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After the First World War, the United States was seized with a renewed interest in the nation’s early history, fueling the creation of museums and archives that sought to document early American life. Photographer Frances Benjamin Johnston created an extensive pictorial archive of early American buildings known as the Carnegie Survey of Architecture of the South. Unlike the work of many of her contemporaries, Johnston’s archive has fallen into obscurity. Although the Carnegie Survey was exhibited and praised during Johnston’s lifetime as a precious resource for future generations, it is now widely unknown and largely inaccessible. This important archive rivals the early work of the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Farm Security Administration. Johnston traveled through Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, DC and took 7,248 negatives of pre-Victorian buildings. Nearly 3,000 of these photographs were taken in Virginia.

Johnston’s archive was built on a systematic, research-based model that consulted old maps, land deeds, and other primary records. The specific methodology used to construct the Carnegie Survey makes it valuable for a variety of modern applications. Studies of regionalism and vernacular architecture will benefit from the inclusion of Johnston’s fieldwork photographs. Johnston’s survey method led to the creation of intense regional concentrations of photographs grouped by county. Johnston’s interest in common place structures led to the documentation of an unusually large number of vernacular buildings and agricultural outbuildings. Corncribs are depicted with the same documentary respect given to mansions. The pictorial archive is a rich source of primary material for use in
the developing technological fields of digital history, virtual reality, and computer-aided building recreations. Johnston’s archive is a lost treasure still within our grasp.
REEVALUATING THE CARNEGIE SURVEY:
NEW USES FOR FRANCES BENJAMIN JOHNSTON'S
PICTORIAL ARCHIVE
INTRODUCTION

After the First World War, the United States was seized with a renewed interest in the nation’s early history. This movement continued well into the Great Depression, fueling the creation of museums and archives that sought to document early American life. This documentary impulse also spread to projects addressing modern-day issues, such as the work of the Farm Security Administration photographers for Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal program. Feverishly active in this time period was Frances Benjamin Johnston (1864-1952), who designed and created an extensive photographic archive of early American buildings known as the Carnegie Survey of Architecture of the South. Unlike the work of many of her contemporaries, Johnston’s archive has fallen into obscurity. Although the Carnegie Survey was exhibited and praised during Johnston’s lifetime as a precious resource for future generations, it is now widely unknown and largely inaccessible. This important archive rivals the early work of the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Farm Security Administration photographs of Walker Evans. The history of how Johnston brought her idea of a pictorial building archive into reality is one of the great stories of creativity and perseverance during the Depression. Most relevant for current scholars, the specific methodology used to
construct the Carnegie Survey makes it valuable for a variety of modern applications. Johnston’s archive is a lost treasure still within our grasp.

A nationally known photographer since 1890, Johnston’s illustrious career included photography of six successive presidential administrations, portraits of notables such as Mark Twain, architectural commissions for McKim, Mead, and White and other firms, submissions to international expositions, garden photography, and extensive magazine work. For the last years of her life Johnston worked to document the buildings of early America, organizing and completing the Carnegie Survey for the Library of Congress. Many Americans are familiar with the ongoing Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), but few are aware that the Carnegie Survey predated it. The dimensions of the Carnegie Survey are vast. Johnston traveled through Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, DC and took 7,248 negatives of pre-Victorian buildings. Nearly 3,000 of these photographs were taken in Virginia, the first state Johnston surveyed and the site of the earliest permanent English settlement on the Atlantic coast. Johnston photographed historic structures in 65 Virginia counties, visiting nearly all of the early settlement areas and tracing established migration patterns.

The methodology Johnston used to create the Carnegie Survey was very different from many of her contemporaries. A popular style in that time period was the atmospheric, sentimental depiction of old buildings, visible in the work of Wallace Nutting and Henry Forman. Johnston’s archive was built on a systematic, research-based model that derived a fieldwork travel itinerary through the consultation of old maps, land deeds, and other primary records. The data supporting a photograph was important to
Johnston, and she dedicated a significant amount of time to preparatory research. Johnston also worked closely with a number of prominent architects including Thomas Tileston Waterman, Milton Grigg, and Edmund Campbell. Together they engaged in an active professional partnership that included collaboration in scholarly publications, shared fieldwork trips, and the exchange of expertise. Johnston’s photographs illustrated many of their books, and in recognition of her architectural contributions, the American Institute of Architects inducted her as an honorary member in 1945.

Johnston composed the photographs using a standardized system that captured the maximum amount of information at a site. Building exteriors were photographed from consistent angles with clear, in-focus compositions that captured architectural details and surrounding landscape. Interior photographs documented features such as paneling, mantels, plasterwork, staircases and doorways. When the series of photographs taken at a site is seen together, the group of images leads viewers systematically through the spaces of early Americans in a logical, comprehensive manner. Johnston’s survey techniques led to the creation of intense regional concentrations of photographs. The photographs are grouped by county and document regional microcosms of early building types and the transmission of forms through migration. Johnston’s interest in common place structures led to the documentation of an unusually high number of vernacular buildings and agricultural outbuildings. Corncobs are depicted with the same documentary respect given to mansions. The Carnegie Survey is a rich untapped resource that could support a host of modern applications in a variety of fields, including studies of regionalism, vernacular architecture, and as primary material for recent technical innovations such as
virtual reality building recreation. Many great treasures must languish for years before their true value is recognized. It is time to rediscover Johnston’s archive.

Fig. 1 Johnston in the field
CHAPTER I
CULTURAL CONTEXT

Johnston had an eager audience for her photographs, for American society in the 1920s and 30s was fascinated with the past. Rapid urbanization and modernization led to increased social isolation and the carnage of World War I sparked widespread feelings of nihilism and despair. Faced with a dark present, Americans looked back to their roots for comforting myths of a simpler time when virtuous farmers populated the United States. This veneration of the nameless “common man” was a source of solace for many Americans, and it fostered a renewed interest in early material culture. In 1918 the critic Van wyck Brooks wrote, “The spiritual welfare of this country depends altogether on the fate of its creative minds…. The present is a void, and the American writer floats in that void…. Discover, invent a usable past we certainly can…. The past is an inexhaustible storehouse of apt attitudes and adaptable ideals.”¹ Many artists began to mine the objects of the past for creative inspiration.

The reevaluation of the American heritage became a cultural phenomenon that fueled a generation of collectors of early American artifacts. In addition to encouraging

an emotional connection to early Americans, this cultural trend supported a variety of serious documentary surveys. Leading many of these surveys were individuals who wished to preserve records of America’s past that were endangered by the destructive development of modernization. Their goal was to amass scientifically ordered archives for future generations before the primary resources were lost. Henry Mercer collected over 50,000 objects that documented the “lives and tasks of early Americans through the tools that met their needs and wants prior to the Industrial Revolution.” He established the Mercer Museum in Doylestown, Pennsylvania to exhibit the collection. Nina Fletcher Little and her husband Bertram amassed an extensive collection of folk art and Americana, which they wrote about in periodicals such as The Magazine Antiques and later catalogued in publications such as Little by Little: Six Decades of Collecting American Decorative Arts and Country Arts in Early American Homes.

A federally sponsored documentary project was the Index of American Design, part of Roosevelt’s New Deal Program. Artists were paid to produce over 18,000 highly detailed watercolor renderings of objects considered “American Design,” which included such varied items as quilts, gates, cigar store figures, tools, ceramics, and furniture. The directors of the Index repeatedly invoked Van wyck Brook’s statement when describing the purpose of the project.

---

Just as Brooks instructed Americans to look to the past for artistic inspiration, many in this time period saw parallels between the folk objects and the forms of modern art. Folk/modern became an aesthetic duality, one that combined old and new in a culturally rich hybrid. Of the individuals actively involved with both folk and modern art, one of the most prominent was Abby Aldrich Rockefeller. Instrumental in the founding of the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA), Rockefeller actively championed modern and folk art through her involvement at MOMA, philanthropy, and collecting. One of MOMA’s early exhibitions was “American Folk Art—The Art of the Common Man in America, 1750-1900.” The exhibition catalog, written by folk art expert Holger Cahill states, “The work of these men [and women] is folk art because it is the expression of the common people, made by them and intended for their use and enjoyment.... it has little to do with the fashionable art of its period....” Rockefeller’s personal folk art collection became the core of another museum, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation’s Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Folk Art Museum, established by her husband in 1952.

Biographer Bernice Kent, author of *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*, describes the shared taste for folk and modern art common among Rockefeller’s peers: “She saw the relationship between contemporary art and the simplified shapes, arbitrary perspective, and bold colors of folk art. From the modern artist’s viewpoint, this was a decided departure from the highly ‘realistic’ coloration of representational art of previous years. For those artists adventurous enough to break from the academic tradition... [folk art] could legitimize their own experimentation.”

---

6 Ibid., 322.
7 Ibid., 323.
A major public works project that drew on these attitudes to create a new body of artistic work was the photography office of the Farm Security Administration-Resettlement Administration. A small team of photographers led by Roy Stryker, the stated mission of the office was to document the effect of New Deal relief programs. Instead, the project became a massive documentary exploration of the American people, their folkways, local traditions, and resiliency in the face of the Great Depression.\(^8\) The FSA photographs, as they are commonly known, are most useful as records of the United States in the 1930s, which reflects the photographers’ concern for America’s present and future. For them, the past was a creative springboard that could help guide future development.

Several FSA photographers actively exhibited an interest in the dual folk/modern aesthetic. Walker Evans collected signs as folk art and often included signs, commercial paintings, and buildings in his photographs.\(^9\) Judith Keller writes in the introduction to *Walker Evans: Signs*, “His preoccupation with signs extended beyond the graphic elements and significant texts they might provide. He admired signs as objects, he collected them (whether from street corners or antiques shops), and, in the early 1970s—well before Post-modernism had arrived—he exhibited signs, sometimes next to his own photographic representations of them.”\(^10\) Folk objects and buildings are aesthetic inspirations for Evans’ modern sensibilities, not worth documenting solely for their own merit. His compositions are highly formal and stylized rather than rendered in a journalistic documentary manner. The carefully composed abstract shapes reveal Evan’s

---


interest in folk forms as they related to the similar forms of modern art. Biographer Belinda Rathbone writes, “like the subject matter of his photographs, Evans’ selection of these objects endowed them with an aura that transcended their original purpose or content. ‘The point is,’ as he explained in a wall label, ‘that this lifting is, in the raw, exactly what the photographer is doing with his machine, the camera, anyway, always.’”11 FSA affiliated photographer and painter Ben Shahn shared Evans’ fascination with hand-painted folk signs, often devoting an entire photograph to a single sign.12

Johnston was certainly not the only person photographing buildings in this time period. Berenice Abbot documented the modern New York cityscape, and Margaret Bourke-White photographed elegant compositions of industrial mass-production inside factories.13 Johnston commented on Bourke-White’s photography in an interview, contrasting the complicated angles of her photographs to Johnston’s straightforward compositions with the statement, “I leave the trick angles to Margaret Bourke-White and the surrealism to Salvador Dali.”14

The artist Charles Sheeler is best known for his photographs and paintings of the Ford Motor Company Plant at River Rouge. Much of Sheeler’s work involves industrial architecture, but like Walker Evans, he was inspired by the similarity of folk and modern architecture.

---

forms. With the help of Henry Mercer, Sheeler rented a colonial house in Doylestown, Pennsylvania as a weekend residence. While in Pennsylvania Sheeler would visit Mercer’s museum and study the contents of the collection. Sheeler collected folk objects himself, especially items made by the Shaker community, explaining, “I don’t like these things because they are old but in spite of it…. I’d like them still better if they were made yesterday because then they would afford proof that the same kind of creative power is continuing.” He included the house and his collected objects in photographs and paintings such as Americana. Charles Brock, author of Charles Sheeler: Across Media, notes, “The Buck’s County librarian who in 1908 produced the detailed description of the Doylestown house wanted to document the actual structure. In 1917 Sheeler’s primary aim was to select elements of the house and arrange them, using various strategies and techniques, for the purpose of creating compelling works of art.”

---

16 Sims, Charles Sheeler, 3.
17 Friedman, Charles Sheeler, 20.
19 Brock, Charles Sheeler, 33.
It is important to note that Johnston was of an entirely different generation from Evans, Sheeler, Bourke-White, and most of the well-known photographers from the 1930s. When the stock market collapsed in 1929, Johnston was 65. By the time she finished the bulk of her Virginia photography for the Carnegie Survey, she was 71. A comparable figure in the photographic world of Johnston’s generation was Alfred Steiglitz, whom she knew and corresponded with on occasion. Johnston entered the photographic scene very early in its development. Her first camera was a newly developed Kodak from George Eastman. Johnston participated in the refinement of the Kodak design through her frequent correspondence with Eastman critiquing features that needed improvement and offering suggestions.\textsuperscript{20} Thus, when Johnston began pursuing opportunities to bring about the Carnegie Survey, she was not an unknown woman with a

camera, but photographic royalty with a professional reputation and forty years of experience.

A simultaneous popular cultural movement was the Colonial Revival. Instead of the "common man" that Holger Cahill and other folk art collectors celebrated, participants in the Colonial Revival were more interested in the "great men" of America’s colonial period. The largely reverential attitude of the Colonial Revival, first made widely popular during the 1876 Centennial celebrations, expressed nationalistic, anti-modern ideals through adoption of the material culture of colonial America. The former minister Wallace Nutting became one of the most prominent figures in the Colonial Revival. Nutting took sentimental photographs of colonial era houses and staged interiors, which he published in books such as *Virginia Beautiful* and transformed into a successful business selling prints and hand-colored illustrations. He also opened a furniture factory that reproduced early American designs such as Windsor chairs.¹¹ Thomas Andrew Denenberg, author of *Wallace Nutting and the Invention of Old America*, writes that Nutting offered a

... soothing, idealized American history—a golden-age past that played well in an era of staggering social change. Not only did such individual purchases as a hand-tinted photograph, a reproduction Windsor chair, an illustrated book, or a chest of drawers just like Grandmother’s take on added value as the conditions of life in the machine age provoked discomfort and discord, but the package of interconnected images, texts, and consumer experiences provided a complete antimodern ideology for the beleaguered middle class.²²

Many newly constructed homes in this era were built in an impressionistic pastiche of colonial forms that became known as the Colonial Revival style. The focus of the

---

Colonial Revival movement manifested a particular concern for buildings and the physical experience of the colonial era. Colonial buildings were moved, rebuilt, or installed inside museums. A number of historical recreations or building assemblages were established, including Greenfield Village, Historic Deerfield, The Sherburne, and Colonial Williamsburg. The period rooms at the Metropolitan Museum debuted in 1926, exhibits of woodwork and furniture that had been extracted from historic houses to install within the museum space. Visitors could walk through a disjointed interior landscape of rooms that spanned centuries and cultures. While this practice is now unpopular, those at the time saw themselves as saving the architectural material and making it accessible to the public.

Museums were established for a variety of different reasons. Electra Havermeyer Webb described the creation of the Sherburne Museum in Vermont, a massive grouping of relocated houses filled with early American objects, as a fusion of her interest in folk objects with her husband’s interest in old buildings. For some, the Colonial Revival was the expression of patriotic sentiment or feelings of guilt about the destructive nature of modernity. These museums often functioned as mausoleums for a lost society. In 1926 W.A.R. Goodwin and John D. Rockefeller began taking steps to restore Williamsburg, Virginia to its colonial appearance. In the article “The Multistoried House: Twentieth-Century Encounters with the Domestic Architecture of Colonial Virginia,” architectural historian Camille Wells characterizes the early work at Colonial

---


Williamsburg as more scholarly than other contemporary institutions, with employees absorbing a “concern for historical accuracy from the copious documentary research.”

Johnston worked closely with the architects at Colonial Williamsburg, especially Thomas Tileston Waterman. Wells notes key differences between Waterman and his colleague Henry Chandlee Forman, then chief architect for the National Park Service. Forman “like Waterman... performed his own fieldwork and made numerous sketches of the structures that interested him. Unlike Waterman, whose drafting style was crisp and clinical, Forman favored freehand representations in a quaint style that articulated his emotional involvement with the houses he examined.”

While aspects of the work of Waterman, Milton Grigg, and others involved in the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg have been superceded by modern scholarship, Johnston was working with the best in the field.

The 1920s and 30s also witnessed a newfound interest in traditional folk music, which previously had been practiced in its local communities to little outside attention. The Carter family of southwest Virginia gained fame through their interpretations of folk songs they collected from the people of the mountain South. Through their radio performances on a Mexican station whose broadcast range reached across America, the Carter family introduced many Americans to folk music and bolstered its popularity.

The folk singer Woody Guthrie used traditional melodies as foundations for his iconic

---

original lyrics, which often centered on present day social commentary.\textsuperscript{28} The career of ethnomusicologist Alan Lomax also began in this time period, when the 18-year-old Texan accompanied his father on song collecting trips.\textsuperscript{29}

Lomax shared a passion for folk music with Guthrie and the Carter family, but his motivations were different. Although he collected the songs tirelessly over his decades-long career, his goal was to preserve them in an archive just as they were, not as a necessary step of collecting raw material to reinterpret in new creative endeavors.\textsuperscript{30} In his 1940 essay “Music in Your Own Back Yard,” Lomax wrote,

\begin{quote}
... Songs are our heritage as Americans. Woven in bright strands through the pattern of pioneer life, they are part of the American tradition of which we are so proud. To-day, almost too late, we realize that they are in danger of disappearing. Yet these folk songs can easily be preserved. You, and all Americans, can find them right in your own back yards.... I've made it my job... to collect folk songs. I've traveled all over the country, thousands of miles....
\end{quote}

Johnston can be seen as a philosophical compatriot of Lomax. Prior to establishing the Carnegie Survey, Johnston’s forty-year career was filled with documentary projects, commissions for architectural firms, and a long-standing interest in buildings. Rather than filling an emotional void for the American public or creating a resource to inspire

\textsuperscript{30} Several years ago the author had the opportunity to assist in the processing of Lomax’s vast fieldwork archive. While he was a talented musician who sometimes accompanied his fieldwork subjects in concert, Lomax did not use his fieldwork material to create new music. Ironically, a creative outlet for Lomax seems to have been photography. A gifted photographer, Lomax’s archive includes many images of fieldwork subjects both performing and in casual poses.
new construction, Johnston’s ultimate goal was to document the buildings in a photographic record before they disappeared.\textsuperscript{32}

In 1935 Lomax was hired by the Library of Congress to conduct a Southern fieldwork trip accompanied by anthropologist, folklorist, and author Zora Neale Hurston, best known for her novel \textit{Their Eyes Were Watching God}. Lomax collected songs by recording them on bulky equipment and Hurston documented local folkways and stories, many of which she later incorporated into her fiction.\textsuperscript{33} In a 1935 letter to anthropologist Ruth Benedict, Hurston described their trip:

   I am down here in the Everglades collecting material in a fine way. I am working with Alan Lomax and we are getting some grand material. He has a new, sensitive recording machine from the library of Congress and he is a good operator. I know the material & where to get it.... We are collecting more than songs. Trying to get as many kinds of folk expression as exist.\textsuperscript{34}

The Library of Congress was a major force in the movement to create documentary archives for posterity. In 1937, Lomax became the director of the Library’s Archive of American Folk-Song.\textsuperscript{35} During the summer of 1935, Lomax, Hurston, and Johnston were all in the field collecting material for Library-sponsored projects. While Lomax and Hurston were documenting Florida’s music and folkways, Johnston was finishing up her photographic survey of Virginia buildings before she started fieldwork in other states the following year.

\textsuperscript{32} Interview, Frances Benjamin Johnston interviewed by Mary Mason, 12 February, WRC, National Broadcasting Co., FBJ Collection, Reel 21.


\textsuperscript{35} Kahn, “Early Collecting Years,” 2.
A final project that parallels Johnston’s goals and methodology is the Historic American Buildings Survey. Both began in the 1930s with the cooperation of the Library of Congress. HABS documentation continues to this day and is actively administered by the National Park Service. The Library of Congress is the official repository for HABS records and the American Institute of Architects (AIA) serves in a consulting position.

Johnston began independent fieldwork for the Carnegie Survey in 1927 and she had made a formal arrangement with the Library of Congress by 1930. HABS began in 1933 when Charles E. Peterson submitted a proposal to the National Park Service for the documentation of America’s “antique buildings” by unemployed architects. The project received congressional authorization with the Historic Sites Act of 1935 to “secure, collate, and preserve drawings, plans, photographs and other data of historic and archaeologic sites, buildings and objects.” Johnston’s colleague and collaborator Thomas Waterman later assumed the post of Architectural Director of HABS. Waterman expressed his opinion of Johnston’s architectural photography in the acknowledgments of his book *Dwellings of Colonial America*:

Special thanks are due to Miss Frances Benjamin Johnston of Washington, D.C., and New Orleans, for use of negatives in her superb collection at the Library of Congress of records of the early architecture of the South, largely financed by the Carnegie Corporation through the American Council of Learned Societies. Her technical skill, architectural knowledge, and artistic ability may clearly be seen in her photographs.

---

The Carnegie Survey and HABS dovetail together both in methodological approach and in the sense that each archive was created with knowledge of the scope of the other. Attempts were made to concentrate on buildings that had not already been documented, especially in the case of the later HABS. In 1934 Johnston asked Peterson for his recommendations of structures to photograph in an upcoming fieldwork trip, and he sent a list of “houses... especially important for some architectural feature.”

Johnston and Peterson even had the same contact at the Library of Congress. Both approached Leicester Holland, head of the Library of Congress Fine Arts Division and chairman of the AIA Committee on the Preservation of Historic Buildings. The ultimate goal of Peterson’s vision for HABS was the creation of measured drawings. In *Recording Historic Buildings*, Harley McKee’s compilation of HABS recording standards, measured drawings are described as “the ultimate in recording; they should be made for structures of outstanding interest whenever the means are available. Such drawings, made by measuring each part of the subject, are accurate, to scale, show proportions accurately, are measurable, highly informative, and can emphasize or de-emphasize parts according to their historic importance. Aspects which cannot be portrayed by photographs (as: floor plans, general sections) or those normally hidden from the eye (as: construction details) can be recorded by drawing.”

Although Johnston’s ultimate goal was the creation of photographs, the wording of Peterson’s 1933 proposal reflects markedly similar documentary motivations:

> The plan I propose is to enlist a qualified group of architects and draftsmen to study, measure and draw up the plans, elevations and details of the important antique buildings of the United States. Our architectural

---

40 Letter from Charles Peterson to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 16 March 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.

heritage of buildings from the last four centuries diminishes daily at an alarming rate. The ravages of fire and the natural elements together with the demolition and alterations caused by real estate 'improvements' form an inexorable tide of destruction destined to wipe out the great majority of the buildings which knew the beginning and first flourish of the nation. The comparatively few structures which can be saved by extraordinary effort and presented as exhibition houses and museums or altered and used for residences or minor commercial uses comprise only a minor percentage of the interesting and important architectural specimens which remain from the old days. It is the responsibility of the American people that if the great number of our antique buildings must disappear through economic causes, they should not pass into unrecorded oblivion.

The list of building types . . . should include public buildings, churches, residences, bridges, forts, barns, mills, shops, rural outbuildings, and any other kind of structure of which there are good specimens extant. . . Other structures which would not engage the especial interest of an architectural connoisseur are the great number of plain structures which by fate or accident are identified with historic events.42

Johnston articulated her motivations for starting the Carnegie Survey in a 1940s radio interview with Mary Mason of the National Broadcasting Company. She recalled,

The idea of this research came to me several years ago when I returned to Virginia to photograph some of the famous James River estates. Wherever I traveled I came across tragic examples of decay and neglect. Often, too, fire had destroyed and left no trace of some of these once-beautiful homes. Of course, the most noted manors in Virginia have been photographed often and well. But the old farm houses, the mills, the log cabins of the pioneers, the country stores, the taverns and inns, in short those buildings that had to do with the everyday life of the colonists had been overlooked. In fact, no photographic records of them existed.43

The Library of Congress has recently completed digitizing the records of the Historic American Buildings Survey and the later Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) for online access. In addition to the word-searchable website, the records are


43 Interview, Frances Benjamin Johnston interviewed by Mary Mason, FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
also available for study in the Prints and Photographs Reading Rooms at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. The materials include scanned images of "measured drawings, black-and-white photographs, color transparencies, photo captions, written history pages, and supplemental materials."\textsuperscript{44} Since the project's inception in 1933, some "350,000 measured drawings, large-format photographs, and written histories for more than 35,000 historic structures and sites"\textsuperscript{45} throughout America have been recorded. The Carnegie Survey spanned only ten years, but it generated 7,248 negatives of historic structures in nine states and the District of Columbia. Johnston's photographs for the Carnegie Survey are available for study in the Prints and Photographs Reading Room at the Library of Congress or in a 1984 microfiche edition of the survey owned by some university libraries.

\textsuperscript{44} "Scope and Background of the Collections," available from http://lcweb2.loc.gov/pp/hhhtml/hhintro.html#pete; INTERNET.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
CHAPTER II
FRANCES BENJAMIN JOHNSTON, ARCHITECTURAL PHOTOGRAPHER

The roots of the Carnegie Survey go back to the very beginning of Johnston’s career. Some of her earliest projects were photographic surveys of federal buildings and commissions to document the work of architectural firms. Johnston grew up in the government culture of Washington, D.C. Although she was born in West Virginia in 1864, at an early age her family moved to Washington, D.C., where her father worked for the Treasury Department and her mother wrote a column for the Baltimore Sun under the pseudonym “The Lady Correspondent.” Johnston was their only surviving child, and she grew up in this educated, urbane household with her parents and Aunt Nim, her mother’s widowed sister. Johnston inherited her mother’s talent with words, winning a poetry contest sponsored by St. Nicholas Magazine while a teenager and possessing a distinctive writing voice throughout her life.

Johnston planned to become a professional artist. In her late teenage years her parents sent her to Paris to train at the Academy Julian, which was one of the few schools

---

that allowed female students to draw from nude models.\textsuperscript{48} After several years in France Johnston returned to Washington to embark on a career as an illustrator.\textsuperscript{49} Art Nouveau illustration was at the height of popularity, particularly works in the style of Alfonse Mucha and Toulouse Lautrec.\textsuperscript{50} No surviving illustrations by Johnston have been found from this time period, but it is possible her work resembled the illustrations of Aubrey Beardsley, an English artist whose work she admired.\textsuperscript{51}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{cover_design.png}
\caption{Cover Design for Smither's Catalogue of Rare Books, pen and ink, 1896 by Aubrey Beardsley}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{48} Berch, \textit{Life and Work of FBJ}, 12-3.
\textsuperscript{49} Berch, \textit{Life and Work of FBJ}, 12-3; Frances Benjamin Johnston, “Notes for informal talk by Frances Benjamin Johnston at the Quota Club dinner, February 20\textsuperscript{th} 1936,” FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
\textsuperscript{51} Aubrey Beardsley is included in a collection of typed notecards of poster artists in Johnston’s personal papers. Johnston’s friend Mills Thompson also has a card. Beardsley’s card contains a quote from \textit{The Poster}, (Jan., 1896), stating, “Aubrey Beardsley’s posters, like his other drawings, are impossible things, but this very quality makes them of the greatest value for advertising purposes. They have a sort of nightmare appearance, a weirdness, which has caused his artistic conceptions to be compared to Poe’s literary fantasies.” Notes, FBJ Collection, Reel 28.
Beardsley, who died of tuberculosis at the age of 25, nonetheless left a large portfolio of pen and ink works on paper, illustrated books such as Oscar Wilde’s *Salome*, and was the founding editor of the controversial literary journal *The Yellow Book*.\(^{52}\) His work is characterized by what critics described as his “mastery of pure line” and intricate decorative detail.\(^{53}\) As his illness left him confined in bed much of the time, the compositions are frequently set inside rooms and include furniture and architectural elements such as fireplaces, molding, and window treatments.\(^{54}\) Dominant features in Beardsley’s artwork such as careful compositions, stark linearity, and attention to background architectural details are also present in the photographic style Johnston developed. Indeed, Johnston turned to photography after she found she could not express herself fully in the medium of drawing. In a perhaps mythologized story, Johnston wrote George Eastman in the 1880s asking for camera recommendations and Eastman in return sent her an early Kodak.\(^{55}\) Johnston described what she considered her inspiration to enter photography in a 1936 speech:

I knew how perfectly terrible my sketches and drawing were, there was no light of encouragement anywhere. Photography, on the other hand, in the beginning, I did not take seriously at all. I met at that crucial time a lady with a new hand camera and a large gift of self esteem, in the days when hand cameras were almost museum pieces, and so clumsy in size and shape that it was thought that only a great, big he-man was competent to operate its complicated mechanism. This accepted idea gives one understanding of the pinnacle of achievement on which my friend, Mrs. Blank, had placed herself… My reaction to her achievement… became the definite turning point in my whole career. My thought, I remember as clearly as it happened all those long years ago, and it ran about like this:--

---


\(^{53}\) Ibid., *Aubrey Beardsley*, 115.

\(^{54}\) R.A. Walker writes, “For him it was from drawing-table, to sofa, to bed. Even a carriage to an evening concert was taken in great trepidation. How many of his drawings are of interiors, or conceived in formal gardens.” R.A. Walker, coll. and ed., *The Best of Beardsley* (London: Chancellor Press, 1948), 20.

“If that fluffy self-conceited Mrs. Blank can make good photographs, I can, TOO!”

Johnston took classes from Thomas William Smillie at the Photography Division at the nearby Smithsonian Institution and opened a photographic studio.

Following her return from Paris, Johnston was active in the Washington arts community, a member of the bohemian group “The Push” as well as the Arts Club of Washington. Many of her close friends came from this scene, such as Mills Thompson, an illustrator who worked on the 1896 decoration of the Library of Congress and also designed posters to advertise Johnston’s business. Johnston’s circle was not confined to her fellow artists, however. Throughout her life she possessed a skill for networking and social code switching that rivaled that of a professional diplomat, a talent that would prove invaluable throughout her career. Johnston was equally proficient in the company of artists and high society ladies, farmers and presidents. In *Architecture in the United States*, architectural historian Dell Upton observes, “Those architects with the greatest artistic reputations usually create distinctive personae that are as well known to the public as their architecture.” Johnston seems to have employed the same technique. Many accounts attest to her colorful character. Johnston was witty and persuasive, and she generally achieved her goals through carefully crafted letters, well-prepared interviews, and hard work. She created a unique public personality that was independent of societal modes of behavior, thus allowing her to relate successfully on her own terms with the wide range of humanity her work brought her in contact with.

56 Frances Benjamin Johnston, “Notes for informal talk by Frances Benjamin Johnston at the Quota Club dinner, February 20th 1936,” FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
Figs. 4 and 5 Mills Thompson 1896 illustration of Johnston and Thompson at work on a commercial poster for Johnston’s business

Johnston’s voluminous manuscript collection contains few personally revealing documents, an indication of her carefully crafted professional image. She was very close to her mother, who frequently traveled with her on location until her death in 1920. The bulk of the documents in Johnston’s manuscript collection at the Library of Congress are notes generated for photographic projects, copies of the articles Johnston published, and correspondence to business contacts and acquaintances.

Johnston’s familiarity with the inner workings of the federal government and her parents’ connections helped her attain what some have called the status of “photographer to the American court.” She captured six successive presidential administrations on film, gaining special access to the Theodore Roosevelt household. Johnston also made a name for herself as a portraitist, garden photographer, and with her attendance at the

59 Berch, Life and Work of FBJ, 48, 94.
60 Kay and Sue Thompson, “First Lady of the Lens: The pioneer of camera journalism is too busy to stop,” The Woman with Woman’s Digest (Dec. 1945): 61, FBJ Collection, Reel 34.
61 Assorted manuscript material, FBJ Collection, Reels 21 and 35.
1900 Paris Exposition, a participant in the international photography scene. She also took on special projects such as the photographic illustration of Edith Westcott’s *New Education Illustrated* series of progressive education handbooks. 62 Throughout these years, Johnston followed in her mother’s journalistic path by writing articles illustrated by her photographs. These articles were published in popular magazines such as *Demorest’s* and *Harper’s Weekly* and covered a wide range of topics from a visit to the U.S. Mint to a dangerous, pioneering photographic expedition into Mammoth Cave in West Virginia. 63 Personal letters to Johnston from fans who read these features indicate that her work was widely known and admired. 64

A large percentage of Johnston’s output involved photography of buildings. Between 1889 and 1906 Johnston took 499 photographs of the White House. The catalogued images in the Library of Congress finding aid describe varied subjects including “exterior views and floor plans. Interiors, including East Room, Green Room, Blue Room, Red Rooms, dining rooms, unidentified formal rooms, corridors and vestibules, President’s office and library, bedrooms and nursery, Cabinet Room, staff offices and work areas, and conservatory. Paintings, decorative pieces, and sculpture. Gardens, grounds, and outbuildings; outdoor events, such as receptions.” 65 Lot 11727 in the Johnston collections consists of 2,176 photographs of Washington, D.C. architecture and views taken between 1890 and the 1940s, “including government buildings,

---

62 Edith Westcott, *New Education Illustrated*, FBJ Collection, Reel 33.
64 Letter from Miss D.H. Ormshee to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 18 October 1897, FBJ Collection, Reel 4; Letter from Miss Ella Sylvia to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 29 October 1897, FBJ Collection, Reel 4.
museums and libraries, residences, commercial buildings, schools, churches, organizations’ buildings; includes views of interiors, furnishings, architectural elements. Monuments; gardens; street scenes. A few of government housing during World War I, Center Market, and flood conditions. Portraits included in some views of sites.\textsuperscript{66}

Architects hired Johnston to document restoration work.\textsuperscript{67} In 1898, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) rented the neglected Octagon building in Washington, D.C. designed by William Thornton for the Tayloe family in 1799. Thornton was also the architect of the United States Capitol building.\textsuperscript{68} Five years later when the AIA was able to purchase the Octagon, they began a restoration project.\textsuperscript{69} The AIA commissioned Johnston to document the house’s pre-restoration condition and the restoration process, information conveyed in photographs such as Johnston’s images of the entrance vestibule before and after cleaning.\textsuperscript{70}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{66} “LC CALL NO.: LOT 11727 Washington, D.C. architecture and views,” Frances Benjamin Johnston Collection Finding aid,” FBJ Collection, ix.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 4.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 71-3.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 70-91.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Figs. 6 and 7 Johnston’s 1898 photographs for the American Institute of Architects of the Octagon’s entrance vestibule before and after cleaning.
Around the turn of the century Johnston increasingly began accepting commissions from active architecture firms to document their new buildings. The firm of McKim, Mead, and White frequently hired Johnston to photograph their recent work in New York. Charles Follen McKim was the president of the AIA during the purchase of the Octagon when McKim, Mead, and White were simultaneously working on the restoration of the Roosevelt administration White House. Johnston was intimately connected with the Roosevelts, the White House, and the Octagon, so these projects may have led to a long-term working relationship with McKim, Mead, and White. An undated lecture written in the third person by Johnston titled “The Old World Gardens” describes this transition to an increased emphasis on architectural photography over portraiture in her practice:

In this atmosphere, with the national capital filled with interesting and distinguished people, Miss Johnston did portraits of many celebrities and prospered gloriously, until photography became commercial. Interest disappeared. On the horizon the photographer staff of every great daily loomed ominous, and Miss Johnston came to New York at the request of architects, famous men—John Carr[iere], [Charles] F. Mc Kim, and other great architects. She became official photographer for the New Theatre and big architectural undertakings.

The finding aid catalog listing for the New Theater lists 7 photographs taken circa 1909-1910 of “exterior and interior of theater (also known as Century Theater), including friezes, murals, [decorated] arches, ceiling, columns, foyer.”

---

71 Ibid., 71-3.
72 The typescript says “John F. Mc Kim,” but Charles Follen McKim is likely the individual referred to. A portrait taken by Johnston exists. He died in 1909, which places Johnston’s architectural commissions starting before that date. John Carriere was a partner in the architectural firm Carriere and Hastings.
Johnston’s interest in buildings extended beyond lucrative commissions into her personal life. Early in her career, she built a two-story brick studio with a skylight. The building served as her darkroom, office, studio, and salon for socializing with friends. The Library of Congress collection includes 154 photographs of this space taken between 1890 and 1913. The images depict “interiors of studio located at 1332 V St. N.W., showing furnishings, art objects, photographic equipment, architectural details, and Johnston with friends. Garden.”

At the same time Johnston was creating the Carnegie Survey she was also working to restore an old rowhouse purchased in the Georgetown area of Washington, D.C. Johnston simultaneously ran an architectural salvage business, buying mantels and paneling from houses that were being knocked down and selling the material to restorationists. Publication of Johnston’s early Carnegie photos led to a friendship with G.B. Lorraine, a Richmond, Virginia realtor who specialized in selling old homes to clients immersed in the romance of the Colonial Revival movement. Lorraine shared the names and locations of obscure colonial houses with Johnston. The Virginia fieldwork for the Survey developed Johnston’s knowledge of the current colonial-era real estate stock, and in her letters she gave him tips for houses to sell and restore. Johnston’s own restoration project in Georgetown was hampered by a combination of bad workmen,

---

75 Berch, *Life and Work of FBJ*, 23-4. Berch writes, “The studio was two stories, with office, workroom, and darkroom on the ground floor. The whole seven hundred square feet of the second floor was designed as open studio space. For the convenience of visitors, a special covered staircase provided access to the second floor directly from the outside” (24).
78 Ibid., 119-21.
79 Assorted correspondence between G. B. Lorraine and Frances Benjamin Johnston, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
dishonest tenants, and her own meager resources. At the completion of the Carnegie Survey, Johnston left Washington, D.C. and moved to architecturally rich New Orleans. Johnston bought an old house on Bourbon Street where she lived until her death in 1952.

Fig. 8 Johnston’s House, Arkady, at 1132 Bourbon Street
New Orleans, Louisiana

CHAPTER III
THE MAKING OF JOHNSTON’S ARCHIVE

The beginnings of the Carnegie Survey occurred in Fredericksburg, Virginia in 1927. In the interview with Mary Mason, Johnston described the early development of her effort to establish the Carnegie Survey: “My work soon brought me into touch with others who had imagination and the means to support my research. It really began with my photographic survey at Fredericksburg, Virginia, sponsored by a woman who had vision and who shared my belief that such records should be made before it was too late.” 81 This woman was Mrs. Daniel Devore, who funded Johnston’s 1927 photographic survey of the buildings in the town of Fredericksburg. Mrs. Devore lived at the nearby Chatham estate, and had previously commissioned Johnston to photograph her house. The Fredericksburg project is crucial as a prototype for the later Carnegie Survey. The variety of buildings Johnston documented in Fredericksburg is evident in her later statewide work. In addition to large estates such as Chatham, Johnston photographed stores, cabins, outbuildings, taverns, quarters, an apothecary shop, warehouses, a market square, City Hall, a cemetery, churches, Monroe’s law office, a spinning house, and

81 Interview, Frances Benjamin Johnston interviewed by Mary Mason, FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
unusual structures such as a garden house and toll-keeper’s house. The University of Mary Washington has digitized a selection of Johnston’s Fredericksburg photographs and made them available online at their Department of Historic Preservation website (http://departments.umw.edu/hipr/www/fredericksburg/johnston.htm) (See Table 4 in the Appendix for a listing of all photographs taken for the Fredericksburg Survey). In addition to documenting specific buildings, the project also served to document the urban landscape of Fredericksburg, an early colonial town.

Fig. 9 Yates Carmichael Garden House
Fredericksburg, Virginia

82 “Pictures of Fredericksburg by Frances Benjamin Johnston, 1927. List of Images and Description,” Department of Historic Preservation, University of Mary Washington, Fredericksburg, Virginia; available from http://departments.umw.edu/hipr/www/fredericksburg/johnston.htm; INTERNET.
A group of 247 photographs were exhibited in Fredericksburg’s Town Hall in 1929. Multiple images from one site were shown together, and single images of structures were grouped by building type, such as “Old Dwellings,” “Merchants’ Stores and Offices,” and “Warehouses.”* Johnston’s manuscript collection includes the guestbook from the exhibition, which lists the signatures of 475 attendees. The cover of the exhibition program reads:

PICTORIAL SURVEY
OLD FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA
OLD FALMOUTH AND OTHER NEARBY PLACES
A Series of Photographic Studies of the Architecture of the Region Dating by Tradition from Colonial Times to Circa 1830
Made for Mrs. Daniel B. Devore, of Chatham, as An Historical Record and to Preserve Something Of the Atmosphere of An Old Virginia Town
By FRANCES BENJAMIN JOHNSTON
On View at the Town Hall During May, 1929
Admission Free

Johnston’s stated motive of making a “historical record” is repeated in the creation of the Carnegie Survey.

In 1930 Johnston took her portfolio of Fredericksburg photographs to Leicester Holland, an architect, Chief of the Division of Fine Arts at the Library of Congress, and chairman of the AIA Committee on the Preservation of Historic Buildings. Johnston donated her Fredericksburg photographs to Holland’s Fine Arts division and proposed the

---

84 Guestbook for the Pictorial Survey of Fredericksburg Virginia, May 1929, FBJ Collection, Reel 28. A number of the attendees identified themselves as out-of-state visitors.
85 Frances Benjamin Johnston, Program for the Pictorial Survey of Fredericksburg, May 1929, FBJ Collection, Reel 33.
continuation of the project throughout Virginia. Holland also dreamed of establishing a pictorial archive of American architecture, but had never been able to realize the project due to lack of funds, and most importantly, lack of a photographer of Johnston’s caliber.  

Holland welcomed Johnston’s proposal and began looking for money.

Although Johnston eventually extended her work throughout the South, choosing Virginia as the first state to survey was particularly well suited to her project in several ways. Travel was difficult in the 1930s given a combination of rough roads and unreliable drivers. While the fieldwork expeditions were still a physical and financial hardship for Johnston, who was nearing her seventies, she could reach Virginia locations with relative ease from her Washington, D.C. studio. The state of Virginia was widely regarded at the time as one of the most culturally important landscapes in America. The first site of English settlement at Jamestown in 1607, Virginia boasted a heritage akin to Massachusetts.

Johnston began establishing herself in the local architectural community. Thomas T. Waterman, Milton Grigg, and Henry Brock welcomed Johnston as a colleague. Surviving correspondence between Johnston and the architects includes the sharing of tips about forgotten architectural gems, scholarly information regarding research of house types and building sites, plans for fieldwork trips in which they accompanied Johnston, and affectionate reminiscences of past excursions. Waterman and

---

86 Dell Upton and John Vlach stress the importance of skilled photography to the study of architecture in their introduction to *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*. They argue that “Photographs should be abundant and clear so that a landscape or building can be easily understood. High quality graphic presentation is a significant measure of the seriousness and commitment now required in the study of the vernacular landscape. It is unlikely that a clear interpretation can ever be made from evidence that is unclear.... The discipline signaled by measured plans and maps and clear, in-focus photographs is a statement of intellectual commitment.” (Dell Upton and John Vlach, eds., *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1986), xiv, xv.)
Brock used Johnston’s photographs to illustrate several of their books including *Dwellings of Colonial America, The Mansions of Virginia, The Early Architecture of North Carolina,* and *Colonial Churches in Virginia.* Extensive correspondence, manuscript proofs, and notes reveal Johnston’s involvement in the textual portion of the books to have rivaled that of a co-author. Waterman even credited Johnston as a co-author on the title page of *The Early Architecture of North Carolina,* calling the work “A Pictorial Survey By Frances Benjamin Johnston With An Architectural History by Thomas Tileston Waterman.” The book is copyrighted in Johnston’s name. Holland wrote the foreword to the 1941 work, whose final paragraph is a description of the shared accomplishments of the Carnegie Survey and Historic American Buildings Survey:

> It is only during the last ten years that the support given by the Carnegie Corporation of New York has made possible Miss Johnston’s magnificent photographic records of southern architecture, and it is only by the establishment of the Historic American Buildings Survey that Mr. Waterman has been able to carry out the extensive travel and intensive study necessary to make clear the threads in the tangled web. I question whether any artist or archaeologist has ever before searched through the area of the state as thoroughly as these two have done, and I am sure that no others could present the findings in such incomparable pictures or with such a fund of technical scholarship.

Johnston’s immersion in the network of Virginia architects established another important connection for the project—the support of architect Edmund Campbell at the University of Virginia. Campbell was the chair of the University’s Fine Arts Department and through a series of negotiations with Holland, it was agreed that the University of Virginia would receive selections of Johnston’s photographs for use in scholarly research.

---

87 “Publications Featuring Johnston Photos (selected listing),” Frances Benjamin Johnston Collection Finding aid, FBJ Collection, 4-5.  
89 Leicester B. Holland, foreword to *The Early Architecture of North Carolina,* by Frances Benjamin Johnston and Thomas Tileston Waterman (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941), vi.
With the support of the architectural community and with the Library of Congress and the University of Virginia pledging their desire to include the finished product in their archives, Johnston’s proposal was granted funding by the Carnegie Corporation.

Frederick Keppel, president of the Board of Directors, seems to have exerted a powerful influence. Johnston sent him regular letters throughout the development of the Carnegie Survey informing him of her progress and the importance of the work. Multiple drafts of these letters survive, covered with Johnston’s proofreading marks. Fortunately for the historical record, Keppel greatly admired Johnston’s photographs and early on in the project purchased a set of prints of Virginia sites to frame and hang in his executive office for all visitors to see. Returning from a visit to New York where she saw the spectacle, Johnston confided with amusement in a letter to Flolland that “the interview with Dr. Keppel turned out quite beyond my fondest expectation[s.] He is more completely sold on the success of the Survey and knows more about it than anyone else, if I may make one ranking exception. The framed prints in a very handsome room are épântant! Simply swell and I was thrilled with them. Dr. Keppel said ‘You know, I am the son of a dealer in rare prints and I knew what they would look like framed!’ Just as simple as that.”

Two individuals particularly crucial to the success of the project were Isabella Neff Burnet and Huntley Ruff. Edmund Campbell was a brilliant but busy man. To her great frustration, Johnston’s letters and inquiries sometimes sat for weeks before receiving an answer until Campbell’s secretary, Isabella Neff Burnet, assumed an active role in the Carnegie Survey of Virginia. Organized, insightful, and above all excited

---

90 Letter from Frances Benjamin Johnston to Leicester B. Holland, 4 July 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
about the project, Burnet became the de facto researcher for all of the Virginia photographs, the bulk of which were taken between 1930 and 1935.91 Burnet joined Johnston in the meticulous research that went into each photographic fieldwork trip—compiling lists of sites that had been documented previously by other photographers, consulting old land grants and local records, and planning maps of intended sites.92 Although Johnston would set out for the field armed with a carefully researched list of historic building locations, she supplemented the itinerary with structures she spotted on the road. In one interview Johnston confided her young architectural friends joked that she could smell a house from five miles away.93 Burnet provided Johnston with the research, consistency, and intellectual camaraderie needed for the magnitude of the Survey. Nearly every letter Burnet wrote to Johnston ends with a word of encouragement or a compliment about the outcome of a particular photograph, and Johnston sent Burnet a print of one of these favorites as a gift.94 Several years into the project when Burnet planned a trip to Washington, D.C. to see the prints at the Library of Congress, Johnston wrote in anticipation to Holland that as Burnet’s “fine co-operation has had a great deal to do with the success of the Va. Survey, I hope you will arrange to see that she is received with very special honors.”95

Johnston traveled along Virginia’s muddy, bumpy, sometimes washed out roads in a used Oldsmobile, but she didn’t drive it. For Johnston, born in 1864, the car was a

---

91 Assorted correspondence between Isabella Neff Burnet and Frances Benjamin Johnston, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
92 Letter from Isabella Neff Burnet to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 10 February 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
93 Interview, Frances Benjamin Johnston interviewed by Mary Mason, FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
94 Letter from Isabella Neff Burnet to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 23 August 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
95 Letter from Frances Benjamin Johnston to Leicester B. Holland, 2 September 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
relatively new phenomenon in her long life. Hiring a driver relieved the physical strain of travel and allowed Johnston to look out the windows to study the countryside and scout for sites. Johnston went through a dizzying array of drivers, including one who stole her car, but Huntley Ruff was a driver she was devoted to and hired whenever he was available.\textsuperscript{96} Ruff became her favorite through his loyalty, professional demeanor, and perhaps his interest in the work, hinted at in a photograph of Johnston taken by Ruff.\textsuperscript{97} In 1934 Johnston wrote to Mrs. Gibbs of Gibbs Hill in Staunton, Virginia, an estate she eventually photographed, explaining that her visit was delayed because her driver had been ill. Rather than hire a substitute driver, Johnston preferred to wait until Ruff had recovered, because as he “understands all about the workings of my photographic outfit in addition to being very dependable with my car, his services on an extended trip w[e]igh as much more important than a further slight dela[y].”\textsuperscript{98} Like most of Johnston’s drivers, Ruff was African-American. Johnston’s correspondence to homeowners in advance of an overnight visit to a site indicates a steely insistence that her drivers receive proper accommodations. Ruff and Burnet do not share the prestige of Keppel, Holland and the other powerful men who helped make Johnston’s project possible, but these two individuals were the ones Johnston worked with most closely on a daily basis, and whose considerable contributions ensured the success of the project.

The methodology of the Carnegie Survey closely parallels the official standards for recording historic architecture later used by HABS, which are described in Harley

\textsuperscript{90} Letter from Frances Benjamin Johnston to Edward Jones, 4 September 1944, FBJ Collection, Reel 15, quoted in Berch, \textit{Life and Work of FBJ}, 130; Letter from Huntley Ruff to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 3 February 1935, FBJ Collection, Reel 12; Letter from Frances Benjamin Johnston to Huntley Ruff, 16 February 1935, FBJ Collection, Reel 12.

\textsuperscript{91} Berch, \textit{Life and Work of FBJ}, 110-1.

\textsuperscript{92} Letter from Frances Benjamin Johnston to Mrs. Gibbs, 24 August 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11;
McKee’s *The Historic American Buildings Survey: Recording Historic Buildings* (See Tables 1 and 2 in the Appendix for a complete comparison).99 Johnston was concerned about photographing buildings that had already been documented, so Isabella Neff Burnet compiled a list of “photographic collections now existing, covering the counties within the new survey.”100 HABS standards also advocate “avoiding duplication,” and note “it is important to determine what, if anything, has been previously recorded or published in the given area.”101 Johnston studied early settlement patterns and colonial roadways to plan areas to survey. The photographs are organized by county and follow historical settlement patterns, mirroring the HABS standard to take “geographical distribution into account” (See Tables 5 and 6 in the Appendix for a listing of Virginia Carnegie Survey photographs organized by county).102 HABS standards stress that “the present state of historical knowledge about a given structure is an important factor, since it is preferable to record those about which the most facts are known.”103 Johnston likewise was careful to capture historical data. Her manuscript collection contains records of the owner of each dwelling she photographed. Typed card catalog records in the Prints and Photographs Reading Room at the Library of Congress contain additional information about the history and ownership of each site where historical data was available. HABS standards note the importance of local cooperation in the recording process, an area Johnston excelled in. Her skills at social networking, honed through years of experience in Washington, D.C., were well suited for fostering local cooperation. Johnston

99 McKee, *Recording Historic Buildings*.
100 Letter from Isabella Neff Burnet to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 2 January 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
102 Ibid., 10.
103 Ibid., 12.
established contacts throughout the state with individuals whose homes she photographed. These individuals could provide an introduction to other local homeowners. Johnston maintained this network of contacts through written correspondence and sometimes returned to take additional photographs in a different season of the year. Sharing an interest with HABS in structures with industrial significance, Johnston photographed mills, bridges, warehouses, marketplaces, weaving houses, and other buildings associated with early technology. \(^{104}\) Johnston shared with HABS the belief that “an area where a number of historic buildings is deteriorating, or where extensive demolition is anticipated, deserves a high priority.” \(^{105}\) Johnston photographed ruins, falling-down houses, and even foundations, such as Green Spring in James City County. She documented fragile outbuildings and vernacular structures. Many of these structures were in advanced stages of decline and now no longer exist [see Fig. 10]. Paralleling the HABS standard to “keep abreast of expanding scholarly interests by taking into account... new directions,” Johnston designed a resource with long-range utility. \(^{106}\) By documenting a wide variety of structures in the built environment, including diverse specialized outbuildings, quarters, and mills, as well as the gentry structures favored by scholars in the 1930s, Johnston created an archive that could support research from future fields of scholarly study. Through the inclusion of many different building types, the archive is not bound by the scholarly concerns of the time of its creation.

\(^{104}\) Ibid., 12.
\(^{105}\) Ibid., 10.
\(^{106}\) Ibid., 10.
Fig. 10 Quickmore Log Cabin Ruin
Virginia, Amherst County
CHAPTER IV
REGIONALISM

The methodology of the Carnegie Survey provides material for the study of regionalism. Regionalism is defined by historians Edward Ayers and Peter Onuf in their introduction to *All Over the Map: Rethinking American Regions*, as “a sense of common interest and identity across an extended, if indeterminate, space.” Regions are described as “places where discrete, though related, structures intersect and interact in particular patterns. The region is climate and land; it is a particular set of relations between various ethnic groups; it is a relation to the federal government and economy; it is a set of shared cultural styles. But each of these elements... is constantly changing.”

The structure of Johnston’s archive allows scholars to conduct close studies of a certain region or compare and contrast throughout the state.

Henry Glassie’s *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia* demonstrated the potential of studying buildings with an intense regional focus. Regional studies are now standard in the architectural history canon. Incorporating the photographs in the Carnegie Survey

---

108 Ayers and Onuf, *All Over the Map*, 5-6.
into regional studies would allow one to study structures that may no longer be there, or are not present in such abundant concentrations as before. A precedent exists for this practice. A recent example is architectural historian Gabrielle Lanier’s 2005 book *The Delaware Valley in the Early Republic: Architecture, Landscape, and Regional Identity*, which extensively utilizes Thomas Yorke’s 1888 photographic survey of Delaware Valley homes combined with her own fieldwork.¹¹⁰ Jack Larkin’s 2006 book *Where We Lived: Discovering the Places We Once Called Home*, compares early American housing across the country using 400 HABS photographs.¹¹¹ Using Johnston’s archive for regional analysis allows for more extensive comparison of building types throughout Virginia, or between Virginia and the other eight states documented in the Carnegie Survey. Given that these structures were photographed in the 1930s, the Survey documents more surviving examples than are available for fieldwork today.

Johnston’s archive can be used to trace regional settlement and migration patterns as well as ethnic building types. Johnston completed photographic surveys of 64 Virginia counties (See Table 3 in the Appendix for a map of surveyed counties). The history of settlement in Virginia follows general patterns. The earliest European settlement started in the east and spread westwards. The English were concentrated along the coastal Tidewater, Eastern Shore, and Northern Neck areas. The Scotch-Irish and the Germans came down from Pennsylvania to settle in the Piedmont and mountain areas. A large Quaker population moved to Virginia after increasingly tolerant legislation in 1705 and

1738. By 1776 fifteen monthly Society of Friends meetings supported approximately 5,000 Quakers. Enslaved and free African Americans lived throughout the state.

The buildings in the Carnegie Survey demonstrate these settlement patterns. In Frederick County near Winchester, Johnston photographed a massive stone Quaker Meeting House. Further south in Albemarle County, she documented Zion Church, a distinctive octagonal building that housed an African-American congregation until it was torn down in 1980. In southwest Virginia, the Scotch-Irish are represented in photographs of the McDonald Stone House, a two-story stone structure in Botetourt County, near the town of Fincastle. Tidewater English construction is visible in structures such as Little England in Gloucester County. German settlement is represented in documentation of structures such as the Zeigler house in Loudon County near Middleburg.

---

Fig. 11 Quaker Meeting House
Near Winchester, Frederick County, Virginia
Fig. 12 Zion Church Exterior View
Covesville, Albemarle County, Virginia
Fig. 13 McDonald Stone House Front and Side View
Near Fincastle, Botetourt County, Virginia
Many types of regional information are contained in the Survey. The photographs can be used to study floor plans, position of outbuildings, agricultural practices, interior elements such as staircases and mantels, exterior appearance, landscape choices, gardens, and house sitings. The authors of *America’s Architectural Roots: Ethnic Groups that Built America*, describe the influence of country of origin and traditional building patterns on the built environment created by colonial settlers. The diversity and range of the Survey allows the study of dwellings and community structures such as mills and churches both in local concentrations and across Virginia. By viewing many examples of

---

building types across regions, one can better identify how they varied as well as any shared influences. An electronic database of the photographs would make it possible to search within a certain geographic area or across the whole state for specific types of structures. A list could be generated, accompanied by the images, so the buildings could be compared side by side. Incorporating photographs from structures in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina also documented in the Carnegie Survey would allow even more variety and possibilities for comparative analysis. Virginia migration patterns could be followed further into the South and structures could be compared across states.
CHAPTER V

VERNACULAR ARCHITECTURE

A particular strength of Johnston’s archive is its documentation of vernacular structures. Architectural historians Thomas Carter and Elizabeth Collins Cromley define vernacular structures as the “architecture most people build and use, comprising buildings that are commonly encountered.” The vernacular structures of pre-Victorian America included cabins, I-houses and other dwellings, livestock and tobacco barns, dairies, corncribs, wells, mills, and stores along with many other buildings once common in the landscape. These structures fulfilled crucial functions in the economy and social world of early America. Barns protected farmers’ agricultural livelihoods, while dairies, wells, and corncribs were used for home food production. The waterpower of mills was used to grind grain or saw wood, and mills often became a community gathering place. Stores distributed consumer goods across the land. Consideration of vernacular buildings is an important element of architectural history, even when one is focusing on high style buildings. Vernacular buildings existed in alongside gentry buildings in complex symbiotic relationships, and to study only the gentry buildings is to ignore the network of

their original use. Dell Upton places the beginning of the study of vernacular architecture in the socially conscious environment of the 1960s. He describes how the “attention to social history has prodded architectural historians to broaden their vistas” and move beyond the gentry focus that characterizes much of the previous scholarship.\textsuperscript{115} With the establishment of the vernacular architecture field, “Small farm houses, slave houses, churches, courthouses, and farm buildings have all been added to the historical record.”\textsuperscript{116}

What does Johnston’s archive have to offer for the study of vernacular architecture? Given the era of its creation, one would assume that the photographs would be most useful for studying gentry buildings. However, Johnston possessed an unusual interest in what would become known as vernacular buildings, and she carefully documented these structures along with the larger buildings generally considered important in the 1930s. In the interview with Mary Mason where she explained the motivation of the Carnegie Survey, Johnston explicitly identified vernacular buildings when she explained that while many elite houses were well documented, “the old farm houses, the mills, the log cabins of the pioneers, the country stores, the taverns and inns, in short those buildings that had to do with the everyday life of the colonists had been overlooked. In fact, no photographic records of them existed.”\textsuperscript{117} Realtor G.B. Lorraine sent Johnston a July 23, 1934 news clipping that stated

{quote}

For the first time a definite photographic record of colonial architecture in Accomac and Northampton counties is in the making. Miss Frances Benjamin Johnston, of Washington, is now on the shore for this purpose. The survey is concerned not so much with the large manor houses as with

\textit{The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography} 96, no. 4 (October 1988): 434.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, 434.
\textsuperscript{117} Interview, Frances Benjamin Johnston interviewed by Mary Mason, FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
the type of building used in the familiar and everyday life of the early settlers. Many unusual examples of Eastern Shore architecture have already disappeared or are slowly crumbling into dust, but Miss Johnston is receiving co-operation in locating homes, other buildings and gardens whose existence was almost unsuspected."

Working thirty years before the establishment of the vernacular architecture field, Johnston was acutely aware of the fragility of these buildings and the critical need to document them.

Fig. 15 Quickmore Log Cabin Side and Front View
Amherst County, Virginia

The Carnegie Survey contains photographs of mills, log cabins, taverns, weaving houses, slave quarters, corncribs, well houses, barns, country stores, warehouses, law

118 "Old Architecture is Being Photographed," The News Leader, 23 July 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
offices, plantations, gardens, toll-keeper’s houses, covered bridges, churches, graveyards, fireplace mantels, staircases, debtor’s prisons, and an assortment of agricultural outbuildings. The spatial layout of the multiple buildings on a site is revealed in compositions that place other structures in the background to anchor their relationship to each other, a feature that may be useful in archaeological excavations. A dwelling and its outbuildings are documented as a cohesive unit.

Many more vernacular structures were still standing when Johnston did the Survey than when non-gentry buildings became a popular area of study later in the century. The diversity of vernacular buildings, including barns, outbuildings, mills, and country stores is a particularly valuable feature of Johnston’s archive. Slave dwellings occur frequently
in documentation of outbuildings, which are a valuable record of the conditions of African-American life. John Vlach, one of the few contemporary scholars to make extensive use of Johnston’s archive, has published selections of Johnston’s photographs of slave quarters in works such as Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery. These buildings are documented in their regional concentrations alongside the fancier buildings in the area. The inclusion of all class levels of buildings in the archive allows a more representative portrayal of the early American built environment.

Fig. 17 Boyd’s Tavern Front View of Building on Grounds Near Short Pump, Albemarle County, Virginia

The documentation of vernacular buildings in the Carnegie Survey would enrich the study of vernacular architecture by incorporating fieldwork data that predates what is considered the beginning of the field. Camille Wells characterizes the founding of the Agricultural Buildings Survey by Edward Chappell in 1980 as a watershed moment in the documentation of vernacular structures when “close attention to early Virginia’s humble outbuildings was new and mildly controversial.” The project was initiated “to observe and record thoroughly the colonial and early national outbuildings that still dotted the Virginia countryside,” spurred by the “understanding that the condition and prospects of

---

early Virginia’s surviving agricultural structures were even more dismal than were those for most other early buildings.”

Johnston documented vernacular structures with the same concern fifty years before the founding of the Agricultural Buildings Survey, when more buildings were still extant. Given the fragile state of vernacular buildings, for many of the structures in the archive, Johnston’s photographs are now the only records. The Carnegie Survey contains more diverse data than is possible to obtain from current extant structures. Combining photographs of vernacular structures with modern fieldwork would allow the study of larger sample sizes, which could reveal previously unseen patterns and lead to new discoveries. The use of Johnston’s archive for the study of vernacular architecture would provide more data for regional variation, evolving forms, and could reveal new patterns and nuances by including buildings lost to the vernacular threshold. Johnston’s concern for documenting the structures of everyday people before they disappeared was a major motivation of the survey. The archive is a gift to scholars today.

Fig. 19 Country Store, Front View
Carter's Bridge, Albemarle County, Virginia
Fig. 20 McClintock’s Cabin, Front and Side View
Albemarle County, Virginia

Fig. 21 Giddings Well House
Albemarle County, Virginia
Fig. 22 Arthur Wright Farm
Frederick County, Virginia
Fig. 23 Carver’s Old Mill, View of Wheel
Near Gordonsville, Albemarle County, Virginia
Fig. 24 Debtor's Prison, Front Detail
Accomac Court House, Accomac County, Virginia
CHAPTER VI
VIRTUAL REALITY AND TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS

Johnston’s archive contains rich primary material well suited for a variety of modern technological applications that were unknown at the time the Survey was completed. The addition of the Carnegie Survey’s resources to modern computer-aided studies and projects will enrich what we know about the built environment and lead to new discoveries. The archive’s age makes it even more valuable for reexamination, for at the time of the Survey many more structures were still extant, particularly fragile vernacular structures. We have the opportunity to go back in time, aided with the technical resources of the 21st century. Three major technical applications of Johnston’s archive are searchable databases, virtual reality recreations, and viewshed analysis.

The creation of a linked, searchable database would allow the photos to be viewed by geographic context, building type, design style, or ethnic group. This would expand the archive’s research potential by allowing groups of contextually related photographs to be viewed together, thus revealing more information through comparison. This flexible format would facilitate the study of different aspects of the archive and could easily incorporate searches for new research concerns. Johnston specified the archive’s
materials as copyright free, so theoretically this project would be possible. Library of Congress collections management policies do not allow prints to be scanned by outside parties, and the minimum purchase price of a print is $25.00. An arrangement would have to be made with the Library of Congress to complete this project, but it would be of profound value to many scholars and students as well as average citizens to have the archive publicly accessible in such a format.

The refinement of virtual reality computer technologies has spurred a movement to create virtual reality models of historic structures. The goal is to learn more about the people of past cultures by gaining a better understanding of the environments they lived in. This rising field combines the attitudes of historic preservationists and social historians with a desire to stimulate the senses. Historian Edward Ayers is a leading figure in the digital history field. In a 2001 address, Ayers argued the importance of

... visualizing the past in images as well as words. We have vast amounts of geographic information just sitting there waiting to be tapped.... but historians have seldom depicted space in the same detail.... We start with a landscape, our own postage-stamp of the world, and we should imagine it as fully as we can.... Already, people are creating three-dimensional models of lost buildings and lost landscapes.... Surely a form of scholarship will emerge to analyze those virtual structures in ways that will reveal dimensions to the past we have never considered.  

Ayers gives as examples “Charleston in 1800 or New Orleans in 1860 or Atlanta in 1900.... To walk through a plantation in 1850 or a lumber camp in 1910 or an African American community in 1950.... There are human and fascinating ways to picture the past... ways we have barely tried.”

\[122\] Edward Ayers, “Final Plenary Address for the 75th Anniversary of the Southern Historical Collection,” available from http://www.virginia.edu/history/events/southsem/SHC%20talk.doc; INTERNET.  
\[123\] Ibid.
Groups such as the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities at the University of Virginia use computer software to create virtual images of buildings. Technology is an alternative to the physical changes required for building restoration. Montpelier recently was restored to a conjectural version of how it looked in Madison’s time, which led to the removal of all subsequent architectural fabric.¹²⁴ This visual effect could have been accomplished electronically through virtual reality recreations of the house at its various stages of development, and no architectural evidence would have been lost. Virtual reality technology is a powerful tool that can preserve buildings from being permanently altered or destroyed as well as recreate buildings that no longer exist—such as those meticulously documented in Johnston’s archive.

Johnston’s archive could translate hundreds of buildings into virtual reality if it were used as a resource, most of them buildings that no longer exist. Currently, archaeological evidence and architectural analysis are the means by which these models are constructed, but Johnston’s archive has the advantage of providing detailed records of buildings that were still standing. While the features of the building may have been altered, the photographs offer more of the original fabric of the house than foundations and modern educated guesses. Johnston also documented many buildings in a pre-restoration state, which provides a valuable record of a structure before alterations by twentieth-century architects. Using the Carnegie Survey photographs with virtual reality software would allow for more detailed, complete recreations.

¹²⁴ “Restoring Montpelier,” James Madison’s Montpelier; available from http://www.montpelier.org/restoration/restoration.cfm; INTERNET.
Fig. 25 Rear of Edgemont, Charlottesville, Virginia, prior to restoration

Fig. 26 Front of Edgemont prior to restoration
A growing field related to virtual reality is the study of viewscapes, or viewshed analysis. Viewshed analysis uses GIS technology and topographic information, combined with data about past landscape environments, to create an approximate image of what earlier people saw. Used in a range of historic contexts including prehistoric groups, the technology studies what people could see, how far they could see, and how the geographic siting of settlement affected the experience of daily life. Technological innovations are also providing new information about the flora of the past. Archaeologists are studying phytoliths and garden evidence discovered during excavations to determine previous landscape environments. These concerns are now expressed in the interpretation of historical sites. Recently the Thomas Jefferson Foundation spent fifteen million dollars to purchase Montalto, the large mountain next to Monticello. Threatened with a housing development, the land was acquired to preserve what Jefferson saw out of the windows of Monticello, or his viewscape. The Foundation
asserts the importance of Montalto in the physical experience of Monticello, and has begun interpreting the mountain with special tours.\textsuperscript{125}

The Carnegie Survey is full of this sort of information. Johnston also paid particular attention to the views of past people. A series in the Carnegie Survey often includes a photograph that recorded the view experienced at a particular location that would have been seen by previous residents.

Fig. 28 Gibbs Hill View of Countryside
Staunton, Augusta County, Virginia

\textsuperscript{125} Hawes Spencer and Rosalind Warfield-Brown, “Moving a mountain: How Monticello got Montalto back,” \textit{The Hook} #305 (February 5, 2004); available from http://www.readthehook.com/Stories/2004/02/05/coverMovingAMountainHowMon.html; INTERNET.
Johnston’s conscious attention to these details is reinforced by her photograph titles, which she often labeled “View of Garden from House,” usually followed by “View of House from Garden.” The Carnegie Survey images include generous documentary coverage of landscape in relation to the built environment, including some photographs that are entirely landscape. Johnston’s sensitivity to the influence of surrounding landscape was developed by her earlier commissions photographing gardens and her lecture circuits giving talks on the plant life illustrated in her photos. The 1930s landscape had less disturbance of topography and visual clutter from subsequent development than the environments available to those attempting viewshed fieldwork currently. Johnston’s images of lost landscapes are excellent raw material for new viewshed analyses.
CONCLUSION

Johnston’s archive is a forgotten treasure. The images in the Carnegie Survey have the potential to be used in a variety of modern applications. Studies of regionalism and vernacular architecture will benefit from the inclusion of Johnston’s fieldwork photographs. The pictorial archive contains a rich source of primary material for use in the developing fields of digital history, virtual reality, and other technological reconstructions. Kay and Sue Thompson captured the importance of Johnston’s achievement in their 1945 article “First Lady of the Lens: The pioneer of camera journalism is too busy to stop,” describing, “Clearly her photographic eye envisioned what the rest of the country could not see…. unless a photographic record for posterity was made—and soon—the tales old structures tell so truthfully would be lost forever.”\textsuperscript{126} In a 1936 speech at a Quota Club dinner, Johnston stated, “I have been able to reach many of my ideals and see some of my best dreams come true, as in these last years of work in research in Colonial Architecture.”\textsuperscript{127} Johnston succeeded in making this photographic record of old structures for posterity, but the archive is of little use if it is

\textsuperscript{126} Kay and Sue Thompson, “First Lady of the Lens: The pioneer of camera journalism is too busy to stop,” \textit{The Woman with Woman’s Digest} (Dec. 1945): 61, FBJ Collection, Reel 34.
\textsuperscript{127} Frances Benjamin Johnston, “Notes for informal talk by Frances Benjamin Johnston at the Quota Club dinner, February 20\textsuperscript{th} 1936,” FBJ Collection, Reel 21.
ignored and neglected by those who could learn from its contents. It is time to rediscover this treasure and appreciate what it contains.

Fig. 29 Trent Mill Covered Bridge
Buckingham County, Virginia
**Table 1: Criteria for HABS Documentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Categories</th>
<th>Category Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning a survey:</td>
<td>Scope of subjects to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoiding duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning projects:</td>
<td>Architectural importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deterioration and threat of demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New fields of scholarly study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for selecting structures:</td>
<td>Historic district and area studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat of destruction or modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility at special times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State of the structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical and architectural interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typicality and cultural interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance to historians and preservationists(^{128})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: A Comparison of Criteria for Documenting Structures

In the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Carnegie Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HABS Criteria</th>
<th>Harley McKee’s description of criteria</th>
<th>Methodology of The Carnegie Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of subjects to be surveyed</td>
<td>Scope will be “determined by the purpose of the survey and the interests of those who make it…. HABS, as a whole and for individual projects, aims for a balance of all types.”(^{129})</td>
<td>The age of buildings Johnston documented in the Carnegie Survey range from very early surviving structures to pre-Victorian nineteenth century buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Periods</td>
<td>“There is a natural interest in an area’s earliest buildings and for that reason HABS emphasizes the recording of those periods. These early structures are often the rarest types and are the most likely to be in a poor state of preservation, making it all the more important to consider them for recording.”(^{130})</td>
<td>The buildings in the Carnegie Survey encompass colonial architecture, Roman Revival, Greek Revival, and various vernacular structures, with an emphasis on early colonial buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Duplication</td>
<td>“It is important to determine what, if anything, has been previously recorded or published in the given area. Structures which have been covered adequately may, as a rule, be eliminated from further consideration, although occasionally additional recording may be desired.”(^{131})</td>
<td>Johnston was concerned about avoiding duplication, so Isabella Neff Burnet compiled a list of “photographic collections now existing, covering the counties within the new survey.”(^{132})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural importance</td>
<td>“The existence in an area of a number of unrecorded structures, which possess intrinsic merit, notably illustrate their type or period, represent known</td>
<td>Consultation with Waterman, Grigg, and Campbell revealed which structures they felt possessed architectural importance, but Johnston also</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{129}\) Ibid, 8.  
\(^{130}\) Ibid, 8.  
\(^{131}\) Ibid, 9.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architects, builders, or craftsmen, or have a significant place in the development of construction, building type, or style, makes a strong case for the allocation of a recording project.</td>
<td>documented buildings she felt important, especially functional and agricultural buildings. The Survey’s documentation of buildings in architecturally rich Albemarle County is particularly extensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration and threat of demolition</td>
<td>“An area where a number of historic buildings are deteriorating, or where extensive demolition is anticipated, deserves a high priority.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cooperation</td>
<td>“A large part of HABS recording is done through cooperation with historical and preservation organizations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic distribution</td>
<td>“State, regional, and city programs need to take the geographical distribution into account. Areas where but little recording has been done, or where the historic architecture has been inadequately published, deserve special consideration.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Johnston photographed ruins, falling-down houses, and even foundations, such as Green Spring in James City County. Many of the structures in the Survey were in advanced stages of decline and now no longer exist [see Fig. 9]. Johnston’s captions for the photographs include notations on several prints that the buildings were no longer extant.

Johnston’s skills at social networking were well suited for this project. She established contacts throughout the state with individuals whose homes she photographed and could provide an introduction to other local homeowners. She maintained these relationships through written correspondence and sometimes returned to take additional photographs of a house in a different season of the year.

Johnston studied early settlement patterns and colonial roadways to plan areas to survey. Johnston’s photographs are organized by county and follow Virginia’s patterns of settlement, stretching from the coastal Tidewater up to the Northern Neck and out across the Piedmont. The Germans and Scotch-Irish of the Shenandoah

---

133 McKee, 9-10.
134 McKee, 10.
135 Ibid, 10.
136 Ibid, 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New fields of scholarly study</th>
<th>&quot;It is important to keep abreast of expanding scholarly interests by taking into account such new directions as urban design, industrial archeology, and periods of architecture which have previously attracted little attention. From time to time it is well to take a fresh look at the subjects being recorded.&quot;\textsuperscript{137}</th>
<th>By documenting a wide range of structures in the built environment, including diverse specialized outbuildings, quarters, and mills as well as the handsome gentry structures favored by scholars at the time, Johnston created an archive that could support research from future fields of scholarly study, including vernacular architecture, regionalism, and virtual reality recreation. By emphasizing the collection of many different building types, the archive is less limited by the scholarly concerns of the time of its creation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic district and area studies</td>
<td>&quot;Sometimes many of the structures in a block or other area form a group which is interesting for its homogeneity, diversity, or because it represents a culture.... Even when only part of the structures are to be recorded, it is advantageous to consider the entire area as a unit.&quot;\textsuperscript{138}</td>
<td>Johnston created area studies with her county surveys. The 1927 Fredericksburg project was a historic district study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of destruction or modification</td>
<td>&quot;A significant structure, imminently threatened, demands special attention. If a building is about to be demolished or its character changed by remodeling, it is important to have photographs made, if not drawings. Equal concern should be felt if restoration is contemplated.... recording a building that is carefully maintained is less urgent than Johnston was careful to document fragile outbuildings and vernacular structures, as well as dwellings in a poor state of repair. She took pre-restoration photographs of houses that were later changed significantly, such as Edgemont.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid, 10.  
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility at special times</th>
<th>“Access to a building during demolition, remodeling, or restoration often makes it possible to find important details exposed, which would not otherwise be observable.”&lt;sup&gt;140&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Johnston photographed structural information when she had the opportunity, especially in mills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of the structure</td>
<td>“Buildings which have remained as they were originally, are highly desirable to record because they illustrate exactly a given period. Their value is further enhanced if the setting and auxiliary buildings also remain unchanged.”&lt;sup&gt;141&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Attention to the documentation of setting and auxiliary buildings is one of the main stylistic features of Johnston’s work. Given that her fieldwork began 80 years ago, many of the buildings documented were in a less altered state than those remaining for study today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical data available</td>
<td>“The present state of historical knowledge about a given structure is an important factor, since it is preferable to record those about which the most facts are known or are likely to be ascertained.”&lt;sup&gt;142&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Johnston’s personal papers contain records of the owner of each dwelling she photographed. Typed card catalog records in the Prints and Photographs Reading Room at the Library of Congress contain additional information about the history and ownership of each site, where it is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and architectural interest</td>
<td>“For the purposes of selection, history and architecture ought to be given equal weight. Some buildings with important historical associations have little or no architectural interest; the reverse is also true.”&lt;sup&gt;143&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Johnston documented many types of vernacular structures not considered architecturally significant in the 1930s. Johnston recorded them anyway to create a more representative historical record. Johnston also asked Charles Peterson for recommendations of structures to photograph, and he sent a list of “houses... especially important for some architectural feature.”&lt;sup&gt;144&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial significance</td>
<td>“Increasing interest in the development of technology and</td>
<td>Johnston photographed mills, bridges, warehouses,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>139</sup> Ibid, 11.<br><sup>140</sup> Ibid, 11.<br><sup>141</sup> Ibid, 11-2.<br><sup>142</sup> Ibid, 12.<br><sup>143</sup> Ibid, 12.<br><sup>144</sup> Letter from Charles Peterson to Frances Benjamin Johnston, 16 March 1934, FBJ Collection, Reel 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the importance</td>
<td>Industry in the evolution of our national culture have served to focus attention on the physical remains of the early industrial age.</td>
<td>Marketplaces, weaving houses, and other buildings important for early technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineering</td>
<td>“… the increasing attention being given by civil engineers to the history of their profession justifies a substantial expansion of recording activity for structures which occupy an important place in that history.”</td>
<td>Civil engineering was not a prominent aspect of architecture in the time period Johnston was documenting, but she included records of covered bridges and other structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments</td>
<td>“… when some rare, important, or beautiful detail is encountered in a building otherwise devoid of interest, the detail should be recorded even though a full record is not made of the rest.”</td>
<td>The Carnegie Survey contains photographic series for sites where the documentary emphasis is on a particular detail, not the structure itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typicality and cultural interest</td>
<td>“Although two buildings seldom are alike in all particulars there are some which can be considered especially representative of a series, kind, region, period, culture, or way of life, and therefore valuable. Simple structures such as workmen’s houses or slave quarters can be as important to record as more elaborate and fashionable ones, in this respect.”</td>
<td>This category of buildings is what Johnston was most interested in documenting, and their representation in the Carnegie Survey reflects her interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarity</td>
<td>“Structures which are uncommon in character, or which have uncommon features, are often of great interest and deserve the close attention of anyone making a survey. The same is true of good examples of a kind which Johnston documented unusual structures, such as a garden house or a grotto, but she also was careful to document once-common vernacular structures that were becoming rare due to the vernacular threshold.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146 Ibid, 15.
147 Ibid, 15.
148 Ibid, 15.
was once numerous, but of which only a few remain.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance to historians and preservationists</th>
<th>“Research and publication on the history of American architecture are matters of basic concern. The interchange between scholars and historical institutions is widely recognized as mutually beneficial.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnston enlisted the support and collaboration of the Library of Congress, the University of Virginia, and the foremost architectural historians of the time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149 Ibid, 15.
150 Ibid, 16.
Table 3: Virginia Counties Surveyed by Johnston for the Carnegie Survey
### Table 4: Photographs Taken for the Fredericksburg Survey\(^{151}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Spotsylvania(^{152})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Ebert’s Store, Brompton, Cabins George & Water Streets, Row of Cabins Water Street, Cabin, Barton Street, Cabin, Liberty Street, Cabins, Upper Main Street, Factory Street, St. George Fitzhugh House & Outbuildings, Brick House, Brick House, Brick House, Princess Anne Street, Old Tavern & Cabin, Faquier Street, Houses on Water Street from Bridge, Main Street House, Gov. Hill House, Cabin, Princess Anne Street, Merchant’s Stores and Offices, Daniel’s House, Federal Hill, Boswell House, William Henry Fitzhugh House, Brick Row, George Street, Dabney House, now Lincoln Bank, John Paul Jones House, Kenmore, Miss Doggett’s House, The Quarters, Lang House, Frame House on Main Street, Hugh Mercer Apothecary Shop, City Hall, Market Yard, St. George’s Church, President Monroe Law Offices, Masonic Cemetery, President Monroe’s Domicile, Carmichael House, Presbyterian Church, Dr. Charles Mortimer House, Coghill House, Sentry Box, Miss Eliza Roy’s House, Rising Sun Tavern, Spinning House, Mary Washington House, Ferry Farm, Gunnery Springs, The Knight House, Warehouses, Falls Cottage, Fall Hill, Snowden House, Oakley, Port Royal, Chatham

---

\(^{151}\) Based on records in the FBJ Collection, Reel 27.

\(^{152}\) Johnston’s records note that 2 images of Port Royal were taken in Caroline County during the Fredericksburg Survey.
Table 5: Alphabetical County List of Virginia Photographs in the Carnegie Survey\textsuperscript{153}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Accomac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td>Ailworth Cottage, Bowman's Folly, Chincoteague Farm, Coard Farm House, Drummond Mill, Debtor's Prison, Margaret Custis House, The Folly aka Mock Farm, Goffigan House Ruins, Guy Cottage, Hedrick Farm, Hill Farm, Mount Custis, Ross House, St. James Rectory, Needas Farm, Ohio, Porch on House, Rogers House, Roseland, Rose Cottage, Warwick, West House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Albemarle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1926-1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Allegheny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td>Crow's Tavern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{153} Based on records in the FBJ Collection, Reel 27.
County Amherst
Year 1935
Images 6
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Quickmore Log Cabin

County Appomattox
Year 1935
Images 5
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Brick House Farm, Appomattox Court House

County Arlington
Year not given
Images 3
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Washington Golf and Country Club

County Augusta
Year 1930
Images 15
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Gibbs Hill

County Bedford
Year 1935
Images 10
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Poplar Forest, Welbourne, Sandusky (Doorway)

County Botetourt
Year 1934
Images 8
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Greenfield, McDonald Farm, McDonald Stone House

County Buckingham
Year 1934
Images 23
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Bellmont, Buckingham Court House, Covered Bridge

County    Caroline
Year       1926-1935
Images     38
Structures 8
Sites Recorded
Gaymont, The Mansion, Mt. Gideon, Oakley, Oakridge, Ormsby, North Wales, St. Julien

County    Campbell
Year       1931-1935
Images     31
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Martha’s Farm, Graves Mill and Cabin

County    Charles City
Year       1931-1935
Images     102
Structures 10
Sites Recorded
Glebe House (HABS), Greenway (HABS), Kittiewan, Lorna Hund, Lower Weyanoke, Montpelier, Shirley and Dependencies, Shirley (Carter-Nelson Silver), Weyanoke, Westover

County    Chesterfield
Year       1933-1935
Images     29
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Castlewood, Frazier’s Tavern, Minor Houses

County    Clark
Year       1933
Images     17
Structures 4
Sites Recorded
Helm, Store (Neoclassic Design), Ruined Slave Quarters, Stone House and Quarters

County    Dinwiddie
Year       1933
Images     42
Structures 8
Sites Recorded
Battersea, House (Steps), Lloyd House, Minor Houses, Old Tavern, On Ettricks, Wales, Mansions

County    Essex
Year      1935
Images   13
Structures  3
Sites Recorded
Bathhurst (HABS), Blandfields [sic], Customs House

County    Fairfax
Year      1920-1932
Images   66
Structures  11
Sites Recorded
Broadwater House, The Blue Door, Colross Manor, Gardiner Booth House, Gardiner House, McGuire House, Moore House, Murray House, Smoot Gardens, House on Route 20, Wellington

County    Fauquier
Year      1929-1934
Images   80
Structures  7
Sites Recorded
Barrett House, Belvoir, North Wales Country Club, Scalesby, Flower Studies (Garden Group), Warrenton Country School, Warrenton Flower Show

County    Fluvanna
Year      1931
Images   39
Structures  4
Sites Recorded
Lower Bremo, Bremo, Bremo Recess, Bremo, Adobe House

County    Frederick
Year      1931
Images   11
Structures  2
Sites Recorded
Glen Burnie, Wright Farm

County    Gloucester
Year      1935
Images   65
Structures  11
Sites Recorded
House at Ark, Glebe House (HABS), Kempville, Little England, Mt. Prodigal, Ordinary, Pursan, Roaring Springs, Rose Hill, Rosewell (Ruins) (HABS), Toddsbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Halifax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green's Folly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935-1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buckeye, Hickory Hill, Montevideo, Old Tavern, Rocketts, Rural Plains (HABS), Scotchtown (HABS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1927-1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agecroft, Gill House, Reveille, 1 Main Street, 1800 Monument Avenue, Reededale, Nordley, Taylor House, Trigg House, Buckhead Springs, Virginia House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Isle of Wight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court House (HABS), Farm, Jordan, Windsor Castle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>James City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green Spring, Kings Mill [sic], Williamsburg, Peyton Randolph House, Court House, Powhatan, Secretary’s Office, Warburton House, Wythe House

County          King and Queen
Year           1934
Images         18
Structures     6
Sites Recorded
Dixon, The Glebe for Drysdale Parish, Hillsborough (HABS), Hockley, Little Plymouth, White Hall

County          King George
Year           1935
Images         16
Structures     3
Sites Recorded
Hamstead, Mansion, Twiford

County          King William
Year           1935
Images         48
Structures     12
Sites Recorded
Chelsea, Court House, Dublin Mill, The Mount, Mammy House, Piping Tree Ferry House, Retreat (HABS), Village Houses, Roseville (HABS), Sweet Hall, Seven Springs, Waterville

County          Lancaster
Year           1935
Images         4
Structures     1
Sites Recorded
Bewdley Ruins

County          Loudon
Year           1924-1931
Images         245
Structures     22
Sites Recorded
Foxcroft School, Oak Hill, Benton, Middleburg Flower Show, Oatlands, Rogers House, Rockland, Rust Portraits, E. Marshall Rust, School House, John Hanny House, Mountain Home, Green Level, Montressor, Temple Hall, House, Yellott Farm, House, Cabin, Mill, House, Zeigler House

County          Louisa
Year           1935
Images 14
Structures 6
Sites Recorded
Boswell's Tavern, Farm House, Hawkwood, Farmhouse, Ionia, Valentines Mill

County Madison
Year 1935
Images 3
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Woodberry Forest

County Mathews
Year 1935
Images 18
Structures 4
Sites Recorded
Auburn, Green Plains, Hesse, Tide Mill

County Mecklenburg
Year 1935
Images 10
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Bett's Place, Farm House, Prestwould

County Middlesex
Year 1935
Images 10
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Wilton-on-the-Planktatank

County Montgomery
Year 1935
Images 8
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Fothering Gay

County Nansemond
Year 1935
Images 2
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Pembroke (HABS)
County   Nelson
Year      1935
Images    14
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Cabell House, Soldier’s Joy, Union Hill

County   New Kent
Year      1935
Images    16
Structures 4
Sites Recorded
Apperson Farm, The Castle (HABS), Christ’s Cross (HABS), The Tavern

County   Northampton
Year      1934-1935
Images    57
Structures 14
Sites Recorded
Brownsville, Cessford, Debtor’s Prison, Eastville Court House, Eastville Inn, Elkington, Eyre Hall, Ingleside, Kendall Grove, Old Birds Nest, Tankard’s Rest, Vancluse [sic], Hard Farm, Wellington

County   Northumberland
Year      1935
Images    19
Structures 5
Sites Recorded
Cobbs Hall, Ditchley, Hard Bargain, Heathville [sic] Tavern, Mantua

County   Orange
Year      1930-1934
Images    49
Structures 5
Sites Recorded
Barboursville, Lochiel, Inn, Montebello, Montpelier

County   Pittsylvania
Year      1935
Images    36
Structures 8
Sites Recorded
Bachelor’s Hall, Berry Hill, Dan’s Hill (HABS), Michaux, Moses House, Mountain View, Oak Hill, Willow Oaks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sites Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>The Wigwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>Brandon, Upper Brandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>Dumfries Ruins (HABS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Anne</td>
<td>Boush House, Dey House, Fairfield Farm, Eastwood, Henley, Huggin House, Keeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Bladensfield, Menokin, Mount Airy (HABS), Sabine Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td>Buena Visa, Bushong, Farm House, Garst Log House, Hobby Horse Farm, Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotsylvania</td>
<td>(see Table 4 for earlier Fredericksburg pictures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year 1933-1935
Images 22
Structures 10
Sites Recorded
Alsop Farm, Cox House, Gayle Farm, Haley Farm, Hazel Hill, Log Cabin, Oak Cottage, Reynolds House, Wigg Hill, Ziekiel Farm

County Stafford
Year not recorded
Images 53
Structures 21
Sites Recorded
Belmont, Kate Waller Barrett House, Courthouse, Cabin Adjoining Courthouse, Basil Gordon Warehouse, Old Eagle Tavern, Mcduff Green Warehouse, Old Warehouse, Frank Hill’s Old Store, Old Stone Bakery, Barnes House & Forbes House, Old Cabin on Fall Run, Brook’s House, Gordon Green Terrace, Mrs. Ellis Store, William Burton House, Union Church, Dr. Jett’s Farm, Brooks Home, Old Dunbar Quarters, Doorway, House on Hill

County Surry
Year 1933-1936
Images 44
Structures 9
Sites Recorded
Bacon’s Castle (HABS), Claremont Manor, Four Mile Tree, Melville, Pleasant Point (HABS), Rich Neck, Rolfe House, Tavern, Walnut Valley

County Warren
Year 1935
Images 9
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Mt. Zion

County Warwick
Year 1935
Images 10
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Jones House, Poor Farm

County Westmoreland
Year 1935
Images 41
Structures 6
Sites Recorded
Kirnan, Peckatone (Kitchen), Wilmington, Wilton, Stratford, Wakefield

County: York
Year: 1935
Images: 47
Structures: 5

Sites Recorded:
- Kiskikiak [sic], Paul Cottage, Shields (HABS), Customs House (HABS), York Hall (HABS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Meeting House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Stone Church, Fort Defiance, Tinkling Springs Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomac</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George’s Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County List of Photographs of Virginia Churches in the Carnegie Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Sites Recorded</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elizabeth City</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County Frederick
Year 1930
Images 3
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Quaker Meeting House

County Gloucester
Year 1930
Images 15
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Abingdon Church, Ware Church

County Hanover
Year 1930
Images 3
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Fork Church

County Henrico
Year 1930
Images 4
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
St. John’s Church

County Isle of Wight
Year 1930
Images 6
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
St. Luke’s Church (HABS)

County James City
Year not given
Images 19
Structures 3
Sites Recorded
Hickory Neck Church, Bruton Parish Church, Jamestown Church

County King George
Year not given
Images 9
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Lamb’s Creek Church, St. Paul’s Church

County    King William
Year      not given
Images   7
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Mangohick Church, St. John’s Church

County    Lancaster
Year      not given
Images  14
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
St. Mary’s Church, Christ Church (HABS)

County    Louisa
Year      not given
Images  3
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Providence Church (Presbyterian)

County    Madison
Year      not given
Images  4
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Heberon

County    Middlesex
Year      not given
Images  5
Structures 1
Sites Recorded
Christ Church

County    Nansemond
Year      not given
Images  6
Structures 2
Sites Recorded
Glebe Church, St. John’s Church

County    New Kent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Sites Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Peter’s Church (not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Paul’s Church (not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hunger’s Church (not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Briery Church (not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Anne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Merchant’s Hope Church (not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Donation Church, Eastern Shore Chapel (not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnham Church</td>
<td>Rockbridge</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Stone Church</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquia Church</td>
<td>Surry</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Surry Church</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeocomico Church</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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