are essential to a portrayal of the complete story of the church. Erica E. Hirshler draws on her studies in this area to discuss the coincidence of a proliferation of women artists and the concentrated need for and employment of artists afforded by the Trinity interiors. For example, Sarah Wyman Whitman, working in a technique similar to La Farge's, created a window for the parish house. Margaret Redmond in 1927 made windows for the church in the "English style." Both Whitman and Redmond participated in the debate over stained-glass style and technology in Boston's ecclesiastical art circles.

In her carefully researched study, Milda B. Richardson makes up for the neglect shown another later "maker" of Trinity Church, Charles D. Maginnis. As other rectors succeeded Brooks and ideas of liturgy changed, the original chancel was altered with less than inspired solutions. A 1937 competition to redesign it was won by Maginnis, an "enthusiastic participant in the Academic Eclecticism movement" (176). He identified the space and scale problem inherent in the junction of Trinity's nave and chancel, and focused on the altar, in keeping with the current liturgical practice of the Episcopal Church. Maginnis's scheme shows respect for Richardson but also the independence and confidence that allowed him to achieve more than a weak copy of the earlier interior work.

*The Makers of Trinity Church* achieves its purpose with substance and clarity but also does more. It documents the creation of an architectural monument by illustrating the many forces involved: the people, the moment, the social infrastructure. In a way, the book is a multifaceted building monograph written by specialists using many of the same sources to enlighten different aspects of the project. The overlaps in the topics of the "maker" essays give the writers a chance to offer their insights into a variety of figures, which brings out differences of opinion. Another benefit of the book is that lesser-known people and elements of the story are given the attention and credit they deserve: Paine, Dexter, the women artists, Maginnis, and the furnishings particularly. The volume provides good descriptions of the building for those who do not know it. A comprehensive bibliography of the church can be found in the notes. A formal one would have been more helpful, but all the information is compiled here, which is an improvement over its previously scattered state. More illustrations are always desired but not always possible. The south transept is not reproduced, an unfortunate omission. A drawing showing locations of the stained glass, published previously by the parish, would have been a useful addition to those less familiar with the building; there are very few drawings in general. However, these are minor matters in comparison with what the book makes available to the general public and scholars.

Several essays note a more ephemeral aspect of Trinity, which is not a museum but a vibrant living parish. The current church, with great daring and resourcefulness, has taken on a project of restoring and extending its facilities. The parishioners' appreciation of the art and architecture they have inherited precipitated this enormous project and inspired the symposium and its publication—a great example for other keepers of historic monuments to follow.

KATHERINE M.EYER
Boston, Massachusetts

**American Landscapes**

Phebe S. Goodman

**The Garden Squares of Boston**


Nancy S. Seasholes

**Gaining Ground: A History of Landmaking in Boston**


The garden squares of Boston's Beacon Hill and South End—surrounded by row houses and ornamental iron fences and planted with trees and grass—provide familiar images of the city for native and tourist alike. They are so familiar, in fact, that most people probably do not think much about them except to notice that they seem to make the neighborhoods in which they are located more elegant, private, and pleasant. Likewise, most people know that Boston was originally a seaport town located on a peninsula and that some of the city as we know it today was built on infill, though it is not all that clear what land is made and what is original. Two recent books set out to document and place into historical context these two distinctive, but surprisingly unexplored, aspects of Boston's built environment: the garden squares, so visible, and landmaking, so hidden. Both bring the viewpoints and methodologies of landscape and archaeology to urban history.

Phebe S. Goodman is a landscape designer who was, for many years, the executive director of the Friends of Copp's Hill Burying Ground, a group that works in partnership with the Boston Parks and Recreation Department to maintain the square, and she has served as a landscape preservation consultant for the Chester Square Neighborhood Association in Boston's South End. With the perspective of a landscaper, she became
intrigued with Boston’s garden squares, which led her to research their history and to write this book. Hers is a small volume about a small feature in the urban landscape. The significance of garden squares in urban planning, however, becomes clear as she establishes their historical context, analyzes their evolution—including issues of demolition, decline, preservation, and restoration—and provides rare early photographs and views along with current photographs, all with extensive and informative captions.

The book begins with a discussion of residential or garden squares in early-eighteenth-century London, which actually had very little garden, but were important in creating an identity of privacy and exclusivity for the residential neighborhoods built around them. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the squares played a similar role in land speculation and real estate development in Boston and other American cities such as New York, Philadelphia, and Savannah. Thus Boston’s residential squares are considered within this wider context of transatlantic culture and American urban growth.

Charles Bulfinch’s role in “transplanting” the residential square to Boston in 1793 is well presented. His design and development of Franklin Place, a group of sixteen row houses and four semidetached townhouses, put the stamp of Robert Adam classicism on the newly urbanizing city and honored Boston’s recently deceased prodigal son, Benjamin Franklin. The book documents Bulfinch’s success in attracting sixteen elite Boston families to relocate to the new garden square (in fact a crescent since it was not completed to his original plans), but also details the financial disaster of the Tontine method of financing, which led to his bankruptcy. The histories of the two other privately developed squares, Pemberton and Louisburg, that provided a focus for residential development on Beacon Hill are also discussed. Of the three residential squares located close to the original center of Boston, only Louisburg Square still exists and, choked with cars, does not present the green sanctuary envisioned by its planners. With text and images, Goodman has done us the service of restoring Boston’s first residential squares.

If two of Boston’s three original private garden squares belong now only to history, the eight public garden squares in Boston’s South End represent viable urban open space in the present and for the future. When in the 1840s the city began to develop the barren, marginally inhabited strip of land known as the Neck and the fill on its southern perimeter, the challenge was to make attractive an area that was relatively unappealing. Public officials wanted to keep taxpaying Yankees within city limits and away from the garden suburbs. The squares seemed an amenity that might work. They reasoned that residential squares could link the new neighborhood with the prestige of Beacon Hill, attract middle-class residents, and enhance property values. Goodman recounts the tumultuous story of the five major South End squares—Blackstone and Franklin (the largest two and actually square in shape), and the curvilinear smaller enclosed gardens of Chester Square, Union Park, and Worcester Square. She presents their ambitious and (naively) optimistic beginnings, planned by the city with ornamental ironwork, plantings, and fountains to serve as the centerpieces of stable neighborhoods for upwardly mobile middle-class residents. She devotes the final chapter to their decline and deterioration in the early twentieth century, the impact of urban renewal and their role as contested ground in the 1960s, and their current maintenance, preservation, and restoration. The garden squares have survived in the South End because the neighborhood has continued to be residential, but Goodman warns that without careful stewardship by neighborhood groups and public agencies, their future is in “jeopardy.”

Boston’s garden squares encompass eleven discrete open spaces totaling less than ten acres of urban land. Size is not synonymous with significance. However, Nancy S. Seasholes takes on more than five thousand acres of Boston’s land in Gaining Ground. It is a big topic, and this is a big book. In her expansive, exhaustively researched, and unexpectedly readable study, Seasholes documents the process by which Boston, right from the beginning in the 1630s, has extended its boundaries by making land. Today fully one-sixth of Boston is built on landfill, more than probably any other city in North America. Boston’s architectural landmarks are well studied, but the earth on which they stand is a story that had yet to be told.

Gaining Ground focuses solely on Boston’s landmaking. Seasholes is a historical archaeologist who worked on the environmental review projects for archaeological contract firms in the city in the 1980s and 1990s. As part of her historical research, she had to determine whether a site was on original or added land, and if it were the latter, why, by whom, when, and how. Evidently she found the venerable Walter Muir Whitehill’s Boston, A Topographical History (3rd ed., Cambridge, Mass., 2000), inadequate (and at times inaccurate) for the site-specific research questions she had to answer. She began to accumulate her own information, eventually writing a dissertation and the publication under review. Few historians would have found Whitehill wanting; even fewer would have assumed that a five-hundred-plus-page book would attract a publisher and interest readers. But Seasholes was undaunted. To her credit, she has surpassed the generalized account of Boston’s topographical development by the Brahmin Whitehill and challenged the reader to find out in detail the history of Boston’s far-reaching landmaking, and, thus, the buried story of Boston’s topographical development.

Interestingly, in addition to scholars concerned with Boston’s built and made environment, a general audience for this book may have been cultivated over the past thirty years. The ambitious project to depress Boston’s infamous elevated Central Artery, known as the Big Dig, precipitated numerous archaeolog-
ical studies of the proposed route through the years, and inevitably has revealed to the public that as much history may lie underground as above.

Seasholes has organized her fourteen chapters of text and images so clearly that the reader has no difficulty following the ups and downs and ins and outs of Boston's complex four-hundred-year transformation from a few peninsulas and islands to the city we know today. The introduction leads the reader chronologically through the historic developments that spurred Boston's landmaking, such as the need for docks, wharves, and defense in the seventeenth century, a town almshouse or new residential areas in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a site for an airport or park in the twentieth. Recurring concerns about the inadequacy of Boston's harbors or the peril of pollution and disease were factors, as were the implementation of water and sewer systems or municipal parks. Broader historic developments such as the growth of the China Trade and the immigration of the Irish also sparked landmaking projects. A second chapter briefly discusses the technique and technology of landmaking, explaining the basic methods and their changes over time.

Having established a historical context, Seasholes methodically examines each section of the city, neighborhood by neighborhood, starting with the Waterfront, then the Bulfinch Triangle and the West End, Beacon Hill, the Back Bay and South End, the Fens and Fenway, South Cove, South Bay, South Boston, Dorchester, East Boston, and Charlestown. The book unfolds geographically, and within each chapter the land projects are considered in more or less chronological sequence. Each section starts with a bird's-eye-view image of the area being discussed with the original 1630 shoreline marked in bold lines. The text is illuminated with copious illustrations, including readable historical maps that reveal important evidence. Where applicable, recent archaeological findings are related to the historic record.

One can, and should, read this book from start to finish, but another way to approach it is to read about the part of the city in which you are most interested. The information and insights you gain from that chapter will probably encourage you to check out another neighborhood, then another, and, in the process, you will eventually have read the entire book. It really is that good.

Though most people associate major landmaking in Boston with creation of the mid-nineteenth-century residential districts of the Back Bay and the South End, Seasholes points out that the 400 acres of the Back Bay do not compare with the more than 1,400 acres made to create the airport, or even the Boston flat projects, which created 650 acres for the South Boston Waterfront, Marine Industrial Park, and the Conley container terminal.

Seasholes has limited her investigation to land projects of organizations rather than individuals. To this end, in addition to her analysis of the historic maps and views, she has assembled an impressive research base of official reports and private papers of city boards, commissions, corporations, contractors, and others who actually made the land. Her study is distinguished by the archaeological expertise that comes from time spent on the sites combined with methodological rigor. The amount of primary information she has collected and synthesized is remarkable, and her ability to present her findings in such a clear and accessible fashion is outstanding. For instance, the timeline of neighborhoods and land projects brings together information that is presented elsewhere but gives the reader a comprehensive grasp of the entire development. With its completeness, complexity, and elegance, this book sets a new standard for topographical histories of Boston.

Differing greatly in scope, size, and ambition, The Garden Squares of Boston and Gaining Ground, each in its own way, add substantially to our understanding of and appreciation for the complexities of the urban landscape—what lies hidden below the surface and what is visible above.

MARGARET SUPPLEE SMITH
Wake Forest University

Kim Coventry, Daniel Meyer, and Arthur H. Miller
Classic Country Estates of Lake Forest: Architecture and Landscape Design, 1856-1940

Fortunate are the architectural historians of the homes of the wealthy, for they can call on a rich cache of documentary evidence. For nineteenth- and twentieth-century studies, this means drawing on high-quality photographs, renderings, plans, and portraits of the owners. Kim Coventry, Daniel Meyer, and Arthur H. Miller have combined these elements to create a visually appealing history of the landed estates of the Chicago suburb of Lake Forest. The volume is filled with elegantly composed views, color renderings, studio portraits, and the occasional family snapshot of the well-dressed owners at play. The images dominate the book and provide a look into the private world behind estate walls. The authors weave history, urban development, architectural analysis, and the history of landscape architecture and interior design into their narrative.

Lake Forest is not a suburb in the classic sense of a middle-class bedroom community. Located thirty miles north of Chicago, it served rather as a summer retreat similar to Newport, Rhode Island, and beachside towns on Long Island, New York. Its estates reached their zenith in the first third of the twentieth century. Today Lake Forest may be most renowned for the elegant work of the reigning architect of that period, David Adler. The scale of the estates, many as large as two hundred to four hundred acres, resulted in a unique landscape of clustered yet isolated homesteads. As in Long Island, Miami Beach, and Newport, the wealthy chose to congregate. In 1911–12, Lake Forest added a small shopping district; however, there has never been any significant public space or commercial center to the community. Rather, residents met in private clubs or on the estates. Over time, with