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Chapter I

Introduction

Tucked away at the end of an ordinary dormitory hallway, a low, medieval doorway provides a dramatic entrance to what Yalies have dubbed the "Swiss Room". As befitting Yale's elaborate Collegiate Gothic campus, the Swiss Room is a late Gothic interior, dim, low-ceiling and paneled in dark wood, complete with long trestle tables and an antique tiled stove. Available for use with permission from the Master's office, the Swiss Room provides an "Alpine retreat" for both Yale faculty and students.¹ (Figures A1-A5)

The room was donated to the Yale University Art Gallery in 1929 by Robert de Forest, former president of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and an 1870 Yale graduate. The gift had only one stipulation--that it be installed within five years or revert back to de Forest.² Due to the Gallery's lack of exhibition space, the room was installed as a faculty lounge during Yale's massive building campaign of 1930-34.³ It is located in Berkeley College, in the south corner of Building B on the second floor. (Figure B1)

² "The de Forest Rooms," Bulletin of the Associates of Fine Arts at Yale 6 (June 1935): 52. The gift also included a proviso allowing the rooms to be installed outside the Gallery.
³ The room is non-structural and inserted into the original Berkeley plan in a space which was similar in size and orientation to the Munich arrangement. It was reconstructed according to photographs of its previous installation as a structural room in Munich. Installation was
The room is actually an amalgamation of two different but relatively contemporary interiors. The oldest elements from each date to the late 15th century. The smaller portion was originally the anteroom of a Swiss inn from the canton of Engadine. The larger portion came from the city of Toblach in the Tirol, which is today part of northern Italy. (Figure B2) Both were imported from Munich where they had been installed as part of a larger ensemble in a private residence.4

The Swiss Room originally served Yale as a dining space for Berkeley faculty. Its program has expanded over the years to include classroom activities, small student gatherings and special functions.5 Currently, the space is used every Monday night by the Berkeley Fellows, who carry up their dinner trays from the dining hall below, and there are student parties several evenings a month. Less regular uses include occasional catered dinners and receptions given by the Master of Berkeley College, and infrequent small seminars during the day. There is expected to be increased use as a classroom and seminar facility.

The entire Berkeley residential college is currently under renovation which will include the installation of new mechanical systems and a general

overseen by James E. Todd, Inc. under the supervision of the principal architect, James Gamble Rogers.

4 Hans Lehmann, Zurich, letter to Robert de Forest, New York, July 6, 1928. Yale University Art Gallery Registrar Archives, Yale University, New Haven.

5 Schiff, "Old Yale: Berkeley’s Alpine Hideaway," 15.
refurbishment of the interior finishes. The Swiss Room has been designated by the Building Committee as a "special room" requiring a more careful mechanical retrofit and a detailed and site-specific conservation plan to preserve historic fabric and finishes. This report will provide the first step to developing and implementing conservation strategies by providing a history of the room and its furnishings, including previous interpretations of the space, and offering recommendations for the display and continued protection of the room as an artifact in frequent use. Chapter II will describe the history of period room acquisition and display up through the 1920s, including the acquisition of the Swiss Room by the Metropolitan Museum of Art; Chapter III will provide a comparative analysis of the elements in the Swiss Room to better documented Swiss interiors to determine the Swiss Room’s authenticity and age; Chapter IV will discuss how the Swiss Room has been interpreted and used at Yale; and finally, Chapter V will provide a condition survey of the room, the current maintenance program, future recommendations, and their consequences.
Chapter II
The History of Period Room Acquisition and Display

During the early decades of the 20th century the acquisition of architectural antiques and whole interiors was very much in vogue with American museums. The Philadelphia Museum of Art, for example, under the direction of Fiske Kimball tried to acquire thirty-seven specific types of interiors. This was the number he deemed necessary to create a continuous world history of interior decoration from "Oriental to Western and from Christ to the modern era." His collection included such diverse examples as a Chinese throne room, a French cloister and a variety of European and American domestic interiors.

In comparison, the Metropolitan Museum of Art was more interested in collecting period rooms for their new American Wing, the first museum showcase celebrating American arts and crafts. The majority of their interiors came from homes built on the Eastern Seaboard by the "parsons, planters, mariners, merchants, and tradesmen by whose efforts and sacrifices the Republic was made possible." However, even they were looking for examples of popular historic European styles. For fifteen years their curator

---


and former director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Edward Robinson, looked specifically and unsuccessfully for an example of a domestic Gothic interior, eventually enlisting the help of a European expert in Gothic architecture, Dr. Hans Lehmann.\(^8\) The Swiss Room, located in 1929, was Lehmann’s second attempt to fulfill his charge.\(^9\)

Lehmann was the director of the famous Zurich Landesmuseum, or Swiss National Museum, known for its extensive collection of Swiss period rooms which included “the best Gothic arrangements” in the world.\(^10\) In 1925 he found the first Swiss Gothic Room for the Metropolitan, a middle-class interior from the rectory at Casaccia which was an important pilgrimage site for travelers between Italy and Switzerland during the 1500s. The room, however, was unexceptional with unrelieved plank walls and little ornament except for the carved ceiling beams. Despite its rarity, it was rejected as lacking “sufficient importance.”\(^11\) The opportunity was passed on to Brooklyn Museum, an institution which “stressed documented work over masterpieces [and] history over connoisseurship.”\(^12\)


\(^9\) Robert de Forest, New York, letter to Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1929 (?). Yale University Art Gallery Registrar Archives, Yale University, New Haven. 2.

\(^10\) De Forest, letter to Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1.

\(^11\) De Forest, letter to Frank Babbot, November 27, 1925, 1.

In 1928, Lehmann found a second Gothic interior, three adjoining rooms which were believed to be from a Swiss inn, an Austrian refectory, and a German house, all of which had been reinstalled in a private residence in Munich. The owner had collected them while “traveling through the hilly districts” in the 1880s. Lehmann sent photos of them to de Forest with a note assuring him that “their equalness and genuineness cannot be found in any museum in Europe,” outside his own, and that any further attempt to satisfy the Metropolitan Museum would be futile. The owner, he said, was reluctantly selling them only because he was aging and afraid his heirs would quarrel over them when he was gone. He warned the museum that the owner needed a prompt decision, because there were a number of other interested parties and because the removal of the interiors would require extensive rebuilding of the house.

Because of the time constraint, de Forest did not have the opportunity to discuss the room with museum curators, who were on sabbatical. He was also unable to assemble a museum team to supervise the numbering, removal, and packing of the elements, all vital procedures to ensure proper

---

13 Hans Lehmann, Zurich, letter to Robert de Forest, New York, August 1, 1928. Yale University Art Gallery Registrar Archives. Yale University, New Haven.

14 Hans Lehmann, letter to Robert de Forest, July 6, 1928.

15 Robert de Forest, New York letter to Dr. Hans Lehmann, Zurich, July 9, 1928. Yale University Art Gallery Registrar Archives. Yale University, New Haven.
demolition and an accurate reconstruction.\textsuperscript{16} Despite these breaches of standard museum practice, de Forest acquired the ensemble plus its antique furnishings and two alpine stoves with his own private funds based on Lehmann’s recommendations. His intention was to sell it to the Metropolitan Museum upon their approval.\textsuperscript{17}

Unfortunately for de Forest, this second room was also rejected by the Board of Directors, this time because it lacked “archeological accuracy.”\textsuperscript{18} De Forest’s correspondence with the curators and the Board suggests there were disparities between Lehmann’s description and photographs, and the room that arrived in New York. According to the Metropolitan curators, it “hardly merited Dr. Lehmann’s enthusiasm.”\textsuperscript{19}

Presumably the Metropolitan Museum and Lehmann reached an understanding regarding the disparity because de Forest resigned himself to Lehmann’s opinion that the Swiss Room was the best that could be acquired in Europe. Unfortunately, the best did not “attain to acknowledged standards” of acquisitions worthy of the Metropolitan Museum.\textsuperscript{20} Nonetheless, de Forest continued to retain his trust in Lehmann professionally and recommended


\textsuperscript{17} De Forest, letter to Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1929 (?), 8.

\textsuperscript{18} De Forest, letter to Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1929 (?), 8.

\textsuperscript{19} De Forest, letter to Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1929 (?), 7.

him to Yale as a consultant on the installation and furnishing of the room at Berkeley College.

The scarcity of genuine European artifacts found *in situ* was not a new dilemma. Europeans had a long tradition of mining ruined or abandoned churches, castles, and other monumental structures for a cheap supply of building materials. These elements, however, were often reused without regard to their origins or historical significance. Museum representatives were just as likely to find valuable Renaissance carvings embedded in the walls of local "houses, barns, and hencoops" as they were in important period buildings.\(^{21}\) Some elements traveled even farther. For example, many of the ecclesiastical stained-glass windows found in British baronial homes had been removed from French churches during war campaigns or other sojourns through France.\(^{22}\)

The acquisition and reinstallation of entire rooms had also been a fairly common practice by private individuals\(^{23}\) and provided museum collectors with similar problems of provenance. Due to their inherently fugitive nature when exposed to the elements, however, rooms were generally only acquired from extant buildings which were being remodeled, slated for demolition, or

\(^{21}\) Tompkins, *Merchants and Masterpieces*, 246.


\(^{23}\) European private collectors were interested in both high-style rooms and their much less expensive provincial counterparts.
were only recently abandoned. They also tended to be reused in ways akin to their original purpose, often being removed and reinstalled intact.

"Period room" collecting by museums did not begin until 1891 with the opening of Skansen in Stockholm, which included entire historic Scandinavian houses relocated to its 75 acre site. Other European museums followed suit, though on a much smaller scale. One of the more ambitious installations was the opening of Lehmann's own Landesmuseum in Zurich in 1898. A monument to growing Swiss nationalism, it displayed a total of 62 interiors which illustrated the history of Swiss culture and architecture from the 16th through the 18th centuries.²⁴

In the United States frugal builders also reused building materials such as beams, paneling, and floorboards to save time and reduce costs. However, the reuse of entire rooms because of their artistic importance was relatively unheard of until the twentieth century, with the exception of national monuments like Mount Vernon and Monticello. One of the only known private collectors was Ben: Perley Poole, who acquired such historical architectural antiques as the paneling from the John Hancock House when it was demolished in 1865.²⁵

For the general public, however, American crafts and architecture remained relatively unappreciated in favor of their European counterparts

---


until the opening of the Metropolitan Museum’s American Wing in 1927.\textsuperscript{26} Furthermore, while European styles were often "revived" in the United States and Americans had an insatiable appetite for European antique moveables, seldom did whole interiors make their way across the Atlantic in the 19th century. Even in the early 20th century, period room collecting in the United States continued to remain primarily the domain of museums, with the exception of a few private collectors such as Henry Davis Sleeper,\textsuperscript{27} until after the opening of several major period room installations.\textsuperscript{28}

National enthusiasm for period rooms started with the opening of three American period rooms assembled by George Francis Dow at the Essex Institute in 1907. His success sparked a concerted effort by the Metropolitan Museum, previously interested in purchasing a few European interiors, to focus its efforts more on acquiring American rooms.\textsuperscript{29} While the Metropolitan continued to acquire very select, high-style European rooms and architectural salvage for the museum, and its satellite museum The Cloisters,\textsuperscript{30} but their memorable achievement was the period room displays

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Halsey, \textit{The Homes of Our Ancestors}, vii.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} Peirce, \textit{American Interiors}, 51.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} Stillinger, \textit{The Antiquers}, 227.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} Tompkins, \textit{Merchants and Masterpieces}, 198.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} A branch of the Metropolitan Museum located in Fort Tryon Park in New York City. Opened in 1926 it houses a large medieval collection assembled since 1914. The collection and the building include portions of many European cloisters imported to the United States by the Metropolitan Museum.
\end{itemize}
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in the tremendously influential American Wing which opened November 11, 1924. The following year the Philadelphia Museum of Art followed suit by opening its new building where the emphasis was more on the global history of decorative arts and included the original twelve of Kimball’s comprehensive collection. A third large exhibit opened in 1929 when the Brooklyn Museum, which since 1914 had also been collecting both American and European interiors, unveiled its assortment of nineteen rooms and suites.31

The American portions of the collections listed above had been sought primarily from neglected historic homes beginning shortly after Dow’s well-received opening.32 Most the European rooms were amassed later in the 1910s-20s. Previously, the import tariffs had made European rooms cost-prohibitive for most institutions. This was lessened in 1909 by the passing of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill which abolished the 20% import duty on works of art more than 100 years old.33

The acquisition and installation of period rooms reflected both a new interest in architectural elements, and a change in museum ideology regarding the display of artifacts. Most of the major American museums were created during the late 19th century, and acquired their exhibits through

31 Peirce, American Interiors, 63-4.
32 Stillinger, The Antiquers, 150.
33 Tompkins, Merchants and Masterpieces, 176.
donations and voracious collecting in the late 1800s and into the twentieth century. Museums sent curators to auctions and dealers throughout Europe in an attempt to surpass one another in acquiring the best *objets d'art*. Having quickly amassed a large quantity of objects, they looked for a "context" in which to display their collections. One of their solutions was the use of period rooms.

Ideology regarding the proper use and importance of period rooms varied from museum to museum. In the 1910s the Metropolitan Museum’s mission was to "not merely to assemble beautiful objects and display them harmoniously, still less to amass a collection of unrelated curios, but to group together the masterpieces of different countries and times in such relation and sequence as to illustrate the history of art in the broadest sense, to make plain its teaching and to inspire and direct its national development." This meant that decorative arts objects, paintings, and sculptures would gain new meaning by displaying them in their original context, mainly domestic or religious interiors. Most other museums, however, interpreted this new

---

34 Tompkins, *Merchants and Masterpieces*, 181. For example, in 1917 the bequest to the Metropolitan Museum from the estate of J. P. Morgan included between six and eight thousand objects and required building a new wing to house it.

curatorial approach as merely fulfilling the need to provide a more "attractive backdrop for furniture."³⁶

It was Fiske Kimball, director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art who took the concept of period room displays to a higher level. He felt that objects removed from their region of origin were "culturally neutral" and therefore difficult to understand. In the United States this primarily meant European and Oriental art. Kimball believed that by surrounding foreign objects with related architectural salvage integrated as part of the building, i.e., doorways installed as doorways and rooms as rooms, museum visitors would be transported to that foreign environment and thereby more fully appreciate non-native art.³⁷

Acquisition and installation of period rooms, however, was also perceived as a contribution to the international cultural status of the United States. At that time America was still viewed by many Europeans as a cultural backwater lacking in knowledge and appreciation of what was perceived as the superior cultures of Western civilization. Even in the late 1920s Europeans were still surprised to learn American institutions were purchasing their cultural and artistic treasures.³⁸ Museum curators believed

³⁶ Peirce, American Interiors, 2. This included the closely affiliated Brooklyn Museum whose board of trustees included de Forest’s brother Lockwood.


³⁸ Hans Lehmann, Zurich letter to Robert de Forest, New York, October 13, 1928. Yale University At Gallery Registrar Archives, Yale University, New Haven.
that amassing an extensive, quality collection proved to the world that Americans were no longer England’s provincial cousin. Their efforts were rewarded. In a letter to the Philadelphia Museum of Art the Earl of Balfour’s niece wrote,

To me, an Englishwoman, the trustees of our great Philadelphia museum are actually realizing a splendid ideal in obtaining genuine rooms from the countries, which for centuries have dominated the development of civilization, and in housing historic treasures in the very walls and atmosphere of Italian, French, Dutch and other homes where the true spirit of these countries can be caught and understood. Memorials such as these will live forever and should provide for those who gave them the pleasure and satisfaction of knowing that they have done much towards disproving the theory that because of its isolation America lacks understanding of foreign countries, their people and their customs.  

When selecting the right “memorials” whether American, European, or Asian in origin, museums wanted interiors and architectural elements that were representative of their period and possessed artistic and historical significance. The emphasis was on authenticity, with limited re-fabricated elements. Whenever possible curators carefully researched the provenance and supplemented it with additional information found in probate records, wills, inventories, contemporary letters, diaries, newspapers and books on

---

manners and customs regarding how the space was originally used and furnished.\textsuperscript{40}

This task was made easier when acquisitions were complete rooms, purchased from private owners or collectors, and had well-known histories. Over time, however, the number of museums searching for appropriate interiors quickly depleted the supply, and forced institutions to settle for less than ideal examples. The war in Europe also influenced availability.\textsuperscript{41} How period rooms in the United States and abroad were sought, acquired and displayed can be illustrated by examining the acquisition and installation policies of the Brooklyn Museum, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and the Metropolitan Museum. It also shows how the standards changed over time with the availability of genuine artifacts.

Museums first had to develop a methodology for acquiring this type of artifact. The Brooklyn Museum’s first purchase was the Danbury Alcove in 1915. Brokered through an antique dealer disassembled, they discovered upon installation that it was not a complete room, but a conglomeration of several old and new interiors. The curators subsequently implemented a policy to only purchase rooms directly from owners and preferably in their entirety.\textsuperscript{42} One of their next purchases, the Porter Belden House, was two complete

\textsuperscript{40} Peirce, \textit{American Interiors}, 3.

\textsuperscript{41} Lehmann, letter to Robert de Forest, August 1, 1928, 1.

\textsuperscript{42} Peirce, \textit{American Interiors}, 5.
rooms acquired from the owner when he decided to convert the building to apartments.⁴³

Acquiring the best specimens, however, often required targeting desired interiors and waiting for the opportunity to buy them. The Rueben Bliss Chamber had been sought for several years before the Brooklyn Museum could acquire it. Located by curators in 1918, it was not purchased until 1922 when the owners finally decide to demolish the building when the commercial value of the land was deemed greater than the historic and architectural value of the house.⁴⁴ These rooms were not necessarily high-style, but rather high quality, "whose history was firmly established."⁴⁵

Period room acquisition and policy at the Philadelphia Museum of Art was largely driven by Fiske Kimball, who took over as director in 1924. One of his first acquisitions was a room from the Treat House in Upminster, England, whose interiors were sold and the house demolished in 1924. Competing with other bidders, the museum was able to secure one room.⁴⁶ Another intact room acquired at that time was the "French Renaissance Room," however it was not found in situ. It had originally been part of a

---

⁴³ Peirce, American Interiors, 11.
⁴⁴ Peirce, American Interiors, 14.
⁴⁵ Stillinger, The Antiquers, 220.
convent but had spent most of the 19th and early 20th centuries installed in a chateau before being purchased by Kimball.47

These rooms were considered ideal not only because they had architectural value, but also because of their historical importance. Several of the complete interiors installed by the Philadelphia Museum of Art, the Metropolitan Museum and the Brooklyn Museum were internationally known before their removal to the museums. For example the Philadelphia collection included a Louis XVI interior from the historic Hotel de Letellier on the rue Royale in Paris and the Dutch interior "the Ship," both of which had been frequently published.48

Once a style of interior became popular, however, both American and European institutions began the hunt for one of their own. High quality period rooms quickly became less available due to the limited original supply, and later the destruction of the war while costs escalated as soon as sellers perceived that museums desired a particular style. For example, the Metropolitan Museum purchased a high-style Swiss monastic interior with elaborate inlaid *trump l'oeil* paneling from Flims, Switzerland, in 1906.49 By

---


1910, when Robinson first started looking for what became Yale’s Swiss Room, he found them “as good as sold out of Switzerland and Germany.”\textsuperscript{50}

Consequently, museums began to interpret the "region" or "style" of a difficult to find room more loosely, and quality declined. For example, in 1930 after a two year search, the Philadelphia Museum of Art finally located a "Gothic Chapel" which was part of a ruined and abandoned 15th-century hospital for the Knights of Saint Anthony near Aumoniere, France. While some of the room was intact, many of the missing elements were taken from other, less damaged, portions of the complex. Furthermore, the missing stained glass windows were replaced with panels from altogether different sites and periods. One substitution was a 15th-century panel from Orleans, another a 16th-century panel from Rouen that had been removed from its original location in 1802 and installed in a home in Norwich, England. A third window had been fabricated from miscellaneous bits of old glass.\textsuperscript{51}

Kimball and his decorative arts curator, R.T. Haines Halsey, were also not above pure fantasy to augment a weak portion of their collection. The "Early Italian Room" installed in 1928 included several unrelated Italian architectural features including a stone doorway and carved ceiling.\textsuperscript{52} Halsey also took artistic license, installing rooms with ceiling heights twice the

\textsuperscript{50} Lehmann, letter to Robert De Forest, October 13, 1928.

\textsuperscript{51} Taylor, “A Gothic Chapel,” 11.

\textsuperscript{52} Kimball, “Six Antique Rooms from the Continent,” 31
original for dramatic effect. On some exhibits such as the Tower Hill Room, they even stripped off all the original paint—now considered by curators to be important historical information and vital to the understanding of a room—"in order to better show the detail of the moldings and the crispness of carving."

Other museums were more rigorous in their installation. For instance the Brooklyn Museum tried never to alter original floorplans. Reproducing original paint colors and fabrics, however, was not even considered by most museums until the Brooklyn Museum reinstalled their collection in the 1940s under the direction of Luke Vincent Lockwood. They had previously painted all of their woodwork white to better set off the non-architectural elements.

The voracity of museum collectors ignited panic and outrage against what many locals saw as "vandalism" causing several countries, such as France in 1927, to impose restrictions against the exportation of monument historiques. Never completely effective, parts and pieces continued to be exported, although at a lower rate. In America, local interest groups were equally active. The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities

---


(SPNEA), for example, challenged the actions of the museums on several occasions although they, too, had limited success.\footnote{Kimball, “Six Antique Rooms from the Continent,” 3.}

Part of the impetus and internal pressure at least for Europeans to continue to sell what was perceived as national treasures was the economic environment after World War I. Especially in Germany, where the Swiss Room was purchased, the war and the reparations demanded by the Versailles Treaty had devastating results. The situation was exacerbated by a skyrocketing inflation rate which left most Germans in difficult, even life-threatening positions, while the U.S. dollar remained strong. In such an environment, even a small transaction with an American museum could bring immense rewards.\footnote{Peirce, American Interiors, 23.}

This post-war economic environment, combined with the urgency of competing American curators meant there was always the danger of acquiring fraudulent specimens. Avoiding fakes required a good provenance supplemented a careful examination of the artifact by a reputable art dealer. Unfortunately, buyers for museums, hurrying to outbid and outmaneuver their rivals, rarely took the time for careful research or study until the item in question was at their museum. Furthermore, up until the middle of the 20th

\footnote{Carl Zigrosser, A World of Art and Museums (Philadelphia: Art Alliance Press, 1975), 129. Collectors working in Germany sent back dire reports of the conditions of the people they met. “The life savings and hope for security of hundreds of thousands of sober, industrious people has vanished overnight.”}
century the buyers, whether curators or agents, frequently had no more than a
general background in art appreciation. Most relied on inherent ability and
on-the-job training to get the feel for identifying genuine articles and selecting
those which a museum would perceive as valuable.

In some respects this type of training was enough. The ability to
identify forgeries often comes only with experience gained from looking at
authentic artifacts. With enough experience a forged piece will simply "look
wrong". Often even a leading expert may be unable to be more specific about
the tell-tale mistake without considerable further study. When examining
suspicious pieces, connoisseurship is often supplemented with the knowledge
of when particular styles were more likely to have been faked. Forgers usually
work in a style when it is popular among collectors. For example, in the 1870s
forgers were quietly prolific in Gothic artifacts and interiors. According to
modern sources these fakes infiltrated almost all the major collections in
Europe. Most of them were not discovered, however, until the 1940s.

It can be concluded, therefore, that the practice of collecting period
rooms was undertaken by museums strongly desirous of acquiring the best
and most valuable interiors in an ever shrinking market while relying on
inexpert opinions and individuals with dubious motives. In such an

---

61 Kurz, Fakes, 275.
environment mistakes were made, although not as often as might be expected.

It is within this context that the Swiss Room will be examined.
Chapter III
The Documentation and Relative Dating of the Swiss Room

After the Swiss Room was transferred to the Yale University Art Gallery, the Metropolitan Museum forwarded on all the available documentation regarding its history and acquisition. This information was limited primarily to letters and telegrams between de Forest and Lehmann regarding the history of the sale, Lehmann’s assessment of the room as a “good and genuine” artifact, and de Forest’s disappointed opinion to the contrary. 62

The latter was supported by a memo sent under a separate cover listing specific “problems” found by Metropolitan curators while the room was temporarily assembled in their storage.63 The problems described in the memo included the assertion that several panels were new but had been stained to look old, that some of the rope molding detail was also new, and that the two types of friezes were not contemporary. These “problems” alone


63James Rorimer, New York, letter to Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven. March 20, 1932. University Art Gallery Registrar Archives. Yale University, New Haven. Undirected and unsigned, the memo describing their observations gives no hint of the author or the recipient to whom it was addressed except for a handwritten notation ascribing it to James Rorimer, curator of Decorative Arts at the Metropolitan Museum and a cryptic note that the document was “absolutely confidential”.
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would not disqualify it as an appropriate addition to the Metropolitan Museum’s collection. It was rejected primarily because it was relatively unexceptional compared to the museum’s other, high-style interiors. This does not preclude the room having some historical significance.

Three initial conclusions can be drawn from the existing documentation, especially when placed in the context of the history of period room collecting. First, because the Swiss Room had been installed within a private home as an object of pleasure and not for academic study, a documented provenance beyond the Munich owner may have never existed. Second, the room was composed of large, structural elements whose removal to Munich suggests the original buildings may have been demolished, also without record. Third, although the rooms were sold to the Metropolitan Museum as genuine artifacts by a well-respected expert, it is possible they were not. They were assembled between 1880 and 1890, just after a large number of forged Gothic elements had entered the market, an event which was only revealed later in the twentieth century. Forgers were, and still are, very knowledgeable of old woodworking techniques. The right technique coupled with old salvaged wood can make a product indistinguishable from an original. It is possible that Lehmann was fooled by a seller who, given the economic conditions in Germany at the time, was less than completely honest.
It is important to be mindful when considering this last possibility, however, that Lehmann was more than an agent for the Metropolitan Museum; he was the leading authority on Swiss interiors. He also had no expectations that he could locate a perfect and complete interior. It is therefore quite likely that while less than ideal, the Swiss Room incorporates some rare and valuable Gothic elements.

To disclose information about the origin, age and authenticity of these elements and to identify the intrinsic value identified by Lehmann, it is necessary to supplement the existing documentation with research on the architectural forms, materials, motifs, construction and carving techniques of 15th-19th century Swiss Gothic architecture. Unfortunately, the scarcity of Gothic interiors in the 1920s, as evidenced by the Metropolitan Museum’s inability to locate and purchase one, suggests that the Swiss Room is rare and that comparative references are few. Alternatively, it may just have been a popular style among collectors and that there were still extant examples in the 1920s, but none for sale.

An examination of the collections and publications of the historical museums in St. Moritz, Lucerne, Basel, and Zurich, Switzerland revealed fifteen contemporary examples including rooms from Chur, St. Gallen, Zurich, Muri, Mellingen, Rorschach, Flims, Savognin, Chiavenna, Pontresina, Tarasp, Flims, and Zouz. (Figures D1-D11) This physical evidence was supplemented with research done by medieval and Gothic architectural
historians. The following is a comparison of the information found regarding known Swiss Gothic interior elements and history with the elements found in the Swiss Room.

The Swiss Room consists of two different wall configurations with correspondingly different ceilings. The walls from the so-called "Tirolean" portion consist of blind friezes over battened panels with a decorative arched plank-and-beam ceiling. The "Engadine" portion is much simpler consisting only of panel and batten walls and an unpainted coffered ceiling. The two designs are currently divided by a heating chase enclosed in the 1930s with wooden boxing (Figure E1) supported by a new column carved to match the older interiors. (Figure E2) Conversely, there is no similar strong division between the "Tirolean" and "Engadine" wall configurations in the Berkeley installation; they simply abut at the southwest corner of the Tirolean section and the northwest corner of the Engadine section. In the following discussion the Tirolean and Engadine sections of the room are subdivided according to the ceilings.64

The window surrounds of the single bay window are carved Indiana limestone and typical to the rest of the college. The glazing for the eight lites of the bay window is composed of old, multi-colored glass roundels set in lead

---

64The configuration of the rooms is only slightly different from the earlier Munich installation. The Yale installation is missing the partition wall between the two. The door to the silver closet, which is hung with the decorative trim on the inside, may have been the connecting door.
cames, a style popular in Swiss, German, and Italian architecture. The glass
was apparently collected by Lehmann’s Zurich antique dealer, Dr. Stori, and
was sent to Yale by Lehmann with instructions for their proper arrangement
within the Yale casements. (Figure E3)

Inset in four of the eight windows are glass panels; two are old pieces
donated to Yale and two are new pieces commemorating the installation of
the room. The antique pieces are both portraits, one of Caspar Burkhart,
Schutzenmeister, and the other of Maria von Burgand. They were both
donated to the university by Professor Shepherd Stevens. The square shape
of the these pieces means they are personal commemorative panels, made for
the nobility or members of the church on the occasion some great event in
their lives, such as a marriage or election to an office; circular panels
commemorated civic events such as the incorporation of a city. The new
panels include one circular panel to commemorate the addition of Berkeley
College to the Yale campus and a square panel with an inscription
acknowledging de Forest’s gift and listing his accomplishments. Due to the
arched shape of the windows the panels are placed one-quarter of the way

Museum of Art Registrar Archives, Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn.
67 The provenance and history of the panels has not been located yet.
down from the top of arch. In most traditional settings the top of the panel would be flush with the lintel.

Typical to Swiss construction the window is deep-set which allows for the insertion of a bench or a broad shelf. The bench installed in the Swiss Room, however, was not part of either portion of the room but fabricated during the 1930's construction. Besides providing additional seating it also hides the heating unit, which is vented through the top of the seat back.

Glass windows came to the mountain regions of Switzerland in the middle of the 15th century, replacing traditional opaque coverings such as paper, cloth or wooden shutters. This innovation allowed direct sunlight into interiors for the first time during the long winter months, and had a profound effect on most Swiss interior ornamentation. Paneling, carved and painted ceilings, and ornate furniture replaced more utilitarian decoration, first in the large cities and then spreading into the countryside. This suggests that neither portion of the Swiss Room dates from before the 1450s and more likely from the early 16th century.

Paneled rooms, even ones as simple as the Swiss Room, were only found in middle- or upper-class homes or well-established institutions. Seldom did a house have more than one, and sometimes only a wooden ceiling, or a ceiling and two or three paneled walls. The remaining walls were

---

plastered. Paneled rooms were also found in inns and monasteries, primarily the spaces dedicated for the Abbott and his special visitors’ use. Whatever the arrangement, wooden elements would only have been incorporated into the best room in the house. The most elaborately carved wooden rooms, however, were usually the public spaces of wealthy communities such as the Rathaus and guild halls, specifically in the ceremonial spaces and their antechambers. (Compare Figure D3 and D10.)

The sections of paneling in these interiors were rarely composed of complete, wide boards. Instead they were made up of smaller boards joined tightly together along irregular seams. These joints were practically invisible and their presence betrayed only by the change in the pattern of the wood. (Figure D8) This can be contrasted to modern woodworking which tends to join boards along a more straight seam, though with equal skill in creating a perfect fit. Most of the joints in the Swiss Room follow the irregular pattern.

The wood used in both portions of the Swiss Room paneling has a distinctive figure and pattern which is very similar to arvenwood, or “Swiss pine,” the lumber which historically was most commonly used in

---

70 Lehmann, letter to Robert de Forest, September 8, 1928.

71 Seat of the local government.


73 Many of these joints are no longer intact.
Switzerland. This wood was still available in the 1920s, however, and often used by Lehmann when recreating missing elements for Landesmuseum exhibits. The darker wood of the friezes may be cembra pine, or “alpine cedar,” which is also still available.

Paintings of Gothic interiors show that woodwork from the 15th and 16th centuries was originally blond, presumably a natural finish, or a medium-light brown. Over time the wood in the Swiss Room has darkened to a fairly uniform deep brown due to the build-up of soot, oils, and other particulate matter. Any newer boards milled from arvenwood would have had to be stained to match the existing original wood. During the Metropolitan Museum’s 1929 assessment they identified several “modern” replacement panels by looking for evidence of staining.

Historically the Swiss worked wood using adzes, a handheld blade which was swung along the grain to create a flat surface. This left faint irregular ripples across the face of the board. Modern boards are usually

---

74 This has been determined by a visual assessment and not a laboratory test.
75 Hans Lehmann, Zurich letter to William Henry Fox, Brooklyn, June 26, 1926. Brooklyn Museum Registrar Archives, Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, The panels and corresponding sections of frieze on the door to the kitchenette were created out of oak for the 1930s installation.
77 Rorimer, letter to Yale University Art Gallery, March 20, 1932. Those elements which were inserted when the room was first installed at Berkeley are distinctive because they were stained with the red aniline dye used throughout the college. Later alterations were stained to match the existing.
planed by machine and then sanded smooth. Most, but not all the ceiling planks and wall panels show what appears to be adze marks when a raking light is shined across them. Alone, however, these marks are not indicative of genuine material. Forgers familiar with the old technique could have duplicated the adze marks. Yale itself when building Berkeley College gave most of the woodwork in its ceremonial spaces a similar, if more exaggerated, appearance using jack-planes.\(^{79}\) They wood around the chase which divides the Tirolean and Engadine portions of the room has been similarly treated.

More conclusive evidence that the paneling is genuine would be signs of its three installations. At this time, the walls have not yet been disassembled. However, several of the panels have been abraded which has exposed areas of severe wood borer damage directly beneath the surface which had to have taken many years to accumulate.\(^{80}\) As the room is now installed in a concrete structure it is unlikely this damage occurred after 1929.

Abutting the ceilings of both portions of the Swiss Room, a series of seven moldings of varying lengths encircle the room, giving at first glance the illusion of a unified interior.\(^{81}\) Typically these moldings are found along

\(^{79}\) The original jack planes are still in the storage at Irving and Casson, the Boston-based firm who did all of the original woodwork at Berkeley College.

\(^{80}\) A.F. Bravery, Recognizing Wood Rot and Insect Damage in Buildings (Aylesbury: Building Research Establishment, Department of the Environment), 64.

\(^{81}\) Several moldings were replicated during the 1930s installation to fill in gaps. These new moldings are distinguishable from the originals by their dark, flat stain, and the sharp flat edges of the carvings.
the top of the walls or around the perimeter of the ceiling, and also around doors, hand lavers, chests, and tables. All are inappropriately positioned in the Swiss Room. In the case of the Tirolean interior they should not be layered on top of the frieze. (Compare Figure E4 and D1.) In the Engadine portion they should be layered over the paneling in the same plane as the battens, not affixed to the heavy timbers. (Compare Figure E5 and D7.) Furthermore, while Swiss interiors often had more than one molding style in a room, there are no examples containing such an assortment on the walls alone. Even the more complex rooms had at least one full wall of the same design. Most of the moldings in the Swiss Room are pieced from lengths consistent with a typical door or window surround. The moldings may also have originally been the minor decorative crosspieces in a ceiling design. (Figure E6)

Six of the seven moldings are a similar leaf and vine motif executed in slightly different styles. The seventh is a more abstract pattern. All appear to have been done in intaglio with a gold ground, only traces of which remain. (Figure E7) Painted Swiss moldings from the 15th and 16th centuries usually had color only on the figures with the background left as bare wood. The intaglio style did not come into vogue until the mid-seventeenth century.83

82 Lutz, Max, Die Schweizer Stube, (Bern: Buchdruckerei Fritz Pochon-Jenet, 130) 25.

This suggests that either the gold accent was added as part of a later Baroque refurbishment or the moldings are not contemporary with the room.

The floor throughout the Swiss Room is composed of waxed, unglazed ceramic tiles installed as part of the 1930s construction. The original flooring material popular throughout Switzerland was wide, plain, unfinished wood planks. (Figures D3-D7)

The “Tirolean” Room

The slightly convex ceiling consists of carved beams supporting full-length planks mortised into heavy timbers. This construction was found in the Tirol and throughout Switzerland from the 15th through the mid 16th century. The rope molding on the heavy timbers and the sword motif carved on the beams are also common to these regions. (Figure E8) What characterize the ceiling as Tirolean are the rosettes carved in the timber and

---


85 The arched ceiling springs from a single plate on the side walls, while the beams are mortised into the heavy timbers on the end walls. A decorative rather than structural feature, the planks would have hidden the actual structural joists above. During the installation at Berkeley the beams were attached to nailing strips laid in the overhead concrete superstructure 16” on center for long-term stability. The planks were then nailed to the beams. Wall panels are not affixed to the superstructure and are joined with traditional fasteners. There is some water damage to the ceiling due to a burst pipe in 1996.


87 The sword motif is incorporated in almost every carved beam ceiling of this period.
incorporated within the central design of each beam. (Figure E9 and E10)

Examples of this motif can be found at St. Johann in the northwestern Tirol and Bolzano in the southwestern Tirol. (Figure E11) They are not found in examples from northern Switzerland or the lake region although they do appear at Savognin in the Engadine.88

The carving on the beams in the Swiss Room, such as the ski motifs (Figure E12) which create a beveled edge, are very simple in comparison to the examples preserved in Swiss museums. The "ski" was a typical detail on most beams and columns throughout the region from the 1400s through the mid-1500s, its popularity gradually declining during the Renaissance. Most "skis", however, are fluted with scalloped edging near the tip.89 (Figure D3)

The "ski" motif in Swiss Room is its simplest form, and more in keeping with an armory than a monastery. (Figure E13)

Swiss decorative elements usually incorporate many motifs, sometimes without repetition, but almost always in an overall pattern.90 For example the carving on the ceiling beams at Fraumunster Abbey in Zurich consists of a series of unique coats of arms, but placed in the same location along the beam. Most of the beams in the Tirolean portion of the Swiss Room have, in addition to the motifs mentioned above, a block of carving near their

---

88 Schweizerische Ingenieur und Architektenverein, Das Burgerhaus in der Swiez, 26.
89 Lutz, Die Schweizer Stube, 57.
90 Schweizerische Ingenieur und Architektenverein, Das Burgerhaus in der Swiez, 45.
ends and some also have half their length beveled into a diamond shape. The randomness of these two designs, however, shows that the beams are not in their original order. (Figure E14)

The paneled walls are capped by a blind frieze with a “martyr’s head and tablets of God” motif common to ecclesiastic and civic interiors of the Gothic period. (Figure E15) Like the ceiling, however, this too has very simple carving. Monastic interiors were more likely have to the flat planes filled with carvings of coats of arms and religious iconography. (Figure D5) The Tirolean frieze is only a cutout design. In comparison, the east wall of the Swiss Room has four panels of a different frieze which is much closer in the level of detail which would be expected in an ecclesiastical environment. Its branch and leaf pattern, also typical of religious spaces, fills the plane. (Figure E16) This frieze, however, is also missing its coat of arms. It is possible these friezes belonged to the same room; rooms with mulitple friezes were not uncommon. (Figure D1) However, their stylistic differences makes this unlikely. It is also unlikely that either frieze is a poor reproduction. Most modern Gothic fakes are executed in the proper technique, but tend to be too playful and too overloaded with ornamentation, betraying their Gothic revival origins.

---


If the Tirolean walls as a unit are compared to other extant Swiss constructions, several aesthetic and structural disparities become evident. First, there appears to be a lack of congruity where the decorative elements meet at the corners. Even in the most complex Swiss interiors with multiple layers of moldings, friizes, and panels it is common to have corner details connect on the same plane. (Figure E17) The Tirolean corners are complicated and lack clean lines. (Figure E18)

Second, the battens are affixed to the panels with large studs, a method of attachment much more consistent with ceiling construction. (Compare Figure E19, a detail of the Swiss Room Tyrolean wall construction with Figure E20, an example of a comparative ceiling construction. Note the similar large, regularly spaced studs.) Stylistically, there was often little difference between walls and ceilings in this type of construction and the typical batten and frieze over panel construction was used interchangeably. (Figure D5) Wall battens, however, were generally held in place with small, nearly invisible nails, the emphasis being on the appearance of the wood, the rhythm of the wooden elements, and the continuity of planes.

The third disparity is the corner support posts, which are also more consistent with ceiling construction. When panels and blind friezes are used on walls they tend to meet in the corner at a single beam.\textsuperscript{93} (Figure D1) However, at each corner of the Tyrolean portion of the room are a pair of

\textsuperscript{93} Schweizerische Ingenieur und Architektenverein, \textit{Das Burgerhaus in der Swiez}, 45
columns, one larger than the other. This double column configuration is typically used horizontally to support an arched ceiling, with the larger beam functioning as a wall plate. (Figure E21 shows a detail of the northwest corner of Swiss Room. Note how the double posts form the corner and the single beam the support for the ceiling.)

The final evidence that the current walls were originally a ceiling is that the ceiling height is at least one foot too low. At its current height the room is not tall enough to accommodate the Leuchterweibchen, or staghorn chandelier, common to these rooms. If the two Leuchterweibchen currently installed in the Swiss Room were still lit by candles either the ceiling would catch fire, or they would be hung so low as to be a danger to the occupants.94

The wall panels may once have formed the ceiling of a church or monastery due to their religious motifs. It is difficult to determine the style of the room from which it came, however, as ceiling designs tended to be simpler than walls, except in the wealthiest orders.

Simple, rectangular doorways can be found in any region in Switzerland. Alternative designs such as arched openings or heavily carved lintels reflect regional variations. The doorway to the Tirolean portion of the Swiss Room is trapezoidal (Figure E22), similar to the Haus Capol found in Flims. The manner in which the carved element around the doorway, in this

---

94 The chandeliers were originally designed to produce only one foot-candle of power per bulb, the equivalent of candlelight.
case a rope molding, tapers off approximately eighteen inches to two feet from the floor is also typical to the region. (Figure D6) This does suggest the original wall had a high baseboard. Though the doorway is not in its original location, the similarity in carving style of its rope moldings to those in the ceiling and along the heavy timbers suggests that the ceiling and the doorway were always part of the same room.

The hinges on the doors may be Tirolean or possibly even German and appear original to the doors, if not to the room. (Figure E23 and E24) They are certainly not Engadine, which are almost exclusively a “double dragon” design and therefore not infilled from the other portion of the Swiss Room. (Figure E25) The keyhole plates and door handles, however, which may date from the 1400s (Figure E26-8, Figure E29-31, and Figure E32) have been added. The plates show several generations of attachment methods including old small, hand-hammered rosehead spikes and also modern bolts. It was common for Lehmann to supply his buyers with hardware added to old doors for a more authentic-looking interior. Each door has also been retrofitted with modern locks.

The “Engadine” Room


The walls of the Engadine portion are very simple with broad panels and irregularly spaced battens. This type of interior is common throughout Switzerland and alone does not identify the region of origin. The battens do not have a Gothic profile.\(^9^7\)

The coffered ceiling in the Engadine portion was described by the Metropolitan Museum as being modern.\(^9^8\) Its simple square configuration, however are what would be expected to accompany the walls. The heavy central timber, however, would not be visible in a room this small. Swiss structural joists were always hidden above a decorative paneled ceiling until the 17th century.\(^9^9\) (Figure E33) Affixed to the beam is a carved Engadine molding. This molding would have been laid flat against a plastered or paneled ceiling. (Figure D5)

The wall plates, or heavy timbers supporting the ceiling, are most likely original. The decorative elements affixed to the side of the wall plate include several sections of a medieval Romansch inscription. These are almost certainly from the Engadine since the Romansch language\(^1^0^0\) is spoken almost exclusively in the Engadine Valley. If the inscriptions were affixed to a

---


\(^9^8\) Rorimer, letter to Yale University Art Gallery, March 20, 1932.

\(^9^9\) Lutz, *Die Schweizer Stube*, 46.
beam it would have been along the sides of a central ceiling beam, such as the one carrying the Engadine molding, or over a door.\textsuperscript{101}

The decorative molding placed on the underside of the wall plates suggest these beams were part of a much higher ceiling. (Figure E34.) This placement can be compared with Figure D5, a monastic anteroom which has a similar wall and ceiling system, except that it is two-tiered and approximately fifteen feet high. This additional height allows the molding on the underside to be clearly visible from below. The Swiss Room’s ceiling is only eight feet high. The Swiss Room is also missing the blind frieze, however, this would not have been incorporated into the decorative scheme of an inn.\textsuperscript{102}

The stove installed in the Swiss Room is representative of the popular heating method throughout Germany, Austria, and Switzerland from the 1500s into the 20th century. (Figure E35) A very efficient source of radiant heat, the earliest stoves were built out of fired, molded clay tiles with a bright green glaze. Later, less efficient but more high-style stoves were made out elaborately designed, multicolored faience tiles, but green tiles remained equally dominant. The overall shapes of the stoves vary from region to region as well as the color, motif, and design of the tiles. For example, in Zurich stovemakers worked primarily in blue and white faience, while in

\textsuperscript{100} Romansch, the fourth official language of Switzerland besides French, German, and Italian, is a Latin dialect spoken by Roman Catholic Swiss.


\textsuperscript{102} Lutz, Die Schweizer Stube, 51.
Lucerne they also included green faience.\textsuperscript{103} (Figure E36) The bright green clay tile used for the Swiss Room’s stove does not identify its region Switzerland, although its simplicity in pattern suggest a humble origin. Its square base, circular chimney, and conical tiles is typical to the earliest stoves. (Figure E37)

The Swiss Room’s stove was not shipped to the United States intact, but was disassembled in Munich and shipped as individual blocks.\textsuperscript{104} When it was reassembled at Yale the contractor made several design errors. First, the stove should be elevated on an open platform. As the original floor was wood, the heat from the stove would have caused an instant conflagration if the two were placed in contact. Secondly, the platform on the north side of the stove should be one or two steps leading up to a seat, not just a high shelf. This arrangement provided both access to the chimney and the warmest seat in the house. Figure E38 shows the correct reconstruction of a stove. Finally, the Swiss Room tiles were arranged without regard to the subtle design impressed on them and have a un-Swisslike irregularity of pattern.\textsuperscript{105} (Figure E39)

The one truly decorative element, the molded angel motif at the top of the chimney is very similar to the one found on a stove from central

\textsuperscript{103} de Capitani, \textit{The Swiss National Museum}, 43-44.

\textsuperscript{104} Lehmann, letter to Robert de Forest, September 8, 1928.

\textsuperscript{105} Schweizerische Ingenieur und Architektenverein, \textit{Das Burgerhaus in der Swiez}, 45.
Switzerland. (Compare Figure E40 to E39.) While this does not conclusively prove the stove was from outside the Engadine, it does suggest it.

If the Engadine paneling is complete, its dimensions make this portion of the Swiss Room too small for anything but an anteroom. This precludes it being part of an ordinary domestic interior and it is much too simple to be part of a grand establishment. Its simplicity and lack of iconography also suggests that it had neither religious nor civic significance, and therefore it was probably the entrance to an inn. Such a large stove would have never been used in a room of this size and use.

Summary

The evidence suggests that the Swiss Room is more than a juxtaposition of two interiors and instead an amalgamation of at least three ceilings, one wall, and several unrelated decorative elements. Some of these elements can be linked stylistically to Tirol and the Engadine, while the source of others remains inconclusive. The provincial character of all the elements, and the time when they were acquired implies that they would not have been brokered through an architectural salvage dealer, and therefore the rooms were almost certainly pieced together from fragments found in situ.
Comparative research suggests the following ages of the elements. The motifs, constructions techniques, and configurations of the elements date the “Tirolean” ceiling and wall and the “Engadine” wall to the late 15th-mid 16th century. The stove is early 16th century. The overlay of moldings are most likely no earlier than 17th century. The “Engadine” ceiling is late 19th century. Interspersed among the old paneling are late 19th century replacements. The column, ceiling chase, window surrounds, window seat and floor are from the 1930s installation. The windows were assembled in the 1930s, but are made from old glass and 16th-century painted glass panels.

Large portions of each section appear genuine though not complete. The fact that they were not integrated better suggests the person assembling the rooms was unfamiliar with the nuances of Swiss interior architecture. If the Munich owner had been defrauded at the time of purchase he probably would have acquired a more complete interior, and it would have been assembled by persons more knowledgeable in the construction of Gothic interiors.

At the time the room was sold to the Metropolitan Museum, Metropolitan curators were explicit regarding the quality and style they expected, and they had already rejected a previously-supplied provincial interior. If the seller’s intent was to deceive the Metropolitan Museum, a much more high-style interior could have been created by recarving the

106 All dates should be confirmed through analytical testing such as fluorescence microscopy.
older, simpler pieces into designs closer in harmony with museum tastes. The insertion of an odd modern panel, therefore, is most likely a routine repair, and not an attempt at fraud. What the seller apparently did conceal was exactly how piecemeal his collection really was.
Chapter IV
The Interpretation of the Swiss Room at Yale

Swiss interiors were sparsely furnished during the 15th through 17th centuries. A stove for warmth, a small table, a few folding chairs and some wall cabinets comprised most of household moveables. The best room might include a built-in bed, hand laver, and benches. The only source of artificial light in the best houses was one central chandelier and the occasional task-specific candlestick. A large, colorful stove would have been the central feature in such a room, and it stood alone, not blocked by furniture, in order to radiate the most heat.\(^\text{107}\)

The Swiss Room at Yale combines a domestic interior with a commercial anteroom, which would not have been furnished at all. In Munich these different spaces were separated physically. Their original use and furnishings, however, was disregarded, and the rooms became a decorative backdrop in a late 1800s domestic environment.\(^\text{108}\)

In 1934 the Yale University Art Gallery took the next step in blurring their individuality and historical intent by combining the two to form one large space with no clear boundary as to where one portion ended and the other began. The rationale for the merger was that “although from different

\(^\text{107}\) Lehmann, letter to William Henry Fox, June 26, 1926.

\(^\text{108}\) Lehmann, letter to Robert de Forest, July 6, 1928.
localities, [the two] were to all intents identical in period and in the same provincial German tradition and could therefore be most properly installed together." The design itself was driven by the need to fit the old pieces into an existing room at Berkeley.

Once installed, the interpretation, use, and even the name of the Swiss Room underwent several metamorphosis. During the construction of Berkeley College, the Building Committee referred to the room both as the “Dutch Room,” almost certainly a secretarial error for “Deutch,” or the “Faculty Lounge,” its intended use. Upon completion of the college, the space was re-named “the de Forest Room” after its donor. In early publications describing the new building the Swiss Room was characterized both as a fine example of German Gothic, Swiss Gothic, and “German provincial.” By 1939, however, the room was better known by its new use as the “Fellow’s Common Room,” and its place of origin rightly attributed

109 “The de Forest Rooms;” 53.


112 “Robert W. de Forest,” 878.

113 “The de Forest Rooms,” 53.

114 The faculty lounge having instead been put in the basement of the Master’s House.
to Switzerland. Sometime before 1966 the name "Swiss Room" reasserted itself, and the space has been known as such ever since.

The room was intended to serve as a faculty dining room, and has been furnished with tables and chairs appropriate for communal dining. The original furniture scheme incorporated reproduction period furniture "carefully executed from original and appropriate models" which made a distinction between the Engadine and the Tirolean portions of the room. In selecting the right historical prototypes, however, the regional style of each section was broadly interpreted. An early German Renaissance trestle table and five chairs were grouped together in the Engadine portion to which was added a 17th-century German cupboard donated by the Honorable Charles Nagel. (Figure E41) In the Tirolean room eighteen Italian Gothic armchairs were set around two long Italian Gothic trestles tables placed end to end in line with the ceiling beams. Two Italian Gothic folding chairs were placed at the head and foot. These design decisions may have been aided by the fact


117 "Two Seventeenth Century German Cupboards," 54. The cupboard appears to be the lower part of a taller piece. It is inscribed with the date 1656. German Cupboard is made up of soft fir with oak and walnut appliqués. The motifs antedate the 1656 inscription. The University Art Gallery has not yet located its acquisition file.

118 Carlos Salvadore, Italian Architecture, Furniture, and Interiors during the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries (Boston: George H. Polley & Co., 1904), 154-9.
that Italian Gothic chairs tended to be upholstered while Swiss Gothic chairs were mainly bare wood.\textsuperscript{119}

What gave the room its special ambiance and "authenticity" was the lighting design. The fixtures included the two iron chandeliers, two pendant lights and three wall sconces commissioned for the room in addition to a fixture no Swiss room was thought to complete without, the \textit{Leuchterweibchen}. (Figures E42-4) Roughly translated as "the little goodwife," \textit{Leuchterweibchen} were chandeliers composed of a bust of a woman, usually made out of wood, and a staghorn. They were one of the few Gothic objects without religious significance or motifs. Always commissioned to commemorate a particular event, the figure usually held the owner's crest.

The Swiss Room's \textit{Leuchterweibchen} is a copy of a chandelier from a house in St. Gallen. The bust is a portrait of Margaretha Muntprat and the fixture commemorates her marriage into the Goldlin family in 1538. The original is now owned by the well-known German collectors Irene and Peter Ludwig.\textsuperscript{120}

When the \textit{Leuchterweibchen} was installed in the Swiss Room, it was modified for light bulbs at such a low wattage that it gave the illusion of

\textsuperscript{119}Salvadore, \textit{Italian Architecture, Furniture, and Interiors}, 183-5.

\textsuperscript{120} Gerhard Bott, ed., \textit{Ludwig's Lust: Die Sammlung Irene and Peter Ludwig}, (Munchen: Prestel Verlag, 1993).
candlelight. The light level was not only appropriate to the space, its effect was so successful first-time visitors found it "almost startling."\[121\]

These decisions regarding installation, furnishing, and lighting of the Swiss Room were carefully researched, and well-executed for the time. The contractor in charge of the process, James Todd, worked with the Lehmann and his associates to create a truly special environment. Equal care went into deciding how the space could best serve Yale and also be protected as an artifact. It was chosen to be a faculty space by the University Art Gallery because that use "implied careful and proper treatment, once the setting up was complete, and at the same time would allow visiting on the part of an interested public."\[122\]

Unlike the Swiss Room’s original owner, the Metropolitan Museum that exhibits artifacts and period rooms strictly as display items, Yale’s art gallery has two types of collections; those that are exhibited or stored in the protected environment of the university museum and those that are displayed and used throughout the campus. Part of this policy is to keep objects which have been donated by alumni of a college on display or in use within that college. The installation of the Swiss Room in Berkeley College solved the Gallery’s lack of exhibition space in a way which fit this tradition

\[121\] "The de Forest Rooms," 54.

\[122\] "The de Forest Rooms," 53.
and allowed the artifact to serve a functional, not just decorative purpose at Berkeley College.

Yale, however, is not a house museum. Once installed at Yale, even though ostensibly held by the Gallery, the Swiss Room entered the world of the new American private collector, who desired not only to possess artifacts, but to live in one. From the Du Ponts to ordinary citizens, Americans during the late 1920s and 1930s were being encouraged to create their own period rooms and live within its history.\textsuperscript{123} Already steeped in tradition with a campus that epitomized the value of historicity, this new attitude was well suited to Yale’s ideology.

An artifact in common use, especially one which is over 400 years old is difficult to protect. Users must be reminded to respect the artifact and its limitations. Over time the perception of the Swiss Room has changed from an artifact demanding respect to an old room that can be adapted to meet program requirements. This change has permitted activities once unthinkable to become commonplace. Decisions about the Swiss Room are no longer being made by its owner, the University Art Gallery, whose current staff is not even aware the Swiss Room existed, but by its user and trustee, Berkeley College, that is not aware of what the Swiss Room was or came from.

\textsuperscript{123} Stillinger, \textit{The Antiquers}, 227.
This shift in use and perception of ownership was ironically due to Berkeley College’s appreciation of the uniqueness of Swiss Room. By 1935 the space was already being used “for special dinners and meetings of the Fellows of the College and for undergraduates.” In the late 1950s early 1960s that use was extended to include regularly scheduled classes and meetings. Currently, most small, ceremonial gatherings for Berkeley students and the college Master are held there, as well as the more mundane gatherings such as the meetings for the student paper. Since its installation the space has held a significant place as a “special room” in the residential college and has contributed to the experience of Berkeley College for generations of faculty, alumni, and students.

The Fellow- and Master-sponsored events are having a nominal effect on the historic fabric now that food preparation activities have been removed from the room. The student use of the space, however, which is frequently accompanied by heavy drinking, is very detrimental. The house-keeping staff commonly observes smoking, the extinguishing of cigarettes and cigars on the floor, an excessive amount of alcoholic beverages and other liquids spilled on the floor and furnishings, the breakage of furniture, and abrasion to the walls. Besides the injury to the historic fabric this has also resulted in the destruction of approximately half the original chairs and damage to the tables.

124 Pruder, Berkeley College 1934-39, 34.
Some furniture substitutions have been made from other special Berkeley rooms, such as the library and dining hall which have similar but not identical furniture. (Figure E45) Two reproduction Gothic armchairs and a German provincial cabinet\textsuperscript{125} (Figure E46) have been moved up from the disbanded German library in the basement. A reproduction Queen Anne table and a long, metal folding table and several metal folding chairs were added to increase the seating capacity from twenty-five to thirty-three. This mixture of styles has the appearance of clutter.

Furthermore, a distinction between the two sections of the room is no longer made by discrete arrangements of furniture. Usually the long tables span both rooms and the small tables drift from one section to the other. The “new” cabinet and the original cupboard are no longer placed in an aesthetic or historic arrangement, but located where they can hide the most damaged portions of the walls. Overall the space has a look of neglect.

The gradual increase in use and subsequent wear and tear to the historic fabric was accompanied and perhaps directly affected by a change in the policy of managing the space, which became ultimately decided by the Master of Berkeley College, not the University Art Gallery. Instead of choosing uses compatible with the Swiss Room, a museum artifact, it was

\textsuperscript{125} The cabinet is almost certainly the property of the Yale University Art Gallery, but as of yet, no acquisition file can be found. It is very similar in color and floral motif to furniture still found in German-influenced areas of Switzerland, like Zurich.
decided to allow the Swiss Room, a college resource, to be adapted as its program changed.

This change in policy had a dramatic effect. One example is in regard to the lighting. The Swiss Room as created in the 1930s could not provide light levels sufficient for classroom use. When it was decided it would be used as a seminar space in the 1950s a second, German *Leuchterweibchen* (Figure E47) was moved from the south entryway and installed in the Engadine room and all four of the chandelier fixtures were rewired in an attempt to illuminate the room at a much higher light level. Besides dramatically changing the ambiance, the low ceiling and high, concentrated wattage created pockets of intense light at almost eye level. The result is a mixture of glare and dimness which is insufficient and uncomfortable. The increased heat from the lamps is also damaging the ceiling. (See Chapter V- Lighting.)

Additional changes in the 1960s included the installing of an air conditioning unit, the only one in Berkeley College, which was connected to the water pipes in an adjacent closet and vented through the west wall. The decision was made because the noise and traffic pollution from Elm Street, which the Swiss Room overlooks, made it undesirable to open the windows and the subsequent temperature of the room during the warmer months was uncomfortable. This alteration required removing four wall panels to museum storage and replacing them with oak reproductions inset with grills. (Figure B4) It also added to the room’s use in the summer, which was
previously almost none; the maintenance staff now use the room and the air conditioner during coffee breaks. These rapid heating and cooling cycles are not beneficial to wood interiors. (See Chapter V-Climate Control)

The interpretation and use of the Swiss Room, therefore, has come full circle. The room is now interpreted and used for what its elements were most likely originally intended, as both a ceremonial and a common space with their attendant celebratory and mundane activities. As such it is being deteriorating in the natural course of a room in a high-traffic area.

Now, while Berkeley College is undergoing such a large renovation and subsequently examining its holdings, and while the Swiss Room is still in reasonable though not stable condition, this is the optimum time for Berkeley College in conjunction with the University Art Gallery to make careful and informed decisions regarding the future of the Swiss Room. There are four specific questions that should be addressed. To whom does the room belong; is it part of Berkeley College or is it still the property of the Art Gallery? Second, who should maintain the Swiss Room and to what degree? It is currently is maintained by the regular house-keeping staff with the Master of Berkeley College making occasional special cleaning requests. Are their methods appropriate or should the University Art Gallery staff be involved? Third, how should the Swiss Room be used; is the owner making informed and deliberate decisions regarding the use of the space and that use’s long-term effects? Fourth, how should the space be interpreted? Should
the furniture return to a more rigid, but evocative arrangement or should it be flexible to accommodate multiple uses?

To assist the parties in making these decisions the following chapter more fully describes the existing condition of the Swiss Room, its current maintenance program as a function of its use, and several options, and their consequences, for both continuing the current program and use or implementing changes.
Chapter V

The Existing Condition and Future Maintenance of the Swiss Room

The following summary of existing conditions in the Swiss Room has been divided into its components of wood, interior stone, glazing and tile, with an additional sections on climate control, lighting, and furniture. Each section explains the current maintenance program as reported by housekeeping staff and provides a list of options and their consequences for both continuing the current maintenance plan and implementing select changes to it. No distinction has been made in this assessment between the Tirolean and Engadine sections.

The effects of the current and proposed maintenance options on the wood and masonry elements were derived primarily through interviews with a leading national conservator, Joseph Murphy of Irving and Casson, Co. which is based in Boston, Massachusetts. Irving and Casson was responsible for the installation of most new woodwork during the Yale building campaign in 1930-34, which included Berkeley College. The firm has also been involved with several recent wood refinishing campaigns at Yale including the Law School and Law Library.

126 For the location of specific conditions, see Appendix A, Figures 1-7.
Wooden Elements

CURRENT CONDITION. The shrinking and swelling of the wood paneling with the humidity and temperature fluctuations has caused some of the wooden elements to cup, warp, and crack. (See Climate Control.) The walls are also being damaged by abrasion, mainly from chair backs and tables which have created a distinct chair rail line around the perimeter. (Figure C4) There is also the detachment of the top layer of substrate where there has been significant insect activity. (Figure E48)

Insect infestation was at one time a serious concern. A large number of flight holes show that damage from wood borers was extensive in certain areas. As mentioned, abrasion continues to reveal weak areas where borers have tunneled away the substrate. There are also problems in a few of the Tirolean beams and the decorative molding attached to the central Engadine ceiling beam. The wood is currently too dry to support active infestation. This does not preclude a future problem, however.

The majority of wood has darkened considerably from its original color. This is due to the significant amount of soot and oils which have built up over time, primarily from cigar and cigarette smoking by students. (Figure E49). There are also areas which have been water damaged, such as portions of the Tirolean ceiling where an overhead pipe burst (Figure E50) and two
Tirolean wall panels which were damaged due to the long-term placement of a coffee maker. (Figure E51)

CURRENT MAINTENANCE. The cleaning staff reports that the room is cleaned approximately three times a year with Liquid Gold, an over-the-counter wood cleaning product.\(^{127}\) It has also been rubbed with “lemon oil” (turpentine) at least once in the past six months in an attempt to impart a glossy surface.\(^{128}\) These products have removed most of the protective coatings of wax and shellac originally on the surface. Both products also introduce a surface film to the wood which attracts dirt. The wood is not known to have been professionally cleaned, refinished, or restored since its installation.\(^{129}\)

RECOMMENDATIONS. Before any option is implemented the climate control (see Climate Control) and lighting issues (see Lighting) should be resolved and the wood allowed to acclimate to its new equilibrium.

\(^{127}\) Cleaning products are universal throughout the residential college.

\(^{128}\) This gave the wood a temporary reddish color, which has almost faded away.

\(^{129}\) Maintenance does report an unsuccessful attempt to wax some of the other woodwork in the residential college. Within a year the wax was said to have flaked off, a sign of the coating’s failure to bond with the substrate. This may be the result of a misapplication or the use of a poor quality wax, or it may be a sign that a cleaning product was used on the wood which contained silicates.

If the latter is the case, conservation options may be limited. Silicates penetrate through surface finishes into the wood itself. They significantly effect the performance of any other finish applied over them. Unfortunately a method does not yet exist to remove silicates through chemical means, even after the removal of all the undercoats. The only solution is to work with the silicate residue or sand the wood down to a clean level.
The current use and maintenance of the space is deteriorating the original fabric through smoke damage and abrasion. Furthermore, the current maintenance is acerbating the problem. The cleaning treatments, especially the “lemon oil” are removing the existing protective finish, which is primarily a wax mixture, making the wood more vulnerable to abrasion and moisture loss. They also leave a film on the surface which attracts dirt. If unchecked the wood will continue to lose its glossy appearance and become increasingly vulnerable to decay as the protective surface further degrades.

To stabilize the deterioration of the room a no-smoking policy should be implemented and strictly enforced. Only orderly gatherings should be permitted in the space and student events should be moved to a less fragile environment; eliminating high-impact use will greatly slow the material deterioration of the space. In addition, the routine cleaning of the wood by maintenance staff should be eliminated. They should be instructed to only dust the entire room, including the ceiling, monthly and wipe it down with a damp cloth once a year. This will remove the surface dirt and cobwebs, however the wood will not look clean.

Creating a clean, uniform, and protected surface would require, in addition to the above changes, engaging a team of professional conservators to thoroughly clean, repair, and refinish the wood. This process would include: examination by an exterminator familiar with historic buildings to determine whether insect damage is current and if so to treat the wood with a
low-water fumigation method; cleaning the wood on an inch-by-inch basis to remove the dirt without damaging the patina; decreasing the visibility of water- and insect-damaged through sanding, limited replacement, and/or staining to match existing; repairing the gaps in the paneling using a professional joiner; examining the insect-damaged beams for consolidation, if necessary; and installing a 1-1/2” x 1-1/2” molding stained to match existing to the top of the baseboard to prevent furniture from touching the wall. Once the repairs are complete the wood should be finished with at least two coats of preservative and three coats of protection, each formulated from traditional woodworking ingredients. No part of work should be attempted by nonprofessionals.

Once the wood has been thoroughly cleaned, repaired and refinished the monthly dusting and yearly wipe-down should be sufficient to keep the wood clean while retaining the surface gloss and protective coating, providing no smoking is permitted and the room is treated respectfully. The wood will not look new, but will be more uniform in appearance, and the existing scars will be much less visible. The new baseboard molding should prevent further damage from routine abrasion.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{130} Since the current new mechanical work will make the old air conditioning system obsolete, the reproduction panels with the air conditioning grills may be removed at this time and the original panels which are in museum storage reinstalled.

\textsuperscript{131} Monitor for effectiveness.
A word of warning: if the use patterns of the space are not changed, the benefits of a thorough restoration will be so short-term as to be neither cost effective nor contribute significantly to the life of the fabric. It is also not cost effective to implement the conservation program in stages as the room would need to be re-cleaned each time, the most important and costly portion of the program.

In fifty years the wood should be cleaned and refinished again.

Interior Stone

CURRENT CONDITION. The limestone appears to be in good condition with little or no lost material. Much of it, however is discolored through efflorescence (probably gypsum) with particulate inclusions and some ferrous staining. (Figure E52) Efflorescence occurs naturally on limestone in a moist climate, and is usually white. The dark color is captured dirt, probably from air pollution from when New Haven was a more industrial city. Limestone is self-cleaning and discoloration on exposed exterior stonework is usually washed away with rainfall. In protected or interior environments, however, it becomes a hard crust which is not easily removed.132 The ferrous staining is the rust from water infiltrating the windows, oxidizing the metal casements, and then migrating down onto the stone.

CURRENT MAINTENANCE. At the present time there is no current cleaning schedule for the interior stonework.

RECOMMENDATIONS. Since cleaning is purely an aesthetic decision, and the deposits are not harming the stone, the College could leave the stone as it is. If cleaning is desired it can be done with a 20% solution of muriatic acid and a hard bristle brush. Muriatic acid is the traditional method of cleaning stone, and is superior to modern commercial cleaners because it is less expensive, more effective, and more predictable. Because it is an acid, it does require wearing protective clothing during the cleaning process and unsupervised work may result in damage to the surrounding woodwork. While the stone will appear significantly cleaner it will not, however, return to its original pristine state.

Glazing

CURRENT CONDITION. The glazing is in a serious state of deterioration. Entire panels are bowing out, many of the cames are loose and the glass is no longer held securely. (Figure E53) This is partly due to the retrofitting of a plexiglass panel on the exterior of the casements which trapped a significant amount of heat between the two layers. Several of the roundels are also cracked. As the windows can be opened out over the street there is a great potential glass will fall out, possibly injuring someone.
RECOMMENDATIONS. The windows are in such poor condition remedial work is critical. There are two choices. First, the windows could be removed taking special care with the stained glass panels, and returned to the University Art Gallery. As part of the general rehabilitation of Berkeley the replacement windows being used in the rest of the college could be installed in the Swiss Room. As the casement size and shape of the Swiss Room windows are identical to the rest of the college, this is the least time-consuming option. However, it will greatly change the appearance of the room because the present windows are a dominant contributor to the character of the room.

A second choice is to remove the glazing and plexiglass shield from casements and hire a professional glass conservator to refabricate the windows duplicating the caming and roundel arrangements. This option will maintain historic character of the windows.

Tile Floor

CURRENT CONDITION. The ceramic tiles are currently coated with a protective layer of wax which is dirty and damaged by the extinguishing of cigars and cigarettes butts on the floor, and repeated alcohol spills. Fortunately, the tiles themselves are in excellent condition.
CURRENT MAINTENANCE. The floor is generally cleaned with an ammonia-based product on an as-needed basis, usually every week or after student functions. Because of the difficulty in maintaining a clean and intact finish free from dirt and ground ashes, the wax it is currently being stripped and dispensed with altogether. However, the wax coating has two functions. First, it provides a protection coating against stains and abrasion. Second, it gives the floor a glossy finish. Elimination of the protective finish will result in any damages to the floor being unsightly as well as permanent.

RECOMMENDATIONS. If this high-impact use continues to be permitted, the floor will remain difficult to maintain. This report recommends re-waxing the floor and continuing the weekly mopping schedule along with strictly enforcing a no-smoking policy. The space should be used only for orderly gatherings and most student events should be moved to a more durable environment. Presumably the reduction in use will lower the dirt level and the floor will appear cleaner and maintain its gloss longer, and the wax surface will be much easier to maintain allowing the floor to be re-waxed between strippings.

Climate Control

CURRENT CONDITION. Moisture readings taken in August and December show that the moisture levels in the woodwork of the Swiss Room drop from
10-15% in the summer to less than 5% in the fall and winter while the average temperature remains at about 72 degrees. This seasonal change in moisture content is caused by ventilating the room in summer with humid outside air and in winter with dry air from the radiators. Certain areas of the room are also affected by the lighting design. (See Lighting.) At moisture levels over 20% wood becomes vulnerable to fungi and insect attack, and below 4% it begins to degrade at the cellular level. The optimum target moisture content for wood is 8%, which although can be reached at an infinite number of temperature/humidity combinations, does not occur naturally in the Swiss Room.

Though the average temperature remains constant throughout the year the room can experience short, rapid cooling periods during sporadic air conditioner use in the summer and while windows are left open in the winter to ventilate the space after functions. This is followed by a rapid return to the ambient temperature. The wood, therefore, is constantly expanding and contracting to respond to these changes which has caused it to shrink, warp, cup, and crack.

CURRENT MAINTENANCE. There is no current method to ensure constant temperature or humidity levels. Air conditioning is often turned on at high levels to quickly cool the space for functions and during breaks taken by maintenance staff. Heating is controlled by a thermostat located within the
room and is turned down by the maintenance staff when the room is not in use.

RECOMMENDATIONS. If the room is thoroughly refinished, this will lessen the effect of the heating and cooling cycles by adding a protective coating to the wood which will help keep moisture levels constant. Additional protective measures could include installing a locked thermostat timer for the air conditioner to limit maintenance staff access, and strictly enforcing a no-smoking policy. Limiting access to the controls will greatly reduce the rapid and most damaging fluctuations in temperature which occur during the staff coffee breaks in the summer. The room is rarely used otherwise in the summer months. Special events should be planned for in advance in order to make timely changes to the cooling schedule. The elimination of smoking will greatly reduce the need to air the room in the winter, thereby lessening temperature fluctuations in the colder months.

In addition to the above changes a humidification system could be added to maintain the proper moisture level in the air. This would ensure more stable moisture levels and have long-term benefits for the life of the wood. Once installed the system will require monitoring and probably readjustment every month for at least a year to ensure the proper humidity levels are being daily and seasonably achieved.
Lighting

CURRENT CONDITION. When the chandeliers were rewired to produce much higher light levels, the significant increase in power was accompanied by an equal increase in the heat from the lamps. This creates rapid, local drying cycles in the wooden ceiling. When the lights are on, the heat generated lowers the local relative humidity, and the wood around the chandelier areas loses moisture much more rapidly than adjacent portions of the same element. When the lights are shut off, the room returns to equilibrium. As a result of this differential drying, many cracks have developed around chandelier areas. The largest cracks are in the panels and beams closest to the bulbs, but in some instances they radiate along the entire length of the member. Monitoring of the cracks from August to March has shown the cracks to be stable. The wood around the lamps, however, read below 6% in moisture content on a hygrometer. This condition is accelerating the deterioration of the beams.

RECOMMENDATIONS. One solution is to return the room to its original low light level by decreasing the wattage of the bulbs in the chandeliers. This would greatly eliminate the damage of the beams from heat, and also probably result in also limiting the room’s general use during the evenings and overcast days.
A second choice is to lower the existing wattage but introduce other fixtures to maintain overall light levels. A more disbursed lighting source would improve optical conditions. A lighting plan which illuminates the entire space would provide additional flexibility for use of the space. Adding fixtures would most likely involve cutting into the original fabric.

A third option would be to rewire the existing and any new fixtures with a fiber optics system. Fiber optics produces much less heat than incandescent bulbs. This new system could be attached to a dimmer to provide variable light levels.

Any lighting plan should include the removal of the German Leuchterweibchen in the Tirolean room It is too large for the ceiling height and is knocked into by many of the taller visitors. Its sharp staghorns are only slightly higher than eye level and should be considered a hazard.

Furnishings

CURRENT CONDITION. There are currently five different styles of chairs in four colors of upholstery and four different styles of tables in two colors of stain in the Swiss Room. The original chairs include two sets of arm chairs upholstered in orange leather, and those substituted from other special rooms are side chairs upholstered in various shades of yellow, brown, and orange. Almost all of the chairs have damaged upholstery and missing upholstery
tacks. The large trestle table is in relatively good condition with some scars, except that the wood is cracked along the ends. Both of the smaller tables are unstable and the tops are nearly detached from the bases. Housekeeping reports that damage occurs on a regular basis.

In regard to the special furnishings, the painted cabinet is in good condition, however, the cupboard which has been used as a buffet table, is in an advanced state of disrepair. Many of the ornaments are loose or have broken off and the top is almost fully detached. (Figure E54)

CURRENT MAINTENANCE. The furniture is dusted regularly and replaced as needed.

RECOMMENDATIONS. While not in pristine condition, the furniture is still serviceable. It can continue to be replaced as needed, but this will eventually affect seating capacity in the areas from which substitutions are made.

Some furniture is not suitable for Master-sponsored events. For example, the damaged cupboard should be sent to the Art Gallery for repair and a substitute found. The tables should also be repaired and the chairs reupholstered or substituted with those in better condition from the Dining Hall. However, without the implementation of a new use policy for the Swiss Room any repairs or refurbishment of the Swiss Room furnishings will only have a temporary effect.

If a new, low-impact use plan were adopted, the following furnishing plan could be implemented. Remove the damage cupboard to the Art Gallery
for repair and the return it to the Swiss Room. Repair the tables, reupholster and repair the damaged original armchairs, and commission replicas to complete the original set of twenty-five. Returned all substitute chairs to their original locations. Continue to incorporate additional pieces of special furniture as befitting a Swiss Gothic interior.

Returning the room to its original Yale design scheme will preserve a distinction between the Tirolean and Engadine portions of the room. As a benefit to preserving the Swiss Room, this furniture arrangement does not permit for larger seminars, and it also limits the number of occupants at any one time.

Alternatively, the chairs and tables can be replaced with a uniform Gothic design. Uniform furniture will allow for more flexible arrangements. However, there would no longer be a distinction the Tirolean and Engadine portions of the room.
Chapter VI.

Conclusion

The Swiss Room was donated the Yale University Art Gallery by the president of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and 1870 Yale alumni, Robert W. De Forest shortly before his death in 1929. He in turn had purchased it from an artist in Munich through an intermediate dealer, Hans Lehmann, director of the Swiss National Museum in Zurich. The room, which was actually two interiors from different regions separated by a party wall, was originally intended to be exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum as a period room representative of the Gothic style. When viewed by the curatorial staff, however, it was rejected by the Metropolitan for its lack of “archeological accuracy,” and subsequently presented to the Yale University Art Gallery.

There, lack of exhibition space did not allow the room to be installed as part of the museum. Consequently an off-site location was found at Berkeley College, which was then under construction. The room became a faculty lounge and quickly became a well-used and much-loved room by Berkeley faculty and students.

The Swiss Room was never fully researched by the Metropolitan Museum and only limited documentation exists as to its history before its installation at Yale. A comparative analysis of the elements of the Swiss
Room to other extant Swiss interiors suggests first, the majority of the interior is almost certainly made up of elements from the Engadine and the Tirol as thought, but also incorporates elements common elsewhere in Switzerland and possibly Germany. Second, it is probable that neither portion of the Swiss Room is complete, but rather compiled from one wall system and three ceiling systems, one of which (the Engadine section) dates from the 19th century. Finally, despite these problems the room incorporates valuable individual elements such a Romansch inscription.

The Swiss Room’s greatest value, perhaps, is its status as a cultural icon at Berkeley College. Its active participation in the academic life of Berkeley College, however, has exacted a toll on the fabric of the room. Decisions need to be made by the University Art Gallery in conjunction with Berkeley College regarding the future use and continued maintenance of the Swiss Room. This report recommends implementing the following changes for the maximum lifespan of the historic fabric and for the most appropriate interpretation of the Swiss Room given its history and importance to Berkeley College. Restrict the use of the Swiss Room to small, faculty-sponsored events and enforce a no-smoking policy. Professionally refinish the woodwork using traditional methods and restore the windows. Implement a low maintenance program to only include dusting and wiping-down the walls, and mopping and re-waxing the floors. Install a locked thermostat with a programmable timer. Maintain a distinction between the
Tirolean and Engadine sections by reinstituting the original furniture design and layout, and finally, remove the German *Leuchterweibchen* and reduce the wattage in the chandeliers to their original level.

It should be stressed that these recommendations are not the only possible solutions, however lack of any action will lead to a predictable path of entropy and the eventual demolition of the Swiss Room.
Appendix A

Swiss Room General Views
Appendix A
Figure A1. The Swiss Room looking east from the Tirolean Section
Figure A2. The Swiss Room looking east at the Engadine section.
Figure A3. The Swiss Room looking south at the Engadine wall.
Figure A4. The Swiss Room looking west at the Tirolean wall. Note the chair rail line worn into the paneling. (See page 55.)
Figure A5. The Swiss Room looking west from the Engadine section.
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Swiss Room Plans and Elevations
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NOTE: ALL EXG. FURNISHINGS AND PAINTINGS TO BE REMOVED AND STORED BY THE UNIVERSITY ART GALLERY.

Figure B2.

82
Figure B3.
Figure B4.

84
EAST ELEVATION/SECTION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Figure B6.
SOUTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Figure B8.
Appendix C

Maps
Figure A1. Map of the Engadine and Tirolean Regions

Figure A2. Map of Referenced Sites
Appendix D

Examples of Swiss Interiors
Figure D1. Domestic interior from Chur circa 1460. Note the lack of moldings in conjunction with the blind frieze construction. (See page 32.) Also note the juxtaposition of two frieze motifs. (See page 33.) Note how panel and blind frieze wall construction meets at a single corner post. (See page 34.)
Figure D2. Reception room of the Abbess of Fraumünster Abbey in Zurich. 1489.
Figure D3. Abbott’s room from St. Johann’s Cloister in Schaffhausen. 1500. Note simplicity of the interior. (See page 29.) Note the wide plank flooring. (See page 33.) Note the extensive use of a decorative ski motif on along beams to create a beveled edge. (See page 34.)
Gotische Bündnerstube um 1460 (Haus Brandis in Chur)
Glashäuschrank L. M. Z. (jetzt Renaissance-Buttel) > Bündnertruhe L. M. Z.

Figure D1. Domestic interior from St. Gallen circa 1500. Note the wide plank flooring. (See page 32.)
Figure D5. Monastic anteroom from Chur circa 1520. Note the coats of arms infilling the Gothic blind frieze. (See page 35.) Also note the use of blind friezes for both wall and ceiling construction. (See page 36.) Note the placement of moldings on the underside of the heavy timbers clearly visible from below. The ceiling is approximately 15' high. (See page 39.)
Figure D6. Domestic interior from Flims. 1528. Note the wide plank flooring. (See page 33.) Also note the door surround detail which tapers off to a level flush with the high baseboard. (See page 37.)
Figure D7. Domestic interior from Savognin circa 1570. Not the placement of the molding along the perimeter the same plane as the battens. Note the mixture of similar moldings used throughout the interior. (See page 31.) Note the wide plank flooring. (See page 33.)
Figure D8. Winter room from Wiggen Castle, Rorschach.1582. Note the expert joinery of paneled walls (see page 29)
Figure D9. Domestic interior from Chiavenna, Italy. 1585
Figure D10. Rathaus from Zurich. 1610. Note ornate carving of interior woodwork. (See page 28.)
Figure D11. Domestic interior from Tarasp Castle. 1680
Appendix E.

Details
Figure E1. Swiss Room looking south along the 1930s heating chase. (See page 26.)
Figure E2. Swiss Room. Detail of 1930s column carved to match original motifs and stained with a red aniline dye used in the Berkeley Dining Hall. (See page 26.)
Figure E3. Swiss Room looking east at bay window comprised of old glass roundels and inset with glass panels. (See page 27.)
Figure E4. Swiss Room. Detail of the east Tirolean wall. Note the inappropriately placed molding overlaying the blind frieze. (See page 32.)
**Figure E5.** Swiss Room. Detail of north Engadine wall. Note the inappropriate separation of the moldings and batten by the wall plate. Also note the joint between the original molding on the right and the 1930s infill on the left. (See page 32.)
Figure E6. Swiss ceiling. Note the wider transverse molding and the thinner perimeter molding with related designs. (See page 32.)
Figure E7. Swiss Room. Detail of Tirolean north wall. Note traces of gold paint remaining in the recesses of the carved relief of the molding. (See page 32.)
Figure E8. Swiss Room. Detail of westernmost section of the south Engadine wall. Note “sword” motif carved into the ceiling joists and rope molding carved along the edge of the rafter plate. Also note joists mortised into plate. (See page 33.)
Figure E9. Swiss Room. Detail of west corner of the north Tirolecan wall. Note carved rosette. Compare with Figure E11. (See page 33.)
Figure E10. Swiss Room. Detail of Tirolean ceiling. Note rosettes carved into joists. Compare with Figure E11. (See page 33.)
Figure Ell. Detail of Gothic carvings found in a church near Bolzano, Italy. (See page 34.)
Figure E12. Swiss Room. Detail of the northeast corner of Tirolean section. Note variety of “ski” motifs carved into the corner posts. (See page 34.) Also note the significant amount of dirt on door surround to the left. (See page 56.)
Figure E13. Detail of a column in the armory at Lucerne circa 1500. Note simple “ski” motif. (See page 34.)
Figure E14. Swiss Room. Detail of the southern portion of the Tiroleean ceiling. Note repetitive placement of a random series of carvings. (See page 35.)
Figure E15. Swiss Room. Detail of the west Tirolean wall. Note “tablet’s of God” motif on the blind friezes. (Page 37.) Also note the juxtaposition of a molding with a botanical design on the left with a molding having a more abstract pattern on the right. (See page 32.)
Figure E16. Swiss Room. Detail of the east Tirolean wall. Note the more elaborate botanical motif filling in most of the plane of the blind frieze. (See page 34.)
Figure E17. Corner detail of a room in the Fraumünster Abbey in Zurich circa 1490. Note the multiple decorative elements on distinct planes meeting flush at the corner. (See page 35.)
Figure E18. Swiss Room. Detail of the northeast corner of the Tirolean section. Note the complicated juxtaposition of decorative elements and structural members. (See page 35.)
Figure E19. Swiss Room. Detail of the north Tirolean wall. Note the large, regularly placed studs used to hold the battens, friezes, and panels together. (See page 36.)
Figure E20. Swiss ceiling circa 1500 installed at the Swiss National Museum. Note the use of large, regularly spaced studs to affix batten and panelled ceiling to substrate. (See page 36.)
Figure E21. Swiss Room. West wall and northwest corner of the Tirolean section. Note how the blind frieze and panel construction meets at two corner posts of varying sizes while the ceiling springs from one small beam. (See page 37.)
Figure E22. Swiss Room. Exit. Note trapezoidal shape of door surround and the rope molding detail which tapers off approximately 2' from the floor. (See page 37.)
Figure E23. Swiss Room. Detail of the hinge on non-functioning door on the western section of the south Engadine wall. (See page 38.)
Figure E24. Swiss Room. Detail of the exterior hinge and keyhole plate on the entrance door. (See page 38.)
Figure E25. Double dragon hinge circa 1580. (See page 38.)
Figure E26. Swiss Room. Detail of latch and keyhole plate on the interior of the entrance door. Note multiple generations of attachments. Compare overall shape to Figure E27 and lock ornament to Figure 28. (See page 38.)
Figure E27. Keyhole plates from a Gothic church near Bolzano. Compare overall shape to E26. (See page 38.)

Figure E28. Lock ornament circa 1400-1420. Compare to lock ornament on keyhole plate in Figure E26. (See page 131)
Figure E29. Swiss Room. Detail of latch and keyhole plate on the non-functioning door on the western section of the Engadine wall. Note multiple generations of attachments. Compare overall shape to Figure E30 and lock ornament to Figure E31. (See page 38.)
Figure E30. Keyhole plates from a Gothic church near Bolzano. Compare overall shape to E29. (See page 38.)

Figure E31. Lock ornament circa 1400-1420. Compare to lock ornament on keyhole plate in Figure E29. (See page 133.)
Figure E32. Swiss Room. Detail of lock on china closet door on the east wall of the Tirolean section. Note multiple generations of attachments. (See page 38.)
Figure E33. Swiss Room. Southwest corner of the Engadine section. Note modern coffered ceiling juxtaposed with exposed central heavy timber ceiling support overlaid with an Engadine molding. Also note exposed heavy timber wall plate with overlaid Romansch inscription. (See page 39.)
Figure E34. Swiss Room. Detail of the north wall of the Engadine section. Note Romansch inscription. Also note molding on the underside of the same timber (See page 39.)
Figure E35. Swiss Room. Alpine stove in northeast corner of the Engadine portion looking east. (See page 40.)
Figure E36. Tile stove built by Martin Knüsal in Lucerne. 1566. Note multi-colored faience. (See page 41.)
Figure E37. Swiss Room. Alpine stove in northeast corner of the Engadine portion looking north. Note square base and circular chimney. (See page 41.)
Figure E38. Swiss Room. Detail of the Alpine stove. Note subtle differences in the pattern in the base of the conical tiles. Also note the “cupid” motif at the top of the chimney. Compare to E40. (See page 41.)
Figure E39. Stove from the Fraumünster Abbey, Zurich circa 1500. Note elevated position, side steps and highly decorative green-glazed tiles. (See page 41.)
Figure E40. Detail of E39. Compare “cupid” motif to E38. (See page 41.)
Figure E41. Original condition of 17th century German cupboard installed the Swiss Room. Compare to E54. (See page 47.)
Figure E42. Swiss Room. One of the two pendant light fixtures hung in the bay windows. (See page 47.)
Figure E43. Swiss Room. One of three sconces installed throughout the Tirolean and Engadine portions. (See page 49.)
Figure E44. Swiss Room. Reproduction leuchterweibchen installed in the Engadine portion. (See page 48.)
Figure E45. Swiss Room. Upper photograph is one of the original Engadine table and chairs. In the lower photograph the armchair on the left is one of the original Tirolean set of eighteen and the side chair on the right is and example of the substitution chairs. (See page 52.)
Figure E46. Swiss Room. German provincial cabinet moved up from the defunct German library. (See page 52.)
Figure E47. Swiss Room. Second reproduction leuchterweibchen (German) installed in the Tirolean portion. (See page 53.)
Figure E48. Swiss Room. East wall of Tirolean portion. Note abraded surface of panelling revealing wood borer damage, especially on the lower portion of the corner posts and the full length of the right corner. (See page 57.)
Figure E49. Swiss Room. Eastern portion of the south Engadine wall. Note smoke damage. (See page 57.)
Figure E50. Swiss Room. Ceiling of bay window looking east. Note water damage from burst pipe. (See page 57.)
Figure E51. Swiss Room. The two westernmost panels of the north Tirolean wall. Note water damage due to the long-term placement of a coffee maker. (See page 58.)
Figure E51. Swiss Room. East portion of the bay window stone surrounds. Note staining. (See page 61.)
Figure E53. Swiss Room. Second easternmost lite in bay window. Note cracked roundels and broken cames. (See page 62.)
Figure E54. Existing condition of 17th century German cupboard. Note loss of most of the applied ornament. Compare to E41. (See page 69.)
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