

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>PROCEEDINGS</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
<i>SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>SEVENTY-EIGHTH MEETING</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>EIGHTIETH MEETING</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>EIGHTY-FIRST MEETING</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>EIGHTY-SEVENTH MEETING</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>EIGHTY-EIGHTH MEETING</i>	<i>23</i>
 <i>PAPERS</i>	
<i>SOME CAMBRIDGE REFORMERS OF THE EIGHTIES.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>BY PUTNAM CHASE</i>	
<i>RECOLLECTIONS OF SIXTY YEARS IN CAMBRIDGE.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>BY EPHRAIM EMERTON</i>	
<i>THE BATES-DANA HOUSE.....</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>BY MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI</i>	
<i>ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF CHURCH LIFE.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>BY WILLIAM M. MACNAIR</i>	
<i>EARLY CAMBRIDGE NEWSPAPERS.....</i>	<i>84</i>
<i>BY GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT</i>	

REMINISCENCES OF FOLLEN STREET..... 91
BY MARIA BOWN

VALUE OF ANCIENT HOUSES TO A COMMUNITY.....102
BY GEORGE FRANCIS DOW

CAMBRIDGE PHYSICIANS I HAVE KNOWN..... 103
BY EDMUND H. STEVENS

THE JOHN HICKS HOUSE..... 110
BY ESTHER STEVENS FRASER

OLD NORTH CAMBRIDGE..... 125
BY THOMAS FRANCIS O'MALLEY

OFFICERS..... 136

MEMBERS..... 138

SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING
TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY was held at the house of Richard H. Dana, 113 Brattle Street, at 8 P.M., January 25, 1927. Nearly eighty persons were present.

President Emerton called the meeting to order. The minutes of the last meeting were read and allowed.

The Secretary read his annual report, with that of the Council.

Voted to accept the same and refer to the Editor for printing.

The Curator exhibited and described several recent gifts to the Society.

The Treasurer read his annual report, with the certificate of the Auditor, Mr. Beale.

Voted to accept the same and refer as above.

The Auditor made a further report concerning the "Life Membership Fund" in the Cambridge Savings Bank. From a pencil memorandum in the bank book it appears that the unidentified deposit of \$100 in 1917 was towards printing the Index to the Cambridge Proprietors' Records prepared by Mrs. Gozzaldi. He recommended that this sum, which with its interest now amounts to about \$145, be set apart as a special fund for that object. The withdrawal of this deposit, which has been regarded as making good the two \$50 fees received in 1923 and not deposited, would be very nearly met by permanently includ-

5

ing the unclassified deposit made in 1913 of \$71.28, with its accumulated interest, in the fund, which could then be considered a true Life Membership Fund, and have its interest drawn and used every year.

Voted that these recommendations be referred to the Council for action.

For the Nominating Committee, Mr. Bailey reported the following nominations for

OFFICERS FOR 1927

President --- EPHRAIM EMERTON

*Vice-Presidents --- MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE,
ROBERT WALCOTT*

Secretary --- SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER

Treasurer --- GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

Curator --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Council: the above and

JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, STOUGHTON BELL, FRANK GAYLORD COOK,

PRESCOTT EVARTS, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, JAMES LEONARD PAINE

Ballots were distributed and the chair appointed Messrs. Briggs and Cook as tellers, who reported fifty-nine votes cast for the above, whereupon the chair declared them duly elected.

Under general business Mr. Walcott, for the committee on the change of name to the "Longfellow Bridge," reported that a fresh bill for that purpose had been introduced in the present Legislature, and that a hearing upon it would be held before the Committee on Metropolitan Affairs on Friday the twenty-eighth instant, which he urged all members to attend. On motion of Mr. Beale it was

Voted that the chair appoint a committee from the members present to attend said hearing with authority to speak for the Society.

Mr. Walcott also, for the committee to secure the underwriting of the publication of the Index to Paige's History of

6

Cambridge, reported that about one-half of the necessary \$2,000 has been pledged in amounts from \$25 to \$100. On motion of Mr. Beale

Voted that the President appoint a committee to wait on the Mayor and City Council to see if they will take two hundred copies for distribution by the city; also that the Council of the Society be empowered to subscribe for copies to distribute among the members and that the underwriting committee proceed in accordance with the above.

The President then announced the topic of the evening to be the Cambridge artist and writer, Washington Allston. He introduced as the first speaker Professor PAUL JOSEPH SACHS, Associate Director of the Fogg Museum of Art, who read a detailed and critical discussion of Allston as a painter, illustrated with many lantern slides, comparing his work with the Italian School, etc.

After a short recess Mr. HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW DANA spoke informally on Allston as a man of letters, and read extracts from his poems.

In connection with the subject there was exhibited a number of relics of Allston, the property of Mr. R. H. Dana.

The meeting adjourned at 10.15 P.M. for light refreshments.

7

SEVENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

THE REGULAR SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at 8 P.M., on April 26, 1927, at the residence of Miss Bertha Hallowell Vaughan, 57 Garden Street. About thirty-five members were present. President Emerton presided.

The minutes of the annual meeting were read and allowed.

In the absence of the Curator, the President read his list of recent gifts and accessions.

The President also announced the successful passage of the legislative bill changing the name of the "Cambridge Bridge" to the "Longfellow Bridge." The pen used by Governor Fuller in signing this bill has been presented to our member, Miss Longfellow.

The President then introduced the speaker of the evening, Mr. PHILIP PUTNAM CHASE, who read a paper on "Some Cambridge Reformers of the Eighties."

At the conclusion of the paper the meeting adjourned for light refreshments at 9.30 P.M.

8

SEVENTY-NINTH MEETING

THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY and their friends were entertained at a garden party by Mr. and Mrs. Edward Waldo Forbes, at Gerry's Landing, at 4.30 P.M., on Saturday, June 4, 1927.

The President, after a few words of greeting and of appreciation for the hospitality of the hosts of the day, gave some of his recollections of Cambridge of sixty years ago. Other members also gave reminiscences of the same period.

9

EIGHTIETH MEETING

THE REGULAR AUTUMN MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at 8 P.M., on Tuesday, October 25, 1927, at the house of Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, 25 Reservoir Street. About sixty members were present. Professor Emerton presided.

The minutes of the last two meetings were read and allowed. The Acting Secretary also reported concerning matters of general interest that had come before the Council.

The President stated that this was the first meeting of the Society since the death of Mr. Batchelder on June 10, and called on Rev. Prescott Evarts to read the resolutions prepared by a Committee of the Council, consisting of Mr. Evarts and Professor Beale. The resolutions follow:

In the death of Mr. Samuel Francis Batchelder, the Cambridge Historical Society is conscious of the very great loss it has sustained, and mourns the death of a friend and benefactor.

There was no member of the Society more deeply concerned in its welfare or more efficient in promoting its interests. The Council relied greatly upon his judgment; and to his

resourceful mind and industry the Society owes much of the interest and value of its public meetings.

Although he had been Secretary for but eleven years, his membership counted from the beginning, and his devoted support was continuous.

Besides certain notable papers which he contributed to the Proceedings of the Society, Mr. Batchelder was recognized as a diligent student and interesting narrator of many local incidents in the history of Old Cambridge and of the university. In a picturesque style, enlivened by a humor which was characteristic of him, he embodied the results of his painstaking research and discriminating selection.

Among many interests and companionships, both literary and social, in which he figured conspicuously, we his associates are grateful that he was able to give in such generous measure to building up and sustaining the work of the Cambridge Historical Society.

Recognizing his valuable public services we cannot but remember the personal friendship and the pleasant companionship which resulted from our association with Mr. Batchelder in the meetings of the

10

Council and of the Society. We have lost a friend; and the Society mourns with us in his death the loss of an honored and greatly valued member.

The Curator exhibited a few items received since the last meeting.

Mrs. GOZZALDI read a short account of the house, recently pulled down, that stood on the west corner of Brattle and Church Streets, and occupied at one time by Richard Henry Dana, Sr., and later by Dr. Francis Dana.

The President then introduced the speaker of the evening, Rev. WILLIAM M. MACNAIR, who read a paper on "One Hundred Years of Church Life, A Brief History of the Prospect Congregational Church in Cambridge."

Mr. Eliot and others expressed interest in the suggestion of Judge Walcott for an appropriate tablet to be placed on the Longfellow Bridge and after discussion it was

Voted to request the Council to consider the matter and report at the next meeting.

The meeting then adjourned for light refreshments.

11

*EIGHTY-FIRST MEETING
TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING*

THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at the residence of Professor and Mrs. James R. Jewett, 44 Francis Avenue, at 8 P.M., January 24, 1928. Thirty-five members and a few guests were present. President Emerton presided.

The records of the meetings of June 4 and October 25 were read and accepted.

The Acting Secretary read the Annual Report of the Secretary and Council and it was referred to the Council for publication in the Proceedings.

In the unfortunate absence of Mr. Wright, Mr. Beale read the report of the Treasurer, with the certificate of the Auditor, and it was accepted and referred as above to the Council.

Mr. George C. Deane, for the Nominating Committee, reported the following nominations for

OFFICERS FOR 1928

President --- ROBERT WALCOTT

Vice-Presidents --- MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, STOUGHTON BELL

Secretary --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Treasurer --- GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

Curator ---WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Council: the above and

JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, FRANK GAYLORD COOK, REV. PRESCOTT EVARTS, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, JAMES LEONARD PAINE, CAROLYN HUNTINGTON SAUNDERS

Ballots were distributed and the chair appointed Messrs. Lane and Deane as tellers, who reported thirty-five votes cast for the above, and the chair declared them duly elected.

12

Professor Emerton expressed his pleasure in having had the privilege of serving the Society, and in particular his association with and appreciation of the services of Mr. Batchelder, to whom the Society was so deeply indebted.

Mr. GEORGE G. WRIGHT'S paper on "Early Cambridge Newspapers" was then read, in part, by Professor EMERTON. A volume containing copies of early Cambridge newspapers belonging to Mr. Wright was exhibited. Mr. Lane mentioned the printing, in Stoughton Hall, during the Revolution, of certain issues of the Essex Gazette.

Voted to send Mr. Wright word expressing the appreciation of the Society for his valuable paper and their sympathy for him in his illness. The meeting then adjourned for refreshments.

13

EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING

THE REGULAR SPRING MEETING OP THE SOCIETY was held at 8 P.M., on April 24, 1928, at the residence of Miss Alice M. Longfellow, Craigie House. About sixty members were present. President Walcott presided.

The minutes of the Annual Meeting were read and accepted.

On the recommendation of the Council, due notice having been given in the call for the meeting, it was

Voted that Article IV of the By-Laws be amended to read as follows: "The regular membership of this Society shall be limited to two hundred and twenty-five."

The Secretary read a notice received from Mr. Joseph M. Stokes, Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the City of Cambridge, dated April 16, 1928, for a public hearing at City Hall on April 26 on the proposed change of the names of certain streets in Cambridge, Boston, and Somerville, to Lindbergh Avenue. The streets in Cambridge that would be affected by this proposal are Main Street from Longfellow Bridge to Kendall Square; Broadway from Kendall Square to Hampshire Street and Hampshire Street in its entire length to the Somerville line.

The President then introduced the speaker of the evening, Professor ANDRE KOSZUL, of the University of Strassburg, Exchange Professor at Harvard University, who read a paper on "Longfellow and France."

At the conclusion of the paper the meeting adjourned for refreshments.

14

EIGHTY-THIRD MEETING

THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY and friends were entertained A at 4.30 P.M., on Friday, June 15, 1928, by Rev. and Mrs. Ernest J. Dennen, at 5 Follen Street, about forty persons being present.

The gathering at first assembled within doors and the President spoke upon the purposes of an historical society and the special value of the type of paper he was to read, entitled "Reminiscences of Follen Street," written by Miss MARIA BOWEN. Miss Bowen was present and had brought to the meeting twenty-three pictures (mostly small photographs) of houses and scenes on Follen Street. These she presented to the Society.

Mr. Stoughton Bell read the following resolutions on the death of Mr. George G. Wright:

George G. Wright, a charter member of this society, passed away on Sunday, May 20, 1928, after a long and severe illness.

Mr. Wright was born in Cambridge October 27, 1848, the son of William and Ellen Wright. His family consisted of three brothers and one sister, all of whom were educated in the public schools. Immediately after his graduation from the Cambridge High School in 1867, he became a clerk for Gilman Brothers, wholesale druggists in Boston. After three years spent in their employ he entered the grain business with his father on Mt. Auburn Street in Cambridge. In 1902 he sold this business and engaged in real estate, having under his charge many and valuable properties. His judgment, always good, proved of the greatest value to himself and to the many who sought his advice on real estate values.

His sterling integrity and high purpose were quickly recognized but in spite of the urgent demands of his fellow-citizens he refused to accept political office, preferring to give his time and thought in an unofficial capacity to the city which he loved. He did however, in 1903, accept a position as sinking fund commissioner, becoming chairman some sixteen years ago, a position which he continued to hold until his last illness forced his resignation.

No organization in Cambridge that he felt could contribute to his advancement was without his active support. In many of them he held high office; to them he gave freely of his time, thought and work.

15

He was deeply interested in civil service reform, having been treasurer of the Cambridge Civil Service Reform Association for twenty-eight years, until it was merged with the Massachusetts Association. He was always a firm believer in non-partisan elections for city officials. To him perhaps more than to any other was due the organization and the continued activity of Library Hall Association. For eleven years he acted as clerk, writing many of the articles which appeared in its campaign paper. During those eleven years ninety-five per cent of the candidates endorsed by the organization were elected.

Mr. Wright was a charter member of the Harvard Square Business Men's Association, its president for seven years and on his retirement in 1925 he was given a loving cup and made its first and only president emeritus.

For six years he served as treasurer of the National Municipal League. He was a charter member of the Colonial Club, the Longfellow Memorial Association, active in Mt. Olivet Lodge, A. F. & A. M., the Cambridge Club, the Newtowne Club, contribution member of Post 56, G. A. R., honorary member of Cambridge Battalion, M. V. M., as well as treasurer of Christ Church, Cambridge.

Mr. Wright was a keen lover of nature and for many years he made it a practice to spend one day in each week in the open. He would take the train or trolley car and ride out into the country, where he would spend the day walking through the woods and fields.

He was much interested in this society and in fact in the history of anything pertaining to Cambridge. By his will he left it all his books and papers on Cambridge. His collection of Cambridge newspapers is probably unequalled. During his long connection with this society he contributed to its meetings two papers: one on "The Schools of Cambridge, 1800-1870" and the other on "Early Cambridge Newspapers." These in addition to six years' service as Treasurer.

His books on the White Mountains, of which he was very fond, he left to the Cambridge Public Library.

These and his other public bequests are typical of the man: two free beds in the Cambridge Hospital, one for men and one for women, "preferably for the unskilled laborers," and a fund for social service work, a gift to Christ Church for missionary work and the Sunday School, a gift to the Holy Ghost Hospital, to the Boston Floating Hospital, to the Cambridge Home for Aged People and to Harvard College "in recognition of service rendered from the library."

When Mr. Wright retired as active president of the Harvard Square Business Men's Association he put in words some of the sentiments which were behind his every act on behalf of this and the other organ-

16

izations of the city and of his fellow-men for whom he had toiled so hard. He then said, "Pride in Cambridge should be the keynote of every organization within its borders — a pride which counts not the cost, which knows no limit of time or labor, never losing sight of the object to be attained, the prosperity of our city. Without this love and pride little advance can be made in any direction — with it all things are possible. Believe me, you will find when life's journey is nearing its close more satisfaction in the work you have done to benefit and improve the community in which you have lived than you can possibly derive from any amount of money. The wealth may vanish but nothing can deprive you of the memory of past efforts to benefit others."

What a wealth of memories George Wright must have had and what a debt of gratitude we owe to him. In partial recognition of this debt and of the sense of loss which we the members of the Cambridge Historical Society have suffered

Be it resolved that a copy of these minutes be spread upon the records and a copy thereof be sent to the members of his family.

Miss Bowen's paper was then read by the President.

At the conclusion of the paper, the meeting adjourned for refreshments.

17

EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING

THE FALL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at 8 P.M., on Tuesday, October 23, 1928, at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Osgood, 48 Fayerweather Street. Some forty-five members and friends were present.

The records of the meetings of April 24 and June 15 were read and accepted.

The Curator made a short report about the collection of Cambridge documents and related material received from the estate of George G. Wright.

The President then introduced the speaker of the evening, Mr. GEORGE F. Dow, of Topsfield, Massachusetts, who read a paper on "The Value of Ancient Houses to a Community," illustrated with many lantern slides.

At the conclusion of the paper, the meeting adjourned for refreshments.

18

EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING

THE TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held on Tuesday, January 22, 1929, at 8 P.M., in the Atkinson Room, Fay House, 10 Garden Street. Some eighty-five members and guests were present as guests of Radcliffe College. In the absence of President Robert Walcott on account of illness, Vice-President Stoughton Bell presided.

The records of the meetings of April 24 and June 15 were read and accepted.

The Secretary read the annual report of the Secretary and Council.

Voted it be accepted. Mr. Beale read the annual report for the Treasurer, Mr. Sprague; with the certificate of the Auditor, Mr. Beale.

Voted to accept the same.

Mr. Bell made a report upon the Hicks House, stating that subscriptions were still needed.

Mr. Paine for the Nominating Committee reported the following nominations:

OFFICERS FOR 1929

President --- ROBERT WALCOTT

*Vice-Presidents --- MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE,
STOUGHTON BELL*

Secretary --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Treasurer --- WILLARD HATCH SPRAGUE

Curator --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Council: the above and

JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, FRANK GAYLORD COOK, REV. PRESCOTT EVARTS, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, JAMES LEONARD PAINE, CAROLYN HUNTINGTON SAUNDERS

19

Voted that the Secretary be instructed to cast one ballot for the nominations as reported. The Secretary cast the ballot, and the Chair declared the officers as named duly elected.

Mr. Bell then presented Mrs. GEORGE PIERCE BAKER who read a paper of keen interest and value on "Fay House and Its Occupants."¹

After the paper the meeting adjourned for refreshments.

¹ *This paper, much enlarged, was published in 1929 by the Harvard University Press, with the title The Story of Fay House (8vo. ix+136 pages. 9 illustrations; bibliography; index. \$2.00.)*

20

EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING

THE SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at the residence of Alexander H. Bill, Esq., 45 Highland Street, on Tuesday, April 30, 1929, at eight o'clock. The President called the meeting to order and called attention to the painting on the wall of Mr. Bill's famous ancestor, General Stark. The paper of the evening was read by Dr. EDMUND H. STEVENS of Cambridge, on "Cambridge Physicians I Have Known."

Sixty members and guests were present. Adjourned at 10.30 P.M., after refreshments.

21

EIGHTY-SEVENTH MEETING

THE GARDEN PARTY was held on June 21, 1929, by the courtesy of Mrs. C. E. Fraser, at the John Hicks House, corner of South and Boylston Streets, which the tenants, notwithstanding their very recent arrival in it and present moving to Gloucester for the summer, had arranged most tastefully and in perfect order. Typewritten slips in every room described clearly the interesting features or furnishings.

The President called the meeting to order and stated that the conditions prescribed by Harvard College had been met, though not without a disproportionately large subscription by the Frasers, which was regrettable.

He then called upon Professor Beale for a brief statement of the aims and activities of the Cambridge Tercentenary Committee. In this, much interest was displayed.

It was voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last meeting and to send a message of affection to our Secretary who has labored this past year so faithfully and efficiently on our business and is now at Trudeau in the Adirondacks.

Refreshments were then served and the house thrown open for inspection. Seventy-two persons were present. Invitations were sent to all who had contributed toward the preservation of the house. Pleasure was expressed in that the wording of the stone marker, placed in front of the building and moved with it, was such that it is still truthful. Adjourned at six o'clock.

22

EIGHTY-EIGHTH MEETING

THE FALL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at the residence of Arthur B. Nichols, Esq., Garden Terrace, on Tuesday, October 22, 1929, at eight o'clock. Fifty-two were present. The President referred to the absence of our devoted secretary, Mr. Briggs, at Trudeau in the Adirondacks, where he is recovering from a tuberculous attack. Mr. Thomas F. O'Malley was appointed Secretary pro tem and read the records of the two previous meetings, which were approved. As the speaker of the evening he then read a paper on the history of North Cambridge, based on a communication to the Cambridge Chronicle in 1927, giving an interesting account of the cattle pens and Porter's Hotel, which he stated was operated after the days of the Porter House to which President Kirkland repaired and approved its flip, as quoted by Samuel A. Eliot, Esq., at the last meeting of the Cambridge Club. At the end of the reading, Mr. O'Malley answered various questions illustrating his extensive knowledge of old Cambridge history. Light refreshments were then served and the meeting adjourned.

23

SOME CAMBRIDGE REFORMERS OF THE EIGHTIES

OR

CAMBRIDGE CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLEVELAND DEMOCRACY

IN MASSACHUSETTS

BY PHILIP PUTNAM CHASE

Read April 26, 1927

MY presence here is evidence of the survival in your esteemed President of that Victorian virtue, liberalism, which characterized the period I propose to explore. Without that saving grace he would never have allowed a paper dealing with Reform and modern Reform at that, to be read before this Society, whose Proceedings have hitherto maintained an antiquarian and local character. I would contend, however, for a moment that his gracious decision was justified by the nature of the case; for I would plead for the antiquity of the recent and for the local flavor imparted to a movement national in scope by the prominence of the Cambridge reformers. If it shall also appear that the reformers of the eighties were marked by the peculiarly Victorian quality of liberalism, then I think you will agree that this period is worth the attention of the present generation of Babbitts and Menckens, Hundred Per Centers and Sentimentalists.

To show that the eighties have already receded into history, one must first dispel the illusion that events are to be regarded as recent or refute the devastating charge that the eighties are contemporary merely because some persons then active are still here and active amongst us. At Bunker Hill, in 1825, Daniel Webster addressed the survivors of the Revolution with the words, "Venerable men, you have come down to us from a former generation," etc. I should hesitate to apply that expression to this audience, yet the event which he then recalled to the veterans was scarcely more remote than that to which we now

24

look back; and of the two intervals, if each be measured, as they should be, in terms of the accumulation of human experience, how much greater is that which has elapsed since 1880! For the saying "Better twenty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay" applies to America and recent times in multiplied ratio. It was the comprehension of this non-static condition that distinguished the reformers of the eighties from the stand-patters.

Charles Eliot Norton, writing to Samuel G. Ward (in 1900), said, "I quite agree that this is the best century to have lived in since time began, if for nothing else than this — that we all of us who have lived in it, have lived so much longer in the same space of years than any one before us could do." The effect of this acceleration in modern times brings a twofold enhancement of our interest today in the eighties. First, as we said, it removes them rapidly from the area of the contemporary; and secondly, the nearness of the eighties to the Civil War caused their stage to be peopled at the same time by a generation whose whole training had occurred since the war and also by a considerable group whose ideas and habits had been formed before that crisis. For a time the latter prevailed. Through all the council halls of the land stalked the spectre of the war, paralyzing the powers of the councillors and preventing them from giving their attention to the problems, new and unconnected with the war, which were pressing for solution. This interlacing of the standards of conduct, social ideals, and political prejudices of two generations is always of intense interest and perplexity to the historian. It is scarcely too much to assert that the

chief work of reformers in the eighties consisted in releasing American political life from the dead hand of Civil War memories, issues, and prejudices.

From a political point of view, the central event in the period 1880-96 is the so-called "Return of the Democratic Party," both in national and in Massachusetts politics. Yet this expression does not go to the heart of the matter. As a political party the Democrats cannot be said to have "returned" to any such dominating position as they had occupied before 1860, for they failed to impress upon the national life any of the policies for which they as a party have stood in contradistinction to the Republicans. Nevertheless the years 1874, 1882, 1884, and 1892

25

seemed revolutionary to the old political leaders. A new element seemed to have entered into the political compound which upset their calculations. Certainly in Massachusetts the significance of the period lies in the expression, in organized political action, of the reforms or discontents engendered by the political situation disclosed in the preceding decade, and in the social and economic revolution which had taken place with the displacement of native by foreign labor in our industrial centers. That this revolution was attributed both to Democrats and to Independents is just. Neither could have succeeded without the other, yet the achievements of the period, such as they are, were really non-partisan and for that reason redound to the credit of reformers and independency. On the other hand, the Democratic party organization, in the hands of its progressive wing, provided the sheer voting power necessary for the election of liberals and for the passage of liberal legislation.

This political revolution began in the early sporadic revolts within both the Republican and the Democratic parties; the one springing from a public conscience shocked by the conditions in the Grant regime, the other rising from a newly self-conscious class, discontented with their failure through strikes to win their share of the profits of industry and led by radical agitators to seek relief in panaceas such as Greenbackism. The uprising in the Republican party appeared as Independent movements in 1874 and 1882; in 1884 it became known as Mugwumpism, and its adherents merged with the rejuvenated Democratic party to form what we call Cleveland Democracy. The revolt in the Democratic ranks was a radical wing movement in 1868 and 1878, expressed by Greenbackers. It acquired sufficient momentum under the clever guidance of Ben Butler to secure control of the Democratic party machinery in 1882 and, taking advantage of the stagnation to which the Republican party had been reduced by the Old Guard, to elect Butler governor. Butler kept control of the Democratic organization until 1884. His organization collapsed at the convention which nominated Cleveland. That left the way open for the conservative element to recover control just in time to welcome to their ranks the Independents who were being "disciplined" and expatriated by the Old Guard Republicans. The real test of the political

26

sagacity of these Democrats came when they supported the younger progressive leaders and undertook to coax the Butler Labor Radicals back into line without losing support of their new allies, the Independents. The collapse of this radical revolution in the Democratic party in the East would seem to a modern "Liberal" of the New Republic or Nation brand to

mark the end of this paper, since the men and measures I shall consider were, like all Victorian liberals, relatively conservative. At any rate the rescue of the Democratic party machinery from the hands of Butlerites blinded the Democratic leaders to the depth of the social discontent which underlay Greenbackism, so that they sadly neglected the storm warnings from the West and South where the Farmers' Alliance and Populists kept up the rebellion after the Massachusetts Greenbackers had submitted to the leadership of the Liberals.

Through these steps in the evolution of a new Democratic party in Massachusetts, there runs a curious blending of several movements which had for their devotees almost the religious fervor of crusades. Thus we have the prohibition and no-license movements, the Greenback-Labor party, the Civil Service Reform League, the Tariff Reform League, Single Taxers, Woman Suffragists, etc., and an undercurrent of apprehension concerning the relations of the public schools to the churches. The circumstances under which local, state, and national issues developed in Massachusetts and especially in Cambridge made the Cleveland Democracy the home — not always the happy home — of all these reforms. For that reason the story of the Cambridge reformers and the story of the Cleveland Democracy in Massachusetts are closely interwoven.

Explosive as many of these isms and policies were, their exponents could find a welcome in the Democratic party and could serve a useful part as auxiliaries in attacks upon the common enemy. So long as the Democratic party was in opposition, this policy of criticism made the alliance with critics such as Godkin, Curtis, Atkinson, Bradford, Schurz, and Henry George worth while. But when the party undertook the responsibilities of office, whether local, state, or national, the heterogeneous character of its components became painfully apparent. Socrates Cleveland found he had a whole harem of Xantippes.

Cambridge, we may say, oversubscribed its quota of cranks, but it supplied, along with its group of crusaders, some very level-headed organizers. The strategic position occupied, as I have pointed out, by the Old Line Democrats has a peculiar significance for this town, because of the prominence which several of its citizens had already gained in the Democratic party in the seventies. Such a one, for example, was Charles Theodore Russell, for years the leading Democratic Liberal in the Massachusetts Legislature. It is interesting to note how his party regularity opened a way for his son, William Eustis, to a brilliant and useful career. On the other hand it meant much to the good people of the old village that at just the time when their voting strength in the city was being outstripped by the recent immigrant element resident chiefly in the point and port, the Democratic party should rise to its opportunities, accept the aid and policies offered by the Mugwumps to support so admirable a man as Colonel Higginson, and in return put forward to win the Mugwump votes as a regular Democrat a candidate so able and so attractive as William E. Russell.

No picture of the town as it flourished in those days is intended, nor do I purpose to present a biographical sketch of the few men whom I have selected to exemplify the relation between Cambridge and the chief currents of American political life in the eighties. Only such aspects of their lives as bear specifically on what has interested me most in this period will be included. And if most attention is given to that one of the three who, in general estimation today, was the least eminent, it is because he was peculiarly the man of

the times in that his career was made by the times and his all too brief public life was entirely included within this period, 1880-96.

First, as to the relation of the eighties to the past. Many sons of Cambridge might be named still active in the eighties who remembered Webster's seventh of March speech, who had spiritually stood by Garrison's side in the face of mobs in State Street, who had fought through the war and had fought even harder to lift the burden of humiliation which the scandals of the seventies brought upon the country. But no one of them illustrates the zeal of the abolitionist transferred to fight the battles of political reform in the eighties so well as Thomas

28

Wentworth Higginson. The glowing idealism of the slavery struggle was not dimmed in his breast when the battle flags were furled. Nor was his humanitarian impulse for securing to the black man the rights of a citizen allowed to blind his eyes to the manner in which that issue of race prejudice and war rancor was used as a cloak by the managers of the dominant party to cover personal deficiencies and party ambitions. Without abandoning for a moment the crusade to secure the negro justice, Colonel Higginson was yet alert to see the menace of the new problems arising out of the economic and social reconstruction both North and South. The eighties exhibited the psychological phenomenon which our publicists call "post-war reaction." The optimism prevailing at the close of the war was evidenced by Emerson's Phi Beta Kappa oration in 1867, but by 1880 many observers were pessimistic about the chances of democracy recovering from the reaction which the war had brought to the earlier idealism. O. B. Frothingham comments thus: "After the abolition of slavery everything seemed possible in America. All questions found an easy answer. The energy of the people had not subsided and might be counted on as adequate to the severest tasks. Candor compels the admission that the enthusiastic prediction has not been fulfilled."

Such progress as there is, he says, is not due to democracy so much as to the humanitarian spirit. The tendency of democracy alone is down; it requires positive personal effort to counteract it, but democracy offers an opportunity and challenge to such effort.

It was this opportunity which Higginson seized with eagerness. His adaptability to the new environment and the new problems was remarkable. As Dr. Crothers said in a memoir read before this society, "Almost all the men of Colonel Higginson's generation found great difficulty in adapting themselves to life after the anti-slavery conflict was over. Many of them became bitter and disappointed."

Not so with Higginson. His "Cheerful Yesterdays" is well-entitled. It reflects the optimism and buoyancy of the man. On the other hand it seems that at that time, 1880, he knew no "yesterdays" but was throwing himself into the life of the day

29

as if the new problems were the first he had encountered and to them could be brought the fresh vigor of a young man. He was as ready to enlist in the civic battle as he had been in the military. Nor did he now hesitate because the men with whom he would thus be

associated were of a different race or creed or color. Still further his wonderful sense of humor, his lack of self-conceit and self-consciousness made it possible for him to associate with the rank and file of politicians without embarrassment to himself or to them. His service in the General Court and his valiant contest to rescue this congressional district from the Republican machine candidate paved the way for Leopold Morse and for Sherman Hoar. His comment on his experiences in the Massachusetts General Court is significant. In 1880, he says, there still remained a certain respect for the educated man in politics. The exception was the case where one educated man tried to cast a slur on another by calling him a scholar in politics. Butler did this especially when campaigning against Long (because the latter had been so unfortunate as to translate the "Iliad" while he was Speaker of the House). Among some of the measures in which he was particularly interested were those to abolish the requirement of reading the Bible in the schools; to abolish the poll tax requirement for the franchise; to remove the stigma on the atheist witness in court; and to secure woman suffrage. These measures point to what seems to me perhaps the most remarkable feature of Colonel Higginson's title to a place among the reformers of the eighties, namely, his progressive liberality. Evidence of this progressiveness is seen in Higginson's appreciation of the demand for new issues instead of the old. In 1884 he said,

"The present work of young men in politics, for this presidential year, is first to settle the fact definitely that the issues of the war are ended; and then to decree that all material questions — tariff, banks, everything — shall be held secondary to those questions which touch the national honor and integrity, at home and abroad. The men under thirty are right in their instinctive convictions that new occasions teach new duties. It is now a matter of comparative insignificance what position a man takes or took on the Fugitive Slave Law, or the Dred Scott decision, or even on the Civil War itself; it is a matter of momentous importance whether he stands for good government and national honor."

30

Again in 1884 he says,

"It is a fact patent to all that we are just now witnessing such a disintegration of parties as has not occurred since 1860; never since then have there been four conspicuous candidates for the presidency in the field. It has been noted that this disruption is very largely the work of young men; and that in the 'Independent' party of bolting Republicans this is peculiarly manifest. . . . While the Judge and the Senator are uttering their old-fashioned partisan appeals to the people to stand by the party of their youth, they behold their sons and nephews hard at work organizing bolters and distributing documents in behalf of revolution, which is, in turn, the party of their youth. It is vain to raise the old war cries; they have lost their power. The young men read the proceedings of the two national conventions at Chicago, and they find no perceptible difference. . . . The real difference between the two parties is in a tradition, and to that tradition the young men of the country are now becoming indifferent because the source of the tradition is now removed twenty years. But there is a tradition older than either of the parties — that of honesty and courage in public administration. To this, fortunately for us, young men are never indifferent; and in their search after it they apply tests of their own, and cease to be partisan."

"There is another point at which young voters tend to differ from older ones. They are less likely to assume that virtue is the monopoly of either party."

"... Seventy years ago nearly every horse thief was a Democrat, because he had a strong reason for wishing to be on the side of the administration. We have now a similar class of culprits, but they strike for more valuable booty than horses; they are star route contractors and navy speculators. They are in the Republican party for the same reason that made the horse thieves of 1814 Democrats — from a desire to belong to the party in power."

Although it was as a leader of movements of moral reform that Colonel Higginson won the greatest renown and the largest following, he was also one of the few who were able to appreciate the importance of and to lend the aid of his humanitarian reputation to another and less spectacular kind of reform, one for which Cambridge was on the whole more distinguished than the other. I mean the diagnosis of political ills, the patient study and experiment in a coldly scientific spirit of the ways and means of public administration, and the persistent effort to secure the

acceptance by politicians of policies based on sound principles of political science, and finally the practicing of these principles when burdened with the responsibilities of office. Although it was Charles W. Eliot who was one of the first to recognize the need of this work, yet Higginson was most helpful in giving his support to the younger men who strove to carry these reforms through. His name meant much to such men when they went before the voters to secure election on a platform of tariff reform, sound money, and the merit system in the civil service.

Few of Higginson's contemporaries in either party would give heed to this sort of reform. From the party entrenched in power little progressive action can be expected until the opposition forces it to do something more than point with pride to its record. From the Democrats as yet nothing practical had come. Eager as they were to find an issue on which to turn their opponents out, they failed miserably to adopt a firm policy on any of the problems of vital interest to the country but insisted on hugging to their bosoms the disappointed hopes of 1876, continued to ring the changes on Jeffersonian and Jacksonian rights of states and of individuals and to arraign the Republicans for maladministration.

Before the country could be brought to a realization of its problems and the approach to their solution, two things therefore were necessary: first, to train the rising generation to make a scientific study of the ills of the state and to work persistently for their amelioration; second, to divert the attention of the masses from the outworn sentimental issues of the war which the politicians were still flaunting before them, to rouse their interest in the real issues of the present, popularize those issues through the medium of a winning personality, and strive to harmonize the intellectuals and the labor group in support of a definite program of reform.

Both of these tasks required time, but by 1880 both were under way. It is to the glory of Cambridge and of Harvard that they together provided men and inspiration to accomplish both in so far as so Utopian a program can ever be said to be accomplished.

The whole tradition of American political life was opposed to a scientific approach to the problems of government. It is not

32

surprising therefore that the impetus for this work should come from abroad, not directly but through the training in European methods of research first in literature and then in history and political science, which a growing stream of young Americans brought back to our colleges in the late seventies. It was largely through the influence of President Eliot that Harvard took a leading part in this work. He had already brought Charles Dunbar from the editorial office of the Advertiser to give the first systematic course in economics; and he encouraged the younger men like Taussig, who returned from his German university to take up his work here. Henry Adams headed a group of historical students in graduate studies leading to the Ph.D. degree, then new in American universities. It was not only by precept but also by example that Eliot aided the study of political science, for he early threw himself into the reform movements and by his commanding power of analysis and statement exerted a profound effect on the method of dealing in public addresses with social and economic problems. In this he formed part of that great group of liberal writers and speakers whose essays were sought by the monthly magazines in increasing numbers as the editors correctly gauged the demand of the public for careful analysis of public questions rather than fiction, poetry, or literary criticism. But much as Eliot and Harvard contributed to the study of political problems in the seventies and early eighties, their teaching was limited in its direct effect to comparatively few. Politicians of neither party were interested. They demanded a demonstration of the practical working of these schemes in actual politics. Scientific approach to problems in government meant nothing to them. Their questions were, "Could the boys be held in line without spoils? Would a state railroad commission actually give their constituents lower fares or better service? Would a merit system in the street department mean fewer jobs? or more pay?"

The second great need therefore was for some one to interpret the value of the reform theories to the masses and especially to the politicians. It took time to develop such men. Like most developments, it was the gradual work of many minds. The contributions were so various that it is at times hard to see the connection, yet there runs through all these reform movements

33

a general liberal progressivism, making of the many zealous advocates of apparently irreconcilable projects a single great brotherhood. This general reform atmosphere in Cambridge came to be summarized in the shibboleth "The Cambridge Idea." The part played by some sons of Cambridge in the movement which now develops is worth attention.

While the college was training its students in a new approach to social and economic problems, the citizens of Cambridge were developing a system of non-partisan municipal government which afforded ample opportunity for the assertion of reform measures and the contest of personal abilities entirely apart from membership in the major political parties and quite distinct from their platforms. Cambridge was an attractive town to such independent spirits as Lowell, Norton, and their New York friends, Curtis and Godkin. The

latter made it his home from 1872 to 1874 and from his Cambridge fireside wrote the editorials in the "Nation" which fostered the Liberal Republicans in their revolt against Grant and the radical reconstruction policy. It was Godkin who roused Lowell from his academic retirement to become an ardent champion of Civil Service reform. From Cambridge in 1872 went President Eliot, along with Charles R. Codman and other Bostonians, to speak at the great dinner which the Liberals gave in New York to Carl Schurz. In the election that followed, many of them, those disappointed in not securing the nomination of their favorite, Charles Francis Adams, voted for Greeley and began their withdrawal from the party they had been brought up to revere. In 1874 when Henry Cabot Lodge, just graduated from Harvard, started the Commonwealth Club, James Barr Ames, Archibald M. Howe, and others from Cambridge joined him. The preamble they adopted read

—

"We, the undersigned citizens of Massachusetts, dissatisfied with the corruption which now prevails in politics, and convinced that this dissatisfaction is not confined to any political party or section of society but is shared by honest men alike, agree to form an association," etc. . .

It is interesting to note that this club broke up shortly after a violent dispute over a resolution protesting against the inter-

ference of the United States Army in the organization of the Louisiana legislature. This Southern question proved a bone of contention between many reformers.

*Members of the Commonwealth Club did valiant service in combating the Butler-Greenback movement. They issued a famous sheet called *The Broadside*, containing reports of speeches on sound money and on state finances. They bore testimony to the increasing interest in administrative reform in the seriousness with which they undertook to study the provisions of the new Boston city charter. Again in 1878 several members of this club now calling themselves "Young Republicans," among whom were Moorfield Storey, Roger Wolcott, J. W. Carter, George M. Towle, Benjamin Kimball, and Charles P. Bowditch, organized a most effective protest against Ben Butler's attempt to seize control of the Republican party in the state. The Young Republicans held a great meeting in Worcester, urging the party to support Hayes in his attempt to clean up the Civil Service by the removal of Butler's satellite, Simmons, from the Boston collectorship. Butler, defeated, went over to the Democratic party, tried to capture that, was opposed by Collins and the Old Line Democrats, and for the next three years split the party until his triumphant election as governor in November, 1882.*

During these first years of the eighties the habit of "bolting" and of scratching and of independent voting was spreading in many parts of the country, to the great indignation and annoyance of the political bosses. Cambridge and Harvard College came to be regarded as the center of this cult of independency. Not only did the college teach Free Trade and Sound Money but it seemed to engender in its graduates an attitude of skepticism toward the party dogmas and a readiness to assert their own ideas so as to justify in the minds of many of the older statesmen the saying of Horace Greeley at an earlier date, "Of all horned cattle deliver me from the college graduate." On the other hand, the part taken by men of education and culture was far from satisfying the old-fashioned crusading reformer. In his

famous Phi Beta Kappa oration in Cambridge in 1881, Wendell Phillips poured out his wrath upon the educated men who were careless of their political obligations. He said,

35

"Rarely in this country have scholarly men as a class joined in these great popular schools, in these social movements. ... It is not so much that the people need us, they can do for themselves, . . . these agitations are the opportunities and means which God offers us to refine the taste, mould the character, lift the purpose, and educate the moral sense of the masses on whose intelligence and self-respect rests the state."

Academic Cambridge did not take this indictment calmly. Charles Eliot Norton quotes Longfellow's comment on this as "marvellous and delightful but preposterous from beginning to end." Curtis described it later as "unsparing censure of educated men as recreant to political progress." Phillips had the Cambridge and Harvard group especially in mind when he said,

"Scholars who play statesmen, and editors who masquerade as scholars, can waste much excellent anxiety that clerks shall get no office until they know the exact date of Caesar's assassination, as well as the latitude of Peking and the Rule of Three. But while this crusade — the temperance movement — has been going on for sixty years . . . the scholars have given it nothing but a sneer."

At the dinner following, Norton records that President Eliot answered the orator's aspersions upon scholars with much spirit.

In the same year Harvard saw another gathering at which exactly the spirit which Phillips had condemned was in evidence. The city of Cambridge celebrated its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Sanders Theatre was the scene of the formal exercises. Not a word of radicalism was uttered. Eyes were turned reverentially to the past. Congressman Chandler dismissed the serious currency problems before the country with the words, "We may well learn of our ancestors in monetary matters." President Eliot was introduced by Mayor Hall as "a young man who in 1868, as a member of the Common Council, might have risen to be alderman had he not been taken to be president." Eliot alone sounded a note of realism; though called to speak of the university city, he said, "Cambridge is a manufacturing town producing three aids to civilization — musical instruments, books, and soap." One reads the poems by Holmes and Everett, the oration by Higginson, without the least intimation that this city was just entering on a decade of strenuous political

36

life, facing problems of municipal development in water works, parks, new means of communication with Boston, lighting systems, and school building such as it had never dreamed of. In addition, Cambridge was to take a prominent part in that very crusade, the temperance movement, which Wendell Phillips had roundly scored its educated men for so long neglecting.

When, five years later, it came the turn of the college to celebrate its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, we find an entirely changed atmosphere in Sanders Theatre. In the

place of Mayor Hall sat William E. Russell, not yet ten years out of college, already winning the commendation of his townsmen for his readiness to practice in the Cambridge government some of those principles of municipal administration which were being studied in the college. In place of a congressman notorious for his reactionary attitude toward reform, appeared a President elected by the votes of Independents on a reform platform with the slogan, "Public Office is a Public Trust." In behalf of the alumni, James Russell Lowell greeted this leader of the party opposed to that under which he had held office as Minister to the Court of St. James's. Expressing the warmest appreciation of President Cleveland's courageous course in office, he closed with the words of Seneca's pilot: "O Neptune, you may save me if you will; you may sink me if you will; but whatever happens, I shall keep my rudder true."

This eulogy of the Democratic chief drew public attention to the independent course Lowell had pursued. Although he would, at this period of his career, have been the last to include himself among the militant reformers, his attitude is singularly expressive of Cambridge and of the times.

In the eighties many quoted the Biglow Papers on the stump but no longer thought of their author as a political reformer. Lowell's early appreciation of Lincoln, when the Emancipator was still the underdog in his controversy with Congress, was now recalled when the author of the Commemoration Ode appeared as the defender of Cleveland against the attacks of spoilsmen on one hand and Utopian civil service reformers on the other. John Boyle O'Reilly and Patrick A. Collins, who had condemned Lowell's Anglophile conduct as our minister at the

Court of St. James's, were now forced to applaud his speeches and verses in praise of their Democratic leader.

Lowell's discriminating support of the cause of reform represents the Victorian Liberal — not the modern partisan. His position was incomprehensible to the rank and file of voters. His fastidiousness produced an aloofness which made him unavailable for elective office, but his prestige in literary circles, especially in England, made his support of the Cleveland Democracy a matter of some moment.

The difference between the scene in Sanders Theatre in 1881 and that in 1886 roughly measures the progress of the reform movement in the state and city. In this time two exciting elections had occurred in which the champions of reform had had a chance to prove their mettle.

The congressional and state elections in the autumn of 1882 were full of interest for Cambridge. The redistricting of the state had put her in the same congressional district with Brookline, certain wards of Boston, Somerville, Watertown, Belmont, Waltham, Lexington, Burlington, and Woburn. Into the choice of a candidate to represent this normally Republican district there entered several national issues which roused the reform blood in Cambridge. Several Massachusetts representatives and both her senators had voted for the notorious Harbor and Rivers Bill and had finally passed that log-rolling, extravagant measure over President Arthur's veto. Furthermore the administration of the Boston Customs House and the Charlestown Navy Yard had, during the past year, been too closely

allied with the local Republican organizations to meet the approval of Civil Service reformers. To lull the rising storm of criticism over their Civil Service record, the Massachusetts Republicans at their Worcester Convention had introduced a Civil Service reform plank. Independents, therefore, demanded that any Republican candidate selected must accord with this platform in order to insure their allegiance. In defiance of this known sentiment in the district and of the reform plank in the state platform, the Republican machine proposed to nominate Bowman, a man whose association with the patronage of the Navy Yard and of the Customs House was notorious. Citizens of Ward One in caucus denounced the Republican policy of

38

political assessments on office holders, and the Chronicle published a list of Republicans who had declared they would bolt if Bowman were nominated. The reformers failed to prevent Bowman's nomination in convention; but when a resolution was offered approving the Civil Service plank in the Republican platform, Jabez Fox of Cambridge found an opportunity for a piece of sarcasm for which he became famous. It is so significant of the peculiar position of Independents within the party and of the behavior of the Old Guard Republicans at this time that it is worth quoting. Fox opposed the Civil Service reform motion and said,

"You will see that like a loyal Republican I have changed my views in accordance with action of this convention in selecting its candidate. Let us not follow the wicked Democrats in condemnation of those practices to which our candidate owes his political existence. I would have preferred a candidate who could have stood upon those resolutions, but the convention has decided otherwise. We cannot conceal the candidate's record. Everybody who does not know it now, will know before election day that our candidate believes that Patronage not Merit should be the test of appointments and rewards in office. It seems to me therefore the part of wisdom and prudence for us to stand by and defend his record. Let us say that he believes that the Navy Yard should be used to help elect Congressmen who control its patronage — so do we. Then if we fail let us fall with our faces turned toward the morning and the Navy Yard, and let us not pretend to advocate what Mr. Bowman called the cant about Civil Service Reform."

This amendment being lost, Fox moved and pressed to a vote a resolution declaring, "We invite all voters of the Fifth District to oppose at the polls any candidate whose record shows that he is not in favor of the reforms in the Civil Service demanded by the Republican Convention at Worcester." The motion was lost. Fox definitely left the party.

The Democrats held off from making any nomination until they could see what the Independents would do. When these determined to bolt, a fusion was readily effected and Leopold Morse was supported by both groups against Bowman. The election proved a great victory for the Independents. Not only did they elect Morse in the Fifth District but also, elsewhere,

39

Theodore Lyman, Henry B. Levering, and Patrick A. Collins were elected by the Democrats through the aid of Independent votes. Even Bishop's defeat by Butler was hailed as a triumph for the Independents in so far as it might serve to convince the Republican

machine that it was not safe to count on continued Republican victories unless candidates were selected who appealed to the Independent votes. It is remarkable that even in Cambridge where the fallacies of the Butler propaganda might be supposed to be exposed, the radical Democrats carried the city for Butler by some eight hundred votes. It is even more remarkable that after a year's trial in office, followed by a very-thorough campaign of education by so convincing a speaker as Robinson, the city again fell from grace and in 1883 in a much larger total vote again gave Butler a slight plurality.

In the memory of the Cambridge reformers of that day probably the most important developments of the campaigns of 1882 in point of the advancement of reform movements in general were the founding of the Massachusetts Reform Club and the stimulation of local Civil Service Reform Associations. Of these, that of the Fifth Congressional District was very active. It had been organized by the men who had been energetic in the campaign to defeat Bowman, as we have seen above. The officers of this association were: Henry Lee, president; Charles W. Eliot, Charles T. Russell, John C. Dodge among its vice-presidents; George G. Wright, treasurer; and George H. Ryther, secretary. On the executive committee the following Cambridge men appear: Jabez Fox, A. M. Howe, George V. Leverett, Frank A. Allen, H. N. Tilton, John Conlon, C. F. Wyman, George A. Sawyer.

The election of Butler as governor as well as the election of Leopold Morse to Congress indicated the strength and weakness of the reformers. As Independent Republicans they had neither the power of preventing the nomination of a dangerous candidate on the Democratic ticket nor had they enough influence within the councils of the Republican party to secure the choice of a strong candidate to oppose Butler. In the district contest they were able, however, to exercise a controlling influence because the Democrats, aware of the hopelessness of their position without aid from the Independents, were ready and willing

to nominate a candidate worthy of support by those dissatisfied with the Republican nominee.

During these next three years Cambridge was being stirred to its depths over the license question. Beginning in 1881 the citizens were given an opportunity to vote at the city election in December whether licenses to sell liquor should be granted in Cambridge. The story of that organization of the no-license party in Cambridge and its long and courageous fight to rid the city of the saloon has been told at length in Frank Foxcroft's "Ten No-License Years." For us it is of interest as a demonstration of the success attainable by the enthusiastic reformers of Cambridge engaged on a definite crusade. No-license triumphed in Cambridge because of three factors: (1) the ill-judged action of the liquor interests in injecting licensing into city politics through the Board of Aldermen; (2) the chance under the local option law to disassociate no-license in Cambridge from prohibition in general; (3) the loyal support rendered by good citizens, regardless of prohibition views, to uphold the officials charged with administering the law. None of these factors worked in favor of the reforms which had become part of either national party platform. The activity for the cause of temperance displayed by Father Scully could not be counted on in favor of civil service reform or sound money. In fact his activity in ill-advised championship of his parochial school against the public school had estranged him from most of the Cambridge

liberals. Among the men who led in the practical organization of voters for these local reforms few could claim more intimate or exact knowledge of the political weather than the present treasurer¹ of this Society.

The relation of these reform movements to local politics in Cambridge is peculiar on account of the operation of non-partisan organizations in selecting and presenting candidates for municipal offices and in the actual elections. This has been pointed out in an authoritative article in Municipal Affairs for March, 1900, by Mr. George G. Wright. It is on his authority that, without going into the intricacies of the local situation, I would summarize the situation thus: Given the population of Cambridge at that time, the chances for getting

¹ George G. Wright.

good candidates before the voters and securing a free discussion of the issues were better than could be found in most communities of this size. Furthermore this non-partisan system encouraged the organization and continued activity of associations of voters formed to promote specific reforms to a degree which is impossible where city politics is dominated by two major political parties acting as local branches of the state and national organizations.

It was under such circumstances, but not as a champion of any of the moral reform movements, that William E. Russell entered politics. The immediate occasion of his entry was a petty matter, but the manner of his action was so characteristic of the man that it is worth noting. A teacher in the public schools had secured the nomination for a place on the Common Council, which had supervision of the schools. Some men from Ward One, disapproving of this nomination under the circumstances, had William E. Russell's name printed on new ballots without consulting him and had already begun distributing them at the polls when Russell came to vote. Eye witnesses testify as to the genuineness of his surprise as well as to his immediate decision not only to accept the task but to put his shoulder to the wheel to secure its success. His action in upsetting the slate of the ward caucus brought upon his head the displeasure of some of the good citizens of Ward One, but he was elected by a narrow margin. He had already shown an interest in an important issue, the granting of locations in the streets to a rival street railway to compete with the Union Railway into Boston. The leader of this new railway enterprise, Charles Raymond, was one of those who had initiated the scheme for Russell's entry into city politics and continued to be his backer for years to come. This association with Raymond was the cause of the bitter hostility which the Cambridge Chronicle showed toward Russell as long as that paper remained in the hands of Lynn B. Porter (1886). The editor of the News, Dan Buckley, a free lance in politics, took up the cudgels warmly in favor of Raymond's railway scheme and Russell's political candidacy.

During the next two years William E. Russell, as champion of the good government faction, continued in city politics, mov-

ing up from the Council to the Board of Aldermen and standing for reelection with varying degrees of success at the polls. On one occasion the first count registered his defeat by a scant margin, but a recount gave him back his seat in the Board. His first years were marked by an aggressiveness and desire "to be in on everything" that was going on, which his enemies termed boyish bumptiousness but his friends called alertness and commendable activity. All the while his experience was enlarging through his political contacts as well as through his professional practice. On several occasions he took the stump in behalf of Democratic state tickets, beginning in 1880. Although listed as a member of the group which was to sit on the platform in Faneuil Hall at a Butler meeting in 1883, Russell was not present and it was generally reported that he, as well as his father, scratched Butler in that election.

By 1884 Russell was spoken of as a likely candidate for mayor. The then incumbent had enjoyed three years in the office, there was some opposition to his financial policy, there had been considerable friction between the mayor and the Board of Aldermen over police and fire department administration, the liquor question was at its height. Besides all this, the issues raised in the national election and the success of the Independent movement with its emphasis on Civil Service reform, all created a situation favorable to the candidacy of a young politician who had evidenced a quickness of grasp on municipal problems, and courage and resourcefulness in attempting their solution.

This was the great year for the independent voter. He had already demonstrated his power in Pennsylvania and in New York. Massachusetts had seen sporadic effects in congressional districts; now these were to be coordinated in a statewide movement in behalf of a national issue. Cambridge men played a very prominent part in this work.

Throughout the spring of 1884 the irritation of the machine politicians in both parties with the pernicious activity of the Liberals or Independents had been increasing; and as the party conventions in the several states to choose delegates to the national convention drew near, the question was furiously debated whether these "kickers" and bolters would be allowed

to attend the party caucuses and conventions without some assurance of their repentance and sincere desire to return to the fold and agree to abide by the decisions of the party as to candidates and platforms.

The Democratic State Convention resulted in a compromise, the delegation being divided between Butler and anti-Butler men; but the infusion of young blood into the party and their alliance with the Old Line Yankee Democrats to recover control of the party from the Butler faction, were already under way. The realization that a reformed Democracy could look with some confidence for support from the Independents greatly strengthened the hands and encouraged the hearts of the group to whom young Russell had already begun to attach himself. Two of his associates in city politics, John W. Coveney and John M. Wood, had gone from Cambridge to the Democratic Convention in Chicago.

The news of Blaine's nomination brought matters to a crisis among the Independents in Massachusetts. The machinery for starting the revolt was found in the Massachusetts Reform Club. June 7, the very day after Blaine's nomination, a meeting attended by forty members was held at the Parker House. Here they adopted resolutions condemning Blaine, and appointed a committee with full powers to take such steps as they deemed necessary to secure the cooperation of Independents elsewhere, and to call a convention for the purpose of uniting on the support of some other candidate "in full sympathy with the reform sentiment of the country." Active in these initial steps were the following Cambridge men: Jabez Fox, John C. Dodge, Richard H. Dana, J. B. Thayer, A. M. Howe, Charles W. Eliot, and T. W. Higginson.

The day after the Independents' declaration appeared, the Chronicle, under the caption "Good-bye Kickers," rejoices that "the Independents have shown their true colors; the G. O. P. is well rid of them." Soon afterwards it quotes with glee an editorial comment from a Chicago journal ridiculing the idea that the Blaine nomination had split the party, "The Republican party is about as much split as a man who has a wart removed."

By July 5 the Cambridge Independents held a meeting of

44

their own, opened by Mr. Howe, at which Colonel Higginson presided. This Temple Hall meeting was derisively reported in the Chronicle as "The Saints in Council." Meanwhile the meeting in Boston had occurred in the Meionaon to discuss what candidate should be supported in order to beat Blaine. Here appeared a difference between Colonel Higginson and President Eliot. The former unqualifiedly approved backing the Democratic nominee as much the surest way to defeat Blaine; while Eliot felt a disruption of the old parties desirable and the realignment in new camps, as in 1860, necessary to secure a proper testing of the issues at the polls.

In spite of the promise of enthusiastic support by the Independents, the chances of Cleveland's success in Massachusetts seemed very poor. The young college graduates therefore who espoused his cause in 1884 cannot be said to have flocked to an obviously winning cause. For the Democratic Convention at Worcester had been under the thumb of Butler's henchmen and the progressive element had been snowed under, securing scant representation on the delegation led to Chicago by that audacious charlatan. His utter failure to impress his vivid personality favorably on the Convention, or to effect an alliance with the Tammany leaders to defeat Cleveland, gave the younger members of the delegation a chance to break away from his domination. Of these younger men, John W. Coveney of East Cambridge and Sherman Hoar of Waltham were already in touch with the progressive group in Massachusetts with which the Russells were identified. The breakdown of the regular Democratic organization is therefore of much significance because of the bearing it had upon the immediate relations of the party with the Independents and for the opportunity it afforded a remarkable group of recent Harvard graduates to rise to leadership of the Democratic party. This group included Josiah Quincy, Jr., Nathan Matthews, Jr., Charles S. Hamlen, George Fred Williams, Sigourney Butler, Sherman Hoar, John F. Andrew, and William E. Russell. With them stood a group of very enterprising young politicians of Irish blood: Patrick A. Collins, the two Coveney's, J. J.

Corbett, the two Lomasneys, James Donovan, John E. Fitzgerald, John Boyle O'Reilly, Joseph O'Neil. The decision of these latter young men to sup-

45

port Cleveland and their readiness to cooperate with the Independents formed the real basis for the Cleveland Democracy in Massachusetts. Although not effective in this election, the intimate association of W. E. Russell, through his East Cambridge Democratic friends, with the Lomasneys and the leaders of Democratic politics in the West End of Boston came in later years to be a source of great strength to the progressive element in the Democratic party, and helped to defeat the machinations of Blaine, and later of Lodge, to seduce the Irish Catholic of Boston from his traditional adherence to the Democratic party. It was perhaps this alliance between Brattle Street and the Hendricks Club that prompted Joseph Walker's bitter jibe: "Russell was elected governor by Harvard College and the Boston slums."

In the course of the campaign which followed, some interesting work was done by Cambridge men. Archibald M. Howe and George G. Wright travelled several thousand miles through the Middle West, organizing Independent clubs and arranging speaking engagements for their most effective campaign orator, Carl Schurz. Others devoted their special abilities to attacking such particular abuses in the Republican record as especially appealed to them. Thus President Eliot spoke on the need of tariff reform and was led into a rather amusing exchange of views with Senator Hoar on the effect of the tariff on his friend Francis Iver's buggy manufacturing, especially his sales to Australia. Richard H. Dana continued his splendid work for Civil Service reform. Colonel Higginson spoke in five states on the general fallacy of the Republican claims to continuance in power on the strength of their war record. Norton was in close touch with such leaders as George William Curtis and Carl Schurz and Godkin and secured in the progressive press of the country helpful publicity for the Massachusetts effort. The Republicans began to take the matter seriously before the end of the summer and organized Blaine and Logan Clubs, but their membership lists contained the names of few men of light and leading.

The outcome of the election of 1884 brought to the reformers, especially in Massachusetts, an entirely new set of troubles. Developed in a school of opposition they found them-

46

selves now forced into a defensive position — to defend their President and his party in their attempts to administer the government in accordance with the reform principles on which they had been elected. Many of the reformers took a self-denying vow that they would not take part in the scramble for office. Others, however, like Barkis, were willing. Enough Mugwumps received office to offend the Old Line Democrats, who, after their years of opposition, felt that the spoils, even of a reform administration, are worth something and should go to the veterans before the recruits. So confirmed were the habits of opposition in some Independents that the change of administration made no difference. Their criticism was as sharp against the new President when he rewarded a deserving Democrat with a postmastership as it had been against Arthur. By 1888 Harper's Weekly could rejoice that

bolting had become quite as much the habit of Democrats as it had been among Republicans.

There was, however, a group of men, some Democrats and some Independents, who strove to build up a Democratic party in the state which could consistently support the President and carry out in state affairs some of the principles which had been made issues in the recent national elections. In December, 1887 these men, most of them members of one or more of the reform organizations already considered, formed the Young Men's Democratic Club of Massachusetts, and for the next ten or twelve years played an important part in state and national politics. Literary ability, evidenced by their campaign documents and speeches, was admitted, but success in political organization was not expected of the reformers. What Mr. George G. Wright had demonstrated could be done in municipal politics, these experimenters in politics led by Josiah Quincy, Jr. and Nathan Matthews, Jr., were accomplishing in the Commonwealth. This is not the place to go into the details of their remarkable organization, but it is proper to say here that much of their work would have gone for naught had they not found, born in Cambridge and trained by "Nurse Wright" in Cambridge politics, a man ideally fitted to be placed at the head of their column and in his own person and record present the policies of the new party.

It is not easy to assess the value of the services which William E. Russell rendered to the several causes dear to the hearts of the men we have considered as Cambridge reformers, for he had not been conspicuously identified with any of these movements. His record in the City Council and in the Board of Aldermen was marked by intelligent and active interest in the financial and administrative problems of the city government, but he championed few if any of the proposals which sprang from the group of moral and social reformers. When he became mayor, although he had regularly voted for license, Russell lived up to his promises in faithful enforcement of the no-license policy then adopted by the voters. He put into effect with decision the state law providing for selection and promotion of city employees by the merit system. He insisted upon a fiscal policy which brought the city from a position of financial confusion and weakness to one of order and strength. He upheld the cause of law and order during two severe strikes, at Squire's plant and on the street railway, in a fashion to win the approval of those who demand protection of property rights, yet without losing the support of the great mass of the working men. In judging Russell's work as mayor, the form of city government must be considered: during his four years' incumbency — indeed up to 1892 — the mayor lacked the single executive power necessary for efficient action; he could act only in conjunction with the Board of Aldermen or with the City Council; most of the departments had to be operated through some committee of one or the other of these elected bodies. In addition to his municipal duties Russell gave of his time and strength in aiding the progressive element in the Democratic party in the campaigns from 1882 to 1887, in which he was not himself a candidate for state office. As a campaigner he was progressively effective, and in his own conduct on the stump did much to raise the level of political discussion. President Eliot, speaking of his gallant fight in 1888 when, in a presidential year, Russell cut down the normal Republican plurality in the state, said: "His speeches were serious, earnest, grave, compact arguments without personal issues; under strong temptation there was a complete abstinence from that degradation of our political life." In 1896

Colonel Higginson wrote of Russell's campaign oratory: "Of all the speakers with whom I have ever occupied the platform, the one with whom I found it pleasantest to be associated was the late Governor William Eustis Russell of Massachusetts. Carrying his election three times in a state where his party was distinctly in a minority, he yet had, among all political speakers whom I have ever heard, the greatest simplicity and directness of statement, the most entire absence of trick, of claptrap, or of anything which would have lowered him. Striking directly at the main argument, always well fortified, making his points uniformly clear, dealing sparingly in joke or anecdote, yet never failing to hold his audience, he was very near the ideal of a political speaker; nor has the death of any man in public life appeared so peculiar and irremediable a loss."

In these campaigns Russell was devoting himself to expounding the platform and policies of his party. The issues were chiefly tariff, sound money, and civil service reform, on all of which, particularly the former, Russell was very effective. But after he assumed office as governor he dealt some of the most telling blows for the principles of sound public administration that are to be found in the speeches of any public man. In spite of the cries of partisan politics Russell was essentially right on the great questions of public administration as experts in that subject have come to believe. In this I would not claim that he was a pioneer, since he was following the same line of argument that Seth Low had followed in his reform administration in New York, but the principles on which Russell proceeded he had been developing for himself since his first term as mayor of Cambridge. The central points in his policy were executive responsibility in state administration, separation of executive and legislative functions, abolition of the Governor's Council, general legislation rather than special wherever possible, especially in the case of public service corporations where the pressure for special privileges from members of the legislature is most severe. He recommended legislation to control the lobby and abolition of railroad passes for legislators. He also urged home rule for cities and towns, except where concentration of population produces a community of needs which can better be satisfied by consolidated service as in the case

of the Metropolitan Park, Sewer, and Water Commissions. For one classed as a reformer, Russell's views on such questions as woman suffrage, prohibition, and the limitation of the sphere of state activity now seem very conservative. It has been urged that the liberal policies he advocated on labor legislation, sweatshop inspection, abolition of poll tax franchise, etc., were such as were required by the character of his constituency and were adopted by him as party politics. Concerning his position on prohibition the same charge is made, but here it is clear from his record as mayor as well as in the Board of Aldermen that Russell was consistently opposed to prohibition by constitutional amendment or by legislation. He had well-considered opinions as to the proper function of constitutional law, and he believed that it was a misuse of the latter to load upon it prohibitory legislation which was unenforceable. The local option law under which Cambridge had gone no-license, he proved, as mayor, could be enforced because the moral sense of the community was nearly unanimous against the presence of saloons in a residential district. The bitter

struggle between Governor Russell and the Republican politicians in control of the Council, over the removal of Police Commissioner Osborne, redounded on the whole to the credit of the governor, and served to give point to his contention that an undivided responsibility for executive officers of the state should be placed in the hands of the governor who was directly answerable to the voters at frequent elections and that the governor should have power of removal as well as appointment.

Several other policies which Russell championed conspicuously were decidedly party measures, yet his attitude lifted them above the plane of partisan politics and gave them the dignity of principles. Of these the one which invoked the severest condemnation not only of mere political opponents like Lodge, but also of some Independents, and old Abolitionists like the Hallowells, was the Southern Question. Russell spoke at the Atlanta Exposition, held to celebrate the rise of the new South, at about the same time that Grady came North to plead the right of the South to solve the negro suffrage question in her own way. Russell declared that there was a

50

new North as well as a new South; that the issues of the war were now forgotten and the two sections had no reason for mutual distrust; that politicians who tried to trade on the Bloody Shirt issue had been rejected by the voters. Cambridge reformers instantly divided on this issue. Many of the old Abolitionists, who had deserted the party of Lincoln when the Blaine campaign was on, now rushed to the defense of the Fifteenth Amendment and the memory of Charles Sumner. It was an acid test of liberalism.

On nothing, however, was Russell's sincerity challenged more frequently than on his attitude toward the Irish Catholic population from whom, even then, the bulk of the Democratic votes necessary for his election were supposed to come. How much of his immense popularity with this class of voters came from his own genial personality, how much from his inherited and consistent party regularity, and how much was a response to the principles of Jeffersonian Democracy which he held convincingly before the voters, it is hard to say. This much is certain: William E. Russell won the affection and the respect of a great mass of the labor votes, and held it through fifteen years of active political life in both city and state, in the face of the most trying and skillfully directed attacks by a party possessed of immense prestige and patronage. He was also accepted and supported with devotion by as discriminating, intelligent, and high-minded a group of men, many of whom had known him from infancy, as have ever been assembled in support of a political candidate. His great accomplishment marks also the great failure of most other men of his class as recorded in Massachusetts politics. He saw our duty to the alien population which then threatened and has now engulfed the native voters in our industrial centers; he succeeded in bringing that mass of voters into practical political adjustment with a group of intelligent and public-spirited leaders on a platform sane, progressive, and free from demagoguery. This required in him and requires in his successors much of the fearless crusader's zeal which Higginson showed, and expressed in these words: "... if it [the defense of a public question] brings us for a time into the minority, if it costs us old friendships, if it leads to unjust imputations that ignore the whole of our lives,

51

so much the better; for it gives us the discipline which manhood needs in a republican country to do its duty."

It requires, too, an intellectual honesty — a refusal to juggle and trade, as President Eliot said: "... Gentlemen, I am sure we may welcome this struggle. It is an intellectual combat. It is not a sentimental issue. It is a field for argument, and argument not only for material prosperity but for moral growth."

If Victorian Liberalism seemed to go down to defeat in the cataclysm of 1896 along with Cleveland Democracy and its young champion in Massachusetts, it left behind it two landmarks to show what could be done: it records the only case in American history of a President returning to the White House after an interval of four years in private life, and in Massachusetts the only case of a Democrat thrice elected governor. What Governor Russell said of Cleveland may well be applied to both men, "Every man today clothed with official responsibility, and striving honestly to meet it, is strengthened in his efforts by the courageous standard which you have dared to set."

This sounds the note of individualism and responsibility. It is Puritan and it is Victorian — it is old-fashioned but still strikes a responsive chord in the Cantabrigian mind.

52

RECOLLECTIONS OF SIXTY YEARS IN CAMBRIDGE

BY EPHRAIM EMERTON

Read June 4, 1927

I CAME to live in Cambridge as a freshman in the year 1867 and ever since then, with the exception of five years spent partly in Boston and partly in Europe, my home has been here. During those five years of absence I was in constant communication with Cambridge, so that it is no exaggeration to say that for sixty years this town has been the center of my activities and of my affections.

My earliest recollection of the place takes me back a year or two earlier, when, during a visit with relatives in Brookline, I was driven over here to see the "colleges." I use the plural advisedly, for at that time and for long afterward that was the common form used by dwellers beyond the city limits and indeed by many of our own people. Nor was this usage incorrect. The original "college" was a building, a boarding house for students. I recall distinctly the impression this first glimpse of Harvard made upon me. It was chiefly of trees, endless rows of stately elms, in the midst of which were a few scattered buildings mostly of red brick. The only buildings in the Yard were Harvard, Hollis, Stoughton, Holworthy, Appleton Chapel, Holden Chapel, University, Boylston, Grays, Wadsworth, and

the Dane Law School. It was a dreamland to my subfreshman mind, and nothing was farther from my dream than the idea that here was to be my lifelong home.

In 1867 the college was under the kindly guidance of the Rev. Thomas Hill, a learned mathematician with ideas of university reform which he was not the man to carry out. It was but two years after the awful strain of the Civil War. The country, drained of its resources, was just beginning to stretch itself in a mighty effort to recover what had been lost and go on to a new and unimagined development. The college was

jogging along in the traditional ruts, but the town was beginning to feel the impulse of the new time.

It is my impression that the old omnibus line to Boston had been discontinued not long before. Its place had been taken by a service of horse cars running from Bowdoin Square through Main Street to Harvard Square, little yellow boxes holding about thirty passengers. This service was afterward extended through Brattle Street to Mt. Auburn and through North Avenue to Arlington. The running-time — if one may use the word — between the Squares was nominally thirty minutes, but delays of various sorts were frequent. The tracks were provided with a rather low flange, over which the wheels were apt to slip in stormy times and carry the car out onto the very bumpy pavement. A part of the regular equipment was a four by four "joist" some three feet long, pointed at the ends and shod with iron. When the car ran off the track, the passengers would be turned out, the wedge thrust under one wheel, and all hands would take hold to help in coaxing it back again. In cold weather the floor of the car was covered with straw a foot deep, and no little dexterity was required to twist this around one's ankles with fairness to one's neighbor.

Fares were more or less proportioned to distance. At one time I remember the fare was three cents to the "Lower Port," six cents to Dana Street, and ten to Harvard Square and beyond. Of course we boys paid our six cents, jumped off at Dana Street, and walked to Harvard. This situation was reflected in the popular doggerel:

Punch! Punch! Punch with care!

Punch in the presence of the Passengaire!

A red trip slip for a three cent fare,

A white trip slip for a six cent fare,

A blue trip slip for a ten cent fare!

I am not quite sure about the colors, but recall perfectly the heated discussions over the rights of passengers, the needs of the company, and the integrity of the employees.

The half hour to Bowdoin Square was a distinctly social occasion. One met one's friends and enjoyed that leisurely gossip which seems to be crowded out in these more rapid days.

54

Conductors and drivers knew all the passengers and treated them with a parental consideration. A friend of mine said to a conductor, as a lady left the car on Brattle Street, "Do you know that lady's name?" "Well, no, I don't and I'd ought to, too. I've handled her for years."

The coming of the electric cars put an end to these jocund days. It was the occasion also for what was known as the "railroad war." The question was: should the new rails be laid in Brattle Street? The Brattle Streeters naturally wanted to keep the tracks not too far from their houses, but they feared the noise of the new and heavier cars. This was enough to excite the jealousy of the maritime wards, and a bitter conflict arose, only to be settled by dividing the issue and placing the new tracks partly on Mt. Auburn Street and partly on the newly made Huron Avenue.

The Cambridge of my college days was a typical New England village, of which Harvard Square was the business center. In the middle of the square stood a noble elm tree, casting its grateful shade over a town pump, a public hay scale, and a watering trough where the horse car horses were refreshed after each trip from Boston. Their stables were on Dunster Street. Around the square were the shops which supplied the modest needs of students and citizens. On the south side was the University Bookstore, a semi-official monopoly under the firm of Sever and Francis, later Sever's only. There too was John H. Hubbard's apothecary shop, still surviving as Billings & Stover's, and the confectionery and ice cream parlor of Miss M. R. Jones, affectionately known as "Mr." Jones, now superseded, after several transformations, by a branch of the Boston Huyler's. On the corner of Brighton, now Boylston Street, was Wyeth's grocery. On the west side, at the corner of Brattle Street, was Ramsay's pharmacy, immortalized by Mr. James Russell Lowell's reply, when he was offered a mission to Egypt, that he preferred Ramsay's corner to Ramses the Great. Next to that was Lyceum Hall, scene of all the mild festivities of the day. Farther on came the rival grocery of Wood & Hall, reincarnated as Merrill's, and still existing under that name in more remote quarters. At the point where College House turns at a slight angle was the jewelry and clock shop of Mr. Huntington,

55

skilled artisan, poet, mathematician, and philanthropist, by whose benefactions our city is profiting to this day. On Brattle Street was the considerable furniture shop of Whitney and Brackett, afterward Worcester Brothers, and the meat market of David Brewer, with that of his brother Thomas, over the way on Brattle Square facing the University Press.

These were all specialty shops. An apothecary was an apothecary. If he dispensed soda water, it was because carbonate of soda was a chemical product belonging naturally within his bailiwick. A grocer and a butcher belonged to different lines of trade. Department

stores in the modern sense were unheard of except as "general stores" in the strictly rural districts.

Some of my most vivid and most happy recollections gather about the river. The winding Charles, as our fellow-member Mr. Blackall has pointed out to us, has always determined the general plan of our city. The earliest houses of importance were placed with their beautiful gardens and ample lawns running down to the river's banks. "Its water rushing among the wooden piers" was not a river current but tidewater extending far above Cambridge. Its banks were muddy flats exposed to the sun at low tide, unsightly, and fragrant with many noisome odors. It was spanned by the series of wooden bridges only now in the process of replacement by more permanent structures. These bridges were set at acute angles to the course of the moving tides; the space between their piers was narrow and challenged the skill of the best steersmen to navigate them with safety. The college boathouses were at the foot of Plympton Street near the coal wharf of Richardson & Bacon, another of the monopolies which prospered under the wing of the college until the enterprise of Moses King and his successor, the Harvard Cooperative Society, put an end to them. Rowing at that time had its handicaps, but the happiest hours of my college life were passed on the river and in the profitable idleness that went with this noblest of sports. The racing boats were six-oared, without a coxswain, steered by the feet of the bow oar pressing against a movable yoke attached to the rudder by wires running the length of the boat. Captain of our class crew was a Cambridge boy, Nathaniel Goodwin Read, always known as "Goody," a lover of the sea, captain in the merchant

service at twenty-four. One member of our class crew was among the representatives of Harvard in the first race with Oxford in 1869.

The main outline of the streets of Cambridge was complete when I came to Cambridge. The only important addition has been Huron Avenue. North Avenue had been laid out not long before on a truly splendid scale. With its broad driveway, its unnecessarily wide sidewalks, its ample reserved space between the houses and the street, and its noble rows of trees, it represented the boundless anticipations of the post-war period. In its present degenerate condition it tells the pitiful story of our haphazard methods in dealing with the problem of housing our shifting and short-sighted population. Today no one who builds himself a home expects it to serve more than his own generation.

Craigie Street, connecting the old Watertown and Concord roads, had been built up not long before my time with typical specimens of the popular square-planned mansard-roofed single-family house, one of the ugliest and one of the most comfortable forms known to American domestic architecture. The high-studded and therefore well-lighted cellar with its efficient heating apparatus, at that time about as much of a novelty as electric lighting is today, gave to these houses a guarantee of healthful comfort that appealed strongly to the practical sense of our expanding people. If we remember that not one of the college dormitories of that time had central heating of any kind nor any plumbing worth mentioning and that two wells in the college yard supplied all the water used by students there, besides serving as possible cesspools for superfluous drainage, we can understand what these changes in housing conditions meant for the future of our city.

So much for the outward aspects of the Cambridge of the early seventies. Now a word as to the human side. It is worth while to remind ourselves of the well-worn story of the two venerable men meeting on the street and discussing the good old times, lamenting especially the disappearance of notable individual characters. "Now in our time," says one, "there used to be 'characters' like so-and-so and the rest of them. You don't see any characters in these standardized days."

57

"My dear sir," says the other, "does it never occur to you that we are the 'characters' now?" Distance certainly lends magnitude to the figures that were familiar to me in Cambridge streets, but I like to think that I was permitted to see face to face the men who have left their permanent mark upon our community and upon our country. The benignant presence of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, whose poetry, after the nightmare of "free verse," "naturalism," "realism," and all the other isms, is once more coming into its own with its appeal to the finer instincts and the more normal sense of beauty; Samuel Longfellow, shy and gentle interpreter in poetic form of the religious consciousness of his day; James Russell Lowell, spokesman of the highest ideals of public life; John Holmes, whose whole quality was revealed in his reply to the inquiry whether he was Mr. Holmes' brother: "No, Mr. Holmes is my brother"; John Fiske, revealer to thousands of plain people of some of the most significant currents of philosophic thought and the essential meanings of our early national history; William Dean Howells, foremost exponent of the new school of realistic romancers; Dr. Merrill Wyman, physician, friend, and counsellor to three generations of Cambridge families; and Dr. Henry P. Walcott, reaching out beyond the limits of the general practitioner to the larger function of guardian of the public health.

And then the professors: Andrew P. Peabody, conservative radical in theology, a preacher of such persuasive appeal to the best there was in young men that not even the six morning prayers and the two Sunday sermons could lessen his hold upon their abiding affection; Charles Eliot Norton, only just beginning to preach to unresponsive undergraduates his gospel of sweetness and light; Francis J. Child, tireless collector of the people's most intimate form of literary expression, and equally tireless teacher of the complex simplicities of a good English style; Nathaniel S. Shaler, Asa Gray, and Jeffries Wyman, advance heralds of the great reform in science associated with the name of Charles Darwin; Charles Carroll Everett, one of Mr. Eliot's earliest appointments, bringing into the newly reorganized Divinity School a profound philosophical principle embodied in his first important book, "The Science of Thought," and developed throughout the thirty fruitful years

58

of his academic life; Henry Warren Torrey, "gentleman and scholar," ardent upholder of the old and generous in his welcome of the new order.

One has only to pass in review these familiar figures of sixty years ago to realize that the Cambridge of that day was seething with a new spirit. Whether you call it the spirit of the modern world or the spirit of liberalism or of scientific inquiry or of a trained curiosity, it is the same spirit. And then, into the midst of this abounding but uncoordinated

energy, came the man who was destined to give it coherent form. It is rather the fashion to think of Mr. Eliot as the creator of something new. It is much nearer the truth to describe him as the clear-sighted organizer of forces ready to his hand. It was not an easy task. It meant years of opposition and misunderstanding, but fighting on his side were always these newly awakened and forward-looking activities. It was the combination of the intellectual energy of Cambridge with the practical common sense of Boston that carried the college and with it the town to the impressive developments of the last half century.

It is the task of this Society to keep before the minds of our citizens this noble tradition of a learned body living in the midst of a community which cherishes it as its chief asset and proudest possession. The interests of the university and the city are inseparably bound together, and it is only as each recognizes the sacredness of this tie that both can go on to new and ever-new achievement.

59

THE BATES-DANA HOUSE

BY MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI

Read October 25, 1927

In 1817 Jacob Hill Bates bought the land on the westerly corner of Brattle and Church Streets from John Palmer. He built the house facing east, on the opposite corner of Church Street, where he lived and died. The house on the west corner, which has just been pulled down that Church Street may be widened, he built for his daughter Mary, who was baptized in 1813 and who married Horatio Cook Meriam. She died at the age of twenty, leaving no child; so the house still belonged to Jacob Hill Bates at his death.

The house, which had a swell front on the lower story, was painted yellow. A piazza ran the length of the front, which faced Brattle Street. It stood back from the street with a sloping lawn, on which were elm trees and flower beds.

Probably¹ in the spring of 1832 Richard Henry Dana I, the poet, hired the house from Jacob Hill Bates. He and his family had been living for ten years in the house he hired from Dr. Thomas Foster, on the corner of Quincy and Harvard Streets, now occupied by Professor George Herbert Palmer.

*From this house on Brattle Street Richard Henry Dana, Jr., started for his famous voyage before the mast on August 18, 1834, a few days after his nineteenth birthday. Charles Francis Adams in his *Life of Dana* says that because of the extreme weakness of his eyes as a result of measles he was obliged to leave college and that he lived for a time "an aimless life in Cambridge, useless and dissatisfied." This may be literally so, but his sister told of the time when Professor Covering's lessons for her in this house were disturbed by the fun he and his brother were having in the basement below.*

I have not been able to find out who occupied the house after

¹ am indebted to Miss Elizabeth Ellery Dana for much of this information.— M. I. G.

the Dana family left; probably it was rented to several persons. Before the beginning of the Civil War it was the home of Dr. Francis Dana, son of Francis and Sophia (Willard) Dana, grandson of Chief Justice Dana, who was born December 2, 1806. He graduated from Harvard College in 1827 and from the Harvard Medical School in 1831. He married Isabella Hazen White on June 26, 1832, and died in this house on July 1, 1872. He is buried in the Dana tomb on Garden Street. There is a tablet to his memory on the east wall of Christ Church. Dr. Dana was for years Librarian of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston.

The family consisted of Dr. and Mrs. Dana, a son George Hazen, and a daughter Isabella. Both were born in Boston, George on December 2, 1837 and Isabella on February 9, 1847. At the beginning of the Civil War George Hazen Dana enlisted as Captain in the 32d Massachusetts Regiment. He was commissioned Major by brevet and Lieutenant-Colonel by brevet for gallant and meritorious services at the battle of Gettysburg and from the Rapidan to the James. Captain Dana was wounded in the arm at Gettysburg and brought to this house, where during the summer he lay in a hammock on the lawn, sheltered from the street. Many children used to come and peep in to see a real wounded officer.

The honors bestowed on Dana were well deserved. One instance out of many might be named as evidence of his merit. When Grant's campaign against Richmond opened, Lt.-Col. Dana was serving on the staff of Major-General N. J. T. Dana in the West, a position of comparative ease and safety; but preferring to share the hardships and dangers of his regiment in the Fifth Corps of the Army of the Potomac, he obtained from General Dana a leave of absence for the Richmond campaign, joined his regiment near Spottsylvania, and served in all the terrible battles and marches until the army sat down to the siege of Petersburg. Then, as the Richmond campaign seemed ended, he rejoined General Dana.

In 1865 Lieutenant-Colonel George Hazen Dana married, in Boston, Frances Matson Burke, daughter of Hon. Edmund Burke of Newport, New Hampshire. He lived in Wyoming at

one time, and was a merchant in Singapore. Later he lived in New Hampshire. He is buried in the Dana tomb.

After Dr. Dana's death in 1872, his widow and daughters removed to Boston and later to New Hampshire, and the house was rented to various tenants. Of late years Dr. M. H. Bailey had an office in the house, and it was afterwards occupied by a Law School Club, called Lincoln's Inn, which had a club table there.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF CHURCH LIFE

*A Brief History of the Prospect Congregational Church in Cambridge,
Massachusetts*

BY REV. WILLIAM M. MACNAIR

Read October 25, 1927

ABOUT one hundred years ago the Congregational churches in Massachusetts divided into two opposing bodies. One became known as Unitarian, while the other maintained the Trinitarian theory and was popularly known as Orthodox or Evangelical. In many instances the line of cleavage ran through individual congregations, and the result was that many a village and small town had two churches where only one was known before. This multiplication of churches has not always fallen out to the furtherance of the gospel, as everyone familiar with life in New England villages well knows.

THE BEGINNING OF THE PROSPECT CHURCH

The beginning of the Prospect Congregational Church in Cambridge was due to the theological conflict which raged in New England, but it was not the result of division or schism in any local church. It came about in this way. The Rev. Lyman Beecher came to Boston in the year 1826 to become the pastor of the Hanover Street Congregational Church. He speedily became the leader of the evangelical forces and his preaching attracted the attention of people near and far. Among his hearers was Dr. J. P. Chaplin, a well-known physician living in Cambridgeport, who was the son of the pastor of the church in Groton. Dr. Chaplin was evidently a man of action; for he not only travelled to Boston each week to sit under the preaching of Dr. Beecher but he persuaded a number of neighbors to accompany him. His efforts resulted in a wagon-load of people making the trip week by week, and then it came to pass that Dr. Beecher was invited to cross the Charles and deliver a

63

weekly lecture in Cambridgeport. This weekly lecture was given in the First Baptist Church, of which the Rev. Bela Edwards was pastor. During the early part of 1827 plans were discussed and developed by the little group of men of whom Dr. Chaplin was the leader, for the organization of a church and the erection of a house of worship. The first meeting for the discussion of this project was held on Wednesday evening, April 18, 1827, at the home of Dr. Chaplin, and the opinion was expressed that such a measure was expedient. It was voted that Messrs. William Fisk, F. Faulkner, and Dexter Fairbank be a committee to examine and provide a suitable place for the location of a meeting-house and to make other necessary arrangements. In the records of that day, we read also that it was

"VOTED, That Messrs. Richardson and Dudley take the plan of a house by examination or otherwise and to make a general estimate of the expense.

"VOTED, That Messrs. Chaplin, Fairbank, and F. Faulkner, Jr., be a Committee to draw up a subscription paper and solicit subscriptions."

The committees of that day evidently acted with speed and despatch; for twelve days later a plan was submitted and adopted, and as a result we find a church formally organized and the church-building dedicated on September 20, 1827, just five months after the first meeting of the little group. The building, or meeting-house as it was called in the early days, was located on Norfolk Street close to the corner of Austin Street, and the infant organization was given the cumbersome name of "The First Evangelical Congregational Church in Cambridgeport." In spite of its polysyllabic name the church still lives after a hundred years but rejoices in the simpler name of "The Prospect Congregational Church."

CAMBRIDGE ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

It is interesting to look back through the years of the century and get a glimpse of the little community then called Cambridge. The population numbered about five thousand souls, and the town of that day was divided into several distinct communities. Cambridgeport was a village by itself, separated

64

from East Cambridge by the Great Marsh and from Old Cambridge by extensive farm-lands. North Cambridge did not then exist. Three churches were already in existence in Cambridgeport when the new-comer was born, the First Baptist Church, the First Universalist, and the Second Congregational, the last named surviving today under the name of the Harvard Street Unitarian Church. Two schools served the children of the community, and in this part of Cambridge stood the Town House.

The church was not allowed to start without receiving evidence that its efforts were noticed by the neighbors; for when the members wended their way to engage in worship on Sunday mornings, they found that certain men of Nicodemus-like habits had been before them and had sprinkled the walks with a liberal covering of sulphur. This little attention did no harm to anyone, but it furnishes eloquent testimony to the interest felt in things theological a century ago. We get no clear idea of the early services, but presumably Dr. Beecher and others conducted them, for it was not until 1829 that a pastor was called. This first pastor was the Rev. David Perry, who served but a brief period of eighteen months and then gave up the struggle in 1831. Mr. Perry's pastorate was so brief and so remote from the present day that not much can be said about it. We may infer that the field was difficult, and there is mention made in the records of lack of adequate income, from which we may conclude that the church was not destined to move forward to prosperity on flowery beds of ease.

A NOTABLE LEADER

The church in 1831 made a most fortunate choice in calling to the pastorate the Rev. William Augustus Stearns, a young man just finishing his studies at Andover Theological Seminary. At first Mr. Stearns was reluctant to accept the call, many friends urging him not

to bury himself in that unpromising village between Boston and Cambridge; but finally he decided to throw in his lot with the struggling church, and his pastorate lasted for twenty-three years. This was the longest pastorate in the history of the church and it proved to be also the most constructive; for the membership increased from a handful to

65

more than four hundred, and twice it was found necessary to enlarge the meeting-house on Norfolk Street. Then in 1852 the present substantial and commodious church building was erected on Prospect Street, the very building in which services are now held. The vigorous life and growth of the church under Dr. Stearns is still further attested by the fact that three other churches came into existence not many years after his pastorate.

ITEMS FROM THE RECORDS

In the records of those early days we find many interesting items which enable us to see the church as a living body, dealing with human problems and with very human men and women. Here is a brief paragraph which suggests a background of moral danger and of human frailty and expresses a strong purpose to deal wisely with the problem:

"January 20, 1830. Resolved, That we as a church feel ourselves required by the spirit of the gospel to abstain entirely from the use of ardent spirits, except in the case of bodily hurt or sickness, and that such abstinence be with this church an invariable condition of admission."

In spite of the resolution we find cases of drunkenness dealt with by the Standing Committee, proving that the resolution was born out of concern for the welfare of the members. The church has been noted throughout its history for its activity in the work of temperance reform, and evidently it received a vigorous push in the direction of the battlefield of temperance from its early members.

Cases of discipline arose to trouble the peace of the church from time to time, and the records indicate that such cases were dealt with in a spirit of Christian patience and charity and not in one of censorious fault-finding. Thus when a woman loudly complained in the year 1832 that Mr. Fairbank, a prominent member, had cheated her son in a business transaction, the Standing Committee heard the complaint, investigated the facts, and the painstaking Clerk devoted ten and a half pages of the records to the evidence taken. The church voted unanimously that Mr. Fairbank was not guilty of fraud and deception in the transaction.

66

In 1834 a certain Mrs. Penniman made charges against her stepdaughter, who was a member of the church. The Committee heard the complaint and recorded its conclusion that the trouble in this family was due to the drinking habits of the husband and the scolding habits of the wife. The charges against the daughter were not sustained by the evidence. Lest it be thought that the church of that day always stood by its members whether they

were right or wrong, it may be said that other cases are on record where the offending member is found guilty and is censured or forbidden to attend the communion service for a specified time, or in some cases is excommunicated. In all the cases recorded, a Christian spirit and strong good sense are shown in dealing with troublesome questions or with refractory members.

Here is a case of church discipline of more than passing interest. It occurred at a later day than the pastorate of Dr. Stearns; but as it illustrates the spirit in which church discipline was conducted and established by Dr. Stearns, it may be considered here. A prominent member of the church was sentenced by the Federal Court to pay a fine of \$100,000 and to serve a long term in the prison at Greenfield. The case involved a nice question in ethics. It happened that one of three partners in a firm doing a large business in Boston had borrowed money from the United States sub-treasury. This money had been used for speculative purposes. The other partners were not aware of the source of the loan. In time, however, they learned about it and learned also that government officials were demanding the return of the money. But to return the money at short notice, would bankrupt the firm. The men did their utmost to raise a great sum by borrowing from their friends, and they expected that they would be allowed to re-borrow from the government. Instead of that, they were arrested and prosecuted for using government funds improperly. They were found guilty and sentenced as already indicated. One of the three, a member of the church, wrote from prison and begged the church not to think of him too harshly, as the wrongdoing was the act of one of the partners only and the other two were ignorant of the transaction.

The Standing Committee responded in a spirit of kindness,

67

and the members declared that they did not think of him harshly, but they thought that he should express penitence. The member replied that since the act was that of his partner, he was not morally guilty and if he was not morally guilty he could hardly be expected to express penitence for what he had not done. This sounds reasonable enough, but the Standing Committee sent him this reply: that while he was not responsible for the original wrongdoing, in due time he became aware of it and then in order to maintain his credit and standing and that of his firm he borrowed from friends in the church and the community, well knowing the risk he was taking, but concealing the nature of the risk from his friends. He had no right to borrow from friends when the only hope of repaying them was through further borrowing from the government, which he now knew was wrong, and thus by his action he had brought loss and suffering to many. He should therefore express sorrow and penitence for conduct which had brought unhappiness and loss to his friends. The members of the Committee hastened to say that they realized the nature of his temptation and they trembled to think what they themselves might have done under such pressure. The correspondence is creditable throughout and breathes a spirit of charity, of understanding, and of strong good sense.

THE CHURCH AND SLAVERY

We must now hark back to the pastorate of Dr. Stearns. The young pastor was a man of irenic spirit and did not favor the introduction of matters which would divide the little church. This policy did not satisfy all the members, as witness the following: On March 23, 1837, the use of the church is asked for by the Anti-Slavery Society. The request is signed by John Dallinger, Secretary, a member of the church. The Examining Committee of the church sends a reply to the effect that the members favor the right of a temperate, intelligent, and thorough discussion of every subject in its appropriate time and place, but slavery is a subject on which there exists a great and highly excited diversity of opinion, and the church, having been erected on principles and for purposes in which the whole church is agreed, is no place for controversy. Then,

68

too, the use of the church-building has not been granted hitherto for lectures and causes to which any considerable part of the church is opposed. So the Committee decides to avoid an innovation which would threaten the peace of the church. Other commodious places are open to those who would discuss the abolition of slavery; so the petitioners are requested to withdraw their application for the use of the meeting-house. The vote on this matter stood 19 to 3, with 5 not voting. This was presumably the vote of the male members of the church, for women were not allowed to vote in business meetings of the church until a much later period.

*That the subject of slavery was a very disturbing one is attested by various entries in the records. Thus at the annual business meeting of the church on January 9, 1839, resolutions concerning slavery were introduced by H. M. Chamberlain. After discussion, the resolutions were voted down by a vote of 18 to 9. The majority party then passed a resolution forbidding the introduction of such controversial matter into the meetings of the church. This vote was passed by 15 in the affirmative to 9 in the negative. Alas! the expectations were not realized, for we find that in October of the same year the resolution adopted in January was rescinded and it was then voted "That this church agrees to assume the responsibility of protecting such abolition notices as may be posted in the meeting-house." It was evidently not easy to find a *via media*, for in the records there is a letter from Deacon William Farwell in reply to a communication from the Standing Committee, citing him to appear to explain his non-attendance at worship and the communion service. Deacon Farwell stoutly defended himself on the ground that the church was in fellowship with those who held the doctrine of human slavery. Following the New Testament injunction to tell it unto the church, he had performed his Christian duty by expostulating with the church; and since the church was impenitent, he felt justified in cutting the church off from himself. That the subject remained one of sharp difference of opinion is shown by the fact that in the year 1842 a group of members withdrew from the church to form the Second Evangelical Congregational Church in Cambridgeport. Those who withdrew numbered nineteen, and among them we*

69

find John Dallinger, the youthful Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, and several others whose names have appeared in the records as abolitionists.

Meantime the church was evidently growing under the patient and prudent leadership of Dr. Stearns, and toward the end of the first twenty years the question of building a more commodious house of worship was raised. This was after the original meeting-house on Norfolk Street had been twice enlarged. Finally it was decided that the time was ripe for such a forward move, and land was purchased on Prospect Street. Permission was secured from the court to sell the old meeting-house and to invest the proceeds in the new building; and finally, in the year 1852, the edifice which is now in use was erected at a total cost of \$24,500. This sum paid for the land, the building, and the furnishings. We may note, in passing, the wide difference between the dollar in those days and the dollar that we are familiar with today. The present-day worshippers have just spent upwards of \$27,000 for the repair and renovation of the place of worship. This sum has paid for a new heating plant, a new floor, new pews, the painting of the interior, and the rebuilding of the organ. What it would cost to pay for land, building, and furnishings today would probably stagger the imagination of the fathers who obtained so much value for so modest an expenditure.

In the year 1854 the pastor, Dr. Stearns, was called to the Presidency of Amherst College and there he proved to be no less successful as an educator than he had been in Cambridge as a preacher and citizen. Not only that, but he was also successful in the training of his children. The mantle of his ability and Christian character has descended upon his grandchildren, among whom are numbered Mr. Alfred E. Stearns, Principal of Phillips Academy in Andover, Mr. Harold Stearns Davis, an officer of the Old South Church in Boston, Fannie Stearns Davis Gifford, well-known to readers of the Atlantic Monthly, and Professor William Stearns Davis of the University of Minnesota. Of such a man as Dr. Stearns it may truthfully be said that he being dead yet speaketh.

BRIEF PASTORATES

Following the long and notable pastorate of William Augustus Stearns, the church was served by several excellent men; but they did not remain long enough to make a lasting impression on the church or the community. Thus the Rev. E. W. Gilman was called from Lockport, New York, to assume the mantle laid down by the President of Amherst College. The mantle did not seem to fit the new leader, for we learn from the records that a council was called to decide whether the new pastor should go or stay. The council could find nothing in the life or record of Mr. Oilman to warrant his going; but evidently there was lack of harmony, for Mr. Oilman resigned his position in October, 1858, after serving only two years and three months. The correspondence between Mr. Oilman and the church is creditable to the spirit and character of the successor of Dr. Stearns, and we may conclude that it was an instance of a man finding it hard to follow the king. "What can the man do that cometh after the king?" asks Koheleth, and Mr. Gilman's answer to that situation was to resign. After that the church was without a minister for the space of three years, but an explanation of this long period is found in the fact that outstanding professors from Andover Seminary and other pulpit giants were heard with great satisfaction by the congregation, and so the task of finding a new leader was not hurried.

In 1861 the Rev. James O. Murray, a graduate of Brown University and of Andover Theological Seminary, was called to the vacant pulpit; his pastorate coincided with the Civil War period, lasting until 1865. Dr. Murray was a noted preacher, and after four years was called to the pulpit of the famous Brick Presbyterian Church in New York City. Somewhat later we find that he became a member of the faculty of Princeton University. Strange to say, there are no allusions to the Civil War in the records of the church. No account is given of how many young men enlisted in the army, nor is there any expression or echo of the sentiment of the community concerning the war and its objects. We wish that Deacon Farwell or John Dallinger might have been Clerk of the Church at that time to record the change of feeling toward this great subject.

71

Speaking of Deacon Farwell leads me to remark that according to an entry in the record, he removed from Cambridge, applied for reinstatement, which was granted, and then a letter of transfer to another church was granted him.

The next pastor after James O. Murray was the Rev. Kinsley Twining, who came to the church on September 12, 1867, and was dismissed in April, 1872. Mr. Twining was called from Cambridge to be the pastor of the Central Congregational Church in Providence. He was followed in the Cambridge parish by the Rev. William S. Karr, who came here from Keene, New Hampshire, in January, 1873, and remained here until November, 1875, when he resigned to become a member of the teaching staff of Hartford Theological Seminary. Eight months later he was succeeded here by the Rev. James S. Hoyt, and Dr. Hoyt deserves more than passing mention.

SUCCESS AND DIVISION, UNDER A VIGOROUS LEADER

The Rev. James S. Hoyt came to this church from Port Huron, Michigan, in September, 1876. His pastorate stands out as notable after the briefer periods which intervened between Dr. Stearns and himself. Under his leadership the chapel was built in which the Sunday School meets and wherein prayer-meetings and social gatherings are held. Under his leadership also the church received the largest additions to its membership; but then followed the most serious division which it ever experienced and the loss of a large number of members to the Shepard Church, as it was then called, under the pastorate of the Rev. Alexander McKenzie.

It was soon after the coming of Dr. Hoyt that an evangelistic campaign was conducted in Boston under the leadership of Moody and Sankey. This campaign resulted in the addition of many members to the churches of Boston and Cambridge. The church on Prospect Street received seventy-two members by letter and ninety-five members on confession of faith, a notable record. These additions indicate that Dr. Hoyt and the church were alive to opportunity, for no campaigns of any sort ever send such numbers of new members to a church unless there be life and cooperation expressed by that church. In 1877, one year after the coming of Dr. Hoyt, the church

72

celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its founding. The celebration was memorable. It consisted of a service held in the church on the morning of September 20 (a week day) at 11 o'clock, during which the pastor delivered an historical address, a dinner served in Union Hall at 2 o'clock, and a reception and social gathering in the evening. It is worthy of note in passing that the Committee of Arrangements of that day consisted of seventeen members, all men. Of course this committee called upon the ladies to decorate the church and to do many other things, but it was evidently a man's world fifty years ago in which it was not considered proper to appoint women to membership on important committees. In connection with that anniversary, Dr. Hoyt wrote and the church published a memorial volume bearing the title "Fifty Years of Church Life." In this volume we find a full account of the founding of the church, and a record of its history during the first fifty years. It also contains the names of all the members who united with the church during the period and also the names of all the children in the Sunday School. Among the latter are not a few who are prominent in the life of our city today. If I should read the list, there would be found several members of the Cambridge Historical Society who are present at this very meeting. The thanks of all students of local church history are due to the pastor of fifty years ago for his painstaking work. During the period under review the chapel was built, and this addition to the property has been of great value. It consists of a large room capable of seating two hundred people. It is high in the roof with plenty of air space overhead, and adjoining it are church parlors and a large room used by the Primary Department of the Sunday School.

A question of business management arose in connection with the building of the chapel, which produced an unfortunate division in the church. From the beginning the deacons had been entrusted with the title to the church property. The founders were evidently a bit afraid of the parish system, for the Massachusetts courts had held that in case of a division of opinion between church and parish, the property belonged to the parish. Under that decision many congregations had been deprived of a place of worship, and the founders of this

church therefore did not organize a parish. When the new church was built on Prospect Street, however, stock was sold and the subscribers became the owners of pews in the new meeting-house. These pew-owners had certain rights guaranteed them in their pew-deeds; and when the chapel was built, the pew-owners wanted more rights and they applied for incorporation as an Ecclesiastical Society and then they voted that the deacons be requested to transfer the title to the church property to this incorporated Society. This the deacons declined to do, and they resigned from office. The property was duly transferred, by vote of the church and of the newly-elected deacons, and then there followed the transfer of members to the Shepard Church. Nearly a hundred members in all thus removed their membership and their loyalty from the church on Prospect Street to the church on Mount Auburn Street. It is apparent that the change in business administration was carried by logic and by votes, but sentiment is a powerful element and the sentiment of many was offended and serious division was the result. Dr. Hoyt must have had much to do with the proposed change, for we find that an effort was made to force his resignation but without avail. About a year after the departure of so many valuable members we learn that he resigned and removed to Keokuk, Iowa, where he became the pastor of the Congregational

Church. This division in the church had one good effect, which has proved to be long-lasting: it served as a warning for the next fifty years, for nowhere can a church be found which has maintained greater harmony under different pastors and where greater consideration is shown to the minority when the members differ in judgment. The pastorate of Dr. Hoyt, then, is seen to have been a period of vigorous growth in membership, a time of building and of adding to the material equipment of the church, a time of very happy celebration and then of differing judgment and unhappy division.

AN OUTSTANDING CIVIC LEADER

After the departure of Dr. Hoyt the church set about the task of finding a new leader; and when that leader was found, he proved to be a most fortunate choice for both the church

75

and the community. The Rev. David Nelson Beach, the man invited to become pastor, left the church in Wakefield to carry on a very vigorous and valuable work in this city. It was in December, 1884, that Dr. Beach came to this city and here he remained, incessant in labors, until March, 1896. It is particularly because of his leadership against the saloon in Cambridge that Dr. Beach is remembered. He threw himself into this struggle with all the zeal and enthusiasm of a crusader. He was not alone in this contest, for there was a remarkable group of outstanding citizens in Cambridge at that time, such men as Robert O. Fuller, Frank Foxcroft, Professor Francis G. Peabody, Frank A. Allen, a former Mayor and a member of the Prospect Street Church, men like Mr. E. A. Whitman and Hollis R. Bailey, still living in our midst. Other pastors, too, of the calibre of Father Scully of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church and the Rev. Alexander McKenzie of the Shepard Memorial Church, were in the annual campaigns against the liquor traffic. And younger men just reaching the voting age, such as Mr. Theodore Raymond and Frederick W. Dallinger, now our Representative in Congress, worked valiantly. By common consent Dr. Beach was Generalissimo of the temperance forces and right valiantly did he lead to victory.

During the pastorate of Dr. Beach a memorial organ was presented to the church by Mrs. Julia N. Harding in memory of her husband, Mr. Charles L. Harding. The workmen who have just rebuilt it and equipped it with electric action, declare that the material of which this Hutching organ is built is without a flaw to this day, a tribute to a noted organ-builder of an earlier day. Another gift which expresses the spirit of affection is the Bullard memorial window in which Christ is portrayed blessing little children. This Tiffany window was presented to the church by friends of the Rev. Asa Bullard, widely known and greatly honored for his work in building up and extending the Sunday School work of the Congregational churches.

RECENT PASTORS

When, because of illness in his family, Dr. Beach left Cambridge in 1896 for the West, he became a pastor in Minneapolis and then in Denver, and finally rounded out his very active

career by serving as President of Bangor Theological Seminary for twenty years. He was succeeded here by the Rev. Reuben A. Beard, who came to the church in October, 1897. Dr. Beard had enjoyed a legal as well as a theological education, and during the time of his leadership the church felt the hand of a capable administrator. The weekly offerings came more and more to be the chief source of income for the church. Formerly pew-rents were relied upon, but pew-rents suggest a stable population and the family pew as an institution. Pledged weekly offerings are now very much the rule in the great majority of churches, and Dr. Beard utilized the new method effectively. The various women's societies were united in a comprehensive society known as the Woman's Guild with several important departments through which the women cooperate in the support of local charity and philanthropy and also in the national and world-wide missionary activity of the Congregational churches. Thirty years of successful activity have put the stamp of success upon this woman's organization. Dr. Beard's ability, however, attracted the attention of the denominational leaders and he was called to an administrative position in connection with the missionary work of the denomination. After a few years of this service he was called to the pastorate of the First Church in Fargo, North Dakota, which he has served for twenty years and where he is still to be found.

After the resignation of Dr. Beard the church called to occupy its vacant pulpit the Rev. Charles E. Beals, then preaching at Greenfield. Mr. Beals was pastor from 1903 until December 31, 1907. Warm-hearted and devoted, he was greatly loved and was widely-known because of his interest in modern movements which express what is known as the social gospel. He served as Scribe of the Boston Ministers Meeting and was also the Secretary of the Sagamore Conference, an annual gathering which brought together men interested in promoting harmony between Capital and Labor, and also in promoting international good-will and peace. As a result of such interest, affiliation, and training, Mr. Beals was sought after by the American Peace Society and served as Field-Secretary of that organization for a number of years. He is now the pastor of the South Main Street Congregational Church in Manchester, New Hampshire.

In October, 1908, the Rev. William M. MacNair was called from the church in Mansfield, Massachusetts to become the pastor of this church and it is his privilege to be the pastor at the time of this historic celebration.

PROGRESS AND CHANGES

The most important events and changes of the present pastorate have been the incorporation of the church, the building up of the Sunday School, the raising of an endowment fund, the quiet and successful raising of a Jubilee Fund for the repair and renovation of the church property, and the enlistment of a notably large group of men in a Bible Class known as the Prospect Class for Men.

The incorporation of the church and the transfer of the title deeds to all funds and property was effected without a ripple of dissent in 1918 in contrast with the stormy experiences which accompanied the transfer of church property in the days of Dr. Hoyt. The reason for the change was found in the fact that the pew-owners were a diminishing body. When the original pew-owners died, their heirs did not always remain in Cambridge, so that gradually it became a difficult matter to muster a quorum at business-meetings of the Society. Because of this practical difficulty, added to the fact that the source of church finances was found increasingly in pledged weekly offerings rather than in pew-rents, the members of the church became incorporated in 1918. From this time onward the church is legally designated "The Prospect Congregational Church in Cambridge." At the present time all funds are held by the Treasurer of the church, and all business is transacted at the annual meeting of the church corporation. The First Evangelical Congregational Society in Cambridgeport has become a thing of the past. In connection with the necessary legal steps which were taken in carrying out this important change, the services of Mr. Hollis R. Bailey should be mentioned. Mr. Bailey gave valuable counsel, effected the necessary transfer of property and funds, and then declined to make any charge for his legal services, making the remark, "A church is not a moneymaking institution and I am very glad to give

78

my services." The church feels under deep obligation to Mr. Bailey for his generous assistance.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

During the past twenty years the Sunday School has been one of the largest in Cambridge. It has a membership of approximately four hundred. It was the growth of the Sunday School even when the church was without a pastor in 1908 which had much to do with the willingness of the present pastor to accept the invitation extended to him. In the unselfish service given by able men who have served as superintendents of the School through the long years of the century, the church has been most fortunate. No men have given more faithful and devoted service than Mr. George H. Cutler and Mr. Frank D. Meade, who have been in charge during the past twenty years, the latter still serving. The devotion and faithfulness of the leaders have resulted in a generous response on the part of officers and teachers and are likewise evidenced by the surprisingly large number of boys and girls who attend year after year without missing a single Sunday.

THE ENDOWMENT FUND

Twenty years ago the church had no endowment. It had a charity fund of \$1,000 known as the Valentine Fund, and there was also a small fund of \$500, the income from which paid for insurance upon the organ. Many wealthy men had been connected with the church, but no bequests were made in the earlier days. It remained for a humble woman, supposedly poor, to begin the endowment fund. During the winter of 1908-09 Miss Mary Sprowle died without heirs and bequeathed to the church the sum of \$1,000. During the same winter there accrued to the church from the sale of Hope Church property, title to which had long been vested in this church, the sum of \$3,000. Then came a bequest from

the estate of Hon. Frank A. Allen, a former mayor of the city, of \$3,000, and this was followed by an equal amount from the estate of Mr. Frank C. Bill, for many years an active and honored member of the church. Deacon John L. Chapman gave \$1,000 in memory of his wife, the income to be used for the maintenance of a bed

78

in a missionary hospital in India. A special gift of \$1,000 was received from the Misses Douglass and \$900 was added to the funds by means of numerous small pledges taken in 1917 when the church celebrated its ninetieth anniversary. Deacon Russell L. Snow made the church a beneficiary in his will and the Endowment Fund was increased by about \$8,000 as a result. The latest addition to the fund comes from the estate of Mrs. Lavinia Tapley who passed away this very year. This bequest is for \$1,000. These bequests and gifts do not constitute a large total, but they are of great value and they help greatly to stabilize and strengthen the church during a time of changing conditions. It is hoped that others will feel moved to make the church a beneficiary when they write their wills, for by so doing they will help to perpetuate an institution which has proved its value in the work of building up life and character. Such an agency, needless to say, will always be a valuable factor in the life of a modern city.

THE JUBILEE FUND

Meantime the living members of the church have established an excellent record for generous giving. The pledged contributions of the members plus the income from the endowment funds have proved sufficient to meet the annual expenditures. The church has never had a debt and closes its books year after year without a deficit. It was pointed out seven years ago that the one hundredth anniversary was approaching and that a fund should be raised to pay for much needed repairs. The suggestion met with favor and a Jubilee Committee was appointed to find ways and means of raising the necessary funds. More than \$2,000 was raised at once and expended upon the chapel. Then year by year the Jubilee Fund grew, built up chiefly by the pledged gifts of the members of the church, supplemented by the use of dime-banks which were distributed through the Sunday School and also by an occasional church fair. The Prudential Committee at first suggested \$10,000 as the amount to be raised. This was speedily changed to \$15,000 and as the fund grew the Prudential Committee decided that at least \$25,000 would be needed. This amount has been raised, and then additional expenditure was authorized by vote of the

79

church, the additional amount to be borrowed from the church funds and the amount to be replaced within the next five years.

THE SUBSIDIARY ORGANIZATIONS OF THE CHURCH

A place should be found in any review of a church's history for mention of the subsidiary organizations. The Woman's Guild has been mentioned as organized by Dr. Beard, who was pastor thirty years ago. But the women were organized much earlier than that. One of the books preserved by the church bears on the title page this inscription:

LADIES SEWING CIRCLE,

PROSPECT STREET CHURCH, CAMBRIDGE,

ORGANIZED APRIL 2, 1866

On reversing the book we find at the other end of the volume another inscription, which reads as follows :

FEMALE AUXILIARY TRACT SOCIETY

OF THE FIRST CHURCH IN CAMBRIDGE

AND THE FIRST EVANGELICAL CHURCH IN CAMBRIDGEPORT

DECEMBER, 1828

This old record-book indicates that the Sewing Circle was the successor of the Female Tract Society or else that some individual officer kept the old record-book and thriftily used it for the later organization. At any rate it is apparent that from the beginning it has been customary to have subsidiary organizations in the church. The Sunday School also dates back to the very beginning of the church, even antedating the formal organization of the church in 1827. The Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, which originated in the Willis-ton Church in Portland, Maine, in the early eighties, has had a branch in this church since 1884. During the forty-three years which have elapsed since that year, the Society has maintained an uninterrupted existence. With an ever-changing membership it is always a young people's society and is always active in good works. The Prospect Club grew out of a knitting-club which during the war period did a prodigious amount of knitting for the soldiers. This club met with Mrs. MacNair, the wife of the pastor, and the members formed such warm personal

80

friendships as well as developed such activity in good works that they decided to continue their organization under the name of the Prospect Club. For ten years this group of women has proved itself to be a valuable factor in the life of the church. One other group must be mentioned, the Girl Scouts. In 1917 Mrs. Frank D. Meade began her work as Captain of

Golden Rod Troop No. 3 of Girl Scouts. Since that time the troop has grown to be one of good size, numbering about seventy-five members. They meet once a week in the chapel and enjoy two months' camp-experience every summer at Gloucester under the supervision of Mrs. Meade. In all Scout competitions this troop invariably gives a good account of itself, and the training thus received enables the girls to give a good account of themselves after they have moved on to more adult life.

This brief survey has served to bring before us the One Hundred Years of Church Life which has been enjoyed by one of the churches in Cambridge. One cannot study the records of a century without being moved to consider some of the problems which confront the churches in our modern and rapidly changing cities. The Roman Catholic Church settles its problem by counting all baptized persons as members as long as they live, unless they are excommunicated by the hierarchy, and it holds its members by means which are known to all. The National churches of Europe claim as members practically all persons who do not express a preference for some dissident church, while here in the United States church membership is wholly a voluntary matter and no individual is reckoned a church-member unless he chooses to be reckoned as such. More than that, many persons become enrolled as church-members in early life and then through change of residence or because of economic or social reasons, or change of religious views, they may abandon habits of worship and active affiliation with an organized church of any description. The presence of thousands of aliens in our American cities, the existence of a large element of lapsed church-members, and the rapid shifting of population from one geographical area to another, offer to the organized church a challenge, an opportunity, and a problem of the first magnitude. Some church leaders try to solve it in one way and

some in another, but the existence of this complex problem threatens the very life of the church if the right solution be not found. The opinion of the writer of this paper is that the solution is to be found in a correct conception of the function of the church and a steady adherence to a program which will always express that conception. The future of the Protestant churches will not be made secure by endeavoring to make the church a great catering establishment and inviting the multitude to come in and be fed. Christ indeed fed the multitude, but there is nowhere any suggestion that he intended to go into the restaurant business. Church suppers may have a place in the economy of the church but that place must be entirely subsidiary. Christ healed the sick and expressed his sympathy with human suffering, and I am sure that he wants his followers to be active in combating the ravages of disease; but the church will show its devotion to the ideals and purposes of its Master by aiding the hospitals rather than by turning every church building into a hospital or clinic. The work of the church must ever be to bring the souls of men into harmonious relation with God, and to do this the church must magnify its teaching function and spread far and wide a knowledge of spiritual truth. It must teach a true philosophy of life and it must use all the means in its power to inculcate virtue and to combat vice. The church, in other words, must make Religion its great issue. As an entertainment bureau it may have great competition and be excelled, in the opinion of many, by theatre-managers and others. But when the church seriously bends all its energies to developing a knowledge of the will of God and resolutely sets itself the task of standing for that will of God, then it

will be a great teaching force and it will inevitably be a great reform organization and it will never suffer from lack of employment.

As I have observed the decay and death of various local churches in New England cities, I have become aware that the decay and dissolution are usually due to the loss of vision and purpose or to an erroneous conception of what the church is for. A splendid old Congregational Church, once filled with the families of prosperous merchants and manufacturers, found itself abandoned by most of its constituency, the native New

82

England element. Canadians came in, but the members of the church simply closed their ranks and did not reach out for new worshippers. That church is not yet closed but it has been dead for many a year; and only the financial gifts of members of the denomination at large keep it tottering toward its grave. On the other hand, another church found itself deserted by those who once attended its services, but new neighbors hailing from Newfoundland moved into the vicinage. The newcomers were welcomed and that church is a strong self-supporting church in the Methodist communion to this day. The Protestant church of any denomination which aims to be a class church and tries to maintain itself as a church of native-born Americans amid rapidly changing conditions in our modern cities, is facing an ominous future. But the church which faces these very real conditions with a spirit akin to that of New Testament times, will find itself able to repeat experiences of New Testament days and will live on doing an increasingly valuable work. For to the church is committed a message and a mission, not to any little fraction of humanity however pleasing and agreeable that fractional part of humanity may be, but to all the races of mankind. And these numerous races are at our very doors. The downtown church feels the pressure of the changing population first, but every branch of the church is destined to feel it sooner or later. In these closing words I am giving you my most serious thought in regard to this matter and beg to report that the Prospect Congregational Church in Cambridge has found itself able to complete the first century of its existence because as a church it takes a broad view of the function and mission of the church. It houses a larger body of worshipping people today than it did twenty-five years ago, and it crosses the threshold of the second century of its labors with faith and confidence.

83

EARLY CAMBRIDGE NEWSPAPERS

BY GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

Read January 24, 1928

IN the fall of 1839 two school boys, Peter L. Cox, aged fifteen years, and his brother Henry S., aged twelve years, conceived the idea of publishing a weekly paper for

Cambridge. These boys belonged to a family of printers. An older brother published a paper in Virginia, and Peter became a well-known printer; of the younger no record appears.

Their first paper was called Brother Johnathan's Youngest on account of its small size, of which only nine or ten numbers were published, the name having been suggested by the title of a paper called Brother Johnathan printed in New York on extra large-sized pages. This was followed by the Myrtle, a weekly paper with a five and a half by nine inch page; terms, four cents per month, single copies one cent. The change appears to have taken place February 28, 1840, being numbered Vol. 1, No. 20. The paper contained a variety of foreign and domestic news, list of marriages and deaths, and three local advertisements. It was discontinued March 6, 1840, No. 21, Vol. 1. It was succeeded by the Magnolia, October 22, 1840, published by the same parties, Peter L. and Henry S. Cox; terms, four cents per month, six copies twenty cents. August 26, 1841 (Vol. 1, No. 13) appears the following statement: "The Magnolia is intended for a family paper in which Temperance will hold a prominent position and it is the intention of the publishers to make it worthy of an extensive patronage."

The paper was enlarged January 1, 1841, and again June 3, 1841, the terms being now one dollar per annum in advance. The brothers continued the paper until July 2, 1842, in its latter days being called The Cambridge Magnolia. With this number the paper was discontinued for lack of patronage, the advocacy of temperance preventing its receiving the support of many and the friends of temperance giving little support.

84

This was followed by the Penny Post. The paper bears no name as editor or publisher but was probably issued by Peter and Henry S. Cox. There is only one copy of the Penny Post in the Cambridge Public Library and one in the Harvard College Library, both of the same date. This number appears to be the only one published and no other copy appears in any collection known to me. It contained a number of news items and about a page of advertisements, few of them from Cambridge. It was probably the end of Cox brothers' connection with Cambridge papers.

The Cambridge Palladium next appears, July 28, 1842, published weekly by Leonard Cox, Jr. and Company, terms, \$1.50 a year, single copies three cents. The file in the Cambridge Public Library has only one copy, dated July 28, 1842; that in the Harvard Library, apparently a complete file, begins January 7, 1843.

When revived it had a fair amount of advertising and a large part of its space was filled with discussion of the merits and failings of the fire department. The paper continued until September 30, 1843.

The Cambridge Herald appears January 8, 1848, continuing until March 9, 1848, published weekly by Jacob N. Bang at \$1.00 per year, single copies two cents.

The Cambridge Owl, April 13, 1848 — The Owl, July 13, 1848 to October 12, 1848 — the Plain Dealer and Spirit of the Times, October 26, 1848, Charlestown and Cambridge, were published weekly, single copies one cent, by Jacob N. Bang, a Boston printer located on Cornhill and living on Winsor Street, corner of Market, Cambridge. The reason for this change of name, four names in nine months, does not appear, as the papers are of the same

character. This change of name appears to have been common to all these early papers, those of the Cox brothers as well as those of Bangs.

The Plain Dealer probably had a short existence as only one copy appears in such files as I have seen.

None of these papers could be called newspapers and apparently they must have had a small circulation. In 1846 the Cambridge Chronicle appeared, being the first really local newspaper in Cambridge, the first being dated May 7, 1846 (the

same week in which the first city government was inaugurated). It was published weekly, terms \$2.00 per annum. The first editor was Andrew Reid, whose career was of short duration.

Mr. Reid was succeeded by John Ford, whose name appears February 7, 1847 and continues until 1858. Mr. Ford was in reality the man who laid the foundation of the Chronicle.

Among those who followed Mr. Ford were George Fisher, Linn Boyd Porter, F. Stanhope Hill, and F. H. Buffam. Mr. Fisher enjoys the distinction of being, so far as my memory goes, the only Cambridge editor who has been publicly horsewhipped for his editorial utterance.

In December, 1891, Messrs. Seagrave and Bean purchased the paper and have continued to publish it to the present time.

In 1852 appeared the News Boy, published every fortnight by J. J. Lowell, A. A. Hayes, Jr., F. and P. W. Norris, proprietors. None of these names are in the Cambridge Directory and it appears like the venture of some boys.

The next adventure was the Wide Awake, published every two weeks, February 12, 1865, by Thomas Davis, otherwise known as "Propeller" Davis, a resident of North Cambridge, doing business as a printer- in Boston. As I recall, he was a somewhat erratic seeker after notoriety. It probably had a short life as the library contains only one copy.

The Moon, a paper for boys and girls, was published by Josiah S. Gushing and Edward F. Dunham, May 1871. It contained short stories and a fair amount of advertising. Only two copies are in the files of the Harvard Library, probably all that were issued.

In 1866 appears the Cambridge Press, published by James Cox. Hamlin R. Harding, former mayor, and Patrick H. Raymond, chief engineer of the fire department, served as assistant editors with Mr. Cox. Warren T. Billings, a Boston reporter by occupation, succeeded Mr. Cox in 1898 and the paper came to an end in 1905, with Alice Spencer Geddes and Arthur Lloyd as editors.

In 1878 (March 7) D. Gilbert Dexter started the Cambridge Tribune, published weekly, terms \$2.00 per annum, the first number having the following introduction:

"In addressing the public for the first time through the

86

Tribune we do not desire to come with any flourish of trumpets but in that modest way and manner which shall lead all who may see this initial number to be assured that we mean what we say. We do not intend to make promises which shall never be fulfilled but only those which will be more than fully realized in the work to come. We are aware it is not an easy task to establish on a firm foundation a new enterprise of this kind. Having looked the matter square in the face we feel safe in saying that success is assured us from the outset provided we give the public a good and reliable paper. This we promise faithfully and fully to do. We believe there is room in our goodly city for another journal and acting upon this belief we fling our banner to the breeze.

"Here we hope to give the best in literature and mother departments which go to make up a first class journal. In speaking thus some may say we do not intend to have anything but literature. Not so; we propose to have the best local paper which time and money can produce. While we shall not neglect ' the locals' in the least, we still propose beyond that to make the Tribune of so high a standard in literature and other departments that it will find a ready and hearty welcome everywhere, especially in all our New England homes. It is our intent to make it the New England paper in a strict sense of that term. Our motto is independence without fear of any sort or party; charity towards all. Standing on such a platform, is it too much for us to ask the aid and influence of every true man and woman?"

The Tribune began publication in Brattle Square and has always been an Old Cambridge paper. The paper began its publication just after the people had become aroused by the disclosures of wastefulness and dishonesty at City Hall. The water registrar had been found to be a defaulter, the city messenger had approved bills for stationery in large amounts which were in fact for cigars, and there was general looseness in the transactions at City Hall. The valuation was decreasing, the rate of taxation was increasing (\$5.50 per \$1,000 in four years), population decreasing. The Tribune commenced its career by publishing a stenographic report of the meeting of the Board of Aldermen each week. After a few months this was

87

abandoned, whether from lack of interest or expense I never knew. The Tribune has always been well conducted, being especially neat in its typographical appearance, and its columns were always free from language calculated to cause offense. Among its contributors in the past years have been the poets Longfellow, Lowell and Holmes, T. W. Higginson, William Winter, Rev. Dr. A. P. Peabody, Alexander McKenzie and Edward Abbott, Bishop Lawrence, Professors Norton, James, and Hart.

Mr. Dexter was followed as editor by William B. Howland, F. Stanhope Hill, Henry H. Harrison, Edward F. Gamwell, and J. Lee Robinson.

In 1879 appeared the Cambridge News and Real Estate Advertiser which continued its existence until the death of its founder, Daniel A. Buckley, in 1901. The paper was a free lance, being essentially the personal organ of its owner. It probably was practically supported by him and its circulation among regular subscribers was limited. Its issue did not exceed six hundred copies weekly as three newspaper directories agree on about that circulation. Mr. Buckley's direct and incisive ways of stating facts caused his editorials to be read and repeated by more people than the editorials of papers with a larger circulation.

A weekly paper began its publication in August 1885 or 1886. The editor was John S. Browning, an advertising agent for the Boston Globe and other papers, and the paper carried at the head of the editorial column the following statement: "a local newspaper politically independent, the official advertising medium of the city, devoted especially to governmental affairs."

In 1888 the Cambridge Daily began its publication, which continued a little more than a year, the longest period any daily had been able to exist at that time. The editor and manager was Warren F. Spaulding, who made the paper interesting and its appearance attractive.

The next paper to greet the public of Cambridge was the Cambridge Times, published in East Cambridge by James Livingston. It was issued weekly, price two cents, and its field was practically East Cambridge, although general news of the city was not neglected. Mr. Livingston was followed in

88

1907 by George R. Brine, who had in earlier years served as a member of both branches of the City Council. In 1901, to meet what some citizens thought was a need of our city and to uphold the interests of the Democratic Party locally, appeared the Cambridge Democrat. Grenville S. MacFarland, a recent graduate from Harvard College, was its editor and he kept the paper going until December 19, 1903.

The paper was published weekly, price two cents, and its editor wielded a vigorous pen in behalf of the virtues of his party. A division among its supporters finally caused its death from lack of support.

Following the Democrat appeared the Cambridge Sentinel, October 31, 1903, a weekly Democratic paper, subscription \$1.00 a year, edited by William E. Nickerson. Mr. Nickerson was followed by Henry J. Mahoney and Daniel J. Toomey as editors about 1907. Upon Mr. Toomey's election as clerk of committees, Mr. Mahoney became the sole editor.

The same year appeared the Union Advocate on August 20, 1903, T. A. P. Boardley and C. H. Evans editors, a local paper published weekly in the interests of unionism.

In 1905 the Cambridge Mirror began its publication, with William H. Lee editor. This weekly journal was "published in the interest of Afro-American people and of our advertisers."

In 1906 the Advocate, another paper in the interest of our colored fellow-citizens, appeared, according to the newspaper directory. It appears to have been published by the

Advocate Publishing Company, William Grandison, as printer-manager, with John W. Springer as editor. The paper later passed into the hands of the Commercial Pioneer Association and in 1910 it became the property of J. Thomas Harrison, a printer. Mr. Harrison continued the paper until 1922, when it suspended publication.

In 1907 the Cambridge Free Press, a weekly paper, began publication. Little can be learned about it, as the paper bears no name as editor. It does not appear to have been published much over a year.

In 1911 the Cambridge Recorder, a Democratic paper, appeared under the editorship of Edward J. Sennott and John J. Scott. Mr. Scott was followed by James H. Murphy.

89

The same year the Cambridge Evening News began its career under the guidance of George H. Pratt, apparently for about a year.

In 1912 the Cambridge Standard under the management of Charles Wayland Towne, former publisher of a local paper in Newburyport, began its efforts "to help to make Cambridge conscious of its possibilities, constructive in its planning, cleaner in its politics." This was the most determined attempt to establish a daily paper in Cambridge which has been made so far. It was published about six years and owes its long career to Theodore H. Raymond, whose ambition it was to build a paper in Cambridge with a standing and influence like the Springfield Republican.

The Gridiron in 1915, an independent sensational political paper, published weekly, subscription \$1.00 per year, had a short career of about a year under the editorship of Harold D. Carew and was followed in 1917 by Public Opinion, of the same character and subscription price, with the same editor and having an equally short life.

In 1920 the Cambridge Sun, a semi-weekly, entered the field under the editorship of Ralph R. Stratton. Its publication lasted apparently a little over a year.

In 1920 the Cambridge Home News, another semi-weekly, began its existence, with John J. Wallace as editor. For a short period it was issued daily and finally ended after a period of about six months.

The last paper to appeal for the support of the public was the Cambridge News, which began its publication March, 1922. This was a weekly publication devoted to "the betterment of the civic, mercantile and industrial conditions in Cambridge." Its editor, J. Frederick Flemming, was a reporter by occupation. It was really an advertising sheet, containing little news, and had only about six weeks' existence.

90

REMINISCENCES OF FOLLEN STREET

BY MARIA BOWEN, with the help of neighbors and friends

Read June 15, 1928

THERE are many famous streets in Cambridge, two in chief. Our noble North Avenue, renamed Massachusetts, has still its great width, which used to serve for a race track, and also for the droves of cattle and sheep that came over the Brighton bridge and went up to the railroad. The name is changed, in order to connect it with the former Main Street, proceeding into Boston; the sidewalks have been widened enough for a regiment; and the spacious yards and fine houses have been crowded out of existence by buildings set close together and by low-browed shops. Here and there, especially in its upper course, a picturesque and simple house is left, and a few fine old elms, that must have seen the redcoats hurrying back from Concord. One of the deltas that mark Cambridge everywhere, left by the intersection of old roads, is here. When Cambridge had only six thousand inhabitants, people had to take a lantern to go home by, in the evenings; there were no sidewalks to speak of, and going up North Avenue was like walking in the bed of a brook.

Brattle Street has not at all "fallen from its high estate," saved by the public-spirited devotion of a good citizen, Mr. Joseph Warner, who gave up his vacation one summer to guard against the encroachments of those who would have taken private land to straighten the highway and so destroy "the streamlike windings of that glorious street," Wordsworth's line being as appropriate here as to Oxford and "the High." Church, or Tory Row, as Brattle Street was called, still keeps its great estates in good condition, as it goes on its leisurely way toward Sweet Auburn, now Mount Auburn.

A causeway led across the marshes to the Port, passing several ropewalks. It was reached from Brighton Street, renamed Boylston Street, to avoid connection with cattle.

91

Brighton Street passed Winthrop Square, the first centre of Cambridge. Mr. John Holmes is the authority for the following story. (He was devotedly attached to Cambridge and acquainted with all her traditions.) In colonial times, near the village of Old Cambridge, and on the road to the river, there was a small grassy square, flanked by trees and surrounded by substantial houses, some of them three stories in height, with dignified porches. In one of these lived Dr. Kneeland. When the Revolution broke out, the undisciplined levies, who joined the militia, did much damage, ruining the velvet sward of the large Common or bowling green, breaking up the pews of Christ Church for firewood, and making bullets out of the leaden coats-of-arms let into the low tombs in the graveyard. Dr. Kneeland's Tory opinions were so well known that he boarded up his lower windows for fear the mob might break them, and his children were taught to be very polite to the soldiers. Little Mary Kneeland grew up to marry Dr. Levi Hedge. She was very bright and witty, a little bit of a woman. She told Mr. Holmes that, as a child, she had acquired a great reverence for the soldiers, a forced respect; so that when the troops left Cambridge, and the sentry boxes remained empty, she used to drop a curtsey as she passed each. What a pretty picture the little figure must have made with mobcap over her curls and apron over her frock, as she dropped her frightened curtsey before the empty sentry boxes on her way to school!

Mr. Holmes went to school in a house on the corner of Winthrop Square. Next to it, or opposite, was the Manning house, where Jacob Manning had his little shop. The upper

part of the windows turned back, and was fastened up. The shoemaker sat inside, with his red cap on. Braided ears of corn hung from the beams over his head. The husk was stripped back from the ear, and the different parts of it were braided together to hang it up by, while the ear hung down to dry. Mr. Holmes told this in an evening call on friends. When his host alluded to Royal Morse as omnibus driver Mr. Holmes said: "I rise with local pride to correct you. Cyrus Morse was the driver." Mrs. Morse remembered that General Putnam and other officers were "very jolly," and that it was the fashion then to have pockets very high on the coats, so that

they had a joke that a fellow had to sit on the fence to get his hands into his pockets.

Harvard Square was known as "the village" in the forties. College House, and Lyceum Hall with its steps, the University Bookstore, the Post Office, and a few unpretentious shops surrounded the space where the hay scales were placed. The great branching elm lent such dignity to the scene that Mr. Howells said no square in Italy, with all its fountains and sculptured buildings, was more beautiful. The college still had its green setting, and its elms had not been attacked by insects.

The King's Highway ran from Charlestown, up Kirkland Street (later called Professors' Row), across the unenclosed Common, through Mason Street, and up Brattle Street, to Watertown. It ran straight through two little deltas, beyond the large football delta, and it was often extremely muddy. Cambridge was always, in early times, either muddy or dusty. Mr. Lowell said, in his poem on Indian summer, that he loved even the dust of his native place; but probably he was not so fond of the mud. Two of the Howe children, who lived on Kirkland Street, were often sent to their grandmother's house (No. 2 Garden Street) and they loved to go, though they named the muddy path the Slough of Despond, as they had recently read "Pilgrim's Progress." One day they were given a little delicacy of some kind to carry to their grandmother. They sat down on the edge of the sidewalk to discuss some deep question before venturing into the Slough and they placed the basket at their feet and forgot all about it. It tipped over, and the delicacy fell down into the catch-basin!

The Concord Turnpike crossed the Common to North Avenue. It now crosses Garden Street, making an X, so that it is difficult to tell which street is which.

The street from Arsenal Square east was known as Water-house Lane or Court until Waterhouse Street was named. Colonel Jeduthan Wellington of Belmont, and other malcontents, caused much litigation when the Common was enclosed, as they had been accustomed to drive across it, and did not wish to go around the longer way.

Garden Street goes up between the Botanic Gardens and the Observatory grounds, and on into what were once open fields

and pastures. It was marked by the two large Parsons and Dixwell estates, on the left, and, below them, by a cluster of small houses, and one, older and larger, with a pretty garden, where Mrs. Clarence lived. When this last was built, wolves were said to have been on Observatory Hill. There was a very large elm outside the iron gates of the Observatory, and another at Judge Phillips' gate, round the corner of Linnaean Street. A double house stood on the right of Garden Street, and a wide way led down back of it. This was where a respectable colored colony lived, named Lewis. Their forbears were "squatters" here before the Revolution. At the end of this driveway was a one-story cabin, vine-covered, and inhabited by a little Indian woman, Mrs. Sampson, very meek and quiet, well-known in the neighborhood. Towards the point of intersection of the two streets stood a black shingled little house with an outside staircase, in a plot full of dockweed. On the corner of Concord Avenue stood the omnibus stable, afterwards moved and made into four houses. On the corner of Chauncy Street was a small pond, where frogs were first heard in the spring. There were several brooks in Cambridge. One came from a spring under Buckingham Street hill, passed under Craigie Street, where it had a railing, and emerged in the Worcester's garden on Brattle Street, where it formed a pond much used by skaters in the winter. A smaller pond was in the hollow on Jarvis Field until filled for the Harvard ball-field.

Waterhouse Street long retained its wide and very pretty grassy sidewalk, with a little pathway through the middle. The Hodges house was on the corner, with a grass border in front, rising to a mound where stood two beautiful trees. The seller begged, with tears in his eyes, that the trees might be spared, at least for his lifetime, but it was in vain. His large garden ran down nearly to a point, and held rose bushes, vegetables, and a greenhouse, where were the only black Hamburg grapes, besides Judge Parker's and Mr. Batchelder's, known in Cambridge, and given only to sick people. At the very end and point of this garden stood an old house, said to have been the place where Washington dined when he first arrived at the army. It had its own little garden yard, and stood with its gable to the street. It was long kept as a dining place, famous

for its good food. The elm under which Whitefield preached was nearly opposite, in front of the house of S. Lothrop Thorn-dike. This house is now owned by the Browne and Nichols School.

Follen Street is not like the great highways already described; it is only a small side street, and began its life in a still smaller way as a lane. The large house on the corner of Waterhouse Street was built by her Boston relations for Mrs. Follen, who was a Cabot. The Cabots bought the land reaching from the Waterhouse fence to Chauncy Street, and sold one lot to a Mr. Randall. Mrs. Follen was a charming writer of prose and verses, some of them for her little son. Dr. Follen was an exile from Germany because of too liberal opinions, and taught German in Harvard College. Mrs. Fales, a Boston lady, was boarding in the house later sold to Dr. Francis, and when she saw the surveyors laying out lots from the lane, she at once declared that she would build a house on the end lot, in order to have an unimpeded view down to the Common.

Mrs. Fales was the oldest child of Edward Gray, a Boston lawyer, and Frederick (Mrs. P. T. Jackson's father) was the youngest. The parents both died when the first child was eighteen, and the youngest was only four. Madam Turrell, whose daughter Susannah had

married Edward Gray, took the four-year-old boy, and brought him up. He lived with her until her death in Brattle Square, Boston. Here she had lived through the siege of Boston and all through the Revolutionary War, and she entertained at her house Lord Percy and some of the British officers and, later, General Washington. When she was eighty-one years old, she wrote out some of her memories, and Mrs. Jackson has a copy of the paper. She gave to her granddaughter, Mrs. Fales, the chair in which Washington sat at her house. At the Fales' auction, Mrs. Tower bought this chair, and her daughter still possesses it. The Fales house has a curved front, like the Judge Fay house and one other in Cambridge; it has had a most varied history. Mr. and Mrs. Clarke lived here when Mrs. Fales died, and Mrs. Clarke, who was the daughter of Albert Greene, the poet, of Providence, Rhode Island, died here soon after her marriage. Then a Mrs. Comegys (strange name!) held a young ladies' school here for

a time, until three or four young professors made it their headquarters, called it "the Den," and filled it with merriment. They were Mr. George Lane, Latin professor; Mr. J. D. Whitney, geologist; Mr. Winlock and Dr. Benjamin Gould, astronomers. The Woodman family lived in the house for the year 1860, and were succeeded by Mrs. Lamb, who was a Tales. When she went out West with her children, Mrs. Horace Mann bought the house, and a kindergarten was held here by her sister, Miss Elizabeth Peabody. The little shed in the garden was placed there to hold Benjamin Mann's collections, and his mother called it the "Entomologicon." The next possessor of the house was Mr. Charles Henry Moore, professor of fine arts. Then came the Reverend Mr. Fitch from Andover, then Mr. Smith, a retired Episcopal clergyman, and then the present owners, of Huguenot and Alsatian descent. They keep the fence running over with roses.¹

William Vassall is thought to have built the house later occupied by Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse. William was a brother of the two other Vassalls who lived and died in Cambridge. He was born in the West Indies, graduated from Harvard in 1733, and died at Battersea Rise, Surrey, England, in 1800. His country house was on Waterhouse Street, Cambridge. He also owned "a magnificent estate near Bristol, Rhode Island." His town house was in Boston, on Pemberton Hill, with a frontage on Tremont Street. Here he was living until the Revolution. He was a fine man, and one of the most prominent of his name in this country. (See "Vassalls of New England," by Edward D. Harris.) He sailed for England, being a Loyalist, in 1775. Part of the confiscated estate belonged to, or was taken by, Deacon Walton, the carpenter. Mrs. Jaques, who was a Richardson and lived in a house on the site of Hastings Hall, said she often came, as a child, on hot summer evenings, to sit on Deacon Walton's pile of boards at the corner of the lane. As an old lady, she lived in Belcher Hancock's house on Church Street, after Dr. Wyman left it. She used to wear a turban. She was very kind to poor students, though not well off herself.

After the Revolution, Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse and his second wife, Louisa Lee, daughter of Thomas Lee of Brattle

¹ Professor James Haughton Woods now (1934) owns it.

Street, lived in the Vassall house. At this time there were but three doctors in Cambridge, and they were not especially friendly to each other. One of them was attending a very sick child, and was obliged to call on the others for consultation. Dr. Waterhouse said: "The child will live." Dr. Gamage said: "The child will die." Dr. Jennison said, in his little, high, squeaky voice: "The child will neither live nor die!"

The Vassall house needed repairs and, while this was done and the old chimney taken down, Mrs. Waterhouse built another house, beyond her orchard, and moved over. Her housekeeper's adopted daughter amused the little old doctor with her pretty childish ways, and his tall wife was often seen bringing the old man out on the front porch to sit in the sun. He died in this house, and his wife went back to the other, and died there at the age of ninety-one. For her gardener and his wife, she had built a cottage next to the new house, which was made of stout timbers, "like a ship," as she wished. Mr. Robert Apthorp lived here for a time; then Mr. Dana, of the savings bank; then the latter's married daughter, Mrs. Gay; and then the house was sold in 1850 to Francis Bowen, professor of philosophy. Follen street had now become a court, shut off at the cottage by a fence. The lane was quite rural, and descended between Dr. Follen's house and a small house on the corner of the avenue, which was painted white, and trailed a line of sheds behind it, hedged by tall lilac bushes. A brook once ran across the middle of the lane, and disappeared in, or traversed, the large garden of the Follen house, which gave its name to the street. When the Rev. Daniel Austin rented the Follen house in the forties it was surrounded by a white hawthorn hedge. The house was known later as the Todd house. It belonged to Purser Todd of the navy, and was confiscated by the government on account of debt, though rather unjustly, as the purser was expected to pay while his ship was off the African coast, and he had no means of getting the money. His widow (daughter of Aaron Hill of Brattle Street) insisted on living in the house, on account of her dower rights, which included access to the kitchen pump. She let one front room to Mrs. Delano's little school. The government kept the right-hand half of the house, and here was the Nautical Almanac office. Another room was

let to Chauncy Wright, and then the Winlock family took the whole half until they moved to the Observatory. A Mrs. Magee kept student boarders here once, and a family named Germaine lived in the back of the house. Mrs. Todd took a great fancy to Mr. Winlock, and he was asked to persuade her to sell her half to Dr. H. P. Walcott, and take the price in the form of an annuity. The Todd house was twice set on fire, and the flames, issuing from the roof, made an alarming sight.

The Randall house was bought in 1850 by Mr. Tower, sixth descendant from John Tower who came to this land with his friend, the great-grandfather of Abraham Lincoln, and settled in Hingham about 1636, where his house is still standing. Opposite this little house, the only one in the street that owned a horse and buggy, a gate in the fence led into a large garden, where Dr. Converse Francis' house was raised on a bank and faced the avenue. It held a famous library, which had double rows on some of its shelves, filled with every kind of books, from folios to novels, all the delight of their genial and lovable owner. His wife

was a learned and ardent botanist and the kindest of neighbors. Here could be seen two engravings of Ary Scheffer, the Christus Consolator over the study fireplace, the Dante with Beatrice in the parlor; and there was always the pleasure of discovering some fascinating book in any of the rooms. The barn came near the Fales house. A pretty "green" stretched across the corner where the street made a sharp turn or elbow. A path bisected the green, and a carpenter's tiny shop (afterwards burned) and old apple tree were at the farther upper corner next the orchard. Daniel Chester French, the sculptor, whose father, Judge French, lived in half of the double house across the Common, used to build snow forts, in the whiter, on this green. His friend, Herbert Chamberlain, helped him, and the next day the girls in the street would storm the fort with snowballs. Daniel French made his first statue, a snow lion, hi his father's yard. When he was eleven years old, he was looking from the window, and said: "Father, I see a lion in that snow, and I am going to get him out!" This was what Michelangelo said when he attacked the block of marble now in the Florence Duomo.

Other houses began to gather. Professor Bowen's brother

98

George, who had sailed as a boy of fourteen to seek his fortune in Valparaiso, Chile, and had married a Spanish wife there, came back to move his mother and her family from the West, and build a house for them next his brother's. It was modelled from the Dana house in which Professor Jeremiah Smith dwelt at the corner of Phillips Place and Berkeley Street, where they stayed meanwhile. They brought a red prairie rose with them, which covered the veranda for a time. The street was now cut through to Garden street, and three more houses were built, one by Mr. George Saunders on the corner of Concord Avenue, and two below the cottage by Mr. Wood and Mr. Hall. One of these belonged, later and successively, to Mr. A. C. Martin (architect), Mr. Whittemore, the Follen-Cabots, John Mays, Mrs. Page (who had a beautiful garden and a beautiful yellow Angora cat), Mr. Holcombe (professor of political economy), and finally to Professor Black. The other house was long occupied by Mr. P. T. Jackson, and is now generously fitted out as a hostess house for Harvard students convalescing after illness.

Christ Church rectory was built for Dr. Hoppin and later occupied by his successors, Rev. James Field Spalding, Rev. Basil King, and Rev. Prescott Evarts. Later, the orchard, bought by Professor Bowen, was sold, and three more houses were built, by Mr. Barnard Mackay, Mr. Hersey Goodwin, and Mr. Hall. The cottage was moved away, giving place to the homes of Professor Richards and Professor Ropes. The George Bowen house was sold to Mr. William Goodwin, Greek professor; afterward to Rev. Mr. Dennen, Dean of St. Paul's.

The State Arsenal, the pride of Follen Street, occupied a large block of ground facing Garden Street, and, when Follen Street was cut through, it formed the corner. It was built round a hollow square, where the flagpole was guarded by cannon on each side and pyramids of cannon balls. The following facts are taken from Mr. Archibald Howe's paper read before the Cambridge Historical Society in 1911. In 1796, Massachusetts bought from Joseph Bates, wheelwright, a piece of land bounded on the west by "Milk-Porridge Lane" (now a part of Garden Street), where barracks and a laboratory stood. In 1813, more land was bought from Bates' heirs, and in 1817 Dr. Waterhouse sold land from his nine or ten acres to Amasa Walker, quarter-

master-general. In 1818 Governor Brooks reported to the Senate that a distributing arsenal and laboratory, on Carver Street in Boston, was complete; and also a fireproof brick building in Cambridge, one hundred feet by forty feet, three stories high, for permanent deposit of equipment. In 1848 some old wooden sheds at the arsenal were sold, and a building erected one hundred feet by twenty-five feet, one and a half stories high, finished attic. This [may] have been the building at right angles to that of 1818 and parallel with Garden Street [but if so, a second story was added. The keeper lived in the farther corner, Mr. Rayne, and then Mr. Chamberlain]. In the same year, 1848, an exchange of land between Mrs. Louisa Waterhouse and the Commonwealth made Follen Street possible. In 1852 on the land near Follen Street, a brick building was erected, for gun carriages, it is said. Finally, in 1864 or 1865, a machine shop was built in the rear of the rest. This was occupied in 1876 by the Cambridge Social Dramatic Club.

In the Civil War, of course, the arsenal was guarded. Students were excused from recitation to form the "Arsenal Guard," and some of the children were afraid to go to the end of Follen Street, because, inside the high fence, a sentry in blue coat, with musket on shoulder, walked up and down. The small boys were, on the contrary, much attracted. George Saunders, who lived on the corner opposite the arsenal, was one of many who marched beside the student companies as they came up from college to relieve the Home Guard. When he carried over cookies and doughnuts, he was told he had saved the men's lives, and to go home and ask his mother to send more. His little brother, who was very engaging, was called "the Child of the Regiment." These children could look from their windows across open fields to Agassiz Museum, and they liked to jump from the fence into the tall grass. They watched Mrs. Waterhouse's gardener go back and forth from the little gate in the fence at the back of the barn, and through the orchard, to his cottage on Follen Street. One Sunday, after college chapel, everyone went to one of the arsenal halls, the iron doors were thrown open, and Dr. Andrew Peabody spoke to the soldiers drawn up in front, and read "America" for them to sing, which they did rather badly. Later the First

Regiment marched up Garden Street and Concord Avenue, with Colonel Cowden on horseback at their head. It was a hot day, and the men were halted, while pails of water were brought to them from the Hodges house on the corner of Waterhouse Street.

When the arsenal was removed to Springfield, the cannon were placed on the Common, and the whole block of ground was bought by Mr. Dresser of Raymond Street, and then, in 1884, by E. H. Abbot, who built the fine stone house that stands enclosed by the high brick wall surrounding its garden.

Follen Street has lost its pretty village green, its grassy borders, its imposing arsenal, nearly all its soft-whispering pines, and some of the embowering elms. One, in a garden, the tallest tree in Cambridge, a landmark for the farmers driving down from the country, and chosen by the orioles to build their hanging nests, was blown down in the great September gale of 1815. But Follen Street is still bounded by two large gardens, one at each end; it still has its yards, its many children, its professors and clergymen and

friendly neighbors; and it keeps its memories hidden in its heart. May its future be as pleasant as its past!

101

THE VALUE OF ANCIENT HOUSES TO A COMMUNITY

BY GEORGE FRANCIS DOW

Summary of a paper read on October 23, 1928

The following paragraphs are reprinted from the Cambridge Tribune as a matter of record. At the meeting on October 23, 1928, Mr. Dow showed a great many very interesting lantern slides of old New England houses, accompanying these by a running commentary. It is unfortunate that the printed page can give only the least suggestion of the speaker's antiquarian learning and artistic taste; but these are already known to everyone who has visited the Museum of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, of which Mr. Dow is the Director, at 141 Cambridge Street, Boston.

MR. Dow contended that the value of ancient houses to a community was not only sentimental but practical, and that they gave a flavor to a community which can be sensed by everyone. Visitors to New England from western states go to Salem to see not the new courthouse but the House of Seven Gables. Last year no fewer than twenty-five thousand persons made this visit, he said.

He told of a Virginia society which was the first to preserve old houses in this country and then showed lantern slides of the Paul Revere house, first to be restored in New England.

As pictures of other restored New England houses were shown, Mr. Dow told briefly of their history and particular interest; there was the Whipple house in Ipswich, for instance, which in its overhang still shows traces of old Indian red, the first paint used in New England, composed of ochre and fish oil; the Harrison Gray Otis house in Cambridge Street, now headquarters for the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities; the Sweet-Ilsley house, once a tavern, in Newbury; the Cooper-Austin house, one of the remaining twenty-one pre-Revolutionary houses in Cambridge.

When he showed the Abraham Browne house in Watertown, Mr. Dow said one of the ambitions of his Society is to create an outdoor museum in Watertown similar to that planned by Henry Ford for Dearborn. In passing he observed that the Browne house possesses the only known three-part casement window frame in America.

102

CAMBRIDGE PHYSICIANS I HAVE KNOWN

BY DR. EDMUND H. STEVENS

Read April 30, 1929

YOUR president, Judge Walcott, has asked me to present a few facts regarding the physicians practicing in Cambridge in 1871.

I shall not undertake to give any biographical sketch, but simply speak of them as they were known to me.

In 1870 the following twenty-three physicians of Cambridge, members of the Massachusetts Medical Society, signed the fee table which was issued at that time: Charles H. Allen, W. M. Barrett, A. P. Clarke, Edward R. Cogswell, Stephen W. Driver, John T. Goddard, Alfred F. Holt, Anson P. Hooker, C. K. Kelley,[1] Henry O. Marcy, James R. Morse, Albert L. Norris, J. T. G. Nichols, Frances R. Stachli, J. B. Taylor, Charles E. Vaughan, H. P. Walcott, Alonzo Carter Webber, W. W. Wellington, Edward H. Weston, Franklin A. Wood, Morrill Wyman, and James A. Dow.¹ There were also three very active practitioners who were known as homeopaths; namely, Dr. Charles H. Farnsworth, Dr. Hiram L. Chase, and Dr. William K. Fletcher. There were a number of others not on this list who were practicing in Cambridge at this time, the total number of physicians being in the neighborhood of forty.

Twelve of these physicians had served in the Civil War as surgeons; two others, Dr. S. W. Driver and Dr. E. R. Cogswell, had also served in the war, but not as medical officers. After this strenuous service they returned to civil practice with a strong desire to make a success of their life work. They were all men of high ideals. The history of Cambridge shows that medicine has always stood high, and it was generally known that the physicians in our city were living up to the high ideals of their predecessors. This made Cambridge a most desirable place for doctors to locate.

¹ Name does not appear in the Cambridge Directory of 1870.— Ed.

It is a lamentable fact that but two of the physicians in practice at the time I came to Cambridge in 1871 are now living; namely, Dr. H. P. Walcott¹ and Dr. James A. Dow.²

At that time Cambridge was more or less divided into sections, and I shall speak of the physicians in that order, beginning with Old Cambridge.

Dr. Morrill Wyman had been in the practice of medicine since 1838. He was one of the best known and most highly respected physicians in the state and was actively engaged in his profession in 1871. I have never known a wiser physician than Dr. Morrill Wyman. With his broad training, his love of science, and a marvelous discernment, he noticed many things which escaped the attention of other men. Dr. Wyman became widely known by his publication in 1846 on ventilation. In 1850 he developed the operation for aspirating the chest, which was a great boon to suffering humanity and was recognized the world over as a great advance in medicine. Although he knew nothing of bacteriology, he had an almost uncanny knowledge of the causes of disease. It was a great pleasure to listen as he

discoursed upon topics which the medical books of his day did not even mention. He always spoke of pneumonia as a toxemia. What was then known as "acute Bright's disease" he contended was only a symptom of some other disease from which the patient was suffering. Dr. Wyman's advice and help as a consultant was sought by physicians not only in Cambridge but in Boston and all the surrounding towns. He was ever ready to help the younger men in the profession. I can testify from personal experience that his advice was always helpful to the patient as well as to the physician. He would point out mistakes in a most delicate and helpful manner. In calling Dr. Wyman in consultation, one could always feel that the confidence of the family in their physician would never be lessened by his coming into the case. All he asked was that they should be honest and truthful. It was his habit to ask doctors he met if they had read about some new discovery in medicine which he had read about in some foreign journal only the night before. (He was a constant reader of French and

¹ *Died November 11, 1932.*

² *Died May 27, 1931.*

German journals.) In this way he called their attention to important subjects which otherwise would have escaped their notice. I met him one morning as he was coming out of his yard. He stopped me and asked if I had heard about the discovery of Roux for the cure of diphtheria. Of course I had not. He had read about it that morning in a French journal. He proceeded to give me a full account of it and said he was sure it was one of the greatest discoveries that had been made in medicine for a long time. This was the first development of the diphtheria antitoxin now in universal use. In this way he was always teaching younger men important things. He was always an early riser and had little patience with doctors who were not up and doing early in the morning. I once asked him if he could see a sick child with me at College Hill the next morning. He thought for a moment and replied, "I will be there at six-thirty." When I arrived, he was there waiting for me. He often visited the Cambridge Hospital at seven o'clock in the morning to learn whether the house officers were up and doing. It was not pleasant for them if he found them in bed, unless they had been up during the night caring for some patient. The amount of work he could accomplish was a marvel to other men. Dr. Wyman had much to do with establishing and building the Cambridge Hospital. I cannot better express my affection and esteem for this great man than in the words of Drs. Councilman, Magrath, and Brinkerhoff in the dedication to him of a series of their medical papers: "To the memory of Dr. Morrill Wyman, a physician of Cambridge who as an investigator and practitioner of medicine united careful observation, sound reasoning, and good judgment, we who have known him personally and have received inspiration from his words and life dedicate this series of papers, Boston, Mass., Jan. 1, 1904." Dr. Wyman retired from active practice in 1886, being then about seventy-seven years of age, but he continued to see patients in consultation for the next ten years. His later life was an exemplification of his oft-repeated advice to his patients to "grow old gracefully." He died at the ripe age of ninety-one.

Dr. Henry P. Walcott, who had an office with Dr. Wyman, gave up the practice of medicine quite early and has devoted

many years of his life to public service. As president of the State Board of Health, a position which he held for many years with great distinction, his administration was characterized by such wisdom and sane judgment that he was looked up to by the whole country as a leading authority in all matters pertaining to public health. He is still living,¹ past ninety years of age, and keenly interested in medicine and the general welfare of the community.

Dr. J. T. G. Nichols was the finest type of man and physician. He was a member of the staff of the Cambridge Hospital for many years, starting in the day the hospital was opened. His skill and sound judgment made him a leader among his colleagues and a favorite with all whom he was called upon to treat. His devotion to those under his care elicited the best that was in him. No one can ever show a better record than Dr. Nichols left behind him at the Cambridge Hospital.

Dr. Stephen W. Driver and Dr. Nichols were closely associated in their practice. Dr. Driver stood high in the community and was worshipped by his many patients. He was a valued member of the original staff of the Cambridge Hospital and served it long and faithfully. He continued to practice until he was past eighty. He died at the age of eighty-six, mourned by all who knew him.

Dr. Charles E. Vaughan, who served in the navy during the Civil War, was very highly thought of. His health prevented him from attending to a large practice. He retired in 1890 and spent the remainder of his life in California.

Dr. John L. Hildreth came to Cambridge in 1870. He had practiced medicine for four years in Townsend, Massachusetts, previous to coming to Cambridge. He was one of the members of the original staff of the Cambridge Hospital. For many years he had an extensive practice. He retired from practice at the age of seventy-three, moving from Cambridge to Winchester, where he died, aged eighty-seven.

Dr. W. W. Wellington, a contemporary of Dr. Morrill Wyman, was in practice in Cambridgeport at this time. He was a gentleman of the highest type, an excellent physician, and a most worthy citizen. For thirty years he was secretary of the

¹ Died November 11, 1932.

Cambridge School Committee. He continued his practice until he was past eighty years of age and died full of honors.

Dr. Henry O. Marcy settled in Cambridgeport at the close of the Civil War. He had served in the war as Major-Surgeon. He had a large and rapidly growing practice. To him was due the honor of introducing Lister's antiseptic methods into Boston, where for two years he labored to show the great value of this new discovery, before it was adopted by surgeons in the large hospitals. Dr. Marcy became a celebrated surgeon with an international reputation.

Among other prominent physicians in Cambridgeport were Drs. A. P. Clarke, A. Carter Webber, Edward P. Cogswell, and Alfred F. Holt.

Dr. Alfred F. Holt was an outstanding man with a war record which could well be envied by anybody. Having been graduated in medicine in June, 1860, he settled in Cambridgeport and began the practice of his profession. April 16, 1861 he left Cambridge as a private in Captain J. P. Richardson's Company, this being the first company which was organized and enlisted definitely "for the war." In December of the same year we find Dr. Holt as assistant surgeon of the Thirtieth Massachusetts Volunteers. In December, 1862 he was promoted to Surgeon of the First Texas Cavalry. In 1863 he left the medical department and was made a Senior Major of his regiment. In 1864 he was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel. From then until the close of the war he was almost always in command of his regiment. November 1, 1865 he was mustered out, having served almost continuously since April, 1861. Dr. Holt returned to Cambridge in 1866 and resumed his practice. In 1879 he was appointed Medical Examiner, an office which he filled with distinction. He was Surgeon-General during three administrations. He was a most efficient health officer of Cambridge from 1880 to 1889. He became very efficient in the use of the microscope. His work in this field was of a very high order. His death left a void which has never been filled.

Dr. E. R. Cogswell graduated from Harvard University in the class of 1864. With many of his classmates he left college to enlist in the service of his country. He served with distinction with the troops enlisted for nine months in the campaigns of North Carolina. He received his medical degree in 1867, the

same year he settled in Cambridge as a physician. Few citizens have taken a deeper interest in the welfare of Cambridge than Dr. Cogswell. For many years he gave a large part of his time to public service.

Dr. James A. Dow settled in Cambridgeport in April, 1870. He came from Windsor, Vermont, where he had practiced medicine for three years. He is still living.¹ He retired from practice several years ago.

Dr. Anson P. Hooker, a famous son of a famous father, was greatly in evidence in the practice of medicine in East Cambridge at this time. He was one of the first surgeons to volunteer his services in the Civil War. He went to the front in 1861 as surgeon of the Twenty-Sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Regiment. On account of broken health he resigned in 1862. In 1864 he was acting as Assistant Surgeon-General of Massachusetts. He died in 1874, loved and respected by all who knew him.

Dr. J. B. Taylor was living in East Cambridge at this time. He represented the highest type of family physician. He was father of our late lamented Dr. F. W. Taylor and grandfather of Dr. John H. Taylor.

Among physicians located in North Cambridge were Dr. James R. Morse, an old-tune physician who had practiced in Vermont before coming to Cambridge. He was for many years physician to the Cambridge City Home.

A Dr. Talbot was located in North Cambridge at this time. He was never quite regular in his practice and died comparatively early in life.

Dr. Fletcher located in the north part of the city when he returned from the Civil War.

There were other worthy physicians located in Cambridge in 1871, but time does not permit me to mention each one personally.

Sixty years ago there were a few men in every community who stood out prominently as physicians. Today this is somewhat changed, as the general standing is much higher. The towns in close proximity to Cambridge had one or more men who were held in high esteem and looked up to as leaders. Dr. Lincoln R. Stone of Newton, who is living at the present

¹ Died May 27, 1931.

time, past ninety-six years of age, was a man of this type. He has a good representative in his son, Dr. James S. Stone, a well-known surgeon of Boston. Alfred Hosmer of Watertown, Richard L. Hodgdon of Arlington, J. M. Harlow of Woburn, Frederick Windsor of Winchester, John Sullivan of Maiden, and J. W. Currier of Lexington were all leaders in the profession.

Dr. Benjamin F. D. Adams of Waltham, son of the celebrated Dr. Horatio Adams of that city, was a remarkably brilliant man. He was chairman of the first Board of Health in Waltham. On account of ill health he was obliged to give up his practice in Massachusetts in 1882. The remaining years of his life were spent at Colorado Springs.

Dr. Horace E. Marion, who received his degree from Dartmouth College, served as a private in the Civil War. He afterward became a student of the famous Dixie Crosby of New Hampshire. He was very well known in this section in 1871, and later became prominent in the profession.

In 1871 Cambridge, with an estimated population of forty-two thousand, had about forty physicians. At the present day the population is estimated at about one hundred and twenty thousand. The latest Cambridge directory has listed one hundred and eighty physicians, sixteen being women.

There are about forty physicians of Irish parentage now practicing in Cambridge. In 1871 I recall but one Irish doctor. This illustrates the fact that men of Irish blood take to the profession of medicine as well as to politics.

The men of whom I have spoken, who were leaders in their profession fifty-eight years ago, were, all of them, men who would have made a success in any profession they might have chosen. They were possibly not so familiar with science as doctors of the present day, but they possessed a large stock of common sense, keen minds, and very acute powers of observation. They were wise and sane physicians who did their own thinking.

From present indications, Cambridge is not likely to have a shortage of physicians. I cannot speak too highly of the physicians who have come onto the stage as the older men

have passed off. They are ably keeping up the traditions and high ideals of the great leaders of earlier days.

109

THE JOHN HICKS HOUSE

BY ESTHER STEVENS FRASER

ONCE more the Hicks House¹ in Cambridge passes through a drastic change. In the hundred and seventy years since its construction, only once has the old house known the peaceful existence of long continued ownership in one family. Change has laid a heavy hand upon this home,, transforming and obliterating many features that it once possessed. Now that the old house is passing into a totally different existence, I have been asked to tell what I know concerning the place which was, until ever so recently, my home. If I am prejudiced in its favor or overenthusiastic, I hope to be forgiven, for old houses have a way of appealing to me through their own personality and atmosphere.

John Hicks, the builder of this house, came of a long established Cambridge family of high reputation. His grandfather had owned quite an estate in Cambridge, namely the land which lay between Dunster and Holyoke, Winthrop and South Streets, the latter running then along the Charles River bank. Dunster was an important street in the early days of Cambridge when it was the thoroughfare between Harvard College and the ferry (operated from the foot of Dunster Street), which offered the quickest means of reaching Boston. John Hicks' father, Zechariah Hicks, received an excellent education at Harvard and became master of the famous old North Writing School in the North End of Boston. It is quite probable that John lived at his father's house for a number of years, even after he married Elizabeth Nutting of Cambridge in 1748. For some years the writing-school master rented a fine brick house in North Bennet Street, Boston. Then suddenly, in 1760, there appears in a Boston newspaper the notice that all

¹ *This article, reprinted from the January, 1932 issue of Old Time New England, by courtesy of The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, amplifies and coordinates Mrs. Fraser's remarks at the meeting of the Cambridge Historical Society on June 21, 1929.*

110

the possessions of Zechariah Hicks will be sold at public vendue. The same year, 1760, when John Hicks was thirty-five years of age, we find him purchasing of Caleb Prentice in Cambridge the northwest corner of what had formerly been the Hicks estate for 26 pounds, 13 shillings and 4 pence. It is also said to have been the place where Jonathan Nutting lived in 1630, before setting out to become one of the founders of Concord, Massachusetts. Perhaps he was an early forbear of Mrs. Elizabeth Nutting Hicks.

A carpenter by trade, John Hicks built for himself a six-room, gambrel-roofed home, with a large central chimney ten feet square at the base. The house, which faced west, was laid out upon the usual floor plan of one room each side of the front hall, with staircase winding up in front of the chimney and generous closets utilizing the space behind. Not much of the John Hicks finish has remained in the house due to the changes it has suffered,

but the front staircase, with its sturdily turned balusters and pendent acorns, has attracted much attention from architects. There is also the one wall of simple panelling in the second-story south bedroom, where the fire place is set in an unusual splayed recess. There is no panelling or wainscot of any kind around the other walls of this room. Arguing from this wall of panelled woodwork upstairs, some people believe that the two main rooms downstairs also must have had panelling at one time. Personally, I cannot agree with this line of reasoning, since I found original wallpaper on plaster in places where neither paper nor plaster would have been if these rooms had been wainscotted or panelled in any way. We must remember that in 1760, when this house was being built, plaster walls from cornice to baseboard were much esteemed for the display of newly fashionable wallpaper. Boston had one or more "paper-stainers" at work producing wallpapers that were soon to make panelling and extensive woodwork wholly out of date. However, one room in the third story of the Hicks house did have a wall of simple woodwork, namely, a large panel over the small fireplace which had a plain moulding around it and no mantel shelf, while vertical boarding carried out the rest of the wall on the fireplace side. Around the other three sides of the room, horizontal boarding,

chair-rail height,

completed the woodwork. This and the other third-story room were the only rooms in the main house with any sort of wood wainscot.

Here John and Elizabeth Hicks with their growing family of boys and girls came to live in 1762, when the house was completed. The older boys became students at Harvard, one after another. The eldest son, John Hicks, Jr., after his graduation purchased a half interest in Green and Russell's printing establishment and became co-publisher of the Massachusetts Gazette and Post Boy. Another son, Jonathan, at the age of eighteen, graduated in the class of 1770 and studied medicine, becoming eventually a surgeon in the Revolutionary army. Zechariah Hicks, another son, became a saddler by trade and founded the firm which still exists under the name of W. W. Winship. Occasionally the firm exhibits a little trunk made by Zechariah Hicks at his early shop in Cornhill, Boston. Of the daughters, several married men prominent in Cambridge social and political life, whose descendants still form part of the old-time aristocracy of Cambridge. A great-great-grandson of John Hicks, Mr. Herbert Saunders, for many years curator of the Shepherd Memorial Association and secretary of the Cambridge Historical Society, was my authority for much of the family tradition herein set forth.

The Hicks house must have been a center of family storm and stress in the 1770's. John, the head of the household, was an ardent patriot, while his son, John, publisher of the Boston newspaper, was violently Tory in his sympathies. We can imagine some heated debates wherein neither man was willing to compromise with his strong principles. According to family tradition, one cold December night in 1773 John Hicks, senior, rose from bed while the rest of his household were quietly sleeping. Rather than let his departure be known by the creaking of the stairs, he let himself out of the second story, north bedroom window, by means of a sheet rope. Hastily he made his way to Boston and joined that willful band of "Indians" who relieved the British of collecting taxes on the tea newly arrived in Boston Harbor. All members of that lawless, but indignantly righteous

band, swore themselves to eternal secrecy, lest the British take revenge upon them individually. So John Hicks

112

did not intend to admit that he had been present at the Boston Tea Party. Returning to Cambridge, in the wee small hours of the morning, he tried to regain his second-story bedroom by the same sheet rope which had helped him down so successfully. But alas, the ease with which he had descended could not be duplicated in the ascent, so he was forced to come in by the regular door. At the foot of the stairs he hauled off his heavy leather boots, leaving them standing there, for he intended to rise early in the morning before other members of his household might be stirring. But John Hicks slept longer than he planned and the boots were discovered by his wife when she came down to set breakfast on the fire. Accusingly she waited for him when he tried to tiptoe down quietly.

"John, you were out last night, weren't you?"

"No, Mother," lied John, as he felt constrained to do if the secrecy of the Tea Party were to be properly kept.

"John! how can you say such a thing? You were out last night."

"No, Mother, . . ."

"Well, look at your boots standing here. They weren't here last night when you wore them up to bed. Of course you were out last night!" So she picked up the telltale boots from out of which tea leaves began to fall. Realizing her husband's rabid views on the tea tax question, she immediately guessed what had happened. So she softened her tone and with an understanding smile assured him that that kind of night prowling was quite all right with her.

What John Hicks did between December, 1773, and April, 1775, family tradition saith not, but we may suppose that he nursed his wrath at the tyranny of the British. On the night of April 18th-19th, 1775, while John Hicks lay quietly sleeping, British soldiers were marching out to Lexington and Concord. The next morning when news of the fighting trickled back into Cambridge, he went out to his barn that stood in the rear of the house, lifted up the loose floor boards beneath which his musket and powder horn lay hidden, and saddled his horse. Then he rode out toward North Cambridge where he expected to catch sight of the retreating British soldiers. He had travelled as far as what is now the junction of Massachusetts

113

and Rindge Avenues when redcoats were visible in the distance. Getting down behind some barrels piled here, John Hicks was joined by two other men, Joseph Marcy and Moses Richardson. As the British came abreast of them, these three patriots fired and met death immediately by the soldiers' return volley.

Late that afternoon, when her husband's absence became prolonged through the supper hour, Mrs. Hicks sent out her oldest son remaining at home, a boy of twelve, to see if he could ascertain anything concerning his father's whereabouts. He soon came upon the bodies of the three slain men, secured a cart, and drove home with these tragic remains. Under cover of darkness, lest the British know just how many victims they had exacted from the patriots, these men were hastily buried in Christ Church yard, with no marker for their common grave. At the time of the Cambridge centennial celebration in 1876, an attempt was made to locate the grave of these patriots, and it is thought that they now lie fittingly beneath the monument then erected to their memory.

Back at the Hicks house John's widow began to think seriously of the future. Her eldest sons were setting forth to join the war that had now descended upon the colonies. It might be years before they would return to help look after her. John Hicks, Jr. fled to Halifax, where he remained until long after the war. (Toward the end of his life he returned to Newton, living in comparative ease.) Mrs. Hicks found herself left at home with six or seven children, the oldest being only twelve. With a large house, six open fireplaces to be kept filled with logs when wintry weather should demand it for their comfort, Mrs. Hicks came to the conclusion that the family would be better off in a smaller home. So she gathered together her household possessions and moved two blocks away, on what is now Winthrop Street, to a little house still standing, recently purchased by a well-known Cambridge collector of antiques. Here Mrs. Hicks lived to the ripe old age of ninety-nine years, vividly remembered by her many grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

When Mrs. Hicks moved out of the Dunster Street house, the place remained vacant for a while. Situated, as it was, so conveniently near the center of town, the old house was com-

mandeered by General Washington and General Putnam for the use of subordinate officers and for the storage of supplies during the time that troops were quartered in Cambridge.

So much for the traditional history reported by members of the family who remember hearing grandmother Hicks tell stories of her life and experiences. No doubt this story is very near the truth, but it is not quite the whole truth concerning John Hicks and his home. Recent research has brought to light certain information hitherto unknown to living members of the family, and I am somewhat at sea in my attempt to reconcile parts of them with word-of-mouth tradition. However, if the entire truth were known, I am sure we would perceive what worthy motive or principle lay behind these facts I now report, for John Hicks and all his descendants have ever preferred to sacrifice themselves than to alter their beliefs and principles. And John Hicks not only sacrificed himself, but his home also. It is quite possible that he was a greater patriot than Cambridge histories have chronicled.

A succession of documents obscurely filed with many unindexed records at East Cambridge Court House partially unfold the story of John Hicks as a town official. He had been appointed constable about the year 1770, and his name is signed on the back of several orders which he had to serve, "warning" out of town strangers who were likely to become public charges. The first unusual document relating to John Hicks is the one which reports a meeting of the town fathers whereat it was voted to pay sixpence on a pound for every pound of tax money collected. John Hicks accepted the office of tax collector, and

posted a bond of a thousand pounds for the faithful performance of that office. This was early in January, 1771.

The next document is a note signed by the three Cambridge assessors certifying that they had assessed the Polls and Estates in Cambridge the sum of £307. 8. 0, and had delivered the list to Mr. John Hicks, Collector, the sum therein named being returnable to the town on or before May 31, 1771.

Then comes a superficial sort of accounting which shows that the total taxes due the town were £307. 8, of which sum Hicks has returned £29.19. 10.3 and £65. 13. 3 were collected from

115

Hicks to pay the men who had worked on the town roads. This left some £212 still unaccounted for and although it had several times been demanded it had not been settled by the said John Hicks.

So the next document relates to the summoning of John Hicks to appear in court and the attachment of his real estate as surety for his settlement of claims against him. If only we might know the defendant's side of the case, I am confident that the reasons why John Hicks refused to collect or pay the town taxes would prove to be his complete vindication. For we must not jump to the simple conclusion that he was a crooked town official even though he was called "defective." We must not hastily surmise that Hicks collected the tax funds and kept them for his own use. Such a proceeding would have been well known to the townspeople, yet John Hicks' descendants even up to the present day have held town offices with the full support of the people. Surely, if Hicks had been dishonest, the town of Cambridge would not have erected such an imposing monument to his memory as that which stands in Christ Church yard.

No, John Hicks had some other reason for refusing to pay or collect the town taxes. It seems apparent that between 1770, when Hicks accepted the appointment of town collector, and 1773, when he refused to settle the full tax bill for the town, something had happened to cause his change of heart. Was anything going on between the British government and the American colonists, controversial in nature, that would cause Hicks to take a radically rebellious stand?

Most certainly there was. Between Governor Hutchinson and the people as represented by the Great and General Court, a long-drawn-out controversy over abstract political questions had resulted in a two-year refusal to consider such practical business questions as the public debt and the raising of local taxes. Hutchinson, growing impatient and aiming to force definite action, on October 30, 1770 directed the Treasurer to issue his warrants for the accrued debt amounting to 96,000 pounds. These warrants were artfully distributed to the several counties just before the meeting of the General Court, and had the desired effect of getting that body to proceed to practical

116

business. At this time, the Province of Massachusetts allowed sums for the salaries of the Governor and the Judges of the Superior Court. In June, 1771, the annual tax bill assessed the English Commissioners for the collecting of customs, on their incomes in like manner as other citizens. Governor Hutchinson, however, refused to sign a tax bill that did not exempt these commissioners from taxation.

Now all this controversy over taxes was going on at exactly the time that John Hicks refused to discharge his duty as collector of taxes. No tax money had been raised for two years prior to Hicks having been put into office, and we may be sure that there was a tremendous feeling of resentment toward the entire tax question throughout the province. Considering all these facts, shall we allow ourselves to believe that Hicks was financially crooked, or shall we decide that as a question of principle he was helping on a tax rebellion in common with the people at large, but the cost of which would fall crushingly on himself? The answer seems clear to me—he chose to sacrifice his home to the cause rather than collect from the townspeople that which was under controversy. It was no more radical than his sacrifice of his life after hearing the news of the battle at Lexington and Concord.

In court, when Hicks appeared to answer the summons, judgment must have been against him, for the last document on record reads: "I, David Phipps of Cambridge, Sheriff of Middlesex County, being ordered by Hon. Harrison Gray, Treasurer and Receiver General for His Majesty, to levy by Distress and sale of the estate real or personal of John Hicks, being a defective constable and collector of the town of Cambridge, for the sum of £252 paid by John Foxcroft of Cambridge, do sell, devise, etc. . . . the real estate of John Hicks in the said Cambridge, consisting of half an acre of land with dwelling house, barn and other buildings thereon, bounded westerly on the street leading from the Meeting House down to the Creek ..." (Imagine the Charles River at Cambridge being called a creek.) This document is dated in March, 1773, a few months before the Boston Tea Party took place.

Now the purchaser, John Foxcroft, was Register of Deeds at the Court House in Harvard Square, succeeding his father who

had held that office among others more important for forty-five years. The Foxcrofts were near neighbors of John Hicks and, I incline to believe, most friendly. Francis Foxcroft, the father, became a member of the King's Council, an office that brought grave suspicion upon the family when political strife came to a climax. He died in 1768, desiring that his mansion house remain in the family. At his death, John Foxcroft took over the mansion house and lived in it until it took fire suddenly one night in January, 1777.¹ Thus we perceive that the purchaser of the John Hicks house was not living in it between 1773 and early in 1777, though it is quite probable that he moved into the Hicks place after the Foxcroft mansion burned. Who, then, did occupy the Hicks house in 1775? Perhaps the Hicks family tradition concerning its occupancy is quite correct.

The foregoing facts relating to the seizure and sale of the Hicks house do not materially conflict with the story that John Hicks lived here until his death in 1775. When John Foxcroft purchased the estate in 1773 at the time of its forced sale, he may have done so with the double purpose of increasing his holdings in that locality, and at the same time helping out his neighbor and friend-in-difficulty, John Hicks. He probably allowed the Hicks family to live on as tenants in what had been their own home, until the tragedy of April 19th

upset the entire household. Differences relating to taxation approached their climax between 1770, when Hicks accepted the office of collector, and 1773, when he allowed himself to be forcibly removed from duty. For the sake of his principles Hicks scorned the chance of collecting the taxes and sacrificed his home. Many another man suffered similarly in this momentous war against the mother country. When we consider the force of the conflict we begin to understand the feeling which impelled Hicks to join the Tea Party and to sally forth almost single-handed to meet the British retreating from Concord. Let us suppose, then, that some time after the mansion house was burned in 1777 John Foxcroft moved into the Hicks house with his

¹ *"Last Friday Night the Dwelling House of Mr. John Foxcroft of Cambridge was consumed by Fire, the Family having scarce Time to escape with their Lives. The Fire was occasioned by the Carelessness or Negligence of not putting out the Snuff of a Candle the preceding Evening."*

— *Independent Chronicle, Jan. 30, 1777.*

118

family . By his will, written in 1802, he devises to his nephew, John Foxcroft, "the house in Cambridge in which I now live, with the land on which it stands and the buildings thereon, and situate on the East side of the road leading to my wharf. ..." So, at least, we know that Mr. Foxcroft occupied the Hicks house prior to the writing of his will.

In 1817, John Foxcroft, the nephew, sold the estate to Sydney Willard of Cambridge for two thousand dollars. Little is known concerning Mr. Willard's occupancy, yet I hazard the guess that he added the two-story kitchen ell that materially increased the comforts of the Hicks house. This ell contained a transverse hallway and a large kitchen out of which a back staircase ascended to two bedrooms above. Thus the number of rooms was increased to nine, but the former ample closet space behind the central chimney was sacrificed to obtain access from the rooms of the main house. The ell was securely fastened to the main house by two large iron barbs driven into the old sills and riveted to the foundation of the newer structure. It was intended that the two sections of the house should never fall out of level or part company — but how Destiny did trick the builder!

June 22, 1839 the Hicks house passed into the hands of John A. Fulton, painter and glazier. Now came the first period of settled occupancy that the house ever enjoyed. I say enjoyed — and yet I wonder! For change still laid its restless hand upon the old place. It had become so antiquated that Mr. Fulton felt the need of changing nearly all the window sash, building on a bay window, changing window and door trim in the two main rooms downstairs, changing some of the doors themselves, and last of all modernizing most of the old mantels. In what was probably used as the parlor, a funereal black marble mantel was proudly set in place. Mr. Fulton also tore down or moved away the old Hicks barn and in its place built a spacious double house in the latest Grecian style for renting purposes. At the time of his death in 1900, after sixty-one years of unbroken tenancy, Mr. Fulton willed the Hicks house to his wife, Lorinda Howe Fulton, "to be disposed of when a suitable opportunity offered." Mrs. Fulton rented the Hicks house, then known as 64 Dunster Street, for twenty dollars a

119

month until a suitable disposal of the place might be forthcoming. Possibly at this tune the house was nothing but a student rooming house, though I have heard rumors that the old place was once used as a fraternity house. Across the summer beam in the dining room a measured row of holes is the only remaining evidence of the row of steins that once hung there when not in use for rousing old-time beer parties.

The widowed Mrs. Fulton sold the Hicks house and its property in 1903 to Augustus P. Loring who was acting as agent for Harvard University. Harvard continued to rent the old house for a small sum, making a few repairs and suffering the place to fall into greater and greater dilapidation. The house was considered too far gone to be worth repair and of course it was only the land that Harvard really wanted. Eventually the house was rented by a group of Cowley fathers — ascetics living like monks of old, content to demand nothing but a roof over their heads.

At this juncture my eyes first alighted upon the John Hicks house, an event that was to make a great difference in my own life and a slight improvement in the house itself. I had been wandering around several suburbs of Boston in search of an old house to live in, but all those that attracted my attention seemed to be well occupied. However, the Hicks house looked vacant, the uncurtained windows made it seem uninhabited. Questioning of neighbors brought out the fact that I must deal with the university if I would become occupant of the house. Truth to tell, the old place looked so wretchedly, with bricks fallen out of the chimney and sagging window blinds, that long vision was required to imagine its possibilities.

By dint of much persistence, the university was persuaded to enter into an agreement whereby I assumed all responsibility for small interior repairs and finish, while they were to put the house in sound condition. Because of the historical associations of the old house it seemed important that the place should not be allowed to fall into ruins, but should be accorded some of the honor to which it was entitled.

August 1, 1922 I first saw the interior of what had once been John Hicks' home. I found most of the original mantels changed, burlap walls lining the front staircase, a high wainscot

of cottage sheathing in the living room, the back stairs completely removed, and on the second floor a partition had been moved so that access to the rear hall was cut off and a tiny little bedroom created thereby. Changing all of these items were my most drastic moves after leasing the house. Also the plate glass front door was retired in favor of a six-panelled door bought for three dollars in a wrecking yard. Orders were given to have all the old wallpaper stripped from the walls that we might have a new start when it came to papering.

While repairs on the house were going forward rapidly, I began to consider the question of old-time wallpapers, and to wonder just what sort of patterns Mrs. Hicks might have selected for her home. Gradually, out of the scraps of old wallpaper, from behind modern door trim and behind 1840 mantels that I removed, there began to emerge

fragments of papers that the Hicks family had lived with and others that were selected by families that succeeded them. In the second story north bedroom, I found fragments of fifteen different layers of wallpaper — a succession of patterns and printing processes that makes practically a history of the wallpaper industry for a century and a half in this country. In two other rooms I found pieces of interesting early papers, some of which I chose to reproduce, since they so peculiarly reflected the simple personality of the house.

Studying these early wallpaper fragments, we perceive that the oldest were made by a stencil process, the design being superimposed in white, or black and white, on a tinted ground. Thus I found a diamond pattern in white on a medium gray ground, and another where some sixteen white dots were arranged in a diamond, and a group of black dots following along the right side of the diamond like a shadow line. The third stencil pattern was far more intricate both in layout of design and in its employment of flower forms. Ogee curves of floral sprays interlaced themselves with circles of tiny dots and other ogee curves of large and small beads. This design was all in white on a sort of pompeian red background, the most colorful of the early papers uncovered.

The next papers appear to have been printed with woodblocks. I found one with a pattern in alternating stripes, first

121

geometrical and then a sort of vine which suggested a motif characteristic of early India prints. This pattern was in white on a subtle gray-blue background. The first paper in that downstairs room which was used for a commissary during the Revolution was a two-color block print — black and white on a medium gray ground. The design was a series of interlaced Chippendale Gothic arches beneath which were several different motifs, one a group of tulip flowers, another a small landscape in which a tiny church is discernible, and another shows a monumental obelisk. Perhaps this monument is in the churchyard, for all I know, for the fragments I found beneath old door trim are too narrow for me to tell where the various parts of this design fit together. The fact that this more elaborate paper was the first on the wall of what may have been the "parlor" suggests to my mind the possibility that the stencil process was used for the simpler and cheaper papers, and was not necessarily earlier than the block print patterns. On the other hand it is also possible that this more elaborate Chippendale paper was put on the wall when John Foxcroft came here to live in 1777.

Once the process of block printing was embarked upon, it was only a few years before the average paper was printed in four or five colors on a tinted background. Two rooms at the Hicks house were hung with that type of wallpaper known as "Directoire," where small scenes alternate with rosettes and are arranged in vertical formation between stripes. In the first floor north room, the second pattern was that of a small boy holding a large watering can above a garden of flowers. It was block printed in several tones of gray on a background of pearl gray with tiny white dots. With this paper a most attractive border in pale gray, terra cotta and white was used in a leaf spray design. The other "Directoire" type paper was found behind a mantel set up in 1840. This 1810 type of wallpaper also had a pale gray background with white dots, but was printed in two tones of dull red, two tones of green, and a neutral brown, besides the white just mentioned. I found very small fragments of a tulip and flower spray border with this wallpaper. After the "Directoire"

period, progress was made in color printing and bleached white paper for backgrounds was achieved, but art

122

retrogressed, so we have little interest in the large scale, poorly designed papers that followed those I have described.

We were optimists when we went to the Hicks house in 1922. While we knew that the university eventually wished to use the land upon which the old house stood, we hopefully looked forward to living here many years before Harvard might develop plans for that particular spot. We foolishly thought that expansion of that region might not come until our own need for the Hicks house had ceased to exist. The year 1928 brought a rude awakening. Plans for the huge new gymnasium began to be developed for our neighborhood. The entire square block in which the Hicks house stood was to be wiped out to make room for this vast athletic equipment. We received notice to vacate as the house was to be torn down within six months' time. The grim ogre of change seemed to be descending on the Hicks house for the last time.

Thanks to the efforts and financial assistance of the Cambridge Historical Society and the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, which between them raised almost half the costs, Harvard was induced to preserve and move the Hicks house, which travelled in December, 1928 to its present site at the corner of Boylston and South Streets. The expense of moving was shared with Harvard University, which supplied the new lot and still retained ownership of the building. To facilitate the moving, the main house was severed from the ell, bringing to light the heavy wrought iron barbs previously mentioned. Set upon a new cellar, with new bases to the two old chimneys, the old house submitted once again to complete rehabilitation. A lot of new painting was required, heaps of sand and dust had to be removed, but the hand-made wallpapers had survived the moving quite nobly. Happy in the fact that the Hicks house had not been torn down and thrown out, we renewed our efforts to make the place inviting and livable.

Still, the hand of change was not through with the old house. A brief year passed, then we received notice that our tenancy must terminate in twelve months' time, for the university had other uses for the place. A library for students was to be added to the Hicks house and reading rooms with shelves and shelves

123

of books were to be installed in the house itself. The old place would no longer be a home but a part of an institution, and with its new use there would pass into extinction the spirit of a home that we had so carefully rebuilt. The house we had loved and grown to be a part of was to cease being the perfect background for our antique furniture. What we did about our new home is another story which we may write some day.

As this article is being written, the work of change progresses. Already the huge brick "addition" in the rear is built and a covered passageway connecting the house with Smith Hall is under construction. We understand that several fireplace walls of simple panelling

will be installed in the old house, where the authorities believe panelling once existed. Window glass will be changed back to small panes, and simple trim for doors and windows will be uncovered or replaced if possible. Movable bookshelves from floor to ceiling will be placed in all the rooms and probably the entire house will be repainted both inside and out. The ceiling in the first floor north room has been replastered, as it was considered unsound, and the two simple attic rooms have lost their original appearance, since three dormer windows have been set into the rear of that old gambrel roof. The fine old-time kitchen, with its nine-foot mantel and large open fireplace, will be completely filled with library bookstacks and may never again know the cheery blaze of an open fire in wintry weather.

Prayerfully we hope that all this alteration will not entirely obliterate the old-time atmosphere and personality that has clung to the old house so bravely through all the years. In general, too few universities have sufficient respect for old houses, though they may spend thousands of dollars for research in foreign antiquities. They seem to forget that their own local old houses are history, a vivid and living record of events that once transpired.

124

OLD NORTH CAMBRIDGE

By THOMAS F. O'MALLEY

Read October 22, 1929

THE literature of Cambridge contains but little relating to the early days in North Cambridge. This does not necessarily mean that North Cambridge history is lacking in interest, but rather that the subject has not been written up. The region between Harvard Square and Alewife Brook is rich in historic interest and association. Cambridge's participation in the stirring events of April 19, 1775 was almost exclusively confined to the territory between Beech Street and the Arlington line. From the beginning of our settlement this upper part of the town, even though it was a place of small farms, was also a place of interesting happenings and of importance to the rest of the community. It has suffered because it has been neglected by the writer of local history. Today, he who would know our early history must search in original material, and he will find a wealth of it in our registry of deeds and probate office, and in the records of the county commissioners. The few facts here offered are gleaned largely from these sources.

In the early days and well down into the first half of the last century streets were not common in North Cambridge. Of course there was the great main highway known to us as Massachusetts Avenue and there were a few lanes. Right here I wish to commend the truthfulness of our early townsmen; with them a road was a road, and a lane was a lane. They did not call a narrow cartway a road or a street, but a lane, and the name it bore had some suggestion of its purpose or locality. Thus the present Rindge Avenue and Cedar Street was Kidder's Lane, and Harvey Street was Poor House Lane. Walden Street was a meandering cartway, a rod in width, running from the great road across to Vassal Lane, and seems to have had no particular name. Tannery Street was the ancient way to the fish weirs at Alewife Brook and dates back to 1636, when

125

Andrew Warner was directed to build a cartway there. Beech Street was the connecting link with the highway to Winter Hill and the Milk Row Road to Charlestown Neck.

As a highway Massachusetts Avenue had its beginning in 1635 and was the direct line of communication between Cambridge and the settlements begun at Concord in 1634. It appears in the records under a variety of names, all of which are sufficiently clear to identify it. Some of them persisted to a comparatively late date. Here are a few: "The Greate Coun-trey Road," the "Road to Menotomy," the "County Road," the "Road to Cambridge Farms," the "Road to West Cambridge," the "Road by Davenport's Tavern," and the "Road by Porter's Tavern." Along about the middle of the last century it became known as North Avenue and finally by its present name.

Although it has always followed the same general direction, there is strong reason for believing that at several places it may have been relocated. At least two relocations have come to my notice. The first was in April, 1724. At a meeting of the Proprietors of the Common Lands, Mr. Samuel Whittemore moved "that the Countrey Road against his lott at Jones's Hill may be removed more eastward, that his lott may be laid more together for the convenience of fencing" (Jones's Hill, otherwise known as Gallows Hill, is the elevation between Linnaean and Arlington Streets). Mr. Whittemore's petition was referred to a committee who advised that the road be relocated as prayed for and it was relocated. The second relocation was in 1832-33, when William Hunnewell, Abel Whitney, and thirty-four other residents in the vicinity of the present Porter Square filed with the county commissioners a petition setting forth "that a section of the County road leading from Harvard College toward Concord by the Tavern late of John Davenport, but now of Reuben Demmon, is now angular, circuitous and inconvenient, and at a moderate expense may be made straight and be thereby rendered shorter and less expensive and much more convenient and useful, without any injury to any one." It is not unlikely and quite possible that the purpose of this petition was to undo the mischief done in 1724 when Mr. Whittemore's "convenience of fencing" was the cause of relo-

cation. At any rate the commissioners found that public necessity and convenience required that the crooked way should be made straight, and decreed that it should go directly from Davenport's Tavern over land of Hepzibah Goddard to the gate post in the fence of Henry Potter, comprising that part of the avenue between Beech Street and Linnaean Street.

At that time the road had little resemblance to the broad, well-kept highway of today. It was a real old-fashioned country road, deep in dust in summer and muddy or full of ruts, according to the temperature, in winter.

In "A Cambridge Robinson Crusoe," John Holmes gives us a picture of the old road between Harvard Square and Beech Street as it was, say in the twenties. I quote from the imaginary conversation between the captain and Royal Morse: "Then, going along toward the West Cambridge road, there's a little three-cornered piece of common where the Light Horse always comes up at Commencement time. Oh, ain't that a handsome sight, captain? Well, up there in the corner is the minister's, . . . and there's Mr. Royal Morse's and Mr. Gannett's. . . . Then you come to the corner [Gannett House] and there's a little pasture lot

with a yellow barn on it. They always have a dancing tent there Commencements. . . . Well up the road there's about a dozen houses, say until you get to Davenport's Tavern [at Beech Street]. I suppose Davenport does a great business now with the country pungs that come down in the winter."

"Do you remember the houses, Royal, along the road pretty well?" asked the captain.

"Why, no, I don't, but about a third of 'em was little black story and a half houses, with gambrel roofs."

"Yes," said the captain, "and them houses, in my opinion, saw the row that was going on the nineteenth of April, '75."

This is a not inaccurate description of the old road even down to the days just before Cambridge became a city. There were scattered farmhouses, each with its pointed or gambrel roof (usually facing toward the south), with gables and a long lean-to at the back toward the north. Of these old houses, but four remain to us: the Cooper-Austin house on Linnaean Street, erected in 1657; the Watson-Davenport house on Massachu-

setts Avenue near Rindge Avenue, the main portion of which was built before 1757; the Solomon Sergeant, now McCrehan house, on Rindge Avenue nearly opposite Cedar Street, put up in 1792; and the old Dixon-Goddard-Fitch house which probably dates back to 1692. To these may be added the old house which now stands on a rear lot off Russell Street and which once stood on the avenue. This was a Watson house, also, and probably was the home of Daniel Watson, who in the early part of the nineteenth century owned a large tract of land beyond Russell Street.

While we are speaking of Massachusetts Avenue it might be well to digress for a moment and say a word about the city boundary line, which at Porter Square shoots off in a northeasterly direction and gathers in quite a bit of what seems properly to be Somerville territory before it again returns to the old line at Russell Street. In 1802 Nathaniel Goddard, Benjamin Goddard, Stephen Goddard, Josiah Wellington, and Nathaniel Prentiss occupied the region bounded by the present Massachusetts Avenue, White Street, Elm Street (Somerville), and Russell Street, the greater portion of which was then a part of Charlestown, and they were citizens of the latter town. Tradition hath it that they desired to become members of the First Parish in Cambridge; at any rate they wanted to become residents of Cambridge, so they appealed to the General Court, which happened to be in an accommodating mood, with the result that the hitherto straight boundary line was so stretched as to encompass their property and they were duly "set off from the Town of Charlestown and annexed to the Town of Cambridge." Sixteen years later, 1818, their neighbor, William Hunnewell, also desired to become part and parcel of Cambridge and an equally accommodating legislature again stretched the line and he, too, was "set off from Charlestown and annexed to Cambridge."

It was after 1800 that Porter Square began to assume the appearance of a square. In 1805 while the turnpike craze was epidemic, the Middlesex Turnpike Company was incorporated and proceeded to build a short straight line road from the present Lowell to Boston by way of the West Boston bridge, which had been opened to travel in 1793. Its line brought it through

128

North Cambridge and to it we owe the opening of a new road, first known as the Turnpike, later as Hampshire Street, and now as Beacon Street. Here the turnpike began at Davenport's Tavern at the corner of Beech Street, passed over the land of Stephen Goddard, Walter Frost, Jonathan Harris, Samuel Kent, and the heirs of Gideon Frost, coinciding with the present line of Somerville Avenue and Beacon Street from Porter Square to Washington Street in Somerville. After 1810, when the county commissioners formally and officially established it as a turnpike, it was called Hampshire Street. It was a toll road. In 1828, after a vigorous battle, in which the West Boston Bridge Company and the Craigie Bridge Corporation took a most pronounced part, a new piece of road was put through to connect with Elm Street or Milk Row Road near the present Craigie Street in Somerville, and a more direct line to Charles-town Neck was established. This piece of road is now that part of Somerville Avenue which runs from the foot of Elm Street into Porter Square.

The next event of importance hereabouts was the coming of the railroad. The Boston & Lowell Railroad was already a fact, but it touched only at East Cambridge. On March 17, 1841, the legislature chartered the Charlestown Branch Railroad with authority to build a line from Swett's wharf in Charlestown to Block Island at Fresh Pond in Cambridge. Its location in Cambridge was over the land of Ozias Morse, over Hampshire Street, crossing North Avenue south of Ball's store, through land of Abel Whitney to a point on land of Porter and Meacham (the Porter's Tavern property), and thence northwesterly in a straight line through the land of Porter and Meacham, Henry Potter, John Davenport, Samuel Sargent, and others until it reached Alewife Brook, substantially the line of the Fitchburg Railroad, its successor in title. (There is a plan of this location in the county engineer's office and is well worthy of examination by anyone interested in our local history.) The act of incorporation also provided that the railroad should cross Hampshire Street and North Avenue under bridges — a commendable provision which was destined to give rise to a heated and long drawn-out battle between the towns of Somerville and Cambridge on the one side and the newly established railroad

129

company on the other. It will be recalled that in 1805 the legislature had chartered the Middlesex Turnpike Corporation and that the corporation had built that part of the turnpike which was called Hampshire Street. For a long time prior to the coming of the railroad, the turnpike had ceased to be a paying proposition. Four days prior to the passage of the act creating the railroad corporation, viz., on March 13, 1841, the legislature passed an act dissolving the Middlesex Turnpike Corporation, and the surrender of its charter was accepted to take effect on June 1 following. By this same act it was provided that the turnpike, except so much as had already been, or before June 1, 1841, should be laid out and established as a town or county road, should be discontinued. Hampshire Street was

not laid out as a town or county road prior to June 1, 1841, but remained open and was used as a convenient private way by adjacent owners and all having occasion to use it. In January, 1842 the county commissioners were petitioned to lay it out as a public way and in September following did so. In the meantime the railroad had pushed its construction work and had built the bridge at North Avenue, but balked at building the one at Hampshire Street. In 1843 it brought its petition to the county commissioners, setting out that Hampshire Street, as recently laid out, obstructed and injured the railroad and asked to have the street discontinued or diverted; the purpose being, of course, to avoid the expense of the bridge. The county commissioners couldn't see any merit in the railroad's contention and not only denied its petition, but directed that the bridge should be built. The railroad flatly, persistently, and stubbornly refused to build the bridge, alleging that the county commissioners had no authority to lay out Hampshire Street as a county way after June 1, 1841. After much bickering all around, the towns of Cambridge and Somerville got together and went to the Supreme Judicial Court for a writ of mandamus to compel the railroad company to erect the bridge. The railroad secured eminent counsel, and the case was fought with bitterness and enthusiasm; neither side would yield in the slightest degree. The towns won. The court made short work of the railroad's objection, holding that it, the railroad, was bound to comply with the terms of the statute which created it. This decision

ended the fight, and the railroad company erected a bridge similar in construction to the one on North Avenue. The bridge at Walden Street was first erected prior to September, 1857.

Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson in his reminiscent chapter, "Life in Cambridge Town," written for "Cambridge of 1896," in referring to our locality in pre-city days, says: "North Cambridge as yet was not, though Porter's Tavern was." Porter's early became an important factor both in the business and social life of North Cambridge, and perhaps marked the beginning of the extensive cattle markets that flourished here for many years. Porter's, however, was not the first of the taverns here. The ancient inn was Davenport's, which stood on the side of the present St. James' Episcopal Church at the corner of Beech Street and the avenue. Davenport also owned the extensive establishment across the road and later known as Porter's. In 1830 John Davenport sold his entire tavern properties to Sylvester Edson, who came from Woodstock, Vermont. Edson managed the property for a few years, when it passed into the hands of the Charles River Bank, which held a mortgage on it. On April 1, 1837, the bank conveyed the property to George Meacham, Ebenezer Kimball, and Zacariah B. Porter; Meacham held a half interest and Kimball and Porter a quarter interest each. Zacariah B. Porter came from Brighton where cattle markets already existed, and soon became the dominating managing factor in the new enterprise. This was four years before the coming of the railroad. The property acquired by Porter and his associates comprised about seventeen and a half acres, and extended up the avenue to around Creighton Street, across the track and down to the present Upland Road, and included, besides the hotel, stables and slaughter houses. Not far away, at Walden Street, was the slaughter house of Henry Potter. The "Cattle Market" and "Porter's" grew apace and the names became synonymous. Within five years after Cambridge became a city it was found advisable to have a bank at North Cambridge to care for the cattle business. In 1851, Zacariah B. Porter, Walter M. Allen, and George Meacham and their successors were

incorporated as "the President, Directors and Company of the Cambridge Market Bank" to be established "at the place called Porter's

131

adjacent to the Cattle Market." The capital stock was \$100,000, divided into shares of \$100 each. A bank building was erected close by the hotel, not far from the site of the present North Cambridge Savings Bank. In 1853 the capital stock was increased to \$150,000. The business of the bank seems to have been almost entirely limited to cattle enterprises — at least it did not go into real estate mortgages, for it did not hold more than a half dozen during its sixteen years of existence. During its period of activity it drew to it some of the most active business men of the community. In 1856, George W. Lewis was president, Warren Sanger, cashier, and George Meacham, Henry Potter, Calvin Dimick, Samuel F. Woodbridge, and Chester W. Kingsley were on its board of directors. About the time of the end of the Civil War the bank closed up its affairs and in June, 1866 conveyed its real estate to Samuel F. Woodbridge.

Porter's had its social as well as business side. Colonel Higginson tells us how the Old Cambridge boys "watched with a pleased interest, not quite undemoralizing, the triumphant march of the 'Harvard-Washington Corps'— the college military company—to that hostelry for dinner on public days; and their less regular and decorous return." Lowell wrote of them that "their gyrating banner ... on the evening of training day was an accurate dynamometer of Willard's punch or Porter's flip." This was long before the days of the "Cambridge Idea." Porter's and the Cattle Market are now things of the past. The old hotel is gone and its once extensive grounds have long since been cut up and covered with buildings.

There were other taverns here, all more or less connected with the cattle market, and each having its complement of stables and cattle sheds. Also there was the race track, a natural if not a necessary adjunct to a cattle market. The race track, or "Trotting Park" as it was officially called, was on the large tract bounded northerly by the present Harvey Street, in the early days known as Poor House Lane; easterly by the present Cedar Street; southerly by Kidder's Lane, later Spruce Street and now Rindge Avenue; and westerly by a line about one hundred feet beyond the present Clifton Street. Like all orthodox trotting parks this one had its hotel or tavern. The hotel was

132

on Cedar Street and was known as the "Park House." The building is still standing, much remodelled and now used as a tenement block. From 1849 to 1853 it was conducted by Hiram Woodruff. In 1853 one E. Goodwin had it. In 1855 Francis D. Kidder and Samuel G. Reed, the owners of race track grounds, cut the tract up into streets and building lots.

On Massachusetts Avenue, near the corner of the present Frank Street, was another tavern known as the Elm House. This stood on what was a part of one of the Watson farms. In 1840 a tract of four and one quarter acres, together with the buildings thereon, was conveyed by Elizabeth Watson to Josiah Boynton, who probably first opened the tavern. In 1849 it was occupied by one Anna Corbett, a widow. At any rate she contemplated

remaining there as landlady for in November of that year she entered into an ante-nuptial agreement with William Woodruff in which it was recited that she had "certain personal estate consisting of household furniture and furnishings and household stuff now at the hotel called the Elm House . . . which she is desirous to continue to hold to her separate use" notwithstanding her forthcoming marriage. The schedule of furniture, etc., annexed to the agreement exhibits quite an array of equipment for a tavern and may have been the inducement for William to enter into the matrimonial venture. In 1851 Josiah Boynton conveyed the premises to Calvin Stevens, subject to a lease to William Woodruff for two years. Woodruff seems to have had the place for about four years. In 1853 it was carried on by E. C. Bates. Calvin Stevens conveyed the premises to George W. White, who in May, 1858 sold to Samuel F. Woodbridge. Mr. Woodbridge in early life was a butcher and cattle dealer and may have conducted a cattle market there. Part of the lot was sold to the Union Street Railway in 1873. The remainder of the estate was finally cut up into lots. Wood-bridge Street perpetuates the name of the last owner of this tavern.

There was yet another tavern on Massachusetts Avenue which flourished about this period and that was the Telegraph House. It stood on the corner of Harrison Street, now Hudson Street, on about the site of McColgan's drug store. In 1850 it was under the management of Daniel Mace, well known in those

days as a horseman. In 1852 it appears to have been conducted by one Cooly. How long it was a tavern I am unable to say. Prior to 1800 the premises belonged to James Munroe who had his blacksmith shop there. Munroe died in 1804. The part which the tavern afterwards occupied was set off to his son Nathaniel, who in 1817 sold it to George Meacham. The next year Meacham conveyed it to Hannah Barrett who had title until August, 1834, when James Haywood became the owner. In September, 1846, Haywood sold it to Ingalls Bunker, of New Market, New Hampshire. It is quite possible that Mr. Bunker may have established the tavern. The premises came into the possession of Mary Mace, wife of Daniel, in October, 1850, and was in her possession down into the seventies.

No discussion of Cambridge hotels or taverns up in this part of the town is complete without mention of the celebrated "Fresh Pond Hotel," long a famous and favorite place of resort. The founding of this hostelry brings us back to 1796 when Jacob Wyeth, shortly after his graduation from Harvard, bought of his father eight acres bordering on Fresh Pond upon which was erected the hotel. Mr. Wyeth conducted the business until he accumulated a large estate when he retired from active business and leased the hotel to his nephew, Jonas Wyeth, who also retired with a satisfactory fortune about 1840. The property in later years was used as a convent school and known as Mt. St. Joseph Academy, and finally was taken over by the city as a part of its water system, when the buildings were removed.

As the cattle market developed at Porter's, there began to be a noticeable movement in the real estate line. In 1845 Capt. Gilman Sargent acquired the Philemon Russell estate and cut it up into building lots and laid out Russell Street and Orchard Street from Beech Street to the old Daniel Watson farm northwest of Russell Street. This last-named property came into possession of George Meacham, Henry Potter, and Chester W. Kingsley in 1855, and was later cut up into streets and lots.

On the southwesterly side of the avenue and adjoining the Porter's Tavern property, Henry Potter had a large tract, in all about thirty-five acres, which extended up the avenue as far as the Davenport estate at the corner of Rindge Avenue and westerly beyond the railroad track. This property embraced

134

considerable of the Watson estate, a farm which had come into the possession of Dr. William Gamage. Dr. Gamage was a practicing physician at the village, as Harvard Square was then called, who had been quite active in many lines outside his profession and acquired a large amount of real estate. After his death, this property passed into the possession of Thomas Brewer, who sold it to Potter. Cogswell Avenue, Mead Street, and the easterly end of Walden Street are now laid out over part of it. The land on the corner of Cogswell Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue, where the first edifice of the North Cambridge Baptist Church stood, was given to the society by Henry Potter.

The large triangular-shaped area bounded by Massachusetts Avenue and Rindge Avenue and by a line about two hundred feet northwesterly from the present Rice Street was in 1850 owned by Joseph H. and George G. Rice, who, in June of that year, cut it up into building lots and laid out Pond, now Hollis Street, and Rice Street. This was originally a Goddard estate and successively passed through the hands of Thomas Russell, Richard Sullivan, and Ammi Cutter Teele until it came into the Rices.'

Other tracts in the neighborhood gradually came into the market and were opened up from time to time, but most of them considerably after the time when Cambridge became a city.

In those early days we had a school here — it was on Russell Street, on what was called the Winthrop school lot. An interesting account of it may be found in our first city directories, which, by the way, were printed by the Chronicle. The first religious body to establish itself in North Cambridge was a Baptist society known as the "Sabbath school," organized in 1846, and which for a time met in the Winthrop schoolhouse on Russell Street. This body later became the North Cambridge Baptist Church and erected, in 1854, the first meeting house in North Cambridge.

135

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

1927

President --- EPHRAIM EMERTON

Vice-Presidents --- MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, ROBERT WALCOTT

Secretary --- SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER, WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Treasurer --- GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

Curator --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Council

SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER, JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, STOUGHTON BELL, WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS, FRANK GAYLORD COOK, EPHRAIM EMERTON, PRESCOTT EVARTS, MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, JAMES LEONARD PAINE, ROBERT WALCOTT, GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

1928

President --- ROBERT WALCOTT

Vice-Presidents --- MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, STOUGHTON BELL

Secretary --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Treasurer --- GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

Curator --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Council

JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, STOUGHTON BELL, WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS, FRANK GAYLORD COOK, PRESCOTT EVARTS, MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, JAMES LEONARD PAINE, CAROLYN HUNTINGTON SAUNDERS, ROBERT WALCOTT, GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

136

1929

President --- ROBERT WALCOTT

Vice-Presidents --- MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, STOUGHTON BELL

Secretary --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Treasurer --- WILLARD HATCH SPRAGUE

Curator --- WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS

Council

JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, STOUGHTON BELL, WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS, FRANK GAYLORD COOK, PRESCOTT EVARTS, MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, JAMES LEONARD PAINE, CAROLYN HUNTINGTON SAUNDERS, WILLARD HATCH SPRAGUE, ROBERT WALCOTT

137

REGULAR MEMBERS

1927-1929

MARION STANLEY ABBOT, ANNE ELIZABETH ALLEN, MARY WARE ALLEN, CHARLES ALMY, ALBERT FRANCIS AMEE, SARAH RUSSELL AMES, ALBERT STOKES APSEY, AGNES GORDON BALCH, MARY EMORY BATCHELDER (L), SAMUEL FRANCIS BATCHELDER, ELIZABETH CHADWICK BEALE, JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, MABEL ARRABELLA LEWIS BELL, STOUGHTON BELL, EDWARD MCELROY BENSON, ALEXANDER HARVEY BILL, CAROLINE ELIZA BILL, MARION EDGERLY BILL, CLARENCE HOWARD BLACKALL, EMMA MURRAY BLACKALL, WARREN KENDALL BLODGETT, ELLA JOSEPHINE BOGGS, ANNABEL PERRY BONNEY, MARIA BOWEN, WALTER BENJAMIN BRIGGS, ADA LEILA CONE BROCK, ARTHUR HENDRICKS BROOKS, ELIZABETH HARRINGTON BROOKS, JESSIE WATERMAN BROOKS, SUMNER ALBERT BROOKS, CHARLES JESSE BULLOCK, JOSEPHINE FREEMAN BUMSTEAD, BERTHA CLOSE BUNTON, GEORGE HERBERT BUNTON, ANNIE JUMP CANNON, PHILIP GREENLEAF CARLETON, SARAH SWIFT SCHAFF CARLETON, FLORA KIRKENDALL CARVER, THOMAS NIXON CARVER, NEWTON RUSSELL CAZMAY, ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR., ANNIE BOURNE CHAPMAN, PHILIP PUTNAM CHASE, BERTHA HAMILTON CLARK, LESLIE LINWOOD CLEVELAND, EDITH MARY COE, MARGARET E. COGSWELL, ADA LOUISE COMSTOCK, FRANK GAYLORD COOK, LOUIS CRAIG CORNISH, SAMUEL McCHORD CROTHERS, SALLY ADAMS CUSHMAN, HENRY ORVILLE CUTTER, ELIZABETH ELLERY DANA, HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW DANA, RICHARD HENRY DANA, MARY HELEN DEANE, LILY EUGENIE DEKALB, ERNEST JOSEPH DENNEN, MARY DEANE DEXTER, EDWARD SHERMAN DODGE (L), HARRY FRANCIS ROBY DOLAN, ADELIN ANNA DOUGLASS, LAURA HOWLAND DUDLEY, WILLIAM HARRISON DUNBAR, HERBERT HUNTER DYER, FRANCES HOPKINSON ELIOT, SAMUEL ATKINS ELIOT, EMMONS RAYMOND ELLIS,

FRANCES WHITE EMERSON, WILLIAM EMERSON, EPHRAIM EMERTON, SYBIL CLARK EMERTON, PRESCOTT EVARTS, CLAIRE SCHATER FANDE, LILLIAN HORSFORD FARLOW, CHARLES NORMAN FAY, LILLIAN HALE FAY, EUNICE WHITNEY FARLEY FELTON, WILLIAM WALLACE FENN, EDWARD WALDO FORBES, WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD, FRANCES FOWLER, ESTHER STEVENS FRASER, DANA TAYLOR GALLUP, MARY ISABELLA GOZZALDI, VIRGINIA TANNER GREEN, LILLIAN HELEN HADLEY, THOMAS HADLEY, *EDWIN BLAISDELL HALE, EDWIN HERBERT HALL, ELIZABETH HARRIS, ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, FRANK WATSON HASTINGS, DORIS HAYES-CAVANAUGH, FRANK WILSON CHENEY HERSEY, STANLEY BARBOUR HILDRETH, ALISON BIXBY HILL, LESLIE WHITE HOPKINSON, CORNELIA CONWAY FELTON HORSFORD, KATHERINE HORSFORD, ALBERTA MANNING HOUGHTON, ARRIA SARGENT DIXWELL HOWE, LOIS LILLEY HOWE, BERTHA MORTON HOWLAND, EDA WOOLSON HURLBUT, ELDON REVARE JAMES, PHILA SMITH JAMES, JAMES RICHARD JEWETT, MARGARET WEYERHAEUSER JEWETT, ETHEL ROBINSON JONES, MABEL AUGUSTA JONES, WALLACE ST. CLAIR JONES, GEORGE FREDERICK KENDALL, MARGARET CROWNINSHIELD KENT, NORTON ADAMS KENT, JUSTINE HOUGHTON KERSHAW, ANNA READ LAMBER, WILLIAM COOLIDGE LANE, MAUD ADELA LAWSON, THOMAS WOLCOTT LITTLE, FLORA VIRGINIA LIVINGSTON, ALICE MARY LONGFELLOW, ABBOTT LAWRENCE LOWELL, DAVID GORDON LYON, MABEL EVERETT HARRIS LYON, ELIZABETH MACFARLANE, ETHEL MAY MACLEOD, WILLIAM MACKINTOSH MACNAIR, FRANCIS PEABODY MAGOUN, JR., MARGARET BOYDEN MAGOUN, EMMA ENDICOTT MAREAN, GEORGIE MARIA MARSTERS, DAVID THOMPSON WATSON McCORD, CHARLES JOHN McINTIRE, HERBERT BRUCE McINTIRE, LOUIS JOSEPH ALEXANDRE MERCIER, JOHN DOUGLAS MERRILL, DOROTHEA

FOOTE MERRIMAN, ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN, NELSON CASE METCALF, JOSIAH BYRAM MILLETT, EMMA MARIA CUTTER MITCHELL, HUGH MONTGOMERY, ALICE MANTON MORGAN

**Deceased.*

139

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON, VALMA MARIA MORSE, EMMA FRANCES MUNROE, ARTHUR BOYLSTON NICHOLS, EMILY ALAN SMITH NICHOLS, GERTRUDE FULLER NICHOLS, HENRY ATHEHTON NICHOLS, JOHN TAYLOR GILMAN NICHOLS, ALBERT PERLEY NORRIS, MARGARET NORTON, CARLETON ELDHEDGE NOYES, CHARLOTTE METCALFE NOYES, JAMES ATKINS NOYES, PENELOPE BARKER NOYES, THOMAS FRANCIS O'MALLEY, EDWARD HOLYOKE OSGOOD, MARGARET NICKERSON OSGOOD, JAMES LEONARD PAINE, MARY WOOLSON PAINE, MADELEINE LOUISE PALMER, JOHN SIMPSON PENMAN, CLARENCE HENRY POOR, JR., ARTHUR KINGSLEY PORTER, JOHN LYMAN PORTER, LUCY WALLACE PORTER, ALFRED CLAGHORN POTTER, DAVID THOMAS POTTINGER, ROSCOE POUND, HARRY SEATON RAND, MABEL RENA MAWHINNEY RAND, WILLARD REED, FREDERICK ALBERT RICHARDSON, HARRIETTS TABER RICHARDSON, FRED NORRIS ROBINSON, MARGARET BROOKS ROBINSON, JAMES HARDY ROPES, GERTRUDE SWAN RUNKLE, JOHN CORNELIUS RUNKLE, PAUL JOSEPH SACHS, MARY WARE SAMPSON, ELEANOR WHITNEY DAVIS SANGER (L), CAROLYN HUNTINGTON SAUNDERS, FRANCIS WEBBER SEVER, MARTHA SEVER, WILLARD HATCH SPRAGUE, GENEVIEVE STEARNS, GRACE WILLIAMSON STEDMAN, JOHN HUBBARD STURGIS, HELEN GRACE OLMSTEAD SWAN, WILLIAM DONNISON SWAN, JOHN HOUGHTON TAYLOR, JOSEPH GILBERT THORP, ALFRED MARSTON TOZZER, ELEANOR GRAY TUDOR (L), BERTHA HALLOWELL VAUGHAN, CHARLES PETER VOSBURGH, MAUDE BATCHELDER VOSBURGH, MARY RICHARDSON WALCOTT, ROBERT WALCOTT, GRACE REED WALDEN, HENRY BRADFORD WASHBURN, FREDERICA DAVIS WATSON, KENNETH GRANT TREMAYNE WEBSTER, SARAH CORDELIA FISHER WELLINGTON, ALICE MERRILL WHITE, FANNY GOTT WHITE, HORATIO STEVENS WHITE, WILLIAM RICHARDSON WHITTEMORE, OLIVE SWAN WILLIAMS, SAMUEL WILLISTON, GEORGE GRAFTON WILSON, JOHN WILLIAM WOOD, JR., CHARLES HENRY CONRAD WRIGHT, GEORGE GRIER WRIGHT

140

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

GARDNER WELD ALLEN, HOLLIS RUSSELL BAILEY, MARY PEHSIS BAILEY, JOSEPH GARDNER BARTLETT, MARION BROWN FESSENDEN, FRANCIS APTHORP FOSTER, ANNA LYMAN GRAY, ELIZA MASON HOPPIN, RYSSE GILMAN HOUGHTON (L), ERNEST LOVERING, PHILLIPPE BELKNAP MARCOU, BRADFORD HENDRICK PEIRCE, LILLIAN CLARK RICHARDSON, PHILLIP LEPPINGWELL SPALDING, ALICE MATHEWS VAN BRUNT, MARY LEE WARE

HONORARY MEMBER

JAMES FORD RHODES