Men also have planned, men also walk in these gardens, and there forever children sing and play. But women, young and in prime and old—it is chiefly women. They move among the box-bushes; they train the roses and tie the hollyhocks; they sow pansies and candytuft and snapdragon and mignonette; they cut the dead away, they gather for bowls and vases, gather from daffodil and lilac to the last marigold and mourning bride. They are there in the spring time, in the summer and the autumn.
For Virginia gardens are not, after all, affairs of huge expanse and expense, given over to gardeners, the owners’ knees and fingers warned off. After all, they are simple—Virginia gardens—simple and sweet. We call them old. Many of them are old, even very old as our country goes. Others are not so old. But alike they are fragrant, alike they are dear. There is something—I do not know—they are poetic.
So it is fitting that this book—the book of the Historic Gardens of Virginia—should be a book thought of and largely written by women. Once they interchanged knowledge of one

anothers’ gardens through letters and long, leisurely visits. Nowadays they make Garden Associations. Such a one, the James River Club, mothers this volume. Again to women is owed pleasure—the whiff of box, of mignonette, of clove pinks and damask roses; the sense of sunny brick walls, of butterflies and bees and lovers and children in a world of blossom; an old, sweet wind of garden romance, garden poetry.41

While Johnston here clearly places women in the garden, she does so using a sentimental, nostalgic tone, like Sarah Butler Wister’s own evocation of Stenton in the nineteenth century. This would be in stark contrast with the unsentimental, scholarly approach voiced by Letitia Ellicott Wright when she went about creating an “historic” flower garden at Stenton in 1911-1913.

Activities During the Logan Lease

There is relatively little information about gardening activities at Stenton between 1901 and 1909, the majority of period of the remainder of the lease between the Colonial Dames and the Logan heirs, and the period that predates Letitia Wright’s chairmanship of the Garden Committee. In 1901, it was noted in Committee Reports in May that “work on the garden [was] progressing,” although it is not known exactly what this work entailed.42 Undoubtedly a good deal was cleaning up and refurbishing: there is relatively little evidence about what herbaceous flowering plants may have been placed on the Stenton property during this period. 1907 photographs (figure 14) show mature roses at the rear of the house near the overhanging porch, but a reference to “countless young perennials” having been stolen in 1910 suggests that the Colonial Dames were bringing new plant material to the site, perhaps to the long beds at the rear of the house, or to the beds at the southeast side of the house, which appear on the first plan for the Colonial Revival garden drawn in April 1911 (plan 2).43

It is clear that in the period of the Logan lease, the Colonial Dames were both concerned about, and actively pursuing a resolution for the ultimate fate of the Stenton property. By 1904, they were considering buying the property from the Logan heirs.44 By 1907, they were pursuing the question of purchase by the city, and they may also have considered the option of Stenton becoming the property of the City Parks Association, a private organization.45 In 1908, the taking of Stenton by condemnation had been authorized by the city’s Common Council, and, as noted above, the city purchased the property in 1909.46 That same year, a garden committee was formed in April, with Letitia Ellicott (Mrs. William Redwood) Wright named as chairman. Her chairmanship inaugurates a period of careful record-keeping for Stenton gardening activities that would continue until 1917.
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42 Annual Reports, p. 4.
43 November 1910 Garden Committee Report, Letitia Wright Garden Scrapbook, Bound Volumes, CDMR (hereafter SB).
44 Annual Reports, p. 4.
45 Andrew Wright Crawford to Caroline Warren (Mrs. Louis F.) Benson, 5 June 1907, C.1 Box 2, CDMR.
46 Andrew Wright Crawford to Mary Chew, 29 October 1908, C.1 Box 2, CDMR.
The relationship of the Colonial Dames to the Stenton property remained a concern through much of 1910, until their guardianship of Stenton was ratified by city ordinance in October. This same ordinance still essentially governs the NSCDA’s long-term lease with the City of Philadelphia. Stenton’s Annual Reports indicate that the passage of the ordinance and the purchase by the city was very much due, like the saving of Stenton in 1899, to the efforts of Mary Chew.47

During the first two years of her tenure, Letitia Wright did carry out a number of activities at the site. In 1909, a substantial amount of plant material was installed, although the exact location of all of it is unknown. Some of it was certainly planted in the beds at the southeast side of the house that are first documented in nineteenth-century photographs.48 In 1910, despite her complaint that “due to the unsettled guardianship of Stenton last Spring, the Garden Committee could do little,” she noted that she and her committee “brightened the garden as it was, by planting annuals, caring for the lawn, and the plants that were left us after the grading was done [along 18th Street].” An ivy cutting “from the grave of William Penn” was also placed in Mrs. Wright’s charge that year.49

She also noted a problem that would plague her as she created the garden at Stenton in the next three years: “many plants were taken away by trespassers, peonies and roses among them, as well as countless young perennials.”50 She also identified several key needs for the garden, specifically: a water spigot, with underground piping (they had been pumping water, presumably from the pump still on site near the privy), and a cold frame that “would greatly assist in the raising of perennials and annuals” and “would save money in the long run.” Finally, she noted that “the ivy brought by Mrs. Andrews from William Penn’s grave was planted on one side of the narrow doorway at the north side of the house.” Mrs. Wright was clearly firmly in charge.

Letitia Wright’s and John C. Wister’s Garden: Design Responsibilities

While Mary Chew may have saved Stenton, Letitia Wright created its garden. Mrs. Wright was the daughter of George W. Carpenter (1837-1921), whose father, George Washington Carpenter (1802-1860) had been, among other things, the first director of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and who had established a large estate in Germantown on Germantown Avenue in the 1840s. Mrs. Wright had the assistance of an able committee of her peers. The original members of her committee were (in alphabetical order): Emily Read Fox, Mary H. Howe, Caroline Longacre, Elizabeth Price (Mrs. J. Willis) Martin, Mary Browning (Mrs. Arthur V.) Meigs, Margaret Knorr (Mrs. Jacob) Riegel, Sarah Logan Wister (Mrs. James, Jr.) Starr, and Beulah Jenks (Mrs. Joseph L.) Woolston.51 Of these, Emily Fox, Sarah Starr, and Letitia Wright were Logan descendants; both Sarah Starr and Letitia Wright lived very near Stenton. Of the others, several lived in Chestnut Hill or Germantown. Early donations to Stenton’s new garden
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47 Annual Reports, p. 6.
48 LEW Composition Book, CDMR. This volume documents activities and garden donations in 1909-1910.
49 Annual Reports, p. 5.
50 SB. The regarding of 18th Street caused a good deal of disturbance to the site, as her comment indicates.
51 Emily Fox later married Edward Cheston.
from their own properties were thus relatively easy, as was access to the historic house and its surroundings for planting and supervisory work.\textsuperscript{52}

Among the committee, Elizabeth Martin is perhaps particularly notable, both for her gardening accomplishments and for her place in Philadelphia’s colonial revival. She would become the first president of the Garden Club of America, whose first meeting was held in Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden in 1913, and, she was the chairman of the Women’s Committee that oversaw Philadelphia’s “High Street” reconstruction display for the Sesquicentennial celebration of 1926. She was also key in the effort to preserve and “restore” Bartram’s Gardens.

Another Logan descendant (and Wright’s second cousin), landscape architect and horticulturist John Caspar Wister (1887-1982), was Wright’s important collaborator. John C. Wister was at the very outset of his career at the time he worked at Stenton; his project there was, according to Letitia Wright, his first professional one.\textsuperscript{53} John Wister was a Germantown native – raised at nearby Belfield, the early nineteenth-century estate of the painter Charles Willson Peale. His cousin Wright lived at nearby Waldheim just to the south.\textsuperscript{54} Wister’s family connections were augmented by professional training: the year before the passage of the city ordinance that placed the NSCDA in charge of Stenton, Wister had completed an undergraduate degree at Harvard University. There he had studied at the recently founded School of Landscape Architecture, whose faculty included luminaries like Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. Wister went on to publish extensively on horticulture, and to become the first director of the Arthur Hoyt Scott Horticultural Foundation at Swarthmore College, beginning in 1930, as well the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Horticulture Society.\textsuperscript{55}

Wister’s first involvement with the site came in the period of transition in 1910, when he was asked to draw up a plan of the Stenton grounds for the Garden Committee at the behest of Letitia Wright. The subsequent form and details of the garden suggest that Wister and Wright had been working together closely on formulating the garden in 1910. In his December 1910 report, Wister noted several problems that the lease with the city presented, including the vagueness of the boundary of the Stenton property. Wister also recommended that screen planting be undertaken to define the property more effectively than an existing privet hedge:

the place should be properly surrounded by a thick planting of trees and shrubs, so as to hide the staring tenement houses to the south, the factory to the west, the Railroad to the north, & to make

\textsuperscript{52} Elizabeth Martin lived at 1721 Locust, but maintained a summer residence at “Edgecombe”, 139 Bethlehem Pike in Chestnut Hill; Margaret Riegel lived at 5217 Greene Street, quite near Stenton; Beulah Woolston lived at 164 W. Chelten Avenue. See Boyd’s Philadelphia Blue Book 1909-1910 (Philadelphia: C. E. Howe, 1909), passim.

\textsuperscript{53} Typescript Letitia Wright Annotations, Anniversary Bulletin of the Garden Club of America New Series, no. 11 (May 1923), CDMR.

\textsuperscript{54} Belfield house is now part of the property of La Salle University. Waldheim was located to the north of Lindley Avenue between Ellicott Street on the west and Ogontz Avenue on the east.

a suitable finish between the grounds of your Society, and the grounds of the City on the east. . . . I recommend a thick & rather tall planting in order to block out as much as possible the surrounding buildings. I recommend that evergreen trees, such as Hemlock, Pines, or Spruces, be freely used, & that with them such deciduous trees as will lighten up the mass of dark evergreens by their flowers or their foliage. . . . My aim would be to make these plantations, besides being a screen, things of beauty in themselves, & not for the summer alone but for the entire year.56

In addition to defining the perimeter plantings, Wister’s report also identifies several important features, both existing and new, and suggests that Wister made many of the important decisions about the location of these features. It should be noted, however, that while Wister may have articulated much of what was to come, it seems as likely as not that he and Wright determined what was to go into the garden in consultation. Perhaps most important, Wister locates and characterizes a new “garden”: “I have indicated upon the plan a suitable spot for a garden. I think such a garden should contain wide grass walks & Box borders & old fashioned flowers.” Wister also notes “lines of shrubbery and garden beds” “on the south and east sides of the House.” The beds on the south side of the house have already been noted in regard to a nineteenth-century photograph (figure 4). It is probable that the beds on the east, which are perhaps first securely documented by a 1907 photograph (figure 14), taken by Charles Pancoast, also predated the first Colonial Dames lease, as Wister’s report suggests. Wister assumes a rectilinear, axial relationship with the plan of the house for these two older beds that may never have existed, however. Finally, Wister recommends and locates cold frames, and a plant nursery, which “would enable [the Garden Committee] to buy small size trees and shrubs at wholesale, grow them a year or two in the nursery & then place them in their permanent positions.”57

Wister also articulated his role and that of Mrs. Wright and her cohort, retrospectively, in a letter written to Marion Rivinus, a later Stenton garden chairman, in 1952. He also provided an important assessment of the information available about earlier gardens at Stenton at the time of the creation of the Colonial Revival garden:

My cousin, Mrs. Wright, worked very hard on this and had long lists of plants taken from James Logan’s correspondence with Collinson and others, . . . I had two separate pieces of work there . . . The first was to design the garden[-] . . . it was put in to hitch in with the house in the manner of the colonial days for there was no record as to what had been where. I had nothing to do with planting the garden. . . . The other work I did was to make a planting plan and supervise the planting of the shrubbery [sic] on the borders of the property. It was at that time entirely open on three sides with no definite boundary marking where the Stenton property and the general park playground began. . . . As I designed [the shrubbery border], it had only plants that had been mentioned by James Logan but it was not difficult to do this because he had what we all know was available in his time and of course none of the new Chinese and Japanese things such as the flowering apples and cherries or foreign azaleas discovered since his time.58

Wister’s brief description provides important information about the project at Stenton. First, one of the most significant resources for Letitia Wright’s work was historic plant lists, and

56 “Report to the Garden Committee of the Pennsylvania Society of Colonial Dames of America to Accompany A Plan of Stenton,” December 1910, Letitia Wright records, CDMR.
57 Wright later noted in her report for 1912 that the nursery was “on the north side of the mansion.” SB.
58 John C. Wister to Marion Rivinus, 6 August 1952, CDMR.
that she and her committee were responsible for the selection and placement of plant material within the geometric bed outline that Wister designed. Second, that Wister provided the plan of the beds for the garden that was intended to mimic the “manner of the colonial days,” but, as has already been suggested in this report, there was little evidence about “what had been where.” Further, that in addition to the outline of the beds in the new garden, Wister was responsible for a shrub border that defined the edges of the Stenton property and separated it from the park on the east, northeast, and southeast. Finally, the contents of the shrub border were also intended to come from Logan family records (see plan 3, undated Wister full scheme).

In summary, Wister defined the essential intended features of the Stenton garden, both at the time and in retrospect. The beds, both of herbaceous flowers within the garden, and the shrub border around the perimeter of the property, were to be composed of plant material understood to have been purchased by the Logan family. This was not strictly carried out in practice, as will be detailed below, but this was the essential theory at the outset, and, as Wister’s letter indicates, continued to be the narrative by which the garden was defined and understood. The placement of the plants within the garden was entirely new to 1911 and after, although the shape of the beds themselves was intended to have a relationship with colonial practices. The box bush borders around the beds, which Wister planned for from 1910, were, at the very least, a sign of the “colonial,” since there was no evidence that box had ever been grown there.

Letitia Wright’s Plant Lists and Stenton’s “Restoration”

As Wister’s retrospective description indicates, one of the most important features of Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden was the plant material selected by Letitia Wright. There is a good deal of information about the sources that she used to select this plant material and her attitudes toward it and Stenton more generally, thanks to an article which she authored, “The Colonial Garden at Stenton Described in Old Letters.” She first presented her work as a lecture given to the Garden Club of Philadelphia on October 19th, 1911, and subsequently delivered the same lecture at a number of other occasions between 1913 and 1916.

In the preface to her article, Letitia Wright gives an account of her research and the sources that she consulted. She notes that “the letters from which these extracts have been taken, were written in Colonial days and they have been in the possession of the family ever since. They were brought to light in 1911 when every effort was being made to obtain data from the restoration of the Stenton Garden.” Typewritten transcriptions based on Wright’s research of a

60 These were: for the NSCDA, 16 May 1912, for the first meeting of the Garden Club of America, 1 May 1913 (this will be noted again below), both at Stenton, for the Site and Relic Society of Germantown [Germantown Historical Society], Vernon Hall, 16 January 1914, for the Acorn Club, 3 March 1914, and for the Longfellow Guild, 13 November 1914. Address: p. 3. She also is known to have delivered the same lecture, or a version of it, before the John Bartram Association at Bartram’s Garden in June 1916. Sallie Wister, “Garden at Stenton Restored through Letters of Logans,” Philadelphia Public Ledger, 3 June 1916. Letitia Wright’s lecture was also published as a pamphlet for sale at Stenton, and as part of the anniversary issue of the Bulletin of the Garden Club of America commemorating the first decade of the organization and its foundation meeting at Stenton (1923).
61 Address, p. 3. Most of these papers have since been given to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
number of Logan plant orders, dating from the late 1740s to the late 1760s survive in the Stenton Collection.\textsuperscript{62}

Wright’s article begins with a discussion of James Logan’s illustrious background and achievements that, as has been noted, was first constructed at the end of the nineteenth century, although, interestingly, she makes an allowance for his achievements in the colony as well:

James Logan . . . was descended from illustrious families whose histories are interwoven, from the earliest years, with the history of Scotland. Although so nobly descended, Voltaire’s saying ‘He who serves his country well has no need of ancestors’ might well apply to him.\textsuperscript{63}

Wright then follows her introduction of the man with a summary of the chronology of the establishment of the Stenton estate and the construction of the house. Her writing reflects serious and careful research in her sources and her documentation of events is quite accurate and unsentimental, in contrast to much of the writing of the latter nineteenth century. Wright appropriately notes that the “genesis of Stenton, and therefore of the Garden” begins in 1714.\textsuperscript{64} Further, she rightly places James Logan’s occupation of Stenton in 1730, based on a letter to his brother William.\textsuperscript{65}

She then follows this thoroughly grounded statement with a great leap, asserting without supporting documentation that “among colonial gardens the one at Stenton was important; for it was there that men like John Bartram, of Philadelphia, and Abraham Redwood, of Newport, received the inspiration which prompted them to establish gardens which became noted the world over.”\textsuperscript{66} Wright did record Logan’s botanic interests, noting his experiments on corn, although she placed these at Stenton; there is no evidence that they in fact occurred there. Remarkably, this reference to James Logan’s corn experiments is the extent of Wright’s discussion of Logan’s garden at Stenton.

Much of Wright’s article does evoke a vivid and rich picture of the cross-Atlantic botanic collection and dispersion projects of the eighteenth-century, and William Logan’s connections to these enterprises and the botanists, plantsmen, and gentleman amateurs on both sides of the ocean. She particularly emphasizes the correspondence of John Blackburne to Logan on plants sent by Logan, although she assumes that all of the plants sent came from the Stenton garden.\textsuperscript{67} Among the essential themes of her article is the collection and dissemination of American species, both within the colonies and across the Atlantic. Her broad and engaging evocation of the Logan’s time, however, does little to inform her readers about the “colonial garden” that is her putative subject: its shape, location, and even its contents. She is most informative about the plants that might have gone into a garden connected to William Logan, noting his orders of fruit trees, flowering bulbs and herbaceous plants, and some annuals.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{62} Letitia Wright files, CDMR.  
\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Address}, p. 6.  
\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Address}, p. 5.  
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Address}, p. 6.  
\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Address}, p. 6.  
\textsuperscript{67} See pp. 13-16.  
\textsuperscript{68} See particularly pp. 10-11.
Near the end of her article, Wright turns to a discussion of the ancient lineage of some of the more prosaic plants she has noted from William Logan’s correspondence, a literary device conventionally used to establish the legitimacy of an author’s subject from the Renaissance onward.69 First, she charts an ancient history for the cherry tree, back to Imperial Rome and forward through Tudor England. This is followed by a similar background for the carnation, which she traces to ancient Greece. After having established the historical lineage, and thus the legitimacy of the plants she addresses and their place in the Stenton garden, Letitia Wright articulates her method in creating the new Stenton garden:

from the foregoing [Logan family] letters a list of trees, shrubs and flowers has been selected for the garden at Stenton, only such being planted as were there during the colonial period; the list mostly collected from the correspondence of William Logan who lived there after his father’s (James Logan’s) death.70

Wright concludes by asserting Stenton’s place in history: its place as the site of James Logan’s activities, and its role in the battle of Germantown. She finishes by boldly comparing Stenton to the original American historic house museum, underlining the didactic role of Stenton as a “historical object lesson.”

Next to Mt. Vernon, in Virginia, it is towards Stenton that the footsteps of those interested in colonial homes are turning. It is impossible to over-estimate its growing importance to the coming generations as an example of how our colonial forefathers lived and conducted their homes both inside and outside.71

Letitia Wright’s article reveals several important aspects of her thinking and approach in creating Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden. First, her notions on appropriate plant material for her garden “restoration” were based on extensive and careful research for her period, and research to which she brought a sophisticated level of interpretation when it came to understanding the complex transatlantic botanical transactions of the eighteenth century. Her reconstruction approach was articulated and conceived clearly, even if she did not adhere strictly to it in practice. What was missing from Wright’s formulation, of course, was the garden into which the plants historically had fit; its creation was the task she delegated to John C. Wister.

The Creation of the Garden: Summary discussion

The progress of the garden’s creation is abundantly documented in two sources: a scrapbook assembled by Letitia Wright, 1910-1913, and the Minute Book of Garden Committee, 1911-1916.72 It is not clear precisely when Letitia Wright began the research that informed her article. On March 11th, 1911, Mrs. Wright presented a plan drafted by John Wister in a meeting held at Mrs. A. J. Cassatt’s residence.73 A small sketch plan (plan 2) survives in the Garden
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69 It is interesting to note that A.J. Downing used the same convention to discuss different types of fruit in his first book, The Fruits and Fruit-Trees of America (New York & London: Wiley & Putman, 1845).
70 Address, 18.
71 Address, p. 19.
72 The latter Bound Volumes, CDMR. Hereafter MB.
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Scrapbook dated April 1911, which may be this plan or a slightly later version of the one presented a month before at a general meeting. A larger plan (drawn at a scale of 20 feet per inch, plan 3), undated, showing the whole property also survives of Wister’s planting scheme outside the new flower plans. This larger plan indicates a number of important features of the site in the period as well as Wister’s scheme for the perimeter planting. The smaller, earlier sketch plan also shows a number of important aspects of the garden and the grounds to the east of the main house. First, it indicates the location of the beds to the rear (northeast) and side (southeast) of the house that have been noted briefly above and which predate the Colonial Dames’ occupation of the site. Second, it shows the geometric outline of the concentric beds and the location of a number of trees that were already in this part of the Stenton property, although they are not identified by species. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, it outlines a color scheme around the perimeter of the garden, although it is not known if these notations date to the period of the plan or if they were in fact ever carried out.

Letitia Wright was given approval to proceed and work began the same month: the area of the garden was ploughed and manured and annuals seeds were sown in a hot bed on the property. Photographs from Wright’s scrapbook show that the beds had been laid out by the beginning of April, bordered by boards, and the low wall just to the northeast of the garden (surviving on site to the present), had begun to be built. The Garden Committee Minute Book also records that a deep ash foundation for the paths between the beds was also laid at the same time. On April 8th, Wright made a report to the Stenton board more generally. She again sounded the theme of historical exactitude, and the consultation of living members of the Logan family in her efforts, just as Mary Chew had done at the beginning of the period of the Logan lease:

Desiring to follow out as nearly as possible any old landmarks or noted planting in the garden, the Committee have studied the importation of plants and seed shipped from Europe to the Logan family, as well as the many native shrubs and plants sent from South Carolina. Visits were also paid to Mr. Samuel Betton and Mr. Albanus C. Logan, both of whom lived at Stenton, the latter being born there. They agree that the old garden, originally comprising two acres, was placed exactly where we are now laying it out. The foundation of the old terrace wall was found and rebuilt upon.

Wright also noted the general plan for the coming year: “we hope to procure a good effect quickly by planting annuals in the garden this first year.” The purpose of her report on this occasion was clearly not solely factual – it was also promotional, and her aim was to inspire emotional and financial support from her peers by stirring competition with their New York rivals:

If Stenton is to be “an object lesson to the public”, as the [Philadelphia city] ordinance reads, should we not try to restore the garden as nearly as possible to the old original, and, in any event, make of it a typically colonial garden? Should we not try to have it, in time, as representative a garden “within our hedges” as the New York Society has in the Van Courtland House? We submit our estimate of the cost to you in the hope that you will be generous to us, while we shall

74 Stenton Collection. This plan is undated.
75 MB, 7 April 1911.
use our utmost endeavors to produce a result that will satisfy you and be a pleasure to the many visitors to Stenton.\textsuperscript{76}

The total estimate to establish the garden was the substantial sum of $787.80, of which a significant $228 was for “box for bordering beds.” Because of the hefty price for the boxwood borders, Mrs. Charles Custis Harrison had suggested in the April meeting at Mrs. Cassatt’s that the box be obtained from Mt. Vernon, which was in fact carried out that summer.

April and May of 1911 saw the establishment of plantings in the garden beds and essential service features. Significant work on existing trees was also undertaken, presumably in response to Wister’s report of the previous December. Letitia Wright also donated 18 dogwoods and 1 magnolia, unidentified by species or variety. By the end of April, planting had begun in earnest. Plants were delivered to the site in this period, although their source and specific identity are unknown. Pipes were laid to bring water to the garden from a hydrant in the city park property to the east -- a less strenuous source than the hand pump. Masons built the low wall at the northwest end of the garden, and laid the brick walk between it and the entrance to the garden. The paths between the beds received a finish of tanbark mulch. Sod, cut from Albanus Logan’s property (presumably Loudoun) and from J. M. Fox’s was used to fill the rectangular plat at the center of the beds. Wright later noted that she and her committee were working under an important deadline: Philadelphia’s Mayor Raeburn had proposed Stenton as the site of a national city planning conference.\textsuperscript{77} The notations in Mrs. Wright’s records at the time of the event, held May 15\textsuperscript{th}, are relatively cryptic. She remarks in the Minute Book that it was “a beautiful day and many interesting men & women, enthusiastic in their profession were at Stenton this day.”

More significant for the garden itself, she noted in the Garden Scrapbook that the eminent “Mr. [Frederick] Olmsted [Jr.] of Boston” had “expressed himself as finding the garden perfectly charming, and only suggested that the pyrus japonica [malus floribunda] might be removed, as it was not a colonial plant.” This statement indicates several important things. First, that these flowering trees had already been planted in the garden, in the position that they were to occupy at the four corners of the garden beds for over eighty years. Second, it is among the earliest indications (beyond the intention to plant boxwood borders around the new garden) that the plant material being placed in the new garden, despite the scholarly rhetoric of Mary Chew and Letitia Wright, did not strictly adhere to the Logans’ eighteenth-century purchases.

In May and June of 1911, the matter of the relationship of the Logans’ plant material to the new garden was discussed more directly. The Garden Scrapbook indicates that in May research was operating under full steam: Letitia Wright reported that “in conformity with their idea of reproducing the garden at Stenton from the accounts given in letters they would draw up a plan stating as correctly as possible what plants had been used.” In June, research in family documents was complete and Wright had compiled a series of lists from them; these survive in the Stenton collection. The Scrapbook also reveals that these were interpreted in specific ways by Wright and her committee:

\textsuperscript{76} SB.

\textsuperscript{77} Typescript Letitia Wright Annotations, \textit{Anniversary Bulletin of the Garden Club of America}. 
The Chairman had gone over a list of about 400 names of trees, shrubs, flowers, herbs and bulbs contained in old seed invoices and bills of shipment. These were separated in their respective order suitable for future study and planting. There are over forty varieties of trees that would be suitable for planting and that are to be found in the catalogues at the present time. Many of the plants were unsuitable for us to grow at Stenton, being bog or greenhouse specimens, or sent for some curious habit of growth, with no beauty to recommend them. The Committee will study the matter further and hope next year to have growing in the garden only such plants as there is a record of at Stenton in Colonial times.

The lists themselves reveal the interpretive latitude that they gave the committee. While some of the plants listed are clearly identified by complete botanic name (betula nigra, for example), others are simply noted by species (“salix – several sorts”), and some only by contemporary common name. The last is particularly the case with herbaceous plants – the flowers that were to go into the new garden. This lack of specificity clearly allowed the Garden Committee to order plants that they thought appropriate. The lists of plants purchased and donated to the garden (see Appendix B) that year indicates that the committee filled in the list with the “old-fashioned flowers” that John Wister had recommended in his 1910 report.

In June 1911, boxwood cuttings from Mt. Vernon began arriving by train – three shipments at the end of the month. These were planted in the nursery area. In July and August, the Garden Committee Minute Book shows that the committee was pleased with its work, noting both annuals and perennials in bloom. By August, hot dry weather had killed many of the box cuttings (those that survived were revived by September rain). The Philadelphia photographer Charles R. Pancoast, who had taken views of the grounds in 1907, photographed the new garden on several days in August and September (figures 16-21). In the fall, the committee ordered and planted a variety of bulbs, most of which do correspond to items on the Logan lists (see Appendix B).

In 1912, a number of important steps were taken toward the completion of the garden. In February, estimates for tree and shrub orders were solicited from large nurseries: Meehan’s and Andorra, both in the Philadelphia area, and Biltmore in North Carolina. The Andorra Nurseries won the bid, and John Wister, whose estimate for planting supervision had been accepted in February, made the orders. Wister was supervising planting by April. Most of this material probably went to the 18th Street frontage, since Mrs. Wright noted in her annual report that the planting was needed to “screen the factory and other buildings and to render Stenton more private as well as beautiful.” The boxwood cuttings were also being transplanted to the garden border the same month. In March, the younger members of the Garden Committee, Mary Howe and Caroline Longacre, were making a planting plan for the beds, which unfortunately, is not known to survive. In April, both annuals and perennials were being planted in the beds. Annuals continued to be planted in the following months to continue bloom in the garden. The fall bulb planting was extensive, and focused particularly on tulips.

---

78 SB.
79 MB.
80 MB. The Pancoast photograph collection, Stenton, includes the photographer’s original notes for his photographs. These indicate that he was on site on September 25th in addition to the August dates noted in the Minute Book.
81 Annual Report for 1912 – presented 19 March 1913, SB.
82 SB and MB, passim.
In 1913, many of the activities of the previous year were repeated: annuals were raised and planted, and John Wister supervised further planting in March (in part because some of the shrubs planted the year before had not survived). The Garden Committee Minute Book makes note of flowers in bloom throughout the season. A few additions and changes to the Stenton Garden were made. Of the former, the most notable was the creation of an herb bed at the base of the low wall to the northwest of the new garden beds. The Garden Scrapbook makes it clear that the committee members were not familiar with many of the herbs that they were ordering – much of their language indicates ignorance about fragrance, taste, and so on. In February, a significant number of “old” roses were ordered to be planted in the “garden”: the beds to the rear (northeast) of the house adjacent to the porch on the southeast side of the kitchen wing. By the end of the year, the recently planted shrubbery on the perimeter of the property was apparently deemed sufficiently complete to have the privet hedge removed.83

Arguably, the most important event in Stenton’s garden in 1913 did not entail work in it: it was the background for the meeting of the affiliated Garden Clubs on May 1st, at which the Garden Club of America was created, with Elizabeth Martin elected its first president. As for the City Planning Conference of two years earlier, there is scant discussion of the event itself in the Stenton garden records, and only in retrospect was the import of the meeting characterized by its participants.84

Many of the maintenance tasks of the previous three years repeated themselves in 1914, with perennials transplanted in the spring. Clumps of evergreens were planted in the four corners of the central grass plot in the garden in May. Letitia Wright was clearly receding from her role in the garden: her Garden Scrapbook ends in 1913 with summary lists of plantings. By the fall of 1914, she is no longer making many, if any of the entries in the Garden Committee Minute Book. One suspects that either she lost interest as the task of creating the garden came to a close, or other matters intervened – her husband died that fall. Her committee did continue actively, and were particularly ambitious in their fall planting of tulips, for which a color scheme is recorded (see Appendix B). There are no Minute Book entries for 1915, and there are no significant changes or additions noted in 1916, the final year for this volume. The final chapter of the garden’s creation came in 1917, with the last phase of Jack Wister’s shrubbery planting.

Analysis: Letitia Wright’s Method and Achievement

It would be an anachronism to judge Letitia Wright’s efforts by late twentieth-century standards. While she and her cohort may have used the term “restoration,” it would be fundamentally to misunderstand the garden she created to apply the values that have been developed after her work. Instead, it is more valuable to compare her to her contemporaries, and to understand her achievement.

83 Ibid.
84 Anniversary Bulletin, passim.
As has already been noted, the didactic approach adopted by the generation of Colonial Dames that established Stenton as an “historical object lesson” was one of great seriousness and earnestness. The account of their efforts strikingly contrasts with the sort of insular sentiments expressed by the James River Garden Club about the gardens. The seriousness of purpose and thoroughness of research applied to Stenton’s garden project contrasts even with the attitude expressed later by Philadelphia women involved in an analogous enterprise. In characterizing her method in describing the reconstruction of Philadelphia’s Market Street for the city’s Sesquicentennial Celebration of 1926, Mabel Stewart Ludlum noted that “no original research has been spent upon these notes. They are compiled from Watson’s *Annals*, Joseph Jackson’s *Market Street*, Horace Mather Lippincott’s *Early Philadelphia* and much miscellaneous reading. When accounts differed I took the one I like best.”85 It should be noted that Elizabeth (Mrs. J. Willis) Martin, one of the original members of Stenton’s Garden Committee, was the President of the Women’s Committee that recreated High Street. Letitia Wright’s article on the Logan’s botanic enterprises, which stands up to the scholarship of any of the other early publications by the Germantown Historical Society (then called the Site and Relic Society), never articulated such a cavalier attitude about sources, even if, in the final analysis, she would not have chosen flowering plants that she did not find attractive.

The notion that a beautiful “colonial” garden was an appropriate part of historical interpretation was not unique to Letitia Wright and her peers. It was, in fact, the standard operating assumption that informed the “restorations” conducted by the National Park Service and many other site managers in the decades following Wright’s efforts. As Charles Hosmer has noted, “administrators of historical restorations [beginning in the 1920s] believed that visitors should see an essentially beautiful picture of the past, and this outlook inhibited efforts to produce historically accurate garden settings.”86 Hosmer perhaps unduly opposes the interest in beauty and historical accuracy (are accurate restorations necessarily ugly?), but he captures the essence of the Colonial Dames work in the Stenton garden. That is, that beauty, and orderliness, were a crucial part of the “historical object lesson” that Stenton was to impart. In other words, only an image that associated positive values with the colonial past would serve the exemplary lesson they hoped Stenton and its garden would impart.87 For Wright and her cohort at Stenton, these attributes were not associated with the reactionary, nostalgic response inherent in the description of Virginia gardens written by her southern counterparts. The screen of trees and shrubs that John Wister designed and planted around the Stenton property did segregate the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century present, but it also provided part of the educational message of the house. Letitia Wright’s emphasis on William Logan’s “plants from Carolina” for this screen impart information about the Logans, but the stress on New World species in her selections was probably also intended to be patriotic, if not downright boosterish.

Wright’s success among her contemporaries can be found in published accounts that appeared after the completion of the garden. These accounts frequently make no distinction between the work of 1910s and the “original” Logan garden. For example, in Francis Burke

---

87 The reflection of those positive values on the Colonial Dames of this era, who linked their own identity to the colonial past, goes without saying.
Brandt and Henry Gummere’s *Byways and Boulevards In and About Historic Philadelphia*, Stenton is recommended to the Sesquicentennial era tourist as a reflection of “the enduring charm of early colonial days” and the visitor is urged to “see first the old-fashioned flower garden, still enchanting for its simple beauty.”

Letitia Wright’s Stenton garden should be recognized as an intellectual and historic achievement that expresses and documents significant aspects of the values that informed the creation of historic house museums and historic sites’ gardens. In addition, it is significant as the first work of an important twentieth-century landscape designer and horticulturist. The Colonial Revival garden at Stenton was one of the earliest examples created for such a site: work at Mount Pleasant in Philadelphia’s Fairmount Park, for example, would not begin until the era of the Sesquicentennial. Although the entire Stenton property was given National Historic Landmark status in the 1960s, Stenton’s early twentieth-century garden should be deemed of historic significance on its own merits. In addition, as Part I of this report suggests, there will never be as much information about earlier gardens at Stenton as there is about Letitia Wright’s work. Stenton’s Colonial Revival garden should be considered a significant historic feature of the site, and treated accordingly.

**Summary of Events Since 1917**

Since 1917, when John Wister’s planting of the tree and shrubbery screen at the perimeter of the property was complete, there have been no new gardens established at Stenton on the scale of the achievements of the 1910s. The grounds today reflect the endurance of the essential features of that garden, thanks to maintenance and renewal efforts that have periodically been undertaken on the part of dedicated and long-serving Garden Committee chairmen. Preservation efforts in the last twenty years by Lilian S. L. Chance, Garden Chairman for the Stenton Committee, are particularly notable in this regard.

The Garden Committee chairmen who have succeeded Letitia Wright have remained within the framework established by the geometric beds, masonry walks, and shrubbery perimeter planting established in the 1910s. In the period after World War II, as Philadelphia’s post-industrial problems developed, fewer of the members of the NSCDA lived in the city, let alone Germantown. The area immediately around Stenton has seen the negative effects of the decline of Philadelphia’s economy manifested in factory closings and abandoned housing. The NSCDA has continued to preserve Stenton, however, although at times less effectively than at the turn of the century. A few achievements are worth noting, however. The era of the Bicentennial period brought the completion of Historic Structures Reports for the main house and the kitchen wing, restoration of the grade around the barn, and extensive archaeology. The garden also received a great deal of attention in this period, largely thanks to the efforts of Lillian S. L. Chance. A landscape analysis and preservation plan was authored by Rudy Favretti and completed in 1984. Management records of the time indicate that elimination of the garden’s main beds was under consideration, although fortunately this was not carried out.

Favretti’s analysis recommended a restoration, based on Wister’s planting plan. Favretti drew up planting plans in 1985-6 (plans 4 and 5) for both the beds within the garden and the tree and shrub perimeter planting. For the latter, his proposed new planting supplemented existing trees and shrubs, rather than eliminating specimens in place, even if they did not correspond to Wister’s original scheme. For the former, he devised a planting scheme in part based on the plants included in the original garden, taking into consideration the increased shade that the canopy of more mature trees provided. A number of the plants he proposed proved impractical or invasive, and the scheme was not carried out exactly as drawn.

Within the last decades, Lil Chance has worked extensively to re-establish, re-plant, and maintain the garden’s rectilinear beds, as well as the grounds more generally. Tree maintenance and replanting continues to be one of the greatest challenges on the Stenton grounds.
Part III: Broad-based identification of character-defining features and summary recommendations for their management

It is essential that any intervention in Stenton’s garden be part of broader institutional management strategy and goals, and that a written management plan for the garden be developed that takes current and potential management resources and institutional goals into consideration. Stenton’s garden must be considered in the context of the overall mission of the house. It could potentially provide opportunities for the institution that have not yet been explored, and should be considered in the light of the overall program of the house. It should be noted, at minimum, that the garden presents excellent options for the interpretation of the history of the site under the NSCDA’s management; in addition, it could be used to interpret colonial revival gardens and the colonial revival movement more generally. Further, its long-standing use as an event site could be further exploited.

This CLI, as noted in the Overview at the beginning, is not intended as the definitive Stenton garden report, rather, it represents one important aspect of Stenton’s landscape. Further investigation of Stenton’s landscape, particularly in regard to the Logan period, should be considered a priority for understanding and interpretation.

1. The flower beds and their surroundings

The flower beds are the most recognizable, and arguably the most important feature of Stenton’s Colonial Revival garden. Their symmetrical, rectilinear geometry endures as a sign of a colonial style garden, just as they did in the period when they were first created.

- *Wister’s plan.* The original configuration of the beds is one of their most important, defining features. Due to pressing maintenance considerations, and the changing scale of the box bushes, a number of the beds have been combined in the last decade. It should be a management goal to re-establish the original configuration when and if feasible, although this presents challenges in regard to the box bushes – see below.

- *Malus floribunda.* The four crabapple trees at the corners of the garden have been a feature of the garden since its creation in 1911. Despite Olmsted’s criticism that they were an anachronism for a colonial garden, they were not removed. They are therefore not an anachronism for Stenton’s Colonial Revival Garden. Only one of the original trees survives as of the time of this report, and replacing those that have been lost should be considered seriously. As the last decades have shown, the trees present a challenge in the form of their shade, and if replaced, they should be pruned to minimize their canopy as they mature.

- *Paths and bed edging, central lawn.* The material of the paths between the beds and their edging has changed periodically in the history of the garden, and the early records that a mulch coating was used, although photographs suggest that gravel was later the surface material. Hard paving should be avoided on the paths, both for drainage and historic preservation reasons. In its earliest period, the beds had board edges, later replaced by soldier courses of brick. The board edges should continue to be considered a desirable material, particularly since the subsequent brick is no longer on site. The character of the central green plat changed in the
period of establishment, as both photographs and written documents attest. After 1913, evergreens were planted at the corners of the lawn which did not survive (see figure 24). They seem not to have been a part of Letitia Wright’s or John Wister’s original conception. Replacements might be considered, but not as a high priority. A central, green lawn, however, is an essential feature of the garden bed area.

-Boxwood hedges. As John Wister’s 1910 report indicates, the boxwood hedges around the perimeter of the beds were an essential feature of the conception of the garden from the beginning, and their Mount Vernon lineage was one of their most historically significant features. The ultimate intended size of the box was not clearly articulated in the documents dating to the period of the garden’s establishment, however, and, while they grow slowly, they do grow, and take poorly to extensive pruning. The difficult decision of pruning versus relocation or removal will continue to be a challenge. The historic importance of individual specimens (or groups) should continue to be weighed against the effect of the size of the bushes on the garden’s overall scale.

-“Old-fashioned flowers.” There is clear evidence about the annuals, perennials, and bulbs planted in the beds of the garden in the period of establishment, roughly 1911-1917, based on the lists that survive in the management records (see Appendix B), and on photographs taken in this period (figures 17-26). Because the planting plan drawn up by the junior members of Letitia Wright’s committee is not known to survive, however, it is unclear whether there ever was a fixed idea about what plants should eventually go where. The photographs and the records make it clear that plantings changed from year to year. Several themes are clear, however: color arrangements, particularly the recession of color from one to another, is one feature that shows up in the Garden Committee’s comments about bloom, and in Wister’s original sketch plan from 1912. Second, that plants were moved in the initial period, as much for aesthetic reasons as to comply with the stated purpose of only including flowers from the Logan period. Thus, there is little hard evidence about fixed positions for plants. Rather, there was an aesthetic arrangement of material much in the spirit of Gertrude Jekyll’s famous English borders and a marked contrast, very typical of the period, between the irregular, “informal” arrangement of plants and the “formal” rectilinear geometry of the beds themselves. The photographs indicate, however, that there was, at least in 1911, an axial symmetry along both the length and width of the garden in the planting relationship of beds to each other, particularly in the smaller, inner ring (this is reflected in Rudy Favretti’s planting plan). Any replanting of the beds should use the plants reflected in the lists from the period of establishment, both annuals and perennials, as a first priority. Plants not used in this period should not be considered a priority.

2. Perimeter planting
As has been noted, the planting of the perimeter in a shrub and tree screen for the site was one of the primary features of the establishment of the garden in 1911-1917. As has also been noted, native species were a particular focus in these plantings, and that a number of trees and shrubs were already on site, either from the period of the Logan lease or before, and these were not removed in the Wister planting.
In contrast to the importance of the geometry of the garden’s flower beds, the original Wister Plan for the garden (Stenton Collection) seems not to have been executed precisely or exactly. It should be taken, therefore, as a general guideline and not a precise plan of action, particularly since Wister did not remove existing specimens. Its essential features are the “informal” (irregular) arrangement of trees and shrubs, and the role of the planting in shielding the site visually.

Existing trees and shrubs. As part of the preparation of this report, certified arborist Kenneth J. Le Roy identified trees on site by species and measured their circumference. A plan of the site showing these trees accompanies this report, prepared by Eric Baratta. In Mr. Le Roy’s opinion, several trees on site could date to the beginning of the twentieth century or before, including a plane tree near the southwest perimeter of the site. In addition, several individual trees are particularly notable: the two Halesias to the northeast of the garden beds being chief among these. These probably date to Wister’s period, and are unusually large specimens. In addition, Mr. Le Roy noted that there continues to be an emphasis on native species, in part due to survivors and in part due to subsequent replantings, much of which has been carried out by Lil Chance. Finally, the catalpa just to the east of the garden beds has been on site since before 1911, as is indicated in the garden photographs taken by Charles Pancoast (see figures 21 and 22). Mr. Le Roy also made several broad management suggestions: first, that the site is supporting a lot of seedlings. Some of these, particularly oaks and gingkoes on the 18th Street edge of the property, might be cultivated. Others pose a maintenance problem, such as the black cherry seedlings found throughout the property, most, if not all of which should be removed. Finally, Le Roy recommended the removal of all invasive species, particularly Norway Maples such as the large specimen near the driveway entrance.

In relation to the Wister plantings and future action, it is clear that his plan should be taken as general advice, and that supplemental screening plantings should follow the lead of the plant lists, availability, and the individual circumstances of each planting site, as did Rudy Favretti’s plan. Invasive species should be avoided, and American species emphasized. At this point, the site is lacking in screen plantings in several areas, and understory planting might be considered, as well as planting specimen tree species to supplement mature trees that will inevitably be lost in the next decades.

3. Beds at side, rear of house

-Side Beds – the beds at the side (southeast) of the house, as has been noted, are known to have existed in the latter nineteenth century. As has also been noted, they were a feature of the Wister plans, and continued to be featured prominently in the grounds at least through the 1930s, as Hubbard’s 1939 photographs (figure 29) indicate. Their restoration could be considered, using the evidence of historic photographs and plant lists for material.

-Rose Beds.- Like the beds at the side of the house, those just to the rear of the house probably existed before 1900. Their place in the Colonial Revival Garden as a rose bed is a secondary, but nonetheless important feature. Some re-planting might be considered here, particularly of roses based on the list compiled for the Colonial Revival Garden.
Appendix A: Stenton Colonial Revival Garden Chronology

Abbreviations
MB: Garden Committee Minute Book
SB: Letitia Wright Garden Scrapbook
LEW: Letitia Ellicott Wright

Garden Committee members:
Letitia Ellicott Carpenter Wright (Mrs. William Redwood Wright), chairman
Emily Read Fox
Mary H. Howe
Caroline Longacre
Elizabeth Price (Mrs. J. Willis) Martin
Mary R. Browning (Mrs. Arthur V.) Meigs
Margaret L. Knorr (Mrs. Jacob) Riegel
Sarah Logan Wister (Mrs. James, Jr.) Starr
Beulah Jenks (Mrs. Jos. L.) Woolston

1901
[from Annual Report, 1901]
- 40 trees planted – hemlocks, oaks, lindens and maples

1909
- 18th Street regraded – dirt piled “against barn” and blocking “northern entrance” for carriage drive [MB 1912]
- LEW appointed chairman of Garden Committee (April)
- planting in beds on southeast side of house, perhaps northeast beds as well.

1910
SB: - “brightened the garden as it was”
- planted annuals, cared for the lawn and the plants that were left after grading
- plants stolen, including peonies and roses, and other young perennials.
- pumping water seen as a problem
- needs identified - underground water piping
- cold frame
- drawing of grounds “since the re-grading”
- change in divisions in the grounds noted: flower beds now end abruptly “in the middle of the lawn”; shrubs “dotted about at random.”
- “We [the garden committee] think that the grass walk at the side of the house should end in an old-fashioned summer house; not a pergola. On either side of this some of the isolated shrubbery might be grouped.
- flower beds bordering path “at the back of the house” should be continued to end of plot
- Wisteria [on side of house] needs a new trellis; temporarily tied up with rope for the winter.
- “The two other lots are over-run by a crop of Burdock weeds. They are now being dug up, and we hope to have the lot planted in good grass next spring.”
1910, cont.
- Ivy brought by Mrs. Andrews from William Penn’s grave was planted on one side of the narrow doorway at the north side of the house”
- Unidentified “bulbs, etc.” and English Daisies, Pansies purchased from “Dreers”

MB: gutter installed in unknown location, dumping water into unidentified rose beds

L. Wright Papers: December report by John C. Wister describes scheme for beds, locates cold frames, nursery

1911

March
SB: - proposed plan of the garden by Mr. John C. Wister presented with report cost estimate.
- Mrs. C. C. Harrison suggests box might be obtained from Mt. Vernon.
- LEW asserts that ivy recently planted was in spot of described by DNL in “old letters”
- LEW also asserts she found that there had been a dovecote, in “colonial times”: same as is there
- LEW asks about a trellis for wisteria vine, will wait for architects (Cope & Stewardson) to outline the plans about it.
- tools authorized to have garden ploughed and manured, to order cold frames and to ask “the prominent seed men” to donate seeds for the garden.
- decision “to leave the present hedge - and to mark the beds with narrow boards this spring.”
- Garden almost all covered with manure
- Saring planted the seeds of the annuals
- Garden ploughed
- Seeds sown in hot bed

April
SB:
- garden staked out
- walks being dug (excavation to 9”), ashes as foundation installed
- edge boards installed
- Tree work estimated – identifies some species on site
- planting “plants which arrived on the 21st.”
- 18 dogwoods and 1 magnolia planted
- “arranged some hard perennials and planted daisies”
- arrangements being made about plumbing for water supply
- masons at work – “old” bricks being used or re-laid as well as new
- Total cost for garden: 787.80, of which $150 is for “Engineer’s time”, and $228 for box “for bordering beds”
- Seeds, annuals, and perennials, grass seed bought from Dreer “brick walk” $40
1911, cont.

May
SB:
- Annuals, perennials planted
- permission granted by city to close up entrance to the park & run hedge back of the ice-house
- photos show sod in middle, hedge planted toward park
- sod cut from Albanus C. Logan’s and J. M. Fox’s properties and brought to Stenton for central plat.
- rose beds dug up, re-sodding, cleaning hedges
- LEW speaks with “Mr. Olmsted of Boston” at conference on city planning, approves of garden, but says pyrus japonica [malus floribunda] anachronistic.

MB: - steps being built; masons finish their work
- seedlings planted out
- tan bark covering for paths
- Planning conference held at Stenton
- “annual” entertainment held

June
SB: - discussion of available appropriate perennials – excluding greenhouse specimens and bog plants - (“old” Stenton records in part model) – to be sought in catalogues - and seeds ordered immediately for planting
- LEW marks down names of roses for “future use”
- perennial bed dug near seed-beds
MB: roses in bloom
MB: Perennial bed dug, ready for seedlings
- seed ordering
- perennial seed planted
- 3 shipments of box cuttings from Mt. Vernon arrive in last week

August
MB: - Pancoast photos
- most of first two shipments of box cuttings have died from heat, drought

September
MB: “work on the house” progressing
- Kyle tree work “nearly completed”

November
- committee meets re. Bulb planting
- Euonymous transplanted “into vines corner”
- damask rose planted
1912

January

February
SB:
Estimates on tree planting from Meehans, Andorra & Biltmore
Discussion about raising money - Decided to proceed with planting at estimate of $500
Decision to ask for $200 for Annual Maintenance Fund
“The planting will be done according to original planting and nothing grown in garden or
grounds except what there is a record of in Colonial Times. By this means it will prove as far as
can be a restoration of the original.”
- Emlyn Stewardson recommends trellis configuration
- John Wister estimates shrub and tree planting supervision – accepted.
- discussion of hedge of arborescent box instead of Hemlock
- Andorra selected for shrubs

March
MB:
Caroline Longacre and Mary Howe are making “planting plan” for garden
LEW meets with “Price’s man” about putting up trellis in “back of building” – Saring will paint
- hollyhocks have died, also foxgloves, yellow primroses blooming in hot beds

April
MB: Plants in hot beds to be planted early in month
- Mr. Wister has marked location for the beds to be planted
- annual seeds ordered
- “boys” have been running over flower beds & “doing mischief”
- Iris being planted and “path laid out”
- color scheme for garden worked out by MEH, CL, ERF.
- Andorra delivers shrubs
- Saring transplanted box from Mt. Vernon into the borders evenly –
- finishes digging up the beds in garden - then the long borders.
- Mrs. Meigs trees have arrived- trenches dug for them to improve soil
- 100 pansies needed to complete two beds as last year
- some of the alyssum border has been sowed
- sod must be placed on border of carriage road where it is damaged – no entrance on north
because of re-grading
- perennials being planted, ref. to manure to mulch “Mr. Wister’s planting”
- Andorra delayed in delivering rhododendrons

SB:
- Permission to plant shrubs at the rear of Guard house in park
- trouble with Saring, he leaves, “permanent gardener” called for, annual expenditures for
supplies, tools, etc.
- dahlias noted as an “anachronism” and can be sold when replaced by other plants
1912, cont.
they have a permanent gardener, and an annual appropriation for manure, seeds, bulbs,

May
MB: - 6 fine columbines brought to bloom as those raised by the Committee are not large enough
to bloom this year
- delphiniums & pansies planted
- sod being laid on edge of carriage drive
- late tulips in bloom

June
MB: Roses in bloom

July
MB: More annuals planted for fall bloom

Aug-Oct.
MB: - having trouble with Saring

October
MB: - perennials planted out in rows in the “back garden.”
- dug up & cleaned roots of Aconitum Nap - masked Dahlias (colors) at the back
- about 600 tulips planted in border “near the drive”
- also 200 Dutch tulips in long borders “out of the garden proper”
- Chrysanthemums in bloom - the autumn green must be removed from red & yellow section.

November
- fall clean-up, including Dahlias lifted

December
SB:
- Beulah Woolston resigns
- decision made to remove "Crimson Rambler" and "Straggling Rose" from front of house both
  inappropriate& unsuccessful - Ampelopsis to be replaced by Virginia Creeper
- Decision to have Herb-bed at back of the house - Mr. Betton says it used to be there - Miss Fox
  designated
- Decision that Salmon Pink Oriental Poppies would be used “direct descendant of the old kind”

N.D.
SB: donation from Alabama Society, NSCDA, used to purchase magnolia grandiflora.
1913

SB 74 - receipts for Wm. H. Moon for shrubs, Magnolia grandiflora

January
SB:
- donors for garden noted
- Decided to put herb-bed in front of house - instead of in the “original” site [not carried out] – actually placed at rear of house adjacent to low wall (NW of garden)
- Miss Longacre & Miss Howe to investigate climbing roses
- contributions coming in from other Dames’ chapters - other states

February
SB:
- discussion of roses to be grown at Stenton according to date, especially climbing roses – roses selected and ordered, Emily Fox to oversee planting “in garden”
- Emily Fox will oversee planting of the herb garden and confer with LEW before ordering the seeds.
- LEW ordered some seeds for Spring planting already discussed at meeting held in Jan.
- New gardener to take charge March 1st, to be hired by Mrs. Saring (recommended by Mrs. Harrison & Mrs. Wright) and board with her in tenant’s house.

March
MB
- Emily Fox and LEW arranged about placing the herb bed
- Mr. Wister walked all around the shrubbery, noting plants that didn’t not survived the winter and LEW and he arranged what should be planked in their place and some more to be replaced.
- LEW & Wister planting 25 dogwoods, 4 sassafras, five azaleas brought from Waldheim

April
MB:
- rooting out of the roses (earth removed, good compost & fertilizers replacing it)
- roses have been given to Miss Fox for her city gardening charity - the new ones expected at any time.
- Garden committee planting & re-arranging the flower beds: columbine, pinks, rockets, corn flowers, foxgloves
- Moving box, planting sweet Wm in garden, foxgloves all in, also iberis, rocket, primulas
- Daffodils & tulips in bloom, apple trees
- Phlox, Iberis [sic] semp. In bloom
SB:
- society is "cramped for funds this year" so "board did not wish to make any appropriation for the Garden this year"
- Plan of herb bed read
- Plan of roses ordered read [plant count included, as in minute book]
1913, cont.
SB:
pasted in, 75 -- receipts from Kelsey’s nursery, Salem MA, 24 April 1913 - for
5 Ilex opaca 1 ½ - 2 ft.
10 Pinus rigida, 2-3 ft.
2 Stuartia pentagyna, 2-3 ft.
5 Xolisma ligustrina. 1-2 ft.

May
MB: 5/1: Affiliated Garden Clubs - Mrs. J. W. Martin & LEW hostesses. Much gratified with
the pleasure & approval in the Garden - Blue phlox, yellow, & two shades of pink tulips much
admired.
- Border about the grounds being planted.
- New roses planted
- Iris, pyrethrums, wallflowers, pansies, daisies, columbines, Sweet Wm’s, Peonies in bloom;
also scarlet poppies, peach Canterbury bells, pinks; annuals, roses
- larkspurs need staking.
- phlox separated into 150 clumps in row in nursery garden - seedlings doing well.
- seeds coming up finely; soon ready for transplanting.

June
MB
- planting seedlings

August
MB
- moving 24 mums - St. Illoria variety to Stenton
- Hotbeds ready but seedlings of annuals not planted through a misunderstanding with gardener
LEW and Mary Chew meet at S. to talk over repairs to the barn, the drain “necessary to carry off
the water” and the “grading operations.” “Satisfactory conclusions arrived at and written to Mrs.
Harrison.”
- annuals in bloom, perennials trimmed at end of month. “Mrs. Meigs trees much overgrown”
“garden nursery to be put in order for seedlings. All borders dry & caked for lack of rain.”
SB
-LEW requests sewer connection from company installing sewer on Wyoming Ave.
-Estimates re. replacement of roof of "spring house" w/carpenter, also installing drain and
connection to sewer - addressed to LEW

September
MB:
- Annual phlox planted out and other annuals, inc. marigolds.
- Boxwood cuttings from Mt. Vernon arrived & were planted.
SB:
29 Sept. 1913 from F. Whelan, Mt. Vernon to LEW, saying he is send a "big lot" of box cuttings
October
MB:
- afternoon tea at Stenton. - garden admired, no details
Mums out - grading Committee appointed - Mrs. Chew, Moss Rodney, Mrs. Wright

November
MB:
LEW meets Mr. Wagner & McPond at St. re. grading
- bulbs planted in “small beds” yellow, already planted in border in alternation with blue Phlox – var. Divaricata planted earlier this fall.
- LEW superintends planting of Mrs. Cleveland tulips (200) presented by Mrs. Cresswell.
- Chrysanthemums practically over except the very late yellow varieties. English daisies, Roses, Pinks, Calendulas very pretty - also the late planted phlox drummondii.
SB:
- "additions to former tulip list - Oct. - pink, red, yellow, white - double & single - donation by Mrs. Creswell - "100 Mrs. Cleveland - early pink / 25 in each inner corner bed
- 1000 yellow tulips in the outside border in front of the Mansion, in alternation with blue phlox.

December
MB:
Planted 59 hyacinths donated to the garden by Mr. Walker of Oestman & Co. Planted in pots as it was so late in the season - M. F. assisting
- Started digging to find underground passage the gardener doing the work.
- LEW went to Stenton examined the excavation 10 ft deep. - 1 rd wide (scant) about 12 ft. or 15 ft long. No sign of a wall of brick or stone. Ordered gardener to fill up. Earth had frozen so would not pack very well.
- “men in the park” began removing hedge on Dec. 12. LEW arranged where hedge should be heeled in for the winter in garden.
- tree spraying and other work, manure has been ordered

1914
April
MB:
- Planting meeting at Stenton, Mrs. Henry Mrs. Farnum & chairman - Mrs. H. Brought two doz. Fine larkspur clumps & 1 doz blue Mrs. H. brought a man with her
- transplanted Iberis semp., Valerian, Holyhocks [s] & hyacinths in pots not very good, planted too late in the season - Took up all the young plants from the paths - pansies, arabis, sweet William blue cornflower.
1914, cont.

May
MB:
- evergreens planted in four corners of central lawn in garden.
- “many boxes” of annuals planted: phlox pink & white, candy tuft, verbenas, snap dragons, balsam and stocks
- vandalism recurring in garden – meet with police

[no MB entries between May and Nov. - Wm. Redwood Wright dies 1914]

November
MB:
- not LEW writing
- planting tulip bulbs ordered from Van Tubergen

1915
no entries – SB, MB

1916

April
- Mrs. Henry, Mrs. Farnum and Miss Longacre spent the afternoon going over grounds. Marked place 39 ft. from house and 36 ft. from line of supposed new wall where Penn elm tree is to be planted.
- daffodils in bed by old wing showing color - in garden - scillas & ranunculus (very few)

May
- Blooming plants noted
- “newly transplanted” box borders seem to be doing well.
- in each corner of middle grass plot one or two of the evergreens seem to be dead. Arbor vitae particularly - Does this ever do well so near railroads & factories?
- moving tulips from “upper beds” to “trench by barn” after bloom
- suggestion to move purple iris to “lower” beds, and other transplanting plans

1917

Shrubs planted on perimeter under supervision of J.C. Wister.
Appendix B: Chronological Plant Lists

1901-1911

1901 Annual report:
40 trees (slips) planted
hemlocks, oaks, lindens and maples

SB, Wister 1910 report; Pancoast 1911 photographs
Privet hedge planted at unknown date on southeastern perimeter

1909 LEW Composition book
1909 Donations
8 hollyhocks
147 Larkspurs
62 Columbines
10 Swamp goldenrod
9 N.E. Asters
Ferns
30 blue phlox
900 cornflowers
6 foxgloves
Bergamot
10 Rudbeckia
2 Brandywine Cowslips
2 clumps spirea
5 clumps Bergamot
4 hardy pinks
3 aconites
8 foxgloves
3 alyssum
90 poppies
7 daisies
25 pansies

LEW Garden Report, 15 March 1910:
1909 Purchases
6 doz. Forget me nots
8 doz. Daisies
1 doz. Verbenas
1 doz. Fall Phlox
2 doz. Dwarf Phlox
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 pansies</td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 daisies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oriental Poppies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sax Alyssum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Foxgloves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aconites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hardy Pinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Clumps Bergamot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brandywine Cowslips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 doz. Perennial Pinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 rose bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Annual Larkspurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hollyhocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Columbines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Swamp golden rods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 N.E. Asters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Blue Phlox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Cornflowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Foxgloves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergamot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1910 Garden Committee Report
peonies and roses, other young perennials stolen probably planted by Dames in long beds to rear of house, side of house shown in Wister plan, 4/1911

1910 LEW Composition Book:
24 annual larkspurs
8 hollyhocks
cornflowers
sweet Williams
catchfly
Pyrethrums or feverfew
Pink Eng daisies
Forget me not
pansies

1911 Letitia Garden Report:
“descendant of the Charter Oak of Connecticut at Stenton presented by Mrs. Roland G. Curtin”
“many years” before 1911.
"LIST OF TREES AND SHRUBS AT STENTON, Planted before 1911"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acer Sacharum</td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula Lenta</td>
<td>Black Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsythia fortunei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnocladus Canadensis</td>
<td>Coffee tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus syriacus</td>
<td>Althea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juglans</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum ovalifolium</td>
<td>California Privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morus alba</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paeonia Moutan</td>
<td>Tree Peony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphus Coronarius</td>
<td>Mock Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus orientalis</td>
<td>Plane tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus Carolina</td>
<td>Carolina Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Italica&quot;</td>
<td>Lombardy Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus avium</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus coronaria</td>
<td>Crab apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirea von Houttei</td>
<td>Bridal wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringia Vulgaris</td>
<td>Lilac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus Americana</td>
<td>Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB:
Trees and shrubs treated in 1911 – of sufficient size for treatment
-Letter from D. H. Kyle & Company, Germantown, to LEW, 13 April 1911, re. treatment for trees in poor condition:
3 Silver Maples treated
5 Catalpas treated
1 Pear Tree "
1 large Pear " in garden"
3 Lilac bushes "
2 Norway Maples standing along drive on each side of path leading to Mansion
1 Mulberry "

SB, p. 64:
### Plant Action Location

**1911-1913**

*SB, p. 64, cont.:

Trees "PLANTED SINCE 1911"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus Hippocastaneum</td>
<td>Horse chestnut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Parviflora</td>
<td>Dwarf Horse chestnut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorpha Fruticosa</td>
<td>Lead Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aralia pentaphyla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Spinosa</td>
<td>Hercules Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea lutea</td>
<td>Flame Azalea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Nudiflora</td>
<td>Pinxterflower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea Viscosa</td>
<td>Clammy Azalea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis Helimifolia</td>
<td>Groundsel Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callicarpa purpurea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calycanthus floridus</td>
<td>Sweet shrub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chionanthus Virginiana</td>
<td>Fringe Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus Florida</td>
<td>Dogwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus coccinea</td>
<td>Scarlet Thorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus Cordata</td>
<td>Washington Thorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus Crusgalli</td>
<td>Cockspur Thorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euonymus Americanus</td>
<td>Burning Bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleditchia triananchos</td>
<td>Honey Locust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesia tetraptera</td>
<td>Silver bell tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamamelis virginica</td>
<td>Witch hazel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex Opaca</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Verticellata</td>
<td>Winter berry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itea Virginica</td>
<td>Willow rod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperis communis prostratus</td>
<td>Prostrate Juniper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniperis Virginiana</td>
<td>Red Cedar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmia latifolia</td>
<td>Mt. Laurel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucothoe catesbii</td>
<td>Drooping Andromeda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindera benzoin</td>
<td>Spice bush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Sweet gum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia glauca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Grandiflora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Stellata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>Bay tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyssos sylvatica</td>
<td>Tupelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxydendron arboreum</td>
<td>Sourwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus rigida</td>
<td>Pitch pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Strobus</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus Italica</td>
<td>Lombardy Poplar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus pissardi</td>
<td>Purple leaved Plum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus arbutifolia</td>
<td>Chokeberry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus Coronaria</td>
<td>Crab apple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plant Action Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Action</th>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911-13, cont.</td>
<td>Ptelia Trifoliata</td>
<td>Hop tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus palustrus</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus Rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Carolina</td>
<td>Wild Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Rubiginosa</td>
<td>Sweet Briar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhododendron Maximum</td>
<td>Great Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salix carprea</td>
<td>Pussy Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuartia pentagyna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thuja occidentalis</td>
<td>Arborvitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaccinum corymbosam</td>
<td>Blueberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viburnum cassinodes</td>
<td>Withered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viburnum Opulus</td>
<td>Cranberry tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitex angus castus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xanthoxylon Americana</td>
<td>Prickly Ash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1911

**April**

*MB:*

- 18 dogwood planted – from LEW donation
- 1 magnolia

*SB:*

- “Spring”

Plants “donated by members of the committee and friends during the past months.”

Cowslips yellow & brown
Coreopsis
Clumps of old-fashioned Johnnie-jump-ups
Spirea [*sic*]
Fox gloves - pink & white (8)
Rockets -
Nigella
Mallow
Columbines
Chrysanthemums
Lobelia
Marigold
Begonia
Blooming annuals
Roses
Primroses
Rose of Sharon
Myrtle
Flags
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1911, cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly hocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Flowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fever few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch-fly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SB:**

“Spring”

- Perennial Seeds - by Mrs. Woolston
- Sod. " Mr. Logan
- Sod. " Mr. Fox
- Leaf mold " Mr. Wright
- Fertilizer " Mr. Wright
- Peony corms " "

**May**

**SB:** 5/1

- Rockets, nigella, cowslips, planted
- Mallow, columbines

**MB:**

- Hollyhocks, mallows, columbines, planted
- Sunflowers, cowslips, arabis, myrtle, vinca, columbines, chrysanthemums,
- Periwinkle & “rose of Sharon”
- African marigolds, yellow-faced heartsease,
- Begonias, orange day-lilies, straw flowers [?]
- Yellow cowslips
- “Heels” in rose garden dug up
- Flags stolen

**SB:**

- Perennials raised from seed by Saring “during summer”

- 90 Asters
- 150 Digitalis - white & spotted (50 stolen)
- 425 Sweet William
- 60 Polyanthus
- 30 Campanula
- 60 Double wall flower
- 25 Hesperus
- 75 Carnations
- 100 Coreopsis
- 35 Geum
- 75 Evening Primroses
- 75 Columbines
- 25 Euonymus
- 90 Pyrethrums
1911, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant action location</th>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Hibiscus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Hollyhocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Perennial Scabiosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Larkspur Elatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Larkspur Belladonna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Asclepius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Iceland Poppies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Receda Albanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lupines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lupines (stolen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Digitalis (stolen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**June**

**MB**
- Roses blooming
- 3 shipments of Mt. V. box cuttings planted
- Sweet alyssum blooming
- Perennial Seeds from Dreer, Farquhar, ordered, planted
- Boddington, Sutton’s Annual phlox blooming
- A. Flag poppies blooming
- Verbena blooming

**July**

**MB:**
- begonias blooming
- phlox drummundii blooming

**August**

**MB:**
- Cosmos blooming/staked

**SB:**
- Annuals "raised in the hot-beds by Saring - and in bloom in Stenton garden – during the summer"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antirrhinum</td>
<td>Snap dragon</td>
<td>Giant mixed</td>
<td>(white)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendula</td>
<td>Pot Marigold</td>
<td>Empress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candy tuft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celosia</td>
<td>Cockscomb</td>
<td>Various colours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centaurea</td>
<td>Corn flower</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmos</td>
<td>Mammoth Perfection</td>
<td>Crimson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1911, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dianthus</td>
<td>Double snow ball</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Fire ball</td>
<td>Blood-Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Salmon King</td>
<td>Salmon Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eupatorium Ageratoides</td>
<td>Leurough-wort[?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus globosus</td>
<td>Fistuloses, Globe Sun-Flower</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Cucumeri folies</td>
<td>Stella Miniature Sunflower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunn Emannia</td>
<td>Giant yellow Tulip poppy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumarias folia</td>
<td>Larkspur</td>
<td>Carmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Dark Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Shell Pink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Lilac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Sky Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupines</td>
<td>Annual [?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavateria Grandifolia,</td>
<td>Annual Mallow</td>
<td>Shrimp Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mignonette -</td>
<td>Grange Queen</td>
<td>Orange -Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigella</td>
<td>Love in a mist</td>
<td>Cornflower blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppy Danebrog or Danish Cross</td>
<td>Improved large-flowers mixed</td>
<td>Scarlet &amp; white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salpiglossis</td>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>various colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scabiosa</td>
<td>Improved Pompadour</td>
<td>Purple &amp; white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Large flower king of the Blacks Black purple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Purple edged white</td>
<td>Purple edged white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Fairy</td>
<td>Azure Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Crimson</td>
<td>Crimson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Tile-Red</td>
<td>Tile-Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Lilac</td>
<td>Lilac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot; Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>Princess Alles</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Various colours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### November

**MB:**
- bulbs planted
- Euonymous planted in “vines corner”
- “hundred leaf rose” infested
- damask rose planted
- lilacs to be removed – scale

**SB:**
- Autumn 1911 Donations to Stenton Garden
- Perennials - Iris & Bulbs
Stenton Colonial Revival Cultural Landscape Inventory  Appendix B: Chronological Plant Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1911, cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Damask Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td>ordered from Abel &amp; Co., for Stenton Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bulbs**
- Clara Butt, bright rose 100
- Gretchen, soft rose, 100
- Ella Willmott, pale yellow, 50
double col. 10 finest sorts **Anemone**
- St. Bridget col. 10 do.
- Giant French de Caen do.
- fl. Pheno double 10 sorts do.
- Jap. Anemone Pr. Henry, crimson red., 50
- "      " Queen Charlotte, rose, 50
- "      " Whildwind [sic] White, 100
- Fritillaria mixture, 20
- Iris, Spanish finest named var., 200
- "  Bearded, 25 named, 100
- "  Primella, Cyanca, dark blue, 50 April ?
- "        " , yellow, 50
- "  Siberica, white, 50
- Ranunculus, col. 25 varieties, 200
- "      Fair maids of France, 20
- Winter Aconite Eranthis, 100
- Gesuriana, 100
- "        , Golden Crown, 100
- Ingoldsby pink, 50
- Emperor daffodil, 100
- Empress " , 100
- Golden Spur, 100
- Sir Watkins, 100
- Eranthis, 200

**1912**

**March**

*MB:*
- hollyhocks, foxgloves  have died
- yellow primroses  blooming in hot beds
  potted and set out

**April**

*MB:*
- Spanish Iris, Japanese Anemone, planted in hot beds
    Anemones, wallflowers &
    Campanulas, primroses and
    poppy anemones “peach bells”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1912, cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Daffodils and arabis</td>
<td>blooming</td>
<td>“all over the garden”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- crown imperial</td>
<td>blooming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- box cuttings</td>
<td>transplanted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- trees</td>
<td>planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 100 pansies needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>“to complete the two beds as we had them last year”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- alyssum border</td>
<td>partly sowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall pyrethrums [?], foxgloves, sweet rockets, sweet William delphiniums, helianthus, foxgloves, and cornflowers</td>
<td>planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “a lot of old-fashioned” double daffodils &amp; boltonia</td>
<td>donated by LEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- wall-flowers</td>
<td>blooming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- flags</td>
<td>to be separated/planted</td>
<td>in “shrubbery border”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sweet Williams</td>
<td>to be planted</td>
<td>in “long beds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blue phlox</td>
<td>showing color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- daffodils “planted last Fall”</td>
<td>blooming – “very beautiful”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May**

**MB:**
- pansies sent from Fern Hill, planted
- 75 delphiniums and pansies donated by Mrs. Henry
most dark blue
- hollyhocks planted
- blue phlox and pink tulips blooming together
- red and yellow tulips blooming together
- foxgloves planted
- Sweet William planted in “large bed”
- marigolds & coxcomb planted

**SB:**
- Trees and shrubs purchased from Andorra Nurseries, 5/31
2 Aesculus
3 Chionanthus
5 Crataegus cordataq
4 Crataegus Crus-Galli
2 Gleditschia tricanthos
3 Halesia
10 Hamamelis
3 Liquidambar
2 Magnolia stellata
2 Oxydendrum arboreum
6 Pinus strobes
6 Lombardy poplars
2 Ptelea trifoliata
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912, cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Aesculus parviflora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Amorpha fruticosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aralia spinosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Azalea lutea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Kalmias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sweet Brier Roses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Viburnum cassinoides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Crataegus coccinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Magnolia glauca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pyrus coronaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Rhododendron maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Azalia viscosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Baccharis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Calycanthus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Euonymus Americana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Ilex verticillata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Juniperis prostrata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Leucothoe catesbaei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Lindera benzoine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Myrica cerifera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Rosa caroliniana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Viburnum opulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**June**

Roses  blooming
- Foxgloves, Canterbury bells, blooming
pinks, carnations, pyrethrum

**July**

*MB*

- annuals  planted for fall bloom

**October**

*MB:

- perennials  planted out in rows  in the “back garden.”
- roses  trimmed  in front of house
- 600 tulips  planted/donated  from Mrs. McKean’s estate [Fern Hill] – planted in “1st in border from near the drive, through rear of garden”
- 200 Dutch tulips  planted  “in long borders out of the garden proper”
- Aconitum Nap.  Roots cleaned of

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1912, cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dahlias (colors)</td>
<td>marked</td>
<td>“at the back”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chrysanthemums</td>
<td>in bloom</td>
<td>“the autumn green must be removed from red &amp; yellow section.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November**

*MB*

Dahlias lifted

*SB:*

**Tulip planting report**

-200 Horsfeldii daffodils planted from the “farmyard entrance at the end of the long wing . . . at the back of the shrubbery border in groups of 3 or 4, extending all the way round the garden.”

-Crimson, rose & flesh colored tulips planted “from the farmyard entrance to the brick walk, grouped”

- 100 La preciense – rosy & white (early) donated by LEW
- 100 Mrs. Cleveland – soft rose (early)
- 50 Proserpine – dark rose (early)
- 100 Gretchen – soft rose (late)
- 50 Clara But – clear rose (late)
- 50 Edwin – cherry red (late)
- 50 Gesnerianna – bright carmine (late)
- “a few” Lord Byron – deep carmine “extended this planting near the brick walk”

-Crimson and pink tulips, blending to yellow “from the brick walk to the catalpa tree”

- 100 Lord Byron – deep carmine (late)
- 100 Ingoldsby Pink – salmon (late)
- 100 Gesnerianna – yellow (late)

-clumps of tulips planted “from the brick walk beyond the catalpa tree to the Guard House corner, among the late tulips”

- 100 Chrysolora – yellow (early)
- 100 salmon red (early)

-other late tulips planted “from the catalpa tree to the end of the border near the apple tree and hedge are planted”

- 100 Orion – scarlet (late)
- 200 La Merveille – red and orange (late)
1912, cont.

-Keizer Kroon tulips planted from the catalpa tree, “carried all the way round to the hedge and beyond in the next border as far as the walk entering the park”
  100 Keizer Kroon
  700 Duc von Tholl donated by Mrs. McKean’s estate

SB (n.d.)
Magnolia grandiflora purchased from funds donated by Alabama Soc.

1913

February

SB:
Herb bed established in bed along wall northwest of garden, at base of wall

Notes re. Herb bed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of herb</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Time of Bloom</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>[notes]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tansy</td>
<td>2-3 ft.</td>
<td>midsummer</td>
<td>Bright yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennel</td>
<td>6-10 ft. July</td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>fine leaves, fragrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horehound</td>
<td>2-2 ½ ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>greyish leaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavender</td>
<td>1-3 ft.</td>
<td>Mid July-Sept.</td>
<td>Bluish</td>
<td>needs Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peppermint</td>
<td>1-1 ½ ft.</td>
<td>June-July</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Protect in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>2-4 ft.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>purple-blue</td>
<td>Protect in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue</td>
<td>1 ½ - 2 ft.</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>Protect in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>1-2 ft.</td>
<td>June and July</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>greyish - aromatic leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyme</td>
<td>1-2 inches</td>
<td>June-July</td>
<td>Bluish Lilac</td>
<td>Aromatic downy leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wormwood</td>
<td>1 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine foliage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Marjoram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roses ordered
-Climbing roses ordered to be planted in front of house, dates of origin noted

2 Sempervirens...India...1529
2 Moschata........So. Europe...1590
2 Nivea.............So. Europe...1590
Stenton Colonial Revival Cultural Landscape Inventory Appendix B: Chronological Plant Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913, cont.</td>
<td>bush roses</td>
<td>ordered to be planted “in garden” under supervision of Emily Fox</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Old Blush..............1797  
1 Marsden..............1796  
1 Cabbage..............1730  
1 York & Lancaster..Very old  
1 Pink Moss.............1730  
1 Cinamonia.............1596  
1 Red Damask...........Orient 1573  
1 Yellow Scotch.......Native to Scotland

**March**  
*MB:*  
- Yellow Eranthis blooming  
- Daffodils, arabis, chinodoxas, blooming  
- magnolia stellata  
- 25 dogwoods, 4 sassafras, 5 azaleas planted from Waldheim

**April**  
*MB:*  
- roses rooted out given to E. Fox for “her city gardening charity”  
- Box bushes moved  
- Sweet William, foxgloves, iberis, rocket, planted  
- Primulas  
- Daffodils & tulips blooming  
- plants "in nursery"  
- Foxgloves white 72  
- Pinks 63  
- Primulas 10  
- Rocket white 55  
- Columbine 104  
- Sweet Williams 319  
- pyrethrums  
- aconitum  
- Hollyhocks  
- daffodils, early yellow tulips, in bloom  
- a few red tulips  
- arabis in full bloom  
- chinodoxias fine effect border of square beds

**May**  
*MB:*  
Garden Club lunch
**Stenton Colonial Revival Cultural Landscape Inventory Appendix B: Chronological Plant Lists**

**Plant action location**

### 1913, cont.
- Blue phlox blooming
- yellow & 2 shades of pink tulips blooming admired by group
- “new roses” planted
- Iris, peonies blooming
- pyrethrums, wallflowers, pansies, daisies, columbines, Swt. Wm. showing color
- blue phlox separated
- larkspurs need staking

**October**
SB:
Cosmos blooming "very fine"

**November**
MB:
- bulbs planted in “small beds”
  "yellow planted in border in alternation with blue Phlox - var Divaricata planted earlier this fall."
- Mrs. Cleveland tulips (200) planted presented by Mrs. Cresswell,
- Chrysanthemums "practically over"
- English daisies, Roses, Pinks, Calendulas blooming, "very pretty"
late planted phlox drummondii.

**December**
- 59 hyacinths donated by Mr. Walker of Oestman & Co.
  Planted in pots (too late to plant out)
- "Hedge" in park removed, to be heeled in for the winter in garden.
- trees sprayed

### 1914

**April**
MB
- two doz. larkspur clumps donated by Mrs. Henry, planted
  & 1 doz blue
- Iberis semp. transplanted
- Valerian, Holyhocks [s] & hyacinths blooming in pots, "not very good"
- pansies, arabis, sweet William, taken up from the paths
  blue cornflower.

**May**
"Evergreens planted "in the four corners of the green plot
-annuals planted in centre of the garden."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Location</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1914, cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>phlox pink &amp; white, candy tuft, verbenas, snap dragons, balsam and stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[no entries between May and Nov. - Wm. Redwood Wright dies 1914]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November**
- tulip bulbs ordered from Van Tubergen. Planted
- 30 Inglescombe Pink In square bed at entrance
- 30 Thomas Moore In square bed opposite
- 30 Yellow Prince In square bed at right
- 30 La Candeur In square bed at left
- 1 doz. Clara Belle, 1 doz. Miss Wilmott. In each inner corner bed
- pink (Inglescombe) Long border, near house
- white (La Candeur) " at the corner
- pale yellow (La Coquette) " , next
- deeper yellow (Yellow Prince) " , near the intersecting path
- Thomas Moore (orange scarlet) Long border, next,
- red (Harry Veitsch) Long border, opposite entrance.

"From here on the same scheme reversed continued around to the entrance again."

**1915** – no record of activities

**1916**

**April**
*MB:*
- daffodils showing color in bed "by old wing"
- scillas & ranunculus starting to bloom in garden

**May**
*MB:*
- arabis (candytuft) - cowslips, blooming
- pansies, grape hyacinths
- hyacinths, tulips
- Bleeding heart coloring
- "Newly transplanted box borders" doing well
- Some arbor vitae at corner of central grass died
- Blue phlox & tulips in full bloom.
- Dark purple iris & one white flag coming out well.
- red & yellow tulips dug up, planted
- 650 plants of sweet alyssum planted
Trees and shrubs purchased from Thomas Meehan, placed around perimeter of property by J.C. Wister

10 Acer dasycarpum
5 Acer saccharum
15 Cornus florida
10 Crataegus cordata
5 Liriodendron
2 Populus monilifera
2 Quercus coccinea
2 Quercus palustris
2 Quercus rubra
2 Tilia Americana
10 Amelanchier Botryapium
10 Aralia spinosa
10 Araonia melanocarpa
10 Clethra alnifolia
10 Halesia tetraptera
20 Hamamelis Virginia
10 Ilex verticillata
25 Lindera Benzoin
5 Oxydendron arboreum
10 Pavia macrostachia
25 Viburnum dentatum
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Garden from south, looking north, 1911, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 18
Garden from east, looking west, 1911, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 19
Garden from southeast, looking northwest, 1911, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 20
Garden from southwest, looking northeast, 1911, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 21
Garden from southwest, looking northeast, 1911, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 22
Garden from northwest, looking southeast, n.d. (ca. 1912-1918), William H. Rau, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 23
House from southwest, looking northeast, 1918, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer,
Stenton Collection
Figure 24
Garden and house from east, looking west, 1918, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 25
Garden and house from northeast, looking southwest, 1918, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 26
Garden and house from east, looking west, 1918, Charles R. Pancoast, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 27
Plan of Garden, T-Square Club Annual, 1922, Stenton Collection
Figure 28
Rear of house from northeast, looking southwest, T-Square Club Annual, 1922,
Stenton Collection
Figure 29
Rear of house (piazza) looking northwest, T-Square Club Annual, 1922, Stenton Collection
Figure 30
Beds at side of house, 1939, Courtland Van Dyke Hubbard, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 31
Beds at rear of house, 1939, Courtland Van Dyke Hubbard, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 32
Beds at rear of house and wisteria on porch, 1939, Courtland Van Dyke Hubbard, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 33
Southeast elevation of house, seen from southeast, 1939, Courtland Van Dyke Hubbard, photographer, Stenton Collection
Figure 34
House and garden from southeast, 1968, Lawrence S. Williams & Son, photographers, Stenton Collection