Sculpture as Texture: Edgar Miller’s Reliefs

Marin R. Sullivan

Examining the decades-long career of Edgar Miller holistically is to confront an inimitable image-maker, a supremely talented artist who worked in a staggeringly diverse range of mediums, materials, and influences. Though he often included graphic, geometric elements in his projects, Miller eschewed abstraction for abstraction’s sake, and the majority of his images, in both two- and three-dimensions, express a fantastical world inhabited by his own unique, highly stylized flora, fauna, and human figures. Thus, to speak of Edgar Miller as a sculptor feels almost disingenuous, just as it would to speak of him simply as a designer, a painter or an architect. His creative practice was so distinct, materially sophisticated, and complex that to single out one aspect or medium seems to miss the point entirely.

Upon closer examination however, Miller’s extensive and sometimes eccentric body of work reveals a tremendous mastery of what might be thought of as sculptural, almost every facet of which invites further scholarly study. So much in his processes of making across his entire oeuvre involved carving, molding, assembling—the very mechanics that define the medium of sculpture Fig.1. In terms of actual artistic output, and on purely categorical grounds, many of the projects he completed and objects he created can be classified as sculpture, whether realized in carved relief or as free-standing objects.
He designed and made numerous smaller-scaled animal statues and figurines over the course of his career Fig. 2. One of his largest projects in the medium, just in terms of sheer size, was Animal Court—a group of limestone bulls, bears, big horn sheep, and other mammals arranged around a shallow pool in the center of the main courtyard of the Jane Addams Homes in Chicago Fig. 3. A consortium of architects, including John Holabird, designed the public housing project, which was initiated under the auspices of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and opened in 1937.\footnote{A wide variety of influences impacted Miller’s work in the medium, including a four-year apprenticeship with noted sculptor Alfonso Iannelli in the 1920s, and the rise of Art Deco and Art Moderne across Chicago.}
Fig. 2
Miller made sculpture in a wide variety of materials, including wood, terracotta, and plaster, each of which yielded a different expression and demanded a different approach in terms of how they were conceived and created. He also employed an even wider array of techniques to shape matter. Miller’s willingness to pick up new art forms—whether stained glass, lead relief, stone and wood carving, terracotta and tile work—has certainly contributed to the artist being referred to as a “Renaissance Man.” His mastery in each material process, and the dexterity required to shift from each, sometimes in the course of a single project, however, can sometimes be obscured by such generalizing labels. The diversity of his practice, his implicit resistance to the singularity and precepts of clearly delineated categories that came to define modern art, have also led to an effacement of Miller and his achievements within the histories of that art.
Examining his multifaceted practice through the specific lens of sculpture, however, reveals a vital unifying thread: a profound, often direct, engagement with materials as a means to shape the world, to transform and create objects, structures, and spaces. My intention here is not to emphasize or prioritize sculpture over any other medium in Miller’s artistic arsenal or simply attempt to recuperate his reputation within modern art histories, but rather to suggest that looking at his diverse body of work through a sculptural framework can yield new insight into his artistic practice. It is through the examination of the inherently sculptural aspects of Miller’s creative output, that an inherently textural materiality of his work become apparent. A painted mural, stained glass panel, or even a graphic illustration can of course also possess texture—and Miller’s output in these mediums certainly did—but the term here is meant to denote the characteristic physical structure, the enlivened materiality so acutely expressed in and through sculpture—not just the surface of a thing, but the way the very being of an object can impact the space it occupies.

It is perhaps not coincidental then that the majority of Miller’s sculpture was not created as autonomous artistic expression, but rather in the service of or in relationship to larger architecture and design projects. He frequently collaborated with architecture firms, most notably the Chicago-based Holabird & Root. The resulting works, like the eight sandblasted and etched glass panels Miller designed for the now-destroyed Diana Court in the Michigan Square Building at 540 North Michigan Fig. 4, blur the lines between object and image, interior design and fine art.4
Fig. 4
Edgar Miller, Two Glass Panels from Diana Court in the Michigan Square Building, 1929-1931 (demolished 1973), Holabird and Root, Art Institute of Chicago.

Miller also contributed multiple ecclesiastical objects and statuary for Chicago-area churches, mausoleums, and cemeteries, including the Madonna Della Strada Chapel at Loyola University, the Highland Park Presbyterian Church, and Calvary Cemetery Fig. 5. The sculpture realized for the Edward Cudahy Mausoleum in the Calvary Cemetery, for example, was not simply a religious object, but took the form of functional cast bronze doors, lent texture by Miller’s sculptural rendering of six supplicant angels. Though such an approach does not align with the standard conceptions of the “modern artist,” toiling alone in his or her studio advancing
their own highly personalized expression, it did allow Miller to reach a much broader audience. He stated,

I used any legitimate architectural or design statement that had common sense…I got an enormous amount of enjoyment out of doing these things, but have never taken them with great seriousness. They were for people who were interested in living in dramatic charming surroundings, that’s all. So much art is so damn serious and deadly…. My great desire was to communicate with others in a common language. The human being who relates to human beings is the one who achieves something.\(^5\)

Miller deployed this creative mentality as well as realized the highest concentration of sculptural elements integrated with architecture at the two apartment complexes Miller realized in collaboration with Sol Kogen in the Old Town neighborhood of Chicago and for which he is perhaps most well-known: the Carl Street Studios at 155 West Burton Place and the Kogen-Miller Studios at 1734 North Wells Street. Within Miller’s oeuvre, these two building complexes stand as early and overwhelmingly dense examples of sculpture as architecture and architecture as sculpture within Miller’s oeuvre. Beginning with Carl Street in 1927 and Wells Street a year later, Miller created what he called “total environments.” While the term Gesamtkunstwerk had emerged in Europe in nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, Miller’s adoption of this idea in Deco-era Chicago was decades ahead of its widespread appearance in the American avant-gardes of the postwar period. These two complexes enabled him to use the mother of all the arts, architecture, to create a space that integrated all of the “lesser arts.”\(^6\) As historian Michael Williams notes, however, “[Miller’s] approach to design had more in common with a sculptor’s than an architect’s. Each duplexed space was created without any formal plans, blueprints or engineering schemes. Instead, he would add and subtract to the studios as he worked, letting each space develop organically.”\(^7\)
Fig. 5
Edgar Miller, Bronze doors, 1933, Edward Cudahy Mausoleum, Calvary Cemetery, Evanston, IL.
Photo: EML
The result was architecture bursting with sculpted materials and objects, enlivened textures emerging from every surface, nook, and cranny. From the terra cotta reliefs of animals lining the base of a bay window extending out over the street at Burton Place Fig. 6 to the grand, yet subtle plaster bas relief (low relief) on the interior wall above the front door of the R.W. Glasner Studio at the back of the Wells Street complex, every room and what seems like nearly every surface erupts with texture, with transformed matter and three-dimensional elements extending out into space. The bas relief Fig. 7, in particular, exemplifies Miller’s approach to sculpture.

Fig. 6
Edgar Miller, sculptural details,
exterior of Carl Street Studios at 155 W Burton Pl.
Photos: EML
Fig. 7
Foyer, R.W. Glasner Studio.
Photo: Alexander Vertikoff / EML
Architectural in design, the work possesses a strong vertical orientation, with distinct vignettes of sinuous, lithe nude figures positioned around a central axis dominated by a multi-tiered cylindrical element. Enclosed in an angular frame, these figures are encircled by Miller’s trademark equine depictions encircle these figures, enclosed in an angular frame. Two additional figures are visible in the upper right- and left-hand corners, connected by a representation of lightning and a rainbow, with a sun at the apex. The motif is symbolic rather than narrative, with the core figures intended to reference music, dance, architecture, drama, and visual art. The pictorial elements, however, also lend a subtle if pronounced texture, arranged in an open if symmetrical layout that activates the entire space of the wall and surrounding rooms.

In these two larger architectural projects, however, sculpture and the sculptural lives within the service of the total environment, the total work of art, in which, as scholar Sarah McCracken Potter writes, “the boundaries between the media thus become obscured, lending to their natural synthesis within the structure of the complexes.” While the two studio complexes are enticing case studies due to the sheer amount of sculptural content contained within their interiors and on their facades, they actually prove challenging in assessing how sculpture operated within Miller’s overall practice. The medium as such becomes almost effaced in the studios, subsumed into spaces that are all texture, all shaped space. The two complexes served as an artistic incubator for Miller, a place to experiment and implement ideas with complete creative freedom, and thus many regards are outliers, if spectacular ones.

A perhaps more effective route is to examine projects where Miller was not the lead architect or designer, but rather contributed sculpture(s) that others commissioned, projects where a “total (Miller) environment” was the ultimate goal or even possible. Between roughly the 1930s and 1960s, Miller completed numerous commissioned sculptures for architectural structures. Many, including the bas reliefs he completed for Holabird and Root’s Statler Hotel in
Washington, D.C., in 1943 **Fig. 8**, bear a strong formal resemblance to the decorative elements that appear in the Old Town studio complexes, with their white-on-white plaster surfaces and symbolic figural imagery. Each architectural commission came with specific demands and creative restrictions, however, as well as different levels of involvement by the artist.
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Edgar Miller, Bas-relief sculptures, c. 1945, Presidential Ballroom, Statler Hotel (now Capital Hilton), Holabird and Root, Washington, D.C.
Photos: EML / Chicago History Museum

Miller was not the only artist in Chicago or elsewhere in the U.S. during this period to accept commissions to create sculpture for the interiors and exteriors of buildings. This had been a frequent and consistent feature of architecture stretching back to antiquity. Iannelli, Gwen Lux, Alvin Meyer, and John Storrs were just a few of the Art Deco-era sculptors to realize commissioned reliefs, friezes, and other architectural sculptural projects in Chicago during the early twentieth century. Miller rarely if ever referred to himself or his work in relation to Art Deco, and his art betrays an eclecticism that does not fit neatly into its streamlined machine
aesthetic—though there was some formal resonance with the ceramic relief sculptures made by other Midwest-based artists like Lily Swan Saarinen, who created terracotta animals for buildings including the Crow Island School in Winnetka, Illinois.

Lux contributed sculptures to the extensive Art Deco artistic program at Rockefeller Center in New York, and along with her then-husband Eugene Lux, created a series of carved bas relief sculptures in the late 1920s for two Thielbar and Fugard-designed buildings in Chicago at 520 North Michigan Avenue and the Trustees System Service Building at 20 North Wells Street Fig. 9. In the case of the latter, Lux’s sculpture framed the main entrance, which also featured Miller’s intricate cut-lead grillwork set in between panels of glass. Miller and his contemporaries became associated with the term Art Deco, and collectively they made a significant impact on the look and feel of many urban environments during the years between the two World Wars.

The sculptural decoration of buildings and their facades became something of a hallmark of Art Deco architectural design, until the movement gave way to the unornamented lines and
glass curtain walls of the International Style and Miesian Modernism. As a critic writing in the May 1931 issue of *American Architect* stated of the practice,

The function of ornament is to add texture and interest to the building, which it embellishes. Its primary function is that of texture for it permits of relief from monotony. It enriches in such a manner as to soften otherwise severe surfaces, and it makes for easy transition from one material to another. Its secondary purpose is to afford a relief from the edginess the mind cannot help but feel if ornament is lacking. It therefore creates a feeling of composure to the passerby. In many ways, in the skyscraper it should afford to the eye a welcome rest from the gigantic power of mass and in doing so aid to bring down to a human scale, that which otherwise is too great for comfortable comprehension.¹²

Today, when architectural sculpture or ornament is almost non-existent, it is often considered superfluous. On the exteriors of Art Deco structures and in the interior lobby spaces of postwar modernist buildings, sculpture was frequently deployed as a means to add texture and material contrast. For Miller and his contemporaries, this was not superficial decoration, but art that responded to and in the most successful examples complemented and transformed architecture. Three somewhat idiosyncratic examples, all of which included commissioned works completed by Miller in Chicago during the mid-twentieth century, further demonstrate his strategies and approach to sculpture and its textural effects: the Frank Fisher Apartments, completed in 1936; the Northwestern University Technological Institute, completed in 1942; and the United States Gypsum Corporation Headquarters, completed in 1963.

In the mid-1930s, Miller collaborated with his friend, Chicago architect Andrew Nicholas Rebori, on an apartment complex, built for a narrow lot at 1209 North State Street. Completed in
1936, the Frank Fisher Apartments, named after the Marshall Field’s executive who hired Rebori to build him an investment property of small apartments, proved notable for its unique styling and advanced use of glass blocks and air conditioning. Rebori had served as an architectural consultant on Miller’s two Old Town artist studio complexes and previously worked with Miller on other architectural projects, including the Streets of Paris at the 1933 Century of Progress Exposition.

Although Rebori served as the lead architect on the Fisher Apartments, Miller contributed a comprehensive decorative program that consciously connected to the overall architectural design. The handcrafted artwork and design elements gave the building, as later described in the report prepared for landmark status, “a touch of Arts and Crafts bohemianism that sets it apart visually from neighboring buildings.” In an extensively illustrated feature from 1937 on new “apartment houses” built across the United States, Architectural Forum declared of the Fisher project,

It would be hard to carry romantic eclecticism any farther than has been done in this most unusual apartment house. Built in no recognizable style, the structure combined glass brick, stained glass, medieval brickwork, and woodcarving in the Swedish manner, and displays an equally individualistic approach on the interior…the short end of the building faces on the street, its entrance vigorously marked by the four woodcarvings of Edgar Miller.

In slightly later article published in Architectural Record, Rebori and Miller outlined a philosophy of what they called “organic housing.” For Rebori and Miller, “Home Life, whether in an apartment house or residence, is not a mass-production process but a social adventure which demands the leavening influence of grace and beauty,” and thus decoration was not an afterthought but a crucial component. They wrote, “Interior and decorative design should
combine simplicity of conception and organization with functional efficiency, but the ideal to be striven for is to make each unit that is designed to house human beings an organism that will encourage and sustain pleasurable living.”

The State Street facade of the Fisher Apartments displayed two distinct sculptural groups: a set of five low-relief terracotta inserts depicting Miller’s characteristic animals, and four pieces of oak stylistically carved to resemble a horse, buffalo, mountain lion, and whale, visible from both the south and north and extending out from the building above the entrance Fig. 10. These elements complemented the building, but also provided points of visual pause and material contrast. Rebori and Miller wrote, “In terms of humanistic logic, they mark the entrance with statements of life and vitality which can be enjoyed more than a purely mechanical marker ever could be enjoyed.” In short, Miller’s sculptural additions provided distinct, lively texture.

Miller stated of Rebori and his approach to architecture, “He [Rebori] was aware of the value and presence of proportions in space that also must fulfill physical purpose. He was an architect, one of the few that function within the art of architecture, not merely the business.” Miller went on to state that sculpture’s purpose within architecture was to introduce an element of movement between two and three-dimensions, allowing the viewer to experience the space
better by oscillating between these various points of view. Miller continued, “The art of architecture has access to another dimension: the volume within the solid form as well as the view of this enclosure’s surface. The architect designs this enclosure around the realization of its service to human purpose. I am very conscious of the fulfillment of this complex pattern in viewing Rebori's architecture.”

Miller’s sculpture, especially works made in relation to architecture, emphasizes the tactile, but this connection is not dependent on the presence of the artist’s own hand. Miller was responsible for the overall design of these large-scaled commissions, but for a variety of reasons, whether due to skill, the use of union labor, or efficacy, he often did not physically fabricate the final product himself. This was the case when Holabird & Root commissioned the artist in 1942 to create an extensive sculptural program for the interior and exterior of Northwestern University’s new Technological Institute on their Evanston campus, just north of Chicago. Miller designed and modeled large, relatively high-relief sculptures around the doors lining the courtyard of the main entrance along Sheridan Avenue, which were carved in Indiana limestone by Jon Jonson Fig. 11. Like so many of Miller’s commissioned sculptures, little is known of how the Technological Institute reliefs were fabricated. Some sources cite Jonson, but in a later interview with John Holabird, the architect notes that sculptor Sylvia Shaw Judson was actually in charge executing of Miller’s design. Holabird noted, however, “She could use a mallet and chisel, but with lots of her limestone work they’d take measurements off and she wasn’t strong enough, really, to use a hammer, so her limestone work was done by a studio, and then she’d sometimes go and supervise the finishing or do some touch-up.”
As a feature on the project in *Architectural Record* described them, “The decorative sculptures—both exterior and interior—depict man’s physical environment and his progress in mastering it; Edgar Miller, sculptor.”

For the exterior reliefs, the theme was the “Great Men of Science and Technology,” although one sculptural panel is dedicated Marie Curie. Over the five main doors, large panels present pictorial narratives and textual quotations relating to Vitruvius, Archimedes, Lavoisier, (Benjamin) Franklin, and Galileo **Fig. 12**. Under these panels crowning the North and South entrances, a row of lower relief insets of scientific symbols represents air, water, earth, and fire. Framing the jambs of the three main doors on the east side are the names of other notable scientists, inventors, and engineers from history, along with symbols of their accomplishments. For example, Gutenberg is represented by a man working at a printing press, and a cluster of inventors from the Industrial Revolution, including Chicago Industrialist Cyrus McCormick, are represented by their most notable creations.
Holabird & Root had used relief sculptures on the facades of their buildings as early as 1928 with the Fred M. Torrey depictions of Fort Dearborn at 333 North Michigan Avenue, and the addition of architectural ornament on the exterior of the Northwestern Technological Institute certainly continued this approach, employing sculpture to emphasize the purpose of the building or the entity that had commissioned it. Miller also designed two marble reliefs flanking the interior entrance to the building’s auditorium Fig. 13. This combination of imagery looking both forward and backward in time on the two interior panels in the lobby as well as the goal of enlivening wall surfaces, further emphasized modern technological achievements. Designed in a more angular, linear style that mixed high and low relief elements, the sculptures were carved by Carl Stein and Son into a porous travertine marble from Winona, Minnesota. The interior reliefs depict a fragmented, abstracted modern industrial landscape—devoid of any humans, and instead populated with machines, airplanes, factories, dams, mills, and refineries all connected by thinly etched roads, waterways, and rail tracks. More organic features like steam, water, and mountains do appear, especially in the north panel, but are included in a strictly industrial context.

Fig. 13
Edgar Miller, limestone sculptures, 1942, lobby/interior, Northwestern Technological Institute.
Photos: M.R.Sullivan
At Northwestern in 1942, a retelling of great moments in scientific history carried a clearly propagandistic tone, extolling the virtues of such disciplines in the war effort and expressing the mid-twentieth century desire for better living through technology.\(^{25}\) On a more formal level, Miller’s reliefs also animated what was otherwise a rather austere façade, providing conceptual and aesthetic texture to the building. While continuing in the tradition of architectural ornamentation, the sculptures emerging from the interior and exterior walls of the Technological Institute also palpably emphasized the materiality of both art and science.

Just over twenty years later after completing the project at Northwestern, Miller took on another project meant to materially and conceptually celebrate American industry, creating a sculptural relief for the new downtown Chicago headquarters of the U.S. Gypsum Corporation at 101 South Wacker Drive Fig. 14. Designed by Perkins + Will and completed in 1963, the structure was notable for its placement at forty-five-degree orientation to the street and its graphic, building-wide black and white decorative scheme seen on both exterior and interior surfaces. Miller’s relief was seven by nine feet, affixed to a black wall in the ground floor lobby. Miller worked in reverse from preliminary clay models and cast the pieces himself in the company’s trademark material.\(^{26}\) The building and reliefs are no longer extant, and this discussion of Miller’s sculpture will be the briefest due to relative lack of information about the commission.

Fig. 14 & Fig. 15
Edgar Miller, sculptures for the lobby of the U.S. Gypsum Building, 1963, gypsum, whereabouts unknown.
Photo: Chicago History Museum
Visible in images taken shortly after the opening of the building by the noted Chicago-based architectural photography firm of Hedrich-Blessing, Miller’s sculpture was one of a number of stark white sculptural reliefs in gypsum commissioned for the U.S. Gypsum building. Most of these, installed in the lobbies of the upper floors and the employee cafeteria were far more abstract than Miller’s; their makers are unidentified. Miller’s relief sculpture was a relatively high-profile commission, created for the street-level lobby of a major, architecturally significant modern skyscraper in Chicago’s downtown Loop. It was also a somewhat “late” commission, created during a moment in Miller’s career when the quality of his work as well as his reputation were starting to decline. However, as Richard Cahan and Michael Williams note in their essential text *Edgar Miller and the Handmade Home*, the artist himself would have refuted such an assertion, certain he was “always doing his best work.”

Miller was primarily occupied with commercial commissions during the late 1950s and 1960s. In sculpture, for example, he completed a number of molds for large-scale commercially reproduced decorative sculptures for Jo Mead Designs that were marketed to private consumers as well as restaurants and hotels. By 1967, Miller and his wife Dale would leave Chicago for Florida.

The reliefs Miller created for U.S. Gypsum’s headquarters share some of the roughly modeled, narrative figuration present in the Jo Mead sculptures, but the project overall shares much more with Miller’s sophisticated sculptural output of 1930s and 1940s. Appropriately, the sculptures were made out of natural color gypsum, a white soft sulfate mineral that can take the form of alabaster and is most commonly used in the manufacturer of plaster, wallboard, and fertilizer. The reliefs depicted abstracted scenes of mining and manufacturing gypsum, which connects them both formally and conceptually to the interior lobby panels at the Northwestern Technological Institute and to the established function of such commissioned relief sculptures to further emphasize, to visualize, the larger function and purpose of the building **Fig. 15.**
The U.S. Gypsum building reliefs also share an overall formal scheme with the Northwestern Technological Institute reliefs. Both commissions have open compositions, meaning they are comprised of a cohesive group of sculptures, but not contained in a single panel, though some aspects of the Northwestern commission adhere to a more closed relief structure. While never seemingly concerned with developing a signature style, the use of relatively high and open relief, became a repeated element in Miller’s sculptural works. Unlike the lightly incised lines of bas-reliefs adorning Deco-era buildings along Michigan Avenue, for example, or even the high-reliefs of contemporaries which always seem contained and rigid, Miller’s commissioned reliefs have something of a wild character to them—roughly modeled, set askew, and dynamic. They introduce an element of textures not just through their surface or line quality, but also through their total material being.

Together, these three commissioned projects demonstrate how in Miller’s creative practice sculpture functioned as texture, but artistic texture itself became something sculptural. His reliefs and three-dimensional sculptural elements did not just create interesting surfaces or moments of visual excitement, but actually drew attention to the object quality of the buildings themselves, emphasizing their own spatial, three-dimensional nature. In this regard, the choice of materials, whether prescribed or selected by Miller himself, also became a crucial element to exploit and explore in his sculpture, architectural or otherwise. His materials offered again and again, a pronounced textural effect—one that carried a broader sculptural approach throughout his body of work. Whether Miller was incorporating salvaged decorative elements into the Old Town artist studios or the expertly creating reliefs in gypsum, Miller expressed a material mastery that added life, organicism, and texture to everything around them. As he stated, “I never had a fear of an unfamiliar medium. For instance, I realized I could carve, and just tackled
it immediately. The ideal way, for example, with wood, is to take hold of it and carve it through the end. One thing I realized: if you ever want to do something, do it.”

---
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