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Administrative Information
Management Summary
The Old Courthouse, situated west of the Mississippi River in St. Louis, Missouri, is the second courthouse built on this property. Construction of this courthouse dates to 1839, although the structure saw a multitude of additions and renovations throughout the 19th century as St. Louis grew and the courthouse expanded in response to the growing need for more and larger court space. St. Louis’ extraordinary growth ultimately spelled the death of this fine 19th-century building as a functioning courthouse, since by the 20th century it could no longer effectively meet the needs of what had become a metropolitan area. In 1930, most of the business conducted in the Old Courthouse transferred to the newly-constructed Civil Courts building, and by Executive Order on December 21, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt authorized the allocation of funds for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, contingent upon one-fourth of the funding being provided by the City of St. Louis. The Order noted the motivation for the Memorial was based on the significance of the land to the Louisiana Purchase and American westward expansion; but also referred to the importance of “The Court House in which the Dred Scott case was tried.” In 1940, the City of St. Louis gave the Old Courthouse to the National Park Service, and planning and restoration of the Old Courthouse moved forward in earnest.

Today, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial comprises not only the Old Courthouse but also Eero Saarinen’s famed Gateway Arch, completed in 1965. An underground museum and visitor center beneath the Arch orient the public to St. Louis’ history as the gateway to the American frontier. The Old Courthouse contains park offices, the park library, exhibits, and two magnificent historic courtrooms. Five of the park’s seven interpretive themes are addressed in the Old Courthouse, where visitors can learn about the Old Courthouse and its role in debates regarding rights and responsibilities of citizens, the Dred Scott Decision, the West as symbol, St. Louis’ strategic location and role in westward expansion, and Thomas Jefferson’s vision of the West as fostering democratic values.

The National Park Service restoration of the Old Courthouse in the 1940s and 1950s targeted 1870 as the period for exterior and interior restoration. In the grand second-floor courtrooms there was never an expressly stated period of interpretation but decisions were guided by the premise that earliest was best and care was given to document much of the work and many of the reproduction elements of the furnishings. In these courtrooms, historic and reproduction furnishings help create a sense of the historic use of these spaces, yet neither courtroom presents a tightly focused and documented period of interpretation.

1 Executive Order, December 21, 1935. “Allocation of funds to the Secretary of the Interior for the acquisition and development of a historic site to be known as the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.”
2 Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Draft Long Range Interpretive Plan, 2006. The two other park themes are the Gateway Arch as symbol of westward expansion and the architectural significance of Saarinen’s Gateway Arch.
3 Charles E. Peterson to Chief of Planning, June 30, 1941, JNEM Archives; “Justification,” Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Old Courthouse, 1944, JNEM Archives.
Figure 1 “Old St. Louis Court House, First Floor Plan.”
Figure 2 “Old St. Louis Court House, Second Floor Plan.”
St. Louis city and county ownership of the Old Courthouse has left a rich legacy of excellent documentation of the building’s history, often referencing interior finishes and furnishings, but unfortunately with little consistency. Two 1860 prints documenting the west courtroom survive, and two 1910s photographs record the appearance of the east courtroom. This Historic Furnishings Report relies upon this documentation as well as period newspaper articles and original receipts and vouchers in both the park library and the Missouri Historical Society. (See “A Note on Sources with Suggestions for Future Research” in this report.)

Visitors experience the historic courtrooms in a variety of ways (guided tour, self-guided tour, education or special group programs) and this Historic Furnishings Report will complement and mesh well with all of these visitor experiences. Once this report is implemented, the interior waysides and publications should be revised and updated to be consistent with what the public sees. The new information unearthed for this report can be integrated into park interpretation at any time.

A paint analysis of the east courtroom should be conducted to fully document the historic furnishings period called for in this report. A comprehensive study would be best, but at the least the 1910s paints and finishes need to be identified and reapplied in order to attain a fully accurate presentation of this courtroom’s appearance during this chosen period of historic furnishing and interpretation.

When this report is fully implemented the second-floor courtrooms will contain small, incidental furnishings that give the rooms a realistic and “in use” appearance. They will also contain either historic or reproduction furnishings such as chairs and tables, etcetera., some of which, while not original to the courthouse, may have a significant replacement value. This may present conflicts and/or the need for additional staff time if tours or arranged groups enter and use the court area for mock trials. These changes can be addressed in a number of different ways. Small items could be temporarily removed from the court so as not to be damaged or lost. Alternatively, mock trials might be held in another courtroom within the Old Courthouse if one were available.

**Interpretive Objectives**

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial’s 2006 *Draft Long Range Interpretive Plan* enumerates seven interpretive themes. Two of these themes in particular are emphasized in the Old Courthouse – the structure as a “crucible and house of debate where the struggle for civil rights, justice, freedom, and equality highlighted the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in St. Louis and the United States,” and “the Dred Scott Decision . . . a significant event in United States history which spotlighted the potential expansion of slavery into the American West and helped exacerbate sectional tensions which led to the Civil War.” In a more general manner the themes of the West as shaping democratic values, the West as symbol of American growth and identity, and St. Louis’ strategic location are also addressed in the interpretation of the Old Courthouse.

Well-documented and more accurately furnished historic courtrooms will allow the park to address all of these themes more thoroughly than at present. Based on preliminary research findings, the park determined in July 2005 to furnish the west courtroom to the 1870 time period, after the new heating system was installed in the building. This is the earliest time to which the courtroom can be documented and presented. The east courtroom will be furnished to the 1910s, the era for which it is best documented and can be presented most accurately. (See Appendix A for the “Historic Furnishings Options” upon which this decision was made.)

**Operating Plan**

The Old Courthouse is open to the public seven days a week. Visits may be self guided or via a public or educational group tour. Guided tours of the building allow visitors to see areas of the structure not accessible on the self-guided tours. Visitors to the Old Courthouse today have the opportunity to learn about Dred Scott as well as the use of the courtrooms in a variety of fashions. An orientation movie
mentions Scott and his significance, ranger-led tours generally begin in the west wing of the courthouse where the original Scott courtroom was located, and interpretive panels both in the west wing corridor and around the second-floor rotunda gallery explain the history of Dred Scott. Numerous education programs are offered for different age levels; they feature different aspects of the Old Courthouse’s legal history. One program, the “Dred Scott v. Irene Emerson Trial,” allows 4th–12th graders to study the Scott cases at a closer level, including participating in a mock trial. While designed for school groups, this program is also given to bus groups, church groups, family reunion groups, and general public tours if the size is sufficiently large and the individuals are interested.

For the many visitors to the Old Courthouse who tour the building on their own, the interpretive panels already noted provide information on Dred Scott, the Scott family, and the history of the Dred Scott case. Interior wayside panels, mounted on the security railing, explain the history of each courtroom. Ranger-led tours actually enter the courtrooms and visitors are permitted to try on reproduction judges’ robes and view the courtrooms from the judges’ benches.

**Prior Planning Documents**


Historical Information
Numerous sources were consulted for this study of the Old Courthouse’s historic courtrooms, their furnishings, and use. The most visually significant materials are the original furnishings themselves and historic views of the Old Courthouse interiors. Examination of the extant original courtroom furniture determined that it dates to the 19th century, perhaps as early as the 1870–85 period. For the three courtrooms included in this report, only four images exist from the historic period when the building served as a courthouse. Two newspaper prints document the west courtroom in 1860 and two photographs record the appearance of the east courtroom in the 1910s. A fifth historic courtroom interior shows the last trial in the Old Courthouse, held in Circuit Court 6 in the east end of the south wing (now rooms 232, 233, 234, 235, and part of 231) on June 20, 1930. Additionally, an extensive array of blueprints and floor plans document many of the plans and alterations of the Old Courthouse over the years including since it has been a National Park Service property. The majority of these plans are in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial archives but a few different ones are in the extensive TIC (Technical Information Center, National Park Service) collection.

St. Louis County and City Court records provided uneven but at times remarkably detailed documentation for historic courtroom furnishings and maintenance. The vast number of St. Louis newspapers provided period commentary and documentation for Courthouse renovations; the Globe-Democrat photo-morgue at the St. Louis Mercantile Library contained a handful of 20th-century images of the courtrooms. At the Missouri Historical Society a considerable number of mid-19th-century vouchers and receipts for Courthouse work were found in the Dexter P. Tiffany Papers, and the papers of John A. Bryan contain material documenting National Park Service restoration of the Old Courthouse in the 1940s and 1950s.

For comparative courthouse interiors electronic research proved to be quite fruitful. Although images of 19th-century courtrooms were actually fairly plentiful, ones that were in fact comparable to the St. Louis circular courtrooms were rarer. Standard academic Web sites were consulted and, through the use of an electronic database, Harper’s Weekly was thoroughly searched for interior views.

Time and funding place limits on most research, and some sources are not always located at the outset of a project. Amid an abundance of material on historic courthouses and the St. Louis Old Courthouse in particular, care was taken to pursue the leads most likely to be beneficial to the specifics of historic courtroom furnishings. Thorough research was not possible in a number of sources which may contain good documentation for the Old Courthouse courtroom furnishings.
While a large undertaking, historic newspapers were partially mined for this Historic Furnishings Report. Research centered around times of known renovation or furnishing activity in the courthouse and in many instances this provided additional information to incorporate in the report. Research files include records of the newspapers and publication dates examined so that subsequent research need not duplicate efforts. Two other sources, used by John Lindenbusch for the 1982 Historic Structures Report, have information about the Old Courthouse and its furnishings. While Lindenbusch used both the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis General Term Records and the Mayor’s Messages to the Municipal Assembly of the City of St. Louis extensively, it appears that returning to the original material can at times shed better light on historic furnishings questions for the courtrooms. Unfortunately only a handful of years were looked at in both the Mayor’s Messages and the General Term Records, thus leaving these sources open for future historic courtroom furnishings research as well.
History of the Structure

The history of the Old Courthouse, its expansions, renovations, updates, and maintenance mirrors the history of St. Louis from 1839 to 1930. In 1855, the *Daily Evening News* termed the ongoing construction: “a constant state of metamorphosis.” This phrase might well have been used throughout the 19th century and into the early years of the 20th century, as the Old Courthouse was perpetually adapting to the growing and changing needs of its region.

A detailed history of the construction and renovations of the Old Courthouse may be found in a National Park Service report that dates to 1982. John H. Lindenbusch’s *Historic Structure Report, Part I: Historical Data Section and Historic Grounds Study – Old St. Louis Courthouse* meticulously documents the building’s physical history and also includes the early years of National Park Service stewardship, tracking the history of the courthouse up to 1960.

4  *St. Louis Daily Evening News*, March 13, 1855.
Analysis of Historic Occupancy

Early Expansion and Remodeling
The Old Courthouse stands just west of the Mississippi River and Eero Saarinen’s Gateway Arch in St. Louis, Missouri. Its construction spanned many decades of the 19th century, and its physical growth and renovation reflected the increasing size of St. Louis and the myriad needs of a public building in an emergent western city. Expansion barely kept pace with need and as each addition or renovation to the courthouse was completed it was found to be too small for the city and county’s growing population.

Construction of St. Louis’ first courthouse was from 1826 to 1828. Within a decade this courthouse was deemed inadequate and in 1839 work began on the second courthouse – what today is known as the Old Courthouse – designed by Henry Singleton.6 The Old Courthouse’s immense dome made an impressive statement of presence and aspiration on this western landscape, and its interior rotunda assumed an inspiring atmosphere as over the years it hosted civic rallies, nationally prominent orators, funeral ceremonies, and other public gatherings.

Dred Scott Trials
Elsewhere in the Old Courthouse in 1847 Dred and Harriet Scott had their first freedom trial. In 1850 the Scotts – as yet unknown in American households and history – had a second trial in the courthouse and through the 1850s the Scotts’ case worked its way through the Missouri legal system, moving to the Federal Courts in 1854, and finally to the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1856–57 term. In 1857, in an action independent of the Roger B. Taney Supreme Court ruling, Dred Scott and his family were emancipated from slavery and obtained their licenses at the Old Courthouse to reside in Missouri.

The Dred Scott trials ultimately drew national and international attention to St. Louis, but the bulk of cases heard in the Old Courthouse were far less well known, reflecting the comings and goings of legal issues in a burgeoning fur-trade city. Certainly, the Old Courthouse saw activities unique to its St. Louis geography, economy, and circumstances, and, while the Old Courthouse did host other significant and sensational trials, the bread and butter of courthouse business consisted of civil suits in which people made claims over issues such as land

---

disputes, property issues, divorce, and other personal disputes, and criminal cases such as theft, murder, trespassing, or other illegal activity.

**Routine Maintenance, Seasonal Operations, and Mid-19th-Century Use and Appearance**

In addition to the magnificent frescoed rotunda and the stately courtrooms, the Old Courthouse housed the city’s first public restrooms in its basement and offices for all manner of legal support and functions including judges’, clerks’ and sheriff’s offices, jury rooms, and the law library.

Because the Old Courthouse was the pre-eminent public building in St. Louis well into the late 19th century, the county and city maintained the structure in a manner suitable to its stature. In the early years the coal-burning stoves that heated the structure left a considerable residue of coal dust that meant the courtrooms were frequently repainted, as is well documented over the years in the Court Records. Seasonal heat and humidity dictated that a steady supply of ice be provided in the summer months to keep all court business functioning in as efficient a manner as possible. When the weather was dry, the dirt roads outside had to be watered down to keep the dust from infiltrating the building.

In keeping with the city’s prominence and aspirations, the two magnificent courtrooms constructed in the 1850s on the second floor of the courthouse provided an impressive venue for the legal business they were to host. Early expansion of the Old Courthouse in the 1850s and 1860s gave the building the basic footprint that it has today. Use of its interior spaces then shuffled and reshuffled over the rest of the century as functions shifted in response to legal and public need. In the course of maintaining and upgrading this vast public building over the years new systems were adopted as they became available; their impact was evident throughout the Old Courthouse and not limited to the courtrooms addressed in this report.

Gaslighting was first used in the courthouse in 1854. Its brighter light and anticipated safety features kept the courthouse up to date and allowed easier use of the building. Documentation of periodic purchases for unspecified courthouse locations during these years gives a

---

7. “Joseph Foster... one Coat of Painting in the Lower west court room,” Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p. 234, October 21, 1842, photocopy: p 48, Box 6, Folder 1, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Archives, henceforth JNEM Archives; “Ordered that a warrant issue upon the treasurer in favor of Julian and Brother for Eleven dollars and 60 cents for painting and lettering Court rooms and offices about Court House, St. Louis County Court, Records Of Vol. 7, p. 33, Dec. 2, 1851, photocopy: 199, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; “The Court hereby approve the contract made by R. S. Mitchell with M. L. Julian for painting the East Wing of the Court house. Said Contract being dated May 11, 1855,” St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. VIII, p. 236, May 18, 1855, photocopy: 282, Box 6, Folder 1, [part of multi-page description of carpenter’s work in president of Board of Assessors office], JNEM Archives; and “... all the present finish and stone base to receive 3 coats of lead and linseed oil paint. Lead to be from the Collier White Lead Oil Co. and all wood work grained in the A N o. 1 manner and receive 2 coats of best copal varnish,” HSR, Box 5, F 5, p. 287, [1870], JNEM Archives.

8. “To R. D. Watson for ice for use of the different Courts for forty two dollars and sixty cents,” St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. IV, p. 76, September 14, 1844, photocopy: 138, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM.

9. St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. 7, p. 178, August 11, 1852, photocopy: 213, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
general feel for some of the activity and furnishings in the building. Purchases included candles for lighting, coal, stoves, and stovepipe, and their repair.

A courthouse custodian was responsible for these supplies, cleaning the building, and ensuring all fires and lighting devices were put out. Clocks and thermometers were also integral to daily courthouse operations. Carpet, and sometimes grass matting, was used in the courtrooms over the years.

**Remodeling and Central Heating, 1870**

Some 15 years after gaslights illuminated the courthouse interior the once-modern system was no longer considered acceptable. In late March 1870 a number of court officials pooled their requests and shrewdly leaked them to the *St. Louis Daily Democrat*, whose editorial then called the courtrooms appallingly unhealthy and successfully exerted public pressure sufficient to spawn major renovations to the courthouse. The newspaper referenced,

a petition signed by Judges Rombauer and Knight, of the Circuit Court; Judges . . . of the Supreme Court; . . . County Recorder; and the Directors of the Law Library Association, . . . asking that certain much needed improvements be made in some of the rooms of the  

---


11 “. . . an account of John Bingham amounting to three hundred and twenty seven dollars for coal furnished for the Court House. . . .” St. Louis County Court Records, III:336, April 15, 1843; . . . bids will be received. . . . for furnishing three thousand bushels of stove coal for the use of the Courthouse and Jail,” St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. IV, p. 75, September 13, 1844, photocopy: 136, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; “To Andrews & Beakley for stoves and pipes for the Court House for one hundred and sixty nine dollars and ninety five cents.” St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. III, p. 540, March 20, 1844, photocopy: 119, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; “To Thomas R. Axtell for one stove at Courthouse for Eight 25/100 Dollars,” St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. IV, p. 3, April 20, 1844, photocopy: 123, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; “Ordered that a warrant issue upon the Treasurer in favor of C. H. Milton for Eighty two dollars for stoves and repairs to stoves for Court Rooms.” St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. 7, p. 34–35, Dec. 3, 1851, photocopy: 200, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.

12 The custodian was also responsible for the exterior grounds. Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p. 317, April 5, 1843, photocopy: p. 66, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; and “Rules for the Keeper of the Court House and Rotunda Keeper,” July 25, 1862, RU 124 HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives.

13 A watchmaker, Bergeman, repaired two clocks in 1854. “One Regulateur repd [repaired] + new cord” and “One octagon 8 Day clock, new hand [of] [ch?]”, Bill, J [or F] Bergeman to Court House of St Louis, July 7, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST; Lindenbusch found note of electric clocks for the courthouse as early as 1878. They ran, “on current supplied by batteries, were the subject of special maintenance contracts in the ensuing years, indicating that the janitorial staff… found it impossible to keep them in running condition.” Lindenbusch, p. 131; “Winding and keeping live clocks: [$]15.00,” The Mayor’s Message,” Circuit Court Expenses, p. 20, 1890–91; “. . . Application of James J. Lindley Circuit Court for a thermometer for Court Room No 4 [north wing]. . . .” Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 8, p. 260, November 14, 1872, photocopy: 214, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.

Court House. What is wanted is more light and fresh air – especially fresh air. The court rooms are a disgrace to the city, and detrimental to health, and should be altered so as to make them in keeping with the recent salutary improvements in the rotunda and dome, which meet the approbation of the public.  

A few days later the same newspaper continued its crusade with an article entitled, “Judicial Darkness – Justice Not Blind.”

The architect who drew the plans of the Court House appears to have entertained the pagan idea that Justice is blind. At any rate, he fashioned the court rooms in such a manner that very little solar light can shine upon the judicial altars, and in all the court rooms gas is used at midday to enable the eyes of Justice to gaze upon the briefs of the lawyers.  

The judges and other court officials desired a central heating system to help heat adjoining jury rooms and to clear the air of the smoke and dirt from the coal burned in stoves in their courtrooms; they cited precedent in that both the new county jail and the city hospital had steam heating systems. They wanted to eliminate the use of the gaslights, which they argued were unduly expensive, further added to the poor air quality, and did not provide sufficient light. Investigating the petition in early April, the courthouse architect, Thomas Walsh, quickly concurred and ordered the improvements on April 14, 1870. Walsh verified, “this mode of heating by stoves belongs to the past,” and urged immediate action so that the work could be done while the courts were not in session. His justification noted “the heating of the building by Steam is an improvement which should be made; the stoves now used for that purpose not only blacken the frescoed walls, and ceilings, and annoy the Court, but are insufficient to heat the rooms. . . .” Walsh estimated the cost of the heating and ventilating change at $25,000. Heating systems of this scale were becoming increasingly common and had been installed in a number of larger buildings including two in St. Louis. This new method of heating the courthouse meant the addition of a furnace in the basement and a massive boiler and extensive piping throughout the courthouse. As elsewhere in the building, in the courtrooms this meant the removal of stoves and the introduction of radiators, which were thought to provide a more even and cleaner heat. Like so many newer technologies, often embraced before being fully perfected, the central heating did not fully live up to expectations. Heat levels proved less consistent than desired, there was still too much smoke and dirt associated with the system, and poorly insulated pipes kept the efficiency low and expense high.  

15 Judges Rombauer and Knight presided in the two second-floor courtrooms. Daily Democrat, March 27, 1870.
16 St. Louis Daily Democrat, April 1, 1870, Lindenbusch, 112.
17 Ibid., and February 1, and April 1, 1870.
18 Thos. Walsh, Architect to Hon. Judges of the County Court, April 7, 1870 [refers to petition to Judges of the County Court by Judges Rombauer and Knight, No. 2085 “Petition of Judges & Bar for alterations in the various Court and other rooms in Court House” March 28, 1870] referred to Walsh “for investigation,” 281, improvements ordered, April 14, 1870, JNEM Archives HSR Box 5, F5 279–81.
19 Thos. Walsh, Architect to Hon. Judges of the County Court, April 21, 1870, HSR Box 5, Folder 5, 282, JNEM Archives. A newspaper article in the fall reported that all but the north wing of the courthouse received the steam heat system. The Missouri Republican-St. Louis, October 30, 1870.
20 Lindenbusch, 114.
Court struggled to make their initial investment in the heat system worthwhile. In 1873 the court spent $1,000 to install a furnace and water circulator for the basement steam lines in an effort to improve efficiency.21 In the summer, ice continued to be required to keep people comfortable in the courthouse, particularly in the warmer second-floor rooms. The 1873 contract for ice suggests that the courts met in the evening to avoid work in the hottest part of the day.22

From a lighting standpoint the courthouse renovations of 1870 proved more successful, particularly in the second-floor courtrooms where skylights replaced ventilators. The two circuit courtrooms were rearranged and refurnished as well, but the change in lighting proved most noteworthy.

These are so changed and remodeled that they are scarce recognizable to those accustomed to their old condition. Circuit Courts No. 1 and 3 are really elegant, and have lost their old sombre, uncomfortable appearance. . . . The old ventilators over the courtrooms are taken out and the eye of the domes covering these courts are enlarged and wrought iron skylights placed over them, and the sub-domes underneath reflecting rays of light directly down into the court-rooms below; and over the lawyers’ desks. These sub-domes are a very handsome feature in the courts and are tastefully frescoed. These improvements make the court-rooms cheerful and pleasant. . . .23

In fact, the lighting and other changes were so dramatic that one newspaper reported the judges appeared more dignified and the lawyers better dressed. “The Judges now look less like owls, sitting in the dark, and more like learned men occupying tribunals for the dispensation of justice. . . . The lawyers are delighted with these improvements, and have commenced wearing better clothes. . . .”24

Much as the lawyers culled and improved their wardrobes, the courts disposed of their old and “unserviceable” furniture following the renovations of 1870. In both 1873 and 1875 the St. Louis County Court Records document the sale of chairs, desks, tables, benches, chandeliers, and “other old rubbish now stored in the basement. . . .”25

Late 19th-Century Maintenance and Improvements amid General Decline
In 1876, reflecting the continuing growth of the region, the governments of the City and the County of St. Louis split into two separate entities. The courthouse was thus transferred to the City of St. Louis. As the individual room histories that follow will detail, the Old

21 Record of St. Louis County Court, vol. unknown, p. unknown, March 17, 1873, photocopy: 221, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives. This was a “Woodson Patent Furnace and Water Circulator.”
22 James E. Flynn supplied, “Northern Lake Ice of the best quality to the Four Courts building and the Court House as may be required during the evening season at forty four (44) cents per hundred weight.” Record of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 18, p. 455, April 7, 1873, photocopy: 222, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
23 The Missouri Republican-St. Louis, October 30, 1870.
24 Missouri Democrat, October 30, 1870.
25 A few early chandeliers remained in the Old Courthouse basement in 2004, however it is not certain they were used in this building originally. Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 18, p. 455, April 7, 1873, photocopy: 222, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives; and Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 21, 154, June 29, 1875, photocopy: 265, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
Courthouse continued to have ongoing repairs, repainting, and updates. At some point prior to the turn of the century the courthouse was wired for electricity. A large portion of that wiring could have been through the old gas piping making installation a less onerous task than it might seem. By 1893 electric fans were in use in the building, and by the turn of the century note was made of problems with electrical service. Lindenbusch noted that in acquiring new furniture, the city made “a gradual shift away from custom-made furniture and toward the purchase of objects from commercial dealers such as Mueller Brothers, the Scarritt Furniture Company or F.J. Comstock & Co.” In addition to saving the city money, this transition to commercial items reflects the decline of custom work and the rise of commercially available furniture in St. Louis.

By the early 1890s it was clear that the city was struggling to keep up with the expense of maintaining the Old Courthouse, one of its many public buildings. The Mayor’s Message at the close of 1892 contained the Commissioner of Public Buildings’ comment that, overall, the Courthouse was in a “dilapidated and unwholesome condition.” Two years later, in June 1894 the city passed an ordinance appropriating $12,000 to address plumbing, roofing, exterior painting, and paving around the courthouse grounds, and the addition of new jury rooms. In 1959, National Park Service architect John A. Bryan characterized this as “an extensive program of alteration and redecoration [that] had taken place in the courthouse in 1894.” Extensive as it was, it appears not to have affected the inside of the courthouse greatly. A minor portion of the appropriation went to interior painting, which was done only in hallways. Interestingly, the courtrooms were not repainted because they had wallpaper in them. No documentation has been found for when any such wallpaper was applied in the courthouse, but fragments of wallpaper(s) that likely date to the late 1890s were found under the judge’s bench in the second-floor, west courtroom (room 207) in November 2004 (see figure 27). Also confirming the late 19th-century wallpapering of the courtrooms, in the 1950s a Lincrusta wallpaper was removed from the second-floor, east courtroom’s skylight.

One Last Refurbishing Effort – The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Coincides with Plans for New Court Building

By the end of the 19th century, even after the city and county had split, it was becoming clear that this grand structure would become the “Old” Courthouse as more and more courts were needed to handle the volume of legal business in the city and region. The Four Courts Building had been erected in 1871 to relieve pressure on and use of the Old Courthouse’s facilities. Despite sprucing up of the building in the 1890s, it still needed considerable work.

26 General Term, III, as cited in Lindenbusch, 157.
27 Lindenbusch, 154.
29 The Mayor’s Message, 1892, xiii and 18; 1893, 304, as cited in Lindenbusch, 156–57.
31 Lindenbusch, 157–62.
32 Lincrusta is an embossed wallpaper made with linseed oil; it was popular in the late 19th century. Bryan noted removing Lincrusta from the courtroom skylight surround. See John Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, East Wing, 34–38, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives.
An exhibition catalog of the St. Louis Architecture Club made note: “Court House sadly in need of restoration to its original condition.”

In 1903, as the city geared up to host the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, two new circuit courts were added, causing another reassigning of rooms in the Old Courthouse. Anticipating an influx of visitors, local newspapers called for courthouse rejuvenation, hoping to show the city off and bring tourists to downtown St. Louis as well as to the Fairgrounds.

The Courthouse site is the center of activity in New St. Louis. . . . As the Courthouse is the center of activity now, make it the center of interest and the starting point from which the little journeys through New St. Louis shall be made by the armies of World’s Fair visitors. Put into commission in the grand corridor beneath the dome a bureau of information that shall comprehend the wants of any and all who may seek direction and advice. Turn the tide of travel from Union Station and the other discharging points of the railroads into the downtown business district of New St. Louis, and let the majestic white structure with its towering dome of gold be the mecca of the human tide.

In the fall of 1903 the Board of Public Improvements passed many bills for repairs and alterations, expenses of the growing Circuit Court, and exterior painting of the Old Courthouse, yet the results must not have been sufficiently visible. In February 1904, just six weeks before the Fair opened, the St. Louis Post Dispatch again decried the appearance of the courthouse: “This old building is an example of simple and stately architecture and should not be suffered to continue in a shabby condition. Inside and out the work should be thoroughly and intelligently performed; and the grounds should be made to look at least decent.” Indeed, while the functional, business-related changes had taken place in 1903, the cosmetic work was running behind schedule. Allocation of money for the interior repair and restoration of the dome and painting of the hallways and corridors coincided roughly with the opening of the Exposition. Other improvements apparently did not happen until after the Fair had closed. John Bryan noted that the Board of Aldermen had “appropriated $50,000 to improve the appearance of the Old Courthouse for the World’s Fair visitors,” but the improvements were not completed until 1905.

These last sweeping attempts at renovating and refurbishing parts of the Old Courthouse were insufficient in the face of St. Louis’ continuing growth and needs. Even as after-the-fact Fair refurbishing occurred, in 1904 the Public Buildings Commission determined the Old Courthouse inadequate and called for a new court building.

34 “Paint The Courthouse: Make A Real Broadway,” St. Louis Post Dispatch, March 22, 1903.
36 St. Louis Post Dispatch, February 24, 1904.
38 “Murals in the Rotunda of the Old Courthouse,” [John] Bryan to Superintendent [Julian] Spotts, May 23, 1955, photocopy in the possession of Nancy Hoppe, JNEM. Additionally, this memo refers to a 1904 drawing of the rotunda that was damaged in the fire of 1936. It also mentions a watercolor drawing, “submitted by Marx & Jones, then the leading firm of decorators in St. Louis.” Neither of these drawings appear to be extant.
this Court House is thoroughly unsuited to modern needs and requirements of comfort and safety and economical administration. The old Court House, with its imposing and dignified exterior is too fine an architectural monument for the city to ignore. It should be thoroughly remodeled inside, fire-proofed and modernized to the fullest extent possible, repaired but not painted on the exterior, and its purpose changed from a Court House to a Hall of Records and Museum of Archives pertaining to the city's history.\textsuperscript{39}

In 1923 the city approved money to purchase land and construct a new court building for the circuit and probate courts,\textsuperscript{40} and in 1930 the bulk of the court work moved to the new Civil Courts Building. An assortment of uses were found for the aging Old Courthouse building; the New Deal Works Progress Administration set unemployed architects and historians to work documenting the structure in the mid-1930s and in 1940 the National Park Service received the Old Courthouse as a gift from the City of St. Louis.

**National Park Service Stewardship**

The National Park Service moved swiftly to assess the condition of the Old Courthouse and to plan for its repair and restoration. Maintaining good records of their decisions and work was clearly a priority. While a significant factor in preserving the Old Courthouse was its role in the Dred Scott cases, from the outset it was determined that the actual courtrooms in which his trials took place were not extant, with proof provided

\ldots in an article which appeared in the *Missouri Republican*, June 15, 1857, found by Mr. Bryan. Among other things, the article states that the floors, roof and general architectural character of the West Wing were changed in 1856. Because of the remodeling there seems to be a real question as to whether or not the particular room in which Dred Scott was tried is still in existence.\textsuperscript{41}

Interestingly, the fact that Dred Scott’s “case” took place over many years helped to contribute to the preservation of the second-floor, east courtroom. Early in 1941 the National Park Service was considering relocating its regional offices to St. Louis and there was some discussion of using the large space of the second-floor, east courtroom for its offices. It was quickly pointed out, however, that some of the Dred Scott proceedings might have occurred in this oval courtroom since the case had so many hearings other than the actual trials known to have taken place on the first floor.\textsuperscript{42} National Park Service architect John Bryan also cited the architectural significance of the east courtroom to justify its retention as a historic space rather than use as NPS offices; additionally, he pointed out that the National Park Service was starting to be questioned by influential figures in St. Louis who had doubts about the priorities that would alter such an architecturally significant space.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{39} Public Buildings Commission, “Report to the Honorable Rolla Wells, Mayor of St. Louis” (St. Louis, 1904), p. 10, as cited in Lindenbusch, 211.

\textsuperscript{40} Lindenbusch, 219.

\textsuperscript{41} Charles E. Peterson to Stella Drumm, Librarian, Missouri Historical Society, April 11, 1940, Bryan Papers, MOHIST.

\textsuperscript{42} Elbert Cox to Director [NPS], March 6, 1941, JNEM Archives.

\textsuperscript{43} John A. Bryan to Mr. Spotts, March 3, 1941, JNEM Archives; Lindenbusch, 228–29.
Successfully protecting the second-floor, east courtroom, National Park Service stewardship of the Old Courthouse moved forward with 1870 as its date for restoration and reconstruction. “In general, the architects have suggested that the building and its grounds be restored to their appearance in 1870, which is taken for the date of completion of the building in its present form.”44 One of the tasks undertaken in the Old Courthouse by the Works Progress Administration was placing furniture back in its “original” locations.45 The specifics of the National Park Service work in the two oval courtrooms will be addressed in the “Evidence of Room Use and Furnishings” portions of this Historic Furnishings Report.

National Park Service stabilization and restoration of the Old Courthouse took place through the 1940s and 1950s.46 The second-floor courtrooms have been historically furnished and used to interpret law in St. Louis since John Bryan’s restoration of them in the 1950s. This Historic Furnishings Report allows Jefferson National Expansion Memorial the opportunity to take a step back and reassess the original NPS research and documentation along with NPS studies from the 1970s–1980s. Review of the earlier research and decisions, combined with new research, improves the documentation of the history and appearance of these two courtrooms and the space that once hosted the Dred Scott trials. It also allows the park to make new management decisions about historic furnishings and interpretation based on clearer knowledge of its historic courtrooms.

44 “Justification,” Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Old Courthouse, 1944, JNEM Archives.
45 Lindenbusch, 228.
46 For a thorough discussion of the National Park Service restoration of the Courthouse see Lindenbusch, 227–37.
Evidence of Room Use and Furnishings

This portion of the historic furnishings report presents evidence of room use and furnishings room by room for the following rooms in the Old Courthouse: the “Dred Scott” Courtroom, the second-floor, west courtroom (207), and the second-floor, east courtroom (220). Where documentation permits, this includes a summary of each room’s history, physical changes, and major furnishings and furnishings changes.

Floor plans for the first and second floors of the Old Courthouse, including room numbers, may be found on pages 9 and 10 (figures 1 and 2).

“Dred Scott” Courtroom (presently rooms 102, 103, and 104)

Room History
The west wing of the Old Courthouse was completed in 1842 and the Circuit Court of St. Louis convened in the lower west courtroom from 1843 until 1855. Completion of this new courtroom was a top priority in the spring of 1842 as the county court determined to conduct no other work elsewhere in the building until this courtroom was complete. Court records document the flurry of finishing activity, including carpentry, lathing, and plastering, stuccoing and molding, and bricklaying. The opening of this courtroom – at its inception considered the “big courtroom in the new Courthouse” – attracted considerable publicity as the newspapers highlighted its spectacular décor and decried the expense to the taxpayers.

In 1843 the Courthouse rotunda was not completed, yet there was considerable demand for public meeting space, particularly for an impressive venue for civic gatherings. Protective of his judicial site, presiding Circuit Court Judge Henry Walton made clear that the courtroom would not serve any function but that of the Circuit Court; the courtroom was “assigned and set apart for the use of the Circuit Court, [and] shall not be used for public meetings of any kind.” As the Circuit Court of St. Louis, this courtroom saw a great variety of trials over its 12 years of life. Cases included land disputes, divorce or other interpersonal relations, and property law suits.

47 Joseph Foster conducted the carpentry, as he did for much of the courthouse over the years. Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 119–20, April 2, 1842, photocopy; John Shannon did plastering, Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 121–122, April 11, 1842, photocopy; “Contract for the Plaistering [sic] two Court Rooms in Court House,” April 12, 1842, RU 124 HSR Records Box 6, Folder 5, 85–86, JNEM Archives; Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 216, September 26, 1842, photocopy; St. Louis Daily People’s Organ, January 25, 1843, 2, column 1.

48 Ibid.

Members of the St. Louis Bar also met in the courtroom. The Bar Association of St. Louis did not form until 1874 but various bar members did meet on an ad hoc basis, for example, to honor members who had died. Such meetings were considered appropriate use of the Circuit Court and not “public meetings,” and note of one such meeting that had broader interest than usual was recorded in The Saint Louis Weekly Reveille. At the outset of the Mexican War the St. Louis Bar decided to adjourn the court before the term ended, expecting to resume with the next term in November. Judge Lawless adjourned the court term based on the resolution:

That, in view of the state of public affairs, and the general excitement produced by the commencement of hostilities, by Mexico, against the United States, and the imminent peril of the U.S. army of occupation, we deem it proper that jurors and witnesses should be relieved from further attendance at this term, and do request the court to adjourn the trials of all issues of fact to the next term; and that all witnesses or jurors be discharged.51

As early as 1807 “freedom suits” began to be heard in St. Louis; no doubt many were heard in this impressive space. In these cases enslaved individuals sued for their freedom; nearly 300 such suits were brought in St. Louis before 1865.52 Dred and Harriet Scott v. Irene Emerson, a case which likely appeared little different than those freedom cases that preceded it, was heard in this courtroom in 1847. The first trial was lost on a technicality. Undeterred by this setback the Scotts pursued a second freedom trial, held in this courtroom in 1850.53 (The only other times Scott was known to be in the Old Courthouse for legal actions were in 1857 when he was emancipated and in 1858 when he received his license to reside in Missouri. By that time he was a nationally-recognized figure. It is not certain in which courtroom the Scotts were emancipated, however it appears likely to have been in one of the oval second-floor courtrooms. Dred and Harriet Scott would have received their licenses as free blacks to reside in Missouri in the County Court chambers of the first floor, east wing.)

By 1855 structural problems rendered this grand courtroom unusable. The alteration of this impressive space into two courtrooms with adjoining jury rooms flanking a central corridor determined a different use for this “Dred Scott” courtroom space for the remainder of the Old Courthouse’s life as a working courthouse. A variety of smaller courts and entities, initially including the Land Court and the law commissioner, used these two courtrooms over the years.54 In the late 1930s, once the Old Courthouse no longer housed active courts, the south room of this west wing hosted the nascent collections of the St. Louis Museum of Science and Industry.55 The Veteran’s Administration briefly used some of this ground-floor space immediately after the second World War, but, when it was given the opportunity to consolidate its operations elsewhere in the city, it, too, vacated the Old Courthouse.56

52 See the website of the St. Louis Circuit Court Historical Records Project at: http://www.stlcourtrecords.wustl.edu/about-freedom-suits-history.php for a summary of this information and links to related research.
54 Lindenbusch, 44.
Today, interpretive panels are displayed in the corridor, focusing on the history of Dred Scott and his cases and eventual freedom; the flanking courtrooms contain exhibition space.

Physical Evidence
Although housed in an impressive courtroom suitable to the rule of law conducted in it, the St. Louis Circuit Court had to abandon this grand space due to structural problems with its ceiling and the floor of the courtroom above. In 1855 the first floor of the west wing of the Old Courthouse saw major alteration as load-bearing walls running its full width were inserted, mirroring the construction on the east side of the courthouse and creating a central corridor with north and south courtrooms on either side of it. One of St. Louis’ numerous newspapers noted:

The carpenters and other workmen are now busily engaged in tearing down and ripping up everything inside of the beautiful room heretofore occupied by the Circuit Court, for the purpose of running a hall through it, similar to the one in the opposite wing fronting Fourth Street. This will leave a long room on each side, full of large columns, which cannot but be very much in the way.57

Jury rooms for each courtroom were constructed at the west ends of these new courts at this time as well. These jury rooms are not extant today, and it is not known when they were removed.

Furnishings
At its opening in 1843 this first-floor courtroom created major news in St. Louis. Many felt a scandalous amount of money had been spent on an overly lavish interior, but regardless of finances it appears to have been a truly impressive space, no doubt all the more so as nothing of a similar nature was to be seen in the American West. An oval courtroom, with high ceilings, a surround of fluted columns, decoratively molded plasterwork, and fine fabric coverings all went to articulate this “spacious and gorgeously furnished and finished room.”58

Documented furnishings and finishes for this fine Circuit Courtroom from the 1840s include pressed-brick floor paving,59 44 satinet-covered lawyers’ desks, a counsel table,60 and a bar distinguished by “massive railings.”61 The assignment and arrangement of the lawyers’ desks was specified in the Court Records with care given to ensure each lawyer had his own desk in the order they were listed on the court’s roll; the layout of desks was described as well with

57 Daily Evening News, March 13, 1955, as transcribed in Charles E. Peterson “MEMORANDUM for the Files,” May 28, 1946, Bryan Papers, Box 1, MOHIST.
58 St. Louis Daily People’s Organ, January 25, 1843, 2, column 1.
59 “... have the lower room in the western wing thereof fronting upon Fifth Street paved with pressed brick set upon edge.” Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 216, September 26, 1842, photocopy: 41, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
60 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 268, January 12, 1843, photocopy: p 54, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; St. Louis Circuit Court Record Books 13:432 ; Original in Circuit Court Book 13, 432, St. Louis Civil Courts Archive.
61 St. Louis Daily People’s Organ, January 25, 1843, 2, column 1.
the desks lined up from north to south presumably with the bench then at the north end of
the court room.

The Circuit Court room having been assigned to the Circuit Court on this day the Court
proceeded to assign the seats to counsel in the order in which their names appear in the roll.
Choice of seats was given to Counsel in the order aforesaid. To preserve the identity of the
location of the seats, numbers were assigned to each seat Commencing by number one at
the North west corner of the of the [sic] space allotted at the bar and proceeding in the enu-
meration from the north to the south of that space and then back from south to the north
end thereof and so on to the termination of the numbers. The following seats numbered as
hereinafter set forth were chosen by the following named Counsel + which being so chosen
are hereby assigned to them respectively.62

County Court records from 1843 also reveal the cost and the contractors from whom many
of the original furnishings for the Circuit Court were acquired: in March a George Trask re-
ceived $30.56 for “chairs furnished for the Circuit Court,” and a William A. Lynch was paid
$6.50 for “furnishing a Jury box.”63 Later that summer the same Mr. Lynch provided a “desk
and chair” [likely the judge’s bench and chair] for $11.64

Mention of courtroom finishes and furnishings after its grand opening in 1843 are more scat-
tered. It is known, however, that after a decade of use carpet was installed in the Circuit
Court. About $45 was spent on carpet, indicating a considerable amount of carpet was pur-
chased; this was likely for both the flooring of the bench and jury areas as well as covering the
brick courtroom floor.65 Also in 1854 gas lighting was introduced to the courthouse rotunda
and it may well have been piped to other areas of the building, including the Circuit Court.66

Upkeep of the heavily used court space was a regular duty of courthouse maintenance. Note
was made in 1854 of the painting and varnishing of the grand courtroom. The repainting was
likely done at other times as well, but documentation for it does not appear in the sources
that survive. The quantity of varnishing greatly exceeded the painting with over 800 yards of
wood receiving two coats of varnish.67 The work was done by M. L. Julian, who did a consid-
erable amount of painting and varnishing throughout the Courthouse in the 1850s.

62 St. Louis Circuit Court Record Books 13:432 ; Original in Circuit Court Book 13, page 432, St. Louis Civil Courts
Archive, January 24, 1843; see Reference section below for the enumeration of each lawyer in the court.
63 St. Louis County Court Records, March 28, 1843, III: 307.
64 St. Louis County Court Records, Ill: 373, June 21, 1843.
65 St. Louis County Court, Records of Vol. 7, 286, Mar. 8, 1853, photocopy: 224, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
66 Lindenbusch, 44.
67 Voucher, Robert Mitchell, County of St Louis to M.L. Julian, September 5, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County
Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST.
808-2/3 yds  2 coats varnishing at 25 cts per yd   $202.17
88        yds  1 coat paint at 12-1/2 cts        11.00
half bill for measuring            2.24
-----------
$215.41
Documentation and References
1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, pp. 119–120, April 2, 1842, photocopy: p 27, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... superintendent be required to complete as soon as possible the court rooms fronting on fifth street and that he commence no new work on any other portion of said building except such as will be absolutely necessary for the preservation of the said court house. And further that he notify Joseph Foster the person doing the carpenters work for said building for his agent if any [missing words?] that he is to proceed to do the carpenters work on the aforesaid rooms and have the same ready for plastering without delay agreeably to such plans and instructions as said superintendent shall furnish and give and none other and that the superintendent suspend the work on the inside shutters contemplated for the court rooms.”

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, pp 121–122, April 11, 1842, photocopy: p 28, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... and the court also accept the proposal of John Shannon for plastering the court house at the following prices towit; Furnishing all materials and putting on plain work per yard twenty cents, moldings twenty cents per foot and the angle and centre [sic] pieces at twenty five dollars each...”

1842  “Contract for the Plastering [sic] two Court Rooms in Court House,” April 12, 1842, RU 124 HSR Records Box 6, Folder 5, pp 85–6, JNEM Archives; John Shannon. Specifications & Contracts Approved by Court March 6, 1842. Bond filed April 14, 1843: “... John Shannon ... do all the Plastering and ornamental work of the Saint Louis County Court House or as much as may be directed, being the two Rooms Contained in the west wing of Said Court House furnishing all materials Sand Excepted ... the sum of twenty cents pr.Yard for all the plaine [sic] plastering and twenty Cents pr. foot superficial for all buildings twenty five dollars for the large Centres and angle pecies [sic] Each...”

Specification of the plastering ornamental work and materials Sand excepted for the two Court Rooms of the Saint Louis County Court House Ceilings and all other work that may require Lathing to be lathed with the best quality of Sawed white pine laths one inch and a Quarter in width with four nailes [sic] in each lath the nailes to be of the best quality of Boston Nails no fours.

Ceilings and Side walls to be Scratch coated and browned with the best quality of lime and Sand marter [sic] well haired and laid on Even and true Browning to be well watter [sic] floated Hardfinished with the best quality of lime and ground marble dust mortar, in a Stile Eaquel [sic] to that now finnished [sic] in the north and South wings of the Court House, all to be finnished with plaster of Paris.

All Side Walls to be finished plaine, there will be Stucco Cornices of Appropriate Size with Architraves Soffits Centres Circular moldings and channels.

Wm. Twombly, Supt.
(Specification of the Plastering the two Court Rooms of St. Louis Court House.)”
1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 128, April 14, 1842, photocopy: p 30, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “William Twombly Esquire the superintendent of the court house and Jail presents to the court the contract of John Shannon to furnish all material and do all the plastering for the two court rooms in the west wing of the court house and also his bond in the sum of three thousand dollars for the faithful performance of said contract with Samuel Merry as his security which said bond and contract are approved of by the court.”

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 152, June 14, 1842, photocopy: p 32, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “… an account of S. Ridgely & Co. amounting to thirty one dollars and twelve cents for one branch lamp, ballance [sic] ball chain & loading and gas furnished for the court rooms. . .” [work is being done on west building at this point, thus likely for the 2 west courtrooms]

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 150, June 14, 1842, photocopy: p 32, RU 124 Historic Structures Report Records, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “… an account of Andrews and Beaky amounting to three hundred and ninety dollars and eighty three cents for stoves and pipes furnished for the Court House and offices. . .”

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 216, September 26, 1842, photocopy: p 41, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “… have the lower room in the western wing thereof fronting upon Fifth Street paved with pressed brick set upon edge after the same manner of the office.

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 234, October 21, 1842, photocopy: p 48, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “… all under contracts with the county be requested to suspend further work until further ordered from the time aforesaid [November 1], . . . except Joseph Foster who is not to proceed any further under his contract than the completion of the Lower Court Room as hereafter provided. This is not intended to prevent the finishing of the pavement Carpenters work and one Coat of Painting in the Lower west court room.”

1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 268, January 12, 1843, photocopy: p 54, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “… Archibald Gamble Esquire to be authorized to procure stuff suitable for covering the lawyers desks and counsel table in the new Court room. . .”

1843  January 24, 1843, St. Louis Circuit Court Record Books 13: 432; Original in Circuit Court Book 13, page 432, St. Louis Civil Courts Archive: “Court met pursuant to adjournment, present the honorable Bryan Mullanaphy Judge, William Milburn Esqr. sheriff + John Ruland clerk. The Circuit Court room having been assigned to the Circuit Court on this day the Court proceeded to assign the seats to counsel in the order in which their names appear in the roll. Choice of seats was given to Counsel in the order aforesaid. To preserve the identity of the location of the seats, numbers were assigned to each seat Commencing by number one at the North west corner of the of the [sic] space allotted at the bar and proceeding in the enumeration from the north to the south of that space and then back from south to the north end thereof and so on to the termination of the numbers. The following seats numbered as hereinafter set forth were chosen by the following named Counsel + which being so chosen are hereby assigned to them respectively.
To Mr. A Knox Desk No. 1. To Mr. Dougherty Desk No. 23.
To Mr. Woodruff Desk No. 2. To Mr. Langton Desk No. 24.
To Mr. Shepley Desk No. 3. To Mr. Leslie Desk No. 25.
To Mr. McKinley Desk No. 4. To Mr. John B. King Desk No. 26.
To Mr. Todd Desk No. 5. To Mr. Drake Desk No. 27.
To Mr. Carroll Desk No. 6. To Mr. Primm Desk No. 28.
To Mr. Kelly Desk No. 7. To Mr. Bowlin Desk No. 29.
To Mr. Olney Desk No. 8. To Mr. A.W. Manning Desk No. 30.
To Mr. Johnston Desk No. 9. To Mr. Bogy Desk No. 31.
To Mr. Freman Desk No. 10. To Mr. Hunton Desk No. 32.
To Mr. S Knox Desk No. 11. To Mr. F.W. Risque Desk No. 33.
To Mr. Walker Desk No. 12. To Mr. Polk Desk No. 34.
To Mr. Nelson Desk No. 13. To Mr. Geyer Desk No. 35.
To Mr. L.F. Thomas Desk No. 14. To Mr. Bates Desk No. 36.
To Mr. Dayton Desk No. 15. To Mr. Darby Desk No. 37.
To Mr. Nabb Desk No. 16. To Mr. Allen Desk No. 38.
To Mr. Gantt Desk No. 17. To Mr. Hamilton Desk No. 39.
To Mr. Blair Desk No. 18. To Mr. Tunstall Desk No. 40.
To Mr. John Davis Desk No. 19. To Mr. Spaulding Desk No. 41.
To Mr. Tiffany Desk No. 20. To Mr. Gamble Desk No. 42.
To Mr. Hudson Desk No. 21. To Mr. Bent Desk No. 43.
To Mr. Callahan Desk No. 22. To Mr. Lawless Desk No. 44.”

1843 *St. Louis Daily People’s Organ*, January 25, 1843, p. 2 column 1: “We strayed into the big courtroom at the new Court House yesterday morning, and witnessed the selection of the desks by the crowd of lawyers, with which our Courts are encumbered. It reminded us of the manner [in which] school boys scramble for seats at the commencement of a term . . . . A writing table, covered with the finest satinet, infinitely better than nineteen-twentieths of the taxpayers can afford for pantaloons, and then the commodious drawer with the key, and we suppose the choicest stationary included... While we were looking about in this spacious and gorgeously furnished and finished room, with its fluted columns and massive railings around the bar — its costly masonry and lofty ceilings — with cornice and center circle, we were lead to inquire who paid for all this, or is it all paid for? We are not much acquainted with the modus operandi of collecting taxes; neither are we certain for whose particular use they are expended. We do not know that lawyers are a peculiarly meritorious class of citizens and therefore naturally suppose that they will be called upon to pay something for the use of this building. We once attended a sale of the Butcher’s stalls in the market house — a building with accommodations far inferior to this — and saw some of them bid high prices for a good stall. By a parity of reasoning, we do not see why the lawyers should not each pay a suitable sum for the stalls in the New Court House. It is certainly reasonable to suppose that every shopkeeper in town would be much obligated to the County for furnishing them with stands to do business in, gratis; and they should all be equally entitled to accommodations, unless, as we observed before, there is something peculiarly meritorious in the legal profession.”
1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 285, January 31, 1843, photocopy: p 58, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “Joseph Foster be directed to procure iron of the best quality and proceed to secure the floor in the upper Court Room in the west wing [immediately above “Dred Scott” courtroom] of the Court House from further settling by connecting the girders of said floor with the timbers of the roof according to the plan now submitted by said Joseph Foster.”

1843  Henry Walton, P.J. [Presiding Judge?], County Court Records of Saint Louis County, Vol. III, p 308, March 28, 1843, RU 124 HSR Records Box 5, Folder 5, p 109, JNEM Archives: “…lower room in the West Wing of the Court House be assigned and set apart for the use of the Circuit Court…shall not be used for public meetings of any kind;…the upper room in the East Wing of the Court House be assigned and set apart for the use of the Court of Common Pleas,…”

1843  St. Louis County Court Records, March 28, 1843, III: 307: “The Court audit and allow an account of George Trask amounting to thirty dollars and fifty six cents for chairs furnished for the Circuit Court. …The Court audit and allow an account of William A. Lynch amounting to Six dollars and fifty cents for furnishing a Jury box… [likely for this same court room for which previous work was noted]”

1843  St. Louis County Court Records, April 1, 1843, III:318: “Upon the application of the United States Deputy Marshal, the Court order that the Circuit Court of the United States be allowed to use the lower room in the West wing of the Court House for the purpose of holding said Court therein until such time as said room shall be required for the use of the Circuit Court of the County of Saint Louis.”

1843  St. Louis County Court Records, III: 373, June 21, 1843: “… audit and allow an account of William A. Lynch amounting to eleven dollars for a desk and chair furnished for the circuit court room.…”

1846  The Saint Louis Weekly Reveille, May 18, 1846, p. 861: “THE WAR FEELING! “Meeting of the Saint Louis Bar. On a call of Miron Leslie, Esq., the members of the St. Louis bar met in the Circuit Court yesterday, to take into consideration the necessity of adjourning the court until next term. 

Judge Lawless was called to the chair, and after remarks from Messrs. Geyer, Gantt, Darby, Polk and Primm, upon the present excited state of feeling, and the impossibility of coolly, at this crisis, conducting the business of the court, Mr. Geyer offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

'Resolved, That, in view of the state of public affairs, and the general excitement produced by the commencement of hostilities, by Mexico, against the United States, and the imminent peril of the U.S. army of occupation, we deem it proper that jurors and witnesses should be relieved from further attendance at this term, and do request the court to adjourn the trials of all issues of fact to the next term; and that all witnesses or jurors be discharged!'

The court stands adjourned until the November term.”
1853 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 7, p. 286, Mar. 8, 1853, photocopy: 224, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “Ordered that a warrant issue upon the treasurer in favor of J. C. Louderman & Co. for forty four dollars and 74 cents for carpet for Circuit Court Room.”

1854 Voucher, St. Louis County to John Ryan, September 3, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST: “To paving the Circuit Court room, + sidewalk of the Court – house $3.00 “[work done August 1854]

1854 Voucher, Robert Mitchell, County of St Louis to M.L. Julian, September 5, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST:

```
808-2/3 yds  2 coats varnishing at 25 cts per yd $202.17
88       yds  1 coat paint at 12–1/2 cts        11.00
half bill for measuring                          2.24
---------
$215.41
```

1855 March 13, 1855, Daily Evening News as transcribed in Charles E. Peterson “MEMORANDUM for the Files,” May 28, 1946, Bryan Papers, Box 1, MOHIST: “The carpenters and other workmen are now busily engaged in tearing down and ripping up everything inside of the beautiful room heretofore occupied by the Circuit Court, for the purpose of running a hall through it, similar to the one in the opposite wing fronting Fourth Street. This will leave a long room on each side, full of large columns, which cannot but be very much in the way. One of these rooms is to be occupied by the Circuit Court, and the other by the Criminal Court. The Jury Rooms, which are to be taken off at the West end, will reduce the main rooms to something like just proportions.”

1859 from November 10, 1859 Missouri Republican as transcribed in Charles E. Peterson “MEMORANDUM for the Files,” May 28, 1946, Bryan Papers, Box 1, MOHIST: “While under my [Mitchell] charge… the West Wing was almost entirely remodeled, made fireproof and re-roofed. . . .”

1938 John A. Bryan, A Physical History of the Old Courthouse St. Louis, Missouri, 1826–1938. JNEM Archives October, 1938: “the South Room of the West Wing is now filled with a small collection of mechanical models. This material is said to be the beginning of the St Louis Museum of Science and Industry, organized three or four years ago.”

1940 Charles E. Peterson to Stella Drumm, Librarian, Missouri Historical Society, April 11, 1940, Bryan Papers, Box 1, MOHIST: “…in an article which appeared in the Missouri Republican, June 15, 1857, found by Mr. Bryan. Among other things, the article states that the floors, roof and general architectural character of the West Wing was changed in 1856. Because of the remodeling there seems to be a real question as to whether or not the particular room in which Dred Scott was tried is still in existence.”
1945  John Bryan, “Administrative History,” 1959, p.19, RU 124 HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives: “... Just as the war in Europe and Japan was being ended, the Veterans’ Administration asked for temporary office space in the West Wing, first floor, of the Old Courthouse. The walls were painted one coat, and a cheap grade of linoleum was laid in the room on the north side of the hall. ... The Veterans’ Administration did not remain there long, because with the Government’s purchase of the large building at the northeast corner of Broadway and Pine, all the various branches of the Veterans’ Administration that had been scattered in various parts of the City were consolidated under one roof. With the removal of those offices, the West Wing was locked again, awaiting the time when restoration work could begin there.”

West Courtroom – Room 207

1865–1865  Common Pleas Court
1865–1896  Circuit Court 3
1896–1930  Circuit Court 4

Room History
The original second-floor west courtroom was built in the 1840s. Its basic construction and plastering were done simultaneous with the first-floor court in this wing (see Dred Scott Courtroom) with Joseph Foster doing carpentry work and John Shannon as plasterer. While the downstairs courtroom had opened to great admiration in early 1843, it was also criticized as being too costly. The St. Louis County Court moved to scale back expenses for this second-floor oval courtroom, asking carpenter Joseph Foster to provide an estimate for “finishing the upper Court Room,” incorporating many “plain” elements. Even with the scaled back decorations and seating, Foster’s estimate, attained with the help of Judge James J. Purdy and including all finishing work, doors, judge’s seat, benches and tables, was for $17,800.

Justice Purdy appears to have overseen the other finishing work and furnishing for this courtroom, which opened as the Common Pleas Court in 1844. While it housed the Common Pleas Court until 1865, its original appearance was short lived. It was thoroughly remodeled in the 1850s as part of more extensive courthouse renovations in the west wing. These renovations were required largely because of structural problems with the floor of this courtroom and the ceiling of the grand courtroom below (Dred Scott Courtroom). The financial circumstances of the court had changed in that decade and the public appears to have been amenable to the construction of another grand courtroom by the mid-1850s (the loss of the celebrated first-floor courtroom due to these same structural problems probably helped to

68 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, pp. 119–120, April 2, 1842, photocopy: 27, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 121–22, April 11, 1842, photocopy: 28, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives; “Contract for the Plastering [sic] two Court Rooms in Court House,” April 12, 1842, RU 124 HSR Records Box 6, Folder 5, 85–86, JNEM Archives; Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 128, April 14, 1842, photocopy: 30, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
69 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 281, January 20, 1843, photocopy: 57, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
70 Joseph Foster to County Court of Saint Louis County, January 30, 1843, RU 124 HSR Records Box 5, Folder 5, 106, JNEM Archives.
justify creating the awesome upper courtroom). Not completed in time for the October 1856 session, the Court of Common Pleas had to meet in the east wing’s new second-floor courtroom. In the spring of 1860, the nationally famous Shaw Trial, in which Effie Carstang sued Henry Shaw for breach of promise, took place here.\footnote{Robert Moore, The Old Courthouse, 44–45.}

In 1865, as the St. Louis courts grew in response to the city and region’s growth, Circuit Court 3 was assigned this upper courtroom in the west wing. The work of this court took place here until 1896. It was during this time, as part of regular bar admission ceremonies, that future Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis was admitted to the St. Louis Bar in Circuit Court 3 on November 21, 1878.\footnote{Brandeis was known to have had at least seven cases in the St. Louis courts, although it is not known where they took place. “Brandeis in Saint Louis,” Burton C. Bernard, in Commemorative Program [dedication of Bronze Bust of Brandeis], June 28, 1966, Papers of Louis D. Brandeis, MOHIST. See also Burton C. Bernard, “Brandeis in St. Louis,” The St. Louis Bar Journal, Winter 1964, 53.} Near the end of the century in 1896 the courtroom was redesignated as Circuit Court 4.

In the 1930s it was widely believed that this upper west courtroom had been the site of the Dred Scott trial(s). National Park Service research soon determined that this was not the case and that the so-called Dred Scott courtroom no longer existed as such.\footnote{Charles E. Peterson to Stella Drumm, Librarian, Missouri Historical Society, April 11, 1940.} The idea that this second-floor, west courtroom had been the location of the Scott trial(s) persisted, at least in the popular mind, for a number of years; in 1942 a Time-Life photograph of the courtroom by Walter Sanders was captioned to indicate the trial took place here (figure 16). Visitors toured the west courtroom even in its rough state in the 1940s and 1950s (figure 17). On May 1, 1958 the Bar Association of St. Louis held a re-enactment in this courtroom of the second Dred Scott trial. St. Louis area lawyers and Dred Scott descendants took part in the presentation. The re-enactment was held over two days, one on the evening of April 30, 1958, and another on the evening of May 1, 1958 (figure 19).\footnote{St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 1, 1958, 20D.}

The particular care and attention taken with many of the furnishings and reproductions in this courtroom indicates the Park Service thought of this west courtroom as more significant in some manner. Perhaps it was thought to be more closely linked with the earlier Dred Scott time period or courtroom, although this was not articulated. It was thought that the Scotts might have received their emancipation in this courtroom, but perhaps the simple proximity to the then-modified first-floor space below where the Scott trials were known to have taken place helped foster this emphasis on the west courtroom as historically most significant. It is possible that the original NPS restoration of this courtroom may not have been linked to the Scott trials at all and that, as David Henderson observed in the 1980s, it received a slightly earlier emphasis because this was “... an impressive room, and significant as the only major space in the oldest wing of the building which retains its original character.”\footnote{Henderson, 125–26.}

In the 21st century the west courtroom is used to interpret the early history and architecture of the Old Courthouse and best evokes the setting of the Dred Scott trials which took place in a somewhat similar court space directly below. Historic mock trials are offered through the park’s education office and are sometimes done for other groups as well. The wayside
panel at the entrance to the courtroom includes one of the 1860 prints made of this space and briefly summarizes the history of the courtroom, clarifying the location of the Dred Scott trials which took place downstairs in the west wing of the Courthouse.

Physical Evidence
The upper west courtroom saw a number of physical changes over its years of use. Its earliest, 1843, appearance was specified to be inexpensive: “The columns in said room to be of the plainest kind and the seats in the galleries and lobbies to be plain pine benches with backs. . . .” The bar for the Common Pleas Court was to be like the one downstairs in the Circuit Court, however.76 As early as late January 1843 there is record of difficulties with the floor of the second-floor courtroom. The County authorized, “Joseph Foster be directed to procure iron of the best quality and proceed to secure the floor in the upper Court Room in the west wing of the Court House from further settling by connecting the girders of said floor with the timbers of the roof according to the plan now submitted by said Joseph Foster.” And in April Foster was paid $201.36 “for raising the floor of the upper room in the west wing.”77 The money saved in the 1840s achieved a frugal effect. During the 1850s renovation – driven by structural problems – the earlier courtroom was described as a failure: “As it was formerly arranged, it was the worst room for speaking that could have been devised, and it was disfigured by numerous unsightly columns and three useless galleries, all of which will be removed.”78

In the 1950s National Park Service renovation it was thought that the original 1850s paint color for this courtroom had been discovered: “as the Architect peeled off the several coats of paint that had been applied to the walls through nearly one hundred years, he discovered that the first coat was a brownish pink, similar to that in the panels of the [courtroom] dome, and that color was put back on the walls.”79 Original vouchers found at the Missouri Historical Society for M. L. Julian’s painting in what was then the Common Pleas Court made note of substantial painting, although no color was noted. Julian, who worked extensively in the Courthouse, billed the county more than 1,500 yards of two coats of zinc painting in the west courtroom. Additionally, he applied ceiling whitening and significant varnishing and faux granite painting in the courtroom in 1854.80

### Attached, J. Belcher:

A survey of Painting done . . . by M. L. Julian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate (cents)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144 yards 2 coats on walls</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>15 cents</td>
<td>$21.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567 yds 2 coats (zinc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 cents</td>
<td>$266.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858 &quot; 3 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 &quot;</td>
<td>$197.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840 2/3 2 &quot; varnish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 &quot;</td>
<td>$210.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 1 &quot; 12-1/2 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-1/2 yds Granite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 yd graining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half of the bill for measuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$751.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The April 2005 “Courtroom Paint Analysis Final Report, Old Courthouse” neither confirms nor denies the 1950s findings of a brownish pink original color. Throughout the west courtroom, many of the original early surfaces are no longer extant to examine. Those samples found under the judge’s platform might contain early colors. And while they did reveal some very deep colors – a red and an olive green, for example – they are more likely from the late Victorian period. Knowledge and techniques of paint sampling and analysis have changed since the 1950s, so it is conceivable that early NPS research saw similar evidence but interpreted it differently than we do today.

The “Courtroom Paint Analysis Final Report, Old Courthouse” did determine the colors for the courtroom after the 1870 furnishings changes. The walls were a cream color with a very slight orange-pink tint and the columns were also a cream color but with greenish gray tint. The capitals contained yellow-brown, green, and brownish gray accents and the column base had yellow-brown and brownish gray elements (figure 26).

The layout of Circuit Court 3 is depicted in two 1860 prints (see figures 3 and 4). These images are addressed in the furnishings section that follows since they detail much of the courtroom appearance at this date. The physical evidence they contain shows that the courtroom was arranged with the judge’s bench on the west wall. Peopled with the activity of a sensational trial in progress, these prints present a vivid image of the west courtroom, albeit during a case more involved than the typical business conducted there. Nonetheless, the sketches document the courtroom and its use, and also provide an understanding regarding Common Pleas Judge Samuel Reber’s request just two years later “that the present arrangement of the desks and seats in said Court be done away with, and that there be substituted tables and chairs in lieu thereof.” Reber had successfully detailed his dissatisfaction to the County Commissioners, explaining the court’s furniture and configuration crowded the area inside the bar, the area in which the actual judicial business took place.

... the present arrangement of the attorneys [sic] desks (& seats) is in the highest degree inconvenient and detrimental to the rapid dispatch of the public business – If the desks & seats (& the platforms on which they stand) were removed from within the Bar, and their place supplied with two plain tables (one on each side of the entrance) with a suitable number of chairs – And a small semi circular table in front of the Clerks [sic] Desk – it would be a vast improvement.—

There is too little Lobby in the room and the plan proposed would much increase its capacity to accommodate those whose business brings them there without encroaching on the convenience of the Bar.

Judge Reber’s request was quickly approved “and the President of this Board and County Architect are appointed a committee to act in the matter, and make such change of furniture as they may deem advisable.” Unfortunately there are no images to show the courtroom’s new appearance after the changes were made, although Judge Reber’s description of the

81 Phone conversation with Steve Seebohm, August 14, 2006.
83 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. XI, p. 139, June 2, 1862, photocopy: 102, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
84 [Judge] Sam[uel] Reber to the Board of County Commissioners, May 31, 1862, HSR Box 5, F 5, 212, JNEM Archives.
85 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. XI, p. 139, June 2, 1862, photocopy: 102, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
desired layout seems quite similar to that seen in the 1910s photographs of the second-floor, east courtroom (see figures 10 and 11).

A decade later, in 1870, the upper courtroom, by then housing Circuit Court 3, saw extensive change, although not the structural rebuilding of the 1850s. As part of the larger Circuit Court push to bring better air and light into the courtrooms, this court, presided over by Judge James K. Knight, was deemed the worst. “Judge Knight’s court, in particular, is be-knighted, and might be mistaken for a heathen temple, in which a perpetual flame is kept up.”86 A wrought iron-framed skylight replaced the ventilator, allowing more natural light and eliminating the need to use the gaslights during the daytime, and the new steam heat with radiators was expected to contribute to cleaner air. The basic courtroom layout was changed at this time as well, and this courtroom received new furniture also. While Judge W. F. Boyle requested an office be made in the southeast corner of the court for himself and his clerk, it is not clear that this was done until later in the century.87

In the 1880s the courtroom saw further change although it is not entirely clear how extensive these changes were. Lindenbusch concluded that the current bar in the west courtroom dates to 1883 and that there was a “thorough refurnishment of the furnishings” in 1886–87.88 While this may have been the case, it is important to note that Lindenbusch may have misinterpreted the original sources and attributed very specific furnishings changes when in fact the primary documentation is too general to draw such conclusions. Lindenbusch asserted that this courtroom received a new bar in 1883,89 however the General Term record, from which he drew this conclusion, only noted $41.75 for “Railings for Court Room 3,” not specifying the bar itself and in fact indicating more than one railing was acquired.90 Other railings in the courtroom included those at the clerk’s enclosure in front of the bench and possibly one or more at the public entrance to the courtroom, like the east courtroom had by the 1910s (figure 11). Similarly, Lindenbusch, while recognizing that the evidence from 1886–87 was fragmentary, nonetheless suggested a complete refurnishing of the upper west courtroom took place during this period. He cited “an expenditure of $1,062.56 in the year proceeding April 11, 1887, for furniture, fixtures and repairs for the Circuit Court.” The primary evidence, however, actually relates more to the Circuit Court overall – and there were three Circuit Courts, with many office spaces in addition to their courtrooms in the courthouse at this time. Without doubt, some sort of change occurred in Circuit Court 3 in 1886, as Lindenbusch noted $133.50 was spent on “extras in fitting up Court Room No. 3.”91 But Lindenbusch extrapolated too much from the term “extras” and indicated that this meant that a major change likely took place in the west courtroom at this time.

---

86 Daily Democrat, April 1, 1870, Lindenbusch, 112.
87 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 23, p. 84, January 2, 1877, photocopy: 279, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
88 General Term II, 579, 1883 as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 148; and Mayor’s Message, 1887, and General Term, III, 78, as cited in Lindenbusch, 150.
89 General Term II, 579, 1883 as cited in Lindenbusch, 148.
90 General Term II, 579, April 2, 1883. The exact citation reads: “... W.J. Beattie... presents to the Court his account for Railings for Court Room No. 3 as per bid, amounting to the sum of forty one dollars and seventy five cents... said account... be allowed and certified.”
91 Mayor’s Message... 1887, and General Term, III, 78, as cited in Lindenbusch, 150.
As the close of the 19th century approached, the entire courthouse was suffering from tight finances and tremendous upkeep costs in the aging building. Circuit Court 3, like the east courtroom, had been wallpapered at some point during these years and by the turn of the century had electric lights. Also by the end of the century, although perhaps done much earlier but only identified in 1899, each of the four corners of the courtroom contained roughly triangular shaped rooms; the judge's room was to the east of the bench in the northeast corner, two jury rooms occupied the northeast and northwest corners, and the clerk's office was in the southeast corner (figure 5). The 1899 J. W. Ginder floor plan also shows the courtroom configured with the bench along the north wall and with a set of five risers to tier public seating on the south side, the position it likely had since the 1870 rearrangement of the room, and the 1903 blueprint (figure 6) shows the room laid out in a mirror image of the earlier plan with the bench along the south wall. The furniture appears not to have been new but a new platform was constructed for the bench and perhaps other smaller changes were done also, categorized as “fitting up” for Court Room 4.92

Accompanying the courthouse changes prior to the World’s Fair and spawned by the addition of new circuit courts, in 1903 Circuit Court 4 was reconfigured and the bench moved from the north to the south wall of the room.93 The judge’s room was moved at this time as well and its door transferred from the northeast to the southeast corner of the courtroom; this allowed the judge to continue to have direct access to his office from the bench and this corner also provided a larger office (figure 7). Other courtroom plans from early in the 20th century show the changing use of the adjoining corner rooms. The jury must have convened elsewhere in the building, since by 1907 the rooms on the west were for a janitor (northwest, 204) and a telephone room (southwest, 203); the clerk for Circuit Court 4 must also have had a more remote office since the northeast corner room (205) was used by a Judge Valliante (figure 8). By 1912 the northeast room was used by the stenographer (figure 9).

Other than new windows in 1912 and the routine repainting and refinishing necessary to a heavily used public space, the other major physical changes to the west courtroom did not occur until well into the 20th century after the National Park Service was responsible for the building. In 1933, a few years after the Old Courthouse had ceased to house the courts, a group of local architects went over the building and noted that the upper west courtroom was in the best condition of all of the courts.94 A fire in the courthouse three years later caused considerable damage to the west courtroom however. The May 1936 fire, apparently caused by bad wiring, left the west courtroom roof and ceiling in bad condition; the courtroom had scaffolding propping up the ceiling for more than a decade, from about 1941 until the mid-1950s. A 1938 photograph of the west courtroom reveals its condition after the fire but prior to scaffolding being erected; it also shows the remnants of a hanging ceiling fixture (figure 14). As was the approach throughout the Old Courthouse, National Park Service restoration of the upper west courtroom, begun in 1955, focused on 1870 as its cut-off date. As many

92 General Term V, 259–300, Jan 2, 1903 and “The Mayor’s Message,” 1904, p. 100. Lindenbusch, 181 states a new platform was constructed at this time although it is not noted what he based this upon.
93 General Term, V, 259–300, January 2, 1903.
furnishings and as much extant original finishes as possible were preserved and restored, according to mid-20th century standards. Wall paint thought to be original to the room was discovered and reproduced with the colors for the woodwork selected to “most closely harmonize with the walls.”\(^95\) The original marble floor was repaired and patched, using marble from another courtroom in the Old Courthouse;\(^96\) the extensive damage caused by fire meant considerable work in the roof and replastering of the ceiling were required here. The suspended ceiling was virtually destroyed by the fire in the 1930s and completely replaced by the National Park Service in 1955. Extant furnishings were “reconditioned,” broken and/or missing elements repaired or replaced, and a false skylight installed. In the case of finishes, oak graining was done to match existing oak grain finish; all paint was stripped from the furniture and “all wood work shall be stained one coat of walnut or mahogany as directed. . . .”\(^97\)

Furnishings
The orientation of the furniture in the west courtroom falls into three periods: 1857–70, 1870–1903, and 1903–present. Four floor plans at the end of this section depict in a general fashion this repositioning of furnishings; the latter two incorporate the 1903–present period when the overall orientation remained the same but a few significant changes were made by the National Park Service.

The earliest furnishing references for the upper west courtroom date to its original appearance in the 1840s. Gaslighting appears to have been installed, although candles supplemented those fixtures, and stoves supplied heat here as they did throughout the building.\(^98\) Plain columns, gallery and lobby seats, and pine benches are all specified for the west courtroom as the County took steps to keep expenses down and be frugal in its furnishings.\(^99\) Tables and the judge’s bench and seat are also enumerated in the County Court Records of 1843.\(^100\) A relatively expensive clock ($20) was also purchased for this otherwise unembellished courtroom,\(^101\) and stairs, likely those leading to the judge’s bench, were carpeted; some sort of screen, perhaps giving privacy to the judge’s entrance, was also constructed for the court as well.\(^102\)

95 ”As the Architect peeled off the several coats of paint that had been applied to the walls through nearly one hundred years, he discovered that the first coat was a brownish pink, similar to that in the panels of the dome, and that color was put back on the walls. The original color of the columns and cornice could not be determined, and the cocoa brown of the present columns with the soft green of the cornice were colors that the Architect determined would most closely harmonize with the walls.” John Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, West Wing, 39–42, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives.


97 “Specifications for Restoring Portions of The Old Courthouse Rotunda, West Courtroom,” St. Louis, Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, February 21, 1955, 8–9, RU 124 HSR Records Box 6, Folder 5, JNEM Archives.

98 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 150 and 152, June 14, 1842, photocopy: 32, RU 124 Historic Structures Report Records, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives, and “Court Records,” IV, 81 as cited in Lindenbusch p. 20; and Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 152, June 14, 1842, photocopy: 32, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives and Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 150, June 14, 1842, photocopy: p 32, RU 124 Historic Structures Report Records, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.

99 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 281, January 20, 1843, photocopy: p 57, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.

100 Joseph Foster to County Court of Saint Louis County, January 30, 1843, RU 124 HSR Records Box 5, Folder 5, 106, JNEM Archives.

101 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, 520, March 6, 1844, photocopy: 117, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.

102 Records of St. Louis Court, Vol. 6, 35, February 16, 1850, photocopy: 189, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
After the 1850s remodeling of the Common Pleas Court, the upper west courtroom had a dramatically different appearance. The tiled floor of alternate red and buff Iron Mountain, Missouri, marble, the ornate Corinthian columns, and a new judge’s platform and bench with a blue cloth desk surface all contributed to this fresh, fine, and impressive courtroom. Its configuration and furnishings were recorded in two 1860 prints made for newspapers covering the Henry Shaw trial (figures 3 and 4). Together these prints show the basic courtroom layout with the bench along the west wall, the clerk’s desk with pigeon holes enclosed in front of the bench, the witness seat to the south of the judge, the jurors and the bailiff’s stand positioned on the south side of the court, round tables for lawyers centered before the judge, and additional desks, with lyre-shaped legs, for lawyers viewing the trial on the north side of the courtroom. Other details include a centrally hung rococo revival gas chandelier and gaslights flanking the judge’s bench, painted window valances, coat hooks mounted in the plaster walls, and a column stove and its piping at the north side of the room.

In the 1870 renovation of the courthouse this court, by then Circuit Court 3, was considered to be particularly dark. The new skylight provided better natural light such that the gaslights did not have to be used during the daytime, the coal-burning stoves were removed and replaced with marble-topped radiators with brass screens, and the judge’s bench was moved to the north side of the room. Judge James K. Knight had requested for his courtroom all of the alterations the east courtroom was to receive; he additionally asked for improvements to his bench, which apparently was not as fine as that in Judge Rombauer’s courtroom: “I think the Judges [sic] Desk should be altered to correspond with the one in Court Room No. 1.” While not documented in the written record it is likely that coat hooks hung along the walls of the courtroom; as early as 1860 they are visible in one of the Shaw trial illustrations (figure 4), and they can also be seen in the 1910s photographs of the east courtroom (figures 10 and 11). The “ghost” of these coat hooks is seen in figures 16 and 17 from the 1940s, thus documenting their use in the west courtroom well into the 20th century.

Circuit Court 3 received new railings in 1883, but at a cost of about $42, it is not likely this meant an entirely new bar. Significant repairs and furniture and lighting acquisitions took place throughout the Circuit Courts in 1886–87, with about $130 identified specifically “for extras in fitting up Court Room No. 3.” While this was not a small expenditure – perhaps for something more significant than window shades, like carpeting or recovering a judge’s chair and desk surface – it was not enough to suggest the courtroom received a complete refurbishing. At some point, probably in the 1880s or early 1890s wallpaper was hung in some area(s) of the courtroom. It is documented as having been cleaned in 1891, and in 2004 fragments of what appears to be a late-19th century wallpaper or border paper were found beneath the platform for the judge’s bench (figure 27).

103 Contract of County of St Louis and [John] Holliday and Olmsted, November 24, 1856, JNEM Archives; Voucher, Robert Mitchell, County of St Louis to M. L. Julian, August 29, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST; “Measurements of Foster’s Work at Courthouse (1863)” 103–104 (see appendix D). JNEM Archives 1627, JNEM Archives.
104 No. 2085 “Petition of Judges & Bar for alterations in the various Court and other rooms in Court House,” March 28, 1870, HSR Box 5, F5 280, JNEM Archives.
105 General Term II, 579, April 2, 1883.
106 Mayor’s Message, 1887 and General Term, III, 78 as cited in Lindenbusch, 150.
In 1903 the upper west courtroom was rearranged and the judge’s bench moved from the north to the south wall. The 1907 plan for the heating system shows two radiators located centrally in the court, apparently placed to conform somewhat to the bar. A third, smaller, radiator was just south of the entrance to the courtroom along the east wall (figure 8). By 1919 the courtroom floor was so deteriorated that the entire floor must have been covered with linoleum. While its exact appearance is not known, the floor covering shown in the 1910s images of the east courtroom serves as a likely model. An expenditure of $1,000 for this was noted in the Circuit Court’s General Term Records. These appear to be the last documented furnishings for Circuit Court 4.

In the 1930s, as the National Park Service and the City of St. Louis discussed the disposition of the Old Courthouse, Historian John Bryan noted the “old bench and bar” remained intact; he also recorded the practical furnishing of “old iron arms that formerly carried telephone and telegraph wires.” Bryan also noted its non-historic appearance: “The courtroom in the West Wing is not occupied and is used as a dump apparently. The floor is strewn with excelsior, scrap paper, tin cans, empty paint buckets, old lumber and fallen plaster. If vandals were preparing the room for a disastrous fire, the needed rubbish would be amply provided in the present situation.” The court’s deteriorated condition was well documented in photographs taken over the years after the 1936 fire. The scaffolding helped secure the ceiling until actual restoration work began in 1955.

Structural and architectural work was completed first. Much as with the east courtroom, the National Park Service installed electric lighting with an eye to having the space well lit yet not obviously modern in appearance. Color and finishes were as described in the Physical Evidence section above. A 1955 photograph documents the west courtroom at this point, after ceiling, wall, and finish work had been completed, but before reproduction lighting and furnishings had been introduced (figure 18).

Pearl-gray aluminum venetian blinds, better than roller shades at controlling light and considered appropriate to the mid-19th-century period, were hung at the windows. The raised platforms of the judge’s bench, witness, jury, and bailiff’s stands were carpeted a “medium gray-brown.” Historic curved benches for jurors were to have been restored and placed in the west courtroom; unfortunately, this did not happen and no such benches appear to have survived. It is not known if these benches were from this space originally, but they were likely to have been among the older benches in the building and hence deemed appropriate for this courtroom. (Figure 15 shows three curved benches on the jury platforms and two placed just inside the bar; they are noted as “stored elsewhere in courthouse.”)

108 General Term, VI, 457, 548, 554–55 and 558 as cited in Lindenbusch, 213.
113 Henderson, 124–25.
114 “... the west room complete with circular [curved?] benches. ...” “Justification,” Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Old Courthouse, 1944, JNEM Archives.
Bryan devoted considerable time and effort to designing and documenting reproduction wall sconces and desk lamps based on 19th-century prototypes for the west courtroom. The arms and the back-plate for the sconces were derived from two different sources; the source for the back-plate was less well documented (figures 21 and 22).

The new bracket lights spaced regularly around the walls were designed by Architect Bryan from two authentic sources - the brackets themselves are duplications of an old metal bracket from a gaslight fixture which the Architect obtained about thirty years ago from a St. Louis building of 1858 which was being razed. This was used by the manufacturer, Butler-Kohaus Company of St. Louis, as the pattern for the new brackets. The back-plate was designed from similar ornamentation of the Mid-Nineteenth Century. . . .115

The lamps for the judge’s bench “were adapted from lamp designs found in the Illustrated London News of 1851.”116  It is difficult to determine the nature of this adaptation without the actual 1851 image with which to compare the reproduction (figure 20). Bryan also made detailed construction drawings for the walnut judge’s chair, two clerk’s chairs, 14 jury chairs, and the lawyer’s tables still used in the west courtroom in 2006. He did not make note of the design sources for these furnishings117 (figures 23–25).

In 1966 a commemorative furnishing was added to the west courtroom. A bronze bust of Louis Brandeis, honoring the Supreme Court Justice’s admission to the St. Louis bar in this courtroom in the 19th century, was placed just south of the entrance to the room.118  The Brandeis bust is the final documented furnishing for this courtroom.

116  Ibid.
117  Ibid.
Summary Floor Plans, West Courtroom

The following four *summary floor plans* are provided for visual reference and are not for implementation. They show partial furnishings for the courtroom and are in some cases speculative, based on the varied availability of documentation for the courtroom at the different periods of time. Please read the room history for thorough, footnoted, documentation on the courtroom’s appearance and changes over the years.

![Figure A – Overview of west courtroom, 1860 to present](image)
Figure B – West courtroom, c. 1860, with bench at west side of courtroom
Figure C – West courtroom, 1870–1903, with bench at north side of courtroom
Figure D – West courtroom, 1903–1955, with bench at south side of courtroom
Figure E – West courtroom, 1955-present, with bench at south side of courtroom
Furnishings and Finishes Summary Chronology, West Courtroom

For a complete courtroom chronology with full citation and context see the room references that follow on p. 57.

1854
Ceiling whitened, walls painted, varnishing, “Granite” graining, M. L. Julian
“Work” in court room [included nails and hinges], James S. Purdy

1855
Carpet, S. Hosental

1856
Complete renovation of court room
Floor tiled with marble from Iron Mountain, Missouri; alternate “light and flesh” colors,
[John] Holliday and Olmsted

1859
New judge’s platform and bench, Joseph Foster
Desk covered with blue cloth, Joseph Foster
Make and hang base doors, Joseph Foster

1860
Carstang v. Shaw trial images
Harper’s Weekly, March 31, 1860 (see figure 3)
New York Illustrated News, April 14, 1860 (see figure 4)

1862
Attorneys’ desks and seats on platforms within the bar; request by Judge Samuel Reber to change this arrangement was approved; two tables replaced the attorneys’ desks; semi-circular table placed in front of Clerk’s desk

1870
Judges (James K. Knight for west courtroom) and Bar petition, No. 2085, to County Court (and leak petition to newspapers) for better heat, light, and fresh air throughout the courthouse

Stove dirt “blackening frescoed walls and ceilings”
Steam heat with radiators - brass screens and covered with polished marble slabs - installed, coal-burning stoves removed
“Benches and railing changed in both position and form” (both east and west courtrooms); modify judge’s bench to look like that in east courtroom
Old ventilator removed; eye of dome enlarged, wrought iron skylights, frescoed sub-dome

1877
Judge W. F. Boyle, Circuit Court 3, requests a small room for the judge be built in southeast corner of the courtroom
1878
Louis D. Brandeis admitted to St. Louis Bar, November 21st

1883
“Railings for Court Room No. 3,” W. J. Beattie

1886
Payment of $133.50 ‘for extras fitting up Court Room No. 3’

1891
Wallpaper cleaned

1900
Electrical lights in need of repair in all courtrooms

1903
Relocation of bench and clerk’s desk from north to south side of courtroom

1904
“Fitting up” courtroom

1907
New heating system proposed, Board of Public Improvements (see figure 8)

1912
New windows, four-pane sash, Board of Public Improvements (see figure 9)

1919
Linoleum in courtroom at cost of more than $1,000

1934
HABS (Historic American Buildings Survey) drawings done for entire courthouse

1936
Fire damages roof and skylight; ceiling sagging

1941
Charles E. Peterson: 1870 is restoration date for courtroom interior

1941–55
Scaffolding props up damaged ceiling

1955
Restoration work began

• Carpet, gray-brown, for judge’s platform and floor of bailiff’s stand, witness stand and jury platform, T. Puckett Flooring Co.
• Complete demolition of lantern and domed ceiling
• Furniture “reconditioned”
  o Center rail: reproduction center cap for west end based on cap at east end
  o Bailiff stand: empty drawers plugged; leatherette writing surface
  o Clerk’s enclosure: removed old light socket and electric wire raceway
  o Judge’s bench and Clerk’s enclosure: install missing front cabinet doors and panels;
    friction latches and pull knobs on cabinet doors
  o Judge’s bench: all wood electric wire raceways, gas pipe, light fixtures under shelf of
    bench removed; “Repair and cover the back of all pigeon hole compartments under the
    shelf of the Judge’s Bench. Cover the vertical face under the Judge’s Bench each side
    above and below the protruding pigeon holes with plywood. Cover Judge’s Bench with
    leatherette to match leatherette in east courtroom.”
  o Refinish all furniture: all extant paint “completely stripped;” refinish as walnut or ma-
    hogany “as directed”
• Walls replastered
• “Brownish pink” wall color thought to be original paint found; courtroom walls painted
  brownish pink based on this
• No evidence found for column and cornice colors; cocoa brown for columns and soft
  green of cornice were used; thought to “harmonize” with brownish pink of walls
• Install false skylight in lantern: oval 10-paneled frame to match that in East courtroom
• Reproduction six-over-six windows; replace 1912 four-pane windows

1956
Venetian blinds installed, pearl gray with lead-colored tapes, H&L Co.

1958
Reproduction wall sconces and desk lamps, (see John Bryan’s design drawings, figures 20–
  22), made by Butler-Kohaus Company, St. Louis
Reproduction chairs and tables of walnut (see John Bryan’s design drawings, figures 23–25)

1959
Asphalt tile flooring removed; extant tiles cleaned and repaired; broken tiles replaced by
  F. M. Kraemer Marble Company

1966
Bust of Louis D. Brandeis installed in courtroom

1979
Paint investigation and analysis (“Paint Analyses Interior of Old Court House” by Gerhardt
  Kramer)

1986
Deteriorated plaster repaired and painted by park staff

2004
Repainted by park staff; bench and jury platforms recarpeted by contractor
Documentation and References

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, pp. 119–120, April 2, 1842, photocopy: p 27, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... superintendent be required to complete as soon as possible the court rooms fronting on fifth street and that he commence no new work on any other portion of said building except such as will be absolutely necessary for the preservation of the said court house. And further that he notify Joseph Foster the person doing the carpenters work for said building for his agent if any that he is to proceed to do the carpenters work on the aforesaid rooms and have the same ready for plastering without delay agreeably to such plans and instructions as said superintendent shall furnish and give and none other and that the superintendent suspend the work on the inside shutters contemplated for the court rooms.”

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, pp. 121–122, April 11, 1842, photocopy: p 28, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... and the court also accept the proposal of John Shannon for plastering the court house at the following prices towit; Furnishing all materials and putting on plain work per yard twenty cents, moldings twenty cents per foot and the angle and centre [sic] pieces at twenty five dollars each...”

1842  “Contract for the Plaistering [sic] two Court Rooms in Court House,” April 12, 1842, RU 124 HSR Records Box 6, Folder 5, pp 85–6, JNEM Archives: “John Shannon. Specifications & Contracts Approved by Court March 6, 1842.  Bond filed April 14, 1843.

... John Shannon... do all the Plastering and ornamental work of the Saint Louis County Court House or as much as may be directed, being the two Rooms Contained in the west wing of Said Court House furnishing all materials Sand Excepted... the sum of twenty cents pr.Yard for all the plaine [sic] plastering and twenty Cents pr. foot superficial for all buildings twenty five dollars for the large Centres and angle pecies [sic] Each... .

Specification of the plastering ornamental work and materials Sand excepted for the two Court Rooms of the Saint Louis County Court House Ceilings and all other work that may require Lathing to be lathed with the best quality of Sawed white pine laths one inch and a Quarter in width with four nailes [sic] in each lath the nailes to be of the best quality of Boston Nails no fours.

Ceilings and Side walls to be Scratch coated and browned with the best quality of lime and Sand marter [sic] well haired and laid on Even and true Browning to be well water [sic] floated Hardfinished with the best quality of lime and ground marble dust mortar, in a Stile Eauel [sic] to that now finished [sic] in the north and South wings of the Court House, all to be finished with plaster of Paris.

All Side Walls to be finished plaine, there will be Stucco Cornices of Appropriate Size with Architraves Soffits Centres Circular moldings and channels.

Wm. Twombly, Supt.

[Specification of the Plastering the two Court Rooms of St. Louis Court House.]”

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 128, April 14, 1842, photocopy: p 30, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “William Twombly Esquire the superintendent of the court house and Jail presents to the court the contract of John Shannon to furnish all material and do all the plastering for the two court rooms in the west wing of the court house and also his bond in the sum of three thousand dollars for the faithful performance of said contract with Samuel Merry as his security which said bond and contract are approved of by the court.”
1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 152, June 14, 1842, photocopy: p 32, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... an account of S. Ridgely & Co. amounting to thirty one dollars and twelve cents for one branch lamp, ballance [sic] ball chain & loading and gas furnished for the court rooms. . . ”

1842  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 150, June 14, 1842, photocopy: p 32, RU 124 Historic Structures Report Records, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... an account of Andrews and Beaky amounting to three hundred and ninety dollars and eighty three cents for stoves and pipes furnished for the Court House and offices. . . ”

1842  Stella M. Drumm and Charles van Ravenswaay, Glimpses of the Past: The Old Courthouse, p 36, Missouri Historical Society, Volume III, St. Louis, 1940: “... by January, 1843, the “big court room” in the (second-floor) west wing was nearly completed. This was described by a writer as “this spacioiusly and generously furnished and finished room, with its fluted columns and massive railing around the bar – its costly masonry and lofty ceilings – with cornices and center circle.” . . . “Who paid for all this, or is it all paid for?” This article, published in the Daily People’s Organ, raised the question as to why the lawyers were not required to pay for their use of the Courthouse, just as shopkeepers are compelled to furnish their own stands to do business.”

1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 281, January 20, 1843, photocopy: p 57, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... Joseph Foster . . . to furnish the Court as soon as possible with an estimate of the cost of finishing the upper Court Room in the west wing of the Court House. The columns in said room to be of the plainest kind and the seats in the galleries and lobbies to be plain pine benches with backs, the bar to be finished in the same manner as the bar in the room below and the Court further order that said contractor be requested to furnish a statement of the quantity of lumber on hand which is suitable for finishing said work and what part of said work if any is in a state of forwardness and that he be also requested to furnish the Court with a statement of the cost of the work done by him, up to this time... .”

1843  Joseph Foster to County Court of Saint Louis County, January 30, 1843, RU 124 HSR Records Box 5, Folder 5, p 106, JNEM Archives: “... an estimate of the cost of the upper Courtroom of the West Wing &c- And also to furnish the Court with a statement of the value of the carpenters work done by me under contract . . . the cost of finishing the carpenter’s work of said Court room, including Lumber will be about twenty-five hundred dollars—all the window shutters, and doors and trimmings for ditto are ready to put up as soon as the Plastering is completed- . . . I am of opinion that it will require the County to purchase but a small quantity of Lumber to complete the room except for the Tables, Benches & Judges Seat. With the assistance of Judge Purdy I have measured and valued the Carpenter’s work as required above so far as I am able at this time and our opinion is that it is worth about seventeen thousand eight hundred dollars $17800.”

1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 285, January 31, 1843, photocopy: p 58, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “Joseph Foster be directed to procure iron of the best quality and proceed to secure the floor in the upper Court Room in the west wing of the Court House from further settling by connecting the girders of said floor with the timbers of the roof according to the plan now submitted by said Joseph Foster.”
1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 315, April 4, 1843, photocopy: p 65, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... to Joseph Foster... two hundred and one dollars and thirty six cents for raising the floor of the upper room in the west wing of the Court House...”

1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 312, April 1, 1843, photocopy: p 65, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “Upon the application of the United States Deputy Marshal, the Court order that the Circuit Court of the United States be allowed to use the lower room in the west wing of the Court House for the purpose of holding said Court therein until such time as said room shall be required for the use of the Circuit Court of the County of Saint Louis.”

1843  St. Louis County Court Records, III: 366, June 1, 1843: “... that Justice Purdy... submit a plan for finishing the upper Court room in the West Wing of the Court House.”

1843  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p 366, June 1, 1843, photocopy: p 73, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “... Justice Purdy cause to be made one or more plans for finishing the rotunda... submit a plan for finishing the upper Court room in the West Wing of the Court House.”

1844  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. III, p. 520, March 6, 1844, photocopy: 117, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “To Edwin Adriane for Clock for the room of the Court of Common Pleas for twenty dollars.”

1844  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. IV, p. 67, September 6, 1844, photocopy: 134, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: ”To Jesse Little for work and materials furnished in varnishing tables in the Court room of the St. Louis Common Pleas for one Hundred and twenty five Dollars.”

1844  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. IV, p. 73, September 12, 1844, photocopy: 136, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “To William H. Pococke for graining Common Pleas Court room and for fees in measuring for two hundred and forty one Dollars and twenty-nine cents. ... To James J. Purdy for Desks in Clerks office the Court of Common Pleas and repairing chair for Criminal Court for Sixteen Dollars and twenty five Cents.”

1844  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. IV, p. 139, March 7, 1845, photocopy: 164, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “To Waugh & Corthoran for tablecloths for Court of Common Pleas office for nine 40/100 dollars.”

1844  Records of St. Louis Court, Vol. 6, p. 35, February 16, 1850, photocopy: 189, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “Ordered that a warrant issue upon the Treasurer in favor of John T. Long for Twelve dollars and 20 cents for carpeting stairs and erecting screen in Common Pleas Court room.”

1854  Voucher, County of St Louis to M.L. Julian, August 29, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST:
“Whitening Ceiling in Ct Room

Com Ple[as] 30.
Putting in 7 Lights Glass 1.75 12.25
Amt J[?] Jmps Bill for [Slaging?] 25.50

-------
67.75
751.69

-------
819.44

1854 Voucher, Robert Mitchell, County of St Louis to M.L. Julian, August 29, 1854, Tiffany P. Dexter Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST:
“For sundry painting etc as per accompanying Bill measured by J. Belcher
Attached, J. Belcher:
A survey of Painting done… by M.L. Julian

144 yards 2 coats on walls at 15 cents per yd $ 21.60
1567 yrs 2 coats (zink [sic]) at 17 cents “ “ $266.39
858 “ 3 “ “ 23 “ “ 197.34
840 2/3 “ varnish “ 25 “ “ “ 210.16
28 1 “ “ 12-1/2 “ “ 3.50
43-1/2 yrs Granite 43.50
1 yd graining .50
half of the bill for measuring 8.70

-------
$751.69”

1854 Voucher, Court House west wing, County of St. Louis, Robert Mitchell, to James S. Purdy, 1854, Dexter P. Tiffany Papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST:
“8-1/2 days work in court Room, Com Pleas, at $2.75 per day… 23.37
Nails & Hinges 100+25 1.25”

1855 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 286–87, October 3, 1855, photocopy: 287, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “To S. Hosental for nineteen dollars 20 cents for carpet for Court of Common Pleas Room.”

1856 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 315, January 7, 1856, photocopy: 1, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To Ulstick Studley & Co. for three dollars 50 cents for station- ary for clerk of St. Louis Court of Common Pleas.”

1856 July 3, 1856 Daily St. Louis Intelligencer, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 19: “As it was formerly arranged, it was the worst room for speaking that could have been devised, and it was disfigured by numerous unsightly columns and three useless galleries, all of which will be removed.”

1856 Daily St. Louis Intelligencer, October 14, 1856 as cited in Lindenbusch pp. 46–47: “session of the Court of Common Pleas opened, its judge was given temporary possession of the oval courtroom on the second floor of the east wing.”
1856  Contract of County of St Louis and [John] Holliday and Olmsted, November 24, 1856, JNEM Archives: “. . . [H and O], marble workers. . . Robert Mitchell. . . furnish all materials for and do all the tiling for the floor of the Court Room for the Court of Common Pleas And the lobby entering thereto, in the west wing. . . The tiles to be of the fine Marble obtained near the Iron Mountain in this said State of Missouri, and of which material & workmanship the samples are furnished to and now are in the Architects possession and marked A & B. The tiles to be 12” x 12” (except for making out the borders) one inch thick, joints cut not more 1/16 of an inch under Square – very finely rubbed surface – well laid in best quality Hydraulic Cement and finely smoothed off The tiles are to be alternate light and flesh color. . . to have the tiling all fully prepared for laying and on or before the first day of February next ensuing. And to commence there or as soon thereafter as the other work in the said room shall be sufficiently advanced. And have that job completed within two weeks from the time of notice to commence laying it down. . .

. . . agrees . . . to pay for the said marble tiling finished and complete to the Architects satisfaction at the rate of eighty-cents per superficial ft – (sq/100) eighty per cent of the amt [amount] to be paid as the work is being put down to completion and the balance after the lapse of thirty days after the final completion and reception of the work.

1862  [Judge] Sam Reber to the Board of County Commissioners, May 31, 1862, HSR Box 5, F 5 p. 212, JNEM Archives: . . . “the present arrangement of the attorneys desks (& seats) is in the highest degree inconvenient and detrimental to the rapid dispatch of the public business – If the desks & seats (& the platforms on which they stand) were removed from within the Bar, and their place supplied with two plain tables (one on each side of the entrance) with a suitable number of chairs – And a small semi circular table in front of the Clerks Desk – it would be a vast improvement.–

There is too little Lobby in the room and the plan proposed would much increase its capacity to accommodate those whose business brings them there without encroaching on the convenience of the Bar. [Approved. June 2/62]”

1862  Record of St. Louis County Court Vol. XI, p. 139, June 2, 1862, photocopy: 102, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “Court of Common Pleas, courtroom, desks, /c

A communication is received from the Hon. Samuel Reber, Judge of the St. Louis Court of Common Pleas, asking that the present arrangement [as seen in 1860 images] of the desks and seats in said Court be done away with, and that there be substituted tables and chairs in lieu thereof; which being considered by the Board the suggestion is approved and the President of this Board and County Architect are appointed a committee to act in the matter, and make such change of furniture as they may deem advisable.

. . . The Board appoint the President and county Architect a committee to act in the removal of . . . the Old Desks, refuse Lumber and such other rubbish in and around the Court House as is not in use, nor needed by the County”.

1863  “Measurements of Foster’s Work at Courthouse (1863)” Filed March 18, 1863, Auditor’s Office, JNEM Archives 1627; [measurement for contract August 12, 1839; measurement began 1862]

p. 103 “May 27 “To 1-1/2 days making platform + Bench for the Judges, of the Court of Common Pleas. . . [@ $] 2.50 [ $]3.75”

p. 104 “Nov. 11, 1859 To 2 days repairing windows + doors in the Probate + Common Pleas
Court Room [$] 5.00 Nov. 21, 1859 To ½ day covering Desk for the Judge if the Common Pleas Court Nov. 21 To 1 yard Blue cloth for Same [desk covered, above] [$] 2.10 Nov. 26, 1859 To 6 days making + hanging Base doors for the Common Pleas Court Room [$]15.00”

1870  St. Louis Daily Democrat March 27, 1870, as cited in Lindenbusch, pp. 110–111: “The campaign they [court officials] conducted showed them to be politically sagacious since, . . . they banded together to present their requests at the same time. They also managed to enhance their chances for success by means of a judicious leak of the contents of their petition to local newspapers before they presented it to the county commissioners. The editorial response was most favorable and helpful.

‘A petition signed by Judges Rombauer and Knight, of the Circuit Court; Judges . . . of the Supreme Court; . . . County Recorder; and the Directors of the Law Library Association, will be presented to the County Court on Monday, asking that certain much needed improvements be made in some of the rooms of the Court House. What is wanted is more light and fresh air – especially fresh air. The court rooms are a disgrace to the city, and detrimental to health, and should be altered so as to make them in keeping with the recent salutary improvements in the rotunda and dome, which meet the approbation of the public.’’

1870  April 1, 1870 St. Louis Daily Democrat as cited in Lindenbusch, p.112: “Judicial Darkness – Justice Not Blind –The architect who drew the plans of the Court House appears to have entertained the pagan idea that Justice is blind. At any rate, he fashioned the court rooms in such a manner that very little solar light can shine upon the judicial altars, and in all the court rooms gas is used at midday to enable the eyes of Justice to gaze upon the briefs of the lawyers. Judge Knight’s court, in particular, is beknighted, and might be mistaken for a heathen temple, in which a perpetual flame is kept up.”

1870  Thos. Walsh, Architect to Hon. Judges of the County Court, April 7, 1870

[refers to petition to Judges of the County Court by Judges Rombauer and Knight (No. 2085 “Petition of Judges & Bar for alterations in the various Court and other rooms in Court House” March 28, 1870 referred to Thos. Walsh, Architect), p. 281, April 14, 1870 improvements ordered] HSR Box 5, F5 pp. 279–81, JNEM Archives:

p. 279 . . . “After an examination of the apartments referred to, I find it necessary to make these alterations from the fact of the Court Rooms being without light & air on dark gloomy days; the alterations in these Court Rooms would obviate the necessity of burning gas in them during business hours, which would be great saving to the County.

. . . The entire expense of the improvements above mentioned would not exceed the sum of Twelve Thousand Dollars.

The heating of the building by Steam is an improvement which should be made; the stoves now used for that purpose not only blacken the frescoed walls, and ceilings, and annoy the Court, but are insufficient to heat the rooms; this mode of heating by stoves, belongs to the past.

The present time would be best to prepare this work, as it could be put up while the courts adjourn.”

p. 280 [from 3/28/70 petition:] “In Court Room No. 1 [220] being the old Circuit Court Room a skylight and ventilator above the chandelier, - a skylight will save the County in gas bills – (now absolutely necessarily incurred) its cost within a few years –

Water closets if they can be constructed without creating smells in the jury room and judge’s room in the small corner on the south east & north east corner of Court Room. A flew
[niche today?] broken through into the jury room, as now no stove can be placed into that room – and in cold whether [sic] jurors suffer severely. R. E. Rombauer

In Court Room No. 3 (old Common Pleas) [207] the same improvements as above indicated [sic] by Judge Rombauer are absolutely necessary for proper dispatch of business.

In addition I think the Judges [sic] Desk should be altered to correspond with the one in Court Room No. 1 [220]. James K. Knight"

1870 “The Court House,” The Missouri Republican-St. Louis, October 30, 1870: “...lightening up of the halls and passages in the second story. This has now been admirably remedied, while the sky-lights have added animation to the general appearance. ... The third alteration is in the courtrooms in the second story. These are so changed and remodeled that they are scarce recognizable to those accustomed to their old condition. Circuit Courts No. 1 and 3 are really elegant, and have lost their old sombre, uncomfortable appearance. The judges' benches and railings are changed both in position and form, and greater and better accommodation is given the public. The old ventilators over the courtrooms are taken out and the eye of the domes covering these courts are enlarged and wrought iron skylights placed over them, and the sub-domes underneath reflecting rays of light directly down into the court-rooms below; and over the lawyers' desks. These sub-domes are a very handsome feature in the courts and are tastefully frescoed. These improvements make the court-rooms cheerful and pleasant, and the judges, lawyers and the public should feel highly satisfied with the manner in which they have been executed.

The building throughout, except the north wing, is now heated by steam. The steam coils are enclosed by brass screens and covered by polished marble slabs, and the heat can be increased or modified at pleasure, thereby doing away with the old system of stoves; and the dust, noise and inconveniences arising from them. The ventilation is found to work well in all the rooms and offices, and is so arranged as to carry off all rarified air from the courts both in summer and winter.

... After a thorough examination, the public cannot fail to accord Mr. Thos. Welsh [sic] the architect, a compliment for his ingenuity and good taste. By these alterations devised and carried out by him, the interior of the edifice has been vastly improved, both in appearance and comfort, and the effect will be most agreeably experienced throughout the numerous official and judicial departments, and by the hundreds who visit them daily.”

1870 “The Court House: The Recent Improvements,” Missouri Democrat, p. 4, October 30, 1870: “... The rooms of the Circuit Court have also been remodeled and lighted by skylights, and there is now no longer any necessity for burning gas during the cloudy days to enable the clerks to write. The manner in which these rooms have been lighted and [refitted?] reflects credit upon the architect and the mechanics. The Judges now look less like owls, sitting in the dark, and more like learned men occupying tribunals for the dispensation of justice. The skylights have been ingeniously placed over the flat dome-like ceilings and radiate a clear but mellow light throughout. The lawyers are delighted with these improvements, and have commenced wearing better clothes, to suit the changed appearance of the furniture and walls.

The building throughout (except the north wing, which is rented to the city) is comfortably heated by steam coils, covered with bronze screens and marble slabs. At first the odor rising from the heating of the new coils is not very agreeable, but that will soon pass away.
1877  Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. 23, p.84, January 2, 1877, photocopy: 279, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “Alterations in Court Room. W. F. Boyle Judge Circuit Court No. 3 presents a request to authorize the construction of a small room in the south east corner of his Court Room for the use of the Judge of the Court and that a desk for himself and one for the Clerk be supplied.

Which request the Court refer to the Committee on Court House for report.”

1883  General Term II, p. 579, April 2, 1883: “. . . W. J. Beattie . . . presents to the Court his account for Railings for Court Room No. 3 as per bid, amounting to the sum of forty one dollars and seventy five cents,. . . said account. . . be allowed and certified.”

Circa 1886  Mayor’s Message, 1887 and General Term, III, 78, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 150: “The furnishings which were found in the oval court room of the west wing in 1940 dated from this period [1885–88]. The evidence is fragmentary for that, consisting only of an expenditure $1,062.56 in the year preceding April 11, 1887, for furniture, fixtures and repairs for the Circuit Court, and a payment of $133.50 made on March 8, 1886, ‘for extras in fitting up Court Room No. 3.’”

1890–91  Mayor’s Message, 1891, p. 20, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 155:
“Circuit Court Expenses –

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Dating stamp} & 7.00 \\
\text{Furniture and repairs} & 585.60 \\
\text{Cleaning and renovating carpets} & 60.95 \\
\text{Winding and keeping live clocks} & 15.00 \\
\text{Carpets} & 359.50 \\
\text{Lamps etc.} & 54.36 \\
\text{Window shades} & 5.80 \\
\text{Cleaning wall paper in rooms Nos. 1 and 3} & 27.00 \\
\end{array}
\]

1903  General Term, V, pp. 259–300, January 2, 1903: “. . . in division Number four of this Court the judges bench and clerks desk be removed from the North side and placed on the South side of said room . . .”

1904  Mayor’s Message, 1904, p. 100: “Court House . . . Fitting up court rooms No. 3, No. 4 [207], No. 10 and No. 11 and adjoining offices . . . Alterations, court rooms No. 1 [220] and No. 7”

1919  General Term, VI, 457, 548, 554–555 and 558, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 213: “More than $1,000 were spent in 1919 for linoleum in Court No. 4, indicating that the marble floor of the oval room in the west wing was hidden from sight at that time. Almost as much linoleum was laid in Court No. 9 . . . At about the same time, a great deal of carpet . . . “Wilton Velvet” was purchased for the use of the Circuit Court.

1936  John A. Bryan, Preliminary Report and Estimate for the Repair and Restoration of the Old Courthouse, December 16, 1936, pp 9–10, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 6, Folder 3, JNEM Archives: “The courtroom in the West Wing is not occupied and is used as a dump appar-
ently. The floor is strewn with excelsior, scrap paper, tin cans, empty paint buckets, old lumber and fallen plaster. If vandals were preparing the room for a disastrous fire, the needed rubbish would be amply provided in the present situation. This room is elliptical in shape and could be made a beautiful part of the building if properly restored. The old bench and bar are still in place there."

p. 15: “A fire occurred in the building in May, 1936 and did considerable damage to the roof and skylights in the West Wing. Much of the sheathing was burned away and the repairs to the roof consisted merely in applying new sheathing over the resulting holes, and covering that with rolls of composition roofing. Many of the iron members of the trusses and purlins were badly warped and twisted by the fire, but no effort was made to straighten or to reinforce the defective members. This roof is in a dangerous condition and under a heavy snow is apt to collapse.”

p. 16: “The domed ceiling in the elliptical courtroom in the West Wing has sagged perceptibly. This was the most elaborate job of plastering to be found in any of the courtrooms.”

p. 17: “The north windows in the West and East Wings, first floor, have the original twelve-pane, double hung sash. The other windows have been changed to four-pane sash.”

pp. 20–1: “It is recommended that the existing skylights; several of the chimneys; the old iron arms that formerly carried telephone and telegraph wires; a number of useless vents; and miscellaneous pieces of iron which will crack or mar the stone by rusting, should all be removed, and any resulting holes properly patched. The skylights have been a constant source of trouble, and the soot which they collect has eliminated any possible lighting value for the rooms below. It is, therefore, elsewhere recommended that electric lights be installed in the ceiling wells above panels of translucent glass, thus insuring perfect light in the rooms at all times.

It is of prime importance that the precarious structural condition of the roof in the West Wing be rectified as soon as possible. The ridge of the roof has settled approximately one foot at the skylight and the warping of the truss members by the fire of May, 1936 has caused the entire roof load to be transmitted to the domed ceiling below, and thence through the columns to the second floor system. Thus a most hazardous condition exists in that area, particularly when considering damage possible to be caused by heavy snow loads during the coming winter.”

p. 25: “All of the plaster in the Second Floor should be replaced. It may be possible to pull the ceiling framing of the West Courtroom back into place if the structural members of the roof are replaced with trusses designed to carry the ceiling and roof loads. The sag in the domed ceiling was caused by the imposition of the roof load after the fire had caused the failure of the iron roof trusses.”

pp. 28–9: “The two elliptical courtrooms on the Second Floor have Vermont marble tiling, in excellent keeping with the delicate detail in those spaces, and thus it is recommended that the marble from the floor of the Southwest Courtroom on the Second Floor of the West Wing be taken up and the material used to fill out the worn and broken parts in the elliptical rooms. The Floor of the Southwest Courtroom above mentioned should then receive a new covering of asphalt tile in olive green tones.”

p. 30: “The two elliptical Courtrooms on the Second Floor should be wired for ceiling outlets in the center openings where the skylights exist. The plaster coves in those rooms are not adaptable for cove lighting.”

p. 31: “The north side of the East and West Wings has the original twelve-pane double hung sash; and it is recommended that all of the window sash be made to conform to that style; painted a lead color. . . .
Since Venetian blinds offer a better control of light than do roller shades, and are more in conformity with the style of window treatment during the middle of the Nineteenth Century, it is recommended that all the outside windows be provided with this type of blind, painted a pearl gray color and provided with lead-colored tapes.

1941 Charles E. Peterson to Chief of Planning, Memorandum, October 27, 1941, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 6, Folder 5, JNEM Archives: “. . . We recommend retaining the wood framing of the oval courtroom ceilings because:

1) They are in good condition for the most part. A few in the West Wing were charred, but there is no apparent danger of failure. They are of a more or less permanent nature as long as they are kept dry.

2) The construction itself is quite interesting and dates from 1870, our chosen date of restoration.

3) Both of these courtrooms are now structurally enclosed in fireproof boxes. . . . The 1936 fire seems to have been caused by bad wiring, which has since been removed. . . .

4) There is danger that the peculiar shape of these ceilings might not be accurately reproduced without excessive precautions in the drafting room and on the job.

5) The cost of replacement would be considerable.

1941–59 John Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, West Wing, pp 39–42, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives: “. . . a committee of local architects went over the building in 1933. At that time the West Circular Courtroom was in better shape than any of the others. However, the fire of 1936 in the West Wing did great damage to the domed ceiling in the Circular Room and the heavy wood timbers in the attic above, from which the paneled plaster was hung, were so badly burned that the whole ceiling had to be propped up while measured drawings of it were made. The props remained in place from 1941 until 1955 when the restoration work began.

. . . As the Architect peeled off the several coats of paint that had been applied to the walls through nearly one hundred years, he discovered that the first coat was a brownish pink, similar to that in the panels of the dome, and that color was put back on the walls. The original color of the columns and cornice could not be determined, and the cocoa brown of the present columns with the soft green of the cornice were colors that the Architect determined would most closely harmonize with the walls.

The new bracket lights spaced regularly around the walls were designed by Architect Bryan from two authentic sources – the brackets themselves are duplications of an old metal bracket from a gaslight fixture which the Architect obtained about thirty years ago from a St. Louis building of 1858 which was being razed. This was used by the manufacturer, Butler-Kohaus Company of St. Louis, as the pattern for the new brackets. The back-plate was designed from similar ornamentation of the Mid-Nineteenth Century; and the new bronze lamps on the Judge’s Bench were adapted from lamp designs found in the Illustrated London News of 1851.

The new chairs and tables in the room are of walnut, made from designs prepared by the Architect; and the marble floor has been extensively repaired to bring back the original pattern of brown and white checkerboard pattern. . . .

Summary of Expenditures in the West Wing . . .

Circular Courthouse, second floor . . .
Carpet on Judge’s platform and on floor of Bailiff’s Stand, Witness Stand, and Jury Platform, by T. Puckett Flooring Co. 1955-
Venetian Blinds, by H & L Co., 1956 . . .
Total - $33,940.00"

1944 “Justification,” Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, Old Courthouse, 1944, JNEM Archives: “. . . DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK
The estimates provide for the complete restoration of the Old Courthouse to its appearance in 1870, together with certain items to adopt portions of the structure to modern uses. . . . restoring the two oval court rooms, the west room complete with circular benches . . .”


When restoration plans of National Park Service architects can be carried out, a chandelier again will hang from the dome, to cast its light on polished judge’s bench, gleaming window panes and stone-flagged floor. . . .”

1955 “Specifications for Restoring Portions of The Old Courthouse Rotunda, West Courtroom,” St. Louis, Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, February 21, 1955, pp 8–9, RU 124 HSR Records Box 6, Folder 5, JNEM Archives:

“1. The demolition of the lantern and domed ceiling complete down to the entablature over the columns in the West Courtroom. The demolition of the plaster and wood lath of the entablature. The demolition of all other plaster in the Courtroom and adjoining anterooms except the new plaster in Room S-202.

2. The installation of the new lantern and domed hung ceiling over the Courtroom.
3. The relathing with metal lath and replastering of the entablature including the dentils.
4. The replastering of all other walls.
5. The reconditioning of doors and furniture.”
Ceiling. - Demolish entire domed ceiling saving sufficient sections as models for reproduction purposes. Hang furring and lath from rafters above in accordance with the contract drawings. Rebuild lantern and replaster ceiling and lantern reproducing the existing architectural designs. . . .

Entablature. - The entire plaster and wood lath base of the entablature including cornice, dentils, moldings and plain surfaces shall be demolished. Metal lath shall be substituted for the wood lath and the entire entablature reproduced in plaster to match existing architectural features. . . .

Doors. . . . – Recondition step leading down into Room S-202. . . . Columns. . . . Missing and broken ornamental metal leaves on the side of the capitals facing the center of the Courtroom shall be replaced by metal leaves removed from the wall sides of certain columns where they are not conspicuous. All existing leaves shall be inspected and anchored where necessary. . . . Center Rail. - The center rail shall be reconditioned throughout, butt joints tightened, loose spindles (if any) secured, base renailed where necessary, and a center cap
provided for the west end post to match cap in the east end post. Bailiff’s Stand. - Recondition Bailiff’s stand, platform and steps. Repair platform base on north side. Tighten and secure risers and treads in steps. Plug hole in platform inside of stand. Vacant drawer openings in Bailiff’s stand shall be plugged with wood to simulate desk drawer ends. Cover Bailiff’s stand with leatherette to match leatherette in East Courtroom. 

Jury Box. - Recondition Jury box. . . . Witness Stand. - Recondition Witness stand. Tighten or fill joints in platform. Provide new quarter round at plaster walls. Clerk’s Enclosure. - Recondition rail of Clerk’s enclosure. Remove old light socket and wood electric wire raceway. . . . Judge’s Bench. - On the front of the Judge’s Bench in the Clerk’s Enclosure supply and install missing cabinet doors and panels. Recondition and tighten cabinet doors and hinges and supply all cabinet doors with friction latches and pull knobs. Plug all holes. Recondition bracket and provide new mechanical bracket for pull down shelf. Provide shelf with pull knob and latch to hold shelf in closed position. . . . Remove all wood electric wire raceways, gas pipe, light fixtures under the shelf of the Judge’s Bench. Remove old cabinet on the left and the vacant drawer supports on the right under the shelf of the Judge’s Bench. Repair and cover the back of all pigeon hole compartments under the shelf of the Judge’s Bench. Cover the vertical face under the Judge’s Bench each side above and below the protruding pigeon holes with plywood. Cover Judge’s Bench with leatherette to match leatherette in East Courtroom. Provide missing spindle in the rail at the east end of the Judge’s Platform. . . . Remove linoleum from steps and recondition steps leading to Judge’s Platform. . . .

Refinishing. - All furniture including the Center Rail, Bailiff’s Stand, Jury Box, Witness Stand, Clerk’s Enclosure, and Judge’s Bench shall be refinished as hereinafter specified.”

p. 35: SKYLIGHT WEST COURTROOM. – The false skylight in the lantern of the West Courtroom shall consist of a wood oval ten paneled frame to match the skylight in the lantern of the East Courtroom.

p. 39: “63. OAK GRAIN FINISH. – Where oak grain finish is called for it shall match the existing oak grain finish.

64. FINISHING FURNITURE. – All the furniture in the West Courtroom including the Center Rail, Bailiff’s Stand, Jury’s Box, Witness Stand, Clerk’s Enclosure and Judge’s Bench with all risers to the platforms, but not the floors of the platforms and all risers to steps but not the treads of the steps shall be refinished.

All existing paint shall be completely stripped and removed. Areas shall be sanded . . . All wood work shall be stained one coat of walnut or mahogany as directed by the Contracting Officer. After the staining, a filler coat shall be rubbed in followed by one coat of shellac, two coats of satin stain varnish, and then polished with wax.”

p. 42: “73. FALSE SKYLIGHT WEST COURTROOM. – The false skylight shall be lighted with ten 40-watt fluorescent bulbs . . . The underside of the panel shall be painted a flat white so as to reflect light from the fluorescent fixtures to give a sunlight glow to the false skylight.

74. COVE LIGHTING WEST COURTROOM. – Fluorescent lights for lighting the dome of the West Courtroom shall be installed between the projecting ribs of the ceiling, recessed in the plaster work above the cornice of the entablature so as not to be visible from the floor of the Courtroom or the Judge’s bench.”

1957 Superintendent [Julian Spotts] to Regional Director, Region Two, August 6, 1957, RU 106 Superintendent’s Records, Series 9-2 Old Courthouse Materials, Box 5, “Light Fixtures East and West Courtrooms” folder, JNEM Archives:
“Herewith the blue prints of drawings Nos. 2011 and 2012 for light fixtures proposed for the restored east and west courtrooms.

The wall brackets are proposed to replace the old gas brackets (type unknown) in the west courtroom and the desk lamps are designed to replace gas lamps (type unknown) on the Judge’s Benches in the west and east courtrooms. There is not enough evidence available to reproduce in detail the original fixtures, however, the designs are in keeping with the atmosphere of the period.

The arms on the bracket lights are copied from a fixture found in an old Building erected in St. Louis in 1856, the escutcheon or back plate from another St. Louis building dating from 1860, with other details following types that Architect Bryan has found in various mid-19th Century public buildings in St. Louis and Cincinnati. The stem of the desk lamp is inspired by one published in the The London Illustrated News of 1851, and the shade of the lamp is designed by the architect to harmonize with the ribbed ceiling of the west courtroom.

With further reference to the wall brackets, the back plate will be given the contour of a shield, that is swelled out in the middle, so as to keep the metal from interfering with the electric wires in the box on the wall. The lower arms of the bracket will be set at a 45 degree angle that is shown on the drawing. The drawing was made as indicated in order to show the complete leafage of the arm. With the brackets at 45 degree angles, the fixture will not take up as much space as the drawing indicates.”

1966 Burton C. Bernard, “Brandeis in Saint Louis,” [Commemorative Program, dedication of Bronze Bust], June 28, 1966, Papers of Louis D. Brandeis, MOHIST: “The career of Louis Brandeis started in this court room on November 21, 1878, when, at the age of twenty-two, he was admitted to the St. Louis Bar . . . There are at least seven cases in the archives which evidence his activity in court in St. Louis.”

East Courtroom – Room 220
1858–1865 Circuit Court
1865–1915 Circuit Court 1
1915–1930 Circuit Court 13

Room History
The rebuilding of the east wing of the Courthouse commenced in 1852 and was completed in 1856. The Circuit Court was the last room to be finished in the new east wing, and its completion was greatly anticipated as it was to be “. . . the most beautiful room in the building, if not in the West.”119 A number of receipts from its original construction and furnishing survive and are detailed in the “Furnishings” portion of this room use section below. Briefly in 1856 – perhaps even before it was fully completed – this fine new courtroom was the temporary home of the Court of Common Pleas. At this time the Common Pleas courtroom on the west side of the second floor was having its floor tiled.120 From 1858 to 1865 the Circuit Court of

119 Daily St. Louis Intelligencer, July 3, 1856, as cited in Lindenbusch, 46.
120 Contract of County of St Louis and [John] Holliday and Olmsted, November 24, 1856, JNEM Archives; and Daily St. Louis Intelligencer, November 24, 1856, as cited in Lindenbusch, 46–47.
the City and County of St. Louis, previously on the ground floor in the west wing, conducted business in its oval courtroom on the second floor of this new court building.

In 1865 the courtroom was designated Circuit Court 1 and it remained as such for some fifty years until 1915. The Missouri Historical Society appears to have first been “organized” in this courtroom in 1866.121 The poorly lit and ventilated condition of this east courtroom in 1870, like so many others in the building, provoked presiding Judge Rombauer to band together with his colleagues to request major renovations not only for his courtroom and others but for a complete revamping of the courthouse’s heating system. Maintenance and upkeep were further documented in the summer of 1880. Sufficient renovation was undertaken and still in progress such that Circuit Court 1 had to meet in the Court of Appeals courtroom that fall.

Annotations on the back of an April 3, 1914 photograph by A.W. Sanders (figure 10) of Circuit Court 1 in its final year in this courtroom provides names of a few of the court employees who worked here: Elmer Moore, clerk; Mr. Merton, court stenographer; Mr. M[eyeseges?], sheriff; and a Mr. Staten, messenger.122 The following year Circuit Court 13 was assigned the east courtroom and it remained there until 1930 when all the circuit courts were transferred out of the Old Courthouse.

In 1936 National Park Service historical architect John A. Bryan assessed this oval east courtroom as “the best courtroom in the building from an architectural point of view.” At that time the St. Louis Art League used the space for its life drawing classes.123 In 1941 the NPS briefly considered moving its regional office to St. Louis, and this courtroom was thought to be ideal for housing the office. The historic fabric of the courtroom was in jeopardy and historians and architects alike rallied to support and justify its preservation.124 Ultimately, the regional office remained in Omaha, allowing preservation and restoration of the east courtroom to move forward.

National Park Service restoration of the courtroom began in 1954, guided by an 1870 “cut-off” date. The goal was to restore and recreate, to the extent possible, this fine 1858–70 courtroom for when the courthouse was open to the public to visit. The National Park Service also prepared the courtroom for scheduled meetings and other uses by groups in the area. Whenever known, reproduction elements were based upon site-specific models found in other Old Courthouse features. In the absence of such first-hand comparative furnishings, for example with the courtroom light fixtures, Mr. Bryan employed designs based on documented examples from the mid-19th century.

Much of what was not considered historic fabric in the 1950s was removed and destroyed during this effort, though fortunately the written record retained some description of materials removed.125 This campaign essentially removed what was by then the worn and aged

---

121 John A. Bryan to Mr. Spotts [NPS Superintendent], March 3, 1941, JNEM Archives.
122 JEFF 3521, JNEM Archives.
123 John A. Bryan, Preliminary Report and Estimate for the Repair and Restoration of the Old Courthouse, December 16, 1936, 10, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 6, Folder 3, JNEM Archives. (This report is the same as “An Architectural and Historical Sketch of the Old Courthouse,” John A. Bryan, NPS, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, 1937.)
124 John A. Bryan to Mr. Spotts [superintendent], March 3, 1941, JNEM Archives; Robert D. Starrett to Spotts, March 3, 1941, JNEM Archives; and Elbert Cox to Director [NPS], March 6, 1941, JNEM Archives.
trappings of a late-19th–early 20th-century courtroom. Details of the NPS restoration are included below, but overall, it can be said that the approach was removal of anything post-dating 1870, but otherwise retention of features and furnishings, the earlier the better.

The 1950s NPS restoration and renovation choices were driven in part by the decision to also use the courtroom for public meetings. “Worthy groups, particularly patriotic organizations, are allowed to use the room for meetings without charge. It seats about 100 persons.”126 Acoustical plaster was thus used and more seats provided than historically would have been there. By the 1980s preservation standards and approaches had changed sufficiently that the NPS took steps to minimize what were by then considered the inappropriate choices of the original restoration. Such decisions were noted in David Henderson’s Historic Structures Report; “This intrusive [acoustical plaster] coating was carefully and heavily overpainted white in 1980, to diminish the acoustic texture and to simulate the historic whitewash finish.”127

In 2006 the courtroom continues to be used to interpret its spectacular 19th-century architecture and the legal actions in the Old Courthouse and St. Louis. Education programs which explore different trials that took place in the Old Courthouse can be conducted here, and sometimes are conducted for the general public if a tour group is large enough and has sufficient time and interest. An interpretive wayside panel, which gives a brief overview of the courtroom’s history, is at the entrance to the courtroom for visitors touring the building on their own.

**Physical Evidence**

No major structural changes, to the extent that they seriously compromised the magnificent Robert S. Mitchell oval courtroom, have occurred in the east courtroom. The full range of original finish work is documented, including plastering,128 painting, oak grain painting and other faux finishes by M. L. Julian. Robert Mitchell contracted directly with him for the county; this contract was for work throughout the new east wing, not just the second-floor courtroom, and the desire to move the work along swiftly was written into the agreement:

> . . . to do all knotting, Stopping, painting, varnishings and glazing and furnish all Materials necessary there to except for glass for the East wing of the St. Louis County Court House-- . . . in the very best style of workmanship, and of the very best materials in their several kinds, and push the work forward as fast as shall be required by [Mitchell] . . . .129

Julian’s work was completed by May 1856 and he was paid $200.130 The main carpentry work also taking place during the construction of the east wing was done by Joseph Foster, who did

---

127 Henderson, 116.
128 “To Patrick Gregory for five hundred dollars for Plastering East Wing of the Court House,” Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 297, November 6, 1855, photocopy: 290, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
129 Contract of the County of St Louis [via Robt. S. Mitchell] and M. L. Julien [sic], May 11, 1855, JNEM Archives. (see Appendix C) and St. Louis County Court, Records Of Vol. VII, 236, May 18, 1855, photocopy: 282, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives. The painter’s name is spelled Julian in this and most other sources. Whether or not Julian’s work included graining of furniture is not specified; there is extant oak graining on the inside of cupboard doors in the judge’s bench today.
130 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 369, May 9, 1856, photocopy: 7, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
extensive carpentry throughout the courthouse in the 1840s and 1850s. In November 1855 he received $900 for his work, and later that winter he was paid an additional $1,000.00. The exact extent or nature of Foster’s work is not known for this courtroom, and in November 1856 another firm, Lanham & Tinfrock, was listed as providing $400 worth of carpentry for this court specifically. The 1870 renovation throughout the courthouse included considerable work in this courtroom. In Circuit Court 1, specifically, a skylight and ventilator were called for, and water closets were requested as well. Additionally, Judge Rombauer requested a ‘flew’ [flues] to the jury room so that it might receive sufficient heat.

A newspaper article from the fall of 1870 reported that the judge’s bench in the east courtroom was relocated as part of the major renovations of 1870. Historian John Lindenbusch asserts that the bench was placed on the east end of this courtroom to take advantage of the windows there, although he does not cite a source for this rationale. Extant floor marks show that the bench was at one point on the east side of the courtroom, and it is noted in the General Term that it was moved from the east side in 1903, but precisely when it was first put there is not entirely clear. Since the Circuit Court method of assigning desks to lawyers was used in this east courtroom until 1862, and this practice included a courtroom layout with the bench on the north wall, it is likely the bench was on the north wall until 1870. This is further supported by the fact that there are no floor marks suggesting it was ever anywhere else than on the north and east walls. A decade later, in the summer of 1880, work seems to have been done throughout the courthouse again, and Lindenbusch noted that in the east courtroom it “may have involved the ‘galvanized iron ventilators’ for which the city expended $135.25;” an additional ventilator had been authorized for the east courtroom the previous year. In 1881, $400 worth of renovations was done in Circuit Court 1 but their exact nature remains unknown.

Some modernization, such as the introduction of electricity, occurred in the courthouse in the late 19th century, but overall this was a period of decline for the structure. Rather than repair plaster and repaint, a gilded Lincrusta wallpaper lined the upper dome of the skylight in the 1890s and perhaps earlier. An 1899 measured drawing of the second floor of the courthouse by J. W. Ginder shows that at the turn of the century the east courtroom retained its 1870 layout with the judge’s bench along its east side and judge’s and jury rooms in

131 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 297, November 6, 1855, photocopy: 290, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives and Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 318, January 8, 1856, photocopy: 1, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
132 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 425, November 10, 1856, photocopy: 15, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
133 Thos. Walsh, Architect to Hon. Judges of the County Court, April 7, 1870, HSR Box 5, F5, 280, JNEM Archives, and Judges Rombauer and Knight to Judges of the County Court, “Petition of Judges & Bar for alterations in the various Court and other rooms in Court House,” No. 2085, March 28, 1870, HSR Box 5, F5, 281, JNEM Archives.
134 The rearrangement of this courtroom was reported thus: “. . . Circuit Courts No. 1 and 3 . . . the judges’ benches and railings are changed both in position and form. . . .” “The Court House,” The Missouri Republican – St. Louis, October 30, 1870, Lindenbusch 113.
135 General Term, V, 259–300.
136 Lindenbusch, 131–32 and 144.
137 General Term II, 490, 500, 505 and 526, as cited in Lindenbusch, 146.
138 Henderson, 117; Lindenbusch, 232–33; Bryan wrote: “In the center of the ceiling there is a light well, or inner dome, and the lining of that space was covered with a crinkled, heavy material, similar to linoleum, which had been gilded. Judge Thomas C. Hennings, the oldest of the living judges who at one time or other sat in this room, told us that the trade name of the materials was ‘Lincrusta.’” John Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, East Wing, 34–38, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives.
its southeast and northeast corners, respectively (figure 5). The addition of two new circuit courts in 1903, and perhaps in some part the imminent World’s Fair, instigated a final rearrangement of the east courtroom. As early as January 1903 the intention to move the bench to the north side was stated, and this was officially authorized on May 23, 1903.\(^{139}\) The “Mayor’s Message” for 1904 noted “alterations” for Circuit Court 1.\(^{140}\) Although these changes were not enumerated, they may well have centered on expanding the judge’s bench and clerk’s enclosure. The 1899 measured drawing by J. W. Ginder (figure 5) shows a fairly modest bench and clerk’s space, but by the 1910s, as the historic photographs of the courtroom show (figures 10 and 11), a larger clerk’s enclosure and judge’s bench were in place. It should also be noted that the bench in the 1899 plan measures approximately the same size as the central portion of the 1910s bench, extant today in the east courtroom. This suggests that when the bench was moved to the north side of the courtroom in 1903, it was also enlarged to the size and appearance seen in the 1910s photographs. In fact, stylistically the bench design is consistent with the likelihood that the earlier bench was incorporated as the center section of the 1903 enlarged bench; the outer sides of the 1899 bench appear to conform to where the columns and two lights are on the bench in the 1910s images and today. New radiators, perhaps in different locations, appear to have been introduced around 1907,\(^{141}\) and in the 1910s the original six-over-six window sash was replaced with two-over-one.\(^{142}\)

All other significant structural work dates to the tenure of the National Park Service. In the 1930s, reinforcements were added to combat settling in the roof near the skylight, the deteriorated marble floor was patched with marble from the first-floor west wing’s southwest courtroom, and wiring was added for ceiling lighting. Other Park Service work in the east courtroom focused on paint, finishes, and fixed furnishings. John Bryan noted: “in designing a new railing, we used as the pattern for the newel post a small column like the ones on the front of the Judge’s Bench in this room; and as a pattern for the balusters, we used the type that are in the railing alongside the Judge’s Bench in the West Courtroom.”\(^{143}\) The long front panel of the bench was found to be walnut beneath a golden oak graining. This walnut was brought back and then the remainder of the bench, the clerk’s desk and the bailiff’s stand were walnut grained as well.\(^{144}\) The type of paint analysis the NPS would undertake today was not done in the 1950s, so if original colors were not readily visible or did not happen to be found, colors were based upon what was thought to be appropriate to the period, hence the room’s color scheme was based upon a “crushed strawberry” thought to have been used in the mid-19th century in the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.\(^{145}\) Comparison of the 1914 Sanders photograph (figure 10) and the courtroom today shows that the bailiff’s stand has

---

\(^{139}\) General Term, V, 259–300, and Lindenbusch, 181.

\(^{140}\) Mayor’s Message, 1904, 100, and Lindenbusch, 181.

\(^{141}\) Figure 8, “Plan Showing Proposed Heating System at Court House,” B.P.I. [Bureau of Public Improvements], June 14, 1907, eTIC 41906, 283447-2.

\(^{142}\) John A. Bryan, Preliminary Report and Estimate for the Repair and Restoration of the Old Courthouse, December 16, 1936, 17, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 6, Folder 3, JNEM Archives; Lindenbusch, 232–33; and figure 9, “New Window Frames, Sash, etc., Court House,” Board of Public Improvements, May, 1912, eTIC 41914 283436–1.


\(^{144}\) Ibid.

\(^{145}\) For the walls in this room a purplish red was chosen while the cornice and the columns were done in a flat white, with sparse use of gold in the column caps. The color of the walls was one that was often called “crushed strawberry” during the middle of the 19th century, especially in the decorating of the National Capitol in Washington. John Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, East Wing, 34–38, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives.
been shifted slightly to the south (see figure G East Courtroom Floor Plan 1903-present). The National Park Service installed an air-handling vent in the wall of the courtroom during the 1950s renovations, and it appears likely that this shift in the bailiff’s stand occurred at that time to allow less obstructed access for the duct work.

Furnishings

The orientation of the furniture in the east courtroom falls into three periods: 1850s–1870, 1870–1903, and 1903-present. Three floor plans at the end of this section depict in a general fashion this repositioning of furnishings; the last plan, 1903-present, also shows a minor shift in the bailiff’s stand, likely done in 1955 by the National Park Service.

A few details are known of the furnishings of this courtroom, dating to the mid-to-late 1850s. Although no documents are extant enumerating gaslighting in the courtroom, in all likelihood this courtroom had gaslights, since the rotunda had received gaslighting in 1853. Receipts for furnishings from 1855 include carpet for the courtroom, and McPherson marble tile flooring, supplied by the Empire Stone Company, which received a total of $1,801.04 in three payments for its materials and labor. Also in the final year of construction, in 1857, R. Hutton provided a number of chairs for both this courtroom and what was likely the circuit court judge’s office, and B. Barth was paid for a substantial amount of carving, likely architectural work, perhaps for the capitals of the columns.

There is only a handful of furnishings evidence from the first few years when the space functioned as the Circuit Court. While the exact appearance of the lawyers’ desks is not certain, it is known that, until 1862, they were assigned as they had been when the Circuit Court met in its previous setting on the first floor of the west wing. Thus the lawyers had fixed locations within the courtroom determined by their listing on the judge’s roll. Not long after the Circuit Court set up on the second floor, Robert Mitchell called for a chandelier and two stoves for the room, indicating that more heat and light than had initially been provided was needed for the immense space. In the fall of 1859 Joseph Foster did a considerable amount of repair work for what was presumably new furniture; he spent two days “Repairing the Judges [sic] chair+C [etc.].”

146 “. . . [to] Isaac Walker for seventy two dollars 98 cents for carpet for Court Room,” April 5, 1855, St. Louis County Court, Records Of Vol. VIII, 207, photocopy: 280, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives.
147 Architect Robert S. Mitchell contracted for the county with the Empire Stone Company “. . . to furnish all the materials for and do all the tiling and flagging for the several floors of the East wing of the St. Louis Court House—. . . The tiles to be of the fine variegated marble known as the McPherson Marble, one and one half inch thick (1 ½”) and in squares from 8” to 12” to be free from defect. Cut nearly square on edges, very finely rubbed and set in the very best manner in cement as shall be directed and finely cleaned off.” Contract of County of St Louis and Empire Stone Company, May 11, 1855, JNEM Archives. [The complete contract may be seen in manuscript form in Appendix D.] See Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 318, January 8, 1856, photocopy: 1, Box 6, Folder 4, Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 355, April 9, 1856, photocopy: 5, Box 6, Folder 4, and St. Louis County Court, Records Of Vol. VIII, 369, May 13, 1856, photocopy: 7, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives for the three payments, for $850, $321.04 and $630.00 respectively.
148 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, 462, May 6, 1857, photocopy: 18, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives
149 St. Louis Circuit Court Record Books 13:432 ; Original in Circuit Court Book 13, 432, St. Louis Civil Courts Archive
150 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. IX, p. 81, February 12, 1859, photocopy: 39, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
151 “Measurements of Foster's Work at Courthouse (1863),” 104, JNEM Archives 1627.
By 1865 presiding Judge James C. Moody called for a thorough cleaning of the courtroom, primarily due to the smoke generated in the coal-burning stoves that heated the space. This work was approved and undertaken. These petitions of Circuit Court Judge Moody and others revealed also that the walls were frescoed, a painting method that incorporates paint into the plaster when it is wet, to make cleaning easier and repainting less frequent in anticipation of heavy dirt and soot from the stoves. Dirt from foot traffic as well as the stoves had also made it necessary to have the floor matting cleaned as well. Floor matting, or grass matting, was a popular and relatively inexpensive type of floor covering. Often used in domestic settings in summer months, it appears to have been used year round in the east courtroom at this time.

The next wave of documented furnishings in the east courtroom dates to the 1870 renovation of the courthouse which included considerable changes to this room. The decorative painting scheme around the interior of the new skylight likely dates to this time, although NPS architectural historian David Henderson thought it might have been slightly earlier and executed by Leon Pomarede in 1869 at the same time he worked on the upper rotunda. Evidently in 1870 the bench and desk in Circuit Court 1 were of enviable quality and were not altered as part of this renovation. The position of furniture in the courtroom was altered at this time, however, and, according to Lindenbusch, the bench was relocated to the east side of the court. Known changes to the east courtroom’s furnishings then included the replacement of stoves and stovepiping with marble-topped steam radiators with brass screens, and a wrought iron, enlarged skylight with a fresco-decorated sub-dome to further distribute the natural light above a single chandelier. The light situation was so much improved that the court did not expect to have to use the gaslight even on cloudy days.

For the remainder of the 19th century there are just a few other references to furnishings changes in the east courtroom, Circuit Court 1. In 1873 Judge Chester H. Krum requested 18 arm chairs, possibly 12 of which were for jurors, another ventilator was added to the courtroom in 1879, and in 1881 unspecified significant changes were made in the courtroom, and a leather judge’s chair was acquired. At some point in the 1880s wallpaper had been hung in the courtroom, as it was itemized to be cleaned in 1891 as a cost-saving alternative to being replaced. Other work was done in the circuit court that year and, while it is not clear what of it may have been specific to any particular courtroom or office, it is likely that the east courtroom had roller shades on its windows by this date and carpet covering some, if not all, of its floor.

152 St. Louis County, Court Records Of Vol. 12, 184, February 13, 1865, photocopy: 140, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives, and St. Louis County, Court Records Of Vol. 12, 191, February 24, 1865, photocopy: 141, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
153 St. Louis County, Court Records Of Vol. 12, 191, February 24, 1865, photocopy: 141, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
154 Wm. Rumbold, County Archt. & Supt. to the Honorable County Court of St. Louis County, Feb. 23, 1865, HSR, Box 5, F 5, 262, JNEM Archives.
155 Henderson, 117.
156 “There is now no longer any necessity for burning gas during the cloudy days to enable the clerks to write.” The smell of the steam-heating system was so different that it was remarked upon also: “At first the odor rising from the heating of the new coils is not very agreeable, but that will soon pass away.” “The Court House: The Recent Improvements,” Missouri Democrat, October 30, 1870, 4; and “The Court House,” The Missouri Republican - St. Louis, October 30, 1870.
157 It is not known for sure that these were actually acquired. Court Records of St. Louis County, Vol. 18, 389, February 17, 1873, photocopy: 218, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives.
158 Lindenbusch, 131–32.
159 General Term II, 490, 500, 505 and 526, as cited in Lindenbusch;146.
160 Window shades had become quite commonly used by the late 19th century and the amount of money spent on carpet, coupled with the likely wear and tear on the marble floor after almost 50 years of steady use leads to the likely footnote continued on page 73.
Lincrusta wallpaper found in the skylight area in the 1950s restoration of this courtroom is most likely the wallpaper referenced as being cleaned in 1891; there may have been other wallpapers as well since wallpaper from this period appears to have been used in the west courtroom (figures 37 and 38). Lincrusta wallpaper, an embossed composition wall covering that was sometimes gilded, was fairly heavy and durable and hence fairly easily cleaned. By 1900 the courtroom had converted to electric lighting, as had the entire Circuit Court. In 1903 Circuit Court 1 was reconfigured and the bench moved to the north side of the room; no new furniture was added, nor any extensive renovation documented. It is likely, however, that the judge’s bench and clerk’s enclosure were enlarged at this time with bookcases added flanking the central pigeon-hole portion of the bench.

New radiators appear to have been placed in the courtroom around 1907 (figure 8) and two 1910s photographs of the east courtroom, by then Circuit Court 13, thoroughly document the overall appearance of the space and show that specific other items, not documented in the written record, were in place as well. These photographs show a courtroom that was probably little changed from the time of its initial reconfiguration in 1903. The images display the court’s impressive judicial setting, many of the features of which have a timeless character and presence to them. Some details lend a late-19th-to-early 20th-century feel to the space nonetheless. These include the electric light fixtures and chandeliers, the coathooks hanging from the high wainscot, the oak, rocking arm-chairs for the jurors and the patterned linoleum flooring (figures 10 and 11).

By the time the National Park Service took over the Old Courthouse it appears that all these early 20th-century furnishings, except the bar, remained, simply in a deteriorated state. For example, John Bryan’s “Preliminary Report and Estimate” noted “on the second floor of the East Wing the oval courtroom has a floor. . . of Vermont white marble, partly covered with linoleum. . . .” Written documentation identifies that roller shades, Lincrusta wallpaper, “crude wainscoting,” and a “very crude modern railing of pine” that had replaced the massive bar (as seen in the 1910s photographs, figures 10 and 11), were all removed. It is likely that the moveable furniture, chairs, tables, etcetera were also removed at this time as part of this same NPS effort to recreate the mid-19th-century courtroom. The National Park Service then introduced a number of reproduction pieces, including furniture, based on other courthouse original furnishings, and items thought to be appropriate to the period of restoration: venetian blinds, and a leather judge’s chair, for example.

conclusion that the courtroom had some carpet by this time. “The Mayor’s Message,” 1890–91, page 2, noted:

“Circuit Court Expenses –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dating stamp</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and repairs</td>
<td>585.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and renovating carpets</td>
<td>60.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding and keeping live clocks</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpets</td>
<td>359.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamps etc.</td>
<td>54.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window shades</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning wall paper in rooms Nos. 1 and 3</td>
<td>27.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

161 Lindenbusch, 154.
162 Ibid., 181.
165 Ibid.
Summary Floor Plans, East Courtroom

The following three *summary floor plans* are provided for visual reference and are not for implementation. They show partial furnishings for the courtroom and are in some cases speculative, based on the varied availability of documentation for the courtroom at the different periods of time. Please read the room history for thorough, footnoted, documentation on the courtroom’s appearance and changes over the years.

Figure F – Overview of east courtroom, 1950s to present
Figure G – East courtroom, c. 1850s–1870, with bench at north side of courtroom
Figure H – East courtroom, 1870–1903, with bench at east side of courtroom
Figure I – East courtroom, 1903-present, with bench at north side of courtroom
Furnishings and Finishes Summary Chronology, East Courtroom

For a complete courtroom chronology with full citation and context see the room references that follow on p. 81.

1855
Carpet, Isaac Walker
McPherson marble tile floor, St. Louis Empire Stone Company
Possible grain painting and finishes (oak, faux marble, etc.), M. L. Julian
Painting, M. L. Julian
Carpenter’s work, Joseph Foster
Plastering, Patrick Gregory

1856
Carpenter’s work, Joseph Foster
Floor tiling, St. Louis Empire Stone Company
Carpenter’s work, Lanham & Tinfrock

1857
Chair(s), R. Hutton
Carving, B. Barth

1859
Chandelier and two stoves

1863
Repairing judge’s chair other miscellaneous repairs, two days work

1865
Cleaning of frescoed walls and ceiling
Cleaning of floor matting

1870
Judges (Rombauer for east courtroom) and Bar petition, No. 2085, to County Court (and leak petition to newspapers) for better heat, light, and fresh air throughout the courthouse

Stove dirt “blackening frescoed walls and ceilings”
Steam heat with radiators - brass screens and covered with polished marble slabs
– installed, coal-burning stoves removed
“Benches and railing changed in both position and form” (both east and west courtrooms)
Old ventilator removed; eye of dome enlarged, wrought iron skylights, frescoed sub-dome

1873
Judge Chester H. Crum requests 18 arm chairs for his courtroom

1879–80
Additional ventilator of galvanized metal
1881
$400 worth of unspecified renovations
Leather judge’s chair

1891
Wallpaper cleaned

1900
Electrical lights in need of repair in all courtrooms

1903
Relocation of bench and clerk’s desk to north side of courtroom

1904
Courtroom “alterations”

1907
New heating system proposed, Board of Public Improvements (see figure 8)

1912
New windows, four-pane sash, Board of Public Improvements (see figure 9)

1914
Photograph of Circuit Court 1, by A.W. Sanders, April 3, 1914, JEFF 3521, JNEM
(see figure 10, includes transcription of donor’s inscription)

1915
Courtroom assigned to Circuit Court 13; “No. 13” painted on transom door

About 1915
Photograph of Courtroom, OCH Interiors No.52, MOHIST, gift of Dr. William F. Swekosky
(see figure 11)

1936
John A. Bryan’s “Preliminary Report and Estimate of the Repair and Restoration of the Old Courthouse”
• Marble floor partially covered with linoleum, also patched with cement

Bryan recommended:
• Roof be structurally reinforced “to overcome settling around the skylight”
• Wire for ceiling outlets where skylights are located
• Venetian blinds, pearl gray with lead-colored tapes
• Reintroduce twelve-pane double hung sash windows

1938
Electric wires hanging down: “cross and re-cross on the ceiling”
1954–59
March 1954 work began on east courtroom

- Remove high tongue-and-groove wainscot with hooks on west wall; found beneath wainscot that the wall had “originally been plastered and decorated”
- Gilded Lincrusta wallpaper in ceiling center removed; revealed 3-color classical designed panels on light-dome thought to date to 1854. This pattern was reproduced by Charles Morgenthaler, a St. Louis artist.
- Color scheme selected was based on what was thought to have been a popular mid-19th-century color, “crushed strawberry,” and used in the National Capitol in Washington; flat white for cornice and columns and gold highlights in the column capitals
- Replaced “very crude modern railing of pine” between the witness and jury box; the newel post was based on columns in front of the judge’s bench and the balusters were based on the railing by the Judge’s bench in the west courtroom
- Replaced non-original steps to witness stand and to jurors’ room; new steps conform to curve of oval room.
- Golden oak graining on judge’s bench removed to reveal walnut; remainder of bench grained to match the walnut; Clerk’s desk and Bailiff’s stand also grained walnut to match bench
- Venetian blinds installed on the seven windows
- 100 solid seat and backed folding chairs acquired and placed on floor
- Bronze desk lamps fabricated (1958; see John Bryan’s design drawing, figure 20)
- New high-backed, leather judge’s chair (1958; see John Bryan’s design drawing, figure 24)
- Maroon linoleum installed on judge’s platform, witness stand and jury box (1954)

Mid-1950s
New ceiling of acoustical plaster
Reproduction six-over-six windows replace 1912 four-pane windows

1979
Paint investigation and analysis (“Paint Analyses Interior of Old Court House” by Gerhardt Kramer)

1980
Overpaint acoustical plaster ceiling to try to diminish texture and simulate historic whitewash finish

1986
Deteriorated plaster repaired and painted by park staff

2003
Repainted by park staff
January 24, 1843, St. Louis Circuit Court Record Books 13: 432; Original in Circuit Court Book 13, page 432, St. Louis Civil Courts Archive: “Court met pursuant to adjournment, present the honorable Bryan Mullanphy Judge, William Milburn Esqr. sheriff + John Ruland clerk. The Circuit Court room having been assigned to the Circuit Court on this day the Court proceeded to assign the seats to counsel in the order in which their names appear in the roll. Choice of seats was given to Counsel in the order aforesaid. To preserve the identity of the location of the seats, numbers were assigned to each seat Commencing by number one at the North west corner of the of the [sic] space allotted at the bar and proceeding in the enumeration from the north to the south of that space and then back from south to the north end thereof and so on to the termination of the numbers. The following seats numbered as hereinafter set forth were chosen by the following named Counsel + which being so chosen are hereby assigned to them respectively.

Henry Walton, P.J. [Presiding Judge?], County Court Records of Saint Louis County, Vol. III, p 308, March 28, 1843, RU 124 HSR Records Box 5, Folder 5, p 109, JNEM Archives: “. . . the upper room in the East Wing of the Court House be assigned and set apart for the use of the Court of Common Pleas, . . .”

Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 207, April 5, 1855, photocopy: 280, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “Ordered That a Warrant issue upon the Treasurer in favor of Isaac Walker for seventy two dollars 98 cents for carpet for Court Room.”

Contract of County of St Louis and Empire Stone Company, May 11, 1855, JNEM Archives: [Architect Robert S. Mitchell for Co. of St. Louis] . . . [Empire Stone Co.] to furnish all the materials for and do all the tiling and flagging for the several floors of the East wing of the St. Louis Court House—

The tiles to be of the fine variegated marble known as the McPherson Marble, one and one half inch thick (1 ½") and in squares from 8” to 12” to be free from defect. Cut nearly square on edges, very finely rubbed and set in the very best manner in cement as shall be directed and finely cleaned off—

One size only (except for borders) to be used in each room.

The flagging to be of the stone known as Barrett, free from defects (or other equally good and satisfactory to the Architect) 2” thick. And in squares of from 18” to 24”, fine sand rubbed, neatly jointed squares, and set in cement averaging 1 ½” thick—

. . . Preparations are to be made immediately for the getting out and preparing the materials, and the work of laying to be commenced as soon as any of the rooms are plastered and ready. . . . For each superficial foot of Marble tiling Sixty eight (68/100) cents — and for each superficial foot of flagging Forty seven and one half (47 1/2/100) cents . . . [Empire Stone] not be entitled to receive more than eighty per cent (80/100) of the value of the work done during its progress and at its entire completion which shall be estimated by the Architect and the payment made on his order . . . ”

Contract of County of St Louis [via Robt. S. Mitchell] and M.L. Julien [sic], May 11, 1855, JNEM Archives: “. . . to do all knotting, Stopping, painting, varnishings and glazing and furnish all Materials necessary there to except for glass for the East wing of the St. Louis
County Court House---. . . in the very best style of workmanship, and of the very best materials in their several kinds, and push the work forward as fast as shall be required by [Mitchell]. . . [paid] ninety per cent 90/100 of the accompanying bill of prices. . . and ten per cent 10/100 deducted therefrom. . . shall not be entitled to more than (80/100) per cent of the value of the work during its progress up to completion, and the balance after a lapse of thirty days after the final completion and reception. All claims, liens and demands being settled - . . . (see Appendix C)”

1855 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 236, May 18, 1855, photocopy: 282, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “The Court hereby approve the contract made by R. S. Mitchell with M. L. Julian for painting the East Wing of the Court house. Said Contract being dated May 11, 1855.”

1855 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 297, November 6, 1855, photocopy: 290, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “To Joseph Foster for nine hundred dollars for Carpenter’s Work on East Wing of the Court House. . . .
To Patrick Gregory for five hundred dollars for Plastering East Wing of the Court House.”

1855 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 302, November 10, 1855, photocopy: 290, Box 6, Folder 1, JNEM Archives: “To the Empire Stone Co. for five hundred & fifty dollars for Tiling for East Wing of the Court House.”

*1856 Records of St. Louis County Court, Of Vol. VIII, p. 318, January 8, 1856, photocopy: 1, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To St. Louis Empire Stone Company for eight hundred fifty dollars for tiling for East Wing of the Court House.
To Joseph Foster for one thousand dollars for Carpenter’s Work for East Wing of the Court House.
To B. Crickard for two thousand dollars for cut stone work for East Wing of the Court House.
To R. Walker for twenty dollars for taking care of Circuit Court Room.”

1856 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 355, April 9, 1856, photocopy: 5, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To Empire Stone Company for three hundred twenty one dollars four cents for tiling for East Wing of the Court House.”

1856 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 369, May 9, 1856, photocopy: 7, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To M. L. Julian for two hundred dollars for painting East Wing of Court House.”

1856 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 369, May 13, 1856, photocopy: 7, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To St. Louis Empire Stone Co. for six hundred thirty dollars for tiling for East Wing of the Court House.”

1856 Daily St. Louis Intelligencer, July 3, 1856, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 46: “. . . east wing was ‘almost entirely finished, the only unfinished room being that intended for the Circuit Court.’ Of that space on the second floor, it was said that ‘it will be the most beautiful room in the building, if not in the West.’
Part of the praise directed toward the new courtroom...can be attributed to the installation of the finest flooring that to date could have been found in the Courthouse.

1856 *Daily St. Louis Intelligencer*, October 14, 1856, as cited in Lindenbusch, pp. 46–47: “...session of the Court of Common Pleas opened, its judge was given temporary possession of the oval courtroom on the second floor of the east wing.”

1856 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 425, November 10, 1856, photocopy: 15, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To Lanham & Tinfrock for four hundred dollars for carpenters work for Circuit Court Room.”

1857 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. VIII, p. 462, May 6, 1857, photocopy: 18, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “To R. Hutton for forty eight dollars for chairs for office and Court room.

To B. Barth for $450.00 for carving.”

1859 Records of St. Louis County Court, Vol. IX, p. 81, February 12, 1859, photocopy: 39, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “Ordered that the Architect cause a chandelier and two stoves to be placed in the Circuit Court room.”

1863 “Measurements of Foster’s Work at Courthouse (1863)” Filed March 18, 1863, Auditor’s Office, JNEM Archives 1627; [measurement for contract August 12, 1839; measurement began 1862]

p. 104... “Oct. 3, 1859  To 2 days Repairing the Judges chair+C [etc.] in the Circuit Court Room [220] [@] 2.50 [$]5.00”

1865 Records of St. Louis County Vol. 12, p. 184, February 13, 1865, photocopy: 140, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “Court House Circuit Courtroom. Petition filed by Judges Jas C. Moody & others to have the Circuit Court room cleaned & painted & same referred to the County Architect.”

1865 Wm. Rumbold, County Archt. & Supt. to the Honorable The County Court of St. Louis County Feb. 23, 1865, HSR, Box 5, F 5, p 262, JNEM Archives: “The petition of the Hon. J. C. Moody of the Circuit Court to your honorable body, in relation to the ‘needed cleaning & painting’ in his court room, would respectfully report that the same is in need of cleaning only by washing down the walls & ceiling and other wood work be a proper person, also the better keeping in proper condition the floor matting, and washing the floor to cleanse the same.

One of the principal objects in fresco painting the walls of these court rooms was that the same might be easily [sic] cleansed by washing without injury to the paint or walls, and present a new room when so cleansed.

I would also remark that the Stoves are the principal cause of the walls being in their present condition either from the smallness of the flues, or the winds when in certain directions, causing almost continual smoking in the rooms.

[Approved. Febr 24/65]”
1870  *Daily Democrat*, March 27, 1870, as cited in Lindenbusch, pp. 110–11: “The campaign they conducted showed them to be politically sagacious since... they banded together to present their requests at the same time. They also managed to enhance their chances for success by means of a judicious leak of the contents of their petition to local newspapers before they presented it to the county commissioners. The editorial response was most favorable and helpful.

‘A petition signed by Judges Rombauer [220] and Knight [207], of the Circuit Court; Judges... of the Supreme Court; ... County Recorder; and the Directors of the Law Library Association, will be presented to the County Court on Monday, asking that certain much needed improvements be made in some of the rooms of the Court House. What is wanted is more light and fresh air – especially fresh air. The court rooms are a disgrace to the city, and detrimental to health, and should be altered so as to make them in keeping with the recent salutary improvements in the rotunda and dome, which meet the approbation of the public.”

1870  *Daily Democrat*, April 1, 1870, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 112: “Judicial Darkness – Justice Not Blind –The architect who drew the plans of the Court House appears to have entertained the pagan idea that Justice is blind. At any rate, he fashioned the court rooms in such a manner that very little solar light can shine upon the judicial altars, and in all the court rooms gas is used at midday to enable the eyes of Justice to gaze upon the briefs of the lawyers.”

1870  Thos. Walsh, Architect to Hon. Judges of the County Court, April 7, 1870, HSR Box 5, F5 pp. 279–81, JNEM Archives: [refers to petition to Judges of the County Court by Judges Rombauer and Knight [No. 2085 “Petition of Judges & Bar for alterations in the various Court and other rooms in Court House” March 28, 1870 referred to Thos. Walsh, Architect p. 281 April 14, 1870 improvements ordered]

p. 279... “After an examination of the apartments referred to, I find it necessary to make these alterations from the fact of the Court Rooms being without light & air on dark gloomy days; the alterations in these Court Rooms would obviate the necessity of burning gas in them during business hours, which would be great savings to the County.

... The heating of the building by Steam is an improvement which should be made; the stoves now used for that purpose not only blacken the frescoed walls, and ceilings, and annoy the Court, but are insufficient to heat the rooms; this mode of heating by stoves, belongs to the past. The present time would be best to prepare this work, as it could be put up while the courts adjourn.”

p. 280 HSR [from 3/28/70 petition:] “In Court Room No. 1 [220] being the old Circuit Court Room a skylight and ventilator above the chandelier, - a skylight will save the County in gas bills – (now absolutely necessarily incurred) its cost within a few years –

Water closets if they can be constructed without creating smells in the jury room and judges room in the small corner on the south east & north east corner of Court Room. A flew broken through into the jury room, as now no stove can be placed into that room – and in cold whether sic jurors suffer severely. R.E. Rombauer

1870  “The Court House,” *The Missouri Republican-St. Louis*, October 30, 1870, JNEM Archives: “... lightening up of the halls and passages in the second story. This has now been admirably remedied, while the sky-lights have added animation to the general appearance. ... The third alteration is in the courtrooms in the second story. These are so changed and remodeled that they are scarce recognizable to those accustomed to their old condition. Circuit
Courts No. 1 and 3 are really elegant, and have lost their old sombre, uncomfortable appearance. The judges’ benches and railings are changed both in position and form, and greater and better accommodation is given the public. The old ventilators over the courtrooms are taken out and the eye of the domes covering these courts are enlarged and wrought iron skylights placed over them, and the sub-domes underneath reflecting rays of light directly down into the court-rooms below; and over the lawyers’ desks. These sub-domes are a very handsome feature in the courts and are tastefully frescoed. These improvements make the court-rooms cheerful and pleasant, and the judges, lawyers and the public should feel highly satisfied with the manner in which they have been executed.

The building throughout, except the north wing, is now heated by steam. The steam coils are enclosed by brass screens and covered by polished marble slabs, and the heat can be increased or modified at pleasure, thereby doing away with the old system of stoves; and the dust, noise and inconveniences arising from them. The ventilation is found to work well in all the rooms and offices, and is so arranged as to carry off all rarified air from the courts both in summer and winter.

... After a thorough examination, the public cannot fail to accord Mr. Thos. Welsh [sic] the architect, a compliment for his ingenuity and good taste. By these alterations devised and carried out by him, the interior of the edifice has been vastly improved, both in appearance and comfort, and the effect will be most agreeably experienced throughout the numerous official and judicial departments, and by the hundreds who visit them daily.”

1870 “The Court House: The Recent Improvements,” Missouri Democrat October 30, 1870, p. 4: “...The rooms of the Circuit Court have also been remodeled and lighted by skylights, and there is now no longer any necessity for burning gas during the cloudy days to enable the clerks to write. The manner in which these rooms have been lighted and [refitted?] reflects credit upon the architect and the mechanics. The Judges now look less like owls, sitting in the dark, and more like learned men occupying tribunals for the dispensation of justice. The skylights have been ingeniously placed over the flat dome-like ceilings and radiate a clear but mellow light throughout. The lawyers are delighted with these improvements, and have commenced wearing better clothes, to suit the changed appearance of the furniture and walls.

The building throughout (except the north wing, which is rented to the city) is comfortably heated by steam coils, covered with bronze screens and marble slabs. At first the odor rising from the heating of the new coils is not very agreeable, but that will soon pass away.

1873 Records of St. Louis County, Vol. 18, p. 389, February 17, 1873, photocopy: 218, Box 6, Folder 4, JNEM Archives: “...application of Chester H. Krum Judge Circuit Court for eighteen arm chairs for use of his Court Room filed and referred to Committee on Court House with power to act in the premises.”

1881 General Term II, 490, 500, 505 and 526, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 146: “By order of the judges of the Circuit Court, renovations were made in the oval courtroom in the east wing during 1881. ...costing $400. ...exact nature not noted. The judge of the court there also received a leather chair and a revolving office chair as new furniture.”
1890–91  Mayor’s Message, p. 20, as cited in Lindenbusch, p. 155:
“Circuit Court Expenses – . . .
Dating stamp 7.00
Furniture and repairs 585.60
. . .
Cleaning and renovating carpets 60.95
Winding and keeping live clocks 15.00
Carpets 359.50
Lamps etc. 54.36
Window shades 5.80
Cleaning wall paper in rooms Nos. 1 and 3 27.00”

1903  General Term V, pp 259–300, January 2, 1903: “. . . in division Number one of this Court the judges bench and clerks desk be removed from the east side and placed on the North side of said room. . . ”

1904  “Mayor’s Message,” 1904, p. 100: “. . . Alterations, court rooms No. 1 [220] and No. 7”

1936  John A. Bryan, Preliminary Report and Estimate for the Repair and Restoration of the Old Courthouse, December 16, 1936, p10, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 6, Folder 3, JNEM Archives: “The courtroom in the East Wing, oval in shape, is the best courtroom in the building from an architectural point of view. It is now used for classes in life drawing by the Art League.”

 p. 14: “On the second floor of the East Wing the oval courtroom has a floor [?] of Vermont white marble, partly covered with linoleum, . . . ”

 p. 16: “The best condition of this floor exists on the domed ceiling of the oval courtroom in the East Wing. Practically all of the ceiling on the Second Floor elsewhere than in this East Wing room will need to be replaced.”

 p. 17: “The north windows in the West and East Wings, first floor, have the original twelve-pane, double hung sash. The other windows have been changed to four-pane sash.”

 p. 21: “It is recommended that the roof over the large oval courtroom in the East Wing be reinforced structurally, to overcome the settling in the roof around the skylight.”

 p. 28–29: “The two elliptical courtrooms on the Second Floor have Vermont marble tiling, in excellent keeping with the delicate detail in those spaces, and thus it is recommended that the marble from the floor of the Southwest Courtroom on the Second Floor of the West Wing be taken up and the material used to fill out the worn and broken parts in the elliptical rooms.”

 p. 30: “The two elliptical Courtrooms on the Second Floor should be wired for ceiling outlets in the center openings where the skylights exist. The plaster coves in those rooms are not adaptable for cove lighting.”

 p. 31: “The north side of the East and West Wings has the original twelve-pane double hung sash; and it is recommended that all of the window sash be made to conform to that style; painted a lead color. . . . Since Venetian blinds offer a better control of light than do roller shades, and are more in conformity with the style of window treatment during the middle of the Nineteenth Century, it is recommended that all the outside windows be provided with this type of blind, painted a pearl gray color and provided with lead-colored tapes.”
1938 John A. Bryan, *A Physical History of the Old Courthouse St. Louis, Missouri, 1826–1938*, October, 1938, JNEM Archives: “...the most beautiful one in the building in its shape and proportions, but the most abused space in the building today. It is used for a free-hand drawing class. Electric wires cross and re-cross on the ceiling; cans of paint stand on the floor and on the drawing benches, while papers and smocks are strewn carelessly about the room.”

1941 Robert D. Starrett to [Superintendent Julian] Spotts, March 3, 1941, JNEM Archives: “Reference is made to the memorandum of Associate Director Demaray, February 26, in which was expressed the desire to remove the east courtroom of the Old Courthouse to make way for office space.

In the opinion of the writer this would tend to defeat the purpose for which the building was saved. ... To rip out the mid-19th Century construction might prove needless. It may happen that after the Regional Office has occupied the building for a time that changes in office assignment will require attention and until that date, could not the oval courtroom be used as it now stands? The architects have informed the undersigned that the woodwork in the room in question is probably the oldest and least disturbed in the building and that it should be preserved because of its historic background. Therefore the question again is reiterated: Could not the court room be utilized as office space without disturbing the physical features of the room? It may not be necessary in the final analysis—then, too, it may save later regrets.”

1941 John A. Bryan to Mr. Spotts, March 3, 1941, JNEM Archives: “Of all the courtrooms in the Old Courthouse which it is important to leave as a courtroom only, Room 203 [sic - 220] (the oval room in the East Wing) is the outstanding one. It has come down to the present time substantially as it was originally designed, by Robert Mitchell in 1854. ... To alter the form of either of the oval rooms is a suggestion that should never come from anyone connected with the National Park Service. The whole legal authority for the expenditure of this money is to preserve and restore historic buildings; and its original architecture is just as much an historic feature as might be the fact of a famous lawsuit having been tried in that room. A large body of influential St. Louisans are [sic] beginning to question the program of the Park Service in regard to the buildings in the area; and to make such alterations as have been proposed might conceivably bring on legal action against the Department of the Interior by the Missouri Historical Society which was organized in this room in 1866.”

1941 Elbert Cox to Director [NPS], March 6, 1941, JNEM Archives: “Mr. Lee’s memorandum of February 27 for Dr. Pitkin, in the matter of the old courthouse at St. Louis, has been received. ... It is entirely possible that certain of the proceedings in the Dred Scott case were held in Room 203 of the old courthouse. Some of them might also have been held in Room 109. As Dr. Pitkin recalls the matter, Room 117 is the Dred Scott trial room according to local tradition, but actually the proceedings dragged through the local courts for so long that almost any court room in the building might have associations with this case as a purely Missouri affair.”

1954–59 John Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, East Wing, pp 34–38, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5, JNEM Archives: “In March, 1954 work was begun on the Oval Courtroom in the East Wing. ... Along the west wall a high wainscot
of tongue-and-groove boards had been put in place, with the hooks for hats and coats. By
taking a crowbar and prying off some of the boards, it was discovered that the wall behind
had originally been plastered and decorated, and that the original stone base extended all
along that side of the room. Therefore we removed the crude wainscoting. . . . In the cen-
ter of the ceiling there is a light well, or inner dome, and the lining of that space was covered
with a crinkled, heavy material, similar to linoleum, which had been gilded. Judge Thomas C.
Hennings, the oldest of the living judges who at one time or other sat in this room, told us that
the trade name of the materials was “Lincrusta” and that it was widely used in public build-
ings, churches, and even in pretentious residences between 1890 and 1900. Since we knew
that an extensive program of alteration and redecoration had taken place in the Courthouse
in 1894, we assumed that this gilded material had been put in place then. It was loose in sev-
eral places, and came off readily, but the glue on the back of it pulled off most of an interest-
ing series of panels in Classic design, in three colors, that had been under the Lincrusta, and
which we felt sure was original work of 1854. By piecing together fragments from the different
panels, we were able to work out a complete pattern for the entire opening. Charles Morgen-
thaler, a St. Louis artist, was engaged to decorate the interior of this light dome in the original
pattern and coloring.

For the walls in this room a purplish red was chosen while the cornice and the columns
were done in a flat white, with sparse use of gold in the column caps. The color of the walls
was one that was often called “crushed strawberry” during the middle of the Nineteenth
Century, especially in the decorating of the National Capitol in Washington.

On the east side of the room the original railing separating the witness stand from the jury
box had evidently been removed and a very crude modern railing of pine had been substi-
tuted. In designing a new railing, we used as the pattern for the newel post a small column
like the ones on the front of the Judge’s Bench in this room; and as a pattern for the balusters,
we used the type that are in the railing alongside the Judge’s Bench in the West Courtroom.

The small flight of steps leading to the witness stand did not appear to be original, and
moreover they were dangerous. New steps having curves to fit the oval room were put in
place so that the entrance to the Judge’s Bench from the east side and to the Jury Room in the
northeast corner of the room could be had with the same long steps in front of the Witness
Stand. . . . The golden oak graining on the Judge’s Bench was removed and revealed the fact
that the long panel on the front of the Bench was genuine walnut. It was refinished and then
the rest of the Bench was grained in walnut to match the front panel. The Clerk’s Desk was
also grained in imitation of walnut, as well as the Bailiff’s Stand.

Venetian blinds were placed at the seven windows, and one hundred new folding chairs of
solid seat and back design were placed on the floor. A new high-backed chair, upholstered
in brown leather was provided for the Judge’s Bench, and new bronze desk lamps were pro-
vided. . . . Summary of Expenditures . . . Oval Courtroom, 2nd

. . . Maroon linoleum on Judge’s Platform, Witness Stand & Jury Box – Puckett Flooring
Co., 1954 . . . Total: $23,993.55”

Magazine, February 6, 1955, p. 5: “ . . . the photos taken in the refurbished century-old Cir-
cuit Courtroom on the second floor west [sic - east] wing – one of seven Circuit Courtrooms
in the building. . . . the walls have been painted a deep burgundy, a popular color of that day.
Floors are of white marble. Carved walnut furnishings carry out the room’s rich tradition. . . .
Worthy groups, particularly patriotic organizations, are allowed to use the room for meetings without charge. It seats about 100 persons.”


View of the new balustrade separating the witness stand from the jury box. The newel post is copied from the columns on the front of the judge’s bench, and the balusters are copied from those in the West Courtroom. All this new woodwork is grained to match the walnut paneling on the front of the judge’s bench.”


The wall brackets are proposed to replace the old gas brackets (type unknown) in the west courtroom and the desk lamps are designed to replace gas lamps (type unknown) on the Judge’s Benches in the west and east courtrooms. There is not enough evidence available to reproduce in detail the original fixtures, however, the designs are in keeping with the atmosphere of the period.

The arms on the bracket lights are copied from a fixture found in an old Building erected in St. Louis in 1856, the escutcheon or back plate from another St. Louis building dating from 1860, with other details following types that Architect Bryan has found in various mid-19th Century public buildings in St. Louis and Cincinnati. The stem of the desk lamp is inspired by one published in the The London Illustrated News of 1851, and the shade of the lamp is designed by the architect to harmonize with the ribbed ceiling of the west courtroom.”

1958 Julian Spotts to Jordan Scheid Co. Inc., May 13, 1958, RU 106 Superintendent’s Records, Series 9-2 Old Courthouse Materials, Box 5, “Courthouse Chairs” folder, JNEM Archives. [The contract was not awarded to Scheid but to Federal Office Equipment Company, with a quantity of only 50 ordered.]

“The sample chair to be duplicated was manufactured at least 25 years ago or more, by a factory who has since gone out of business and no other factory is presently manufacturing this number of is tooled up to make same as a stock unit.

We are however able to furnish an exact duplicate of this chair through the cooperation of our factory. To do so, however will require a complete retooling and setting up job that cannot be done unless the quantities will be of 100. As an engineer, I am quite sure you can appreciate what is involved in retooling to do a special order.”
On the basis of 100 chairs, may I submit the following bid.

Solid walnut, each $36.35
Birch, walnut finish, each $31.45 . . .”

1958 Supply Contract issues by Julian C. Spotts, Superintendent, JNEM Archives, April 9, 1958, Bryan Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, MOHIST: [for 100 chairs] “ . . . single folding type . . . backs and roll seats of 5-ply hardwood . . . legs of maple and beech . . . finish dark walnut . . . shall duplicate exactly the sample chairs on hand in the office of the Contracting Officer . . .”

1980 Henderson, HSR, p. 116: “Bryan stated that the acoustical plaster [applied in 1958] was to facilitate auditorium use of the courtroom. This intrusive coating was carefully and heavily overpainted white in 1980, to diminish the acoustic texture and to simulate the historic whitewash finish.”

p. 119: “The courtroom today other than the wall color generally approximates its appearance in 1903, the year the judge’s bench was moved from the east to the north wall. Accordingly it is recommended that the present colors and features be sustained except as follows: a. Remove Venetian blinds. This will not only eliminate a non-historic intrusion, the increased natural light will permit discontinuance of general use of the fluorescent cove lights and thus reestablish a more appropriate character in the room . . . . b. Replace the fluorescent lamps in the simulated skylight with special small units and new reflectors concealed back of the glass opening.”
Furnishings Plan
Lists of Recommended Furnishings

West Courtroom (Room 207)

The best visual documentation for the appearance of the west courtroom dates to 1860, and yet none of the extant courtroom furnishings date to this early time period. In fact, knowledge about the historic furnishings for this courtroom for virtually all the years of its use is fairly thin and any attempt at historically furnishing the space will entail the use of a good amount of comparable evidence. Two newspaper prints (figures 3 and 4) show this courtroom in 1860, yet the courtroom was completely revamped in 1870 with a new arrangement of furnishings, a new heat system eliminating stoves, and improved lighting. It is possible that the extant courtroom furniture (bench, bailiff’s stand, clerk’s enclosure) dates to this 1870 remodeling. However, no images of the west courtroom after the 1870 renovations are known to exist. Thus, the historic furnishings recommendations that follow are based on comparative evidence, with minimal reference to the 1860 prints which depict an entirely different courtroom configuration and are thought to represent an entirely replaced set of courtroom furnishings.

As throughout the courthouse, major changes took place in this courtroom in 1870 and, while it is not documented in the written record, it appears that many of the extant original furnishings date to the 1880s and perhaps to as early as 1870. This makes it possible to historically furnish this courtroom to the 1870s period. The 2005 Paint Analysis, undertaken with this Historic Furnishings Report in mind, provided much new information about the courtroom and allows a paint scheme in the courtroom (figure 26) that is markedly different from what has been on display. This paint scheme is documented to the 1870–1903 period; it is the second paint and finish campaign after the judge’s bench was moved to its 1870 location and may date to as early as the mid-late 1870s depending on how frequently the courtroom was repainted at this time.

The 1870s historic furnishings period coincides with major documented changes in the courtroom when the new heating system with radiators was installed, the bench was moved to the north wall, and the rest of the courtroom was reconfigured accordingly. While not the Dred Scott courtroom, nor even of the Dred Scott era, the west courtroom furnished to the 1870s will present a courtroom as close as can be accurately achieved to the Dred Scott time period, given the furnishings extant and the information available at the time of this report. Additionally, having the west courtroom furnished to the 1870s period and the east courtroom furnished to the 1910s helps to support the interpretation of the growth and change in the courthouse and St. Louis.
**Finishes**

Columns: Primarily cream with greenish gray tint; capitals with yellow-brown, green and brownish accents; bases with yellow-brown and brownish gray elements. *(Paint Analysis, pp. 6–7, see figure 26)*

Walls: Painted walls, cream (soft orange/pink tint). *(Paint Analysis, p. 7, see figure 26)*

Ceiling: Painted ceiling, white with off-white elements. *(Paint Analysis, p. 6, see figure 26)*

Cornice: Painted cornice, greenish off-white with grayish greens. *(Paint Analysis, p. 6, see figure 26)*

Windows and doors: Window casings and doors, grain painted. *(Paint Analysis, p. 7, see figure 26)* Triangular wood cornices should be reproduced above the windows (see figures 3 and 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.1</td>
<td>Venetian blinds,</td>
<td>Figure 30</td>
<td>Acquire reproductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wooden-slatted, on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower 2/3 with roller shades above, 7 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.2</td>
<td>Floor, tile</td>
<td>Extant</td>
<td>Use extant original tiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.3</td>
<td>Carpet, ingrain, on</td>
<td>Figure 30</td>
<td>Acquire; coordinate colors with paint colors: see figure 26 and Paint Analysis pp. 6–7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judge’s, jury’s and bailiff’s raised platforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.4</td>
<td>Sconces, wall, 8</td>
<td>Superintendent [Spotts], 8/6/1957</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce. Extant reproductions are amalgamations and were of a design appropriate to a pre-1870 courtroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>Chandelier</td>
<td>Petition, 3/28/1870; figures 31 and 32</td>
<td>Acquire chandelier, use extant 19th-century fixture in OCH basement (figure 28) as design reference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West wall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.6</td>
<td>Bailiff’s stand with steps, at south side</td>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Extant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.7</td>
<td>Lamp, kerosene, 1, on bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Standard furnishing for courtroom; see figure 10.</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>Docket, on bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Standard furnishing for courtroom</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>Stool, bailiff’s, revolving, 1</td>
<td>Standard furnishing for courtroom. In 1870 this courtroom received a major remodeling, likely including the extant judge’s bench, etc.; a new bailiff’s stool was a likely part of this campaign. Figure 34 shows revolving stools were readily available in the 1870s. Images of 19th- and early 20th-century courtroom interiors indicate something of a hierarchy of seating types based on stature, type of job being done, and the amount of time one might need to remain seated. More comfortable seating – a revolving stool – was likely thought to allow the bailiff to better focus on court cases.</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.10</td>
<td>Jury’s platforms, 3 tiers</td>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.11</td>
<td>Top hats, 3, on floor by chairs.</td>
<td>Figures 31 and 32</td>
<td>Acquire reproductions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### North wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.12</td>
<td><strong>Chairs</strong>, jury, tilting, 12, on platform</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom. In 1870 this courtroom received a major remodeling, likely including the extant judge's bench, etc.; new jury chairs were a likely part of this campaign. Figures 35 and 36 No. 506 show tilting chairs were readily available in the 1870s. Images of 19th- and early 20th-century courtroom interiors indicate something of a hierarchy of seating types based on stature, type of job being done, and the amount of time one might need to remain seated. More comfortable chairs – tilting chairs – were likely thought to allow the jury to better focus on court cases.</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Judge’s bench</strong></td>
<td>Extant in courtroom</td>
<td>Use extant bench.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.13</td>
<td><strong>Chair</strong>, judge’s, high-backed, upholstered</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom, figures 3, 4, 10, 11, 30 and 31.</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.14</td>
<td><strong>Chair</strong>, 1, high-backed, upholstered, to side of judge’s chair</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom (while usually only one judge sat at the bench, historic courtroom images showing multiple chairs at the bench are plentiful, probably in place for the less frequent occasions when more than one judge was involved); figures 10, 11, 30 and 31.</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.15</td>
<td><strong>Radiators</strong>, 2, behind columns on judge’s platform</td>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Omit – will not be visible to public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.16</td>
<td><strong>Books and papers</strong>, on bench</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom</td>
<td>Reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.17</td>
<td><strong>Gavel</strong>, on bench</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom</td>
<td>Use extant reproduction or acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.18</td>
<td><strong>Inkwell</strong>, on bench</td>
<td>Figures 30 and 32</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.19</td>
<td><strong>Desk lamps</strong>, gas, 4, mounted above columns on bench</td>
<td>Piping for gas fixtures extant in bench; figure 30 (but with additional lamps due to larger bench and courtroom)</td>
<td>Acquire reproductions. Extant reproductions are not well documented and are too early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.20</td>
<td><strong>Armchair, witness</strong>, 1, east of bench</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom; figures 3, 4, 10, 11 and 32.</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.21</td>
<td><strong>Papers</strong>, in pigeon holes</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom</td>
<td>Reproduce based on RU Insolvent Debtors Cases, JNEM Archives. Also consult with Mike Everman, Missouri State Archives, Local Records Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.22</td>
<td><strong>Clerk’s chair</strong>, 1</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for courtroom; figures 30 and 35</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.23</td>
<td><strong>Table</strong>, semi-circular, opposite fall-front with pigeon holes</td>
<td>Reber to County Commissioner, 5/31/ 1862</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.24</td>
<td><strong>Books</strong>, 2, document box, and papers on table</td>
<td>Figures 30 and 31</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.25</td>
<td><strong>Lamp</strong>, 1, on clerk’s table</td>
<td>Figure 32</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.27</td>
<td><strong>Radiator</strong>, with brass screen and marble top, between columns, south of entrance to court</td>
<td><em>St. Louis Republican, 10/30/1870; figure 5</em></td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.28</td>
<td><strong>5 tiered platforms</strong>, for additional jurors and public viewing court proceedings</td>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.29</td>
<td><strong>Matting</strong>, on all five tiers</td>
<td>Rumbold to County Court, 2/23/1865; standard furnishing for courtroom</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.30</td>
<td><strong>Chairs</strong>, 40, wood seat, on platforms at south side</td>
<td>Standard furnishing for courtroom; figures 30, 31, 33 (No. 7), and 36 (No. 502)</td>
<td>Reproduce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Center of court-room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.31</td>
<td><strong>Bar</strong></td>
<td>Reber to County Commissioner, 5/31/1862; figure 5; General Term II, 4/2/1883</td>
<td>Use extant original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.32</td>
<td><strong>Radiators</strong>, 2, with brass screens and marble tops, at either end within the bar</td>
<td><em>St. Louis Republican, 10/30/1870; figure 5</em></td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.33</td>
<td><strong>Tables</strong>, attorney's, 2, at either side of entrance within bar</td>
<td>Reber to County Commissioner, 5/31/1862; <em>St. Louis Republican, 10/30/1870; figures 10 and 11</em></td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.34</td>
<td><strong>Books</strong>, 2, inkwell, pens and papers on attorney's tables</td>
<td>Figure 31</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.35</td>
<td><strong>Chairs</strong>, 10, office style (5 at each attorney's table)</td>
<td>Figures 31, 33 (Nos. 1 and 3), and 36 (No. 501)</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Courtroom (Room 220)
The east courtroom will be historically furnished to the 1910s, the time for which its appearance is best documented. The basic configuration of the space with the judge’s bench along the north wall dates to 1903, and two 1910s historic photographs (figures 10 and 11) show the bulk of the Circuit Court at this time.

A paint analysis of the east courtroom is needed to document the complete appearance of this courtroom in the 1910s, or if not possible to that decade at least to 1903, after the judge’s bench was moved from the east to the north wall. Despite a great deal of National Park Service alteration and removals in the courtrooms during the 1950s restoration, Steve Seebohm’s 2005 Paint Analysis of the west courtroom revealed considerable new information. It is conceivable that similar new data could be found in the east courtroom. Exploration beneath the judge’s and bailiff’s platforms, both for paint colors on the walls, columns, et cetera, as well as possible trash pits, should be undertaken. Elsewhere in the courtroom, the junctures where the coat hooks would have met the columns may prove fruitful areas to explore; an attempt to better define the two-toned wall treatment evident in the historic photographs would be of great use as well. Additionally, for both early and later colors, the dome surfaces should be examined; there is considerable paint build-up on the dentils and capitals, door and window casings, and a more thorough inspection of the cornices could prove profitable. Seebohm also suggests that the junctures where the door casings meet the walls may not have been thoroughly stripped when newly plastered and thus should be explored for remains of early original plaster and its color.

Once this list of recommended furnishings is implemented the courtroom will have a noticeably different appearance. The reintroduction of a linoleum flooring, a variety of early 20th-century chairs, and period-appropriate light fixtures, will give the courtroom a later feel. Likewise, the addition of many of the small courtroom furnishings will better evoke the sense of a functioning and credible court. When seen in contrast to the 1870s courtroom on the west side of the Courthouse, visitors will get a sense of the continuity of the judicial system alongside the changes the Old Courthouse experienced over the many years of its historic use.

Finishes

Paint and finish analysis is needed for the 1910s to determine paint colors and finishes for this courtroom.

Walls: In addition to findings from the paint analysis, acquire reproduction Lincrusta for the walls of the inner dome. (Bryan, Administrative History, pp. 34–38; figures 37 and 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220.1</td>
<td>Floor and platform surfaces, linoleum</td>
<td>Figures 10, 11 and 39 (pattern 1044)</td>
<td>Acquire reproduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.2</td>
<td>Lights, ceiling, 4, four-arm chandeliers with frosted, crenellated globes</td>
<td>Figures 10–12</td>
<td>Acquire reproductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>Lights, ceiling pendants above bench, 3, with green shades</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire reproductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.4</td>
<td>Roller shades, blue, 10 (2 per each window, one hung above the other)</td>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Acquire reproductions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**West wall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>Wainscot, with coat hooks at top</td>
<td>Figure 11; Bryan, Admin. Hist., pp. 34–38</td>
<td>Reproduce wainscot and coat hooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.6</td>
<td>Rail, with right angle turn and newel post</td>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Reproduce based on historic photograph and extant bar in 207.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.7</td>
<td>Desk and bookcase, against wall north of entrance to room</td>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Use JEFF 4728, Museum Collections (original to Old Courthouse but not the desk shown in figure 11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**North wall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220.8</td>
<td>Framed gate, with cast grating</td>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Reproduce based on historic photograph and extant gate with grate at clerk's enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>Wood paneling, in front of window</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Reproduce based on historic photographs and identical extant paneling at west end of judge's bench.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.10</td>
<td>Radiator, in front of center window</td>
<td>Figures 8 and 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.11</td>
<td>Chair, judge's, upholstered, high-backed</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.12</td>
<td>Chairs, high-backed, spindle-turned, steam-pressed crest railed, 2, flanking judge's chair</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.13</td>
<td>Judge's bench</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Use extant original bench; reproduce paneled doors for shelving flanking central fall-front.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.14</td>
<td>Desk lamps, 2, with green shades, mounted on bench</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.15</td>
<td>Stenographer's desk, east of judge's bench</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Reproduce based on historic photographs and extant paneling in bench.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.16</td>
<td>Chair, stenographer's</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.17</td>
<td>Armchair, witness, plywood-backed</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.18</td>
<td>Rail, pine, east of witness' chair, mounted into column</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11; Bryan, Admin. Hist., pp. 34–38</td>
<td>Remove existing NPS reproduction rail and reproduce pine rail based on evidence herein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.19</td>
<td>Gavel, at judge's chair</td>
<td>Figure 10; standard furnishing for judge's bench</td>
<td>Use extant reproduction gavel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.20</td>
<td>Dockets, 2, on judge's bench</td>
<td>Figure 10; standard furnishing for judge's bench</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.21</td>
<td>Inkwells, glass, 2, on judge's bench</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFR #</td>
<td>OBJECT AND LOCATION</td>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.22</td>
<td>Table, small, at west side in front of bench</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.23</td>
<td>Paper bundles, 3, on top of table</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.24</td>
<td>Sign, “Law Docket,” hung from bench, west side</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Reproduce or acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.25</td>
<td>Papers, in pigeon holes</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Reproduce as with 207.22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.26</td>
<td>Signs, “1” and “2” on doors flanking pigeon holes</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.27</td>
<td>Wastebasket, wire</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.28</td>
<td>Writing desk, mounted at west end of clerk’s desk</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Use desk from OCH basement (figure 29) or acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.29</td>
<td>Lamps, gooseneck, 2, on clerk’s desk</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.30</td>
<td>Inkwell, pen, and papers, on clerk’s desk</td>
<td>Standard furnishings for clerk’s desk</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.31</td>
<td>Table, attorney’s, in front of clerks’ enclosure</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce based on other period attorney’s table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.32</td>
<td>Books, 3, papers, and inkwell, glass, on table</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.33</td>
<td>Chairs, office style, 2, at attorney’s table</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East wall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFR #</th>
<th>OBJECT AND LOCATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220.34</td>
<td>Coat hooks, wall-mounted</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.35</td>
<td>Calendar, above coat hooks</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.36</td>
<td>Armchairs, jurors’, with four-caster swivel base, 12</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.37</td>
<td>Newspaper, on juror’s chair</td>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.38</td>
<td>Calendar, mounted on door behind bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.39</td>
<td>Thermometer, mounted on door frame behind bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.40</td>
<td>Bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Use extant original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.41</td>
<td>Lamp, with metal shade, on bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFR #</td>
<td>OBJECT AND LOCATION</td>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.42</td>
<td>Docket, on bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.43</td>
<td>Gavel, on bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.44</td>
<td>Stool, high-backed, swivel, with foot rest, at bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.45</td>
<td>Spittoon, at bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.46</td>
<td>Wall pocket, with papers, mounted on front of bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire wall pocket, reproduce papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South wall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.47</td>
<td>Benches, curved, 4, at south end of courtroom</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce. based on period courtroom benches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Center of court-room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.48</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire reproduction based on historic photographs and extant bar in 207.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.49</td>
<td>Bench, in front of bailiff’s stand</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.50</td>
<td>Table, round, next to bar at west side</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.51</td>
<td>Books, 2, and papers, on table</td>
<td>Figures 10–12</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.52</td>
<td>Spittoon, north of table</td>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.53</td>
<td>Chairs, office style, 2, inside bar, east of table</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.54</td>
<td>Radiator, inside bar, east of chairs</td>
<td>Figures 8, 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.55</td>
<td>Table, attorney’s, in front of jury platforms</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire or reproduce based on other period attorney’s table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.56</td>
<td>Chairs, office style, 5, at attorney’s table</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.57</td>
<td>Inkwell, glass, and papers on attorney’s table</td>
<td>Figures 10 and 11</td>
<td>Acquire inkwell, reproduce papers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustrations
Illustrations with Captions
**Note**  Figures 1 and 2 can be found on pages 9 and 10.

**Figure 3**  “Carstang v. Shaw,” *Harper’s Weekly*, March 31, 1860. This is the second-floor, west, courtroom (207).
THE TRIAL OF THE BREACH OF PROMISE CASE, CARSTANG vs. SHAW, AT ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, MARCH, 1869. — [From a Sketch by G. G. Freidelin, Esq.]
Figure 4  Henry Shaw Trial, New York Illustrated News, April 14, 1860. This is the second-floor, west, courtroom (207).
Figure 5  “Measured Drawing of Second Floor, The St. Louis Court House, for St. Louis Architectural Club’s Yearbook for 1900,” Joseph W. Ginder, 1899, RU 106 Superintendent’s Records, Box 21, Folder 3, JNEM Archives.
Figure 6  “Circuit Court Room No. 4,” 1903, JNEM Archives.
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ILLUSTRATIONS
Figure 7  “The St. Louis Court House, Second Floor Plan,” c. 1903–1909, JNEM Archives.
Figure 8  “Plan Showing Proposed Heating System, Second Floor” June 14, 1907, National Park Service, Technical Information Center, 41906 283447-2.
Figure 9  “New Window Frames, Sash etc. Court House,” May, 1912, National Park Service, Technical Information Center, 41914 283436-1.
The inscription on the front mount reads: “Mr. Elmer Moore with compliments of the Judge.” On the back of this photograph the inscription reads: “Division No. 1 Circuit Court City of St. Louis. Photograph was made in early part of year 1911 [sic - 1914] soon after adjournment of Court at about 5 p.m. Those whose likenesses appear are: on the bench – the Judge, at his left the Court Stenographer Mr. Merton, Just below and in front of Judge was the Clerk Elmer Moore, to the right at the stand – the Sheriff – Mr. M[eges?], in front of and below sheriff’s desk – Mr. Staten – Messenger. The benches were for jurors not actually engaged in trial. This photograph was preserved by Mr. Moore and by him given to the undersigned to be presented to the Jefferson Natl Expansion Memorial. J. H. Grimm. August 1/46.”
Figure 11  “Courtroom [east] in Old Courthouse,” c. 1910s, MHS Negative 0052, Gift of Dr. William F. Swekosky, Missouri Historical Society.
Figure 12  “Circuit Court 5, Old Courthouse,” c. 1914–16, JNEM Archives. The inscription on the back, which is not completely accurate, reads: “Judge Wm. M. Kinsey on the bench in “Dred Scott” [sic – this is room 212, currently the park’s archives and library] room, Old Courthouse, St. Louis, Missouri. Judge Kinsey held court from 1904–1916, photo c. 1904 [sic – the cove ceilings were installed in 1911; 1914 drawings of Circuit Court 5 show the bench, sheriff’s stand and lockers that appear in this photograph].”
Figure 13  “Scene of the last trial at Old Courthouse,” June 20, 1930. MHS Negative 0053, Gift of Judge James M. Douglas, Missouri Historical Society. Note on back of photograph reads: “Scene of the last trial at Old Courthouse, Broadway & Market Sts. Division No. 6 – Judge M. Hartmann, Presided; Adolph E. Zimmer, Clerk; Harry T. Stanton, Reporter & Henry Moehle, Deputy Sheriff. June 20, 1930. John C. Hobz, defendant, on witness stand, Mrs. Ruth Hobz, co-defendant sitting beside her attorney, Moutague [sic] Punch; John C. Robertson, attorney for Chas. J. Walter, plaintiff at counsel's table. W. C. Curtis was foreman of the jury, which returned a verdict for the defendants at 10:20 P.M. Arthur Stephens, Deputy Sheriff of Div. No. 7 is seen at extreme left of photo.”
Figure 14  West Courtroom, 1938. RU 106, NPS 9170, Box 21, Folder 1; 106-2449; 898, JNEM Archives.
Figure 15  “West Wing Second Floor Plan, Rehabilitation of Old Courthouse,” May 14, 1942, sheet 23, JNEM Archives.
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**Figure 16**  

Please note: no web rights have been acquired for this Getty image. If you are viewing this Historic Furnishings Report on-line, this image will not be included.
This page is blank. The web rights to the image used on this page in the Historic Furnishings Report were not acquired. To see the image please see the hard copy of the Historic Furnishings Report at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Library.
Figure 17  West Courtroom with scaffolding and a school group on tour, c. 1940s, JNEM Archives.
Figure 18  West courtroom after initial restoration was complete. John A. Bryan, National Park Service architect, at bar. *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, December 28, 1955, Archives of the St. Louis Mercantile Library at the University of Missouri, St. Louis, The Mercantile Library.
**Figure 19**  “Re-enactment of second Dred Scott Trial,” May 1, 1958. Al Fenn, photographer. This reenactment took place in the second floor, west, courtroom (207). Time Life Pictures/Getty Images.

Please note: no web rights have been acquired for this Getty image. If you are viewing this Historic Furnishings Report on-line, this image will not be included.
This page is blank. The web rights to the image used on this page in the Historic Furnishings Report were not acquired. To see the image please see the hard copy of the Historic Furnishings Report at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Library.
Figure 20  “Full-scale drawing of desk lamp for courtrooms; cast and turned bronze metal,” John A. Bryan & F. Goodrich, January 17, 1958, sheet 1 of 2, Map Case 1, Drawer H-8, JNEM Archives.
**Figure 21**  “Full size wall bracket for Circular Courtroom [west],” John A. Bryan, January 17, 1958, sheet 2 of 2, Map Case 1, Drawer H-8, JNEM Archives.
FULL SIZE
WALL BRACKET FOR CIRCULAR COURTHOUSE
Figure 22 Prototypes for Bryan’s wall brackets – top: 19th-century chandelier, bottom: gas bracket. John A. Bryan, Administrative History: Interior Restoration: 1941–1959, West Wing, 1959, RU 124, HSR Records, Box 5, Folder 5. JNEM Archives.
Figure 23  “Walnut Table,” John A. Bryan, c. 1958. Bryan Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Missouri Historical Society.
WALNUT TABLE
(2) TOP SIZE 34" x 60"
HEIGHT 30"
(1) TOP SIZE 32" x 42"
HEIGHT 30"
DRAWERS 15" WIDE X 2" DEEP X 16" LONG
Figure 24  “Judge’s Chair,” John A. Bryan, c. 1958. Bryan Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Missouri Historical Society.
Judge's Chair (2)

Back and seat to have coiled springs padded with hair. Covering of top grain, ginger brown leather, held in place by large bronze-headed tacks. Frame and base of solid black walnut. Ball-bearing rollers & swivel attachment.

Depth of seat: 22 inches
Depth overall: 29 1/2
Width overall: 29
Width between arms: 24
Height of back: 54
Figure 25  “Jury Chair, Clerk’s Chair,” John A. Bryan, c. 1958. Bryan Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Missouri Historical Society.
Jury Chair
SAME CONSTRUCTION
AS JUDGE'S CHAIR
SANDALWOOD TAN LEATHER (14)

Clerk's Chair (2)
SAME CONSTRUCTION
AS JUDGE'S CHAIR
TOUR GRAIN
LEATHER
Ginger Brown

SOLID BLACK WALNUT
DEPTH OF SEAT 19½''
DEPTH OVERALL 26''
WIDTH OVERALL 25''
WIDTH BETWEEN ARMS 20½''
HEIGHT OF BACK 36½''

DEPTH OF SEAT 19½''
DEPTH OVERALL 26''
WIDTH OVERALL 25''
WIDTH BETWEEN ARMS 20½''
HEIGHT OF BACK 36½''
Figure 26  “West Courtroom Color Rendering,” Steven C. Seebohm, Courtroom Paint Analysis Final Report Old Courthouse, 2005, JNEM Archives. For best quality color see original drawing in JNEM collection; Munsell color numbers are given in the original report.
Section Three West Court Room

Historically appropriate colors based on sample fragments found over column capital 'A' and consultants suggested treatments.

Historic colors based on research.

West Courtroom Color Rendering
Executed by: Steven C. Seebahn/Blue Water Studio, LLC
Figure 27  Wallpaper fragment found in west courtroom in 2004 as part of investigation for *Courtroom Paint Analysis*, 2004. JNEM Archives.
**Figure 28** Chandelier in basement, Old Courthouse, JNEM Archives.
Figure 29  Writing desk in basement collections storage, Old Courthouse, JNEM Archives.
Figure 30  “First Day of the McFarland Trial – Scene in the Court-room,” Harper’s Weekly, April 23, 1870. This trial took place in New York City, April and May 1870. Collection of the Library of Congress.
Figure 31  Wharton Trial, Annapolis, Maryland, December 23, 1871, *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*. Collection of the Library of Congress.
MARYLAND—SCENE IN THE COURTHOUSE AT ANAPOLIS—TRIAL OF MRS. WHITTON, ON THE CHARGE OF MURDERING GENERAL KECHUM BY POISON.—FROM A SKETCH BY JAS. B. TAYLOR.
SEE PRECEDING PAGE.
Figure 32  Surrogate’s Court Room, New York City, contested will of Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, December 1, 1877, *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*. Collection of the Library of Congress.
Figure 33  Office chairs, Abernathy Bro’s Illustrated Trade Catalogue, p. 8, Leavenworth, Kansas, 1872. National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 412.
No. 7
Wood Seat, Bent Back Dining Chair. Painted imitation Oak and Walnut.
Per Dozen.......................... $

No. 1
Common Office Chair. Painted Oak.
Per Dozen.......................... $

No. 2
Double Top, Bent Rim Office Chair. Painted Black, and imitation Oak.
Per Dozen.......................... $

No. 3
Wood, Bent Back Office Chair. 
Per Dozen.......................... $
Figure 34  Stools, *Abernathy Bro’s Illustrated Trade Catalogue*, p. 10, Leavenworth, Kansas, 1872. National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 412.
WOOD SEAT COUNTER STOOL
Painted, Im. Oak and Walnut.
PER DOZEN ........................................... $

CANE SEAT, ........................................... $

WOOD SEAT DESK STOOL
PER DOZEN ........................................... $
Cane Seat Desk Stool.
PER DOZEN ........................................... $

REVOLVING DESK STOOL
Painted Imitation Oak and Walnut.
PER DOZEN ........................................... $
Figure 35  Rotary office chairs, *Abernathy Bro’s Illustrated Trade Catalogue*, p. 15, Leavenworth, Kansas, 1872. National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 412.
ROTARY OFFICE CHAIRS.

CONTINENTAL CANE BACK SCREW REVOLVING
PATENT SPRING RECLINING
OFFICE CHAIR.
Oak Varnished.
EACH.............................................. $
Walnut.
EACH.............................................. $

CANE ROUND SEAT, REVOLVING, OFFICE
Walnut, in Oil or Varnish.
EACH.............................................. $
Figure 36  Principals’ and Teachers’ Chairs, *United States School Furniture Co.*, c. 1880, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 883.
Principals' and Teachers' Chairs.

No. 502.
WOOD SEAT.

No. 506.
TILTING AND SCREW.

No. 503.
CANE SEAT.

No. 501.
WOOD SEAT.

No. 505.
TILTING.

No. 500.
CANE SEAT.
Figure 37  Roman and Gothic styles of Lincrusta, *Lincrusta-Walton*, c. 1901, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 1258.
Figure 38  Variety of small patterns of Lincrusta, *Lincrusta-Walton*, c. 1901, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 1258.
PETITS DESSINS DIVERS (Suite)

HEXAGONAL

ENTRELCAS MOSACES ET CROISILLONS

ROSACES EN LOSANGES

PLANCHETTE ORNÉE

PETITS CAISSONS

ILLUSTRATIONS
Figure 39  Linoleum patterns, *Linoleum*, pre-1893, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 317.
Appendixes
Sarah H. Heald, HFC, to Kathryn Thomas, JEFF, July 12, 2005.

These options were presented to the park as part of the Historic Furnishings project to help determine the period of interpretation for the two courtrooms. The park selected the 2nd option—“present two different interpretive periods”—but without the exhibit-like dramatization of the west courtroom undergoing the renovations of 1870.
Old Courthouse – Historic Furnishings Options - July 12, 2005

Determination of a period of interpretation is needed for the two (2) historically furnished courtrooms in the Old Courthouse, St. Louis, MO. The two courtrooms are on the second floor of the building, one on the east side, and the other on the west side of the courthouse.

Factors and issues to consider when selecting a period of historic furnishings focus on three areas.

1) The nature of the documentation upon which the historic furnishings will be based is important because it determines the amount of conjecture one will use to "recreate" historic interiors. Minimal conjecture is the ideal but is rarely fully achieved.

2) The significance of the period of interpretation selected should be clear and mesh with the interpretive goals.

3) The nature and quantity of site-specific original furnishings and their date of manufacture are important because this contributes to the credibility and accuracy of a historic interior. What original furnishings are there for the historic structure and when were those furnishings made?

Other points to consider that are specific to the Old Courthouse courtrooms:

- The courtroom in which the Dred Scott trials took place was radically altered in the 1850s and thus no “Dred Scott courtroom” exists to be historically furnished.

- What is the focus of the interpretation for these 2 courtrooms? For the Old Courthouse? Are the Dred Scott trials best interpreted through a medium other than historic furnishings of these 2 courtrooms? If Dred Scott is well interpreted elsewhere is it important to be “closer in time” to his trials in these courtrooms?

- The extant major original furnishings in the collection of the OCH (benches/bar/bailiff’s stand) appear to date to the 19th century probably as early as 1870, certainly by the 1880s.
Options for Historic Furnishings

1) Present both second floor courtrooms in the 1910s.

Advantages:
   a. Excellent visual documentation (2 photographs) for East courtroom ensures greater accuracy of historic furnishings and minimizes conjecture.
   b. Many major furnishings from this period are in collection (in courtrooms currently).

Disadvantages:
   a. Questionable interpretive value/significance of time period.

2) Present two different interpretive periods in the courtrooms with the West courtroom in 1870 and the East courtroom in the 1910s.

Advantages:
   a. Allows use of good historic photographic information from the 1910s and thus provides the public a more accurate historic interior (East courtroom).
   b. Presents 1 courtroom closer in time to Dred Scott period (West courtroom), which may be important even if Dred Scott is well interpreted in other media in the park because visitors invariably associate the courtrooms with the Dred Scott trials.
   c. Does not impose the 1910s time period on a courtroom (West courtroom) for which there is little primary evidence for its appearance at that time.
   d. Many major furnishings from these periods are in collection (in courtrooms currently).
   e. Contrast of time periods could allow interpretation of how the OCH was continually under renovation, showing the phenomenal growth of St. Louis in the 19th century into the 20th century. This could enhance Interpretive Themes d, e, and f (St. Louis as a center; OCH as civic focal point through 19th century; remarkable growth of St. Louis).
   f. The differences of the 1870s and the 1910s could be dramatized and be treated more as an exhibit than a traditional historic furnishings installation. The West courtroom (1870) could be exhibited undergoing renovation with scaffolding and work in progress. This approach could heighten the differences of the time periods to make the point of ongoing courthouse renovations and growth even more apparent.

Disadvantages:
   a. Needs carefully focused interpretation to address historic interior differences (this could be seen as an advantage) – most visitors will not detect a difference in time periods.
   b. No consistent time period for historic furnishings; may cause visitor confusion or present unintended misinformation.
3) **Present both second floor courtrooms in the 1870s.**

Advantages:
- a. Closest time to Dred Scott time period for which there is sufficiently good documentation and extant furniture likely existed.
- b. Building renovations/new systems in OCH in 1870 generated some primary evidence (written documentation) about the building at this time, providing somewhat better evidence upon which to base historic furnishings and interpretation.
- c. Only one period of historic furnishings/interpretation provides greater clarity for visitors.
- d. Many major furnishings from this period are in collection (in courtrooms currently).

Disadvantages:
- a. Use of more comparative (not site-specific) evidence than if used 1910s historic photographs; 1870 historic furnishings will be based on more conjecture.
- b. Significance of 1870 date may not be great enough to off-set the use of greater conjecture, especially in the East courtroom for which the 2 good 1910s photographs minimizes conjecture.
Appendix B

Upper document: voucher, “For sundry painting etc as per accompanying Bill measured by J. Belcher,” Robert Mitchell, County of St. Louis to M. L. Julian, August 29, 1854.


Both documents are from the Tiffany P. Dexter papers, County Court Receipts, B5, F8, MOHIST.
Account Chargeable to:  West Wing of Court House -
COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS

Voucher No. 

For:  Sunday painting etc. as per accompanying bill

Measured by:  J. Butcher

Date:  /51, 69

This account, amounting to $751 - 69 is correct, and was necessary.

Architect:  Robert F. Mitchell

County Engineer:

Received, this 29th day of January, 1869, the sum of 185-

Dollars, in full of the above account.

Survey of painting done on the St. Louis Court House by M. J. Julian

1 144 yards 2 coats on walls at 75c per yd. $21.60
2 156 sq. ft. 2 coats on halls at 80c or yd. 266.32
2 33 sq. ft. 2 coats 1/2 1/2 25 197.34
2 80 2 coats varnish 2 sq. ft. 210.16
2 28 1 coat 2 1 1/2 3.80
2 1/2 1 coat granite 43.80
1 do. graining half of bill for measuring 8.70

Total:  $751.69

St. Butcher

S. S. W. Court
Contract of the County of St Louis [via Robt. S. Mitchell] and M. L. Julien [sic], May 11, 1855, JNEM Archives.
This article of agreement made and entered into by and between M. J. Julian, of the City of St. Louis, Cow., and G. J. Smith, of the City and County of St. Louis, Cow., for the purpose of furnishing the St. Louis Courthouse, as called for in the specification, to be executed by the said M. J. Julian, the said G. J. Smith, and the said M. J. Julian, and the said G. J. Smith, respectively, as the workmen, in the manner and to the specifications herein mentioned, to date of the same, and the architect, to the best of their ability, to furnish all materials necessary to execute the work as directed by the architect.

And the said M. J. Julian agree that if the said G. J. Smith, his executors, administrators, and assigns, shall fail or neglect to perform the work as directed by the architect, or in any way fail to perform the work as directed by the architect, or if he shall neglect to correct defective work or the use of defective materials, the architect, having verified the same, in writing, may prosecute and enjoin the said M. J. Julian, and, failing to do so, over the same as per the specifications, the work as directed by the architect, and in case of his neglect, or failure to perform the work as directed by the architect, or in any way fail to perform the work as directed by the architect.
And the aforesaid County of St. Louis hereby agrees to pay for the above work at the rate of $____ per cent of the accompanying bill of prices, and valued according to the bill, and the balance to be paid to the party of the first part.

The party of the first part shall not be entitled to more than $____ per cent of the value of the work done to progress up to Completion, and the balance after the expiration of Sixty days (60) after the final completion and acceptance of the Same, and demand as being entitled to Payment, to be made on the Architect's Certificate, No certificate to be drawn before the fifteenth day of November next ensuing.

And it is mutually agreed and understood by and between the parties to this agreement, that the measurement shall be made by such person as the party of the first part and the architect may agree upon, or if the parties not be able to agree on the measurement, then each of the parties of the first part and the architect may choose one person, and those persons shall act as a person and the measurements made by these three, and certified by, shall be binding.

And if any of the work or material should be found defective, the measurer or measurers, as above, shall for the amount of defective taken make for such amount and their decision shall be binding.

The testimony shewing the facts, shall be drawn and signed, and the said Robert Mitchell, county clerk, has heretofore set his hand and seal, and the said County of St. Louis, as the architect has set his hand and seal this the day and year first above written.

[Signature]

Robert Mitchell
Count Clerk
Bill of Prices for Painting and Glazing
the East wing of the St. Louis County Courthouse, Provided
all materials (except glass) included. Stopping & sand papering
included in all cases.
Three coats (3) were plain
3
fine oil in oil $1.90
Fine oil in oil as above 3 coats
1.95
lining sashes per superficial part
1 each
1st coat paint and 2 of same
1.75
10th
1st coat
2.25
3rd coat
2.25
Hamming 1st coat with best Grade Opaque
10
2nd
2nd coat best inside Opaque
1.92
10
1st coat Valencia Marble or black marble
1.00
1st coat

Glazing and beeswax puttying, including
anything except glass, purchase
10

These prices are for plain and ordinary marble,
Surfaces, ornamental and carved, Surfaces are to be
allowed for in proportion to trouble

Bond

Here all men by these presents that we, M. S.
Sielian as principal, and
James R. Pipal, W. H. B. Yost, and
Chat W. Hibbs, as security, all of the City and
County of St. Louis in the State of Missouri, do bind our
jointly and severally unto the City of St. Louis in the State of
Missouri, in the Sum of Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000) to

payment of which are and shall also be made unto the said
County of St. Louis, we bind ourselves, our executors, admin-
tors and assigns forever to these presents.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto set our
hands and seals this the
day of
A.D. Eighteen Hundred and Fifty five (1855)

The conditions of the bond are such that where
the said M. J. Julian has entered into an agreement
leaving our seal hereunto, with the said County of St. Louis
to furnish all the materials, and do all the painting
as stated in the agreement, of the east wing of the
St. Louis County Court House

Now if the said M. J. Julian shall
well and truly perform said several agreements in all that
therein contained, according to the true intent and mean-
things then this bond to be null and void otherwise to be
in full force and virtue

Mr. L. Julian (Bond)

I, A. H., Esq. (Seal)

[signature]

Charles W. Hunt (Seal)

Chas. W. Hunt (Seal)

Contract

A. J. Julian

County

[Signature]
Appendix D

“Measurements of Foster’s Work at Courthouse (1863)” Filed March 18, 1863, Auditor’s Office; measurement for contract August 12, 1839; JNEM Archives 1627.

The pages in Appendix D are select pages from the Foster document. The Circuit Court referenced in this document was the east courtroom (220) and the Court of Common Pleas was the second-floor west courtroom (207).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1932 foot on with place</td>
<td></td>
<td>11' 10'</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 1 Board 36&quot; x 14&quot; - 11' 3&quot; long</td>
<td></td>
<td>11' 3&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Miter.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13' 10&quot;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Hut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bank Made of 1&quot; Tongue Plank 23&quot; x 51/4 long</td>
<td></td>
<td>12' 4&quot;</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934 4 Bands 1&quot; x 11&quot; - 2' 4&quot; high</td>
<td></td>
<td>10' 3&quot;</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Top - 1&quot; x 11&quot; 3/2&quot; long</td>
<td></td>
<td>17' 4&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 1 Crown Ornamenting 12&quot; x 2&quot; 1\2&quot; - 12' 3&quot; long, 13/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>12' 2&quot;</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Miter</td>
<td></td>
<td>17' 3&quot;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower, 1936 2 Stove 15&quot; thick 11&quot; x 21/2&quot; with stand 15/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>15' 6&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knob &amp; Lintel Miter - 4 beaded both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Stove 15&quot; thick 11&quot; x 1&quot; 1/2 Board bottom 3 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>7' 6&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cross Rung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938 2 Colors Rung + 6 Colors put on</td>
<td></td>
<td>2' 6&quot;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 1 bottom of desk 1&quot; x 2' 11&quot; wide 8' 1/2&quot; long</td>
<td></td>
<td>14' 11&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand, 1940 1 draw 12&quot; in front 4&quot; deep 12&quot; long</td>
<td></td>
<td>5' 1&quot;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 do - 12&quot; 4&quot; 1/2&quot; 7&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>12' 1&quot;</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footing 4&quot; thick bottom 4&quot; Reeded &amp; Plated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 2 Benches, 13&quot; x 25&quot; - 2' 11&quot; long, Reeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and framed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 x 10&quot; 10&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegs, 1942, 14 Pegs holes 4&quot; x 61/2&quot; - 10&quot; deck made 14/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943 4 1/2 Planks, 8 tempered &amp; glued together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pegs holes on the left hand side 4&quot; 1/2 - 11&quot; long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peg 1/2 Planks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pegs holes right hand side 4&quot; x 6&quot; - 11&quot; deck</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944 Pegs holes for bent 7' x 12' 4&quot; 15&quot; high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, don of 2&quot; x 12&quot; 4' 20&quot; deep</td>
<td></td>
<td>7' 40&quot;</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground together, 1 peiger hole cut out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$58,525.25

$58,359.41

$2,575.62
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Piece of wood, 2.5 x 6&quot; - 11&quot; long</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Made as before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>18&quot; x 14&quot; - 4&quot; legs, helved joint</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Piece at bottom 5&quot; x 15&quot; - 11&quot; long</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17&quot; x 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oil cloth covering</td>
<td>5.75 x 6&quot; put on with glue</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Feet, 6&quot; long 4&quot; wide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing Table and Desk for Court Clerk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turned legs, 4.5 x 4&quot; - 2.5&quot; high, furnished</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ends, 1&quot; thick 5&quot; x 24&quot; long</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.3&quot; x 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frames into legs</td>
<td>47&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pedestals, 18&quot; front 2.5&quot; deep 2' long</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frames into front and back</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Seat, 4 x 2.5&quot; glued on to desk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Runners for drawer, 2.5&quot; x 2.5&quot; long</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Side pieces, 1&quot; thick 5&quot; wide 2.5&quot; long</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tops, 1&quot; thick 24&quot; x 4&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bottom around table top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Piece, 1&quot; x 156&quot; - 13&quot; long at 2.5&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Circular brass, 1&quot; x 158&quot; 10&quot; long</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2 days work setting in the Land Court Room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 days replacing special in the Criminal Court Room</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 days in the State &amp; County Collector Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days making brackets in the past</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 days making 1 large Arc Sheet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 days putting up brackets in the Law Commissioner Office</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 days making frisell and putting up scaffolding to fronts up to arches in</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Basement of the South Wing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 days in the Supreme Court Room</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 days boarding back in the East Wing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>11 days setting at the past</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 days making platforms &amp; benches for the Judges of the Court of Common Plea</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days repairing Landscaping of North Wing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day setting scaffolding for the painters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to paint first floor in the outside of the sidewalk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>2 days work in the Land Court Room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days work setting up doors with trough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making Belted Boxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 days putting up steps, at North Wing parents,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leading to the front yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day making steps for County Collector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 days work in the Butter Room</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day on lower floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>10 days making elevators for the County Commissioner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day making for the stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cutting North &amp; West gable ends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $235.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 6th</td>
<td>1 day work in prison.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 days in Admissions Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day in the County Marshal's Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3rd</td>
<td>2 days repairing, the Judge Chair, in the Criminal Court Room.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days repairing desk, in different part of the Court House.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 24th</td>
<td>3 day putting up, Judge Noell's, for the Stone Cutter, North and West Parlor.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day repairing doors in the Criminal Clerk's Office.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 days repairing windows &amp; doors in the Probate of Common Pleas Court Room.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day making pattern for stone column in the North Wing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 days covering desk for the judge of the Common Pleas Court.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 yard stone cloth for stone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 days making &amp; hanging barge doors for the Common Pleas Court Room.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 17th</td>
<td>1 day altering barge doors for the County Clerk's Office.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days making stone, for North Parlor North Wing.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 days making brackets for setting boxes for stone pillars in North Wing.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1st</td>
<td>1 day putting brackets, for stone cutter, to put up chimneys on the west front of the North Wing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day hanging &amp; putting in barge hanging in the County Clerk's Office.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day repairing doors &amp; hanging barge in the Land Court Room.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days making brackets for stone cutter, for North Parlor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 days making other brackets for the same barge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $346.60
Bibliography
Bibliography

Books and Government Reports


Primary Sources
*General Term Records, Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis*, at present 22nd Missouri Judicial Circuit, Archives of the Civil Courts, St. Louis. Only select dates were looked at in conjunction with a handful of Lindenbusch’s *Historic Structure’s Report* references.

*Journal of the Board of Public Improvements*, 38 vols. 1877–1915. St. Louis Public Library. Select years when there was known courtroom work were checked (April 1886, July 1894, 1903–1905; also 1877 as earliest year) but no mention of courtroom furnishings was found.


*The Mayor’s Message with Accompanying Documents to the Municipal Assembly of the City of St. Louis*, issued annually until 1916. Titles vary from year to year. St. Louis Public Library.

“Report to the Honorable Rolla Wells, Mayor of St. Louis,” Public Buildings Commission, St. Louis, 1904. St. Louis Public Library.

*St. Louis Circuit Court Records*, to 1876. Not consulted in original format but as transcribed in collections of JNEM Archives.
Manuscript Collections
John Bryan Papers, Missouri Historical Society.
Dexter P. Tiffany Papers, Missouri Historical Society.

Trade Catalogs


*Tentures Murales Lincrusta-Walton Fse: Album General*, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 1258.

*United States School Furniture Co.*, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, Trade Catalog 883.

Blueprints and Plans
JEFF Documents and Drawings, Technical Information Center, National Park Service.
Old Courthouse Blueprints and Plans, JNEM Archives.

Newspapers
*Daily Evening News.*

*Daily Missouri Democrat.*

*Globe-Democrat* photo morgue, St. Louis Mercantile Library.

*Missouri Republican.*

*New York Times.*

*St. Louis Christian Advocate.*

*St. Louis Daily People’s Organ.*

*St. Louis Dispatch.*

*St. Louis Post Dispatch.*